

Relational Decomposition for Program Synthesis

Céline Hocquette and Andrew Cropper

University of Oxford
{celine.hocquette, andrew.cropper}@cs.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

We introduce a novel approach to program synthesis that decomposes complex functional tasks into simpler relational synthesis sub-tasks. We demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach using an off-the-shelf inductive logic programming (ILP) system on three challenging datasets. Our results show that (i) a relational representation can outperform a functional one, and (ii) an off-the-shelf ILP system with a relational encoding can outperform domain-specific approaches.

1 Introduction

The goal of program synthesis is to automatically generate a computer program from a set of input-output examples (Gulwani et al. 2017). For instance, consider the examples shown in Table 1. Given these examples, we want to learn a program that inserts the letter *a* at position 2 in the input list to produce the corresponding output list.

Input	Output
[l, i, o, n]	[l, a, i, o, n]
[t, i, g, e, r]	[t, a, i, g, e, r]

Table 1: Input-output examples.

The standard approach to program synthesis is to search for a sequence of functions (Ellis et al. 2018; Kim et al. 2022; Ameen and Lelis 2023; Witt et al. 2023; Rule et al. 2024) or actions (Cropper and Dumančić 2020; Curtis et al. 2022; Aleixo and Lelis 2023; Lei, Lipovetzky, and Ehinger 2024) to map inputs to outputs. For instance, given the examples in Table 1 and only the functions *head*, *tail*, and *cons*, a system could synthesise the program:

```
def f(xs):
    return cons(head(xs), cons('a', tail(xs)))
```

Whilst a functional approach is effective for simple programs, it can struggle when learning programs that require long sequences of functions. For instance, to insert the letter *a* at position 3, a system could synthesise the program:

```
def f(xs):
    return cons(head(xs), cons(head(tail(xs)),
                                cons('a', tail(tail(xs)))))
```

Copyright © 2025, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

This program is long and difficult to learn because the search complexity in program synthesis is exponential with the search depth (Gulwani et al. 2017; Witt et al. 2023). Therefore, most existing approaches struggle to learn long sequences of functions.

Rather than learn a sequence of functions to map an input to an output, our key contribution is to show that we can decompose complex functional synthesis tasks into simpler relational synthesis sub-tasks. Specifically, we decompose each training input-output example into a set of facts and try to learn the relations between them.

To illustrate this idea, consider the first input-output example in Table 1. We decompose the input list into a set of facts of the form $in(I, V)$, where each fact states that the input value at index I is V :

```
in(1, l). in(2, i). in(3, o). in(4, n).
```

Similarly, we decompose the output list into a set of facts of the form $out(I, V)$, where each fact states that the output value at index I is V :

```
out(1, l). out(2, a). out(3, i). out(4, o). out(5, n).
```

We then try to generalise the *out* facts given the *in* facts and additional background knowledge. For instance, given the examples in Table 1, we can learn the rules:

```
out(I, V):- I<2, in(I, V).
out(2, a).
out(I, V):- I>2, in(I-1, V).
```

The first rule says that the output value at index I is the input value at index I for indices strictly smaller than 2. The second rule says that the output value at index 2 is *a*. The third rule says that for indices I strictly greater than 2, the output value at index I is the input value at index $I - 1$. We can learn similar rules for *insert at position k* by learning different indices.

As a second illustrative scenario, consider the task shown in Figure 1, which is from the *Abstraction and Reasoning Corpus* (ARC) (Chollet 2019). The goal is to learn a function to map the input image to the output image. Rather than treating the input-output example as a single example, we decompose the input and output images into facts about individual pixels. Specifically, we decompose the input image into a set of facts of the form $in(X, Y, C)$, where each fact states that the input pixel at row X and column Y has colour C :




Figure 1: Demonstration for the ARC task 3bd67248.

```
in(1,1,blue).   in(2,1,blue).   in(3,1,blue).
in(4,1,blue).   in(5,1,blue).   in(6,1,blue).
in(7,1,blue).
```

We use a set of facts of the form $empty(X,Y)$ to indicate that the input pixel at row X and column Y is empty/uncoloured:

```
empty(1,2).     empty(1,3).     empty(1,4).
empty(1,5).     empty(1,6).     empty(1,7).
empty(2,2).     empty(2,3).     empty(2,4).
```

Similarly, we decompose the output image into a set of facts of the form $out(X,Y,C)$, where each fact states that the output pixel at row X and column Y has colour C :

```
out(1,1,blue).  out(7,2,yellow). out(1,7,red).
out(2,1,blue).  out(7,3,yellow). out(2,6,red).
out(3,1,blue).  out(7,4,yellow). out(3,5,red).
```

We then try to generalise the out facts given the in and $empty$ facts and additional background knowledge. For instance, we can learn the rules:

```
out(X,Y,C):- in(X,Y,C).
out(X,Y,yellow):- empty(X,Y), height(X).
out(X,Y,red):- empty(X,Y), height(X+Y-1).
```

The first rule says that any coloured pixel in the input image is the same colour in the output image. The second rule says that any uncoloured pixel in the bottom row of the input image is yellow in the output image. The last rule says that any uncoloured pixel in the input image whose coordinates X and Y sum to $H + 1$, where H is the height of the image, (i.e. located on the diagonal) is red in the output image. In other words, our relational approach concisely expresses the concept of a line without being given the definition.

