

---

# Strategic Interactions between Large Language Models-based Agents in Beauty Contests

---

Siting Estee Lu\*

School of Economics  
University of Edinburgh  
s.lu@ed.ac.uk

## Abstract

The growing adoption of large language models (LLMs) presents potential for deeper understanding of human behaviours within game theory frameworks. Addressing research gap on multi-player competitive games, this paper examines the strategic interactions among multiple types of LLM-based agents in a classical beauty contest game. LLM-based agents demonstrate varying depth of reasoning that fall within a range of level-0 to 1, which are lower than experimental results conducted with human subjects, but they do display similar convergence pattern towards Nash Equilibrium (NE) choice in repeated setting. Further, through variation in group composition of agent types, I found environment with lower strategic uncertainty enhances convergence for LLM-based agents, and having a mixed environment comprises of LLM-based agents of differing strategic levels accelerates convergence for all. Higher average payoffs for the more intelligent agents are usually observed, albeit at the expense of less intelligent agents. The results from game play with simulated agents not only convey insights on potential human behaviours under specified experimental set-ups, they also offer valuable understanding of strategic interactions among algorithms.

## 1 Introduction

With the emergent line of research surrounding the study of large language models (LLMs) capabilities, there is also growing discussions over the implications of LLMs on economic research and social sciences experiments, particularly in the field of game theory. One of this work's main objectives is to make a case for using LLMs as simulated agents in economic games to shine a light on potential strategic behaviours. Since LLMs are trained based on human-generated data, observing interactions between them could be fairly relatable to human subjects in experiments, and offer more insights than conventional simulation methods. As opposed to diving into more expensive human-based experiments straightaway, it is also relatively easy and cost-effective to toy with different set-ups prior to concentrating on designs that are worth pursuing.

Recent research mainly focused on exploring 2-player cooperative and non-cooperative games, and often consists of a single LLM type (Horton (2023), Phelps and Russell (2023), (Akata et al. (2023))). While they provide interesting baselines for evaluating strategic behaviours, assuming agent homogeneity could make behaviour modelling more restrictive and does not leverage on the potential of having multiple LLM types. Furthermore, competitive games involve more strategic consideration in predicting and attempting to outmaneuver opponents, exploring such games could offer new insights on strategic interactions that is different from the other games, and could provide

---

\*I am immensely grateful to my co-authors of another paper, Guo et al. (2024), Shangmin Guo, Haoran Bu, Haochuan Wang, Yi Ren, Dianbo Sui, Yuming Shang, for providing some of the experimental results that enabled the progression of this line of research. I am also thankful to Ed Hopkins, Marco Pellliccia, Vincent Crawford, and audiences at European Economic Review Summer School, for their valuable suggestions.

novel use cases for LLMs that are worth exploring. In this paper, I investigate a classical multi-player competitive game widely studied in Economics – beauty contests. Under this framework, agents’ strategic levels and adaptive learning behaviours are jointly explored. I found that LLM-based agents have strategic levels in between 0 and 1, evaluated using Nagel (1995)’s level-k model. In repeated setting with revelation of past information, most of them show convergence towards the Nash equilibrium (NE) choice. Since opponent types could be important contributing factor to adaptive learning, variations in proportion of agents types within the group and their impact on game outcomes are investigated. When facing fixed-strategy opponents, LLM-based agents display greater convergence tendency in low strategic uncertainty environment; When the more intelligent LLM-based agent are playing against less intelligent agents, both agent types could show faster learning rate than when they are playing against their own types. These results contribute first to assessing the models with a human-based metric on strategic levels, thereby drawing relation to represent heterogeneous human subjects with different LLM types, and via simulation of various set-ups, one can explore the potential strategic behaviours and postulate the possibility of inducing faster learning by varying group composition of agent types.

On a broader view, this work not only hope to highlight the plausibility of using LLM-based agents as a tool for social science research, the theories that were developed to explain and evaluate human behaviours can unequivocally help us to understand how this new era of computer algorithms would behave when competing against each other. With the growing integration of LLMs into daily life, LLMs could be used as surrogate agents to communicate and interact with one another. Understanding how algorithms interact could have significant social implications and diverse applications.

## 2 Background

**LLMs as computational model of human behaviour:** Since the training process of LLMs rides on top of human-generated data and refinements based on direct human feedback, human reasoning process are baked into the algorithms, therefore, it is proposed that LLMs can be perceived as implicit computational model of human behaviour. (Ouyang et al. (2022), OpenAI (2024), Horton (2023)) Herein, I hope to streamline and differentiate between the two main aspects of how LLMs’ human-like behaviour could cater to research for the social sciences community:

*(a) Imitation of decision-making with known constraints.* This approach uses LLMs to create synthetic agents with given profiles or constraints, and its objective is more grounded in granulating the elements contributing to decision-making. It resembles agent-based modelling (ABM), where agents are pre-programmed to behave as we expect, and the outcome from which serves as a form of visualization and checkpoint of the theoretical predictions. In beauty contests, this implies setting the strategic levels of the LLM-based agents a priori and examine their behaviours in comparison to theoretical predictions of agents of a certain level.

*(b) Mirroring human-like behaviours without known constraints.* By abstracting away from putting restrictions on behaviours a priori, simulation conducted with LLM-based agents essentially offers a tool for computational experiments. In beauty contests, this approach implies identifying the intrinsic strategic levels of the LLM-based agents under pre-specified temperature. Their behaviours with different experimental designs can be used to speculate the possible outcomes that could be anticipated if conducted with human subjects. The extra benefit of this is that there is more flexibility in endogenous changes of strategic levels over time in repeated games.

**LLMs as heterogeneous agents.** There are many ways to define agent heterogeneity. One of which could be on the basis of differences in the underlying training data. For instance, Anthropic’s reward model training data primarily comes from crowd-sourcing feedback through Amazon Mechanical Turk, a platform often used for social sciences research; and OpenAI’s models are mainly trained on used prompts. (HuggingFace (2022)) LLMs could also comprise of different priors and come in varying sizes, leading to different performances in text-based generating ability, thereby making them heterogeneous agents. However, while the above distinctions of types are straightforward, it does not necessarily imply heterogeneity in strategic situations that I seek to study. Therefore, in this paper, LLM types are characterized by their strategic levels, determined during the one-shot beauty contests, using a measure ubiquitous to how we evaluate the strategic types of human subjects and drawing parallels between the two.

