

Entropy is all you need for Inter-Seed Cross-Play in Hanabi

Johannes Forkel¹ Jakob Foerster¹

Abstract

We find that in Hanabi (Bard et al., 2020), one of the most complex and popular benchmarks for zero-shot coordination and ad-hoc teamplay, a standard implementation of independent PPO with a slightly higher entropy coefficient 0.05 instead of the typically used 0.01, achieves a new state-of-the-art in cross-play between different seeds, beating by a significant margin all previous specialized algorithms (Hu et al., 2020; 2021; Lupu et al., 2021; Cui et al., 2021; Muglich et al., 2022; Cui et al., 2022; Muglich et al., 2025), which were specifically designed for this setting. We provide an intuition for why sufficiently high entropy regularization ensures that different random seed produce joint policies which are mutually compatible. We also empirically find that a high λ_{GAE} around 0.9, and using RNNs instead of just feed-forward layers in the actor-critic architecture, strongly increase inter-seed cross-play. While these results demonstrate the dramatic effect that hyperparameters can have not just on self-play scores but also on cross-play scores, we show that there are simple Dec-POMDPs though, in which standard policy gradient methods with increased entropy regularization are not able to achieve perfect inter-seed cross-play, thus demonstrating the continuing necessity for new algorithms for zero-shot coordination.

1. Introduction

When using self-play to train a joint policy in a decentralized partially observable Markov decision process (Dec-POMDP) like Hanabi, this typically results in the joint policy adopting a coordination convention which breaks some symmetries of the Dec-POMDP. When agents from such a joint policy are then paired with agents from another joint policy which wasn't seen during training, e.g. with a joint

policy trained with the same algorithm but a different random seed, a wholly different implementation of the same algorithm, or with humans, this often results in coordination failures, since the coordination conventions of the different joint policies are incompatible with each other. For a simple example of such incompatible symmetry breaking in a Dec-POMDP, consider the one-round simultaneous action game with the pay-off matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 2 & -2 & 1 \\ -2 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

In this Dec-POMDP both optimal joint policies break the game symmetry in another way: either both players always choose the first action, or both always choose the second action, for a return of 2. Those two joint policies are incompatible though, in that their *cross-play* (XP) score is very low: when the local policies from one of those joint policies are paired with the local policies of the other joint policy, then a return of -2 is achieved. This is lower than return of the optimal symmetric joint policy, under which both agents always choose the third action, which gives a return of 1.

In Hanabi, a very large and complex Dec-POMDP, standard MARL algorithms like independent PPO (IPPO) or independent DQN, typically produce joint policies which, while achieving high returns in self-play, do very poorly when paired in cross-play between independent seeds of the same algorithm (Hu et al., 2020; Bard et al., 2020), and in cross-play with human proxy bots (Dizdarević et al., 2025). This is because they are unconstrained in which of the many different conventions they can develop and thus mostly converge to conventions which break symmetries of the game.

The goal of zero-shot coordination (ZSC) is to find algorithms, which produce compatible joint policies across different implementations, in particular across different random seeds of the same implementation. In Hanabi, ZSC algorithms have led to state-of-the-art scores in cross-play between independently trained joint policies from different random seeds of the same implementation (Hu et al., 2021; Cui et al., 2022), and in cross-play with human-proxy bots (Dizdarević et al., 2025).

We find that when taking a standard IPPO implementation for Hanabi, and tune its hyperparameters to achieve not just

¹Department of Engineering Science, University of Oxford. Correspondence to: Johannes Forkel <johannes.forkel@eng.ox.ac.uk>.

high SP scores, but also high XP scores between different random seeds, then re-running IPPO with those hyperparameters gives a new state-of-the-art in XP between different random seeds, surpassing the previous SOTA achieved with Off-Belief Learning (OBL) (Hu et al., 2021; Cui et al., 2022) by a significant margin. The hyperparameters we found, which achieve those high XP scores, are fairly standard, with the main difference being a significantly higher entropy coefficient. We thus see that a higher entropy coefficient doesn't just have the obvious benefit of better exploration and state coverage, but that it also prevents the forming of conventions which break game symmetries. We furthermore find that using RNNs in the actor-critic networks leads to much higher inter-seed XP scores than when using pure feedforward architectures, and that choosing λ_{GAE} close to 0.9 also significantly reduces the gap between SP scores and inter-seed XP scores.

