
Can Large Language Models Adapt to Other Agents In-Context?

Matthew Riemer^{1,2,3} Zahra Ashktorab¹ Djallel Bouneffouf¹ Payel Das¹ Miao Liu¹ Justin Weisz¹
Murray Campbell¹

Abstract

As the research community aims to build better AI assistants that are more dynamic and personalized to the diversity of humans that they interact with, there is increased interest in evaluating the theory of mind capabilities of large language models (LLMs). Indeed, several recent studies suggest that LLM theory of mind capabilities are quite impressive, approximating human-level performance. Our paper aims to rebuke this narrative and argues instead that past studies were not directly measuring agent performance, potentially leading to findings that are illusory in nature as a result. We draw a strong distinction between what we call *literal theory of mind* i.e. measuring the agent’s ability to predict the behavior of others and *functional theory of mind* i.e. adapting to agents in-context based on a rational response to predictions of their behavior. We find that top performing open source LLMs may display strong capabilities in literal theory of mind, depending on how they are prompted, but seem to struggle with functional theory of mind – even when partner policies are exceedingly simple. Our work serves to highlight the double sided nature of inductive bias in LLMs when adapting to new situations. While this bias can lead to strong performance over limited horizons, it often hinders convergence to optimal long-term behavior.

1. Introduction

Recently, generative AI, particularly in the form of LLM assistants, has been deployed as a tool for a growing variety of real-world use cases where the LLM must interact with a diverse set of people performing a diverse set of tasks. As typically deployed today, these LLMs are only interacting with users at inference time due to the significant compu-

tational cost of continuing to train these large models in the context of individual users. As a result, LLMs must learn to adapt their behavior to users in-context based on recorded interaction histories. Indeed, a similar scenario of growing importance involves LLMs interacting with other AI agents through the agentic framework [93]. Our work is inspired by the work of Akata et al. [2] to leverage canonical repeated games from behavioral game theory as a way to assess the adaptation ability of LLMs across the full spectrum of incentive structures. Unfortunately, we find significant deficiencies in the ability of top open source LLMs to adapt to new scenarios in-context, providing a sobering analysis of the ability of LLMs to reliably adapt without continual training of the model weights themselves.

Many recent papers have been inspired by how humans are evaluated for theory of mind capabilities when evaluating theory of mind in LLMs [17; 46; 55; 95; 94]. While this does on the surface seem to like a logical course of action, it is important to remind ourselves that AI has a tendency to over optimize for its training objectives in a manner that is quite alien to the way the human brain works. For example, in Bubeck et al. [17] they tout performance of LLMs on human theory of mind tests, but then in the very next section note a noticeable lack of "process consistency" in LLM explanations. What this means is that LLMs can come up with compelling explanations for what they do that have very little to do with their actual reasoning process. We must therefore proceed with caution about our conclusions when we evaluate LLMs in a way that does not directly align with what we really care about. When we evaluate humans, we typically focus on what we term in this paper to be *literal theory of mind*, which is their ability to predict the behavior of other agents. As noted by Ma et al. [55] this can take the form of various abstractions of this behavior including actions, intentions, beliefs, percepts, desires, knowledge, and emotions. However, with humans we take for granted that this prediction of the behavior of other agents will be consistently applied into their own reasoning process when determining their own behavior. The main insight of our paper is that this process consistency cannot be taken for granted when evaluating LLMs.

The direction of our paper was inspired by an unexpected result in our early experiments testing behavioral game theory

^{*}Equal contribution ¹IBM Research ²Mila ³Université de Montréal. Correspondence to: Matthew Riemer <mdriemer@us.ibm.com>.

with LLMs. We considered the incredibly simple scenario of an LLM agent playing the classic game Rock, Paper, Scissors against an agent that always plays the action "Rock" for 100 consecutive rounds. The optimal course of action is for the LLM to respond with the counter to this action "Paper" as much as possible. If you were in the LLMs shoes how do you think you would do? It is certainly reasonable to take a few exploratory actions, but there would be little excuse for not winning a high percentage of the 100 rounds. What we found is that a vanilla application of some common open source LLMs resulted in a policy that chose each action "Rock", "Paper", and "Scissor" roughly evenly. This is interesting because this is actually the famous Nash equilibrium solution for this game. However, this is the solution for optimizing your worst case return across any possible opponent. To act in this way against this particular opponent that always plays "Rock" for 100 consecutive rounds actually demonstrates a profound lack of theory of mind. But here the thing, this LLM agent does actually display a high-level of literal theory of mind. Indeed, it only takes so many rounds of seeing the other agent take the "Rock" action before the LLM is able to predict it will keep doing so. The problem is that this prediction has nothing to do with its own chosen course of behavior. We believe this is an important insight for the AI community to grapple with when measuring theory of mind in agents, and formalize the concept of *functional theory of mind* to accurately describe the capability that is lacking in many modern LLMs.

Our paper makes the following key contributions to the community. In Section 3 we formulate the problem of in-context reinforcement learning in the multi-agent context, allowing us to provide definitions for literal theory of mind (Definition 3.1) and functional theory of mind (Definition 3.2). We find the difference between these two capabilities can be stark and is highly dependent on the way we prompt the LLM for the task. In Section 4.2 we dive deeper into the reasoning challenges of performing effective in-context reinforcement learning, including difficulties associated with attention dilution and multi-hop reasoning. We find that LLMs may still struggle to effectively adapt to other agents even when they are directly told both what the other agent will do is and the reward structure of the game. In Section 4.3 we consider the ability of LLM agents to coordinate with peers that deploy adaptive tit for tat style strategies. While we find that advanced prompting strategies can lead to significant improvements in the adaptability of models, open source LLMs still are unable to consistently match the performance of simple tabular models. Finally, in Section 4.4 we take a deeper look at the tradeoff between inductive bias and convergence rates in LLMs by testing the impact of different action representations that evoke different degrees of the LLMs prior knowledge about the game.

2. Related Work

Frameworks for Machine Theory of Mind. In the field of multi-agent reinforcement learning, theory of mind is generally interpreted as the ability to directly predict the behavior (i.e. the actions) that another agent will take [54; 72]. However, there can be a number of different ways to abstractly represent this behavior [55]. For example, abstraction can be applied in the temporal dimension representing behavior as a composition of hierarchical skills [98; 8; 79; 81; 4; 1] or goals [90; 6; 112; 38; 39]. Abstraction can also be applied at the agent level in order to represent the abstract actions of groups [61; 103]. Moreover, as showcased by the games Hanabi [9; 63; 58; 64] and Poker [27; 16], theory of mind can be directly related to inferring recursive [62] beliefs about unobserved information or knowledge. We consider the efficacy of predictions of all of these representations of behavior as examples of measuring literal theory of mind (Definition 3.1). However, it has been recently recognized in the human-computer interaction (HCI) literature that we must go even further to achieve *mutual theory of mind* for better collaboration with humans [104; 113]. In this framework, the mutual shaping of mental representations as well as the functional goal of improved performance on tasks are emphasized. We are inspired by this aspirational goal in our paper, leading us to define a functional measurement of theory of mind performance (Definition 3.2).

Measuring LLM Theory of Mind. While a number of recent studies have touted superior human-level LLM theory of mind capabilities, to the best of our knowledge these tasks have always center around passive question answering [17; 94; 46; 95] as typified by the classic Sally-Anne false-belief test [10]. LLMs have also been successfully employed to simulate a diversity of personas [70; 28], trust behaviors [109], or even for macro-economic simulations [50]. However, these tasks all lack interactivity and only reflect strong performance at literal theory of mind (Definition 3.1). On the other hand, Kim et al. [43] found that LLMs perform poorly when subjected to multiple question types that demand the same consistent underlying reasoning. This finding is in the same spirit and complimentary to the finding of our paper as well as the finding that LLMs lack process consistency [17]. Moreover, LLMs have been found to fail at important interactive applications such as adaptive education for users of diverse age or education levels [86] and providing coding assistance for beginner programmers [65]. Our aim in this paper is to formulate functional theory of mind (Definition 3.2) to describe the set of tasks where current LLM theory of mind capabilities tend to fall short.

Behavioral Game Theory with LLMs. Our paper builds off the work of Akata et al. [2] who considered LLMs playing the Prisoner’s Dilemma and Battle of Sexes as we do. We closely mimic the prompting style and experimental

design that they considered. However, we focus on significantly longer interaction horizons and performance playing with simple policies rather than playing with other LLMs. LLMs will generally tend to generate in-distribution interaction histories when they play themselves, so we find it more interesting to focus on very simple relatively out of distribution partner policies. For the Battle of Sexes game, Akata et al. [2] found that GPT4 only could adapt the canonical human-like alternating policy when using a special form of social cognition prompting that considers its own predictions of the actions of others (similar to "perspective taking" prompting [110]). We also tried this approach in our setting and did not find it to be an adequate fix the issues that LLMs experience. The ability for LLMs to play Rock, Paper, Scissors was also previously considered by Fan et al. [24]. They considered performance against simple one action policies, but considered far fewer rounds, making it much harder to speculate about the convergence behavior of models. Moreover, Fan et al. [24] did not contrast performance in these games as we do with the performance of theory of mind prediction. As a result, the findings of our work are novel and surprising – although it is possible to see early evidence in their paper that GPT3.5 and GPT3 do not converge against simple policies. Lorè & Heydari [53] also experimented with LLM performance in social dilemmas including the Prisoner’s Dilemma, but do not consider the theory of mind capabilities of these models.

