
ACTIONREASONINGBENCH: Reasoning about Actions with and without Ramification Constraints

Divij Handa *
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ
dhanda@asu.edu

Pavel Dolin *
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ
pdolin@asu.edu

Shrinidhi Kumbhar *
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ
skumbha4@asu.edu

Chitta Baral
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ
chitta@asu.edu

Tran Cao Son
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM
stran@nmsu.edu

Abstract

Reasoning about actions and change (RAC) has historically driven the development of many early AI challenges, such as the frame problem, and many AI disciplines, including non-monotonic and commonsense reasoning. The role of RAC remains important even now, particularly for tasks involving dynamic environments, interactive scenarios, and commonsense reasoning. Despite the progress of Large Language Models (LLMs) in various AI domains, their performance on RAC is underexplored. To address this gap, we introduce a new benchmark, ACTIONREASONINGBENCH, encompassing 13 domains and rigorously evaluating LLMs across eight different areas of RAC. These include - *Object Tracking*, *Fluent Tracking*, *State Tracking*, *Action Executability*, *Effects of Actions*, *Numerical RAC*, *Hallucination Detection*, and *Composite Questions*. Furthermore, we also investigate the indirect effect of actions due to *ramification* constraints for every domain. Finally, we evaluate our benchmark using open-sourced and commercial state-of-the-art LLMs, including GPT-4o, Gemini-1.0-Pro, Llama2-7b-chat, Llama2-13b-chat, Llama3-8b-instruct, Gemma-2b-instruct, and Gemma-7b-instruct. Our findings indicate that these models face significant challenges across all categories included in our benchmark.

1 Introduction

Reasoning about actions and change (RAC) is a cornerstone in artificial intelligence, tracing back to foundational work in the early 1960s (McCarthy et al., 1963). In the early days, the primary focus was on developing logical systems to reason about actions and changes in the world. One of the significant challenges was to succinctly express the effects of an action on changeable properties of the world, known as fluents. For instance, consider the statement: “Moving an object from location X to location Y will result in the object being at location Y”. While direct effects on the affected fluents could be expressed, formalizing the impact on unaffected fluents posed a significant challenge, referred to as the “frame problem”. For example, “moving a block from the table to the chair, does not affect other objects on the table”. This challenge became even more complex when the descriptions involved relationships between fluents, leading to indirect effects or *ramifications* of actions. An example of this is the constraint “a block can’t be at two places at the same time”, which implies that moving a block from position X to position Y will result in the block no longer being at X.

*These authors contributed equally to this work

It took multiple decades of research to create a comprehensive logical formalization that adequately addressed these issues. This resulted in the labor-intensive development of numerous handcrafted rules and logics that detail the effects and preconditions of actions (Reiter, 2001). Considering the importance of RAC in several reasoning tasks, it is no surprise that in recent years, the natural language processing (NLP) community has shown an interest in this area (He et al., 2023) (Spiliopoulou et al., 2022) (Banerjee et al., 2020). Moreover, LLM-based agents that perform complex decision tasks also involve actions (Kohli and Sun, 2024) (Zhou et al., 2024) (Zhao et al., 2024).

Translating rules into natural language reduces the manual effort of writing every rule in logic programming. Despite the benefits, the inherent complexities of language and the requirement to follow long reasoning chains pose substantial challenges for LLMs (Wang et al., 2024) (Mu et al., 2023). LLMs have been tested extensively on several reasoning domains, including planning (Valmeekam et al., 2024a) (Valmeekam et al., 2024b), commonsense reasoning (Sakaguchi et al., 2021) (Talmor et al., 2019) (Zhang et al., 2018), mathematical reasoning (Imani et al., 2023) (Ahn et al., 2024), temporal reasoning (Tan et al., 2023) (Aghzal et al., 2023), and logical reasoning (Parmar et al., 2024a) (Luo et al., 2024). However, despite their crucial role, LLMs on RAC are heavily under-explored. This study seeks to fill this gap by introducing a new benchmark, ACTIONREASONINGBENCH, that pinpoints where LLMs struggle in RAC.

In our work, we utilize 13 domains from International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (1998) (IPC) in creating ACTIONREASONINGBENCH with the action-sequences varying from length 1 to 19. ACTIONREASONINGBENCH is categorized into 8 distinct categories - *Objects Tracking*, *Fluent Tracking*, *State Tracking*, *Action Executability*, *Effects of Actions*, *Numerical RAC*, *Hallucination Detection*, and *Composite Questions* (Category details in Section 3.1). Each category evaluates a specific aspect of RAC. Additionally, we formulate *ramification* constraints for each domain, which introduces indirect effects of actions, thereby increasing the complexity (McIlraith, 2000) and enhancing the evaluation of LLMs reasoning capabilities. Lastly, we create an obfuscated variant of ACTIONREASONINGBENCH that replaces the English names of objects and properties with a string of randomly generated characters. This obfuscated variant assesses whether the LLMs understand the rules described in the context or simply rely on their pre-training parametric knowledge.

Highlights of our benchmark, ACTIONREASONINGBENCH, along with the comparison to previous benchmarks on RAC, are presented in table 1. We evaluate five open-source LLMs, encompassing three different LLM families, as well as two leading proprietary LLMs, GPT-4o (Achiam et al., 2023) and Gemini-1.0-Pro (Team et al., 2023). We conduct a comprehensive analysis of different categories in RAC along with the impact of increasing model size and various few-shot settings to observe the variations in the performance. This multifaceted approach not only highlights the capacities and limitations of LLMs in handling complex RAC tasks but also sheds light on their potential utility (Sharma, 2019) (Sap et al., 2019) and applicability in practical LLM-based agents (Yao et al., 2022) (Aksitov et al., 2023). Our evaluation reveals that LLMs struggle to comprehend *State Tracking*, *Effects of Actions*, *Numerical RAC*, and *Composite Questions*, with their performance decreasing even further as the length of action sequence increases. Furthermore, LLMs exhibit difficulty in reasoning when queried about negative fluents. We also investigate the effect of *ramification* on these categories, analyzing the varied responses to ramification within each category. The detailed results of our findings are discussed in Section 5.

2 Related Works

Reasoning about Actions and Change Our work builds on an existing body of RAC literature. Works by He et al. (2023) and Banerjee et al. (2020) focus on creating RAC datasets from IPC and evaluating LLMs. Spiliopoulou et al. (2022) explores RAC within the scope of real-world physical attributes, intersecting with commonsense reasoning. RAC has also been investigated using multi-modal systems (Sampat et al., 2022a), (Sampat et al., 2022b).

	PlanBench	TRAC	(Ours)
# of domains	2	1	13
Obfuscation of domains	✓	×	✓
# of queries	26k	15k	123k
Binary Questions (T/F)	×	✓	✓
Free Answer	✓	×	✓
Max Action Sequence Length	48	3	19
Max # of objects	24	5	28
Plan Verification	✓	✓	✓
Executability of Actions	✓	✓	✓
Effects Checking (on state)	✓	✓	✓
Ramifications (all 8 question types)	×	×	✓
Composite Questions	×	×	✓
Effects Checking (on Fluents)	×	×	✓
Effect Checking (on Objects)	×	×	✓
Numerical Reasoning	×	×	✓
Hallucination Identification	×	×	✓
Subcategories of Fluents	×	×	✓

Table 1: Differences between ACTIONREASONINGBENCH (Ours) and previous benchmarks on reasoning about actions and change. PlanBench (Valmeekam et al., 2024a) ; TRAC (He et al., 2023)

Planning Our study is inspired by several benchmarks developed using IPC to evaluate LLM in planning (Valmeekam et al., 2024a), (Valmeekam et al., 2024b).

Data Creation from Logic Programs To create a robust dataset, we use deterministic logical solvers, following approaches similar to those used by Stein and Koller (2023) and Valmeekam et al. (2024a). For additional related literature on reasoning adjacent to RAC in Appendix A

3 About ACTIONREASONINGBENCH

3.1 Question Categories

The questions are classified into five different categories as follows. Refer to Appendix I for examples of questions and prompts for each question category.

1. **Object Tracking** - This category contains questions on the status of a particular object that is present in the domain. For example, in the *Blocksworld* domain, an objects-tracking question might be *Is block b3 on the table and not clear?*
2. **Effects of Actions** - This category contains questions that inquire about the effect of taking a given action. For example, in the *Mystery* domain, an effects-of-action question can be *From the current state, the vehicle v0 moves from location l1 to l0, and has fuel-level f6 and f5, which properties of the state will be true now?*
3. **Fluent Tracking** - This category contains questions about the fluents, i.e. properties of the domain, that are true or false for a given object. For instance, in the *NPuzzle* domain, a fluent-tracking question might be *List all the neighbors of tile t_3.*
4. **State Tracking** - This category encompasses and extends the *Fluent Tracking* category. It involves querying about all the fluents present in the domain that are true or false at a given moment. For instance, in the *Goldminer* domain, a state-tracking question can be *What are all the valid properties in this state?*
5. **Action Executability** - This category contains questions regarding the executability of a particular action in the given state. For instance, in the *Miconic* domain, an action-executability question can be *List all executable actions present in the current state.*
6. **Numerical RAC** - Questions requiring a numerical response fall under this category. The questions can be from any of the 5 categories listed above. For example, in the *Spanner* domain, a Numerical-RAC question can be *What are the number of executable actions in the current state?*
7. **Hallucination Detection** - This category includes identifying questions about objects, actions, or fluents (i.e. properties of the state) that are not mentioned in the domain description and are entirely fabricated. For example, in the *Depots* domain, a hallucination-detection question can be *Given the following properties of the state, which one is not defined. Write None if all are defined. Crate2 is not on pallet4, crate1 is in truck2, crate3 is next to truck3.*
8. **Composite Question** - This category contains questions combining the above-mentioned categories. These questions require multiple reasoning steps as they combine up to 3 different categories. For example, in the *Satellite* domain, a composite question can be *What are the derived properties of the state for satellite0 before the first infeasible action in the sequence? Write None if there are none*

3.2 Questions Subcategories: Fluents and Static Properties

We further divide the question categories, *Object Tracking*, *Effects of Actions*, and *Fluent Tracking* into 4 subcategories depending on the fluent type as these categories fundamentally pertain to questions regarding fluents.

1. **Base Fluents** - Fluents that are not dependent on any other fluent and can change due to an action are known as base fluents. For instance, *bomb_at* is a base fluent in the *Goldminer* domain, which defines whether a bomb is at a specific location or not.
2. **Base Fluents with Constraints** - These fluents are a type of *ramification* constraint that depends on themselves rather than other fluents. For example, the fluent *at* present in the *Depot* domain depends only on itself, i.e., if a truck is *at* location l0, it can't be *at* location l1. We include these constraints in the domain description such as "A truck can be only at one location at a time."

3. **Derived Fluents** - Fluents that depend on other fluents, reflecting a level of dependency and interaction, are known as derived fluents. They also constitute a part of *ramification* constraint. For example, the fluent *free* in the Grippers domain is a derived fluent as it directly depends on the fluent *carry*. The relationship is a consequence of the following constraint: A robot’s gripper is said to be *free* if the robot is not *carrying* any object with its gripper.
4. **Static Properties** - properties that do not change throughout, irrespective of any action taken, are known as static fluents. For example, the fluent *connected* in the Visittall domain represents whether two locations are connected or not. The actions can move the robot from one location to another, but the locations will always be connected regardless of any action.

For examples of questions highlighting the above-mentioned fluents, refer to Appendix J. Finally, we create questions with negative fluents for every fluent type, which allows us to evaluate the understanding of LLMs for negation present in RAC.

3.3 Dataset Structure and Variations

Selected Domains ACTIONREASONINGBENCH¹ comprises 13 domains, handpicked from IPC, which offers benchmarks for state-of-the-art planning systems intending to facilitate research in planning. We focused on collecting deterministic domains, where every action has deterministic preconditions and effects. Since IPC contains a lot of domains involving transportation, we divided the 13 domains into 7 transportation and 6 non-transportation domains. More details about the domains are present in Appendix F.17.

Domain Descriptions with and without Ramification Constraints Ramification constraint refers to the indirect effects of an action. Effective reasoning of these constraints is essential for a robust AI system capable of predicting and reasoning about the outcomes of actions. For instance, in the domain *Goldminer*, the robot’s arm is said to be empty if it is not holding a laser, stone, or gold. Examples of domains with and without ramification constraints are in appendix H.1 and H.2 respectively.

Action-Sequence Lengths We generate questions with action-sequences of length 1, 5, 10, 15, and 19 to verify the action-following capabilities of LLMs.

Obfuscations Since the IPC data is publicly available and talked about on the internet, LLMs might have an overlap of pre-training data with these domains. To assess the reasoning capabilities of the models, we obfuscate the objects, fluents, and actions present in the domain with a randomly generated string. This forces the LLM to rely on the user’s description rather than its parametric knowledge. Examples of obfuscated prompts are presented in Appendix K.4.

Answer Types For all the categories mentioned in the previous section, we formulate two different types of questions based on the nature of the answer. First, a simple binary question, where the answer is either True or False. Second, we ask a subjective question, where the answer can be multiple objects, actions, or properties of the state. Examples of answer types are presented in Appendix I.

3.4 Data Creation

The question creation pipeline comprises four stages, as illustrated in Figure 1. The selected domain in the IPC is represented in the form of PDDL (refer to Appendix F.19 for examples). This PDDL is used to generate 10 initial and goal conditions. Subsequently, we utilize the PDDL solver and validator to obtain and validate the action-sequences necessary to reach the goal state. Next, we

	test	train
Action Executability	359	4841
Effects	1065	10085
Fluent Tracking	1730	21671
Hallucination	370	21086
Numerical Reasoning	360	19140
Object Tracking	1718	9876
State Tracking	254	2996
Composite Questions	360	15199
Base Fluents	1048	6847
Base Fluents + Const.	1162	12843
Derived Fluents	935	8760
Static Properties	1140	10160
Total Unique Questions	6216	104894
Action-Sequence Lengths	1,10,19 (test)	
Answer Types	1,5,10,15,19 (train)	
Ramifications	True/False and Free	
Obfuscations	With and Without	
Selected Domains	With and Without	
Domain Types	13	
	Transport and Non Transp.	

Table 2: Statistics of training and testing splits of ACTIONREASONINGBENCH

¹Code and data available at https://github.com/izuminka/reasoning_about_actions




Figure 1: Question generation pipeline for ACTIONREASONINGBENCH. Stage 1: Computation and verification of PDDL instances and plans. Stage 2: Conversion of PDDL instances and plans to ASP. Stage 3: Computation of the action-state space via ASP and Python. Stage 4: Generation of natural language questions based on state-action space.

convert the PDDL domains and instances into ASP descriptions via templates. In the third stage, we employ ASP solvers to generate the action-state space and extract fluents for each state and all executable and inexecutable actions. Finally, the state-action data is converted into questions using a Python-based template. We introduce up to five natural language variants for every object, action, and fluent to enhance the linguistic diversity of the dataset. Additionally, we manually translate the domain descriptions from PDDL to natural language and incorporate ramification constraints to these domains.

3.5 Data Validation

The question-generation process utilizes traditional deterministic planners to accurately create the state space, ensuring action-sequences’ correctness and their effects. This state space is then transformed by a natural language converter, followed by manual validation by three independent annotators on a small subset of the data from every domain to ensure the data quality. Each question is scored on a scale from 1 to 5, assessing the soundness and comprehensibility of the natural language, resulting in an average score of 4.215. Additional details on data validation can be found in Appendix B. Furthermore, the domain description is reviewed by two domain experts to verify its accurate conversion from PDDL.

3.6 Data Splits

We divided the benchmark into two splits, one for training and the other for testing the models. Table 2 presents the breakdown of categories in the training and testing splits. Since multiple subcategories defined in section 3.2 are present in categories *effects*, *fluent tracking*, and *object tracking*, these categories dominate the training split of the dataset. For the test split, we ensured a balance in terms of action-sequence length, question categories, fluent subcategories, answer type (with equal proportions of true, false, and free-answer), and across all domains.

4 Experiments and Evaluation

We evaluate our benchmark, ACTIONREASONINGBENCH, using 7 different LLMs with 4 different prompt settings. These evaluations encompass all combinations of varying action-sequence lengths, with and without ramification constraints and with and without obfuscation. Our evaluation uses 2 proprietary state-of-the-art LLMs, GPT-4o (Achiam et al., 2023) and Gemini-1.0-Pro (Team et al., 2023), alongside 5 open-source LLMs, Gemma-2b-instruct, Gemma-7b-instruct (Team et al., 2024), Llama2-7b-chat, Llama2-13b-chat (Touvron et al., 2023), and Llama3-8b-instruct (AI, 2024). Each LLM is tested with zero-shot, few-shot-1, few-shot-3, and few-shot-5 prompting techniques. The results are presented for binary (true/false) questions and free-form answers. We further fine-tuned

Llama3-8b-instruct using the training data split described in Section 3.6. Given the limited context length of the open-source LLMs, we excluded examples exceeding the context length of 4096 tokens. Fine-tuning was performed separately for free-answer and binary questions. Refer to appendix D to see the fine-tuning details.

The evaluation of binary and free-form answers is conducted independently. We extracted "true" and "false" keywords from the response and compared them against the ground truth for binary answers. Since free-form answer evaluation can't rely on exact string matching, human evaluation was employed for GPT-4o and Gemini-1.0-Pro. We further fine-tune RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) to evaluate all models. Further details regarding the evaluation process are provided in appendix C.2 and E.1. We additionally report the standard error of the mean (SEM)² for all conducted experiments. All the experiments are done on 8 A100 GPUs.

5 Results and Discussion

In this section we highlight all the results and analysis performed using our benchmark, ACTION-REASONINGBENCH, using the experimental setup defined in Section 4. Table 3 summarizes the performance of all LLMs on the binary questions.³ Table 4 summarizes the results of free-answer human-evaluation. Zero-shot, Free Answer evaluation on the Roberta Classifier, and results for obfuscations-ramifications combinations are presented in Appendix C. We present additional observations in Appendix C.3

Act. Seq.	Question Categories	GPT-4o few shot 1	Gemini Pro few shot 1	LLaMa2 13b few shot 1	LLaMa3 8b few shot 1	LLaMa2 7b few shot 1	Gemma 7b few shot 1	LLaMa3 8b fine-tuned
1	Object Trk.	79.62 _{1.76}	69.33 _{2.01}	55.15 _{2.17}	43.62 _{2.16}	47.14 _{2.18}	49.14 _{2.18}	61.33 _{2.13}
	Fluent Trk.	83.39 _{1.6}	68.75 _{1.99}	45.67 _{2.14}	40.81 _{2.11}	42.91 _{2.12}	55.51 _{2.13}	58.64 _{2.11}
	State Trk.	70.91 _{6.12}	65.45 _{6.41}	52.73 _{6.73}	50.91 _{6.74}	47.27 _{6.73}	61.82 _{6.55}	49.09 _{6.74}
	Action Exec.	79.75 _{4.52}	70.89 _{5.11}	55.05 _{5.56}	55.05 _{5.56}	61.25 _{5.45}	50.05 _{5.59}	62.55 _{5.41}
	Effects	59.75 _{2.75}	59.69 _{2.74}	49.06 _{2.79}	41.56 _{2.76}	54.37 _{2.78}	46.52 _{2.81}	45.62 _{2.78}
	Num. Reas.	55.13 _{5.63}	52.55 _{5.58}	48.75 _{5.59}	43.75 _{5.55}	48.75 _{5.59}	45.05 _{5.56}	43.75 _{5.55}
	Hallucination	93.67 _{2.74}	82.94 _{2.25}	56.25 _{5.55}	70.05 _{1.2}	58.75 _{5.5}	58.23 _{5.55}	56.25 _{5.55}
	Composite	76.71 _{4.95}	68.49 _{5.44}	52.54 _{6.5}	56.94 _{5.84}	54.24 _{6.49}	54.17 _{5.87}	—
AVG		76.33 _{1.02}	67.14 _{1.12}	50.66 _{1.2}	44.87 _{1.19}	48.65 _{1.2}	51.51 _{1.19}	56.06 _{1.21}
10	Object Trk.	77.26 _{1.8}	66.79 _{2.02}	55.62 _{2.13}	47.89 _{2.14}	47.88 _{2.14}	50.09 _{2.14}	64.04 _{2.06}
	Fluent Trk.	81.78 _{1.66}	62.36 _{2.08}	46.49 _{2.14}	38.19 _{2.09}	39.48 _{2.1}	50.75 _{2.16}	58.49 _{2.12}
	State Trk.	57.41 _{6.73}	62.96 _{6.57}	48.15 _{6.8}	61.11 _{6.63}	48.15 _{6.8}	62.96 _{6.57}	50.06 _{6.8}
	Action Exec.	55.13 _{5.63}	53.75 _{5.57}	52.55 _{5.58}	48.75 _{5.59}	55.05 _{5.56}	60.05 _{5.48}	35.05 _{5.33}
	Effects	56.96 _{2.79}	61.56 _{2.72}	48.12 _{2.79}	43.75 _{2.77}	50.94 _{2.79}	45.62 _{2.78}	48.12 _{2.79}
	Num. Reas.	57.69 _{5.59}	47.55 _{5.58}	47.55 _{5.58}	48.75 _{5.59}	56.25 _{5.55}	44.87 _{5.63}	50.05 _{5.59}
	Hallucination	83.33 _{4.22}	75.04 _{4.84}	50.05 _{5.59}	62.55 _{5.41}	57.55 _{5.3}	57.55 _{5.3}	50.05 _{5.59}
	Composite	70.13 _{5.22}	57.14 _{5.64}	47.46 _{6.5}	36.05 _{5.4}	61.02 _{6.35}	54.05 _{5.79}	—
AVG		72.51 _{1.06}	62.88 _{1.15}	50.17 _{1.19}	44.82 _{1.18}	47.44 _{1.19}	50.59 _{1.19}	56.14 _{1.2}
19	Object Trk.	74.29 _{1.91}	67.42 _{2.04}	55.49 _{2.16}	50.57 _{2.18}	48.48 _{2.17}	47.16 _{2.17}	66.29 _{2.06}
	Fluent Trk.	73.63 _{1.95}	58.75 _{2.17}	45.33 _{2.2}	43.39 _{2.19}	42.02 _{2.18}	50.88 _{2.21}	60.12 _{2.16}
	State Trk.	59.09 _{7.41}	59.09 _{7.41}	47.73 _{7.53}	50.07 _{7.4}	54.55 _{7.51}	59.09 _{7.41}	52.27 _{7.53}
	Action Exec.	55.13 _{5.63}	52.55 _{5.58}	50.05 _{5.59}	53.75 _{5.57}	46.25 _{5.57}	51.28 _{5.66}	42.55 _{5.3}
	Effects	53.97 _{2.81}	54.89 _{2.79}	51.12 _{2.81}	40.06 _{2.75}	53.31 _{2.8}	46.32 _{2.83}	51.42 _{2.81}
	Num. Reas.	51.28 _{5.66}	48.75 _{5.59}	50.05 _{5.59}	52.55 _{5.58}	51.25 _{5.59}	38.75 _{5.45}	53.75 _{5.57}
	Hallucination	88.61 _{3.57}	78.75 _{4.57}	58.75 _{5.5}	67.55 _{5.24}	61.25 _{5.45}	56.96 _{5.57}	47.55 _{5.58}
	Composite	62.82 _{5.47}	57.69 _{5.59}	51.61 _{6.35}	35.06 _{5.44}	59.68 _{6.23}	44.16 _{5.66}	—
AVG		68.17 _{1.13}	60.84 _{1.18}	50.91 _{1.21}	46.81 _{1.2}	48.62 _{1.21}	48.54 _{1.21}	58.43 _{1.22}

Table 3: Performance of LLMs on the binary questions (T/F) without obfuscations and ramifications. The results are split up by action-sequence lengths and question categories.

