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## The Problem

## What do we want from Personal Robots?


[Google, 2022]


## Every home is different



## The way we program robots today is ... rigid!



Engineers hand-craft behaviors


Ship robot


Frustrate users!

Cannot be flexibly re-programmed by everyday users


# Instead of explicitly engineering behaviors 

Can we implicitly program robots via natural interactions?

## Programming via natural interactions



Question: How do we translate between humans and robots?


Large Language Models to the rescue!


## An Example

## HAL <br> Helping Out In the Kitchen

## (Home Apprentice Learner)

## Activity!



## Think-Pair-Share!

Think ( 30 sec ): Think of all the steps to go from what the human said to the code the robot has to execute.

Pair: Find a partner

Share (45 sec): Partners exchange ideas

Human: "Help me make vegetable soup"


## How things worked

 pre-LLMTwo Fundamental Challenges

## Two Fundamental Challenges

Challenge 1 :
Ground natural language in robot state
"Pick up the farthest red block on the left."
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Challenge 2:
Planning actions to solve a task


## Two Fundamental Challenges

## Challenge 1: <br> Ground natural language in robot state

"Pick up the farthest red block on the left."


What is grounding? Why is it hard?
"Pick up the farthest red block on the left."


## Grounding: Mapping language to robot's internal state

## Natural Language



MDP
"Pick up the farthest red block"

$$
<S, A, R, \mathscr{T}>
$$

## Grounding: Mapping language to robot's internal state

## Natural Language

"Pick up the farthest red block"


MDP
$\langle S, A, R, \mathscr{T}\rangle$


```
on('obj1','table')
on('obj2','table')
on('obj3','table')
on('obj4','table')
left('obj2','obj1')
left('obj3','obj2')
left('obj4','obj3')
```


## Grounding: Mapping language to robot's internal state

## Natural Language



## MDP

"Pick up the farthest red block"

$$
\langle S, A,(R, \mathscr{T}\rangle
$$



$$
R(\text { in }(\text { obj } 4, \text { hand }))=+1
$$

## How did we solve grounding?

Train this on small, custom robot datasets!
"Pick up the farthest red block"


## Why did this not scale?



1. Failure to generalize to different human utterances
2. Failure to capture common sense
3. Failure to capture complex instructions (while loops)

## Two Fundamental Challenges

## Challenge 1 :

Ground natural language in robot state

Challenge 2:<br>Planning actions to solve a task

## What is task planning? Why is it hard?



Take the apple from the shelf and put it on the table

## What is task planning? Why is it hard?



Take the apple from the shelf and put it on the table

1. Move to the shelf
2. Pick up the apple
3. Move back to the table
4. Place the apple

## What is task planning? Why is it hard?
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## What is task planning? Why is it hard?

shelf

(At robot table)
(At apple shelf)
(HandEmpty robot)

(At robot shelf)
(At apple shelf)
(HandEmpty robot)



## What is task planning？Why is it hard？

shelf

table
（At robot table）
（At apple shelf）
（HandEmpty robot）

（At robot shelf）
（At apple shelf）
（HandEmpty robot）

（HandEmpty robot）
（At robot table）
robot shelf）
（At apple shelf）
（HandEmpty robot）
Place（apple，table）
ィーーーーートーーーーー।
Move（table，shelf）
goal（At robot table）
state！｜（HandEmpty robot）
（At robot shelf）
（Holding robot apple）

## What is task planning? Why is it hard?



# How did we solve it? 

## Good old fashioned search!

Lots of heuristics to make it real time

## Why did it not scale?

Combinatorially large search tree
Had no notion of common sense

## Two Fundamental Challenges

## Challenge 1:

Ground natural language in robot state
"Pick up the farthest red block on the left."


Challenge 2:
Planning actions to solve a task


## LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS

Episode IV
A NEW HOPE

## Many recent papers on LLM+Task Planning

SayCan [Ichter et al.'22]


Code-As-Policies [Liang et al.'22]


Also ProgPrompt [Singh et al. '22], InnerMonologue [Huang et al.'22], Socratic [Zeng et al.'22], TidyBot [Wu et al'23], CLARIFY [Skreta et al.'23], Text2Motion [Lin et al. '23], ..