Our relational decomposition approach has many benefits. Foremost, it decomposes a synthesis task into smaller ones by decomposing each training example into multiple examples. Therefore, instead of learning a program to map an entire input list/image at once, we learn a set of rules, each generalising some list elements or image pixels. Crucially, we can independently learn each rule and then combine them, which makes the overall program easier to learn (Cropper and Hocquette 2023). For instance, a functional program for the list function task *insert at position 3* requires at least 8 sequential function calls. By contrast, a relational program only needs 3 rules with at most 3 literals each.

To demonstrate the effectiveness our idea, we use inductive logic programming (ILP) (Muggleton 1991; Cropper and Dumancic 2022). Given background knowledge and examples, the goal of ILP is to find a program that generalises the examples with respect to the background knowledge. ILP represents the data and learned programs as logic programs and is therefore a relational approach to program synthesis.

Contributions The main contribution of this paper is to show that complex functional program synthesis tasks can be solved more easily if decomposed into relational learning tasks. The second contribution is to show that an off-the-shelf ILP system (Cropper and Morel 2021; Cropper and Hocquette 2023) with a relational representation and a domain-independent bias can achieve high performance compared to domain-specific approaches on three varied and challenging datasets.

Overall, we make the following contributions:

- We introduce a program synthesis approach that decomposes a functional task into multiple relational tasks.
- We evaluate our approach using an off-the-shelf ILP system on three challenging datasets, including image reasoning and list functions. Our empirical results show that (i) a relational encoding drastically improves learning performance compared to a standard functional encoding, and (ii) an off-the-shelf ILP system with this relational encoding can outperform domain-specific approaches.

2 Related Work

Program synthesis. Deductive program synthesis approaches (Manna and Waldinger 1980) take complete specifications as input and deduce programs that exactly satisfy the specification. By contrast, we focus on *inductive program synthesis*, which takes partial specifications as input, typically input-output examples (Gulwani et al. 2017). For brevity, any subsequent mention of program synthesis refers to inductive program synthesis.

LLMs. Large language models (LLMs) prompted to directly predict outputs perform poorly compared to humans and state-of-the-art approaches on the ARC dataset (Mirchandani et al. 2023; Xu et al. 2024). Some approaches combine LLMs with human assistance, such as using a human-written natural-language description of the target function as a hint for the LLM (Tang et al. 2024). For instance, Wang et al. (2024) prompt an LLM to generate multiple hypotheses written in natural language. A human annotator then selects the correct ones and an LLM is prompted to implement the selected natural language hypotheses as Python programs. By contrast, we do not use humans to select correct hypotheses or to provide textual descriptions of the solutions. Directly comparing symbolic program synthesis approaches to LLM approaches is difficult. For instance, as Wang et al. (2024) state, LLMs are trained on extensive corpora, and might have already seen the test data. Moreover, due to their high resource requirements, most work using LLMs on ARC only look at subsets of the tasks. For instance, Wang et al. (2024) only look at 100/400 problems because of the “*high cost of GPT4*”. By contrast, our approach is resource-efficient and runs on a single CPU.

Domain specific-approaches. There are many domain-specific approaches to program synthesis, such as for string transformations (Gulwani 2011), 3D shapes (Tian et al. 2019), list functions (Rule 2020), or visual reasoning (Wind 2022; Xu, Khalil, and Sanner 2023; Lei, Lipovetzky, and Ehinger 2024). By contrast, our approach is versatile and generalises to multiple domains. Moreover, we use an off-the-shelf

general-purpose ILP system.

Functional synthesis. Most program synthesis work focuses on learning functional programs (Ellis et al. 2019; Shi et al. 2022; Witt et al. 2023; Rule et al. 2024), such as LISP (Summers 1977) or Haskell (Katayama 2008) programs. By contrast, we learn relational (logic) programs. Some approaches evaluate the distance between intermediate states and the desired output states (Ellis et al. 2019; Cropper and Dumančić 2020; Ameen and Lelis 2023). These approaches require a state-based representation and learn a sequence of actions or functions to transform the state. By contrast, we decompose examples and use a relational representation.