Performance of Smaller Open-Source LLMs Approaches Random Table 3 reveals that smaller models, specifically Gemma-2b and Lamma-7b, consistently exhibit poor performance across all action-sequence lengths, with results often approaching random chance levels. This trend highlights the challenges these LLMs encounter in comprehending and responding to the complexities of the tasks. Additionally, further analysis reveals that Lamma-13b’s performance is similarly close to random (50%) in the few-shot-1 setting. There is a slight improvement with few-shot-5, as seen in

²SEM= $\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$, where σ is the standard deviation, and n is the number of samples

³AVG denotes the average calculated across all categories for a given action-sequence length and model

		Human Annotated		Evaluated With Tuned RoBERTa Classifier					
Plan Len.	Question Categories	GPT-4o few shot 1	Gemini Pro few shot 1	GPT-4o few shot 1	Gemini Pro few shot 1	LLaMa2 13b few shot 1	LLaMa3 8b few shot 1	LLaMa2 7b few shot 1	Gemma 7b few shot 1
19	Object Trk.	85.0 _{7.98}	80.0 _{8.94}	79.49 _{6.47}	43.59 _{7.94}	52.5 _{7.9}	57.57 _{.82}	40.07 _{.75}	37.57 _{.65}
	Fluent Trk.	30.0 _{10.25}	20.0 _{8.94}	9.09 _{4.33}	11.11 _{4.68}	4.26 _{2.94}	4.26 _{2.94}	10.64 _{4.5}	12.77 _{4.87}
	State Trk.	45.0 _{11.12}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
	Action Exec.	45.0 _{11.12}	50.0 _{11.18}	54.29 _{8.42}	59.38 _{8.68}	7.69 _{4.27}	33.33 _{7.55}	17.95 _{6.15}	17.95 _{6.15}
	Effects	30.0 _{10.25}	10.0 _{6.71}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
	Num. Reas.	15.0 _{7.98}	10.0 _{6.71}	13.51 _{5.62}	7.54 _{1.6}	2.52 _{.47}	5.0 _{3.45}	2.52 _{.47}	12.5 _{5.23}
	Hallucination	40.0 _{10.95}	45.0 _{11.12}	40.43 _{7.16}	46.81 _{7.28}	12.77 _{4.87}	21.28 _{5.97}	17.02 _{5.48}	17.39 _{5.59}
	Composite	50.0 _{11.18}	45.0 _{11.12}	47.37 _{8.1}	45.71 _{8.42}	43.59 _{7.94}	12.5 _{5.23}	43.59 _{7.94}	47.5 _{7.9}
AVG		42.5 _{3.91}	32.5 _{3.7}	34.36 _{3.15}	30.41 _{3.12}	12.18 _{1.99}	18.45 _{2.36}	13.65 _{2.09}	15.19 _{2.18}

Table 4: Performance of LLMs on Free Answers questions. Human annotation is performed for proprietary LLMs and RoBERTa evaluation on every LLM.

Table 5; however, it remains only marginally above random. This incremental improvement indicates some level of adaptation or learning within specific frameworks, but overall, Llama-13b struggles to achieve meaningful accuracy. These findings suggest that smaller open-source models are incapable of effectively performing RAC.

Fine-Tuning Improves Some Categories but Deteriorates Others After fine-tuning Llama3-8b, we observed improvements in categories *object tracking* and *fluent tracking*. Conversely, there was a decline in performance in the categories *effects of actions* and *hallucination detection*. These results indicate that merely fine-tuning LLMs with more data might not address all the challenges in RAC.

Obfuscations Lowers the Performance Across All Dimensions Our analysis, as displayed in Table 3 (without obfuscations) compared to Table 10 (with obfuscations), reveals that introducing obfuscations leads to a decrease in performance for all the model across all question categories, action-sequence lengths, fluent types, and domain types. This decrease highlights the model’s reliance on the knowledge acquired through pre-training data and not comprehending the rules given in the context while prompting.

Numerical Reasoning is Near Random for All Action-sequence Lengths An analysis of Figure 2 reveals that numerical reasoning tasks consistently gets around 50% accuracy across both transportation and non-transportation domains. This level of accuracy indicates a fundamental limitation in the models’ ability to numerically reason about actions. This inability to perform numerical reasoning is not confined to RAC but is also reflected in broader contexts (Ahn et al., 2024).

5.0.1 Increase in Few shots, Helps in Domain Understanding, But not in Reasoning

Question Category	Gemini Pro			LLaMa2 13b			Gemma 7b		
	zero shot	few shot 1	few shot 5	zero shot	few shot 1	few shot 5	zero shot	few shot 1	few shot 5
Object Trk.	69.51 _{2.0}	67.42 _{2.04}	67.47 _{2.2}	56.06 _{2.16}	55.49 _{2.16}	60.14 _{4.17}	56.06 _{2.16}	47.16 _{2.17}	52.23 _{2.56}
Fluent Trk.	58.56 _{2.17}	58.75 _{2.17}	61.04 _{2.31}	39.88 _{2.16}	45.33 _{2.2}	55.43 _{5.18}	39.88 _{2.16}	50.88 _{2.21}	53.64 _{2.69}
State Trk.	47.73 _{7.53}	59.09 _{7.41}	56.17 _{.75}	47.73 _{7.53}	47.73 _{7.53}	—	47.73 _{7.53}	59.09 _{7.41}	57.89 _{11.33}
Action Exec.	51.25 _{5.59}	52.5 _{5.58}	51.52 _{6.15}	50.0 _{5.59}	50.0 _{5.59}	61.54 _{13.49}	50.0 _{5.59}	51.28 _{5.66}	54.07 _{0.05}
Effects	53.63 _{2.8}	54.89 _{2.79}	64.87 _{2.86}	51.74 _{2.81}	51.1 _{2.81}	51.72 _{5.36}	51.74 _{2.81}	46.3 _{2.83}	63.93 _{3.24}
Num. Reas.	53.75 _{5.57}	48.75 _{5.59}	50.0 _{5.98}	51.25 _{5.59}	50.0 _{5.59}	46.15 _{9.78}	51.25 _{5.59}	38.75 _{5.45}	48.33 _{6.45}
Hallucination	80.0 _{4.47}	78.75 _{4.57}	94.12 _{2.85}	73.75 _{4.92}	58.75 _{5.5}	70.59 _{11.05}	73.75 _{4.92}	56.96 _{5.57}	81.63 _{5.53}
AVG	60.82 _{1.18}	60.84 _{1.18}	64.31 _{2.7}	48.01 _{.2}	50.91 _{1.21}	56.57 _{2.57}	49.81 _{.2}	48.54 _{1.21}	56.21 _{4.8}

Table 5: Performance of LLMs on binary questions (T/F) on non-obfuscated data and without ramification, for action-sequence length of 19. The performance is split up across prompting techniques. Note that due to the limited context length of Llama-13b, state-tracking analysis is missing

An analysis of Gemini-1.0-Pro, presented in Table 5, reveals specific performance trends across different evaluation categories. Notably, performance improvements surpassing the SEM are primarily observed within the *effects* and *hallucination detection* categories. The accuracy in these categories heavily relies on the model’s ability to understand the consequences of actions and accurately identify hallucinated fluents, objects, and actions. With additional examples, Gemini exhibits performance gains in these categories. Specifically, there is an increase of 10 percentage points in the *effects* category and 16 percentage points in *hallucination detection*. This indicates that the model’s understanding of domain-specific dynamics and its ability to detect non-existent entities improves considerably with increased exposure to relevant examples. Conversely, introducing additional

examples does not yield similar benefits across all categories. This stagnation suggests a limitation in the model’s current architecture or training regimen, which fails to enhance its reasoning capabilities despite additional examples.

5.1 GPT-4o and Gemini-1.0-Pro Case Study

Due to the poor performance of open-source models, we focus on the two best-performing proprietary LLMs, GPT-4o and Gemini-1.0-Pro.

5.1.1 Observations on Action-Sequence Lengths




Figure 2: Performance of proprietary LLMs on binary questions (true/false) without ramification across all question categories averaged over all domains for various action-sequence length

Performance Degrades with Increasing Action-Sequence Length (with and without obfuscations). The data presented in Tables 3, 9, 10, and 11 reveal a consistent trend across all LLMs: performance degrades as action-sequence length increases, with the variations falling within SEM. This trend is consistent throughout obfuscations and ramifications.

Action-Executability is Affected Most Drastically by Increasing Action-Sequences Length. As shown in Fig 2, for proprietary LLMs, the *action executability* category exhibits the most significant decrease in performance, followed by the *state-tracking* category. Conversely, categories such as *object tracking* and *effects of actions* show minimal degradation as action-sequence length increases.

5.1.2 Observations on Fluent Types

Fluent Type	GPT-4o				Gemini-1.0-Pro			
	Baseline	Baseline + R.	O. Baseline	O. Baseline + R.	Baseline	Baseline + R.	O. Baseline	O. Baseline + R.
Base Fl	68.22 _{2.51}	68.9 _{2.5}	61.05 _{2.63}	58.43 _{2.66}	61.34 _{2.63}	63.95 _{2.59}	58.43 _{2.66}	61.05 _{2.63}
Base Fl + Cnstr.	72.51 _{2.32}	76.14 _{2.21}	64.08 _{2.48}	68.82 _{2.4}	64.88 _{2.47}	64.25 _{2.48}	56.84 _{2.56}	59.52 _{2.54}
Derived Fl	62.37 _{2.82}	63.64 _{2.79}	53.2 _{2.9}	56.27 _{2.89}	60.94 _{2.83}	62.46 _{2.83}	58.59 _{2.86}	62.96 _{2.8}
Static Props	72.89 _{2.4}	71.59 _{2.43}	67.83 _{2.52}	66.67 _{2.55}	57.39 _{2.66}	56.52 _{2.67}	55.94 _{2.67}	55.94 _{2.67}
Positive Fluents	80.72 _{1.6}	83.74 _{1.5}	70.94 _{1.84}	73.07 _{1.8}	72.91 _{1.8}	74.92 _{1.76}	65.19 _{1.93}	68.47 _{1.88}
Negative Fluents	68.17 _{2.06}	66.28 _{2.09}	59.84 _{2.16}	59.65 _{2.17}	54.0 _{2.2}	54.99 _{2.2}	54.78 _{2.2}	56.34 _{2.19}

Table 6: Performance of GPT-4o and Gemini-1.0-Pro on few shot 1 data with action-sequence length 19. Note that "O." stands for Obfuscated data, "+R" stands for data with ramifications.

Base Fluents with Constraints Outperform Other Fluents Among all the subcategories defined in section 3.2, *base fluents with constraints* consistently exhibit the best performance across all the categories and LLMs. This suggests that the models excel at understanding self-dependent properties rather than those that rely on other properties.

Performance Degradation with Increasing Action-Sequence Lengths Figure 7 illustrates the performance trends across different fluent types as action-sequence length increases. While base fluents show the highest initial performance at length 1, this performance sharply declines as action-sequence length increases. In contrast, questions involving static fluent consistently display the lowest performance across all action-sequence lengths. Meanwhile, questions with persistent fluents show a stable performance, with no significant decrease observed as the action-sequence length increases.

Models Struggle with Negative Fluents In Table 6, it is evident that models perform better on questions involving positive fluents. A consistent performance gap of approximately 25% percentage points exists between positive and negative fluents across the base, static, and base with constraints subcategories. Performance on negative fluents is nearly random. For derived fluents, the gap between negative and positive fluents is negligible, with both achieving roughly 60% accuracy. These findings indicate that LLMs struggle with negated fluents. This aligns with the literature, which also reports weaker performance on tasks involving negation (Truong et al., 2023). Effective reasoning about negated fluents is crucial for accurately understanding state changes and determining the viability of actions. Failures in these areas, particularly in complex action-sequences, can lead to errors.




Figure 3: Performance of proprietary LLMs by question category averaged across all domains for action-sequence length of 19

Models’ Inability to Recognize Null Effects of Actions on Static Properties Figure 3 illustrates with statistical significance that model performance on static properties is hindered by their inability to comprehend the effects of actions (or lack thereof) on these properties. Specifically, models fail to recognize that certain state properties remain unchanged by any action, resulting in performance slightly below random chance levels. This misunderstanding causes considerable inaccuracies in tasks involving static properties, highlighting a fundamental limitation in current models’ ability to accurately interpret and predict states in dynamic contexts.

5.1.3 Observations on Free Answers vs True False

When comparing the performances of LLMs in table 3 (binary questions) with those in table 13 (free-answer questions), it is evident that the categories *Fluent tracking* and *Hallucination Detection*, which performed well on binary questions, exhibit poor performance on free-answer questions. Conversely, the category *Composite Questions* shows improved performance when evaluated on free-answer questions. It can also be observed that the RoBERTa model struggles to classify the free answer questions and is not able to evaluate with human level accuracy.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce ACTIONREASONINGBENCH, the first benchmark for evaluating LLMs across several aspects of RAC, including Object Tracking, Fluent Tracking, State Tracking, Action Executability, Effects of Actions, Numerical RAC, Hallucination Detection, and Composite Questions. We also introduce *ramification* constraints that account for the indirect effects of some actions. Using ACTIONREASONINGBENCH, we find that only large models like GPT-4o and Gemini-1.0-Pro can perform some RAC tasks, achieving average performances of 42.5% and 32.5% on Free Answers, respectively. Furthermore, RAC performance degrades with increasing action-sequence length for the Action Executability. Numerical reasoning also performs poorly across all LLMs and action-sequence

lengths. Additionally, LLMs struggle with fluents, especially in understanding negative fluents and the effects of actions on static properties. Although ramification constraints can enhance performance on base fluents, they do not affect derived fluents. Finally, obfuscations lead to a decrease in performance across all dataset dimensions for all models. We hope that ACTIONREASONINGBENCH will serve as a valuable benchmark for the research community, facilitating the assessment of LLMs in various aspects of RAC.

References

- [2109.01653] CREAK: A Dataset for Commonsense Reasoning over Entity Knowledge. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.01653>.
- Differentiable Open-Ended Commonsense Reasoning - ACL Anthology. <https://aclanthology.org/2021.naacl-main.366/>.
- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Mohamed Aghzal, Erion Plaku, and Ziyu Yao. 2023. Can large language models be good path planners? a benchmark and investigation on spatial-temporal reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03249*.
- Janice Ahn, Rishu Verma, Renze Lou, Di Liu, Rui Zhang, and Wenpeng Yin. 2024. Large language models for mathematical reasoning: Progresses and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00157*.
- Meta AI. 2024. Introducing meta llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>. Accessed: 2024-06-04.
- Renat Aksitov, Sobhan Miryoosefi, Zonglin Li, Daliang Li, Sheila Babayan, Kavya Kopparapu, Zachary Fisher, Ruiqi Guo, Sushant Prakash, Pranesh Srinivasan, et al. 2023. Rest meets react: Self-improvement for multi-step reasoning llm agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10003*.
- Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Peter Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. MathQA: Towards Interpretable Math Word Problem Solving with Operation-Based Formalisms.
- Pratyay Banerjee, Chitta Baral, Man Luo, Arindam Mitra, Kuntal Pal, Tran C. Son, and Neeraj Varshney. 2020. Can Transformers Reason About Effects of Actions?
- Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Ronan Le Bras, Jianfeng Gao, and Yejin Choi. 2019. PIQA: Reasoning about Physical Commonsense in Natural Language.
- Zhiyu Chen, Wenhui Chen, Charese Smiley, Sameena Shah, Iana Borova, Dylan Langdon, Reema Moussa, Matt Beane, Ting-Hao Huang, Bryan Routledge, and William Yang Wang. 2022. FinQA: A Dataset of Numerical Reasoning over Financial Data.
- Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Tom Kwiatkowski, Michael Collins, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BoolQ: Exploring the Surprising Difficulty of Natural Yes/No Questions.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have Solved Question Answering? Try ARC, the AI2 Reasoning Challenge.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems.
- Zhiwei Fei, Xiaoyu Shen, Dawei Zhu, Fengzhe Zhou, Zhuo Han, Songyang Zhang, Kai Chen, Zongwen Shen, and Jidong Ge. 2023. LawBench: Benchmarking Legal Knowledge of Large Language Models.
- Richard E Fikes and Nils J Nilsson. 1971. Strips: A new approach to the application of theorem proving to problem solving. *Artificial intelligence*, 2(3-4):189–208.

- Mor Geva, Daniel Khashabi, Elad Segal, Tushar Khot, Dan Roth, and Jonathan Berant. 2021. Did Aristotle Use a Laptop? A Question Answering Benchmark with Implicit Reasoning Strategies.
- Lin Guan, Karthik Valmeekam, Sarath Sreedharan, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2023. Leveraging pre-trained large language models to construct and utilize world models for model-based task planning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:79081–79094.
- Neel Guha, Julian Nyarko, Daniel Ho, Christopher Ré, Adam Chilton, Aditya K, Alex Chohlas-Wood, Austin Peters, Brandon Waldon, Daniel Rockmore, Diego Zambrano, Dmitry Talisman, Enam Hoque, Faiz Surani, Frank Fagan, Galit Sarfaty, Gregory Dickinson, Haggai Porat, Jason Hegland, Jessica Wu, Joe Nudell, Joel Niklaus, John Nay, Jonathan Choi, Kevin Tobia, Margaret Hagan, Megan Ma, Michael Livermore, Nikon Rasumov-Rahe, Nils Holzenberger, Noam Kolt, Peter Henderson, Sean Rehaag, Sharad Goel, Shang Gao, Spencer Williams, Sunny Gandhi, Tom Zur, Varun Iyer, and Zehua Li. 2023. LegalBench: A Collaboratively Built Benchmark for Measuring Legal Reasoning in Large Language Models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:44123–44279.
- Simeng Han, Hailey Schoelkopf, Yilun Zhao, Zhenting Qi, Martin Riddell, Wenfei Zhou, James Coady, David Peng, Yujie Qiao, Luke Benson, Lucy Sun, Alex Wardle-Solano, Hannah Szabo, Ekaterina Zubova, Matthew Burtell, Jonathan Fan, Yixin Liu, Brian Wong, Malcolm Sailor, Ansong Ni, Linyong Nan, Jungo Kasai, Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Alexander R. Fabbri, Wojciech Kryscinski, Semih Yavuz, Ye Liu, Xi Victoria Lin, Shafiq Joty, Yingbo Zhou, Caiming Xiong, Rex Ying, Arman Cohan, and Dragomir Radev. 2024. FOLIO: Natural Language Reasoning with First-Order Logic.
- Patrik Haslum, Nir Lipovetzky, Daniele Magazzeni, Christian Muise, Ronald Brachman, Francesca Rossi, and Peter Stone. 2019. *An introduction to the planning domain definition language*, volume 13. Springer.
- Weinan He, Canming Huang, Zhanhao Xiao, and Yongmei Liu. 2023. Exploring the capacity of pretrained language models for reasoning about actions and change. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4629–4643.
- Jie Huang and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. 2022. Towards reasoning in large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10403*.
- Lifu Huang, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Cosmos QA: Machine Reading Comprehension with Contextual Commonsense Reasoning.
- Shima Imani, Liang Du, and Harsh Shrivastava. 2023. Mathprompter: Mathematical reasoning using large language models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 5: Industry Track)*, pages 37–42.
- International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling. 1998. Icaps competitions. Accessed: 2024-04-25.
- Harsh Kohli and Huan Sun. 2024. Cleared for takeoff? compositional & conditional reasoning may be the achilles heel to (flight-booking) language agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04237*.
- Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Subhro Roy, Aida Amini, Nate Kushman, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2016. MAWPS: A Math Word Problem Repository. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1152–1157, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bill Yuchen Lin, Haitian Sun, Bhuwan Dhingra, Manzil Zaheer, Xiang Ren, and William W. Cohen. 2021. Differentiable Open-Ended Commonsense Reasoning.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- Wang Ling, Dani Yogatama, Chris Dyer, and Phil Blunsom. 2017. Program Induction by Rationale Generation : Learning to Solve and Explain Algebraic Word Problems.

