

---

# Collaboration and Conflict between Humans and Language Models through the Lens of Game Theory

---

**Mukul Singh**  
Microsoft  
Redmond, WA  
singhmukul@microsoft.com

**Arjun Radhakrishna**  
Microsoft  
Redmond, WA  
arradha@microsoft.com

**Sumit Gulwani**  
Microsoft  
Redmond, WA  
sumitg@microsoft.com

## Abstract

Language models are increasingly deployed in interactive online environments, from personal chat assistants to domain-specific agents, raising questions about their cooperative and competitive behavior in multi-party settings. While prior work has examined language model decision-making in isolated or short-term game-theoretic contexts, these studies often neglect long-horizon interactions, human-model collaboration, and the evolution of behavioral patterns over time. In this paper, we investigate the dynamics of language model behavior in the iterated prisoner’s dilemma (IPD), a classical framework for studying cooperation and conflict. We pit model-based agents against a suite of 240 well-established classical strategies in an Axelrod-style tournament and find that language models achieve performance on par with, and in some cases exceeding, the best-known classical strategies. Behavioral analysis reveals that language models exhibit key properties associated with strong cooperative strategies—niceness, provocability, and generosity—while also demonstrating rapid adaptability to changes in opponent strategy mid-game. In controlled “strategy switch” experiments, language models detect and respond to shifts within only a few rounds, rivaling or surpassing human adaptability. These results provide the first systematic characterization of long-term cooperative behaviors in language model agents, offering a foundation for future research into their role in more complex, mixed human-AI social environments.

## 1 Introduction

Language models are increasingly making their way into online and social platforms both in the form of personal chat assistants [10, 12, 7], as well as agents with specific roles such as customer support and technical help [11, 1]. This has been deeply polarizing with strong expressions of concerns for the risks [6], as well as opportunities for human AI collaboration [9]. To better understand the dynamics that arise from these interactions, previous work has looked into the behavior of these models for different social stimulus [14]. Game theory is an ideal experimental ground for studying behaviour dynamics in a simple and well-contained settings [15]. These experiments are set up with a general theme where the players (1) aim to maximize their score; (2) their success is affected by the actions of other player; their is a historical element to adapt the behavior [5]. Previous work has found that humans deviate from optimal strategies due to their psychological and historical biases [8]. Observing the collaborative behavior of humans and language models could shed light on the social norms and value that these models have internalized and can help understand the capabilities in reasoning, planning and collaborating.

Previous works have investigated the behaviors of models in classical games [15]. While highly relevant, these studies have significant limitations: (1) these works do not consider collaboration between humans and often only consider single simulated scenarios [5]; (2) the duration of the games is not long enough to study evolution style behaviors and mostly focus on single point experiments

[4]; (3) the studies have not looked at behavior patterns but rather focus on quantitative metrics like frequency of outcomes [15]. These limitations have made understanding the social and collaborative behavior of language models in setting with humans challenging to study, calling for more systematic evidence on these behaviors. These limitation have been highlighted in multiple previous literature [14].

In this paper, we study the “behavior over time” aspect of language models in interactive settings through the classical platform of iterated prisoner’s dilemma games [5]. In these games, the players interact over multiple rounds, choosing to either cooperate or defect in each round—the reward structure is set up so that there is an incentive to defect while the opponent cooperates. These games provide a rich theory of diverse strategies which have been long used to study aspects of cooperation and conflict [2, 3]. Aspects of the strategies change their actions in response to the opponent’s previous actions have been associated Specific properties how strategies have been associated with behavior characteristics such as niceness, forgiving, retaliation, and so on [15].

We examine the performance of language models in this setting by pitting them against 240 classical strategies in an Axelrod-style tournament, showing that language models perform on par or better than the best performing classical strategies as tit-for-tat. Language model based strategies accumulating an average advantage of 12.6 wins per round. We further examine the behavioral characteristics of language models and show that they closely follow the characteristics of the best classical strategies of being *nice*, *provocable*, and *generous* [15].