**LLMs as complements to human participants.** At the core of discussions surrounding the usefulness of LLMs in social sciences research, there exists an important question of whether they can rise up to the task of participating in social experiments in place of human subjects or rational players. There are growing replications of social experiments and strategic games to investigate this question, and while it was found that LLM-based agents deviate away from game-theoretical predictions and may be far from rational, they inevitably demonstrate ability to imitate human behaviours, making them human-like participants. (Argyle et al. (2023), Webb et al. (2023), Huijzer and Hill (2023), Dillion et al. (2023), Guo (2023), Aher et al. (2023), Mei et al. (2024), Fan et al. (2023), Guo et al. (2024)) The main concern about using LLM-based agents is the opacity of their minds. (Dillion et al. (2023)) Although the same can be said about human minds, it is argued that there exist many theories to describe human reasoning in strategic situations, but a lack of equivalent to decipher the “thinking” process of AI algorithms. However, since LLMs are trained on human-generated data, which includes reasoning procedures, they could develop mechanisms similar to that of human brain, thus theories applied to human might also be applicable for explaining LLMs’ behaviours. (Kosinski (2023)) Despite this connection, it is still important to treat simulated results with care, thus my work does not aim at arguing for replacing human subjects in experiments with LLM-based agents completely, but rather using them as complements to shed some light on potential strategic behaviours.

**Choice of beauty contests.** I focused on beauty contest games, which provide a desirable set-up that encompasses both competitive nature and interactions between multiple, and possibly heterogeneous, agents, whose level of reasoning can be easily distinguished. (Nagel (1995), Camerer et al. (2004)) The game can also be constructed with a single interior NE solution, even in repeated setting, obstructing away from the complication of analyzing multiple equilibria. Furthermore, there are many applications of beauty contest games with substantial social value. For instance, the Keynesian Beauty Contest started off with the practical application to describe the stock market. (Keynes (1936), Nagel et al. (2017)) With the market becoming more computerized, crypto trading bots emerge and function by executing pre-defined buying and selling strategies. (Trality (2024)) The backbone of these automatic bots can be replaced in the future by LLMs that account for vast human data on trading behaviours, and one could instead be focusing on choosing between proxies backed by different LLMs. Therefore, understanding LLM-interactions could better inform us about the potential social implications, and beauty contests is a good starting point.

### 3 Beauty Contest Games

In this section, I first explore the one-shot and repeated beauty contests involving multiple LLMs: ChatGLM2, ChatGLM3, Llama2, Baichuan2, Claude1, Claude2, PaLM, GPT3.5, GPT4. The results in my analysis are based on experimental data adapted from Guo et al. (2024). Different from Guo et al. (2024), whose main objective is to evaluate LLMs’ performance relative to the rational players that select NE choice, this work aims to analyze LLMs’ behaviour as though they are human players. Following which, I then choose two types of LLMs to construct groups of heterogeneous agents, and analyze how variations in group composition could affect learning pattern. The additional computing resources required to conduct the additional set-ups are not substantial, but could have profound social significance.

**General Experimental Design.** Using a modified set-up following Nagel (1995), and an exemplary prompt following Guo et al. (2024) (recited in Appendix A.1):

Agents are asked to choose a number between 0 and  $\bar{c}$ , where  $\bar{c}$  is randomly generated from 0 to 1000. One choosing closest to  $p$ ,  $p = \frac{2}{3}$ , of the average wins the game. A fixed prize of  $\$x$  is awarded to the winner, and the prize is split amongst those who tie. In repeated setting, the same game is played for 6 periods, and agents are given historical information up to 3 past periods, which include choices made by all agents, average of these choices,  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the average, and past winners. The limitation on revealing up to 3 past periods is due to token restrictions to control computation intensity. Therefore, this can be perceived as a partial feedback set-up or one with forgetting parameter.

**Analysis Focus.** The two main concepts central to the analysis are:

1. *Determination of Strategic Levels.* Following Nagel (1995), an agent is of strategic degree  $n$  if he chooses a number  $r(\frac{2}{3})^n$ , where  $r$  is defined to be the reference point, characterized by naive player or a point of salience in heuristics. In one-shot games and in period 1 of repeated games, this is assumed to be the mean of the range of numbers that can be chosen.

2. *Convergence.* In repeated setting, changes in choices are tracked to determine if there is convergence to the unique NE of 0. The convergence rate is computed as  $c_t = \frac{-(a_{t+1}-a_t)}{a_t}$ , where  $a_{t+1} \leq a_t$ ,  $a_t$  being the action/number chosen in period  $t$ . Changes in strategic levels are found by re-adjusting the reference point to the mean of the previous period choices.

**Data collection.** The experiments are conducted with API calls of different LLMs, providing a collection of independent observations that allows for a robust measure of strategic level for each LLM type. In repeated settings, the information availability can be explicitly controlled through prompts that reveal histories perfectly or selectively to LLMs. (Bauer et al. (2023)) While the stochasticity of model responses is dependent on the temperature selected, Chen et al. (2023) shows that strategic or choice consistency is less influenced by temperature, which depends more on the underlying reasoning process. Therefore, the set-ups used in this paper use the default temperature.




Figure 1: Frequency of choices

are of much lower frequency. **GPT4** displays the highest spike in choices around 44, going by iterated elimination of dominated strategies, this shows step-2 depth of reasoning. A lower frequency spike is also observed around 33, indicating level-1 thinking under the level-k model. This could imply **GPT4** has a level in between 1 and 2. There are no data for **ChatGLM2**, indicating it is unable to complete the games and produce comprehensible output given the instructions.

**One-Shot Game.** 150 sessions were ran with 9 agents back-boned by different LLMs. In classical beauty contests,  $\bar{c}$  is often fixed at 100, all choices between  $(66.66, 100]$  are weakly dominated by 66.66, and those above 44.44 are weakly dominated by 44.44, etc. Via iterative elimination of weakly dominated strategies, the number of steps taken determines agents' strategic levels. Otherwise, going by level-k model with a focal point set at the mean of the number range, 50, level-0 would choose 50, and level-1 responds by choosing 33.33, etc. The unique interior NE solution of the game is 0. In this modified set-up with a randomly generated upper-bound for each game, the steps of assessing the strategic levels are unaffected. For instance, using the level-k model, level-0 would simply choose the focal point,  $\frac{\bar{c}}{2}$ , and level-1 would respond by choosing  $\frac{2}{3} \frac{\bar{c}}{2}$ .

*Choices.* As shown by Figure 1, the normalized choices are concentrated on 50 for **ChatGLM3**, **Baichuan2**, **Claude1**, **PaLM**. As per level-k model, they are level-0 players. **Llama2** records fairly dispersed and randomized choices, and thus can be perceived as level-0 as well. **Claude2** shows a spike around 33, indicating the likelihood of level-1 thinking. There is also a high choice frequency around 66, which could be rationalized as step-1 of the iterated elimination of dominated strategies. (Mauersberger and Nagel (2018)) For **GPT3.5**, most of the choices are concentrated around 33, stipulating level-1 reasoning. While there are some other spikes at 50 and 66, those

Models	ChatGLM3	ChatGLM2	Llama2	Baichuan2	Claude2	Claude1	PaLM	GPT3.5	GPT4
Average	52.029	N/A	59.519	51.158	41.609	47.696	49.976	38.912	41.072
Median	51.724	N/A	62.685	50.0	33.333	49.313	50.0	33.333	44.442

Table 1: Average and Median Choice of the LLMs across 150 Sessions

Nagel (1995) and Bosch-Domenech et al. (2002) have conducted beauty contests with different human populations, such as students (mean=36.73, median=33), theorist (mean=17.15, median=15\*), newspaper readers (mean=23.08, median=22\*), etc.<sup>2</sup> Human subjects show strong deviation away from game-theoretic prediction, and display on average iteration steps 1 and 2 evaluated by the level-k model. Compared to them, LLM-based agents are choosing slightly higher numbers, as shown in Table 1, which corresponds to an average strategic level between 0 to 1. This result comply with the impression that general public could display more randomized choices, and each LLM has a different strategic level, which can represent different human subjects or subsets of population.

