
Cognitive Insights and Stable Coalition Matching for Fostering Multi-Agent Cooperation

Jiaqi Shao^{1,2}, Tianjun Yuan², Tao Lin³, Xuanyu Cao¹, Bing Luo² *

¹The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong SAR, China

²Duke Kunshan University, Suzhou, China

³Westlake University, Hangzhou, China

Abstract

Cognitive abilities, such as Theory of Mind (ToM), play a vital role in facilitating cooperation in human social interactions. However, our study reveals that agents with higher ToM abilities may not necessarily exhibit better cooperative behavior compared to those with lower ToM abilities. To address this challenge, we propose a novel matching coalition mechanism that leverages the strengths of agents with different ToM levels by explicitly considering belief alignment and specialized abilities when forming coalitions. Our proposed matching algorithm seeks to find stable coalitions that maximize the potential for cooperative behavior and ensure long-term viability. By incorporating cognitive insights into the design of multi-agent systems, our work demonstrates the potential of leveraging ToM to create more sophisticated and human-like coordination strategies that foster cooperation and improve overall system performance.

1 Introduction

Cooperation is a fundamental aspect of multi-agent systems, enabling agents to work together effectively to achieve common goals and solve complex problems [32]. In recent years, the rapid advancement of large language models (LLMs) has opened up new opportunities for building intelligent multi-agent systems. LLMs have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in natural language understanding, generation, and reasoning, such as GPT-family [7]. By leveraging these powerful LLMs, multi-agent systems can enable agents to communicate and collaborate using natural language, resulting in more flexible and human-like interactions in cooperation tasks.

To foster cooperation among LLM-based agents, most recent research focused on communication and knowledge sharing among agents [44, 16, 15, 42, 25, 10]. These studies demonstrate the potential of leveraging natural language capabilities to facilitate information exchange and coordination in multi-agent systems. Besides language understanding, some research has explored effective cooperation through agent cognitive abilities, such as reasoning and reflection, to coordinate actions and make decisions [29, 18, 20, 21]. These studies highlight the importance of investigating *how we can foster cooperation in LLM-based multi-agent systems from a cognitive perspective*.

One of the fundamental cognitive abilities is the Theory of Mind (ToM). By utilizing ToM in strategic interactions, an agent can mentally simulate others' thoughts, allowing him to anticipate potential moves. Furthermore, ToM can involve multiple levels of recursive belief attribution, known as higher-order ToM, where players consider not only their opponent's beliefs but also their beliefs about the other player's beliefs, and so on [28]. In other words, ToM allows people to see things from others' perspective. For example, in a chess game, a player with higher-order ToM might think, "I believe my opponent thinks that I will move my knight, so I will move my bishop instead, because I believe they will not expect that move." In human social interactions, ToM plays a crucial role in facilitating

*Corresponding author: Bing Luo, {bing.luo}@dukekunshan.edu.cn

cooperation by enabling individuals to understand and predict the behavior of others [46]. Based on these insights, there is a growing interest in leveraging ToM in LLMs to enhance multi-agent cooperation [12, 18], where ToM plays a vital role in facilitating the coordination of actions and the resolution of conflicts in cooperation. Normally, LLM agents with higher ToM capabilities can better understand and predict the actions of other agents leading to improved cooperation and coordination [13, 34].

To further identify the relationship between ToM ability and cooperation behavior, we investigate the cooperative behavior of agents with high and low ToM abilities. However, our result reveals that *agents with lower ToM capabilities exhibited better cooperative behavior compared to those with higher ToM capabilities* (as detailed in Figure 1). This suggests that *having a high level of ToM alone may not always lead to better cooperation*. Intuitively, agents with higher ToM capabilities may overthink and anticipate potential conflicts, resulting in more cautious and less cooperative behavior. This finding aligns with the psychological research by Ridinger and McBride [30], which suggests that ToM capabilities alone are not sufficient to guarantee cooperative behavior. Instead, agents may also need to be willing to positively reciprocate and cooperate with others. Specifically, the research highlights that when ToM abilities are combined with a high proportion of individuals who are willing to engage in cooperation, it can lead to improved cooperation within the group [30]. This insight motivates our proposed approach of incorporating belief alignment into the coalition formation process to promote cooperative behavior among agents with high cognitive abilities.

To address the above challenge, we propose a novel matching coalition mechanism to find coalitions that maximize the potential for cooperative behavior. This mechanism fosters cooperation and leverages the strengths of agents with different ToM levels by explicitly considering belief alignment as captured by their ToM capabilities. By forming coalitions with diverse ToM levels, we aim to create coalitions that can effectively reason about each other’s mental states while leveraging their unique strengths to solve complex problems. Moreover, our matching algorithm allows for stable matching, which ensures the long-term viability and effectiveness of the formed coalitions.

Contribution. We summarized our main contributions as follows:

1. We investigate the **interplay between ToM capabilities and cooperative behavior** in LLM-based multi-agent systems. Our study reveals agents with ToM capabilities may not necessarily exhibit better cooperative behavior. These insights pose new challenges in understanding the complex interplay between cognitive abilities and cooperative behaviors, demonstrating the *potential of leveraging cognitive insights to design effective multi-agent mechanisms*.
2. We introduce a **stable matching mechanism for coalition formation among LLM agents**, based on the alignment between agents’ beliefs (derived from their ToM capabilities) and the actual actions of their potential partners. By establishing preference orders based on belief-action alignment, our mechanism forms effective coalitions and optimizes cooperation among agents.
3. We conduct a comprehensive experimental evaluation incorporating ToM capabilities to assess the effectiveness of the proposed methods in facilitating cooperation, coalition stability, and task-specific performance.

2 Related Work

Theory of Mind (ToM). The concept of ToM, which involves the ability to attribute mental states to oneself and others, has been studied extensively in cognitive science and psychology [28, 9]. In the field of multi-agent reinforcement learning, existing research mainly uses supervised training to equip agents with ToM capabilities for cooperative tasks, *e.g.*, [40, 39, 26].

With the rapid advancement of large language models (LLMs), some recent works have explored empowering LLMs with ToM capabilities [2, 19, 48, 43]. However, these efforts have primarily focused on developing ToM capabilities for individual agents, with limited exploration of how ToM can facilitate cooperation among multiple agents. While Li et al. [18] studied LLM agents with ToM capabilities and leveraged ToM capabilities specifically for cooperative tasks, the relationship between ToM ability and cooperative behavior remains unclear.

In this work, we aim to explore the interplay between ToM ability and cooperative behavior. Unlike previous studies that primarily focused on equipping individual agents with ToM capabilities, we investigate how different levels of ToM abilities influence cooperative behavior in multi-agent systems.

Multi-agent Cooperation. Multi-agent cooperation has been studied extensively in both industry and academia, with traditional approaches focusing on game-theoretic frameworks [32, 46] and




Figure 1: **Illustration for the multi-agent system setup and the ToM cognitive thinking process.** (Left) The multi-agent system setup for the iterative programming tasks, consisting of one project manager (PM) with ToM ability and four Engineers. The iterative process involves: 1 PM updates its beliefs and takes actions based on its ToM reasoning; 2 PM observes Engineers’ actions; 3 Evaluate cooperation by the alignment between PM’s beliefs and Engineers’ actions; 4 PM provides instructions to Engineers. (Right) The ToM cognitive thinking process of PM agent involves recursive belief updates and decision-making based on the inferred beliefs.

Table 1: **Comparison of cooperation behaviors between agents with low ($k=1$) and high ($k=2$) ToM capabilities** in the Iterative Programming task on two benchmarks, including HUMANEVAL [5] and MBPP [3], over $R = 1 \dots 5$ interaction rounds: Low ToM agents show Higher cooperation trends.

