

Theoretical foundations for programmatic reinforcement learning

Guruprerana Shabadi

École Polytechnique, France
University of Warsaw, Poland

Nathanaël Fijalkow

CNRS, LaBRI, Université of Bordeaux, France
University of Warsaw, Poland

Théo Matricon

CNRS, LaBRI, Université of Bordeaux, France

Abstract

The field of Reinforcement Learning (RL) is concerned with algorithms for learning optimal policies in unknown stochastic environments. Programmatic RL studies representations of policies as programs, meaning involving higher order constructs such as control loops. Despite attracting a lot of attention at the intersection of the machine learning and formal methods communities, very little is known on the theoretical front about programmatic RL: what are good classes of programmatic policies? How large are optimal programmatic policies? How can we learn them? The goal of this paper is to give first answers to these questions, initiating a theoretical study of programmatic RL.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Logic and verification; Theory of computation → Programming logic; Computing methodologies → Reinforcement learning

Keywords and phrases Reinforcement learning, Markov decision processes, Program synthesis

1 Introduction

Reinforcement learning (RL) is a very popular and successful field of machine learning where the agent learns a policy in an unknown environment through numerical rewards, modelled as a Markov decision process (MDP). In the tabular setting, the environment is given explicitly, which implies that typically policies are also represented explicitly, meaning as functions mapping each state to an action (or distribution of actions). Such representation becomes quickly intractable when the environment is large and makes it hard to compose policies or reason about them. In the general setting the typical assumption is that the environment can be simulated as a black-box. Deep reinforcement learning algorithms which learn policies in the form of large neural networks have been scaled to achieve expert-level performance in complex board and video games [18, 23]. However, they suffer from the same drawbacks as neural networks which means that the learned policies are vulnerable to adversarial attacks [17] and do not generalize to novel scenarios [19]. Moreover, big neural networks are very hard to interpret and their verification is computationally infeasible.

To alleviate these pitfalls, a growing body of work has emerged which aims to learn policies in the form of programs [22, 4, 21, 24, 10, 12, 20, 16, 2, 13], under the name “*programmatic reinforcement learning*”. Programmatic policies can provide concise representations of policies which would be easier to read, interpret, and verify. Furthermore, their short size compared to neural networks would mean that they can also generalize well to out-of-training situations while also smoothing out erratic behaviors. The goal of the line of work we initiate here is to lay the theoretical foundations for programmatic reinforcement learning.

All the works cited above use very simple programming languages, combining finite state machines, decision trees, and Partial Integral Derivate (PID) controllers (originating from

control theory). We believe – and show evidence in this work – that more expressive programming languages can help describing policies succinctly and naturally. The fundamental question we ask is:

Given a class \mathcal{P}_{Env} of environments, how to define a class of programmatic policies \mathcal{P}_{Pol} such that for each environment in \mathcal{P}_{Env} , there exists an optimal¹ programmatic policy $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Pol}}$.

We call such statements “*expressivity results*”. The design of \mathcal{P}_{Pol} is a compromise, since the class should be rich enough to express optimal policies, but simple enough to meet the objectives stated above: readable, interpretable, verifiable, generalizable, as well as learnable. There are actually many instances of expressivity results originating from different fields:

- In the study of games, positionality results for MDPs [15, 8] state the existence of optimal pure memoryless policies.
- In program verification, more specifically in the analysis of pushdown systems [6, 7], there are several results proving the existence of optimal pushdown policies.
- In automatic control, PID controllers [3] form a very classical and versatile class of programmatic controllers widely used in practice for continuous systems.
- In machine learning, the fact that neural networks are universal approximators implies that neural networks can be used as (approximate) policies for general reinforcement learning tasks.

Once existence is understood, one can wonder about sizes: how large are optimal programmatic policies? We refer to results placing upper and lower bounds on sizes of optimal programmatic policies as “*succinctness results*”.

To define classes of environments we use a simple but versatile programming language: (an idealised version of) PRISM, which is at the heart of the most successful probabilistic model checkers (PRISM [11] and STORM [9]). The technical contribution of this work is to prove expressivity and succinctness results for a subclass of the PRISM language, consisting of two dimensional deterministic grids. We construct a very simple and elegant class of programmatic policies in the form of sequences of subgoals, inspired by Shannon’s early experiments on mechanical mice. Our main result is obtained through geometrical insights into the corresponding class of environments. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first example of a non-trivial programming language, employing at its heart control loops, which can express small optimal policies on a large class of environments.

2 A framework for programmatic reinforcement learning

For simplicity, the environments we consider are discrete-time MDPs. The definitions we give here and the questions we ask can be naturally extended to more complicated environments, using for instance rewards functions or continuous time.

► **Definition 1** (MDP). *A markov decision process (MDP) is a tuple (S, A, δ, s_0, T) where S is a set of states, A is a finite set of actions, $\delta : S \times A \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(S)$ is the transition function mapping a state and an action to a probability distribution over the state space, and $s_0 \in S$ is the initial state.*

¹ Different notions of optimality can be considered here.

We refer to [15] for the classical definitions (probabilistic space, policies, optimal policies). An MDP can be regarded as an environment in which an agent observes the current state of the game and picks an action to take following which the game updates the state using the transition function. Before presenting the PRISM syntax, let us consider the following example.

► **Example 2.** The following codeblock defines an MDP in PRISM syntax².

```

1 x : [0..99] init 0;
2 y : [0..99] init 0;
3
4 [up] x < 10 && x + y >= 2 ->
5   0.5 : y' = y + 1
6   0.5 : y' = y + 1 && x' = x + 1;
7 [down] x < 10 && x + y >= 2 ->
8   0.5 : y' = y - 1
9   0.5 : y' = y - 1 && x' = x - 1;
10 [right] x < 10 && 3*x - y <= 20 ->
11   1 : x' = x + 1;
```

The MDP specified here contains two state variables x, y which take integer values ranging from 0 to 99. The initial state is $(0, 0)$. The MDP contains two regions which are specified by the predicates: $x < 10 \ \&\& \ x + y \geq 2$ and $x < 10 \ \&\& \ 3*x - y \leq 20$. In the states where the first predicate is satisfied, two actions `up` and `down` are enabled. If in one of these states and the `up` action is picked by the agent, with 0.5 probability the next state is obtained by incrementing the y -coordinate by 1 and with 0.5 probability both x and y are incremented.

