
Enhancing Language Model Rationality with Bi-Directional Deliberation Reasoning

Yadong Zhang^{1*} Shaoguang Mao² Wenshan Wu²
Yan Xia² Tao Ge² Man Lan¹ Furu Wei²

¹ East China Normal University

² Microsoft Research

<https://aka.ms/GeneralAI>

Abstract

This paper introduces **BI-Directional DELiberation Reasoning** (BIDDER), a novel reasoning approach to enhance the decision rationality of language models. Traditional reasoning methods typically rely on historical information and employ uni-directional (left-to-right) reasoning strategy. This lack of bi-directional deliberation reasoning results in limited awareness of potential future outcomes and insufficient integration of historical context, leading to suboptimal decisions. BIDDER addresses this gap by incorporating principles of rational decision-making, specifically managing uncertainty and predicting expected utility. Our approach involves three key processes: Inferring hidden states to represent uncertain information in the decision-making process from historical data; Using these hidden states to predict future potential states and potential outcomes; Integrating historical information (past contexts) and long-term outcomes (future contexts) to inform reasoning. By leveraging bi-directional reasoning, BIDDER ensures thorough exploration of both past and future contexts, leading to more informed and rational decisions. We tested BIDDER’s effectiveness in two well-defined scenarios: Poker (Limit Texas Hold’em) and Negotiation. Our experiments demonstrate that BIDDER significantly improves the decision-making capabilities of LLMs and LLM agents.

1 Introduction

The rapid advancement of large language models (LLMs) has significantly enhanced natural language understanding and generation [29]. However, as the application scope of LLMs expands, they often struggle to make rational and optimal decisions in real-world scenarios [8, 10, 23], particularly in complex environments that require careful consideration of both historical data and potential future outcomes.

Existing methods predominantly enhance reasoning performance by navigating through the problem space and selecting optimal nodes (states) based on the progress toward solving the problem [43, 49]. These unidirectional (left-to-right) reasoning approaches limit LLMs’ ability to effectively leverage future information, resulting in suboptimal decisions due to insufficient integration of historical context with potential future outcomes [18]. To address these shortcomings, we propose **BI-Directional DELiberation Reasoning** (BIDDER), a novel approach designed to enhance decision rationality. BIDDER leverages the strengths of classical bi-directional modeling, as exemplified by Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT [9]), and integrates these with decision theory principles to overcome the limitations of traditional reasoning methods in LLMs.

The key innovation of BIDDER lies in its bi-directional reasoning capability, which ensures a thorough exploration of both past and future contexts. As illustrated in Figure 1, unidirectional reasoning

*Work was done when interning at Microsoft Research Asia.

utilizes historical context to make left-to-right decisions. In contrast, bi-directional reasoning explores potential future states and predicts the expected utility for future moves, using both historical contexts and future exploration contexts for more informative reasoning.

BIDDER’s approach involves three main processes: inferring hidden states to represent uncertain information from historical data, using these hidden states to explore future potential states and outcomes, and integrating both historical contexts and future explorations to inform reasoning. By leveraging these bi-directional deliberation processes, BIDDER enables LLMs to make more informed and rational decisions. Although future information cannot be directly obtained, BIDDER refers to the Q-Learning [42] algorithm in Reinforcement Learning, employing LLMs to explore various future time horizons and use this information to calculate the expected utility of potential actions.

To demonstrate BIDDER’s effectiveness, we conducted experiments in two well-defined strategic decision-making scenarios: Poker (Limit Texas Hold’em) [50] and Negotiation [21, 6]. These scenarios provide a rigorous testbed for evaluating the decision-making capabilities of LLMs due to their clear comparison of final payoffs and well-established theoretical optimal solutions. Our experimental results show that BIDDER significantly enhances the decision-making capabilities of LLMs, aligning their behavior more closely with optimal solutions. By incorporating bi-directional deliberation reasoning, BIDDER minimizes uncertainty, considers long-term payoffs, and ensures that LLMs can effectively integrate both historical context and future explorations into their decision-making processes.

The contributions of this work are as follows:

- We introduce the first **bi-directional reasoning approach** with LLMs to enhance their decision rationality by considering both historical context and future potential outcomes. Unlike traditional methods that focus solely on past information, this bi-directional reasoning helps manage uncertainty and predict expected utility more effectively.
- We incorporate principles from the Q-Learning algorithm, leveraging LLMs to **explore future trajectories and aggregate rewards**, thereby constructing reasoning contexts that include potential future outcomes.
- We validate BIDDER’s effectiveness through rigorous experiments in strategic decision-making scenarios, demonstrating its superiority over traditional reasoning methods.

2 Method

BI-Directional DELiberation Reasoning (BIDDER) is designed to enhance the decision rationality of LLMs. It is based on the concepts of uncertainty and expected utility in decision theory [1] and leverages bi-directional reasoning to incorporate both historical context and potential future outcomes into the decision-making process. Since future contexts are not available at the decision point, we refer to the Q-Learning algorithm in Reinforcement Learning [42], calculating the expected total reward for taking different actions in a given state as the context for right-to-left reasoning.

Figure 2 illustrates the entire process of this method. Specifically, BIDDER consists of three modules: **1)** inferring hidden states behind decision-making from available historical data, **2)** utilizing the inferred hidden states to explore future trajectories, and **3)** aggregating the utilities along each explored trajectories and making decisions to maximize the expected long-term utility.




Figure 1: Comparing Unidirectional and Bi-Directional Reasoning: Unidirectional reasoning utilizes historical context to make left-to-right decisions. In contrast, bi-directional reasoning explores potential future states and aggregate the expected utility for future moves. It then uses both historical contexts and future exploration contexts to conduct bi-directional reasoning.




Figure 2: **BI-Directional DELiberation Reasoning** includes: 1. **Hidden State Inference**: Inferring hidden states (e.g. opponent’s strategies) behind decision-making from historical data (e.g. opponent’s actions); 2. **Future Exploration**: Exploring possible future trajectories based on inferred states; 3. **Action Reward Collection**: Aggregating utilities from predicted trajectories to make decisions. The bi-directional reasoning enhances decision rationality by incorporating both historical context and potential future outcomes.