## Can LLMs directly

 predict robot action?
# Do As I Can, Not As I Say: <br> Grounding Language in Robotic Affordances 

Michael Ahn* Anthony Brohan* Noah Brown* Yevgen Chebotar* Omar Cortes* Byron David* Chelsea Finn ${ }^{\star}$ Chuyuan Fu* Keerthana Gopalakrishnan* Karol Hausman* Alex Herzog* Daniel Ho* Jasmine Hsu* Julian Ibarz* Brian Ichter* Alex Irpan* Eric Jang* Rosario Jauregui Ruano^ Kyle Jeffrey ${ }^{\star}$ Sally Jesmonth* Nikhil Joshi* Ryan Julian* Dmitry Kalashnikov* Yuheng Kuang* Kuang-Huei Lee* Sergey Levine* Yao Lu* Linda Luu* Carolina Parada* Peter Pastor* Jornell Quiambao* Kanishka Rao* Jarek Rettinghouse* Diego Reyes* Pierre Sermanet* Nicolas Sievers* Clayton Tan* Alexander Toshev* Vincent Vanhoucke* Fei Xia* Ted Xiao* Peng Xu* Sichun Xu* Mengyuan Yan* Andy Zeng*



So ... we just ask an LLM to tell us what to do?


# No! LLMs can say anything .. 

## I spilled my drink, can you help?

GPT3

LaMDA

FLAN

You could try using a vacuum cleaner.

Do you want me to find a cleaner?

I'm sorry, I didn't mean to spill it.

Idea: Constrain LLM by what the robot can do (affordance)

## The "SayCan" Approach

Instruction Relevance with LLMs


I would: 1. Find an apple, 2. $\qquad$



Robot: 1.
User input: Bring me a fruit flavoured drink without caffeine.

find a grapefruit soda

find a lime soda
$\mid$
fi
$0 . p 1$
find a redbull

$$
0.00
$$

find a 7up

go to the table

1

## Can LLMs predict robot code?

# Code as Policies: <br> Language Model Programs for Embodied Control 

Jacky Liang Wenlong Huang Fei Xia Peng Xu Karol Hausman Brian Ichter Pete Florence Andy Zeng

## Different policy representations



Learn Robot Policies


## Why choose code as a representation?

## Interpretable <br> Verifiable




## Simple code generation examples

```
# if you see an orange, move backwards.
if detect_object("orange"):
    robot.set_velocity(x=-0.1, y=0, z=0)
# move rightwards until you see the apple.
while not detect_object("apple"):
    robot.set_velocity(x=0, y=0.1, z=0)
```

\# do it again but faster, to the left, and with a banana.
while not detect_object("banana"):
robot.set_velocity (x=0, $y=-0.2, z=0$ )

## How do we prompt LLMs to generate robot code?

## 1. Instructions

You are an AI assistant writing robot code given natural language instructions. Please refer to the following API guidelines ...
2. Import Hints

```
import numpy as np
from utils import get_obj_names, put_first_on_second
```

3. Few-shot Examples

## Example: Using imported functions

```
from utils import get_pos, put_first_on_second
# move the purple bowl toward the left.
target_pos = get_pos('purple bowl') + [-0.3, 0]
put_first_on_second('purple bowl', target_pos)
objs = ['blue bowl', 'red block', 'red bowl', 'blue block']
# move the red block a bit to the right.
target_pos = get_pos('red block') + [0.1, 0]
put_first_on_second('red block', target_pos)
# put the blue block on the bowl with the same color.
put_first_on_second('blue block', 'blue bowl')
```


## Example: Using control flows

\# while the red block is to the left of the blue bowl, move it to the right 5 cm at a time.
while get_pos('red block')[0] < get_pos('blue bowl')[0]:
target_pos $=$ get_pos('red block') $+[0.05,0]$ put_first_on_second('red block', target_pos)