ILP. ILP represents background knowledge and programs as relational logic programs. Despite this relational nature, many ILP approaches use functional/procedural representations (Lin et al. 2014; Cropper and Dumančić 2020). Related approaches that use relational representations include Silver et al. (2020), who learn game policies from demonstrations, and Evans et al. (2021), who learn dynamics from temporal sequences. These approaches are specifically designed for learning policies and temporal sequences respectively. By contrast, we use a general-purpose off-the-shelf ILP system.

Decomposition. Some approaches partition the training examples into subsets, learn programs independently for each subset, and then combine the solutions into a global solution (Cropper and Hocquette 2023). By contrast, we decompose each input-output training example into multiple examples. BEN (Witt et al. 2023) decomposes an example into input-output objects, uses analogical reasoning to align the objects, and then synthesises programs to solve the resulting subtasks. BEN synthesises functional programs that manipulate a state-based representation of an ARC task, specifically the objects in the state. By contrast, we learn a relational program. BEN uses a set of domain-specific functions. For instance, on the ARC dataset, BEN uses 11 transformation functions such as *border(s)*, which draws a border of size s and *denoise(s)*, which denoises an object. By contrast, we only use basic arithmetic operations, such as the ability to add two numbers. Finally, while BEN uses predefined matching rules based on neighbouring or identical colours to identify objects, we decompose images into pixels.

3 Problem Setting

We describe our problem setting.

3.1 Program Synthesis

An example is a pair $i \mapsto o$ formed of an input i and an output o . We denote as \mathcal{X} an example space, i.e. a set of examples. We denote as \mathcal{H} a hypothesis space, i.e. a set of programs. We define a synthesis task:

Definition 1 (Synthesis task) A synthesis task is a tuple (E, \mathcal{H}) where $E \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is a set of examples.

Given a program p and an input i , we denote as $\llbracket p(i) \rrbracket$ the result of executing p on i . We define a synthesis solution:

Definition 2 (Synthesis solution) For a synthesis task (E, \mathcal{H}) , a program $p \in \mathcal{H}$ is a synthesis solution when p satisfies every example in E , i.e. $\llbracket p(i) \rrbracket = o$ for every $(i \mapsto o) \in E$.

3.2 Inductive Logic Programming

We decompose a synthesis task into an ILP task. We define the ILP problem. We assume familiarity with logic programming (Lloyd 2012) but have included a summary in the appendix. We restate key terminology. A *clause* is a set of literals. A *definite clause* is a clause with exactly one positive literal. We use the term *rule* synonymously with *definite clause*. A *definite program* is a set of definite clauses with the least Herbrand model semantics. We refer to a definite program as a *logic program*.

We first define an ILP task:

Definition 3 (ILP task) An ILP task is a tuple $(E^+, E^-, B, \mathcal{H})$, where E^+ and E^- are sets of ground atoms denoting positive and negative examples respectively, B is a logic program denoting the background knowledge, and \mathcal{H} is a hypothesis space.

We formulate the ILP problem in the learning from entailment setting (Raedt 2008). Given an ILP task, we define an ILP solution:

Definition 4 (ILP solution) For an ILP task $(E^+, E^-, B, \mathcal{H})$, a program $p \in \mathcal{H}$ is an ILP solution when p entails every example in E^+ ($\forall e \in E^+, p \cup B \models e$) and no example in E^- ($\forall e \in E^-, p \cup B \not\models e$).

3.3 Relational Decomposition

We define a relational decomposition function:

Definition 5 (Relational decomposition function) A relational decomposition function is a function which maps a synthesis task (E, \mathcal{H}) to an ILP task $(E^+, E^-, B, \mathcal{H}')$.

In the next section, we empirically show that we can encode a program synthesis task into an ILP task using a simple decomposition function, and that we can achieve a substantial improvement in learning performance through this change of representation.

4 Evaluation

To test our claim that a relational representation can outperform a functional one, our evaluation aims to answer the question:

Q1 How does our relational representation compare against a standard state/functional representation?

To answer **Q1**, we compare the learning performance of an ILP system with a relational representation against a state/functional representation. We use the same ILP system so the only difference is the representation.

To test our claim that our relational decomposition approach is general-purpose, our evaluation aims to answer the question:

Q2 How does a general-purpose ILP system with a relational representation compare against domain-specific approaches?

To answer **Q2**, we compare the learning performance of a general-purpose ILP system with a relational representation against domain-specific approaches.



Figure 2: The *mirror* task from *ID-ARC*.

4.1 Datasets

We use the following diverse and challenging datasets.

ID-ARC. The *ID-ARC* dataset (Xu et al. 2024) is a one-dimensional adaptation of *ARC*. It has 18 tasks, each with 3 training examples and 1 testing example. Figure 2 shows an example task where the goal is to copy the blue pixels symmetrically with respect to the red pixel.

