
Code Driven Planning with Domain-Adaptive Critic

Zikang Tian^{1,2,3}, Shaohui Peng⁴, Di Huang¹, Jiaming Guo¹, Ruizhi Chen⁴,
Rui Zhang¹, Xishan Zhang^{1,3}, Yuxuan Guo^{1,3,6}, Zidong Du^{1,5}, Qi Guo¹,
Ling Li^{2,4}, Yewen Pu⁷, Xing Hu^{1,5}, Yunji Chen^{1,2*}

¹SKL of Processors, Institute of Computing Technology, CAS, Beijing, China

²University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

³Cambricon Technologies, Beijing, China

⁴SKL of Computer Science, Institute of Software, CAS, Beijing, China

⁵Shanghai Innovation Center for Processor Technologies, SHIC, Shanghai, China

⁶University of Science and Technology of China ⁷Autodesk Research

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have been widely adopted as task planners for AI agents in sequential decision-making problems, leveraging their extensive world knowledge. However, the gap between their general knowledge and environment-specific requirements often leads to inaccurate plans. To address this, existing approaches rely on frequent LLM queries to iteratively refine plans based on immediate environmental feedback, which incurs substantial query costs. However, this refinement is typically guided by short-term environmental feedback, limiting LLMs from developing plans aligned with long-term rewards. We propose **Code Driven Planning with Domain-Adaptive Critic (CoPiC)**. Instead of relying on frequent queries, CoPiC employs LLMs to generate a diverse set of high-level planning programs, which iteratively produce and refine candidate plans. A trained domain-adaptive critic then evaluates these candidates and selects the one most aligned with long-term rewards for execution. Using high-level planning programs as planner and domain-adaptive critic as estimator, CoPiC improves planning while significantly reducing query costs. Results in ALFWorld, NetHack, and StarCraft II Unit Building show that CoPiC outperforms advanced LLM-based baselines, achieving an average (1) 20.29% improvement in success rate and (2) 79.39% reduction in token costs.

1 Introduction

Pre-trained on web-scale data, Large Language Models (LLMs) have shown remarkable potential in zero-shot learning, commonsense understanding, and contextual reasoning [2, 33, 34]. Consequently, recent studies have increasingly explored the use of LLMs-based planners to complete tasks in various environments like household scenarios [3, 20] and games [36, 37]. These planners decompose high-level task instructions into coherent natural-language plans for environment execution. Compared to traditional learning-based AI agents, LLMs-based planners significantly improve both efficiency and applicability, thanks to the advanced capabilities of LLMs.

However, the gap between general knowledge and specific environments often causes LLMs to have hallucinations, resulting in plausible yet infeasible plans involving non-existent objects or unavailable actions. To address this issue and facilitate grounded planning, especially for complex tasks involving multiple objects and diverse preconditions, most existing methods (shown on the left side of Figure 1) allow LLMs to iteratively generate and refine plans using immediate environmental observation, thereby improving their feasibility [40, 25, 37, 30]. However, the frequent step-by-step observations lead to extremely high LLMs query costs. And the greedy search for plans by LLMs hampers the




Figure 1: Difference between CoPiC and other planning paradigms: CoPiC leverages multiple high-level planning programs to reduce LLMs query costs, while a domain-adaptive critic is employed to select high-quality plans aligned with long-term rewards.

generation of long-term rewarding plans, reducing planning efficiency and further escalating query costs.

In summary, directly generating and refining static plans tailored to specific observations fails to adapt effectively to dynamic environments, resulting in high LLMs query costs. Inspired by the reliable code-generation capabilities of LLMs [5, 15, 11], LLMs can potentially generate high-level planning programs that produces and refines plans based on varying observations, thus reducing query costs compared to static plans. However, the gap between LLMs’ general knowledge and specific environments makes it challenging for a single planning program to handle all environmental observations. To address this, we introduce a mixture-of-experts (MoE) mechanism to generate multiple planning programs that produce diverse candidate plans, alongside a domain-adaptive critic that evaluates these candidates to select the plan most aligned with long-term rewards.

Inspired by these insight, we propose **Code-Driven Planning with a Domain-Adaptive Critic (CoPiC**, as shown on the right side of Figure 1). CoPiC comprises two core modules: an LLMs planner and a domain-adaptive critic. The LLMs planner generates multiple high-level planning programs that interact with environment, producing and refining candidate plans iteratively, which reduces the LLMs query costs incurring by generating and refining static plans step-by-step. The domain-adaptive critic evaluates these candidates and selects the one most aligned with long-term rewards, further bridging the gap between LLMs’ general knowledge and environment-specific requirements. Upon termination of the planning programs, CoPiC leverages execution results to refine the planning programs and fine-tune the critic within a reinforcement learning framework, ensuring continuous improvement and adaptation to dynamic environments. This paper makes the following contributions:

- We propose a novel planning paradigm that combines an MoE mechanism, where each planning program acts as an expert, with a domain-adaptive critic to bridge the gap between LLMs’ generality and environmental specificity.
- We propose CoPiC, a framework consisting of an LLMs planner that generates multiple high-level planning programs and a domain-adaptive critic that selects the highest-quality plan, enhancing planning performance while reducing LLMs query cost.
- We evaluated CoPiC in three environments: ALFWorld [26], NetHack [18], and StarCraft II Unit Building. The results demonstrate that CoPiC significantly outperforms advanced and immediate feedback-based baselines, including AdaPlanner [30] and Reflexion [25], achieving a 23.33% increase in success rate, a 91.27% reduction in query costs, and a 34.76% decrease in the average number of steps. These findings highlight CoPiC’s ability to deliver superior planning performance while reducing LLMs query overhead.

2 Related Works

CoPiC is LLMs-based, program-driven and containing a critic scoring module. Therefore, we mainly review related works in these three areas. For a comprehensive overview, we also incorporate PDDL-based methods into the related works.

LLMs-based Planning To bridge the gap between LLMs and the environment, prior works often adopt an immediate feedback paradigm, leveraging instant environmental feedback to refine plans. ReAct [40] and Inner Monologue [14] use step-by-step execution feedback to update actions, while Reflexion [25] incorporates a trial-and-error mechanism, generating reflective texts from historical feedback. While these methods improve planning quality, they rely on extensive LLMs queries, resulting in high latency and limiting the generation of long-term rewarding plans. In contrast, CoPiC, which reduces costs through program-driven plan generation and improves domain adaptation via a critic module learned on domain experience.

LLMs-based Planning with Scoring Some LLM-based planning methods use a Scoring Module to evaluate and select the best LLM-generated plans. For example, Prospector [17] uses direct LLM scoring or pre-trained models with offline expert data. SayCan [3] assesses skill feasibility and integrates it with LLM planning, while SayCanPay [12] further enhances efficiency by evaluating planning’s payoff. Thus, current methods rely on two approaches: direct LLMs scoring (which lacks environmental priors and introduces scoring errors) or pre-training scoring models with offline expert data (which is costly and poorly generalizes to out-of-distribution data). In contrast, CoPiC introduces planning programs to dynamically and efficiently generate online data, enabling Critic fine-tuning and scoring without these limitations.

Program-Based Planning with LLMs Extensive research on code generation using LLMs underpins the development of CoPiC. Key examples include Codex [6] for Python function completion, AlphaCode for competitive programming, and studies like CodeT [4], Self-Debugging [7], and CodeRL [19] that explore LLM debugging. Researchers have also applied LLMs to decision-making tasks, such as Code as Policies [20], PROG PROMPT [29], AdaPlanner [30], REPL-Plan [22], and SDG [23]. AdaPlanner [30] generates programmatic plans for each individual task, which are essentially static and lack dynamism. REPL-Plan [22] leverages the Read-Eval-Print-Loop (REPL) tool, recursively invoking REPL through LLMs to generate new reusable APIs for planning. Unlike these methods, CoPiC produces multiple dynamic planning programs for each task category, creating a set of reasonable candidate plans. A domain-adaptive critic then selects the most rewarding plan, thus enhancing performance.

PDDL-based Planning with LLMs The Planning Domain Definition Language (PDDL) [1] is a human-readable, structured language for automated planning, defining possible world states, actions with prerequisites and effects, an initial state, and desired goals. It represents planning problems using a domain file (common elements across problems) and a problem file (specific initial states and goals). Recently, there has been growing interest in integrating traditional PDDL-based planning with LLMs, as seen in works such as [28], [9], and [27]. However, in these approaches, LLMs are primarily used for file completion or plan summarization, while actual planning relies on additional solvers to search the problem space for solutions. In contrast, CoPiC eliminates the need for external solvers by performing planning directly through programs generated by LLMs.

3 Preliminary

3.1 Problem Formulation

We explore the planning problem of LLMs-centric AI agent π to address a variety of natural language described tasks \mathcal{I} within specific environments. We first formulate the planning problem as a finite-horizon Partially Observable Markov Decision Process (POMDP) given by the tuple $\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}, R, P, \mathcal{I} \rangle$. Here, \mathcal{S} is state space, \mathcal{O} is a set of observations retrieved from states via an observation function $O : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$, \mathcal{A} is the set of actions, $R : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the reward function defined in environment, $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the stochastic transition function, \mathcal{I} is the space of language described tasks.

Given an instruction $I \in \mathcal{I}$, the objective of the LLMs-centric AI agent π is to find a plan p to try to fulfill I :

$$\pi(p|I, o) : \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A}^T) \tag{1}$$

where $o \in \mathcal{O}$ is the observation, T signifies the total number of steps in the devised plan, $\Delta(\cdot)$ refers to the probability simplex function, and $p \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}^T)$ is a action sequence with length of T .




Figure 2: Overview of the CoPiC framework. CoPiC consists of two modules: an LLM planner that generates multiple planning programs to produce candidate plans and a domain-adaptive critic that selects the plan with the highest long-term reward. CoPiC alternates between the Planning Phase (“1. Programs Generation via LLMs” and “2. Critic Scoring”) for generating and evaluating plans and the Learning Phase (“3. Programs Evolution with History Summarization” and “4. Critic Fine-Tuning via RL”) for refining programs and improving the critic, progressively enhancing adaptability and performance.

3.2 CoPiC

Previous mainstream paradigms (illustrated on the left side of Figure 1) address the aforementioned problem by enabling LLMs to generate, iteratively refine, and correct plans based on immediate environmental feedback. However, these approaches often incur substantial querying costs and limit the agent’s ability to produce high-quality plans. In contrast, **CoPiC** employs efficient, low-cost planning programs generated by LLMs, coupled with a domain-adaptive critic, to produce and refine plans. This approach not only reduces querying costs but also improves the overall quality of the plans. Specifically, CoPiC initializes a set of planning programs $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^n$ utilizing LLMs. Each program ρ_i is tasked with outputting a plan p_i based on I and o :

$$\{\rho_i(p_i|I, o) : \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A}^T)\}_{i=1}^n \quad (2)$$

This results in a set of candidate plans $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^n$. To select the most domain-adaptive and holistic plan p from these candidates, CoPiC introduces a domain-adaptive critic module:

$$C_\theta(p|o, I, \{p_i\}_{i=1}^n) \quad (3)$$

where θ denotes the parameters of the critic module. Consequently, the combination of the set of planning programs and the critic module forms our agent:

$$\pi_\theta(p|I, o) = C_\theta(p|o, I, \{\rho_i(p_i|I, o)\}_{i=1}^n) \quad (4)$$

By integrating the efficiency of planning programs with the effectiveness of the domain-adaptive critic, CoPiC significantly reduces LLMs querying costs while enhancing planning quality.

4 Method

As shown in Figure 2, CoPiC comprises two modules: an **LLMs Planner** that generates multiple planning programs to produce candidate plans and a **Domain-Adaptive Critic** that evaluates and selects the plan with the highest long-term reward from candidates. CoPiC alternates between **Planning Phase** and **Learning Phase**.

During the Planning Phase, the LLMs planner generates planning programs that iteratively interact with environment, dynamically adjusting and producing candidate plans at each step. The domain-adaptive critic then evaluates the candidates within the current context and selects the plan most

aligned with long-term rewards. During the Learning Phase, execution results are used to refine the planning programs and fine-tune the critic within a reinforcement learning framework, enhancing domain adaptability. These two phases alternate to progressively optimize both planning programs and the critic. Detailed descriptions of these two phases are provided in the following subsections.

4.1 Planning Phase

4.1.1 Programs Generation via LLMs

Programs generation via LLMs produces planning programs to generate and refine plans, thereby reducing the LLMs query costs typically incurred when directly generating and refining step-by-step plans. It is composed of two stages: planning programs generation and plans generation.

Planning Programs Generation. This stage begins by generating planning program $\rho(p|I, o)$ using “Init Prompt” to instruct the LLMs, as shown in “1. Planner Generation via LLMs” section of Figure 2. The general structure of the prompt used for ALFWorld is presented in this figure, which includes the Python definition of ALFWorld, a successful example of a different task type, and the task description that needs to be completed. However, a single planning program’s limited sampling capability on plans may struggle with complex tasks. To address this, we generate n ($n > 1$) planning programs $\{\rho_i(p_i|I, o)\}_{i=1}^n$ for ensuring diverse plans. Detailed prompts for all environments can be found in Appendix B.

Plans Generation. Subsequently, each policy $\rho_i(p_i|I, o)$ takes the task instruction I and the current observation o of the environment to generate a plan p_i , forming a set of candidate plans $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

4.1.2 Critic Scoring

The Critic module then evaluates $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and selects the most adaptive and long-term rewarding plan p for execution in the environment. The implementation of the Critic C_θ is inspired by TWOSOME[31]. As illustrated in the “2. Critic Scoring” section of Figure 2, Critic C_θ is initialized from a tiny language model. Its scoring consists of three stages: calculation of plans’ probability, plan text length regularization and normalization scoring of plan.

Calculation of Plans’ Probability. The critic begins by taking the “Critic Prompt” as input, which includes the text description of the current observation, candidate plans, and a prompt instructing the critic to evaluate these plans. We denote the critic prompt as d_{cp} and the text description of each plan from the planner as d_{p_i} , $i = 1, \dots, n$. The plan description d_{p_i} for plan p_i can be represented as a sequence of tokens:

$$d_{p_i} = \{w_i^1, w_i^2, \dots, w_i^{N_i}\}, i = 1, \dots, n \quad (5)$$

where N_i denotes the total number of tokens in d_{p_i} .

