

Tackling One Health Risks: How Large Language Models are leveraged for Risk Negotiation and Consensus-building.

Leveraging LLMs for One Health Risk Negotiation.

Alexandra Fetsch ^{1†}, Iurii Savvateev^{2†}, Racem Ben Romdhane², Martin Wiedmann³, Artemiy Dimov^{4,5,6}, Maciej Durkalec^{7,8}, Josef Teichmann⁹, Jakob Zinsstag^{4,5}, Konstantinos Koutsoumanis¹⁰, Andreja Rajkovic¹¹, Jason Mann¹², Mauro Tonolla¹³, Monika Ehling-Schulz¹⁴, Matthias Filter², Sophia Johler^{1*}

¹ Chair of Food Microbiology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany; Email: alexandra.fetsch@lmu.de, sophia.johler@lmu.de

² Study Centre Supply Chain Modelling and Artificial Intelligence, German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment, Berlin, Germany; Email: Iurii.Savvateev@bfr.bund.de, racem.ben-romdhane@bfr.bund.de, matthias.filter@bfr.bund.de

³ Department of Food Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, USA; E-mail: martin.wiedmann@cornell.edu

⁴ Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Allschwil, Switzerland; Email: artemiy.dimov@swisstph.ch, jakob.zinsstag@swisstph.ch

⁵ University of Basel, Petersplatz 1, 4001 Basel, Switzerland

⁶ Institute for Food Safety and Hygiene, Vetsuisse Faculty, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

⁷ Study Centre for Land- use related Evaluation procedures, One-Health, German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment, Berlin, Germany; Email: Maciej.Durkalec@bfr.bund.de

⁸ Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, National Veterinary Research Institute, Puławy, Poland

⁹ Department of Mathematics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland; Email: jteichma@math.ethz.ch

¹⁰ Department of Food Science and Technology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece; E-mail: doulgeraki@agro.auth.gr

¹¹ Faculty of Bioscience Engineering, Department. of Food Technology, Safety and Health, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium, E-mail: Andreja.Rajkovic@UGent.be

¹² Nestlé USA, Inc., Arlington, USA; Email: jason.mann@us.nestle.com

¹³ Institute of Microbiology, University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland, Mendrisio, Switzerland, Email: mauro.tonolla@supsi.ch

¹⁴ Institute for Microbiology, Center of Pathobiology, Department of Biological Sciences and Pathobiology, University of Veterinary Medicine Vienna, Vienna, Austria; E-mail: Monika.Ehling-Schulz@vetmeduni.ac.at


† contributed equally

***Corresponding author:** Prof. Dr. Sophia Johler

Phone +49 89 2180 78 600

Fax +49 89 2180 78 602

Email sophia.johler@lmu.de



Abstract

Key global challenges of our times are characterized by complex interdependencies and can only be effectively addressed through an integrated, participatory effort. Conventional risk analysis frameworks often reduce complexity to ensure manageability, creating silos that hinder comprehensive solutions. A fundamental shift towards holistic strategies is essential to enable effective negotiations between different sectors and to balance the competing interests of stakeholders. However, achieving this balance is often hindered by limited time, vast amounts of information, and the complexity of integrating diverse perspectives. This study presents an AI-assisted negotiation framework that incorporates large language models (LLMs) and AI-based autonomous agents into a negotiation-centered risk analysis workflow. The framework enables stakeholders to simulate negotiations, systematically model dynamics, anticipate compromises, and evaluate solution impacts. By leveraging LLMs' semantic analysis capabilities we could mitigate information overload and augment decision-making process under time constraints. Proof-of-concept implementations were conducted in two real-world scenarios: (i) prudent use of a biopesticide, and (ii) targeted wild animal population control. Our work demonstrates the potential of AI-assisted negotiation to address the current lack of tools for cross-sectoral engagement. Importantly, the solution's open source, web based design, suits for application by a broader audience with limited resources and enables users to tailor and develop it for their own needs.

Keywords: Risk analysis, Negotiations, One Health, Large Language Models, Multi-agent frameworks, GPT

Introduction

Humanity faces complex and interconnected challenges driven by growing economic, ecological, and geopolitical pressures. At the same time, we see the rise of new technologies providing previously unseen data processing opportunities, realistic problem formulation, and real-time problem solution procedures. Population growth, climate change, and increasing resource scarcity have heightened the demand for food, water, and energy (2, 3). Meeting these needs while ensuring adequate sustenance remains a pressing issue, straining ecosystems already threatened by biodiversity loss and degradation (2-4). The increasing frequency and severity of threats such as infectious disease pandemics highlight the interconnectedness of ecosystems, animal health, and human health, and the need for proactive, preventative approaches to mitigate these risks (2, 5). To address these multidimensional challenges, integrative frameworks such as One Health have gained growing recognition (6), emphasizing the links between the health of humans, animals, plants, and the environment and calling for integrated, participatory efforts (7, 8). Decision-making in this context is inherently complex, requiring the consideration of diverse parties' (i.e. stakeholders') interests and balancing specific and overall public health concerns with economic and social factors (9). One key challenge is the area of risk analysis, which involves identifying potential threats, assessing their severity and likelihood, and determining the most effective course of action (1, 10, 11).

Addressing complex health risks in today's interdependent societies requires a transformation of traditional risk analysis frameworks. Recently, we introduced the concept of a negotiation-centered framework for multi-sector risk analysis in the Bulletin of the World Health Organization (1). The understanding of negotiation in our concept is closely linked to the definition by de Dreu, Beersma (11), in which negotiation is defined as the discussions "between parties with perceived

divergence of interests" and risks "to reach agreement on the distribution of scarce resources, work procedure, the interpretation of facts, or some commonly held opinion or belief" to manage the risks sustainably and efficiently. This negotiation-centered risk analysis (Figure 1), particularly steps (i) to (iv), was further elaborated in the present work by LLM-based multi-agent modelling under human supervision. Throughout our proposed framework, stakeholders are empowered to engage in a participatory approach that balances multiple risk dimensions and trade-offs. In this context, using AI-technologies, such as LLMs, could expedite shaping the problem definition, reaching consensus on risks and actions to prioritize, and constructing a strategy to address identified risks (1). Our proposed framework aligns with the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) outlined in the UN 2030 Agenda (12). The practical implementation of the SDGs at the national level requires trade-off decisions and active involvement of local stakeholders (13-15). Moreover, achieving these goals necessitates a dialogue between science and policymakers, turning political commitment into concrete actions (16).




Figure 1. Workflow of negotiation-centered risk analysis (incorporating the visualization of the risk negotiation framework of Ehling-Schulz, *et al.* (1)). The figure visualizes the negotiation-centered risk analysis framework incorporating 6 different steps as follows (i) stakeholder round table establishment; (ii) problem formulation; (iii) risk assessment and valuation; (iv) risk negotiation; (v) communication and implementation; and (vi) outcome evaluation and optional risk re-negotiation.

However, processes allowing the operationalization of such AI-assisted participatory approaches are still missing. Our study aimed to define and test a procedure that leverages Large Language Models (LLMs) (17), and an agent-based modeling (18, 19) to perform negotiation-centered risk analysis steps. In this proof-of-concept, we (i) developed a multi-step pipeline that integrates LLM-based agents within a Human-in-the-Loop (HIL) approach, and (ii) challenged the framework's applicability using two distinct real case scenarios.