Multi-agent Solution Concepts. It is often assumed that the goal of learning in multi-agent settings is to arrive at a Nash equilibria. This represents a fixed solution that is robust to the worst case rational policy. However, to properly cater our behavior to a diverse set of policies in which we receive the best possible performance when paired with each, we must instead learn an adaptive policy that specializes to the current and anticipated future policies of other agents [25; 26; 40; 108; 41]. This solution concept was defined as an *Active equilibria* in Kim et al. [41], which represents a strictly more ambitious goal than simply learning a Nash equilibria or Correlated equilibria [42]. In this work, we aim for policies that do the best they can with the policy they play with (regardless of whether their behavior is rational).

Novelty of Evaluation Criteria. It is worth emphasizing that Definitions 3.1 and 3.2 are not novel. In fact, our goal with Definition 3.1 is to establish a definition that describes as big of a cross-section of the prior literature as possible. Definition 3.2 is merely a statement of T -step regret, which has a long history as a metric for reinforcement learning performance [35]. It was also previously considered as a criteria for repeated matrix games with LLMs [69]. The novelty of our paper is simply in pointing out that it is the main functional evaluation criteria that should be employed for measuring adaptive theory of mind capabilities.

See Appendix A for detail about the connection of our work to the continual learning literature and possible applications.

3. Building and Evaluating Multi-Agent RL Policies with In-Context Learning

The Environment. The interaction process between multiple agents is often formalized as a stochastic game [92] or rather a Markov game in the fully observable setting [52]. For generality in this work, we rather consider the setting of Decentralized partially observable Markov decisions processes (Dec-POMDPs) [13] that generalize POMDPs [33] and MDPs [71] to the multi-agent and decentralized setting. A Dec-POMDP is defined by the tuple $\langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}, T \rangle$. Here \mathcal{I} is a finite set of agents, \mathcal{S} is a finite set of global states, and $\mathcal{A} = \times_i \mathcal{A}^i$ is the set of joint across agents $i \in \mathcal{I}$. $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{S}$ is the state transition function based on the joint actions across agents, and $\mathcal{R} = \times_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{R}^i$ is the joint reward function with reward function $\mathcal{R}^i : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ for each agent $i \in \mathcal{I}$. $\mathcal{X} = \times_i \mathcal{X}^i$ is the joint set of observations with \mathcal{X}^i denoting a finite set of observations for each agent. $\mathcal{O} : \mathcal{S} \mapsto \mathcal{X}$ is the function that produces observations for each agent based on the state. Finally, T is the horizon of interactions before termination.

Agent Interaction. We can now consider environment interaction at each step from the perspective of a given focal agent $i \in \mathcal{I}$ where we will use $-i := \mathcal{I} \setminus i$ to denote set of all other agents. At step t agent i takes action a_t^i and the other agents take a joint action \mathbf{a}_t^{-i} yielding a transition from s_t to s_{t+1} with probability $\mathcal{T}(s_{t+1} | s_t, \mathbf{a}_t)$ where $\mathbf{a}_t = \{a_t^i, \mathbf{a}_t^{-i}\}$. The agents then receives its own observation of this state x_{t+1}^i and reward r_t^i . In the environments we consider in our paper it is assumed that x_{t+1}^i also contains information about the actions of the other agents at the previous step \mathbf{a}_t^{-i} . However, this need not always be the case. In such a POMDP, each agent’s policy $a_t^i \sim \pi^i(h_t)$ generates its action stochastically based on its own interaction history h_t^i where $h_t^i := \{x_1^i, a_1^i, r_1^i, \dots, x_t^i\}$. Note that policies being defined in this way subsumes the common case where part of the history is discarded for computational or memory efficiency.

LLM History Representations. As we are interested in evaluating LLMs for this problem it is additionally assumed that this history representation h_t^i must be encoded in text (i.e. LLM tokens). This implies that there must be a function that we have direct access to converting the observations x_t^i , actions a_t^i , and rewards r_t^i to the form of LLM token representations. Moreover, it is important to note that we are interested in learning generalist policies across tasks with LLMs. As a result, following the protocol of Akata et al. [2], it can also be useful to include any information about the environment tuple $\langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}, T \rangle$ to the agent to promote rapid adaptation to new tasks.

3.1. Disentangling Literal Theory of Mind from Functional Theory of Mind Evaluation

The goal of any individual agent i interacting in an environment for T steps is to learn a policy π^{i*} that maximize its expected reward given the policies of the other agents in the environment π^{-i} starting from state s_1 :

$$\pi^{i*} = \arg \max_{\pi^i} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T r_t^i | s_1, \pi^{-i} \right].$$

Because the best course of action π^{i*} is critically dependent on the policies of the other agents π^{-i} , it is common for agents to directly learn a model of the other agent’s policies $\hat{\pi}^{-i}$ in decentralized settings. This is analogous to model-based RL [97; 15; 91] and is useful for stabilizing learning [54]. However, it is worth noting that it is not a strict requirement for representing π^{i*} that is optimal in functionality [96]. That said, it is tempting to consider when using LLMs as it can be generated by simply prompting the model with a token representation of the interaction history h_t^j for $j \in -i$. We can then model performance of any particular approximate *literal theory of mind* model using Definition 3.1.

Definition 3.1 (*T*-Step Literal Theory of Mind Loss). The loss from start state s_1 with respect to a joint policy π^{-i} that generates T actions $\mathbf{a}_1^{-i}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_T^{-i}$ of its approximation $\hat{\pi}^{-i}$ that generates T actions $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^{-i}, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_T^{-i}$ is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Literal}}(s_1, \hat{\pi}^{-i}, \pi^{-i}, T) = \mathbb{D}(\phi(\mathbf{a}_1^{-i}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_T^{-i}), \phi(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_1^{-i}, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_T^{-i}))$$

where \mathbb{D} is some distance function and ϕ is some abstraction mapping function over actions.

We phrase Definition 3.1 in terms of an abstract distance function \mathbb{D} and abstraction mapping function ϕ to keep the definition as broad as possible and encompass as much as we can of the existing literature on theory of mind. Primitive actions can definitely be directly considered (as we do in this paper). In this case, ϕ is the identity mapping and \mathbb{D} is set to a percent error metric. ϕ can also be straightforwardly set to various temporal abstractions of actions given sufficient history length T . Moreover, latent features that impact the behavior of agents such as intentions, beliefs, percepts, desires, knowledge, and emotions can also be considered as alternative for ϕ – as an inverse mapping must exist. However, the agent’s actions alone may not provide enough information, for example, to fully determine an agent’s emotional state, we can only judge the theory of mind performance of an agent in terms of the information provided. As such, Bayesian reasoning may be the desired outcome in the presence of lack of information, so this does not serve as meaningful limitation of this definition.

One obvious issue with Definition 3.1 is that it is a function of a theory of mind model $\hat{\pi}^{-i}$, which is not even necessarily needed to express the policy of an agent π^i . For cases where the value of $\hat{\pi}^{-i}$ is decoupled from the reasoning involved in π^i , it is of particular importance to consider a functional metric of the degree to which the policy π^i is catered to the particular other agent policies π^{-i} . We can define this metric in terms of the T -step regret incurred by π^i .

Definition 3.2 (*T*-Step Functional Theory of Mind Regret). The T step regret from start state s_1 of policy π^i that receives individual rewards r_1^i, \dots, r_T^i when playing with policy π^{-i} in comparison to the optimal policy π^{i*} that plays the expected optimal T -step response to policy π^{-i} to receive rewards $r_1^{i*}, \dots, r_T^{i*}$:

$$\Delta_{\text{Functional}}(s_1, \pi^i, \pi^{-i}, T) = \sum_{t=1}^T (r_t^{i*} - r_t^i).$$

Definition 3.2 provides us with a functional metric for measuring theory of mind in the presence of other agents parameterized by π^{-i} . However, it is still worth considering when the conclusions from this metric will be much different than conclusions from a literal theory of mind metric following Definition 3.1. To do this we must define a new policy π_{ToM}^i that is directly based on the literal theory of mind model prediction $\hat{\pi}^{-i}$ such that behavior is chosen to be a rational maximization of the action-value function. In our experiments we simulate such a policy utilizing ground truth knowledge of the payoff structure and use $\Delta_{\text{ToM}}(s_1, \hat{\pi}^{-i}, \pi^{-i}, T)$ to denote the regret of such a policy. Δ_{ToM} thus represents the best regret that can be possibly achieved by faithfully following the predictions of our theory of mind model under the assumption that the predictions are correct.

Metrics for our Experiments. In our experiments, we aim to get a wholistic view both the literal theory of mind and functional theory of mind performance of each LLM and prompting strategy. We report the accuracy of the literal theory of mind predictions with respect to individual actions as ToM %. We also report the regret per step functionally achieved by each policy as $\Delta_{\text{Functional}}/T$. Finally, to get a clearer picture of the difference between the literal theory of mind performance and functional theory of mind performance, we report Δ_{ToM}/T the regret per step of the rational policy based on the literal theory of mind model.

3.2. Initial Results

We begin by conducting experiments on the Rock, Paper, Scissor domain as discussed in the introduction. LLAMA-2 had previously been found to achieve strong performance on repeated matrix games [53], so we considered initial experiments with the full LLAMA-2 family [102] as well as the competitive Falcon 40B [5] and Mixtral models [32].