## Example: Hierarchical Code Generation

```
import numpy as np
from utils import get_obj_bbox_xyxy
# define function: total = get_total(xs).
def get_total(xs):
    return np.sum(xs)
# define function: get_objs_bigger_than_area_th(obj_names, bbox_area_th).
def get_objs_bigger_than_area_th(obj_names, bbox_area_th):
    return Lname for name in obJ_names
        if get_obj_bbox_area(name) > bbox_area_th]
```

    Have the LLM recursively define functions!
    ```
# define function: get_obj_bbox_area(obj_name).
def get_obj_bbox_area(obj_name):
    x1, y1, x2, y2 = get_obj_bbox_xyxy(obj_name)
    return (x2 - x1) * (y2 - y1)
```


## Verifiably solve a number of tasks!



## Can LLMs convert

 demonstrations (non-language) to code?
# Demo2Code: From Summarizing Demonstrations to Synthesizing Code via Extended Chain-of-Thought 

NeurIPS 2023

Huaxiaoyue Wang, Gonzalo Gonzalez-Pumariega, Yash Sharma, Sanjiban Choudhury Cornell University

## User Story: Helping Grandma in the kitchen



## User Story: Helping Grandma in the kitchen



Language alone is insufficient to communicate the task
X Lacks specificity (e.g. Heat up water how? Pour rice where?)
X Leaves out implicit preferences (e.g. Personal style of stiring??)

## User Story: Helping Grandma in the kitchen



## Language:

"Here's how to make vegetable fried rice.
Heat up some water. While the water boils, keep stirring vegetables. Pour rice."
$+$

## Demonstrations

(Sequence of states
represented as text)
 MODELS』

## Challenges

## Challenge 1: Long Horizon Demonstrations



## Long-horizon tasks can have $>=$ hundreds of states



## Multiple such demonstrations



Naively<br>concatenating demonstrations will<br>easily exhaust context length!

## Challenge 2: Complex Task Code



## Loops, checks, and calls to custom robot libraries ..




Directly generating code from demonstrations is intractable!


## Both

## demonstration and code

## share a latent, compact,

 specification

## Directly going from demo to code is hard ...

## [Demonstration N]

## [Demonstration 2]

## [Demonstration 1]


\# Cook object at location
def cook_object_at_loc(obj,
loc):
if not is_holding(obj):
move_then_place(obj, loc)
cook_until_is_cooked(obj)
\# Move to a location and place object
def move then place(obj, loc): curr_loc = get_curr_loc() if curr_loc != loc:
move(curr_loc, loc) place(obj, place_location)
def main():
cook_object_at_loc(patty, stove)
stack_objects(top_bun,
lettuce)

## Key Insight: Extended chain-of-thought

## [Demonstration N]

## [Demonstration 2]

[Demonstration 1]

```
Make a burger.
State 5:
'robot' is not holding
'pattyl'
'patty1' is at 'stove1'
State 9:
'pattyl' is cooked
```


## State 12

```
'robot' is not holding 'pattyl'
'patty1' is on top of 'bottom_bun1'
```


## Specification



Every step along the chain is small and easy for LLM
\# Cook object at location def cook_object_at_loc(obj, loc):
if not is_holding(obj):
move_then_place(obj, loc)
cook_until_is_cooked(obj)
\# Move to a location and place object
def move then place(obj, loc):
curr_loc = get_curr_loc()
if curr_loc != loc:
move(curr_loc, loc)
place(obj, place_location)
def main():
cook_object_at_loc(patty, stove)
stack_objects(top_bun,
lettuce)

## Demo2Code

## Demo2Code: Recursive Summarization and Expansion

```
[Demonstration N]
    [Demonstration 2]
    [Demonstration 1]
Make a burger.
State 5:
'robot' is not holding
'pattyl'
'pattyl' is at 'stove1'
State 9:
'pattyl' is cooked
State 12:
'robot' is not holding
'patty1'
'pattyl' is on top of
'boottom_bun1'
```

Make a burger with one patty and one lettuce.

Specifically:
Cook a patty at that stove


Stage 1
Recursive summarize demo to specification

Stage 2
Recursive expand specification to task code