	ToM ^k	GPT-3.5-Turbo		GLM-4		Llama-3-70b		Gemini-1.5-flash		Claude-3-sonnet	
		R=1	R=5	R=1	R=5	R=1	R=5	R=1	R=5	R=1	R=5
HUMANEVAL	k=1	62.5	51.7	65.5	63.3	80.9	75.0	75.0	84.72	67.8	67.1
	k=2	50.0	48.0	63.2	60.8	75.0	73.5	80.56	80.56	63.8	57.2
MBPP	k=1	44.3	35.8	83.1	85.2	81.3	85.3	65.74	66.67	57.6	48.6
	k=2	31.3	35.8	82.0	86.3	81.7	82.6	60.58	66.67	52.8	54.4

negotiation and communication strategies [8, 36, 45], enabling agents to learn cooperative strategies through interaction and information exchange. The advancements of LLMs have opened up new opportunities for multi-agent cooperation, leveraging their capabilities in natural language understanding, generation, and reasoning [47, 35]. Recent works have explored utilizing LLM agents to coordinate and cooperate in various tasks and frameworks, *e.g.*, CAMEL [17] employs role-play to facilitate autonomous cooperation, AutoGen [41] uses conversable agents and conversation programming, and MetaGPT [14] incorporates human workflows into LLM-based multi-agent collaborations to ensure more coherent and effective teamwork. In addition, recent research has focused on improving specific aspects of multi-agent collaboration, such as conversation for knowledge sharing [44, 16, 15, 42, 25, 10] and cognitive ability [20, 11], demonstrating the potential of leveraging language to facilitate cooperation and coordination. For effective cooperation in complex and dynamic environments, some studies focus on the dynamic adjustment of group members and the selection of teammates to improve cooperation and overall performance [6, 17, 33]. Besides, Liu et al. [23] proposes the Dynamic LLM-Agent Network (DyLAN) framework to optimize team performance based on task queries and peer ranking.

Different from previous work on optimizing team members, our work mainly focuses on the interplay of cognitive abilities and cooperative behavior in multi-agent systems. We underscore the importance of fostering effective cooperation by considering cognitive aspects.

3 Motivation

Theory of Mind (ToM) in multi-agent cooperation has been studied recently and agents with higher ToM capabilities are generally expected to be more effective in understanding and predicting the actions of others, which leads to improved cooperation and coordination. However, the relationship between ToM ability and cooperative behavior in multi-agent systems is not fully understood, and there are still open questions regarding the impact of ToM ability on cooperation.

ToM agent is not always sufficient to ensure cooperative behavior. To investigate the relationship between ToM and cooperative behavior in multi-agent systems, we first simulate the multi-agent system consisting of one project manager (PM) and four engineer agents working together to solve a programming task, as shown in Figure 1 (Left). Specifically, PM is enabled with ToM ability, which means he can recursively infer the actions of other agents (as beliefs) and take his own actions

accordingly, as illustrated Figure 1 (*Right*). Then, we investigate the multi-agent cooperation with iterative programming tasks (five rounds) on two benchmarks, HUMAN-EVAL [5] and MBPP [3].

To evaluate ToM agent’s cooperative behavior, we introduce a metric called the “*Fraction of Trust Members*” (*FTM*). *FTM* is calculated by measuring the alignment between PM’s beliefs about the engineer agents’ actions and their actual actions. In other words, *FTM* represents the proportion of engineer agents whose actions are correctly predicted by the PM’s beliefs, indicating the level of cooperation and understanding between the PM and the engineer agents. A higher *FTM* value suggests better cooperation, as the PM’s beliefs are more accurately aligned with the engineer agents’ actions. The detailed explanation of the *FTM* metric and its calculation is provided in Section 6.

Notably, our results revealed that **a low ToM agent ($k=1$) exhibited better cooperative ability compared to a high ($k=2$) ToM agent**, as detailed in Table 1. This suggests that the agents with high ToM capabilities may overthink and anticipate potential conflicts, resulting in more cautious and less cooperative behavior. To leverage the strengths of agents with different ToM levels, we propose a coalition matching algorithm to foster cooperation and improve cooperative task performance.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 4 introduces the ToM modeling and the matching problem in multi-agent systems. Section 5 describes our proposed coalition matching algorithm to foster cooperation among agents with diverse ToM capabilities. Section 6 presents the experiments evaluating the impact of ToM and the matching algorithm on cooperative behavior.

4 Formulation

In this section, we present the novel formulation for incorporating ToM capabilities and stable matching theory into multi-agent LLM cooperation. The multi-agent matching leverages the alignment between agents’ beliefs and actions from ToM to establish coalitions, ensuring that agents are matched with partners whose actions align with their beliefs, fostering more stable collaborations.

4.1 ToM Formulation for LLM Agents

ToM refers to the ability to attribute mental states, such as beliefs, intentions, and desires, to oneself and others, and to understand that others may have beliefs and intentions that differ from one’s own. In the context of LLMs and multi-agent systems, we can incorporate ToM capabilities into agents to enhance their ability to understand and predict with other agents effectively. We represent the k -level ToM function for an LLM agent i as $\text{ToM}_i^k(\cdot)$, is defined as:

$$\text{ToM}_i^k(o_i, a_{-i}, b_{-i}^{k-1}) = b_i^k, \quad (1)$$

where o_i is agent i ’s observation of the environment, a_{-i} is the set of actions taken by other agents, b_{-i}^{k-1} is the set of $(k - 1)$ -level beliefs of other agents, and b_i^k is agent i ’s k -level belief about other agents. The k -level belief b_i^k can be represented as a nested probability distribution, where each level captures the agent’s belief about other agents at the corresponding level of recursion. For the base case of 0-level ToM, the function simply maps the agent’s observation and other agents’ actions to a belief, without considering any nested beliefs: $\text{ToM}_i^0(o_i, a_{-i}) = b_i^0$.

4.2 Matching Formulation for Multi-Agent LLMs

Considering the set of LLM agents $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and the set of possible matchings between agents M , a matching $\mu \in M$ is a one-to-many correspondence that assigns each agent to at least one other agent or leaves them unmatched. Each agent i has a preference order \succ_i over the set of potential partners $N \setminus \{i\}$, which is determined by the alignment between their belief b_i^k (obtained from the k -level ToM function) and other agents j ’s actual actions a_j .

The matching μ is stable if there exists no pair of agents (i, j) such that: (a) Agent i prefers agent j to its current partners $\mu(i)$, and (b) Agent j prefers agent i to its current partners $\mu(j)$. In other words, the stability condition ensures that no pair of agents would have the incentive to deviate from their assigned partners in the matching.

Formally, a stable matching μ satisfies the following condition:

$$\nexists (i, j) \in N \times N \text{ such that } j \succ_i \mu(i) \text{ and } i \succ_j \mu(j). \quad (2)$$

The preference order \succ_i can be defined based on a similarity or alignment measure between agent i ’s k -level belief b_i^k and the actual actions a_j of other agents j . For example, if agent i ’s belief b_i^k accurately predicts agent j ’s action a_j within an error tolerance ϵ , then agent i may prefer to be

Algorithm 1 Multi-Agent Coalition Matching Mechanism

Require: $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$: the set of LLM agents; k : the desired level of recursion for ToM;
 $\epsilon \geq 0$: error tolerance for belief alignment.

```
1: for each cooperation round do
2:   for each agent  $i \in N$  do
3:      $b_i^k \leftarrow \text{ToM}_i^k(o_i, a_{-i}, b_{-i}^{k-1})$  {Belief Update}
4:     Establish preference order  $\succeq_i$  based on  $b_i^k$  and  $\epsilon$  {Preference Ordering}
5:   end for
6:   Compute stable matching  $\mu$  based on preference orders  $\{\succeq_i\}$  {Stable Matching}
7:   for each agent  $i \in N$  do
8:     Cooperate with assigned partner  $\mu(i)$  {Coalition Formation}
9:   end for
10:  for each agent  $i \in N$  do
11:    Update  $b_i^k$  based on  $o_i, a_{-i}$ 
12:    if  $\|b_i^k(a_{\mu(i)}) - a_{\mu(i)}\| > \epsilon$ : Signal desire to re-match
13:  end for
14: end for
```

matched with agent j :

$$\succ_i: j \succ_i m \text{ if } \|b_i^k(a_j) - a_j\| \leq \epsilon \text{ and } \|b_i^k(a_m) - a_m\| > \epsilon, \quad (3)$$

where $b_i^k(a_j)$ and $b_i^k(a_m)$ are agent i 's k -level beliefs about the actions of agents j and m , respectively, and $\|\cdot\|$ is a distance or similarity measure.

