

# IPPO Learns the Game, Not the Team: A Study on Generalization in Heterogeneous Agent Teams

Ryan LeRoy  
Los Gatos High School  
USA  
lerr8664@lgsstudent.org

Jack Kolb  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
USA  
kolb@gatech.edu

## ABSTRACT

Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (MARL) is commonly deployed in settings where agents are trained via self-play with homogeneous teammates, often using parameter sharing and a single policy architecture. This opens the question: to what extent do self-play PPO agents learn general coordination strategies grounded in the underlying game, compared to overfitting to their training partners' behaviors? This paper investigates the question using the Heterogeneous Multi-Agent Challenge (HeMAC) environment, which features distinct Observer and Drone agents with complementary capabilities. We introduce Rotating Policy Training (RPT), an approach that rotates heterogeneous teammate policies of different learning algorithms during training, to expose the agent to a broader range of partner strategies. When playing alongside a withheld teammate policy (DDQN), we find that RPT achieves similar performance to a standard self-play baseline, IPPO, where all agents were trained sharing a single PPO policy. This result indicates that in this heterogeneous multi-agent setting, the IPPO baseline generalizes to novel teammate algorithms despite not experiencing teammate diversity during training. This shows that a simple IPPO baseline may possess the level of generalization to novel teammates that a diverse training regimen was designed to achieve.

## KEYWORDS

Reinforcement Learning; Multi-Agent; Heterogeneous Agents; Generalization; PPO; Rotating Policy Training

### ACM Reference Format:

Ryan LeRoy and Jack Kolb. 2026. IPPO Learns the Game, Not the Team: A Study on Generalization in Heterogeneous Agent Teams. In *ACM Conference, Washington, DC, USA, July 2017*, IFAAMAS, 6 pages.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (MARL) has achieved strong results in complex cooperative and competitive environments, such as Quake III [3], Dota 2 [8], and StarCraft II [15]. A common recipe in these successes is self-play in largely homogeneous teams, often using parameter sharing so that all agents execute the same policy network. This setup stabilizes learning and encourages the discovery of a coherent joint strategy. However, it raises a key question: do such policies truly capture the underlying game structure, or are they over-specialized to the exact teammates seen during training?

In realistic multi-agent systems, agents are rarely guaranteed to coordinate with copies of themselves. Instead, they must cooperate

with teammates of unknown architecture, training procedure, and competence level. This heterogeneity is especially pronounced in domains like human-robot teaming, mixed autonomy, and modular robot teams, where agents may be added, upgraded, or trained by different parties over time. An agent that only performs well with clones of itself is of limited practical use.

To probe this issue, we study a heterogeneous cooperative task from the Heterogeneous Multi-Agent Challenge (HeMAC) [2]. HeMAC features two types of agents: Observers (planes) that scout for a target with a wide field of view, and Drones that physically intercept the target but have limited vision and a constrained energy budget. Coordination between these roles is crucial for success, making HeMAC a natural testbed for studying generalization across heterogeneous teammates.

We introduce Rotating Policy Training (RPT), a paradigm in which each agent role is associated with a small pool of policies trained with different RL algorithms (e.g., PPO, A2C, DQN). During training, the policy associated with each agent is repeatedly rotated on a per-episode basis. The original goal of RPT was to improve robustness by forcing each policy to coordinate with a diverse set of teammate behaviors. Surprisingly, our experiments reveal that RPT performs comparably to a much simpler baseline: all agents trained via self-play with independent PPO.

This key finding leads to a central claim of the paper: in the HeMAC environment, IPPO [10] appears to learn the underlying game dynamics and a general coordination protocol, achieving a level of robustness and generalization similar to that induced by the more complex RPT scheme. When paired with unseen Double Deep Q-Network (DDQN) [14] teammates at test time, the IPPO baseline matches RPT's performance.

## 2 RELATED WORK

Our work lies at the intersection of cooperative MARL, ad-hoc teamwork, and population-based or league-style training.

### 2.1 Cooperative MARL and CTDE

Centralized Training with Decentralized Execution (CTDE) is a dominant paradigm in cooperative MARL [5, 9]. Under CTDE, training leverages global state information and joint action-value functions to address credit assignment, while execution relies only on local observations. CTDE methods often assume homogeneous agents and can exploit shared structure across agents' observations and actions.

In contrast, this work uses fully decentralized training with independent PPO for simplicity. Each agent uses a independent PPO policy, which conditions on role-specific observations and rewards.

This choice intentionally removes centralized training signals, emphasizing what can be learned purely from local information and self-play.