Subsequently, C_θ calculates the probability for the description of each plan in the context of the critic prompt, based on the probability of the corresponding tokens in that description:

$$\text{prob}(d_{p_i}|d_{cp}) = \prod_{k=1}^{N_i} \text{prob}(w_i^k|d_{cp}, w_i^1, \dots, w_i^{k-1}) \quad (6)$$

$$i = 1, \dots, n$$

Plan Text Length Regularization. Due to the property of probability multiplication in language models, longer plans with more text inherently have lower likelihoods. Therefore, we apply the following regularization to eliminate the influence of plan text length:

$$\text{logit}(d_{p_i}|d_{cp}) = \frac{\log(\text{prob}(d_{p_i}|d_{cp}))}{W_i}, i = 1, \dots, n \quad (7)$$

Here W_i denotes the number of words in p_i . Based on the results from TWOSOME, we chose the number of words W_i over the number of tokens N_i for regularization.

Normalization Scoring of Plan. For language models, the sum of likelihoods for different sets of candidate plans is inconsistent; hence, C_θ scores plan p_i by normalizing the logit of its description

using a softmax function:

$$\text{score}(p_i) = \frac{\exp(\text{logit}(d_{p_i}|d_{cp}))}{\sum_{j=1}^n \exp(\text{logit}(d_{p_j}|d_{cp}))} \quad (8)$$

Therefore, the score of each plan corresponds to the probability of its description. We then select the plan p by sampling according to these probabilities:

$$p = C_\theta(I, o, \{p_i\}_{i=1}^n) \sim \{(p_i, \text{score}(p_i))\}_{i=1}^n \quad (9)$$

After executing p , the environment transitions to a new observation o' and provides a reward r , forming a transition (I, o, p, r, o') that is stored in a buffer, which is then used in the Learning phase.

4.2 Learning Phase

4.2.1 Programs Evolution with History Summarization

The Programs Evolution with History Summarization iteratively improves the set of planning programs $\{\rho_i(p_i|I, o)\}_{i=1}^n$ by incorporating interaction history through in-context learning, as shown in the “3. Programs Evolution with History Summarization” section on the left side of Figure 2. It consists of history summarization and planning programs refinement.

History Summarization. After engaging with the environment across N episodes, the interaction history of the last M episodes (where $M \leq N$) is summarized in the following format: $\{(\text{trajectory}_i, \text{signal}_i)\}_{i=N-M+1}^N$. Here, $\text{trajectory}_i = (o_i^0, p_i^0, o_i^1, p_i^1, \dots)$ represents the record of interactions, and $\text{signal}_i \in \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$ indicates whether the task was completed in the i th episode.

Planning Programs Refinement. The successful examples, current planning programs, and history summarization are then integrated into a “Feedback Prompt”, which enables the LLMs to evolve and generate an improved set of planning programs. The LLMs is tasked with analyzing failed trajectories in comparison to successful ones (e.g., attempting to open a container without approaching it first). This comparative analysis reveals weaknesses in the planning programs, enabling targeted debugging. By implementing this approach, the LLMs can progressively refine the set of planning programs.

4.2.2 Critic Fine-Tuning via RL

Critic fine-tuning via reinforcement learning (RL) enhances domain experience utilization and ensures that the critic selects plans optimized for long-term rewards. To achieve this, CoPiC employs a parameter-efficient LoRA training architecture within the Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) framework [24] to fine-tune the Critic module.

LoRA. This process incorporates Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [13] parameters and Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) layers to the final transformer block of the Critic’s tiny language model. These components function as the actor and critic in the PPO setup, respectively.

Fine-Tuning using PPO. Transitions from the replay buffer are used to fine-tune the Critic according to the PPO objective. During fine-tuning, only the LoRA parameters and added MLP layers are updated, while the parameters of the language model itself remain frozen. The planning and learning phases is detailed in Algorithm 1.

5 Results

We conducted extensive experiments across three environments: ALFWorld [26], NetHack [18], and StarCraft II Unit Building. The results highlight that CoPiC: **1**) reduces querying costs while improving success rate (Sec 5.2), **2**) exhibits superior data efficiency (Sec 5.3), and **3**) supports open-source LLMs (Sec 5.4.1), underscores the significance of programs evolution (Sec 5.4.2) and the critic module (Sec 5.4.3).

5.1 Experiment Setup

Environments 1) **ALFWorld:** A widely used benchmark in planning researches (e.g., [25, 30, 17, 22]), comprising six complex household task types. 2) **NetHack:** A roguelike game renowned for

| Method | Pick | | Examine | | Clean | | Heat | | Cool | | Pick Two | |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| | SR \uparrow | Cost \downarrow |
| CoPiC (Ours) | 100.00 | 0.05M | 100.00 | 0.04M | 100.00 | 0.33M | 100.00 | 0.26M | 100.00 | 0.28M | 94.12 | 0.06M |
| AdaPlanner | 100.00 | 0.63M | 22.22 | 1.95M | 93.55 | 0.89M | 73.91 | 0.74M | 90.48 | 1.57M | 88.24 | 1.58M |
| Reflexion | 66.66 | 2.09M | 61.11 | 1.51M | 70.97 | 2.54M | 78.26 | 1.88M | 76.19 | 1.46M | 82.35 | 1.65M |
| Prospector | 70.92 | 1.74M | 65.00 | 1.18M | 75.48 | 2.15M | 83.26 | 1.48M | 81.05 | 1.18M | 71.94 | 1.30M |
| REPL-plan | 82.5 | 0.66M | 83.11 | 0.41M | 89.61 | 0.75M | 91.30 | 0.61M | 88.76 | 0.47M | 100.00 | 0.43M |
| GPT-3.5 | 0.00 | 0.56M | 16.70 | 0.41M | 0.00 | 0.73M | 0.00 | 0.54M | 4.76 | 0.47M | 0.00 | 0.40M |
| Cot-Zero-Shot | 4.17 | 0.72M | 5.56 | 0.55M | 0.00 | 0.96M | 0.00 | 0.71M | 0.00 | 0.65M | 0.00 | 0.52M |
| Cot-Few-Shot | 16.67 | 0.92M | 11.11 | 0.68M | 6.45 | 1.24M | 17.39 | 0.85M | 14.28 | 0.78M | 11.76 | 0.65M |
| BUTLER | 50.00 | - | 39.00 | - | 74.00 | - | 83.00 | - | 91.00 | - | 65.00 | - |

Table 1: Comparison of CoPiC and baselines in ALFWorld. M represents millions.

its intricate mechanics, with representative tasks (Drink Water, Open Box/Chest, and Upgrade Exp Level to 3) designed to test agent’s planning abilities. 3) **StarCraft II Unit Building**: A challenging resource management problem studied in prior work [8, 32, 10, 35], consisting of tasks with varying complexity: Easy (SCV and BattleCruiser), Medium (SCV, Thor, Banshee, and Raven), and Hard (SCV, SiegeTank, Medivac, VikingFighter, and Ghost). For a detailed introduction to the environment, including task specifics and reward function design, please refer to Appendix C. Note that the reward function design is straightforward and does not incorporate any expert knowledge.

Baselines We selected baselines: (1) Immediate feedback-based LLM planning methods, including vanilla LLM planning (GPT-3.5 / GPT-4o), CoT-Zero-Shot, CoT-Few-Shot [38], **Reflexion** [25], **AdaPlanner** [30], **Prospector** [17], and **REPL-plan** [22]; See Sec 2 for difference of CoPiC with these baselines. (2) Non-LLM training-based methods: BUTLER [26].

Metric We evaluated CoPiC against the baselines in two aspects: (1) **Planning Quality**–Success Rate (SR \uparrow) and **Step** \downarrow . SR is the percentage of tasks successfully completed during testing (higher is better). Step is the number of environment interaction steps needed to complete tasks during testing (lower is better). Since both SR and Step reflect planning quality, we place the results related to Step in Appendix E.3. (2) **Planning Efficiency**–Token Cost (Cost \downarrow). The total token costs of language model queries required to complete tasks, reflecting method efficiency and cost (lower is better).

Note: For CoPiC, the Cost includes the token costs of both LLMs and Critic’s tiny language model.

Setting 1) The number of planning programs is set to $n = 3$ in CoPiC. 2) We use Tinyllama [41] as the Critic’s language model for its lightweight nature and impressive performance. 3) For CoPiC and the baselines, GPT-3.5 serves as the base LLMs for ALFWorld and StarCraft II Unit Building tasks. Given the complexity of NetHack [16], GPT-4o is used as the base LLMs for this environment. Additional details on the experimental settings can be found in Appendix D.

5.2 CoPiC: 20.29% Higher SR, 79.39% Lower Cost

| Method | Nethack | | | | | | StarCraft II Unit Building | |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| | Drink Water | | Open Box/Chest | | Upgrade Exp Level to 3 | | Hard | |
| | SR \uparrow | Cost \downarrow | SR \uparrow | Cost \downarrow | SR \uparrow | Cost \downarrow | SR \uparrow | Cost \downarrow |
| CoPiC (Ours) | 70.00 | 0.53M | 65.00 | 0.42M | 78.67 | 0.15M | 100.00 | 0.06M |
| AdaPlanner | 60.00 | 0.64M | 52.67 | 1.21M | 67.67 | 1.25M | 71.00 | 0.36M |
| Reflexion | 58.67 | 1.07M | 50.00 | 1.91M | 69.67 | 2.12M | 24.00 | 0.78M |
| Prospector | 55.33 | 1.01M | 48.00 | 1.78M | 65.00 | 1.98M | 68.00 | 0.68M |
| REPL-Plan | 54.00 | 0.74M | 46.00 | 1.20M | 63.00 | 1.11M | 58.00 | 0.39M |
| GPT-4o | 33.33 | 1.17M | 10.00 | 1.08M | 0.00 | 1.82M | 0.00 | 0.6M |
| Cot-Zero-Shot | 56.67 | 1.24M | 20.00 | 1.11M | 3.33 | 1.68M | 0.00 | 0.63M |
| Cot-Few-Shot | 33.33 | 1.38M | 16.67 | 1.52M | 10.00 | 2.47M | 17.00 | 0.69M |

Table 2: Comparison of CoPiC and baselines in Nethack and StarCraft II Unit Building.

As shown in Table 1 and Table 2, CoPiC outperforms the advanced baselines (Reflexion, AdaPlanner, Prospector and REPL-Plan) across three environments. **On average, CoPiC achieves a 20.29% increase in success rate (SR \uparrow), and a 79.39% reduction in token costs (Cost \downarrow).**




Figure 3: A comparison of SR varying with trials for CoPiC, AdaPlanner and Reflexion on ALFWorld. The ‘Trials’ label on the x-axis is proportional to (∞) the total number of interactions across all tasks, with a higher number of trials indicating more data.

| Open-Source LLMs | Method | SR | Cost |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| DeepSeek-Coder | CoPiC (ours) | 100.00 | 0.82M |
| | Adaplanner | 79.78 | 7.14M |
| | Reflexion | 81.00 | 5.29M |
| DeepSeek-V3 | CoPiC (ours) | 100.00 | 0.89M |
| | Adaplanner | 76.81 | 7.87M |
| | Reflexion | 83.00 | 7.94M |
| Qwen2.5-Coder-14B-Instruct | CoPiC (ours) | 99.76 | 0.80M |
| | Adaplanner | 64.29 | 1.82M |
| Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct | Reflexion | OOM | OOM |

Table 3: Average performance comparison using diverse open-source LLMs on ALFWorld. ‘OOM’ indicates out-of-memory error.

In ALFWorld, CoPiC achieved an **20.40% improvement in SR**, and an **83.76% reduction in Cost**. And compared with AdaPlanner, which depends on task-specific prompts, CoPiC leverages a domain-adaptive critic to holistically refine programs, eliminating the need for such customization.

For NetHack, CoPiC achieved an **13.72% improvement in SR**, and a **70.96% reduction in Cost**. For challenging tasks like ‘Upgrade Exp Level to 3,’ CoPiC reduced LLMs queries by 96.11% while improving SR by 10%, thanks to its ability to prioritize long-term rewarding strategies over short-term gains. For example, it identified preserving a pet’s life as a better long-term strategy for defeating monsters, highlighting its domain adaptability.

In StarCraft II Unit Building, CoPiC demonstrated substantial improvements on Hard tasks, with a **44.75% increase in SR**, and an **87.86% reduction in Cost**. Results for Easy and Medium tasks further support its superior performance (see Appendix E).

In summary, CoPiC consistently outperforms all baselines across key metrics in diverse environments, demonstrating its ability to generate long-term rewarding plans while maintaining high efficiency. Unlike baselines like Reflexion, AdaPlanner and REPL-Plan, which rely on test-set learning, **CoPiC, trained solely on training tasks, generalizes effectively to unseen test tasks without incurring additional LLMs querying costs or requiring critic fine-tuning**. This unique zero-shot adaptation capability is enabled by its integration of planning programs and a domain-adaptive critic. Additionally, examples of evolved planning programs can be found in Appendix F and G.

5.3 CoPiC Requires Less Environmental Data

Figure 3 presents the average learning curves of CoPiC, AdaPlanner, and Reflexion on ALFWorld. CoPiC demonstrates higher asymptotic performance while requiring less environmental data. These results indicate that, compared to the immediate feedback mechanisms used in AdaPlanner and Reflexion, **CoPiC is more efficient and domain-adaptive, enabling the selection of plans with long-term rewards and ultimately delivering superior performance**.

5.4 Ablation

We conducted ablation studies to demonstrate that: **1)** CoPiC also supports open-source LLMs. **2)** The Programs Evolution module refines planning programs iteratively, enhancing overall performance. **3)** The Critic Scoring selects high-quality plans, thereby improving performance. Additional ablation studies on the impact of the number of planning programs are provided in Appendix E.4.