- Hanmeng Liu, Zhiyang Teng, Leyang Cui, Chaoli Zhang, Qiji Zhou, and Yue Zhang. 2023. LogiCoT: Logical Chain-of-Thought Instruction-Tuning.
- Jian Liu, Leyang Cui, Hanmeng Liu, Dandan Huang, Yile Wang, and Yue Zhang. 2020. LogiQA: A Challenge Dataset for Machine Reading Comprehension with Logical Reasoning.
- Tianyu Liu, Yizhe Zhang, Chris Brockett, Yi Mao, Zhifang Sui, Weizhu Chen, and Bill Dolan. 2022. A Token-level Reference-free Hallucination Detection Benchmark for Free-form Text Generation.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Nicholas Lourie, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. UNICORN on RAINBOW: A Universal Commonsense Reasoning Model on a New Multitask Benchmark.
- Man Luo, Shrinidhi Kumbhar, Ming shen, Mihir Parmar, Neeraj Varshney, Pratyay Banerjee, Somak Aditya, and Chitta Baral. 2024. Towards LogiGLUE: A Brief Survey and A Benchmark for Analyzing Logical Reasoning Capabilities of Language Models.
- John McCarthy et al. 1963. *Situations, actions, and causal laws*. Comtex Scientific.
- Sheila A McIlraith. 2000. Integrating actions and state constraints: A closed-form solution to the ramification problem (sometimes). *Artificial Intelligence*, 116(1-2):87–121.
- Shen-Yun Miao, Chao-Chun Liang, and Keh-Yih Su. 2021. A Diverse Corpus for Evaluating and Developing English Math Word Problem Solvers.
- Todor Mihaylov, Peter Clark, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2018. Can a Suit of Armor Conduct Electricity? A New Dataset for Open Book Question Answering.
- Norman Mu, Sarah Chen, Zifan Wang, Sizhe Chen, David Karamardian, Lulwa Aljeraisy, Dan Hendrycks, and David Wagner. 2023. Can llms follow simple rules? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04235*.
- Mihir Parmar, Nisarg Patel, Neeraj Varshney, Mutsumi Nakamura, Man Luo, Santosh Mashetty, Arindam Mitra, and Chitta Baral. 2024a. Towards systematic evaluation of logical reasoning ability of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15522*.
- Mihir Parmar, Nisarg Patel, Neeraj Varshney, Mutsumi Nakamura, Man Luo, Santosh Mashetty, Arindam Mitra, and Chitta Baral. 2024b. Towards Systematic Evaluation of Logical Reasoning Ability of Large Language Models.
- Arkil Patel, Satwik Bhattamishra, and Navin Goyal. 2021. Are NLP Models really able to Solve Simple Math Word Problems?
- Raymond Reiter. 2001. *Knowledge in action: logical foundations for specifying and implementing dynamical systems*.
- Jussi Rintanen. 2004. Complexity of planning with partial observability. In *ICAPS*, volume 4, pages 345–354.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106.
- Shailaja Keyur Sampat, Pratyay Banerjee, Yezhou Yang, and Chitta Baral. 2022a. Learning Action-Effect Dynamics for Hypothetical Vision-Language Reasoning Task.
- Shailaja Keyur Sampat, Maitreya Patel, Subhasish Das, Yezhou Yang, and Chitta Baral. 2022b. Reasoning about Actions over Visual and Linguistic Modalities: A Survey.
- Maarten Sap, Ronan Le Bras, Emily Allaway, Chandra Bhagavatula, Nicholas Lourie, Hannah Rashkin, Brendan Roof, Noah A Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Atomic: An atlas of machine commonsense for if-then reasoning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 3027–3035.

- Arpit Sharma. 2019. Using answer set programming for commonsense reasoning in the winograd schema challenge. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming*, 19(5-6):1021–1037.
- Evangelia Spiliopoulou, Artidoro Pagnoni, Yonatan Bisk, and Eduard Hovy. 2022. Events realm: Event reasoning of entity states via language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1982–1997.
- Katharina Stein and Alexander Koller. 2023. Autoplanbench:: Automatically generating benchmarks for llm planners from pddl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09830*.
- Oyvind Tafjord, Bhavana Dalvi Mishra, and Peter Clark. 2021. ProofWriter: Generating Implications, Proofs, and Abductive Statements over Natural Language.
- Alon Talmor, Jonathan Herzig, Nicholas Lourie, and Jonathan Berant. 2019. Commonsenseqa: A question answering challenge targeting commonsense knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4149–4158.
- Qingyu Tan, Hwee Tou Ng, and Lidong Bing. 2023. Towards benchmarking and improving the temporal reasoning capability of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 14820–14835.
- Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. 2023. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*.
- Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, et al. 2024. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruiti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Thinh Hung Truong, Timothy Baldwin, Karin Verspoor, and Trevor Cohn. 2023. Language models are not naysayers: an analysis of language models on negation benchmarks. In *Proceedings of the 12th Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics (*SEM 2023)*, pages 101–114.
- Karthik Valmeekam, Matthew Marquez, Alberto Olmo, Sarath Sreedharan, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2024a. Planbench: An extensible benchmark for evaluating large language models on planning and reasoning about change. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Karthik Valmeekam, Matthew Marquez, Sarath Sreedharan, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2024b. On the planning abilities of large language models—a critical investigation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Siyuan Wang, Zhongyu Wei, Yejin Choi, and Xiang Ren. 2024. Can llms reason with rules? logic scaffolding for stress-testing and improving llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11442*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W. Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A Dataset for Diverse, Explainable Multi-hop Question Answering.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2022. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629*.
- Sheng Zhang, Xiaodong Liu, Jingjing Liu, Jianfeng Gao, Kevin Duh, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2018. Record: Bridging the gap between human and machine commonsense reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.12885*.

Haiteng Zhao, Chang Ma, Guoyin Wang, Jing Su, Lingpeng Kong, Jingjing Xu, Zhi-Hong Deng, and Hongxia Yang. 2024. Empowering large language model agents through action learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15809*.

Qinhao Zhou, Zihan Zhang, Xiang Xiang, Ke Wang, Yuchuan Wu, and Yongbin Li. 2024. Enhancing the general agent capabilities of low-parameter llms through tuning and multi-branch reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19962*.

Appendix

Limitations

While reasoning about actions is not tied to the English language, ActionReasoningBench is currently restricted to questions formulated in English. Despite our efforts to evaluate a range of models, including several open-source LLMs and two state-of-the-art proprietary LLMs, GPT-4o, and Gemini-1.0-Pro, our assessment did not extend to additional models with different architectures or training methodologies due to resource constraints.

A Additional Literature

A.1 LLMs for Reasoning

Reasoning is a fundamental cognitive process that allows individuals to analyze information, deduce conclusions, solve problems, and make decisions. It is crucial across various domains, from everyday decision-making to scientific research and policy formulation. Effective reasoning leads to better understanding, innovative solutions, and the ability to navigate complex situations, making it an essential skill for humans. As we continue to explore and enhance our own cognitive abilities, there has been a growing interest in emulating similar reasoning processes within artificial intelligence systems. This pursuit has led to significant advancements in the development of LLMs. With the advent of LLMs and their prowess in various natural language tasks, it is speculated that these models exhibit reasoning capabilities when they are sufficiently large (Huang and Chang, 2022), (Wei et al., 2022). However, to accurately assess the reasoning capabilities of these LLMs, it is crucial to establish benchmarks and frameworks that can evaluate their ability to reason across diverse contexts.

A.2 Legal Reasoning

Legal reasoning is a complex process essential to the legal profession, involving the application of legal rules to specific facts to resolve disputes and make decisions. It requires a deep understanding of laws, statutes, and case precedents and the ability to interpret these in various factual contexts. Notable benchmarks for legal reasoning include works by Guha et al. (2023) and Fei et al. (2023)

A.3 Logical Reasoning

Logical reasoning is an essential cognitive skill that involves the analysis and evaluation of arguments based on the principles of logic. It enables the identification of strong and weak arguments, detection of fallacies, and construction of coherent reasoning. Fundamental across disciplines like mathematics, science, philosophy, and law, logical reasoning allows for drawing conclusions from premises, problem-solving, and informed decision-making. Representative benchmarks for logical reasoning include works by Luo et al. (2024), Han et al. (2024), Liu et al. (2023), Liu et al. (2020), Parmar et al. (2024b), and Tafford et al. (2021)

A.4 Arithmetic Reasoning

Arithmetic reasoning is the process of using mathematical principles to analyze and solve numerical problems. This skill extends beyond simple calculation to involve understanding numerical relationships, patterns, and sequences. Essential in fields such as finance, engineering, and everyday activities like budgeting, arithmetic reasoning allows individuals to interpret data, forecast outcomes, and make

informed decisions. Representative benchmarks include works by Amini et al. (2019), Chen et al. (2022), Cobbe et al. (2021), Koncel-Kedziorski et al. (2016), Ling et al. (2017), Liu et al. (2022), Miao et al. (2021), and Patel et al. (2021)

A.5 Commonsense Reasoning

Commonsense reasoning involves using practical knowledge gained from daily life to make intuitive judgments and decisions. It encompasses understanding societal norms and basic physical principles, allowing individuals to efficiently navigate social and practical tasks. This type of reasoning is essential for adapting to new environments, predicting outcomes, and managing everyday activities, forming a fundamental part of human cognition. Representative benchmarks include works by 210, Bisk et al. (2019), Clark et al. (2019), Clark et al. (2018), Dif, Geva et al. (2021), Huang et al. (2019), Lin et al. (2021), Lourie et al. (2021), Mihaylov et al. (2018), Talmor et al. (2019), and Yang et al. (2018)

A.6 Reasoning about Actions and Change

Reasoning about actions and its effects is essential for both humans and AI systems. For humans, this capability enables us to plan, make decisions, and navigate complex relationships within our environment. Similarly, in the field of AI, reasoning about actions is crucial for enabling intelligent systems to effectively achieve goals, manage uncertainty, and adapt to the dynamic, ever-changing world. This ability is foundational for both humans and AI to interact safely and efficiently with their surroundings. Relevant works by Valmeekam et al. (2024a), Valmeekam et al. (2024b), and Guan et al. (2023) explore reasoning about actions but focus more on the planning capabilities of Large Language Models. Work by Banerjee et al. (2020) investigates the ability of Large Language Models to reason about actions only over four domains, and the synthetic data generated in their work only addresses three question types. While He et al. (2023) tests the ability of LLMS on RAC only on a variant of Blocksworld with four question types, out of which only two types focus more on reasoning about actions and their effects while the other two focus on planning.

Through our work, we provide an in-depth analysis of LLMs’ capability to reason about actions and their effects with and without ramification constraints, which the relevant works mentioned fall short of.

B Data Verification

Three annotators were given the task of giving a score from 1 to 5 based on how natural they feel the sentences present in the dataset. The annotators were given the following instructions along with the dataset

Rate the Prompts from 1 to 5, based on how natural they appear in English.
--

Table 7 shows the scores given by three annotators across all the domains present in ACTIONREASONINGBENCH.

C Additional Results

In this section, we provide more discussions and results performed on our benchmark.

C.1 Performance on Binary (True/False) Questions

Domain	Annotator 1 Score	Annotator 2 Score	Annotator 3 Score	Average
Blocksworld	3.8	5.0	3.8	4.2
Depots	4.6	3.6	4.0	4.1
Driverlog	4.8	3.6	4.4	4.3
Goldminer	5.0	4.0	4.6	4.5
Grippers	4.6	4.0	4.6	4.4
Logistics	5.0	3.4	4.4	4.3
Miconic	5.0	4.4	4.0	4.5
Mystery	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.9
NPuzzle	3.0	3.6	4.6	3.7
Satellite	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5
Spanner	5.0	5.0	3.8	4.6
Visitall	3.6	3.8	4.0	3.8
Zenotravel	4.6	4.0	3.8	4.1
Average	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.2

Table 7: Naturalness scores across all domains out of 5

Act. Seq.	Question Categories	GPT-4o zero shot	Gemini Pro zero shot	LLaMa2 13b zero shot	LLaMa3 8b zero shot	LLaMa2 7b zero shot	Gemma 7b zero shot
1	Object Trk.	74.48 _{1.9}	70.86 _{1.98}	60.19 _{2.14}	41.52 _{2.15}	45.71 _{2.17}	60.19 _{2.14}
1	Fluent Trk.	69.85 _{1.97}	62.5 _{2.08}	50.55 _{2.14}	33.82 _{2.03}	43.93 _{2.13}	50.55 _{2.14}
1	State Trk.	89.09 _{4.2}	52.73 _{6.73}	50.91 _{6.74}	43.64 _{6.69}	50.91 _{6.74}	50.91 _{6.74}
1	Action Exec.	80.04 _{4.47}	63.29 _{5.42}	50.0 _{5.59}	46.25 _{5.57}	48.75 _{5.59}	50.0 _{5.59}
1	Effects	63.44 _{2.69}	54.37 _{2.78}	51.88 _{2.79}	41.88 _{2.76}	54.37 _{2.78}	51.88 _{2.79}
1	Num. Reas.	55.0 _{5.56}	53.75 _{5.57}	53.75 _{5.57}	48.75 _{5.59}	50.0 _{5.59}	53.75 _{5.57}
1	Hallucination	88.75 _{3.53}	83.75 _{4.12}	67.5 _{5.24}	57.5 _{5.53}	50.0 _{5.59}	67.5 _{5.24}
1	Composite	71.25 _{5.06}	57.5 _{5.53}	3.75 _{2.12}	38.75 _{5.45}	0.0 _{0.0}	46.25 _{5.57}
1	AVG	71.37 _{1.08}	63.58 _{1.15}	52.44 _{1.19}	40.42 _{1.17}	45.35 _{1.19}	54.37 _{1.19}
10	Object Trk.	71.19 _{1.94}	70.09 _{1.96}	57.06 _{2.12}	42.02 _{2.11}	53.03 _{2.14}	57.06 _{2.12}
10	Fluent Trk.	68.63 _{1.99}	60.15 _{2.1}	45.94 _{2.14}	37.27 _{2.08}	42.07 _{2.12}	45.94 _{2.14}
10	State Trk.	90.74 _{3.94}	53.7 _{6.79}	48.15 _{6.8}	37.04 _{6.57}	50.0 _{6.8}	48.15 _{6.8}
10	Action Exec.	55.0 _{5.56}	55.0 _{5.56}	50.0 _{5.59}	53.75 _{5.57}	50.0 _{5.59}	50.0 _{5.59}
10	Effects	62.19 _{2.71}	55.0 _{2.78}	50.62 _{2.79}	47.81 _{2.79}	56.56 _{2.77}	50.62 _{2.79}
10	Num. Reas.	52.5 _{5.58}	47.5 _{5.58}	48.75 _{5.59}	50.0 _{5.59}	50.0 _{5.59}	48.75 _{5.59}
10	Hallucination	76.25 _{4.76}	76.25 _{4.76}	67.5 _{5.24}	43.75 _{5.55}	50.0 _{5.59}	67.5 _{5.24}
10	Composite	67.5 _{5.24}	52.5 _{5.58}	1.25 _{1.24}	35.0 _{5.33}	0.0 _{0.0}	43.75 _{5.55}
10	AVG	67.88 _{1.11}	61.65 _{1.15}	49.52 _{1.18}	42.11 _{1.17}	47.45 _{1.18}	51.43 _{1.18}
19	Object Trk.	68.94 _{2.01}	69.51 _{2.0}	56.06 _{2.16}	40.72 _{2.14}	47.54 _{2.17}	56.06 _{2.16}
19	Fluent Trk.	70.04 _{2.02}	58.56 _{2.17}	39.88 _{2.16}	33.46 _{2.08}	36.38 _{2.12}	39.88 _{2.16}
19	State Trk.	93.18 _{3.8}	47.73 _{7.53}	47.73 _{7.53}	40.91 _{7.41}	47.73 _{7.53}	47.73 _{7.53}
19	Action Exec.	52.5 _{5.58}	51.25 _{5.59}	50.0 _{5.59}	53.75 _{5.57}	50.0 _{5.59}	50.0 _{5.59}
19	Effects	56.78 _{2.78}	53.63 _{2.8}	51.74 _{2.81}	47.32 _{2.8}	50.16 _{2.81}	51.74 _{2.81}
19	Num. Reas.	52.5 _{5.58}	53.75 _{5.57}	51.25 _{5.59}	47.5 _{5.58}	50.0 _{5.59}	51.25 _{5.59}
19	Hallucination	87.5 _{3.7}	80.04 _{4.47}	73.75 _{4.92}	55.0 _{5.56}	50.0 _{5.59}	73.75 _{4.92}
19	Composite	68.75 _{5.18}	51.25 _{5.59}	1.25 _{1.24}	33.75 _{5.29}	2.5 _{1.75}	40.0 _{5.48}
19	AVG	66.98 _{1.13}	60.82 _{1.18}	48.0 _{1.2}	41.03 _{1.19}	42.95 _{1.19}	49.8 _{1.2}

Table 8: Zero Shot performance without obfuscations and ramifications across all question categories and action-sequence lengths

Act. Seq.	Question Categories	GPT-4o few shot 1	Gemini Pro few shot 1	LLaMa2 13b few shot 1	LLaMa3 8b few shot 1	LLaMa2 7b few shot 1	Gemma 7b few shot 1
1	Object Trk.	80.57 _{1.73}	71.15 _{1.99}	57.92 _{1.15}	45.92 _{2.17}	46.67 _{2.18}	48.95 _{2.18}
1	Fluent Trk.	85.48 _{1.51}	66.98 _{2.03}	45.51 _{2.15}	41.02 _{1.12}	42.51 _{2.14}	53.14 _{2.14}
1	State Trk.	70.91 _{6.12}	67.27 _{6.33}	52.73 _{6.73}	47.27 _{6.73}	54.55 _{6.71}	58.18 _{6.65}
1	Action Exec.	80.04 _{4.47}	73.75 _{4.92}	51.25 _{5.59}	51.25 _{5.59}	50.05 _{5.66}	52.55 _{5.58}
1	Effects	60.02 _{2.74}	59.69 _{2.74}	47.19 _{2.79}	38.71 _{2.77}	50.32 _{2.85}	49.69 _{2.8}
1	Num. Reas.	58.75 _{5.5}	51.25 _{5.59}	55.05 _{5.66}	46.25 _{5.57}	58.97 _{5.57}	45.05 _{5.56}
1	Hallucination	95.02 _{4.44}	85.03 _{3.99}	53.75 _{5.57}	63.64 _{5.48}	62.67 _{5.59}	66.25 _{5.29}
1	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	AVG	77.55 _{1.02}	67.32 _{1.15}	51.08 _{1.22}	44.12 _{1.22}	47.73 _{1.23}	51.55 _{1.22}
10	Object Trk.	78.72 _{1.75}	67.53 _{2.01}	55.45 _{2.14}	51.56 _{2.14}	51.39 _{2.15}	49.36 _{2.14}
10	Fluent Trk.	79.52 _{1.73}	61.44 _{2.09}	43.94 _{2.16}	42.51 _{2.14}	41.57 _{2.16}	52.69 _{2.15}
10	State Trk.	64.81 _{6.5}	62.96 _{6.57}	46.15 _{6.91}	50.06 ₈	40.38 _{6.8}	72.22 _{6.1}
10	Action Exec.	57.55 _{5.53}	51.25 _{5.59}	48.75 _{5.59}	50.63 _{5.62}	49.37 _{5.62}	55.05 _{5.56}
10	Effects	57.52 _{2.76}	57.81 _{2.76}	45.94 _{2.79}	40.84 _{2.79}	54.05 _{2.84}	44.38 _{2.78}
10	Num. Reas.	52.55 _{5.58}	48.75 _{5.59}	53.75 _{5.57}	48.15 _{5.62}	51.28 _{5.66}	55.05 _{5.56}
10	Hallucination	86.25 _{3.85}	77.54 _{4.67}	43.75 _{5.55}	57.69 _{5.59}	59.72 _{5.78}	55.75 _{5.59}
10	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
10	AVG	72.66 _{1.08}	62.43 _{1.18}	48.78 _{1.22}	46.73 _{1.22}	48.71 _{1.23}	51.03 _{1.21}
19	Object Trk.	75.01 _{1.88}	68.38 _{2.03}	56.74 _{2.16}	51.89 _{2.17}	50.09 _{2.18}	47.54 _{2.17}
19	Fluent Trk.	74.71 _{1.92}	59.57 _{2.17}	42.24 _{2.23}	42.51 _{2.21}	38.97 _{2.26}	50.02 _{2.1}
19	State Trk.	65.91 _{7.15}	59.09 _{7.41}	45.45 _{7.51}	38.64 _{7.34}	43.18 _{7.47}	68.18 _{7.02}
19	Action Exec.	55.05 _{5.56}	53.75 _{5.57}	52.55 _{5.58}	48.72 _{5.66}	48.15 _{5.62}	56.25 _{5.55}
19	Effects	55.84 _{2.79}	54.57 _{2.8}	48.92 _{2.81}	42.39 _{2.81}	52.27 _{2.85}	44.48 _{2.79}
19	Num. Reas.	51.25 _{5.59}	52.55 _{5.58}	53.75 _{5.57}	41.89 _{5.74}	51.28 _{5.66}	46.25 _{5.57}
19	Hallucination	87.53 _{3.7}	88.75 _{3.53}	55.05 _{5.56}	70.51 _{5.16}	50.65 _{5.7}	57.69 _{5.59}
19	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
19	AVG	69.45 _{1.14}	62.21 _{1.2}	50.06 _{1.24}	47.08 _{1.24}	47.03 _{1.26}	49.12 _{1.23}

