

Shall We Play a Game?

Language Models for Open-ended Wargames

Glenn Matlin*,
Parv Mahajan[†], Isaac Song[†], Yixiong Hao[†], Ryan Bard[†],
Stu Topp[‡], Evan Montoya[‡], M. Rehan Parwani[‡], Soham Shetty[‡],
Mark Riedl

College of Computing, Georgia Institute of Technology
glenn@gatech.edu

Abstract

Wargames are multi-faceted, multi-player depictions of conflict in which participants’ decisions influence future events. Wargames are often used to explore the strategic implications of decision-making. However, it also encompasses entertainment-oriented simulations, ranging from *Chess* to tabletop role-playing games like *Dungeons & Dragons* (D&D). On the more open-ended side of the spectrum of wargames, players use natural language to convey their moves, and adjudicators propose outcomes. Language Models (LMs) are increasingly being considered for how they can provide insights into real-world, consequential decisions. We conduct a scoping literature review of a curated selection of 100 recent works on AI in wargames, from which we construct an ontology of wargames in terms of the creativity afforded to either the players or adjudicators. Focusing on the space of wargames with the most open-endedness for players and adjudicators, we distill a set of considerations for when and how to use LMs in different application areas. We also present a set of safety considerations, best practices for deploying LMs in open-ended wargames, and conclude with a set of high-impact open research challenges.

1 Introduction

A strange game. The only winning move is not to play. How about a nice game of *Chess*?

— WOPR from “Wargames” 1983

For thousands of years, the decision to initiate violent conflict between groups of people has always been a strictly human affair. And while the common refrain goes “*war never changes*,” it is incomplete without its ending phrase, “*only the weapons are new*”.¹ The reality is that Artificial Intelligence (AI) is radically changing how humans

make decisions about war. The use of AI in high-stakes scenarios means that machine errors will be measured using the loss of human life instead of a loss function or a benchmark score.

The adoption of AI as part of real-world decision-making processes has accelerated over the past five years, largely thanks to advancements in research and engineering on Language Models (LMs) (Kwa et al., 2025). LM-powered AI systems are increasingly used to help with the analysis and planning of difficult tasks. The implicit promise of AI to provide general-purpose human-level intelligence means that these systems are now of significant interest to national governments, military and security organizations, and multinational corporations as a means to automate operations, either to achieve higher effectiveness or reduce failure rates.

Wargames, however, are not just for war. The term describes any game that is a multi-faceted depiction of conflict in which the participants’ decisions influence the future outcomes of events. As such, “wargames” are conducted to aid strategic decision-making in business, diplomacy, law, healthcare, cybersecurity, and military. Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in these communities seek to leverage AI in wargames that are language-centric and thus open-ended, affording a high degree of creative ideation by players (Hogan and Brennen, 2024). These games historically could only be conducted as purely human exercises, which were resource-intensive and difficult to analyze at scale (Mood, 1954; Perla, 1987; Davis, 2017).

This is in contrast to analytical wargames, which feature constrained action spaces with limited possible outcomes, a stark difference when compared to the messy and uncertain world we live in. Analytical wargames are therefore limited in their applicability to scenarios that draw on narrative understanding or social human factors (Geist et al., 2022). Games with bounded action spaces and well-defined evaluation criteria are amenable

¹“Practical Warfare”, pg. 7 (London, 1915)

to implementation as computational simulations and for which AI systems such as search, Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS), and Reinforcement Learning (RL) could be applied effectively.

LMs open up numerous new possibilities with respect to automating aspects of language-based, open-ended games. At the same time, these opportunities pose a serious risk in deployment due to the greater degree of freedom afforded by the open-ended nature of these games (Rivera et al., 2024). Early experiments with LMs used off-the-shelf models to play an analytical wargame of scripted events, found it resulted in brittle reasoning, hallucinations, and rule non-adherence (Lamparth et al., 2024).

We present a comprehensive scoping literature review that establishes critical, discussion-oriented desiderata for deploying AI in complex wargaming scenarios. This paper fills a significant gap in the literature by providing researchers with both a thorough domain analysis and a strategic roadmap for high-impact research directions. The key contributions of this paper are:

- A curated reference catalog on open-ended wargames to guide AI researchers.
- A novel taxonomy to help researchers identify key features of wargames.
- A domain-specific desiderata for the application of LMs in wargaming, outlining key design principles and challenges.
- A framework of best practices for practitioners to mitigate risks and ensure the reliability of LMs in wargaming applications.
- An examination of the safety considerations for using LMs in wargames.
- A set of open research questions and clear directions for future work.

2 Background

For this paper, we will focus our analysis on **serious wargames** (Perla, 1985; Coulthart, 2017; Rubel, 2006; Morgan, 1991). The term *serious game* is used to describe games designed for purposes beyond entertainment, such as training, education, analysis, or policy exploration (Wallman, 1995; Smith et al., 2020). Unlike purely recreational games, the primary objective is to generate insight rather than to optimize win conditions, and design choices are made to support learning and analysis (De Rosa and De Gloria, 2021). Serious wargames are multi-faceted depictions of conflict with one or more parties in which the partici-

pants' decisions influence the future outcomes of events, ultimately allowing for real-world insights. Wargame exercises are used to explore strategic choices, elicit expert judgment, or stress-test plans (US Army War College, 2015). Serious wargames have the following attributes:

- Ongoing conflict between actors with opposing interests or needs;
- A synthetic environment that enables agent choice and feedback;
- Agents make decisions and experience consequences via adjudication or rules;
- Strategic reasoning uses information about other agents and the environment;
- The outcomes of the game are used to inform real-world decisions or generate insights.

Throughout human history, wargames have served as a simplified model of conflict to navigate the world and make effective decisions (Perla and McGrady, 2011). Conflict and war have been a focal topic of games and stories for thousands of years. Strategy wargames are nearly as old as written history. Examples of strategy-focused conflict games can be found across the ancient world, including the Egyptian *Senet*, the Greeks' *Polis*, Chinese *Go*, and India's *Chaturanga*, which eventually became perhaps the most well-known wargame in the world: *Chess*. Modern contemporary wargaming evolved from these games to incorporate additional rule systems or maps, and are designed to more closely simulate military battles, most notably *Kriegspiel* (Von Reisswitz-Kaderzin and Grabowska and Georg Heinrich Leopold, 1989). Wargames have become commercially successful entertainment—*Risk*, *Diplomacy*, *Civilization*, *Twilight Struggle*, *Advanced Squad Leader*, *Space Hulk*, and even *Dungeons & Dragons*—all grew out of a desire by military leaders to model and simulate the chaotic nature of conflict (Greenberg, 1981; Schuurman, 2021).