We define now the idealised PRISM syntax. The state space is described by tuples of discrete variables. Each variable is specified by

```
1 x : [n..m] init v;
```

where n, m are integers and $v \in [n, m]$. The rest of the program consists in a set of commands of the form

```

1 [a] P(x) ->
2   p1 : x' = delta(x, 1)
3   ...
4   pn : x' = delta(x, n);
```

where a is an action, x, x' are states, P is a predicate on states, $\delta : S \times [1, n] \rightarrow S$ is the update function computing the next state, and $\sum_i p_i = 1$. The interpretation is as follows: from any state x satisfying P , the action a is available, and its effect is a random event: with probability p_i we move to state $\delta(x, i)$. In this idealised definition predicates and update functions are not restricted in any way (they should be at the very least computable). We call *environment programs* the class of environments defined by such programs, and happily identify programs and the environments they define.

The point of PRISM programs is that the use of predicates and update functions enable partitioning the state space into regions which have similar transitions, leading to very concise representations of large MDPs. For instance, the MDP given in the example above has 10.000 states, but is given by 14 lines of code.

² We deviate from PRISM syntax in cosmetic ways. PRISM supports specifying a wider range of stochastic models, for instance reward models for MDPs.

Finally, we consider a specification, such as reaching a target state almost surely; we then say that a policy is optimal if it satisfies the specification. We can now formulate the problem we study in this work in a very precise manner:

Given a subclass of PRISM programs \mathcal{P}_{Env} , define a class of programmatic policies \mathcal{P}_{Pol} such that for each MDP definable by \mathcal{P}_{Env} , there exists an optimal policy given by some program $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Pol}}$.

3 Two dimensional deterministic gridworlds with linear predicates

PRISM programs as we defined them above can have extremely complex behaviours; for instance, it is very easy to write a PRISM program illustrating Collatz conjecture:

```

1 x : [0..m] init n;
2
3 [even] x mod 2 = 0 ->
4   1 : x' = x / 2;
5 [odd] x mod 2 = 1 ->
6   1 : x' = 3x + 1;
```

It is conjectured that for any initial state $x = n$, for m large enough, the unique path eventually reaches $x = 1$, but the proof of this conjecture has eluded mathematicians for decades. Therefore, we will now focus our attention on a simple subclass of PRISM programs, which will be rich enough to include complicated behaviours, yet tamed enough to admit non-trivial expressivity and succinctness results. The restrictions are:


- There are 2 state variables x, y in $[0, n - 1]$, where n is a parameter.
- There are 4 actions, which represent the cardinal directions of LEFT, RIGHT, UP, and DOWN corresponding to the updates $x' = x - 1$, $x' = x + 1$, $y' = y + 1$, and $y' = y - 1$ respectively.
- The predicates P are all conjunctions of linear predicates, meaning $\bigcap \sum_i a_i x_i \geq b_i$.

We call LINGRID this class of environment programs. The linear predicates partition the grid into convex polygonal regions, which we refer to later as the *regions*, see Figure 1. Note that an instance of LINGRID with parameter n has exactly n^2 many states. The number of regions may be much smaller, it is linear in the size of the environment program. The goal of this work will be to show that we can represent policies whose size depend only on the number of regions, and not on the parameter n .

Let us make a cosmetic yet important assumption: we work in a continuous relaxation of the environment, where from a state the agent can choose any convex combination of the available actions, leading to an edge of the current region. The discrete and continuous semantics are equivalent when choosing a small enough granularity for discretization: the continuous relaxation is very reasonable and it enables geometric reasoning.

We consider reachability objectives, where the goal is to reach a target region. Since the environments are deterministic, this means finding a *path* from the initial state to the target. In other words, an optimal policy is a path to the target region. Thus, we will be using path and policy interchangeably moving forward.

► **Example 3 (Spiral).** In Figure 1a we have an example of an instance of LINGRID. The state space is a 28×28 grid and there are 5 regions with the allowed actions in the regions indicated by arrows within the region. The initial state (in orange) is $(0, 0)$ and the target region is the triangular region in the middle. Figure 1b visualizes the path from the initial state to the target region, looping around it. The length of the path is proportional to the state space; extrapolating, it is $O(n^2)$ in an $n \times n$ grid. But the path is very regular, which indicates that we should be able to have a compact representation: by the end of this paper,



■ **Figure 1** Spiral


we will construct a programmatic representation whose size depends on the number of regions but is independent of n .

To reason with gridworlds we need precise terminology and notations. States are pairs $(x, y) \in [0, n]^2$. For any $v_1, v_2 \in [0, n]^2$, we define the segment $[v_1, v_2]$ to be the set of points connecting v_1 and v_2 . We let **Regions** denote the set of regions, which are closed convex polygons, and $\mathbf{Actions}(R)$ denote the set of actions available in region R . We say that there exists a move between v_1 and v_2 if they belong to the same region and $v_2 - v_1$ is in the convex hull of $\mathbf{Actions}(R)$ seen as unitary vectors $(1, 0)$, $(-1, 0)$, $(0, 1)$, and $(0, -1)$. By extension, there exists a path from v_1 to v_k if there exists a sequence of consecutive moves starting in v_1 and ending in v_k . For a region $R \in \mathbf{Regions}$, we use $\mathbf{Edges}(R)$ to refer to the set of edges of R . Note that edges are segments, but when introducing an edge we implicitly mean the edge of some region. Since each edge is shared by at most two regions, we can define $\mathbf{Adj}(R, [v, v']) \in \mathbf{Regions}$ to be the region adjacent to R which both share the edge $[v, v']$ on their boundaries. However, since some edges lie on the boundaries of the grid $[0, n]^2$, $\mathbf{Adj}(R, [v, v'])$ might not exist.


4 The tree of the winning region

The first direction we explore while searching for concise representations of policies is region based policies where the policy picks a single action per region. For example, with the spiral gridworld from Example 3, it is sufficient to pick one action per region to navigate the agent from the initial state to the target region. However, this is not the case in general, as shown in the following example.

► **Example 4** (Double pass triangle). In Figure 2a, we have an example of an instance of LINGRID. Figure 2b visualizes the path from the initial state $(0, 4)$ to the target region. The important remark here is that the triangular region in the middle is crossed twice, with different actions: first time right, second time left. It is very tempting to refine this region as shown in Figure 2c to obtain a region-based policy: this is what we will be doing next!



■ **Figure 3** Backward construction of the tree of the winning region



■ **Figure 5** Images published in Life magazine in 1952 which show the path taken by Claude Shannon's mechanical mouse first while learning to navigate the maze and the direct path taken in its second attempt.