For human subjects, when given identical game set-up, it is possible that they might employ different strategies. (Devetag et al. (2016), Costa-Gomes and Weizsäcker (2008)) The same could apply to LLM-based agents. It could be important to understand how varied one’s choice might be given the same instructions. By fixing the upper-bounds to the same value, Claude2 , GPT3.5 and GPT4 displayed more variability in choices as compared to other models (Appendix A.3.1) This shows that choices might not be static even when the instructions are exactly the same. While Bauer et al. (2023) indicates running multiple sessions could already accommodate the stochastic nature of LLM responses, my method of computing for average strategic levels further account for both identical and different upper-bounds, rendering a more robust and consistent measure for each model.

*Reference dependence.* The reference point of level-k model is defined to be the choice of a non-strategic agent, and is assumed to be the mean of the number range, pertaining to insufficient reasoning. (Mauersberger and Nagel (2018)) However, this focal point can be disputable. In my set-up, the varied upper-bounds may well be the focal points rather than taking the extra step of computing for the mean. Figure 2 shows the average strategic levels are between 0 and 1 given the reference point  $r = \frac{\bar{c}}{2}$ , and between 1 to 2.5 when it is  $r = \bar{c}$ . In the following sections, I evaluate the results using the conventional focal point of  $\frac{\bar{c}}{2}$ . Figure 2a shows the strategic level to be high for ChatGLM3 , Claude2 , GPT3.5 and GPT4 . Surprisingly, GPT4 has slightly lower strategic level than GPT3.5 , even though it is often presumed to be a stronger model. Its lower depth of reasoning could be due to its capability or it being trained on more data, thereby encompassing higher possibility of noisy strategies that leads to it choosing higher numbers.




Figure 2: Average strategic levels of LLM-based agents with different reference points.

*Payoff.* Figure 3 demonstrates that Claude2 , GPT3.5 and GPT4 have relatively higher average payoffs than the others, out of which, GPT3.5 have the highest average payoffs as compared to the other models. Associating the results with strategic levels, LLM-based agents with higher average strategic levels often obtain higher average payoffs, except for ChatGLM3 , which could be due to high variability in its strategic levels that might have adversely influenced its average gain.




Figure 3: Average payoffs.

**Repeated Games.** 30 sessions of repeated beauty contests were ran, following the repeated set-up

<sup>2</sup>The median with \* are guesstimated based on the figures in Nagel (1995), Bosch-Domenech et al. (2002).

highlighted in the general experimental design. In Figure 4, most LLM-based agents show convergence in actions, particularly for **Claude1**, **Claude2**, **GPT3.5**, and **GPT4**, which are the models with higher strategic levels. Their chosen numbers are approximately 0 in period 6, indicative of them learning to play NE choice across time.




Figure 4: Convergence in average chosen number.

it could be more adept at revising its beliefs about opponents over time given past information. The abnormality in Figure 5a comes from **ChatGLM3** and **Llama2**, the first shows a decrease in average strategic level, indicating lack of ability to respond to historical information and adjust behaviour accordingly; the second display naive, random selection.

*Payoff Evolution:* Figure 5b shows **GPT3.5** outperforms the rest in all periods, while **Claude2** and **GPT4** are more or less comparable. The rest of the LLM-based agents do not obtain average payoffs as high, but most of them display growth over time. Coupled with Figure 4 that shows convergence in average choice towards NE, the increasing payoffs could be an indication of learning about the optimal action to take to win the game.




Figure 5: Averaging strategic levels and average payoffs across 30 sessions for 6 periods.

In this section, the purpose of one-shot games is to evaluate the strategic levels of LLM-based agents that I can draw parallel to human subjects. The results from which resembles experiments conducted with human subjects, who show strong deviation away from game-theoretic prediction and tend to display low levels of reasoning. However, the distinction is that LLM-based agents display even lower level of reasoning than that of human subjects in current literature. The repeated setting shine a light on how the simulated agents could behave over time. Similar to human subjects, LLM-based agents do not display iteration steps that go over 2 within the span of the games, and they do seem to learn from historical information and show convergence towards NE choice.

#### 4 Adaptive Learning with Variation in Group Composition

In this section, I further analyze the strategic interactions between LLM-based agents by exploring their adaptive learning behaviour given variation in group composition. I selected two LLM types, **GPT3.5** and **PaLM**. Based on previous section, **GPT3.5** has a strategic level of approximately 1 and **PaLM** has level-0, representing higher and lower intelligence agent type respectively, where



intelligence is interpreted loosely as metonym for strategic level. Herein, games are played among 10 agents, who are asked to choose a number between  $[0, 100]$ . Each game comprises of 5 periods with full historical information disclosure. (Details: Appendix A.3.3)

**Partial static environment: LLM vs. Static Algorithm.** In this setting, LLM-based agents are playing against fixed-strategy players, whose actions are hard-coded to be 0. Across different treatments, the proportion of fixed strategy players and LLM-based agents change, but the group size remains the same. The 3 treatments are: (1) 1 LLM + 9 Hard-coded Agents (Low strategic uncertainty); (2) 5 LLMs + 5 Hard-coded Agents (Mixed strategic uncertainty); (3) 9 LLMs + 1 Hard-coded Agents (High strategic uncertainty). An exemplary prompt is shown in Appendix A.2. LLM-based agents are specifically told that some of their opponents are playing a fixed strategy of 0.

For both LLM types, there is convergence in choices to 0, exhibiting either refinement of belief about opponents’ strategies or progression in their depth of strategic thinking when given historical information. The pace is slower as strategic uncertainty grows, where the proportion of LLM-based agents becomes larger relative to fixed strategy agents. Comparing between the high and low types, when strategic uncertainty is high, low types display larger variability in behaviour and they might not converge at all. Furthermore, low types are also less “cautious” in a sense that they could converge to 0 in period 2 straightaway when strategic uncertainty is relatively low, while convergence to 0 takes a gradual process for high types. This could indicate that high types are going from less sophisticated strategies to more refined choices through iterative learning and adaptation, and the lack of such systematic adjustments in choices for the low types could suggest that they are relying more on intuitive guesses than successive elimination of less likely options.




Figure 6: Transition in choices of LLM-based agents playing against fixed strategy opponents.