## 2.2 Ad-hoc Teamwork and Teammate Modeling

Ad-hoc teamwork studies how agents can coordinate with previously unseen partners [13]. A common approach is explicit teammate or opponent modeling, in which an agent maintains and updates a belief over partner types, policies, or goals [1]. These methods can, in principle, adapt rapidly at test time, but they are often computationally expensive and can struggle with non-stationary teammates who are themselves learning.

RPT offers a different angle. Rather than modeling teammates explicitly at test time, it aims to induce robustness implicitly by training with a rotating cast of heterogeneous partners. Our results show that RPT achieves generalization performance similar to IPPO in HeMAC. This suggests that, at least in this domain, IPPO may already suffice to produce policies that generalize across new teammates, matching the robustness of a complex RPT training scheme without explicit modeling.

## 2.3 Population and League-Based Training

Population-based and league-based training have powered several landmark results in games [4, 8, 15]. These approaches maintain a population of agents with diverse strategies and training objectives, using them to generate a rich, non-stationary curriculum. Their primary aim is often to produce a single, strong final policy that can defeat or match all prior versions in the league.

RPT is inspired by these ideas but repurposes the population as a diagnostic tool rather than a path to superhuman play. Instead of a large league, RPT maintains a small set of heterogeneous policies per agent type (e.g., PPO, A2C, DQN). These policies are rotated batch-by-batch during training, forcing any given policy to coordinate with teammates that have different learning dynamics and representational biases. In our experiments, this added heterogeneity does not significantly outperform IPPO. The result indicates that, for HeMAC, extra population complexity is not necessary to achieve robust coordination with novel teammates.

## 3 METHOD

Our approach, Rotating Policy Training (RPT), introduces temporal heterogeneity during the training process by cycling through a diverse set of reinforcement learning algorithms for each agent. Unlike standard self-play where a single algorithm (e.g., PPO) is used throughout, RPT maintains three distinct policy instances per agent: Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) [11], Advantage Actor Critic (A2C) [6], and Deep Q-Network (DQN) [7].

At the start of training, we initialize these three distinct policies with separate neural networks and replay buffers. During training, we dynamically rotate which algorithm controls the agent. A key design choice in our implementation is to perform this rotation at the *episode* level. When an episode terminates, each agent independently samples a new active algorithm uniformly from its available pool {PPO, A2C, DQN}. This forces the agents to adapt to the varying exploration strategies of their teammates.

---

### Algorithm 1 Rotating Policy Training (RPT)

---

```

1: Input: Agents  $N$ , Timesteps  $T$ 
2: Initialize: For each agent  $i$ , create policy set  $\Pi^i = \{\pi_{\text{PPO}}^i, \pi_{\text{A2C}}^i, \pi_{\text{DQN}}^i\}$ 
3: Initialize: Active policy  $\pi_{\text{active}}^i \leftarrow \pi_{\text{PPO}}^i$  for all  $i$ 
4:
5: for timestep  $t = 1, \dots, T$  do
6:   Get actions  $a = \{\pi_{\text{active}}^i(o^i)\}_{i=1}^N$ 
7:   Step environment:  $o', r, d, \text{trunc\_} \leftarrow \text{Env}(a)$ 
8:   Store transitions in algorithm-specific memories
9:   // Update active algorithms
10:  for agent  $i = 1$  to  $N$  do
11:    Update  $\pi_{\text{active}}^i$  (e.g., if batch full or train freq met)
12:    if  $d^i$  is True or  $\text{trunc}^i$  is True then
13:      // Rotation step
14:      Sample new algo  $k \sim \text{Uniform}(\{\text{PPO}, \text{A2C}, \text{DQN}\})$ 
15:       $\pi_{\text{active}}^i \leftarrow \pi_k^i$ 
16:    end if
17:  end for
18: end for

```

---

## 3.1 Policy Architectures

We utilize consistent network architectures across algorithms where possible, implemented using the SKRL library.

- **Policy/Actor (PPO, A2C):** A Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) with two hidden layers of 256 units each. We use Tanh activations for the hidden layers. The output layer is a categorical distribution over discrete actions.
- **Value/Critic (PPO, A2C):** A separate MLP with two hidden layers of 256 units using Tanh activations, outputting a single scalar value estimate.
- **DQN:** A deterministic MLP with two hidden layers of 256 units and Tanh activations, outputting Q-values for all possible actions.