While those results clearly show that some hyperparameters, in particular the entropy coefficient, can have a strong influence on inter-seed XP, we also give two simple examples of Dec-POMDPs, in which using standard policy gradient methods, even with an increased entropy coefficient, are not able to consistently find the optimal symmetric policy.

2. Background

2.1. Decentralized Partially Observable Markov Decision Processes (DecPOMDPs)

We formalize the cooperative multi-agent setting as a decentralized partially observable Markov decision process (Dec-POMDP) (Oliehoek et al., 2007):

Definition 2.1. A Dec-POMDP is defined as a 9-tuple $(\mathcal{S}, n, \{\mathcal{A}^i\}_{i=1}^n, \{\mathcal{O}^i\}_{i=1}^n, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \{\mathcal{U}^i\}_{i=1}^n, T, \gamma)$, where:

- \mathcal{S} is the state space and n is the number of agents.
- \mathcal{A}^i and \mathcal{O}^i are the local action and observation spaces for agent i , and $\mathcal{A} = \prod_i \mathcal{A}^i$, $\mathcal{O} = \prod_i \mathcal{O}^i$ are the joint action and observation spaces.
- The state transition is governed by $s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{T}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t)$, and local observations are given by $o_{t+1}^i = \mathcal{U}^i(s_{t+1})$.
- The rewards are given by $r_{t+1} = \mathcal{R}(s_t, a_t)$, the horizon is T , i.e. s_T is always a terminal state, and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ is the discount factor.

Given $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, the state-action history (SAH) is given by $\tau_t = (s_0, a_0, \dots, s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, s_t)$. Each agent i selects local actions based on his local action-observation history (AOH) $\tau_t^i = (a_0^i, o_1^i, \dots, a_{t-1}^i, o_t^i)$, following a local policy $a_t^i \sim \pi^i(a_t^i | \tau_t^i)$. Given a SAH $\tau_t = (\tau_t^1, \dots, \tau_t^n)$, a joint policy $\pi = (\pi^1, \dots, \pi^n)$ chooses a joint action

$a_t = (a_t^1, \dots, a_t^n)$ in the space of legal actions $\mathcal{A}(\tau_t) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{A}^i(\tau_t^i)$, with probability $\pi(a_t | \tau_t) := \prod_{i=1}^n \pi^i(a_t^i | \tau_t^i)$. We denote the set of joint policies by Π , and define the self-play (SP) objective $J_{\text{SP}} : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as the expected return:

$$J_{\text{SP}}(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau_T \sim \pi} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t \mathcal{R}(s_t, a_t) \right]. \quad (2)$$

Furthermore, given a joint policy π , we define its greedified version $\hat{\pi}$ by

$$\hat{\pi}(a_t | \tau_t) := \begin{cases} 1/K & \text{if } a_t \in \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\tau_t)} \pi(a | \tau_t), \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

where here $K := |\operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\tau_t)} \pi(a | \tau_t)|$ is the number of joint actions with the highest probability.

Remark 2.2. Note that the fact that we are allowing the local observations o_{t+1}^i to only depend deterministically on s_{t+1} , rather than stochastically on s_t and a_t , i.e. $o_{t+1}^i \sim \mathcal{U}^i(s_t, a_t)$, is not a restriction on the Dec-POMDP. This is because any Dec-POMDP with a stochastic observation function of the latter form, can be transformed to an equivalent Dec-POMDP with the observation function $o_{t+1}^i = \mathcal{U}^i(\tilde{s}_{t+1})$, by just setting $\tilde{s}_{t+1} = (s_{t+1}, o_{t+1}^1, \dots, o_{t+1}^n)$. Including the observations in the state eases notation, since then the local AOHs are just deterministic functions of the SAHs.