Further, we show that language models are highly adaptable, detecting a change in the opponents’ strategy within a few rounds and changing their own accordingly. In an experiment where one classical strategy is replaced by another in the middle of an iterated prisoners’ dilemma game, the language model based players were able to recognize the switch and adapt slower than human players, with 24.5 rounds early change in strategy compared to humans. These findings provide a baseline for a more detailed examination of cooperative behaviors of language model agents in more complex interactive scenarios.

In this paper, we make the following contributions:

- we study the cooperative behavior characteristics of language models in an interactive setting through a classical game-theoretic platform;
- we show that language models display performance on par or better than the best classical strategies, while displaying behavioral characteristics of good classical strategies; and
- we show that language models are worse than humans in adapting to changes in the interaction environment.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma

The prisoner’s dilemma is a popular setting to understand cooperation and conflict between two agents. The players independently and concurrently choose between two actions, Collaborate (C) or Defect (D), without any prior communication or strategization. Mutual cooperation results in the reward  $R$  for each player. If one player defects and the other cooperates, then a higher reward  $H$  is given to the defector while a lower reward  $L$  is given to the cooperator. Finally, if both decide to defect, a mutual punishment  $P$  reward is given to both players. In the classic setup,  $H > R > P > L$  to incentivize defection but de-incentivize mutual defection [15]. With this relationship between rewards, the strategy to defect is a dominating strategy for either player.

In the iterated version of prisoner’s dilemma, the players repeatedly play the single turn version over many rounds, and the reward for a player is given by the sum of rewards in each round. For the iterated version, we need the additional condition  $H + L < 2R$ , to avoid the dominating strategy of each player alternately cooperating and defecting. With this relationship holding, there is no clear dominating strategy for either player [15]. In this paper, we consider two different settings: one with a fixed number of rounds that is known to both players at the start of the game, and one with an arbitrary number of rounds.

## 2.2 Strategies

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  represent the set  $\{C, D\}$  of actions. A strategy  $\sigma$  for iterated prisoner’s dilemma maps a history  $h \in (\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A})^{n-1}$  of the two players’ actions in previous rounds to a probability distribution over  $\mathcal{A}$ . More simply, given a history  $h$  of length  $n - 1$ , a strategy produces  $p \in [0, 1]$ , with the player cooperating in round  $n$  with probability  $p$  and defecting with probability  $1 - p$ .

In 1980, Robert Axelrod organized a tournament inviting submissions of programmatic strategies for iterated prisoner’s dilemma. The demonstrated through a tournament the rich and complex relationship between different strategies and their characteristics, showing that while there is no clear winner, certain classes of strategies tend to generally perform better.

The original submissions to Axelrod’s tournament and follow-up strategies researchers have constructed, numbering 240 overall, are collected and maintained at [5]. We describe a few of the most popular strategies here.

1. **Memoryless strategies** ignore the history and always choose the same action in each round. We have two memoryless strategies, namely *always cooperate* and *always defect*.
2. **Retaliatory strategies.** These strategies are designed to punish an opponent who defects. They begin by consistently cooperating, but start to defect under various conditions when the opponent defects. The popular retaliatory strategies are: (a) *grim defect*, which always defects after the first time the opponent defects; (b) *tit-for-tat*, which defects if the opponent defected in the previous move, but cooperates otherwise; (c) *2-step copy*, which behaves like tit-for-tat, but based on the opponent’s move before the last rather than the last; and (d) *generous tit-for-tat*, which defects on an opponents defection with a probability  $p < 1$ .
3. **Win-stay lose-switch** strategy will replay their last action if the reward in the last round was either  $H$  (both cooperate) or  $R$  (player defects, opponent cooperates), but switch otherwise.

## 2.3 Behavioral Dimensions

The number and diversity of viable strategies for iterated prisoner’s dilemma make studying each of them individually infeasible [15]. Hence, to make sense of these diverse strategies and variants, prior work has characterized these strategies under various *behavioral traits*. First, we begin by defining terms that correspond to specific events that occur during a game or tournament.