Methods

Case scenarios and practical approach

To showcase the negotiation-centered risk analysis framework, two case scenarios were developed, each highlighting One Health considerations. The first case relates to the use of *Bacillus (B.) thuringiensis* as a biopesticide in agriculture, involving negotiating tradeoffs between using *B. thuringiensis* as a biopesticide to reduce transmission of insect borne pathogens and a risk of *B. thuringiensis* deposited on crops potentially causing foodborne illness. The second case addresses tradeoffs between hunting of wild boars as population control option, to lower crop damage, biodiversity loss, and disease spread, and alternative population control methods to minimize animal suffering (see Supplementary Material for further details).

For practicality, project team members assumed roles representing one of three stakeholder groups in each scenario. To simulate round-table discussions, two virtual hackathon exercises were conducted per scenario. Participants received clear instructions beforehand, with each session set for two hours and moderated

objectively by another project team member to guide discussions. These exercises were held between May and August 2024.

Computing and coding

The pipeline was built using algorithms for the multi-agent framework from Abdelnabi, Gomaa (18) and Langchain (20). In short, the preliminary negotiation between agents was implemented in the form of the interactive Jupyter Notebook (Python) allowing users to provide background information for agents, as well as interactively include suggestions from LLMs and then to analyze the results. The risk negotiation procedure was done using a custom-made Python script allowing the generation of the necessary input files to be used by the game-setup from Abdelnabi, Gomaa (18). The analysis of the obtained results was done by the set of Python scripts that use the obtained simulation results to generate the deal distributions. All technical generated results, templates and documents used during the negotiation scenarios are available from the repository under the following URL: [Zenodo \(https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17095804\)](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17095804). Codes can be accessed via [Github \(https://github.com/KIDA-BfR/Risks-assessments-LLMs\)](https://github.com/KIDA-BfR/Risks-assessments-LLMs)

Results

Description of the AI-assisted negotiation-centered risk analysis process

We developed a multi-agent modelling process with human supervision (HIL approach), which incorporates the following steps: (i) setting the rules and stakeholder roundtable establishment (stakeholder selection); (ii) problem formulation; (iii) risk assessment and valuation, including the collection of negotiation issues, i.e. effect dimensions (iiia), finding consensus on effect dimensions (iiib), collecting risk management options for each of the effect dimensions (iiic), agreeing on collected options (iiid) and, individually valuing each

option based on their importance (iii); finally, (iv) risk negotiation, i.e. a simulation followed by the discussion of the suggested equilibrium. For further details on the individual steps see Supplementary Material.

Practical implementation and demonstration in real case scenarios

In the following, we focus on the key steps of the used workflows while full details of the negotiation outcomes, technical details of the scenarios, filled templates and used codes are provided as Supplementary Materials. The general schema of the workflow using the specifications from one of the case scenarios is provided in Figure 2A.





Figure 2. Practical implementation of AI-assisted negotiation-centered risk analysis. The figure illustrates the key principal steps from Figure 1 and how LLMs augmented the process for the case study example 1 (*B. thuringiensis* as biopesticide negotiation scenario - see experimental procedures for details). **(A)** Each stakeholder's stance can be represented as a finite collection of points, where each point corresponds to the value, they assigned to a specific option representing an effect dimension. These points exist within a high-dimensional space that represents previously described effect dimensions (issues). The negotiation process can be visualized as a search for a Nash equilibrium, where the value-based points from each stakeholder act as attractors, drawing the negotiation path toward their preferred outcomes. The outcome of the negotiation is an equilibrium point where these preferences balance. Importantly, the human-in-the-loop approach may cause the final approved deal to deviate from the simulated equilibrium, which leads to possible differences between the real-world agenda and simulated agentic behavior. **(B)** The post-analysis allows for a deeper understanding of how deals evolved, how they align with the combined stakeholders' preferences (e.g., the mean preference surface), and the rationale behind each deal.

Initially, each stakeholder filled in a template to specify the position (e.g. on the ethical foundations, long/short term goals etc). Stakeholders' position papers were used to simulate the "preliminary negotiation" to collect concrete issues for the further discussion, as well as possible options for each issue. The generated list of issues and options was discussed among stakeholders and fine-tuned, e.g. to include additional issues and options, if needed. A veto right, implying that the deal should satisfy the acceptance threshold of the corresponding party (see step 4), was assigned to one of the stakeholders to mimic the existing legal policy. Then, each stakeholder completed a scoring template to indicate both the importance of each issue and the option preference per issue. Individual scores were kept confidential from other stakeholders. Provided scores, combined with the formulation of a discussed topic, issues/options, and negotiation rules were provided as a prompt to set up an agent, virtually representing one of the stakeholders in a non-zero game simulated within a LLM-based multi-agent framework using a cooperative scenario developed by Abdelnabi and colleagues (18). Following this, stakeholders were provided with a report containing the distribution of the most popular deals (Fig. S1), and were asked to discuss them to determine whether a compromise can be reached. Stakeholders could, also, access additional information on how individual deals evolved (Fig 2B). Figure 3 provides a detailed snapshot of a practical implementation of such featured analysis (see also Movie S1 for a complete post-analysis guide). As a result, in both case scenarios, LLMs were effectively utilized by stakeholders to reach a consensus (see Supplementary Text S1 for details of the case scenarios and related negotiation procedures).



C

```

1 <SCRATCHPAD>
2 1) Think about what others may prefer:
3 - Farmers: They seem to prefer moderate safety measures (A2), balanced environmental monitoring (B2), standard regulation (C2), regular monitoring for resistance (D2),
4 high support for farmers (E1), and regular communication (F2).
5 - Food Safety Authority: Likely to prioritize stringent regulation and monitoring (C1 or C2), consumer safety (A1 or A2), and environmental impact (B1 or B2).
6
7 2) Based on others' preferences, propose one proposal that balances between your scores and accommodating others and that is more likely to lead to an agreement:
8 - I need to ensure my score is at least 65.
9 - Farmers' proposal: A2 (10), B2 (10), C2 (3), D2 (2), E1 (0), F2 (0) = 25 (not acceptable for me).
10 - I need to push for A1 and F1 to get higher scores while being flexible on other issues.
11
12 New proposal:
13 - A1 (50) to ensure consumer safety.
14 - B2 (10) to balance environmental monitoring.
15 - C2 (3) to accommodate standard regulation.
16 - D2 (2) to monitor resistance.
17 - E1 (0) to support farmers.
18 - F1 (20) to ensure comprehensive communication.
19
20 Total score: 50 + 10 + 3 + 2 + 0 + 20 = 85 (acceptable for me).
21
22 </SCRATCHPAD>
23
24 <ANSWER>
25 I appreciate the Farmers' input. How about we consider the following deal:
26 <DEAL> A1, B2, C2, D2, E1, F1 </DEAL>
27 This proposal ensures the highest safety measures for consumers, balanced environmental monitoring, standard regulation, regular monitoring for resistance,
28 high support for farmers, and comprehensive communication.
29 </ANSWER>
30
31 <PLAN>
32 - If the Farmers or Food Safety Authority have concerns, be ready to discuss the importance of A1 and F1 for consumer trust and safety.
33 - Be flexible on B2, C2, and D2 as long as A1 and F1 are included.
34 - Emphasize the importance of comprehensive communication (F1) for public trust.
35 </PLAN>

```

Figure 3. Practical implementation of the negotiation game post-analysis
 (A) Stakeholders' preferences can be represented as 3D surfaces defined by Issues, Options, and Scores (with negative values used for visualization). Each deal appears as a line on these surfaces. The surface representing the average scores across stakeholders reflects the combined interests.
 (B) Each proposed deal results from 12 rounds of negotiations. In each round a stakeholder either endorses a previously proposed deal or suggests a new one.
 (C) Each deal proposed in a round is linked with a scratchpad that outlines the rationale behind the proposal and plans for the next steps.