2.1 Players vs Adjudicators

Agents in wargames are commonly grouped into one of two categories: *player* and *adjudicator*. A **player** is an agent that engages in analysis and planning, proposes moves during play, and experiences the consequences of those outcomes. The **adjudicator** is an agent that determines outcomes (via rules, computation, or expert judgment) of players' moves. In some games, such as *Chess* or *Civilization*, the players are constrained to pre-defined sets of rules. In other games, such as

Dungeons & Dragons or *Model United Nations*, actions are unconstrained, and a player can propose any move that they can express in natural language (Martin et al., 2018). Likewise, while adjudicators may be constrained to some *a priori* defined rules and calculations (e.g., game mechanics defining valid actions and outcomes), they might also be able to propose any effect or world change that can be expressed in natural languages (e.g., expressing player outcomes using narrative generation or mental heuristics) (Zhu et al., 2023a). In some cases, players and adjudicators can negotiate the effects of moves, with players making the case for why an effect could or could not occur (Callison-Burch et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2023b).

2.2 Creative vs Analytical Wargames

The nature of game design forces trade-offs between realism and simplicity to manage complexity (Wallman, 1995; Wasser et al., 2019; Reddie et al., 2023). Therefore, game designers make intentional choices about the game’s scope and rules to focus on the key skills they want to reinforce or gather data about (, 2004; Walton et al., 2019; Booth and Reddie, 2024). SMEs often classify wargames based on the primary skill required for success. One common way to classify games is to place them along a spectrum between **creative wargames** to **analytical wargames** (Zegers, 2011; Franken and Thomsett, 2013; Barzashka, 2019; Combe Ii, 2021; De Rosa and De Gloria, 2021).² Creative game types are those that are open-ended, non-linear, and heavily rely on open-ended problem solving, while analytical type games are those that are heavily structured and rule-based games where analytical skills are more important (Zegers, 2011).³ In Section 3, we present a novel ontology that updates the conceptual design space of wargames to separate players’ and adjudicator creativity.

2.3 AI in Wargames

Contemporary research into AI in wargames has targeted analytical games, where the world state

²In the military domain, these game formats are commonly referred to as seminar wargames and matrix wargames, respectively (College, 2015; Ashdown, 2018).

³Note that the use of the term *agent* creativity is not consistent with literature on *human* creativity, as even playing a highly constrained game like *Chess* can be regarded as requiring creative problem solving (Colton Simon and Wiggins Geraint A., 2012).

and the ways it can be changed through moves are defined by strict rules and a discrete—though sometimes combinatorially large—game state space. Common examples include *Chess*, *Go*, and *Starcraft*. (Silver et al., 2017; Vinyals et al., 2019; Goodman et al., 2020; Ma et al., 2025) These games do not present opportunities to incorporate ambiguity, creativity, or multi-party interactions, which are central to open-ended games. Computational support in the form of tightly scoped kinetic or logistical simulations is much more feasible, often providing ground-truth game state and transitions. Therefore, analytical games are amenable to artificial intelligence game-playing agents using techniques such as state-space search, MCTS, and RL (Wan et al., 2023; Black and Darken, 2024). These AI techniques can be powerful solvers but at the expense of generalization to novel scenarios (Balloch et al., 2022).

3 Methodology

We conducted a scoping literature review (Arksey and O'Malley, 2005; Tricco et al., 2018) across Google Scholar, arXiv, and Semantic Scholar using a series of queries based on Boolean logic and keywords to be filtered out for closer inspection. These papers were then de-duplicated by arXiv or DOI, and each paper was screened by title/abstract before full-text review. Our final set of 100 papers can be found in Appendix B We adopted the definition of “Artificial Intelligence” (AI) as “the use of computers to carry out tasks that previously required human intelligence” (Minsky, 1968). This broad definition is intentional. While much of the recent excitement in AI for wargaming is driven by LMs, our survey is not exclusively focused on LMs. We consider any system that meets this definition of AI, including symbolic AI, expert systems, and other machine learning approaches. This allows us to provide a more comprehensive overview of the field and its historical context. Single-move games or LM polling presented as games were excluded due to a lack of interactivity. Opinion or editorial pieces without research content, including any blog posts that lack technical appendices or methodology, were not included. Studies were only included if they met all of the following criteria:

- Publication year 2020-2025 to ensure LM relevance.

- Includes the use of technologies or methods that would commonly be understood to be considered artificial intelligence.
- AIs serving as players or adjudicators, which includes a breadth of other terminology used, e.g., AI agent, world model, state generator.
- Full text available online with a preference for reports from peer-reviewed or authoritative sources.

4 Ontology of Wargames

The original conception of a spectrum between creative wargames and analytical wargames conflates the roles of player and adjudicator. As we argue below, considering the analytical versus creative nature of the players separate from that of the adjudicator helps us understand the space of games with respect to AI approaches. While prior categorization schemes focus on the flexibility afforded to the player, they elide the unique challenges inherent when the player’s moves are language-based. While it would appear that increased flexibility afforded to players, in the form of language descriptions of moves, must necessarily be met with increased flexibility afforded to the adjudicator in the form of language descriptions of outcomes, it need not be the case. The presence of natural language in wargames is not equal across all games. Consider *Twilight Imperium*, where players negotiate deals in natural language, but the resulting exchanges (e.g., trade goods, promissory notes) are recorded in structured terms that are simple to adjudicate. Consider also games such as *Free Kriegsspiel*, in which players’ actions are limited to the movements of army pieces on a board. At the same time, the adjudicator has a high degree of autonomy to dictate—and explain—the outcomes of each move. These examples demonstrate that the degree of creativity afforded to the player and the adjudicator can be considered as two independent axes, which form the basis of our proposed ontology.

