

Symmetry-Breaking Augmentations for Ad Hoc Teamwork

Ravi Hammond^{1,2} Dustin Craggs^{1,3} Mingyu Guo³ Jakob Foerster² Ian Reid^{1,4}

Abstract

In many collaborative settings, artificial intelligence (AI) agents must be able to adapt to new teammates that use unknown or previously unobserved strategies. While often simple for humans, this can be challenging for AI agents. For example, if an AI agent learns to drive alongside others (a training set) that only drive on one side of the road, it may struggle to adapt this experience to coordinate with drivers on the opposite side, even if their behaviours are simply flipped along the left-right *symmetry*. To address this we introduce *symmetry-breaking augmentations* (SBA), which increases diversity in the behaviour of training teammates by applying a symmetry-flipping operation. By learning a best-response to the augmented set of teammates, our agent is exposed to a wider range of *behavioural conventions*, improving performance when deployed with *novel* teammates. We demonstrate this experimentally in two settings, and show that our approach improves upon previous ad hoc teamwork results in the challenging card game Hanabi. We also propose a general metric for estimating symmetry-dependency amongst a given set of policies.

1. Introduction

Humans and artificial agents alike use a diverse range of *conventions* when interacting with one another. These conventions are used to communicate and coordinate with others, and are crucial for effective teamwork in many multi-agent settings. They range in complexity from knowing which side of the road to drive on to coordinating using a shared language. For agents to effectively coordinate with others, they must develop an understanding of their conventions,

¹Australian Institute for Machine Learning, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia ²Department of Engineering Science, University of Oxford, Oxford, England ³School of Computer and Mathematical Sciences, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia ⁴Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence. Correspondence to: Ravi Hammond <ravi.hammond@adelaide.edu.au>.



Figure 1. Augmenting conventions of other agents. The driver stops at red and drives on green (top), but with SBA, our agent sees the driver stopping and starting with many colours (bottom).

especially when coordination failures can lead to severe consequences such as vehicle collisions.

This problem of adapting to previously unseen teammates has been formalised as ad hoc teamwork (AHT) (Stone et al., 2010). One method of training and evaluating an AHT agent is to use reinforcement learning (RL) to learn a *best response* (BR) to a training population of teammates (Fudenberg & Tirole, 1991) (more formally defined in Section 2.2) and then evaluate against a test set of held-out agents. The key challenge therefore is *generalising* to unseen policies after only being exposed to a subset of possible strategies during training. Furthermore, due to symmetries, the space of possible conventions is often combinatorial even in simple environments, making it computationally challenging to compute best responses even if the population of training partners was sufficiently large to cover the distribution. Children reduce this computational burden by transferring existing knowledge to equivalent symmetries by utilising higher-level reasoning (Beasty, 1987). In contrast, Chimpanzees have been observed to fail these symmetry tests (Dugdale & Lowe, 2000). AI agents also struggle with this, from computer vision models failing to generalise to different coloured images (Galstyan et al., 2022), to cooperative agents that cannot recognise when teammates are using symmetry-equivalent conventions (Hu et al., 2020).

To address this, we introduce *symmetry-breaking augmen-*

tations (SBA), a policy augmentation technique that alters the behaviour of agents in the training pool by making them break symmetries in different ways. SBA acts as an operator that can be applied to other agents in an environment, flipping their behaviours along environmental symmetries. When symmetries are present, this combinatorially amplifies the range of conventions that the ad hoc agent is exposed to. Thus, even with a relatively small training population, SBA allows RL agents to learn to adapt to a much more diverse set of conventions during training. When deployed, we show that SBA agents exhibit improved performance when collaborating with previously unseen teammates.

For example, consider a traffic conductor learning to direct drivers. Initially the conductor is unaware of what colour conventions drivers may use for stop and go. As shown in Figure 1, SBA can be used to create new training experiences by altering the observed colours. This prevents the conductor from over-fitting to the potentially limited conventions of its training partners, and provides experiences that enable adaptation to different conventions in the future.

SBA is most effective when the agents in the training population use symmetry-breaking conventions. For this we introduce the *Augmentation Impact* (AugImp) metric, which measures the extent to which a specific augmentation alters policies within a population. This enables us to analyse a population prior to training to predict how effective an augmentation will be at improving AHT performance.

We also introduce a proof-of-concept matrix game to demonstrate how SBA improves performance in the presence of training partners that use symmetry-based conventions. We also evaluate SBA in Hanabi (Bard et al., 2020), an ideal environment for testing AHT adaptability to teammates with a variety of conventions. In Hanabi, independently trained agents frequently develop incompatible conventions, even when trained with the same algorithm (Hu et al., 2020). A successful AHT Hanabi agent needs to quickly infer and adapt to the conventions of its teammates while not triggering unexpected responses.

SBA amplifies the diversity of conventions agents are exposed to during training, thus reducing the likelihood of overfitting to certain specific conventions when the training population does not cover all possibilities. We experiment by training an AHT agent with existing Hanabi populations of simplified action decoder (Hu & Foerster, 2019) and independent Q-learning (Tan, 1993) policies, with training populations of three different sizes each. We show that in Hanabi, SBA leads to improvements of up to 17% game score when adapting to previously unseen teammates from the same population. Additionally, we show that SBA improves performance when generalising outside of the training distribution to a population of Other Play agents (Hu et al., 2020).

To summarise, our contributions are:

- SBA, a general method of augmenting a training population for AHT which amplifies the diversity of conventions the ad hoc agent is exposed to during training.
- A general metric that measures the effectiveness of policy augmentation techniques for AHT by measuring how much they diversify behaviours in a training population.
- Evaluating SBA in Hanabi, and showing that it displays state-of-the-art performance for AHT.

2. Background

2.1. Dec-POMDPs

We formalise the cooperative multi-agent setting as a decentralised partially-observable Markov Decision Process (Dec-POMDP) (Nair et al., 2003). The Dec-POMDP, G , is a 9-tuple $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^i\}_{i=1}^n, \{\mathcal{O}^i\}_{i=1}^n, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R}, T, \gamma)$, with finite sets $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^i\}_{i=1}^n, \{\mathcal{O}^i\}_{i=1}^n$, respectively denoting the set of agents, states, actions, and observations, where i denotes the set pertaining to agent $i \in \mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, n\}$. \mathcal{A}^i and \mathcal{O}^i are the set of actions and observations for agent i , and $a^i \in \mathcal{A}^i$ and $o^i \in \mathcal{O}^i$ are a specific action and observation that agent i may take and observe. We also write $\mathcal{A} = \times_{i=1}^n \mathcal{A}^i$ and $\mathcal{O} = \times_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}^i$, as the sets of joint actions and observations, respectively. $s_t \in \mathcal{S}$ is the state at time t , and $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$ is the joint action of all agents at time t , which changes the state according to the transition distribution $s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{T}(\cdot | s_t, a_t)$. The subsequent joint observation of the agents, $o_{t+1} \in \mathcal{O}$, is distributed according to $o_{t+1} = \mathcal{U}(\cdot | s_{t+1}, a_t)$, where $\mathcal{U} = \times_{i=1}^n \mathcal{U}^i$. At time t , the joint observation o_t is appended to the trajectory $\tau_t = (o_1, a_1, \dots, o_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, o_t)$, and each agent i individually decides its own action a_t^i based on its policy $\pi^i(a_t^i | \tau_t^i)$, which is conditioned on its action-observation history (AOH) $\tau_t^i = (o_1^i, a_1^i, \dots, o_{t-1}^i, a_{t-1}^i, o_t^i)$. π^i represents agent i 's component of the decentralized joint policy $\pi \in \Pi$, where Π is the set of all possible joint-policies in the environment G . When G transitions to state s_{t+1} , all agents receive a common reward $r_{t+1} \in \mathbb{R}$ according to the distribution $r_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{R}(\cdot | s_{t+1}, a_t)$. The behaviour of a joint-policy π is characterised by the distribution of trajectories τ it produces, and, taking into account the time horizon T and discount factor $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, is optimal if it maximises the expected return:

$$J(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} r_t \right]. \quad (1)$$

2.2. Ad Hoc Teamwork

Ad hoc teamwork (AHT) is the problem of creating an agent that is able to collaborate effectively with a group of novel teammates. This has been a long-standing challenge in the

field of artificial intelligence (Stone et al., 2010; Bard et al., 2020).

