

Mimicry and the Emergence of Cooperative Communication

Dylan Cope and Peter McBurney
King's College London
dylan.cope@kcl.ac.uk

Abstract

In many situations, communication between agents is a critical component of cooperative multi-agent systems, however, it can be difficult to learn or evolve. In this paper, we investigate a simple way in which the emergence of communication may be facilitated. Namely, we explore the effects of when agents can mimic preexisting, externally generated useful signals. The key idea here is that these signals incentivise listeners to develop positive responses, that can then also be invoked by speakers mimicking those signals. This investigation starts with formalising this problem, and demonstrating that this form of mimicry changes optimisation dynamics and may provide the opportunity to escape non-communicative local optima. We then explore the problem empirically with a simulation in which spatially situated agents must communicate to collect resources. Our results show that both evolutionary optimisation and reinforcement learning may benefit from this intervention.

Introduction

The emergence of communication between cooperative co-evolving agents has a chicken-and-egg problem. For producing a signal to be advantageous, the speaker needs to invoke a desirable behaviour in the listener. Likewise, from the listener's perspective, attending to signals is only advantageous if they carry pertinent information. Therefore, communication only emerges when, by chance, the speaker happens to signal relevant information and the listener happens to respond positively to those signals. In this paper, we are interested in how the emergence of communication may be facilitated by the capacity for speakers to mimic externally generated signals that already carry valuable information. The key hypothesis here is that the external signals provide an incentive for the listener to develop a positive response to a stimulus. Then, the speaker can mimic that signal to also invoke the same beneficial behaviour in the listener.

To investigate this idea, we start with a theoretical analysis of some of the difficulties that emergent communication

faces. We first focus on independent optimisers and show how the potential for mimicry alters the optimisation criteria to help communication develop. Then we shift to analysing centralised optimisers. We look at how, despite ameliorating some issues, communication may still fail to develop due to local optima. However, here again, the capacity for agents to mimic useful external signals improves the potential for communicative strategies to develop. Finally, we conduct an empirical investigation using a simulation with spatially situated agents collecting resources. We train agents to solve this task using deep neuroevolution and multi-agent reinforcement learning, to compare different optimisation methods. These results demonstrate that mimicable signals can have a positive effect, and mimicry does indeed emerge.

Unlike most studies of mimicry, this investigation concerns *cooperative communication*, i.e. signalling between agents acting to achieve shared goals. This is in contrast to *deceptive communication*, where a preexisting signalling system is exploited by an adversary that mimics signals to its advantage. However, communication as a tool for cooperation is indispensable for complex collective decision-making. Furthermore, Grice (1975) suggests that a *cooperative principle* is fundamental to human language. Therefore, exploring the evolution of cooperative communication may shed light on the emergence of language, or provide insight into developing sophisticated cooperative artificial agents.

Background and Related Work

Mimicry

Mimicry is a widely studied phenomenon in evolutionary theory (Maran, 2017; Kleisner and Maran, 2019; Wickler, 1965; Quicke, 2017), tracing back to the work of Bates (1862). This form of mimicry, called *Batesian mimicry*, involves a system with three parts: a *model* that a *mimic* takes on the perceived characteristics of, to fool a *perceiver* (Kleisner and Maran, 2019). Deceptive communication can take the form of *aggressive mimicry* where a predator exploits a prey, for instance, some spiders lure male moths by mimicking female moth sex pheromones (Yeargan and Quate, 1996). Alternatively, *defensive mimicry* involves

prey exploiting predators, such as non-toxic moths imitating the sounds produced by toxic moths to deter bats (O’Reilly et al., 2019). In both cases, the mimic generates a signal to trick or deceive another agent. Researchers in Artificial Life on mimicry have expanded on this work, with deceptive communication studied in ecosystem simulations (Hraber et al., 1997; Lehman et al., 2018; Islam and Grogono, 2016; Marriott et al., 2018; Reynolds, 2011; Floreano et al., 2007).

Genetic Algorithms and Neuroevolution

Genetic Algorithms (GAs) are a class of optimisation algorithms that evolve a population of ‘genomes’ that encode (attempted) solutions to a given task (Mitchell, 1996; Holland, 1992; Floreano and Claudio, 2008). Performance on the task, called fitness, is measured for each member of the population, and then selection and repopulation processes are applied to construct the next generation of the simulation. The most basic selection method is *truncation*, where a subset of the best individuals are used for repopulation. The population is restored to its original size by producing *off-spring*. This may be done by applying random perturbations to parents (i.e. *mutations*), and/or by *sexual recombination* (also called crossover) where segments of two or more genomes are combined. For almost as long as there have been GAs and artificial neural networks, there have been approaches for optimising network parameters with GAs (Ronald and Schoenauer, 1994; Angeline et al., 1994; Stanley and Miikkulainen, 2002; Galván, 2021). In deep reinforcement learning, simple GAs can be effective (Such et al., 2017), and population-based methods have been demonstrated to soften the exploitation-exploration problem (Conti et al., 2018; Jaderberg et al., 2019).

Decentralised POMDPs

A *Decentralised Partially-Observable Markov Decision Process* (Dec-POMDP) is a formal model of a cooperative, multi-agent, sequential decision-making problem defined as a tuple $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, T, r, \Omega, O)$ (Oliehoek and Amato, 2016), where \mathcal{S} is a set of states, and $\mathcal{A} = \prod_i \mathcal{A}^i$ is a product of individual agent action sets. A *joint action* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}$ is a tuple of actions from each agent that is used to compute the environment’s transition dynamics, defined by a probability distribution over states $T : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Team performance is defined by a cooperative reward function $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S}$ over state transitions and joint actions. $\Omega = \{\Omega^i\}$ is a set of observation sets, and $O : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \prod_i \Omega^i$ is an observation function. For the purposes of this paper, each agent i follows a policy π_θ^i that maps observation sequences to action distribution, where θ is some parameterisation that may be optimised (using methods that we will discuss in the following subsections).