To remedy this deficiency with the classic analytical to creative spectrum, we add a second dimension, which characterizes the adjudicator’s

role, as defined in Table 1 and represented visually in Figure 1. To be in the bottom half of the space, adjudicator’s responses to the player are characterized as *adjudicator analytical*, meaning the adjudicator’s responses to the player are limited to prescribed responses. To be on the top half of the space, the adjudicator’s responses to the player are characterized as *adjudicator creative*, meaning the adjudicator has the agency to create novel responses. Inherent to this is the ability for the players to negotiate the outcome with the adjudicator. This negotiation is not a player move per se, but happens after the move is made as a means to dynamically alter the mapping from the player’s move to the response. As seen in Figure 2, recent work has shifted sharply toward more open-ended wargames, particularly for player creativity. We




Figure 1: Ontology of AI creativity in wargames with illustrative example games in each of the four quadrants.




Figure 2: The distribution of selected papers on AI in wargames by quadrant over time from 2020 to 2025. *Note:* At the time of writing, 2025 is incomplete.

Axis	Analytical	Creative
Player	Fixed scripts; narrow menus	Novel proposals; free-form argumentation
Adjudicator	Deterministic rules/tables	Expert narrative judgment; flexible calls

Table 1: Open-endedness axes with categorical levels (Analytical/Creative) for player and adjudicator

attribute this acceleration to the rise of LMs. Although 2025 counts are incomplete, early preprints under review indicate the upward trajectory continues.

4.1 Quadrant I: Analytical Player, Analytical Adjudicator

This quadrant covers rigid, rule-based systems for both the players and the adjudicators (often predetermined scoring). Games in this quadrant include traditional strategy board games such as *Chess*, *Go*, and the original *Kriegspiel*, as well as more modern variants such as *Stratego*, the No Press variant of *Diplomacy*, *Warhammer 40k*, and *Starcraft* (Vinyals et al., 2019; Schuurman, 2021; Bakhtin et al., 2022; Bakhtin et al., 2022; Anthony et al., 2020). Because players act from prescribed menus and adjudication reduces to deterministic scoring, these titles are ideal for high-throughput simulation. RL, MCTS, and related search-heavy approaches thrive here, yet the rigid action spaces leave little room for LM advantages such as narrative reasoning (Anthony et al., 2020; Perolat et al., 2022; Light et al., 2025; Gao et al., 2024a).

4.2 Quadrant II: Analytical Player, Creative Adjudicator

This quadrant covers games in which players are often relatively limited in their action space, while a human SME adjudicator determines the outcomes based on their judgment. Our data suggests this configuration is not currently common for AI in wargames. Games that would fall into this quadrant include variants of wargames such as Meckel’s early version of *Free Kriegsspiel* (Schuurman, 2021). It also includes a class of procedural-based human-adjudicated war games involving high-fidelity military simulations where established orders and procedures constrain player actions while human experts decide action outcomes. Examples include major real-world wargames such as early US Navy Fleet Problems and standard Tactical Exercise Without Troops (TEWT), where the focus is on decisions within procedural military actions as the field expert adjudicator determines the outcomes (Nofi, 2010; John Armatys and John Bassett, 2022).

Other types of games that fall under this category include semi-rigid adjudicated wargames, where the game is played rigidly and adjudicators have the possibility of overriding the outcomes,

such as tightly scripted training vignettes where SME adjudicators improvise consequences (UK Ministry of Defense, 2017). Outside of military wargames, certain corporate wargames also fall into this quadrant; these games share similar emphasis on managerial or operational procedures over a creatively adjudicated and simulated scenario (Cohen and Rhenman, 1961; Hershkovitz, 2019). Generally, wargames in this quadrant tend to lean more towards serious games with common shared emphasis on resolving realistic human-adjudicated scenarios with established procedures.

4.3 Quadrant III: Creative Player, Analytical Adjudicator

This quadrant covers games with highly creative agents alongside tightly fixed adjudication—expressive, low-procedural-complexity titles that still rely on rigid scoring, such as *Quo Vadis*, *Article 27: The UN Security Council Game*, and *The Resistance: Avalon* (Martinenghi et al., 2024). It attracts LM research because games like *Diplomacy* blend natural-language negotiation with deterministic resolution; Cicero shows that coordinated planning plus chat-channel conditioning can match strong human play (Meta Fundamental AI Research Diplomacy Team et al., 2022). This was possible, however, because the negotiations only occur within a prescribed stage of gameplay and does not affect adjudication, which can be automated. The game design of rigid adjudication and procedural resolution of conflicts means the evaluation is relatively straightforward and repeatable, which helps explain its popularity in AI competitions and benchmarking.

However, the limited evaluation creativity that makes Q-III attractive also limits the generalizability of AI contributions. While games in this quadrant often focus on social interactions of the players, the constrained procedural actions limit complex or realistic games and with low nuance in the outcome of those social interactions.

4.4 Quadrant IV: Creative Player, Creative Adjudicator

This quadrant covers wargames in which both players and adjudicators use qualitative expressions in open-ended games. These are often discussion-based exercises that prioritize strategic creativity and narrative plausibility over rigid rule-sets. Prominent examples include mod-

ern seminar-style wargames, such as the U.S. Army's TRADOC wargames used to explore future military concepts, and matrix wargames like the "ISIS Crisis" game, which use a structured argumentation format to analyze complex, multi-faceted conflicts (US Army, 2023; Downes-Martin, 2025). Adjudicated simulations, such as Model United Nations, where participants engage in diplomatic role-playing, also fall into this category. Furthermore, most tabletop role-playing games (TTRPGs) involve non-combat, non-die-based portions of play that are exemplars of Q-IV wargames. Readers may know games like *D&D*, *Shadowrun*, *Paranoia*, *Call of Cthulhu*, and *Vampire: The Masquerade* as examples of this quadrant, where player freedom is high and a Game Master provides narrative adjudication.⁴

Games that allow creativity for both players and adjudicators better support classic aims of wargaming: exploring uncertainty, revealing assumptions, and eliciting expert judgment. Real-world scenarios involving complex social interactions are hard to formalize and attempts to create rule sets for players or adjudicators tend to oversimplify real-world phenomena to the point where outcomes are hard to make actionable in the real world. Within the context of playing games with entirely human players and entirely human adjudicators, this games in this quadrant are well-explored; treatises on this matter trace back to the *Free Kriegsspiel* movement (Schuurman, 2021) from the early 1870s. However, despite their practical utility for simulating complex real-world environments, few have attempted to *automate* construction or evaluation processes for Q-IV settings. Games in this quadrant have, until recently, been beyond the reach of practical computing. However, this changes with the availability of highly capable LMs.