*Convergence of Choices and Evolution of Strategic Levels.* For both types, decreasing strategic uncertainty is related to higher convergence rate. When evaluating the transition in strategic levels across periods, high types show transition from 0 to 1, while most of the low types stay at level-0, with some fluctuations between 0 and 1 when strategic uncertainty is high and actions are more noisy.

*Payoffs.* The payoffs are in favor of LLM-based agents when strategic uncertainty is relatively high. High types could gain better payoffs under low and high strategic uncertainty as compared to mixed environment, where they receive a flat payoff of 0 throughout the periods. Comparing between the types, interestingly, payoffs achieved in all settings by the low types could be comparable or even higher than that of the high types, though the variations is also larger. This indicates that higher strategic level does not necessarily imply higher payoffs when competing against fixed strategy opponents. This results not only signifies the potential game play if human subjects are playing against opponents that naively adopt a fixed strategy of 0, it could also illustrate a possible outcome if they are going against static computer algorithms executing a fixed NE strategy. (Appendix A.3.3)

*Application.* One example of beauty contest applications is the Bertrand competition model. (Mauersberger and Nagel (2018)) LLM-based and fixed strategy agents can be perceived as firms adopting different pricing strategies, with the objective to win over the market and maximize their profits. Fixed strategy firms could be playing the equilibrium action by setting the price equals to marginal cost, while LLM-based firms could be more dynamic and adjust their prices in each period. If there exist certain rigidity in the short run, such as production capacity constraints for the firms or limited response time for the consumers, then those who set higher prices would be able to gain

higher profits. In the long run, however, all factor inputs are flexible and consumers will not purchase from the firm that sells a homogeneous product but at a higher price than the equilibrium. As a result, high type firms could often achieve better outcome than low types in the short run, where they can earn a positive profit by converging gradually. Even in the long run, the larger variance in pricing strategies for the low types as compared to high types, where they either failed to converge or display high volatility in prices, could adversely impact their profits. If firms outsource their pricing strategies to automated algorithms, the simulation could also be interpreted as competition between different algorithms. While automated pricing has been widely discussed in literature, those back-boned by LLMs that could respond to changes in rivals' strategies by adjusting their own could spark fresh perspectives. (Brown and MacKay (2023), Chen et al. (2016))

**Dynamic environment: LLM vs. LLM.** In this setting, LLM-based agents are playing against each other (GPT3.5 is denoted as  $H$ , and PaLM as  $L$  henceforth). The 5 treatments are: (1) 10  $H$  LLMs; (2) 9  $H$  LLMs + 1  $L$  LLM; (3) 5  $H$  LLMs + 5  $L$  LLMs; (4) 1  $H$  LLM + 9  $L$  LLMs; (5) 10  $L$  LLMs. I use the original prompt in Appendix A.1.

In Figure 7, set-up 1 and 5 depict pure intelligence environments. While the high types show adjustment in their choices to lower numbers, the low types persistently choose around 50. In set-up 2 to 4, both high and low type agents show convergence to lower numbers. The main difference is that the gap between the numbers chosen by the high and low types is smaller when there is higher proportion of low types in the group. The results shows that low type agents fail to adapt their strategies despite disclosure of historical information in the pure environment that only comprises of low types, but mixed environments could instigate faster learning, which applies for both high and low types, particularly when there is higher proportion of high types. This put forth a strong statement that adding a single high type could very well stir the pot and speed up learning.




Figure 7: Impact of variations in proportion of different LLM-based agents on chosen number.

*Convergence of Choices and Evolution of Strategic Levels:* Figure 8 shows low and approximately flat convergence rates for set-up 1 and 5. In the mixed environments, the convergence speed fluctuates but could be higher than the pure environments. For instance, most of the convergence rates in set-up 2 to 4 lay above the lines for set-up 1 and 5, and higher the proportion of  $H$ , the higher the convergence rates. As for variations in strategic levels across time, all set-ups, except for 5 where low types do not display any apparent evidence of learning, shows changes in strategic levels. In set-up 3 particularly, high types could reach a strategic level greater than 1, which implies having highly mixed environment could also stimulate considerable growth in depth of reasoning for some agents. A possible conjecture for this could be that the strategic landscape is more complex in a highly mixed environment, agents cannot simply default to strategies assuming similar reasoning process from all agents, and this induces increasing depth of reasoning.



*Payoffs:* The maximum possible payoffs that can be achieved in the mixed environment is either comparable or could be higher in mixed environments than pure environments. Since this is a competitive game, higher gain for some also means higher losses for some, thus the variability in payoff outcomes is also larger. While low types usually obtain positive payoffs at the beginning of the game for choosing 50, which is closer to  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the average, this head-start is soon eroded if there exist any high type in the group, who learn to react to this information rapidly, therefore, low types are less likely to win across periods. The degree of heterogeneity also matters. High types could obtain higher average payoffs at the expense of low types when low types  $\geq 50\%$ , and low types are better off if there are less high types. (Appendix A.3.3)




Figure 8: Average convergence rates.

*Application.* The simulation results could assist in informing policies. An obvious example is the streaming system in schools, where students are allocated into different classes based on their grades to facilitate better learning. (Ireson and Hallam (1999), Liem et al. (2013)) Suppose students are classified into high and low types in terms of ability, my findings provide an argument for a mixed learning environment, where the low types would learn faster when integrated into a class with larger proportion of higher ability peers; even for high types, their learning rate could be slightly improved. Furthermore, the results also makes a case for the usefulness of a variety of LLMs, including weaker models. Even though they do not learn when competing with each other, they could when placed in presence of stronger LLMs. Stronger LLMs could also benefit from playing against small proportion of weaker LLMs as shown by higher learning rates, or better average payoffs when playing against higher proportion of weaker LLMs. These set forth the value of continual investment in LLMs of differing strength.

**Reasoning Elicitation.** While it is recognized that drawing direct relations between LLM-based agents and humans in terms of internal reasoning process may be speculative and overextending parallels, therefore analyzing observed actions take precedence in this paper, but reasoning elicitation may serve as an avenue to gain some potential idea of agents’ rationale for making certain choices and how they might learn. In all set-ups, LLM-based agents were prompted at the beginning of period 1 to state their understanding of the game, and for each subsequent periods, they are asked to reinstate the goals. This step is essential to mitigate the potential of them not comprehending the game. In which case, LLM-based agents are able to correctly recite the game rules. The agents were also asked to give a statement of reasoning in support of their choices. In period 1, both high and low types make choices based on their belief of a popular number, which is often the mean of the range. In subsequent periods, I found that low types appear to learn by either adjusting the reference point, and make selection that still comply with a strategic level of 0, or via imitation by following the winner’s past choice. They may also not learn at all, and continue to select a number that they believe to be the popular choice. As for the high types, they can learn by (1) anchoring their guesses to two-thirds of the past period’s average; (2) imitating winner’s strategy; (3) adjusting based on past period payoffs; and also (4) pattern recognition. Agents may place different reliance on distinct pieces of historical information when making their choices, and multiple types of learning could come into play. This diversity in learning mechanisms could lead to higher speed of changes in average choices, and in turn translate into higher strategic level. (Appendix A.3.4)