LLM Model	$\Delta_{\text{Functional}}/T$	Δ_{ToM}/T	ToM %
Tabular	0.083 \pm 0.004	0.039 \pm 0.006	97.4 \pm 0.4
LLAMA-2 70B Chat	0.857 \pm 0.142	0.119 \pm 0.006	92.1 \pm 0.4
LLAMA-2 70B	0.971 \pm 0.067	0.048 \pm 0.003	96.8 \pm 0.2
LLAMA-2 13B Chat	0.891 \pm 0.173	0.095 \pm 0.006	93.7 \pm 0.4
LLAMA-2 13B	1.015 \pm 0.044	0.049 \pm 0.003	96.7 \pm 0.2
LLAMA-2 7B Chat	0.904 \pm 0.151	0.085 \pm 0.004	94.3 \pm 0.3
LLAMA-2 7B	0.972 \pm 0.039	0.066 \pm 0.004	95.6 \pm 0.3
Falcon 40B	0.973 \pm 0.040	0.056 \pm 0.005	96.2 \pm 0.3
Mixtral 8x7B Instruct v1	0.542 \pm 0.070	0.050 \pm 0.005	96.7 \pm 0.3

Table 1: Initial results for Rock, Paper, Scissors against simple single action policies.

Our results are provided in Table 1. Our prompting strategy for the LLM policy π^i follows what was established for repeated matrix games by Akata et al. [2] (see Figure 2). Our prompting strategy for the theory of mind model is detailed in Figure 3. The horizon of interaction is $T = 100$ steps against a randomly chosen fixed single action policy i.e. always Rock, always Paper, or always Scissors. 95% confidence intervals of the mean estimate across opponent policies are provided. See Appendix B for further details.

Functional Theory of Mind Gap

Throughout Table 1 we see a massive gap between the regret based on a rational response to the theory of mind model Δ_{ToM} with accuracy ToM % and the functional regret achieved in practice $\Delta_{\text{Functional}}$.

We also implemented a simple tabular model that performs efficient exploration following the classic RMax algorithm [15] for near optimal worst case sample efficiency driven by optimistic Q-Learning [105] with the actions at the last time step treated as the state representation. The tabular theory of mind model is based on a simple frequency count based prediction using the same state representation. It is clear that no LLM model gets even close to the performance of the tabular model in terms of functional theory of mind performance – although some come close in terms of their literal theory of mind performance. We find that Mixtral outperforms the LLAMA-2 family and we will thus subsequently include experiments with LLAMA-3 (which performs better). However, it is also interesting to see the trends within the LLAMA-2 family of models. Bigger models seems to get better performance and models with instruction tuning labeled "Chat" tend to get worse literal theory of mind performance with better functional theory of mind performance. This is an intuitive result as instruction tuning further prioritizes interactive decision making and takes the model further from its original language modeling objective that is key to predicting what will come next in a sequence of interactions.

4. Further Analysis: LLMs Playing Matrix Games with Simple Partner Strategies

In this section, we attempt to gain a further understanding of this surprising result. Rocks, Paper, Scissors (RPS) is a canonical competitive game – as can be seen by the payoff table in Figure 5. We also wanted to evaluate our models on a canonical cooperative game, for which we chose the Iterated Battle of Sexes (IBS) following Akata et al. [2] with a payoff table detailed in Figure 6. Once again following Akata et al. [2], we also evaluate our models on the famous Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma (IPD) mixed incentive game with a payoff table detailed in Figure 7. We opted to test our each model on the full spectrum of incentive structures to rule out explanations for performance lacking in competitive games such as an intrinsic altruism bias in LLMs (as has been previously suggested by Leng & Yuan [49]).

4.1. Different Prompting Strategies

We wanted to first take a deeper look at the impact of prompting strategy on performance. We will henceforth call the prompting strategy used in the previous section *LM Prompting* see Figure 2) where the probability of each action in the action space is explicitly drawn from the model to generate the next action via next token prediction. See Figure 3 for the literal theory of mind version of the prompt. In *QA Prompting* (Figures 5 and 6), decision making is posed as a question answering problem where the LLM keeps generating stochastic outputs until they are in the desired format and action space vocabulary. This is implemented as a step along the way to Chain of Thought (CoT) reasoning [106] that we refer to as *CoT Prompting* (Figures 7 and 8) in which the LLM must generate a reasoning process and its own answer based on that reasoning process in the correct format. Finally, we consider *Social Prompting* as proposed for IBS by Akata et al. [2] where the LLM first generates a prediction of the other agent’s action and then conditions its reasoning based on that action. This approach is detailed in Figure 14

Prompting	Game	$\Delta_{\text{Functional}}/T$	Δ_{ToM}/T	ToM %
LM	RPS	0.542 ± 0.070	0.050 ± 0.005	96.7 ± 0.3
QA	RPS	0.881 ± 0.117	0.606 ± 0.043	59.6 ± 2.9
CoT	RPS	0.648 ± 0.042	0.998 ± 0.020	33.5 ± 1.4
Social QA	RPS	0.676 ± 0.058	0.619 ± 0.045	58.7 ± 3.0
Social LM	RPS	0.643 ± 0.058	0.119 ± 0.038	92.0 ± 2.5
LM	IBS	2.055 ± 0.391	0.216 ± 0.026	97.3 ± 0.4
QA	IBS	2.518 ± 0.422	1.818 ± 0.259	75.9 ± 4.0
CoT	IBS	2.169 ± 0.107	1.659 ± 0.095	79.8 ± 1.4
Social QA	IBS	2.557 ± 0.451	2.19 ± 0.383	70.3 ± 5.7
Social LM	IBS	2.082 ± 0.329	0.182 ± 0.057	97.4 ± 0.8
LM	IPD	0.949 ± 0.142	0.098 ± 0.029	97.8 ± 0.5
QA	IPD	2.365 ± 0.179	1.342 ± 0.177	68.8 ± 2.7
CoT	IPD	0.955 ± 0.115	1.105 ± 0.041	60.6 ± 4.5
Social QA	IPD	1.569 ± 0.132	1.338 ± 0.234	68.2 ± 3.9
Social LM	IPD	1.098 ± 0.089	0.110 ± 0.037	97.4 ± 0.8

Table 2: Comparing literal and functional metrics across prompting strategies on Rock, Paper, Scissors (RPS), Iterated Battle of Sexes (IBS), and the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma (IPD) for Mixtral 8x7B Instruct v1 playing with single action partners.

with the variant using QA prompting for the action prediction (Figure 6) being called *Social QA Prompting* and the one using LM Prompting for the action prediction (Figure 4) being called *Social LM Prompting*.

Our results applying these various prompting strategies to the best LLM models from the previous section are included in Tables 2 and 8. We find that LM Prompting always achieves the best literal theory of mind performance. Adding the QA format seems to make literal theory of mind a lot works by taking the input distribution further from the LLM task and closer to the kind of processing needed for actual decision making. The gap between functional theory of mind and literal theory of mind performance is predictable smaller in this case. CoT Prompting has an inconsistent effect on literal theory of mind and always appears to make the functional theory of mind performance better than vanilla QA Prompting. Social Prompting seems consistently helpful regardless of the method of literal theory of mind prompting. However, a large gap between functional theory of mind and literal theory of mind remains even with Social Prompting.

Gap Remains with Literal Theory of Mind Inputs

In Table 2 even when the literal theory of mind predictions are given as input, the LLM does not perform effective rational reasoning with this input.

Note that the discrepancy in the LM Prompting ToM % comes from the need to prompt before agent’s action is generated for Social Prompting (Figure 4) when prompting after the action is generated (Figure 3) is more effective.

4.2. Reasoning Over Long Contexts

Due to the surprising result of Social Prompting still experiencing a significant functional theory of mind gap, we wanted to understand more about the difficulty these LLMs may experience when reasoning over a long context. We now consider the LLAMA-3 70 Instruct model [23] for its superior performance over long context tasks. We now also include *Oracle Prompting* where the actual action the partner will take (and not just a prediction) is directly provided as input (Figure 11). As well as *Oracle + Max Prompting* where maximizing the reward in response to their action is further emphasized. We additionally consider a variant where the interaction history or the payoff table are removed from the prompt. Finally, we added a variant of CoT Prompting where three in-context examples of ideal thought processes are provided (Figure 9) that we call *CoT 3-Shot*.

In Table 3 we provide the regret per step of each prompting strategy across the three games. LLAMA-3 seems to consistently outperform LLAMA-2, but even still Social Prompting does not close the gap with the tabular model. Meanwhile, CoT leads to big improvements sometimes, but is inconsistent, making performance worse for some cases.

Gap Remains with Oracle Inputs

In Table 3 even when the actual actions and payoff structure are given as input, the LLM does not perform effective rational reasoning with this input.