5 The class of policy programs

5.1 Inspiration

In 1950, Claude Shannon built, as a small project at home, one of the first instances of machine learning that the world had witnessed: a mechanical mouse capable of learning to solve a configurable maze in which the maze walls could be positioned as desired³. To do this, he repurposed telephone relay circuits and placed them underneath the maze board to navigate the mouse towards the exit. In a first pass, the mouse would systematically explore the whole maze looking for the exit and *learn* the path, so that in its subsequent attempts, it could swiftly reach the target. The magic was hidden in the relay circuits which would remember the path and were able to tell the mouse to turn left or right based on whether a switch was on or off. The first attempt is reminiscent of reinforcement learning with a trial and error approach to learn a policy to solve the game. However, our focus in this work will be on the subsequent attempts where we observe a programmatic abstraction to obtain a concise representation of the policy: instead of specifying the direction to follow at each point of the maze, the relay switches only indicated the points at which to change direction.

5.2 Programmatic policies

Before defining the programming language, let us dive into an example.

► **Example 6.** The following code block contains a programmatic policy for the spiral example given in Example 3.

```

1 Do:
2   From [(0, 0), (13, 13)] ->
3     Target [(13, 13), (14, 12)], Preference: (13,13)
4     Else Target [(14, 12), (26, 0)], Preference: (14,12)
5   From [(14, 12), (26, 0)] ->
6     Target [(14, 14), (28, 28)], Preference: (14, 14)
7   From [(14, 14), (28, 28)] ->

```

³ <https://www.technologyreview.com/2018/12/19/138508/mighty-mouse/>

```

8       Target [(14, 14), (0, 28)], Preference: (0,28)
9       From [(14, 14), (0, 28)] ->
10      Target [(0, 0), (13, 13)], Preference: (0,0)
11  Until([(13, 13), (14, 12)])

```

This program ensures to reach the segment $[(13, 13), (14, 12)]$, which is an edge of the target region. To do this, it specifies moves starting from four segments: $[(0, 0), (13, 13)]$, $[(14, 12), (26, 0)]$, $[(14, 14), (28, 28)]$, and $[(14, 14), (0, 28)]$. Figure 1a can help visualize these segments: this is the four diagonals. From $[(0, 0), (13, 13)]$ we have two target segments: if we can reach $[(13, 13), (14, 12)]$, then we do (indeed this is part of the target region so we are done), otherwise we aim at $[(14, 12), (26, 0)]$. Importantly, when aiming at $[(14, 12), (26, 0)]$ we want to go as close as possible to $(14, 12)$ as specified by the preference. Here this means choosing only action RIGHT, and not DOWN. In the other three segments there is a single target segment.

In general, a policy program is a sequence of Do Until loops:

```

1 Do:
2   P
3 Until(e)

```

This is interpreted as: run the local program P until reaching the edge e , which we call the local goal. A local program is a set of instructions of the form

```

1 From s ->
2   Target s1, Preference: v1
3   Else Target s2, Preference: v2
4   ...
5   Else Target sk, Preference: vk

```

where s, s_1, \dots, s_k are segments and v_1, \dots, v_k vertices, with v_i an extremal point of s_i . It is interpreted as: from any state v in the segment s , let i be the *least* index such that there is a move from v to s_i ; move to the reachable state of s_i closest to v_i . We also allow the possibility of simply specifying a direction to follow in $\{\text{LEFT}, \text{RIGHT}, \text{UP}, \text{DOWN}\}$ instead of a target and a preference.

6 Properties of the tree of the winning region


In this section we will prove properties of paths in gridworlds environment. These are preliminary steps before constructing an algorithm deriving programmatic policies from paths. A branch of the tree of the winning region is a sequence of segments

$$([a_1, b_1], [a_2, b_2], \dots, [a_p, b_p]).$$

The branch $([a_1, b_1], [a_2, b_2], \dots, [a_p, b_p])$ induces a sequence of pairs of regions and edges $((R_1, e_1), \dots, (R_{p-1}, e_{p-1}))$. For each $i \in [1, p-1]$: (i) the moves between $[a_i, b_i]$ and $[a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}]$ are contained in R_i , (ii) $\text{Actions}(R_i) \neq \emptyset$, (iii) $R_i \neq R_{i+1}$, (iv) $[a_i, b_i] \subseteq e_i$, and (v) $e_{i+1} \in \text{Edges}(R_i) \cap \text{Edges}(R_{i+1})$.

► **Lemma 7.** *There exist at most two indices $i < j \in [1, p-1]$ such that $(R_i, e_i) = (R_j, e_j)$ and $e_{i+1} = e_i, e_{j+1} = e_j$.*

Proof. Arguing by contradiction, suppose there exist 3 indices $k < i < j$ such that $(R_i, e_i) = (R_j, e_j) = (R_k, e_k)$ and $e_{i+1} = e_i, e_{j+1} = e_j$ and $e_{k+1} = e_k$. Let us denote the common edge e_i by the segment $[a, b]$ and without loss of generality, assume for each of the segments $[a_i, b_i]$,



■ **Figure 6** Any path which visits $[a_{k+1}, b_{k+1}] \rightarrow [a_i, b_i] \rightarrow [a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}] \rightarrow [a_j, b_j] \rightarrow [a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$ is necessarily self intersecting.

$[a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}]$, $[a_j, b_j]$, $[a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$, $[a_k, b_k]$, and $[a_{k+1}, b_{k+1}]$, the first vertex of the segment is closer to a and the second vertex is closer to b . This orientation makes the following arguments easier.


In the rest of the proof, we base our arguments on the algorithm used to construct the tree of the winning region. First, let us place ourselves in the situation when the leaf associated to the segment $[a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$ was being extended. $[a_j, b_j]$ is a segment from which there exists a path to $[a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$. As we filter out parts of edges which have already been explored, either $[a_j, b_j] \subseteq [a, a_{j+1}]$ or $[a_j, b_j] \subseteq [b_{j+1}, b]$. So assume $[a_j, b_j] \subseteq [a, a_{j+1}]$. Then, in fact we have a path from each point in $[a, a_{j+1}]$ to $[a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$. This is due to the fact that there exists $x \in [a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$ such that $x - a_j$ is included in the cone of actions allowed in R_j . As for each $y \in [a, a_{j+1}]$, $x - y$ is along the same direction as $x - a_j$, it is also in the cone of allowed actions. Thus, the whole segment $[a, b_{j+1}]$ has been explored until now.