## 5 Limitations and Extensions

Much like experiments with human subjects, LLM-based agents could also be sensitive to variations in game design, feedback, and instructions. This work only explored a small number of set-ups and for a particular competitive game, which can be a limitation in scope, but it serves the main purpose of pitching for the potential of LLMs as a valuable tool for social sciences research, and beauty contests being a game of substantial impact in economics research provides an excellent foundation for this line of work. Some of the possible extensions would be to include:

**Variations in Game Design and Feedback.** While I focused on  $p = \frac{2}{3}$ ,  $p$  can be varied to  $\frac{1}{2}$  or  $\frac{4}{3}$  to replicate human subject experiments, in which case, equilibrium multiplicity could arise, allowing for analysis on equilibrium selection. (Nagel (1995)) In addition, the same set-ups can be implemented but with variations in which piece(s) of historical information to reveal.

**Objectives.** Human are sensitive to problem framing and phrasing of survey questions, similarly, LLMs' decisions could be influenced by the formatting of prompts as well. (Tversky and Kahneman (1981), Kalton and Schuman (1982), Sclar et al. (2023)) This work explores how agents behave when the objectives are set to be winning the game and followed by maximizing their payoffs, but in most economic models, the primary focus is usually on maximizing utilities and then winning. In this competitive game, the winning strategy is also one that gives the best payoff, thus changing the sequence of objectives is unlikely to result in drastic differences in game outcomes, but could serve as a sanity check.

**Prompt Language.** In Guo et al. (2024), the prompt language was changed to Mandarin Chinese in the multi-LLM-based agents setting. It was found that PaLM is unable to complete the games, indicating potential difficulty in comprehending the instructions when they are given in another language. As for GPT3.5, it can complete the game in Chinese setting but the choices are more clustered. The variance in strategies observed as compared to the English setting may reflect differences in strategic behaviours among different language users that the models are trained on, or it could stem from a significantly smaller availability of human-generated data in another language. While current work focused on English setting, future work could involve replicating the set-ups in other prompt languages to model heterogeneous population in another dimension.

**Human-machine Interactions.** Previously, experimental designs involving computers usually comprise of pre-defined algorithms, and humans were found to display higher degree of strategic reasoning when competing against fellow human opponents as opposed to computer algorithms. (Coricelli and Nagel (2009)) Human vs. LLMs could offer a fresh form of human-machine interactions as LLM-based agents could respond dynamically and switch their strategies given historical information, thereby contributing to greater strategic uncertainty and complexity. Given LLMs display some degree of learning abilities, they could also be learning from playing with human subjects, making the interactions more intriguing to explore.

**Future Validity.** Another important question would be the future validity of the results proposed by this paper. In this paper, the measures of strategic levels are robust to changing game parameter, such as the upper bound of the choice range, which could serve as a form of sensitivity test and make the results more replicable under the same conditions. Apart from this, there has been growing interest in exploring if prompting LLMs with questions could make them more strategically sophisticated in the future, and therefore the results cannot be replicated. This work shows that within a given session, models converge towards NE choice if they gain exposure to past play information, which is indicative of their learning ability over time, offering the possibility of individuals training their own algorithms to better fit their preferences in different contexts and LLMs becoming more sophisticated in the future. However, since the experiments are conducted with effectively stagnant LLM versions, and information in each round is controlled and has no impact on the back-end databases, this enhance the validity of results, making them replicable under the same set-ups. If future versions of LLMs incorporate the questions asked by the individuals into their training, then new models could be relatively more sophisticated or on the contrary, less sophisticated due to incorporation of more noisy data. This could give rise to more serious concerns over whom are the models aligning to, which is an open question for future exploration.

## 6 Conclusion

The contribution of this work is threefold. Firstly, it serves as part of the literature that seeks to make a case for integration of LLMs as tools for social sciences research. It then proposed the adoption of LLM-based agents in multi-player competitive games and explore the beauty contests in particular. Drawing parallels to human subjects, LLM-based agents were evaluated similarly in terms of strategic levels and were found to have levels in between 0 and 1, which is slightly lower than human subjects. Most of them also exhibit learning from historical information, showing convergence to the NE choice at varying rate, demonstrating either revision in "beliefs" about their opponents, or increasing depth of reasoning. Similar to human subjects, though strategic levels evolve over time, the increase

is minimal. Further, to better understand strategic interactions in varying environments, I simulated game play between LLM-based agents and fixed-strategy opponents, as well as among LLM-based agents. By varying the proportion of agent types in each group, I found LLM-based agents converge slower to 0 as the proportion of fixed-strategy agents decreases, demonstrating the impact of increased strategic uncertainty. Agents were also found to learn faster when placed in mixed environments with players of different strategic levels than environments that comprises of a single type. This postulates the potential for stimulating faster learning, particularly among less intelligent agents, by introducing heterogeneity into the groups. Last but not least, this work offers some insights into how different algorithms could behave when interacting with one another, showing potential outcomes if algorithms were to act as proxies for humans and applied to competitive situations.

There are many possible extensions and great potentials for LLMs to be employed as toolkits for social sciences research in interpreting and deciphering human behaviour, which remain a relatively new subject area. The reverse is true as well, theories and experimental results from decades of learning about human decision-making can be similarly used to better understand machine behaviours and improve their performance.

