

Mental Modeling of Reinforcement Learning Agents by Language Models

Wenhao Lu*, Xufeng Zhao†, Josua Spisak†, Jae Hee Lee, Stefan Wermter

University of Hamburg

{wenhao.lu, xufeng.zhao, josua.spisak, jae.hee.lee, stefan.wermter}
@uni-hamburg.de

Abstract

Can emergent language models faithfully model the intelligence of decision-making agents? Though modern language models exhibit already some reasoning ability, and theoretically can potentially express any probable distribution over tokens, it remains underexplored how the world knowledge these pre-trained models have memorized can be utilized to comprehend an agent’s behaviour in the physical world. This study empirically examines, for the first time, how well large language models (LLMs) can build a mental model of agents, termed *agent mental modelling*, by reasoning about an agent’s behaviour and its effect on states from agent interaction history. This research may unveil the potential of leveraging LLMs for elucidating RL agent behaviour, addressing a key challenge in eXplainable reinforcement learning (XRL). To this end, we propose specific evaluation metrics and test them on selected RL task datasets of varying complexity, reporting findings on agent mental model establishment. Our results disclose that LLMs are not yet capable of fully mental modelling agents through inference alone without further innovations. This work thus provides new insights into the capabilities and limitations of modern LLMs.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) surprisingly perform well in some types of reasoning due to their common-sense knowledge (Li et al., 2022b), including math, symbolic, and spatial reasoning (Kojima et al., 2022; Yamada et al., 2023; Momennejad et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2024). Still, most reasoning experiments focus on human-written text corpora (Cobbe et al., 2021; Lu et al., 2022), rather than real or simulated sequential data, such as interactions of reinforcement learning (RL) agents

with physical simulators. The latter unveils the potential of leveraging LLMs for elucidating RL agent behaviour, with which we may further facilitate human understanding of such behaviour—a long-standing challenge in explainable RL (Milani et al., 2024; Lu et al., 2024). It is tempting as LLMs can provide explanatory reasoning over a sequence of actions in human-readable language, and this is possible due to their known ability to in-context learn from input-output pairs (Garg et al., 2022; Min et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023).

There is an ongoing debate about whether the next-token prediction paradigm of modern LLMs can model human-like intelligence (Merrill and Sabharwal, 2023; Bachmann and Nagarajan, 2024). While next-token predictors can theoretically express any conceivable token distribution, it remains underexplored how the world knowledge these models have memorized during the pre-training phase (Roberts et al., 2020) can be utilized to comprehend an agent’s behaviour in the real or simulated physical world. In this work, we conduct the first empirical study to examine whether LLMs can build a mental model (Johnson-Laird, 1983; Bansal et al., 2019) of agents (Figure 1), termed *agent mental modelling*, by reasoning about an agent’s behaviour and the consequences from its interaction history. Understanding LLMs’ ability




Figure 1: A conception of LLMs approximating the agent’s mental model for facilitating end-users understanding of the agent.

*Corresponding author

†The authors contributed a greater and equal amount

to interpret agent behaviour could guide the development of agent-oriented LLMs that plan and generate sequences of *embodied* actions. Though recent studies (Li et al., 2022a; Huang et al., 2023) show that LLMs can aid in planning for embodied tasks, they merely demonstrate a limited understanding of the physical world. Further, this agent understanding could also inform the use of LLMs as communication mediators between black-box agents and various stakeholders.

Understanding RL agent behaviour is more complex for LLMs than solving traditional reasoning tasks, which often involve the procedure of plugging different values into equations (Razeghi et al., 2022). In this work, we formalize agent mental modelling, requiring LLMs to not only comprehend the actions taken by the agent but also perceive the resulting state changes.

The contributions of this paper include: 1) we shed light on evaluating LLMs’ ability to build a mental model of RL agents, including both agent behaviour and environmental dynamics, conducting quantitative and qualitative analyses of their capability and limitations; 2) we present empirical evaluation results in RL tasks, offering a well-designed testbed for this research with proposed evaluation metrics, and discuss the broader implications of enabling agent mental modelling.

2 Related Work

In-Context Learning. LLMs have exhibited strong performances in inferring answers to queries upon being given input-output pairs (Brown et al., 2020; Garg et al., 2022; Min et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023). In this study, we focus on evaluating LLMs’ understanding of agents within in-context learning but applied to sequential decision-making settings (Xu et al., 2022). Here, the context is in the form of state-action-reward tuples instead of input-output tuples. Closely related to our work is in-context reinforcement learning, where pre-trained transformer architecture-based models are fine-tuned to predict actions for query states in a task, given history interactions (Laskin et al., 2022; Lee et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024). Unlike this line of work, we aim to evaluate LLMs’ capability of building a mental model of RL agents via in-context learning, instead of optimizing LLMs.

Internal World Models. LLMs can also be grounded to a specific task such as reasoning in

the physical world or fine-tuned for enhanced embodied experiences (Liu et al., 2022; Xiang et al., 2023). However, because our focus is on the off-the-shelf performance of LLMs, we avoid this by creating a collection of interactions of RL agents with physics engines (e.g., MuJoCo (Todorov et al., 2012)). This results in a more challenging dataset benchmarking that does not explicitly query the LLMs for physics understanding, instead testing their inherent capability to understand the dynamics and rationale behind an RL agent’s actions. This allows us to look into the inherent internal world model (Lake et al., 2017; Amos et al., 2018) of LLMs, which may offer capabilities for planning, predicting, and reasoning, as seen in works on embodied task planning (Ahn et al., 2022; Driess et al., 2023).

3 LLM-Xavier Evaluation Framework

Our work studies the capability of LLMs to understand and interpret RL agents, i.e., *agent mental modelling* in the context of Markov Decision Process (MDP) \mathcal{M} (Puterman, 2014), including policies $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ and transition function $T : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$, where \mathcal{S} represents the state space and \mathcal{A} represents the action space. See Figure 2 for an overview of the LLM-Xavier¹ evaluation framework².




Figure 2: An overview of the LLM-Xavier workflow for offline evaluating LLMs’ understanding of RL agent.

3.1 In-Context Prompting

The evaluation is carried out in the context of an RL task \mathcal{T} which can be viewed as the instantiation of an MDP \mathcal{M} . For each \mathcal{T} , we compile a dataset of interactions between the agent and the task environment, consisting of traversed state-action-reward

¹Inspired by Xavier from X-Men who can read minds, to signify its ability to model the mental states of RL agents.

²The source code of the LLM-Xavier framework is available at <https://github.com/LukasWill/LLM-X>.

tuples, denoted as $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}} := \{(s_i, a_i, r_i)\}_{i \leq L}$, where L indicates the task episode length. Further, the subset of the interaction history with a time window (history size) H ending at time t is denoted as $\mathcal{E}_{t,H} := \{(s_i, a_i, r_i)\}_{t-H+1 \leq i \leq t}$, i.e, capturing the most recent H tuples up to time $t \leq L - 1$.