The next time we visit this edge, we have that $[a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}] \subseteq [b_{j+1}, b]$. Similar to before, since $[a, b_{j+1}]$ has been explored $[a_i, b_i] \subseteq [b_{j+1}, a_{i+1}]$ or $[a_i, b_i] \subseteq [b_{i+1}, b]$. Suppose we are in the former case. So $[a, b_{i+1}]$ has been explored and thus $[a_{k+1}, b_{k+1}] \subseteq [b_{i+1}, b]$. Now, one can see in Figure 6 that any path represented by the segments, which visits $[a_{k+1}, b_{k+1}] \rightarrow [a_i, b_i] \rightarrow [a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}] \rightarrow [a_j, b_j] \rightarrow [a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$ is necessarily self intersecting. Note that here we assumed $[a_j, b_j] \subseteq [a, a_{j+1}]$ and $[a_i, b_i] \subseteq [b_{j+1}, a_{i+1}]$, but each of the three other cases can be verified similarly that they all give us self intersecting paths. ◀

► **Lemma 8.** Assume there exist indices $i < j \in [1, p - 1]$ such that $(R_i, e_i) = (R_j, e_j)$, $e_i \neq e_{i+1}$ and $\text{Actions}(R_i)$ contains at least two orthogonal directions. Then,

1. if the sequence of segments forms an **inner loop** at (R_j, e_j) , then all the edges of regions **inside the loop** are not visited by the subsequence (e_1, \dots, e_j) .
2. if the sequence of segments forms an **outer loop** at (R_j, e_j) , then all the edges of regions **outside the loop** are not visited by the subsequence (e_1, \dots, e_j) .
3. if j is the least index such that $i < j$ and $(R_j, e_j) = (R_i, e_i)$, we can construct $[a'_{j+1}, b'_{j+1}]$ from $[a_j, b_j]$, $[a_i, b_i]$ and $[a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}]$ such that $[a'_{j+1}, b'_{j+1}] \subseteq [a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$ and each point in $[a'_{j+1}, b'_{j+1}]$ is reachable from a point in $[a_j, b_j]$.


Proof. Let us begin by understanding what we mean by a loop and edges being inside and outside loops. Looking at Figure 7a, the path (in green) starting at (R_i, e_i) forms a loop at



■ **Figure 7** (a) Inner loop at (R_i, e_i) partitions all the edges not involved in the loop into inner (blue) and outer (orange) edges (b) Loop at (R_i, e_i) with the path previously visiting an inner edge at index $k + 1$ (c) Counterexample path in the case where DOWN and LEFT are allowed in R_i (d) Counterexample path in the case where UP and LEFT are allowed in R_i .

this edge. As soon as this loop is completed, the edges of regions not involved in the loop are partitioned into disjoint two sets: the edges inside the loop (in blue) and those outside (in orange). It is important that $e_{i+1} \neq e_i$ else the loop of edges would not be formed.

We will now prove item 1, the proof of item 2 follows a similar pattern. To this end, we again proceed by contradiction and assume that we have a sequence of segments which visits an inner edge before forming a loop at $(R_j, e_j) = (R_i, e_i)$. Let $p_i \in [a_i, b_i], p_j \in [a_j, b_j]$. There exists a path going from p_i to p_j . Now take a look at Figure 7b in which we can see a loop being formed by the path from p_i to p_j . If this sequence of segments visits an inner edge before forming the loop, it has to pass through the space in the edge between p_i and p_j because if not, we would have a self intersecting path. Thus, there exist indices $k < l < i$ such that $e_k = e_l = e_i$ which are the indices where the sequence enters and exits the edge e_i while visiting an inner edge. Let $p_k \in [a_k, b_k], p_l \in [a_l, b_l]$ and consider a path visiting $p_k \rightarrow$



■ **Figure 8** Constructing $[a'_{j+1}, b'_{j+1}]$ from $[a_j, b_j]$, $[a_i, b_i]$ and $[a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}]$ in the proof of Lemma 8.

$p_l \rightarrow p_i \rightarrow p_j$ which can also be seen in Figure 7b.

Since $\text{Actions}(R_i) \neq \emptyset$, without loss of generality, we assume that $\text{LEFT} \in \text{Actions}(R_i)$ as seen in the figure. Using the assumption that we have at least two orthogonal directions allowed in R_i , we have two cases: $\text{UP} \in \text{Actions}(R_i)$ or $\text{DOWN} \in \text{Actions}(R_i)$. In the first case, p_{i+1} would be reachable from p_k and $[a_k, b_k]$ (see Figure 7c) and so this segment would have been explored while the node $[a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}]$ was being extended which means that $[a_k, b_k]$ cannot exist in the space between p_i and p_j . Similarly in the second case, if $\text{DOWN} \in \text{Actions}(R_i)$, p_{j+1} would be reachable from p_i and $[a_i, b_i]$ (see Figure 7d) and therefore for the same reasons, $[a_i, b_i]$ cannot exist above p_j . This concludes the proof of item 1.

Moving on to proving item 3, let us denote $[a_z, b_z]$ by $[(x_z, y_z), (x'_z, y'_z)]$ for $z \in \{i, i+1, j, j+1\}$. Same as before, let us assume without loss of generality that $\text{LEFT} \in \text{Actions}(R_i)$ and $x_{i+1} \leq x_i, x_{j+1} \leq x_j$. This can be visualized through Figure 8. As at least two orthogonal directions are allowed in R_i , let us again split into two cases with the first one being $\text{UP} \in \text{Actions}(R_i)$. Firstly, $[a_j, b_j]$ is below $[a_i, b_i]$ as seen in the figure because if not, $[a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$ (which would also have to be above $[a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}]$ to avoid self intersecting paths) would be reachable from $[a_i, b_i]$ so it would have already been explored at index j and cannot exist there at index i . By assumption, as j is the least such index satisfying the property, using arguments similar to the previous part of the proof, we have that there is no index $k > j$ such that $[a_k, b_k] \subseteq [a_i, b_j]$. This means that when the tree node associated to the segment $[a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$ was being extended, $[a_i, b_j]$ was unexplored. Also, we have that $\text{DOWN} \notin \text{Actions}(R_i)$, otherwise $[a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$ would be reachable from $[a_i, b_i]$. Thus necessarily, $y_{j+1} = y_j$, i.e., a_{j+1} lies on the same y -coordinate as a_j . As a result, we can determine a_{j+1} simply by intersecting the line $y = y_j$ with the region R_i . Lastly, $y'_j \leq y'_{j+1}$, i.e., b_j lies below b_{j+1} and therefore we can set $a'_{j+1} := a_{j+1}$ (which can be computed) and b'_{j+1} to be other point on the edge of R_i on the same y -coordinate as b_j . We remark that there is a path from each point in $[a_j, b_j]$ to $[a'_{j+1}, b'_{j+1}]$: just go left! Symmetric arguments can be used to deal with the case in which $\text{DOWN} \in \text{Actions}(R_i)$. ◀

7 Constructing policy programs

What remains to be done is derive from a path a programmatic policy; one could say “compress” a path. This is the purpose of Algorithm 1. Lemma 8 provides the main idea for the construction of the policy synthesis procedure. As we have shown, whenever a loop is formed by the path, a new edge is discovered as soon as the loop is exited due to the non self-intersecting property. This motivates us to consider programmatic policies with a sequence of `Do Until` blocks corresponding to the sequence of edges in the order in which they are discovered by a path.