Emergent Communication

Emergent communication is the study of agents that learn or evolve to communicate. Each agent’s action set in the Dec-POMDP can be expressed as $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_i^c \times \mathcal{A}_i^e$ or $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_i^c \cup \mathcal{A}_i^e$, where \mathcal{A}_i^c is a set of *communicative actions*, and \mathcal{A}_i^e is a set of *environment actions*. This variant of a Dec-POMDP is known as a Dec-POMDP-Com (Goldman and Zilberstein, 2004, 2008; Oliehoek and Amato, 2016). The messages have no prior semantics as the transition function of the Dec-POMDP only depends on the environment actions \mathcal{A}_i^e , and agents are not a priori programmed to send messages with predetermined meanings. Therefore, semantics emerge through maximising reward.

Many works in Artificial Life research have studied the evolution of communication (Ackley and Littman, 1994; Oliphant, 1996; Bullock, 1997; Parisi, 1997; Noble et al., 2002; Floreano et al., 2007; Mirolli and Nolfi, 2010; Fox and Bullock, 2023), with a variety of approaches and settings considered. However, to the best of our knowledge this is the first study of the effects of mimicry on the emergence of communication in a cooperative setting.

Deep Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning

Reinforcement learning (RL) is a paradigm of machine learning algorithms generally formulated in terms of solving Markov decision processes (Sutton and Barto, 1998). Advances in deep learning over the last decade have been applied to RL in the form of value estimation (Mnih et al., 2015; Hessel et al., 2018) and policy gradient optimisation (Schulman et al., 2017; Lillicrap et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2017; Schulman et al., 2015). For this work, we will use the Multi-Agent Proximal Policy Optimisation (MAPPO) algorithm (Yu et al., 2022), a centralised multi-agent policy gradient method for training cooperative agents.

When applied to multi-agent communication problems, deep multi-agent RL (DMARL) enables the study of more complex behaviours. However, a fundamental issue with multi-agent learning problems is that when each agent learns independently, the learning dynamics may be chaotic (Hussain et al., 2023; Hussain and Belardinelli, 2024). This is especially tricky for communication, where the only thing that grounds a message’s consequences are the effects on the receiver’s actions. Foerster et al. (2016) and Sukhbaatar et al. (2016) were the first to approach this issue by developing differentiable communication channels between agents that can be discretised after training.

Independently Optimised Communication

In this section, we outline the difficulty for two independent optimising agents to develop communication with one another. We will look at each agent as an optimiser that maximises a utility function where the other agent is treated as static. Hence, in this case, the ‘chicken-and-egg’ issue is

a matter of each agent optimising non-stationary criteria in which the other agent appears to be random.

Consider a listener $\pi_{\theta^l}^l$ (a policy parameterised by θ^l) that observes signals $m \in \Sigma$ and takes actions $a \sim \pi_{\theta^l}^l(m)$. These actions result in some utility $U(a|z)$, where $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ is some latent variable. The agent will optimise θ^l to maximise the expected utility. Assuming that U is known, we define the expected utility for taking action a when observing m :

$$E[U(a|m)] = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P(z|m)U(a|z) \quad (1)$$

In settings where a speaker and listener are co-evolving or co-learning, the initial signals generated by the speaker are random. Therefore, messages are independent of the latent variable and $P(z|m) = P(z)$. As a result, when optimising the listener for this task the signals provide no information. In the worst case, the quantity

$$\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P(z)U(a|z) \quad (2)$$

is the same for all actions, meaning the listener cannot do better than taking random actions.

Next, we can construct a similar dilemma from the speaker's perspective. The speaker $\pi_{\theta^s}^s$, a policy parameterised by θ^s , observes the private variable $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and produces some signal $m \sim \pi_{\theta^s}^s(z)$. The expected utility for producing a given message is dependent on the listener, so:

$$E[U(m|z)] = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta^l}^l(a|m)U(a|z) \quad (3)$$

But again, at first, the listener produces random actions. So when optimising the expected utility for the speaker, we are effectively optimising the following expression,

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} U(a|z), \quad \text{as } \forall a, \pi_{\theta^l}^l(a|m) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \quad (4)$$

which is independent of the speaker's message. In other words, the speaker cannot affect the expected utility.

Externally Generated Useful Signals

To introduce the possibility of mimicry we will introduce *externally generated* signals that already carry useful information. In this setting, sometimes the listener observes a signal generated by the speaker, otherwise, it comes from an external source. Importantly, the listener does not know which source each signal has come from.

Let the proposition S denote that a signal is generated by the external source. We can decompose $P(z|m)$ from Equation 1 by into a weighted sum of these two cases:

$$P(z|m) = P(z|m, S)P(S) + P(z|m, \neg S)P(\neg S) \quad (5)$$

The speaker being untrained means $P(z|m, \neg S) = P(z)$. Making the substitution into Equation 1:

$$E[U(a|m)] = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left[\left(P(z|m, S) \cdot P(S) + P(z)P(\neg S) \right) \cdot U(a|z) \right] \quad (6)$$

Thus, supposing that $P(S)$ is non-zero and $P(z|m, S) \neq P(z)$, the listener is incentivised to modify its actions depending on the signal it observes. As a result, the expected utility for the speaker, defined by Equation 3, does not reduce to Equation 4 as the listener no longer produces random actions. Further, this means that is that the speaker is incentivised to mimic the externally generated signals, as those are what invoke the useful behaviours in the listener.