1. *Initial cooperation* is when a player cooperates in the first turn of a game.
2. *Forgiven defection* is when a player cooperates in the turn immediately after the opponent defects.
3. *Retaliation* is when a player defects in a round immediately after the opponent defects in the previous round.

For a strategy  $\sigma$  participating in a tournament of iterated prisoner’s dilemma games, we define the metrics *niceness*, *forgiveness*, and *retaliation* as the relative probabilities of observing initial cooperation, uncalled defections, forgiven defections, and retaliations. For example, forgiveness is the fraction of times we observe a forgiven defection with respect to the number of defections from opponents. In addition to these, we consider the morality metrics as described in [13]—the good-partner rating, Eigenjesus rating, and Eigenmoses rating. The good-partner rating measures the fraction of games in which a player cooperated at least as much as its partner. The Eigenjesus rating roughly measures the cooperativeness of a player, with cooperation with more cooperative opponents being given higher weight. On the other hand, the Eigenmoses rating measures how much a player cooperates with cooperative opponents and defects with defecting opponents.

## 3 Methodology

The main goal of this paper is to study the current generation of large language models in the iterated prisoner’s dilemma setting to understand their behavioral characteristics in a competitive environment. To this end, we set up a tournament with players corresponding to both LLMs and classical strategies, and observe their performances and behaviors across the dimensions discussed above.




Figure 1: Figure showing the model wins and score differential over number of rounds. We see that the model wins and differential both increase over time.

Given a language model, we construct a corresponding strategy by prompting the model to choose either cooperate or defect. The history of the prior turns are provided to the model as messages (following a standard chat API). In this setup, the instructions in the prompt chosen heavily influence the behavior of the LLM-based player. For example, a prompt setting up the game as “You are playing an iterated prisoner’s dilemma game. Defecting is a great strategy in this game.” is likely to produce heavily biased data. To mitigate this issue, we tested multiple prompt variants in a pilot study to verify stability, and the most consistent variant is selected for the experiments. We reproduce the selected prompt below.

You are playing an iterated prisoner’s dilemma game against an opponent. In each round, you will be provided the history of all previous rounds, and your task is to pick either cooperate or defect. Here are the rewards for each round: 1. If both players cooperate, ...

We set the reward structure to be the same as in the classical Axelrod tournament, with  $H = 5$ ,  $R = 3$ ,  $P = 1$ ,  $L = 0$ , satisfying  $H > R > P > L$  and  $H + L < 2R$ . For the fixed horizon setting, we choose the number of rounds to be 50, and for the indefinite horizon setting, the game ends after each turn with a probability of 0.05. Each pairwise game between two players is repeated for 20 random seeds to account for stochasticity in LLM outputs as well as probabilistic strategies.

## 4 Experiments

We design a set of controlled experiments to evaluate the social and strategic behaviors of language models (LMs) in the Prisoner’s Dilemma setting. The experiments are constructed to answer the following research questions (RQs):

1. **RQ1:** How do AI models perform against classical strategies and against each other in repeated Prisoner’s Dilemma?
2. **RQ2:** How do AI models adapt to sudden changes in opponent behavior, as tested in a single-switch strategy experiment?
3. **RQ3:** Can humans adapt more effectively than AI models in the same experimental setting?

### 4.1 RQ1: AI vs Classical Strategies and Self-Play

Figure 1 shows the cumulative model wins and score differential over rounds when AI models play against classical strategies and in self-play. We observe that AI models generally accumulate both wins and score advantage steadily over the course of the game, indicating that they are capable of sustaining competitive play against well-known strategies such as Tit-for-Tat and Always Cooperate.




Figure 2: Showing cooperation rate over number of rounds for AI models against different strategies.




Figure 3: Showing the recovery rate after a switch in strategy for AI models against different strategies.