Quadrant IV wargames are particularly well-suited to leverage the improving capabilities of AI. LMs are trending toward longer time-horizon competence, expanding context windows, and enhanced retrieval across longer contexts (Kwa et al., 2025; Zhang et al., 2024a). They also exhibit improvements in persuasion and qualified judgment

⁴TTRPGs can be played with varying emphasis on combat and rules. A rigid form of play, focusing only on combat where adjudication strictly follows the rules and die rolls, would shift TTRPGs into Q-I. An extreme variation where players follow rigid rules but the Game Master ignores die rolls to determine the outcomes would be in Q-II; this style is exemplified by video games where a human controls the results.

(Karger et al., 2025; Schoenegger et al., 2025), indicating a trajectory toward more capable agents and adjudicators.

However, Q-IV wargames also present unique safety concerns. Creative players may develop novel strategies or exploit scenario ambiguities in ways that push beyond the exercise's intended scope. In contrast, creative adjudicators possess significant latitude when interpreting player actions and determining the outcome. The open-ended nature of this generation allows for AI to introduce bias, inconsistency, or inappropriate scenario escalation. These risks are compounded when AI systems assume both roles, due to the combination of reduced human oversight and expressive flexibility.

5 Discussion of Application Domains

The motivation for integrating LMs into wargaming is rooted in the need to better navigate complex, high-stakes decision-making under uncertainty across diverse domains. LMs offer a way to enhance these simulations, enabling more dynamic, nuanced, and scalable explorations of strategic landscapes, and making the exercises more repeatable and easier to conduct more often. The application of LMs in wargaming, however, varies significantly across domains.

Military wargames serve a variety of purposes across the tactical, operational, strategic, and grand strategic levels. At the tactical and operational levels, LMs are less useful; player experience and SME evaluation and feedback are often more important than the outcome of the wargame itself. At the strategic level, wargames develop, evaluate, and update operations plans for potential, future wars. These wargames invite LMs as both creative players and creative adjudicators to explore a wide spectrum of player objectives and decision-making in high-stakes contexts (Black, 2024). This pushes the boundaries of AI alignment and reliability in high-stakes environments.

Grand strategy wargames merge the threat or use of military force with statecraft, including International Relations (IR). IR wargames are centered on language, signaling, and credibility. The work in this domain uses seminar-style formats where LMs can draft diplomatic communications, maintain narrative coherence, and explore the evolution of political positions through persuasion (Lin-Greenberg et al., 2022). This is significant as it highlights the potential of LMs to model

and analyze the nuances of human negotiation and diplomacy.

For businesses, wargames test corporate strategy against competitive dynamics and market uncertainties (Schwarz, 2013), with LMs simulating competitors, customers, or regulators to surface narrative risks that traditional analysis might miss. In economics and finance, wargames likewise serve as laboratories for testing theories in dynamic, multi-agent systems (Qi et al., 2024).

In medicine and public health, wargames support crisis preparedness and response planning (Smith et al., 2020), with tabletop exercises testing emergency plans and inter-agency coordination while LMs help generate and analyze scenarios to bolster societal resilience.

While this section provides a high-level synthesis, a more granular analysis of the unique characteristics and applications within each domain is available in Appendix B.2, while Appendix C lists implementation considerations to ensure effective application of LMs in domain-specific wargames.

6 Safety Considerations

The results of wargames often directly inform organizational policy, discussions, and institutional decision-making, including in sensitive policy and defensive contexts (UK Ministry of Defence, 2023). Because the design and interpretation of wargames usually assume human players and adjudicators with meaningfully different behavior patterns than LMs, the incorporation of LMs in wargaming necessitates reevaluation of traditional wargaming methodology and interpretation when LMs are involved (Downes-Martin, 2013). The following is a non-exhaustive list of safety considerations:

- **Escalation dynamics:** LMs show escalatory tendencies in diplomatic and military contexts (Rivera et al., 2024), requiring mitigation techniques (Elbaum and Panter, 2025) for wargaming applications.
- **Unfaithful reasoning:** LMs exhibit unfaithful Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning (Turpin et al., 2023; Lanham et al., 2023), potentially misattributing decision factors in wargaming contexts.
- **Implicit bias:** Pre-training noise creates systematic errors (Taubenfeld et al., 2024) leading to implicit world state preferences (Mazeika et al., 2025), causing blind spots in adversarial modeling.

- **Long context incoherence:** LMs struggle to maintain cohesion over long contexts (Liu et al., 2024). Effective wargaming requires strategic continuity and long horizon simulations may challenge the effective attention (Modarressi et al., 2025).
- **Prompt sensitivity:** The behavior of LMs can be heavily influenced by the system prompt, e.g., including “helpful assistant” or “skeptical critic” can significantly change the LM’s behavior and can be exploited to generate desired outcomes undermine the insights gained from the game.
- **Sycophancy:** Post-training creates emergent sycophancy (Sharma et al., 2024a), which may mask strategic vulnerabilities and incorrectly validate operator assumptions in red-team exercises. Because post-training encourages helpfulness, harmlessness, and honesty (Askell et al., 2021) the way the LM is rewarded during training can affect its ability to adopt personas that do not have these qualities, such as in the case of an adversary.