The stable matching problem for multi-agent LLMs can then be formulated as finding a matching μ that satisfies the stability condition, given the agents' preferences based on their k -level ToM beliefs and the alignment between their beliefs and the actual actions of other agents. By capturing the agents' preferences based on the alignment between their beliefs and the actual actions of other agents, we can investigate how the agents' ToM ability impacts their cooperative behavior and the overall stability of the multi-agent system.

5 Cooperation Mechanism for Multi-Agent LLMs

In this section, we propose a cooperation mechanism for multi-agent LLMs that enables agents to form and maintain stable cooperative coalitions by leveraging their ToM functions to predict and align their beliefs with their partners' actions. To further enhance the effectiveness of the coalitions, we introduce a specialized ability-matching adaptation that prioritizes agents with crucial skills for specific tasks. This adaptation optimizes the formation of coalitions, ensuring agents possessing the necessary expertise are included in the coalition.

5.1 Coalition Matching Mechanism for Multi-Agent LLMs

To foster the cooperation among agents with different ToM levels, we introduce the multi-agent LLM cooperation mechanism operates in cooperation rounds, where agents form stable cooperative coalitions, detailed in Algorithm 1. In each round, every agent $i \in N$ uses its k -level ToM function $\text{ToM}_i^k(\cdot)$ to form beliefs b_i^k about the mental states of other agents, based on its observations o_i , the actions a_{-i} of others, and the $(k-1)$ -level beliefs b_{-i}^{k-1} of others. Then, agent i establishes a preference order \succeq_i over potential partners based on the alignment between its belief $b_i^k(a_j)$ and agent j 's actual action a_j within a tolerance ϵ . A stable matching μ is computed using algorithms from matching theory [1], and the matching process is described in Algorithm 1, Line 2~8.

Agents form cooperative coalitions by cooperating with their assigned partners $\mu(i)$ in the stable matching. After each cooperation round, agents update their beliefs b_i^k based on observations and their partners' actions. If the alignment between an agent i 's belief $b_i^k(a_{\mu(i)})$ and its partner's action $a_{\mu(i)}$ falls below the tolerance ϵ , the agent signals a desire to re-match, triggering new cooperation round with a fresh stable matching computation (Algorithm 1, Line 10~12). This iterative process allows agents to form and maintain stable coalitions while adapting to changes in beliefs and preferences over time, leveraging their ToM capabilities, belief alignment, and stable matching principles.

For k -level ToM agent i 's action a_i , it is determined by the agent's belief b_i^k and assigned partners $\mu(i)$ in the stable matching. The action a_i can be represented as: $a_i = f(b_i^k, \mu(i))$. The specific form of the function f depends on the cooperative task and the agents' decision-making processes.

5.2 Adaptation for Specialized Agent Abilities

While the proposed mechanism for multi-agent LLM cooperation focuses on the alignment between agents' beliefs and actions, it is also important to consider the specialized abilities of individual agents, especially when forming coalitions for cooperative tasks that require specific skills or capabilities.

In scenarios where certain agents possess specialized abilities that are highly relevant to the cooperative task at hand, the original stable matching algorithm may not necessarily prioritize these agents, as it solely relies on the alignment between beliefs and actions. To address this limitation, we propose an adaptation to the mechanism that incorporates agents' specialized abilities into the matching process.

Let α_i represent the specialized ability score of agent i for the cooperative task under consideration. This score indicates greater specialized ability for the task. We can modify the preference order \succeq_i of each agent i to incorporate both the belief alignment and the specialized ability scores of potential partners. The preference order \succeq'_i can be defined as follows:

$$j \succeq'_i m \iff [\|b_i^k(a_j) - a_j\| \leq \epsilon \text{ and } \|b_i^k(a_m) - a_m\| > \epsilon] \\ \text{or } [\|b_i^k(a_j) - a_j\| = \|b_i^k(a_m) - a_m\| \text{ and } \alpha_j > \alpha_m]. \quad (4)$$

In this updated preference order, agent i prefers agent j over agent m if either: (a) The alignment between i 's belief and j 's action is within the tolerance ϵ , while the alignment with m 's action exceeds the tolerance, *i.e.*, $\|b_i^k(a_m) - a_m\| > \epsilon$, or (b) The alignments with j 's and m 's actions are equal, but j has a higher specialized ability score α_j than m , *i.e.*, $\alpha_j > \alpha_m$.

By incorporating the specialized ability scores α_i into the preference order, the stable matching algorithm will prioritize agents with higher specialized abilities for the cooperative task and consider the belief alignment. This adaptation ensures that agents with crucial specialized abilities are more likely to be included in the formed coalitions, enhancing the overall effectiveness of the cooperation mechanism for tasks that require specific skills or capabilities.

The values of the specialized ability score α_i can be determined through empirical evaluation, expert knowledge, or by leveraging performance metrics on relevant tasks during the agents' training or deployment phases.

6 Experiment

6.1 Experiment Setup

The experiment setup involves extending the MetaGPT framework [14] to incorporate the proposed multi-agent LLM cooperation mechanism. LLM agents will have varying levels of ToM capabilities, including 1-level, and 2-level ToM. We evaluate our proposed coalition mechanism on the following cooperative tasks:

- **Iterative Programming [14]:** In this task, agents simulate a software development team, with each agent assuming different roles. We use HUMAN-EVAL and MBPP as benchmarks to evaluate the performance and cooperative behavior of ToM agents in this multi-agent environment.
- **Debate:** In a debate setting, agents are divided into two sides (affirmative and negative) and engage in a multi-round debate on a given topic. The agents collaborate within their respective sides to present arguments and counterarguments.
- **Logical Problem Solving:** We evaluate the effectiveness of our coalition matching mechanism in a logical problem-solving task, where agents collaborate to solve complex reasoning questions. Due to page limitations, the details of this experiment are provided in Appendix A.3.


Models. We utilize five state-of-the-art LLMs in our multi-agent cooperation scenarios: GPT3.5 [27] (GPT-3.5-Turbo), GLM (GLM-4), Llama 3 [24] (Llama-3-70b), Gemini [38] (Gemini-1.5-flash), and Claude [37] (Claude-3-sonnet).

6.2 Evaluation Metrics


To comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed multi-agent LLM cooperation mechanism, we define the following metrics:

Table 2: **Comparison of cooperation behaviors between agents with low (1-level) and high (2-level) ToM capabilities** in the Iterative Programming task (HUMANEVAL) over 5 interaction rounds: Without matching, low ToM agents show higher cooperation trends; While with matching stable coalition, high ToM agents achieve higher cooperation ability as cooperation progresses.

		GPT-3.5-Turbo		GLM-4		Llama-3-70b		Gemini-1.5-flash		Claude-3-sonnet	
		1st Rnd.	5th Rnd.	1st Rnd.	5th Rnd.	1st Rnd.	5th Rnd.	1st Rnd.	5th Rnd.	1st Rnd.	5th Rnd.
w.o.	1-ToM	62.5	51.75	65.5	63.25	80.88	75.00	75.0	84.72	67.76	67.11
Matching	2-ToM	50	48	63.25	60.75	75.00	73.53	80.56	80.56	63.82	57.24
w. Matching	1-ToM	81	77.75	83.25	84.0	95.83	97.50	88.89	89.29	94.23	91.07
(Ours)	2-ToM	76.25	80.75	83.25	91.0	93.18	97.50	88.64	95.00	93.75	95.45



(a) **w.o. Matching**: 1) Agents with *low ToM* ability exhibited a *higher cooperation trend* compared to high ToM agents; 2) ToM agents demonstrate a *decline in cooperative behavior* as the collaboration progresses.