It is worth noting that a balance needs to be struck between giving both the listener and the speaker opportunities to improve. When $P(E)$ is high, the speaker will emit many signals that are never received. This is an issue for optimisation methods such as genetic algorithms or reinforcement learning that rely on estimating the expected utility from samples. As $P(E)$ increases, there will be greater variance in the expected utility estimates and progress will be slow (or impossible). This implies that this form of mimicry may provide the most advantage when the external source of information is removed at some point or fades over time. However, we will leave that situation for future work.

Getting Stuck in Local Optima

Many forms of optimisation are *centralised*, meaning that the problem of non-stationarity can be resolved. Yet, communication may fail to emerge if the optimisation process gets stuck in a local optimum. In the following analysis, we will consider a simple set-up in which both communicative and non-communicative strategies are possible. The aim is to show that even when communicative strategies are globally optimal, escaping local non-communicative optima may require a significant jump in communicative capabilities. Thereby making the transition from non-communicative to communicative behaviour unlikely.

To Speak, or Not to Speak

To make our analysis more concrete, we will construct a simple problem where communication is optional by defining a utility function U . In the previous section, we considered a setting where the only choice for the speaker was which signal to send. Here, the speaker chooses from a set of actions \mathcal{A}^s , where only a subset of these actions are signals: $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{A}^s$. The rest of the actions represent the speaker choosing to not communicate and acting independently of the listener. When the speaker does not send a signal, the listener observes a 'silent' symbol.

However, this setting is still cooperative, so these actions will still contribute some expected utility to the group. We

will introduce a simple utility function U composed of U^s , a function of the speaker's actions, and U^l , a function of the listener's actions.

$$U(a^s, a^l | z) = U^s(a^s) + U^l(a^l | z), \quad \text{where:}$$

$$U^s(a^s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a^s \in \Sigma \\ u & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad U^l(a^l | z) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a^l = z \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

In these equations, $a^s \in \mathcal{A}^s$ is the speaker's action, $a^l \in \mathcal{A}^l$ is the listener's action, and $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ is a variable hidden from the listener and known to the speaker. This variable is drawn from a uniform random distribution $z \sim U(\mathcal{Z})$. We will assume that $|\mathcal{A}^l| = |\mathcal{Z}|$, so each of the listener's actions corresponds to a guess about which z the speaker observed. In our notation, $a^l = z$ indicates that a correct guess was made, which awards the team 1 utility.

The speaker's direct contribution to the team, U^s , is defined by whether it communicates. If a communicative action is chosen, i.e. the action is a signal $a^s \in \Sigma$, and no utility is awarded. In this case, the team's utility solely derives from the listener's ability to guess the correct answer. When the speaker chooses not to communicate, i.e. $a^s \notin \Sigma$, the team is given a fixed reward u . This implicitly adds a cost to communication, as the speaker must give up u reward to send a signal.

When is Communication Selected?

We will denote the parameters for the speaker and listener policies together as θ , as we assume that both agents are jointly optimised. Given some θ , we can express the expected utility as:

$$E[U | \theta] = uP(a^s \notin \Sigma | \theta) + P(a^l = z | \theta) \quad (8)$$

We will refer to $P(a^l = z | \theta)$ as the *guess accuracy*. Given $|\Sigma| = |\mathcal{A}^l|$, it is always possible to successfully communicate. So when searching for parameterisations that maximise the expected utility we can consider two cases:

$$\max_{\theta} E[U | \theta] = \max \left\{ u + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|}, 1 \right\} \quad (9)$$

The first case represents the strategy where the speaker never communicates, therefore the team always gets u reward, and the listener makes the correct guess one in $|\mathcal{Z}|$ times. We will denote this quantity as α and refer to this strategy as the *optimal non-communicative strategy*. Similarly, the second case is the *optimal communicative strategy*, in which the speaker always signals the correct answer to the listener. Therefore, whether communication is the optimal overall strategy is given by:

$$\alpha < 1, \quad \text{where } \alpha = u + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} \quad (10)$$

The condition in Equation 10 only tells us that communication is *globally optimal*. To explore local optima, we will consider a simple greedy population-based optimiser, for instance, a genetic algorithm. At each optimisation step, the optimiser selects the member of the θ_i that has the highest $E[U | \theta_i]$. Suppose we have two possible parameterisations, θ_1 and θ_2 (i.e. a population of size two). We are interested in the case where one of the parameterisations corresponds to the speaker being more likely to communicate successfully:

$$P(a^s \in \Sigma | \theta_2) > P(a^s \in \Sigma | \theta_1) \quad (11)$$

$$P(a^l = z | a^s \in \Sigma, \theta_2) > P(a^l = z | a^s \in \Sigma, \theta_1)$$

The first condition states that the speaker under θ_2 is more likely to send signals. The second condition states that when this happens, the listener is more likely to guess correctly, i.e. communication is more often successful. The optimiser will select the more communicative parameterisation θ_2 , and thus we will say that communication is *locally optimal* if:

$$E[U | \theta_2] > E[U | \theta_1] \quad (12)$$

Now we may ask the following question: given that a communicative strategy competes against an optimal non-communicative strategy, how high does the guess accuracy need to be for communication to be selected?

This is important because if any increase in accuracy results in the communicative strategy being selected, then any small amount of communication that emerges will be selected by the optimiser. This would allow communication to emerge gradually as a shift away from optimal non-communicative strategies. However, we will now show that in this competition there is a significant gap that needs to be overcome for communication to emerge, and therefore it cannot happen incrementally.