5.4.1 CoPiC Supports Open-Source LLMs

CoPiC supports both closed-source LLMs (e.g., GPT series) and open-source LLMs for generating and refining planning programs. We evaluated CoPiC, AdaPlanner, and Reflexion on the ALFWorld benchmark using open-source LLMs like DeepSeek [21, 11] and Qwen2.5-14B [39, 15]. To ensure

fairness, Qwen2.5-Coder-14B-Instruct was used for CoPiC and AdaPlanner, as both employ code-based methods, while Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct was applied to Reflexion, which follows a chat-style paradigm. As shown in Table 3, **CoPiC outperformed AdaPlanner by 26.29% in success rate while reducing cost with 85.09%**. Reflexion struggled with Qwen2.5-14B due to limited context handling, resulting in invalid responses, chat history accumulation, and eventual out-of-memory (OOM) errors. These results demonstrate CoPiC’s superior compatibility and efficiency.

5.4.2 Programs Evolution Refines Planning

To evaluate the impact of programs evolution, we conducted an experiment where CoPiC’s learned critic was frozen, existing planning programs were discarded, and the LLMs was tasked with generating and refining new planning programs using the frozen critic. The evolution curves are shown in Figure 4(a). As illustrated, **the average success rate (red curve) across three tasks (Clean, Heat, Cool) in ALFWorld improved from 75.60% (initial) to 91.44% (2nd iteration) and reached 100.00% (4th iteration)**. These results underscore the pivotal role of programs evolution in refining planning programs and achieving high performance. Besides, a case of program evolution was provided in Appendix G.

5.4.3 Critic Scoring Enhances Plan Quality




Figure 4: (a) Ablation on Programs Evolution: Evolution curves of program refinement for three ALFWorld tasks—Clean, Heat, and Cool—along with their average performance. (b) Ablation on Critic: Performance comparison of CoPiC with (w/) and without (w/o) the Critic module in the ALFWorld environment.

We implemented a variant of CoPiC without the critic, employing a strategy that randomly selects plans from the candidate plans generated by the planning programs. As shown in Figure 4(b), under the same cost (i.e., an equal number of interaction trials), **the success rate with a critic is consistently 20% to 60% higher than without a critic across two tasks (Heat and Cool) on average**. This demonstrates that the critic not only reduces LLMs querying costs but also enables the selection of higher-quality plans. In summary, these findings highlight the essential role of the critic in empowering the LLMs to generate high-performance planning programs.

6 Conclusion and Discussion

In this paper, we propose **Code Driven Planning with Domain-Adaptive Critic (CoPiC)**, a novel planning framework that utilizes LLMs for complex tasks. CoPiC uses LLMs to generate multiple planning programs to iteratively refine plans, reducing the high query costs associated with step-by-step static plan refinement. And a domain-adaptive critic is adopted to evaluate these plans, selecting those best aligned with long-term rewards, further bridging the gap between LLMs’ generality and environment-specific needs. We assess CoPiC across three challenging environments: ALFWorld, Nethack, and StarCraft II Unit Building. Our results show that CoPiC outperforms advanced baselines – Reflexion, AdaPlanner, Prospector and REPL-Plan – at a significantly reduced cost. Looking ahead,

we are committed to expanding CoPiC’s application to more complex tasks, including full games of StarCraft II and Civilization, as well as more intricate real-world scenarios.

Limitations To facilitate the evolution of planning programs and the training of the critic, CoPiC requires LLMs to generate an initial planning program that can interact with the environment and acquire experience, even if it is not optimal. Consequently, the used LLMs must possess adequate code generation capabilities.

References

- [1] Constructions Aeronautiques, Adele Howe, Craig Knoblock, ISI Drew McDermott, Ashwin Ram, Manuela Veloso, Daniel Weld, David Wilkins Sri, Anthony Barrett, Dave Christianson, et al. Pddl the planning domain definition language. *Technical Report, Tech. Rep.*, 1998.
- [2] Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Sandipan Kundu, Amanda Askell, Jackson Kernion, Andy Jones, Anna Chen, Anna Goldie, Azalia Mirhoseini, Cameron McKinnon, et al. Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*, 2022.
- [3] Anthony Brohan, Yevgen Chebotar, Chelsea Finn, Karol Hausman, Alexander Herzog, Daniel Ho, Julian Ibarz, Alex Irpan, Eric Jang, Ryan Julian, et al. Do as i can, not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances. In *Conference on robot learning*, pages 287–318. PMLR, 2023.
- [4] Bei Chen, Fengji Zhang, Anh Nguyen, Daoguang Zan, Zeqi Lin, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. Codet: Code generation with generated tests. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.10397*, 2022.
- [5] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- [6] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde De Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- [7] Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Teaching large language models to self-debug. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05128*, 2023.
- [8] David Churchill and Michael Buro. Build order optimization in starcraft. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment*, volume 7, pages 14–19, 2011.
- [9] Gautier Dagan, Frank Keller, and Alex Lascarides. Dynamic planning with a llm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06391*, 2023.
- [10] Islam Elnabarawy, Kristijana Arroyo, and Donald C Wunsch II. Starcraft ii build order optimization using deep reinforcement learning and monte-carlo tree search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10525*, 2020.
- [11] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Yu Wu, YK Li, et al. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming—the rise of code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196*, 2024.
- [12] Rishi Hazra, Pedro Zuidberg Dos Martires, and Luc De Raedt. Saycanpay: Heuristic planning with large language models using learnable domain knowledge. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 20123–20133, 2024.
- [13] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [14] Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Ted Xiao, Harris Chan, Jacky Liang, Pete Florence, Andy Zeng, Jonathan Tompson, Igor Mordatch, Yevgen Chebotar, et al. Inner monologue: Embodied reasoning through planning with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05608*, 2022.

- [15] Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiayi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, Keming Lu, et al. Qwen2. 5-coder technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12186*, 2024.
- [16] Dominik Jeurissen, Diego Perez-Liebana, Jeremy Gow, Duygu Cakmak, and James Kwan. Playing nethack with llms: Potential & limitations as zero-shot agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.00690*, 2024.
- [17] Byoungjip Kim, Youngsoo Jang, Lajanugen Logeswaran, Geon-Hyeong Kim, Yu Jin Kim, Honglak Lee, and Moontae Lee. Prospector: Improving llm agents with self-asking and trajectory ranking. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 14958–14976, 2024.
- [18] Heinrich Küttler, Nantas Nardelli, Alexander Miller, Roberta Raileanu, Marco Selvatici, Edward Grefenstette, and Tim Rocktäschel. The nethack learning environment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:7671–7684, 2020.
- [19] Hung Le, Yue Wang, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Chu Hong Hoi. Coderl: Mastering code generation through pretrained models and deep reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:21314–21328, 2022.
- [20] Jacky Liang, Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Peng Xu, Karol Hausman, Brian Ichter, Pete Florence, and Andy Zeng. Code as policies: Language model programs for embodied control. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 9493–9500. IEEE, 2023.
- [21] Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, et al. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*, 2024.
- [22] Anthony Z Liu, Xinhe Wang, Jacob Sansom, Yao Fu, Jongwook Choi, Sungryull Sohn, Jaekyeom Kim, and Honglak Lee. Interactive and expressive code-augmented planning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.13826*, 2024.
- [23] Shaohui Peng, Xingui Hu, Qi Yi, Rui Zhang, Jiaming Guo, Di Huang, Zikang Tian, Rui Chen, Zidong Du, Qi Guo, Yunji Chen, and Ling Li. Self-driven grounding: Large language model agents with automatical language-aligned skill learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2309.01352, 2023.
- [24] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [25] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [26] Mohit Shridhar, Xingdi Yuan, Marc-Alexandre Côté, Yonatan Bisk, Adam Trischler, and Matthew Hausknecht. AlfworlD: Aligning text and embodied environments for interactive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03768*, 2020.
- [27] Tom Silver, Soham Dan, Kavitha Srinivas, Joshua B Tenenbaum, Leslie Kaelbling, and Michael Katz. Generalized planning in pddl domains with pretrained large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 20256–20264, 2024.
- [28] Tom Silver, Varun Hariprasad, Reece S Shuttleworth, Nishanth Kumar, Tomás Lozano-Pérez, and Leslie Pack Kaelbling. Pddl planning with pretrained large language models. In *NeurIPS 2022 foundation models for decision making workshop*, 2022.
- [29] Ishika Singh, Valts Blukis, Arsalan Mousavian, Ankit Goyal, Danfei Xu, Jonathan Tremblay, Dieter Fox, Jesse Thomason, and Animesh Garg. Progprompt: Generating situated robot task plans using large language models. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 11523–11530. IEEE, 2023.

- [30] Haotian Sun, Yuchen Zhuang, Ling kai Kong, Bo Dai, and Chao Zhang. Adaplaner: Adaptive planning from feedback with language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [31] Weihao Tan, Wentao Zhang, Shanqi Liu, Longtao Zheng, Xinrun Wang, and Bo An. True knowledge comes from practice: Aligning llms with embodied environments via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14151*, 2024.
- [32] Zhentao Tang, Dongbin Zhao, Yuanheng Zhu, and Ping Guo. Reinforcement learning for build-order production in starcraft ii. In *2018 Eighth International Conference on Information Science and Technology (ICIST)*, pages 153–158. IEEE, 2018.
- [33] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [34] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [35] Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Junyoung Chung, Michael Mathieu, Max Jaderberg, Wojciech M Czarnecki, Andrew Dudzik, Aja Huang, Petko Georgiev, Richard Powell, et al. Alphastar: Mastering the real-time strategy game starcraft ii. *DeepMind blog*, 2:20, 2019.
- [36] Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi (Jim) Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2024, 2023.
- [37] Zihao Wang, Shaofei Cai, Guanzhou Chen, Anji Liu, Xiaojian Ma, and Yitao Liang. Describe, explain, plan and select: Interactive planning with large language models enables open-world multi-task agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01560*, 2023.
- [38] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [39] an Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, et al. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671*, 2024.
- [40] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629*, 2022.
- [41] Peiyuan Zhang, Guangtao Zeng, Tianduo Wang, and Wei Lu. Tinyllama: An open-source small language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02385*, 2024.

A Broader Impacts

In this work, We proposed CoPiC and validated it in three environments: ALFWorld, NetHack, and StarCraft II Unit Building. These environments are all virtual worlds. Therefore, CoPiC will not positively or negatively impact the real world.

B Prompt Details

In this section, we detail the prompts of CoPiC used in ALFWorld, Nethack, and StarCraft II Unit Building.

B.1 Prompts in ALFWorld

B.1.1 Initialization-ALFWorld

```
# You are a household agent. Here is some Python code defining a household environment:

# Entity class an object/receptacle in the environment, including its properties
class Entity:
    def __init__(self, **kwargs):
        self.name = None
        self.loc = None # location
        self.in_on = None # the receptacle that the object is in/on
        self.ishot, self.iscool, self.isclean = None, None, None
        self.isopen, self.ison, self.istoggled = None, None, None
        self.pickupable, self.openable, self.toggleable = None, None, None
        self.heatable, self.coolable, self.cleanable = None, None, None
        self.isobject, self.isreceptacle, self.isreceptacleobject = None, None, None
        self.type = None
        self.checked = None
        for key, value in kwargs.items():
            setattr(self, key, value)

        assert self.name is not None
        assert self.type is not None

# Entitys class stores all the entities in the environment
class Entitys:
    # return the entity with the given name, where the format of the given name is similar to "apple 22".
    def __getitem__(self, entity_name):
        ...

# Agent class represents the state of the agent, including its location,
# what it's holding, entities it has seen, as well as the actions it can take.
class Agent:
    def __init__(self, ...):
        self.holding = None
        self.location = None
        self.seen_entitys = Entitys()

    # Here are some assistant methods the agent can using:

    # return the receptacletypes that can contain the objecttype
    def find_canbe_contained(self, objecttype: str):
        ...

    # return an object(Entity) with the given objecttype
    def find_object(self, objecttype: str):
        ...

    # return a list of object(Entity) with the given objecttype
    def find_objects(self, objecttype: str):
        ...

    # return a receptacle(Entity) with the given receptacletype
    def find_receptacle(self, receptacletype: str):
        ...

    # return a list of receptacle(Entity) with the given receptacletype
    def find_receptacles(self, receptacletype: str):
        ...

    # name2type transforms a name to a type, like 'apple', 'apple 22' or 'appletype ' -> 'appletype '
    def name2type(self, name: str):
        ...

    # Here are the admissible actions the agent can take:
```

```

# Explore the environment and observe the entities in it.
def explore(self):
    ...

# Go to a receptacle
# For example: goto('countertop 1').
# Only goto(receptacle.name) and goto(object.in_on) is allowed. goto(entity.loc) is prohibited.
def goto(self, receptacle):
    ...

# Take an object from a receptacle if the agent is not holding anything.
# For example: take('soapbar 1', 'towelholder 1')
def take(self, object, receptacle):
    ...

# Put an object in or on a receptacle if the agent is holding it.
# For example: put('soapbar 1', 'cabinet 1')
def put(self, object, receptacle):
    ...

# Open a receptacle and observe its contents.
# For example: open_receptacle('cabinet 1')
def open_receptacle(self, receptacle):
    ...

# Close an opened receptacle.
# For example: close_receptacle('cabinet 1')
def close_receptacle(self, receptacle):
    ...

# Clean an object with sinkbasin.
# For example: clean('soapbar 1', 'sinkbasin 1')
def clean(self, object, receptacle):
    ...

# Heat an object with a receptacle.
# For example: heat('tomato 1', 'microwave 1')
def heat(self, object, receptacle):
    ...

# Cool an object with a receptacle.
# For example: cool('pan 2', 'fridge 1')
def cool(self, object, receptacle):
    ...

# Turn on an object.
# For example: turn_on('desk lamp 1')
def turn_on(self, object):
    ...

# Method need to be completed for the task: <task>
<task_method>:
    ...
# Now complete the `<task_method>` to solve the task by composing the agent's methods to interact with
↪ the environment.

# Here is an successful example of a solution to the task:

<example>

# Here is the actual task.
# <task>, that is, <task_method_desc>
# Referring to the successful example and its code, you should complete your solution function below:
<task_method>:
# Note: Do not directly call the `<example_method_name>` in the example. You should use its code as a
↪ reference.

```

B.1.2 Evolution-ALFWorld

```

<Init_prompt>

# Here is an example of a solution to the task:

<example>

# Here is the actual task.
# <task>, that is, <task_method_desc>

You have generated code of <task_method> to solve the task as follows:
<python_program_0>

```

```

<python_program_1>

<python_program_2>

However, you executed the <task_method> function and get an interaction history as follows:
<interaction_history>

Let's think step by step. Referring to the successful case and the interaction history, you should
↪ generate superior solution function.

<task_method>:
# Note: Do not directly call the `<example_method_name>` in the example. You should use its code as a
↪ reference.