ARC. The *ARC* dataset (Chollet 2019) evaluates the ability of learning systems to perform abstract reasoning and problem-solving from a small number of examples. The goal of each task is to transform two-dimensional input images into their corresponding output images. The tasks are widely varied and include for instance pattern recognition, geometric transformations, colour manipulation, or counting. Image sizes range between 1x1 and 30x30 pixels. Input and output images can have different sizes. Each pixel is one of 10 different colours. We use the *training* subset of the original dataset, which includes 400 tasks, each with 2 to 10 training examples and 1 to 3 testing examples¹.

List functions. The *list functions* dataset (Rule 2020; Rule et al. 2024) evaluates human and machine learning ability. The goal of each task is to identify a function that maps input lists to output lists, where list elements are natural numbers. The tasks range from basic list functions, such as duplication and removal, to more complex functions involving conditional logic, arithmetic, and pattern-based reasoning. The dataset contains 250 tasks, each with 11 examples.

4.2 Systems

We use the following systems².

POPPER. We use the ILP system POPPER (Cropper and Morel 2021) because it can learn large programs, especially programs with many independent rules (Cropper and Hocquette 2023).

ARGA. ARGA (Xu, Khalil, and Sanner 2023) is an object-centric approach designed for *ARC*. ARGA abstracts images into graphs and then searches for a program using a domain-specific language based on the abstracted graph representation. ARGA uses 15 operators, such as to rotate, mirror, fill, or hollow objects.

HL. Hacker-Like (HL) (Rule 2020; Rule et al. 2024) is an inductive learning system designed to reproduce human learning using hacker-like techniques to revise code. HL uses

¹The *ARC* challenge uses top-3 accuracy (checking if any of three predictions are correct). However, we follow related work (Xu et al. 2024; Wang et al. 2024) and use top-1 accuracy.

²We also considered LLMs. However, as we state in Section 2, there are many differences that make a direct comparison difficult, such as the amount of human guidance LLM approaches need to perform well on these datasets and their prohibitively high cost. We also tried to compare against BEN (Witt et al. 2023) but the code is not publicly available and the authors could not share it with us.

Monte Carlo tree search to search over metaprograms, which are compositions of primitives and metaprimatives. HL is designed for the *list functions* dataset. While HL is not designed to outperform humans, it outperforms other program synthesis approaches on the *list functions* dataset (Rule et al. 2024).

4.3 Bias and Representation

To evaluate our relational approach, we use a purposely simple bias formed of the decomposed training examples and basic relations for arithmetic addition and value comparison. We describe our bias and decomposition function for each domain.

ID-ARC. We decompose a one-dimensional image into a set of pixel facts. The fact $in(I, C)$ holds if the pixel at index I in the input image has colour C . The fact $empty(I)$ holds if the pixel at index I is a background pixel (an uncoloured pixel). The fact $out(I, C)$ holds if the pixel at index I in the output image has colour C . We allow integers between 0 and 9, representing the 10 different colours, as constant symbols.

ARC. We decompose a two-dimensional image into a set of pixel facts. The fact $in(X, Y, C)$ holds if the pixel at row X and column Y in an input image has colour C . The fact $empty(X, Y)$ holds if the pixel at row X and column Y is a background pixel (an uncoloured pixel). The fact $out(X, Y, C)$ holds if the pixel at row X and column Y in an output image has colour C . We allow integers between 0 and 9 as constant symbols. We use the relations $height/1$, $width/1$, $midrow/1$, $midcol/1$ to identify the image height and width, the middle row and middle column respectively. We also use the relation $different/2$ to determine colour inequality.

List functions. We decompose a list into a set of element facts. The fact $in(I, V)$ holds if the element at index I in the input list has value V . The fact $end(I)$ denotes the end position of an input list. The fact $out(I, V)$ holds if the element at index I in the output list has value V . Following Rule (2020), we allow integers between 0 and 9 for the first 80 problems and integers between 0 and 99 for the remaining problems.

Functional representation. For the functional representation, we follow Rule (2020) and use the relations $cons/3$, $head/2$, $tail/2$, and $empty/1$ to manipulate lists. We also use the same arithmetic relations and constant symbols as in the relational representations.

4.4 Methods

We measure predictive accuracy as the proportion of correct predictions on test data. For our relational decomposition approach, a prediction is correct only if all the elements/pixels in the output are correct. We repeat each learning task 3 times and calculate the mean and standard error. The error bars in the figures represent the standard error. We use a m6a AWS instance with AMD EPYC 7R13 processor. Each system uses a single CPU. For the *list functions* dataset, we perform leave-one-out cross-validation. For tasks 81 to 250 in the *list functions* dataset, due to the large number of constant values, we sample 10,000 negative examples per task.

Reproducibility. The evaluation data and the code to reproduce the results are included as appendix and will be made

publicly available if the paper is accepted for publication.