Theorem 1. *Given a θ_1 that implements an optimal non-communicative strategy, and a communicative strategy θ_2 . Under θ_2 , when the speaker sends a signal, the guess accuracy must be greater than α for θ_2 to be selected. Formally, the following must hold for θ_2 to be selected:*

$$P(a^l = z | a^s \in \Sigma, \theta_2) > \alpha \quad (13)$$

Proof. We will first rewrite the expected utility as:

$$E[U | \theta] = uP(a^s \notin \Sigma | \theta) + P(a^l = z | \theta) \quad (14)$$

$$= uP(a^s \notin \Sigma | \theta) + P(a^l = z | a^s \notin \Sigma, \theta)P(a^s \notin \Sigma | \theta) + P(a^l = z | a^s \in \Sigma, \theta)P(a^s \in \Sigma | \theta) \quad (15)$$

In words, the expected utility is broken down into three terms by applying the law of total probability to the second term of the first line. This breaks the probability that the listener gets the correct answer into the following cases:

1. The speaker did not send a signal, but the listener got the correct answer anyway. Regardless of how the listener acts, there is always a one in $|\mathcal{Z}|$ probability that they get the correct answer. Therefore,

$$P(a^l = z | a^s \notin \Sigma, \theta) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|}, \forall \theta \quad (16)$$

2. The speaker did send a signal, and the quantity $P(a^l = z | a^s \in \Sigma, \theta_2)$ denotes the (improved) accuracy of the listener.

Substituting Equation 16 into the equation for $E[U | \theta]$, we can group the terms that correspond to the speaker not signalling:

$$E[U | \theta] = \left(u + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|}\right)P(a^s \notin \Sigma | \theta) \quad (17)$$

$$+ P(a^l = z | a^s \in \Sigma, \theta)P(a^s \in \Sigma | \theta) \\ = \alpha P(a^s \notin \Sigma | \theta) \\ + P(a^l = z | a^s \in \Sigma, \theta)P(a^s \in \Sigma | \theta) \quad (18)$$

Therefore, we can substitute this expression for $E[U | \theta_2]$ into the selection criteria in Equation 12 to find:

$$P(a^l = z | a^s \in \Sigma, \theta_2) > \alpha + \frac{E[U | \theta_1] - \alpha}{P(a^s \in \Sigma | \theta_2)} \quad (19)$$

The LHS of this inequality is the probability that the listener gets the correct answer, given that the speaker sent a signal. So this measures how successfully the pair can communicate under θ_2 . If we hold α constant, the RHS is a function of the probability that the speaker chooses to send a signal under θ_2 , and the expected utility of the other parameterisation $E[U | \theta_1]$. For Theorem 1 we have assumed that θ_1 corresponds to some speaker/listener pair that does not communicate, thus:

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} \leq E[U | \theta_1] \leq \alpha \quad (20)$$

The lower bound of this inequality corresponds to a speaker that always tries to communicate with a listener that randomly guesses, this is the *poorest performing non-communicative strategy*. The upper bound corresponds to a speaker that never sends a signal, so this is the optimal non-communicative strategy. Applying the upper bound to Equation 19, the second term disappears and we are left with Equation 13, thereby demonstrating Theorem 1. \square

Theorem 2. *Given that θ_1 implements the poorest performing non-communicative strategy, any communicative strategy θ_2 can be selected.*

Proof. Applying the lower bound from Equation 20 to Equation 19, for the poorest performing non-communicative

strategy we find:

$$P(a^l = z | a^s \in \Sigma, \theta_2) > \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} + u \left(1 - \frac{1}{P(a^s \in \Sigma | \theta_2)}\right) \quad (21)$$

We know that even by guessing randomly the accuracy is at least one in $|\mathcal{Z}|$, therefore we can set $P(a^s \in \Sigma | \theta_2) = 1$. As θ_1 is the poorest performing, $P(a^l = z | a^s \in \Sigma, \theta_1) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|}$, and thereby the second assumption given Equation 11, the condition in Equation 21 must hold. Intuitively, as the poorest performing is ignoring the benefit of u for no improvement in listener accuracy, and improvement in accuracy with θ_2 gives it the advantage. Thus, the communicative strategy must be locally optimal in this situation. \square

To summarise, in this subsection, we have shown that given a θ_1 and θ_2 where θ_1 is an optimal non-communicative strategy, and θ_2 is a communicative strategy, θ_2 will only be selected by a greedy optimisation algorithm if the increase in the listener's accuracy is greater than the non-zero constant α . Put simply, to escape the non-communicative local optimum at θ_1 in a single optimisation step the communicative policy needs to make a large improvement to the listener's accuracy. This jump may be unlikely, as the agents have to go from no communication to a high-performing level of communication in a single step.

The Consequences of Listener Competency


So far, we have explored different conditions in which communicative strategies will be selected. We have treated both the speaker and listener as jointly parameterised by some θ , but let us now separately consider the speaker parameters θ^s and listener parameters θ^l . In this section, we look at how the listener's sensitivity to different messages impacts the potential for the speaker to evolve communication.

Ultimately, we are interested in this investigation to see how being stuck in local optima with different listeners changes the possibility for evolution to escape the local optima. This in turn is relevant as we will argue that the presence of mimicable external signals will produce more beneficial listeners. To progress, this analysis will focus on the case of evolution, rather than reinforcement learning, to make the arguments more concrete. However, an analogous line of reasoning could be drawn for reinforcement learning.


We will start by comparing two cases involving different listener strategies. First, a listener parameterised by θ_U^l that selects actions uniformly at random, independently of the message it receives:

$$\forall m \in \Sigma, P(a^l | a^s = m, \theta_U^l) = P(a^l | \theta_U^l) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} \quad (22)$$

Secondly, we will consider a deterministic, 'competent' listener θ_I^l that selects some unique action for each message it



(a) Illustration of the environment with two agents (blue circles) and one resource (gold star). One agent mimics the resource.



(b) Diagram explaining the agents' signal detection mechanisms. Four detectors indicate which spatial region relative to the agent a signal was emitted from. Therefore, the agent can tell the direction a signal came from, but not the identity of the sender.