```

B.2 Prompts in Nethack

B.2.1 Initialization-Nethack

You are an agent who plays the rogue-like game NetHack 3.6.6 using a `Python` program. Here is a template for the `Python` program that interacts with NetHack, and you need to fill in the ↪ template at the placeholders (i.e., `init`, `update_init` and `core_function`) to accomplish a ↪ certain task in Nethack.

```

Here is the template:
```python
from netplay.core.skill_repository import SkillRepository
from netplay.nethack_agent.agent import NetHackAgent
from netplay.nethack_agent.skill_selection import *
from netplay.copic_agent.data import object_names, weapon_names, armor_names, \
 ring_names, amulet_names, tool_names, container_names, weptool_names, food_names, \
 potion_names, scroll_names, spell_names, wand_names, coin_names, gem_names, \
 rock_names, misc_names, questitem_names, object_can_pickup_names

class NethackTemplate(SimpleSkillSelector):

 def init(self, agent, dict_obs: dict):
 """
 placeholder: Add variables for this specific skill selector...
 """

 def update_init(self, agent, dict_obs: dict) -> dict:
 """
 placeholder: Update variables for this specific skill selector...
 """

 def core_function(self, agent, dict_obs: dict) -> SkillSelection:
 """
 placeholder: Fill in your core function here, using to interact with NetHack.
 """

...

```

Here is an example of `init`, `update\_init` and `core\_function` for accomplishing the task 'Find an ↪ item'.

```

```python

def init(self, agent, dict_obs: dict):
    # variables for this specific skill selector...
    self.stairs_up = {depth: set() for depth in range(1, 101)}
    self.stairs_down = {depth: set() for depth in range(1, 101)}

def update_init(self, agent, dict_obs: dict) -> dict:
    depth = dict_obs["Stats"]["depth"]
    for room in [dict_obs.get("Rooms", {"current_room": {"content_description": []}})["current_room"] +
↪ \
        dict_obs.get("Rooms", {"other_rooms": []})["other_rooms"]:

        for item in room["content_description"]:
            if item["item_name"] == "stairs up":
                self.stairs_up[depth].add((item["x"], item["y"]))
            elif item["item_name"] == "stairs down":
                self.stairs_down[depth].add((item["x"], item["y"]))

def core_function(self, agent, dict_obs: dict, item_name: str) -> SkillSelection:
    """
    Functionality of this function: Find the specified item.
    """
    find_item_flag = False

```

```

thoughts_obs_prefix = f"I'm gonna find an item named {item_name}."

if item_name not in object_names:
    # first judge if the item is an object
    observations = thoughts_obs_prefix + f", but {item_name} is not a valid item name."
    reasoning = f"{item_name} is not a valid item name, so I should finish the task."
    speak = f"{item_name} is not a valid item name, so I should finish the task."
    skill = {
        "name": "finish_task",
    }
else:
    for room in [dict_obs.get("Rooms", {"current_room": {"content_description":
↳ []})["current_room"]] + dict_obs.get("Rooms", {"other_rooms": []})["other_rooms"]:
        for item in room["content_description"]:
            if item["item_name"] == item_name:
                find_item_flag = True
                x, y = item["x"], item["y"]
                distance = item["distance"]
                observations = thoughts_obs_prefix + f", here is a {item_name} at ({x}, {y})
↳ {distance} steps."
                if distance is not None and distance <= 1:
                    reasoning = f"The distance <= 1, so I found the {item_name}"
                    speak = f"I found the {item_name}, so the find_item task is accomplished"
                    skill = {
                        "name": "finish_task",
                    }
                else:
                    if agent.get_path_to(item["x"], item["y"]):
                        reasoning = f"The distance is {distance} (> 1 or == null), so I need to try
↳ to move to the {item_name}"
                        speak = f"I need to move to the {item_name}"
                        skill = {
                            "name": "move_to",
                            "x": x,
                            "y": y
                        }
                    else:
                        reasoning = f"The distance is {distance} (> 1 or == null), but I can't find a
↳ path to the {item_name}"
                        speak = f"I can't find a path to the {item_name}, so I need to explore the
↳ level to find a path"
                        skill = {
                            "name": "explore_level",
                        }
                break

            if not find_item_flag:
                observations = thoughts_obs_prefix + f", but I can't find the {item_name} in my view."
                reasoning = f"I can't find the {item_name} in my view, so I need to further explore the
↳ level."
                speak = f"I can't find the {item_name}, so I need to further explore the level."
                skill = {
                    "name": "explore_level",
                }

    json_dict = {
        "thoughts": {
            "observations": observations,
            "reasoning": reasoning,
            "speak": speak
        },
        "skill": skill
    }

    return json_dict
...

```

The `dict_obs` used in the functions of this Python class is a dict. A specific example is as follows:

```

```json
{
 "Agent Information": {
 "x": 57,
 "y": 15,
 "game_message": "Hello Agent, welcome to NetHack! You are a neutral male gnomish Ranger.",
 "avoid_monster_flag": false,
 "pray_message": null
 },
 "Rooms": {
 "current_room": {
 "room_id": 0,
 "room_type": "room",
 "content_description": [
 {

```

```

 "item_name": "horizontal closed door",
 "x": 59,
 "y": 14,
 "distance": 2
 }
]
},
"other_rooms": [
 {
 "room_id": 1,
 "room_type": "room",
 "distance": 8,
 "content_description": [
 {
 "item_name": "horizontal closed door",
 "x": 69,
 "y": 24,
 "distance": 12
 }
]
 },
 {
 "room_id": 2,
 "room_type": "room",
 "distance": 16,
 "content_description": [
 {
 "item_name": "horizontal closed door",
 "x": 79,
 "y": 34,
 "distance": 22
 }
]
 }
]
},
"Close Monsters": [
 {
 "item_name": "goblin",
 "x": 60,
 "y": 15,
 "distance": 3,
 "direction": "east"
 },
 {
 "item_name": "tame little dog",
 "x": 58,
 "y": 16,
 "distance": 1,
 "direction": "south-east"
 }
],
"Distant Monsters": [],
"Exploration Status": [
 {
 "room_id": 0,
 "room_type": "room",
 "can_be_further_explored": true,
 "blocking_glyphs": [
 {
 "x": 59,
 "y": 14,
 "blocking_glyph": "vertical closed door"
 }
]
 }
]
},
"Inventory": {
 "a": {
 "item_name": "dagger",
 "count": 1,
 "status": "",
 "modifier": "+1",
 "uses": "",
 "info": "weapon in hand",
 "shop_status": "",
 "shop_price": ""
 },
 "b": {
 "item_name": "crossbow",
 "count": 1,
 "status": "",
 "modifier": "+1",

```

```

 "uses": "",
 "info": "alternate weapon; not wielded",
 "shop_status": "",
 "shop_price": ""
 },
 "c": {
 "item_name": "crossbow bolts",
 "count": 51,
 "status": "",
 "modifier": "+2",
 "uses": "",
 "info": "in quiver pouch",
 "shop_status": "",
 "shop_price": ""
 },
 "d": {
 "item_name": "crossbow bolts",
 "count": 36,
 "status": "",
 "modifier": "+0",
 "uses": "",
 "info": "",
 "shop_status": "",
 "shop_price": ""
 },
 "e": {
 "item_name": "cloak of displacement",
 "count": 1,
 "status": "uncursed",
 "modifier": "+2",
 "uses": "",
 "info": "being worn",
 "shop_status": "",
 "shop_price": ""
 },
 "f": {
 "item_name": "cram rations",
 "count": 5,
 "status": "uncursed",
 "modifier": "",
 "uses": "",
 "info": "",
 "shop_status": "",
 "shop_price": ""
 }
},
"Stats": {
 "HP": "14 / 14",
 "armor_class": 7,
 "strength": 17,
 "dexterity": 9,
 "constitution": 14,
 "intelligence": 15,
 "wisdom": 13,
 "charisma": 7,
 "energy": "3 / 3",
 "depth": 1,
 "dungeon_number": 0,
 "gold": 0,
 "level": 1,
 "exp": 0,
 "score": 0,
 "encumbrance": "unencumbered",
 "hunger": "not hungry",
 "alignment": "Neutral",
 "conditions": "None"
}
}
...

```

in which:

- the `hunger` in `Stats` can be one of the following values: "oversatiated", "satiated", "not hungry",  
 ⇐ "hungry", "weak", "fainting", "starved".

Methods that have been implemented in `NethackTemplate` and can be directly called:

- `self.find\_safe\_place(agent, dict\_obs)`. Return: `{"safe\_flag": True/False, "safe\_position": p/None}`.

⇐ Here the `safe\_flag` being `True` indicates that a `safe\_position` has been found; being `False`

⇐ indicates that a `safe\_position` has not been found, and at the same time, the `safe\_position` is

⇐ `None`.

The candidate skills repository is as follows:

Skills:

```

- zap: Zap a wand in the given cardinal (n, e, s, w) or ordinal direction (ne, se, sw, nw) or target
↳ yourself using self. Params: (item_letter: string, direction: string)
- pickup: Pickup things at your location or specify where you want to pickup an item. Params: (x:
↳ Optional[integer], y: Optional[integer])
- up: Go up a staircase at your location or specify the position of the staircase you want to use.
↳ Params: (x: Optional[integer], y: Optional[integer])
- down: Go down a staircase at your location or specify the position of the staircase you want to use.
↳ Params: (x: Optional[integer], y: Optional[integer])
- loot: Loot a box on the floor. Params: (x: Optional[integer], y: Optional[integer])
- offer: Offer a sacrifice to the gods. Params: (x: Optional[integer], y: Optional[integer])
- drop: Drop an item. Params: (item_letter: Optional[string])
- read: Read a scroll, spellbook, or something else. Params: (item_letter: Optional[string])
- put_on: Put on an accessory. Params: (item_letter: Optional[string])
- remove: Remove an accessory (ring, amulet, or blindfold). Params: (item_letter: Optional[string])
- takeoff: Take off one piece of armor. Params: (item_letter: Optional[string])
- wield: Wield a weapon. Params: (item_letter: Optional[string])
- wear: Wear a piece of armor. Params: (item_letter: Optional[string])
- apply: Apply (use) a tool. If used on a wand, that wand will be broken, releasing its magic in the
↳ process. Params: (item_letter: Optional[string])
- eat: Eat something from your inventory. Params: (item_letter: Optional[string])
- eat_from_ground: Eat something from the ground. Params: (x: integer, y: integer)
- drink: Drink something from your inventory or straight from the ground. Params: (item_letter:
↳ Optional[string])
- tip: Tip out the content of a container. Params: (item_letter: Optional[string])
- dip: Dip an object into something. Params: (item_letter: Optional[string])
- kick: Kick something. Params: (x: integer, y: integer)
- rest: Rests n-moves while doing nothing or until something happens (default=5). Params: (count:
↳ Optional[integer])
- cast: Opens your spellbook to cast a spell. Params: ()
- pay: Pay your shopping bill. Params: ()
- pray: Pray to the gods for help. Params: ()
- look: Look at what is under you. Params: ()
- set_avoid_monster_flag: If set to true skills will try to avoid monsters. Params: (value: bool)
- melee_attack: Pursues and attacks a given target using melee attacks until it is dead. Params: (x:
↳ integer, y: integer)
- explore_level: Explores the level to find new rooms, as well as hidden doors and corridors. Params: ()
- move_to: Move to the specified position using pathfinding. Params: (x: integer, y: integer)
- go_to: Moves to the specified room or corridor using the shortest path possible. Params: (room_id:
↳ integer)
- press_key: Presses the given letter. For special keys only ESC, SPACE, and ENTER are supported. Params:
↳ (key: string)
- type_text: Types the text by pressing the keys in order. Params: (text: string)
- finish_task: Use this skill when the task has been fulfilled. DO NOT CONTINUE playing without an task.
↳ Params: ()
- engrave: Engrave writing on the floor. For example, engraving the word "Elbereth" will cause most
↳ monsters to not attack you hand-to-hand (but if you attack, you will rub it out); this is often
↳ useful to give yourself a breather. Params: (text: string)

```

Now fill the template to accomplish the tasks 'Upgrade your experience level to 3 in the 1st depth' in  
↳ Nethack.

#### Attention:

```

- Do not attack monsters whose names contain "tame ", as "tame " indicates these monsters are your pets.
↳ Do not attack "shopkeeper", "gas spore". Therefore, for a monster, when "tame " not in
↳ monster["item_name"] and monster["item_name"] not in ["shopkeeper", "gas spore"] is 'True', can this
↳ monster be attacked.
- Only after verifying that there is a path between the agent and the destination (x, y) using
↳ `agent.get_path_to`, can the `move_to`, `melee_attack`, `pickup`, `up` and `down` skills be returned
↳ to move/attack/pickup/up/down the destination (x, y).
- The distance between the agent and (x, y) can be calculated using `agent.get_distance_to(x, y)`.
- Use `item` in `object_can_pickup_names` or `item` in `food_names` to determine whether `item` can be
↳ `pickup` or `eat`, respectively.
- The `init()` method initializes some useful variables at the reset of each game episode and updates
↳ these variables during the game process, such as the initialization of variables `stair_up` and
↳ `stair_down` in the example, and the `update_init()` method for updating these variables. You can add
↳ or modify the initialization variables and the update method to implement your program. For example,
↳ `corpse` is too heavy to pickup. However, we can remember the location of the corpse and, when hungry
↳ and without food in the backpack, find the corpse and eat it. Besides, monsters are capable of
↳ movement, so there is no point in recording their information during the `init()` phase, as it is
↳ futile.
- For skills with parameters that include `item_letter` (such as `drop`, `read`, `apply`, `eat`, `drink`,
↳ ...), `item_letter` refers to the `key` of the corresponding item in the inventory, not the `value`.
- You may add new methods to the template class, yet these new methods can only be used within the
↳ placeholders (namely `init`, `update_init`, and `core_function`).
- Your program must be complete and ready to use immediately, without requiring any modifications or
↳ leaving any placeholders to be filled.
- Your `core_function` must return a dict in the following format:

```

```

```python
{
    "thoughts": {
        "observations": "<observations>",
        "reasoning": "<reasoning>",

```

```

    "speak": "<Summary of thoughts, to say to user>"
  }
  "skill": {
    "name": "<The name of the skill>",
    "<param1_name>": "<The value for this parameter>",
    "<param2_name>": "<The value for this parameter>",
  }
}
...