4.5 Results




Figure 3: *ID-ARC*.




Figure 4: *ARC*.




Figure 5: *List function* tasks 1-80.

Q1: How does our relational representation compare against a standard state/functional representation? Figures 3, 4, 5, and 6 show the results. They show that our relational representation consistently outperforms the functional representation on all three domains and for all maximum learning times. A McNemar’s test confirms the statistical significance ($p < 0.01$) of the difference.

One reason for the performance improvement is that our relational approach decomposes a complex functional task into multiple relational subtasks. For instance, consider the *list functions* task 187, shown in Figure 7. The goal is to




Figure 6: *List function* tasks 81-250.

append the element 0 to the input list, then concatenate the input list to the input list. For this task, our approach learns the rules:

```
out(I, V) :- in(I, V).
out(E, 0) :- end(E).
out(I, V) :- end(E), in(I-1-E, V).
```

The first rule says that the *out* value at index I is the *in* value at index I . The second rule says that the *out* value at index E is 0, where E is the index of the first empty position in the input list. The last rule says that the *out* value at index I is the *in* value at index $I - 1 - E$, where E is the index of the first empty position in the input list. In other words, our approach learns one rule for copying the input list, another rule for adding a 0 to its end, and a third rule for appending the input list.

Input	Output
[77, 7, 22]	[77, 7, 22, 0, 77, 7, 22]
[1, 64, 54, 28]	[1, 64, 54, 28, 0, 1, 64, 54, 28]
[83, 90, 11, 35, 5]	[83, 90, 11, 35, 5, 0, 83, 90, 11, 35, 5]

Figure 7: *List functions* task 187.

Similarly, consider the *ARC* task 253bf280 shown in Figure 8. The goal is to colour in green pixels in between two blue pixels in the input image. Our approach learns the rules:

```
out(X, Y, blue) :- in(X, Y, blue).
out(X, Y, green) :- in(X, Y1, blue), in(X, Y2, blue), Y1 < Y < Y2.
out(X, Y, green) :- in(X1, Y, blue), in(X2, Y, blue), X1 < X < X2.
```

The first rule says that an *out* pixel is blue if it is blue in the input. The second rule says that an *out* pixel is green if it is between two blue pixels in the same row in the input. The third rule says that an *out* pixel is green if it is between two blue pixels in the same column in the input. In other words, our approach learns three rules: one for the permanence of blue pixels, one for horizontal lines, and one for vertical lines. Crucially, our approach learns these rules independently, as each rule generalises a subset of the decomposed examples. Moreover, our approach learns this perfect solution without being given the definition of a line.

Another reason for the performance improvement is that our relational approach can express programs compactly. For instance, consider the *ARC* task 6d75e8bb, shown in Figure 9.




Figure 8: ARC task 253bf280.

The goal is to colour in red empty pixels within the rectangle delimited by blue pixels. Our approach learns the rules:

```
out(X,Y,C):- in(X,Y,C).
out(X,Y,red):- empty(X,Y), in(X1,Y,C), in(X,Y1,C).
```

The first rule says that an *out* pixel has colour *C* if it has colour *C* in the input. The second rule says that an *out* pixel is red if it is empty in the input and if there are a pixel in the same row (*X*) and a pixel in the same column (*Y*) with the same colour (*C*) in the input. In other words, our approach compactly captures the concept of a rectangle without being given the definition in the background knowledge.




Figure 9: ARC task 6d75e8bb.

POPPER with our relational representation struggles to learn solutions for some tasks due to our purposely simple bias. For instance, the goal of the ARC task 23b5c85d is to learn a program that extracts the smallest rectangle. However, we do not include a counting mechanism so POPPER cannot compare the size of objects. We expand on this limitation when discussing Q2.

Overall, these results suggest that the answer to Q1 is yes: our relational representation can outperform a functional one.

Q2: How does a general-purpose ILP system with a relational representation compare against domain-specific approaches? Figures 3, 4, 5, and 6 show the results. They show that the general-purpose ILP system POPPER with our relational representation outperforms domain-specific approaches on two of the three datasets tested. We discuss the results for each dataset in turn.

ID-ARC ARGa outperforms our relational encoding on the *ID-ARC* dataset (94% vs 67% predictive accuracy with a maximum learning time of 20 mins). This result is unsurprising because ARGa is designed for image reasoning tasks and uses domain-specific background knowledge, such as the ability to measure the size of an object, and to fill, mirror, and hollow objects. This background knowledge is particularly useful for tasks such as *fill*, *mirror*, and *hollow*. By contrast,



Figure 10: The *denoise* task from *ID-ARC*.

our relational representation is not designed for these tasks and does not include domain-specific operators.