Indeed, it is surprising to see that Oracle consistently performs worse than the tabular RMax model that is learned

Prompting	RPS	IBS	IPD
Tabular	0.083 \pm 0.004	0.211 \pm 0.012	0.086 \pm 0.009
QA	0.444 \pm 0.107	1.391 \pm 0.283	0.996 \pm 0.133
CoT	0.213 \pm 0.015	2.475 \pm 0.208	0.892 \pm 0.210
CoT + 3-Shot	0.121 \pm 0.017	0.526 \pm 0.081	2.773 \pm 0.730
S2A	0.224 \pm 0.027	1.855 \pm 0.314	0.808 \pm 0.192
S2A + CoT	0.234 \pm 0.014	2.030 \pm 0.287	0.679 \pm 0.137
Social QA	0.256 \pm 0.017	1.613 \pm 0.163	0.550 \pm 0.071
Social LM	0.378 \pm 0.052	3.437 \pm 0.154	0.803 \pm 0.097
Oracle	0.238 \pm 0.046	1.343 \pm 0.146	0.839 \pm 0.056
Oracle + Max	0.153 \pm 0.014	0.785 \pm 0.072	0.767 \pm 0.100
Oracle +Max -History	1.275 \pm 0.152	2.060 \pm 0.079	0.206 \pm 0.018
Oracle +Max -Payoffs	0.103 \pm 0.015	0.883 \pm 0.097	0.241 \pm 0.046

Table 3: Ablating long-context reasoning in terms of $\Delta_{\text{Functional}}/T$ for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct across Rock, Paper, Scissors (RPS), Iterated Battle of Sexes (IBS), and the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma (IPD) when playing with single action partners.

from scratch without access to the payoff table or knowledge of the other agent’s policy. This speaks to a difficulty reasoning over the long contexts of this task. Incentivising maximization in the prompt definitely improves performance, but does not change the overall picture. For RPS and IBS the interaction history seems vital for performance and the payoff table is not, implying the LLM must struggle to effectively reason about the payoffs. For IPD the combo of both the payoff table and interaction history is destructive such that it does much better with either in isolation. Seeing that the difficulty of reasoning over long contexts is at the core of the issue, we also tried a popular approach called System 2 Attention (S2A) [107] to summarize the payoffs and history before sending it to either QA or CoT Prompting (Figures 12 and 13). S2A seems to add some value to CoT for IPD, but it is not as good as CoT for RPS and IBS. Still nothing is matching the performance of the tabular model.

4.3. Coordinating with Simple Adaptive Policies

Our main aim is to build towards LLMs that display mutual theory of mind capabilities [104] in which theory of mind is used to foster coordination behavior between agents. As such, the single action agents may not be realistic as they do not shift their actions in response to the LLM agent’s actions. In Table 4 we test the prompting strategies we have considered previously, but now playing with tit for tat style strategies [7] made famous for the efficacy in IPD. Analogously, in RPS we always play the best response to the other agent’s action at the last step and in IBS we always play the same action that the other agent did at the last step. We also add the very strong Mistral Large 2 model to match LLAMA-3 models but within the Mistral family. In most cases the LLMs perform quite poorly. All models are again much worse than the tabular model with the exception of




Figure 1: **IPD Regret for Mistral Large 2 with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.

CoT Prompting for Mistral Large 2 playing IBS. In this case, it even outperforms RMax with 3 examples, which makes sense given the payoff table it knows and the examples it is given which RMax does not receive. However, this model is inconsistent and, for example, does not perform well at RPS. Interestingly, CoT prompting seems to hurt the LLAMA-3 and Mixtral models. Social Prompting also doesn’t seem to really provide benefits, which makes sense because the literal ToM performance falls off quite a bit in this setting.

Model	Prompting	RPS	IBS	IPD
Tabular	N/A	0.211 \pm 0.007	0.468 \pm 0.031	0.248 \pm 0.005
Mixtral 8x7b Instruct v1	QA	1.224 \pm 0.025	1.484 \pm 0.109	1.074 \pm 0.086
Mixtral 8x7b Instruct v1	CoT	1.052 \pm 0.026	4.654 \pm 0.222	2.604 \pm 0.038
Mixtral 8x7b Instruct v1	CoT + 3-Shot	1.067 \pm 0.016	2.590 \pm 0.190	1.796 \pm 0.113
Mixtral 8x7b Instruct v1	S2A	1.065 \pm 0.021	1.627 \pm 0.167	2.002 \pm 0.099
Mixtral 8x7b Instruct v1	S2A + CoT	0.994 \pm 0.026	3.640 \pm 0.418	2.675 \pm 0.051
Mixtral 8x7b Instruct v1	Social LM	1.304 \pm 0.020	1.257 \pm 0.100	1.674 \pm 0.135
Mistral Large 2	QA	1.064 \pm 0.018	2.167 \pm 0.131	2.581 \pm 0.048
Mistral Large 2	CoT	1.007 \pm 0.014	0.223 \pm 0.074	2.657 \pm 0.030
Mistral Large 2	CoT + 3-Shot	0.999 \pm 0.016	0.032 \pm 0.023	0.417 \pm 0.154
Mistral Large 2	S2A	1.018 \pm 0.027	1.009 \pm 0.129	0.454 \pm 0.193
Mistral Large 2	S2A + CoT	1.029 \pm 0.025	0.663 \pm 0.231	2.586 \pm 0.132
Mistral Large 2	Social LM	0.903 \pm 0.020	2.021 \pm 0.197	2.668 \pm 0.021
LLAMA-3 70B Instruct	QA	1.174 \pm 0.023	1.377 \pm 0.110	2.770 \pm 0.041
LLAMA-3 70B Instruct	CoT	1.029 \pm 0.019	4.468 \pm 0.176	2.761 \pm 0.023
LLAMA-3 70B Instruct	CoT + 3-Shot	0.968 \pm 0.020	3.065 \pm 0.237	2.565 \pm 0.066
LLAMA-3 70B Instruct	S2A	1.025 \pm 0.026	2.100 \pm 0.149	2.606 \pm 0.060
LLAMA-3 70B Instruct	S2A + CoT	1.047 \pm 0.048	2.938 \pm 0.258	2.740 \pm 0.031
LLAMA-3 70B Instruct	Social LM	1.112 \pm 0.023	2.448 \pm 0.335	2.759 \pm 0.012

Table 4: Comparing LLM models and prompting strategies when playing with tit for tat style strategies for the other agent across Rock, Paper, Scissors (RPS), Iterated Battle of Sexes (IBS), and the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma (IPD).

4.4. The Good and Bad of Inductive Bias

So far in this section we have used the neutral action representations J , F , and B to avoid contamination following prior work [14; 2]. However, it is interesting given our results so far to get a better sense of the degree that prior knowledge in the LLMs impacts performance and the choice of action representation is great way for us to control the extent that this knowledge is evoked. For the best performing models LLAMA-3 70B Instruct and Mistral Large 2, we conduct experiments for all three games playing with both single action and tit for tat style partners. We provide comprehensive results for functional theory of mind performance in Figures 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, and 37, and for literal theory of mind performance in Figures 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, and 38. Here we compare neutral actions with the actual canonical action names for the game, the neutral actions with 20 repetitions to take up a longer portion of the context, and nonsense word actions (see Appendix B). We generally find that both LLM models experience systematic bias that prevents them from converging to optimal performance as the number of interactions grow. Indeed, only LLAMA-3 playing IBS with tit for tat partners (Figure 23) seems on the road to slow convergence. Meanwhile, literal theory of mind seems to be converging in a greater number of settings (Figures 24, 28, 30, and 32). We find that real actions often help with functional theory of mind performance early in the interaction stream while

becoming harmful for converged performance as interaction goes on (Figures 1, 15, 21, 25, 27, and 31).

Impact of Inductive Bias

As exemplified by Figure 1, inductive bias can be helpful with a limited number of interactions while also hurting convergence in the long-term.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have tried to make sense of the ongoing discourse about theory of mind with LLMs. We defined two types of theory of mind that we call literal theory of mind (Definition 3.1) and functional theory of mind (Definition 3.2), concluding that functional theory of mind presents the most pressing problem for modern LLMs. We demonstrate that modern LLMs cannot display function theory of mind in simple matrix games with simple partner policies and there is a big gap with what would be expected based on rational reasoning based on its prediction of what the other agents will do. We hope that our analysis will inspire researchers evaluating the theory of mind capabilities of LLMs to consider more interactive evaluation procedures. Current procedures developed for evaluating humans have presented a misleading picture about the status of LLM capabilities for tasks where multi-agent coordination is paramount.