The algorithm works as follows: it takes in a sequence of segments from a tree of the winning region $([a_1, b_1], \dots, [a_p, b_p])$ and the corresponding sequence of edges (e_1, \dots, e_p) . It goes through both these sequences and each time a new edge is encountered, it begins a new `Do Until` block. At each iteration of the loop, if it sees that a segment of the next edge is already a target, i.e., if it visits the same pair of consecutive edges twice, it merges the two segments. This merging procedure ensures that when we encounter a loop in our path, segments belonging to the same edge are merged thus resulting in a compact representation of the sequence of segments. When we merge, we also set the preference depending on which side the next segment is with respect to the previous segment on the same edge. Intuitively, this allows to distinguish between *inner* and *outer* loops where the preference would force the policy to navigate towards a certain extreme of a segment thereby allowing the agent to progress closer towards the target region. The regions in which the allowed actions are a subset of $\{\text{LEFT}, \text{RIGHT}\}$ or $\{\text{UP}, \text{DOWN}\}$ are handled differently by the algorithm. Since diagonal directions are not allowed in such regions, it suffices to specify the direction in which to navigate.

We now shift our attention to proving the correctness of Algorithm 1, which means proving an *expressivity result*, given by Theorem 9 and a *succinctness result* in the form of an upper bound on the size of the synthesized programmatic policies, in Theorem 10.

► **Theorem 9.** *Given the shortest sequence of segments in the tree of the winning region $([a_1, b_1], \dots, [a_p, b_p])$ going from the initial state to the target region, Algorithm 1 synthesizes a programmatic policy that can navigate an agent through these segments.*

Proof. We will show that the synthesized policy navigates an agent through the sequence of segments in the same order. Arguing by induction, it suffices to show that if the agent is currently at a point $p_i \in [a_i, b_i]$ for some $i \in [1, p - 1]$, the policy would guide the agent towards a point $p_{i+1} \in [a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}]$. When the agent is at p_i , the execution of the program would be in a certain `Do Until` block. Firstly, we argue that the edge e_i that contains $[a_i, b_i]$ contains at least one target in its `From e_i` instruction in the current block. This is true by construction because the synthesis algorithm processes each segment sequentially and as a result each edge that appears in the sequence would have an associated `From` instruction. Note that the only case when this would be untrue is when the goal of the `Do Until` block is reached in which case the program execution would switch to the next block.

Next, within a `From` instruction, there may be several target segments separated by `Else` statements. Again, by construction, at least one of them is reachable from p_i . Furthermore, the first reachable target segment contains $([a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}])$ because if not, this target segment (which would appear at index greater than $i + 1$) would be reachable from $([a_i, b_i])$. Consequently, we would have a shorter sequence of segments leading to a contradiction.

Lastly, it remains to prove that the policy would indeed navigate to a point in $([a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}])$. Here, we need to distinguish two cases. In the first case, suppose that the target segment in the `From e_i` instruction was formed without any merging of segments. Then necessarily

■ **Algorithm 1** Synthesizing a programmatic policy

Input: A branch in the tree of the winning region $([a_1, b_1], \dots, [a_p, b_p])$ and the corresponding sequence of edges (e_1, \dots, e_p) and regions (R_1, \dots, R_{p-1})
 VisitedEdges = \emptyset
for $i = 1$ to $p - 1$ **do**
 if $e_i \notin$ VisitedEdges **then**
 add e_i to VisitedEdges
 start new Do Until block with local goal e_i
 if there is no From e_i in current Do Until block **then**
 add a From e_i instruction to the current block
 if $(\text{Actions}(R_i) \subseteq \{\text{LEFT}, \text{RIGHT}\})$ or $(\text{Actions}(R_i) \subseteq \{\text{UP}, \text{DOWN}\})$ and $e_{i+1} \neq e_i$
 then
 let $\text{dir} \in \{\text{LEFT}, \text{RIGHT}, \text{UP}, \text{DOWN}\}$ such that dir is the direction of e_{i+1} with respect to e_i
 add the instruction GO dir inside the From e_i instruction if it is not already present
 else if some segment $[a, b]$ included in e_{i+1} is currently the preferred target segment of e_i and $e_{i+1} \neq e_i$ **then**
 merge $[a, b]$ and $[a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}]$ into one segment
 if merged segment is $[a, b_{i+1}]$ **then**
 set preference to a
 if merged segment is $[a_{i+1}, b]$ **then**
 set preference to b
 else
 add to the top of the instruction From e_i a new target $[a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}]$ with preference a_{i+1}
end

the target segment coincides with $([a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}])$ or it is a region in which the allowed actions are a subset of $\{\text{LEFT}, \text{RIGHT}\}$ or $\{\text{UP}, \text{DOWN}\}$. Both the scenarios are easily handled. The interesting case is when the target segment was formed by the merging of segments. It means that the edge e_i was visited twice and we have a loop at e_i . This is where the **Preference** plays a role in navigating the agent in the correct direction. Note that at least two orthogonal actions allowed in R_i . As we noted in the proof of Lemma 8, when we enter a loop in such a region, the segment $[a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}]$ has the same x or y coordinates as $[a_i, b_i]$ depending on the actions allowed. This means that there is a point p_{i+1} with the same x or y coordinate as p_i in the target segment. By taking another look at Figure 8, we can further see that p_{i+1} coincides with the point reachable in the target segment that is extremal with respect to the **Preference**. Here, the synthesized merged segment would be $[a_{i+1}, b_{j+1}]$ with **Preference**: b_{j+1} . If the agent is at a point in $[a_j, b_j]$, and the allowed actions are UP and LEFT, the policy would navigate the agent towards a point in $[a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}]$ with the same y -coordinate (i.e., go LEFT) because that would be the point that is extremal with respect to the specified **Preference**. ◀

► **Theorem 10.** *Given the shortest sequence of segments in a tree of the winning region $([a_1, b_1], \dots, [a_p, b_p])$ going from the initial state to the target region, Algorithm 1 synthesizes a programmatic policy of length at most $O(|\text{Regions}|^4)$.*

Proof. Firstly, we remark that as we have at most $|\text{Regions}|^2$ edges in the gridworld, we have at most $|\text{Regions}|^2$ blocks Do Until representing the subgoals. Suppose that the sequence

of segments visits q unique edges and let $\bar{e}_1 \rightarrow \bar{e}_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \bar{e}_q$ denote the sequence of these edges in the order that they are first visited. Each of these correspond to a `Do Until` block in the policy.