As specified before, LLMs mainly augment the stakeholders at either issue/option formulation or negotiation. We showed that issue/option formulation can be achieved either via single-shot GPT-4o calls (case scenario 1) call, or with a more elaborate multi-agent conversation (case scenario 2) (Figure 4). While single GPT-4o calls are easy to implement and do not require additional software, the multi-agent conversation allows stakeholders to dynamically integrate additional information via the tool usage (e.g. web search). Considering the above-described multidisciplinary nature of the negotiation-centered risk analysis, the dynamic integration of new information and sources is a key factor ensuring comprehensive analysis.




Figure 4. Integrating agent-based modeling in the effect dimensions specification. Agent-based modeling was used to facilitate a preliminary discussion about the raised problem and was used for issue/option definition as described in the corresponding section of Figure 2. This preliminary discussion process can be viewed as an aggregation of information sourced from all stakeholders into a unified dataset (e.g. dialog). The subsequent issue definition using LLMs resembles a dimensionality reduction technique, such as random projection feature extraction, which allows to summarize information appearing in high dimensional frameworks in a comparably low dimensional setting.

Discussion

Tackling risks can only be done in an interdisciplinary and multidimensional manner, where stakeholders from various disciplines use their expertise to

negotiate risks and balance trade-offs. However, such multidisciplinary negotiations will inevitably face difficulties such as the lack of a common currency to assess risks and/or benefits and balancing all stakeholders' interests under time constraints (1). In addition, during the process of risk assessment data gaps often become apparent. Thus, the generation and consideration of new data might be needed to minimize uncertainty. In the present work, we combined multi-agent modelling (18, 20), and a "human in the loop" (HIL) approach to augment negotiation-centered risk analysis (1). Specifically, we leveraged LLMs (i) to help stakeholders formulate the exact issues (e.g. risks) to discuss, as well as the possible risk management options to pursue, and (ii) to propose agreements aimed at achieving an equilibrium that maximizes overall benefits while minimizing risks. In both of our case scenarios the stakeholders were able to successfully complete the risk negotiation within the time-constraints requirement.

Our risk negotiation simulation is built on the negotiation game setup as described by Abdelnabi, Goma (18). We devised a process of how the issue/option formulation and subsequent preference scoring should be done and outlined a procedure for HIL negotiation of the obtained results. We argue that such formalization is key to ensure the interests of all stakeholders are equally accounted for. The issue score serves as an indicator of how important that issue is. Meanwhile, the distribution of scores between various options linked to that issue signals the areas of compromises or their absence. Importantly, stakeholders are allowed to modify the exact option formulation at the final negotiation stage and may even disclose parts of their confidential information such as maximum scores per issue or the complete valuation of risks, to ease the compromise search. Finally, our approach is not bound to a specific LLM such as GPT-4o (21) or a specific framework as Langchain (19). The presented solution is one of many possible implementations of the proposed framework. We consider the main added value of this work in the procedural linkage between the negotiation framework,

i.e. the six-step approach described by Ehling-Schulz, Filter (1) and computational science areas.

Our study implemented and further defined the negotiation-centered risk analysis process, particularly regarding step 3 (risk assessment and valuation) and step 4 (risk negotiation). Further, in both One Health risk scenarios stakeholders successfully reached consensus in a participatory manner. Information exchange among stakeholders from various disciplines is considered essential for effective risk analysis (22, 23). In this regard, the simulated “preliminary discussion” on a given topic prior to the issue and options specification in step 3 is of particular importance. Specifically, we used LLMs to derive a formulation of issues/options not solely based on individual proposals from each stakeholder, but rather on the text of the simulated preliminary discussion. Since this discussion includes positions of the stakeholders, their motivation, arguments, as well as their potential willingness to adapt their opinions, we argue that suggestions on issue/option formulations will be more semantically enriched and cover more nuances compared to direct proposals from stakeholders.

At the strategic negotiation step (i.e. step 4), two out of three stakeholders in each scenario had similar interests, while the other opposed those two (see Supplementary for exact scores indicating preferences). Under such circumstances, the function of a discussion moderator becomes crucial. Being a moderator confers the advantage of being able to start and conclude the conversation with a preferred option. Therefore, the moderating side has an additional indirect weight in its position, which adds a new dynamic to the negotiation process and prevents it from settling for the local minima defined by the opposing side(s). Getting stuck in local minima is a common issue in real-world optimization problems and is an area of active research (24). Therefore, here we additionally pinpoint an important degree of freedom that should not be neglected during the negotiation flows. Further, we highly recommend appointing an experienced moderator with strong skills in facilitation and discussion

management, as well as impartial expertise in the field, to effectively guide the discussions during real negotiation exercises. Additionally, stakeholders could use the archived simulated conversations to see how the discussion evolved, what strategies were effective and which discussion points remained unsolved, thereby potentially pointing to areas of compromise and divergence. This information is of particular importance, if the proposed pipeline is used as preparation for the actual negotiations. When discussing the results of the simulated negotiation, stakeholders stressed the issues and options which they were adamant about and, in turn, signaled a willingness to compromise on other issues. This strategy allowed stakeholders to reach a consensus and emphasized the necessity of integrating a HIL approach into our process, to ensure that minority opinions are accounted for.

As our framework relies on LLMs, it is limited by the fundamental issues linked with their usage such as hallucinations, quantitative inaccuracies, lack of reasoning abilities, and biases. LLMs can generate plausible-sounding but incorrect or nonsensical information, often due to the quality of their training data and the probabilistic nature of their text generation processes (25). LLMs can struggle with mathematical tasks (26), and be prone to biased conclusions derived from the unfiltered training datasets containing stereotypes, misrepresentations, social/ethical biases etc (27). Even though there are recent developments mitigating such limitations (28, 29), we argue that a human-in-the-loop approach is still essential to address such risks associated with LLMs in accordance with Courtois and Lavadoux (30). Yet, in a rapidly evolving AI domain such as LLM-based modelling, one may foresee dramatic shifts towards independently interacting and negotiating agents without human oversight. The recently described higher performance of GPT-4 alone compared to physicians alone, and/or in combination with GPT-4 (31), is one of the first benchmarking results towards this shift. Importantly, our negotiation simulation pipeline can, also, be run in an autonomous manner Savvateev, Romdhane (32) to enable the exploration

of the variety of possible negotiation scenarios before the actual negotiations. From an ethical perspective, when using LLMs in risk negotiation, we need to decide how far risk negotiation should be influenced by LLMs and what the human corrective is to assure diversity, equity and the protection of the weak (33).

Our pipeline seeks to find a compromise between stakeholders' perspectives and, as such, does not directly utilize stakeholders' expertise or verify the data underpinning their opinions. In this context, the preliminary discussion, i.e. where LLMs simulate an exchange of stakeholder opinions and integrate supplementary information via web searches (see case 2), serves as a phase where stakeholders' positions can be further validated by cross-referencing the presented facts with publicly accessible information.

Within the current work, we focused on a cooperative negotiation scenario where all stakeholders seek a compromise, whereas the reach dynamic of multi-agent communication allows researchers to simulate other plausible situations such as sabotaging or greedy games scenarios (18). Another development direction is to enrich LLM-based agents with personality traits (e.g. extraversion, neuroticism, etc. (34, 35)) that greatly influence real-case negotiations (36). Finally, the integration of the next-generation LLMs with advanced complex reasoning features such as GPT-o1 (37) will further improve the quality of the simulated negotiations. It was shown that LLMs can help humans find common ground in democratic deliberation (38). The negotiating agents in our framework can also be augmented with an additional layer that learns the interests of the other agents from the propositions. Different methodologies can be used, as described by Baarslag, Hendrikx (39), for bilateral negotiations.