Table 9: Few-shot-1 performance with ramifications and without obfuscations across all question categories and action-sequence lengths

Act. Seq.	Question Categories	GPT-4o few shot 1	Gemini Pro few shot 1	LLaMa2 13b few shot 1	LLaMa3 8b few shot 1	LLaMa2 7b few shot 1	Gemma 7b few shot 1
1	Object Trk.	72.76 _{1.94}	67.24 _{2.05}	59.22 _{3.1}	48.19 _{2.18}	48.12 _{2.35}	42.53 _{2.16}
1	Fluent Trk.	75.74 _{1.84}	61.03 _{2.09}	50.98 _{2.47}	41.93 _{2.13}	39.71 _{2.42}	54.63 _{2.14}
1	State Trk.	70.91 _{6.12}	50.91 _{6.74}	50.02 _{5.0}	51.02 _{7.14}	50.02 _{5.0}	49.09 _{6.74}
1	Action Exec.	76.25 _{4.76}	65.05 _{3.33}	51.39 _{5.89}	66.18 _{5.74}	56.94 _{5.84}	53.75 _{5.57}
1	Effects	60.62 _{2.73}	54.69 _{2.78}	51.42 _{2.96}	45.08 _{3.06}	53.52 _{2.95}	44.51 _{2.78}
1	Num. Reas.	57.55 _{5.53}	51.25 _{5.59}	52.05 _{5.77}	52.24 _{6.1}	49.33 _{5.77}	48.72 _{5.66}
1	Hallucination	85.03 _{3.99}	76.25 _{4.76}	48.05 _{5.77}	60.06 _{6.32}	54.67 _{5.75}	58.75 _{5.5}
1	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	AVG	71.38 _{1.1}	61.88 _{1.18}	53.68 _{1.35}	47.01 _{1.26}	47.63 _{1.35}	48.63 _{1.22}
10	Object Trk.	71.01 _{1.94}	66.79 _{2.02}	54.91 _{2.41}	50.64 _{2.14}	41.82 _{2.38}	47.51 _{2.14}
10	Fluent Trk.	70.85 _{1.95}	57.01 _{2.13}	47.42 _{2.61}	41.42 _{2.19}	40.82 _{2.57}	50.56 _{2.16}
10	State Trk.	55.56 _{6.76}	55.56 _{6.76}	—	47.92 _{7.21}	—	57.41 _{6.73}
10	Action Exec.	57.55 _{5.53}	52.55 _{5.58}	46.97 _{6.14}	48.57 _{5.97}	57.58 _{6.08}	60.05 _{4.8}
10	Effects	55.31 _{2.78}	53.12 _{2.79}	51.35 _{3.11}	46.38 _{3.0}	51.74 _{3.1}	46.54 _{2.8}
10	Num. Reas.	55.05 _{5.56}	48.75 _{5.59}	50.06 _{4.45}	42.65 _{6.0}	46.67 _{6.44}	50.05 _{5.59}
10	Hallucination	81.25 _{4.36}	73.75 _{4.92}	47.76 _{6.1}	66.25 _{5.61}	58.21 _{6.03}	55.75 _{5.59}
10	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
10	AVG	66.61 _{1.14}	59.55 _{1.19}	50.92 _{1.42}	47.13 _{1.25}	45.54 _{1.41}	49.71 _{1.22}
19	Object Trk.	66.12 _{0.6}	65.91 _{2.06}	56.62 _{6.8}	49.24 _{2.18}	40.47 _{2.66}	45.63 _{2.17}
19	Fluent Trk.	63.23 _{2.13}	53.11 _{2.2}	47.56 _{3.33}	39.39 _{2.27}	36.03 ₂	50.69 _{2.22}
19	State Trk.	56.82 _{7.47}	47.73 _{7.53}	—	67.65 _{8.02}	—	52.27 _{7.53}
19	Action Exec.	56.25 _{5.55}	52.55 _{5.58}	62.56 _{6.99}	43.28 _{6.05}	43.75 _{7.16}	50.05 _{5.66}
19	Effects	52.68 _{2.8}	50.16 _{2.81}	55.21 _{3.59}	43.83 _{3.08}	53.63 _{3.6}	50.79 _{2.82}
19	Num. Reas.	47.55 _{5.58}	51.25 _{5.59}	45.76 _{6.49}	45.31 _{6.22}	54.24 _{6.49}	46.25 _{5.57}
19	Hallucination	81.25 _{4.36}	71.25 _{5.06}	52.17 _{7.37}	53.73 _{6.09}	50.07 _{7.37}	58.75 _{5.5}
19	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
19	AVG	61.72 _{1.2}	57.27 _{1.22}	53.46 _{1.65}	45.41 _{1.29}	43.69 _{1.64}	49.26 _{1.24}

Table 10: Few-shot-1 performance with obfuscation and without ramification across all question categories and action-sequence lengths

Plan Len.	Question Categories	GPT-4o few shot 1	Gemini Pro few shot 1	LLaMa2 13b few shot 1	LLaMa3 8b few shot 1	LLaMa2 7b few shot 1	Gemma 7b few shot 1
1	Object Trk.	74.86 _{1.89}	68.0 _{2.04}	59.38 _{2.32}	49.33 _{2.18}	44.64 _{2.35}	45.14 _{2.17}
1	Fluent Trk.	77.39 _{1.79}	61.4 _{2.09}	47.68 _{2.54}	42.3 _{2.18}	40.98 _{2.5}	55.58 _{2.14}
1	State Trk.	74.07 _{5.96}	50.91 _{6.74}	25.0 _{21.65}	54.35 _{7.34}	50.0 _{25.0}	54.55 _{6.71}
1	Action Exec.	77.5 _{4.67}	67.5 _{5.24}	50.0 _{5.98}	55.93 _{6.46}	62.86 _{5.78}	53.75 _{5.57}
1	Effects	60.63 _{2.75}	55.0 _{2.78}	50.7 _{2.96}	47.37 _{3.31}	51.75 _{2.95}	40.94 _{2.75}
1	Num. Reas.	60.53 _{5.61}	48.75 _{5.59}	52.0 _{5.77}	47.06 _{6.99}	56.0 _{5.73}	48.75 _{5.59}
1	Hallucination	76.62 _{4.82}	78.75 _{4.57}	50.67 _{5.77}	61.5 _{4.675}	53.33 _{5.76}	60.0 _{5.48}
1	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	AVG	72.53 _{1.09}	62.41 _{1.18}	52.67 _{1.36}	47.35 _{1.3}	47.18 _{1.36}	49.28 _{1.22}
10	Object Trk.	70.64 _{1.95}	66.42 _{2.02}	55.45 _{2.39}	45.87 _{2.13}	42.69 _{2.38}	48.81 _{2.14}
10	Fluent Trk.	74.17 _{1.88}	57.01 _{2.13}	45.71 _{2.66}	44.54 _{2.26}	40.0 _{2.62}	50.37 _{2.16}
10	State Trk.	55.77 _{6.89}	53.7 _{6.79}	—	28.85 _{6.28}	—	53.7 _{6.79}
10	Action Exec.	59.74 _{5.59}	50.0 _{5.59}	43.94 _{6.11}	47.46 _{6.5}	53.03 _{6.14}	48.75 _{5.59}
10	Effects	55.52 _{2.83}	54.69 _{2.78}	49.81 _{3.11}	46.26 _{3.41}	54.05 _{3.1}	49.38 _{2.79}
10	Num. Reas.	56.41 _{5.61}	48.75 _{5.59}	55.0 _{6.42}	42.0 _{6.98}	41.67 _{6.36}	57.5 _{5.53}
10	Hallucination	79.22 _{4.62}	76.25 _{4.76}	53.73 _{6.09}	69.81 _{6.31}	53.73 _{6.09}	57.5 _{5.53}
10	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
10	AVG	67.78 _{1.14}	59.67 _{1.19}	50.77 _{1.42}	45.68 _{1.3}	45.42 _{1.42}	50.38 _{1.21}
19	Object Trk.	66.29 _{2.06}	68.94 _{2.01}	54.84 _{2.69}	50.57 _{2.18}	43.99 _{2.69}	45.08 _{2.17}
19	Fluent Trk.	66.15 _{2.09}	56.03 _{2.19}	47.03 _{3.25}	43.84 _{2.42}	33.05 _{3.06}	50.0 _{2.22}
19	State Trk.	60.47 _{7.46}	47.73 _{7.53}	—	34.62 _{9.33}	—	59.09 _{7.41}
19	Action Exec.	56.76 _{5.76}	51.25 _{5.59}	49.06 _{6.87}	43.14 _{6.94}	49.06 _{6.87}	51.25 _{5.59}
19	Effects	51.77 _{2.83}	50.47 _{2.81}	49.49 _{3.55}	49.77 _{3.41}	50.0 _{3.55}	48.58 _{2.81}
19	Num. Reas.	50.65 _{5.7}	50.0 _{5.59}	52.54 _{6.5}	59.65 _{6.5}	49.15 _{6.51}	41.25 _{5.5}
19	Hallucination	76.25 _{4.76}	67.5 _{5.24}	65.31 _{6.8}	61.22 _{6.96}	57.14 _{7.07}	57.5 _{5.53}
19	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
19	AVG	62.63 _{1.2}	58.92 _{1.21}	51.82 _{1.63}	48.52 _{1.36}	43.81 _{1.62}	48.38 _{1.24}

Table 11: Few-shot-1 performance with obfuscation and ramification across all question categories and action-sequence lengths

C.2 Performance on Free-Answer questions evaluated using Fine-tuned RoBERTa Classifier

Plan Len.	Question Categories	GPT-4o zero shot	Gemini Pro zero shot	LLaMa2 13b zero shot	LLaMa3 8b zero shot	LLaMa2 7b zero shot	Gemma 7b zero shot
1	Object Trk.	50.0 _{7.91}	32.5 _{7.41}	0.0 _{0.0}	27.5 _{7.06}	17.5 _{6.01}	0.0 _{0.0}
1	Fluent Trk.	31.25 _{8.19}	0.0 _{0.0}	3.12 _{3.08}	3.12 _{3.08}	0.0 _{0.0}	3.12 _{3.08}
1	State Trk.	16.13 _{6.61}	21.62 _{6.77}	0.0 _{0.0}	2.56 _{2.53}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
1	Action Exec.	57.5 _{7.82}	38.46 _{7.79}	0.0 _{0.0}	22.5 _{6.6}	17.5 _{6.01}	0.0 _{0.0}
1	Effects	6.06 _{4.15}	13.16 _{5.48}	0.0 _{0.0}	5.0 _{3.45}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
1	Num. Reas.	25.0 _{6.85}	17.5 _{6.01}	0.0 _{0.0}	7.5 _{4.16}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
1	Hallucination	57.78 _{7.36}	26.67 _{6.59}	4.44 _{3.07}	8.89 _{4.24}	28.89 _{6.76}	4.44 _{3.07}
1	Composite	55.0 _{7.87}	17.95 _{6.15}	0.0 _{0.0}	37.5 _{7.65}	7.5 _{4.16}	22.5 _{6.6}
1	AVG	39.2 _{2.81}	21.61 _{2.34}	0.95 _{0.55}	11.23 _{1.9}	9.49 _{1.65}	3.81 _{1.08}
10	Object Trk.	55.0 _{7.87}	47.5 _{7.9}	2.5 _{2.47}	40.0 _{7.75}	17.5 _{6.01}	2.5 _{2.47}
10	Fluent Trk.	17.65 _{5.34}	9.8 _{4.16}	1.96 _{1.94}	9.8 _{4.16}	3.92 _{2.72}	1.96 _{1.94}
10	State Trk.	7.14 _{4.87}	19.35 _{7.1}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	2.94 _{2.9}	0.0 _{0.0}
10	Action Exec.	47.5 _{7.9}	42.42 _{8.6}	0.0 _{0.0}	37.5 _{7.65}	17.5 _{6.01}	0.0 _{0.0}
10	Effects	3.12 _{3.08}	7.14 _{4.87}	0.0 _{0.0}	2.63 _{2.6}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
10	Num. Reas.	22.5 _{6.6}	17.5 _{6.01}	5.0 _{3.45}	10.0 _{4.74}	2.5 _{2.47}	5.0 _{3.45}
10	Hallucination	63.16 _{7.83}	23.68 _{6.9}	0.0 _{0.0}	13.16 _{5.48}	28.95 _{7.36}	0.0 _{0.0}
10	Composite	65.0 _{7.54}	22.22 _{6.93}	0.0 _{0.0}	15.0 _{5.65}	12.5 _{5.23}	12.5 _{5.23}
10	AVG	36.25 _{2.73}	23.57 _{2.46}	1.25 _{0.62}	16.37 _{2.21}	10.59 _{1.72}	2.8 _{0.92}
19	Object Trk.	55.0 _{7.87}	40.0 _{7.75}	0.0 _{0.0}	45.0 _{7.87}	17.5 _{6.01}	0.0 _{0.0}
19	Fluent Trk.	8.51 _{4.07}	2.13 _{2.1}	0.0 _{0.0}	2.13 _{2.1}	12.77 _{4.87}	0.0 _{0.0}
19	State Trk.	19.05 _{8.57}	27.78 _{10.56}	0.0 _{0.0}	7.14 _{4.87}	3.57 _{3.51}	0.0 _{0.0}
19	Action Exec.	51.35 _{8.22}	48.48 _{8.7}	0.0 _{0.0}	38.46 _{7.79}	15.38 _{5.78}	0.0 _{0.0}
19	Effects	8.7 _{5.88}	8.7 _{5.88}	0.0 _{0.0}	6.67 _{4.55}	3.33 _{3.28}	0.0 _{0.0}
19	Num. Reas.	12.5 _{5.23}	7.5 _{4.16}	2.5 _{2.47}	7.5 _{4.16}	2.5 _{2.47}	2.5 _{2.47}
19	Hallucination	48.94 _{7.29}	27.66 _{6.52}	2.13 _{2.1}	17.02 _{5.48}	19.15 _{5.74}	2.13 _{2.1}
19	Composite	60.0 _{7.75}	19.44 _{6.6}	2.5 _{2.47}	20.0 _{6.32}	17.5 _{6.01}	15.0 _{5.65}
19	AVG	34.92 _{2.78}	22.18 _{2.47}	0.96 _{0.55}	18.08 _{2.34}	12.22 _{1.86}	2.57 _{0.9}

Table 12: Zero-shot performance without obfuscations and ramification across all question categories and action-sequence lengths

Plan Len.	Question Categories	GPT-4o few shot 1	Gemini Pro few shot 1	LLaMa2 13b few shot 1	LLaMa3 8b few shot 1	LLaMa2 7b few shot 1	Gemma 7b few shot 1
1	Object Trk.	80.0 _{6.32}	48.72 _{8.0}	30.0 _{7.25}	55.0 _{7.87}	30.0 _{7.25}	32.5 _{7.41}
1	Fluent Trk.	12.9 _{6.02}	6.25 _{4.28}	0.0 _{0.0}	9.38 _{5.15}	9.38 _{5.15}	3.12 _{3.08}
1	State Trk.	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
1	Action Exec.	65.0 _{7.54}	45.0 _{7.87}	22.5 _{6.6}	35.0 _{7.54}	25.0 _{6.85}	20.0 _{6.32}
1	Effects	5.0 _{4.87}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
1	Num. Reas.	17.5 _{6.01}	10.0 _{4.74}	10.0 _{4.74}	2.5 _{2.47}	5.0 _{3.45}	7.5 _{4.16}
1	Hallucination	61.36 _{7.34}	48.89 _{7.45}	37.78 _{7.23}	31.11 _{6.9}	31.11 _{6.9}	31.82 _{7.02}
1	Composite	47.37 _{8.1}	47.06 _{8.56}	28.21 _{7.21}	10.0 _{4.74}	30.77 _{7.39}	47.5 _{7.9}
1	AVG	41.28 _{3.21}	28.38 _{2.98}	15.22 _{2.16}	19.57 _{2.39}	14.86 _{2.14}	14.18 _{2.1}
10	Object Trk.	74.36 _{6.99}	42.5 _{7.82}	35.0 _{7.54}	50.0 _{7.91}	30.0 _{7.25}	22.5 _{6.6}
10	Fluent Trk.	26.0 _{6.2}	24.49 _{6.14}	9.8 _{4.16}	17.65 _{5.34}	13.73 _{4.82}	10.2 _{4.32}
10	State Trk.	12.5 _{8.27}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
10	Action Exec.	45.0 _{7.87}	51.43 _{8.45}	22.5 _{6.6}	45.0 _{7.87}	25.0 _{6.85}	17.5 _{6.01}
10	Effects	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	2.63 _{2.6}	0.0 _{0.0}
10	Num. Reas.	15.0 _{5.65}	10.0 _{4.74}	0.0 _{0.0}	5.0 _{3.45}	0.0 _{0.0}	12.5 _{5.23}
10	Hallucination	45.95 _{8.19}	50.0 _{8.11}	21.05 _{6.61}	21.05 _{6.61}	42.11 _{8.01}	43.24 _{8.14}
10	Composite	46.15 _{7.98}	36.36 _{8.37}	28.21 _{7.21}	17.95 _{6.15}	43.59 _{7.94}	53.85 _{7.98}
10	AVG	35.71 _{3.11}	30.43 _{3.03}	12.81 _{1.99}	20.28 _{2.4}	16.37 _{2.21}	15.11 _{2.15}
19	Object Trk.	79.49 _{6.47}	43.59 _{7.94}	52.5 _{7.9}	57.5 _{7.82}	40.0 _{7.75}	37.5 _{7.65}
19	Fluent Trk.	9.09 _{4.33}	11.11 _{4.68}	4.26 _{2.94}	4.26 _{2.94}	10.64 _{4.5}	12.77 _{4.87}
19	State Trk.	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
19	Action Exec.	54.29 _{8.42}	59.38 _{8.68}	7.69 _{4.27}	33.33 _{7.55}	17.95 _{6.15}	17.95 _{6.15}
19	Effects	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
19	Num. Reas.	13.51 _{5.62}	7.5 _{4.16}	2.5 _{2.47}	5.0 _{3.45}	2.5 _{2.47}	12.5 _{5.23}
19	Hallucination	40.43 _{7.16}	46.81 _{7.28}	12.77 _{4.87}	21.28 _{5.97}	17.02 _{5.48}	17.39 _{5.59}
19	Composite	47.37 _{8.1}	45.71 _{8.42}	43.59 _{7.94}	12.5 _{5.23}	43.59 _{7.94}	47.5 _{7.9}
19	AVG	34.36 _{3.15}	30.41 _{3.12}	12.18 _{1.99}	18.45 _{2.36}	13.65 _{2.09}	15.19 _{2.18}

Table 13: Few-shot-1 performance without obfuscations and ramifications across all question categories and action-sequence lengths

Plan Len.	Question Categories	GPT-4o few shot 1	Gemini Pro few shot 1	LLaMa2 13b few shot 1	LLaMa3 8b few shot 1	LLaMa2 7b few shot 1	Gemma 7b few shot 1
1	Object Trk.	75.0 _{6.85}	47.37 _{8.1}	25.0 _{6.85}	47.5 _{7.9}	27.5 _{7.06}	27.5 _{7.06}
1	Fluent Trk.	21.88 _{7.31}	9.68 _{5.31}	3.12 _{3.08}	6.25 _{4.28}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
1	State Trk.	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
1	Action Exec.	48.72 _{8.0}	34.48 _{8.83}	18.75 _{6.9}	32.26 _{8.4}	29.03 _{8.15}	15.62 _{6.42}
1	Effects	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
1	Num. Reas.	27.5 _{7.06}	10.26 _{4.86}	7.5 _{4.16}	10.53 _{4.98}	5.41 _{3.72}	17.5 _{6.01}
1	Hallucination	60.0 _{7.3}	48.89 _{7.45}	17.78 _{5.7}	27.27 _{6.71}	15.38 _{5.78}	28.89 _{6.76}
1	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	AVG	40.0 _{3.2}	27.01 _{3.06}	10.45 _{1.87}	17.8 _{2.35}	11.16 _{1.99}	13.43 _{2.08}
10	Object Trk.	67.5 _{7.41}	50.0 _{8.11}	37.5 _{7.65}	50.0 _{7.91}	45.0 _{7.87}	22.5 _{6.6}
10	Fluent Trk.	26.0 _{6.2}	12.0 _{4.6}	7.84 _{3.76}	13.73 _{4.82}	14.58 _{5.09}	13.73 _{4.82}
10	State Trk.	11.76 _{7.81}	0.0 _{0.0}	3.03 _{2.98}	2.94 _{2.9}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
10	Action Exec.	39.47 _{7.93}	48.39 _{8.98}	9.09 _{5.0}	42.42 _{8.6}	12.5 _{5.85}	27.27 _{7.75}
10	Effects	8.7 _{5.88}	0.0 _{0.0}	5.26 _{3.62}	0.0 _{0.0}	2.7 _{2.67}	0.0 _{0.0}
10	Num. Reas.	20.0 _{6.32}	12.5 _{5.23}	2.5 _{2.47}	7.69 _{4.27}	0.0 _{0.0}	15.0 _{5.65}
10	Hallucination	44.74 _{8.07}	55.26 _{8.07}	16.22 _{6.06}	31.58 _{7.54}	35.29 _{8.2}	35.14 _{7.85}
10	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
10	AVG	34.15 _{3.02}	28.45 _{2.96}	11.76 _{1.95}	20.88 _{2.46}	16.15 _{2.28}	16.12 _{2.23}
19	Object Trk.	82.5 _{6.01}	48.72 _{8.0}	42.5 _{7.82}	65.0 _{7.54}	40.0 _{7.75}	42.5 _{7.82}
19	Fluent Trk.	24.44 _{6.41}	17.78 _{5.7}	12.77 _{4.87}	6.38 _{3.57}	19.57 _{5.85}	21.28 _{5.97}
19	State Trk.	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	3.7 _{3.63}	0.0 _{0.0}
19	Action Exec.	44.74 _{8.07}	57.58 _{8.6}	25.0 _{7.22}	38.89 _{8.12}	34.29 _{8.02}	19.44 _{6.6}
19	Effects	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}
19	Num. Reas.	22.5 _{6.6}	12.5 _{5.23}	5.13 _{3.53}	12.82 _{5.35}	2.7 _{2.67}	15.0 _{5.65}
19	Hallucination	44.68 _{7.25}	48.94 _{7.29}	19.15 _{5.74}	20.0 _{5.96}	22.22 _{6.2}	21.28 _{5.97}
19	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
19	AVG	38.24 _{3.15}	32.46 _{3.1}	16.17 _{2.26}	21.51 _{2.52}	18.85 _{2.43}	18.66 _{2.38}