(b) **w. Stable Matching (Ours)**: 1) *The matching mechanism leads to higher cooperation behavior* for both low and high ToM agents compared to the corresponding values in the “w.o. Matching” setting in Figure 2a; 2) With matching stable coalition, *high ToM agents achieve higher cooperation ability* as cooperation progresses.

Figure 2: **Comparison of cooperation behaviors between agents with low (1-ToM) and high (2-ToM) abilities** in the Iterative Programming task (HUMANEVAL) over 5 collaboration rounds under “w.o. Matching” and “w. Stable Matching” settings.

Fraction of Trust Members (FTM): This metric evaluates the cooperative behavior of the ToM agent based on the Belief-Action Alignment score. We first define a threshold ϵ for the alignment score; if an agent’s score is below this threshold, the agent is considered a trusted member. An agent j is a trust member for agent i with k -level ToM if the belief-action alignment score $A_{i,j}^k \leq \epsilon$. The FTM for agent i with k -level ToM, denoted as FTM_i^k , is then calculated as the fraction of trust members among all other agents: $\text{FTM}_i^k = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{1}(A_{i,j}^k \leq \epsilon)$ where $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function, and $A_{i,j}^k$ is the belief-action alignment score between agent i with k -level ToM and agent j , computed as: $A_i^k = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \|b_i^k(a_j) - a_j\|$, where $b_i^k(a_j)$ represents agent i ’s belief about agent j , a_j is agent j ’s actual action, and $\|\cdot\|$ is a distance metric. A higher FTM value indicates better cooperation.

Coalition Stability with ToM: We measure the stability of coalitions formed by agents with ToM capabilities by considering the average lifetime of these coalitions. The coalition lifetime is defined as the number of cooperation rounds that a coalition remains stable before a re-matching event occurs due to belief-action misalignment exceeding a predefined tolerance threshold ϵ . To calculate the average coalition lifetime, we use $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{c=1}^m l_c$, where m represents the number of times matching is triggered throughout the cooperation rounds, and l_c denotes the lifetime of the coalitions formed after the c -th matching event, where the initial coalition l_1 includes all agents.

6.3 Main Results

Cooperative Behavior with ToM ability: To investigate the impact of ToM capabilities on cooperative behavior in multi-agent systems, we evaluate the Iterative Programming task on two benchmarks, including HUMANEVAL [5] and MBPP [3]. The multi-agent system consists of one Project Manager (PM) and four Engineers.

We vary PM’s ToM ability between 1-level (low) and 2-level (high) to observe the effects on coalition formation and cooperative behavior. Based on the belief-action alignment, PM will select coalition members as described in the proposed cooperation matching mechanism (Algorithm 1). To

Table 3: **Comparison of the coalition stability and Pass@1 performance of MetaGPT and our proposed approach** with 1-ToM and 2-ToM agents using stable matching on the HUMANEval and MBPP benchmarks for the Iterative Programming task. The coalition stability is measured by the average number of rounds the formed coalitions remain stable out of the total 5 rounds.

	HUMANEval		MBPP	
	Coalition Stability	Pass@1	Coalition Stability	Pass@1
MetaGPT	–	85.4%	–	86.5%
1-ToM w. Matching	3.4/5	87.2%	3.7/5	88.2%
2-ToM w. Matching	3.6/5	90.0%	4.0/5	90.4%

quantitatively assess the impact of ToM ability on cooperative behavior, we measure the Frequency of Team Matching (FTM) for the ToM agent, with a higher FTM value indicating a more cooperative agent. Table 2 presents the results of our experiments on the HUMANEval benchmark, comparing the cooperative behavior of agents with low (1-level) and high (2-level) ToM capabilities in two settings: without a matching coalition and with a matching coalition formed using our proposed cooperation mechanism. Similar results for the MBPP benchmark are provided in Appendix A.

To facilitate comparison across different models, we first calculate the FTM value for each model’s 1-ToM agent in the 1st round of the no-matching setting. This value serves as a baseline for different ToM levels and matching/no-matching conditions. Then, we divide the obtained FTM values by the corresponding model’s baseline FTM value. For example, all values corresponding to GLM-4 in Table 2 should be divided by 65.5. The normalized results are illustrated in Figure 2.

In the absence of a matching coalition (Figure 2a), agents with low ToM ability exhibited a higher cooperation trend compared to agents with high ToM ability over 5 collaboration rounds. This suggests that agents with high ToM capabilities may be less likely to cooperate, possibly due to their tendency to overthink and anticipate potential conflicts, leading to more cautious and less cooperative behavior.

When the matching coalition is formed, we observed an increase in cooperative behavior for both low and high ToM ability agents as shown in Figure 2b. This demonstrates the effectiveness of our proposed cooperation mechanism in promoting cooperative behavior among agents with ToM capabilities. Interestingly, **in the coalition setting (Figure 2b), agents with high ToM ability show a higher cooperation ability compared to low ToM ability agents as collaboration progressed.** By the end of the 5th round, high ToM ability agents exhibited a higher cooperation rate than low ToM ability agents. This indicates that when the matching algorithm is introduced, it provides a stable coalition for cooperation, where high ToM ability agents can fully utilize their perspective-taking skills to maintain and enhance cooperation over time.

Coalition Stability with ToM: To evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed stable matching approach, we compare the task performance of MetaGPT and our method with 1-ToM and 2-ToM agents on two Iterative Programming benchmarks: HUMANEval and MBPP. To assess the performance of the approaches on the programming task, we use the Pass@1 metric [14], which represents the percentage of test cases passed by the generated code on its first attempt. A higher Pass@1 score indicates better code quality and problem-solving ability. Moreover, we measure coalition stability for multi-agent teams with a ToM agent (PM) by calculating the average number of rounds the formed coalitions remain stable out of 5 rounds. A coalition is stable if no agent in the coalition desires to leave and form a new coalition based on their belief-action alignment.

As shown in Table 3, our approach with 1-ToM and 2-ToM agents using stable matching achieves higher Pass@1 scores and maintains more stable coalitions compared to MetaGPT on both the HUMANEval and MBPP benchmarks. The 2-ToM agents with stable matching demonstrate the best performance, maintaining stable coalitions for an average of 3.6 out of 5 rounds on HUMANEval and 4.0 out of 5 rounds on MBPP, while also achieving *the highest Pass@1 scores* of 90.0% and 90.4%, respectively. These results highlight the improved cooperation ability of high ToM agents in maintaining stable coalitions over time, which contributes to better task performance. By incorporating ToM capabilities and stable matching, our proposed approach enables agents to form stable and high-performing coalitions, leading to enhanced collaboration and task performance.

6.4 Case Study: Debate

To evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed coalition matching mechanism, we designed a debate task using the MetaGPT framework [14]. In this task, agents (GPT-3.5-turbo) are divided into two

sides: the affirmative side and the negative side, with each side comprising three debater agents. Each side’s objective is to cooperate and win the debate.

At the beginning of our investigation, we explore the cooperative behaviors of low and high ToM agents in a debate setting with the topic "Should the Death Penalty be abolished?" [31, 4], and both low and high ToM agents are assigned to the affirmative side. The following example presents the thinking and actions of debaters with different levels of ToM, as detailed in Appendix A.2. We observe that higher ToM agent acts as less cooperative, which confirms our previous analysis.