Our AI-assisted negotiation-centered risk analysis procedure helps to mitigate time and information constraints stakeholders experience during roundtable discussions. It may also be used to simulate potential negotiation scenarios, offering stakeholders an insight into how the negotiation process might unfold. At

the same time, having human supervision at all principal preparatory stages enables monitoring for potential data inherent biases and alignment with ethical principles. Our approach allows for efficient and effective policymaking and management of risks and can help tackle several of the pressing challenges facing our society.

Supplementary Material

The PDF file includes:

Supplementary Text S1-S6

Supplementary Figures S1 to S4

Other Supplementary Material for this manuscript includes the following:

Movie S1

References

1. Ehling-Schulz M, Filter M, Zinsstag J, Koutsoumanis K, Ellouze M, Teichmann J, et al. Risk negotiation: a framework for One Health risk analysis. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2024;102(6):453-6. Epub 20240508.
2. Gruetzmacher K, Karesh WB, Amuasi JH, Arshad A, Farlow A, Gabrysch S, et al. The Berlin principles on one health – Bridging global health and conservation. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2021;764:142919.
3. Rockström J, Steffen W, Noone K, Persson A, Chapin FS, 3rd, Lambin EF, et al. A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature*. 2009;461(7263):472-5.
4. Anonymous. Biodiversity and health - Note by the Executive Secretary United Nations, Convention on Biological Diversity, 2021 Contract No.: CBD/SBSTTA/24/9.
5. Zinsstag J, Schelling E, Wyss K, Mahamat MB. Potential of cooperation between human and animal health to strengthen health systems. *Lancet*. 2005;366(9503):2142-5.
6. FAO, UNEP, WHO, WOA. One Health joint plan of action (2022–2026). Working together for the health of humans, animals, plants and the environment. . Rome, Italy: FAO, UNEP, WHO, and WOA, 2022.
7. Adisasmito WB, Almuhairi S, Behravesh CB, Bilivogui P, Bukachi SA, Casas N, et al. One Health action for health security and equity. *Lancet*. 2023;401(10376):530-3. Epub 20230119.
8. Zinsstag J, Kaiser-Grolimund A, Heitz-Tokpa K, Sreedharan R, Lubroth J, Caya F, et al. Advancing One human-animal-environment Health for global health security: what does the evidence say? *The Lancet*. 2023;401(10376):591-604.
9. Jaffee S, Henson S, Unnevehr L, Grace D, Cassou E. The safe food imperative: Accelerating progress in low- and middle-income countries. Washington D.C., USA: World Bank Group, 2019 Contract No.: License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.
10. Bremner J, Vial F, Fooks A, Higman W, Avant J, Stentiford G. Operationalizing “One Health” for food systems. *One Earth*. 2023;6(12):1618-22.
11. de Dreu CKW, Beersma B, Steinel W, van Kleef GA. The psychology of negotiation: Principles and basic processes. In: Kruglanski AW, Higgins ET, editors. *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles*, 2nd edition. New York: Guildord Press; 2007. p. 608-29.
12. UN. Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development (The United Nations (UN)). United Nations, 2015.

13. Bryan BA, Hadjidakou M, Moallemi EA. Rapid SDG progress possible. *Nature Sustainability*. 2019;2(11):999-1000.
14. Gao L, Bryan BA. Finding pathways to national-scale land-sector sustainability. *Nature*. 2017;544(7649):217-22.
15. Jiménez-Aceituno A, Peterson GD, Norström AV, Wong GY, Downing AS. Local lens for SDG implementation: lessons from bottom-up approaches in Africa. *Sustainability Science*. 2020;15(3):729-43.
16. Morand S, Lajaunie C. Biodiversity and COVID-19: A report and a long road ahead to avoid another pandemic. *One Earth*. 2021;4(7):920-3.
17. OpenAI. <https://openai.com>.
18. Abdelnabi S, Gomaa A, Sivaprasad S, Schönherr L, Fritz M. Cooperation, competition, and maliciousness: LLM-stakeholders interactive negotiation. *arXiv e-prints*. 2023:arXiv:2309.17234.
19. Langchain. <https://www.langchain.com>.
20. Langchain. Two agents debate with tools. 2024-10-25 ed: Langchain; 2024.
21. OpenAI. GPT-4o: <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>. 2024.
22. Destoumieux-Garzón D, Mavingui P, Boetsch G, Boissier J, Darriet F, Duboz P, et al. The One Health concept: 10 years old and a long road ahead. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science*. 2018;5.
23. WHO WHO. One Health. [2024-10-23]; Available from: https://www.who.int/health-topics/one-health#tab=tab_1.
24. Wang S, Jia H, Hussien AG, Abualigah L, Lin G, Wei H, et al. Boosting aquila optimizer by marine predators algorithm for combinatorial optimization. *Journal of Computational Design and Engineering*. 2024;11(2):37-69.
25. Ji Z, Lee N, Frieske R, Yu T, Su D, Xu Y, et al. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *arXiv e-prints*. 2022:arXiv:2202.03629.
26. Satpute A, Gießing N, Greiner-Petter A, Schubotz M, Teschke O, Aizawa, et al. Can LLMs master math? Investigating large language models on math stack exchange. *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*; Washington DC, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2024. p. 2316–20.
27. Gallegos IO, Rossi RA, Barrow J, Mehrab Tanjim M, Kim S, Démoncourt F, et al. Bias and fairness in large language models: A survey. *arXiv e-prints*. 2023:arXiv:2309.00770.
28. Plecko D, Bareinboim E. Causal fairness analysis. *arXiv e-prints*. 2022:arXiv:2207.11385.
29. Towhidul Islam Tonmoy SM, Mehedi Zaman SM, Jain V, Rani A, Rawte V, Chadha A, et al. A comprehensive survey of hallucination mitigation techniques in large language models. *arXiv e-prints*. 2024:arXiv:2401.01313.
30. Courtois P, Lavadoux F. Negotiating smarter: How AI might change the game. *EIPA2024*.
31. Goh E, Gallo R, Hom J, Strong E, Weng Y, Kerman H, et al. Influence of a large language model on diagnostic reasoning: A randomized clinical vignette study. *medRxiv*. 2024. Epub 20240314.
32. Savvateev I, Romdhane RB, Filter M, editors. Practical implementation of AI-assisted risk negotiation. *Global commodity chains from a risk assessment perspective*; 2024; Berlin, Germany: German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment.
33. Zinsstag J, Grolimund AK, Tulay E, Bernhardt R. *Transhumanism and One Health*. CABI One Health. 2024.
34. Ma Z, editor. Exploring the relationships between the big five personality factors, conflict styles, and bargaining behaviors. *IACM 18th Annual Conference*; 2005; Seville, Spain; 2005.
35. Noh S, Chang H-CH. LLMs with personalities in multi-issue negotiation games. *arXiv e-prints*. 2024:arXiv:2405.05248.
36. Brandstätter H, Königstein M. Personality influences on ultimatum bargaining decisions. *European Journal of Personality*. 2001;15(S1):S53-S70.
37. OpenAI. Learning to reason with LLMs: <https://openai.com/index/learning-to-reason-with-llms/>. GPT-o1 ed2024.

38. Tessler MH, Bakker MA, Jarrett D, Sheahan H, Chadwick MJ, Koster R, et al. AI can help humans find common ground in democratic deliberation. *Science*. 2024;386(6719):eadq2852.
39. Baarslag T, Hendrikx MJC, Hindriks KV, Jonker CM. Learning about the opponent in automated bilateral negotiation: a comprehensive survey of opponent modeling techniques. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*. 2016;30(5):849-98.

Supplementary Material

Tackling One Health Risks: How Large Language Models are leveraged for Risk Negotiation and Consensus-building.