2.2. Zero-Shot Coordination (ZSC)

Given that there are typically many different Nash equilibria in a Dec-POMDP, as it is fully cooperative, and since those different Nash equilibria can be incompatible which each other, there is the problem of equilibrium selection. To measure the compatibility of different Nash equilibria in a Dec-POMDP, we define the cross-play score between different joint policies:

Definition 2.3 (Cross-Play (XP)). Given a Dec-POMDP with n players, we define the cross-play (XP) score $J_{\text{XP}} : \Pi^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, between n joint policies π_1, \dots, π_n by

$$J_{\text{XP}}(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) := \mathbb{E}_{\phi \sim \text{Perm}(n)} \left[J((\pi_{\phi(1)}^1, \dots, \pi_{\phi(n)}^n)) \right],$$

where $\text{Perm}(n)$ is the set of permutations of $\{1, \dots, n\}$.

The goal of zero-shot coordination is to find algorithms, which produce joint policies that are compatible with each other, in that they achieve a high XP score. A simplified setting is when the implementation is the same, but the random seeds are different. We refer to the XP score between different seeds of the same implementation as inter-seed XP.

2.3. Entropy Regularized Multi-Agent Policy Gradient Methods

Let $\theta \mapsto \pi_\theta$ be a differentiable parameterization of the joint policy π_θ . For an entropy coefficient $\alpha \geq 0$, we consider

the entropy regularized policy gradient

$$\begin{aligned}
& \nabla_{\theta}^{\alpha} J_{\text{SP}}(\pi_{\theta}) \\
& := \nabla_{\theta} J_{\text{SP}}(\pi_{\theta}) + \alpha \mathbb{E}_{\tau_T \sim \pi_{\theta}} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \text{Ent}(\pi_{\theta}(\cdot | \tau_t)) \right] \quad (3) \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{\tau_T \sim \pi_{\theta}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}^i(a_t^i | \tau_t^i) \left(-\alpha \log \pi_{\theta}^i(a_t^i | \tau_t^i) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \sum_{t'=t}^{T-1} \gamma^{t'-t} \mathcal{R}(s_{t'}, a_{t'}) \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\nabla_{\theta}^{\alpha} J_{\text{SP}}(\pi_{\theta})$ is **not** the same as the gradient $\nabla_{\theta} J_{\text{SP}}^{\alpha}(\pi_{\theta})$ of the maximum entropy reinforcement learning objective

$$J_{\text{SP}}^{\alpha} := J_{\text{SP}}(\pi_{\theta}) + \alpha \mathbb{E}_{\tau_T \sim \pi_{\theta}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t \text{Ent}(\pi_{\theta}(\cdot | \tau_t)) \right]. \quad (4)$$

In practice one needs to estimate $\nabla_{\theta}^{\alpha} J_{\text{SP}}(\pi_{\theta})$ from a batch of SAHs. Typically a clipped objective as in PPO (Schulman et al., 2017) is used, and a loss term is added for the learning of either local or centralized value functions, whose parameters are possibly partly shared with π_{θ} . The learned value functions, also referred to as critics, are used to reduce variance in the estimates of $\nabla_{\theta}^{\alpha} J_{\text{SP}}(\pi_{\theta})$. Those gradient estimates are then used with a variant of gradient ascent to train π_{θ} and the critics.

In Yu et al. (2022) it was found that IPPO, and multi-agent PPO (MAPPO), which uses a centralized critic instead of a local one like IPPO, are effective in learning joint policies with high SP scores in Hanabi and other Dec-POMDPs. In e.g. Muglich et al. (2025) however it was reported that IPPO achieves very low inter-seed XP scores.

3. An intuition why entropy regularization prevents symmetry breaking

In this section we assume a tabular softmax parametrization, and denote by $\theta^i(a^i | \tau^i)$ the logit corresponding to agent i taking local action a^i given local AOH τ^i :

$$\pi_{\theta}^i(a^i | \tau^i) = \frac{\exp(\theta^i(a^i | \tau^i))}{\sum_{b^i \in \mathcal{A}^i(\tau^i)} \exp(\theta^i(b^i | \tau^i))}. \quad (5)$$

We let $\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the initial parameters, and for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ set $\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k + k^{-1} \nabla_{\theta}^{\alpha} J_{\text{SP}}(\pi_{\theta_k})$.