In order to simplify the complexity of the description, we will limit the subsequent discussion to a two-player game, referring to the current player as "player" and the other participant as "opponent." We standardize the notation here:

- The player’s initial hidden state s_0 , and the opponent’s hidden state \bar{s}_0 .
- The player’s public trajectory at time t : $\tau(t) = \{a_0, s_1, \dots, s_t\}$ (as the hidden state, s_0 is unobservable by other players), and the opponent’s trajectory $\bar{\tau}(t)$.

2.1 Infer Hidden State From History

Inferring hidden states is essential for understanding environmental changes influenced by latent variables, such as an opponent’s status or strategy in a game. Predicting these variables allows for a more accurate reconstruction of future behaviors, enhancing the rationality of decision-making.

Previous research [15, 45] has shown that LLMs can recognize contextual causal relationships and correct causal arguments with high probability. Therefore, we use a causal reasoning approach to infer environmental information, with historical data $\bar{\tau}(t)$ as the effect and environmental uncertainties \bar{s}_0 as the causes.

Formally, we consider the relationship $P(\bar{\tau}|\bar{s}_0)$, where P represents the probability distribution. By analyzing $P(\bar{\tau}|\bar{s}_0)$, we aim to estimate the causal factors \bar{s}_0 influencing the observed data $\bar{\tau}$. The LLM can be regarded as an implicit Bayesian inference model, inferring hidden states \bar{s}_0 based on observed data $\bar{\tau}$, et al. $P(\bar{s}_0|\bar{\tau})$.

In this prompt, **[Opponent Trajectory]** represents the opponent’s observed actions (historical data $\bar{\tau}$), and **[Discretized State Space List]** enumerates possible hidden states \bar{s}_0 causing these actions. The LLM processes this information and selects the most probable hidden state \bar{s}_0 , thereby inferring the causes from the effects. This method leverages the LLM’s ability to understand and reason about complex causal relationships, enabling effective prediction and decision-making in uncertain environments.

Hidden State Inference Prompt

$\bar{s}_0 = \text{Hidden_Inference}(\bar{\tau})$

Opponent Action History:

[Opponent Trajectory]

Possible Hidden States for Opponent’s Actions:

[Discretized State Space List]

Select the most likely state of the opponent.

2.2 Explore Future Trajectories with Opponent Modeling

Based on the hidden states inferred in Section 2.1 and opponent’s behavioral records, we simulate their likely actions under various states using prompts.

At the current decision point t , we explore all possible actions with the following termination conditions:

- Reaching the preset exploration horizon T .
- Reaching a terminal state or a chance node².

Opponent Modeling Prompt

$\bar{a}_t = \text{Opponent_Modeling}(\bar{\tau}(t))$

Inferred Hidden State of Opponent:

[Opponent’s Hidden State]

Opponent Action History:

[Opponent Trajectory]

Select the most likely action which opponent will take under inferred hidden state.

For the current reasoning point, we generate a set of exploration paths based on opponent modeling:

$$\mathcal{T}(t) = \{\tau \mid \tau = (s_t, a'_t, \dots, a'_{t+T-1}, s_{t+T})\} \quad (1)$$

$$s_{t+1} = s_t \times a'_t \times \bar{a}_t \quad (2)$$

Here, $\mathcal{T}(t)$ represents the set of all possible trajectories starting from the current state s_t . Each trajectory τ consists of a sequence of states and actions, starting from the current state s_t , and includes the sequence of actions a'_t, \dots, a'_{t+T-1} and the explored states s_{t+1}, \dots, s_{t+T} up to the exploration horizon T . For the detailed algorithm of future trajectories exploration, please refer to Appendix C.

2.3 Aggregate Rewards for Explored Trajectories

We use LLMs to estimate the rewards for the potential payoff of explored paths. This extends the paths in Equation 1 to include estimated rewards. We utilize the Bellman equation [2, 35] to aggregate the return of each trace τ :

$$G(\tau) = \sum_{k=0}^T \beta^k r(s_{t+k}) \quad (3)$$

Here, $G(\tau)$ is the total reward accumulated along the path τ , $r(s_{t+k})$ is the reward at horizon k , and β is the discount factor, determining the importance of future rewards.

The return for each current action a is calculated as follows:

$$G(a) = \max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}(t,a)} G(\tau) \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{T}(t, a) = \{\tau \mid \tau = (s_t, a'_t = a, \dots, a'_{t+T-1}, s_{t+T})\} \quad (5)$$

Here, $G(a)$ is the maximum cumulative return starting from the current time step t and taking action a . The set $\mathcal{T}(t, a)$ represents all possible trajectories starting from the current state s_t and action a .

Finally, the LLM makes decisions based on the past available information, the inferred hidden states and the future long-term returns of each action at the current point in time:

²A chance node signifies the introduction of new information that can influence decisions. For instance, in Texas Hold’em poker, this occurs when a new community card is revealed.

<p>Decision Making Based on Bidirectional Deliberation Reasoning</p> <p>$a_t^* = \text{Decision_Making}(s_t, \bar{s}_0, \{G(a)\})$</p>
<p>[Past Trajectory and Player’s Current State]</p> <p>Inferred Hidden State of Opponent:</p> <p>[Opponent’s Hidden State] #Left-to-right Deliberation Reasoning</p> <p>Possible Hidden States of Opponent:</p> <p>[$\{G(a)\}$ of all feasible actions in current state] #Right-to-left Deliberation Reasoning</p> <p>Make the most rational decisions based on current information.</p>

This bidirectional deliberation reasoning framework enhances decision rationality by incorporating both historical contexts and potential future outcomes into the decision-making process to minimize uncertainty.

3 Experiments

3.1 Limit Texas Hold'em

We utilized two-player Limit Texas Hold'em as our testbed. Limit Texas Hold'em is a popular betting game which, unlike no-limit Texas Hold'em, restricts the number of raises and fixes the raise amount. The detailed game rule of Limit Texas Hold'em can be found in the Appendix A.1. Among the two game participants, we refer to the focal participant as the Player, while the other participant is designated as the Opponent.