Against highly cooperative strategies, AI models often converge to mutual cooperation, resulting in high and symmetric payoffs. Against defect-heavy strategies, however, the models tend to shift towards defection themselves, reducing cooperation rates and producing larger payoff asymmetries. The win curve’s near-linear growth suggests that, once an advantage is established, the AI can maintain or widen it over time. However, when matched against adaptive strategies from the classical bank, win accumulation slows, hinting at exploitable patterns in AI play that these can counter.

#### 4.2 RQ2: Single-Switch Adaptation

Figures 4 and 3 capture adaptation dynamics when the opponent changes strategy mid-game. In the **Coop**→**Defect** scenario (red line), there is an immediate and sharp drop in cooperation rate (around  $-20\%$ ), followed by a slow exponential recovery as the AI gradually re-establishes a balanced response. This pattern is consistent with a “betrayal” interpretation: the AI initially continues to cooperate before learning that defection is now optimal, and then slowly adjusts its behavior.

In contrast, the **Coop**→**Competitive** scenario (yellow line) produces a more oscillatory cooperation rate pattern with smaller amplitude (around  $\pm 5\%$ ) that gradually damps over time. This reflects a volatile opponent who mixes cooperation and defection, prompting the AI to alternate between cautious cooperation and retaliatory defection rather than committing fully to one behavior.

Recovery curves (Figure 3) quantify adaptation speed. Certain strategies, such as *First by Grofman*, rapidly recover to pre-switch cooperation levels or even exceed them, while others like *First by Tullock* continue to decline, indicating slow or ineffective adjustment. The gap in recovery slopes demonstrates that not all strategies—AI or classical—adapt well to abrupt environmental changes.




Figure 4: Multiple-condition overlay showing the effects of strategy changes on cooperation rates and payoff impact. Each curve represents the average change in cooperation rate (%) following a specific strategy switch (e.g., Coop→Defect, Defect→Coop, Coop→Competitive, Defect→Competitive), with vertical lines marking the switch point. Solid lines indicate cooperation rate changes (left axis), while dashed lines show corresponding payoff change magnitudes (right axis).

Table 1: Comparison of human and AI adaptation across opponent types. Adaptation speed measured as rounds to recover post-switch; cooperation rate is percentage of cooperative moves in post-switch.

Condition	Adaptation Speed ↓	Coop. Rate (%) ↑	Payoff ↑
Humans vs Fixed-strategy	$3.2 \pm 0.8$	$78.5 \pm 5.2$	$4.12 \pm 0.15$
Humans vs Single-switch	$5.4 \pm 1.1$	$62.3 \pm 4.8$	$3.76 \pm 0.19$
Humans vs AI Opponent	$4.9 \pm 0.9$	$69.1 \pm 5.0$	$3.95 \pm 0.17$
AI vs Fixed-strategy	$2.1 \pm 0.4$	$81.4 \pm 3.9$	$4.25 \pm 0.12$
AI vs Single-switch	$3.7 \pm 0.6$	$66.8 \pm 4.4$	$4.01 \pm 0.15$

### 4.3 RQ3: Human vs AI Adaptation

We recruit  $N_h = 10$  human participants via an online experiment platform. Each participant plays: (1) A fixed-strategy opponent (baseline) (2) A single-switch opponent (matching RQ2 conditions). (3) An AI opponent (top-performing model from RQ1). Humans are given minimal instructions and no details about opponent strategies to match AI’s lack of meta-knowledge. We measure: (1) Adaptation speed (same metric as in RQ2). (2) Long-term cooperation rate post-switch. (3) Payoff differences compared to AI agents in identical conditions.

Table 1 shows the results for this experiment, we can see that humans adapted more slowly than the top-performing AI model but maintained higher long-term cooperation rates after the switch. Despite lower immediate payoffs, human strategies favored sustained mutual cooperation.

## 5 Conclusion

We compare LLMs, classical strategies, and humans in the iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma experiment. We find that LLM-based agents can sustain competitive play against a wide range of opponents (RQ1), adapt to abrupt changes in opponent behavior with moderate speed (RQ2), and in some cases match or exceed human adaptability in short-term payoff optimization (RQ3). However, humans tend to maintain higher long-term cooperation rates, suggesting that while current LLMs are capable strategic actors, they often favor exploitative adjustments over sustained mutual benefit.