7 Open Research Areas

We highlight priorities in open research questions for integration of LM wargaming agents:

- **Evaluation Methods:** There are no standard evaluation methods or protocols that measure agent ability over long tasks, interleaving human interactions (Reddie et al., 2018; Downes-Martin, 2025; Reddie et al., 2023). Additionally, because using LMs as judges introduces systematic errors (Li et al., 2024), it is difficult to construct benchmarks without expensive SME trials (Wei et al., 2025).
- **Long-horizon planning and world models:** Player agents require sophisticated planning algorithms to generate and evaluate alternative long-horizon strategies matching realistic teammates and adversaries. World models predicting move effects enable principled plan rollouts. While common in reinforcement learning, integration with LM’s externalized reasoning remains poorly understood.
- **Robustness to distributional shifts:** Brittle wargaming agent behavior in out-of-distribution (OOD) scenarios can cause failures in novel environments (Balloch et al., 2023; Zollicoffer et al., 2025). OOD detection methods (Liang et al., 2018) require validation in

multi-agent transformer settings with latent distributional shifts (Smith et al., 2024).

- **Persona modeling:** Reliable elicitation and maintenance of coherent hierarchical personas without behavioral leakage between levels remains challenging. Activation steering shows promise (Chalnev et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025) but remains brittle and unpredictable (Tan et al., 2024; Hao et al., 2025).
- **Faithful Interpretability:** Chain-of-Thought (CoT) often proves unfaithful (Turpin et al., 2023), and current interpretability methods cannot recover explanations for tactical decisions in multi-agent wargaming involving deception and opponent modeling. Sparse auto-encoders (Huben et al., 2024) and activation patching (Ravindran, 2025) offer possible ways forward. When it comes to personas, we may wish to know what training sources have influenced the personas and whether the LM’s concept of disparate personas are appropriately disentangled.
- **Human-AI (HAI) vs. AI-AI (A2A).** AI in wargames can function either collaboratively or competitively with humans (HAI) or solely against other AI systems (A2A). These roles highlight different AI capabilities; HAI emphasizes human parity and cooperation, while A2A reduces the emphasis on human-like behaviors. Certain quadrant-role pairings, such as Q-IV/HAI, are notably underexplored, and existing literature frequently overlooks explicit differentiation. Negotiation-focused and creatively adaptive agents predominantly align with HAI roles, emphasizing imitation or integration of human diplomatic behaviors. Typically, a single AI agent interacts within groups of human players, particularly in negotiation-centric board games. These interactions commonly occur in random online matches featuring text-based communication, often without human participants being explicitly informed about AI involvement (Meta Fundamental AI Research Diplomacy Team et al., 2022). Evaluation commonly prioritizes human-like diplomatic interaction and performance relative to human standards. However, the importance of A2A contexts grows with the increasing deployment of agentic AI in organizational and enterprise environments. Conflicts involving multiple autonomous agents inherently differ from human-involved

dynamics. While existing studies explore cooperative tasks or model coordination, work on competitive diplomatic interactions among AI agents is underexplored. Consequently, human-likeness, a standard benchmark in HAI, may not adequately transfer to A2A settings characterized by distinct equilibria and strategic considerations.

8 Related Works

In this section we contextualize our paper with respect to other surveys of LMs in games: agent architecture (Hu et al., 2025), modeling (Gao et al., 2024b), simulation (Ma et al., 2024), and general game applications (Xu et al., 2024). There are also survey papers on strategic reasoning (Zhang et al., 2024b), game theory (Sun et al., 2025), and benchmarking social reasoning and persuasion (Yao et al., 2025; Park et al., 2024; Feng et al., 2025).

These surveys focus on games with well-defined rules and clear win conditions. In contrast, our work focuses on the sub-domain of open-ended, language-based wargames characterized by their qualitative nature, ambiguous rules, and the importance of narrative and argumentation. To our knowledge, this is the first scoping literature review and comprehensive research agenda for the use of AI in this class of wargame.

9 Conclusions

Wargaming is a cognitive tool for subject matter experts to explore the implications of strategic decision-making. It is not just a tool for militaries; it can be applied to many domains, including entertainment. To better understand the space of games, we present a novel ontology that considers the creative range of moves afforded to players and adjudicators. Wargames that address open-ended problem spaces and/or social dynamics are played with natural language descriptions of moves. Language models can be useful tools in conducting creative, language-based games. How LMs are used in wargames can be domain-specific. Additionally there are reasons why LMs can, without careful consideration of how they are employed, raise safety concerns with respect to how they affect human decision-making and inferences drawn from the wargaming exercises. Finally, we address the broader goals of artificial intelligence and present open research questions on the capabilities of AI in wargames.