All networks process the standard observation space augmented by a running standard scaler to normalize inputs. PPO and A2C utilize RandomMemory buffers (size 512) for on-policy rollouts, while DQN utilizes a larger RandomMemory (size 10,000) acting as a replay buffer. This DQN buffer is relatively small compared to the number of training timesteps. This buffer size was chosen because of the non-stationarity that comes with rotating through multiple policies.

## 3.2 Training Procedure

Training for RPT is conducted for 3 million agent timesteps (9 million total for RPT) using a sequential trainer. For our training we used SKRL [12] as its flexibility enabled us to rotate through agents when doing RPT. Switching logic is triggered via the `record_transition` hook; if an agent flags termination, a `switch_pending` flag is set, and the algorithm is swapped in the `pre_interaction` hook before the next episode begins. Note that since 3 million agent timesteps occur, and each agent is only playing for 1/3 of the total timesteps, the sample efficiency is 3 times worse than it appears. This is further discussed in our results section.




Figure 1: The HeMAC environment with one Observer (plane) and one Drone. Observers have a wide vision cone, while Drones have limited vision but can physically intercept the target.

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

### 4.1 Environment: HeMAC

We conduct experiments in the Heterogeneous Multi-Agent Challenge (HeMAC) [2]. HeMAC is a cooperative environment featuring two distinct agent roles:

- **Observers (Planes):** High-altitude agents with a wide vision cone responsible for locating targets.
- **Drones:** Interceptor agents with limited vision but the ability to capture targets.

The observation space consists of local sensor data, and the action space is discrete. The team must coordinate to locate and intercept targets moving with stochastic dynamics.

### 4.2 Baselines

To validate the effectiveness of our rotating policy schedule, we compare against a standard homogeneous baseline:

- **Independent PPO (Baseline):** A individual multi-agent PPO implementation where every agent uses a PPO policy throughout the entire training run (3M steps). No algorithm rotation occurs.
- **RPT (Ours):** The method described in Section 3, where every agent rotates between PPO, A2C, and DQN throughout training to encourage robustness.

### 4.3 Training Protocol

Both methods are trained for 3 million agent timesteps on the same hardware setup. To ensure fairness, the PPO baseline utilizes the exact same network architecture (256x256 MLP) and hyperparameters as the PPO component of the RPT agent. We use a curriculum of spawn configurations that cycles throughout training to ensure agents experience a balanced distribution of initial positions.

### 4.4 Generalization Evaluation

To assess generalization to novel teammates, we evaluate all agents in a mixed-team setting with unseen policies:

- We independently train role-specific **DDQN policies** for Observers and Drones using self-play. These serve as "held-out" partners that were not encountered by either the Baseline or RPT agents during training.
- At evaluation time, we form teams where exactly one agent (either an Observer or a Drone) is controlled by the target policy (PPO or RPT), while all other agents use the held-out DDQN policy for their role.
- We cycle systematically through which agent is controlled by the target policy and through all spawn configurations, yielding evaluation over all combinations of roles, positions, and teammate assignments.

## 5 RESULTS

This section reports our training results for our baseline and RPT training. We also discuss conclusions that can be made and future work to be done.

## 6 DISCUSSION

The experimental results support a somewhat counterintuitive conclusion: a simple IPPO baseline can learn coordination strategies that generalize effectively to novel, heterogeneous teammates, while a more elaborate Rotating Policy Training scheme performs similarly.





Figure 2: The plot showing training reward curves for the RPT and PPO policies. These rewards are then plotted based on number of agent timesteps trained. To do this the RPT rewards were down-sampled by a factor of 3 to account for the random switching.

### 6.1 Why Does RPT Match Performance?

RPT aims to increase robustness by exposing agents to heterogeneous teammates. However, rotating policies at the batch level introduces substantial non-stationarity into the learning problem:

- From the perspective of any single policy, the joint policy of its teammates changes frequently and discontinuously.



**Figure 3: The plot showing reward when evaluated with mixed in novel teammate policies. These rewards are then plotted based on number of agent timesteps trained. To do this the RPT rewards were down-sampled by a factor of 3 to account for the random switching.**

- DQN uses large replay buffers for its off-policy training. With other agents training alongside it this leads to increased non-stationarity from DQN’s perspective.

These factors likely slow the convergence and prevent the target RPT-PPO policies from fully exploiting the structure of the HeMAC game. This means that even with the added teammate diversity, the agent still learns slower. In contrast, IPPO enjoys a relatively stable training signal: teammates follow the same learning rule and share parameters, making the overall training process more stationary.