When initializing θ_1 randomly and/or using noisy estimates of the gradients, then there are typically many different limiting policies $\pi_{\theta_{\infty}}$ that one can converge to. Roughly speaking, increasing the entropy coefficient α makes the optimization landscape “more concave,” since entropy is a strictly concave function on the probability simplex, having




Figure 1. Consider the one-round simultaneous action game with payoff matrix given in (1), and the parametrization $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2) \mapsto \text{softmax}(\theta_1, -\theta_1, \theta_2) =: \pi_{\theta}^1(\cdot) = \pi_{\theta}^2(\cdot)$. Bottom: the function $\theta \mapsto J_{\text{SP}}^{\alpha}(\pi_{\theta})$, with $\alpha = 1.0$ on the left and $\alpha = 1.2$ on the right. Top left: $\pi_{\theta_{\infty}}$ and its return $J_{\text{SP}}(\pi_{\theta_{\infty}})$ as a function of the entropy coefficient that was used during training of π_{θ} . Top right: XP matrix between multiple greedified joint policies, which were trained with independent REINFORCE, with different entropy coefficients. 5 seeds per entropy coefficient.

as its unique maximizer the uniform distribution. For $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, when assuming unbiased gradient estimates, the limiting policy $\pi_{\theta_{\infty}}$ will always be the uniformly random policy. Thus one can expect that there is a threshold for α , above which the limiting policy will always be the same. For a demonstration of this phenomenon in a simple Dec-POMDP, see Figure 1.

A higher entropy coefficient typically results in a lower $J_{\text{SP}}(\pi_{\theta_{\infty}})$, since with a higher entropy coefficient π_{θ} assigns higher probabilities to suboptimal actions. However, since during XP evaluation after training, the policies always take the action with the highest probability, all that matters is that the policies learn to assign the highest probability to the actions that are chosen by the optimal symmetric policies. Thus the way to use entropy regularization to learn symmetric policies is to increase α to the lowest value where, when training multiple joint policies with that α , the average SP score equals the average XP score.

We emphasize that while a sufficiently high entropy coefficient will ensure that $\pi_{\theta_{\infty}}$ will always be the same, the greedification of that policy will not necessarily have the highest return among all symmetric policies. Consider for example the one-round simultaneous action game with pay-

off matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

For high enough α , the local policies of the unique π_{θ_∞} will assign the same probability to the first two actions, and a lower probability to the third one. The greedified version of this policy will have a return of 1.5, while the optimal symmetric policy, under which both local policies always choose the third action, has a return of 2. Roughly speaking this means that a high entropy coefficient will ensure that the learned policies are *respecting* the symmetries of the game, but they are not necessarily *exploiting* the symmetries of the game. To respect *and* exploit known symmetries in Dec-POMDPs for zero-shot coordination, one can use the Other-Play algorithm (Hu et al., 2020).

4. Experimental Results

We will open-source all the code which generated the experimental in a future updated version of this paper.

4.1. An Illustrative Toy Example: The Cat/Dog Game

Consider the cat/dog toy game from (Hu et al., 2021), shown in Figure 2 which is taken from that paper. In this game there are two SP optimal joint policies, with a return of 10: one in which Alice always signals “on” when she sees a cat and “off” when she sees a dog, and one in which this pairing is opposite. The XP score of those two joint policies is -10 though. Under the optimal symmetric joint policy Alice always reveals and Bob then guesses the correct pet, which has a return of 7. There is also a suboptimal symmetric policy under which Alice always bails, for a reward of 1.

We train $m = 12$ joint policies π_1, \dots, π_m with independent REINFORCE with baseline, for different entropy coefficients, and then compute the XP matrix $(J_{SP}((\hat{\pi}_j^1, \hat{\pi}_k^2)))_{j,k=1}^m$ of the greedified joint policies $\hat{\pi}_1, \dots, \hat{\pi}_m$. This matrix is shown on the left in Figure 3. We see that when the entropy coefficient is 8.1 or above, both Alice and Bob learn to assign the highest probability to the optimal symmetric actions. However, we also see that for the entropy coefficients 7.5, 7.7, 7.9, Alice assigns the highest probability to revealing, but that when Bob sees “on” or “off” he breaks the symmetry and guesses a pet instead of bailing, implying that Alice also breaks the symmetry among her suboptimal actions “on” and “off.” This means that we do not necessarily need to increase entropy so much that no symmetries at all are broken. It is enough to increase entropy to the first point where we achieve $SP = XP$ during greedy evaluation, as then the policies have learned to assigned the highest probability to actions that belong to symmetric policies. We furthermore see that for an ex-