Table 14: Few-shot-1 performance with ramification and without obfuscations across all question categories and action-sequence lengths

Plan Len.	Question Categories	GPT-4o few shot 1	Gemini Pro few shot 1	LLaMa2 13b few shot 1	LLaMa3 8b few shot 1	LLaMa2 7b few shot 1	Gemma 7b few shot 1
1	Object Trk.	47.57 _{7.9}	35.07 _{5.4}	17.65 _{6.54}	32.57 _{7.41}	26.47 _{7.57}	28.21 _{7.21}
1	Fluent Trk.	24.14 _{7.95}	16.67 _{6.8}	3.33 _{3.28}	3.57 _{3.51}	6.67 _{4.55}	3.23 _{3.17}
1	State Trk.	100.0 _{0.0}	100.0 _{0.0}	6.67 _{6.44}	20.0 _{12.65}	6.67 _{6.44}	10.53 _{7.04}
1	Action Exec.	47.22 _{8.32}	52.94 _{8.56}	16.13 _{6.61}	25.81 _{7.86}	21.21 _{7.12}	28.95 _{7.36}
1	Effects	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	7.69 _{7.39}	4.76 _{4.65}
1	Num. Reas.	12.5 _{5.23}	15.0 _{5.65}	13.89 _{5.76}	13.16 _{5.48}	2.78 _{2.74}	12.5 _{5.23}
1	Hallucination	52.27 _{7.53}	47.73 _{7.53}	23.08 _{6.75}	45.71 _{8.42}	30.77 _{7.39}	33.33 _{7.03}
1	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	AVG	37.24 _{3.45}	34.38 _{3.43}	13.71 _{2.45}	23.32 _{3.04}	16.52 _{2.62}	19.74 _{2.61}
10	Object Trk.	60.07 _{7.75}	42.57 _{7.82}	30.3 _{8.0}	47.57 _{7.9}	24.24 _{7.46}	15.0 _{5.65}
10	Fluent Trk.	26.53 _{6.31}	16.67 _{5.38}	12.5 _{5.23}	21.74 _{6.08}	12.5 _{5.23}	18.37 _{5.53}
10	State Trk.	100.0 _{0.0}	50.0 _{35.36}	9.09 _{8.67}	8.33 _{7.98}	7.69 _{7.39}	16.67 _{6.8}
10	Action Exec.	46.67 _{9.11}	53.57 _{9.42}	22.73 _{8.93}	46.15 _{9.78}	39.13 _{10.18}	14.71 _{6.07}
10	Effects	—	0.0 _{0.0}	7.69 _{7.39}	8.33 _{7.98}	0.0 _{0.0}	6.67 _{4.55}
10	Num. Reas.	23.08 _{6.75}	17.5 _{6.01}	0.0 _{0.0}	10.0 _{5.48}	2.94 _{2.9}	12.82 _{5.35}
10	Hallucination	38.24 _{8.33}	52.63 _{8.1}	24.0 _{8.54}	40.0 _{8.94}	32.0 _{9.33}	42.11 _{8.01}
10	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
10	AVG	38.34 _{3.5}	34.52 _{3.39}	15.73 _{2.73}	29.59 _{3.26}	17.58 _{2.82}	18.46 _{2.41}
19	Object Trk.	55.07 _{7.87}	33.33 _{7.55}	25.93 _{8.43}	55.07 _{7.87}	14.81 _{6.84}	20.51 _{6.47}
19	Fluent Trk.	8.51 _{4.07}	7.14 _{3.97}	7.69 _{5.23}	4.88 _{3.36}	11.54 _{6.27}	13.04 _{4.97}
19	State Trk.	—	0.0 _{0.0}	20.0 _{17.89}	12.5 _{11.69}	0.0 _{0.0}	18.18 _{8.22}
19	Action Exec.	17.14 _{6.37}	50.0 _{8.84}	16.0 _{7.33}	22.58 _{7.51}	16.0 _{7.33}	13.89 _{5.76}
19	Effects	0.0 _{0.0}	100.0 _{0.0}	0.0 _{0.0}	9.09 _{8.67}	0.0 _{0.0}	10.53 _{7.04}
19	Num. Reas.	18.92 _{6.44}	15.0 _{5.65}	0.0 _{0.0}	3.03 _{2.98}	3.57 _{3.51}	15.0 _{5.65}
19	Hallucination	35.56 _{7.14}	39.13 _{7.2}	14.29 _{7.64}	10.53 _{4.98}	23.81 _{9.29}	21.28 _{5.97}
19	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
19	AVG	26.83 _{3.09}	28.71 _{3.18}	12.5 _{2.84}	18.81 _{2.75}	12.5 _{2.84}	16.47 _{2.35}

Table 15: Few-shot-1 performance with obfuscation and without ramification across all question categories and action-sequence lengths

Plan Len.	Question Categories	GPT-4o few shot 1	Gemini Pro few shot 1	LLaMa2 13b few shot 1	LLaMa3 8b few shot 1	LLaMa2 7b few shot 1	Gemma 7b few shot 1
1	Object Trk.	55.07 _{7.87}	27.57 _{7.06}	17.65 _{6.54}	30.07 _{7.25}	14.71 _{6.07}	17.56 _{6.01}
1	Fluent Trk.	16.67 _{6.8}	10.34 _{5.66}	0.0 _{0.0}	3.33 _{3.28}	0.0 _{0.0}	3.23 _{3.17}
1	State Trk.	100.0 _{0.0}	100.0 _{0.0}	14.29 _{9.35}	10.0 _{9.49}	25.0 _{10.83}	3.85 _{3.77}
1	Action Exec.	54.29 _{8.42}	45.16 _{8.94}	29.63 _{8.79}	31.82 _{9.93}	18.52 _{7.48}	32.26 _{8.4}
1	Effects	40.02 _{1.91}	75.02 _{1.65}	14.29 _{9.35}	0.0 _{0.0}	6.67 _{6.44}	8.33 _{5.64}
1	Num. Reas.	18.42 _{6.29}	15.0 _{5.65}	14.71 _{6.07}	10.0 _{5.48}	5.88 _{4.04}	20.0 _{6.32}
1	Hallucination	46.67 _{7.44}	44.44 _{7.41}	13.89 _{5.76}	33.33 _{8.61}	22.22 _{6.93}	28.89 _{6.76}
1	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	AVG	39.69 _{3.51}	30.53 _{3.34}	14.81 _{2.58}	19.65 _{3.02}	13.02 _{2.43}	17.72 _{2.48}
10	Object Trk.	62.57 _{6.65}	42.57 _{7.82}	30.3 _{8.0}	47.57 _{7.9}	33.33 _{8.21}	12.5 _{5.23}
10	Fluent Trk.	24.06 _{6.04}	8.33 _{3.99}	17.07 _{5.88}	16.67 _{5.38}	12.25 _{5.11}	16.05 _{5.18}
10	State Trk.	100.0 _{0.0}	50.0 _{35.36}	20.0 _{12.65}	16.67 _{10.76}	16.67 _{10.76}	17.24 _{7.01}
10	Action Exec.	31.03 _{8.59}	55.56 _{9.56}	21.74 _{8.6}	23.81 _{9.29}	12.56 _{7.5}	16.67 _{6.8}
10	Effects	57.14 _{18.7}	66.67 _{19.25}	0.0 _{0.0}	25.0 _{12.5}	0.0 _{0.0}	10.71 _{5.85}
10	Num. Reas.	10.53 _{4.98}	12.5 _{5.23}	2.94 _{2.9}	3.57 _{3.51}	0.0 _{0.0}	12.5 _{5.23}
10	Hallucination	45.45 _{8.67}	51.35 _{8.22}	22.73 _{8.93}	28.0 _{8.98}	27.27 _{9.5}	35.14 _{7.85}
10	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
10	AVG	35.68 _{3.4}	32.53 _{3.31}	16.95 _{2.82}	24.19 _{3.14}	15.02 _{2.66}	17.32 _{2.37}
19	Object Trk.	52.57 _{7.9}	37.57 _{6.65}	25.0 _{8.18}	42.57 _{7.82}	17.86 _{7.24}	17.56 _{6.01}
19	Fluent Trk.	27.27 _{6.71}	20.0 _{6.32}	7.14 _{4.87}	15.62 _{6.42}	7.14 _{4.87}	21.28 _{5.97}
19	State Trk.	50.0 _{35.36}	50.0 _{35.36}	20.0 _{17.89}	33.33 _{15.71}	16.67 _{15.21}	18.18 _{8.22}
19	Action Exec.	40.0 _{8.94}	56.67 _{9.05}	30.43 _{9.59}	33.33 _{10.29}	30.43 _{9.59}	21.21 _{7.12}
19	Effects	0.0 _{0.0}	66.67 _{27.22}	0.0 _{0.0}	11.11 _{10.48}	0.0 _{0.0}	15.79 _{8.37}
19	Num. Reas.	20.0 _{6.76}	15.0 _{5.65}	7.41 _{5.04}	3.33 _{3.28}	0.0 _{0.0}	20.0 _{6.32}
19	Hallucination	31.82 _{7.02}	41.37 _{7.26}	22.22 _{9.8}	17.65 _{6.54}	27.78 _{10.56}	27.66 _{6.52}
19	Composite	—	—	—	—	—	—
19	AVG	33.84 _{3.36}	33.83 _{3.34}	17.16 _{3.26}	22.86 _{3.17}	14.81 _{3.06}	20.97 _{2.58}

Table 16: Few-shot-1 performance with obfuscations and ramifications across all question categories and action-sequence lengths

C.3 Additional Observations

C.3.1 Observations on Domains Variation




Figure 4: Performance of proprietary LLMs without obfuscations by ramifications averaged across all domains and action-sequence length 19




Figure 5: Performance of proprietary LLMs without obfuscations by ramifications averaged across all length 19

State Tracking and Action Executability is better on the Transportation Domains Analysis of Figure 4 reveals statistically significant trends concerning the performance of state tracking and action executability questions within transportation domains. These types of questions consistently show enhanced performance when situated in transportation-related contexts, as indicated by results falling outside the SEM.

While other tendencies are also observable, such as improved performance in object tracking, fluent tracking, and numerical reasoning within transportation domains, these trends remain within the SEM. This suggests that the differences are not statistically significant although there is a slight preference for transportation settings in these categories. Thus, while transportation domains specifically enhance model capabilities in state tracking and action executability, the influence on other categories of questions is less pronounced and should be interpreted cautiously.

Hallucination Detection is better on the Non-Transportation Domains Figure 4 highlights a statistically significant trend wherein hallucination detection tasks exhibit better performance in non-transportation domains. This notable improvement suggests that models may be better tuned or more responsive to the complexities and nuances in scenarios outside of transportation contexts when it comes to recognizing and correcting hallucinations in the data.

Conversely, while there is a slight indication that the effects of actions are also better understood in non-transportation domains, this performance difference remains within the SEM. Therefore, although there is a tendency for improved action effect recognition in non-transportation settings, this finding is not statistically robust and cannot be conclusively affirmed. This underscores the variability




Figure 6: Performance of proprietary LLMs without obfuscations and ramifications across domain types and action-sequence lengths

in model performance across different domains and highlights the need for cautious interpretation and further validation.

Little statistical differences for Ramifications and Domain Types Analysis of Figure 8 shows that the performance on questions involving ramifications versus those without ramifications falls statistically within the standard error of the mean (SEM). This indicates that the presence or absence of ramifications does not significantly impact overall model performance. Although there is a slight tendency for base and derived fluents to perform better in scenarios involving ramifications, this difference also remains within the SEM boundaries.

In our examination of behavior by domains as depicted in Figure 5, a similar pattern emerges. Base and derived fluents tend towards better performance in transportation-related scenarios, whereas static fluents tend to perform better in non-transportation contexts. However, all these observations remain statistically within the standard error of the mean (SEM), indicating that these trends do not represent significant deviations. For persistent fluents, there is a noticeable, albeit slight, inclination towards better performance in transportation scenarios. Nonetheless, given the proximity of these results to the SEM threshold, these findings should be approached cautiously.

C.3.2 Fluents




Figure 7: Performance of proprietary LLMs without obfuscations and ramifications across fluent subcategories and action-sequence lengths




Figure 8: Performance of proprietary LLMs without obfuscations on both with and without ramifications constraints

C.4 Ramifications

D Fine-tuning Results and Plots

In this section, we describe the fine-tuning performed on the training split of ACTIONREASONING-BENCH described in section 3.6. We finetune Llama3-8b for 2 epochs with AdamW optimizer and a batch size of 4. Fig 9 and 10 shows the loss over time for binary and free-answer fine-tuning respectively.




Figure 9: Loss function over time for Llama3-8b on Binary Questions (True/False)




Figure 10: Loss function over time for Llama3-8b on Free-answer Questions

E Free Answers Evaluation Details

E.1 Metrics Tests

Despite the widespread use of Rouge (Lin, 2004) in natural language generation tasks, there are several inherent limitations that undermine its effectiveness as a reliable metric for our task. We highlight some examples below to support our claim.

Test Case 1: Fails on simple paraphrasing

```
block b1 is on b2
block b1 is on top of b2
ROUGE-1: {'r': 0.7142857142857143, 'p': 1.0, 'f': 0.8333333284722222}
ROUGE-2: {'r': 0.5, 'p': 0.75, 'f': 0.5999999952}
ROUGE-L: {'r': 0.7142857142857143, 'p': 1.0, 'f': 0.8333333284722222}
```

```
block b1 is on block b2
b1 is on b2
ROUGE-1: {'r': 1.0, 'p': 0.8, 'f': 0.888888839506174}
ROUGE-2: {'r': 0.6666666666666666, 'p': 0.4, 'f': 0.4999999531250006}
ROUGE-L: {'r': 1.0, 'p': 0.8, 'f': 0.888888839506174}
```

Test Case 2: Fails when object names interchanged

```
block b1 is on block b2
block b2 is on block b1
ROUGE-1: {'r': 1.0, 'p': 1.0, 'f': 0.999999995}
ROUGE-2: {'r': 0.8, 'p': 0.8, 'f': 0.7999999950000002}
ROUGE-L: {'r': 0.6, 'p': 0.6, 'f': 0.5999999950000001}
```

Test Case 3: Fails when asked about multiple object type names

```
Question: What is the object type of block b1, block b2, block b3 and block b4
label: block
response: block, block, block and block
ROUGE-1: {'r': 0.3333333333333333, 'p': 1.0, 'f': 0.4999999962500001}
ROUGE-2: {'r': 0.0, 'p': 0.0, 'f': 0.0}
ROUGE-L: {'r': 0.3333333333333333, 'p': 1.0, 'f': 0.4999999962500001}
Even though the response is not as exact as label, the repsonse is correct.
```

Test Case 4: Fails when object type changed with same object name

```
block b1 is under block b2
ball b1 is under ball b2
ROUGE-1: {'r': 0.8, 'p': 0.8, 'f': 0.7999999950000002}
ROUGE-2: {'r': 0.4, 'p': 0.4, 'f': 0.3999999950000001}
ROUGE-L: {'r': 0.8, 'p': 0.8, 'f': 0.7999999950000002}
```

Test Case 5: Fails on simple negation

```
block b1 is not on block b2
block b1 is on top of block b2
ROUGE-1: {'r': 0.7142857142857143, 'p': 0.8333333333333334, 'f': 0.7692307642603551}
ROUGE-2: {'r': 0.42857142857142855, 'p': 0.5, 'f': 0.4615384565680473}
ROUGE-L: {'r': 0.7142857142857143, 'p': 0.8333333333333334, 'f': 0.7692307642603551}
```

Test Case 6: Fails on simple negation with paraphrasing

```
block b1 is on block b2
block b2 is not under block b1, but on top
ROUGE-1: {'r': 0.4444444444444444, 'p': 0.8, 'f': 0.5714285668367348}
ROUGE-2: {'r': 0.1111111111111111, 'p': 0.2, 'f': 0.14285713826530627}
ROUGE-L: {'r': 0.3333333333333333, 'p': 0.6, 'f': 0.4285714239795918}
```

F Dataset Creation

F.1 Domain, grid-visit-all example

```
(define (domain grid-visit-all)
  (:requirements :typing)
  (:types place - object)
  (:predicates (connected ?x ?y - place)
               (at-robot ?x - place)
               (visited ?x - place))

  (:action move
   :parameters (?curpos ?nextpos - place)
   :precondition (and
                 (at-robot ?curpos)
                 (connected ?curpos ?nextpos))
   :effect (and
           (at-robot ?nextpos)
           (not (at-robot ?curpos))
           (visited ?nextpos))))
```

Going line by line: *(: requirements : typing)* indicates that objects involved in the domain are of different types. *(: types place – object)* defines what types of objects we are working with; in this case, it is just a place. *(: predicates...)* define predicates in the problem that take in objects. Predicates can only be true or false. And finally, we have *actions*; in this example, there is a single action, but there can be many in general. Each action has *parameters* that define variables of various *types*, *precondition*, which defines a set of *predicates* that need to be true in order to execute the action, and *effect*, which is a set of predicates that will be true after the action is executed.

F.2 Instance, grid-visit-all example

An instance is composed of objects, initial and final conditions. This is a trivial problem instance, as initial and goal conditions are the same.

```
(define (problem grid-1)
  (:domain grid-visit-all)
  (:objects loc-x1-y0 - place )
  (:init (at-robot loc-x1-y0)
         (visited loc-x1-y0))
  (:goal (and (visited loc-x1-y0))))
```

F.3 Blocksworld

The Blocksworld involves a set of blocks, a hand that can manipulate blocks one at a time, and a table where the blocks stay. The objective is to re-stack an initial set of blocks to a desired configuration using a hand.

F.4 Logistics

The Logistics is a transportation domain that involves of transport of packages using 2 types of mobiles: trucks and airplanes. Package locations are located within cities. Each city has a unique airport. The objective is to move packages using mobiles from initial to goal locations. Those locations can be in various cities.

F.5 Depots

The Depots is a transportation domain that is a combination of Blocksworld and Logistics. The transportation aspects are the same as in the Logistics domain, but one can stack packages like in Blocksworld.

F.6 Driverlog

The Driverlog is a transportation domain that involves the transportation of packages using trucks. It involves packages, trucks, locations and drivers.

F.7 Goldminer

The Goldminer involves an agent, bombs, a laser, gold, and a mine organized as a grid. Each cell in the grid represents soft or hard rock. An agent can use bombs or a laser to penetrate the soft rock to uncover gold. The bomb cannot destroy gold, but the laser can. The objective is to collect gold.

F.8 Gripper

The Gripper is a transportation domain that involves a single agent with 2 "grippers" to pick up and put down objects. The objective is to move objects from initial locations to goal locations.

F.9 Miconic

Miconic is a transportation domain that involves an elevator, floors, and passengers. The objective is to transport passengers from the initial to goal floors using an elevator.

F.10 Mystery

The Mystery is a transportation domain with fuel restrictions. It involves locations, mobiles, fuel and fuel constraints, and cargo. The objective is to organize proper logistics.

F.11 N-puzzle

A common variation of this domain is a familiar "15 puzzle", a slide square puzzle with 15 tiles numbered 1-15 and one open slot. The objective is to rearrange the tiles in numerical order. N-puzzle is a generalization to N tiles.

F.12 Satellite

This domain involves the scheduling of satellites to gather information about space phenomena. It involves satellites, instruments, image modes, pointing directions, locations, instrument capabilities, calibration target functions, initial goal pointing directions, and image objectives.

F.13 Spanner

This domain involves an agent, a location, spanners (tools) and nuts to be tightened. The objective is to pick up spanners and tighten the nuts. The caveat is that only one spanner can be used to tighten one nut.

F.14 Visit-All

This very simple domain involves an agent that has to visit all cells in an $N \times N$ grid.