References

- Richard Rouse III. 2004. *Game Design: Theory and Practice, Second Edition*. Jones & Bartlett Publishers.
- Sahar Abdelnabi and Ahmed Salem. 2025. [Linear Control of Test Awareness Reveals Differential Compliance in Reasoning Models](#).
- Kushal Agrawal, Verona Teo, Juan J. Vazquez, Sudarsh Kunnavakkam, Vishak Srikanth, and Andy Liu. 2025. [Evaluating LLM Agent Collusion in Double Auctions](#).
- Farhan Ahmed, Pratik Vaishnavi, Kevin Eykholt, and Amir Rahmati. 2022. [Ares: A System-Oriented Wargame Framework for Adversarial ML](#). In *2022 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*, pages 73–79, San Francisco, CA, USA. IEEE.
- Elif Akata, Lion Schulz, Julian Coda-Forno, Seong Joon Oh, Matthias Bethge, and Eric Schulz. 2025. [Playing repeated games with Large Language Models](#). *Nature Human Behaviour*, 9(7):1380–1390.
- Alterra AL, Andrew Ahn, Nic Becker, Stephanie Carroll, Nico Christie, Manuel Cortes, Arda Demirci, Melissa Du, Frankie Li, Shuying Luo, Peter Y. Wang, Mathew Willows, Feitong Yang, and Guangyu Robert Yang. 2024. [Project Sid: Many-agent simulations toward AI civilization](#).
- Amal Alabdulkarim, Winston Li, Lara J. Martin, and Mark O. Riedl. 2021. [Goal-Directed Story Generation: Augmenting Generative Language Models with Reinforcement Learning](#).
- Timothée Anne, Noah Syrkis, Meriem Elhosni, Florian Turati, Franck Legendre, Alain Jaquier, and Sebastian Risi. 2025. [Harnessing Language for Coordination: A Framework and Benchmark for LLM-Driven Multi-Agent Control](#). *IEEE Transactions on Games*:1–25.
- Thomas Anthony, Tom Eccles, Andrea Tacchetti, János Kramár, Ian Gemp, Thomas C. Hudson, Nicolas Porcel, Marc Lanctot, Julien Pérolat, Richard Everett, Roman Werpachowski, Satinder Singh, Thore Graepel, and Yoram Bachrach. 2020. [Learning to Play No-Press Diplomacy with Best Response Policy Iteration](#). In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 17987–18003, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Hilary Arksey and Lisa O'Malley. 2005. [Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework](#). *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1):19–32.
- French Ministry of the Armed Forces. 2024. [Wargaming Handbook](#). Centre interarmées de concepts, de doctrines et d'expérimentations, 1.4 ed.
- Neil Ashdown. 2018. [Matrix games provide additional tool for analysis](#). *Jane's Intelligence Review*:56–57. Publisher: IHS Markit.
- Amanda Askill, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, Andy Jones, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Nova DasSarma, Nelson Elhage, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Jackson Kernion, Kamal Ndousse, Catherine Olsson, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. [A General Language Assistant as a Laboratory for Alignment](#).
- Anton Bakhtin, David J. Wu, Adam Lerer, Jonathan Gray, Athul Paul Jacob, Gabriele Farina, Alexander H. Miller, and Noam Brown. 2022. [Mastering the Game of No-Press Diplomacy via Human-Regularized Reinforcement Learning and Planning](#).
- Jonathan C. Balloch, Zhiyu Lin, Xiangyu Peng, Mustafa Hussain, Aarun Srinivas, Robert Wright, Julia M. Kim, and Mark O. Riedl. 2023. [Neuro-Symbolic World Models for Adapting to Open World Novelty](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 2848–2850, Richland, SC. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents, Multiagent Systems.
- Jonathan Balloch, Zhiyu Lin, Mustafa Hussain, Aarun Srinivas, Robert Wright, Xiangyu Peng, Julia Kim, and Mark Riedl. 2022. [NovGrid: a flexible grid world for evaluating agent response to novelty](#). In *Proceedings of the AAAI Spring Symposium on Designing Artificial Intelligence for Open Worlds*.
- Ivanka Barzashka. 2019. [Five theoretical challenges for analytical wargaming](#).
- Nikolas Belle, Dakota Barnes, Alfonso Amayuelas, Ivan Bercovich, Xin Eric Wang, and William Wang. 2025. [Agents of Change: Self-Evolving LLM Agents for Strategic Planning](#).
- Benjamin Schechter. 2020. [Wargaming Cyber Security](#).
- Scotty Black. 2024. [Mastering the Digital Art of War: Developing Intelligent Combat Simulation Agents for Wargaming Using Hierarchical Reinforcement Learning](#).
- Scotty Black and Christian Darken. 2024. [Scaling Artificial Intelligence for Digital Wargaming in Support of Decision-Making](#).
- Ruby E. Booth and Andrew W. Reddie. 2024. [Wargame Design: Addressing the Trilemma](#). *MORS Journal of Wargaming*, 1(1):5–19.
- Jonathan Boron and Chris Darken. 2020. [Developing Combat Behavior through Reinforcement Learning in Wargames and Simulations](#). *2020 IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*:728–731. Conference Name: 2020 IEEE Conference on Games (CoG) ISBN: 9781728145334 Place: Osaka, Japan Publisher: IEEE.
- Ron Bradfield, George Wright, George Burt, George Cairns, and Kees Van Der Heijden. 2005. [The origins and evolution of scenario techniques in long range business planning](#). *Futures*, 37(8):795–812.

- Philip Brookins and Jason Matthew DeBacker. 2023. [Playing Games With GPT: What Can We Learn About a Large Language Model From Canonical Strategic Games?](#). *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
- William N. Caballero and Phillip R. Jenkins. 2025. [On Large Language Models in National Security Applications](#). *Stat*, 14(2):e70057.
- Chris Callison-Burch, Gaurav Singh Tomar, Lara J. Martin, Daphne Ippolito, Suma Bailis, and David Reiter. 2022. [Dungeons and Dragons as a Dialog Challenge for Artificial Intelligence](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9379–9393.
- Sviatoslav Chalnev, Matthew Siu, and Arthur Conmy. 2024. [Improving Steering Vectors by Targeting Sparse Autoencoder Features](#).
- Nattawat Chavanit, Sukawit Bualoy, and Samart Moodleah. 2023. [Naval Wargame Prototyping: Multi-player Real-Time Strategy Game Simulation Using Unreal Engine](#). *2023 15th International Conference on Information Technology and Electrical Engineering (ICITEE)*:1–6. Conference Name: 2023 15th International Conference on Information Technology and Electrical Engineering (ICITEE) ISBN: 9798350304466 Place: Chiang Mai, Thailand Publisher: IEEE.
- Runjin Chen, Andy Arditi, Henry Sleight, Owain Evans, and Jack Lindsey. 2025. [Persona Vectors: Monitoring and Controlling Character Traits in Language Models](#).
- Yuwei Chen. 2022. [Rethinking Adversarial Examples in Wargames](#). *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)*:100–106. Conference Name: 2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW) ISBN: 9781665487399 Place: New Orleans, LA, USA Publisher: IEEE.
- Yuwei Chen and Shiyong Chu. 2024. [Large Language Models in Wargaming: Methodology, Application, and Robustness](#). In *2024 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)*, pages 2894–2903, Seattle, WA, USA. IEEE.
- Yizhou Chi, Lingjun Mao, and Zineng Tang. 2024. [AMONGAGENTS: Evaluating Large Language Models in the Interactive Text-Based Social Deduction Game](#). In *Proceedings of the 4th Wordplay: When Language Meets Games Workshop (Wordplay 2024)*, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xu Chu, Zhijie Tan, Hanlin Xue, Guanyu Wang, Tong Mo, and Weiping Li. 2025. [Domaino1s: Guiding LLM Reasoning for Explainable Answers in High-Stakes Domains](#). In Wanxiang Che, Joyce Nabende, Ekaterina Shutova, and Mohammad Taher Pilehvar, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 3275–3293, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mark Chussil. 2007. [Learning faster than the competition: war games give the advantage](#). *Journal of Business Strategy*, 28(1):37–44. Publisher: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Lucia Cipolina-Kun, Marianna Nezhurina, and Jenia Jitsev. 2025. [Game Reasoning Arena: A Framework and Benchmark for Assessing Reasoning Capabilities of Large Language Models via Game Play](#).
- Kalman J. Cohen and Eric Rhenman. 1961. [The Role of Management Games in Education and Research](#). *Management Science*, 7(2):131–166. Publisher: INFORMS.
- US Naval War College. 1966. *Fundamentals of war gaming*. Naval War College, Newport, R.I, 3rd edition: March 1966.
- US Naval War College. 2015. *War Gamers' Handbook: A Guide for Professional War Gamers*. U.S. Naval War College.
- Colton Simon and Wiggins Geraint A. 2012. [Computational Creativity: The Final Frontier?](#).
- P. C. Combe II. 2021. [EDUCATIONAL WARGAMING: Design and Implementation into Professional Military Education](#). *Journal of Advanced Military Studies*, 12(2):115–138.
- Brian J. Connolly. 2024. [Battlefield information and tactics engine \(BITE\): a multimodal large language model approach for battlespace management](#). In Peter J. Schwartz, Myron E. Hohil, and Benjamin Jensen, editors, *Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning for Multi-Domain Operations Applications VI*, page 3, National Harbor, United States. SPIE.
- Anthony Costarelli, Mat Allen, Roman Hauksson, Grace Sodunke, Suhas Hariharan, Carlson Cheng, Wenjie Li, Joshua Clymer, and Arjun Yadav. 2024. [GameBench: Evaluating strategic reasoning abilities of LLM agents](#).
- Stephen Coulthart. 2017. [What's the problem? Frameworks and methods from policy analysis for analyzing complex problems](#). *Intell. Natl. Sec.*, 32(5):636–648. Publisher: Routledge.
- Kevin P. Coyne and John Horn. 2009. [Predicting Your Competitor's Reaction](#). *Harvard Business Review*.
- Pedro M. P. Curvo. 2025. [The Traitors: Deception and Trust in Multi-Agent Language Model Simulations](#).
- Paul Davis. 2017. [Illustrating a Model-Game-Model Paradigm for Using Human Wargames in Analysis](#).
- Francesca De Rosa and Alessandro De Gloria. 2021. [Design methodology of analytical games for knowledge acquisition](#). *International Journal of Serious Games*, 8(4):3–23.