Figure 2. Toy cooperative communication game (figure taken from (Hu et al., 2021), with kind permission of the authors): Alice observes the pet and can either signal “on”, signal “off”, “reveal” for a reward of -3 , so that Bob can see the pet, or “bail” out for a reward of 1. Bob then can guess “cat” or “dog” for a reward of ± 10 depending on whether he was correct, or he can “bail” out for a reward of 1.

tremely high entropy coefficient, Alice assigns the highest probability to bailing, which results in the suboptimal symmetric policy. This is because Bob during training didn’t often enough guess the correct pet when he saw it.

Thus in this game we can find the optimal symmetric policy simply by increasing the entropy coefficient until the SP score of the learned policies equals the average XP score between multiple seeds. However, as we have mentioned already, this recipe doesn’t always work. Consider a version of the cat/dog game where the reward for revealing the pet is -8 instead of -3 . This gives the optimal symmetric policy a return of 2. The cross-play matrix for policies trained with different entropy coefficient is shown on the right in Figure 3. In this game, we see that above the threshold for the entropy coefficient where the policies stop breaking symmetries, Alice already prefers bailing over revealing. Thus in this game there is no entropy coefficient for which Alice learns to assign revealing the highest probability. We note that the ZSC algorithms Other-Play (Hu et al., 2020) and Off-Belief Learning (Hu et al., 2021) will learn the optimal symmetric policy in this game.

The cat/dog game provides the intuition that in games where there isn’t a lot of incentive to break symmetries, i.e. when the return of the optimal symmetric policy is almost as high as the return of the optimal asymmetric ones, then an increased entropy coefficient will result in policy gradient methods learning policies whose greedification is close to the optimal symmetric policy. In games where the optimal asymmetric policies have much higher returns than all symmetric policies, one can still learn symmetric policies through increasing the entropy coefficient, but those policies will not necessarily achieve the highest return among the symmetric policies.




Figure 3. Left: XP matrix between policies in the cat/dog game, which are trained with entropy regularized independent REINFORCE with baseline, with different entropy coefficients. During training the policies sample actions, and during XP they always take the action with the highest probability. Right: same as left, except that the reward for “reveal” is now -8 instead of -3 .

4.2. Hanabi

4.2.1. XP FOR DIFFERENT ENTROPY COEFFICIENTS

All Hanabi experiments are done in JaxMARL (Rutherford et al., 2023). We use 4 different network architectures. The first architecture consists of one feed-forward embedding layer, two LSTM layers, and then one actor and one critic head. We refer to this architecture as “LSTM.” The second architecture, which we refer to as “FF,” replaces the two LSTM layers in the first architecture by two feedforward layers. Third and fourth, the public-private LSTM architecture described in Figure 5 in the appendix, where the critic is either local or centralized. We refer to this architecture as “PP LSTM” and in the case of a centralized critic, the policy gradient algorithm becomes MAPPO (Yu et al., 2022). We use the PP LSTM architecture in order for the actor architecture to be exactly the same as the one that is used for Off-Belief Learning (Hu et al., 2021; Cui et al., 2022).

In 2-player Hanabi, we train four seeds of IPPO policies, for each of the first three architectures, and for each of the entropy coefficients $0.01, 0.02, \dots, 0.10$, with $\lambda_{\text{GAE}} = 0.9$ and all other hyperparameters being fixed at the values shown in Table 3 in the appendix. For each of the three architectures we this way obtain 40 joint policies π_1, \dots, π_{40} , and compute the XP matrix $(J_{\text{SP}}((\hat{\pi}_j^1, \hat{\pi}_k^2)))_{j,k=1}^{40}$, with each entry being the average score over 5000 games. These XP matrices are shown in Figures 6, 7, and 8 in the appendix. When taking the average SP in the diagonal 4×4 blocks, and the average XP in every 4×4 block of that matrix, we get the block XP matrices shown in Figure 4.