```

- The `core_function` must include the logic for `explore_level`. If you are unsure of what to do at this time, `explore_level` can be utilized for exploration within the environment.

- Because NetHack is a very complex environment, your program needs to be as logically clear and rigorous as possible to consider the various situations that may arise in NetHack.

B.2.2 Evolution-Nethack

```

<Init_prompt>
Now there are 3 `Python` programs used to interact with Nethack to accomplish the tasks 'Upgrade your
↳ experience level to 3 in the 1st depth':
Program 1:
```python
{${python_program_0$}}
...
Program 2:
```python
{${python_program_1$}}
...
Program 3:
```python
{${python_program_2$}}
...

```

At each step, each program provides a plan. Subsequently, an oracle scoring model selects the optimal plan from the 3 plans to interact with the environment.

And the results of the 3 `Python` programs are:  
`{${the_interaction_results$}}`

With the 3 reference programs and their results, I need you explore and develop a more optimal program to accomplish the task. In addition, the class in the optimized program still need to be named `NethackTemplate`.`

Attention:

- Do not attack monsters whose names contain "tame ", as "tame " indicates these monsters are your pets.
- Do not attack "shopkeeper", "gas spore". Therefore, for a monster, when `"tame "` not in `monster["item_name"]` and `monster["item_name"]` not in `["shopkeeper", "gas spore"]` is `True`, can this monster be attacked.`
- Only after verifying that there is a path between the agent and the destination (x, y) using `agent.get_path_to`, can the `move_to`, `melee_attack`, `pickup`, `up` and `down` skills be returned to move/attack/pickup/up/down the destination (x, y).`
- The distance between the agent and (x, y) can be calculated using `agent.get_distance_to(x, y)`.`
- Use `item in object_can_pickup_names` or `item in food_names` to determine whether `item` can be `pickup` or `eat`, respectively.`
- The `init()` method initializes some useful variables at the reset of each game episode and updates these variables during the game process, such as the initialization of variables `stair_up` and `stair_down` in the example, and the `update_init()` method for updating these variables. You can add or modify the initialization variables and the update method to implement your program. For example, `corpse` is too heavy to pickup. However, we can remember the location of the corpse and, when hungry and without food in the backpack, find the corpse and eat it. Besides, monsters are capable of movement, so there is no point in recording their information during the init()` phase, as it is futile.`
- For skills with parameters that include `item_letter` (such as `drop`, `read`, `apply`, `eat`, `drink`, ...), `item_letter` refers to the `key` of the corresponding item in the inventory, not the `value`.`
- You may add new methods to the template class, yet these new methods can only be used within the placeholders (namely `init`, update_init`, and `core_function`).`
- Your program must be complete and ready to use immediately, without requiring any modifications or leaving any placeholders to be filled.
- Your `core_function` must return a dict in the following format:`

```

```python
{
  "thoughts": {
    "observations": "<observations>",
    "reasoning": "<reasoning>",
    "speak": "<Summary of thoughts, to say to user>"
  }
  "skill": {
    "name": "<The name of the skill>",
    "<param1_name>": "<The value for this parameter>",
    "<param2_name>": "<The value for this parameter>",
  }
}
...

```

```

- The `core_function` must include the logic for `explore_level`. If you are unsure of what to do at this
↪ time, `explore_level` can be utilized for exploration within the environment.
- Because NetHack is a very complex environment, your program needs to be as logically clear and rigorous
↪ as possible to consider the various situations that may arise in NetHack.

```

B.3 Prompts in StarCraft II Unit Building

B.3.1 Initialization-StarCraft II Unit Building

```

You are an AI capable of generating `Python` programs to accomplish certain tasks in StarCraft II, and
↪ you have an in-depth understanding of all the knowledge about the Terran race in StarCraft II.

Here is an example for you to refer to on how to generate a program to accomplish the task:
```json
{
 "SCV": "num_1",
 "MARINE": "num_2",
 "REAPER": "num_3",
 "MARAUDER": "num_4",
 "HELLION": "num_5"
}
```
with the goal of training the specified quantities of the corresponding type of units in the game.

```python
import math

def planner(obs, action_space, task):
 """
 Parameters:
 obs is a dict with the following format:
 {
 "Resource": {
 "supply_cap": 15,
 "supply_left": 3,
 "gas": 0
 },
 "Building": {
 "COMMANDCENTER": 1,
 "BARRACKS": 0,
 "SUPPLYDEPOT": 0,
 "REFINERY": 0,
 // ...
 },
 "Unit": {
 "SCV": 12,
 "MARINE": 0,
 // ...
 }
 }
 with the specified number of each resource/building/unit in the current game state

 action_space is a list of strings including all the available actions

 task is a unit dict:
 {
 "SCV": "num_1",
 "MARINE": "num_2",
 "REAPER": "num_3",
 "MARAUDER": "num_4",
 "HELLION": "num_5"
 }
 with the goal of training the specified quantities of the corresponding type of units in
 ↪ the game.
 """
 plan_build = []
 plan_unit = []

 # infer the tech_tree from the unit of the task
 tech_tree = {
 "SCV": {
 "base_building": "COMMANDCENTER",
 "pre_dependency": {},
 },
 "MARINE": {
 "base_building": "BARRACKS",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "SUPPLYDEPOT",
 },
 },
 },

```

```

 },
 "REAPER": {
 "base_building": "BARRACKS",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "SUPPLYDEPOT",
 },
 },
 "MARAUDER": {
 "base_building": "BARRACKSTECHLAB",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "SUPPLYDEPOT",
 2: "BARRACKS",
 },
 },
 "HELLION": {
 "base_building": "FACTORY",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "SUPPLYDEPOT",
 2: "BARRACKS",
 },
 },
}
}
obtain the base_building for the technology
base_buildings = {k: v["base_building"] for k, v in tech_tree.items()}

'''
when supply_left is less than 8, increasing supply_cap (BUILD SUPPLYDEPOT) is necessary.
'''
if obs["Resource"]["supply_left"] < 8:
 if "BUILD SUPPLYDEPOT" in action_space:
 plan_build.append("BUILD SUPPLYDEPOT")

'''
gas is important, check if there is a need to collecting gas (BUILD REFINERY).
'''
if "BUILD REFINERY" in action_space and obs["Resource"]["gas"] == 0:
 plan_build.append("BUILD REFINERY")

'''
Check the 'unit' that still need to be trained in the current game state, and add f'TRAIN {unit}'
↳ to the plan_unit for each unit in units. You need to ensure that f'TRAIN {unit}' is in the
↳ action_space.
'''
unit_still_needed_num = {unit: max(0, target_num - obs["Unit"][unit]) for unit, target_num in
↳ task.items()}
for unit, target_num in unit_still_needed_num.items():
 if f"TRAIN {unit}" in action_space and target_num > 0:
 plan_unit.append(f"TRAIN {unit}")

'''
calculate the number still needed for each base_building in the task
'''
scale_of_scv_per_base_building = 16
scale_of_otherunit_per_base_building = 8
base_building_needed_num = {building: 0 for _, building in base_buildings.items()}
for unit, target_num in task.items():
 if unit == "SCV":
 base_building_needed_num[base_buildings[unit]] += math.ceil(task[unit] /
↳ scale_of_scv_per_base_building)
 else:
 base_building_needed_num[base_buildings[unit]] += math.ceil(task[unit] /
↳ scale_of_otherunit_per_base_building)

'''
Based on the tech_tree, analyze which 'building' are still needed for each unit in the task at
↳ the current game state. Then add f'BUILD {building}' to the plan_build for each building in
↳ required buildings. You need to ensure that f'BUILD {building}' is in the action_space.
'''
for unit, tech in tech_tree.items():
 pre_dependency = tech.get("pre_dependency")
 base_building = tech.get("base_building")
 # first check pre_dependency, as only when the pre_dependency is met can the base_building be
 ↳ constructed.
 if pre_dependency:
 pre_dependency = dict(sorted(pre_dependency.items(), key=lambda x: x[0]))
 for priority, building in pre_dependency.items():
 # only need 1 for each building in pre_dependency
 if f"BUILD {building}" in action_space and obs["Building"][building] == 0:
 plan_build.append(f"BUILD {building}")

then check the base_building
if f"BUILD {base_building}" in action_space and obs["Building"][base_building] <
↳ base_building_needed_num[base_building]:

```

```

 plan_build.append(f"BUILD {base_building}")

mix the plan_build and plan_unit alternately to get the plan
plan = []
while plan_build or plan_unit:
 if plan_build:
 plan.append(plan_build.pop(0))
 if plan_unit:
 plan.append(plan_unit.pop(0))

return the first 5 actions as a plan
return plan[:5]
...

```

The logic of the program's operation is to iteratively generate plans and interact with the game,  
↳ ultimately completing the `task`.

Now your `task` is:

```

```json
{
  "SCV": "num_1",
  "SIEGETANK": "num_2",
  "VIKINGFIGHTER": "num_3",
  "MEDIVAC": "num_4",
  "GHOST": "num_5",
}
...

```

with the goal of training the specified quantities of the corresponding type of units in the game.

Some general knowledge:

1. Training certain types of units requires TECHLAB, with corresponding base_building forms like
↳ "BARRACKSTECHLAB, FACTORYTECHLAB, or STARPORTTECHLAB".
2. Training certain types of units requires additional technological buildings like "GHOSTACADEMY,
↳ ARMORY, or FUSIONCORE".

Now generate a program to accomplish this task. Your program should retain the comments from the program
↳ in the example. And your program should start with "```python" and end with "```". The function name
↳ in your program should be `planner`, with parameters `(obs, action_space, task)`.

B.3.2 Evolution-StarCraft II Unit Building

```

<Init_prompt>
Now there are 3 `Python` programs used to interact with the environment:
Program 1:
```python
${python_program_0$}
...
Program 2:
```python
${python_program_1$}
...
Program 3:
```python
${python_program_2$}
...

```

At each step, each program provides a plan. Subsequently, an Oracle scoring model selects the optimal  
↳ plan from the 3 plans to interact with the environment.

And the results of the 3 `Python` programs interacting with the environment is:  
`\${the\_interaction\_results\$}

With the 3 reference programs and their result, I need you explore and develop a more optimal program to  
↳ accomplish the task. The criteria for optimizing the program should consider the following 3 aspects  
↳ (Ranking in order of importance from high to low):

1. Technology tree: For units with a count equal to 0 in the result, reconsider their base\_building and  
↳ technology trees. For units with a count greater than 0 in the result, retain their base\_building and  
↳ technology trees.
2. Optimality: The new program should aim to complete tasks as quickly as possible compared to the  
↳ reference programs.
3. Diversity: The new program should strive to have logical differences from the reference programs as  
↳ much as possible.

Some general knowledge:

1. Training certain types of units requires TECHLAB, with corresponding base\_building forms like  
↳ "BARRACKSTECHLAB, FACTORYTECHLAB, or STARPORTTECHLAB".
2. Training certain types of units requires additional technological buildings like "GHOSTACADEMY,  
↳ ARMORY, or FUSIONCORE".

Your program should retain the comments from the program in the example. And your program should start  
↳ with "```python" and end with "```". The function name in your program should be `planner`, with  
↳ parameters `(obs, action\_space, task)`.

## C Environments Details

### C.1 Nethack

As shown in Netplay [16], the primitive Nethack with the goal to retrieve the Amulet of Yendor is impossible for LLM-based agent. Therefore, here we customized 3 potentially completable tasks based on NetHack: **Drink Water**, **Open Box/Chest**, and **Upgrade Exp Level**, thereby reasonably quantifying the performance of different approaches. **Drink Water** requires the agent to find a sink or fountain in the environment and drink from it. **Open Box/Chest** requires the agent to locate a box or chest in the environment and attempt to open it (e.g., using a key or by kicking). **Upgrade Exp Level to 3** requires the agent to kill monsters to reach level 3. All three tasks are still conducted in the original NetHack environment, where the agent must still pay attention to various states such as HP, hunger, and whether poisoned, etc., while also needing to defeat monsters to obtain food, equipment, and experience, etc. Therefore, these three tasks remain very challenging. All tasks use sparse reward functions, granting a reward of 1 only upon successful task completion and 0 otherwise.

### C.2 StarCraft II Unit Building

StarCraft II is a famous real-time strategy (RTS) game, which encompasses resource management, technological research, building order, and large-scale battles, all of which require strategic planning and quick decision-making. The game presents a multifaceted planning environment due to its high-dimensional action space, long-term planning horizon, and the need for both macro-management and micro-operation, thus offering a demanding yet fertile ground for AI advancement.

Among the many challenges in StarCraft II, building order is one of the pivotal ones, focusing on the types and orders of the buildings and units produced. An adeptly devised building order can markedly elevate the probability of triumph. How to construct an optimal building order is a sophisticated strategic dilemma, which has been explored through various methodologies, including heuristic search [8], reinforcement learning [32, 10], and imitation learning [35].

Therefore, taking into account the complexity nature of building order tasks, we designed a building benchmark based on StarCraft II. Given instructions describing a target unit collection, the agent needs to carefully plan resource collection, building sequence, and unit production until the task is completed.

#### C.2.1 Design details

Specifically, we design 3 level tasks: **Easy** (SCV and BattleCruiser), **Medium** (SCV, Thor, Banshee, and Raven), **Hard** (SCV, SiegeTank, Medivac, VikingFighter, and Ghost).

The primary factor contributing to the escalation in task difficulty is the increase in the number of unit types. Besides, each task comprises a variety of instructions, differentiated by distinct unit quantity combinations. For example, in Medium task, the instructions “(16 SCVs, 3 Thors, 3 Banshees, 4 Ravens)” and “(22 SCVs, 4 Thors, 3 Banshees, 5 Ravens)” exemplify this diversity.

#### C.2.2 Reward Function

The following python program details the reward function for StarCraft II Unit Building.