We randomly generated 100 game sessions. To enhance the diversity of the hands, we increased the frequency of strong hands appearing in these 100 games. The specific distribution of hand types is detailed in the Appendix A.1. For fairness, each game has a mirrored game, where the Player and the Opponent switch their hands.

3.1.1 Baselines

We adapt a variety of approaches to comprehensively compare the performance of methods from different sources in Limit Texas Hold'em environment. These methods include:

Rule-Based Approaches:

- Random*: Randomly selects an action from the set of feasible actions.
- Rule*: Predefined procedures that select actions based on hand strength, such as raising when holding a pair.
- Counterfactual Regret Minimization (CFR)* [58]: An iterative algorithm that converges to a Nash equilibrium in two-player zero-sum games.

Machine Learning Approaches:

- Deep Q-Network (DQN)* [27]: Utilizes deep neural networks to approximate the Q-value function, addressing decision-making problems in high-dimensional state spaces.
- Deep Monte Carlo (DMC)* [33]: Integrates deep learning with Monte Carlo methods, using deep neural networks to generate efficient samples to estimate the expected value of complex distributions.
- Deep CFR* [5]: Combines deep learning with counterfactual regret minimization, employing neural networks to approximate regression targets for strategy solving in complex games.

LLM Reasoning Approaches:

- Direct*: The LLM generates the final action in response to the given game setting prompt.
- Chain-of-Thought (CoT)* [43, 20]: A zero-shot native reasoning method where the LLM follows a step-by-step thought process.
- Reflexion* [32]: This method refers to the concept of language agents with verbal reinforcement learning.

3.1.2 Main Result

We utilized the gaming environment described in the Section 3.1. Table 1 presents the performance of different methods when facing various opponents, with the values representing the average final chips obtained over 100 games.

		<i>Opponent</i>		<i>Random</i>	<i>Rule</i>	<i>CFR</i>	<i>DQN</i>	<i>DMC</i>	<i>DeepCFR</i>	<i>AVG</i>
		<i>Player</i>								
Rule	Random	-0.28	-0.05	-0.56	-1.87	-0.55	-1.89	-0.87		
	Rule	0.01	-0.14	0.04	0.21	-0.07	0.33	0.06		
	CFR	0.55	-0.17	-0.38	-3.15	-1.89	-3.88	-1.49		
Reinforcement Learning	DQN	2.61	0.19	2.86	0.06	-0.03	-5.28	0.07		
	DMC	1.53	0.34	1.41	0.17	-0.09	-0.038	0.55		
	DeepCFR	1.55	0.11	2.85	3.15	-0.03	-0.67	1.16		
LLM Reasoning	Direct	0.86	0.68	0.74	-0.30	-0.12	-0.30	0.26		
	CoT	0.99	0.49	0.83	0.71	0.42	-0.64	0.47		
	Reflexion	1.42	0.48	0.76	1.00	0.44	-0.53	0.60		
BIDDER (Ours)	T=1	2.66	0.74	2.83	1.61	-0.10	1.45	1.53		
	T=2	2.47	0.74	3.39	1.61	-0.10	1.44	1.59		
	T=3	1.61	0.74	2.76	1.87	-0.14	0.39	1.21		

Table 1: The outcomes (payoff) of various models against different opponents in Limit Texas Hold'em. To more clearly distinguish between varying degrees of Payoff, the background color will be greener as the profit increases and redder as it decreases.

From Table 1, it is evident that compared to the previous LLM Reasoning method (Direct, CoT and Reflexion), BIDDER shows significant improvement when facing different opponents, demonstrating a noticeable increase in average earnings.

Additionally, in comparison with Machine Learning methods, BIDDER astonishingly outperformed. It is noteworthy that BIDDER relies solely on LLM for bidirectional information judgment, operating as a completely non-learning method. This highlights the potential of BIDDER in decision-making based on LLM.

3.1.3 Rationality Evaluation

		<i>P vs O</i>	<i>Random</i>	<i>Rule</i>	<i>CFR</i>	<i>DQN</i>	<i>DMC</i>	<i>DeepCFR</i>	<i>AVG</i>
Rule	Random	33.72	37.76	29.65	34.52	34.22	32.52	33.73	
	Rule	35.29	36.44	44.81	48.36	43.54	42.08	41.75	
	CFR	46.43	51.43	37.77	39.38	42.22	40.82	43.01	
Reinforcement Learning	DQN	54.86	54.59	60.45	51.66	64.48	52.65	56.45	
	DMC	42.00	50.62	43.51	29.36	39.3	28.95	38.95	
LLM Reasoning	Direct	6.20	2.01	6.90	5.56	7.85	2.43	5.16	
	CoT	9.32	2.05	11.43	11.6	15.6	6.96	9.49	
BIDDER (Ours)	T=1	65.51	55.75	66.76	47.29	80.81	28.68	57.47	
	T=2	68.38	58.62	70.09	45.77	79.24	29.79	58.97	
	T=3	66.03	55.75	69.85	45.59	78.65	28.98	57.47	
Equilibrium	DeepCFR ³	91.99	91.07	93.7	89.45	93.15	83.69	90.51	

Table 2: The Rational Degree (%) of various models in Limit Texas Hold'em against different opponents, as calculated by Equation 6.

Equilibrium can be viewed as a stable state in a multi-agent game environment, achieved by each participant through a rational decision-making process. In most cases, it can be regarded as the most rational decision. We take the behavior at each decision point of DeepCFR as the optimal solution a_o , and compare the rationality levels of different methods with the optimal solution.

The quantitative calculation method is:

$$\text{Rational Degree} = \frac{\#\{a = a_o\}}{\#\{\text{All action } a\}} \quad (6)$$

³Due to the presence of random perturbations in the calculation of CFR, the results are not 100% consistent.

Table 2 shows the rationality levels of different methods when facing various opponents. From Table 2, we can see that BIDDER has significantly improved the Rational Degree compared to previous LLM Reasoning methods and Machine Learning methods. This indicates that BIDDER has enhanced the decision rationality of the LLM.