Let us now analyse the size of each `Do Until` block which corresponds to a programmatic representation of a part of the sequence of segments going from \bar{e}_m to \bar{e}_{m+1} for a certain $m \in [1, q - 1]$. Let $([c_1, d_1], \dots, [c_l, d_l])$ denote this sequence of segments which forms a part of the sequence $([a_1, b_1], \dots, [a_p, b_p])$. Note that $[c_1, d_1]$ and $[c_l, d_l]$ are segments within the edges \bar{e}_m and \bar{e}_{m+1} respectively. Also, keep in mind the sequence of pairs of regions and edges traversed by the sequence $((R_1, e_1), \dots, (R_l, e_l))$ which will be useful in the rest of the proof.

Observe that each unique edge in $\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}$ is associated with a `From` instruction within the `Do Until` block. As a first step, let us treat the indices $i \in [1, l - 1]$ such that $e_{i+1} = e_i$. By Lemma 7, this happens at most twice with e_i so this contributes at most two targets, and thereby two lines to the `From` instruction of e_i . On the other hand, suppose $e_{i+1} \neq e_i$. As a first subcase, suppose $\text{Actions}(R_i) \subseteq \{\text{LEFT}, \text{RIGHT}\}$ or $\text{Actions}(R_i) \subseteq \{\text{UP}, \text{DOWN}\}$. From Algorithm 1 it is clear that such regions would add at most two targets (directions) to the `From` e_i instruction. Next assume at least two orthogonal directions are allowed in R_i . If $e_{i+1} \neq e_i$ at most once with e_i , then it contributes only one target to the `From` e_i instruction. However, if there is another index $j \in [1, l - 1]$ such that $e_i = e_j$ and $e_{j+1} \neq e_j$, by Lemma 8, it means that we have an inner or an outer loop. From this case, we would again have at most two targets: either $e_{j+1} = e_{i+1}$ and so the target segments would be merged (and the loop continues) or e_{j+1} is a new edge never visited before (and the loop is exited). In other words, a loop contributes at most two target segments to each edge and there is at most one loop in a `Do Until` block.

In total, we have at most six targets associated with each edge in the `Do Until` block. Since only m edges are explored by the m -th block, each block has at most $4m$ instructions. Thus, we obtain the following bound on the total length of the policy

$$\sum_{m=1}^{|\text{Regions}|^2} 4m = O(|\text{Regions}|^4). \quad (1)$$

◀

In Theorem 10, we made the assumption that each segment in the sequence can be stored in constant space. This would imply that we can store rationals of arbitrary precision representing the endpoints of the segments in constant space. Obviously, this is not a valid assumption in practice and in the case where all the edges of the regions are described by rationals, we prove the following upper bound on the space required to store the segments.

► **Lemma 11.** *Suppose there exists $D \in \mathbb{N}$ such that each of the endpoints of each of the edges of the regions are of the form $(\frac{a}{D}n, \frac{b}{D}n)$ for some $a, b \in [0, D]$, then each segment of a path of the tree of the winning region $([a_1, b_1], \dots, [a_p, b_p])$ can be stored in space at most $O(pD \log(D))$ when both a_p and b_p can be written in the same form.*

Proof. Let

$$\left[\left(\frac{x_1}{D}l, \frac{y_1}{D}l \right), \left(\frac{x_2}{D}l, \frac{y_2}{D}l \right) \right]$$

be an edge of a region in `Regions` for some $x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2 \in \llbracket 0, D \rrbracket$.

Associated to this edge, we can write the two following equations for the line on which it lies on:

$$y = \frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2 - x_1}x + \frac{(x_2 - x_1)y_1 - (y_2 - y_1)x_1}{(x_2 - x_1)D}l \quad (2)$$

$$x = \frac{x_2 - x_1}{y_2 - y_1}y + \frac{(y_2 - y_1)x_1 - (x_2 - x_1)y_1}{(y_2 - y_1)D}l \quad (3)$$

Note that when $y_2 - y_1 = 0$ or $x_2 - x_1 = 0$, one of the two equations does not exist. Observing that $(x_2 - x_1), (y_2 - y_1) \in \llbracket -D, D \rrbracket$, we have that $H := D(D!)$ is divisible by $(x_2 - x_1)D$ and $(y_2 - y_1)D$. So we can write

$$y = \frac{s}{H}x + \frac{d}{H}l \quad (4)$$

$$x = \frac{s'}{H}y + \frac{d'}{H}l \quad (5)$$

where

$$s := H \frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2 - x_1} \quad (6)$$

$$d := H \frac{(x_2 - x_1)y_1 - (y_2 - y_1)x_1}{(x_2 - x_1)D} \quad (7)$$

and similarly for s' and d' . In particular, these numerators satisfy the following bounds

$$|s| = \left| H \frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2 - x_1} \right| \leq H|y_2 - y_1| \leq HD \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |d| &= \left| H \frac{(x_2 - x_1)y_1 - (y_2 - y_1)x_1}{(x_2 - x_1)D} \right| \leq \frac{H}{D} (|(x_2 - x_1)y_1| + |(y_2 - y_1)x_1|) \\ &\leq \frac{H}{D} 2D^2 = HD \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

With this, we are now able to write the equation for the line containing each of the edges as shown in 4. These two forms of the equation are relevant to us because each time we are extending a node of a segment $[a_i, b_i]$ in a tree of the winning region, we are computing $[a_{i-1}, b_{i-1}]$ by intersecting an edge with the half-planes reachable by the allowed actions in R_{i-1} which amounts to finding the intersection points of the line containing e_{i-1} with a certain horizontal or vertical line. So we can substitute the value of the x or y coordinate in 4 to obtain the endpoints of $[a_{i-1}, b_{i-1}]$. Notice that filtering out explored parts of edges only uses precomputed intersection points.