## References

- Aher, G. V., Arriaga, R. I., and Kalai, A. T. (2023). Using large language models to simulate multiple humans and replicate human subject studies. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 337–371. PMLR.
- Akata, E., Schulz, L., Coda-Forno, J., Oh, S. J., Bethge, M., and Schulz, E. (2023). Playing repeated games with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16867*.
- Argyle, L. P., Busby, E. C., Fulda, N., Gubler, J. R., Rytting, C., and Wingate, D. (2023). Out of one, many: Using language models to simulate human samples. *Political Analysis*, 31(3):337–351.
- Bauer, K., Liebich, L., Hinz, O., and Kosfeld, M. (2023). Decoding gpt’s hidden ‘rationality’ of cooperation.
- Bosch-Domenech, A., Montalvo, J. G., Nagel, R., and Satorra, A. (2002). One, two,(three), infinity,... : Newspaper and lab beauty-contest experiments. *American Economic Review*, 92(5):1687–1701.
- Brown, Z. Y. and MacKay, A. (2023). Competition in pricing algorithms. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 15(2):109–156.
- Camerer, C. F., Ho, T.-H., and Chong, J.-K. (2004). A cognitive hierarchy model of games. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(3):861–898.
- Chen, L., Mislove, A., and Wilson, C. (2016). An empirical analysis of algorithmic pricing on amazon marketplace. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 1339–1349.
- Chen, Y., Liu, T. X., Shan, Y., and Zhong, S. (2023). The emergence of economic rationality of gpt. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(51):e2316205120.
- Coricelli, G. and Nagel, R. (2009). Neural correlates of depth of strategic reasoning in medial prefrontal cortex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(23):9163–9168.
- Costa-Gomes, M. A. and Weizsäcker, G. (2008). Stated beliefs and play in normal-form games. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 75(3):729–762.
- Devetag, G., Di Guida, S., and Polonio, L. (2016). An eye-tracking study of feature-based choice in one-shot games. *Experimental Economics*, 19:177–201.
- Dillion, D., Tandon, N., Gu, Y., and Gray, K. (2023). Can ai language models replace human participants? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*.
- Fan, C., Chen, J., Jin, Y., and He, H. (2023). Can large language models serve as rational players in game theory? a systematic analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05488*.
- Goldberg, D. (1991). What every computer scientist should know about floating-point arithmetic. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 23(1):5–48.
- Guo, F. (2023). Gpt in game theory experiments. *arXiv:2305.05516*.
- Guo, S., Bu, H., Wang, H., Ren, Y., Sui, D., Shang, Y., and Lu, S. (2024). Economics arena for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01735*.
- Horton, J. J. (2023). Large language models as simulated economic agents: What can we learn from homo silicus? Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- HuggingFace (2022). Illustrating reinforcement learning from human feedback (rlhf).
- Huijzer, R. and Hill, Y. (2023). Large language models show human behavior.
- IBM (2024). Tokens and tokenization. Accessed: 2024-04-10.
- Ireson, J. and Hallam, S. (1999). Raising standards: Is ability grouping the answer? *Oxford review of education*, 25(3):343–358.

- Kalton, G. and Schuman, H. (1982). The effect of the question on survey responses: A review. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 145(1):42–57.
- Keynes, J. M. (1936). The general theory of interest, employment and money.
- Kosinski, M. (2023). Theory of mind may have spontaneously emerged in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02083*.
- Liem, G. A. D., Marsh, H. W., Martin, A. J., McInerney, D. M., and Yeung, A. S. (2013). The big-fish-little-pond effect and a national policy of within-school ability streaming: Alternative frames of reference. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(2):326–370.
- Mauersberger, F. and Nagel, R. (2018). Levels of reasoning in keynesian beauty contests: a generative framework. In *Handbook of computational economics*, volume 4, pages 541–634. Elsevier.
- Mei, Q., Xie, Y., Yuan, W., and Jackson, M. O. (2024). A turing test of whether ai chatbots are behaviorally similar to humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(9):e2313925121.
- Nagel, R. (1995). Unraveling in guessing games: An experimental study. *The American economic review*, 85(5):1313–1326.
- Nagel, R., Bühren, C., and Frank, B. (2017). Inspired and inspiring: Hervé moulin and the discovery of the beauty contest game. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 90:191–207.
- OpenAI (2024). How chatgpt and our language models are developed.
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., et al. (2022). Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Phelps, S. and Russell, Y. I. (2023). Investigating emergent goal-like behaviour in large language models using experimental economics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07970*.
- Sciar, M., Choi, Y., Tsvetkov, Y., and Suhr, A. (2023). Quantifying language models’ sensitivity to spurious features in prompt design or: How i learned to start worrying about prompt formatting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11324*.
- Trality (2024). Crypto trading bots: The ultimate beginner’s guide.
- Tversky, A. and Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *science*, 211(4481):453–458.
- Webb, T., Holyoak, K. J., and Lu, H. (2023). Emergent analogical reasoning in large language models. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 7(9):1526–1541.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Original Exemplary Prompt

#### One-shot games with multi-LLM-based agents.

**[System Instruction.]** I want you to act as a clever game player and perform as rationally as possible.

**[User Instruction.]** You are playing a game and the rules are as follows:

- it consists of {number of players} players, including you.
- this is a one-round game.
- you need to choose a real number between 0 and {upper bound}, 0 and {upper bound} inclusive.
- everyone does not know how others would make choices beforehand.
- the winner is the person whose number is the closest to the two thirds of the average of all chosen numbers.
- the winner gets a fixed prize, in case of a tie the prize is split amongst those who tie.
- your goal is primarily to maximize the possibility of getting the prize and secondly to maximize the your prize.

#### Subsequent Prompt for Historical Information.

**[User Instruction.]**

- The game of the same config has been hold for {number of runs} run(s), and the historical choices of everyone are shown below (your id is {ID of the agent}: {historical information including (1) period index, (2) choices made by all agents, (3) average of the choices; (4) 2/3 of the average; (5) winner id.}
- Everyone can optimize his/her answer with the history to play in a new run in order to achieve goals.

(Return to 3) (Return to 4)



## A.2 New Exemplary Prompt

### Opponents Playing Fixed Strategy of 0

**[System Instruction.]** I want you to act as a clever game player and perform as rationally as possible.

**[User Instruction.]** You are playing a game and the rules are as follows:

- it consists of {number of players} players, including you.
- this is a one-round game.
- you need to choose a real number between 0 and {upper bound}, 0 and {upper bound} inclusive.
- everyone does not know how others would make choices beforehand.
- the winner is the person whose number is the closest to the two thirds of the average of all chosen numbers.
- the winner gets a fixed prize, in case of a tie the prize is split amongst those who tie.
- your goal is primarily to maximize the possibility of getting the prize and secondly to maximize the your prize.
- some of your opponents will be playing a fixed strategy of 0 and all others are behaving as rationally as possible.

*Follow-up for each period.*

Please just strictly output a JSON string, which has following keys:

- understanding: str, your brief understanding of the game
- popular answer: float, the number which you think other players are most likely to choose
- answer: float, the number which you would like to choose
- reason: str, the brief reason why you give the popular answer and the answer that way

*Subsequent Prompt (after period 1).*

- The game of the same config has been hold for {number of runs} run(s), and the historical choices of everyone are shown below (your id is {ID of the agent}: {historical information including (1) period index, (2) choices made by all agents, (3) average of the choices; (4) 2/3 of the average; (5) winner id.}
- Everyone can optimize his/her answer with the history to play in a new run in order to achieve goals.

(Return to 4)

### A.3 Additional Details

#### A.3.1 Choice Variability Given the Same Upper-bound

Figure 9 shows that within the 150 sessions, for the sessions that have the same randomly generated upper-bound,  $\bar{c}$ , the same LLM-based agent could choose slightly different numbers. For instance, Claude2, GPT3.5 and GPT4 displayed more variability in choices as compared to other models. This results is indicative that, like human players, there could be variability in choices for LLM-based agents. Since choices might not be static even when the instructions is exactly the same, the determination of average choices and the corresponding strategic levels based on both identical and different upper-bounds would lead to a more consistent and robust measure.




Figure 9: Variability in chosen number given the same upper-bound.

Return to Section 3.

#### A.3.2 Choices and Strategic Levels in Repeated Games




Figure 10: Choices and strategic levels over 6 periods across 30 sessions.