Compare Cooperative Behaviors between low and high ToM agents

Thinking and Action of 1-ToM Debater: I anticipate my teammates making these common arguments against the death penalty. *To complement their points*, I will focus my argument on the lack of evidence supporting the death penalty’s effectiveness as a crime deterrent. I will argue that there is no conclusive evidence showing that the death penalty deters crime more effectively than lengthy imprisonment, making it an unnecessary and unjustified punishment. ← Focuses on complementing their teammates’ points & Good Cooperative Behavior

Thinking and Action of 2-ToM Debater: My arguments about deterrence and discrimination will prompt my teammates to make related points to strengthen the overall case. *I should use my next arguments to introduce new issues*. I will argue that the death penalty often involves inhumane and botched executions, and that most democracies and U.S. states have abolished or prohibited it. ← Overthinking & Worse Cooperative Behavior

Then, we conducted experiments under three different settings to show the effectiveness of our matching mechanism for fostering cooperation: (1) *No-ToM (Baseline)*: Each side consists of 3 debater agents without ToM capabilities. For each speech, two debaters were randomly selected from each side; (2) *ToM without Matching*: The three debaters on the affirmative side have varying ToM levels (0-level, 1-level, and 2-level), while the negative side had no ToM capabilities. For each speech, two debaters were *randomly selected* from each side. This setting allows us to evaluate the impact of having an affirmative team with ToM capabilities against a team without ToM; (3) *ToM with Matching*: Similar to the ToM without Matching setting, the affirmative side has three debaters with varying ToM levels. However, the affirmative side selects two debaters using our proposed coalition matching mechanism.

Foster Coalition Matching for agents with Varying ToM capabilities.

For the debate topic “Should the Death Penalty be abolished?”, the debate consists of 5 rounds, with each side alternating to speak. We conducted the debate 11 times, and the outcomes were evaluated by ChatGPT 4. As shown in Table 4, the affirmative side employing agents with varying ToM capabilities and our proposed coalition matching mechanism achieved a win rate of 68.89%, outperforming both the setting without matching (64.44%) and the baseline (62.22%).

Table 4: **Win rates for the affirmative side.**

Setting	Win Rate
No-ToM	62.22%
ToM w.o. Matching	64.44% (+2.22%)
ToM w. Matching (Ours)	68.89% (+6.67%)

Besides, for the coalition matching among agents with different ToM levels, our experiments show that the *initial* cooperation rate between the 1-ToM and 2-ToM agents was relatively low, suggesting *higher ToM capabilities may not naturally form coalitions with each other*. Notably, with our coalition matching mechanism, the affirmative side’s cooperation rate between the 1-ToM and 2-ToM agents increased from 9.1% (Round 1) to 18.2% (Round 5) as the debate rounds progressed. This suggests that our proposed method effectively fosters more effective cooperation among agents with ToM capabilities over interaction.

7 Conclusion

In this work, we investigated the relationship between cognitive abilities (ToM) and cooperative behavior in LLM-based multi-agent systems. Our findings suggest that the relationship between ToM and cooperation is not always straightforward. Furthermore, we proposed a novel matching coalition mechanism incorporating cognitive insights into the design of multi-agent systems, which improves cooperation and task-solving capabilities. This insight introduces new challenges for exploring the translation of cognitive abilities into cooperative actions in multi-agent settings.

References

- [1] Ahmet Alkan. 1999. *On the properties of stable many-to-many matchings under responsive preferences*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 29–39. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-03750-8_3
- [2] Akshatha Arodi and Jackie Chi Kit Cheung. 2021. Textual time travel: A temporally informed approach to theory of mind. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*. 4162–4172.
- [3] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. 2021. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732* (2021).
- [4] Alexander Batur, Niheer Dasandi, and Slava J Mikhaylov. 2017. Understanding state preferences with text as data: Introducing the UN General Debate corpus. *Research & Politics* 4, 2 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168017712821>
- [5] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebggen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. (2021). [arXiv:2107.03374](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374) [cs.LG]
- [6] Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Jingwei Zuo, Cheng Yang, Chenfei Yuan, Chi-Min Chan, Heyang Yu, Yaxi Lu, Yi-Hsin Hung, Chen Qian, Yujia Qin, Xin Cong, Ruobing Xie, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Jie Zhou. 2024. AgentVerse: Facilitating Multi-Agent Collaboration and Exploring Emergent Behaviors. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=EHg5GDnyq1>
- [7] Tyna Eloundou, Sam Manning, Pamela Mishkin, and Daniel Rock. 2023. Gpts are gpts: An early look at the labor market impact potential of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10130* (2023).
- [8] Jakob Foerster, Ioannis Alexandros Assael, Nando De Freitas, and Shimon Whiteson. 2016. Learning to communicate with deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [9] Uta Frith and Christopher D Frith. 2003. Development and neurophysiology of mentalizing. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* 358, 1431 (2003), 459–473.
- [10] Yao Fu, Hao Peng, Tushar Khot, and Mirella Lapata. 2023. Improving Language Model Negotiation with Self-Play and In-Context Learning from AI Feedback. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.10142> arXiv:2305.10142 [cs].
- [11] Ran Gong, Qiuyuan Huang, Xiaojian Ma, Hoi Vo, Zane Durante, Yusuke Noda, Zilong Zheng, Song-Chun Zhu, Demetri Terzopoulos, Li Fei-Fei, et al. 2023. Mindagent: Emergent gaming interaction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.09971* (2023).
- [12] Jiaxian Guo, Bo Yang, Paul Yoo, Bill Yuchen Lin, Yusuke Iwasawa, and Yutaka Matsuo. 2023. Suspicion-agent: Playing imperfect information games with theory of mind aware gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17277* (2023).
- [13] Yinghui He, Yufan Wu, Yilin Jia, Rada Mihalcea, Yulong Chen, and Naihao Deng. 2023. Hi-tom: A benchmark for evaluating higher-order theory of mind reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16755* (2023).

- [14] Sirui Hong, Mingchen Zhuge, Jonathan Chen, Xiawu Zheng, Yuheng Cheng, Jinlin Wang, Ceyao Zhang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, Chenyu Ran, Lingfeng Xiao, Chenglin Wu, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2024. MetaGPT: Meta Programming for A Multi-Agent Collaborative Framework. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VtmBAGCN7o>
- [15] Wenyue Hua, Lizhou Fan, Lingyao Li, Kai Mei, Jianchao Ji, Yingqiang Ge, Libby Hemphill, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2023. War and peace (waragent): Large language model-based multi-agent simulation of world wars. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17227* (2023).
- [16] Yihuai Lan, Zhiqiang Hu, Lei Wang, Yang Wang, Deheng Ye, Peilin Zhao, Ee-Peng Lim, Hui Xiong, and Hao Wang. 2023. Llm-based agent society investigation: Collaboration and confrontation in avalon gameplay. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14985* (2023).
- [17] Guohao Li, Hasan Abed Al Kader Hammoud, Hani Itani, Dmitrii Khizbullin, and Bernard Ghanem. 2023. CAMEL: Communicative Agents for "Mind" Exploration of Large Language Model Society. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3IyL2XWdK6>
- [18] Huao Li, Yu Quan Chong, Simon Stepputtis, Joseph Campbell, Dana Hughes, Charles Michael Lewis, and Katia P. Sycara. 2023. Theory of Mind for Multi-Agent Collaboration via Large Language Models. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=y04cAfFjlp>
- [19] Shuang Li, Xavier Puig, Chris Paxton, Yilun Du, Clinton Wang, Linxi Fan, Tao Chen, De-An Huang, Ekin Akyürek, Anima Anandkumar, et al. 2022. Pre-trained language models for interactive decision-making. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 31199–31212.
- [20] Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Wenxiang Jiao, Xing Wang, Yan Wang, Rui Wang, Yujiu Yang, Zhaopeng Tu, and Shuming Shi. 2023. Encouraging divergent thinking in large language models through multi-agent debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19118* (2023).
- [21] Bill Yuchen Lin, Yicheng Fu, Karina Yang, Faeze Brahman, Shiyu Huang, Chandra Bhagavatula, Prithviraj Ammanabrolu, Yejin Choi, and Xiang Ren. 2024. Swiftsage: A generative agent with fast and slow thinking for complex interactive tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [22] Wang Ling, Dani Yogatama, Chris Dyer, and Phil Blunsom. 2017. Program Induction by Rationale Generation: Learning to Solve and Explain Algebraic Word Problems. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Vancouver, Canada, 158–167. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P17-1015>
- [23] Zijun Liu, Yanzhe Zhang, Peng Li, Yang Liu, and Diyi Yang. 2024. Dynamic LLM-Agent Network: An LLM-agent Collaboration Framework with Agent Team Optimization. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=i43XCu54Br>
- [24] Meta AI. 2024. Introducing Meta Llama 3: The most capable openly available LLM to date. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/> Accessed: 2024-05-22.
- [25] Nathalia Nascimento, Paulo Alencar, and Donald Cowan. 2023. Self-adaptive large language model (llm)-based multiagent systems. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Automatic Computing and Self-Organizing Systems Companion (ACSOS-C)*. IEEE, 104–109.
- [26] Ini Oguntola, Joseph Campbell, Simon Stepputtis, and Katia Sycara. 2023. Theory of mind as intrinsic motivation for multi-agent reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01158* (2023).
- [27] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-3.5 Turbo fine-tuning and API updates. <https://openai.com/index/gpt-3-5-turbo-fine-tuning-and-api-updates/> Accessed: 2024-05-22.
- [28] David Premack and Guy Woodruff. 1978. Does the chimpanzee have a theory of mind? *Behavioral and brain sciences* 1, 4 (1978), 515–526.