```
# Cook object at location
def cook_object_at_loc(obj,
loc):
    if not is holding(obj):
    move_then_place(obj, loc)
    cook_until_is_cooked(obj)
```

\# Move to a location and place object
def move then place(obj, loc): curr_loc = get_curr_loc() if curr_loc != loc:
move(curr_loc, loc) place(obj, place_location)
...
def main():
cook_object_at_loc(patty, stove)
stack_objects(top_bun, lettuce)

$$
\|\cdot\| a n-I \mid
$$

## Stage 1: <br> Recursive

Summarization

[Scenario 1]
Make a burger.

State 2:
'patty1' is not at 'table1'
'robot1' is holding 'patty1'
State 3:
'robot1' is at 'stove2'
'robot1' is not at 'table1'
State 4:
'patty1' is at 'stove2'
'robot1' is not holding 'patty1'
State 5:
State 6:
State 7:
State 8:
'patty1' is cooked
State 9:
'patty1' is not at 'stove2'
'robot1' is holding 'patty1'
State 10:
'robot1' is not at 'stove2'
'robot1' is at 'table3'
State 11:
'patty1' is at 'table3'
'patty1' is on top of 'bottom_bun1
'robot1' is not holding 'patty1'
State 12:
'robot1' is not at 'table3'
-••
State 35:
'top_bun3' is at 'table5
'top_bun3' is on top of 'lettuce3' 'robot1' is not holding 'top_bun3'

[Scenario 2]
Make a burger.

State 2:
'patty3' is not at 'table6'
'robot1' is holding 'patty3'
State 3:
'robot1' is at 'stove3'
'robot1' is not at 'table6'
State 4:
'patty3' is at 'stove3'
'robot1' is not holding 'patty3'
State 5:
State 6:
...
State 35:
'top_bun3' is at 'table5'
'top_bun3' is on top of 'lettuce3'
'robot1' is not holding 'top_bun3'



* In [Scenario 1], at state 2 , the robot picked up 'patty1'.
* At state 3, the robot moved to 'stove2'.
* At state 4, the robot placed 'patty1' on 'stove2'.
* At state 5-7, the robot has cooked 'patty1'
* At state 8, the robot has finished cooking 'patty1'.
* At state 9, the robot picked up 'patty1'.
* At state 10, the robot moved to 'table3'
* At state 11, the robot placed 'patty1' on top of 'bottom_bun1'.
* At state 12 , the robot moved to 'table6'.
* At state 13, the robot picked up 'tomato1'
* At state 14, the robot moved to 'cutting_board1'.
* At state 33, the robot picked up 'top_bun1'
* At state 34, the robot moved to 'table3'
* At state 35, the robot placed 'top_bun1' on top of 'lettuce1'
<* In [Scenario 2], at state 2, the robot picked up 'patty3'.
* At state 3, the robot moved to 'stove3'
* At state 4, the robot placed 'patty3' at location 'stove3'.
* At state 35, the robot stacked 'top_bun3' on top of 'lettuce ${ }^{\prime}$ '.



Stage 1:
Recursive Summarization

* In [Scenario 1], at state 2-8, the subtask is "cook", because: At state 5-7, the robot has cooked 'patty1'. The robot cooked a patty at a stove, where the patty is 'patty1', and the stove is 'stove2'.
* At state 9-21, the subtask is "stack", because: At state 11, the robot placed 'patty1' on top of 'bottom_bun1'. ...
* At state 23-28, the subtask is "cut", because:
* At state 29-35, the subtask is "stack", because: ...
* In [Scenario 2], at state 2-8, the subtask is "cook", because: ...
* At state 9-11, the subtask is "stack", because: ...
* At state 13-18, the subtask is "cut", because:
* At state 19-21, the subtask is "stack", because: ...
* At state 23-28, the subtask is "cut", because:
* At state 29-31, the subtask is "stack", because: ...
* At state 33-35, the subtask is "stack", because:




## Stage 1: <br> Recursive Summarization

[^0]


## Stage 2: <br> Recursive <br> Expansion


from perception_utils import get_all_obj_names_that_match_type, ...