- Deutschland Bundeswehr. 2017. *Wargaming Handbook*. Bundeswehr Doctrine Centre.
- Stephen Downes-Martin. 2013. *Adjudication: The Diabolus in Machina of Wargaming*. *Naval War College Review*, 66(3):67–80.
- Stephen Downes-Martin. 2020. *Preference Reversal Effects and Wargaming*. In McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
- Stephen Downes-Martin. 2025. *Wargaming to Support Force Development*. In Canadian Forces Base Kingston, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.
- Stephen Downes-Martin, Michael Anderson, Gil Cardona, Thomas Choinski, Rebecca Dougharty, John Hanley, Frederick Hartman, John Lillard, Roger Meade, Gary Schnurrpusch, Keith Morris, Peter Perla, Merle Robinson, Vincent Schmidt, Bill Simpson, Eugene Visco, and Timothy Wilkie. 2017. *Validity and Utility of Wargaming*. In Military Operations Research Society.
- Alexander Duffy, Samuel J. Paech, Ishana Shastri, Elizabeth Karpinski, Baptiste Alloui-Cros, Tyler Marques, and Matthew Lyle Olson. 2025. *Democratizing Diplomacy: A Harness for Evaluating Any Large Language Model on Full-Press Diplomacy*.
- Upol Ehsan and Mark O. Riedl. 2020. *Human-Centered Explainable AI: Towards a Reflective Sociotechnical Approach*. In Constantine Stephanidis, Masaaki Kurosu, Helmut Degen, and Lauren Reinerman-Jones, editors, *HCI International 2020 - Late Breaking Papers: Multimodality and Intelligence*, pages 449–466, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Sebastian Elbaum and Jonathan Panter. 2025. *Managing Escalation in Off-the-Shelf Large Language Models*.
- Joshua Engels, David D. Baek, Subhash Kantamneni, and Max Tegmark. 2025. *Scaling Laws For Scalable Oversight*.
- Xiachong Feng, Longxu Dou, Minzhi Li, Qinghao Wang, Yu Guo, Haochuan Wang, Chang Ma, and Lingpeng Kong. 2025. *A Survey on Large Language Model-Based Social Agents in Game-Theoretic Scenarios*. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Xidong Feng, Yicheng Luo, Ziyang Wang, Hongrui Tang, Mengyue Yang, Kun Shao, David Mguni, Yali Du, and Jun Wang. 2023. *ChessGPT: Bridging policy learning and language modeling*. In A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 7216–7262. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Christopher Flathmann, Beau Schelble, and Christian Ihekweazu. 2025. *Leveraging Generative AI to Create Lightweight Simulations for Far-Future Autonomous Teammates*. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*:10711813251357885.
- Australian Armed Forces. 2022a. *Wargaming Handbook*. Army Knowledge Centre.
- Polish Armed Forces. 2022b. *Wargaming: practitioner's guide*. Wydawnictwo Centrum Doktryn i Szkolenia Sił Zbrojnych im. gen. broni Władysława Sikorskiego, Bydgoszcz, Edition I.
- Arnoud Franken and Harry Thomsett. 2013. *When it Takes a Network: Creating Strategy and Agility through Wargaming*. *California Management Review*, 55(3):107–133. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Amelia Freeman. 2024. *Artificial Intelligence in Wargaming: Kaliningrad Crucible*. Case Study.
- Chen Gao, Xiaochong Lan, Nian Li, Yuan Yuan, Jingtao Ding, Zhilun Zhou, Fengli Xu, and Yong Li. 2024b. *Large language models empowered agent-based modeling and simulation: a survey and perspectives*. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1):1259.
- Xule Gao, Rui Wang, Zhaohui Liu, and Yi Ren. 2024a. *A Land-Based War-Gaming Simulation Method Based on Multi-Agent Proximal Policy Optimization*. In *2024 IEEE 24th International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability, and Security Companion (QRS-C)*, pages 611–618, Cambridge, United Kingdom. IEEE.
- Edward Geist, Aaron B Frank, and Lance Menthe. 2022. *Wargames*. Technical Report RRA1722–4.
- James Goodman, Sebastian Risi, and Simon Lucas. 2020. *AI and Wargaming*.
- Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, yelong shen, Yujie Yang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. 2024. *CRITIC: Large language models can self-correct with tool-interactive critiquing*. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Abe Greenberg. 1981. *An Outline of Wargaming*. *Naval War College Review*, 34(5):93–97. Publisher: U.S. Naval War College Press.
- Lewis D. Griffin and Boyu Zhu. 2024. *Matrix Gaming with Large Language Models*. In Connections UK.
- Zhenyu Guan, Xiangyu Kong, Fangwei Zhong, and Yizhou Wang. 2024. *Richelieu: Self-evolving LLM-based agents for AI diplomacy*. In *The Thirty-Eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Hongyi Guo, Zhihan Liu, Yufeng Zhang, and Zhaoran Wang. 2024. *Can Large Language Models Play Games? A Case Study of A Self-Play Approach*.
- Gary Hamel and C. K. Prahalad. 1994. *Competing for the Future*. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Yixiong Hao, Ayush Panda, Stepan Shabalina, and Sheikh Abdur Raheem Ali. 2025. *Patterns and Mecha-*