Figure 10 illustrates the frequency of choices and the corresponding strategic levels computed over 6 periods and across 30 sessions for the repeated setting. The results are similar to the one-shot game, where most of the LLM-based agents choose 50 (normalized) with high frequency. There is greater dispersion in number selected as compared to the one-shot games, which is an indication that agents do change their actions over time and there is more selection below 50. Following Nagel (1995)’s method of computing for strategic levels in repeated setting, where reference points in period 2 onwards are re-calibrated to be the mean choice of the past period. In experiments with human subjects, there are no support for increasing depth of reasoning as they rarely go over iteration step 2. With LLM-based agents, the results are similar. Most of them display spike at 0 and 1, with **GPT4** showing spike at both 1 and 2. While they do stay below iteration step 2, as compared to their period 1 performance (Figure 11), some of them display minor increase in strategic levels. In particular, **GPT4** has strategic level much lower than 2 in period 1, but is able to achieve approximately level-2 over time.




Figure 11: Period 1 strategic level.

Return to Section 3.

### A.3.3 Variations in Group Composition

#### Detailed set-ups.

- 10 agents are playing in each game.
- The same group plays for 5 periods, and all history are revealed.
- They choose a number between 0 and  $\bar{c}$ ,  $\bar{c}$  is fixed to be 100. The winner is the agent whose number is the closest to  $p$  times the average of all chosen numbers, where  $p = \frac{2}{3}$  to ensure a unique interior NE solution.
- In each period, the winner gets a fixed prize of  $\$x$ . In case of a tie, the prize is split amongst those who tie. All other players receive 0.

**Expected choice variation across periods when playing against fixed-strategy opponents.** Denoting  $a_t$  to be the action/number guessed in each time period,  $N_f$  to be the number of fixed-strategy players and  $N_l$  to be the number of LLM-based agents, the selection in the next period:

$$a_{t+1} = BR(N_f, N_l, a_t) = \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{N_f}{10} * 0 + \frac{N_l}{10} a_t \right) \quad (1)$$

The choice variation over the periods is computed with  $\frac{a_{t+1}}{a_t}$ . There are three treatment groups for LLM-based agents vs. fixed-strategy opponents, differing in proportion of player types. For 9/10 fixed-strategy agents, the next period guess is expected to be 0.067 of the previous number; For 5/10 fixed-strategy agents, the guess is expected to be 0.333 of the previous number; For 1/10 fixed-strategy agents, the guess is expected to be 0.6 of the previous number. Lowering proportion of fixed-strategy types in the group is hypothesized to induce higher guesses and will slow down the convergence process.

**Expected choice variation across periods when playing against LLM-based agents.** Let the strategy of high type in period  $t$  be  $a_{Ht}$  and that of low type be  $a_{Lt}$ , the selection in the next period:

$$a_{it+1} = BR(B(N_H), B(N_L), a_t) = \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{B(N_H)}{10} a_{Ht} + \frac{B(N_L)}{10} a_{Lt} \right), i \in (H, L) \quad (2)$$

where  $B(N_H)$  and  $B(N_L)$  are agent  $i$ 's "beliefs" about the number of high types and low types. When playing against fixed strategy opponents, it is possible to observe in period 2 who selected 0, thereby deriving the correct proportion of fixed strategy players within the population. However, as all agents are LLM-based in this set-up, it could be harder to distinguish the proportion of types within the group based on historical choices in period 2, for instance, even if they chose the same

number it does not imply they are of the same type. Further, the agents were not told explicitly their own type relative to the others, so they have to guess if they fall within  $N_H$  or  $N_L$ . As a result, the best response of a specific agent would be dependent on its “beliefs” about the proportion of high and low types. In the case where beliefs are correct given revealed information, then  $B(N_H) = N_H$  and  $B(N_L) = N_L$ .

Suppose one correctly perceived the proportion of agent types based on revealed historical choices, the variation of number selected over the periods could similarly be computed with  $\frac{a_{t+1}}{a_t}$ . There are five treatment groups for LLM-based agents vs. LLM-based agents, differing in proportion of player types.

- Pure high intelligence environment: It is expected that the next period guess will be 0.667 of the previous number.
- Highly intelligent environment:
 
$$\frac{a_{Ht+1}}{a_{Ht}} = 0.067 \frac{a_{Lt}}{a_{Ht}} + 0.6, \frac{a_{Lt+1}}{a_{Lt}} = 0.6 \frac{a_{Ht}}{a_{Lt}} + 0.067, \text{ for } \frac{a_{Ht}}{a_{Lt}} < 1, \frac{a_{Ht+1}}{a_{Ht}} > \frac{a_{Lt+1}}{a_{Lt}}$$
- Mixed intelligent environment:
 
$$\frac{a_{Ht+1}}{a_{Ht}} = 0.333 \frac{a_{Lt}}{a_{Ht}} + 0.333, \frac{a_{Lt+1}}{a_{Lt}} = 0.333 \frac{a_{Ht}}{a_{Lt}} + 0.333, \text{ for } \frac{a_{Ht}}{a_{Lt}} < 1, \frac{a_{Ht+1}}{a_{Ht}} > \frac{a_{Lt+1}}{a_{Lt}}$$
- Less intelligent environment:
 
$$\frac{a_{Ht+1}}{a_{Ht}} = 0.6 \frac{a_{Lt}}{a_{Ht}} + 0.067, \frac{a_{Lt+1}}{a_{Lt}} = 0.067 \frac{a_{Ht}}{a_{Lt}} + 0.6, \text{ for } \frac{a_{Ht}}{a_{Lt}} < 1, \frac{a_{Ht+1}}{a_{Ht}} > \frac{a_{Lt+1}}{a_{Lt}}$$
- Pure low intelligence environment: It is expected that the next period guess will be 0.667 of the previous number.

For pure environments, the rate of change in choices is expected to be the same for high and low types. For set-ups 2 to 4, if high types chose a smaller number than low types because they go through more iterations of reasoning, and  $\frac{a_{Ht}}{a_{Lt}} < 1$ , then high types are expected to lower their guesses less from time  $t$  to  $t + 1$  as compared to low types. There could mean slower rate of change for high types than low types. Otherwise, if high types have strong beliefs that they are playing against opponents who will choose higher numbers while low types believe the other way around, then it is possible for  $\frac{a_{Ht}}{a_{Lt}} > 1$ , then low types are expected to lower their guesses less from time  $t$  to  $t + 1$  as compared to high types, implying faster rate of change in choices for high types than low types.

**Payoff transition when playing against fixed strategy opponents:**




Figure 12: Transition of payoffs for high type LLM-based agent(s) vs. fixed-strategy opponents.




Figure 13: Transition of payoffs for low type LLM-based agent(s) vs. fixed-strategy opponents.

## Payoff transition when playing with LLM-based opponents:




Figure 14: Transition of payoffs given variation in group composition for LLM-based agents playing against each other.

Return to Section 4.