```
# Get a list of all the bottom buns in the kitchen.
bottom_buns = get_all_obj_names_that_match_type('bottom bun')
# Get \overline{a}list of a\imathl the patties in the kitchen.
patties = get_all_obj_names_that_match_type('patty')
# Decide a stove to use.
stove_to_cook_at = stoves[0]
# Cook a patty at that stove.
# Decide a patty to cook.
patty_to_cook = patties[0]
cook_object_at_location(obj=patty_to_cook, location=stove_to_cook_at)
```



## Stage 2: <br> Recursive <br> Expansion


from robot_utils import is_holding, is_in_a_stack, get_obj_that_is_underneath
def cook_object_at_location(obj, location):
\# To cook an object, the robot first needs to be holding obj if not is_holding(obj):
\# If the robot is not holding obj, there are 2 scenarios:
\# (1) if obj is in a stack, unstack obj
\# (2) else, pick up obj.
if is_in_a_stack(obj):
\# Because obj is in a stack, robot need to move then unstack the obj from the obj_at_bottom first
ōbj_at_bottom = get_obj_that_is_underneath(obj_at_top=obj)
move_then_unstack(obj_to_unstack=obj, obj_at_bottom=obj_at_bottom, unstack_location=get_obj_location(obj_at_bottom))
else:
\# Since obj is not in a stack, robot can just move then pick it up move_then_pick(obj=obj)
\# place the object at the location to cook at
move_then_place(obj=obj, place_location=location)
\# cook the object
cook_until_is_cooked(obj=obj)


## Stage 2: <br> Recursive

## Expansion

from perception_utils import get_curr_location, get_obj_location, is_cooked from action_utils import move, unstack, start_cooking, noop
def move_then_unstack(obj_to_unstack, obj_at_bottom, unstack_location):
\# For unstacking, we need to move to the location of the bottom object
if get_curr_location() != get_obj_location(obj_at_bottom):
move(get_curr_location(), get_obj_location(obj_at_bottom))
unstack(obj_to_uns̄tack, obj_at_bottom)
\# After unstacking, we need to move to the unstack_location
if get_curr_location() != unstack_location:
move(get_curr_location(), unstack_location)
def cook_until_is_cooked(obj):
start_cooking(obj)
while not is_cooked(obj):
noop()

Challenge 1:
Long Horizon Demonstrations
Challenge 2:
Complex Task Code


## Experiments



## Demo2Code generates correct code that passes unit tests

| Task | Lang2Code[30] |  |  | DemoNoLang2Code |  |  | Demo2Code(ours) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exec. | Pass. | Match. | Exec. | Pass. | Match. | Exec. | Pass. | Match |
| Cook first then cut | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.39 |
| Cut first then cook | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.34 |
| Cook two patties | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.41 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.40 |
| Cut two lettuces | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.46 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.57 |
| Assemble two burgers one by one | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.10 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.09 |
| Assemble two burgers in parallel | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 |
| Make a cheese burger | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.19 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.17 |
| Make a chicken burger | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.07 |
| Make a burger stacking lettuce atop patty immediately | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.32 |
| Make a burger stacking patty atop lettuce immediately | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.08 |
| Make a burger stacking lettuce atop patty after preparation | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 |
| Make a burger stacking patty atop lettuce after preparation | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.25 |
| Make a lettuce tomato burger | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.23 |
| Make two cheese burgers | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 |
| Make two chicken burgers | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 |
| Make two burgers stacking lettuce atop patty immediately | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.28 |
| Make two burgers stacking patty atop lettuce immediately | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 |
| Make two burgers stacking lettuce atop patty after preparation | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 |