Alexandra Fetsch, Iurii Savvateev, Racem Ben Romdhane, Martin Wiedmann, Artemiy Dimov, Maciej Durkalec, Josef Teichmann, Jakob Zinsstag, Konstantinos Koutsoumanis, Andreja Rajkovic, Jason Mann, Mauro Tonolla, Monika Ehling-Schulz, Matthias Filter, Sophia Johler

Corresponding author: Prof. Sophia Johler
Email: sophia.johler@lmu.de

This PDF file includes:

Supplementary Text S1: Case scenario description, background information, and scenario-specific technical details
Supplementary Text S2: Description of the steps of the AI-assisted negotiation-centered risk analysis process
Supplementary Text S3: Template Scoring Case scenario 1 (*B. thuringiensis*).
Supplementary Text S4: Template Scoring Case scenario 2 (wild boar hunting).
Supplementary Text S5: Case scenario 1: Full details of negotiation outcomes.
Supplementary Text S6: Case scenario 2: Full details of negotiation outcomes.

Fig. S1: Case scenario 1: Combined results – distribution of unique issue-option combinations.
Fig. S2: Case scenario 1: Moderator influence on the issue-option combinations.
Fig. S3: Case scenario 2: Combined results – distribution of unique issue-option combinations.
Fig. S4: Case scenario 2: Moderator influence on the issue-option combinations.

Other supplementary materials for this manuscript include the following:

Movie S1: Visualization of the negotiation simulation

This video is related to step 4 (risk negotiation) of the AI-assisted negotiation-centered One Health risk analysis procedure, as well as to Figure 2, and Figure 3.

Supplementary Material

Supplementary Text S1

Case scenario description and background information

Case scenario 1:

B. thuringiensis is a naturally occurring bacterium present in soil, and the environment, that among others produce a set of proteins toxic for a number of insects and, thus, can be used as a substitute for chemical pesticides ultimately reducing the environmental impact (1). However, research studies report that *B. thuringiensis* can impact non-target organisms, such as beneficial insects and soil microbiota as well as pose ecological risks due to horizontal gene transfer between *B. thuringiensis* crops and wild relatives (2). Also, *B. thuringiensis* display a similar repertoire of potential virulence genes on the chromosome as the human pathogenic *B. cereus sensu strictu* (3), and these genes can be actively expressed in *B. thuringiensis*, eventually resulting in foodborne disease. Indeed, there is growing evidence that exposure of agricultural staff and spill-over of *B. thuringiensis* into the food chain may pose a risk to human health (4-8). To address these risks while discussing whether *B. thuringiensis* should be used as biopesticide, we manually selected the following stakeholder groups: Food Safety Authority (FSA), consumer, and farmer. Stakeholders identified the following question for a prospective discussion: "Should *B. thuringiensis* continue to be used as biopesticide in Central Europe?"

Case scenario 2:

The second case scenario tackled the ongoing debates about hunting in Germany (9-11), specifically focusing on one species, which is wild boar (*Sus scrofa ferus*). Over the past 30 years, wild boar populations in Europe have steadily increased due to factors such as reduced predator presence and changes in agricultural practices (12). This rise has been linked to significant damage to agricultural crops (13), decreased plant biodiversity (14), and the spread of infectious diseases such as African Swine Fever (15). Meanwhile, animal protection activists highlight unnecessary animal suffering caused by hunting and propose alternative methods for population control and crop protection (9), such as immunological contraception (16), fencing (17), and dissuasive feeding (18). To tackle these controversies, hunters, animal protection representatives, and farmers were manually selected as key stakeholder groups. Stakeholders framed the central question as: "Should hunting of wild boars be forbidden in Germany?". They then specified their positions on whether wild boar hunting should be prohibited in Germany.

Scenario-specific technical details

Case scenario 1:

The filled-out templates were directly used for a single-shot call of GPT-4o to simulate a list of possible issues and options for the prospective discussion. The generated list of issues and options was discussed among stakeholders and fine-tuned to include additional issues and options omitted by GPT-4o (Case1_SingleShotCall.docx). A veto right was assigned to Food Safety Authority (FSA). Each stakeholder filled in a scoring template (Case1_StakeholdersScorings.docx). Provided scores, formulation of the discussed topic, issues/options, and negotiation rules were provided as prompts to set up agents representing Food Safety Authority, Consumer and Farmer (see Code_Models-Negotiations_simulation-cooperative_games-initial_prompts_base_Bt folder).

Case scenario 2:

Single-shot calls to GPT-4 were combined with agent-based modeling to generate a list of specific issues and options (see Figure 4 and Preliminary_discussion.ipynb in Code_Models), while the rest of the framework remained unchanged. Specifically, the stakeholders' position papers were used to prompt three LLM-based (i.e. GPT4-based) agents, each virtually representing a stakeholder. In addition to LLM-powered capabilities of text analysis and generation, those agents were equipped with the tools allowing web-based information retrieval using arxiv.org (19), wikipedia.org (20), and duckduckgo.com (21) platforms. These agents engaged in a plain-text conversation with each other about the topic, and the conversation records were used in a single shot GPT-4 call to create a list of suggested issues. This list of issues was discussed and fine-tuned by the stakeholders themselves, representing the same approach used in case scenario 1. The fine-tuned list of issues along with the topic formulation and stakeholder's position papers was then sent to GPT-4o via single shot call to identify the list of options per issue. The options obtained were also fine-tuned and agreed among the stakeholders. Unlike for case scenario 1, none of the stakeholders was given a veto right. Scores provided by stakeholders for issues and options are in Case2_StakeholdersScorings.docx.

Supplementary Text S2

Detailed description of the individual steps of the AI-assisted negotiation-centered risk analysis process

Step 1: Setting the rules and stakeholder roundtable establishment (stakeholder selection)

Once a problem for negotiation is identified, the negotiation rules must be clearly defined to ensure transparency and minimize misunderstandings or potential conflicts during the process. This includes specifying the modalities and organization of the meetings, outlining the roles of participating stakeholders - such as if someone holds veto rights or initiates the negotiation - and detailing the process for progressing through each step. It should also be specified if and how participants may revisit previous steps, as well as the conditions for reaching consensus, such as by majority vote or full agreement. It is also possible to determine through negotiation simulations if certain rules are ineffective. Following these initial steps, and based on a discussed area, the selection of relevant stakeholders is done. The selection process should facilitate knowledge sharing and exchanging perspectives as these factors influence the identification of trade-offs during the risk assessment, management, and communication process (22). For our purposes, a stakeholder is defined as any individual, group, or organization with a vested interest in a discussed area. Stakeholder groups are selected within public, private, or civic sectors to reflect various interests. To identify relevant stakeholders, publicly available information, e.g. peer-reviewed articles from scientific literature archives such as PubMed Central®, may be used. One can use LLMs such as the latest models from OpenAI© (23) or Alphabet© (24), or open-source alternatives (such as Hugging Face (25), Llama (26), or Nvidia (27)), to suggest relevant stakeholder groups for a given problem (see step 2). After identifying relevant stakeholder groups and their representatives, their roles in the negotiation process, such as veto holders, moderator and other responsibilities need to be determined.

Step 2: Problem formulation

A clear problem formulation is necessary before negotiation begins. This can range from a broad, question-based format to a more detailed problem description or a list of problems to be discussed within the previously outlined discussion area. It is essential to ensure that all stakeholders can fully engage with this process. Initially, LLMs can offer a suggested problem definition and subsequently aid in refining the problem formulation. For analysis of confidential information, a user can also switch to the usage of open-source models (25-27), or models within local environments (28). Stakeholder representatives must refine and agree upon a more precise definition, following a

human-in-the-loop (HIL) approach. When refining the problem definition, it is important to focus on a single issue while capturing its full complexity across all dimensions.

Step 3: Risk assessment and valuation

At this step, stakeholders aim to agree on the list of assessed risks/issues, evaluate possible risk management options, and weigh the advantages and disadvantages of each option. The process ultimately leads to determining the risk-based value of each option. This part of the approach, initially detailed by Ehling-Schulz, Filter (22), experienced the most substantial further development and was subdivided into five concrete steps (3a-3e) to be followed during a first exercise as follows: (3a) collect negotiation issues, i.e. effect dimensions; (3b) find consensus on effect dimensions; (3c) collect risk management options for each of the effect dimensions; (3d) agree on collected options; and (3e) individually value each option based on their importance. Practically, each stakeholder is to be instructed to specify their position in relation to the negotiated question by providing information in the form of plain text, potentially within predefined categories such as description, short-term goals, general aim, scientific foundation, ethical foundation. This information will then be used to prompt LLM for the simulation of the preliminary negotiation between the stakeholders with the aim of collecting possible issues (i.e. effect dimensions) and risk management options (i.e. prospective solutions). Thus, stakeholders will end up with a list of concrete issues and a fixed number of options per issue to be further discussed. Next, stakeholders are asked to quantify their preferences by assigning a score to each available option. Using a predefined number of points (e.g. 100), each stakeholder distributes their scores across the identified effect dimensions (i.e. issues) according to their importance, with higher scores indicating higher priority. Once all issues are scored, the specific options for each effect dimension are then also scored based on their importance. Each stakeholder also needs to define a minimum threshold for an agreement. These scoring principles allow representatives to prioritize risk negotiation issues of greatest concern, while also highlighting areas where compromises may be possible. The individual scores are kept confidential and will be used in LLM-assisted negotiation simulations as described in step 4 (29).

Step 4: Risk Negotiation

The risk negotiation step aims to find a compromise ('Nash' equilibrium) between the stakeholder preferences outlined and scored in step 3. This compromise-based risk management approach, referred to as a "deal," consists of a set of proposed risk management solutions (options) designed to address the various identified issues. For example, in one of our real case scenarios, a key question concerned the use of a biopesticide. One issue, "Consumer Safety and Health Risk"

(Issue A), involved options based on the level of safety measures to be applied for this biopesticide: "strict," "moderate," or "minimal" (Options A1, A2, and A3, respectively). Ultimately, multiple issues (A-F) were identified, each linked to three potential options (e.g., A1-A3, B1-B3, etc.). The resulting deal from the risk negotiation process is then a selected combination of options addressing each issue (e.g., A1, B2, C3, D3, E1, F2). Since stakeholders assigned scores to each option based on their preferences (step 3), the deal acceptance criteria can be understood as reaching a specific numerical threshold, and the negotiation process is characterized as a non-zero-sum game. In brief, the risk negotiation is performed with LLM-assisted negotiation simulation within a multi-agent framework described by Abdelnabi, Gomaa (29). In our approach, agents represent the stakeholders and are guided by initial prompts containing shared project details, stakeholder-specific confidential scores, and game instructions. Negotiations are launched with a suggestion from a moderator (chosen from one of the involved parties) and proceed over multiple rounds, with agents exchanging the information in plain text form, either supporting previous deals or proposing new ones based on the interaction history. After all rounds, a final deal is proposed by the moderator. The multiple iterations of the LLM-based simulation are conducted to ensure the reproducibility of the results and to account for fluctuations due to the different initial conditions, i.e. moderator role (see Fig. S2 and Fig. S4 for practical examples of the moderator role influence). The ultimate result is a distribution of suggested deals. Obtained deals are to be discussed among the stakeholders to either agree on one of them or modify the deals to reach a consensus. If necessary, stakeholders can check the history of each of the deals proposed during the negotiation simulation, track how the proposals were formulated, and identify what was the rational behind (see an example of such an analysis in case scenario 1 below; also, Movie S1, provided as Supplementary Material, exemplarily illustrates a potential analysis pipeline).

Supplementary Text S3

Template Scoring Case scenario 1 (*B. thuringiensis*)

Step 3d: Valuation – Scoring options of the stakeholders.

Stakeholder (please check the respective box)

- Consumer
- Farmer
- Food Safety Authority

Date of scoring:

Quick guide for the scoring scheme

1. General rules

You have **100 points** that can be used to define your preferences.

The higher the value, the higher the preference.

You do not know the scores of the other parties, but you do know the descriptions of the other parties, so you can share your guesses on what other may think (*optional*).

Your goal is to define scores reflecting your preferences, but you may also show possible areas where a compromise is feasible.

2. Follow the 2-step scoring approach:

First, for each issue define the maximum score (points) you put on this issue as follows:

- Max score weights the importance of the issue to you
- You can put scores from 0 to 100:
 - 0- the lowest importance
 - 100- the highest importance
- sum of scores of all issues should be 100 in total (remember: you have 100 points to be used – general rule!)

Secondly, for each suboption of the issues define the option scores as follows:

- Option scores define the preferences and your flexibility
- option scores may not be higher than the max score of this issue (defined at 1)
- at least one of the suboptions (the one reflecting your preferences the most) should be scored equally to the max score chosen for this issue
- the other suboptions may be scored according to your preferences using scores from 0 to the max score chosen for this issue
- Limit yourself to natural numbers

Now, please provide your scorings for the following issues and options:

Issue and suboptions	Your score
A: Consumer Safety and Health Risk <i>This issue pertains to the potential health risks associated with the use of Bt as a biopesticide.</i>	(max score)
A1: "Strict Safety Measures": Implement rigorous testing and regular monitoring to ensure Bt does not pose any health risks to consumers until Bt biopesticide application have been proven to be harmless for humans	
A2 "Moderate Safety Measures": Conduct regular assessments and testing but with less stringent monitoring. Implementing a waiting time.	
A3 "Minimal Safety Measures": Rely on existing safety data with minimal additional testing and monitoring until adverse health effects have been demonstrated.	
<i>Optional: General comment on the scoring for Issue A</i>	

Issue and suboptions	Your score
B: Environmental Impact and Biodiversity <i>This issue concerns the long-term environmental impact of Bt on biodiversity.</i>	(max score)
B1 "Intensive Monitoring": Conduct extensive studies and continuous monitoring of Bt's impact on non-target organisms and ecosystems until Bt biopesticide application have been proven to be harmless for the environment and the biodiversity.	
B2 "Balanced Monitoring": Implement moderate monitoring efforts to assess the environmental impact periodically.	
B3 "Limited Monitoring": Rely on existing environmental impact studies with minimal new monitoring efforts until adverse environmental effects have been demonstrated.	
<i>Optional: General comment on the scoring for Issue B</i>	

Issue and suboptions	Your score
C: Regulation and Monitoring <i>This issue addresses the regulation and oversight required for the use of Bt.</i>	(max score)
C1 "Stringent Regulation and Monitoring": Establish strict regulations, including genome sequencing and tight control over Bt strains used.	
C2 "Moderate Regulation and Regular Monitoring": Implement standard regulations with periodic reviews and monitoring.	
C3 "Minimal Regulation and Basic Monitoring": Maintain current regulatory practices with minimal additional oversight.	
<i>Optional: General comment on the scoring for Issue C</i>	

Issue and suboptions	Your score
D: Resistance Development <i>This issue focuses on the potential for pests to develop resistance to Bt and the strategies to manage it.</i>	(max score)