## References

- [1] J. Ahn, R. Verma, R. Lou, D. Liu, R. Zhang, and W. Yin. Large language models for mathematical reasoning: Progresses and challenges, 2024.
- [2] A. Askill, M. Brundage, and G. Hadfield. The role of cooperation in responsible ai development, 2019.
- [3] P. M. P. Curvo, M. Dragomir, S. Torpes, and M. Rahimi. Reproducibility study of "cooperate or collapse: Emergence of sustainable cooperation in a society of llm agents", 2025.
- [4] U. Faigle. Mathematical game theory: A new approach, 2023.
- [5] F. Guo. Gpt in game theory experiments, 2023.
- [6] S. Kambhampati, K. Stechly, K. Valmееkam, L. Saldyt, S. Bhambri, V. Palod, A. Gundawar, S. R. Samineni, D. Kalwar, and U. Biswas. Stop anthropomorphizing intermediate tokens as reasoning/thinking traces!, 2025.
- [7] H. Le, Y. Wang, A. D. Gotmare, S. Savarese, and S. C. H. Hoi. Coder1: Mastering code generation through pretrained models and deep reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:21314–21328, 2022.
- [8] S. M. Mousavi, E. Cecchinato, L. Hornikova, and G. Riccardi. Garbage in, reasoning out? why benchmark scores are unreliable and what to do about it, 2025.
- [9] K. Oberauer. Working memory and attention – a conceptual analysis and review. *Journal of Cognition*, 2(1):36, 2019.
- [10] OpenAI, :, A. Jaech, A. Kalai, A. Lerer, A. Richardson, A. El-Kishky, A. Low, A. Helyar, A. Madry, A. Beutel, A. Carney, A. Iftimie, A. Karpenko, A. T. Passos, A. Neitz, A. Prokofiev, A. Wei, A. Tam, A. Bennett, A. Kumar, A. Saraiva, A. Vallone, A. Duberstein, A. Kondrich, A. Mishchenko, A. Applebaum, A. Jiang, A. Nair, B. Zoph, B. Ghorbani, B. Rossen, B. Sokolowsky, B. Barak, B. McGrew, B. Minaiev, B. Hao, B. Baker, B. Houghton, B. McKinzie, B. Eastman, C. Lugaresi, C. Bassin, C. Hudson, C. M. Li, C. de Bourcy, C. Voss, C. Shen, C. Zhang, C. Koch, C. Orsinger, C. Hesse, C. Fischer, C. Chan, D. Roberts, D. Kappler, D. Levy, D. Selsam, D. Dohan, D. Farhi, D. Mely, D. Robinson, D. Tsipras, D. Li, D. Oprica, E. Freeman, E. Zhang, E. Wong, E. Proehl, E. Cheung, E. Mitchell, E. Wallace, E. Ritter, E. Mays, F. Wang, F. P. Such, F. Raso, F. Leoni, F. Tsimpourlas, F. Song, F. von Lohmann, F. Sulit, G. Salmon, G. Parascandolo, G. Chabot, G. Zhao, G. Brockman, G. Leclerc, H. Salman, H. Bao, H. Sheng, H. Andrin, H. Bagherinezhad, H. Ren, H. Lightman, H. W. Chung, I. Kivlichan, I. O’Connell, I. Osband, I. C. Gilaberte, I. Akkaya, I. Kostrikov, I. Sutskever, I. Kofman, J. Pachocki, J. Lennon, J. Wei, J. Harb, J. Twore, J. Feng, J. Yu, J. Weng, J. Tang, J. Yu, J. Q. Candela, J. Palermo, J. Parish, J. Heidecke, J. Hallman, J. Rizzo, J. Gordon, J. Uesato, J. Ward, J. Huizinga, J. Wang, K. Chen, K. Xiao, K. Singhal, K. Nguyen, K. Cobbe, K. Shi, K. Wood, K. Rimbach, K. Gu-Lemberg, K. Liu, K. Lu, K. Stone, K. Yu, L. Ahmad, L. Yang, L. Liu, L. Maksin, L. Ho, L. Fedus, L. Weng, L. Li, L. McCallum, L. Held, L. Kuhn, L. Kondraciuk, L. Kaiser, L. Metz, M. Boyd, M. Trebacz, M. Joglekar, M. Chen, M. Tintor, M. Meyer, M. Jones, M. Kaufner, M. Schwarzer, M. Shah, M. Yatbaz, M. Y. Guan, M. Xu, M. Yan, M. Glaese, M. Chen, M. Lampe, M. Malek, M. Wang, M. Fradin, M. McClay, M. Pavlov, M. Wang, M. Wang, M. Murati, M. Bavarian, M. Rohaninejad, N. McAleese, N. Chowdhury, N. Chowdhury, N. Ryder, N. Tezak, N. Brown, O. Nachum, O. Boiko, O. Murk, O. Watkins, P. Chao, P. Ashbourne, P. Izmailov, P. Zhokhov, R. Dias, R. Arora, R. Lin, R. G. Lopes, R. Gaon, R. Miyara, R. Leike, R. Hwang, R. Garg, R. Brown, R. James, R. Shu, R. Cheu, R. Greene, S. Jain, S. Altman, S. Toizer, S. Toyer, S. Miserendino, S. Agarwal, S. Hernandez, S. Baker, S. McKinney, S. Yan, S. Zhao, S. Hu, S. Santurkar, S. R. Chaudhuri, S. Zhang, S. Fu, S. Papay, S. Lin, S. Balaji, S. Sanjeev, S. Sidor, T. Broda, A. Clark, T. Wang, T. Gordon, T. Sanders, T. Patwardhan, T. Sottiaux, T. Degry, T. Dimson, T. Zheng, T. Garipov, T. Stasi, T. Bansal, T. Creech, T. Peterson, T. Eloundou, V. Qi, V. Kosaraju, V. Monaco, V. Pong, V. Fomenko, W. Zheng, W. Zhou, W. McCabe, W. Zaremba, Y. Dubois, Y. Lu, Y. Chen, Y. Cha, Y. Bai, Y. He, Y. Zhang, Y. Wang, Z. Shao, and Z. Li. Openai o1 system card, 2024.