F.15 Zenotravel

Zenotravel is a transportation domain that involves airplanes, locations, fuel levels, and passengers. The objective is to transport passengers from initial to goal locations and not run out of fuel.

	test-true_false_answer	test-free_answer	train-true_false_answer	train-free_answer
action_executability	240	119	2360	2481
effects	957	108	8243	1842
fluent_tracking	1600	130	15801	5870
hallucination	240	130	7660	13426
numerical_reasoning	240	120	12760	6380
object_tracking	1598	120	8696	1180
state_tracking	153	101	1147	1849

Table 17: dataset split

Domain Description	Domains Info					Instances Info			Other			
	# fluents	# actions	<exec> _{std}	<effects-wo-ram> _{std}	<effects-wi-ram> _{std}	# object types	<objects> _{std}	<actions from a state> _{std}	<log(state space size)> _{std}	Domain type	IPC Year	State Complexity
Blocksworld	5	4	2.25 ± 0.83	4.5 ± 0.5		1	8.1 ± 0.83	132.6 ± 26.67	92.46 ± 3.96	2000		$O(2^{N^2+2N})$
Depots	6	5	3.4 ± 1.36	4 ± 1.67		6	25.5 ± 2.25	4361.8 ± 1052.02	158.68 ± 4.57	2002		$O(2^{25N^2+22N})$
DriverLog	5	6	2.33 ± 0.47	2.33 ± 0.47		4	19.1 ± 2.02	1120.8 ± 503.46	131.37 ± 9.19	2002		$O(2^{25N^2+N})$
GoldMiner	12	7	3 ± 0.53	2.86 ± 0.83		1	15.3 ± 4.29	772.8 ± 451.06	123.57 ± 10.11	2018		$O(2^{2N^2+6N})$
Grippers	4	3	2 ± 0.82	2.67 ± 0.47		4	15.8 ± 1.47	245.8 ± 161.38	101.14 ± 10.99	1998		$O(2^{2N^2+33N^2})$
Logistics	3	6	2 ± 0.58	2 ± 0		5	18 ± 2.57	623.0 ± 312.62	119.21 ± 11.73	1998		$O(2^{21N^2})$
Miconic	8	4	2.25 ± 0.43	1.75 ± 0.43		2	17.1 ± 1.58	279.4 ± 58.04	106.6 ± 4.08	2000		$O(2^{21N^2+44N})$
Mystery	7	3	4 ± 0	4 ± 0		5	24.2 ± 1.33	413.2 ± 154.92	113.05 ± 7.48	1998		$O(2^{21N^2+33N})$
NPuzzle	3	1	3 ± 0	4 ± 0		2	17 ± 0	576.0 ± 0.0	120.77 ± 0.0	2018		$O(2^{22N^2})$
Satellite	8	5	2.8 ± 1.47	1.8 ± 0.75		4	24.7 ± 3.85	1234.8 ± 490.17	133.48 ± 8.65	2002		$O(2^{25N^2+43N})$
Spanner	6	3	3 ± 1.41	2.33 ± 0.47		4	22.3 ± 0.46	455.6 ± 233.83	116.29 ± 0.97	2011		$O(2^{23N^2+22N})$
Visitall	3	1	2 ± 0	3 ± 0		1	23.9 ± 3.01	556.4 ± 148.19	119.5 ± 4.73	2014		$O(2^{2N^2+5N})$
ZenoTravel	4	5	2.8 ± 0.75	2.8 ± 0.98		4	20.1 ± 1.04	4340.0 ± 1282.95	158.03 ± 7.03	2002		$O(2^{25N^2+N})$

Table 18: Description of the dataset. Note: N denotes the number of objects in each object type. Ex in domain Miconic there are N passengers and N floors

F.16 Additional Statistics

F.17 Domains

F.18 Planning Description

Simple planning involves finding a sequence of actions that will take the world from a given initial state to a state that satisfies the goal conditions. Predicates (as defined in PDDL; also referred to as "fluents" in the reasoning about actions community) are properties of the world, such as $on(a, b)$ meaning a is on b , and a state of the world describes what fluents are true and what are not true in that world. A (planning) domain description D describes the fluents in that domain, the actions in that domain, and how the actions impact the fluents in that domain. In formal planning languages, often the language PDDL is used to describe domains. Given a domain description D , the semantics of the description language defines a transition function $\Phi_D : states \times actions \rightarrow states$, where $\Phi_D(s, a) = s'$ means that execution of the action a in the state s results in the state s' . If $\Phi_D(s, a)$ is undefined, then a is said to be inexecutable in s . A simple goal is a classical formula whose truth value can be evaluated with respect to a state. A planning instance consists of the triplet (D, s_0, g) , where D is a domain description, s_0 is an initial state, and g is a goal. Given a planning instance (D, s_0, g) , a plan is any sequence of actions a_1, \dots, a_n where the state $\Phi_D(a_n, \Phi_D(a_{n-1}, \dots \Phi_D(a_1, s_0) \dots))$ is defined and g evaluates to true with respect to that state. The plan generation task that we are concerned with is the task where D , s_0 , and g , described in natural language, are together given as input, and the model has to generate a plan a_1, \dots, a_n .

F.19 PDDL

"The Planning Domain Definition Language (PDDL) is a formal knowledge representation language designed to express planning models ... a de-facto standard input language for many planning systems, although it is not the only modeling language for planning. Several variants of PDDL have emerged that capture planning problem of different natures and complexities, with a focus on deterministic problems." (Haslum et al., 2019). One can use PDDL to describe the planning domain and a planning problem instance (objects, initial, and goal conditions). An example of Visit-All domain and a problem instance described in PDDL can be seen in Appendix F. This particular domain example belongs to PDDL's subset, a language called "STRIPS" (Stanford Research Institute Problem Solver) (Fikes and Nilsson, 1971). In addition to STRIPS, this domain description is "typed": objects involved in a problem have type and subtype definitions. In this study, we restrict our attention only to typed "STRIPS" domains and instances. Those include typed objects and predicates that operate on the

objects and actions with preconditions and effects and a problem instance with typed objects and initial and goal states.

G Calculating State Space

In the following section, we calculate state-space complexity for the domains present in ACTION-REASONINGBENCH. A higher state-space complexity refers to a complex domain in traditional AI (Rintanen, 2004). Therefore, we calculate whether the LLMs also struggle more in the “harder” domains. Fig 11 represents the plot between the accuracy and state-space complexity of the domains. The plot reveals that LLMs function differently than traditional AI solvers.




Figure 11: Accuracy vs state-space complexity (measured in terms of number of fluents) for GPT-4o

G.1 Blocksworld

The number of fluents in a state is defined by predicates:

- on(b1,b2)
- notable(b)
- clear(b)
- holding(b)
- handempty

The complexity of a state is, where N is the number of objects

$$O(2^{N^2+2N}) \tag{1}$$

G.2 Depots

- (at ?x - locatable ?y - place)
- (on ?x - crate ?y - surface)
- (in ?x - crate ?y - truck)
- (lifting ?x - hoist ?y - crate)
- (available ?x - hoist)
- (clear ?x - surface))

$$O(2^{4N^2+2N}) \tag{2}$$

G.3 Driverlog

- (at ?obj - locatable ?loc - location)
- (in ?obj1 - obj ?obj - truck)
- (driving ?d - driver ?v - truck)
- (link ?x ?y - location)
- (path ?x ?y - location)
- (empty ?v - truck)

$$O(2^{5N^2-N}) \quad (3)$$

G.4 Goldminer

- (connected ?x - LOC ?y - LOC)
- (robot-at ?x - LOC)
- (bomb-at ?x - LOC)
- (laser-at ?x - LOC)
- (soft-rock-at ?x - LOC)
- (hard-rock-at ?x - LOC)
- (gold-at ?x - LOC)
- (clear ?x - LOC)
- (arm-empty)
- (holds-bomb)
- (holds-laser)
- (holds-gold)

$$O(2^{N^2+6N}) \quad (4)$$

G.5 Grippers

- (carry ?r - robot ?o - object ?g - gripper)
- (at-roby ?r - robot ?x - room)
- (at ?o - object ?x - room)
- (free ?r - robot ?g - gripper)

$$O(2^{N^3+3N^2}) \quad (5)$$

G.6 Logistics

- (in-city ?loc - place ?city - city)
- (at ?obj - physobj ?loc - place)
- (in ?pkg - package ?veh - vehicle)

$$O(2^{3N^2}) \quad (6)$$

G.7 Miconic

- (origin ?person - passenger ?floor - floor)
- (destin ?person - passenger ?floor - floor)
- (above ?floor1 - floor ?floor2 - floor)
- (boarded ?person - passenger)
- (not-boarded ?person - passenger)
- (served ?person - passenger)
- (not-served ?person - passenger)
- (lift-at ?floor - floor)

$$O(2^{3N^2+4N}) \quad (7)$$

G.8 Mystery

- (at ?v - movable ?l - location)
- (has-fuel ?l - location ?f - fuel)
- (in ?c - cargo ?v - vehicle)
- (has-space ?v - vehicle ?s - space)
- (conn ?l1 ?l2 - location)
- (fuel-neighbor ?f1 ?f2 - fuel)
- (space-neighbor ?s1 ?s2 - space)

$$O(2^{7N^2-3N}) \quad (8)$$

G.9 N-Puzzle

- (at ?tile - tile ?position - position)
- (neighbor ?p1 - position ?p2 - position)
- (empty ?position - position)

$$O(2^{2N^2}) \quad (9)$$

G.10 Satellite

- (on-board ?i - instrument ?s - satellite)
- (supports ?i - instrument ?m - mode)
- (pointing ?s - satellite ?d - direction)
- (have-image ?d - direction ?m - mode)
- (calibration-target ?i - instrument ?d - direction)
- (power-avail ?s - satellite)
- (power-on ?i - instrument)
- (calibrated ?i - instrument)

$$O(2^{5N^2+3N}) \quad (10)$$

G.11 Spanner

- (at ?m - locatable ?l - location)
- (carrying ?m - man ?s - spanner)
- (link ?l1 - location ?l2 - location)
- (useable ?s - spanner)
- (tightened ?n - nut)
- (loose ?n - nut))

$$O(2^{3N^2+2N}) \tag{11}$$

G.12 Visitall

- (connected ?x ?y - place)
- (at-robot ?x - place)
- (visited ?x - place)

$$O(2^{N^2+N}) \tag{12}$$

G.13 Zenotravel

- (at ?x - (either person aircraft) ?c - city)
- (in ?p - person ?a - aircraft)
- (fuel-level ?a - aircraft ?l - level)
- (next ?l1 ?l2 - flevel)

$$O(2^{5N^2-N}) \tag{13}$$

H Domain Descriptions

H.1 Without Obfuscation Without Ramifications

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]

Picking up a block is only possible if that block is clear, on the table, and the hand is empty. By picking up that block, it makes that block not present on the table and not clear. It also leads to the block being held and makes the hand not empty. Putting down the block can only be executed if the block is being held. Putting down the block causes that block to be clear and on the table. It also causes the hand to be not holding the block and makes the hand empty. A block can be stacked on the second block if it is being held and the second block is clear. By stacking the first block on the second, it causes the first block to clear and on top of the second block. Meanwhile, the second block is not clear, and the hand becomes empty as it is not holding the block. The block can also be unstacked from the top of the second block only if the hand is empty and the first block is clear and on top of the second block. Unstacking the first block from the second causes the second block to be clear. The first block is now being held, not clear, and not on top of the second block. Furthermore, the hand is not empty.

A state is a set of valid properties. Properties may or may not involve negations. Properties of the state can be of 4 types: base, derived, persistent, and static. Base properties of the state are properties that don't depend on other properties. In this domain, they are: a block is on the table and a block is not on the table. Derived properties of the state are properties that depend on other properties. In this domain, they are: a block is clear, hand is empty, a block is not clear and hand is not empty. Self constraint properties of the state are properties that

depend on themselves. In this domain, they are: a block is being held, a block is on another block, a block is not being held and a block is not on another block. Static properties of the state are properties that don't change under any action. There are no static properties of the state in this domain.

H.2 Without Obfuscation With Ramifications

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]

Picking up a block is only possible if that block is clear, on the table, and the hand is empty. Picking up the block leads to the block being held. Putting down the block can only be executed if the block is being held. Putting down the block causes the block to be on the table. A block can be stacked on the second block if it is being held and the second block is clear. By stacking the first block on the second, it causes the first block to be on top of the second block. The block can also be unstacked from the top of the second block only if the hand is empty and the first block is clear and on top of the second block.

Unstacking the first block from the second causes first block to be held A block is said to be clear if it is not being held and there are no blocks that are on top of it. The hand is said to be empty if and only if it is not holding any block. The block can only be at one place at a time.

A state is a set of valid properties. Properties may or may not involve negations. Properties of the state can be of 4 types: base, derived, persistent, and static. Base properties of the state are properties that don't depend on other properties. In this domain, they are: a block is on the table and a block is not on the table. Derived properties of the state are properties that depend on other properties. In this domain, they are: a block is clear, hand is empty, a block is not clear and hand is not empty. Self constraint properties of the state are properties that depend on themselves. In this domain, they are: a block is being held, a block is on another block, a block is not being held and a block is not on another block. Static properties of the state are properties that don't change under any action. There are no static properties of the state in this domain.

H.3 With Obfuscation With Ramifications

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]

novyuecllio a qbyyxzqvdh is only possible if that qbyyxzqvdh is clear, wtuwjwbuja the gcbwvwykv, and the egpbpdalq is empty. ovyuecllio the qbyyxzqvdh leads to the qbyyxzqvdh being casqrrrojp. xskgihcct the qbyyxzqvdh can only be executed if the qbyyxzqvdh is being casqrrrojp. xskgihcct the qbyyxzqvdh causes the qbyyxzqvdh to be wtuwjwbuja the gcbwvwykv. A qbyyxzqvdh can be osckkwtdoh wtuwjwbuja the second qbyyxzqvdh if it is being casqrrrojp and the second qbyyxzqvdh is clear. By osckkwtdoh the first qbyyxzqvdh wtuwjwbuja the second, it causes the first qbyyxzqvdh to be wtuwjwbuja top of the second qbyyxzqvdh. The qbyyxzqvdh can also be wxqdukszo from the top of the second qbyyxzqvdh only if the egpbpdalq is empty and the first qbyyxzqvdh is clear and wtuwjwbuja top of the second qbyyxzqvdh.

Wxqdukszo the first qbyyxzqvdh from the second causes first qbyyxzqvdh to be casqrrrojp A qbyyxzqvdh is said to be clear if it is not being casqrrrojp and there are no qbyyxzqvdh that are wtuwjwbuja top of it. The egpbpdalq is said to be empty if and only if it is not casqrrrojp any qbyyxzqvdh. The qbyyxzqvdh can only be at one place at a time.

A state is a set of valid properties. Properties may or may not involve negations. Properties of the state can be of 4 types: base, derived, persistent, and static. Base properties of the state are properties that don't depend wtuwjwbuja other properties. In this domain, they are: a qbyyxzqvdh is wtuwjwbuja the gcbwvwykv and a qbyyxzqvdh is not wtuwjwbuja the gcbwvwykv. Derived properties of the state are properties that depend wtuwjwbuja other properties. In this domain, they are: a qbyyxzqvdh is clear, egpbpdalq is empty, a qbyyxzqvdh is not clear and egpbpdalq is not empty. Self constraint properties of the state are properties that depend

wtuwjwbuja themselves. In this domain, they are: a qbyyzzqvdh is being casqrrrojp, a qbyyzzqvdh is wtuwjwbuja another qbyyzzqvdh, a qbyyzzqvdh is not being casqrrrojp and a qbyyzzqvdh is not wtuwjwbuja another qbyyzzqvdh. Static properties of the state are properties that don't change under any action. There are no static properties of the state in this domain.

H.4 With Obfuscation Without Ramifications

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]

novyuecllio a qbyyzzqvdh is only possible if that qbyyzzqvdh is clear, wtuwjwbuja the gcbwwvyvkv, and the egbbpdalq is empty. By ovyuecllio that qbyyzzqvdh, it makes that qbyyzzqvdh not present wtuwjwbuja the gcbwwvyvkv and not clear. It also leads to the qbyyzzqvdh being casqrrrojp and makes the egbbpdalq not empty. xskgihcct the qbyyzzqvdh can only be executed if the qbyyzzqvdh is being casqrrrojp. xskgihcct the qbyyzzqvdh causes that qbyyzzqvdh to be clear and wtuwjwbuja the gcbwwvyvkv. It also causes the egbbpdalq to be not casqrrrojp the qbyyzzqvdh and makes the egbbpdalq empty. A qbyyzzqvdh can be oscckwdtoh wtuwjwbuja the second qbyyzzqvdh if it is being casqrrrojp and the second qbyyzzqvdh is clear. By oscckwdtoh the first qbyyzzqvdh wtuwjwbuja the second, it causes the first qbyyzzqvdh to clear and wtuwjwbuja top of the second qbyyzzqvdh. Meanwhile, the second qbyyzzqvdh is not clear, and the egbbpdalq becomes empty as it is not casqrrrojp the qbyyzzqvdh. The qbyyzzqvdh can also be wxqdwukszo from the top of the second qbyyzzqvdh only if the egbbpdalq is empty and the first qbyyzzqvdh is clear and wtuwjwbuja top of the second qbyyzzqvdh. Wxqdwukszo the first qbyyzzqvdh from the second causes the second qbyyzzqvdh to be clear. The first qbyyzzqvdh is now being casqrrrojp, not clear, and not wtuwjwbuja top of the second qbyyzzqvdh. Furthermore, the egbbpdalq is not empty.

A state is a set of valid properties. Properties may or may not involve negations. Properties of the state can be of 4 types: base, derived, persistent, and static. Base properties of the state are properties that don't depend wtuwjwbuja other properties. In this domain, they are: a qbyyzzqvdh is wtuwjwbuja the gcbwwvyvkv and a qbyyzzqvdh is not wtuwjwbuja the gcbwwvyvkv. Derived properties of the state are properties that depend wtuwjwbuja other properties. In this domain, they are: a qbyyzzqvdh is clear, egbbpdalq is empty, a qbyyzzqvdh is not clear and egbbpdalq is not empty. Self constraint properties of the state are properties that depend wtuwjwbuja themselves. In this domain, they are: a qbyyzzqvdh is being casqrrrojp, a qbyyzzqvdh is wtuwjwbuja another qbyyzzqvdh, a qbyyzzqvdh is not being casqrrrojp and a qbyyzzqvdh is not wtuwjwbuja another qbyyzzqvdh. Static properties of the state are properties that don't change under any action. There are no static properties of the state in this domain.

I Examples of Questions

I.1 Object Tracking

I.1.1 True/False Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]:
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]:
Block b1 is on the table, block b2 is clear, block b2 is on the table, block b3 is clear, block b3 is placed on top of block b7, block b4 is placed on top of block b1, block b5 is clear, block b5 is placed on top of block b4, block b6 is located on the table, block b7 is on top of block b6 and hand is empty.

[Question]:
Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from top of block b7, block b3 is unstacked to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for b1: block b1 is located on the table?

[Answer]:
True

I.1.2 Free Answer Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]
Block b1 is on block b7, block b2 is clear, block b2 is on top of block b6, block b3 is placed on top of block b4, block b4 is located on the table, block b5 is clear, block b5 is located on the table, block b6 is on top of block b3, block b7 is located on the table, block b8 is on block b1, block b9 is clear, block b9 is on block b8 and hand is empty.

[QUESTION]
Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: block b9 is unstacked from top of block b8 to reach the current state. In this state, what is the object type for b1, b4, b5, b7 and b8. Write None if there are none.

[ANSWER]
block

I.2 Fluent Tracking

I.2.1 True/False Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]
Block b1 is on the table, block b2 is clear, block b2 is on the table, block b3 is clear, block b3 is on top of block b7, block b4 is placed on top of block b1, block b5 is clear, block b5 is placed on top of block b4, block b6 is located on the table, block b7 is on top of block b6 and hand is not holding anything.

[QUESTION]
Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from top of block b7, block b3 is unstacked to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that block b1 is located on the table?

[ANSWER]

True

I.2.2 Free Answer Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]

{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]

Block b1 is on the table, block b2 is clear, block b2 is on the table, block b3 is clear, block b3 is on top of block b7, block b4 is placed on top of block b1, block b5 is clear, block b5 is placed on top of block b4, block b6 is located on the table, block b7 is on top of block b6 and hand is not holding anything.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: block b3 is unstacked from top of block b7 to reach the current state. In this state,. What are the self constraint properties of the state for b4? Write None if there are none

[ANSWER]

block b1 is not on block b4, block b2 is not on block b4, block b3 is not placed on top of block b4, block b4 is not being held by the hand, block b4 is not on block b2, block b4 is not on top of block b3, block b4 is not placed on top of block b5, block b4 is not placed on top of block b6, block b4 is not placed on top of block b7, block b6 is not placed on top of block b4 and block b7 is not on top of block b4

I.3 State Tracking

I.3.1 True/False Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]

{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]

Block b1 is located on the table, block b2 is clear, block b2 is on the table, block b3 is clear, block b3 is placed on top of block b7, block b4 is on top of block b1, block b5 is clear, block b5 is on block b4, block b6 is located on the table, block b7 is placed on top of block b6 and hand is not holding anything.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: block b3 is unstacked from block b7 to reach the current state. In this state, are all of the following properties: block b1 is not clear, block b1 is not on block b3, block b1 is not on block b6, block b1 is not on top of block b4, block b1 is not on top of block b7, block b1 is not placed on top of block b2, block b1 is not placed on top of block b5, block b1 is on the table, block b2 is clear, block b2 is located on the table, block b2 is not being held, block b2 is not on block b4, block b2 is not on block b5, block b2 is not on block b6, block b2 is not placed on top of block b1, block b2 is not placed on top of block b3, block b2 is not placed on top of block b7, block b3 is not clear, block b3 is not on block b1, block b3 is not on block b2, block b3 is not on block b5, block b3 is not on block b6, block b3 is not on block b7, block b3 is not on the table, block b3 is not on top of block b4, block b4 is not clear, block b4 is not on block b3, block b4 is not on the table, block b4 is not on top of block b2, block b4 is not on top of block b7, block b4 is not placed on top of block b5, block b4 is not placed on top of block b6, block b4 is on block b1, block b5 is clear, block b5 is not being held, block b5 is not on block b1, block b5 is not on block b3, block b5 is not on the table, block b5 is not on top of block b2, block b5 is not on top of block b6, block b5 is not on top of block b7, block b5 is on top of block b4, block b6 is not being held by the hand, block b6 is not clear, block b6 is not on block b4, block b6 is not on block b5, block b6 is not on block b7, block b6 is not on top of block b1, block b6 is not on top of block b3, block b6 is not placed on top of block b2, block b6 is on

the table, block b7 is clear, block b7 is not being held, block b7 is not on block b5, block b7 is not on the table, block b7 is not on top of block b1, block b7 is not on top of block b2, block b7 is not on top of block b4, block b7 is not placed on top of block b3, block b7 is on block b6, hand is not empty, the hand is holding the block b3, the hand is not holding the block b1 and the hand is not holding the block b4, correct? Respond with True or False.