References

- [1] Abdulhai, M., Kim, D.-K., Riemer, M., Liu, M., Tesauro, G., and How, J. P. Context-specific representation abstraction for deep option learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.09876*, 2021.
- [2] Akata, E., Schulz, L., Coda-Forno, J., Oh, S. J., Bethge, M., and Schulz, E. Playing repeated games with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16867*, 2023.
- [3] Akiba, T., Shing, M., Tang, Y., Sun, Q., and Ha, D. Evolutionary optimization of model merging recipes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.13187*, 2024.
- [4] Allen, C., Katz, M., Klinger, T., Konidaris, G., Riemer, M., and Tesauro, G. Efficient black-box planning using macro-actions with focused effects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.13242*, 2020.
- [5] Almazrouei, E., Alobeidli, H., Alshamsi, A., Cappelli, A., Cojocaru, R., Debbah, M., Goffinet, É., Hessel, D., Launay, J., Malartic, Q., et al. The falcon series of open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16867*, 2023.
- [6] Andrychowicz, M., Wolski, F., Ray, A., Schneider, J., Fong, R., Welinder, P., McGrew, B., Tobin, J., Pieter Abbeel, O., and Zaremba, W. Hindsight experience replay. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [7] Axelrod, R. More effective choice in the prisoner’s dilemma. *Journal of conflict resolution*, 24(3):379–403, 1980.
- [8] Bacon, P.-L., Harb, J., and Precup, D. The option-critic architecture. In *Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017.
- [9] Bard, N., Foerster, J. N., Chandar, S., Burch, N., Lanctot, M., Song, H. F., Parisotto, E., Dumoulin, V., Moitra, S., Hughes, E., et al. The hanabi challenge: A new frontier for ai research. *Artificial Intelligence*, 280:103216, 2020.
- [10] Baron-Cohen, S., Leslie, A. M., and Frith, U. Does the autistic child have a “theory of mind”? *Cognition*, 21(1):37–46, 1985.
- [11] Barto, A. G. and Dietterich, T. G. Reinforcement learning and its relationship to supervised learning. *Handbook of Learning and Approximate Dynamic Programming*, pp. 45–63, 2004.
- [12] Bashivan, P., Schrimpf, M., Ajemian, R., Rish, I., Riemer, M., and Tu, Y. Continual learning with self-organizing maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09330*, 2019.
- [13] Bernstein, D. S., Givan, R., Immerman, N., and Zilberstein, S. The complexity of decentralized control of markov decision processes. *Mathematics of operations research*, 27(4):819–840, 2002.
- [14] Binz, M. and Schulz, E. Using cognitive psychology to understand gpt-3. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(6):e2218523120, 2023.
- [15] Brafman, R. I. and Tenenbaum, J. B. R-max: A general polynomial time algorithm for near-optimal reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Oct):213–231, 2002.
- [16] Brown, N. and Sandholm, T. Superhuman ai for multiplayer poker. *Science*, 365(6456):885–890, 2019.
- [17] Bubeck, S., Chandrasekaran, V., Eldan, R., Gehrke, J., Horvitz, E., Kamar, E., Lee, P., Lee, Y. T., Li, Y., Lundberg, S., et al. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*, 2023.
- [18] Cases, I., Rosenbaum, C., Riemer, M., Geiger, A., Klinger, T., Tamkin, A., Li, O., Agarwal, S., Greene, J. D., Jurafsky, D., et al. Recursive routing networks: Learning to compose modules for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 3631–3648, 2019.
- [19] Chang, M. B., Gupta, A., Levine, S., and Griffiths, T. L. Automatically composing representation transformations as a means for generalization. 2019.
- [20] Das, P., Wadhawan, K., Chang, O., Sercu, T., Santos, C. D., Riemer, M., Chenthamarakshan, V., Padhi, I., and Mojsilovic, A. Pepcvae: Semi-supervised targeted design of antimicrobial peptide sequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.07743*, 2018.
- [21] Dettmers, T., Pagnoni, A., Holtzman, A., and Zettlemoyer, L. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [22] Dognin, P., Rios, J., Luss, R., Padhi, I., Riemer, M. D., Liu, M., Sattigeri, P., Nagireddy, M., Varshney, K. R., and Bouneffouf, D. Contextual moral value alignment through context-based aggregation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12805*, 2024.
- [23] Dubey, A., Jauhri, A., Pandey, A., Kadian, A., Al-Dahle, A., Letman, A., Mathur, A., Schelten, A., Yang, A., Fan, A., et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.

- [24] Fan, C., Chen, J., Jin, Y., and He, H. Can large language models serve as rational players in game theory? a systematic analysis. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pp. 17960–17967, 2024.
- [25] Foerster, J., Chen, R. Y., Al-Shedivat, M., Whiteson, S., Abbeel, P., and Mordatch, I. Learning with opponent-learning awareness. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, pp. 122–130. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2018.
- [26] Foerster, J., Farquhar, G., Al-Shedivat, M., Rocktäschel, T., Xing, E., and Whiteson, S. Dice: The infinitely differentiable monte carlo estimator. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1529–1538. PMLR, 2018.
- [27] Ganzfried, S. and Sandholm, T. Safe opponent exploitation. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC)*, 3(2):1–28, 2015.
- [28] Ha, J., Jeon, H., Han, D., Seo, J., and Oh, C. Clochat: Understanding how people customize, interact, and experience personas in large language models. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–24, 2024.
- [29] Heath, F. F., Hull, R., Khabiri, E., Riemer, M., Sukaviriya, N., and Vaculín, R. Alexandria: Extensible framework for rapid exploration of social media. In *2015 IEEE International Congress on Big Data*, pp. 483–490. IEEE, 2015.
- [30] Hu, E. J., Shen, Y., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., and Chen, W. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [31] Ilharco, G., Ribeiro, M. T., Wortsman, M., Gururangan, S., Schmidt, L., Hajishirzi, H., and Farhadi, A. Editing models with task arithmetic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.04089*, 2022.
- [32] Jiang, A. Q., Sablayrolles, A., Roux, A., Mensch, A., Savary, B., Bamford, C., Chaplot, D. S., Casas, D. d. l., Hanna, E. B., Bressand, F., et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- [33] Kaelbling, L. P., Littman, M. L., and Cassandra, A. R. Planning and acting in partially observable stochastic domains. *Artificial intelligence*, 101(1-2):99–134, 1998.
- [34] Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., Henighan, T., Brown, T. B., Chess, B., Child, R., Gray, S., Radford, A., Wu, J., and Amodei, D. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020.
- [35] Kearns, M. and Singh, S. Near-optimal reinforcement learning in polynomial time. *Machine learning*, 49(2), 2002.
- [36] Khabiri, E., Riemer, M., Heath III, F. F., and Hull, R. Domain scoping for subject matter experts. In *2015 AAAI Fall Symposium Series*, 2015.
- [37] Khetarpal, K., Riemer, M., Rish, I., and Precup, D. Towards continual reinforcement learning: A review and perspectives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.13490*, 2020.
- [38] Kim, D.-K., Liu, M., Omidshafiei, S., Lopez-Cot, S., Riemer, M., Habibi, G., Tesauro, G., Mourad, S., Campbell, M., and How, J. P. Learning hierarchical teaching policies for cooperative agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.03216*, 2019.
- [39] Kim, D.-K., Liu, M., Omidshafiei, S., Lopez-Cot, S., Riemer, M., Tesauro, G., Campbell, M., Mourad, S., Habibi, G., and How, J. P. Heterogeneous knowledge transfer via hierarchical teaching in cooperative multiagent reinforcement learning. 2019.
- [40] Kim, D. K., Liu, M., Riemer, M. D., Sun, C., Abdulhai, M., Habibi, G., Lopez-Cot, S., Tesauro, G., and How, J. A policy gradient algorithm for learning to learn in multiagent reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5541–5550. PMLR, 2021.
- [41] Kim, D.-K., Riemer, M., Liu, M., Foerster, J., Everett, M., Sun, C., Tesauro, G., and How, J. P. Influencing long-term behavior in multiagent reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:18808–18821, 2022.
- [42] Kim, D.-K., Riemer, M., Liu, M., Foerster, J. N., Tesauro, G., and How, J. P. Game-theoretical perspectives on active equilibria: A preferred solution concept over nash equilibria. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.16175*, 2022.
- [43] Kim, H., Sclar, M., Zhou, X., Bras, R. L., Kim, G., Choi, Y., and Sap, M. Fantom: A benchmark for stress-testing machine theory of mind in interactions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15421*, 2023.
- [44] Kirkpatrick, J., Pascanu, R., Rabinowitz, N., Veness, J., Desjardins, G., Rusu, A. A., Milan, K., Quan, J., Ramalho, T., Grabska-Barwinska, A., et al. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks.

- Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114 (13):3521–3526, 2017.
- [45] Klinger, T., Adjodah, D., Marois, V., Joseph, J., Riemer, M., Pentland, A. S., and Campbell, M. A study of compositional generalization in neural models, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.09437>.
- [46] Kosinski, M. Theory of mind may have spontaneously emerged in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02083*, 4:169, 2023.
- [47] Kostas, J., Nota, C., and Thomas, P. Asynchronous coagent networks. In III, H. D. and Singh, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 5426–5435. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/kostas20a.html>.
- [48] Langley, P. Crafting papers on machine learning. In Langley, P. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2000)*, pp. 1207–1216, Stanford, CA, 2000. Morgan Kaufmann.
- [49] Leng, Y. and Yuan, Y. Do llm agents exhibit social behavior? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15198*, 2023.
- [50] Li, N., Gao, C., Li, Y., and Liao, Q. Large language model-empowered agents for simulating macroeconomic activities. Available at SSRN 4606937, 2023.
- [51] Li, Z. and Hoiem, D. Learning without forgetting. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(12):2935–2947, 2017.
- [52] Littman, M. L. Markov games as a framework for multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML’94, pp. 157–163. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 1994. ISBN 1-55860-335-2. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3091574.3091594>.
- [53] Lorè, N. and Heydari, B. Strategic behavior of large language models: Game structure vs. contextual framing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05898*, 2023.
- [54] Lowe, R., Tamar, A., Harb, J., Pieter Abbeel, O., and Mordatch, I. Multi-agent actor-critic for mixed cooperative-competitive environments. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [55] Ma, Z., Sansom, J., Peng, R., and Chai, J. Towards a holistic landscape of situated theory of mind in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19619*, 2023.
- [56] Malloy, T., Klinger, T., Liu, M., Riemer, M., Tesauro, G., and Sims, C. R. Consolidation via policy information regularization in deep rl for multi-agent games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.11517*, 2020.
- [57] Malloy, T., Sims, C. R., Klinger, T., Liu, M., Riemer, M., and Tesauro, G. Deep rl with information constrained policies: Generalization in continuous control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04646*, 2020.
- [58] Malloy, T., Klinger, T., Liu, M., Tesauro, G., Riemer, M., and Sims, C. R. RL generalization in a theory of mind game through a sleep metaphor (student abstract). In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pp. 15841–15842, 2021.
- [59] Malloy, T., Sims, C. R., Klinger, T., Liu, M., Riemer, M., and Tesauro, G. Capacity-limited decentralized actor-critic for multi-agent games. In *2021 IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, pp. 1–8. IEEE, 2021.
- [60] Malloy, T., Liu, M., Riemer, M. D., Klinger, T., Tesauro, G., and Sims, C. R. Learning in factored domains with information-constrained visual representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17508*, 2023.
- [61] Memarian, A., Touzel, M. P., Riemer, M., Bhati, R., and Rish, I. Summarizing societies: Agent abstraction in multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *From Cells to Societies: Collective Learning across Scales*, 2022.
- [62] Moreno, P., Hughes, E., McKee, K. R., Pires, B. A., and Weber, T. Neural recursive belief states in multi-agent reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.02274*, 2021.
- [63] Nekoei, H., Badrinarayanan, A., Courville, A., and Chandar, S. Continuous coordination as a realistic scenario for lifelong learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 8016–8024. PMLR, 2021.
- [64] Nekoei, H., Zhao, X., Rajendran, J., Liu, M., and Chandar, S. Towards few-shot coordination: Revisiting ad-hoc teamplay challenge in the game of hanabi. In *Conference on Lifelong Learning Agents*, pp. 861–877. PMLR, 2023.
- [65] Nguyen, S., Babe, H. M., Zi, Y., Guha, A., Anderson, C. J., and Feldman, M. Q. How beginning programmers and code llms (mis) read each other. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–26, 2024.