The in-context learning prompts we constructed consist of task-specific background information, agent behaviour history, and evaluation question prompts (see Appendix B for example instantiated prompts):

- a) A system-level prompt outlining the MDP components of the environment in which the agent operates, including the state and action space, along with a brief task description.
- b) Specific prompts tailored to individual evaluation purposes (Section 3.2), adapted based on whether the RL setting involves a discrete or continuous state/action space.
- c) With subsets of interaction history $\mathcal{E}_{t,H}$ leading up to the current time t as the in-context history, we prompt LLMs to respond to various masked-out queries x_{query} , corresponding to different evaluation questions, via inference over $y \leftarrow \text{LLM}(\cdot | x_{\text{query}}, \mathcal{E}_{t,H})$.

3.2 Evaluation Metrics

Evaluating the extent to which LLMs can develop a mental model requires examining their understanding of both the dynamics (mechanics) of environments that RL agents interact with and the rationale behind the agent’s chosen actions. To systematically assess these aspects, we design a series of targeted evaluation questions.

Actions Understanding. To assess LLMs’ comprehension of the behaviour of RL agents, we evaluate their ability to accurately predict the internal strategies of agents, including

- 1) *predicting next action* $y = \hat{a}_{t+1}$ given $x_{\text{query}} = s_{t+1}$, and
- 2) *deducing last action* $y = \hat{a}_{t+1}$ given $x_{\text{query}} = (s_{t+1}, s_{t+2})$.

Dynamics Understanding. To assess the awareness of LLMs to infer state transitions caused by agent actions, the evaluation of dynamics understanding includes

- (1) *predicting next state* $y = \hat{s}_{t+2}$ given $x_{\text{query}} = (s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})$, and
- (2) *deducing last state* $y = \hat{s}_{t+1}$ given $x_{\text{query}} = (a_{t+1}, s_{t+2})$.

We extract predictions by post-processing the generations $y \leftarrow \text{LLM}(\cdot | x_{\text{query}}, \mathcal{E}_{t,H})$ with regular expressions and compute performance by comparing them with the ground truth from the dataset. Refer to Appendix B for detailed evaluation prompts and Appendix C for post-processing of continuous state and action spaces.

4 Experimental Setup

We empirically evaluate contemporary open-source and proprietary LLMs on their understanding of the agent’s mental model, including Llama3-8B³, Llama3-70B, and GPT-3.5⁴ models⁵. All language models are prompted with the Chain-of-Thought (CoT) strategy (Wei et al., 2022), explicitly encouraged to provide reasoning with explanations before jumping to the answer.

Offline RL Datasets. To benchmark LLMs’ ability to build a mental model of an agent’s behaviour, we selected a variety of tasks featuring different state spaces, action spaces, and reward spaces, resulting in a dataset comprising seven tasks (Brockman et al., 2016) with approximately 2000 query samples, represented as (s_t, a_t, r_t) tuples. Four of the seven tasks are classic physical control tasks of increasing complexity, while the other three are from the Fetch environment (Plappert et al., 2018), which includes a 7-DoF arm with a two-fingered parallel gripper. See Table 3 in Appendix A for task details.

5 Results and Discussion

5.1 LLMs can utilize agent history to build mental model

Figure 6 shows that LLMs can accurately predict agent behaviours, for example in MountainCar, surpassing the random guess baseline (1/3 chance for three action choices). However, performance declines with more challenging tasks like Acrobot and FetchPickAndPlace, which feature larger state and action spaces. We hypothesize that complex tasks require more specialized knowledge, whereas common-sense knowledge about cars and hills aids LLMs predictions in the MountainCar task.

We study the impact of the size of history provided in the context. As expected, as is shown in Figure 3, providing a longer history generally improves LLMs’ understanding of agent behaviours.

³<https://llama.meta.com/llama3/>

⁴<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-3-5-turbo>

⁵Llama-3-8B-Instruct, Llama-3-70B-Instruct, and gpt-3.5-turbo.




Figure 3: Comparative plots of LLMs’ performance on various tasks with different history sizes (with **indexed history** in prompts): top for MountainCar task, middle for Acrobot task, bottom for Pendulum task with **continuous** action prediction. A description of these scenarios can be found in Appendix A.2

However, the benefits of including more history saturate and may even degrade, as seen with action prediction using Llama3-70b. This indicates that current LLMs, despite their long context length, struggle to handle excessive data in context. In this case, more data may hinder the ability to model the agent’s behaviour, which is in contrast with a typical learning scenario where model performance rapidly increases as learning samples increase.

The issue of performance decline due to excessively long history becomes more pronounced for dynamics predictions, as evidenced in the MountainCar results (refer to Figure 15 for details). However, as task complexity increases, the detrimental

effects of redundant history may diminish (as observed in Acrobot results in Figure 16), primarily because of the challenges posed by complex state and action spaces.

Regressing on absolute action values is easier than predicting action bins. Surprisingly, LLMs perform better at predicting absolute action values than at predicting the bins into which the estimated action falls (refer to Appendix B for differences in prompts). At most, LLama3-8b can allocate the numbers into categories with a mere 10.87% accuracy for the Pendulum task (GPT-3.5 achieves 39.19%), but performs better in predicting numeric values with an accuracy of up to 47.73% (GPT-

3.5 scores 56.82%). A detailed comparison of the averaged accuracy across LLMs is depicted in Figure 4. We hypothesize that predicting bins requires additional math ability to categorize values using context information. Refer to Figure 24 and Appendix F.4.1 for the illustrative discrepancy.




Figure 4: Comparison of models’ performance in predicting *absolute action values* and *action bins* for the Pendulum task. Hatching indicates numeric prediction accuracy (“No Bins”); reduced transparency indicates using **indexed history** in prompts.

5.2 LLMs’ dynamics understanding has the potential to be further improved

Inferring the dynamics in a simulated world for different tasks can be challenging in many aspects, such as reasoning on a high-dimension state, computing physics consequences, and so on.

To investigate LLMs’ potential of understanding dynamics, first, we investigate the impact of providing dynamics principles, which turns out to improve both behaviour and dynamics prediction when the dynamics context is informed to LLMs (see Figure 21 for details).

Further, we explicitly examined prediction performance across state components for each dimension. As depicted in Figure 5, LLMs find it relatively easier to sense car position (element 0) than velocity (element 1) for the MountainCar task; in contrast, for the Acrobot task, LLMs exhibit nearly uniform prediction accuracy across all state elements due to the difficulty in sensing state changes (see Appendix F.2 for details). We hypothesize that LLMs are more proficient in linear regression, as noted in Zhang et al. (2023), and the dynamics equation in MountainCar is almost linear, whereas it is non-linear in Acrobot.