Figure 1: The environment for experimentally testing the effects of mimicry on the emergence of communication. Two agents must be on the same square as a resource to collect it and receive a reward. Agents observe whether or not they are on the same square as a resource, and resources sometimes emit signals that can be detected by an agent within a limited number of tiles from the resource. In (a) the gold region indicates where the signal can be detected by an agent.

receives. We can denote this with a deterministic bijective function $f : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^l$, using the indicator function 1:

$$P(a^l | a^s = m, \theta_U^l) = \mathbb{1}[f(m) = a^l] \quad (23)$$

Next, suppose we have a population of speakers θ_i^s that are subject to selection. For our two cases, the important difference between speakers is the effects on the listener's guess accuracy. Put differently, for communication to evolve there needs to be variation in the expected U^l between θ_i^s :

$$\text{Var}_{\theta_i^s}[E[U^l | \theta_i^s, \theta_U^l]] > 0 \quad (24)$$

Lemma 1. For θ_U^l , $\text{Var}_{\theta_i^s}[E[U^l | \theta_i^s, \theta_U^l]] = 0$

Proof sketch.

$$P(a^l = z | \theta_U^l) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|}, \quad \therefore E[U^l | \theta_i^s, \theta_U^l] = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} \quad (25)$$

As the expected utility is constant with respect to θ_i^s , the variance must equal zero. \square

With this in mind, we can return to the problem of being stuck in local optima. Theorem 1 tells us that the guess accuracy (conditioned on signalling) for a communicative strategy needs to be greater than α for the strategy to be selected over a non-communicative optimal strategy θ_1 .

For the case of a realistic evolving population at this local optima θ_1 , most of the variation in the population will be small changes to the conditional action distributions of the agents. Given that we are assuming that this population has converged on the local optima, the genetic diversity may be relatively low as many genes have reached fixation in the population. For simplicity, suppose that the listener's


strategy is fixed throughout the population, and we can consider selection against the uniform random listener θ_U^l or the competent listener θ_1^l . Equation 13 only applies when the speaker sends a signal (the probability is conditioned on $a^s \in \Sigma$), so we can focus on those cases.

Now suppose that mutation or recombination events have probability p of transferring at least α probability mass onto some action a for any of the agents' conditional action distributions. So for instance, before a mutation, a speaker under θ_1 will always choose some non-communicative action a' when they observe z , so $P(a' | z) = 1$. But after the mutation, some other, arbitrary action a could have probability $\alpha < P(a | z)$, and $P(a' | z) < \alpha$. For the competent listener, we replace the probability that $a^l = z$ with $f(a^s) = z$, as f is deterministic and bijective. This means that whether the condition in Equation 13 holds is dependent on if the speaker selects the correct signal. Given that a mutation as described above may shift α probability mass onto any of the signals, the chance of getting a mutation that produces the correct behaviour is $p/|\mathcal{A}^s|$.


We can perform the same analysis for the uniformly random listener θ_U^l . The key difference is that in order to get the same behaviour, two of these kinds of mutations need to occur simultaneously. One that shifts probability for the listener, and one for the speaker. For the speaker, the probability needs to shift to any of the signals, and for the listener, the specific response to that signal needs to shift to the correct output. This probability must be less than the following:

$$\left(p \frac{|\Sigma|}{|\mathcal{A}^s|} \right) \cdot \left(p \frac{1}{|\Sigma|} \cdot \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}^l|} \right) = \frac{p^2}{|\mathcal{A}^s| |\mathcal{A}^l|} \quad (26)$$

Finally, we can tie this back to mimicry by reintroduc-



(a) Mean reward for the best individual in the population at each generation.



(b) Mean reward of the MAPPO policy after learning from the given number of environment steps.

Figure 2: Reward curves for Evolution (a) and DMARL (b). All curves are means from multiple seeds with standard error bars.

ing the externally generated useful signals from the previous section on independent optimisers. Recall that S denotes the event that a signal received by the listener originates from an external source. The key argument here is that for any $P(S)$, if optimisation is stuck in a non-communicative local optima, the listener will be optimised towards some θ_T^l , provided $P(z|m, S)$ is deterministic. As this happens, the chance for communicative behaviour from the speaker to emerge increases, for the reasons we have just seen.

Experiments

Gridworld Environment

To investigate the possible effects of mimicry on the emergence of communication, we introduce a simple cooperative gridworld environment. In this environment, two agents must collect resources by simultaneously being on the same tile as the resource. After which, a new resource is spawned at a random location. The agents can be viewed as predators and the resources as prey, but we will not use this terminology as the resources are static (i.e. non-agentic). The game is a sequential decision-making problem in which the goal is to collect as many resources as possible within 50 timesteps. A reward of +10 is given when a resource is collected, and a penalty of -0.1 is given otherwise.

At each time step, each agent chooses between five spatial actions — *remain still*, *go up*, *go down*, *go left*, or *go right* — and $|\Sigma_A|$ communicative actions. If a spatial action is chosen, the agent moves accordingly. If a communicative action is chosen, a signal is emitted from the agent’s location that can be observed by the other agent in the next time step. $\Sigma_A \subseteq \Sigma$ denotes the set of possible signals that an agent can emit. Although there is no explicit cost to communication, a time step in which an agent emits a signal is a time step in which they are not moving towards a resource.

Spatial Signals. As mentioned in the previous section, for mimicry to be possible the receiver cannot *a priori* know the source of a given signal. Therefore, systems such as dedicated communication channels are not applicable. Instead, signals are emitted from a source at a given volume.

The volume dictates the number of tiles between a source and a receiver within which the signal is detectable. In this environment, the *model* that the *mimic* will imitate is the resources. Resources emit signals on each time step with probability P_{res} and volume v_{res} from a set $\Sigma_{res} \subseteq \Sigma$. The agent signals and the resource signals may or may not overlap, and this parameter controls whether or not agents have the opportunity to evolve mimicry.