| Make two burgers stacking patty atop lettuce after preparation | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 |
| Make two lettuce tomato burgers | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.27 |
| Overall | 0.27 | 0.18 | 0.15 | 0.20 | 0.23 | 0.21 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.22 |

## EPIC Kitchen Tasks



## Dishwashing Tasks across Users



|  | P4-101 (7) |  | P7-04 (17) |  | P7-10 (6) |  | P22-05 (28) |  | P22-07 (30) |  | P30-07 (11) |  | P30-08 (16) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Match | Pass | Match | Pass | Match | Pass | Match | Pass | Match | Pass | Match | Pass | Match |
| Lang2Code [30] | 1 | 0.856 | 0 | 0.350 | 0 | 0.569 | 0 | 0.620 | 0 | 0.696 | 1 | 0.872 | 0 | 0.706 |
| DemoNoLang2Code | 1 | 0.233 | 0 | 0.522 | 0 | 0.695 | 0 | 0.537 | 0 | 0.233 | 1 | 0.966 | 0 | 0.671 |
| Demo2Code | 1 | 0.854 | 1 | 0.660 | 1 | 1.000 | 0 | 0.838 | 1 | 0.855 | 1 | 0.873 | 0 | 0.796 |

## Tabletop Manipulation Tasks



|  | Task | Lang2Code[30] |  |  | DemoNoLang2Code |  |  | Demo2Code(ours) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Exec. | Pass. | Match. | Exec. | Pass. | Match. | Exec. | Pass. | Match |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Place A next to B | 1.00 | 0.28 | 0.47 | 0.82 | 0.20 | 0.33 | 0.92 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
|  | Place A at a corner of the table | 1.00 | 0.18 | 0.05 | 0.82 | 0.20 | 0.33 | 0.92 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
|  | Place A at an edge of the table | 1.00 | 0.18 | 0.03 | 0.94 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 0.96 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Place A on top of B | 1.00 | 0.20 | 0.26 | 0.93 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 1.00 | 0.73 | 0.41 |
|  | Stack all blocks | 0.93 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.98 | 0.73 | 0.56 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.99 |
|  | Stack all cylinders | 0.80 | 0.00 | 0.66 | 0.88 | 0.53 | 0.32 | 1.00 | 0.90 | 0.96 |
| $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | 0.98 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 1.00 | 0.40 | 0.05 | 0.87 | 0.97 | 0.48 |
|  | Stack all cylinders into one stack | 0.93 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.97 | 0.43 | 0.11 | 0.87 | 0.93 | 0.42 |
|  | Stack all objects into two stacks | 0.95 | 0.30 | 0.09 | 0.85 | 0.40 | 0.50 | 0.80 | 1.00 | 0.63 |
| Overall |  | 0.95 | 0.14 | 0.21 | 0.91 | 0.42 | 0.34 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.74 |

## Demo2Code Learns Personalized Tasks




Make a burger.
Decide a patty to cook
Cook that patty at that stove.
Decide a lettuce to cut.
Cut that lettuce on that cutting board.
Stack that lettuce on that patty.

Stack that top bun on that lettuce.
def main():
patty = patties[0]
cook_obj_at_loc(patty, stoves[0])
lettuce = lettuces[0]
cut_obj_at_loc(lettuce, boards[0])
stack_obj1_on_obj2(lettuce, patty)
. .
stack_obj1_on_obj2(top_bun, lettuce)



User 30: Prefers to scrub and rinse each object


ison('tap_1`); inhand(`mug_1`); soapy(‘mug_1`) rinse('mug 1')


countertop_1`); pickup('jug 1')  ison(`tap_1`); inhand(`jug_1
isnotdirty(`jug_1`); ...
rinse('jug_1')



佂


What is the right level of abstraction for LLMs to generate?
(Growing support for LLMs generating reward functions)
Huang et al. VoxPoser

Can language help for non-language tasks?
(Growing evidence that language captures useful invariances)

## Can LLMs solve planning problems?

Valmeekam et al.
(Growing evidence that says No)
Large Language Models Still Can't Plan


[^0]:    * The order of high level actions is: ['cook', 'stack', 'cut', 'stack', 'cut', 'stack']
    * In [Scenario 1], 'stove2' is always used for cooking. In [Scenario 2], 'stove3' is always used for cooking. We assume that we just need to decide a random stove to use in the beginning. Then, we can keep using the same stove.
    * In both scenarios, 'cutting_board1' is used for cutting the lettuce and tomato. We assume that we just need to use 'cutting_board1' for cutting.


    ## Thus:

    Make a burger.

    ## Specifically:

    \# Get a list of all the bottom buns in the kitchen.
    \# Get a list of all the patties in the kitchen.
    \# Decide a stove to use.
    \# Cook a patty at that stove.