While the average SP for almost all architectures and entropy coefficients is above 24, we see that for increasing entropy the average XP scores approach the average SP scores. We furthermore see that the FF policies are much

worse in XP than the RNN based policies. This can be interpreted as meaning that FF policies struggle to understand what information their partner wants to convey, since they only remember their last observation and their partner’s last action. We also see that for sufficiently high entropy coefficients, the policies coming from different entropy coefficients are compatible with each other.

4.2.2. RUNNING NEW SEEDS FOR THE BEST ENTROPY COEFFICIENT

The highest XP scores in Figure 4 are achieved for an entropy coefficient of 0.05. We ran a new set of 4 seeds for this entropy coefficient, and also ran 4 seeds of IPPO and MAPPO with the PP LSTM architecture. The average SP and XP scores are shown in Table 1. We can see that for all three architectures the average XP is significantly higher than the previous SOTA of 24.30, achieved in (Cui et al., 2022) with Off-Team learning, which was specifically designed to achieve high XP scores between different seeds. In 3-player Hanabi we see that with all three architectures we achieve an average XP score which is significantly higher than the previous SOTA of XP in 3-player Hanabi of 23.02, achieved in (Hu et al., 2021). In 4- and 5-player Hanabi, for which to our knowledge no XP scores have been published previously, we only ran IPPO with the PP LSTM architecture, and entropy coefficients 0.05 and 0.08, respectively. For 5-player Hanabi we computed 5 seeds instead of 4. The mean XP and its standard error are computed as the mean and standard deviation over J_{SP} of all joint policies in which no two local policies come from the same random seed, of which, with our numbers of random seeds, there are 12, 24, 24, 120 for 2, 3, 4, 5 players, respectively.

	SP	XP
2P: IPPO $\alpha = 0.05$	24.48 ± 0.02	24.45 ± 0.02
IPPO PP $\alpha = 0.05$	24.49 ± 0.02	24.46 ± 0.02
MAPPO PP $\alpha = 0.05$	24.49 ± 0.02	24.47 ± 0.02
3P: IPPO $\alpha = 0.05$	24.48 ± 0.02	24.28 ± 0.03
IPPO PP $\alpha = 0.05$	24.66 ± 0.02	24.55 ± 0.03
MAPPO PP $\alpha = 0.05$	24.66 ± 0.01	24.54 ± 0.02
4P: IPPO PP $\alpha = 0.05$	24.55 ± 0.01	24.30 ± 0.03
5P: IPPO PP $\alpha = 0.08$	23.73 ± 0.02	23.59 ± 0.03

Table 1. Average SP and average XP between 4 seeds of IPPO with LSTM architecture, IPPO with public-private LSTM architecture, and MAPPO with public-private LSTM architecture. We use $\lambda_{\text{GAE}} = 0.9$ and an entropy coefficient of 0.05. In 5-player Hanabi we used an entropy coefficient of 0.08 and used 5 seeds.

4.2.3. BIASED ADVANTAGE ESTIMATES LEAD TO SP/XP GAP

When using a critic in IPPO to reduce the variance in the advantage estimates, we are introducing bias into those esti-




Figure 4. 2-Player Hanabi: Block XP matrices between greedified policies trained with IPPO with different entropy coefficients and $\lambda_{\text{GAE}} = 0.9$. Four seeds per entropy coefficient. The scores in the parentheses are the averages of the SP scores in the diagonal 4x4 blocks, and all other scores is the average of the XP scores in the 4x4 blocks. Top: LSTM. Middle: PP LSTM. Bottom: FF. For the full XP matrices see Figures 6, 7, and 8 in the appendix.

mates, since the critic will not be fully accurate. This bias can also lead to symmetric breaking, since an asymmetrically biased critic will lead the actor to break symmetries. To measure the effect of asymmetric bias of the critic, we ran IPPO with entropy coefficients 0.05 and 0.10, and different λ_{GAE} . Those results are shown in Table 2. Note that for all results in the previous sections we used $\lambda_{\text{GAE}} = 0.9$.