```
Reward Function for StarCraft II Unit Building
def building_ins_reward(self, obs, next_obs, parsed_ins):
 # Reward for building construction: the increase in the number of the units to be trained
 reward = 0
 negative_reward_scale = -1
 # 1. the increase in the number of the units to be trained
 if isinstance(parsed_ins, dict):
 units = parsed_ins.keys()
 elif isinstance(parsed_ins, list):
 # units = parsed_ins
 raise NotImplementedError("parsed_ins should be a dict, not a list")

 for k in units:
 # reward on the change of the number of the units to be trained
 c_k_obs, u_k_obs = self.obtain_unit_count(obs, k.upper())
 c_k_next_obs, u_k_next_obs = self.obtain_unit_count(next_obs, k.upper())
```

```

k_obs = c_k_obs + u_k_obs
k_next_obs = c_k_next_obs + u_k_next_obs

if k_obs >= parsed_ins.get(k):
 # negative reward for the units that have been trained enough
 reward += negative_reward_scale * (k_next_obs - k_obs)
else:
 if k_next_obs <= parsed_ins.get(k):
 reward += k_next_obs - k_obs
 else:
 reward += ((parsed_ins.get(k) - k_obs) + negative_reward_scale * (k_next_obs -
 ↪ parsed_ins.get(k)))

return reward

```

## D Experimental Settings Details

### D.1 Fairness Explanation

We quantify the number of tasks that the learning agent of each method must traverse in ALFWorld. The results demonstrate that the number of tasks CoPiC needs to learn is comparable to that of Reflexion and AdaPlanner. This finding validates the fairness of the comparison between CoPiC and the baselines.

**ALFWorld** is a text-based virtual household environment featuring six distinct task types: Pick and Place (Pick), Examine in Light (Examine), Clean and Place (Clean), Heat and Place (Heat), Cool and Place (Cool), and Pick Two and Place (Pick Two). Each task type consists of a training task set, a seen task set, and an unseen task set. Tasks in the seen task set consist of known task instances {task-type, object, receptacle, room} that appear in the training set. Tasks in the unseen task set consist of new task instances that do not appear in the training task set. The number of tasks in each set is as follows:

| Task Type | train | seen | unseen |
|-----------|-------|------|--------|
| Pick      | 790   | 35   | 24     |
| Examine   | 308   | 13   | 18     |
| Clean     | 650   | 27   | 31     |
| Heat      | 459   | 16   | 23     |
| Cool      | 533   | 25   | 21     |
| Pick Two  | 813   | 24   | 17     |
| All       | 3553  | 140  | 134    |

Table 4: Number of tasks in each set of ALFWorld

Reflexion and AdaPlanner both learn directly from unseen test tasks. Reflexion is a framework that reinforces language agents with a “trial-and-error” mechanism, repeating the process for each task. AdaPlanner is a closed-loop planning method that generates and adjusts programs iteratively to interact with each task. Therefore, both methods use the total 134 tasks from the unseen test set during the learning process.

For CoPiC, we **(1) learn from several training tasks and then deploy the learned planning programs and critic to unseen test tasks without incurring additional LLM querying costs or further critic fine-tuning**. For each type of task, CoPiC selects 20 tasks randomly from the training set for evolving planning programs and fine-tuning the critic. Therefore, **(2) the total number of tasks used for the six types of tasks during CoPiC’s learning is  $20 \times 6 = 120$ , which is similar to the 134 tasks used in Reflexion and AdaPlanner**. Notably, since fine-tuning our critic is essentially a learning process for a neural network, we believe that learning on the training set and then evaluating on the unseen test set constitutes a more appropriate setup.

### D.2 Detailed Hyperparameters

We detailed the hyperparameters appearing in Algorithm 1 of CoPiC in Table 5.

| Hyperparameters | Value |
|-----------------|-------|
| n               | 3     |
| N               | 20    |
| M               | 5     |
| K               | 128   |

Table 5: The detailed hyperparameters used in CoPiC.

## E Additional Experimental Results

### E.1 StarCraft II Unit Building

Here, we present the experimental results for the **Easy** and **Medium** tasks of the StarCraft II Unit Building, as detailed in Table 6. In the Easy task, CoPiC achieved the same success rate as advanced baselines at a 88.48% cost reduction. In the Medium task, CoPiC’s success rate was 35.50% higher than that of advanced baselines, while reducing the cost by 75.97%.

| Method        | Easy          |                   | Medium        |                   |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|               | SR $\uparrow$ | Cost $\downarrow$ | SR $\uparrow$ | Cost $\downarrow$ |
| CoPiC (Ours)  | <b>100.00</b> | <b>0.07M</b>      | <b>100.00</b> | <b>0.17M</b>      |
| AdaPlanner    | <b>100.00</b> | 0.41M             | 64.00         | 0.53M             |
| Reflexion     | <b>100.00</b> | 0.89M             | 64.00         | 0.98M             |
| Prospector    | <b>100.00</b> | 0.91M             | 71.00         | 0.95M             |
| REPL-Plan     | <b>100.00</b> | 0.52M             | 59.00         | 0.59M             |
| GPT-3.5       | 32.00         | 0.56M             | 0.00          | 0.6M              |
| Cot-Zero-Shot | 20.00         | 0.6M              | 0.00          | 0.63M             |
| Cot-Few-Shot  | <b>100.00</b> | 0.57M             | 50.00         | 0.65M             |
| PPO           | 0.00          | –                 | 0.00          | –                 |

Table 6: Results on the **Easy** and **Medium** tasks of StarCraft II Unit Building. SR denotes Success Rate and Cost denotes LLMs Querying Costs. **Step** in this Table means the metric **Interact Steps**

### E.2 Comparison of Token Costs between Planner and Critic in CoPiC

| LLMs           | Module          | Input Tokens | Output Tokens | Total Tokens |
|----------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| GPT-3.5        | LLMs Query      | 0.40M        | 0.05M         | 0.45M        |
|                | TinyLlama Query | 0.55M        | 0.02M         | 0.57M        |
| DeepSeek-Coder | LLMs Query      | 0.14M        | 0.02M         | 0.16M        |
|                | TinyLlama Query | 0.63M        | 0.03M         | 0.66M        |
| DeepSeek-V3    | LLMs Query      | 0.18M        | 0.03M         | 0.21M        |
|                | TinyLlama Query | 0.65M        | 0.03M         | 0.68M        |
| Qwen2.5-14B    | LLMs Query      | 0.11M        | 0.02M         | 0.13M        |
|                | TinyLlama Query | 0.64M        | 0.03M         | 0.67M        |

Table 7: Comparison on total tokens costs between LLMs querying and TinyLlama querying (critic) in CoPiC on ALFWorld. M is million.

In CoPiC, we compared the token consumption of LLMs in the Planner for generating and enhancing planning programs with that of TinyLlama in the Critic for plan evaluation and fine - tuning, as presented in Table 7. Despite consuming 2.72 $\times$  tokens of LLMs, the cost of querying TinyLlama (the critic) during training and testing is negligible due to its small size (1.1B), which is only 1/13 (Qwen2.5-14B) to 1/610 (DeepSeek-V3) of our LLMs.

### E.3 Metric: Step

**Step** refers to the number of environment interaction steps needed to complete tasks during testing, reflecting planning quality (fewer steps indicate higher quality). As shown in Table 8, CoPiC achieves a **30.43% reduction in Step** compared with advanced baselines, demonstrating its superior planning quality.

| Method        | Pick         | Examine      | Clean        | Heat         | Cool         | Pick Two     |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| CoPiC (Ours)  | 16.06        | <b>16.94</b> | <b>14.63</b> | <b>16.83</b> | <b>14.60</b> | <b>22.74</b> |
| AdaPlanner    | <b>15.92</b> | 23.33        | 16.94        | 30.50        | 18.90        | 25.47        |
| Reflexion     | 29.31        | 38.18        | 34.09        | 28.44        | 35.81        | 35.14        |
| Prospector    | 18.10        | 24.33        | 21.29        | 26.26        | 21.71        | 26.67        |
| REPL-Plan     | 21.11        | 18.29        | 22.21        | 23.14        | 21.37        | 27.15        |
| GPT-3.5       | 50.00        | 48.06        | 50.00        | 50.00        | 47.95        | 50.00        |
| Cot-Zero-Shot | 48.92        | 49.28        | 50.00        | 50.00        | 50.00        | 50.00        |
| Cot-Few-Shot  | 45.29        | 45.00        | 47.35        | 43.74        | 43.90        | 45.06        |

Table 8: Comparison of CoPiC and baselines in ALFWorld on metric **Step**.

### E.4 Ablation on the Number of Planning Programs

We conducted an ablation study on the number of planning programs in the StarCraft II Unit Building environment. Specifically, we froze the learned critic in CoPiC, discarded the existing planning programs, and instructed the LLM to generate new planning programs guided by the frozen critic. The impact of varying the number of planning programs from 1 to 4 is summarized in Table 9. The results show that multiple planning programs consistently succeeded in completing all three task types, a feat unattainable by a single program. Thus, **utilizing multiple planning programs significantly outperforms relying on a single one**. Additionally, among configurations using 2 to 4 programs, the use of 3 programs achieved optimal performance at the lowest cost. This balance avoids both the underrepresentation of essential technology trees caused by too few programs and the increased complexity in the critic’s evaluation with too many programs.

## F Planning Programs from CoPiC

In this section, we provide examples of planning programs evolving from CoPiC in ALFWorld, NetHack, and StarCraft II Unit Building (hereafter referred to as SC2 for simplicity). To avoid overly long chapters, we present only the planning programs for the “pick and place”, “upgrade exp level to 3”, and “Hard (SCV, SiegeTank, Medivac, VikingFighter, Ghost)” tasks in the three environments, respectively. Planning programs for other tasks in each environment can be found in the supplementary material.

| Task   | Number | SR $\uparrow$ | Cost $\downarrow$ |
|--------|--------|---------------|-------------------|
| Easy   | n = 1  | 0.67          | 0.16M             |
|        | n = 2  | <b>1.00</b>   | 0.10M             |
|        | n = 3  | <b>1.00</b>   | <b>0.05M</b>      |
|        | n = 4  | <b>1.00</b>   | 0.08M             |
| Medium | n = 1  | 0.33          | 0.18M             |
|        | n = 2  | <b>1.00</b>   | 0.21M             |
|        | n = 3  | <b>1.00</b>   | <b>0.14M</b>      |
|        | n = 4  | <b>1.00</b>   | 0.23M             |
| Hard   | n = 1  | 0.33          | 0.13M             |
|        | n = 2  | <b>1.00</b>   | 0.11M             |
|        | n = 3  | <b>1.00</b>   | <b>0.04M</b>      |
|        | n = 4  | <b>1.00</b>   | 0.08M             |

Table 9: Ablation on Planners in StarCraft II Unit Building. n is the number of planning programs.

## F.1 Planning Programs in ALFWorld

### F.1.1 Pick and Place

```
program 1
def pick_and_place(self, objecttype, receptacletype):
 # Check if the agent is already holding an object
 if self.holding is not None:
 # If holding an object, put it down first
 self.put(self.holding, self.location)

 # Pick the object with the given objecttype
 if self.name2type(self.holding) != self.name2type(objecttype):
 # Find the object
 entity = self.find_object(objecttype)
 if entity is None:
 # Find receptacle types that can contain the object
 r_types = self.find_canbe_contained(objecttype)
 if r_types is None:
 # Explore the environment
 self.explore()
 return
 else:
 # Check each receptacle type for the object
 for r_type in r_types:
 r_entities = self.find_receptacles(r_type)
 if r_entities is None:
 continue
 for r_entity in r_entities:
 self.goto(r_entity.name)
 if r_entity.openable and not r_entity.isopen:
 self.open_receptacle(r_entity.name)
 return

 # Place the object in the receptacle
 r_entity = self.find_receptacle(receptacletype)
 if r_entity is not None:
 self.goto(r_entity.name)
 if r_entity.openable and not r_entity.isopen:
 self.open_receptacle(r_entity.name)
 self.put(objecttype, r_entity.name)
 else:
 # If the receptacle is not found, explore the environment
 self.explore()

program 2
def pick_and_place(self, objecttype, receptacletype):
 # Find an object of the given type
 object_entity = self.find_object(objecttype)
 if object_entity is None:
 # If the object is not found, explore the environment
 self.explore()
 return

 # Go to the receptacle that contains the object
 self.goto(object_entity.in_on)
 receptacle_entity = self.seen_entities[object_entity.in_on]

 # If the receptacle is not open, open it
 if receptacle_entity.openable and not receptacle_entity.isopen:
 self.open_receptacle(receptacle_entity.name)

 # Take the object
 self.take(object_entity.name, object_entity.in_on)

 # Find the receptacle where the object will be placed
 receptacle_entities = self.find_receptacles(receptacletype)
 if receptacle_entities is None:
 # If the receptacle type is not found, explore the environment
 self.explore()
 return

 # Go to the receptacle where the object will be placed
 self.goto(receptacle_entities[0].name)

 # Put the object in the receptacle
 self.put(object_entity.name, receptacle_entities[0].name)

program 3
def pick_and_place(self, objecttype, receptacletype):
 # Find the object of the given type
 object_entity = self.find_object(objecttype)
```

```

if object_entity is None:
 # If object not found, explore the environment
 self.explore()
 return

Go to the receptacle type
receptacle_entities = self.find_receptacles(receptacle_type)

if receptacle_entities is None:
 # If receptacle not found, explore the environment
 self.explore()
 return

Iterate through receptacles to find a suitable one
for receptacle_entity in receptacle_entities:
 if not receptacle_entity.isopen and receptacle_entity.openable:
 # Open the receptacle if it's closed and can be opened
 self.open_receptacle(receptacle_entity.name)
 return
 elif receptacle_entity.isopen and object_entity.in_on == receptacle_entity.name:
 # If receptacle is open and object is already in it, do nothing
 return
 elif not object_entity.in_on:
 # If object is not in any receptacle, take it
 self.take(object_entity.name, object_entity.in_on)
 return
 elif not receptacle_entity.isopen:
 # If receptacle is not holding anything, put the object in it
 self.put(object_entity.name, receptacle_entity.name)
 return

```

## F.2 Planning Programs in Nethack

### F.2.1 Upgrade Exp Level to 3