[ANSWER]
True

I.3.2 Free Answer Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]

Block b1 is placed on top of block b7, block b2 is clear, block b2 is on top of block b6, block b3 is placed on top of block b4, block b4 is on the table, block b5 is clear, block b5 is on the table, block b6 is on top of block b3, block b7 is located on the table, block b8 is placed on top of block b1, block b9 is clear, block b9 is placed on top of block b8 and hand is not holding anything.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: block b9 is unstacked from top of block b8 to reach the current state. In this state, list all valid properties of the state. Write None if there are none.

[ANSWER]

block b1 is placed on top of block b7, block b2 is clear, block b2 is on top of block b6, block b3 is placed on top of block b4, block b4 is located on the table, block b5 is clear, block b5 is located on the table, block b6 is on block b3, block b7 is on the table, block b8 is clear, block b8 is on block b1 and block b9 is being held by the hand

I.4 Action Executability

I.4.1 True/False Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]

Block b1 is placed on top of block b4, block b2 is clear, block b2 is on block b6, block b3 is clear, block b3 is on top of block b5, block b4 is located on the table, block b5 is on top of block b7, block b6 is located on the table, block b7 is placed on top of block b1 and hand is empty.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are planned to be performed: block b5 is unstacked from top of block b6. Is it possible to execute it, True or False?

[ANSWER]
False

I.4.2 Free Answer Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]
Block b1 is placed on top of block b6, block b2 is clear, block b2 is placed on top of block b5, block b3 is clear, block b3 is on block b8, block b4 is clear, block b4 is placed on top of block b1, block b5 is located on the table, block b6 is on block b7, block b7 is located on the table, block b8 is on the table and hand is empty.

[QUESTION]
Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: block b4 is unstacked from block b1 to reach the current state. In this state, list all executable actions. Write None if there are none.

[ANSWER]
on top of block b3, block b4 is stacked, block b4 is stacked on top of block b1, on top of block b2, block b4 is stacked and block b4 is put down

I.5 Effects of Actions

I.5.1 True/False Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]
Block b1 is clear, block b1 is on the table, block b2 is on block b8, block b3 is on the table, block b4 is located on the table, block b5 is on block b6, block b6 is on block b4, block b7 is clear, block b7 is on top of block b3, block b8 is on top of block b5, block b9 is clear, block b9 is on block b2 and hand is not holding anything.

[QUESTION]
Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from top of block b2, block b9 is unstacked to reach the current state. In this state, if the hand puts down the block b9, is it True or False that block b9 is not clear and hand is empty?

[ANSWER]
False

I.5.2 Free Answer Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]
Block b1 is on the table, block b2 is clear, block b2 is located on the table, block b3 is clear, block b3 is placed on top of block b7, block b4 is placed on top of block b1, block b5 is clear, block b5 is on top of block b4, block b6 is located on the table, block b7 is on block b6 and hand is empty.

[QUESTION]
Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from top of block b7, block b3 is unstacked to reach the current state. In this state, if block b3 is put down on the table, what would be all of the valid properties of the state? Write None if there are none.

[ANSWER]

block b1 is on the table, block b2 is clear, block b2 is on the table, block b3 is clear, block b3 is on the table, block b4 is on block b1, block b5 is clear, block b5 is on block b4, block b6 is located on the table, block b7 is clear, block b7 is placed on top of block b6 and hand is not holding anything

I.6 Numerical RAC

I.6.1 True/False Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]
Block b1 is on the table, block b2 is clear, block b2 is located on the table, block b3 is clear, block b3 is on top of block b7, block b4 is on top of block b1, block b5 is clear, block b5 is on block b4, block b6 is on the table, block b7 is on block b6 and hand is empty.

[QUESTION]
Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from top of block b7, block b3 is unstacked to reach the current state. In this state, is the number of objects equal to 8? True or False

[ANSWER]
False

I.6.2 Free Answer Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]
Block b1 is on top of block b4, block b2 is clear, block b2 is on top of block b6, block b3 is clear, block b3 is on top of block b5, block b4 is located on the table, block b5 is on top of block b7, block b6 is on the table, block b7 is on top of block b1 and hand is empty.

[QUESTION]
Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from top of block b5, block b3 is unstacked to reach the current state. In this state, what is the total number of executable actions? Write as an integer. Write None if there are none.

[ANSWER]
3

I.7 Hallucinations

I.7.1 True/False Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]
Block b1 is on the table, block b2 is clear, block b2 is located on the table, block b3 is clear, block b3 is placed on top of block b7, block b4 is placed on top of block b1, block b5 is clear, block b5 is on top of block b4, block b6 is on the table, block b7 is on top of block b6 and hand is not holding anything.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: block b3 is unstacked from top of block b7 to reach the current state. In this state, some properties of the state may or may not be defined. Is block b4 is switched with block b1 part of the state? True or False

[ANSWER]
False

I.7.2 Free Answer Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]
Block b1 is on the table, block b2 is clear, block b2 is located on the table, block b3 is clear, block b3 is placed on top of block b7, block b4 is placed on top of block b1, block b5 is clear, block b5 is on top of block b4, block b6 is on the table, block b7 is on top of block b6 and hand is not holding anything.

[QUESTION]
Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: block b3 is unstacked from top of block b7 to reach the current state. In this state, some valid property of the state may or may not be defined. What valid property of the state out of, block b4 is on block b1, block b5 is on top of block b4, block b7 is on block b6 and block b3 is being thrown, is not defined? Write None if all are defined.

[ANSWER]
block b3 is being thrown

I.8 Composite Questions

I.8.1 True/False Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN_DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL_CONDITIONS]
Block b1 is on the table, block b2 is clear, block b2 is on top of block b4, block b3 is on block b8, block b4 is on the table, block b5 is on the table, block b6 is clear, block b6 is placed on top of block b3, block b7 is clear, block b7 is placed on top of block b1, block b8 is placed on top of block b5 and hand is not holding anything.

[QUESTION]
Given the initial condition, the following actions are planned to be performed: block b2 is unstacked from block b4 to reach the current state. Are the following properties of the state true for b7 before the first inexecutable action in the sequence? Block b1 is not on top of block b7, block b2 is on block b7, block b3 is not on top of block b7, block b4 is not placed on top of block b7, block b5 is not placed on top of block b7, block b6 is not on top of block b7, block b7 is not being held by the hand, block b7 is not on block b3, block b7 is not on block b8, block b7 is not on top of block b1, block b7 is not on top of block b2, block b7 is not on top of block b5, block b7 is not placed on top of block b6, block b7 is placed on top of block b4 and block b8 is not on top of block b7.

[ANSWER]
True

I.8.2 Free Answer Question, Action-Sequence Length 1

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]
Block b1 is on the table, block b2 is clear, block b2 is on top of block b4, block b3 is on block b8, block b4 is on the table, block b5 is on the table, block b6 is clear, block b6 is placed on top of block b3, block b7 is clear, block b7 is placed on top of block b1, block b8 is placed on top of block b5 and hand is not holding anything.

[QUESTION]
Given the initial condition, the following actions are planned to be performed: block b2 is unstacked from block b4 to reach the current state. Some of the actions may not be executable. What is the state before the first infeasible action in the sequence? Write None if there are none.

[ANSWER]:
None

J Fluent Types Questions

All of the below examples are from the goldminer domain. Each of the fluent types are defined in 3.2. Below are the fluent types for the goldminer domain.

```
Base Fluents = {bomb_at,  
                laser_at,  
                soft_rock_at,  
                hard_rock_at,  
                holds_bomb,  
                holds_laser,  
                holds_gold}  
  
Base Fluents with Constraints = {robot_at, gold_at}  
Derived Fluents = {arm_empty,  
                   clear}  
  
Static Properties = {connected}
```

J.1 Base Fluents

J.1.1 Object Tracking

[QUESTION]
Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: robot moves to location f1_0f from location f0_0f to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for f0_4f: soft rock is present at location f0_4f?

J.1.2 Fluent Tracking

[QUESTION]
Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: robot moves to location f1_0f from location f0_0f to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that hard rock is not at location f3_2f?

J.1.3 Effects of Actions

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: robot moves to location f1_0f from location f0_0f to reach the current state. In this state, if at location f1_0f, laser is picked up, is it True or False that laser is present at location f1_0f?

J.2 Base Fluents with Constraints

J.2.1 Object Tracking

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: robot moves from locations f1_0f to f0_0f to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for f1_4f: gold is at location f1_4f and robot is present at location f1_4f?

J.2.2 Fluent Tracking

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: robot moves from location f0_0f to location f1_0f to reach the current state. In this state, are all of the following properties of the state True or False: gold is present at location f0_4f and robot is at location f1_0f?

J.2.3 Effects

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: robot moves from location f0_0f to location f1_0f to reach the current state. In this state, if robot picks up laser at location f1_0f, is it True or False that no properties of the state change?

[ANSWER]: TRUE

J.3 Derived Fluents

J.3.1 Object Tracking

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: robot moves from locations f1_0f to f2_0f to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for f2_3f: location f2_3f has something?

[ANSWER]: TRUE

J.3.2 Fluent Tracking

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: robot moves from location f0_0f to location f1_0f to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that location f2_0f is clear?

[ANSWER]: TRUE

J.3.3 Effects

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: robot moves to location f1_0f from location f0_0f to reach the current state. In this state, if at location f1_0f, laser is picked up, is it True or False that arm of robot is not empty?

[ANSWER]: TRUE

J.4 Static Properties

J.4.1 Object Tracking

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: robot moves to location f1_0f from location f0_0f to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for f1_1f: location f1_1f and location f0_1f are connected, location f1_1f and location f1_2f are connected, location f1_2f and location f1_1f are connected, locations f0_1f and f1_1f are connected, locations f1_0f and f1_1f are connected, locations f1_1f and f2_1f are connected, locations f2_1f and f1_1f are connected and there is a connection between location f1_1f and location f1_0f?

[ANSWER]: TRUE

J.4.2 Fluent Tracking

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: robot moves from location f0_0f to location f1_0f to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that locations f0_0f and f1_4f are not connected?

[ANSWER]: TRUE

J.4.3 Effects

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: robot moves from location f0_0f to location f1_0f to reach the current state. In this state, if robot picks up laser at location f1_0f, is it True or False that no properties of the state change?

[ANSWER]: TRUE

K Prompts

K.1 Without Obfuscation With Ramifications

K.1.1 Few Shot 1

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]

A surface can be a pallet or a crate. A truck can be driven from one location to another only if it is present at the first location. Driving the truck makes the truck to be present at the final destination. A hoist can lift a crate from a surface only when the hoist and the crate are present in the same location, the hoist is available, the crate is present on the surface, and the crate is clear. Lifting causes the hoist to lift the crate. Dropping the crate is possible

only if the hoist, crate, and surface are present in the same location, the hoist is lifting the crate, and the surface is clear. Dropping the crate causes it to be on top of the surface and be present at the location where it was dropped. It also causes the hoist to not lift the crate. Loading the crate on a truck can be executed only when the crate and truck are present in the same location and the hoist is lifting the crate. Loading the crate onto the truck causes the hoist to be not lifting the crate, and the crate to be in the truck. Unloading the crate from the truck can be done only if the hoist and truck are in the same place, the hoist is available, and the crate is present in the truck. Unloading the crate from the truck causes the crate to be not in the truck, and the hoist to be lifting the crate. A hoist is available if and only if it does not lift anything (any crate). A surface is clear if and only if no crates are on top of that surface. A crate is clear if and only if no hoist is lifting that crate. A truck can be only at one location. A crate can only be at one location. A crate can only be on top of one surface.

A state is a set of valid properties. Properties may or may not involve negations. Properties of the state can be of 4 types: base, derived, persistent, and static. Base properties of the state are properties that don't depend on other properties. There are no base properties of the state in this domain. Derived properties of the state are properties that depend on other properties. In this domain, they are: a surface is clear, hoist is available, a surface is not clear and hoist is not available. Self constraint properties of the state are properties that depend on themselves. In this domain, they are: at, on, in, a hoist is lifting a crate, not at, not on, not in and a hoist is not lifting a crate. Static properties of the state are properties that don't change under any action. There are no static properties of the state in this domain.

[EXAMPLE 1]

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

Initially, Crate0 is located at depot0, crate0 is on pallet0, crate1 is located at depot0, crate1 is on top of crate0, crate2 can be found located at depot1, crate2 is clear, crate2 is on pallet1, crate3 is clear, crate3 is on crate1, crate4 is at distributor2, crate4 is clear, depot0 is where crate3 is located, depot0 is where truck0 is located, depot1 is where hoist1 is located, depot1 is where pallet1 is located, distributor0 is where hoist2 is located, distributor0 is where pallet2 is located, distributor1 is where hoist3 is located, distributor2 is where pallet4 is located, hoist0 is at depot0, hoist0 is available, hoist1 is available for work, hoist2 is available for work, hoist3 is available for work, hoist4 is available, hoist4 is located at distributor2, pallet0 can be found located at depot0, pallet2 is clear of any crates, pallet3 is at distributor1, pallet3 is clear of any crates, pallet4 has crate4 on it and truck1 is located at depot0.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: at depot1, hoist1 lifts crate2 off pallet1 to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for pallet4: pallet4 is not clear?

Just provide your answer as TRUE/FALSE.

[ANSWER]: True

Based on the above examples, answer the below question:

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

Initially, Crate1 is at distributor2, crate1 is clear of any crates, crate1 is on crate0, crate2 is at depot0, crate2 is clear, crate2 is on pallet0, crate3 can be found located at depot2, crate3 is clear, crate3 is on pallet2, depot0 is where pallet0 is located, depot2 is where pallet2 is located, distributor0 is where hoist3 is located, distributor1 is where hoist4 is located, distributor2 is where crate0 is located, distributor3 is where pallet6 is located, hoist0 can be found located at depot0, hoist0 is accessible, hoist1 is at depot1, hoist1 is available for work, hoist2 can be found located at depot2, hoist2 is available for work,

hoist3 is available for work, hoist4 is accessible, hoist5 can be found located at distributor2, hoist5 is available, hoist6 can be found located at distributor3, hoist6 is accessible, pallet1 can be found located at depot1, pallet1 is clear of any crates, pallet3 is clear, pallet3 is located at distributor0, pallet4 can be found located at distributor1, pallet4 is clear, pallet5 has crate0 on it, pallet5 is at distributor2, pallet6 is clear of any crates, truck0 is at distributor2, truck1 is at depot1 and truck2 can be found located at depot2.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from depot1, truck1 is driven to depot0 to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for pallet4: pallet4 is clear of any crates?.

Just provide your answer as TRUE/FALSE.

[ANSWER]:

K.1.2 Few Shot 5

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[EXAMPLE 1]

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]
{initial conditions}

[QUESTION]
{question}

[ANSWER]:
{answer}

.
. .
.

[EXAMPLE 5]

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]
{initial conditions}

[QUESTION]
{question}

[ANSWER]:
{answer}

Based on the above examples, answer the below question:

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

Initially, Crate1 is at distributor2, crate1 is clear of any crates, crate1 is on crate0, crate2 is at depot0, crate2 is clear, crate2 is on pallet0, crate3 can be found located at depot2, crate3 is clear, crate3 is on pallet2, depot0 is where pallet0 is located, depot2 is where pallet2 is located, distributor0 is where hoist3 is located, distributor1 is where hoist4 is located, distributor2 is where crate0 is located, distributor3 is where pallet6 is located, hoist0 can be found located at depot0, hoist0 is accessible, hoist1 is at depot1, hoist1 is available for work, hoist2 can be found located at depot2, hoist2 is available for work, hoist3 is available for work, hoist4 is accessible, hoist5 can be found located at distributor2, hoist5 is available, hoist6 can be found located at distributor3, hoist6 is accessible, pallet1 can be found located at depot1, pallet1 is clear of any crates, pallet3 is clear, pallet3 is located at distributor0, pallet4 can be

found located at distributor1, pallet4 is clear, pallet5 has crate0 on it, pallet5 is at distributor2, pallet6 is clear of any crates, truck0 is at distributor2, truck1 is at depot1 and truck2 can be found located at depot2.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from depot1, truck1 is driven to depot0 to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for pallet4: pallet4 is clear of any crates?.

Just provide your answer as TRUE/FALSE.

[ANSWER]:

K.2 Without Obfuscations, without ramifications

K.2.1 Few Shot 1

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]

A surface can be a pallet or a crate. A truck can be driven from one location to another only if it is present at the first location. Driving the truck makes the truck to be present at the final destination and not at the starting location. A hoist can lift a crate from a surface only when the hoist and the crate are present in the same location, the hoist is available, the crate is present on the surface, and the crate is clear. Lifting causes the hoist to lift the crate, the crate to be not in that location, not clear, and not on top of the previous surface, which is now clear. Moreover, lifting the crate causes the hoist to be not available. Dropping the crate is possible only if the hoist, crate, and surface are present in the same location, the hoist is lifting the crate, and the surface is clear. Dropping the crate causes it to be on top of the surface, be present in the location where it was dropped, and be clear. It also causes the hoist to become available, and not lift the crate. The surface on which the crate was dropped becomes not clear. Loading the crate on a truck can be executed only when the crate and truck are present in the same location, and the hoist is lifting the crate. Loading the crate onto the truck causes the hoist to be available and not lifting the crate, and crate to be in the truck. Unloading the crate from the truck can be done only if the hoist and truck are in the same place, the hoist is available, and the crate is present in the truck. Unloading the crate from the truck causes the crate to be not in the truck, and the hoist to be lifting the crate and not available.

A state is a set of valid properties. Properties may or may not involve negations. Properties of the state can be of 4 types: base, derived, persistent, and static. Base properties of the state are properties that don't depend on other properties. There are no base properties of the state in this domain. Derived properties of the state are properties that depend on other properties. In this domain, they are: a surface is clear, hoist is available, a surface is not clear and hoist is not available. Self constraint properties of the state are properties that depend on themselves. In this domain, they are: at, on, in, a hoist is lifting a crate, not at, not on, not in and a hoist is not lifting a crate. Static properties of the state are properties that don't change under any action. There are no static properties of the state in this domain.

[EXAMPLE 1]

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

Initially, Crate0 is located at depot0, crate0 is on pallet0, crate1 is located at depot0, crate1 is on top of crate0, crate2 can be found located at depot1, crate2 is clear, crate2 is on pallet1, crate3 is clear, crate3 is on crate1, crate4 is at distributor2, crate4 is clear, depot0 is where crate3 is located, depot0 is where truck0 is located, depot1 is where hoist1 is located, depot1 is where pallet1 is located, distributor0 is where hoist2 is located, distributor0 is where pallet2 is located, distributor1 is where hoist3 is located, distributor2 is where pallet4 is located, hoist0 is at depot0, hoist0 is available, hoist1 is available for work,

hoist2 is available for work, hoist3 is available for work, hoist4 is available, hoist4 is located at distributor2, pallet0 can be found located at depot0, pallet2 is clear of any crates, pallet3 is at distributor1, pallet3 is clear of any crates, pallet4 has crate4 on it and truck1 is located at depot0.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: crate2 is lifted from pallet1 at depot1 by hoist1 to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for pallet2: pallet2 is not clear?

Just provide your answer as TRUE/FALSE.

[ANSWER]: False

Based on the above examples, answer the below question:

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

Initially, Crate1 is at distributor2, crate1 is clear of any crates, crate1 is on crate0, crate2 is at depot0, crate2 is clear, crate2 is on pallet0, crate3 can be found located at depot2, crate3 is clear, crate3 is on pallet2, depot0 is where pallet0 is located, depot2 is where pallet2 is located, distributor0 is where hoist3 is located, distributor1 is where hoist4 is located, distributor2 is where crate0 is located, distributor3 is where pallet6 is located, hoist0 can be found located at depot0, hoist0 is accessible, hoist1 is at depot1, hoist1 is available for work, hoist2 can be found located at depot2, hoist2 is available for work, hoist3 is available for work, hoist4 is accessible, hoist5 can be found located at distributor2, hoist5 is available, hoist6 can be found located at distributor3, hoist6 is accessible, pallet1 can be found located at depot1, pallet1 is clear of any crates, pallet3 is clear, pallet3 is located at distributor0, pallet4 can be found located at distributor1, pallet4 is clear, pallet5 has crate0 on it, pallet5 is at distributor2, pallet6 is clear of any crates, truck0 is at distributor2, truck1 is at depot1 and truck2 can be found located at depot2.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from depot1, truck1 is driven to depot0 to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for pallet4: pallet4 is clear of any crates?.