Additionally, we further analyzed the action distribution of different methods in Limit Texas Hold'em. From Figure 3, we can observe that compared to the Direct approach, BIDDER has a much higher frequency of Raise, which aligns with the optimal solution (DeepCFR). In contrast, the Direct approach shows higher frequencies of Call and Check, indicating that an LLM-based approach acts as a passive decision-maker. BIDDER, however, calculates future returns and prompts the LLM to act based on these returns, transforming the LLM into an active decision-maker. This active decision-making is rational, leading to improved returns.




Figure 3: Direct, BIDDER, and DeepCFR Action Distribution in Limit Texas Hold'em.

3.2 Negotiation

Negotiation requires complex communication and reasoning skills, making it an ideal environment for studying artificial intelligence and classical game theory [28, 38] due to its dynamic, controllable, and easily assessable nature. We utilize a game paradigm known as "division of a common pool of items," as defined in previous research. In this game, agents are tasked with establishing a mutually acceptable division of items while having their own hidden utilities for each item. Our rules are based on those outlined by Cao et al., with the following modifications: ensuring that each individual's total value for all items is equal (consistent with Lewis et al.), which is more equitable compared to the original uniform distribution between 1 and 10. The experiment consists of 100 games, with each game having a different number and distribution of item values. Additionally, symmetrical experiments are conducted by swapping the values for both parties in another game.

3.2.1 Baselines

We use widely adopted baselines for reasoning and decision-making comparisons, including Direct and CoT introduced in Section 3.1.1. Additionally, we consider:

Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) [7]: This is a heuristic search algorithm that efficiently explores large search spaces by sampling potential future outcomes through Monte Carlo simulations.

Tree of Thoughts (ToT) [49]: This approach simulates human System 2 thinking and excels in complex problems, particularly those requiring search and judgment.

It is important to note here that although BIDDER fundamentally employs tree search for future exploration, similar to MCTS and ToT, BIDDER's search process integrates opponent hidden information inference and opponent behavior modeling. This contrasts with MCTS's probabilistic sampling and ToT's self-exploration approach.

3.2.2 Metrics

We employ three metrics for negotiation as defined by Lewis et al., which are:

Score: The average score obtained in each game where an agreement is reached. The score is calculated as the sum of the products of each item assigned to the agent and its value.

Agreement: The probability of reaching an agreement across all games.

Pareto Optimality: The percentage of Pareto optimal solutions for the agreed deals. ⁴

⁴Pareto optimal refers to a state in which it is impossible to improve individual's situation without worsening other's.

These metrics not only reflect the agent’s competitive advantage in negotiations but also demonstrate its cooperative behavior.

3.2.3 Result

<i>Opponent</i> Player	<i>MCTS</i>	<i>Direct</i>	<i>CoT</i>	<i>ToT</i>	<i>BIDDER</i>	Avg
MCTS	[14.8, 100%, 60%]	[15.9, 100%, 20%]	[22.4, 100%, 30%]	[18.5, 100%, 17%]	[15.0, 100%, 33%]	[17.3, 100% , 32%]
Direct	[15.9, 100%, 20%]	[11.2, 50%, 40%]	[16.2, 50%, 40%]	[11.2, 50%, 60%]	[21.0, 17%, 0%]	[15.1, 53%, 32%]
CoT	[25.2, 100%, 30%]	[22.0, 50%, 40%]	[22.4, 70%, 29%]	[16.4, 80%, 50%]	[23.0, 67%, 0%]	[21.8, 73%, 30%]
ToT	[20.8, 100%, 17%]	[15.0, 50%, 60%]	[16.4, 80%, 50%]	[19.8, 71%, 20%]	[21.5, 67%, 0%]	[18.7, 74%, 29%]
BIDDER(Ours)	[30.3, 100%, 33%]	[21.0, 17%, 0.0%]	[18.0, 67%, 0%]	[17.0, 67%, 0%]	[24.0, 50%, 33%]	[22.6, 60%, 13%]

Table 3: Performance of various models in Negotiation against different opponents, and each cell represents [Score, Agreement, Pareto Optimality]

From Table 3, we can observe that compared to MCTS, the reasoning methods based on LLM show significant improvements over the Direct approach in both Score and Agreement metrics. Additionally, all methods achieved 100% Agreement when competing against MCTS. This is because MCTS is more inclined to agree, yet it fails to achieve higher gains in terms of score. Furthermore, compared to the results reported by Lewis et al., the scores for LLM reasoning methods on Pareto optimality are generally lower. We believe there are two possible reasons for this: first, the tested methods are all zero-shot, so LLMs cannot effectively predict the timing for achieving Agreement; second, negotiation is a game that requires both competition and cooperation, and balancing these two aspects poses a challenge for LLMs.

Moreover, we found that BIDDER achieved moderate Agreement but had the highest Score (pay-off). This also reflects BIDDER’s rational decision-making when aiming for payoff maximization, especially when long-term planning is required.

4 Related Work

4.1 Enhanced Reasoning Methods of LLMs

Large Language Models (LLMs) demonstrate remarkable proficiency in a range of complex reasoning tasks, such as mathematical reasoning [26, 31], common sense understanding [37, 4], and symbolic reasoning [34, 36]. A key technique in enhancing LLM reasoning is the Chain-of-Thought (CoT) method, which involves decomposing complex questions into a series of intermediate steps [43, 20]. Building upon CoT, researchers have developed methods such as Tree of Thought (ToT) [49], Graph of Thought (GoT) [3], and Skeleton-of-Thought [30] to further advance reasoning processes. To enhance the consistency and quality of LLM responses, methods like Self-Refine [25] and Reflexion [32] introduce iterative refinement, while several works [12, 41] integrate detailed persona information to improve rationality and knowledge precision in LLM reasoning.

Existing methods such as ToT and GoT enhance reasoning performance by navigating through the problem space and selecting optimal nodes (states). States are evaluated based on the progress toward solving the problem. However, these approaches typically involve unidirectional state transitions and reward generation. In contrast, our work introduces a bidirectional approach, allowing for a more dynamic and rational reasoning process.