```

program 1
class NethackTemplate(SimpleSkillSelector):

 def init(self, agent, dict_obs: dict):
 """
 Initialize variables for this specific skill selector...
 """
 self.monster_list = []

 def update_init(self, agent, dict_obs: dict) -> dict:
 """
 Update variables for this specific skill selector...
 """
 self.monster_list = []
 for monster in dict_obs.get("Close Monsters", []) + dict_obs.get("Distant Monsters", []):
 if "tame" not in monster["item_name"] and monster["item_name"] not in ["shopkeeper", "gas
 ↪ spore"]:
 self.monster_list.append(monster)

 def core_function(self, agent, dict_obs: dict) -> dict:
 """
 Functionality of this function: Upgrade experience level to 3 in the 1st depth.
 """
 current_level = int(dict_obs["Stats"]["level"])
 thoughts_obs_prefix = f"Current level is {current_level}. Trying to reach level 3."

 if current_level >= 3:
 observations = thoughts_obs_prefix + " Accomplished the task."
 reasoning = "Reached level 3."
 speak = "I have reached level 3. Task accomplished."
 skill = {
 "name": "finish_task"
 }
 else:
 if not self.monster_list:
 observations = thoughts_obs_prefix + " No eligible monsters found."
 reasoning = "No eligible monsters found. Need to explore further."
 speak = "No eligible monsters found. Exploring further."
 skill = {
 "name": "explore_level"
 }
 else:
 for monster in self.monster_list:
 x, y = monster["x"], monster["y"]

```

```

 if agent.get_path_to(x, y):
 observations = thoughts_obs_prefix + f" Found a monster {monster['item_name']} to
 ↪ attack."
 reasoning = f"Found a monster {monster['item_name']} at ({x}, {y})."
 speak = f"Attacking the monster {monster['item_name']} at ({x}, {y})."
 skill = {
 "name": "melee_attack",
 "x": x,
 "y": y
 }
 break
 else:
 observations = thoughts_obs_prefix + " No path to any monster."
 reasoning = "No valid path to any monster. Need to explore further."
 speak = "No path to any monster. Exploring further."
 skill = {
 "name": "explore_level"
 }
 }

 json_dict = {
 "thoughts": {
 "observations": observations,
 "reasoning": reasoning,
 "speak": speak
 },
 "skill": skill
 }

 return json_dict

program 2
class NethackTemplate(SimpleSkillSelector):

 def init(self, agent, dict_obs: dict):
 # variables for this specific skill selector...
 self.target_level = 3
 self.corpse_locations = [] # Save locations of corpses to eat them later if needed
 self.tame_monsters = ["tame ", "shopkeeper", "gas spore"]

 def update_init(self, agent, dict_obs: dict) -> dict:
 for room in [dict_obs.get("Rooms", {"current_room": {"content_description":
 ↪ []})["current_room"] + \
 dict_obs.get("Rooms", {"other_rooms": []})["other_rooms"]]:
 for item in room["content_description"]:
 if "corpse" in item["item_name"] and (item["x"], item["y"]) not in self.corpse_locations:
 self.corpse_locations.append((item["x"], item["y"]))

 def core_function(self, agent, dict_obs: dict) -> SkillSelection:
 """
 Upgrade your experience level to 3 in the 1st depth
 """

 stats = dict_obs["Stats"]
 current_level = stats["level"]
 thoughts_obs_prefix = f"I'm currently at experience level {current_level}."

 if current_level >= self.target_level:
 observations = thoughts_obs_prefix + f" I've reached the target experience level
 ↪ {self.target_level}."
 reasoning = "I need to finish the task."
 speak = f"I've reached the target experience level {self.target_level}. Task accomplished."

 skill = {
 "name": "finish_task"
 }
 else:
 # Check for nearby monsters to attack
 for category in ["Close Monsters", "Distant Monsters"]:
 for monster in dict_obs.get(category, []):
 if "tame " not in monster["item_name"] and monster["item_name"] not in
 ↪ self.tame_monsters:
 x, y = monster["x"], monster["y"]
 distance = agent.get_distance_to(x, y)
 if agent.get_path_to(x, y):
 observations = thoughts_obs_prefix + f" I found an attackable monster:
 ↪ {monster['item_name']} at ({x}, {y})."
 if distance > 1:
 reasoning = f"The monster is {distance} steps away, moving closer to
 ↪ attack."
 speak = f"Moving closer to attack the {monster['item_name']}."
 skill = {
 "name": "move_to",
 "x": x,

```

```

 "y": y
 }
 else:
 reasoning = f"The monster is within reach, attacking it now."
 speak = f"Attacking the {monster['item_name']}."
 skill = {
 "name": "melee_attack",
 "x": x,
 "y": y
 }
 return {
 "thoughts": {
 "observations": observations,
 "reasoning": reasoning,
 "speak": speak
 },
 "skill": skill
 }

If no enemies found, check food status
if stats["hunger"] in ["weak", "fainting", "starved"]:
 # Check inventory for food
 for key, item in dict_obs.get("Inventory", {}).items():
 if item["item_name"] in food_names:
 observations = thoughts_obs_prefix + " Found food in inventory."
 reasoning = "I'm hungry and need to eat."
 speak = "Eating some food from the inventory."
 skill = {
 "name": "eat",
 "item_letter": key
 }
 return {
 "thoughts": {
 "observations": observations,
 "reasoning": reasoning,
 "speak": speak
 },
 "skill": skill
 }

If no food in inventory, look for corpses to eat
if self.corpse_locations:
 x, y = self.corpse_locations.pop(0)
 if agent.get_path_to(x, y):
 observations = thoughts_obs_prefix + f" Found a corpse at ({x}, {y}) to eat."
 if agent.get_distance_to(x, y) > 1:
 reasoning = "The corpse is far away, moving closer."
 speak = "Moving closer to the corpse to eat it."
 skill = {
 "name": "move_to",
 "x": x,
 "y": y
 }
 else:
 reasoning = "The corpse is nearby, eating it now."
 speak = "Eating the corpse from the ground."
 skill = {
 "name": "eat_from_ground",
 "x": x,
 "y": y
 }
 return {
 "thoughts": {
 "observations": observations,
 "reasoning": reasoning,
 "speak": speak
 },
 "skill": skill
 }

If there's nothing to attack or eat, explore the level
observations = thoughts_obs_prefix + " No enemies or food found nearby."
reasoning = "I need to explore the level further."
speak = "Exploring the level to find monsters or food."
skill = {
 "name": "explore_level"
}

return {
 "thoughts": {
 "observations": observations,
 "reasoning": reasoning,
 "speak": speak
 }
}

```

```

 },
 "skill": skill
}

program 3
class NethackTemplate(SimpleSkillSelector):

 def init(self, agent, dict_obs: dict):
 """
 Initialize variables for this specific skill selector...
 """
 self.monsters_to_avoid = ["shopkeeper", "gas spore"]
 self.food_items = set()
 self.last_move = None

 def update_init(self, agent, dict_obs: dict) -> dict:
 """
 Update variables for this specific skill selector...
 """
 for room in [dict_obs.get("Rooms", {"current_room": {"content_description":
 ↪ []})["current_room"]] + \
 dict_obs.get("Rooms", {"other_rooms": []})["other_rooms"]]:

 for item in room["content_description"]:
 if item["item_name"] in food_names:
 self.food_items.add((item["x"], item["y"]))

 def core_function(self, agent, dict_obs: dict) -> SkillSelection:
 """
 Functionality of this function: Upgrade experience level to 3 in the 1st depth.
 """
 # Check for current experience level
 current_exp = dict_obs["Stats"]["exp"]
 if current_exp >= 60: # Assume level 3 is reached at 60 experience points
 return {
 "thoughts": {
 "observations": f"Current experience is {current_exp}.",
 "reasoning": "Experience level 3 has been achieved.",
 "speak": "I have reached experience level 3. Task accomplished."
 },
 "skill": {
 "name": "finish_task"
 }
 }

 # Find and attack monsters
 for monster in dict_obs.get("Close Monsters", []):
 if "tame" not in monster["item_name"] and monster["item_name"] not in
 ↪ self.monsters_to_avoid:
 x, y = monster["x"], monster["y"]
 if agent.get_path_to(x, y):
 return {
 "thoughts": {
 "observations": f"Found monster {monster['item_name']} at ({x}, {y}).",
 "reasoning": f"The monster {monster['item_name']} is in attacking range.",
 "speak": f"Attacking {monster['item_name']}."
 },
 "skill": {
 "name": "melee_attack",
 "x": x,
 "y": y
 }
 }

 # Handle hunger
 hunger_status = dict_obs["Stats"]["hunger"]
 if hunger_status in ["hungry", "weak", "fainting", "starved"]:
 if dict_obs["Inventory"]:
 for key, item in dict_obs["Inventory"].items():
 if item["item_name"] in food_names:
 return {
 "thoughts": {
 "observations": f"Hungry status detected. Found {item['item_name']} in
 ↪ inventory.",
 "reasoning": f"Need to eat {item['item_name']} to avoid starvation.",
 "speak": f"Eating {item['item_name']} to survive."
 },
 "skill": {
 "name": "eat",
 "item_letter": key
 }
 }
 }
 for x, y in self.food_items:

```

```

if agent.get_path_to(x, y):
 return {
 "thoughts": {
 "observations": f"Hungry status detected. Found food on the ground at ({x},
↪ {y}).",
 "reasoning": "Need to move to the food to eat it.",
 "speak": "Moving to food to avoid starvation."
 },
 "skill": {
 "name": "move_to",
 "x": x,
 "y": y
 }
 }
else:
 self.food_items.discard((x, y))

Explore the level to find monsters or items
return {
 "thoughts": {
 "observations": "No immediate actions to take.",
 "reasoning": "Exploring the level to find monsters to gain experience.",
 "speak": "Exploring the level."
 },
 "skill": {
 "name": "explore_level"
 }
}

```

## F.3 Planning Programs in SC2

### F.3.1 Hard

```

program 1
import math

def planner(obs, action_space, task):
 """
 Parameters:
 obs is a dict with the following format:
 {
 "Resource": {
 "supply_cap": 15,
 "supply_left": 3,
 "gas": 0
 },
 "Building": {
 "COMMANDCENTER": 1,
 "BARRACKS": 0,
 "SUPPLYDEPOT": 0,
 "REFINERY": 0,
 // ...
 },
 "Unit": {
 "SCV": 12,
 "SIEGETANK": 0,
 // ...
 }
 }
 with the specified number of each resource/building/unit in the current game state

 action_space is a list of strings including all the available actions

 task is a unit dict:
 {
 "SCV": "num_1",
 "SIEGETANK": "num_2",
 "VIKINGFIGHTER": "num_3",
 "MEDIVAC": "num_4",
 "GHOST": "num_5",
 }
 with the goal of training the specified quantities of the corresponding type of units in
 ↪ the game.

 """
 plan_build = []
 plan_unit = []

 # infer the tech_tree from the unit of the task
 tech_tree = {
 "SCV": {
 "base_building": "COMMANDCENTER",

```

```

 "pre_dependency": {},
 },
 "SIEGETANK": {
 "base_building": "FACTORYTECHLAB",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "FACTORY",
 2: "BARRACKS",
 },
 },
 "VIKINGFIGHTER": {
 "base_building": "STARPORT",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "STARPORTTECHLAB",
 2: "STARPORT",
 },
 },
 "MEDIVAC": {
 "base_building": "STARPORT",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "STARPORT",
 },
 },
 "GHOST": {
 "base_building": "BARRACKSTECHLAB",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "BARRACKS",
 2: "GHOSTACADEMY",
 },
 },
}

obtain the base_building for the technology
base_buildings = {k: v["base_building"] for k, v in tech_tree.items()}

'''
 when supply_left is less than 8, increasing supply_cap (BUILD SUPPLYDEPOT) is necessary.
'''
if obs["Resource"]["supply_left"] < 8:
 if "BUILD SUPPLYDEPOT" in action_space:
 plan_build.append("BUILD SUPPLYDEPOT")

'''
 gas is important, check if there is a need to collecting gas (BUILD REFINERY).
'''
if "BUILD REFINERY" in action_space and obs["Resource"]["gas"] == 0:
 plan_build.append("BUILD REFINERY")

'''
 Check the 'unit' that still need to be trained in the current game state, and add f'TRAIN {unit}'
 ↪ to the plan_unit for each unit in units. You need to ensure that f'TRAIN {unit}' is in the
 ↪ action_space.
'''
unit_still_needed_num = {unit: max(0, target_num - obs["Unit"][unit]) for unit, target_num in
 ↪ task.items()}
for unit, target_num in unit_still_needed_num.items():
 if f"TRAIN {unit}" in action_space and target_num > 0:
 plan_unit.append(f"TRAIN {unit}")

'''
 calculate the number still needed for each base_building in the task
'''
scale_of_scv_per_base_building = 16
scale_of_otherunit_per_base_building = 8
base_building_needed_num = {building: 0 for _, building in base_buildings.items()}
for unit, target_num in task.items():
 if unit == "SCV":
 base_building_needed_num[base_buildings[unit]] += math.ceil(task[unit] /
 ↪ scale_of_scv_per_base_building)
 else:
 base_building_needed_num[base_buildings[unit]] += math.ceil(task[unit] /
 ↪ scale_of_otherunit_per_base_building)

'''
 Based on the tech_tree, analyze which 'building' are still needed for each unit in the task at the
 ↪ current game state. Then add f'BUILD {building}' to the plan_build for each building in
 ↪ required buildings. You need to ensure that f'BUILD {building}' is in the action_space.
'''
for unit, tech in tech_tree.items():
 pre_dependency = tech.get("pre_dependency")
 base_building = tech.get("base_building")
 # first check pre_dependency, as only when the pre_dependency is met can the base_building be
 ↪ constructed.
 if pre_dependency:
 pre_dependency = dict(sorted(pre_dependency.items(), key=lambda x: x[0]))

```

```

 for priority, building in pre_dependency.items():
 # only need 1 for each building in pre_dependency
 if f"BUILD {building}" in action_space and obs["Building"][building] == 0:
 plan_build.append(f"BUILD {building}")

 # then check the base building
 if f"BUILD {base_building}" in action_space and obs["Building"][base_building] <
 ↪ base_building_needed_num[base_building]:
 ↪ plan_build.append(f"BUILD {base_building}")