Our relational encoding significantly outperforms HL on the *ID-ARC* dataset (67% vs 0% predictive accuracy with a maximum learning time of 20 mins). Although these tasks involve identifying list functions, HL struggles on them. We asked the authors of HL for potential explanations and they explained that HL does not perform as well on problems requiring a recursive solution as it does on non-recursive problems. For instance, consider the task *denoise* (Figure 10). If represented functionally, this task requires learning a recursive solution, which is difficult for HL. By contrast, our approach learns the non-recursive rule:

```
out(I,C):- in(I1,C), in(I1+1,C), I2<2, I1+I2=I.
```

This rule says that an *out* pixel at index *I* has colour *C* if there are two adjacent pixels with colour *C* in the input image (at indices *I1* and *I1 + 1*), where one of these pixels is at index *I* (if *I2 = 0*, then *I1 = I*, and if *I2 = 1*, then *I1 + 1 = I*), i.e. the pixel at index *I* has an adjacent pixel with the same colour. This rule generalises perfectly to the test data. Notably, unlike ARGa and BEN, which both use a *denoise* operator, our approach can learn this rule without domain-specific operators.

For further comparison, Wang et al. (2024) show that GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 achieve an accuracy of 23% and 61% respectively when prompted to generate a Python program for these tasks. Our approach achieves similar performance (61%) with a maximum learning time of only 1 min and better performance (65%) with a maximum learning time of 10 mins.

ARC POPPER with our relational representation outperforms ARGa (19% vs 8% predictive accuracy with a maximum learning time of 20 mins) on the *ARC* dataset. ARGa struggles, partly because it assumes that the input and output images have identical sizes, so it cannot solve 138/400 tasks which have different sizes.

Given the poor results of HL on the *ID-ARC* dataset, we exclude it from the comparison on *ARC* dataset. Moreover, HL assumes that an input and output are one-dimensional lists so is not directly usable on *ARC*.

For further comparison, LLMs struggle when directly prompted to predict *ARC* outputs, with various reported accuracies, including 14% (Mirchandani et al. 2023), and 17% (Wang et al. 2024). Wang et al. (2024) find improvements in LLM performance via hypothesis search, where GPT-4 achieves an accuracy of 18% or 23%, depending on the specific LLM. However, these results are incomparable to ours as they only evaluate a subset of the dataset due to prohibitively expensive evaluation costs.

Among non-LLM approaches that evaluate the whole *ARC* dataset, as far as we are aware, the best performing approach is ICECUBER (Wind 2022), which uses a 142 handcrafted

functions designed by manually writing solutions for the first 100 *ARC* tasks. A more comparable approach is BEN (Witt et al. 2023), which achieves 24% accuracy given a 20 mins search timeout. However, BEN uses a domain-specific function to decompose images into objects. Without this function, the accuracy of BEN drops to 6%. Moreover, BEN uses hand-designed *ARC*-specific functions, such as *mirror*, *inner*, and *denoise*. By contrast, we only use general background knowledge, such as how to add two numbers.

List functions POPPER with our relational representation significantly outperforms ARGAs on the *list functions* dataset (85% vs 0% on the first 80 tasks, and 30% vs 0% on the other tasks with a maximum learning time of 20 mins). ARGAs struggle because it requires that an input and its corresponding output have identical size, which prevents it from solving 188/250 tasks. Additionally, ARGAs is designed for object-centric tasks so struggles when it cannot identify meaningful objects. Finally, ARGAs uses operators designed for image reasoning, which do not generalise well to list functions. By contrast, our approach generalises to a broader range of problems.

POPPER with our relational representation significantly outperforms HL (85% vs 66% on the first 80 tasks and 30% vs 18% on the other tasks with a maximum learning time of 20 mins). A McNeymar’s test confirms the significance ($p < 0.01$) of the difference. HL is designed to reproduce human learning using hacker-like mechanisms and synthesises functional programs. By contrast, we do not try to reproduce human learning. It is, therefore, understandable that our approach performs better. For instance, Rule (2020) shows that humans struggle on the task *005* (Figure 11) and have 17% predictive accuracy. HL also struggles with this task and achieves 0% accuracy. By contrast, our approach achieves 100% accuracy with the rule:

```
out(1,V):- in(1,K), in(K,V).
```

This rule says that the *out* element at position 1 is the *in* value V at position K where K is the value of the first input element.

Input	Output
[2,1,9,6,7,0,4,5,3]	[9]
[7, 2, 1, 8, 0, 6, 3, 5, 9, 4]	[5]

Figure 11: List function task 005.