4.2 Heuristic Search for LLM Reasoning

With the widespread application of LLMs in the field of natural language processing, enhancing their reasoning capabilities has become a research focus. Heuristic search algorithms, as an effective optimization technique, are being introduced into LLM reasoning to improve efficiency and accuracy. Specifically, Yao et al. proposed the ToT algorithm based on "System2," which constructs a search tree by generating candidate actions through LLM and evaluating them. Subsequently, more methods such as A* algorithm and Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) have been proposed to enhance LLM’s reasoning and planning capabilities [11, 17, 57]. To further improve the efficiency and accuracy of search paths, researchers have also introduced major voting[40], self-verification[44, 51], training value functions[39], and game-theory-based solutions[14, 13].

However, these methods are primarily used for reasoning tasks. In multi-agent decision environments where opponent state information and rewards are uncertain, traditional heuristic search algorithms are insufficient. BIDDER extends the application of heuristic search in LLMs by utilizing historical information to infer hidden opponent information, enabling opponent modeling. This approach allows for exploration and long-term reward calculation in multi-agent environments, thus achieving rational decision-making.

4.3 Decision-making based on LLM Agents

Recent research on large language models (LLMs) in decision-making [53] has spanned various multi-agent systems (MAS) including social behavior[56, 19], economic simulations[55, 22], game theory[10, 46], and game playing[24, 47]. To enhance the strategic reasoning capabilities of LLMs, researchers have incorporated the concepts of Theory of Mind [13, 16, 54] and Reinforcement Learning [48, 52]. These approaches aim to prompt LLMs to grasp the complexities of decision-making tasks.

Although these studies have demonstrated the potential and applications of LLMs in the decision-making domain, specialized reasoning frameworks designed for specific tasks face significant challenges when applied to other fields. Our generalized rational decision-making theory introduces a bi-directional deliberation reasoning method. Through various experiments, it has been validated that this approach significantly enhances the benefits gained by LLMs in decision-making processes.

5 Conclusions

As large language models (LLMs) are increasingly applied across various fields, BIDDER offers a novel approach to enhance their performance in complex decision-making environments. By introducing bidirectional reasoning, BIDDER integrates key concepts from decision science, such as uncertainty management and expected utility, into the reasoning processes of LLMs. By leveraging both historical data and potential future rewards, BIDDER effectively addresses the limitations of traditional unidirectional reasoning methods. The integration of decision theory principles and bi-directional modeling ensures a comprehensive exploration of possible states, leading to more informed and rational decisions. Our experiments in poker and negotiation scenarios demonstrate that BIDDER significantly improves the decision-making capabilities of LLMs, aligning their performance more closely with theoretical optimal solutions. This advancement represents a significant step forward in the development of LLMs, enabling them to make better decisions in complex, real-world scenarios.

References

- [1] Fahiem Bacchus, Adam J. Grove, Joseph Y. Halpern, and Daphne Koller. From statistical knowledge bases to degrees of belief. *Artif. Intell.*, 87:75–143, 1996.
- [2] Richard Bellman. Dynamic programming. *science*, 153(3731):34–37, 1966.
- [3] Maciej Besta, Nils Blach, Ales Kubicek, Robert Gerstenberger, Lukas Gianinazzi, Joanna Gajda, Tomasz Lehmann, Michal Podstawski, Hubert Niewiadomski, Piotr Nyczyk, et al. Graph of thoughts: Solving elaborate problems with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09687*, 2023.
- [4] Sumithra Bhakthavatsalam, Daniel Khashabi, Tushar Khot, Bhavana Dalvi Mishra, Kyle Richardson, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, Oyvind Tafjord, and Peter Clark. Think you have solved direct-answer question answering? try arc-da, the direct-answer ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.03315*, 2021.
- [5] Noam Brown, Adam Lerer, Sam Gross, and Tuomas Sandholm. Deep counterfactual regret minimization. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 793–802. PMLR, 2019.
- [6] Kris Cao, Angeliki Lazaridou, Marc Lanctot, Joel Z Leibo, Karl Tuyls, and Stephen Clark. Emergent communication through negotiation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.03980*, 2018.

- [7] Guillaume Chaslot, Sander Bakkes, Istvan Szita, and Pieter Spronck. Monte-carlo tree search: A new framework for game ai. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment*, volume 4, pages 216–217, 2008.
- [8] Xiaoyu Chen, Shenao Zhang, Pushi Zhang, Li Zhao, and Jianyu Chen. Asking before acting: Gather information in embodied decision making with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15695*, 2023.
- [9] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [10] Jinhao Duan, Renming Zhang, James Diffenderfer, Bhavya Kailkhura, Lichao Sun, Elias Stengel-Eskin, Mohit Bansal, Tianlong Chen, and Kaidi Xu. Gtbench: Uncovering the strategic reasoning limitations of llms via game-theoretic evaluations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12348*, 2024.
- [11] Xidong Feng, Ziyu Wan, Muning Wen, Ying Wen, Weinan Zhang, and Jun Wang. Alphazero-like tree-search can guide large language model decoding and training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17179*, 2023.
- [12] Yao Fu, Hao Peng, Tushar Khot, and Mirella Lapata. Improving language model negotiation with self-play and in-context learning from ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10142*, 2023.
- [13] Kanishk Gandhi, Dorsa Sadigh, and Noah D Goodman. Strategic reasoning with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19165*, 2023.
- [14] Ian Gemp, Yoram Bachrach, Marc Lanctot, Roma Patel, Vibhavari Dasagi, Luke Marris, Georgios Piliouras, and Karl Tuyls. States as strings as strategies: Steering language models with game-theoretic solvers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01704*, 2024.
- [15] Nate Gruver, Marc Finzi, Shikai Qiu, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. Large language models are zero-shot time series forecasters. In Alice Oh, Tristan Naumann, Amir Globerson, Kate Saenko, Moritz Hardt, and Sergey Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, 2023.
- [16] Jiaxian Guo, Bo Yang, Paul Yoo, Bill Yuchen Lin, Yusuke Iwasawa, and Yutaka Matsuo. Suspicion-agent: Playing imperfect information games with theory of mind aware gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17277*, 2023.
- [17] Shibo Hao, Yi Gu, Haodi Ma, Joshua Jiahua Hong, Zhen Wang, Daisy Zhe Wang, and Zhit-ing Hu. Reasoning with language model is planning with world model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14992*, 2023.
- [18] Alex Havrilla, Yuqing Du, Sharath Chandra Raparthy, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Maksym Zhuravinskyi, Eric Hambro, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Roberta Raileanu. Teaching large language models to reason with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04642*, 2024.
- [19] Wenyue Hua, Lizhou Fan, Lingyao Li, Kai Mei, Jianchao Ji, Yingqiang Ge, Libby Hemphill, and Yongfeng Zhang. War and peace (waragent): Large language model-based multi-agent simulation of world wars. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17227*, 2023.
- [20] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213, 2022.
- [21] Mike Lewis, Denis Yarats, Yann N. Dauphin, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Deal or no deal? end-to-end learning for negotiation dialogues, 2017.
- [22] Yang Li, Yangyang Yu, Haohang Li, Zhi Chen, and Khaldoun Khashanah. Tradinggpt: Multi-agent system with layered memory and distinct characters for enhanced financial trading performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03736*, 2023.