Interestingly, the small model (Llama3-8b) is comparable to or even outperforms a larger model like GPT-3.5 in predicting individual state elements

in some tasks, such as Acrobot. This suggests that while small models have inferior predictive ability in actions, their understanding of action effects may not be significantly influenced by the model size, but more likely by state complexity (e.g., predicting y coordinate is easier as the lunar lander is more likely to descent in most steps). Refer to Appendix F.1 and F.2 for more illustrative results.




Figure 5: Dynamics of LLMs’ performance on predicting individual state element for the MountainCar task (with **indexed history** in prompts).

5.3 Understanding error occurs from various aspects

With the anticipation that LLMs’ explanatory reasoning (elicited via CoT) can benefit the human understanding of agent behaviour, in addition to the existing quantitative results, we further examined the reasoning error types across LLMs by manually reviewing their judgments on the rationale of actions taken. Table 1 shows an examination of the MountainCar task, highlighting that Llama3-8b displays the most errors. Meanwhile, GPT-3.5, despite having superior task comprehension (e.g., referring to momentum strategies), is less effective at retaining task descriptions in memory compared to Llama3-70b. Detailed error type reports are in Appendix G.1.

Human evaluation is close to automatic evaluation in assessing LLMs’ action judgments. In this manual review, we queried LLMs to judge a possible next action given the history of the last four actions and states. The provided next action was sometimes correct (if it was the agent’s action) and sometimes incorrect, ensuring LLMs made context-based conclusions rather than merely agreeing or disagreeing with the prompt. We evaluated whether the LLMs’ judgments were correct accord-

Error Types	GPT-3.5	Llama3-8b	Llama3-70b
(1)	9	30	16
(2)	5	19	4
(3)	3	18	4
(4)	1	2	3
(5)	2	25	2
(6)	9	10	13

Table 1: Error counts in LLMs’ responses for MountainCar task over 50 steps, with various error types: (1) Task Understanding, (2) Logic, (3) History Understanding, (4) Physical Understanding, (5) Mathematical Understanding, and (6) Missing Information.

ing to a human reviewer, independent of the RL agent’s action correctness. An automatic evaluation compared LLMs’ decisions to the RL agent’s actions.

The manual evaluation did differ from the automatic evaluation, as shown in Table 2. The table’s percentages refer to the proportion of LLMs responses deemed correct. This difference stems from considering a different action ground truth since the RL agent occasionally acts illogically, leading to the human reviewer deeming those actions incorrect, while automatic evaluation considers them correct. In a larger context, the comparison of models remains consistent across both evaluation methods, validating the automatic evaluation.

Model	Manual	Automatic
GPT-3.5	60%	67%
Llama3-8b	40%	52%
Llama3-70b	67%	65%

Table 2: The accuracy of models evaluated manually or automatically for 50 steps in the MountainCar task with the metric *judging next action*.

5.4 Data format influence understanding

Prompting format generally has an impact on LLMs’ reasoning performance. In the context of agent understanding, we do an ablation study to investigate the robustness of prompts on the *history format* and provided *information*. We find that:

- 1) Excluding the sequential indices from the history context in prompts for LLMs generally negatively impacts their performance in most tasks, indicating that LLMs still struggle to process raw data and indexing helps. The resulting performance variations are reported in Figure 6.

- 2) Task description, despite not being directly relevant to numerical value regression as in statistics, is essential for a better understanding of both agent behaviour and dynamics, which brings the promise of utilizing LLMs to digest additional information beyond mere numerical regression when mental modelling agents. The ablation results can be found in Appendix F.5.2.




Figure 6: Performance comparison of language models with and without indexed history in prompts on various tasks. Bars with hatching indicate accuracy with **indexed history** in prompts.

6 Conclusion

This work studies an underexplored aspect of next-token predictors, with a focus on whether LLMs can build a mental model of agents. We proposed specific prompts to evaluate this capability. Quantitative evaluation results disclose that LLMs can establish agent mental models to some extent only since their understanding of state changes may diminish with increasing task complexity (e.g., high-dim spaces); their interpretation of agent behaviours may tumble for tasks with continuous actions. Analysis of evaluation prompts reveals that their content and structure, such as history size, task instructions, and data format are crucial for the effective establishment, indicating areas for future improvement. A further review of LLMs error responses (elicited via CoT prompting) highlights qualitative differences in LLMs’ understanding performance, with models like GPT-3.5 showing superior comprehension and fewer errors compared to the small Llama3 model. These findings suggest the potential of in-context mental modelling of agents within MDP frameworks and highlight the possible role of LLMs as communication mediators between black-box agents and stakeholders, pointing to future research avenues.

Limitations

It remains unclear whether LLMs can benefit from thousands of agent trajectories compared to the limited number of examples studied in this paper. We hypothesize that large amounts of demonstrations (state-action-reward tuples) in the prompt could enhance the capacity that LLMs have already developed. Additionally, fine-tuning LLMs with demonstrations (Lin et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024) from specific domains may further improve their understanding capacity in these domains. Further analysis on this aspect is left for future work.

We recognize that the issue of hallucination may exist. To increase the robustness and reliability of using LLMs for explaining an agent’s behaviour, a detailed analysis of this behaviour is necessary before being deployed to a setting where they directly interact with humans. Also, our evaluation results underscore the need for developing methods to mitigate hallucinations.

Our study provides a macro-level analysis by examining the average model performance over multiple RL datasets of varying types. However, the capability of LLMs to build a mental model of agents may vary across different datasets. While our analysis discusses this aspect, it is important to explore ways of standardizing this type of benchmarking for language models, which may evolve as LLMs become more intelligent. A long-term goal of this research is to facilitate human understanding of more intelligent agents in critical domains, and we see this work as a foundational step towards developing progressively more agent-oriented language models with realistic world models in mind.

Our experiments are limited to uni-modal RL tasks (i.e., using proprioceptive states), but extending them to multi-modal tasks (e.g., incorporating vision, auditory, and touch feedback) is straightforward. Multi-modal inputs can provide LLMs with richer environmental information than state vectors, and we hypothesize that these additional signals may enhance LLMs’ agent mental modelling.