We use π_A to represent the AHT agent, and π_j for the teammate’s joint-policy. To evaluate the performance of our AHT joint-policy $\pi_A = (\pi_A^1, \dots, \pi_A^n)$ and the teammate joint-policy π_j , using Equation 1, we obtain the average expected AHT return by matching each individual component of π_A , i.e. π_A^i , with all other $n - 1$ components of π_j , i.e. π_j^i . This objective is formalised by:

$$J_{AHT}(\pi_A, \pi_j) = \frac{1}{n} (J(\pi_A^1, \pi_j^2, \dots, \pi_j^n) + \dots + J(\pi_j^1, \dots, \pi_j^{n-1}, \pi_A^n)), \quad (2)$$

A simple approach towards AHT is for the ad hoc agent π_A to learn a best-response policy π_A^* to a training set $\Pi^{train} \in \Pi$ by interacting with each policy $\pi_j \in \Pi^{train}$, and maximising Equation 2. We formally define this objective as:

$$\pi_A^*(\Pi^{train}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi_A} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_j \sim \Pi^{train}} [J_{AHT}(\pi_A, \pi_j)], \quad (3)$$

where π_j is sampled uniformly from Π^{train} . The learned AHT policy, $\pi_A^*(\Pi^{train})$, is then evaluated using the robustness measure, $M_{\Pi^{eval}}(\pi_A^*(\Pi^{train}))$, which evaluates Equation 2 while interacting with previously unseen policies from the evaluation policy set $\Pi^{eval} \in \Pi$. This measure is formally given by:

$$M_{\Pi^{eval}}(\pi_A^*(\Pi^{train})) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_j \sim \Pi^{eval}} J_{AHT}(\pi_A^*(\Pi^{train}), \pi_j), \quad (4)$$

where π_j is sampled uniformly from Π^{eval} .

2.3. Deep Multi-Agent RL

Deep Multi-Agent RL (MARL) has been successfully applied to a number of Dec-POMDP settings including Starcraft II (Schroeder de Witt et al., 2019), Hanabi (Foerster et al., 2019), and negotiation tasks (Zhou et al., 2023). In Hanabi, our implementation of the SBA algorithm introduced later uses Recurrent Replay Distributed Deep Q-Networks (R2D2) (Kapturowski et al., 2018) as its network architecture. Deep Q-Learning (Mnih et al., 2015) is a training regime used in RL where an agent learns to predict the expected total return $Q^*(\tau_t^i, a_t^i)$ for each action a_t^i , given the action-observation history τ_t^i . This is formalised by:

$$Q^*(\tau_t^i, a_t^i) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{t+1}^i \sim \pi} [r_t + \gamma \operatorname{argmax}_{a_{t+1}^i} Q^*(\tau_{t+1}^i, a_{t+1}^i)]. \quad (5)$$

R2D2, which was state-of-the-art at some point, uses many modern best practices such as double-DQN (Van Hasselt et al., 2016), dueling network architecture (Wang et al.,




Figure 2. The ϕ operator converts green observations to red (left), and ϕ^{-1} inversely converts red actions back to green (right). In this game red and green are symmetrically-equivalent, so the application of ϕ and ϕ^{-1} leaves the game unchanged up to relabelling.

2016), prioritized experience replay (Schaul et al., 2015), distributed training with parallel environments (Horgan et al., 2018), and a recurrent network to handle partial observability (Graves, 2012).

The straightforward way of applying Q-Learning to the Dec-POMDP setting is by using Independent Q-Learning (IQL) (Tan, 1993), where an agent assumes that all other teammates are a part of the environment, and independently learns to estimate the expected return without taking any of the other agents actions into account during the bootstrap process in Equation 5. Past work has proposed that the Q-function can be learned by sharing neural network weights θ for each policy component (Hu et al., 2021), while our AHT agent also shares network weights, but disregards the transitions experienced by other agents in the environment.

2.4. Equivalence Mappings

To improve coordination with unseen teammates in the Dec-POMDP setting, domain knowledge can be exploited to prevent agents from using policies that arbitrarily break symmetries. One such example, other-play (OP) (Hu et al., 2020), which is a method that we build our work on top of, achieves this by training agents in self-play (Tesauro, 1994) to maximise expected return while randomly matched with symmetry-equivalent policies of their training time partners. The OP learning rule of a joint-policy π , is formalised by maximising the following objective:

$$\pi^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\phi \sim \Phi} [J(\pi^1, \phi(\pi^2))], \quad (6)$$

where ϕ is sampled uniformly from Φ , which is the the class of equivalence mappings (symmetries) for the given Dec-POMDP G , such that each $\phi \in \Phi$ is an automorphism of \mathcal{S} , \mathcal{A} , and \mathcal{O} onto itself, and leaves G unchanged up to relabeling. For ease of notation, ϕ is shorthand for

$$\phi \in \Phi = \{\phi_S, \phi_A, \phi_O\}, \quad (7)$$

where each $\phi \in \Phi$ acts on the action-observation history as

$$\phi(\tau_t) = (\phi(o_0), \phi(a_0), \dots, \phi(a_{t-1}), \phi(o_t)), \quad (8)$$

and acts on policies as

$$\hat{\pi} = \phi(\pi) \iff \hat{\pi}(\phi^{-1}(a)|\phi(\tau)) = \pi(a|\tau). \quad (9)$$

Policies π , $\hat{\pi}$ in Equation 9 are said to be symmetry-equivalent to one another with respect to ϕ . Illustrated in Figure 2, using ϕ , the augmented policy $\hat{\pi}^i$ experiences a symmetrically-equivalent version of τ_t^i , and its actions are converted back to their original mapping with ϕ^{-i} . While OP uses ϕ to prevent symmetry-breaking conventions for ZSC, our work applies ϕ to the AHT setting, improving robustness (Equation 12) by increasing the variety of conventions present in the training set Π^{train} .

3. Symmetry-Breaking Augmentations

One of the biggest challenges in AHT is predicting the conventions that test-time policies will use and determining how a training population should be selected so that its best response is robust to these conventions. In the following, we introduce SBA, a method that addresses this problem by augmenting the training population through the random matching of the AHT agent with symmetry-equivalent policies of training teammates. We will discuss SBA both as a formal method and as a scalable algorithm-agnostic framework applicable to the deep RL setting.

3.1. SBA Objective

We start by introducing the SBA learning rule which uses the set of equivalence mappings $\phi \in \Phi$ from Section 2.4 to diversify a training population Π^{train} such that the best-response is robust to a larger variety of conventions.

The intuitive approach is to apply a different ϕ to each teammate π_j^i to maximise the variety of teams encountered. However, in a fully-collaborative Dec-POMDP, using different ϕ 's breaks coordination between teammates, so the same ϕ needs to be applied to each $n - 1$ component of π_j . An operation of order $O(n)$. Moreover, if π_j^i is a physical agent acting in the real world, then ϕ can't even be applied because we don't have access to its actions and observations.

Since there exists an inverse $\phi^{-1} \in \Phi$ for each $\phi \in \Phi$, applying ϕ to the AHT agent π_A is equivalent to applying ϕ^{-1} to π_j , where from π_A 's perspective, the teammate policy's conventions are altered in the same way. Consequently, the AHT expected returns (Equation 2) are equivalent:

$$J_{AHT}(\phi(\pi_A), \pi_j) \iff J_{AHT}(\pi_A, \phi^{-1}(\pi_j)). \quad (10)$$

By applying ϕ to π_A , we're guaranteed to always be able to alter π_j 's perceived conventions, and its application is of




Figure 3. Symmetry-breaking augmentations for an n -player Dec-POMDP. The equivalence map ϕ is only applied to the observations and actions of our AHT agent π_A , not the teammate policy π_j .

order $O(1)$. With this, our AHT agent π_A learns the optimal best-response (SBA^*) to Π^{train} that has been augmented with Φ , by interacting with each policy $\pi_j \in \Pi^{train}$, applying $\phi \in \Phi$ to π_A , and maximising the expected AHT return (Equation 2). We formally define this objective as:

$$\pi_A^*(\Pi^{train}) = \underset{\pi}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_j \sim \Pi^{train}, \phi \sim \Phi} [J_{AHT}(\phi(\pi_A), \pi_j)], \quad (11)$$

where π_j and ϕ are uniformly sampled from Π^{train} and Φ respectively. To evaluate the robustness when interacting with an unseen evaluation set Π^{eval} , we use the same robustness measure from Equation 12, $M_{\Pi^{eval}}(\pi_A^*(\Pi^{train}))$, and also apply equivalence mappings to the evaluation policies to reduce the evaluation variance (effectively generating a larger test-population). This measure is formally given by:

$$M_{\Pi^{eval}}(\pi_A^*(\Pi^{train})) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_j \sim \Pi^{eval}, \phi \sim \Phi} J_{AHT}(\phi(\pi_A^*(\Pi^{train})), \pi_j), \quad (12)$$

where π_j and ϕ are sampled uniformly from Π^{eval} and Φ .

3.2. Algorithm

The idea behind SBA is simple: As shown in Figure 3, each of the AHT agents observations o_t^i are mapped with ϕ to an equivalent state with relabelled symmetries, π_A^i chooses an action a_t^i , and the action is inversely relabelled with ϕ^{-1} before being applied to the environment. The permuted observations and actions are appended to π_A^i 's AOH τ^i , which is used to update the model. Notice that ϕ influences the agent's actions and observations, not the environment dynamics, and therefore any RL learning algorithm can be used to update the model, like DQN (Mnih et al., 2015), DDPG (Lillicrap et al., 2015), A3C (Mnih et al., 2016), or PPO (Schulman et al., 2017).

In the simplest version of our algorithm, all of the AHT agents transitions, $\mathbb{T} = (\tau_t^i, a_t^i, r_{t:t+n}, \tau_{t+n}^i)$ are stored,

where $r_{t:t+n} = \sum_{t'=t}^{t+n} r_{t'}$ is the sum of all rewards received between time step t and $t+n$, and \mathbb{T} is used to update the model. See Algorithm 1 for a more formal description.

Algorithm 1 Symmetry-Breaking Augmentations

Input: algorithm \mathbb{A} , Dec-POMDP G , population Π^{train}
Initialise: \mathbb{A} , equivalence mappings Φ from G
for each episode **do**
 $\pi_j \leftarrow$ teammate policy sampled from Π^{train}
 $\phi \leftarrow$ equivalence mapping sampled from Φ
 $s_0, \tau_0 \leftarrow$ initial state and history
 for each step t **do**
 append observation o_t^i from s_t to AOH τ_t^i
 $a_t^i \leftarrow$ sample action using the policy from \mathbb{A} :
 $\phi^{-1}(\pi_A^i(\cdot | \phi(\tau_t^i)))$
 append action a_t^i to AOH τ_t^i
 for each teammate component π_j^{-i} **do**
 append observation o_t^{-i} from s_t to AOH τ_t^{-i}
 $a_t^{-i} \leftarrow$ sample action from $\pi_j^{-i}(\cdot | \tau_t^{-i})$
 append action a_t^{-i} to AOH τ_t^{-i}
 end for
 take joint-action a_t , observe r_t , and s_{t+1}
 end for
 for each AHT agent turn t **do**
 $r_{t:t+n} \leftarrow$ sum rewards from r_t to r_{t+n}
 $\mathbb{T} \leftarrow$ transition $(\tau_t^i, a_t^i, r_{t:t+n}, \tau_{t+n}^i)$
 perform one step of optimisation using \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{T}
 end for
end for

3.3. Augmentation Impact

We aim to increase the diversity of training partners by applying SBA to each member of the training population, and hypothesize that this will lead to better generalisation in the AHT setting. However, if the training agents barely rely on symmetry-based conventions, SBA will have little effect, i.e. $\phi(\pi_j) \approx \pi_j, \forall \pi_j \in \Pi^{train}, \forall \phi \in \Phi$.

Since training an AHT agent can be expensive, it is useful to quantify how much SBA will diversify a population prior to training. For this, we introduce *Augmentation Impact* (AugImp), a metric that takes a population Π , a set of equivalence mappings Φ , and for each pair of policies $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi$, measures the absolute difference of the cross-play scores (Lupu et al., 2021) before and after each augmentation $\phi \in \Phi$. AugImp is formalised by:

$$\text{AugImp}(\Pi, \Phi) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_1 \sim \Pi, \pi_2 \sim \Pi, \phi \sim \Phi} [|J_{\text{XP}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - J_{\text{XP}}(\phi(\pi_1), \phi(\pi_2))|], \quad (13)$$

where π_1, π_2 , and ϕ are uniformly sampled from Π and Φ respectively. The bigger the AugImp score, the more Π is diversified by Φ , and the better effect that SBA will have




Figure 4. In the iterated lever coordination game agents can see what actions were previously taken. The game highlights the difficulty of adapting to conventions not seen during training.




Figure 5. Training curves for the iterated lever coordination game. Shown is the mean, shading is the standard error of the mean, across 30 different seeds. SBA improves test performance because it exposes the agent to more conventions during training.

when training an AHT agent with that population.

4. Iterated Lever Game Experiments

We first test SBA in a simple fully cooperative environment where agents are tasked to coordinate by pulling one of ten possible levers. As shown in Figure 4, a reward of 1 is paid out if both players pick the same lever, otherwise they get nothing. The game is played twice, but in the second round the players are able to see what lever their partner previously pulled. If agents could coordinate beforehand they would always pull the same lever, but when playing with an unknown teammate there is no way to coordinate on the first round. To apply SBA to the lever game, since a permutation of the levers leaves the game unchanged, we use this as our class of symmetries.

We train our AHT agent with a population of five different teammates that each deterministically pull one of the levers, and evaluate with ten policies that pull all ten levers. We refer to Appendix A for more details on the implementation. The code is available online without downloading: <https://bit.ly/lever-game-sba>.

The results are shown in Figure 5, where, as expected, all agents randomly choose a lever in the first round. In the second round, during training the baseline (BR) always

successfully switches to the correct lever for a return of 1.2, but only scores 0.6 at test time because it doesn’t expect the other five levers to be pulled. Our SBA agent, however, experiences all levers during training, so is able to adapt to all teammates for a total score of 1.1 in both training and testing.

5. Hanabi Experiments

We now test SBA in the more complex environment of Hanabi. Hanabi is a fully-cooperative, partially-observable board game that has become a popular benchmark (Bard et al., 2020) for MARL, theory of mind, and AHT research.

In Hanabi, each card has one of five colours and a number from one to five (a “rank”). Players aim to stack these cards by colour in ascending order of rank by playing cards from their hand. The twist is that players cannot observe their own hands. Only your teammates can observe your hand, and they must share information with you to inform your decisions. If a player attempts to play a card that cannot contribute to any of the ordered stacks, a bomb is triggered. Players “bomb out” after three bombs are triggered, losing the game and receiving a score of 0. Otherwise, the final score is the number of cards successfully played, at most 25. Communication is restricted, making conventions essential to consistently achieve a high score and avoid bombouts.

5.1. Teammate Selection

Before training our agent, a teammate policy population needs to be selected. Since there exists a range of pre-trained Hanabi agent populations online, we use AugImp (Equation 13) to guide the selection. We analyse the AugImp scores for four populations: 13 simplified action decoder (SAD), 12 independent Q-learning (IQL), 12 other-play (OP) models, and 5 off-belief learning (OBL) models (pre-trained weights for these models are available on GitHub¹²).

To calculate the crossplay scores for each pair of policies π_1 and π_2 and each augmentation ϕ , we take the mean score over 1000 games. Figure 6 shows the AugImp scores for each population. The scores for SAD and IQL are much larger than OP and OBL, which is expected because OP and OBL are designed to use conventions that don’t break symmetries. For a complete breakdown of the AugImp score distributions for each policy pairing, see Appendix B. Since SBA increases the diversity of SAD and IQL, we use these populations for training because we expect the largest AHT performance improvement.

¹https://github.com/facebookresearch/hanabi_SAD

²<https://github.com/facebookresearch/off-belief-learning>




Figure 6. Augmentation Impact (AugImp) for Hanabi populations. SAD and IQL populations have a larger AugImp than OP and OBL, because they contain policies with more symmetry-breaking conventions.

5.2. Experiment Setup

SBA can be used to augment a training population for any AHT algorithm as long as *known* symmetries exist within the environment and can be applied to the data. In Hanabi, we implement SBA on top of independent Q-learning (IQL), which has also been used as the foundation for other works that have previously achieved SOTA performance in selfplay and crossplay (Hu & Foerster, 2019; Hu et al., 2020; 2021). Our implementation is based on the open-source code for OBL², which uses the R2D2 network (Kapturowski et al., 2018), and we have extended to support training best response agents for AHT. See Appendix C.1 for more details on the implementation.

5.3. Best response agents

We train AHT agents using the pre-trained SAD and IQL populations, and evaluate their ad hoc generalisation to held-out partners. We create a number of testing and training splits for each population (similarly to Muglich et al. (2022b)). Each population is randomly divided into *small*, *medium*, or *large* training/test splits: *small* splits have 1 training policy, *medium* splits have 6, and *large* training sets contain all but 2 policies from the population. The remaining policies form the test set for that split. Smaller split sizes are more challenging, as our AHT agents are exposed to a more limited set of partners during training. We randomly sample 10 different partitions for *medium* and *large* training sets, and run all possible partitions for *small* (13 for SAD and 12 for IQL). See Appendix C.2 for details on train-test splits.

5.4. Ad Hoc Teamwork Results

Here we examine the impact of SBA on AHT performance to the held-out test agents for SAD and IQL. For each of the train/test splits outlined above, we train a standard best

Symmetry-Breaking Augmentations for Ad Hoc Teamwork

Train Size	Agent	SAD \uparrow	IQL \uparrow
small	BR	8.15 \pm 1.28	11.52 \pm 1.08
	SBA (ours)	9.12 \pm 1.42	11.84 \pm 0.99
medium	Gen. Belief	12.47 \pm 1.02	-
	BR	13.09 \pm 0.49	15.04 \pm 0.37
	SBA (ours)	15.40 \pm 0.49	16.08 \pm 0.42
large	BR	14.69 \pm 1.05	15.34 \pm 0.80
	SBA (ours)	16.34 \pm 1.29	15.95 \pm 0.71

Table 1. SBA performance in Hanabi for *small*, *medium*, and *large* training set sizes. The reported score for generalized beliefs (Gen. Belief) on the SAD *medium* split size. Shown is the standard error of the mean (s.e.m) across the *small*, *medium*, and *large* training train-test splits respectively. The maximum score in Hanabi is 25.

response with and without SBA. Each agent is evaluated on the held out test agents from its training split.

Table 1 outlines the mean performance for each of the populations and split sizes. In all cases, SBA improves performance over the baseline. For the *medium* SAD splits we also compare to the best result for this population from Generalized Beliefs (see Section 6.1) (Muglich et al., 2022b). Our method improves upon this previous state-of-the-art by an average of 2.93 points³.

We perform two-tailed Monte Carlo permutation tests (Dwass, 1957) to estimate whether there is a statistically significant difference between the baseline and SBA. For medium and large split sizes, we find that SBA confers a statistically significant advantage over the baseline to the level $\alpha = 0.01$. For small split sizes, we find that the improvement is statistically significant to the level $\alpha = 0.05$. This shows that applying SBA while training an AHT agent in this context consistently improves performance, making it essential for AHT when symmetry-based conventions exist within the training population.




Figure 7. Frequency of the *hint colour* action played. SBA hints colours less often when the training set uses symmetry breaking conventions.

We also examine the effect of SBA when applied to OP agents. We train baseline and SBA agents on *medium* OP

³Our baseline (BR) also outperforms Generalised Beliefs because we base our work on the newer and more fine-tuned OBL implementation.

Train Set	Agent	SAD \uparrow	IQL \uparrow	OP \uparrow	OBL \uparrow
SAD	BR	-	15.22 \pm 0.25	15.69 \pm 0.26	4.51 \pm 0.21
	SBA (ours)	-	16.71 \pm 0.22	17.72 \pm 0.26	3.85 \pm 0.16
IQL	BR	13.23 \pm 0.15	-	15.71 \pm 0.24	5.73 \pm 0.24
	SBA (ours)	13.70 \pm 0.19	-	16.42 \pm 0.16	5.50 \pm 0.20

Table 2. *Symmetry-Breaking Conventions* performance in Hanabi for *medium*, training set sizes, cooperating with out-of-distribution populations. Shown is the standard error of the mean (s.e.m) across 13, 10, and 10 training splits respectively.

train/test splits. Intuitively, OP trains agents to be equivariant under symmetries which should render SBA ineffective. Indeed, the baseline agents achieve an average score of 19.27 ± 0.42 with the held-out partners, while our SBA agents score 19.39 ± 0.42 . We find that this difference is *not statistically significant*, indicating that SBA does not degrade performance even when applied to a population with lower AugImp variance under colour permutation.

To gain insight into why SBA improves performance (whenever it does work!), we analyse how often each agent gives *colour hints* (Figure 7). When an SBA agent is trained with SAD and IQL splits, it hints colours significantly less often compared to a baseline agent. Due to random symmetry breaking, hinting colours risks eliciting an unexpected reaction from the teammate, and SBA learns to avoid this. Instead it learns to use other means of hinting, such as using rank. When trained with OP, however, given OP’s low AugImp variance (Figure 6), it hints colours roughly as often as the baseline.

5.5. Generalisation to Other Populations

The previous experiment examines how SBA affects generalisation to held-out teammates from the same population as those used for training (either SAD or IQL). Here, we investigate whether SBA is effective at creating policies that can transfer to entirely different populations. We take the *medium* split size agents from the previous experiment, and evaluate them when paired with teammates from these different populations.

Table 2 outlines our results. SBA agents trained on SAD exhibit improved transfer performance to the IQL and OP populations. Applying the same significance testing as in the previous experiment, we find that these results are significant to the level $\alpha = 0.01$. Similarly for agents trained with IQL partners, we find that SBA confers a statistically significant advantage when playing with OP agents (to the level $\alpha = 0.05$). Additional results with all split sizes and OP-trained SBA and baseline agents are available in Appendix D.

We also see that SBA can *harm* performance when transferring to the OBL population. For SBA agents trained

with SAD, we find this detrimental effect to be statistically significant to the level $\alpha = 0.01$. OBL policies require explicit colour information approximately 65% of the time for cards that they play (Hu et al., 2021), and thus rely on colour hints. SBA agents exhibit much lower frequency of providing these colour hints to the partner (Figure 7). We hypothesize that this is one of the main reasons why SBA harms performance in this case.

6. Related Work

6.1. Ad hoc Teamwork

There have been a number of works that address the Ad Hoc Teamwork (AHT) problem. One such technique is Generalised Beliefs that uses belief models to assist with generalisation (Muglich et al., 2022b). Belief models are used to provide latent representations of trajectories to a policy model and assist with search rollouts for action selection. They show that this leads to improvements in AHT scores in Hanabi. This technique, however, requires an additional step to train the belief model prior to AHT agent training.

Several approaches achieve generalisation to held-out policies by training a best response to a diverse population (Lowe et al., 2017; Charakorn et al., 2020; McKee et al., 2022), often by training this population using an approach that encourages diversity. Approaches include minimising performance between policies while maximising individual self-play scores (Charakorn et al., 2022; Cui et al., 2022; Rahman et al., 2023b) and finding minimum coverage sets that span the policy space (Rahman et al., 2023a; Lauffer et al., 2023). Canaan et al. (2022) use hand-crafted rules to find diverse agents that have been trained using genetic algorithms and Yu et al. (2023) introduce sub-optimal biases into the reward function. While this ensures diversity in the training teammates, training large enough populations can be prohibitively expensive given the range of possible conventions.

6.2. Zero-shot Coordination

In zero-shot coordination (ZSC), agents must coordinate with new teammates that are also optimised for ZSC. Example solution approaches to this problem address symmetries in conventions by training agents in self-play with symmetry-equivalent versions of themselves (Hu et al., 2020; Treutlein et al., 2021), incorporating symmetrization into the network architecture (Muglich et al., 2022a), or using belief models to find optimal grounded policies that assume all previous actions were taken by the uniform random policy (Hu et al., 2021). While these techniques achieve high scores in ZSC, they are designed to avoid use of specialised conventions, and fail to coordinate with policies that do use these conventions.

6.3. Social Conventions

Like humans who use social conventions to facilitate coordination (Hechter & Opp, 2001; Lewis, 2008), artificial learning agents are also known to exploit conventions to cooperate (Airiau et al., 2014). The issue, however, is that in many collaborative settings there are multiple optimal strategies under self-play (Tesauro, 1994), but no guarantee that two independently trained agents will converge to policies with compatible conventions (Foerster et al., 2019; Hu & Foerster, 2019; Hu et al., 2020).

Solutions have been proposed to encourage learning agents to better converge to test-time conventions. Such as revealing test-time observations during training (Lerer & Peysakhovich, 2019), learning with human behavioral-cloned models to better coordinate with real humans (Carroll et al., 2019), exploiting the similarity between action and observation features to take human-like actions (Ma et al., 2023), and by training with teammates that have hidden biases to better coordinate with sub-optimal humans (Yu et al., 2023). While interesting directions, these methods make assumptions about what conventions the test-time policies will use, whereas our approach exploits and diversifies the conventions that already exist within a training population.

7. Conclusion

In this work we have shown that by applying a simple augmentation to the basic AHT learning framework, which we call *symmetry-breaking augmentations*, we can construct agents that are better able to coordinate in the AHT setting with partners they have not seen before. Our method achieves state-of-the-art performance when evaluated with a diverse collection of policies that, especially the case of the SAD policies, were unable to collaborate well in cross-play due to their high degree of symmetrical conventional specialization. We have shown that SBA always improves performance, even with varying sizes of training sets. We have defined SBA generally, shown how to implement it with deep RL, and shown that through experiments in the cooperative card game Hanabi, SBA can construct robust agents that can play well with other artificial agents it has never seen before.

In future work we will investigate how SBA could be utilised in other algorithmic innovations like search, shuffling symmetries in search rollouts (Sutton & Barto, 2018) to create a more robust expectation of the teammate policy’s future actions. We will also apply SBA to a larger variety of Dec-POMDP’s, such as ones that have disjoint sets of equivalent states and even agents that observe and act in the real world. Since there exist a large number of symmetries in the real world, we believe that the key SBA ideas could be used to augment the experiences of real-world agents.

Impact Statement

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the field of Machine Learning. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

References

- Airiau, S., Sen, S., and Villatoro, D. Emergence of conventions through social learning. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 28(5):779–804, 2014.
- 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.
- Beasty, A. *The role of language in the emergence of equivalence relations: A developmental study*. PhD thesis, University College of North Wales, 1987.
- Canaan, R., Gao, X., Togelius, J., Nealen, A., and Menzel, S. Generating and adapting to diverse ad-hoc partners in hanabi. *IEEE Transactions on Games*, 2022.
- Carroll, M., Shah, R., Ho, M. K., Griffiths, T., Seshia, S., Abbeel, P., and Dragan, A. On the utility of learning about humans for human-ai coordination. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Charakorn, R., Manoonpong, P., and Dilokthanakul, N. Investigating partner diversification methods in cooperative multi-agent deep reinforcement learning. In *Neural Information Processing: 27th International Conference, ICONIP 2020, Bangkok, Thailand, November 18–22, 2020, Proceedings, Part V 27*, pp. 395–402. Springer, 2020.
- Charakorn, R., Manoonpong, P., and Dilokthanakul, N. Generating diverse cooperative agents by learning incompatible policies. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Cui, B., Lupu, A., Sokota, S., Hu, H., Wu, D. J., and Foerster, J. N. Adversarial diversity in hanabi. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Dugdale, N. and Lowe, C. F. Testing for symmetry in the conditional discriminations of language-trained chimpanzees. *Journal of the experimental analysis of behavior*, 73(1):5–22, 2000.
- Dwass, M. Modified randomization tests for nonparametric hypotheses. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pp. 181–187, 1957.
- Foerster, J., Song, F., Hughes, E., Burch, N., Dunning, I., Whiteson, S., Botvinick, M., and Bowling, M. Bayesian action decoder for deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1942–1951. PMLR, 2019.
- Fudenberg, D. and Tirole, J. *Game theory*. MIT press, 1991.
- Galstyan, T., Harutyunyan, H., Khachatrian, H., Steeg, G. V., and Galstyan, A. Failure modes of domain generalization algorithms. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 19077–19086, 2022.
- Graves, A. Long short-term memory. *Supervised sequence labelling with recurrent neural networks*, pp. 37–45, 2012.
- Hechter, M. and Opp, K.-D. Social norms. 2001.
- Horgan, D., Quan, J., Budden, D., Barth-Maron, G., Hessel, M., Van Hasselt, H., and Silver, D. Distributed prioritized experience replay. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.00933*, 2018.
- Hu, H. and Foerster, J. N. Simplified action decoder for deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02288*, 2019.
- Hu, H., Lerer, A., Peysakhovich, A., and Foerster, J. “other-play” for zero-shot coordination. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4399–4410. PMLR, 2020.
- Hu, H., Lerer, A., Cui, B., Pineda, L., Brown, N., and Foerster, J. Off-belief learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4369–4379. PMLR, 2021.
- Kapturowski, S., Ostrovski, G., Quan, J., Munos, R., and Dabney, W. Recurrent experience replay in distributed reinforcement learning. In *International conference on learning representations*, 2018.
- Lauffer, N., Shah, A., Carroll, M., Dennis, M. D., and Russell, S. Who needs to know? minimal knowledge for optimal coordination. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 18599–18613. PMLR, 2023.
- Lerer, A. and Peysakhovich, A. Learning existing social conventions via observationally augmented self-play. In *Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pp. 107–114, 2019.
- Lewis, D. *Convention: A philosophical study*. John Wiley & Sons, 2008.
- Lillicrap, T. P., Hunt, J. J., Pritzel, A., Heess, N., Erez, T., Tassa, Y., Silver, D., and Wierstra, D. Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971*, 2015.

- Lowe, R., Wu, Y. I., 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.
- Lupu, A., Cui, B., Hu, H., and Foerster, J. Trajectory diversity for zero-shot coordination. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 7204–7213. PMLR, 2021.
- Ma, M., Liu, J., Sokota, S., Kleiman-Weiner, M., and Foerster, J. N. Learning intuitive policies using action features. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 23358–23372. PMLR, 2023.
- McKee, K. R., Leibo, J. Z., Beattie, C., and Everett, R. Quantifying the effects of environment and population diversity in multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 36(1):21, 2022.
- Mnih, V., Kavukcuoglu, K., Silver, D., Rusu, A. A., Veness, J., Bellemare, M. G., Graves, A., Riedmiller, M., Fidjeland, A. K., Ostrovski, G., et al. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *nature*, 518(7540): 529–533, 2015.
- Mnih, V., Badia, A. P., Mirza, M., Graves, A., Lillicrap, T., Harley, T., Silver, D., and Kavukcuoglu, K. Asynchronous methods for deep reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1928–1937. PMLR, 2016.
- Muglich, D., Witt, C. S. d., van der Pol, E., Whiteson, S., and , J. N. F. Equivariant networks for zero-shot coordination. In *NeurIPS 2022*, November 2022a.
- Muglich, D., Zintgraf, L. M., De Witt, C. A. S., Whiteson, S., and Foerster, J. Generalized beliefs for cooperative ai. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 16062–16082. PMLR, 2022b.
- Nair, R., Tambe, M., Yokoo, M., Pynadath, D., and Marsella, S. Taming decentralized pomdps: Towards efficient policy computation for multiagent settings. In *IJCAI*, volume 3, pp. 705–711, 2003.
- Rahman, A., Cui, J., and Stone, P. Minimum coverage sets for training robust ad hoc teamwork agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09595*, 2023a.
- Rahman, A., Fosong, E., Carlucho, I., and Albrecht, S. V. Generating teammates for training robust ad hoc teamwork agents via best-response diversity. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023b.
- Schaul, T., Quan, J., Antonoglou, I., and Silver, D. Prioritized experience replay. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.05952*, 2015.
- Schroeder de Witt, C., Foerster, J., Farquhar, G., Torr, P., Boehmer, W., and Whiteson, S. Multi-agent common knowledge reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Schulman, J., Wolski, F., Dhariwal, P., Radford, A., and Klimov, O. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- Stone, P., Kaminka, G. A., Kraus, S., and Rosenschein, J. S. Ad hoc autonomous agent teams: Collaboration without pre-coordination. In *Twenty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2010.
- Sutton, R. S. and Barto, A. G. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- Tan, M. Multi-agent reinforcement learning: Independent vs. cooperative agents. In *Proceedings of the tenth international conference on machine learning*, pp. 330–337, 1993.
- Tesauro, G. Td-gammon, a self-teaching backgammon program, achieves master-level play. *Neural computation*, 6 (2):215–219, 1994.
- Treutlein, J., Dennis, M., Oesterheld, C., and Foerster, J. A new formalism, method and open issues for zero-shot coordination. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 10413–10423. PMLR, 2021.
- Van Hasselt, H., Guez, A., and Silver, D. Deep reinforcement learning with double q-learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 30, 2016.
- Wang, Z., Schaul, T., Hessel, M., Hasselt, H., Lanctot, M., and Freitas, N. Dueling network architectures for deep reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1995–2003. PMLR, 2016.
- Yu, C., Gao, J., Liu, W., Xu, B., Tang, H., Yang, J., Wang, Y., and Wu, Y. Learning zero-shot cooperation with humans, assuming humans are biased. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01605*, 2023.
- Zhou, X., Zhu, H., Mathur, L., Zhang, R., Yu, H., Qi, Z., Morency, L.-P., Bisk, Y., Fried, D., Neubig, G., et al. Sotopia: Interactive evaluation for social intelligence in language agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11667*, 2023.

A. Iterated Lever Coordination Game Details

To emphasise the necessity of augmenting a training policy population with symmetry-breaking augmentation, we have created the iterated lever-coordination game. This game underscores the importance of exposing AHT agents to conventions not initially present in the training population to facilitate generalisation to a broader range of conventions at test-time. The neural network employed in this experiment is a basic 2-layer fully connected network with one hidden layer, utilising the sigmoid function as the activation function. The training process takes place on a CPU with a single thread. We present the crucial hyper-parameters in Table 3.

Hyper-parameters	Value
# Network	
hidden size	20
activation	sigmoid
layers	2
# Optimisation	
optimiser	Adam
lr	0.05
eps	0.9
batchsize	10
# Training	
epochs	1000
num runs	30

Table 3. Hyper-Parameters for *iterated lever coordination game* Reinforcement Learning.

B. Augmentation Impact Breakdown

Training an AHT agent in large Dec-POMDPs can be expensive, so it’s important to determine whether an augmentation technique will meaningfully diversify a population before training commences. SBA is a technique that will only change the policies in the training population if they rely on symmetry-breaking conventions. Therefore, before training, we can use Augmentation Impact (AugImp) (Equation 14) to assess how much a given augmentation (in our case, SBA) will diversify the policies in a population.

The AugImp calculates the absolute difference across all pairs of agents and across all permutations. This metric combines all the information for a population into a single value, but the information about the max and min values is lost. To obtain a more thorough overview of the augmentations, we examine all Augmentation Differences (AD) individually for each policy pair. AD represents the Hanabi score difference between two agents from a population before and after the permutation has been applied to one agent, and it is defined as:

$$AD(\pi_1, \pi_2, \phi) = J_{XP}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - J_{XP}(\phi(\pi_1), \pi_2). \quad (14)$$

In Figure 8, we can observe the complete breakdown of all *Augmentation Differences* (AD) for all four Hanabi populations: SAD, IQL, OP, and OBL. The plot illustrates how different the augmentation scores are compared to no augmentation (depicted as a black ‘x’). As expected, the plot demonstrates that SAD and IQL policy populations have a much larger spread than OP and OBL, with SAD frequently reaching an Augmentation Difference of ± 8 points. Interestingly, there exists one IQL pair that works together particularly well when a specific color permutation is applied.




Figure 8. Augmentation Difference (Equation 14) scores for all pairs of SAD, IQL, OP, and OBL. Each column of blue contains the score differences between two policy pairs before and after applying an augmentation. The black x’s represent the original non-augmented policies. It’s clear that the SBA diversifies SAD and IQL populations much more than OP and OBL.

C. Experiment Details for Hanabi

C.1. Reinforcement Learning

We employ a highly scalable training architecture illustrated in Figure 9, built upon the framework implemented in the Off-Belief Learning Github Repository (Hu et al., 2021). This architecture features multiple parallel thread workers responsible for managing interactions across various Hanabi environments and the agents operating within each environment. Each actor initiates multiple inference calls to neural networks at every time step, with each inference call executed on GPUs. When a player initiates an inference call, the worker thread promptly proceeds to the next agent in the thread, facilitating the simultaneous execution of multiple games and agents on a single worker thread. Inferences invoked by different players are batched together and processed on the GPU in parallel. This approach enables the concurrent execution of a substantial number of games and environments, generating a significant volume of data for training purposes.

At each time step, players collect observations, actions, and rewards, and aggregate them into episodes. These trajectories are padded to 80 time steps and stored in a priority replay buffer. The training loop, operating independently of the aforementioned worker threads, continually samples transitions from the buffer, using them to update the model. After every 10 gradient update steps, the new model synchronizes with all the models conducting inference on GPUs.

We extended the training architecture to accommodate Ad Hoc Teamwork (AHT) agents. In each game within every worker thread, one agent acts as our AHT agent, learning from the experience, while the other agent sends inference requests to a frozen set of pre-trained neural network weights. Each AHT agent interacts with a distinct pre-trained model. When agents collect observations, actions, and rewards for storage in the replay buffer, only the AHT agent’s experience is used for optimization; teammates’ experiences are discarded. At the episode’s start, a different policy augmentation permutation is chosen, maintaining an unchanged teammate in the environment. To ensure an even distribution of teammate policies, the number of games is selected to perfectly divide the number of training agents, ensuring experiences are evenly distributed across teammate policies.




Figure 9. Illustration of RL training setup for AHT using SBA. Some arrows linking *player 1* and *batching layer* are omitted for legibility. Note that the experience of the teammates are not stored in the replay buffer, or used to update the model in the *training loop*.

The architecture adheres to what was, at one point in time, a state-of-the-art model—Recurrent Replay Distributed Deep Q-Networks (R2D2) (Kapturowski et al., 2018)—which incorporates best practices such as double-DQN (Van Hasselt et al., 2016), dueling network architecture (Wang et al., 2016), prioritized experience replay (Schaul et al., 2015), distributed training with parallel environments (Horgan et al., 2018), and a recurrent network to handle partial observability (Graves, 2012). In all our experiments, we execute games and players on 23 worker threads, with 80 games per thread, and allocate 1 thread for training. For inferences, we employ three Nvidia GeForce RTX 3090 GPUs and one for training, and the worker threads are executed on an AMD Ryzen Threadripper 1920X 12-Core CPU. Our essential hyper-parameters are detailed in Table 4.

C.2. Hanabi Training Population Splits

To gain a more accurate understanding of SBA’s performance when learning how to generalize a held-out sets of evaluation policies, it is useful to observe how much generalisation is affected by the size of the training set. Since SBA combinatorially increases the number of partners encountered during training, a performance improvement should still be observed when there is only one policy in the training set. As there is a varying number of pre-trained policies in each population, specifically 13 simplified action decoder (SAD), 12 independent Q-learning (IQL), and 12 other-play (OP), we have different split sizes for *small*, *medium*, and *large* splits. Table 5 provides the exact breakdown of these splits.

Symmetry-Breaking Augmentations for Ad Hoc Teamwork

Hyper-parameters	Value
# replay buffer related	
burn-in frames	10,000
replay buffer size	100,000
priority exponent	0.9
priority weight	0.6
max trajectory length	80
# Optimisation	
optimiser	Adam
lr	6.25e-05
eps	1.5e-05
grad clip	5
batchsize	128
# Q learning	
n step	3
discount factor	0.999
target network sync interval	2500
exploration ϵ	$\epsilon_0 \dots \epsilon_n$, where $\epsilon_i = 0.1^{1+\tau_i/(n-1)}$, $n = 80$

Table 4. Hyper-Parameters for *Hanabi* Reinforcement Learning.

Population	<i>small</i> splits	<i>medium</i> splits	<i>large</i> splits
SAD	1 train/12 test	6 train/7 test	11 train/2 test
IQL	1 train/11 test	6 train/6 test	10 train/2 test
OP	1 train/11 test	6 train/6 test	10 train/2 test

Table 5. Breakdown of the train and test splits we use for *Hanabi* policy populations.

D. AHT Results

D.1. SAD Ad Hoc Teamwork

Split	Agent	SAD (eval)		w/ IQL		w/ OP		w/ OBL	
		Score \uparrow	Bombout \downarrow	Score \uparrow	Bombout \downarrow	Score \uparrow	Bombout \downarrow	Score \uparrow	Bombout \downarrow
small	BR	8.15 \pm 1.28	0.60 \pm 0.03	10.78 \pm 1.34	0.46 \pm 0.06	10.85 \pm 1.50	0.47 \pm 0.07	3.77 \pm 0.39	0.70 \pm 0.01
	SBA (ours)	9.12 \pm 1.42	0.57 \pm 0.03	11.53 \pm 1.39	0.44 \pm 0.06	12.19 \pm 1.59	0.41 \pm 0.07	3.65 \pm 0.34	0.71 \pm 0.01
medium	Gen. Belief	12.36 \pm 0.96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BR	13.09 \pm 0.49	0.39 \pm 0.04	15.22 \pm 0.25	0.27 \pm 0.01	15.69 \pm 0.26	0.26 \pm 0.01	4.51 \pm 0.21	0.65 \pm 0.01
	SBA (ours)	15.40 \pm 0.49	0.28 \pm 0.04	16.71 \pm 0.22	0.20 \pm 0.01	17.72 \pm 0.26	0.17 \pm 0.01	3.85 \pm 0.16	0.70 \pm 0.01
large	BR	14.69 \pm 1.05	0.31 \pm 0.05	16.61 \pm 0.12	0.21 \pm 0.01	16.78 \pm 0.22	0.21 \pm 0.01	4.56 \pm 0.22	0.64 \pm 0.02
	SBA (ours)	16.34 \pm 1.29	0.24 \pm 0.06	17.40 \pm 0.07	0.17 \pm 0.00	17.81 \pm 0.21	0.16 \pm 0.01	4.36 \pm 0.20	0.65 \pm 0.02

Table 6. Mean scores and bombout rates for BR and SBA in *Hanabi* with a SAD population. Models are trained with 1 train and 12 test policies, 6-7, and 11-2. Compared are the reported 6-7 split scores for Generalized Beliefs (gen. belief) (Muglich et al., 2022b) (gen. belief). Shown is the standard error of the mean (s.e.m) across 13, 10, and 10 training splits respectively. An AHT agent trained on a SAD policies significantly improves performance over the baseline.

Table 6 showcases the performance results of SBA and baseline (BR) agents, both trained with SAD training populations of varying sizes: small, medium, and large. The robustness of each AHT agent is assessed by evaluating them with a held-out set of SAD agents, while their generalization is tested through cooperation with three distinct algorithms—namely, IQL, OP, and OBL—that were absent during training. In addition to the *Hanabi* scores, the bombout rate is presented, where lower rates indicate superior performance. The displayed standard error of the mean reflects the error across the training splits.

Symmetry-Breaking Augmentations for Ad Hoc Teamwork

Splits	SAD (eval)	IQL	OP	OBL
1-12	0.021	0.019	0.002	0.648
6-7	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.006
11-2	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.438

Table 7. Monte carlo paired permutation test comparing SBA to BR trained on SAD across different splits, and evaluating with different teammates. 100k samples are taken. Calculated is the two-sided p-value.

Notably, when the SBA agent is evaluated in coordination with other held-out SAD agents, as well as agents from IQL and OP populations, there is a significant improvement in scores across all scenarios. The most substantial improvement percentage is observed when SBA is trained with a medium-sized training set, resulting in up to a 17% score improvement. Remarkably, even when trained with just one agent in the training set, SBA still demonstrates performance enhancement, highlighting the efficacy of symmetry-breaking augmentations.

Interestingly, when SAD agents coordinate with OBL policies, the performance declines. This can be attributed to the fact that, in approximately 60% of instances, OBL plays a card only when it knows both the color and rank information. Since SBA tends to provide color hints less frequently, it fails to furnish OBL with sufficient information, resulting in a reduced frequency of card plays and, consequently, diminished performance.

In determining statistical significance, we employ a Paired Monte-Carlo Permutation test, and the corresponding results are presented in Table 7. Notably, SBA demonstrates a significant performance enhancement when assessed under SAD, IQL, and OP training policies. Conversely, its performance takes a noticeable dip when the AHT agent engages with OBL, particularly for medium-sized training sets. However, for both small and large training sets, the outcomes remain inconclusive.

D.2. IQL Ad Hoc Teamwork

Split	Agent	IQL (eval)		w/ SAD		w/ OP		w/ OBL	
		Score ↑	Bombout ↓	Score ↑	Bombout ↓	Score ↑	Bombout ↓	Score ↑	Bombout ↓
1-11	BR	11.52 ± 1.08	0.41 ± 0.05	8.49 ± 1.19	0.59 ± 0.05	11.52 ± 1.34	0.43 ± 0.06	5.19 ± 0.26	0.58 ± 0.02
	SBA (ours)	11.84 ± 0.99	0.40 ± 0.04	8.32 ± 0.96	0.59 ± 0.04	11.91 ± 1.08	0.40 ± 0.05	4.13 ± 0.33	0.66 ± 0.03
6-6	BR	15.04 ± 0.37	0.27 ± 0.02	13.23 ± 0.15	0.38 ± 0.01	15.71 ± 0.24	0.25 ± 0.01	5.73 ± 0.24	0.57 ± 0.02
	SBA (ours)	16.08 ± 0.42	0.21 ± 0.02	13.70 ± 0.19	0.34 ± 0.01	16.42 ± 0.16	0.20 ± 0.01	5.50 ± 0.20	0.56 ± 0.01
10-2	BR	15.34 ± 0.80	0.25 ± 0.03	13.81 ± 0.11	0.34 ± 0.00	16.06 ± 0.17	0.22 ± 0.01	5.97 ± 0.16	0.54 ± 0.01
	SBA (ours)	15.95 ± 0.71	0.21 ± 0.03	14.08 ± 0.16	0.33 ± 0.01	16.72 ± 0.11	0.20 ± 0.01	5.93 ± 0.16	0.55 ± 0.01

Table 8. Mean scores and bombout rates for BR and SBA in Hanabi with a IQL population. Models are trained with 1 train and 12 test policies, 6-7, and 11-2. Shown is the standard error of the mean across 13, 10, and 10 training splits respectively.

Splits	IQL (eval)	SAD	OP	OBL
1-11	0.187	0.713	0.156	0.117
6-6	0.004	0.156	0.021	0.330
10-2	0.004	0.235	0.031	0.284

Table 9. Monte carlo paired permutation test comparing SBA to BR trained on IQL across different splits, and evaluating with different teammates. 100k samples are taken. Calculated is the two-sided p-value.

Table 8 presents the performance results of SBA and baseline (BR) agents, both trained with IQL training populations of varying sizes: small, medium, and large. The robustness of each AHT agent is assessed by evaluating them with a held-out set of IQL agents, while their generalization is tested through cooperation with three distinct algorithms—specifically, SAD, OP, and OBL—that were absent during training. In addition to the Hanabi scores, the bombout rate is provided, with lower rates indicating superior performance. The displayed standard error of the mean reflects the error across the training splits.

In contrast to when SBA is trained with a SAD population, its performance does not exhibit the same level of strong improvement when trained with IQL. This is expected due to the lower Augmentation Impact score it receives (Section 5.1). Nevertheless, this AHT agent still demonstrates statistically significant performance on an IQL evaluation set for medium and large-sized training sets, as well as when evaluated with OP policies for medium and large training sets. However, when SBA is trained with a single IQL training partner, it never shows statistically significant performance over the baseline (BR). This is likely because the conventions present in a single IQL agent are not strong enough for SBA to meaningfully create a diverse training population.

Furthermore, as shown in Table 9, none of these SBA agents achieve statistically significant improvements over the baseline when playing with SAD agents. This is likely attributed to the fact that SAD conventions are much stronger than IQL, and learning to adapt to IQL conventions alone is not sufficient to adequately adjust to SAD.

D.3. OP Ad Hoc Teamwork

Split	Agent	w/ OP (eval)		w/ SAD		w/ IQL		w/ OBL	
		Score \uparrow	Bombout \downarrow						
6-6	BR	19.27 ± 0.42	0.14 ± 0.02	12.58 ± 0.18	0.40 ± 0.01	15.44 ± 0.07	0.25 ± 0.00	7.27 ± 0.26	0.54 ± 0.01
	SBA (ours)	19.39 ± 0.42	0.14 ± 0.02	12.51 ± 0.24	0.40 ± 0.01	15.52 ± 0.13	0.24 ± 0.01	7.44 ± 0.39	0.53 ± 0.02

Table 10. Mean scores and bombout rates for BR and SBA in Hanabi with a OP population. Models are trained with 1 train and 12 test policies, 6-7, and 11-2. Shown is the standard error of the mean (s.e.m) across 13, 10, and 10 training splits respectively.

Splits	OP (eval)	SAD	IQL	OBL
6-6	0.164	0.641	0.408	0.629

Table 11. Monte carlo paired permutation test comparing SBA to BR trained on OP across different splits, and evaluating with different teammates. 100k samples are taken. Calculated is the two-sided p-value.

Table 10 presents the performance results of both SBA and baseline (BR) agents, trained with a medium-sized OP training population. The robustness of each AHT agent is evaluated by assessing them with a held-out set of OP agents. Generalization is tested by cooperation with three distinct algorithms—specifically, SAD, IQL, and OBL—that were absent during training. In addition to the Hanabi scores, the bombout rate is provided, where lower rates indicate superior performance. The displayed standard error of the mean (s.e.m) represents the error across the training splits.

Given that an agent trained with Other-Play aims to avoid symmetry-breaking conventions, as supported by its low Augmentation Impact score in Section 5.1, augmenting an OP policy with SBA is anticipated to have minimal impact on AHT performance. The results presented in this section substantiate this assertion, demonstrating that SBA does not exhibit any performance improvement over the baseline. In certain cases, due to variance, it even performs slightly worse than the baseline. This observation is further corroborated by the Monte-Carlo Permutation Tests in Table 11, where SBA does not show any significantly improved performance, with p -values ranging from 0.16 to 0.6.