- [23] Xiaoqian Liu, Xingzhou Lou, Jianbin Jiao, and Junge Zhang. Position: Foundation agents as the paradigm shift for decision making. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17009*, 2024.
- [24] Weiyu Ma, Qirui Mi, Xue Yan, Yuqiao Wu, Runji Lin, Haifeng Zhang, and Jun Wang. Large language models play starcraft ii: Benchmarks and a chain of summarization approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11865*, 2023.
- [25] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhunoye, Yiming Yang, et al. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17651*, 2023.
- [26] Shen-Yun Miao, Chao-Chun Liang, and Keh-Yih Su. A diverse corpus for evaluating and developing english math word problem solvers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.15772*, 2021.
- [27] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, et al. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- [28] John F Nash Jr. Equilibrium points in n-person games. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 36(1):48–49, 1950.
- [29] Humza Naveed, Asad Ullah Khan, Shi Qiu, Muhammad Saqib, Saeed Anwar, Muhammad Usman, Nick Barnes, and Ajmal Mian. A comprehensive overview of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06435*, 2023.
- [30] Xuefei Ning, Zinan Lin, Zixuan Zhou, Huazhong Yang, and Yu Wang. Skeleton-of-thought: Large language models can do parallel decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15337*, 2023.
- [31] Arkil Patel, Satwik Bhattamishra, and Navin Goyal. Are nlp models really able to solve simple math word problems? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.07191*, 2021.
- [32] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik R Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [33] David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George Van Den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot, et al. Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search. *nature*, 529(7587):484–489, 2016.
- [34] Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, et al. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04615*, 2022.
- [35] Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [36] Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc V Le, Ed H Chi, Denny Zhou, et al. Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.09261*, 2022.
- [37] Alon Talmor, Ori Yoran, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, Yoav Goldberg, Yejin Choi, and Jonathan Berant. Commonsenseqa 2.0: Exposing the limits of ai through gamification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.05320*, 2022.
- [38] John Von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern. *Theory of games and economic behavior*, 2nd rev. 1947.
- [39] Chaojie Wang, Yan Chen Deng, Zhiyi Lv, Shuicheng Yan, and An Bo. Q*: Improving multi-step reasoning for llms with deliberative planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14283*, 2024.

- [40] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11171*, 2022.
- [41] Zhenhailong Wang, Shaoguang Mao, Wenshan Wu, Tao Ge, Furu Wei, and Heng Ji. Unleashing the emergent cognitive synergy in large language models: A task-solving agent through multi-persona self-collaboration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.05300*, 2023.
- [42] Christopher JCH Watkins and Peter Dayan. Q-learning. *Machine learning*, 8:279–292, 1992.
- [43] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [44] Yixuan Weng, Minjun Zhu, Fei Xia, Bin Li, Shizhu He, Shengping Liu, Bin Sun, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. Large language models are better reasoners with self-verification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09561*, 2022.
- [45] Sang Michael Xie, Aditi Raghunathan, Percy Liang, and Tengyu Ma. An explanation of in-context learning as implicit bayesian inference. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=RdJVFCHjUMI>.
- [46] Lin Xu, Zhiyuan Hu, Daquan Zhou, Hongyu Ren, Zhen Dong, Kurt Keutzer, See-Kiong Ng, and Jiashi Feng. Magic: Investigation of large language model powered multi-agent in cognition, adaptability, rationality and collaboration. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Large Language Model (LLM) Agents*, 2023.
- [47] Yuzhuang Xu, Shuo Wang, Peng Li, Fuwen Luo, Xiaolong Wang, Weidong Liu, and Yang Liu. Exploring large language models for communication games: An empirical study on werewolf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04658*, 2023.
- [48] Zelai Xu, Chao Yu, Fei Fang, Yu Wang, and Yi Wu. Language agents with reinforcement learning for strategic play in the werewolf game. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18940*, 2023.
- [49] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10601*, 2023.
- [50] Daochen Zha, Kwei-Herng Lai, Yuanpu Cao, Songyi Huang, Ruzhe Wei, Junyu Guo, and Xia Hu. Rlcard: A toolkit for reinforcement learning in card games, 2020.
- [51] Bin Zhang, Hangyu Mao, Jingqing Ruan, Ying Wen, Yang Li, Shao Zhang, Zhiwei Xu, Dapeng Li, Ziyue Li, Rui Zhao, et al. Controlling large language model-based agents for large-scale decision-making: An actor-critic approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13884*, 2023.
- [52] Wenqi Zhang, Ke Tang, Hai Wu, Mengna Wang, Yongliang Shen, Guiyang Hou, Zeqi Tan, Peng Li, Yueting Zhuang, and Weiming Lu. Agent-pro: Learning to evolve via policy-level reflection and optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17574*, 2024.
- [53] Yadong Zhang, Shaoguang Mao, Tao Ge, Xun Wang, Adrian de Wynter, Yan Xia, Wenshan Wu, Ting Song, Man Lan, and Furu Wei. Llm as a mastermind: A survey of strategic reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01230*, 2024.
- [54] Yadong Zhang, Shaoguang Mao, Tao Ge, Xun Wang, Yan Xia, Man Lan, and Furu Wei. K-level reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01521*, 2024.
- [55] Qinlin Zhao, Jindong Wang, Yixuan Zhang, Yiqiao Jin, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, and Xing Xie. Competeai: Understanding the competition behaviors in large language model-based agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17512*, 2023.
- [56] Xuhui Zhou, Hao Zhu, Leena Mathur, Ruohong Zhang, Haofei Yu, Zhengyang Qi, Louis-Philippe Morency, Yonatan Bisk, Daniel Fried, Graham Neubig, et al. Sotopia: Interactive evaluation for social intelligence in language agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11667*, 2023.