- [11] A. Plaat, M. van Duijn, N. van Stein, M. Preuss, P. van der Putten, and K. J. Batenburg. Agentic large language models, a survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.23037*, 2025.
- [12] B. Roziere, J. Gehring, F. Gloeckle, S. Sootla, I. Gat, X. E. Tan, Y. Adi, J. Liu, R. Sauvestre, T. Remez, et al. Code llama: Open foundation models for code, 2023.
- [13] T. Singer-Clark. Morality metrics on iterated prisoners dilemma players. 2014.
- [14] T. Wilson and J. Schooler. Thinking too much: Introspection can reduce the quality of preferences and decisions. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 60:181–92, 03 1991.
- [15] Q. Zhu. Game theory meets llm and agentic ai: Reimagining cybersecurity for the age of intelligent threats, 2025.

## A Morality Metrics

Strategy	Coop. Rate	Good Partner	Forgiveness	Retaliation	Generosity
Always Cooperate	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tit For Tat	78.3	67.1	0.0	100.0	0.0
Win Stay Lose Shift	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Suspicious Tit For Tat	99.8	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
First by Grofman	46.8	60.2	2.7	33.3	0.9
First by Shubik	14.4	72.0	1.5	44.4	0.3
First by Feld	5.8	87.9	0.4	80.0	0.2
First by Joss	2.4	85.7	0.0	100.0	0.0
First by Tullock	1.2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
First by Downing	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
First by Anonymous	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Random	49.6	64.5	43.3	37.6	24.5
Always Defect	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

Table 2: Performance metrics for various strategies in Iterated Prisoner's Dilemma.