From the training curve graphs above, both PPO and RPT converged to a value around 150 reward per episode. IPPO converged sooner, likely due to the lower non-stationarity in its environment. Remember that since RPT has to train for 3 times longer for the same number of agent timesteps, RPT has drastically worse sample efficiency when compared to a simpler PPO baseline.

## 6.2 PPO as a Game-Learner

The strong performance of IPPO when paired with unseen DDQN teammates suggests that PPO is not merely memorizing co-training partners. Instead, several factors point to IPPO learning the game not its teammates:

- IPPO retains most of its training return when interacting with DDQN policies, despite never seeing them during training.
- Qualitative behavior remains consistent across teammate types: PPO Observers and Drones perform similar role-specialized strategies regardless of whether their partners are PPO or DDQN.
- IPPO shows consistent performance across spawn configurations, indicating that it has learned to play the game and not to rely on certain environment conditions.

These observations align with the view that, at least in HeMAC, the qualities of IPPO encourage learning of broadly effective coordination protocols that transcend the specifics of training partners. This is seen in our data: Both PPO and RPT achieved 140 reward per episode when evaluated with novel DDQN agents mixed in.

This supports the conclusion that PPO is learning the game and not the teammates just as well as RPT.

## 6.3 Negative Result, Positive Insight

While RPT was originally introduced with the aim of improving performance, its matching-performance is informative. It highlights that:

- Additional complexity and heterogeneity in training do not automatically yield better generalization.
- Simple baselines such as PPO self-play may already possess stronger generalization capabilities than anticipated.
- Population-based or league-style methods must be carefully designed to avoid destabilizing learning, especially in fully decentralized settings.

Thus, RPT is valuable not as a new state-of-the-art algorithm, but as a diagnostic lens through which to study the robustness and limitations of standard MARL methods.

## 7 CONCLUSION

This paper investigated whether common MARL training practices, specifically Independent PPO, lead to policies that overfit to their training teammates or learn more general game-level strategies. Using the HeMAC environment with heterogeneous Observer and Drone agents, we introduced Rotating Policy Training (RPT) as a stress-test that rotates heterogeneous policies during training.

Empirically, RPT matched the performance a standard IPPO baseline, both in training and when evaluated with unseen DDQN teammates. IPPO achieved similar returns in both training and when interacting with novel policies. These findings support the view that PPO in this setting learns the underlying game and robust role-consistent behaviors, rather than brittle, teammate-specific conventions. However RPT had significantly lower sample efficiency due to having multiple policies to train.

## 8 FUTURE WORK

Several directions emerge from this study:

- **Stabilizing rotational training:** Future work could explore variants of RPT that reduce non-stationarity, such as slower rotation schedules, using all on or off policy algorithms, or freezing subsets of the population at different stages.
- **Explicit role conditioning:** While IPPO implicitly learns roles from observations, adding explicit role encodings may further improve generalization to new teammates and new role combinations.
- **Broader environments:** Applying the PPO vs. RPT comparison to other heterogeneous MARL benchmarks would help assess how widely the observed pattern holds.

Ultimately, understanding when simple methods like PPO self-play suffice and when more complex training schemes are necessary remains a key open question in MARL. RPT, even as a negative result, offers a useful tool for understanding that boundary.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Stefano V. Albrecht and Peter Stone. 2018. Autonomous Agents Modelling Other Agents: A Comprehensive Survey and Open Problems. *Artificial Intelligence* 258 (2018), 66–95.