We see that when λ_{GAE} is too small, i.e. when the advantage estimates have low variance but high bias, then this results in a gap between SP and XP. When increasing λ_{GAE} too much though, this will have a detrimental effect on SP.

Entropy	GAE	SP	XP
0.01	0.00	22.75 ± 0.41	18.04 ± 1.01
0.01	0.50	24.43 ± 0.08	5.580 ± 8.08
0.01	0.80	24.41 ± 0.07	14.36 ± 6.45
0.01	0.90	24.18 ± 0.10	22.78 ± 0.79
0.01	0.95	24.16 ± 0.01	22.59 ± 1.00
0.01	1.00	23.52 ± 0.08	23.14 ± 0.25
0.05	0.00	22.45 ± 0.20	20.09 ± 1.42
0.05	0.50	24.43 ± 0.03	7.940 ± 9.60
0.05	0.80	24.51 ± 0.01	16.18 ± 7.37
0.05	0.90	24.47 ± 0.01	24.48 ± 0.02
0.05	0.95	24.31 ± 0.03	24.23 ± 0.08
0.05	1.00	14.96 ± 0.01	14.96 ± 0.01
0.10	0.00	22.12 ± 0.17	20.99 ± 1.03
0.10	0.50	24.16 ± 0.19	22.13 ± 2.08
0.10	0.80	24.35 ± 0.02	24.32 ± 0.03
0.10	0.90	24.14 ± 0.02	24.13 ± 0.02
0.10	0.95	14.99 ± 0.01	14.99 ± 0.01
0.10	1.00	10.07 ± 0.02	10.07 ± 0.01

Table 2. 2-Player Hanabi: Average SP and XP between IPPO LSTM policies trained with different entropy coefficients and λ_{GAE} 's. 4 seeds per set of hyperparameters.

5. Related Work

In Rudolph et al. (2025) it was found that in imperfect information two-play zero-sum games, generic PPO with an increased entropy regularization beats, in terms of exploitability of the trained policies, other popular algorithms which were specially designed for this setting.

In the concurrent work Lauffer et al. (2025), a new multi-agent policy gradient method called *rational policy gradient* is developed for Dec-POMDPs, which aims to learn policies that are robust and diverse. They also briefly mention that in their experiments in the reduced 3- and 4-color versions of 2-player Hanabi, a higher entropy regularization lead to higher cross-play scores. They speculate that this is a feature of the smaller game or the fact that they use policies without history dependence, but do not expand on it further. Our results show though that higher entropy regularization

almost perfectly closes the gap between SP and XP in full Hanabi with 2, 3, 4, 5 players, and that in fact, policies which lack history dependence, are *more* likely to break symmetries than policies which use RNNs.

6. Conclusion

We see that in terms of inter-seed XP in Hanabi, IPPO with properly tuned hyperparameters, beats by a significant margin all previous methods which were specifically designed for this task. We see that a higher entropy coefficient, a higher λ_{GAE} , and using an RNN actor-critic network instead of a feed-forward one, play a significant role in preventing the emergence of asymmetric conventions. However, we have demonstrated through two counter examples, that tuning the entropy coefficient is not guaranteed to give the optimal symmetric policy in every Dec-POMDP. Thus, while we demonstrate the sometimes dramatic effect that hyperparameters can have not just on SP scores but also on XP scores, we emphasize that existing algorithms for ZSC are still needed, and the development of new ZSC algorithms is still necessary.