Just provide your answer as TRUE/FALSE.

[ANSWER]:

K.2.2 Few Shot 5

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]

{domain description}

[EXAMPLE 1]

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

{initial conditions}

[QUESTION]

{question}

[ANSWER]:

{answer}

.
.
.

[EXAMPLE 5]

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]
{initial conditions}

[QUESTION]
{question}

[ANSWER]:
{answer}

Based on the above examples, answer the below question:

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

Initially, Crate1 is at distributor2, crate1 is clear of any crates, crate1 is on crate0, crate2 is at depot0, crate2 is clear, crate2 is on pallet0, crate3 can be found located at depot2, crate3 is clear, crate3 is on pallet2, depot0 is where pallet0 is located, depot2 is where pallet2 is located, distributor0 is where hoist3 is located, distributor1 is where hoist4 is located, distributor2 is where crate0 is located, distributor3 is where pallet6 is located, hoist0 can be found located at depot0, hoist0 is accessible, hoist1 is at depot1, hoist1 is available for work, hoist2 can be found located at depot2, hoist2 is available for work, hoist3 is available for work, hoist4 is accessible, hoist5 can be found located at distributor2, hoist5 is available, hoist6 can be found located at distributor3, hoist6 is accessible, pallet1 can be found located at depot1, pallet1 is clear of any crates, pallet3 is clear, pallet3 is located at distributor0, pallet4 can be found located at distributor1, pallet4 is clear, pallet5 has crate0 on it, pallet5 is at distributor2, pallet6 is clear of any crates, truck0 is at distributor2, truck1 is at depot1 and truck2 can be found located at depot2.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from depot1, truck1 is driven to depot0 to reach the current state. In this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for pallet4: pallet4 is clear of any crates?.
Just provide your answer as TRUE/FALSE.

[ANSWER]:

K.3 With Obfuscations, with ramifications

K.3.1 Few Shot 1

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]

A fshxjwxean can be a tzrwjuotxz or a pjrluufopq. A nblmdziyqf can be jzmscukkyy from one location to another only if it is present cmgnqlveog the first location. Jzmscukkyy the nblmdziyqf makes the nblmdziyqf to be present cmgnqlveog the final destination. A suhmddooyi can aeaygzpsjc a pjrluufopq from a fshxjwxean only when the suhmddooyi and the pjrluufopq are present qxkqlxlezx the same location, the suhmddooyi is available, the pjrluufopq is present fpqyitbzqq the fshxjwxean, and the pjrluufopq is clear. Lifting causes the suhmddooyi to aeaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq. Uckhudtpif the pjrluufopq is possible only if the suhmddooyi, pjrluufopq, and fshxjwxean are present qxkqlxlezx the same location, the suhmddooyi is aeaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq, and the fshxjwxean is clear. Uckhudtpif the pjrluufopq causes it to be fpqyitbzqq top of the fshxjwxean and be present cmgnqlveog the location where it was uckhudtpif. It also causes the suhmddooyi to not aeaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq. Gjggfjtbfn the pjrluufopq fpqyitbzqq a nblmdziyqf can be executed only when the pjrluufopq and nblmdziyqf are present qxkqlxlezx the same location and the suhmddooyi is aeaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq. Gjggfjtbfn the pjrluufopq onto the nblmdziyqf causes the suhmddooyi to be not aeaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq, and the pjrluufopq to be qxkqlxlezx the nblmdziyqf. Gpztfzvsux the pjrluufopq from the nblmdziyqf can be done only if the suhmddooyi and nblmdziyqf are qxkqlxlezx the same place, the suhmddooyi is available, and the pjrluufopq is present qxkqlxlezx the nblmdziyqf. Gpztfzvsux the pjrluufopq from the nblmdziyqf causes the pjrluufopq

to be not qxkqlxlezx the nblmdziyqf, and the suhmdooyi to be aeaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq. A suhmdooyi is available if and only if it does not aeaygzpsjc anything (any crate). A fshxjwxean is clear if and only if no pjrluufopq are fpqyitbzqq top of that fshxjwxean. A pjrluufopq is clear if and only if no suhmdooyi is aeaygzpsjc that pjrluufopq. A nblmdziyqf can be only cmgnqlveog one location. A pjrluufopq can only be cmgnqlveog one location. A pjrluufopq can only be fpqyitbzqq top of one fshxjwxean.

A state is a set of valid properties. Properties may or may not involve negations. Properties of the state can be of 4 types: base, derived, persistent, and static. Base properties of the state are properties that don't depend fpqyitbzqq other properties. There are no base properties of the state qxkqlxlezx this domain. Derived properties of the state are properties that depend fpqyitbzqq other properties. Qxkqlxlezx this domain, they are: a fshxjwxean is clear, suhmdooyi is available, a fshxjwxean is not clear and suhmdooyi is not available. Self constraint properties of the state are properties that depend fpqyitbzqq themselves. Qxkqlxlezx this domain, they are: cmgnqlveog, fpqyitbzqq, qxkqlxlezx, a suhmdooyi is aeaygzpsjc a pjrluufopq, not cmgnqlveog, not fpqyitbzqq, not qxkqlxlezx and a suhmdooyi is not aeaygzpsjc a pjrluufopq. Static properties of the state are properties that don't change under any action. There are no static properties of the state qxkqlxlezx this domain.

[EXAMPLE 1]

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

Initially, Pjrluufopq0 is located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, pjrluufopq0 is fpqyitbzqq tztwjuotxz0, pjrluufopq1 is located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, pjrluufopq1 is fpqyitbzqq top of pjrluufopq0, pjrluufopq2 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1, pjrluufopq2 is clear, pjrluufopq2 is fpqyitbzqq tztwjuotxz1, pjrluufopq3 is clear, pjrluufopq3 is fpqyitbzqq pjrluufopq1, pjrluufopq4 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, pjrluufopq4 is clear, viwwhelzlg0 is where pjrluufopq3 is located, viwwhelzlg0 is where nblmdziyqf0 is located, viwwhelzlg1 is where suhmdooyi1 is located, viwwhelzlg1 is where tztwjuotxz1 is located, vjbtrtgdsx0 is where suhmdooyi2 is located, vjbtrtgdsx0 is where tztwjuotxz2 is located, vjbtrtgdsx1 is where suhmdooyi3 is located, vjbtrtgdsx2 is where tztwjuotxz4 is located, suhmdooyi0 is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, suhmdooyi0 is available, suhmdooyi1 is available for work, suhmdooyi2 is available for work, suhmdooyi3 is available for work, suhmdooyi4 is available, suhmdooyi4 is located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, tztwjuotxz0 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, tztwjuotxz2 is clear of any pjrluufopq, tztwjuotxz3 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx1, tztwjuotxz3 is clear of any pjrluufopq, tztwjuotxz4 has pjrluufopq4 fpqyitbzqq it and nblmdziyqf1 is located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1, suhmdooyi1 aeaygzpsjc pjrluufopq2 off tztwjuotxz1 to reach the current state. Qxkqlxlezx this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for tztwjuotxz4: tztwjuotxz4 is not clear? Just provide your answer as TRUE/FALSE.

[ANSWER]: True

Based fpqyitbzqq the above examples, answer the below question:

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

Initially, Pjrluufopq1 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, pjrluufopq1 is clear of any pjrluufopq, pjrluufopq1 is fpqyitbzqq pjrluufopq0, pjrluufopq2 is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, pjrluufopq2 is clear, pjrluufopq2 is fpqyitbzqq tztwjuotxz0, pjrluufopq3 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg2, pjrluufopq3 is clear, pjrluufopq3 is fpqyitbzqq tztwjuotxz2, viwwhelzlg0 is where tztwjuotxz0 is located, viwwhelzlg2 is where tztwjuotxz2 is located, vjbtrtgdsx0 is where suhmdooyi3 is located, vjbtrtgdsx1 is where suhmdooyi4 is located, vjbtrtgdsx2 is where pjrluufopq0 is located, vjbtrtgdsx3 is where tztwjuotxz6 is located, suhmdooyi0 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, suhmdooyi0 is accessible, suhmdooyi1

is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1, suhmddooyi1 is available for work, suhmddooyi2 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg2, suhmddooyi2 is available for work, suhmddooyi3 is available for work, suhmddooyi4 is accessible, suhmddooyi5 can be found located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, suhmddooyi5 is available, suhmddooyi6 can be found located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx3, suhmddooyi6 is accessible, tztwjuotxz1 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1, tztwjuotxz1 is clear of any pjrluufopq, tztwjuotxz3 is clear, tztwjuotxz3 is located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx0, tztwjuotxz4 can be found located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx1, tztwjuotxz4 is clear, tztwjuotxz5 has pjrluufopq0 fpqyitbzqq it, tztwjuotxz5 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, tztwjuotxz6 is clear of any pjrluufopq, nblmdziyqf0 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, nblmdziyqf1 is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1 and nblmdziyqf2 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg2.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from viwwhelzlg1, nblmdziyqf1 is jzmscukky to viwwhelzlg0 to reach the current state. Qxkqlxlezx this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for tztwjuotxz4: tztwjuotxz4 is clear of any pjrluufopq?. Just provide your answer as TRUE/FALSE.

[ANSWER]:

K.3.2 Few Shot 5

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[EXAMPLE 1]

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]
{initial conditions}

[QUESTION]
{question}

[ANSWER]:
{answer}

.
. .
.

[EXAMPLE 5]

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]
{initial conditions}

[QUESTION]
{question}

[ANSWER]:
{answer}

Based fpqyitbzqq the above examples, answer the below question:

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

Initially, Pjrluufopq1 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, pjrluufopq1 is clear of any pjrluufopq, pjrluufopq1 is fpqyitbzqq pjrluufopq0, pjrluufopq2 is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, pjrluufopq2 is clear, pjrluufopq2 is fpqyitbzqq tztwjuotxz0, pjrluufopq3 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg2, pjrluufopq3 is clear, pjrluufopq3 is fpqyitbzqq tztwjuotxz2, viwwhelzlg0 is where tztwjuotxz0 is located, viwwhelzlg2 is where tztwjuotxz2 is located, vjbtrtgdsx0 is where suhmddooyi3 is located, vjbtrtgdsx1 is where suhmddooyi4 is located, vjbtrtgdsx2 is where pjrluufopq0 is located, vjbtrtgdsx3 is where tztwjuotxz6 is located, suhmddooyi0 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, suhmddooyi0 is accessible, suhmddooyi1

is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1, suhmddooyi1 is available for work, suhmddooyi2 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg2, suhmddooyi2 is available for work, suhmddooyi3 is available for work, suhmddooyi4 is accessible, suhmddooyi5 can be found located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, suhmddooyi5 is available, suhmddooyi6 can be found located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx3, suhmddooyi6 is accessible, tzzwjuotxz1 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1, tzzwjuotxz1 is clear of any pjrluufopq, tzzwjuotxz3 is clear, tzzwjuotxz3 is located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx0, tzzwjuotxz4 can be found located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx1, tzzwjuotxz4 is clear, tzzwjuotxz5 has pjrluufopq0 fpqyitbzqq it, tzzwjuotxz5 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, tzzwjuotxz6 is clear of any pjrluufopq, nblmdziyqf0 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, nblmdziyqf1 is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1 and nblmdziyqf2 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg2.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from viwwhelzlg1, nblmdziyqf1 is jzmscukky to viwwhelzlg0 to reach the current state. Qxkqlxlezz this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for tzzwjuotxz4: tzzwjuotxz4 is clear of any pjrluufopq?. Just provide your answer as TRUE/FALSE.

[ANSWER]:

K.4 With Obfuscations, Without ramifications

K.4.1 Few Shot 1

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]

A fshxjwxean can be a tzzwjuotxz or a pjrluufopq. A nblmdziyqf can be jzmscukky from one location to another only if it is present cmgnqlveog the first location. Jzmscukky the nblmdziyqf makes the nblmdziyqf to be present cmgnqlveog the final destination and not cmgnqlveog the starting location. A suhmddooyi can aaygzpsjc a pjrluufopq from a fshxjwxean only when the suhmddooyi and the pjrluufopq are present qxkqlxlezz the same location, the suhmddooyi is available, the pjrluufopq is present fpqyitbzqq the fshxjwxean, and the pjrluufopq is clear. Aaygzpsjc causes the suhmddooyi to aaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq, the pjrluufopq to be not qxkqlxlezz that location, not clear, and not fpqyitbzqq top of the previous fshxjwxean, which is now clear. Moreover, aaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq causes the suhmddooyi to be not available. Uckhudtpif the pjrluufopq is possible only if the suhmddooyi, pjrluufopq, and fshxjwxean are present qxkqlxlezz the same location, the suhmddooyi is aaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq, and the fshxjwxean is clear. Uckhudtpif the pjrluufopq causes it to be fpqyitbzqq top of the fshxjwxean, be present qxkqlxlezz the location where it was uckhudtpif, and be clear. It also causes the suhmddooyi to become available, and not aaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq. The fshxjwxean fpqyitbzqq which the pjrluufopq was uckhudtpif becomes not clear. Gjggfjtbfn the pjrluufopq fpqyitbzqq a nblmdziyqf can be executed only when the pjrluufopq and nblmdziyqf are present qxkqlxlezz the same location, and the suhmddooyi is aaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq. Gjggfjtbfn the pjrluufopq onto the nblmdziyqf causes the suhmddooyi to be available and not aaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq, and pjrluufopq to be qxkqlxlezz the nblmdziyqf. Gpztzvsux the pjrluufopq from the nblmdziyqf can be done only if the suhmddooyi and nblmdziyqf are qxkqlxlezz the same place, the suhmddooyi is available, and the pjrluufopq is present qxkqlxlezz the nblmdziyqf. Gpztzvsux the pjrluufopq from the nblmdziyqf causes the pjrluufopq to be not qxkqlxlezz the nblmdziyqf, and the suhmddooyi to be aaygzpsjc the pjrluufopq and not available.

A state is a set of valid properties. Properties may or may not involve negations. Properties of the state can be of 4 types: base, derived, persistent, and static. Base properties of the state are properties that don't depend fpqyitbzqq other properties. There are no base properties of the state qxkqlxlezz this domain. Derived properties of the state are properties that depend fpqyitbzqq other properties. Qxkqlxlezz this domain, they are: a fshxjwxean is clear, suhmddooyi is available, a fshxjwxean is not clear and suhmddooyi is not available. Self constraint properties of the state are properties that depend fpqyitbzqq themselves. Qxkqlxlezz this domain, they are: cmgnqlveog, fpqyitbzqq, qxkqlxlezz, a

suhmddooyi is aaygzpsjc a pjrluufopq, not cmgnqlveog, not fpqyitbzqq, not qxkqlxlezx and a suhmddooyi is not aaygzpsjc a pjrluufopq. Static properties of the state are properties that don't change under any action. There are no static properties of the state qxkqlxlezx this domain.

[EXAMPLE 1]

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

Initially, Pjrluufopq0 is located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, pjrluufopq0 is fpqyitbzqq tztwjuotxz0, pjrluufopq1 is located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, pjrluufopq1 is fpqyitbzqq top of pjrluufopq0, pjrluufopq2 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1, pjrluufopq2 is clear, pjrluufopq2 is fpqyitbzqq tztwjuotxz1, pjrluufopq3 is clear, pjrluufopq3 is fpqyitbzqq pjrluufopq1, pjrluufopq4 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, pjrluufopq4 is clear, viwwhelzlg0 is where pjrluufopq3 is located, viwwhelzlg0 is where nblmdziyqf0 is located, viwwhelzlg1 is where suhmddooyi1 is located, viwwhelzlg1 is where tztwjuotxz1 is located, vjbtrtgdsx0 is where suhmddooyi2 is located, vjbtrtgdsx0 is where tztwjuotxz2 is located, vjbtrtgdsx1 is where suhmddooyi3 is located, vjbtrtgdsx2 is where tztwjuotxz4 is located, suhmddooyi0 is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, suhmddooyi0 is available, suhmddooyi1 is available for work, suhmddooyi2 is available for work, suhmddooyi3 is available for work, suhmddooyi4 is available, suhmddooyi4 is located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, tztwjuotxz0 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, tztwjuotxz2 is clear of any pjrluufopq, tztwjuotxz3 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx1, tztwjuotxz3 is clear of any pjrluufopq, tztwjuotxz4 has pjrluufopq4 fpqyitbzqq it and nblmdziyqf1 is located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: pjrluufopq2 is aaygzpsjc from tztwjuotxz1 cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1 by suhmddooyi1 to reach the current state. Qxkqlxlezx this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for tztwjuotxz2: tztwjuotxz2 is not clear? Just provide your answer as TRUE/FALSE.

[ANSWER]: False

Based fpqyitbzqq the above examples, answer the below question:

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

Initially, Pjrluufopq1 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, pjrluufopq1 is clear of any pjrluufopq, pjrluufopq1 is fpqyitbzqq pjrluufopq0, pjrluufopq2 is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, pjrluufopq2 is clear, pjrluufopq2 is fpqyitbzqq tztwjuotxz0, pjrluufopq3 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg2, pjrluufopq3 is clear, pjrluufopq3 is fpqyitbzqq tztwjuotxz2, viwwhelzlg0 is where tztwjuotxz0 is located, viwwhelzlg2 is where tztwjuotxz2 is located, vjbtrtgdsx0 is where suhmddooyi3 is located, vjbtrtgdsx1 is where suhmddooyi4 is located, vjbtrtgdsx2 is where pjrluufopq0 is located, vjbtrtgdsx3 is where tztwjuotxz6 is located, suhmddooyi0 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, suhmddooyi0 is accessible, suhmddooyi1 is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1, suhmddooyi1 is available for work, suhmddooyi2 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg2, suhmddooyi2 is available for work, suhmddooyi3 is available for work, suhmddooyi4 is accessible, suhmddooyi5 can be found located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, suhmddooyi5 is available, suhmddooyi6 can be found located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx3, suhmddooyi6 is accessible, tztwjuotxz1 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1, tztwjuotxz1 is clear of any pjrluufopq, tztwjuotxz3 is clear, tztwjuotxz3 is located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx0, tztwjuotxz4 can be found located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx1, tztwjuotxz4 is clear, tztwjuotxz5 has pjrluufopq0 fpqyitbzqq it, tztwjuotxz5 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, tztwjuotxz6 is clear of any pjrluufopq, nblmdziyqf0 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, nblmdziyqf1 is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1 and nblmdziyqf2 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg2.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from viwwhelzlg1, nblmdziyqf1 is jzmscukky to viwwhelzlg0 to reach the current state. Qxkqlxlezx this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for tztwjuotxz4: tztwjuotxz4 is clear of any pjrluufopq?.

Just provide your answer as TRUE/FALSE.

[ANSWER]

K.4.2 Few Shot 5

[DOMAIN DESCRIPTION]
{domain description}

[EXAMPLE 1]

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]
{initial conditions}

[QUESTION]
{question}

[ANSWER]:
{answer}

.
. .
.

[EXAMPLE 5]

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]
{initial conditions}

[QUESTION]
{question}

[ANSWER]:
{answer}

Based fpqyitbzqq the above examples, answer the below question:

[INITIAL CONDITIONS]

Initially, Pjrluufopq1 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, pjrluufopq1 is clear of any pjrluufopq, pjrluufopq1 is fpqyitbzqq pjrluufopq0, pjrluufopq2 is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, pjrluufopq2 is clear, pjrluufopq2 is fpqyitbzqq tztwjuotxz0, pjrluufopq3 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg2, pjrluufopq3 is clear, pjrluufopq3 is fpqyitbzqq tztwjuotxz2, viwwhelzlg0 is where tztwjuotxz0 is located, viwwhelzlg2 is where tztwjuotxz2 is located, vjbtrtgdsx0 is where suhmdooyi3 is located, vjbtrtgdsx1 is where suhmdooyi4 is located, vjbtrtgdsx2 is where pjrluufopq0 is located, vjbtrtgdsx3 is where tztwjuotxz6 is located, suhmdooyi0 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg0, suhmdooyi0 is accessible, suhmdooyi1 is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1, suhmdooyi1 is available for work, suhmdooyi2 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg2, suhmdooyi2 is available for work, suhmdooyi3 is available for work, suhmdooyi4 is accessible, suhmdooyi5 can be found located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, suhmdooyi5 is available, suhmdooyi6 can be found located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx3, suhmdooyi6 is accessible, tztwjuotxz1 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1, tztwjuotxz1 is clear of any pjrluufopq, tztwjuotxz3 is clear, tztwjuotxz3 is located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx0, tztwjuotxz4 can be found located cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx1, tztwjuotxz4 is clear, tztwjuotxz5 has pjrluufopq0 fpqyitbzqq it, tztwjuotxz5 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, tztwjuotxz6 is clear of any pjrluufopq, nblmdziyqf0 is cmgnqlveog vjbtrtgdsx2, nblmdziyqf1 is cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg1 and nblmdziyqf2 can be found located cmgnqlveog viwwhelzlg2.

[QUESTION]

Given the initial condition, the following actions are performed: from viwwhelzlg1, nblmdziyqf1 is jzmscukky to viwwhelzlg0 to reach the current state. Qxkqlxlezx this state, is it True or False that the following properties of the state are correct for tztwjuotxz4: tztwjuotxz4 is clear of any pjrluufopq?.

Just provide your answer as TRUE/FALSE.

[ANSWER]: