The role of communication in cooperative hunting in a partially observable world
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Abstract

In cooperative hunting, multiple agents need to coordinate their behavior to achieve a common goal. Previous research into the emergence of cooperative hunting has found conflicting results with respect to the effectiveness of communication: some authors show that communication can be helpful for groups of artificial agents, whilst others find that communication can also decrease performance. In this paper, we model the emergence of cooperative hunting using neural networks and genetic algorithms. We find that the effectiveness of communication increases with the complexity of the environment (modeled as the vision range of the hunters). That is, while communication between agents slows down the emergence of cooperative hunting in simple environments (i.e., when vision range is large), communication can speed up emergence of cooperative hunting in complex environments (when vision range is small).

1. Introduction

When designing cooperative multi-agent systems, it is useful to watch the behavior of animals and humans. One type of behavior that has proved interesting is cooperative hunting: a group of animals finds and catches a prey in a complex and dynamical world by using a cooperative strategy. Such cooperative strategies can be interesting for designing behavior of game agents or robot teams.

Nature provides some examples of cooperative hunting behavior: a pack of wolves or hyenas catching their prey. The emergence of cooperative hunting in nature is not fully understood. One possible way to study the emergence of cooperative hunting is to study emergent behavior of artificial groups. The hunting behavior of for example wolves can be described in a few simple rules (Muro et al., 2011). When the world is more complex and adaptive behavior is required, the combination of neural networks and a genetic algorithm is found to be useful to reach emergence of effective cooperative hunting behaviors in artificial teams (Haynes & Sen, 1996; Haynes & Sen, 1997a; Yong & Miikkulainen, 2009).

The main question is: how can cooperative hunting be established best? There are a number of factors that influence the emergence of cooperative behavior, for example, whether the behavior of the different agents...
In this paper, we aim to further verify whether communicative behavior starts outperforming stigmergic behavior. We choose the vision range of the predators as the parameter that reflects the complexity of the environment. Following Yong & Miikkulainen (2009) and Rajagopalan et al. (2011), we formulated the following hypothesis about the evolution of cooperative behaviors in predators: as the complexity of the world increases, the time needed for cooperative hunting to emerge increases more rapidly for non-communicative groups than for communicative groups. In figure 1, this hypothesis is shown in a graph. When the predators communicate, the evolution of cooperative behavior takes more time since the neural networks have to deal with more input information. In a simpler environment this extra information is not useful, so therefore non-communicative predator teams will perform better. In a more complex world communication is useful: the time to establish cooperation is smaller for agents that can communicate.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 the experiment is discussed: world constraints, used techniques and simulation setup. In Section 3 the results are presented and in Section 4 a final conclusion is given.

2. Methods

We designed an experiment to observe cooperation in predators hunting prey that move randomly. The simulation was based on the pursuit-evasion task introduced by Benda (1985). The goal is to test whether predator communication influences evolution of cooperation as was hypothesized in Section 1.

First, we discuss the simulation environment and its constraints. The next subsection will explain how genetic algorithms and neural networks are used in this experiment. Finally, the setup of the experiment will be discussed.

2.1. The simulation environment

In this study, two different simulation environments were tested: a world with boundaries (a ‘square’ world) and a world without boundaries (a toroidal world). The worlds differ in the number of predators that are needed to catch a prey: in the square world, a prey can be caught with the help of the boundaries. In this situation, two predators can successfully catch the prey by driving the prey into a corner, while in the toroidal world at least four agents are needed. Both environments give rise to different hunting opportunities: the square world allows for an interesting chase towards an edge; the toroidal world, on the other hand,
allows the group of predators to split, having both groups go in opposite ways to catch the prey from two sides.

In this experiment, more predator agents \((N = 20)\) were used than necessary for solving the problem. We call these extra agents collaborators. The design of this experiment is different on this point from the experiment design as used in Yong & Miikkulainen (2009), Rajagopalan et al. (2011) and Rawal et al. (2012). Therefore, this experiment is able to show whether more communication is useful in more complex situations. We think that collaborator agents, who do not directly help to catch the prey, could give their colleagues useful information about the complex environment.

Both worlds have \(40 \times 40\) grid locations without obstacles. The prey and predators can move in four directions: east, west, north and south. In Yong & Miikkulainen (2009), Rajagopalan et al. (2011) and Rawal et al. (2012) a \(100 \times 100\) toroidal world was used. To reduce the computation time, a smaller environment was preferred for this study.

The initial positions of the prey and the predators are chosen randomly. The prey and the predators move one step at a time in one of the four cardinal directions, so to move diagonally, an agent would have to take two steps. Like in Yong & Miikkulainen (2009), Rajagopalan et al. (2011) and Rawal et al. (2012), all predators and the prey move simultaneously. However, in our study the prey moves randomly instead of moving directly away from the current nearest predator as in Yong & Miikkulainen (2009). The predators have a neural network that will decide the next step. The neural network has four output nodes corresponding to the directions north, south, east and west. The output node with the highest activation will determine the next step.

Next to these constraints, which are constant across all simulations, the environment has some variable constraints concerning the vision range of the predators and communication. The vision range represents the maximum length of the vision field of the predator. If the vision range is 50%, the predator is able to see 50% of the diagonal of the world. A predator knows the distance to the prey when the following rule holds:

\[
\text{euclideanDistance}(\text{prey, predator}) < \frac{\text{visionRange}}{100\%} \ast \sqrt{\text{Width}^2 + \text{Height}^2}.
\]

That is, if the euclidean distance between the prey and the predator is small enough given the vision range and width and height of the world, the prey is observable to the predator. The distances in \(x\)-direction and \(y\)-direction between the prey and the predator are then given to the neural network of the predator as input. If the euclidean distance is too large, the neural network will be given input zero.

Communication between the predators is modeled as position sharing, that is, a communicating predator knows the distance between him and other predators. Different communication conditions were tested by changing the amount of neighbors that share their position (the variable \(k\)). In case of \(k = 0\) no predator shares its position with another predator, and the predators can sense only prey movements, so they have to use that for deciding their next step. This is the so-called stigmergic communication situation as described in Yong & Miikkulainen (2009) and Rajagopalan (2011). If \(k > 0\), a predator knows the distance between himself and \(k\) nearest neighbor predators.

2.2. Neural Network

Every predator agent has its own neural network. The neural network is a simple feed forward neural network that has \(2+2\times k\) (\(k\) is the number of nearest predators for which a predator knows the position) input nodes,
one hidden layer of ten nodes and an output layer of
four nodes. For calculating activation a simple sigmoid
function is used.

The inputs for the neural network are the distances
to the prey and to the \( k \) nearest predators. Each dis-
tance is encoded in two input nodes: one encodes the
\( x \)-coordinate of the owner of the neural network (a
predator) minus the \( x \)-coordinate of the prey or an-
other predator, while the other does the same for the
\( y \)-coordinates. If the prey is not visible, the inputs
for the prey will be zero. The same holds for predat-
ors that do not share their position: the input for
no-communicating predators will be zero. It is pos-
sible that all inputs are zero, since the agent has no
knowledge at all at that moment.

In each scenario, the neural network has ten hidden
units and four output units: one for the north direc-
tion, one for the east direction, one for south, and one
for west. The move of a predator in a specific situa-
tion is the direction of which the corresponding output
node has the highest value of all output nodes.

2.3. Genetic Algorithm

A genetic algorithm is used to optimize the weights
of the neural networks. The agent population has \( N \)
chromosomes, where each chromosome represents an
agent. Each chromosome contains the parameters of
the neural network of an agent. Each generation, all
\( N = 20 \) agents play the predator-prey pursuit evasion
task in the same world. The 16 agents having the
shortest Euclidean distance to the prey at the end of
the generation are passed on to the next generation.

In Yong & Miikkulainen (2009), Rajagopalan et al.
(2011) and Rawal et al. (2012) the hidden layers of
neural networks evolved out of a separate population
for each neuron. This technique is called multi-agent
Enforced SubPopulations (ESP) (Gomez & Miikkulai-
en, 1997; Gomez & Miikkulainen, 1999). This al-
 lows for the evolution of heterogeneous agents that
perform different tasks within the cooperative hunt.
Due to the computational demands of ESP, we decided
to use a different technique: neural networks were used
as brains of the predators and a genetic algorithm to
optimize the weights of the networks, to give rise to
some cooperative behavior. In this situation there is
one population of neural networks. However, since a
high number of best agents stay in the population
and mutation is applied to the new produced agents, there
is space for heterogeneous behavior to evolve.

After each generation, the 16 predator agents with the
shortest Euclidean distance to the prey pass on to the
next generation. In addition, the two best agents, de-
 fined as those agents that have the shortest Eu-
clidean distance to the prey, are selected to construct 4
new predator agents through Uniform Crossover with
a mixing ratio of 0.5. That is, these new predator
agents inherit each of their individual genes, which in
this case correspond to one of the weights in the neural
network, from a given parent with probability 0.5.

To introduce more variation in the population, muta-
tion with a probability of 0.1% is applied to each of
the four newly produced agent. In other words, to
each individual weight (gene) a random value between
-0.1 and 0.1 is added with a probability of 0.1%. In-
troducing mutation prevents getting stuck in a local
minimum and ensures that the evolution will continue
and new behavior can emerge.

2.4. Experiment setup

Different scenarios were tested with varying the vari-
bles for vision range and communication. The vision
range ranged from 0% to 100% with a step size of 10%.
The size of the communicating neighborhood \( k \) varied
between \( k = 0 \) and \( k = N - 1 \). All combinations
of vision range and communicating neighborhood were
tested.

For each scenario we used \( N = 20 \) predators and one
prey. We calculated the mean score of each scenario
over 100 trials. Each trial ran for a number of genera-
tions. During a generation \( g \), the number of time steps
needed for the predators to catch the prey \( i_{catch}(g) \)
was recorded, with a maximum of 200 time steps. Af-
after a catch or when 200 time steps had passed, the
agents were randomly replaced and a new generation
starts.

When the prey is caught 10 times at \( g_{10catches} \) or when
\( g = 800 \), the experiment stops and the score is calcu-
lated. The performance score of a trial is computed as
the total number of time steps that have passed across
all 10 generations.

\[
\text{score} = \sum_{g=1}^{G} (i_{end}(g))
\]

\[
G = \min(800, g_{10catches})
\]

\[
i_{end} = \min(200, i_{catch})
\]

3. Results

The performance mean score (mean time for catching
the prey 10 times) for the different scenarios are shown
in figures 2 (square world) and 3 (toroidal world) for

\[
\text{performance mean score} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \sum_{g=1}^{G} (i_{end}(g)) \right)
\]
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First, it is interesting to compare the performance for the stigmergic behavior scenarios ($k = 0$) with the performance for $k = 3$. These scenarios are used as well in Yong & Miikkulainen (2009), Rajagopalan et al. (2011) and Rawal et al. (2012). Yong (2009) concluded that $k = 3$ has a lower performance than $k = 0$, but (Rajagopalan et al., 2011) and (Rawal et al., 2012) concluded that communication makes it easier to evolve coordinated hunting behavior. Figures 2 and 3 show that $k = 0$ outperforms $k = 3$ for all different vision ranges except for a vision range of zero in the toroidal world. An ANOVA for repeated measures for performance score on $k$, found a significant difference between $k = 0$ and $k = 3$ for the toroidal world ($F(1,2196) = 12.13, p < 0.05$), but not for the squared world ($F(1,2196) = 2.032, p = 0.15$). Therefore stigmergic behavior outperforms in both simple situations (high vision range) and more complex situations (low vision range). This is in line with our conclusion of Yong (2009), but not in line with the conclusion of Rajagopalan et al. (2012) and Rawal et al. (2011).

To see whether communication with more than a reasonable amount of agents needed to solve the problem is useful, we compare the performance for $k = 0$ and $k = 19$. In the square world the performance scores for $k = 0$ and $k = 19$ intersect each other at a vision range of 20-25%. For higher vision range the performance for $k = 0$ is higher, for lower vision range the performance for $k = 19$ is higher. In the toroidal world the performance scores for $k = 0$ and $k = 19$ is almost similar for higher vision range. For a vision range below 25%, the performance for $k = 19$ is much better. This is in line with the hypothesis.

The results for all values of $k$ can be found in Figure 4(square world) and Figure 5 (toroidal world). We find that a higher value of $k$ is generally more useful in complex situation, when the vision range is below 30%. Furthermore we find that a difference between $k$ and $k + 1$ is small, but the difference between $k$ and $k + 3$ or more, influences the result much more.

**4. Conclusion and discussion**

The goal of this experiment was to test whether communication is necessary in complex situations and whether in simple situations the problem can be solved faster by just stigmergy. Given the results as reported by Yong & Miikkulainen (Yong & Miikkulainen, 2009), it was expected that for simple situations (high vision range) stigmergic behavior outperforms communication. Given the results in (Rajagopalan et al., 2011) and (Rawal et al., 2012), it was expected that communication outperforms stigmergic behavior in more complex situations.

The results of this experiment show that stigmergic behavior outperforms communication in simple situations, but not in complex situations. However, for good performance in complex situations, communication with more predators than needed to solve the problem is needed. In this experiment, it was not enough to communicate with just three other neighbors. Therefore this experiment reinforces the conclusion of Yong & Miikkulainen (Yong & Miikkulainen, 2009) that stigmercy alone works out better than com-
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Figure 3. Mean 10-times-catching time in the toroidal world for vision range between 0-100% and $k=0$ (stigmergic behavior), $k=3$ and $k=19$ neighbors. The figure summarizes results over 100 trials.

When communicating with $k = 19$ neighbors in the toroidal world, the vision range seems not to matter at all. This is an interesting result. We think that the predators in this scenario found an optimal strategy without knowing the location of the prey. For future research it would be interesting to do the experiment again with a prey that always moves away from the predators and to verify whether there could still emerge an optimal strategy for 20 collaborators.

We did the experiment in two different worlds: a square world with boundaries and a toroidal world without boundaries. We saw that communication was much more helpful in the toroidal world. Probably, the agents need the positions of their colleagues to navigate through the environment. To see what the influence is of the extra added collaborators, more research needs to be done. This experiment should be done again for $N=4$ in a toroidal world.
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Figure 4. Mean 10-times-catching time in the square world for vision range between 0-100% and \( k = 0-19 \) neighbors. The figure summarizes results over 100 trials.

Figure 5. Mean 10-times-catching time in the toroidal world for vision range between 0-100% and \( k = 0-19 \) neighbors. The figure summarizes results over 100 trials.