Ethical Concerns

We do not anticipate any immediate ethical or societal implications from our research. However, since we explore LLM applications for enhancing human understanding of agents, it is important to be cautious about the potential for fabricated or inaccurate claims in LLMs’ explanatory responses, which may arise from misinformation and hallucina-

tions inherent to the LLM employed. It is recommended to use our proposed evaluation prompts and task dataset with care and mindfulness.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Climate Action (BMWK) under the Federal Aviation Research Programme (LuFO), Projekt VeriKAS (20X1905)

References

- Michael Ahn, Anthony Brohan, Noah Brown, Yevgen Chebotar, Omar Cortes, Byron David, Chelsea Finn, Chuyuan Fu, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Karol Hausman, et al. 2022. Do as i can and not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances. In *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01691*.
- Brandon Amos, Laurent Dinh, Serkan Cabi, Thomas Rothörl, Alistair Muldal, Tom Erez, Yuval Tassa, Nando de Freitas, and Misha Denil. 2018. [Learning awareness models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Gregor Bachmann and Vaishnavh Nagarajan. 2024. The pitfalls of next-token prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06963*.
- Gagan Bansal, Besmira Nushi, Ece Kamar, Walter S. Lasecki, Daniel S. Weld, and Eric Horvitz. 2019. [Beyond accuracy: The role of mental models in human-ai team performance](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*, 7(1):2–11.
- Greg Brockman, Vicki Cheung, Ludwig Pettersson, Jonas Schneider, John Schulman, Jie Tang, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2016. [Openai gym](#).
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Danny Driess, Fei Xia, Mehdi SM Sajjadi, Corey Lynch, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Brian Ichter, Ayzaan Wahid, Jonathan Tompson, Quan Vuong, Tianhe Yu, et al. 2023. Palm-e: An embodied multimodal language model. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8469–8488. PMLR.
- Shivam Garg, Dimitris Tsipras, Percy S Liang, and Gregory Valiant. 2022. What can transformers learn

- in-context? a case study of simple function classes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30583–30598.
- Hado van Hasselt, Arthur Guez, and David Silver. 2016. Deep reinforcement learning with double q-learning. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, AAAI’16, page 2094–2100. AAAI Press.
- Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Ted Xiao, Harris Chan, Jacky Liang, Pete Florence, Andy Zeng, Jonathan Tompson, Igor Mordatch, Yevgen Chebotar, et al. 2023. Inner monologue: Embodied reasoning through planning with language models. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1769–1782. PMLR.
- Philip Nicholas Johnson-Laird. 1983. *Mental models: Towards a cognitive science of language, inference, and consciousness*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213.
- Brenden M Lake, Tomer D Ullman, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Samuel J Gershman. 2017. Building machines that learn and think like people. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 40:e253.
- Michael Laskin, Luyu Wang, Junhyuk Oh, Emilio Parisotto, Stephen Spencer, Richie Steigerwald, DJ Strouse, Steven Hansen, Angelos Filos, Ethan Brooks, et al. 2022. In-context reinforcement learning with algorithm distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.14215*.
- Teven Le Scao and Alexander M Rush. 2021. How many data points is a prompt worth? In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2627–2636.
- Jonathan Lee, Annie Xie, Aldo Pacchiano, Yash Chandak, Chelsea Finn, Ofir Nachum, and Emma Brunskill. 2023. Supervised pretraining can learn in-context reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Shuang Li, Xavier Puig, Chris Paxton, Yilun Du, Clinton Wang, Linxi Fan, Tao Chen, De-An Huang, Ekin Akyürek, Anima Anandkumar, et al. 2022a. Pre-trained language models for interactive decision-making. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:31199–31212.
- Xiang Lorraine Li, Adhiguna Kuncoro, Jordan Hoffmann, Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Phil Blunsom, and Aida Nematzadeh. 2022b. A systematic investigation of commonsense knowledge in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11838–11855.
- Yingcong Li, Muhammed Emrullah Ildiz, Dimitris Papailiopoulos, and Samet Oymak. 2023. Transformers as algorithms: Generalization and stability in in-context learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 19565–19594. PMLR.
- Timothy P Lillicrap, Jonathan J Hunt, Alexander Pritzel, Nicolas Heess, Tom Erez, Yuval Tassa, David Silver, and Daan Wierstra. 2015. Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971*.
- Licong Lin, Yu Bai, and Song Mei. 2023. Transformers as decision makers: Provable in-context reinforcement learning via supervised pretraining. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ruibo Liu, Jason Wei, Shixiang Shane Gu, Te-Yen Wu, Soroush Vosoughi, Claire Cui, Denny Zhou, and Andrew M Dai. 2022. Mind’s eye: Grounded language model reasoning through simulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05359*.
- Pan Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Tanglin Xia, Liang Qiu, Kai-Wei Chang, Song-Chun Zhu, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan. 2022. Learn to explain: Multimodal reasoning via thought chains for science question answering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:2507–2521.
- Wenhao Lu, Xufeng Zhao, Thilo Fryen, Jae Hee Lee, Mengdi Li, Sven Magg, and Stefan Wermter. 2024. Causal state distillation for explainable reinforcement learning. In *Causal Learning and Reasoning*, pages 106–142. PMLR.
- William Merrill and Ashish Sabharwal. 2023. The expressive power of transformers with chain of thought. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Stephanie Milani, Nicholay Topin, Manuela Veloso, and Fei Fang. 2024. [Explainable reinforcement learning: A survey and comparative review](#). *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 56(7).
- Sewon Min, Xinxin Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work? In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11048–11064.
- Swaroop Mishra, Daniel Khashabi, Chitta Baral, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. Reframing instructional prompts to gptk’s language. In *60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2022*, pages 589–612. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL).
- Ida Momennejad, Hosein Hasanbeig, Felipe Vieira Frujeri, Hiteshi Sharma, Nebojsa Jojic, Hamid Palangi, Robert Ness, and Jonathan Larson. 2023. Evaluating cognitive maps and planning in large language models with cogeval. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

- Matthias Plappert, Marcin Andrychowicz, Alex Ray, Bob McGrew, Bowen Baker, Glenn Powell, Jonas Schneider, Josh Tobin, Maciek Chociej, Peter Welinder, Vikash Kumar, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2018. [Multi-goal reinforcement learning: Challenging robotics environments and request for research](#).
- Martin L Puterman. 2014. *Markov decision processes: discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Yasaman Razeghi, Robert L Logan IV, Matt Gardner, and Sameer Singh. 2022. Impact of pretraining term frequencies on few-shot numerical reasoning. *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*.
- Adam Roberts, Colin Raffel, and Noam Shazeer. 2020. How much knowledge can you pack into the parameters of a language model? In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 5418–5426.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.
- Emanuel Todorov, Tom Erez, and Yuval Tassa. 2012. [Mujoco: A physics engine for model-based control](#). In *2012 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 5026–5033.
- Jiuqi Wang, Ethan Blaser, Hadi Daneshmand, and Shangdong Zhang. 2024. Transformers learn temporal difference methods for in-context reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13861*.
- 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.
- Jiannan Xiang, Tianhua Tao, Yi Gu, Tianmin Shu, Zirui Wang, Zichao Yang, and Zhiting Hu. 2023. Language models meet world models: Embodied experiences enhance language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36.
- Mengdi Xu, Yikang Shen, Shun Zhang, Yuchen Lu, Ding Zhao, Joshua Tenenbaum, and Chuang Gan. 2022. Prompting decision transformer for few-shot policy generalization. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 24631–24645. PMLR.
- Yutaro Yamada, Yihan Bao, Andrew Kyle Lampinen, Jungo Kasai, and Ilker Yildirim. 2023. Evaluating spatial understanding of large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Ruiqi Zhang, Spencer Frei, and Peter Bartlett. 2023. Trained transformers learn linear models in-context. In *R0-FoMo: Robustness of Few-shot and Zero-shot Learning in Large Foundation Models*.
- Xufeng Zhao, Mengdi Li, Wenhao Lu, Cornelius Weber, Jae Hee Lee, Kun Chu, and Stefan Wermter. 2024. [Enhancing Zero-Shot Chain-of-Thought Reasoning in Large Language Models through Logic](#). In *2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*.