- [2] Charles Dansereau, Junior-Samuel Lopez-Yepe, Karthik Soma, and Antoine Fagette. 2025. The Heterogeneous Multi-Agent Challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.19512* (2025). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.19512>
- [3] Max Jaderberg, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Iain Dunning, Luke Marris, Guy Lever, Antonio Garcia Castañeda, Charles Beattie, Neil C. Rabinowitz, Ari S. Morcos, Avraham Ruderman, Nicolas Sonnerat, Tim Green, Louise Deason, Joel Z. Leibo, David Silver, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Thore Graepel. 2019. Human-level performance in 3D multiplayer games with population-based reinforcement learning. *Science* 364, 6443 (May 2019), 859–865. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau6249>
- [4] Max Jaderberg, Valentin Dalibard, Simon Osindero, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Jeff Donahue, Ali Razavi, Oriol Vinyals, Tim Green, Iain Dunning, Karen Simonyan, Chrisantha Fernando, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. 2018. Population Based Training of Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Meta-Learning, NeurIPS 2018*.
- [5] Ryan Lowe, Yi I. Wu, Aviv Tamar, Jean Harb, OpenAI Pieter Abbeel, and Igor Mordatch. 2017. Multi-Agent Actor-Critic for Mixed Cooperative-Competitive Environments. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*. 6379–6390.
- [6] Volodymyr Mnih, Adrià Puigdomènech Badia, Mehdi Mirza, Alex Graves, Timothy P. Lillicrap, Tim Harley, David Silver, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. 2016. Asynchronous Methods for Deep Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv:1602.01783 [cs.LG]* <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.01783>
- [7] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, et al. 2015. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature* 518, 7540 (2015), 529–533.
- [8] OpenAI, Christopher Berner, Greg Brockman, Brooke Chan, Vicki Cheung, Platus Dębiak, Christy Dennison, David Farhi, Quirin Fischer, Shariq Hashme, Chris Hesse, Rafal Józefowicz, Scott Gray, Catherine Olsson, Jakub Pachocki, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jonathan Raiman, Tim Salimans, Jeremy Schlatter, Jonas Schneider, Szymon Sidor, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Filip Wolski, and Susan Zhang. 2019. Dota 2 with Large Scale Deep Reinforcement Learning. *CoRR abs/1912.06680* (2019).
- [9] Tabish Rashid, Mikayel Samvelyan, Christian Schroeder de Witt, Gregory Farquhar, Jakob N. Foerster, and Shimon Whiteson. 2018. QMIX: Monotonic Value Function Factorisation for Deep Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018*. 4292–4301.
- [10] Christian Schroeder de Witt, Tarun Gupta, Philip Abueg, Akbir Khan, Jakob Foerster, Shimon Whiteson, Katja Hofmann, Stephen James, and Sam Devlin. 2020. Is Independent Learning All You Need in the StarCraft Multi-Agent Challenge? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.09533* (2020).
- [11] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal Policy Optimization Algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347* (2017).
- [12] Antonio Serrano-Muñoz, Dimitrios Chrysostomou, Simon Bøgh, and Nestor Arana-Arexolaleiba. 2023. skrl: Modular and Flexible Library for Reinforcement Learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24, 254 (2023), 1–9. <http://jmlr.org/papers/v24/23-0112.html>
- [13] Peter Stone, Gregory Kuhlmann, Matthew E. Taylor, and Yaxin Liu. 2010. Ad Hoc Autonomous Agent Teams: A Preliminary Report. In *Proceedings of the AAMAS 2010 Workshop on Agent-Based Modeling for Real-World Systems*. 69–76.
- [14] Hado van Hasselt, Arthur Guez, and David Silver. 2016. Deep Reinforcement Learning with Double Q-learning. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 2094–2100.
- [15] Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Junyoung Chung, Michael Mathieu, Max Jaderberg, and et al. 2019. AlphaStar: Mastering the Real-Time Strategy Game StarCraft II. <https://deepmind.com/blog/alphastar-mastering-real-time-strategy-game-starcraft-ii/>.

## A DETAILED HYPERPARAMETER SETTINGS

This appendix details the specific hyperparameters used for training the three different policies (PPO, A2C, and DQN) within the Rotating Policy Training (RPT) framework, as well as the independent PPO baseline. Note that the PPO and A2C policies use on-policy memory buffers, while DQN uses a larger replay memory.

**Table 1: Hyperparameters for Trained Reinforcement Learning Policies**

Parameter	PPO	A2C	DQN
<b>General and Network Parameters</b>			
Learning Rate ( $\alpha$ )	$1 \times 10^{-4}$	$1 \times 10^{-4}$	$5 \times 10^{-5}$
Discount Factor ( $\gamma$ )	0.99	0.99	0.99
Network Architecture (Policy/Q)	MLP [256, 256]	MLP [256, 256]	MLP [256, 256]
State Preprocessor	RunningStandardScaler	RunningStandardScaler	RunningStandardScaler
<b>On-Policy (PPO &amp; A2C) Specific Parameters</b>			
Rollout/Memory Size	512	512	-
GAE Lambda ( $\lambda$ )	0.95	0.95	-
Gradient Norm Clip	0.4	0.4	-
Entropy Coefficient (Initial)	0.015	0.015	-
Number of Learning Epochs	3	-	-
Mini Batch Size	64	64	-
PPO Clip Parameter ( $\epsilon$ )	0.2	-	-
<b>Off-Policy (DQN) Specific Parameters</b>			
Replay Buffer Size	-	-	10,000
Initial $\epsilon$	-	-	0.7
$\epsilon$ Timesteps	-	-	600,000
Learning Starts At	-	-	16,000 steps
Random Timesteps	-	-	1,024