On that note, agents are equipped with four sensors that indicate which direction a signal comes from. Each sensor is sensitive to signals emitted from a particular region of the world, relative to the position of the agent. The agent can detect signals from the set Σ , so each sensor is a $|\Sigma|$ -dimensional binary vector, where each entry indicates whether the corresponding signal has been emitted within the sensor’s detection region. Figure 1b illustrates how each of the sensors works. Formally, suppose that the agent is in position a_x, a_y and the source emits the signal with index m , volume v , and from position s_x, s_y . We denote each of the sensors as $\mathbf{v}_\uparrow, \mathbf{v}_\downarrow, \mathbf{v}_\rightarrow, \mathbf{v}_\leftarrow$, and let $d = |a_x - s_x| + |a_y - s_y|$.

- **Above sensor:** $\mathbf{v}_\uparrow[m] = 1$ if $s_y > a_y$ and $d < v$.
- **Below sensor:** $\mathbf{v}_\downarrow[m] = 1$ if $s_y < a_y$ and $d < v$.
- **Right sensor:** $\mathbf{v}_\rightarrow[m] = 1$ if $s_x > a_x$ and $d < v$.
- **Left sensor:** $\mathbf{v}_\leftarrow[m] = 1$ if $s_x < a_x$ and $d < v$.

When the information from the sensors is combined, the agent can distinguish signals coming from eight regions. As the agent is not provided with information regarding the volume of the signal, it cannot distinguish between nearby sources with low volume and far-away sources with high volume. When multiple detectable signals are made in the same region, they are also indistinguishable. If they are made in different regions, then a unique pattern of sensor inputs will encode this information. The ‘Example Situation’ in Figure 1b shows a case in which the agent in the middle (illustrated by the blue circle) is detecting two signals. The first signal is emitted from the resource (illustrated by the golden star), indicated with the ‘A’ is the 0th possible signal. The second signal comes from the other agent to the right,

Overlap Mode	Mean Reward	Std. Reward
Full	8.51	0.91
Partial	11.90	1.26
None	9.84	7.92

Table 1: MAPPO performance statistics by overlap mode, measured after learning from 5×10^6 environment steps.

which is emitting ‘B’, i.e. the 1st signal. We see that as the resource is located southwest of the agent, the 0th index of the below and left sensors.

Experimental Results

We conducted two sets of experiments in this gridworld environment. Firstly, we evolved agents using the ‘SimpleGA’ method (Such et al., 2017), using the implementation in the evosax library (Lange, 2023) and a population size of 256. Secondly, we trained deep reinforcement learning agents with the MAPPO algorithm, using an adapted implementation from the JaxMARL library (Rutherford et al., 2023), with a linearly annealed learning rate starting at 2×10^{-3} and 128 parallel data collection environments. Across all experiments, agents were parameterised by recurrent neural networks with four hidden layers of dimension 128, ReLU activations, and gated recurrent units (Cho et al., 2014).

For our evolution experiments, we used a 5x5 grid for the world, with $|\Sigma_A| = 5$ and $|\Sigma_{res}| = 1$. To investigate the effects of mimicable signals, we looked at the case where $\Sigma_{res} \subset \Sigma_A$, which we refer to as ‘signal overlap’ in Figure 2a. We ran 10 simulations with different seeds, with and without overlap, and found that for both cases 7 of the runs failed to converge. Figure 2a only shows the 6 successful runs. We see that the capacity for mimicry has a significant effect on the emergence of communication.

For the MAPPO experiments, we found that the same parameters as the evolution runs were much too easy. So we increased the grid size to 10x10, and $|\Sigma_{res}| = 5$. As there were now more resource signals, we could test partial and full overlap settings. For full overlap, $\Sigma_A = \Sigma_{res}$, and for partial $|\Sigma_A \cap \Sigma_{res}| = 1$. Again, 10 seeds were run for each setting, with all runs being successful. Figure 2b shows these reward curves, and Table 1 shows the overall final statistics for these runs.

Firstly, in this figure, we see that the ‘full overlap’ setting leads to the earliest initial increases in performance. Next, we see that although the partial setting starts increasing in performance at the same time as the ‘no overlap’ setting, it increases much faster than the other two. An important difference between the runs with and without mimicable signals is the variance in performance. We see that mimicry significantly reduces the standard deviation – with almost an order of magnitude difference between the ‘full’ and ‘no’ overlap cases. Lastly, we see that the ‘full’ overlap case performs worse than without overlap, on average




Figure 3: Partial overlap MAPPO reward curves aligned to the iteration in which the mean total reward exceeded 0, plotted alongside the frequency in which agents mimicked the ‘externally generated signals’, i.e. used resource signals.

by the end of the training, especially when comparing the highest-performing seeds. This shows that in this environment, while anonymous signals may help initially, optimal performance involves being able to infer the source of the signals. This points to a potential pitfall in this kind of setup and helps explain the results in Figure 3.

In Figure 3, we are looking at data from MAPPO training runs with partial overlap. Training curves from different seeds have been aligned by adjusting the iteration so they all pass through the origin at the same point. This helps us see the similarities in the curve’s shapes, without averaging out the patterns due to differences in when performance started to increase. Alongside reward, on the right y -axis we have the *mimicry frequency*. This is the frequency in which a communication symbol sent by an agent is one of the mimicable symbols. We see a sharp increase in this frequency at around the same point in which performance increases. However, after performance begins to plateau, we see the mimicry frequency begin to drop. This further demonstrates that while mimicry can help get communication off the ground, it may be detrimental when trying to refine the communicative strategies.