- [57] Yuchen Zhuang, Xiang Chen, Tong Yu, Saayan Mitra, Victor Bursztyn, Ryan A Rossi, Somdeb Sarkhel, and Chao Zhang. Toolchain*: Efficient action space navigation in large language models with a* search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13227*, 2023.
- [58] Martin Zinkevich, Michael Johanson, Michael Bowling, and Carmelo Piccione. Regret minimization in games with incomplete information. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 20, 2007.

A Game Setting

A.1 Limit Texas Hold'em

Limit Texas Hold'em is a variant of Texas Hold'em poker where the betting limits are fixed. The fixed betting structure and sequential decision-making process create a controlled yet challenging environment for researching agent decision-making. Its partial observability, and stochastic nature make it ideal for studying how agents handle uncertainty, strategic planning, and adversarial competition.

Rules and Gameplay are as following:

1. Blinds: - Small Blind and Big Blind are posted before the cards are dealt. - The Small Blind is usually half the size of the Big Blind.
2. Betting Rounds: - There are four betting rounds: Pre-Flop, Flop, Turn, and River. - Betting amounts are fixed and structured according to the round.
3. Dealing: - Each player is dealt two private cards (hole cards). - Five community cards are dealt in stages: the Flop (three cards), the Turn (one card), and the River (one card).
4. Action Spaces: there are four actions, Call, Raise, Fold and Check. In Limit Texas Hold'em. Each player can only choose a fixed amount of raise. And in each round the number of raises is limited to four times.

For utilizing LLM as a player, the game setting prompt and the state description prompt required for each action are as follows:

Game Setting Prompt
<p>You are {name} and you are a Texas Hold'em player. Texas Hold'em is a popular betting game. Each player is dealt two face-down cards, called hole cards. Then 5 community cards are dealt in three stages (the flop, the turn and the river). Each player seeks the five best cards among the hole cards and community cards. In this Texas Hold'em game, there are a total of {num_players} players namely {players}. The number of chips every player has is infinite. You just need to win more chips in the competition as much as possible.</p>
State Prompt
<p>The current state is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Public Card is {public_card}, and Your Hand is {hand}. 2. You have bet {my_bid} chip, and the number of chips all players have invested is {all_chips}. 3. After your {pre_action}, {oppoent_actions}. <p>You can choose one of the following actions now: {actions}.</p>

A.2 Negotiation

The "Negotiation" game, as described in [Cao et al.](#), is a semi-cooperative model of agent interaction where communication plays a pivotal role. Here are the key rules of the Negotiation game:




Figure 4: The distribution of hand strengths sampled from poker games ranges from 0 to 8, corresponding respectively to High Card, One Pair, Two Pair, Three of a Kind, Straight, Flush, Full House, Four of a Kind, and Straight Flush.

1. **Item Pool:** Agents are presented with a pool of items, which in the paper’s example includes three types of items: peppers, cherries, and strawberries. Each type of item has a quantity associated with it, which is sampled uniformly for each round of the game.
2. **Utility Functions:** Each agent receives a utility function that specifies the rewarding value of each item. These utilities are private, meaning that each agent only knows its own utility values, which are sampled uniformly with at least one item having non-zero utility.
3. **Negotiation Rounds:** Over a series of negotiation timesteps (N), the agents take turns to propose how to divide the items in the pool. The number of turns, N , is sampled between 4 and 10 in each round to prevent a ‘first-mover’ advantage.
4. **Alternating Turns:** The agents alternate turns, with one agent (referred to as Agent A) always acting on odd turns and the other agent (Agent B) on even turns.
5. **Proposals and Messages:** During each turn, an agent can make a proposal regarding the division of the items and send a message through a communication channel. The proposal is a vector indicating the quantity of each item type that the agent is requesting.
6. **Termination:** Either agent can terminate the negotiation at any timestep with a special action, which signifies agreement with the most recent proposal made by the other agent. The negotiation ends, and rewards are distributed based on the last proposal.
7. **Rewards:** If the negotiation is successfully terminated, the agents receive rewards based on the dot product of their utility vectors and the items they receive. If an agent makes an invalid proposal and it is accepted, both agents receive a reward of zero.
8. **No Agreement Scenario:** If the negotiation reaches the upper limit of allowed turns without agreement, both agents receive no reward.

The game is designed to study how agents can learn to communicate and negotiate effectively, with a focus on the emergence of communication protocols and strategies in a multi-agent reinforcement learning setting.

For utilizing LLM as a player, the game setting prompt and the state description prompt required for each action are as follows:

Game Setting Prompt

You are negotiating the division of Peppers, Strawberries, and Cherries with the opponent. Different values these items hold for both you and your opponent. The process is structured into two stages per round: the proposal stage and the utterance stage. Remember, the key in such negotiations is understanding that your opponent also has their value system for these items, which is unknown to you. Balancing between revealing your true desires and misleading your opponent to gain a favorable outcome is essential. It’s also important to be adaptive, as the negotiation progresses and you gather more information about your opponent’s preferences and tactics.

Proposals State Prompt

Now, you are in the Proposal stage: you'll determine the division of items you desire. This is expressed as [a, b, c], where a represents the quantity of Peppers, b the quantity of Strawberries, and c the quantity of Cherries you wish to acquire. It's crucial to base this division on the perceived value these items have for you, keeping in mind that the goal is to reach a mutually agreeable solution.