For example, if while extending the segment $[a_p, b_p]$, to compute $[a_{p-1}, b_{p-1}]$, we have to intersect with the line $x = (a/H)l$ where $a \in \llbracket 0, H \rrbracket$. Substituting this into 4, gives us

$$y_{p-1} = \frac{s}{H} \frac{a}{H} l + \frac{d}{H} l = \frac{sa + dH}{H^2} l \quad (10)$$

with $|sa + dH| \leq H^2 D$. Now suppose while extending the segment $[a_{p-1}, b_{p-1}]$ to $[a_{p-2}, b_{p-2}]$, we have to intersect with the line $y = \frac{u}{H^2} l$ where $u \in \llbracket 0, H^2 D \rrbracket$. Then, in the same way,

$$x_{p-2} = \frac{v}{H^3} \quad (11)$$

for some $v \in \llbracket 0, H^3 D^2 \rrbracket$.

Continuing this argument inductively, we get that the endpoints of the first segment $[a_1, b_1]$ can be written with coordinates of the form

$$\frac{t}{H^p}$$

where $t \in \llbracket 0, H^p D^{p-1} \rrbracket$. Furthermore, since

$$H^p D^{p-1} = D^{2p-1} (D!)^p = O(D^{p(D+2)-1}) \quad (12)$$

So, in order to store $[a_1, b_1]$ which potentially requires more space to store than any of the other segments, we need to store a few integers in $\llbracket 0, H^p D^{p-1} \rrbracket$ which requires

$$\log(H^p D^{p-1}) = O((p(D+2) - 1) \log(D)) = O(pD \log(D)) \quad (13)$$

bytes. ◀

8 Implementation and evaluation

We release a small Python package including modules for generating instances of LINGRID as well as implementation of the algorithms for the construction of the tree of the winning region and synthesis of policies:

<https://github.com/guruprerana/smol-strats>


The `linpreds` module contains classes to generate random gridworlds with linear predicates. This is done by choosing at random linear predicates on a $n \times n$ grid where the endpoints of the linear predicates are in $[0, n - 1]$. We then assign random actions to each of the regions that are created by the intersections of these linear predicates. It also includes functions to generate a PRISM program from the gridworld.

The `polygons` module contains the infrastructure to translate the linear predicates generated into a data structure which makes the backward winning region construction efficient. We use the half-edge data structure (popular in computational geometry) by looking at the gridworld as a planar tiling of the grid with polygons. The `backward_reachability` module constructs the tree of the winning region. The `game.continuous` module implements a reinforcement learning-like game environment which can simulate a policy for instances of LINGRID. Lastly, `policy.subgoals` implements Algorithm 1 and can synthesize programmatic policies from a path of segments.


The `benchmarks` folder contains a set of 17 benchmarks including the spiral and double-pass triangle examples. The others were generated by our code and go up to instances with 50 linear predicates and 600+ regions. The synthesized policies can be seen and the policy path visualized in images in the respective folders of the benchmarks. The benchmark data can be found in Table 1. We measure size in bytes to take into account the size of numerical coefficients involved. We observe that the size of the policy is polynomial (almost linear) in the size of the gridworld. Note that the size of the gridworld is the space required to store all the edges of all the regions of the gridworld.

9 Conclusions and future work

This work is a first step towards theoretical foundations of programmatic reinforcement learning, and more specifically the question of designing programming languages for policies.



(a) Instance of LINGRID



(b) Synthesized policy path

■ **Figure 9** The `size100preds50-4` benchmark which is an instance of LINGRID with 50 predicates and 542 regions.

Benchmark	Gridworld size	Policy size	Regions
spiral	10833	20847	14
size3preds5loopy	8786	15744	11
size50preds10-1	30669	57926	32
size50preds20-1	105252	126263	113
size100preds20-1	119253	136257	126
size100preds20-2	108256	130591	115
size100preds30-1	228676	256031	233
size100preds30-2	220557	248063	230
size100preds30-3	221308	244846	227
size100preds30-4	266882	303592	271
size100preds50-1	612940	655357	616
size100preds50-2	668670	706836	668
size100preds50-3	635978	663439	628
size100preds50-4	538503	576528	542
size100preds50-5	603314	641681	616

■ **Table 1** Size of synthesized policies (in bytes) for a set of generated benchmarks.

The take away message is that for a large class of environments we were able to construct programmatic policies using in a non-trivial way control loops. We proved expressiveness results, meaning existence of optimal programmatic policies, as well as succinctness results, proving that there exist optimal programmatic policies whose size are independent from the number of states (and only on the number of regions). We hope that this paper will open a fruitful line of research on the theoretical front. We outline here promising directions.

A burning question is studying the trade-offs between sizes of programmatic policies and their performances. In this paper, we focused on winning policies, meaning paths to the target region. For the case of deterministic gridworlds, the length of the path is a natural measure of performance: are there small programmatic policies ensuring optimal or near optimal number of steps? More generally, performance should be measured as the expected total reward they ensure.

The motivations of this work is to construct programmatic policies because they are readable, interpretable, and verifiable. Hence alongside with expressivity and succinctness results, we should also investigate how we can reason with programmatic policies, and in particular verify them. Developing verification algorithms for programmatic policies is a natural next step for this work. Another desirable property is generalizability: programmatic policies are expected to generalize better, as it was argued in the original papers [4, 10, 20]. Further theoretical and empirical studies will help us understand this argument better.

Last but not least, once we understand which classes of programmatic policies are expressive and succinct, remains the main question: how do we learn programmatic policies? Many approaches have been developed for decision trees, PIDs, and related classes. Learning more structured programmatic policies involving control loops is a very exciting challenge for the future, which has been tackled very recently [14, 1, 5]!

References

- 1 David S. Aleixo and Levi H. S. Leles. Show me the way! Bilevel search for synthesizing programmatic strategies. In *Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAI*, pages 4991–4998.