A Statistics of Our Offline-RL Datasets

A.1 Data Collection

The dataset of interaction histories (episodes) is collected by running RL agents in each task. Unlike Liu et al. (2022), whose physics alignment dataset contains text-based physical reasoning questions resembling physics textbooks, our dataset comprises interactions of RL agents with various physics engines (environments). For each task, episodic histories are collected by running single-task RL algorithms (Lillicrap et al., 2015; Hasselt et al., 2016; Schulman et al., 2017) to solve that task. An overview of the task dataset statistics is provided in Table 3.




Figure 7: The eight visualized tasks used in the evaluation experiments.

A.2 A Full Task Description

Figure 7 depicts a visualisation of all tested tasks. Below, in A.2, we provide a complete description of the MountainCar task, including its MDP components. For the remaining tasks, only the task descriptions are provided. Most of the texts are credited to <https://gymnasium.farama.org/>.

MountainCar Task Prompt

```
task_description =
The Mountain Car MDP is a deterministic
↳ MDP that consists of a car placed
↳ stochastically at the bottom of a
↳ sinusoidal valley, with the only
↳ possible actions being the
↳ accelerations that can be applied to
↳ the car in either direction. The goal
↳ of the MDP is to strategically
↳ accelerate the car to reach the goal
↳ state on top of the right hill.

observation_space =
The observation is a ndarray with shape
↳ (2,) where the elements correspond to
↳ the following:
position of the car along the x-axis
↳ (range from -1.2 to 0.6), velocity of
↳ the car (range from -0.07 to 0.07)

action_space =
There are 3 discrete deterministic
↳ actions,
0: Accelerate to the left
1: Do not accelerate
2: Accelerate to the right

reward_space =
The goal is to reach the flag placed on
↳ top of the right hill as quickly as
↳ possible, as such the agent is
↳ penalised with a reward of -1 for each
↳ timestep.

transition_dynamics =
Given an action, the mountain car follows
↳ the following transition dynamics,
velocity_t+1 = velocity_t + (action - 1) *
↳ force - cos(3 * position_t) * gravity
position_t+1 = position_t + velocity_t+1
where force = 0.001 and gravity = 0.0025.
↳ The collisions at either end are
↳ inelastic with the velocity set to 0
↳ upon collision with the wall.

init_state =
The position of the car is assigned a
↳ uniform random value in [-0.6, -0.4].
↳ The starting velocity of the car is
↳ always assigned to 0.

termination =
The episode ends if the position of the
↳ car is greater than or equal to 0.5
↳ (the goal position on top of the right
↳ hill).
```

Acrobot Task Description. — *The Acrobot environment is based on Sutton’s work in “Generalization in Reinforcement Learning: Successful Examples Using Sparse Coarse Coding” and Sutton and Barto’s book. The system consists of two links connected linearly to form a chain, with one end of the chain fixed. The joint between the two*

Tasks	# of episodes	Length per episode	State Space	State Dim	Action Space	Action Dim
MountainCar	5	~ 100	continuous	2	discrete	1 (3 choices)
Acrobot	3	~ 100	continuous	6	discrete	1 (3 choices)
LunarLander	3	~ 250	continuous	8	discrete	1 (4 choices)
Pendulum	3	~ 50	continuous	3	continuous	1
InvertedDoublePendulum	3	~ 50	continuous	11	continuous	1
FetchPickAndPlace	10	~ 10	continuous	25	continuous	4
FetchPush	10	~ 10	continuous	25	continuous	4
FetchSlide	10	~ 25	continuous	25	continuous	4

Table 3: A statistical overview of the task dataset tested in the experiment.

links is actuated. The goal is to apply torques on the actuated joint to swing the free end of the outer-link above a given height while starting from the initial state of hanging downwards.

Pendulum Task Description. — The inverted pendulum swingup problem is based on the classic problem in control theory. The system consists of a pendulum attached at one end to a fixed point, and the other end being free. The pendulum starts in a random position and the goal is to apply torque on the free end to swing it into an upright position, with its center of gravity right above the fixed point.

LunarLander Task Description. — This environment is a classic rocket trajectory optimization problem. According to Pontryagin’s maximum principle, it is optimal to fire the engine at full throttle or turn it off. This is the reason why this environment has discrete actions: engine on or off. The landing pad is always at coordinates (0,0). The coordinates are the first two numbers in the state vector. Landing outside of the landing pad is possible. Fuel is infinite, so an agent can learn to fly and then land on its first attempt.

FetchPickAndPlace Task Description. — The task in the environment is for a manipulator to move a block to a target position on top of a table or in mid-air. The robot is a 7-DoF Fetch Mobile Manipulator with a two-fingered parallel gripper (i.e., end effector). The robot is controlled by small displacements of the gripper in Cartesian coordinates and the inverse kinematics are computed internally by the MuJoCo framework. The gripper can be opened or closed in order to perform the grasping operation of pick and place. The task is also continuing which means that the robot has to maintain the block in the target position for an indefinite period of time.

FetchSlide Task Description. — The task in the environment is for a manipulator to hit a puck

in order to reach a target position on top of a long and slippery table. The table has a low friction coefficient in order to make it slippery for the puck to slide and be able to reach the target position which is outside of the robot’s workspace. The robot is a 7-DoF Fetch Mobile Manipulator with a two-fingered parallel gripper (i.e., end effector). The robot is controlled by small displacements of the gripper in Cartesian coordinates and the inverse kinematics are computed internally by the MuJoCo framework. The gripper is locked in a closed configuration since the puck doesn’t need to be grasped. The task is also continuing which means that the robot has to maintain the puck in the target position for an indefinite period of time.

FetchPush Task Description. — The task in the environment is for a manipulator to move a block to a target position on top of a table by pushing with its gripper. The robot is a 7-DoF Fetch Mobile Manipulator with a two-fingered parallel gripper (i.e., end effector). The robot is controlled by small displacements of the gripper in Cartesian coordinates and the inverse kinematics are computed internally by the MuJoCo framework. The gripper is locked in a closed configuration in order to perform the push task. The task is also continuing which means that the robot has to maintain the block in the target position for an indefinite period of time.