- [66] Normandin, F., Golemo, F., Ostapenko, O., Rodriguez, P., Riemer, M. D., Hurtado, J., Khetarpal, K., Lindeborg, R., Cecchi, L., Lesort, T., et al. Sequoia: A software framework to unify continual learning research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.01005*, 2021.
- [67] Omidshafiei, S., Kim, D.-K., Liu, M., Tesauro, G., Riemer, M., Amato, C., Campbell, M., and How, J. P. Learning to teach in cooperative multiagent reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pp. 6128–6136, 2019.
- [68] Padhi, I., Dognin, P., Rios, J., Luss, R., Achintalwar, S., Riemer, M., Liu, M., Sattigeri, P., Nagireddy, M., Varshney, K. R., et al. Comvas: Contextual moral values alignment system. *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2024.
- [69] Park, C., Liu, X., Ozdaglar, A., and Zhang, K. Do llm agents have regret? a case study in online learning and games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16843*, 2024.
- [70] Park, J. S., Zou, C. Q., Shaw, A., Hill, B. M., Cai, C., Morris, M. R., Willer, R., Liang, P., and Bernstein, M. S. Generative agent simulations of 1,000 people. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.10109*, 2024.
- [71] Puterman, M. Markov decision processes. 1994. *Jhon Wiley & Sons, New Jersey*, 1994.
- [72] Rabinowitz, N., Perbet, F., Song, F., Zhang, C., Es-lami, S. A., and Botvinick, M. Machine theory of mind. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 4218–4227. PMLR, 2018.
- [73] Riemer, M. Distributed computing in social media analytics. *Distributed Computing in Big Data Analytics: Concepts, Technologies and Applications*, pp. 121–135, 2017.
- [74] Riemer, M., Krasikov, S., and Srinivasan, H. A deep learning and knowledge transfer based architecture for social media user characteristic determination. In *Proceedings of the third International Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Social Media*, pp. 39–47, 2015.
- [75] Riemer, M., Vempaty, A., Calmon, F., Heath, F., Hull, R., and Khabiri, E. Correcting forecasts with multi-factor neural attention. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3010–3019. PMLR, 2016.
- [76] Riemer, M., Franceschini, M., Bouneffouf, D., and Klinger, T. Generative knowledge distillation for general purpose function compression. *NIPS 2017 Workshop on Teaching Machines, Robots, and Humans*, 5: 30, 2017.
- [77] Riemer, M., Khabiri, E., and Goodwin, R. Representation stability as a regularizer for improved text analytics transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.03617*, 2017.
- [78] Riemer, M., Cases, I., Ajemian, R., Liu, M., Rish, I., Tu, Y., and Tesauro, G. Learning to learn without forgetting by maximizing transfer and minimizing interference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.11910*, 2018.
- [79] Riemer, M., Liu, M., and Tesauro, G. Learning abstract options. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [80] Riemer, M., Klinger, T., Bouneffouf, D., and Franceschini, M. Scalable recollections for continual lifelong learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pp. 1352–1359, 2019.
- [81] Riemer, M., Cases, I., Rosenbaum, C., Liu, M., and Tesauro, G. On the role of weight sharing during deep option learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pp. 5519–5526, 2020.
- [82] Riemer, M., Raparthy, S. C., Cases, I., Subbaraj, G., Touzel, M. P., and Rish, I. Continual learning in environments with polynomial mixing times. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [83] Riemer, M., Khetarpal, K., Rajendran, J., and Chandar, S. Balancing context length and mixing times for reinforcement learning at scale. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- [84] Riemer, M., Subbaraj, G., Berseth, G., and Rish, I. Enabling realtime reinforcement learning at scale with staggered asynchronous inference, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.14355>.
- [85] Riemer, M., Subbaraj, G., Berseth, G., and Rish, I. Realtime reinforcement learning: Towards rapid asynchronous deployment of large models. In *ICML 2024 Workshop: Aligning Reinforcement Learning Experimentalists and Theorists*, 2024.
- [86] Rooein, D., Curry, A. C., and Hovy, D. Know your audience: Do llms adapt to different age and education levels? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02065*, 2023.
- [87] Rosenbaum, C., Klinger, T., and Riemer, M. Routing networks: Adaptive selection of non-linear functions for multi-task learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR, 2018.

- [88] Rosenbaum, C., Cases, I., Riemer, M., Geiger, A., Karttunen, L., Greene, J. D., Jurafsky, D., and Potts, C. Dispatched routing networks. Technical report, 2019.
- [89] Rosenbaum, C., Cases, I., Riemer, M., and Klinger, T. Routing networks and the challenges of modular and compositional computation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.12774*, 2019.
- [90] Schaul, T., Horgan, D., Gregor, K., and Silver, D. Universal value function approximators. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1312–1320. PMLR, 2015.
- [91] Schrittwieser, J., Antonoglou, I., Hubert, T., Simonyan, K., Sifre, L., Schmitt, S., Guez, A., Lockhart, E., Hassabis, D., Graepel, T., et al. Mastering atari, go, chess and shogi by planning with a learned model. *Nature*, 588(7839):604–609, 2020.
- [92] Shapley, L. S. Stochastic games. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 39(10):1095–1100, 1953. ISSN 0027-8424. doi: 10.1073/pnas.39.10.1095. URL <https://www.pnas.org/content/39/10/1095>.
- [93] Shavit, Y., Agarwal, S., Brundage, M., Adler, S., O’Keefe, C., Campbell, R., Lee, T., Mishkin, P., Eloundou, T., Hickey, A., et al. Practices for governing agentic ai systems. *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
- [94] Strachan, J. W., Albergo, D., Borghini, G., Pansardi, O., Scaliti, E., Gupta, S., Saxena, K., Rufo, A., Panzeri, S., Manzi, G., et al. Testing theory of mind in large language models and humans. *Nature Human Behaviour*, pp. 1–11, 2024.
- [95] Street, W., Siy, J. O., Keeling, G., Baranes, A., Barnett, B., McKibben, M., Kanyere, T., Lentz, A., Dunbar, R. I., et al. Llms achieve adult human performance on higher-order theory of mind tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18870*, 2024.
- [96] Sutton, R. S. Dyna, an integrated architecture for learning, planning, and reacting. *ACM Sigart Bulletin*, 2(4):160–163, 1991.
- [97] Sutton, R. S. and Barto, A. G. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. 2018.
- [98] Sutton, R. S., Precup, D., and Singh, S. Between mdps and semi-mdps: A framework for temporal abstraction in reinforcement learning. *Artificial intelligence*, 112(1-2):181–211, 1999.
- [99] Thakkar, M., Fournier, Q., Riemer, M. D., Chen, P.-Y., Zouaq, A., Das, P., and Chandar, S. A deep dive into the trade-offs of parameter-efficient preference alignment techniques, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.04879>.
- [100] Thakkar, M., More, Y., Fournier, Q., Riemer, M., Chen, P.-Y., Zouaq, A., Das, P., and Chandar, S. Combining domain and alignment vectors to achieve better knowledge-safety trade-offs in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.06824*, 2024.
- [101] Thomas, P. S. Policy gradient coagent networks. In Shawe-Taylor, J., Zemel, R., Bartlett, P., Pereira, F., and Weinberger, K. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 24. Curran Associates, Inc., 2011. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2011/file/1e6e0a04d20f50967c64dac2d639a577-Paper.pdf.
- [102] Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [103] Touzel, M. P., Memarian, A., Riemer, M., Mircea, A., Williams, A. R., Ahlstrand, E., Lehnert, L., Bhati, R., Dumas, G., and Rish, I. Scalable approaches for a theory of many minds. In *Agentic Markets Workshop at ICML 2024*, 2024.
- [104] Wang, Q. and Goel, A. K. Mutual theory of mind for human-ai communication. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03842*, 2022.
- [105] Watkins, C. J. C. H. Learning from delayed rewards. 1989.
- [106] Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [107] Weston, J. and Sukhbaatar, S. System 2 attention (is something you might need too). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11829*, 2023.
- [108] Xie, A., Losey, D., Tolsma, R., Finn, C., and Sadigh, D. Learning latent representations to influence multi-agent interaction. In *Conference on robot learning*, pp. 575–588. PMLR, 2021.
- [109] Xie, C., Chen, C., Jia, F., Ye, Z., Shu, K., Bibi, A., Hu, Z., Torr, P., Ghanem, B., and Li, G. Can large language model agents simulate human trust behaviors? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04559*, 2024.