D1 "Integrated Pest Management (IPM)": Promote IPM strategies including crop rotation and biological controls alongside Bt use.	
D2 "Regular Monitoring and Adaptation": Monitor pest resistance levels and adapt Bt usage accordingly.	
D3 "Status Quo": Continue current Bt usage practices without additional resistance management strategies.	
<i>Optional: General comment on the scoring for Issue D</i>	

Issue and suboptions	Your score
E: Economic Viability and Sustainability <i>This issue concerns the economic impact of Bt use on farming and its sustainability.</i>	<i>(max score)</i>
E1 "High Support for Farmers": Provide significant support and subsidies for farmers using Bt to ensure economic viability and sustainability.	
E2 "Moderate Support for Farmers": Offer moderate financial support and incentives for Bt use.	
E3 "Minimal Support for Farmers": Rely on the current market dynamics with minimal additional support for farmers using Bt.	
<i>Optional: General comment on the scoring for Issue E</i>	

Issue and suboptions	Your score
F: Communications <i>This issue addresses the communication required for the use of Bt.</i>	<i>(max score)</i>
F1 "Comprehensive Communication": Ensure comprehensive communication with the public about the safety measures and labelling of sprayed products.	
F2 "Regular Communication": Provide regular updates to the public about the safety and usage of Bt.	
F3 "Minimal Communication": Offer basic communication to the public about Bt use.	
<i>Optional: General comment on the scoring for Issue F</i>	

Optional: General comments on the scoring

Supplementary Text S4

Template Scoring Case scenario 2 (wild boar hunting)

Step 3d: Valuation – Scoring options of the stakeholders.

Stakeholder (please check the respective box)

- Hunter
- Farmer
- Animal protection representative

Date of scoring:

Quick guide for the scoring scheme

1. General rules
 You have **100 points** that can be used to define your preferences.
 The higher the value, the higher the preference.
 You do not know the scores of the other parties, but you do know the descriptions of the other parties, so you can share your guesses on what other may think (*optional*).
 Your goal is to define scores reflecting your preferences, but you may also show possible areas where a compromise is feasible.

2. Follow the 2-step scoring approach:
 First, for each issue define the maximum score (points) you put on this issue as follows:

- Max score weights the importance of the issue to you
- You can put scores from 0 to 100:
 - 0- the lowest importance
 - 100- the highest importance
- sum of scores of all issues should be 100 in total (remember: you have 100 points to be used – general rule!)

Secondly, for each suboption of the issues define the option scores as follows:

- Option scores define the preferences and your flexibility
- option scores may not be higher than the max score of this issue (defined at 1)
- at least one of the suboptions (the one reflecting your preferences the most) should be scored equally to the max score chosen for this issue
- the other suboptions may be scored according to your preferences using scores from 0 to the max score chosen for this issue
- Limit yourself to natural numbers

Now, please provide your scorings for the following issues and options:

Issue and suboptions	Your score
<p>A: Wild boar population control <i>This issue focuses on the management of wild boar populations in Germany, taking into account population control, disease control, socio-economic impacts, and ethical considerations.</i></p>	<p>(max score)</p>

A1 "Strict Control": Implement strict control measures, including regulated hunting seasons and quotas to maintain a balanced population and prevent overpopulation and disease spreading.	
A2 "Moderate Control": Allow moderate hunting with specific guidelines to manage the population without overhunting and considering disease spreading.	
A3 "Minimal Control": Implement minimal control measures, focusing on non-lethal methods of population control such as relocation and sterilization programs and considering disease spreading.	
<i>Optional: General comment on the scoring for Issue A</i>	

Issue and suboptions	Your score
B: Promoting Coexistence and Ethical Treatment <i>This issue highlights the importance of promoting coexistence with wildlife and ensuring the ethical treatment of wild boars in population management.</i>	(max score)
B1 "Coexistence Priority": Prioritize coexistence measures, including extensive use of non-lethal methods and public education on living with wild boars.	
B2 "Balanced Approach": Combine ethical hunting practices with non-lethal methods to promote coexistence and ethical treatment.	
B3 "Hunting Priority": Focus primarily on ethical hunting as a means of population control, with minimal emphasis on non-lethal methods.	
B4 "No Tourism Priority": Prioritize coexistence measures, including extensive use of non-lethal methods and public education on living with wild boars, strictly forbidding hunting tourism.	
<i>Optional: General comment on the scoring for Issue B</i>	

Issue and suboptions	Your score
C: Economic Viability and Agricultural Protection <i>This issue focuses on the economic viability of farming communities and the protection of agriculture from wild boar damage.</i>	(max score)
C1 "High Compensation": Provide high compensation to farmers for crop damage or livestock disease management options caused by wild boars, funded by hunting licenses and related tourism.	
C2 "Moderate Compensation": Offer moderate compensation to farmers for crop damage or livestock disease management options and implement preventive measures such as fencing and repellents.	
C3 "Low Compensation": Provide low compensation to farmers for crop damage or livestock disease management options with a focus on self-sustaining preventive measures by farmers.	
<i>Optional: General comment on the scoring for Issue C</i>	

Issue and suboptions	Your score
D: Cultural Significance and Public Awareness <i>This issue addresses the cultural significance of hunting, public awareness, and education on wild boar management practices.</i>	(max score)
D1 "Promote Hunting Culture": Strongly promote the cultural heritage and conservatory role of hunting through public campaigns and education.	

D2 "Balanced Cultural Promotion": Promote both hunting culture and conservatory role of hunting and the importance of ethical wildlife management equally.	
D3 "Minimal Hunting Promotion": Focus on promoting non-hunting aspects and education of wild boar management and cultural significance.	
<i>Optional: General comment on the scoring for Issue D</i>	

Issue and suboptions	Your score
E: Scientific Data Generation and Monitoring <i>This issue addresses the generation of scientific data and monitoring of wild boar populations including crop damage, occurrence of diseases transferred by wild boars, and genetic population structure.</i>	(max score)
E1 "Comprehensive Monitoring": Implement comprehensive monitoring programs, including advanced tracking and data collection methods, including animal welfare issues.	
E2 "Moderate Monitoring": Establish moderate monitoring efforts with regular data collection and reporting, including animal welfare issues.	
E3 "Basic Monitoring": Establish basic monitoring activities with minimal resource allocation.	
<i>Optional: General comment on the scoring for Issue E</i>	

Optional: General comments on the scoring

Supplementary Text S5

Case scenario 1: Full details of negotiation outcomes

Step 4: Modelling results negotiation.

- the most approved (39.7%) combination of suboptions for the issues by the LLM agents during negotiation was: A1 B2 C2 D2 E1 F2
- Farmers and Food Safety Authorities (FSA) representatives accepted the most approved combination
- The consumer representative didn't accept the most approved combination. Source of disagreement: issue F. The consumer representative would not accept a solution less or equal to F2
- It was decided to disclose the individual scoring of the stakeholders given for issue F:
 - Farmers representative: F1:0 F2:1 F3:3
 - FSA representative: F1:1 F2:9 F3:1
 - Consumers representative: F1:20 F2:0 F3:0

Background information on the scores: the issue is not top priority for farmers, FSA would accept options higher or equal to F2, consumers rated issue F as second issue of concern for them and would only accept a F1 option.

- Agreement was found to adopt the F1 control option
- Final agreement on the following suboption combination: **A1 B2 C2 D2 E1 F1**
- by achieving this consensus on the suboptions the negotiation of the Bt question is officially closed. Further steps according to the risk negotiation workflow are to follow.


Supplementary Text S6

Case scenario 2: Full details of negotiation outcomes

Step 4: Modelling results negotiation.