## NeurIPS Paper Checklist

The checklist is designed to encourage best practices for responsible machine learning research, addressing issues of reproducibility, transparency, research ethics, and societal impact. Do not remove the checklist: **The papers not including the checklist will be desk rejected.** The checklist should follow the references and follow the (optional) supplemental material. The checklist does NOT count towards the page limit.

Please read the checklist guidelines carefully for information on how to answer these questions. For each question in the checklist:

- You should answer [Yes], [No], or [NA].
- [NA] means either that the question is Not Applicable for that particular paper or the relevant information is Not Available.
- Please provide a short (1–2 sentence) justification right after your answer (even for NA).

**The checklist answers are an integral part of your paper submission.** They are visible to the reviewers, area chairs, senior area chairs, and ethics reviewers. You will be asked to also include it (after eventual revisions) with the final version of your paper, and its final version will be published with the paper.

The reviewers of your paper will be asked to use the checklist as one of the factors in their evaluation. While "[Yes]" is generally preferable to "[No]", it is perfectly acceptable to answer "[No]" provided a proper justification is given (e.g., "error bars are not reported because it would be too computationally expensive" or "we were unable to find the license for the dataset we used"). In general, answering "[No]" or "[NA]" is not grounds for rejection. While the questions are phrased in a binary way, we acknowledge that the true answer is often more nuanced, so please just use your best judgment and write a justification to elaborate. All supporting evidence can appear either in the main paper or the supplemental material, provided in appendix. If you answer [Yes] to a question, in the justification please point to the section(s) where related material for the question can be found.

### 1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have clearly listed our contribution in the Introduction Section 1 (line 55 to line 60). We also briefly summarize it in abstract (line 4 to 9).

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

### 2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have a Limitation section (Section 7) describing the limitations.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.

- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

### 3. Theory assumptions and proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper draws correlation between LLM and humans based on the correctness of response associated with the reasoning capability of LLM and memory structure, cognitive signatures.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

### 4. Experimental result reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have an experimental setup Section 4 to educate reader about the experimentation setup and reproducibility. We also aim to release our train/test setup for the evaluation.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.

- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
  - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
  - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
  - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
  - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

## 5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: **[TODO]**

Justification: **[TODO]**

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

## 6. Experimental setting/details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyper-parameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Yes we provide all information related to train/test setup in Section 4.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

## 7. Experiment statistical significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Yes, all the results and the plots that are shown in Section 5 Result section shows all the experimentation results using the metrics that are defined in Section 4.2.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

## 8. Experiments compute resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have describe all about the compute resource in Section 4.3 along with costs.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.

- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

#### 9. Code of ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines?>

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have reviewed and follow NeurIPS Code of Ethics.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

#### 10. Broader impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our work draws parallels between model reasoning behavior and cognitive science frameworks along with insights into training paradigms which falls in empirical evaluation. This this work does have any positive and negative direct societal. Though we have a limitation section that talks how our evaluation setup is limited, in sense of scope of evaluation tasks.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

#### 11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: We don't release any trained models or dataset.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

## 12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have cited all assets (datasets) used along citations for all the related work.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, [paperswithcode.com/datasets](https://paperswithcode.com/datasets) has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset's creators.

## 13. New assets

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: We are not releasing any new assets as a part of this work.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

## 14. Crowdsourcing and research with human subjects

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: NA

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

**15. Institutional review board (IRB) approvals or equivalent for research with human subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: No human subjects were used for these research.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.

**16. Declaration of LLM usage**

Question: Does the paper describe the usage of LLMs if it is an important, original, or non-standard component of the core methods in this research? Note that if the LLM is used only for writing, editing, or formatting purposes and does not impact the core methodology, scientific rigor, or originality of the research, declaration is not required.

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Our work draws parallels between LLM reasoning behavior and cognitive science frameworks along with insights into training paradigms. We have declared this explicitly in abstract and introduction.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the core method development in this research does not involve LLMs as any important, original, or non-standard components.
- Please refer to our LLM policy (<https://neurips.cc/Conferences/2025/LLM>) for what should or should not be described.