- [110] Xu, R., Zhou, Z., Zhang, T., Qi, Z., Yao, S., Xu, K., Xu, W., and Qiu, H. Walking in others' shoes: How perspective-taking guides large language models in reducing toxicity and bias. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.15366*, 2024.
- [111] Yadav, P., Tam, D., Choshen, L., Raffel, C. A., and Bansal, M. Ties-merging: Resolving interference when merging models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [112] Yang, J., Nakhaei, A., Isele, D., Fujimura, K., and Zha, H. Cm3: Cooperative multi-goal multi-stage multi-agent reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.05188*, 2018.
- [113] Zhang, S., Wang, X., Zhang, W., Chen, Y., Gao, L., Wang, D., Zhang, W., Wang, X., and Wen, Y. Mutual theory of mind in human-ai collaboration: An empirical study with llm-driven ai agents in a real-time shared workspace task. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.08811*, 2024.
- [114] Zini, M. S., Pedramfar, M., Riemer, M., Moradipari, A., and Liu, M. Coagent networks revisited. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.10474*, 2020.

A. Extended Related Work: Continual Learning and Applications

In-Context Learning vs. Continual Learning. In a multi-agent environment, the environment is nonstationary from the perspective of each agent if the policies of the other agents it interacts with are changing or learning over time [52]. As a result, the setting of rapid adaptation to new agents in our paper can be considered a special case of continual RL (see Proposition 3 of Khetarpal et al. [37]). Proposition 2 of Khetarpal et al. [37] established that all continual RL problems can be modeled as partial observable problems with agents conditioned on the full interaction history. So, in principle, in-context learning over sufficiently long context representations with sufficiently expressive neural networks can be considered a general solution to continual learning problems. However, it remains to be seen if it is possible to see in-context behaviors resembling continual learning strategies like reservoir sampling replay buffers [78] or scalable memory efficient approximate buffers [76; 80; 12]. It would be interesting to also consider policy changes from step to step and their degree of correspondence with older models similar to work leveraging knowledge distillation for continual learning [51; 77; 44]. Intuitively, chain of thought reasoning may be beneficial because of its similarity with continual learning approaches that can select which layers to process at inference time [87; 18; 19; 88], see [89] for a survey of approaches. More generally, this adaptive computation problem can be formalized within the coagent networks framework [101; 47; 114]. That said, the compositional generalization needed for utilizing these models in practice makes achieving real-world success very challenging [45], potentially making LLM style training a more viable strategy for learning this composition. That said, a word of caution comes from recent theoretical insights about the difficulty of efficiently evaluating models with large context lengths [83] acting in complex environments [82]. This could be a leading reason for the poor performance we are currently seeing with LLMs. Ultimately, there are many potentially interesting continual learning settings that should be considered for a comprehensive evaluation [66], which we leave to future work.

Alternatives to Continual Training. While our work highlights the limitations of using in-context learning for continual learning with current LLMs, full fine-tuning or continual training can be quite expensive in the context of LLMs – especially when it must be done for each end user. However, more computationally efficient alternatives like parameter efficient tuning [30; 21; 99] or model merging [31; 111; 3; 100] may constitute a more economical middle ground. We leave exploration of the comparative efficacy of these strategies to future work. It is important to note that neural scaling laws only demonstrate generalization improvements with bigger model sizes when there is access to as much data as needed [34]. In fact, capacity limits have been found to enhance generalization for RL [57; 60] and multi-agent RL [56; 59; 58] in the limited data regime. Smaller models also may be necessary to maintain performance in realtime environments that are sufficiently stochastic [85; 84]. As such, it may make more sense to consider smaller LLMs if we plan on doing user specific finetuning or auxiliary objectives we would like to maintain like moral values [68; 22].

Applicability Beyond Multi-agent RL. In this paper, we focused on multi-agent RL environments because of our use of this formalism in Definitions 3.1 and 3.2. However, the principles discussed in this paper should apply to many practical domains that are not typically modeled using RL such as biomedical applications [20], making decisions based on conversation topics across the internet [74; 29; 73; 36], learning what information to teach other models [67], and making decisions based on incoming internet data [75]. These problems can generally be considered a special case of the RL formalism [11].

B. Experiment Details

For our experiments we ran each LLM model using the Watsonx API playing a sequence of 100 step episodes with selected policies for the other agents over the course of 24 hours or a maximum of 100 episodes. Every model was evaluated for at least 30 episodes and confidence intervals are based on the actual sample size considered for each LLM model. The payoff tables used for each game are provided in Tables 5, 6, and 7. We also considered the following representations for each action as indicated in the main text:

- RPS
 - action₀: *R, J, JJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJ*, Rock, Pasta
 - action₁: *P, F, FFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFF*, Paper, Rice
 - action₂: *S, B, BBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBB*, Scissors, Bread
- IBS
 - action₀: *J, JJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJ*, Fight, Pasta

		Partner		
		action ₀	action ₁	action ₂
You	action ₀	(0, 0)	(-1, +1)	(+1, -1)
	action ₁	(+1, -1)	(0, 0)	(-1, +1)
	action ₂	(-1, +1)	(+1, -1)	(0, 0)

Table 5: Rock, Paper, Scissors (RPS) Payoff Table

		Partner	
		action ₀	action ₁
You	action ₀	(10, 7)	(0, 0)
	action ₁	(0, 0)	(7, 10)

Table 6: Iterated Battle of Sexes (IBS) Payoff Table

- action₁: *F*, *FFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFF*, Ballet, Rice
- IPD
 - action₀: *J*, *JJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJJ*, Cooperate, Pasta
 - action₁: *F*, *FFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFF*, Defect, Rice

In Tables 1 and 2, the names *R*, *P*, and *S* are used for action₀, action₁, and action₂ respectively as we only consider the RPS game. The LLAMA-2 70B Chat model is also quantized for runtime efficiency. In Tables 3 and 4 the names *J*, *F*, and *B* are used for action₀, action₁, and action₂ respectively to promote consistency with the action spaces also used in IBS and IPD.

B.1. Example Prompts

In this section, we provide example prompts for each prompting type. In all cases, we tailor our provided example to the Iterated Battle of Sexes (IBS) with actions *J* and *F* in which the agent happens to be playing round 5 of 100. There is a slight change in terminology for Rock, Paper, Scissors (RPS) where it is said that the agents "receive a score of +1/0/-1" rather than that they "win 10/8/7/5/0 points". This is just to accommodate for a negative scale of rewards in this game as we did not feel having the reward as always positive would properly reflect the incentive structure of the game to the LLMs.

B.2. Additional Experiments on Action Space Inductive Bias

		Partner	
		action ₀	action ₁
You	action ₀	(8, 8)	(0, 10)
	action ₁	(10, 0)	(5, 5)

Table 7: Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma (IPD) Payoff Table

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

In round 1, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 2, you chose Option F and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.

In round 3, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 4, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

You are currently playing round 5.

Q: Which Option do you choose, Option J or Option F?

A: Option {action}

Figure 2: **LM Prompting Example.** The LLM is given this prompt for each action for the respective game action₀, action₁, and action₂ (for RPS only) and we compare its probabilities computed for the token representation of the actions to determine which action it selects.

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

In round 1, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 2, you chose Option F and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.

In round 3, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 4, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 5, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option {action}

Figure 3: **LM Literal Theory of Mind Prompting - Agent First.** The LLM is given this prompt for each action that its partner will take for the respective game action₀, action₁, and action₂ (for RPS only) and we compare its probabilities computed for the token representation of the actions to determine which action prediction it selects.

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

In round 1, the other player chose Option J and you chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 2, the other player chose Option J and you chose Option F. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.

In round 3, the other player chose Option J and you chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 4, the other player chose Option J and you chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 5, the other player chose Option {action}

Figure 4: **LM Literal Theory of Mind Prompting - Partner First.** The LLM is given this prompt for each action that its partner will take for the respective game action₀, action₁, and action₂ (for RPS only) and we compare its probabilities computed for the token representation of the actions to determine which action prediction it selects.

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

In round 1, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 2, you chose Option F and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.

In round 3, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 4, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

You are currently playing round 5.

Which Option do you choose, Option J or Option F?

Your answer MUST be formatted like:

Option: <J or F>

Figure 5: QA Prompting. The LLM is given this prompt and generates an answer with stochastic decoding. If the provided response matches the template and includes an action from the action list, the response is accepted. If not, we query the LLM for more stochastic responses until the criteria is satisfied. Failures were relatively uncommon.

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

In round 1, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 2, you chose Option F and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.

In round 3, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 4, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 5, you chose Option J.

Which Option did you think the other player chose?