Conclusions

In this paper, we have investigated the relationship between the emergence of cooperative communication, and the capacity for speakers to mimic preexisting useful signals. We have demonstrated, analytically and empirically, that this may benefit the optimisation dynamics of populations of agents learning or evolving. However, there are still many questions left unanswered by this analysis. While we looked at how mimicry affects non-communicative local optima, we did not yet analytically analyse the effects when agents are randomly initialised. On the other hand, we have not yet fully explored some of the negative side effects of this mimicry. Although our results from Figures 2b and 3 suggest that strategies that require disambiguation between the sources of signals may be a good place to start.

References

- Ackley, D. H. and Littman, M. L. (1994). Altruism in the Evolution of Communication. In *Artificial Life IV: Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop on the Synthesis and Simulation of Living Systems*. MIT Press.
- Angeline, P., Saunders, G., and Pollack, J. (1994). An evolutionary algorithm that constructs recurrent neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 5(1):54–65.
- Bates, H. W. (1862). Contributions to an insect fauna of the Amazon valley (Lepidoptera: Heliconidae). *Transactions of the Linnean Society of London*, 23:495–56.
- Bullock, S. (1997). *Evolutionary Simulation Models: On Their Character, and Application to Problems Concerning the Evolution of Natural Signalling Systems*. PhD, University of Sussex. Publisher: University of Sussex.
- Cho, K., van Merriënboer, B., Gulcehre, C., Bahdanau, D., Bougares, F., Schwenk, H., and Bengio, Y. (2014). Learning Phrase Representations using RNN Encoder–Decoder for Statistical Machine Translation. In Moschitti, A., Pang, B., and Daelemans, W., editors, *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1724–1734, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Conti, E., Madhavan, V., Such, F. P., Lehman, J., Stanley, K. O., and Clune, J. (2018). Improving exploration in evolution strategies for deep reinforcement learning via a population of novelty-seeking agents. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’18*, pages 5032–5043, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Floreano, D. and Claudio, M. (2008). *Bio-Inspired Artificial Intelligence*. MIT Press.
- Floreano, D., Mitri, S., Magnenat, S., and Keller, L. (2007). Evolutionary conditions for the emergence of communication in robots. *Current biology: CB*, 17(6):514–519.
- Foerster, J., Assael, I. A., Freitas, N. d., and Whiteson, S. (2016). Learning to Communicate with Deep Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In D. D. Lee and M. Sugiyama and U. V. Luxburg and I. Guyon and R. Garnett, editor, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, pages 2137–2145. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Fox, R. and Bullock, S. (2023). Nectar of the Bots: Evolving Bidirectional Referential Communication. *Adaptive Behavior*, 31(1):65–86. Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd STM.
- Galván, E. (2021). Neuroevolution in deep neural networks: a comprehensive survey. *ACM SIGEVOlution*, 14(1):3–7.
- Goldman, C. V. and Zilberstein, S. (2004). Decentralized control of cooperative systems: categorization and complexity analysis. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 22(1):143–174.
- Goldman, C. V. and Zilberstein, S. (2008). Communication-Based Decomposition Mechanisms for Decentralized MDPs. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 32:169–202. arXiv:1111.0065 [cs].
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. *Syntax and Semantics*, pages 41–58.
- Hessel, M., Modayil, J., Hasselt, H. v., Schaul, T., Ostrovski, G., Dabney, W., Horgan, D., Piot, B., Azar, M., and Silver, D. (2018). Rainbow: Combining Improvements in Deep Reinforcement Learning. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 32(1). Number: 1.
- Holland, J. H. (1992). Genetic Algorithms. *Scientific American*, 267(1):66–73.
- Hraber, P. T., Jones, T., and Forrest, S. (1997). The Ecology of Echo. *Artificial Life*, 3(3):165–190.
- Hussain, A. and Belardinelli, F. (2024). Stability of Multi-Agent Learning in Competitive Networks: Delaying the Onset of Chaos. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(16):17435–17443. Number: 16.
- Hussain, A. A., Belardinelli, F., and Piliouras, G. (2023). Asymptotic Convergence and Performance of Multi-Agent Q-Learning Dynamics. In *2023 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 23)*, London, UK. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (IFAAMAS).
- Islam, M. and Grogono, P. (2016). Modeling the Evolution of Mimicry. In *Proceedings of the Artificial Life Conference*, pages 442–449. MIT Press.
- Jaderberg, M., Czarnecki, W. M., Dunning, I., Marris, L., Lever, G., Castañeda, A. G., Beattie, C., Rabinowitz, N. C., Morcos, A. S., Ruderman, A., Sonnerat, N., Green, T., Deason, L., Leibo, J. Z., Silver, D., Hassabis, D., Kavukcuoglu, K., and Graepel, T. (2019). Human-level performance in 3D multiplayer games with population-based reinforcement learning. *Science*, 364(6443):859–865. arXiv: 1807.01281 Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Kleisner, K. and Maran, T. (2019). Introduction to Signs and Communication in Mimicry. *Biosemiotics*, 12:1–6.
- Lange, R. T. (2023). evosax: JAX-Based Evolution Strategies. In *Proceedings of the Companion Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation, GECCO ’23 Companion*, pages 659–662, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Lehman, J., Clune, J., Misevic, D., Adami, C., Altenberg, L., Beaulieu, J., Bentley, P. J., Bernard, S., Beslon, G., Bryson, D. M., Chrabaszcz, P., Cheney, N., Cully, A., Doncieux, S., Dyer, F. C., Ellefsen, K. O., Feldt, R., Fischer, S., Forrest, S., Frénoy, A., Gagné, C., Goff, L. L., Grabowski, L. M., Hodjat, B., Hutter, F., Keller, L., Knibbe, C., Krcah, P., Lenski, R. E., Lipson, H., MacCurdy, R., Maestre, C., Miikkulainen, R., Mitri, S., Moriarty, D. E., Mouret, J.-B., Nguyen, A., Ofria, C., Parizeau, M., Parsons, D., Pennock, R. T., Punch, W. F., Ray, T. S., Schoenauer, M., Shulte, E., Sims, K., Stanley, K. O., Taddei, F., Tarapore, D., Thibault, S., Weimer, W., Watson, R., and Yosinski, J. (2018). The Surprising Creativity of Digital Evolution: A Collection of Anecdotes from the Evolutionary Computation and Artificial Life Research Communities. arXiv: 1803.03453.
- Lillicrap, T. P., Hunt, J. J., Pritzel, A., Heess, N., Erez, T., Tassa, Y., Silver, D., and Wierstra, D. (2016). Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. In Bengio, Y. and LeCun, Y., editors, *4th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2016, San Juan, Puerto Rico, May 2-4, 2016, Conference Track Proceedings*.