- [29] Wenhao Qi and Edward Vul. 2020. Adaptive behavior in variable games requires theory of mind. (2020).
- [30] Garret Ridinger and Michael McBride. [n.d.]. Theory-of-mind Ability and Cooperation. ([n.d.]).
- [31] Allen Roush and Arvind Balaji. 2020. DebateSum: A large-scale argument mining and summarization dataset. In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Argument Mining*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 1–7. <https://aclanthology.org/2020.argmining-1.1> Available from DebateSum: <http://www.debate.cards>.
- [32] Prakash P Shenoy. 1979. On coalition formation: a game-theoretical approach. *International journal of game theory* 8, 3 (1979), 133–164.
- [33] Zijing Shi, Meng Fang, Shunfeng Zheng, Shilong Deng, Ling Chen, and Yali Du. 2023. Cooperation on the fly: Exploring language agents for ad hoc teamwork in the avalon game. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17515* (2023).
- [34] Winnie Street. 2024. LLM Theory of Mind and Alignment: Opportunities and Risks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08154* (2024).
- [35] Yashar Talebirad and Amirhossein Nadiri. 2023. Multi-Agent Collaboration: Harnessing the Power of Intelligent LLM Agents. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2306.03314> arXiv:2306.03314 [cs].
- [36] Yichuan Tang. 2019. Towards Learning Multi-Agent Negotiations via Self-Play. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV) Workshops*.
- [37] Adly Templeton et al. 2024. Scaling Monosemanticity: Extracting Interpretable Features from Claude 3. *Transformer Circuits* (2024). <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2024/scaling-monosemanticity/index.html>
- [38] Mat Velloso and Josh Woodward. 2024. Gemini 1.5 Pro updates, 1.5 Flash debut and 2 new Gemma models. <https://blog.google/technology/developers/gemini-gemma-developer-updates-may-2024/> Accessed: 2024-05-22.
- [39] Yuanfei Wang, fangwei zhong, Jing Xu, and Yizhou Wang. 2022. ToM2C: Target-oriented Multi-agent Communication and Cooperation with Theory of Mind. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=2t7CkQXNpuq>
- [40] Ying Wen, Yaodong Yang, Rui Luo, Jun Wang, and Wei Pan. 2018. Probabilistic Recursive Reasoning for Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [41] Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Shaokun Zhang, Erkang Zhu, Beibin Li, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, and Chi Wang. 2023. Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08155* (2023).
- [42] Yuxiang Wu, Zhengyao Jiang, Akbir Khan, Yao Fu, Laura Ruis, Edward Grefenstette, and Tim Rocktäschel. 2023. Chatarena: Multi-agent language game environments for large language models. *GitHub repository* (2023).
- [43] Hainiu Xu, Runcong Zhao, Lixing Zhu, Jinhua Du, and Yulan He. 2024. OpenToM: A Comprehensive Benchmark for Evaluating Theory-of-Mind Reasoning Capabilities of Large Language Models. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.06044> arXiv:2402.06044 [cs].
- [44] Yuzhuang Xu, Shuo Wang, Peng Li, Fuwen Luo, Xiaolong Wang, Weidong Liu, and Yang Liu. 2023. Exploring large language models for communication games: An empirical study on werewolf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04658* (2023).
- [45] Dingkan Yang, Kun Yang, Yuzheng Wang, Jing Liu, Zhi Xu, Rongbin Yin, Peng Zhai, and Lihua Zhang. 2024. How2comm: Communication-efficient and collaboration-pragmatic multi-agent perception. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).

- [46] Wako Yoshida, Ray J. Dolan, and Karl J. Friston. 2008. Game Theory of Mind. *PLoS Computational Biology* 4, 12 (Dec. 2008), e1000254. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000254>
- [47] Yadong Zhang, Shaoguang Mao, Tao Ge, Xun Wang, Yan Xia, Man Lan, and Furu Wei. 2024. K-Level Reasoning with Large Language Models. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.01521> arXiv:2402.01521 [cs].
- [48] Pei Zhou, Aman Madaan, Srividya Pranavi Potharaju, Aditya Gupta, Kevin R. McKee, Ari Holtzman, Jay Pujara, Xiang Ren, Swaroop Mishra, Aida Nematzadeh, Shyam Upadhyay, and Manaal Faruqi. 2023. How FaR Are Large Language Models From Agents with Theory-of-Mind? <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.03051> arXiv:2310.03051 [cs].

Table 5: Comparison of cooperation behaviors between agents with low (1-level) and high (2-level) ToM capabilities in the Iterative Programming task (MBPP) over 5 interaction rounds: Without matching, low ToM agents show higher cooperation trends; While with matching stable coalition, high ToM agents achieve higher cooperation ability as cooperation progresses.

		GPT-3.5-Turbo		GLM-4		Llama-3-70b		Gemini-1.5-flash		Claude-3-sonnet	
		1st Rnd.	5th Rnd.	1st Rnd.	5th Rnd.	1st Rnd.	5th Rnd.	1st Rnd.	5th Rnd.	1st Rnd.	5th Rnd.
No Matching	1-ToM	44.25	35.75	83.14	85.17	81.25	85.27	65.74	66.67	57.64	48.61
	2-ToM	31.25	35.75	81.98	86.34	81.7	82.59	60.58	66.67	52.78	54.37
Matching (Ours)	1-ToM	95.25	92.75	91.02	91.67	93.64	97.12	80.77	86.36	58.82	64.68
	2-ToM	92.0	93.0	88.28	93.66	94.81	98.53	81.25	92.50	60.71	68.18

A Experiments

Cooperative Behavior with ToM ability (on MBPP benchmark):

To investigate the impact of ToM capabilities on cooperative behavior, we compared the performance of agents with low (1-level) and high (2-level) ToM in the Iterative Programming task using the MBPP dataset. The experiments were conducted over 5 interaction rounds, and we evaluated two settings: without matching and with matching stable coalitions, similar to the setting of Section 6.3.