 # mix the plan_build and plan_unit alternately to get the plan
 plan = []
 while plan_build or plan_unit:
 if plan_build:
 plan.append(plan_build.pop(0))
 if plan_unit:
 plan.append(plan_unit.pop(0))

 # return the first 5 actions as a plan
 return plan[:5]

program 2
import math

def planner(obs, action_space, task):
 """
 Parameters:
 obs is a dict with the following format:
 {
 "Resource": {
 "supply_cap": 15,
 "supply_left": 3,
 "gas": 0
 },
 "Building": {
 "COMMANDCENTER": 1,
 "BARRACKS": 0,
 "SUPPLYDEPOT": 0,
 "REFINERY": 0,
 // ...
 },
 "Unit": {
 "SCV": 12,
 "MARINE": 0,
 // ...
 }
 }
 with the specified number of each resource/building/unit in the current game state

 action_space is a list of strings including all the available actions

 task is a unit dict:
 {
 "SCV": "num_1",
 "SIEGETANK": "num_2",
 "VIKINGFIGHTER": "num_3",
 "MEDIVAC": "num_4",
 "GHOST": "num_5",
 }
 with the goal of training the specified quantities of the corresponding type of units in
 ↪ the game.
 """
 plan_build = []
 plan_unit = []

 tech_tree = {
 "SCV": {
 "base_building": "COMMANDCENTER",
 "pre_dependency": {},
 },
 "SIEGETANK": {
 "base_building": "FACTORYTECHLAB",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "FACTORY",
 2: "ARMORY",
 },
 },
 "VIKINGFIGHTER": {
 "base_building": "STARPORTTECHLAB",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "STARPORT",
 },
 },
 },

```

```

 "MEDIVAC": {
 "base_building": "STARPORT",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "STARPORT",
 },
 },
 "GHOST": {
 "base_building": "GHOSTACADEMY",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "BARRACKSTECHLAB",
 2: "BARRACKS",
 },
 }
}
base_buildings = {k: v["base_building"] for k, v in tech_tree.items()}

if obs["Resource"]["supply_left"] < 8:
 if "BUILD SUPPLYDEPOT" in action_space:
 plan_build.append("BUILD SUPPLYDEPOT")

if "BUILD REFINERY" in action_space and obs["Resource"]["gas"] == 0:
 plan_build.append("BUILD REFINERY")

unit_still_needed_num = {unit: max(0, target_num - obs["Unit"][unit]) for unit, target_num in
 ↪ task.items()}
for unit, target_num in unit_still_needed_num.items():
 if f"TRAIN {unit}" in action_space and target_num > 0:
 plan_unit.append(f"TRAIN {unit}")

scale_of_scv_per_base_building = 16
scale_of_otherunit_per_base_building = 8
base_building_needed_num = {building: 0 for _, building in base_buildings.items()}
for unit, target_num in task.items():
 if unit == "SCV":
 base_building_needed_num[base_buildings[unit]] += math.ceil(task[unit] /
 ↪ scale_of_scv_per_base_building)
 else:
 base_building_needed_num[base_buildings[unit]] += math.ceil(task[unit] /
 ↪ scale_of_otherunit_per_base_building)

for unit, tech in tech_tree.items():
 pre_dependency = tech.get("pre_dependency")
 base_building = tech.get("base_building")
 if pre_dependency:
 pre_dependency = dict(sorted(pre_dependency.items(), key=lambda x: x[0]))
 for priority, building in pre_dependency.items():
 if f"BUILD {building}" in action_space and obs["Building"][building] == 0:
 plan_build.append(f"BUILD {building}")

 if f"BUILD {base_building}" in action_space and obs["Building"][base_building] <
 ↪ base_building_needed_num[base_building]:
 plan_build.append(f"BUILD {base_building}")

plan = []
while plan_build or plan_unit:
 if plan_build:
 plan.append(plan_build.pop(0))
 if plan_unit:
 plan.append(plan_unit.pop(0))

return plan[:5]

program 3
import math

def planner(obs, action_space, task):
 """
 Parameters:
 obs is a dict with the following format:
 {
 "Resource": {
 "supply_cap": 15,
 "supply_left": 3,
 "gas": 0
 },
 "Building": {
 "COMMANDCENTER": 1,
 "BARRACKS": 0,
 "SUPPLYDEPOT": 0,
 "REFINERY": 0,
 // ...
 },
 "Unit": {

```

```

 "SCV": 12,
 "MARINE": 0,
 // ...
 }
}
with the specified number of each resource/building/unit in the current game state

action_space is a list of strings including all the available actions

task is a unit dict:
{
 "SCV": "num_1",
 "SIEGETANK": "num_2",
 "VIKINGFIGHTER": "num_3",
 "MEDIVAC": "num_4",
 "GHOST": "num_5",
}
with the goal of training the specified quantities of the corresponding type of units in
↳ the game.
'''
plan_build = []
plan_unit = []

infer the tech_tree from the unit of the task
tech_tree = {
 "SCV": {
 "base_building": "COMMANDCENTER",
 "pre_dependency": {},
 },
 "SIEGETANK": {
 "base_building": "FACTORYTECHLAB",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "FACTORY",
 2: "ARMORY",
 },
 },
 "VIKINGFIGHTER": {
 "base_building": "STARPORTTECHLAB",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "STARPORT",
 },
 },
 "MEDIVAC": {
 "base_building": "STARPORT",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "SUPPLYDEPOT",
 2: "BARRACKS",
 },
 },
 "GHOST": {
 "base_building": "GHOSTACADEMY",
 "pre_dependency": {
 1: "BARRACKSTECHLAB",
 2: "FACTORY",
 },
 },
}
}
obtain the base_building for the technology
base_buildings = {k: v["base_building"] for k, v in tech_tree.items()}

'''
when supply_left is less than 8, increasing supply_cap (BUILD SUPPLYDEPOT) is necessary.
'''
if obs["Resource"]["supply_left"] < 8:
 if "BUILD SUPPLYDEPOT" in action_space:
 plan_build.append("BUILD SUPPLYDEPOT")

'''
gas is important, check if there is a need to collecting gas (BUILD REFINERY).
'''
if "BUILD REFINERY" in action_space and obs["Resource"]["gas"] == 0:
 plan_build.append("BUILD REFINERY")

'''
Check the 'unit' that still need to be trained in the current game state, and add f'TRAIN {unit}'
↳ to the plan_unit for each unit in units. You need to ensure that f'TRAIN {unit}' is in the
↳ action_space.
'''
unit_still_needed_num = {unit: max(0, target_num - obs["Unit"][unit]) for unit, target_num in
↳ task.items()}
for unit, target_num in unit_still_needed_num.items():
 if f"TRAIN {unit}" in action_space and target_num > 0:
 plan_unit.append(f"TRAIN {unit}")

```

```

'''
 calculate the number still needed for each base_building in the task
'''
scale_of_scv_per_base_building = 16
scale_of_otherunit_per_base_building = 8
base_building_needed_num = {building: 0 for _, building in base_buildings.items()}
for unit, target_num in task.items():
 if unit == "SCV":
 base_building_needed_num[base_buildings[unit]] += math.ceil(task[unit] /
 ↪ scale_of_scv_per_base_building)
 else:
 base_building_needed_num[base_buildings[unit]] += math.ceil(task[unit] /
 ↪ scale_of_otherunit_per_base_building)

'''
 Based on the tech_tree, analyze which 'building' are still needed for each unit in the task at the
 ↪ current game state. Then add f'BUILD {building}' to the plan_build for each building in
 ↪ required buildings. You need to ensure that f'BUILD {building}' is in the action_space.
'''
for unit, tech in tech_tree.items():
 pre_dependency = tech.get("pre_dependency")
 base_building = tech.get("base_building")
 # first check pre_dependency, as only when the pre_dependency is met can the base_building be
 ↪ constructed.
 if pre_dependency:
 pre_dependency = dict(sorted(pre_dependency.items(), key=lambda x: x[0]))
 for priority, building in pre_dependency.items():
 # only need 1 for each building in pre_dependency
 if f'BUILD {building}' in action_space and obs["Building"][building] == 0:
 plan_build.append(f"BUILD {building}")

 # then check the base_building
 if f'BUILD {base_building}' in action_space and obs["Building"][base_building] <
 ↪ base_building_needed_num[base_building]:
 plan_build.append(f"BUILD {base_building}")

mix the plan_build and plan_unit alternately to get the plan
plan = []
while plan_build or plan_unit:
 if plan_build:
 plan.append(plan_build.pop(0))
 if plan_unit:
 plan.append(plan_unit.pop(0))

return the first 5 actions as a plan
return plan[:5]

```

## G Planner Evolution Process

In CoPiC, LLMs do not indiscriminately improve programs but instead **analyze interaction histories** to make targeted enhancements. We provide an example to illustrate this.

### Old Interaction History (only key parts)

```

Obs: You are in the middle of a room. Looking quickly around you, you see ...
Your task is to: cool some egg and put it in microwave.
...
Act: go to countertop 1
Obs: On the countertop 1, you see a apple 1, a creditcard 1, a egg 1, a fork 2, a knife 2, a peppershaker
↪ 1, a plate 1, and a spoon 1.
Act: go to countertop 1 # Redundant action (comment just for explaining, not included in prompt)
Obs: Nothing happens. # No state change (comment just for explaining, not included in prompt)
...

```

The agent had already reached countertop 1 and identified egg 1. The logical next action should be take egg 1, but the program redundantly re-executed go to countertop 1.

### Original Planning Program (with Flaw)

```

def pick_cool_then_place(self, objecttype, receptacle):
 # First, pick up the object if we're not already holding it
 if self.name2type(self.holding) != self.name2type(objecttype):
 # Find the object
 ...
 # Check each receptacle to find the object

```

```

 for r_type in r_types:
 # find and check each receptacle of receptacletype
 r_entities = self.find_receptacles(r_type)
 if r_entities is None:
 continue
 for r_entity in r_entities:
 self.goto(r_entity.name)
 if r_entity.openable and not r_entity.isopen:
 self.open_receptacle(r_entity.name)
 return
 else:
 # We're holding the object - now we need to cool it
 ...
 # After cooling, place the object in the target receptacle
 ...

```

Based on the interaction history, the LLM identified issue: the program navigated (`self.goto(r_entity.name)`) to receptacles and opened (`self.open_receptacle(r_entity.name)`) them but failed to take the target object (egg 1 in this case). The take action was entirely absent from the logic flow.

### LLM-Enhanced Program

```

def pick_cool_then_place(self, objecttype, receptacletype):
 # First check if we're already holding the object we need to cool
 if self.name2type(self.holding) != self.name2type(objecttype):
 # Find the object
 ...
 # Check each receptacletype to find the object
 ... # same as the old program
 # New critical addition ++++++
 # Check if object is directly on this receptacle
 if hasattr(r_entity, 'contents'):
 for obj in r_entity.contents:
 if self.name2type(obj.name) == self.name2type(objecttype):
 self.take(obj.name, r_entity.name)
 return
 else:
 # We have the object, now we need to cool it
 # Find a fridge to cool the object
 ...
 # Now place the cooled object in the target receptacle
 ...

```

Key Improvement: Added explicit checks for object presence and a `self.take()` call to take the target item after navigation.

### New Interaction History (only key parts)

```

Obs: You are in the middle of a room. Looking quickly around you, you see ...
Your task is to: cool some egg and put it in microwave.
...
Act: go to countertop 1
Obs: On the countertop 1, you see a apple 1, a creditcard 1, a egg 1, a fork 2, a knife 2, a peppershaker
↔ 1, a plate 1, and a spoon 1.
Act: take egg 1 from countertop 1 # useful action
Obs: You pick up the egg 1 from the countertop 1.
...

```

We emphasize that while current LLM-based program improvement methods remain probabilistic, CoPiC's analysis of interaction histories provides two critical guarantees: (1) Problem Diagnosis: Failures explicitly expose flawed logic (e.g., missing take actions), enabling targeted corrections. (2) Measurable Progress: Enhancements to planning programs manifest either through increased task success rates or the elimination of observed failure modes (e.g., redundant navigation due to missing take logic).

## H Pseudocode of CoPiC

---

**Algorithm 1** CoPiC

---

**Input:** Number of planning programs  $n$ , episodes  $N$ , summary size  $M$ , **init\_prompt**, **evolve\_prompt**, critic parameters  $\theta$ , critic fine-tuning steps  $K$

**Output:** Planning programs  $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , critic  $C_\theta$

- 1: Initialize  $n, N, M, \mathbf{init\_prompt}, \mathbf{evolve\_prompt}, \theta, K$
- 2: Initialize interaction history  $H \leftarrow \{\}$ , replay buffer  $D \leftarrow \{\}$ , environment step  $step \leftarrow 0$
- 3: Initialize success rate threshold **threshold**
- 4: Initialize  $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^n$  using **init\_prompt**
- 5: **while** True **do**
- 6:   Set  $n\_success \leftarrow 0$
- 7:   **for** episode = 1 to  $N$  **do**
- 8:     Reset env, get instruction  $I$ , observation  $o$
- 9:     **while** not *done* **do**
- 10:       Generate candidate plans  $\{p_i = \rho_i(p_i|I, o)\}_{i=1}^n$
- 11:       Select plan  $p = C_\theta(I, o, \{p_i\}_{i=1}^n)$
- 12:       Step environment with plan  $p$ , receive  $o'$ , reward  $r$ , success flag *signal*, done flag *done*
- 13:       Store  $(I, o, p, r, o', done)$  in buffer  $D$
- 14:       Store  $(I, o, p, signal)$  in history  $H$
- 15:        $n\_success \leftarrow n\_success + signal$
- 16:       **if** step %  $K == 0$  **then**
- 17:          Fine-tune critic  $\theta$  using buffer  $D$  via PPO
- 18:          Reset buffer  $D$
- 19:       **end if**
- 20:        $o \leftarrow o'$
- 21:     **end while**
- 22:   **end for**
- 23:   **if**  $n\_success/N \geq \mathbf{threshold}$  **then**
- 24:     **break**
- 25:   **end if**
- 26:   Summarize the last  $M$  episodes in  $H$  as an interaction summary
- 27:   Evolve new planning programs  $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^n$  using **evolve\_prompt** and interaction summary
- 28:   Reset history  $H$
- 29: **end while**
- 30: **Return**  $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^n, C_\theta$

---