### A.3.4 Reasoning Elicitation

It is acknowledged that delve into the reasoning behind LLM-based agents’ behaviours could be compelling and beneficial in understanding the choice process better, however, drawing a direct parallel to human subjects in terms of internal reasoning process that actually took place may be speculative. Therefore, details of the reasoning elicitation results are included as part of the Appendix. For illustration, herein, I explore specifically set-up 2 of LLMs vs. static algorithm and set-up 3 of LLMs vs. LLMs. The line of reasoning are fairly consistent across different set-ups.

*Partial static environment.* In period 1, both  $H$  and  $L$  agents correctly recite the game rules and objectives they need to follow. Upon selecting their choices, they were asked about how they arrive at their selection. Based on the responses,  $H$  and  $L$  agents indicate that they make their decision based on their perception of the popular number that may be picked, which implies that they are both reacting to beliefs about opponents’ choices.  $L$  agents chose 50, which they believe is the popular answer.  $H$  agents chose 66.67 or 66.6 because it is close to the upper limit of the range, possibly using the upper-bound as the focal point, or that they are going by iterated elimination of dominated strategies. Based on period 1 reasoning,  $L$  agents exhibit strategic naivete and they did not really take into consideration that they are playing with fixed strategy players who will be choosing 0, they do appear more concern about the average. Conversely,  $H$  agents display more strategic sophistication in reasoning about their opponents’ behaviours, and it appears they contemplate more based on opponents’ choices and  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the average.

In subsequent periods,  $L$  agents show two possible responses. The first is to acknowledge the average of all chosen numbers, and that the winner was the one that chose 0.0. They would then choose 0.0, believing it to be the best strategy and the most likely number to be chosen by the other players. The second possible response is to stick to the answer of 50, believing it to remain the most popular answer, in which case, past information does not appear to have any influence on their behaviour. As for  $H$  agents, they acknowledged in their reasoning process that historical information are taken into account, particularly the average and  $\frac{2}{3}$  of this average, and its choice is adjusted to this value to maximize the probability of winning the game. One discrepancy between different  $H$  agents is the number of decimal places they appear to account for when computing past period average. For example, after learning period 1 information, some  $H$  agents in period 2 adjust to select 22.209333333333333 and some to 22.209. In the set-ups outlined in this paper, agents can choose any number within the range, and computationally, as a result of floating-point precision, the number

of choices are finite. (Goldberg (1991)) The difference in the number selection could be a result of token limitation, which specify the capacity of a model to handle or generate text within a sequence. (IBM (2024)) Given the slight variations in responses, the same type of agent could generate numbers of marginally different precision, where they could be rounded off or truncated to fit within the limit. Even though the difference between the numbers selected are essentially trivial, this property of LLMs may be perceived as a potential rather than a flaw that can have strategic significance and make a difference in payoffs obtained. However, this is not an issue in this set-up since the fixed-strategy players are the ones winning.

Based on the line of reasoning,  $L$  agents either adjust their choices according to the past periods' average or the winners' strategy, which can be an indication of learning through imitation. It is also possible they show no adjustment and continue to pick 50, which they perceive to be the popular choice at the start of the game. Further, throughout the reasoning process, they did not mention fixed-strategy players, except when prompting their understanding of the game in period 1. It appears that they do not make use of such information. On the other hand,  $H$  agents adjust their choice according to the information on past periods' average and  $\frac{2}{3}$  of that value. There is step-by-step convergence that corresponds to the line of reasoning under level-1 thinking process. In contrast to  $L$ ,  $H$  agents mention about fixed-strategy players, but as historical information becomes available, they no longer reason about their choices using the proportion of fixed-strategy players and focus more on the information about  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the average.

*Dynamic environment.* In period 1, both  $H$  and  $L$  accurately recite game rules and objectives. Similar to the case with fixed-strategy opponents, when LLM-based agents are asked to state the reasoning of their choices,  $L$  agents respond that they have chosen 50 because they believe other players are most likely to choose numbers around 50, which is the middle number and a safe bet. Meanwhile,  $H$  agents also believe the popular answer is likely to be around 50, but they respond to that by choosing 66.67, which again can be an indication that they are using the upper-bound as the focal point or they are following iterated elimination of dominated strategies.

In subsequent periods, as compared to the environment with fixed-strategy opponents, LLM-based agents in the game of LLMs vs. LLMs display slightly larger variability in the phrasing of their answers, while the content remain fairly consistent. When making their choices,  $L$  agents take into consideration the average of all chosen numbers,  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the average, as well as the winners' choice. For  $H$  agents, they anchor their guesses to  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the previous round average, complying with level-1 thinking. They also appear to consider winner's strategy, where some of them indicate that they are aligning their choices with the winning strategy from the previous round. Based on overall line of reasoning,  $L$  agents demonstrate mimicry of the winner's choice in previous round, and state that they believe the other players are most likely to choose the same winning number again.  $H$  agents show adjustment in choices to  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the previous period's average due to the following reasons: (1) They incorporated information about winner's strategy, which is an indication of learning by imitation. (2) By stating that they are aiming to be closer to  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the past average implies adjustment according to level-1 reasoning, where the new guess is anchored to a new reference point. (3) There is also a hint of outcome-based learning, where some mentioned they were not the closest to  $\frac{2}{3}$  of average in the past round, and this propels a change in their strategy in the current round. (4) Lastly, a surprising thing that one agent mentioned was that "considering the trend of decreasing choices in the previous runs, it seems reasonable to continue this trend and choose a lower number." This highlights there could be learning based on pattern recognition.

Similar to the analysis before, since agents are allow to choose any number that falls within in the range, there is slight variations in the guesses chosen by  $H$  agents due to token allocation. However, in this set-up, this distinction matters as the winner of the round that guesses with more or less decimal places could have won the game. This property could have interesting implications. It shows that even though information revealed are identical, there could be variations in information consideration and choices among homogeneous agents. While such numerical variations are often trivial, having negligible impact on the determination of strategic levels, a small difference in choices could lead to a large difference in payoffs given the settings illustrated in this paper. It is entirely possible that agents are deliberately choosing a number just slightly larger or smaller in order to beat the rest to be closer to two-thirds of the average, or that agents are unconsciously selecting a longer string of decimal places, which could end up winning the game. The settings with LLM-based agents most likely fall in the second category. Since the information is feed to all agents at the beginning of



each period, there are no distinction in what is being observed, therefore the difference lays in that some agents are able to process longer string of information, which technically boils down to token constraints. However, this constraint can potentially relates to the processing capability of human subjects, illustrating the amount of "attention" to the information given. Having better "attention" could imply incorporating longer string of information in decision-making, and thus higher payoffs in certain set-ups. Nonetheless, there can be instances where having more decimal place is detrimental to the outcome, such that the choice is further away from  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the average than rounded-off numbers selected by players who do not pay as much "attention". Intriguingly, this potential opens up the study of attention in beauty contest game outcomes, which has yet to be addressed.

Return to Section 4.