Utterance State Prompt

Now, you are in the Utterance Stage: you communicate to your opponent what you want, again in the format [a, b, c]. This utterance is your strategic communication and doesn't necessarily have to reflect your actual desires or the proposal you formulated in the first stage. It's a tool for negotiation, potentially used to mislead, bluff, or strategically reveal information to your opponent.

B Reasoning Method Implementation Details

B.1 Limit Texas Hold'em

B.1.1 Direct

Query Prompt

Please provide your results in the form of {'action': ''}. Just output the dictionary, don't use any other text.

B.1.2 CoT

Query Prompt

Please first think and reason about the current state and then generate your action as follows: My thought is {Your Thought}, and my action is {'action': ''}

B.1.3 Reflexion

Query Prompt

Please first think and reason about the current state and then generate your action as follows: My thought is {Your Thought}, and my action is {'action': ''}

Reflexion Prompt

Please carefully check the thought and the action you just output, and then refine your answer. The final output is also in the same format: My revised thought is {Your Thought}. My revised action is {'action': ''}.

B.1.4 BIDDER

Hidden State Inference Prompt

You are a Poker expert. Based on the public information provided below, evaluate the relative strength of each player's hand. The strongest hand should be rated as 5, and the weakest as 1.

Available History Information:

```
{events}
```

Instructions:

1. Evaluate the relative strength of each player's hand based on the information given.
 2. Consider the players' actions and the community cards in your evaluation.
 3. Provide a rating from 1 to 5, with 5 being the strongest hand and 1 being the weakest
- Please provide your evaluation based on the information above.

Sample Output Format:

```
{  
  "Player": {  
    "Rating": <rating>  
  }  
}
```

Modeling Prompt

You are observing an ongoing poker game. Here are the details:

- Current community cards: {public_cards} - Players and their estimated hand strengths: {hand_strength}

The game history so far is as follows: events

What is the most likely action for player when legal actions are: {legal_action}?

The JSON format should look like this: {"action": "<most likely action>"}

Reward Prompt

You are observing an ongoing poker game. Here are the details:

- Current community cards: {public_cards}

- Players and their estimated hand strengths:

```
{hand_strength}
```

The game history so far is as follows:

```
events
```

Predict the potential payoff (normalized between 0 and 1) for {player} for each of the following possible actions and return the results in JSON format: {action_payoff_template}

B.2 Negotiation

For the LLM reasoning baselines in the Negotiation game (including Direct, CoT, and ToT), we utilize the implementation provided by [Duan et al.](https://github.com/jinhaoduan/GTBench)⁵.

⁵<https://github.com/jinhaoduan/GTBench>

B.2.1 BIDDER

Hidden State Inference Prompt

```
{state}
Based on the public information provided below, infer the value of each item to your opponent.

Opponent behavior:
{events}
Item Pool:
{item_pool_prompt}
Instructions:
1. Consider the players' historical actions in your evaluation.
2. The value is between 1 and 10.
Please provide your evaluation based on the information above.
Output Format:
Evaluation:
Peppers: <value>
Strawberries: <value>
Cherries: <value>
```

Reward Prompt

You are negotiating the division of Peppers, Strawberries, and Cherries with the opponent. Different values these items hold for both you and your opponent. The process is structured into two stages per round: the proposal stage and the utterance stage.

Now, you are in the Utterance Stage: you communicate to your opponent what you want, again in the format [a, b, c]. This utterance is your strategic communication and doesn't necessarily have to reflect your actual desires or the proposal you formulated in the first stage. It's a tool for negotiation, potentially used to mislead, bluff, or strategically reveal information to your opponent.

```
{item_pool_prompt}
{value_vector}
{last_utterance_prompt}
The opponent's evaluation of the value of each item is:
Opponent Value Inference:
{inferred_values}
Instructions:
1. Propose the two Utterances with the largest rewards. This also includes agreeing if you agree with your opponent's utterance. Each utterance format is: "<Utterance: [a, b, c]>" (including "<" and ">").
2. Calculate the Payoff for each Utterance (a number); calculate the probability (normalized between 0 and 1) of the opponent agreeing with this utterance, it is necessary to consider the degree of satisfaction the opponent has with the utterance.
```

Sample Output Format:

Utterances:

```
{
  "Utterance": "<utterance>",
  "Payoff": "<payoff>",
  "Probability": "<probability>"
},
{
  "Utterance": "<utterance>",
  "Payoff": "<payoff>",
  "Probability": "<probability>"
}
```

C Algorithm Detail of BIDDER

Algorithm 1 Explore (\mathcal{T}, t): Exploration with Opponent Modeling

Require: s_t : Current decision context; I : Inferred hidden information about opponent; T : Time-step of exploration;

Ensure: $\mathcal{T}(s_t)$: The traces of exploration.

```

1: if  $t = T$  or  $s_t$  is terminal node then
2:   return  $\{\tau\}$ 
3: end if
4:  $\mathcal{T} = \emptyset$ 
5: for each legal action  $a_t$  of  $s_t$  do
6:    $s_{t+1} \leftarrow s_t \times a_t \times \text{Opponent\_Modeling}(I, \tau)$ 
7:    $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \cup \text{Explore}(\tau \cup \{a_t, s_{t+1}\}, t + 1)$ 
8: end for
9: return  $\mathcal{T}$ 

```

Algorithm 2 Rewards Aggregation with Attenuation Coefficient

Require: \mathcal{T} : Explored trajectories; A : The set of valid actions; β : Attenuation Coefficient;

Ensure: $G(A)$: The maximum payoff of each action.

```

1: for each  $a \in A$  do
2:    $G(a) \leftarrow 0$ 
3:   for each trajectory  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$  do
4:     if  $\tau$  starts with action  $a$  then
5:        $G(\tau) \leftarrow \sum_{k=0}^T \beta^k \cdot \tau[k]$ 
6:       if  $G(\tau) > G(a)$  then
7:          $G(a) \leftarrow G(\tau)$ 
8:       end if
9:     end if
10:  end for
11: end for
12:
13: return  $\{G(a) \mid a \in A\}$ 

```