B Prompt Examples

The structured input template used for querying LLMs consists of a system prompt containing the task description, MDP components, and a prompt with specific evaluation questions, as shown in B.1 and B.2, respectively. An example prompt for *predicting the next action* for tasks with discrete action space is depicted in B.3. The prompts for each evaluation metric may vary slightly depending on the task type (i.e., state and action space as illustrated in Table 4), detailed in B.4.

B.1 System Prompt

```

System Prompt

Below is a description of the {task_name}
task.
Task description:

{task_description}

Observation space:

{observation_space}

Action space:

{action_space}

Reward space:

{reward_space}

Transition dynamics:

{transition_dynamics}

Initial state:

{init_state}

Termination:

{termination}

```

B.2 Offline Evaluation Prompt

```

Offline Evaluation Prompt

Given a snippet of an episode (generated
by a reinforcement learning agent optimally
trained for solving the given task) of
the states:

{states}

the corresponding actions taken by the RL
agent,

{actions}

and the rewards received:

{rewards}

Your task is to analyze the sequence of
states, actions, and rewards to address the
question:

{question}

```

B.3 Example Next Action Prediction Prompt

```

Next Discrete Action Prediction Prompt

In next step {i} (indexed from 0),
↪ the agent transitioned to the
↪ state s{i} = {state}. Based on
↪ your observation and
↪ understanding of the agent's
↪ behaviour, can you predict the
↪ action a{i} (an integer from
↪ the given range) the RL agent
↪ will most likely take at step
↪ {i}?

Please first provide a compact
↪ reasoning before your answer
↪ to the action choice. Think
↪ step by step and use the
↪ following template in your
↪ provided answer:

1. [Reasoning]:
2. [Prediction]:
3. [Formatting]:
Return a list with the following
↪ example format,
```python
final action choice is 0
action_choice = [0]
```

Please choose only one action,
↪ even if multiple actions seem
↪ possible.

```

| | conti. action | discrete action |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| conti. state | ✓ | ✓ |
| discrete state | ✗ | ✓ |

Table 4: Different state spaces and action spaces of MDPs (tasks) considered in the experiments.

B.4 Evaluation Prompts in Practice

The evaluation prompts (parts b, c in Section 3.1) are adapted based on the nature of the RL tasks, specifically the type of action or state space (discrete or continuous). For tasks with discrete action spaces, LLMs are prompted to output a single integer within the action range. For tasks with **continuous actions**, we evaluate two options:

- *Predicting bins*: The action range is manually divided into 10 bins, and LLMs are queried to predict which bin the RL agent’s next action will fall into.
- *Predicting absolute numbers*: LLMs are queried to directly output the exact action value within the valid action range for each dimension of the action space.

For tasks involving **continuous state** prediction, we adopt predicting relative changes (e.g., *increase*, *decrease*, *unchange*) instead of exact state values. This approach assesses the LLMs’ ability to sense state transitions (Δs), e.g., changes in physical properties in physics tasks.

C Post-processing LLMs’ Predictions

We evaluate LLMs using metrics that require predicting states and actions. We extract LLMs’ responses through pattern matching and compute evaluation results by comparing them with the ground truth state-action pairs from the episodes on which the LLMs are evaluated.

For predicting **discrete actions**, we compute the matching rate of the LLMs’ predicted actions with the ground truth. For predicting **continuous actions**, if LLMs are prompted to *predict bins*, we compute the matching rate as we did for discrete actions, with the ground truth represented by the bin index to which it belongs. However, if LLMs are queried to directly *predict absolute action values*, we quantize both the predicted and ground truth values into bins (by dividing the original action range into 10 bins) and then measure whether they fall into the same bin.

For predicting **continuous states**, we evaluate if LLMs correctly predict the change in state, Δs , categorizing increases as 1, decreases as 0, and unchanged as 2. We then compute the accuracy classification score for their predictions. We also record the accuracy of predicting changes in individual state elements, Δs_i .

D Pseudo-code of Performing Evaluation Metrics

D.1 Pseudo-code for predicting next action

Algorithm 1 presents an example pseudo-code for next action prediction tasks.

Algorithm 1 Offline Evaluation of LLM’s Agent Understanding

```

Load offline RL dataset  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}$  for a task  $\mathcal{T}$ 
Load the LLM model  $LLM$ 
Initialize action matching counter  $N \leftarrow 0$ 
Set the history size  $H$ 
Set the maximum time steps  $T_{max}$ 
for  $t = 1$  to  $T_{max}$  do
  if  $t > H$  then
    Extract the last  $H$  transitions  $\mathcal{E}_{t,H} \leftarrow (s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}, r_i)_{t-H+1}^t$ 
    // Prepare input for LLM including current state and history  $\mathcal{E}_{t,H}$ 
    Predict  $\hat{a}_{t+1} \leftarrow LLM(s_{t+1}, \mathcal{E}_{t,H})$ 
    if  $\hat{a}_{t+1} = a_{t+1}$  then
      Increment counter  $N \leftarrow N + 1$ 
    end if
  end if
if Task goal is achieved then
  break
end if
end for
Compute evaluation results using the counter  $N$ 

```

E Types of LLMs’ Understanding Failures

Table 5 lists error types we located by analysing LLMs’ responses to evaluation questions for the MountainCar task. The MountainCar task is an RL task in which the agent has to correctly steer a car to move it onto a mountain with the actions: “Left Acceleration”, “Right Acceleration”, and “No Acceleration”.

| No. | Error Types |
|-----|----------------------------|
| (1) | Task Understanding |
| (2) | Logic |
| (3) | History Understanding |
| (4) | Physical Understanding |
| (5) | Mathematical Understanding |
| (6) | Missing Information |

Table 5: List of error types in LLMs’ responses

Examples of each error type from various LLMs responses:

- **Task Understanding**
Llama3-8b replies —

“However, one could argue that the agent’s velocity is already quite high ([0.0075]), and accelerating further might not be necessary or even counterproductive if it leads to overshooting the goal position. Additionally, the agent’s position is still relatively far from the goal ([0.5729] vs. 0.5), so it may need to adjust its strategy soon.”

Analysis: In this example, the model makes multiple mistakes, it misunderstands the task as it thinks overshooting the goal would be bad, and it also wrongly interprets the state -0.5729 as 0.5729.

- **Logic**

Llama3-70b replies —

“Given the current state s_{20} , it’s unclear why the agent would choose to accelerate to the right, as the position is still below the goal and the velocity is not high enough to guarantee reaching the goal.”