- AAAI Press, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v37i4.25626>, doi:10.1609/AAAI.V37I4.25626.
- 2 Roman Andriushchenko, Milan Ceska, Sebastian Junges, and Joost-Pieter Katoen. Inductive synthesis of finite-state controllers for POMDPs. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, UAI*, volume 180 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 85–95. PMLR, 2022. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v180/andriushchenko22a.html>.
 - 3 Karl Johan Åström and Tore Hägglund. *PID Controllers: Theory, Design, and Tuning*. ISA - The Instrumentation, Systems and Automation Society, 1995.
 - 4 Osbert Bastani, Yewen Pu, and Armando Solar-Lezama. Verifiable reinforcement learning via policy extraction. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NeurIPS*, pages 2499–2509, 2018. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2018/hash/e6d8545daa42d5ced125a4bf747b3688-Abstract.html>.
 - 5 Kevin Batz, Tom Jannik Biskup, Joost-Pieter Katoen, and Tobias Winkler. Programmatic strategy synthesis: Resolving nondeterminism in probabilistic programs. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 8(POPL):2792–2820, January 2024. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3632935>, doi:10.1145/3632935.
 - 6 Ahmed Bouajjani, Javier Esparza, and Oded Maler. Reachability analysis of pushdown automata: Application to model-checking. In *International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR*, volume 1243 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 135–150. Springer, 1997. doi:10.1007/3-540-63141-0_10.
 - 7 Arnaud Carayol and Olivier Serre. Pushdown games. In Nathanaël Fijalkow, editor, *Games on Graphs*. Arxiv, 2023.
 - 8 Nathanaël Fijalkow, Nathalie Bertrand, Patricia Bouyer-Decitre, Romain Brenguier, Arnaud Carayol, John Fearnley, Hugo Gimbert, Florian Horn, Rasmus Ibsen-Jensen, Nicolas Markey, Benjamin Monmege, Petr Novotný, Mickael Randour, Ocan Sankur, Sylvain Schmitz, Olivier Serre, and Mateusz Skomra. *Games on Graphs*. Online, 2023.
 - 9 Christian Hensel, Sebastian Junges, Joost-Pieter Katoen, Tim Quatmann, and Matthias Volk. The probabilistic model checker Storm. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer*, 24(4):589–610, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-021-00633-z>, doi:10.1007/S10009-021-00633-Z.
 - 10 Jeevana Priya Inala, Osbert Bastani, Zenna Tavares, and Armando Solar-Lezama. Synthesizing programmatic policies that inductively generalize. In *International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2020. URL: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=S118oANFDH>.
 - 11 Marta Z. Kwiatkowska, Gethin Norman, and David Parker. PRISM 4.0: Verification of probabilistic real-time systems. In *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification, CAV*, volume 6806 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 585–591. Springer, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-22110-1_47.
 - 12 Mikel Landajuela, Brenden K. Petersen, Sookyung Kim, Cláudio P. Santiago, Ruben Glatt, T. Nathan Mundhenk, Jacob F. Pettit, and Daniel M. Faissol. Discovering symbolic policies with deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5979–5989. PMLR, 2021. URL: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/landajuela21a.html>.
 - 13 Jacky Liang, Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Peng Xu, Karol Hausman, Brian Ichter, Pete Florence, and Andy Zeng. Code as policies: Language model programs for embodied control. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, ICRA*, pages 9493–9500. IEEE, 2023. doi:10.1109/ICRA48891.2023.10160591.
 - 14 Rubens O. Moraes, David S. Aleixo, Lucas N. Ferreira, and Levi H. S. Lelis. Choosing well your opponents: How to guide the synthesis of programmatic strategies. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI*, pages 4847–4854. ijcai.org, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2023/539>, doi:10.24963/IJCAI.2023/539.

- 15 Petr Novotny. Markov decision processes. In Nathanaël Fijalkow, editor, *Games on Graphs*. Arxiv, 2023.
- 16 Wenjie Qiu and He Zhu. Programmatic reinforcement learning without oracles. In *International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2022. URL: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=6Tk2noBdvxt>.
- 17 Xinghua Qu, Zhu Sun, Yew-Soon Ong, Abhishek Gupta, and Pengfei Wei. Minimalistic attacks: How little it takes to fool deep reinforcement learning policies. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems*, 13(4):806–817, 2021. doi:10.1109/TCDs.2020.2974509.
- 18 David Silver, Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Matthew Lai, Arthur Guez, Marc Lanctot, Laurent Sifre, Dhharshan Kumaran, Thore Graepel, Timothy Lillicrap, Karen Simonyan, and Demis Hassabis. A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and go through self-play. *Science*, 362(6419):1140–1144, 2018. URL: <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.aar6404>, arXiv:<https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.aar6404>, doi:10.1126/science.aar6404.
- 19 Niko Sünderhauf, Oliver Brock, Walter J. Scheirer, Raia Hadsell, Dieter Fox, Jürgen Leitner, Ben Upcroft, Pieter Abbeel, Wolfram Burgard, Michael Milford, and Peter Corke. The limits and potentials of deep learning for robotics. *International Journal on Robotics Research*, 37(4-5):405–420, 2018. doi:10.1177/0278364918770733.
- 20 Dweep Trivedi, Jesse Zhang, Shao-Hua Sun, and Joseph J. Lim. Learning to synthesize programs as interpretable and generalizable policies. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NeurIPS*, pages 25146–25163, 2021. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2021/hash/d37124c4c79f357cb02c655671a432fa-Abstract.html>.
- 21 Abhinav Verma, Hoang Minh Le, Yisong Yue, and Swarat Chaudhuri. Imitation-projected programmatic reinforcement learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NeurIPS*, pages 15726–15737, 2019. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/hash/5a44a53b7d26bb1e54c05222f186dcfb-Abstract.html>.
- 22 Abhinav Verma, Vijayaraghavan Murali, Rishabh Singh, Pushmeet Kohli, and Swarat Chaudhuri. Programmatically interpretable reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5052–5061. PMLR, 2018. URL: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/verma18a.html>.
- 23 Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Michaël Mathieu, Andrew Dudzik, Junyoung Chung, David H. Choi, Richard Powell, Timo Ewalds, Petko Georgiev, Junhyuk Oh, Dan Horgan, Manuel Kroiss, Ivo Danihelka, Aja Huang, Laurent Sifre, Trevor Cai, John P. Agapiou, Max Jaderberg, Alexander Sasha Vezhnevets, Rémi Leblond, Tobias Pohlen, Valentin Dalibard, David Budden, Yury Sulsky, James Molloy, Tom Le Paine, Çağlar Gülçehre, Ziyu Wang, Tobias Pfaff, Yuhuai Wu, Roman Ring, Dani Yogatama, Dario Wünsch, Katrina McKinney, Oliver Smith, Tom Schaul, Timothy P. Lillicrap, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Demis Hassabis, Chris Apps, and David Silver. Grandmaster level in starcraft II using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 575(7782):350–354, 2019. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1724-z>, doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1724-z.
- 24 He Zhu, Zikang Xiong, Stephen Magill, and Suresh Jagannathan. An inductive synthesis framework for verifiable reinforcement learning. In *ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI*, pages 686–701. ACM, 2019. doi:10.1145/3314221.3314638.