References

- 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.
- Cui, B., Hu, H., Pineda, L., and Foerster, J. K-level Reasoning for Zero-Shot Coordination in Hanabi. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:8215–8228, 2021.
- Cui, B., Hu, H., Lupu, A., Sokota, S., and Foerster, J. Off-team learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 15407–15419, 2022.
- Dizdarević, T., Hammond, R., Gessler, T., Calinescu, A., Cook, J., Gallici, M., Lupu, A., and Foerster, J. Ad-Hoc Human-AI Coordination Challenge. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025.
- 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.
- Lauffer, N., Shah, A., Carroll, M., Seshia, S. A., Russell, S., and Dennis, M. Robust and diverse multi-agent learning via rational policy gradient, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.09535>.
- 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.
- Muglich, D., Schroeder de Witt, C., van der Pol, E., Whetton, S., and Foerster, J. Equivariant Networks for Zero-Shot Coordination. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:6410–6423, 2022.
- Muglich, D., Forkel, J., van der Pol, E., and Foerster, J. Expected return symmetries. 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.01711>.
- Oliehoek, F. A., Spaan, M. T., Vlassis, N., et al. Dec-POMDPs with delayed communication. In *The 2nd Workshop on Multi-agent Sequential Decision-Making in Uncertain Domains*. Citeseer, 2007.
- Rudolph, M., Lichtle, N., Mohammadpour, S., Bayen, A., Kolter, J. Z., Zhang, A., Farina, G., Vinitzky, E., and Sokota, S. Reevaluating policy gradient methods for imperfect-information games, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.08938>.

Rutherford, A., Ellis, B., Gallici, M., Cook, J., Lupu, A., Ingvarsson, G., Willi, T., Khan, A., de Witt, C. S., Souly, A., Bandyopadhyay, S., Samvelyan, M., Jiang, M., Lange, R. T., Whiteson, S., Lacerda, B., Hawes, N., Rocktaschel, T., Lu, C., and Foerster, J. N. JaxMARL: Multi-Agent RL Environments and Algorithms in JAX. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10090*, 2023.

Schulman, J., Wolski, F., Dhariwal, P., Radford, A., and Klimov, O. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.06347>.

Yu, C., Velu, A., Vinitsky, E., Gao, J., Wang, Y., Bayen, A., and Wu, Y. The Surprising Effectiveness of PPO in Cooperative, Multi-Agent Games. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24611–24624, 2022.




Figure 5. Public-Private LSTM Actor-Critic Architecture: In Hanabi, a player’s public observation includes everything except for the player hands. A player’s private observation is the public observation plus the other players’ hands. The state is the public observation plus all players’ hands. For IPPO one doesn’t need a separate MLP for the critic, as the critic conditions only the local AOH τ_t^i , just like the actor. For IPPO, the critic MLP just receives the private observation $o_t^{i,\text{private}}$ as well. Both MLP streams have 3 hidden layers, and the LSTM stream has one feedforward embedding layer and two LSTM layers.

A. Network Architectures

In all architectures we use a width of 512 in all layers. All non-LSTM layers have a ReLU activation. For a description of the public-private LSTM architecture see Figure 5. Furthermore we share weights between all agents.

B. PPO Hyperparameters

For the PPO hyperparameters that are constant across all our Hanabi experiments, see Table 3 below. The only non-standard implementation detail in our code is that we mask out the actor loss for the non-acting player, as it always contributes zero to the gradient. This prevents the actor loss from effectively being divided by the number of agents and allows for more consistent hyperparameters across 2, 3, 4, and 5 player Hanabi.

Hyperparameter	Value
Learning Rate	5×10^{-4}
Number of Environments	1024
Number of Steps per Rollout	128
Total Timesteps	10^{10}
Update Epochs	4
Number of Minibatches	4
Discount Factor (γ)	0.999
Clipping Coefficient	0.2
Value Function Coefficient	0.5
Max Gradient Norm	0.5
Linear Learning Rate Annealing	True
Optimizer	Adam
Initialization	Orthogonal

Table 3. PPO hyperparameters that are fixed across all our experiments.




Figure 6. 2-Player Hanabi: XP matrix between LSTM IPPO policies trained with different entropy coefficients. There are four seeds per entropy coefficient 0.01, 0.02, ..., 0.10. Every entry in the matrix is the average score over 5000 games.

C. Full XP Matrices




Figure 7. 2-Player Hanabi: XP matrix between public-private LSTM IPPO policies trained with different entropy coefficients. There are four seeds per entropy coefficient 0.01, 0.02, ..., 0.10. Every entry in the matrix is the average score over 5000 games.




Figure 8. 2-Player Hanabi: XP matrix between feed-forward IPPO policies trained with different entropy coefficients. There are four seeds per entropy coefficient 0.01, 0.02, ..., 0.10. Every entry in the matrix is the average score over 5000 games.