As a more complex scenario, consider the *list function* task *194* (Figure 12). The goal is to reverse the input list and prepend and append the length of the input list. According to Rule (2020), humans achieve less than 25% accuracy on this task. HL also struggles with it, and achieves 0% accuracy. By contrast, we achieve 100% accuracy with the rules:

```
out(1,E-1):- end(E).
out(I,V):- end(E), add(I,I1,E+1), in(I1,V).
out(E+1,E-1):- end(E).
```

The first rule says that the *out* element at index 1 is $E - 1$, where E is the index of the first empty position in the input list. The last rule says that the *out* element at index $E + 1$ is $E - 1$, where E is the index of the first empty position in the

input list. The second rule says that the *out* element at index I is the *in* element at index $I1$, where $I + I1 = E + 1$. In other words, this second rule compactly expresses the concept of reverse and move by one position.

Input	Output
[81, 43]	[2, 43, 81, 2]
[1, 63, 21, 16]	[4, 16, 21, 63, 1, 4]

Figure 12: List function task 194.

For further comparison, Rule et al. (2024) compare several approaches on this dataset, including HL³, METAGOL (Muggleton, Lin, and Tamaddoni-Nezhad 2015), ROBUST-FILL⁴ (Devlin et al. 2017), CODEX (Chen et al. 2021), and FLEET (Yang and Piantadosi 2022). Among these, only HL and FLEET achieve performance comparable to human, and the other approaches greatly struggle. We can, therefore, infer that our approach also outperforms these alternative approaches and humans.

Overall, the results suggest that the answer to **Q2** is yes: a general-purpose ILP system with a relational representation is competitive with, and can even outperform, domain-specific approaches.

5 Conclusions and Limitations

We have introduced a novel approach to program synthesis that decomposes complex functional tasks into easier relational learning tasks. Our empirical results on image reasoning and list function tasks show that our relational decomposition approach substantially outperforms standard functional approaches. Moreover, we have shown that an off-the-shelf ILP system using our relational representation with little domain-specific bias and low training times is competitive with, and in some cases outperforms, highly engineered domain-specific approaches. More broadly, our results show that simply looking at a problem differently can lead to big performance improvements.

Limitations

Bias. We use a purposely simple bias formed of raw input (list elements or pixels) and basic arithmetic relations. However, our simple bias is limiting for some tasks, such as those that require counting. Future work should expand our bias with more general-purpose concepts, such as counting.

ILP system. We have shown that an off-the-shelf ILP system is competitive with domain-specific approaches. However, this system struggles on some tasks, where there is a good solution in the search space but the system cannot find it within the time limit. This limitation is due to the system we use and not our representation. However, because our relational decomposition approach is system-agnostic, we could use a different ILP system. Moreover, because we use an off-the-shelf ILP system, our approach naturally benefits from any developments in ILP.

³HL (Rule 2020) is also named MPL (Rule et al. 2024).

⁴ROBUSTFILL required 3 days of training which highlights the search efficiency of our approach.