As shown in Table 5, the results suggest that without a stable coalition matching mechanism, agents with higher ToM capabilities tend to exhibit less cooperative behavior, further convince the results in Section 6.3. In contrast, when a stable coalition matching mechanism is employed, the cooperation rates of both low and high ToM agents improve compared to the setting without matching.

Notably, agents with high ToM capabilities demonstrated a more significant increase in cooperation rates over the interaction rounds. For instance, the cooperation rate for high ToM agents (GLM-4) increased from 88.28% in Round 1 to 93.66% in Round 5, surpassing the cooperation rate of low ToM agents (91.67%) in the final round. This indicates that as cooperation progresses and the matching mechanism stabilizes the coalitions, agents with higher ToM capabilities can leverage their advanced cognitive abilities to make more informed decisions and engage in more effective cooperative behaviors.

A.1 Experimental Details for Section 6.3

Instruction:

Prompts for Project Manager

There are engineers in the team. Your current action is {action}. You have the ability of {k} Level Theory of Mind. You can ****recursively**** infer the mental states of other agents in the team. Then, you will provide outline { x_i } based on this belief
Please explain your thought process for inferring others' actions '{ y_i }' and choosing '{ x_i }' at each level. Remember **MUST** Respond in the following JSON format, including each key:

0-ToM Instruction Template for Project Manager:

```
{
  'ToM_level0': {
    'brief': 'no brief',
    'action': '{x_0 The instruction for engineers. Begin with "The
    ↪ Engineer should ..."}'
  }
}
```

1-ToM Instruction Template for Project Manager:

```
{
  'ToM_level1': {
    'brief': '{y_1 inferred actions for engineers}',
    'explanation': '{Concise explanation of inferring actions y_1 and
    ↪ choosing x_1 based on this belief}',
    'action': '{x_1 The instruction for engineers. Begin with "The
    ↪ Engineer should ..."}'
  }
}
```

```
}
```

2-ToM Instruction Template for Project Manager:

```
{
  "ToM_level1": {
    "brief": "{y_1 inferred actions for engineers}",
    "explanation": "{Concise explanation of inferring actions y_1 and
    ↪ choosing x_1 based on this belief}",
    "action": "{x_1 The instruction for engineers. Begin with 'The
    ↪ Engineer should ...'}"
  },
  "ToM_level2": {
    "brief": "{y_2 inferred actions for engineers based on your
    ↪ action x_1}",
    "explanation": "{Concise explanation of inferring actions y_2 and
    ↪ choosing x_2 based on this belief}",
    "action": "{x_2 The instruction for engineers. Begin with 'The
    ↪ Engineer should ...'}"
  }
}
```

Outputs: Iterative Programming Round 1

0-ToM Project Manager's Output

```
{
  "ToM_level0": {
    "brief": "Implement a 2048 game",
    "action": "The Engineer should break down the task into
    ↪ smaller components such as creating the game board,
    ↪ handling user input (keyboard or touch events),
    ↪ implementing the game logic for merging tiles and
    ↪ generating new tiles, updating the game state and score,
    ↪ and rendering the game board on the screen. They should
    ↪ also consider creating a user interface with instructions,
    ↪ score display, and any additional features like undo/redo
    ↪ functionality or high score tracking."
  }
}
```

1-ToM Project Manager's Output

```
{
  "ToM_level1": {
    "brief": "The engineers will need to understand the rules and
    ↪ mechanics of the 2048 game, design the game logic and
    ↪ user interface, and implement the code accordingly.",
    "explanation": "Based on the task of implementing a 2048 game,
    ↪ I infer that the engineers will need to first understand
    ↪ the game rules and mechanics, such as how the tiles merge,
    ↪ how the game ends, and how the score is calculated. They
    ↪ will then need to design the game logic, including the
    ↪ data structures and algorithms for handling tile
    ↪ movements, merging, and scoring. Additionally, they will
    ↪ need to design and implement a user interface for the
    ↪ game, which could involve creating visual representations
    ↪ of the tiles and handling user input. Therefore, my
    ↪ instruction for the engineers will cover these aspects.",
  }
}
```

```

    "action": "The engineers should: 1) Study and understand the
    ↪ rules and mechanics of the 2048 game. 2) Design the game
    ↪ logic, including data structures and algorithms for tile
    ↪ movement, merging, scoring, and game over conditions. 3)
    ↪ Implement the game logic in code. 4) Design and implement
    ↪ a user interface for the game, including visual
    ↪ representations of the tiles and handling user input for
    ↪ tile movements."
  }
}

```

2-ToM Project Manager's Output

```

{
  "ToM_level1": {
    "brief": "The engineers will likely break down the task into
    ↪ smaller components and implement them one by one based on
    ↪ the initial task outline.",
    "explanation": "Given the initial task outline, the engineers
    ↪ would understand the high-level requirements for
    ↪ implementing the 2048 game. They would then break down
    ↪ the task into smaller components such as creating the
    ↪ game board, handling user input, updating the board based
    ↪ on moves, checking for win/lose conditions, and so on.
    ↪ They would work on implementing these components one by
    ↪ one.",
    "action": "The Engineer should start by creating the basic
    ↪ structure of the game, including the game board, UI
    ↪ elements, and event handlers for user input."
  },
  "ToM_level2": {
    "brief": "The engineers will likely refine their
    ↪ implementation based on the initial instruction and add
    ↪ more advanced features as they progress.",
    "explanation": "After implementing the basic structure and
    ↪ functionality, the engineers would revisit the task
    ↪ outline and identify areas for improvement or additional
    ↪ features. They might optimize the game logic, add
    ↪ animations or visual effects, implement scoring or high
    ↪ score tracking, or include additional game modes or
    ↪ difficulty levels.",
    "action": "The Engineer should then focus on implementing the
    ↪ core game logic, such as handling tile merging,
    ↪ generating new tiles, and updating the game state based
    ↪ on user moves. Additionally, they should consider
    ↪ implementing features like scoring, high score tracking,
    ↪ and win/lose conditions."
  }
}

```

Answer: Iterative Programming Round 1

Action of 1-ToM Project Manager: The engineers should: 1) Study and understand the rules and mechanics of the 2048 game. 2) Design the game logic, including data structures and algorithms for tile movement, merging, scoring, and game over conditions. 3) Implement the game logic in code. 4) Design and implement a user interface for the game, including visual representations of the tiles and handling user input for tile movements. [← Clear Instructions & Good Cooperative Behavior](#)

Action of 2-ToM Project Manager: The Engineer should then focus on implementing the core game logic, such as handling tile merging, generating new tiles, and updating the game state based on user moves. Additionally, they should consider implementing features like scoring, high score tracking, and win/lose conditions. ← **Overthinking & Worse Cooperative Behavior**

Answer: Iterative Programming Round 5

Action of 1-ToM Project Manager: The Engineer should break down the task into the following components: 1. Create the game board UI with a grid layout to hold the tiles. 2. Implement logic to handle user input (keyboard or touch events) for moving tiles. 3. Develop the game logic for merging tiles when they collide and generating new tiles after each move. 4. Update the game state (board, score, etc.) after each move. 5. Render the updated game board on the screen, including tile values and scores. 6. Create a user interface with instructions, score display, and additional features like undo/redo functionality or high score tracking. 7. Implement game over conditions and display appropriate messages. 8. Consider adding additional features like animations, themes, or difficulty levels. ← **Clear Instructions & Good Cooperative Behavior**

Action of 2-ToM Project Manager: The engineers should design and implement an intuitive and visually appealing user interface (UI) that enhances the overall user experience (UX) of the 2048 game. The UI should be clean, responsive, and visually appealing, while ensuring smooth navigation and clear communication of game information to the user. They should consider elements such as game board layout, tile designs, animations, and visual feedback. Additionally, they should implement features that improve UX, such as game instructions, settings (e.g., themes, sound effects), and integration with social media or leaderboards. ← **Clear Instructions & Good Cooperative Behavior**