Analysis: Here the reasoning logic does not make sense, If the goal is getting to the right, accelerating to the right should make sense especially if the velocity is not high enough yet-

Llama3-8b replies —

“This pattern suggests that the agent might be trying to control the car’s movement by alternating between accelerating left (action 0) and not accelerating (action 1) to navigate the valley towards the goal position on the right hill.”

Analysis: LLM argues that accelerating left will navigate the car toward the right.

- **History Understanding**

GPT-3.5 replies, given a history of actions: $a_{20} = 2, a_{21} = 0, a_{22} = 0, a_{23} = 0$ —

“The agent has been moving towards the right hill, and in the previous steps, it has been accelerating to the right (action 2) to gain momentum.”

Analysis: The LLM claims the agent has been accelerating to the right using action 2 when the last three actions were action 0.

- **Physical Understanding**

Llama3-70b replies —

“Given the agent’s behaviour of accelerating to the right when the car is far from the right hill and not accelerating when it is closer, the choice of action 1 (no acceleration) in state s_{18} seems reasonable. This action allows the car to conserve momentum and potentially reach the goal position more efficiently.”

Analysis: Here the LLM wrongly believes that not accelerating could allow the car to conserve momentum, however moving upwards gravity will cause the car to lose momentum should it stop accelerating.

GPT-3.5 replies —

“The agent seems to be attempting to move towards the right hill by repeatedly accelerating to the left.”

Analysis: LLM doesn’t realize that accelerating to the left won’t move the car to the right.

- **Mathematical Understanding**

Llama3-8b replies, given the state history $s_{25} = [-4.0838 \times 10^{-1} \quad 1.7447 \times 10^{-3}]$, $s_{26} = [-4.0849 \times 10^{-1} \quad -1.0230 \times 10^{-4}]$, and the new state $s_{27} = [-4.104 \times 10^{-1} \quad -1.9 \times 10^{-3}]$ —

“Looking at the sequence of states provided, the car is moving to the right (position is increasing) while the velocity is decreasing.”

Analysis: The LLM does not realize that the position is decreasing, moving to the left as it wrongly interprets the numbers.

- **Missing Information**

Llama3-8b replies —

“The action of not accelerating might delay the agent’s arrival at the goal position, especially when it is very close to the goal. It is crucial for the agent to maintain its momentum and continue accelerating towards the goal to minimize the time taken to reach the flag.”

Analysis: The car needs to accelerate to the left to get to a position from which it can build enough momentum towards the right to overcome the right hill. The LLM is missing the information about the environment that would allow it to understand this behaviour.

F Additional Results of LLMs' Understanding Performance on Different Tasks

F.1 State Element Prediction Accuracy with Increased History Size

In the task of predicting (full) states, we also plot the prediction accuracy for individual state elements and how they vary with increased history size for different tasks: Figure 8 for the Pendulum task, Figure 9 for the Acrobot task, and Figure 10 for the LunarLander task.




Figure 8: Dynamics of LLMs' performance on predicting individual state element for the **Pendulum** task (with indexed history in prompts).




Figure 9: Dynamics of LLMs' performance on predicting individual state element for the **Acrobot** task (with indexed history in prompts).




Figure 10: Dynamics of LLMs’ performance on predicting individual state element for the **LunarLander** task (with indexed history in prompts).

F.2 Average State Element Prediction Accuracy

In addition to reporting the dynamics of prediction accuracy for individual state elements, we report the averaged prediction accuracy for state elements in the MountainCar task (Figure 11), the Pendulum task (Figure 12), the Acrobot task (Figure 13), and the LunarLander task (Figure 14).

We find that LLMs are slightly more sensitive to changes in angular velocity than angle, as shown by the Pendulum and Acrobot results.




Figure 11: LLMs’ averaged performance on predicting individual state element for the **MountainCar** task.




Figure 12: LLMs’ averaged performance on predicting individual state element for the **Pendulum** task.




Figure 13: LLMs’ averaged performance on predicting individual state element for the **Acrobot** task.

F.3 Average Comparison of Model Predictions

Table 6 displays the average accuracy of LLMs’ predictions regarding the agent’s behaviour and the resulting state changes.

F.4 Dynamic Performance of All Evaluation Metrics

The dynamics of LLMs’ understanding performance with increasing history size for the MountainCar task (Figure 15), the Acrobot task (Figure 16), the Pendulum task (Figure 17 and Figure 18), and the LunarLander task (Figure 19).




Figure 14: LLMs' averaged performance on predicting individual state element for the **LunarLander** task.

| | MountainCar | | | Acrobot | | | Pendulum | | |
|----------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|
| | GPT-3.5 | Llama3-8b | Llama3-70b | GPT-3.5 | Llama3-8b | Llama3-70b | GPT-3.5 | Llama3-8b | Llama3-70b |
| NA Pred. | 74.60% | 59.10% | 86.18% | 43.94% | 46.29% | 65.12% | 17.08% | 3.72% | 11.77% |
| | 81.48% ↑ | 68.63% ↑ | 87.06% ↑ | 46.36% ↑ | 44.95% ↓ | 64.73% ↓ | 17.49% ↑ | 3.51% ↓ | 12.42% ↑ |
| LA Pred. | 76.73% | 61.83% | 78.87% | 39.25% | 47.24% | 55.32% | 14.28% | 1.58% | 14.02% |
| | 80.06% ↑ | 73.99% ↑ | 76.85% ↓ | 44.62% ↑ | 42.35% ↓ | 55.40% ↑ | 20.63% ↑ | 1.89% ↑ | 13.86% ↓ |
| NS Pred. | 33.43% | 30.81% | 37.04% | 0.30% | 0.26% | 0.13% | 9.52% | 8.34% | 7.61% |
| | 37.41% ↑ | 33.65% ↑ | 40.68% ↑ | 0.00% ↓ | 0.42% ↑ | 0.43% ↑ | 7.89% ↓ | 6.65% ↓ | 5.49% ↓ |
| LS Pred. | 31.97% | 22.12% | 29.32% | 1.14% | 2.95% | 1.69% | 6.46% | 10.54% | 10.22% |
| | 32.41% ↑ | 22.45% ↑ | 35.25% ↑ | 0.61% ↓ | 2.32% ↓ | 2.87% ↑ | 5.41% ↓ | 8.27% ↓ | 7.64% ↓ |

Table 6: Comparison of model predictions with and w/o indexed history. Light grey cells show results with **indexed history**. NA Pred. = Next Action Prediction; LA Pred. = Last Action Prediction; NS Pred. = Next State Prediction; LS Pred. = Last State Prediction.

Among all results, it is observed that models' understanding of agent behaviour improves significantly with small history sizes but does not increase further with larger histories. In some cases, like with Llama3-70b, it may even degrade. Overall, model performance in action prediction tends to increase and then likely saturate as history size grows.