References

- Aleixo, D. S.; and Lelis, L. H. S. 2023. Show Me the Way! Bilevel Search for Synthesizing Programmatic Strategies. In *AAAI 2023*, 4991–4998.
- Ameen, S.; and Lelis, L. H. S. 2023. Program Synthesis with Best-First Bottom-Up Search. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 77: 1275–1310.
- Chen, M.; et al. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *CoRR*, abs/2107.03374.
- Chollet, F. 2019. On the Measure of Intelligence. *CoRR*, abs/1911.01547.
- Cropper, A.; and Dumancic, S. 2022. Inductive Logic Programming At 30: A New Introduction. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 74: 765–850.
- Cropper, A.; and Dumančić, S. 2020. Learning Large Logic Programs By Going Beyond Entailment. In *IJCAI 2020*, 2073–2079.
- Cropper, A.; and Hocquette, C. 2023. Learning Logic Programs by Combining Programs. In *ECAI 2023*, 501–508.
- Cropper, A.; and Morel, R. 2021. Learning programs by learning from failures. *Mach. Learn.*, 110(4): 801–856.
- Curtis, A.; Silver, T.; Tenenbaum, J. B.; Lozano-Pérez, T.; and Kaelbling, L. P. 2022. Discovering State and Action Abstractions for Generalized Task and Motion Planning. In *AAAI 2022*, 5377–5384.
- Devlin, J.; Uesato, J.; Bhupatiraju, S.; Singh, R.; Mohamed, A.; and Kohli, P. 2017. RobustFill: Neural Program Learning under Noisy I/O. In *ICML 2017*, volume 70, 990–998.
- Ellis, K.; Morales, L.; Sablé-Meyer, M.; Solar-Lezama, A.; and Tenenbaum, J. 2018. Learning Libraries of Subroutines for Neurally-Guided Bayesian Program Induction. In *NeurIPS 2018*, 7816–7826.
- Ellis, K.; Nye, M. I.; Pu, Y.; Sosa, F.; Tenenbaum, J.; and Solar-Lezama, A. 2019. Write, Execute, Assess: Program Synthesis with a REPL. In *NeurIPS 2019*, 9165–9174.
- Evans, R.; Hernández-Orallo, J.; Welbl, J.; Kohli, P.; and Sergot, M. J. 2021. Making sense of sensory input. *Artif. Intell.*, 293: 103438.
- Gulwani, S. 2011. Automating string processing in spreadsheets using input-output examples. In *POPL 2011*, 317–330.
- Gulwani, S.; Polozov, O.; Singh, R.; et al. 2017. Program synthesis. *Foundations and Trends® in Programming Languages*, 4(1-2): 1–119.
- Katayama, S. 2008. Efficient Exhaustive Generation of Functional Programs Using Monte-Carlo Search with Iterative Deepening. In *PRICAI 2008*, 199–210.
- Kim, S.; Phunyahibarn, P.; Ahn, D.; and Kim, S. 2022. Playgrounds for abstraction and reasoning. In *NeurIPS 2022 Workshop on Neuro Causal and Symbolic AI (nCSI)*.
- Lei, C.; Lipovetzky, N.; and Ehinger, K. A. 2024. Generalized Planning for the Abstraction and Reasoning Corpus. In *AAAI 2024*, 20168–20175.
- Lin, D.; Dechter, E.; Ellis, K.; Tenenbaum, J. B.; and Muggleton, S. 2014. Bias reformulation for one-shot function induction. In *ECAI 2014*, 525–530.
- Lloyd, J. W. 2012. *Foundations of logic programming*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Manna, Z.; and Waldinger, R. J. 1980. A Deductive Approach to Program Synthesis. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 2(1): 90–121.
- Mirchandani, S.; et al. 2023. Large Language Models as General Pattern Machines. In *CoRL 2023*, volume 229, 2498–2518. PMLR.
- Muggleton, S. H. 1991. Inductive Logic Programming. *New Gener. Comput.*, 8(4): 295–318.
- Muggleton, S. H.; Lin, D.; and Tamaddoni-Nezhad, A. 2015. Meta-interpretive learning of higher-order dyadic Datalog: predicate invention revisited. *Mach. Learn.*, (1): 49–73.
- Raedt, L. D. 2008. *Logical and relational learning*. Cognitive Technologies. Springer. ISBN 978-3-540-20040-6.
- Rule, J. S. 2020. *The child as hacker: building more human-like models of learning*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.
- Rule, J. S.; Piantadosi, S. T.; Cropper, A.; Ellis, K.; Nye, M.; and Tenenbaum, J. B. 2024. Symbolic metaprogram search improves learning efficiency and explains rule learning in humans. *Nature Communications*, 15(1): 6847.
- Shi, K.; Dai, H.; Ellis, K.; and Sutton, C. 2022. CrossBeam: Learning to Search in Bottom-Up Program Synthesis. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Silver, T.; Allen, K. R.; Lew, A. K.; Kaelbling, L. P.; and Tenenbaum, J. 2020. Few-Shot Bayesian Imitation Learning with Logical Program Policies. In *AAAI 2020*, 10251–10258.
- Summers, P. D. 1977. A Methodology for LISP Program Construction from Examples. *J. ACM*, 24(1): 161–175.
- Tang, H.; Hu, K.; Zhou, J. P.; Zhong, S.; Zheng, W.; Si, X.; and Ellis, K. 2024. Code Repair with LLMs gives an Exploration-Exploitation Tradeoff. *CoRR*, abs/2405.17503.
- Tian, Y.; Luo, A.; Sun, X.; Ellis, K.; Freeman, W. T.; Tenenbaum, J. B.; and Wu, J. 2019. Learning to Infer and Execute 3D Shape Programs. In *ICLR 2019*.
- Wang, R.; Zelikman, E.; Poesia, G.; Pu, Y.; Haber, N.; and Goodman, N. 2024. Hypothesis Search: Inductive Reasoning with Language Models. In *ICLR 2024*.
- Wind, J. 2022. 1st place solution. <https://www.kaggle.com/c/abstraction-and-reasoning-challenge/discussion/154597>.
- Witt, J.; Rasing, S.; Dumancic, S.; Guns, T.; and Carbon, C. 2023. A Divide-Align-Conquer Strategy for Program Synthesis. *CoRR*, abs/2301.03094.
- Xu, Y.; Khalil, E. B.; and Sanner, S. 2023. Graphs, Constraints, and Search for the Abstraction and Reasoning Corpus. In *AAAI 2023*, 4115–4122.
- Xu, Y.; Li, W.; Vaezipoor, P.; Sanner, S.; and Khalil, E. B. 2024. LLMs and the Abstraction and Reasoning Corpus: Successes, Failures, and the Importance of Object-based Representations. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Yang, Y.; and Piantadosi, S. T. 2022. One model for the learning of language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(5): e2021865119.