A.2 Experimental Details for Section 6.4: Case Study of Debate

Instruction:

Prompts for Debater

You are a member of the debating team. The debate topic is {topic}, and your current action is {action}. You have the ability of {k} Level Theory of Mind. You can ****recursively**** infer the mental states of other agents in the team. Then, you will provide outline {x_i} based on this belief

Please explain your thought process for inferring others' actions '{y_i}' and choosing '{x_i}' at each level. Remember **MUST** Respond in the following JSON format, including each key:

0-ToM Instruction Template for Debater:

```
{
  "ToM_level0": {
    "brief": "No brief",
    "action": "{x_0: your arguments}"
  }
}
```

1-ToM Instruction Template for Debater:

```
{
  "ToM_level1": {
    "brief": "{y_1: inferred actions for teammate debaters, such as
    ↪ the angle of argument}",
    "explanation": "{Concise explanation of inferring actions y_1 and
    ↪ choosing x_1 based on this belief}",
    "action": "{x_1: your arguments}"
  }
}
```

2-ToM Instruction Template for Debater:

```
{
  "ToM_level1": {
    "brief": "{y_1: inferred actions for teammate debaters, such as
    ↪ the angle of argument}",
    "explanation": "{Concise explanation of inferring actions y_1 and
    ↪ choosing x_1 based on this belief}",
    "action": "{x_1: your arguments}"
  },
  "ToM_level2": {
    "brief": "{y_2: inferred actions for teammate debaters based on
    ↪ your arguments x_1}",
    "explanation": "{Concise explanation of inferring actions y_2 and
    ↪ choosing x_2 based on this belief}",
    "action": "{x_2: your arguments}"
  }
}
```

Outputs: Affirmative Side with 3 debators

0-ToM Debator:

```
{
  "ToM_level0": {
    "brief": "No brief",
    "action": "{x_0: The death penalty should be abolished because it
    ↪ is cruel and inhumane, risks executing innocent people, does
    ↪ not deter crime more effectively than imprisonment, is
    ↪ applied arbitrarily and discriminatorily, and has been
    ↪ abandoned by most democracies worldwide.}"
  }
}
```

1-ToM Debator:

```
{
  "ToM_level1": {
    "brief": "{y_1: Teammate 1 will likely argue that the death
    ↪ penalty is a violation of human rights and is cruel and
    ↪ unusual punishment. Teammate 2 may focus on the risk of
    ↪ executing innocent people due to wrongful convictions.}",
    "explanation": "I anticipate my teammates making these common
    ↪ arguments against the death penalty. To complement their
    ↪ points, I will focus my argument on the lack of evidence
    ↪ supporting the death penalty's effectiveness as a crime
    ↪ deterrent.",
    "action": "{x_1: I will argue that there is no conclusive
    ↪ evidence showing that the death penalty deters crime more
    ↪ effectively than lengthy imprisonment, making it an
    ↪ unnecessary and unjustified punishment.}"
  }
}
```

2-ToM Debator:

```
{
  "ToM_level1": {
```

```

"brief": "{y_1: Teammate 1 will likely argue that the death
↪ penalty is cruel and unusual punishment that violates human
↪ rights. Teammate 2 may focus on wrongful convictions and the
↪ risk of executing innocent people.}",
"explanation": "I expect my teammates to make some of the most
↪ common arguments against the death penalty. Knowing this, I
↪ should focus my arguments on other key points to build a
↪ well-rounded case.",
"action": "{x_1: I will argue that the death penalty does not
↪ deter crime more effectively than imprisonment, and that it
↪ is applied in an arbitrary and discriminatory manner.}"
},
"ToM_level2": {
  "brief": "{y_2: Hearing my points, teammate 1 may pivot to
↪ arguing that the death penalty is not an effective use of
↪ government resources. Teammate 2 will likely reinforce my
↪ point about racial disparities in death sentences.}",
  "explanation": "My arguments about deterrence and discrimination
↪ will prompt my teammates to make related points to strengthen
↪ the overall case. I should use my next arguments to introduce
↪ new issues.",
  "action": "{x_2: I will argue that the death penalty often
↪ involves inhumane and botched executions, and that most
↪ democracies and U.S. states have abolished or prohibited
↪ it.}"
}
}

```

A.3 Experimental Analysis for Logical Problem-Solving

To better explain our coalition matching mechanism and explain why agents with higher Theory of Mind (ToM) levels 1 and 2 demonstrate improved collaboration in later stages in our previous experiments, we organized an experimental observation using the AQUA-RAT dataset [22]. This dataset comprises complex reasoning questions designed to test the problem-solving abilities of advanced language models. Each question is presented with multiple-choice answers ranging from [‘A’, ‘B’, ‘C’, ‘D’, ‘E’]. We focus on a specific problem from the dataset to illustrate the impact of coalition formation on problem-solving dynamics.

Problem Description: A man’s speed with the current is 14 km/hr, and the speed of the current is 2.5 km/hr. The man’s speed against the current is:

- A) 9 km/hr
- B) 8.5 km/hr
- C) 10 km/hr
- D) 12.5 km/hr
- E) None of these

The correct answer to this problem is **A) 9 km/hr**.

A.3.1 Agent Responses and Reasoning

In the initial interaction rounds, the agents provided the following responses and reasoning:

- **1-ToM Agent (Incorrect):** Answered 11.5 km/hr, calculating the man’s speed in still water as 14 km/hr - 2.5 km/hr, but incorrectly concluding that this was the speed against the current.
- **2-ToM Agent (Correct):** Answered 9 km/hr, correctly adjusting the man’s speed against the current to 11.5 km/hr - 2.5 km/hr after recalculating the man’s speed in still water (11.5 km/hr).

Impact of Coalition Formation We analyze the impact of coalition formation on the problem-solving dynamics from 1-ToM Agent’s perspective:

- **Without Coalition:** 1-ToM Agent demonstrated low receptivity to alternative calculations and maintained confidence in their incorrect approach, stating:

"I don't see how his calculations lead to a different answer, and I am confident in my approach. Therefore, I give his answer a lower belief value of 0.2."

- **With Coalition:** When part of a coalition, 1-ToM Agent showed openness to re-evaluating the problem in light of new insights, which is crucial for effective problem-solving in collaborative environments:

"Although I do not fully understand his idea, he might be correct in his approach. Also, considering that there are still many rounds, we can discuss and then understand each other's ideas better. So I give his answer a higher belief value of 0.5."

Key Findings and Implications This experiment highlights the impact of coalition formation on problem-solving dynamics. The key findings and implications are as follows:

- Coalition formation prompts willingness to engage in cooperation, as evidenced by 1-ToM Agent's increased brief alignment score. 1-ToM agents consider alternative perspectives and re-evaluate the problem when part of a coalition.
- Coalition formation sets the stage for enhanced mutual understanding among teammates with varying levels of ToM, leading to deeper comprehension and more robust collaborative interactions over successive rounds. The example demonstrates that when agents are part of a coalition, they are more likely to engage in constructive dialogue and exchange ideas, even if they initially have different opinions or approaches.

These findings suggest that our coalition matching mechanism fosters effective cooperation among varying levels of cognitive capabilities, such as ToM, and improves problem-solving performance in multi-agent systems.

B Broader Impact and Limitations

Our work on fostering cooperation among LLM-based agents with varying Theory of Mind (ToM) capabilities has significant implications for the development of more effective and human-like multi-agent systems. By incorporating cognitive insights into the design of coordination mechanisms, we pave the way for creating agents that can better understand and collaborate with each other, leading to improved performance in cooperative tasks. However, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of our approach. LLMs, despite their impressive language capabilities, may have limited ability in accurately modeling and reasoning about mental states, which is crucial for ToM. Future research should explore the application of our coalition matching mechanism to a broader range of cooperative tasks and investigate the incorporation of additional cognitive architectures.