- Maran, T. (2017). *Mimicry and Meaning: Structure and Semiotics of Biological Mimicry*, volume 16 of *Biosemiotics*. Springer International Publishing, Cham.
- Marriott, C., Borg, J. M., Andras, P., and Smaldino, P. E. (2018). Social Learning and Cultural Evolution in Artificial Life. *Artificial Life*, 24(1):5–9.
- Mirolli, M. and Nolfi, S. (2010). Evolving Communication in Embodied Agents: Theory, Methods, and Evaluation. In Nolfi, S. and Mirolli, M., editors, *Evolution of Communication and Language in Embodied Agents*, pages 105–121. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Mitchell, M. (1996). *An Introduction to Genetic Algorithms*. MIT Press.
- Mnih, V., Kavukcuoglu, K., Silver, D., Rusu, A. A., Veness, J., Bellemare, M. G., Graves, A., Riedmiller, M., Fidjeland, A. K., Ostrovski, G., Petersen, S., Beattie, C., Sadik, A., Antonoglou, I., King, H., Kumaran, D., Wierstra, D., Legg, S., and Hassabis, D. (2015). Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529.
- Noble, J., Di Paolo, E. A., and Bullock, S. (2002). Adaptive Factors in the Evolution of Signaling Systems. In Cangelosi, A. and Parisi, D., editors, *Simulating the Evolution of Language*, pages 53–77. Springer, London.
- Oliehoek, F. A. and Amato, C. (2016). *A Concise Introduction to Decentralized POMDPs*. Springer International Publishing, Cham. Series Title: SpringerBriefs in Intelligent Systems.
- Oliphant, M. (1996). The dilemma of Saussurean communication. *Biosystems*, 37(1):31–38.
- O’Reilly, L. J., Agassiz, D. J. L., Neil, T. R., and Holderied, M. W. (2019). Deaf moths employ acoustic Müllerian mimicry against bats using wingbeat-powered tymbals. *Scientific Reports*, 9.
- Parisi, D. (1997). An artificial life approach to language. *Brain and Language*, 59(1):121–146.
- Quicke, D. L. J. (2017). *Mimicry, Crypsis, Masquerade and other Adaptive Resemblances*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Reynolds, C. (2011). Interactive Evolution of Camouflage. *Artificial Life*, 17(2):123–136.
- Ronald, E. and Schoenauer, M. (1994). Genetic lander: An experiment in accurate neuro-genetic control. In Davidor, Y., Schwefel, H.-P., and Männer, R., editors, *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature — PPSN III*, pages 452–461, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer.
- Rutherford, A., Ellis, B., Gallici, M., Cook, J., Lupu, A., Ingvarsson, G., Willi, T., Khan, A., de Witt, C. S., Souly, A., Bandyopadhyay, S., Samvelyan, M., Jiang, M., Lange, R. T., Whiteson, S., Lacerda, B., Hawes, N., Rocktaschel, T., Lu, C., and Foerster, J. N. (2023). JaxMARL: Multi-Agent RL Environments in JAX. In *Agent Learning in Open-Endedness (ALOE) Workshop at NeurIPS 2023*, New Orleans. arXiv:2311.10090 [cs].
- Schulman, J., Levine, S., Abbeel, P., Jordan, M., and Moritz, P. (2015). Trust Region Policy Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1889–1897. PMLR. ISSN: 1938-7228.
- Schulman, J., Wolski, F., Dhariwal, P., Radford, A., and Klimov, O. (2017). Proximal Policy Optimization Algorithms. arXiv:1707.06347 [cs].
- Stanley, K. O. and Miikkulainen, R. (2002). Evolving Neural Networks through Augmenting Topologies. *Evolutionary Computation*, 10(2):99–127.
- Such, F. P., Madhavan, V., Conti, E., Lehman, J., Stanley, K. O., and Clune, J. (2017). Deep Neuroevolution: Genetic Algorithms Are a Competitive Alternative for Training Deep Neural Networks for Reinforcement Learning. arXiv:1712.06567.
- Sukhbaatar, S., Szlam, A., and Fergus, R. (2016). Learning multi-agent communication with backpropagation. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2252–2260, Barcelona, Spain. Neural Information Processing Systems.
- Sutton, R. and Barto, A. (1998). Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 9(5):1054–1054.
- Wang, Z., Bapst, V., Heess, N., Mnih, V., Munos, R., Kavukcuoglu, K., and Freitas, N. d. (2017). Sample Efficient Actor-Critic with Experience Replay.
- Wickler, W. (1965). Mimicry and the Evolution of Animal Communication. *Nature*, 208(5010):519–521.
- Yeargan, K. V. and Quate, L. W. (1996). Juvenile bolas spiders attract psychodid flies. *Oecologia*, 106(2):266–271.
- Yu, C., Velu, A., Vinitsky, E., Gao, J., Wang, Y., Bayen, A., and Wu, Y. (2022). The Surprising Effectiveness of PPO in Cooperative Multi-Agent Games. In *36th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2022) Track on Datasets and Benchmarks.*, New Orleans, USA.