In complex tasks like Acrobot, history size has less impact on model performance in state prediction. We hypothesize that this is due to the complex relationships in the interaction data, where adding more history does not enhance the LLMs' understanding of the environment dynamics. For moderately complex tasks (e.g., Pendulum), model performance initially increases with a small history size, consistent with our earlier finding for predicting actions. This is demonstrated in the third column of Figure 17.




Figure 15: The dynamics of LLMs' understanding performance with increasing history size for the **MountainCar** task




Figure 16: The dynamics of LLMs' understanding performance with increasing history size for the **Acrobot** task.




Figure 17: The dynamics of LLMs' understanding performance with increasing history size for the **Pendulum** task with **discretized** actions in evaluation prompts.




Figure 18: The dynamics of LLMs' understanding performance with increasing history size for the **Pendulum** task with **continuous** actions in evaluation prompts.




Figure 19: The dynamics of LLMs' understanding performance with increasing history size for the **LunarLander** task.

F.4.1 Comparative performance of models on predicting continuous actions

Continuing from the plot of LLMs’ performance on the Pendulum task with continuous actions (third row of Figure 3 in the main text), Figure 20 presents a comparative plot of LLMs’ performance on the Pendulum task with **discretized** actions.




Figure 20: A comparative plot of LLMs’ performance on the **Pendulum** task with **discretized** actions, following the plot of predicting continuous actions (third row of Figure 3 in the main text).

F.5 Ablation Study

F.5.1 Comparison of models without using task dynamics

Figure 21 illustrates the performance variation when dynamics equations are excluded from the prompts.




Figure 21: Comparative plots of LLMs’ performance on **MountainCar** with different history sizes (with **indexed history** in prompts). The suffix of model names “No Dyna.” indicates **not using dynamics equations** in prompts.

F.5.2 Comparison of models without using task instructions

Akin to prior works by Mishra et al. (2022); Le Scao and Rush (2021), which show that task framing in prompt influences language models, we observe a similar effect. When removing task instruction from evaluation prompts, models’ understanding performance across the majority of evaluation metrics is significantly degrading, as demonstrated in MountainCar (Figure 22) and Acrobot (Figure 23) tasks; despite the history context (i.e., sequence of numerical values) remaining unchanged. We hypothesize that LLMs’ ability to mental model agents is enhanced by a more informative context.

F.5.3 Comparison of Models: Action Bins vs. Absolute Values Prediction

Figure 24 presents the evaluation results of LLMs on Pendulum tasks, comparing predictions of action bins (the first two rows) with predictions of absolute action values (the last two rows).




Figure 22: Comparative plots of LLMs' performance on **MountainCar** with different history sizes (with **indexed history** in prompts). The suffix of model names "No Inst." indicates not using task description in prompts.




Figure 23: Comparative plots of LLMs' performance on **Acrobot** with different Size history sizes (with **indexed history** in prompts). The suffix of model names "No Inst." indicates not using task description in prompts.




Figure 24: Comparative plots of LLMs’ performance on **Pendulum** with different history sizes (with **indexed history** in prompts). First row: GPT-3.5 + *predicting bins*; second row: Llama3-8b + *predicting bins*; third row: GPT-3.5 + *predicting absolute action values*; fourth row: Llama3-8b + *predicting absolute action values*.

G LLMs Erroneous Responses in MountainCar Task

Explanations of Various Error Types in LLMs Reasoning. A manual review of the MountainCar task across three LLMs—GPT-3.5, Llama3-8b, and Llama3-70b—revealed significant differences in their explanations that were not necessarily anticipated from the quantitative analysis. Table 5 provides an overview of the types and Table 1 for counts of errors found in each model. During the evaluation, a single response could contain multiple error types. Despite Llama3-8b producing the shortest responses, it also had the highest error count.

- (1) The first type of error, understanding the task, appeared frequently when the LLMs had to evaluate a proposed action, such as no acceleration in the MountainCar task. All three models tended to be concerned about overshooting the goal of reaching a position of ≥ 0.5 . However, in this task, overshooting is irrelevant since the goal is to surpass 0.5. Similar replies across models suggest this mistake stems from a shared common-sense notion. Additionally, Llama3-8b often failed to recognize the presence of a hill on the left side.
- (2) Logical mistakes were noted in GPT-3.5 and Llama3-70b when the LLMs justified moving left without recognizing the need for oscillation to gain momentum, leading to paradoxical replies. These types of errors were more prevalent in Llama3-8b.
- (3) Misunderstanding the history refers to the occasional misinterpretation or incorrect repetition of the history provided to the LLMs.
- (4) Physical misunderstanding, though rare, involved incorrect responses regarding the effects of acceleration on velocity and similar cases.
- (5) Mathematical errors commonly involved the LLMs disregarding the minus sign, leading them to believe that -0.5 is closer to 0.5 than 0.3 . Although these mistakes led to awkward reasoning, they seldom significantly worsened the final decision.
- (6) A common and human-like error involved judging when to switch directions to either

gain or use momentum in the MountainCar task. Even the RL agent occasionally makes such mistakes.

Aside from the errors, GPT-3.5 demonstrated a better understanding of the task, often referring to the need to accelerate left to gain momentum for climbing the right hill. This was rarely mentioned by Llama3-70b and never by Llama3-8b, indicating GPT-3.5’s superior task comprehension and explanatory ability. Llama3-70b, however, had an advantage in maintaining coherence, as it was less likely to contradict its arguments, unlike GPT-3.5, which occasionally argued against an action before ultimately supporting it. Both GPT-3.5 and Llama3-8b also displayed misunderstandings of the actions, such as incorrectly defining “action 0 (no acceleration)”. This suggests a common-sense bias toward interpreting 0 as no action. Llama3-70b was better at retaining the task description in memory.

G.1 A Compact Analysis of Error Types

Table 1 shows a quantitative analysis of the frequency of different error types committed by the LLMs for the MountainCar task. The evaluation highlighted various types of errors (see Table 5 in the Appendix), with Llama3-8b displaying the most errors despite its shorter responses. A common error among all models was misinterpreting the goal of the task, reflecting a shared common sense misunderstanding. Logical errors, particularly in oscillation movements, were prevalent in GPT-3.5 and Llama3-70b, while Llama3-8b frequently produced paradoxical replies. Misunderstanding the task history and physical principles was rare but present. Mathematical errors, especially disregarding the minus sign, occasionally impacted reasoning. Notably, GPT-3.5 demonstrated a better task understanding by referring to momentum strategies in the task, an insight less frequently or never mentioned by Llama3-70b and Llama3-8b, respectively. Llama3-70b did have one other advantage over other models as it was less often confused by its argument and excelled in maintaining task descriptions. Despite occasional errors in defining actions, GPT-3.5’s superior comprehension of the task contributed to its higher-quality explanations.