- the most approved combinations (16.7%, each) of suboptions for the issues by the LLM agents during negotiation were:
 - A2 B2 C2 D2 E1
 - A2 B4 C2 D3 E2
- Farmers and Hunters representatives accepted the two most approved combinations
- The animal protection representative didn't accept the most approved combination. Source of disagreement: issues A and B
- It was decided to partly disclose the priorities of the stakeholders given for the issues
 - Farmers representative: issue C was given highest priority, followed by issue A
 - Hunters' representative: issue A was given highest priority, followed by issue C
 - Animal protection representative: issue B was given highest priority, followed by issue A; issues A+B in combination account for 80% of all sum scores
- As for issue A the hunters' representative could not accept any option less than A2 (moderate)
- However, the animal protection representative shows flexibility in accepting A2 if suboption B4 would be chosen
- Also, the farmers representative shows willingness to accept B4
- Alternatively, the farmers representative shows willingness to accept A3 but in combination with C2, only.
- Agreement was found to negotiate a "suboption package" regarding issues A and B
- less disagreement was observed for issues C, D, E - all stakeholders could live with the proposed agreement
- Final agreement on the following suboption combination was then achieved as follows:
 - **A2 - B4 - C2 - D2 - E1/2**
- by achieving this consensus on the suboptions the negotiation of the hunting question is officially closed. Further steps according to the risk negotiation workflow are to follow.

Fig S2: Case scenario 1: Moderator influence on the issue-option combinations




Distribution of the option preferences calculated for the simulation rounds with a moderator role assigned to (A) Consumer, (B) Farmer or (C) FSA. Orange color highlights the preferred option for the corresponding issue for a chosen moderator.

Fig S3. Case scenario 2: Combined results – distribution of unique issue-option combinations



A: Distribution of proposed deals calculated from all simulation rounds. B: Distribution of option preferences per specific issue calculated from all simulation rounds. C: Distribution of proposed deals calculated from the rounds with a specific moderator (e.g. Animal Protection Representative/APR, Farmer or Hunter,). The exact formulation of each issue/option matches Supplementary Text S2.

Fig S4: Case scenario 2: Moderator influence on the issue-option combinations



Distribution of the option preferences calculated for the simulation rounds with a moderator role assigned to (A) APR, (B) Farmer or (C) Hunter. Orange color highlights the preferred option for the corresponding issue for a chosen moderator.

Supplementary Material: References

1. Jouzani GS, Valijanian E, Sharafi R. *Bacillus thuringiensis*: a successful insecticide with new environmental features and tidings. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol*. 2017;101(7):2691-711. Epub 20170224.
2. Harvey-Samuel T, Morrison NI, Walker AS, Marubbi T, Yao J, Collins HL, et al. Pest control and resistance management through release of insects carrying a male-selecting transgene. *BMC Biology*. 2015;13(1):49.
3. Messelhäuser U, Ehling-Schulz M. *Bacillus cereus*—a multifaceted opportunistic pathogen. *Current Clinical Microbiology Reports*. 2018;5(2):120-5.
4. Frederiksen K, Rosenquist H, Jørgensen K, Wilcks A. Occurrence of natural *Bacillus thuringiensis* contaminants and residues of *Bacillus thuringiensis*-based insecticides on fresh fruits and vegetables. *Appl Environ Microbiol*. 2006;72(5):3435-40.
5. Gavia Rivera AM, Granum PE, Priest FG. Common occurrence of enterotoxin genes and enterotoxicity in *Bacillus thuringiensis*. *FEMS Microbiol Lett*. 2000;190(1):151-5.
6. Jensen GB, Larsen P, Jacobsen BL, Madsen B, Wilcks A, Smidt L, et al. Isolation and characterization of *Bacillus cereus*-like bacteria from faecal samples from greenhouse workers who are using *Bacillus thuringiensis*-based insecticides. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*. 2002;75(3):191-6.
7. Jöhler S, Kalbhenn EM, Heini N, Brodmann P, Gautsch S, Bağcıoğlu M, et al. Enterotoxin production of *Bacillus thuringiensis* isolates from biopesticides, foods, and outbreaks. *Frontiers in Microbiology*. 2018;9.
8. Schwenk V, Riegg J, Lacroix M, Märtlbauer E, Jessberger N. Enteropathogenic potential of *Bacillus thuringiensis* isolates from soil, animals, food and biopesticides. *Foods*. 2020;9(10):1484.
9. Anonymous. Effective alternatives to hunting exist to tackle disease spread, while ensuring animal welfare. EuroGroupForAnimals; 2022 [2024-10-22]; Available from: <https://www.eurogroupforanimals.org/news/effective-alternatives-hunting-exist-tackle-disease-spread-while-ensuring-animal-welfare>.
10. Anonymous. Shooting and trapping in the forest have nothing to do with animal welfare - How animals suffer during hunting.: Deutscher Tierschutzbund; 2024 [2024-10-22]; Available from: <https://www.tierschutzbund.de/en/animals-topics/wild-animals/hunting>.
11. Gieser T. Hunting wild animals in Germany: Conflicts between wildlife management and 'traditional' practices of Hege, in: Michaela Fenske, Bernhard Tschofen (eds) *Managing the Return of the Wild Human Encounters with Wolves in Europe*. London: Routledge, pp. 164-179. 2020. p. 164-79.
12. Massei G, Kindberg J, Licoppe A, Gačić D, Šprem N, Kamler J, et al. Wild boar populations up, numbers of hunters down? A review of trends and implications for Europe. *Pest Manag Sci*. 2015;71(4):492-500. Epub 20150129.
13. Geisser H, Reyer H-U. Efficacy of hunting, feeding, and fencing to reduce crop damage by wild boars. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*. 2004;68(4):939-46.
14. Barrios-Garcia MN, Ballari SA. Impact of wild boar (*Sus scrofa*) in its introduced and native range: a review. *Biological Invasions*. 2012;14(11):2283-300.
15. Juszkievicz M, Walczak M, Woźniakowski G, Podgórska K. African Swine Fever: Transmission, spread, and control through biosecurity and disinfection, including polish trends. *Viruses*. 2023;15(11). Epub 20231119.
16. Croft S, Franzetti B, Gill R, Massei G. Too many wild boar? Modelling fertility control and culling to reduce wild boar numbers in isolated populations. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(9):e0238429. Epub 20200918.
17. Feuerbacher A, Lippert C, Kuenzang J, Subedi K. Low-cost electric fencing for peaceful coexistence: An analysis of human-wildlife conflict mitigation strategies in smallholder agriculture. *Biological Conservation*. 2021;255:108919.
18. Calenge C, Maillard D, Fournier P, Fouque C. Efficiency of spreading maize in the garrigues to reduce wild boar (*Sus scrofa*) damage to Mediterranean vineyards. *European Journal of Wildlife Research*. 2004;50(3):112-20.
19. ArXiv. www.ArXiv.com.

20. Wikipedia. www.wikipedia.org.
21. Duckduckgo. www.duckduckgo.com
22. Ehling-Schulz M, Filter M, Zinsstag J, Koutsoumanis K, Ellouze M, Teichmann J, et al. Risk negotiation: a framework for One Health risk analysis. Bull World Health Organ. 2024;102(6):453-6. Epub 20240508.
23. OpenAI. <https://openai.com>.
24. Alphabet. <https://gemini.google.com/>.
25. HuggingFace. <https://huggingface.co/>.
26. Llama. <https://www.llama.com/>.
27. Nvidia. <https://www.nvidia.com/de-de/>.
28. Ollama. <https://ollama.com/>.
29. Abdelnabi S, Gomaa A, Sivaprasad S, Schönherr L, Fritz M. Cooperation, competition, and maliciousness: LLM-stakeholders interactive negotiation. arXiv e-prints. 2023:arXiv:2309.17234.