Your answer MUST be formatted like:

Option: <J or F>

Figure 6: QA Literal Theory of Mind Prompting. The LLM is given this prompt and generates an answer with stochastic decoding. If the provided response matches the template and includes an action from the action list, the response is accepted. If not, we query the LLM for more stochastic responses until the criteria is satisfied. Failures were relatively uncommon.

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

In round 1, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 2, you chose Option F and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.

In round 3, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 4, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

You are currently playing round 5.

Which Option do you choose, Option J or Option F?

Choose the best action by thinking step by step. Your answer MUST be formatted as:

Thoughts: <paragraph explaining your reasoning>

Option: <J or F>

Figure 7: CoT Prompting. The LLM is given this prompt and generates an answer with stochastic decoding. If the provided response matches the template and includes an action from the action list, the response is accepted. If not, we query the LLM for more stochastic responses until the criteria is satisfied. Failures were relatively uncommon.

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

In round 1, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 2, you chose Option F and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.

In round 3, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 4, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 5, you chose Option J.

Which Option do you think the other player chose? Choose the best action by thinking step by step. Your answer MUST be formatted as:

Thoughts: <paragraph explaining your reasoning>

Option: <J or F>

Figure 8: CoT Literal Theory of Mind Prompting. The LLM is given this prompt and generates an answer with stochastic decoding. If the provided response matches the template and includes an action from the action list, the response is accepted. If not, we query the LLM for more stochastic responses until the criteria is satisfied. Failures were relatively uncommon.

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.

If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

Some example thought processes for superior play in this game include:

Thoughts: The other player has picked Option J in every round so far, so it is logical to assume that they will do so again. If they choose Option J, my best response is Option J. In that case, I will win 10 points.

Thoughts: I chose Option F in the last round, so the other player is likely to choose Option F in response in order to maximize their reward. If they choose Option F, my best response is Option F. In that case, I will win 7 points.

Thoughts: The other player has picked Option J four times in a row, so they are most likely to choose Option J again. If they choose Option J, my best response is Option J. In that case, I will win 10 points.

In round 1, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 2, you chose Option F and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.

In round 3, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 4, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 5, you chose Option J.

Which Option do you think the other player chose? Choose the best action by thinking step by step. Your answer MUST be formatted as:

Thoughts: <paragraph explaining your reasoning>

Option: <J or F>

Figure 9: CoT 3-Shot Prompting. The LLM is given this prompt and generates an answer with stochastic decoding. If the provided response matches the template and includes an action from the action list, the response is accepted. If not, we query the LLM for more stochastic responses until the criteria is satisfied. Failures were relatively uncommon. The provided examples were customized to the actions space and payoff structure of each of the three games.

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.
If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.
If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.
If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

In round 1, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.
In round 2, you chose Option F and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.
In round 3, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.
In round 4, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.
You are currently playing round 5.
The other player will choose Option J. Which Option do you choose, Option J or Option F?
Your answer MUST be formatted like:
Option: <J or F>

Figure 10: Oracle Prompting. The provided action that the other agent will choose is true 'oracle' knowledge in all cases. The LLM is given this prompt and generates an answer with stochastic decoding. If the provided response matches the template and includes an action from the action list, the response is accepted. If not, we query the LLM for more stochastic responses until the criteria is satisfied. Failures were relatively uncommon.

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.
If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.
If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.
If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

In round 1, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.
In round 2, you chose Option F and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.
In round 3, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.
In round 4, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.
You are currently playing round 5.
The other player will choose Option J. Which Option do you choose in response to maximize your points received, Option J or Option F?
Your answer MUST be formatted like:
Option: <J or F>

Figure 11: Oracle Prompting Emphasizing Maximization. The provided action that the other agent will choose is true 'oracle' knowledge in all cases. The LLM is given this prompt and generates an answer with stochastic decoding. If the provided response matches the template and includes an action from the action list, the response is accepted. If not, we query the LLM for more stochastic responses until the criteria is satisfied. Failures were relatively uncommon. The only difference with Figure 11 in the emphasis on maximizing reward in response to the other agent's action.

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.
If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.
If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.
If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

In round 1, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.
In round 2, you chose Option F and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.
In round 3, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.
In round 4, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.
Given the game rules and limited interaction history while playing with the other player described above, extract a concise, unbiased, and self-contained summary that would be useful for deciding which Option you should choose in the next round.

Figure 12: S2A Prompting. We accept the LLM's output for this prompt in all cases. This output replaces the rules and history in the subsequent QA or CoT prompt.

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

- If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.
- If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.
- If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.
- If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

In round 1, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 2, you chose Option F and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.

In round 3, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 4, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

Given the game rules and limited interaction history while playing with the other player described above, extract a concise, unbiased, and self-contained summary that would be useful for guessing which Option the other player will choose in the next round.

Figure 13: **S2A Literal Theory of Mind Prompting.** We accept the LLM’s output for this prompt in all cases. This output replaces the rules and history in the subsequent QA or CoT prompt.

You are playing a game repeatedly with another player. In this game, you can choose between Option J and Option F. You will play 100 rounds in total with the same player.

The rules of the game are as follows:

- If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 10 points and the other player wins 7 points.
- If you choose Option J and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.
- If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option J, then you win 0 points and the other player wins 0 points.
- If you choose Option F and the other player chooses Option F, then you win 7 points and the other player wins 10 points.

In round 1, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 2, you chose Option F and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 0 points and the other player won 0 points.

In round 3, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

In round 4, you chose Option J and the other player chose Option J. Thus, you won 10 points and the other player won 7 points.

Given that you predict the other player will choose Option J in round 5, which Option do you think is best to choose for you in this round, Option J or Option F?

Your answer MUST be formatted like:

Option: <J or F>

Figure 14: **Social Prompting.** The actions that it is predicted that the other player will choose is the actual output of a prior application of literal theory of mind oriented prompt to the same LLM model. If the provided response matches the template and includes an action from the action list, the response is accepted. If not, we query the LLM for more stochastic responses until the criteria is satisfied. Failures were relatively uncommon.

Prompting	Game	$\Delta_{\text{Functional}}/T$	Δ_{ToM}/T	ToM %
LM	RPS	0.857 ± 0.142	0.119 ± 0.006	92.1 ± 0.4
QA	RPS	1.123 ± 0.236	0.743 ± 0.106	50.5 ± 7.1
CoT	RPS	0.928 ± 0.133	0.776 ± 0.081	48.3 ± 5.4
LM	IBS	2.316 ± 0.817	0.496 ± 0.038	94.4 ± 0.4
QA	IBS	2.570 ± 0.833	2.401 ± 0.480	68.8 ± 7.6
CoT	IBS	3.367 ± 0.149	2.301 ± 0.120	71.9 ± 2.3
LM	IPD	2.889 ± 0.422	0.220 ± 0.034	93.5 ± 0.3
QA	IPD	3.025 ± 0.383	1.665 ± 0.430	61.5 ± 7.1
CoT	IPD	1.839 ± 0.289	1.393 ± 0.166	63.8 ± 1.6

Table 8: Comparing literal and functional metrics across prompting strategies on Rock, Paper, Scissors (RPS), Iterated Battle of Sexes (IBS), and the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma (IPD) for LLAMA-2 70B Chat playing with single action partners.




Figure 15: **RPS Regret for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct with a Single Action Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 16: **RPS ToM % for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct with a Single Action Partner Across Action Types.** We compare accuracy across action spaces with a Tabular counting algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 17: **IBS Regret for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct with a Single Action Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 18: **IBS ToM % for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct with a Single Action Partner Across Action Types.** We compare accuracy across action spaces with a Tabular counting algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.



Figure 19: **IPD Regret for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct with a Single Action Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.



Figure 20: **IPD ToM % for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct with a Single Action Partner Across Action Types.** We compare accuracy across action spaces with a Tabular counting algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 21: **RPS Regret for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 22: **RPS ToM % for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare accuracy across action spaces with a Tabular counting algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.



Figure 23: **IBS Regret for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.



Figure 24: **IBS ToM % for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare accuracy across action spaces with a Tabular counting algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 25: **IPD Regret for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 26: **IPD ToM % for LLAMA-3 70B Instruct with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare accuracy across action spaces with a Tabular counting algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 27: **RPS Regret for Mistral Large 2 with a Single Action Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 28: **RPS ToM % for Mistral Large 2 with a Single Action Partner Across Action Types.** We compare accuracy across action spaces with a Tabular counting algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 29: **IBS Regret for Mistral Large 2 with a Single Action Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.



Figure 30: **IBS ToM % for Mistral Large 2 with a Single Action Partner Across Action Types.** We compare accuracy across action spaces with a Tabular counting algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.



Figure 31: **IPD Regret for Mistral Large 2 with a Single Action Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 32: **IPD ToM % for Mistral Large 2 with a Single Action Partner Across Action Types.** We compare accuracy across action spaces with a Tabular counting algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 33: **RPS Regret for Mistral Large 2 with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 34: **RPS ToM % for Mistral Large 2 with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare accuracy across action spaces with a Tabular counting algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 35: **IBS Regret for Mistral Large 2 with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.



Figure 36: **IBS ToM % for Mistral Large 2 with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare accuracy across action spaces with a Tabular counting algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 37: **IPD Regret for Mistral Large 2 with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare performance across action spaces with the Tabular RMax algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.




Figure 38: **IPD ToM % for Mistral Large 2 with a Tit for Tat Partner Across Action Types.** We compare accuracy across action spaces with a Tabular counting algorithm to test the influence of different levels of inductive bias.