- nisms of Contrastive Activation Engineering. In *ICLR 2025 Workshop on Human-AI Coevolution*.
- Shay HersHKovitz. 2019. **WARGAME BUSINESS: Wargames in Military and Corporate Settings**. *Naval War College Review*, 72(2):67–82. Publisher: U.S. Naval War College Press.
- Rebecca K. C. Hersman, Reja Younis, Bryce Farabaugh, Bethany L. Goldblum, and Andrew W. Reddie. 2020. **Under the Nuclear Shadow: Situational Awareness Technology and Crisis Decisionmaking**. Technical report.
- Daniel P. Hogan and Andrea Brennen. 2024. **Open-Ended Wargames with Large Language Models**.
- Sihao Hu, Tiansheng Huang, and Ling Liu. 2024. **PokeLLMon: A Human-Parity Agent for Pokemon Battles with Large Language Models**.
- Sihao Hu, Tiansheng Huang, Gaowen Liu, Ramana Rao Kompella, Fatih Ilhan, Selim Furkan Tekin, Yichang Xu, Zachary Yahn, and Ling Liu. 2025. **A Survey on Large Language Model-Based Game Agents**.
- Wenyue Hua, Lizhou Fan, Lingyao Li, Kai Mei, Jianchao Ji, Yingqiang Ge, Libby Hemphill, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2024b. **War and Peace (WarAgent): Large Language Model-based Multi-Agent Simulation of World Wars**.
- Wenyue Hua, Ollie Liu, Lingyao Li, Alfonso Amayuelas, Julie Chen, Lucas Jiang, Mingyu Jin, Lizhou Fan, Fei Sun, William Wang, Xintong Wang, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2024a. **Game-theoretic LLM: Agent Workflow for Negotiation Games**.
- Robert Huben, Hoagy Cunningham, Logan Riggs Smith, Aidan Ewart, and Lee Sharkey. 2024. **Sparse autoencoders find highly interpretable features in language models**. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Kokil Jaidka, Hansin Ahuja, and Lynnette Hui Xian Ng. 2024. **It Takes Two to Negotiate: Modeling Social Exchange in Online Multiplayer Games**. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 8(CSCW1):1–22.
- Kenan Jiang, Li Xiong, and Fei Liu. 2025. **HARBOR: Exploring Persona Dynamics in Multi-Agent Competition**.
- John Armatys and John Bassett. 2022. **Wargame Developments Handbook**. Wargame Developments, 3rd ed.
- Ezra Karger, Houtan Bastani, Chen Yueh-Han, Zachary Jacobs, Danny Halawi, Fred Zhang, and Philip Tetlock. 2025. **ForecastBench: a dynamic benchmark of AI forecasting capabilities**. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, Singapore.
- Muhammad Junaid Khan and Gita Sukthankar. 2024. **SC-Phi2: A Fine-tuned Small Language Model for StarCraft II Macromanagement Tasks**.
- Byungjun Kim, Dayeon Seo, and Bugeun Kim. 2024. **Microscopic Analysis on LLM players via Social Deduction Game**. *CoRR*.
- Dexin Kong, Xu Yan, Ming Chen, Shuguang Han, Jufeng Chen, and Fei Huang. 2025. **FishBargain: An LLM-Empowered Bargaining Agent for Online Flea-market Platform Sellers**. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*, pages 2855–2858, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- János Kramár, Tom Eccles, Ian Gemp, Andrea Tacchetti, Kevin R. McKee, Mateusz Malinowski, Thore Graepel, and Yoram Bachrach. 2022. **Negotiation and honesty in artificial intelligence methods for the board game of Diplomacy**. *Nature Communications*, 13(1):7214.
- Mu-Tien Kuo, Chih-Chung Hsueh, and Richard Tzong-Han Tsai. 2023. **Large Language Models on the Chessboard: A Study on ChatGPT’s Formal Language Comprehension and Complex Reasoning Skills**.
- Jay Kurtz. 2003. “Business wargaming”: simulations guide crucial strategy decisions. *Strategy & Leadership*, 31(6):12–21. Publisher: MCB UP Ltd.
- Thomas Kwa, Ben West, Joel Becker, Amy Deng, Katharyn Garcia, Max Hasin, Sami Jawhar, Megan Kinniment, Nate Rush, Sydney Von Arx, Ryan Bloom, Thomas Broadley, Haoxing Du, Brian Goodrich, Nikola Jurkovic, Luke Harold Miles, Seraphina Nix, Tao Lin, Neev Parikh, et al. 2025. **Measuring AI Ability to Complete Long Tasks**.
- Kiran Lakkaraju, Jason Reinhardt, Joshua Letchford, Jonathan Whetzel, Bethany L. Goldblum, and Andrew W. Reddie. 2020. **Experimental wargames to address the complexity: scarcity gap**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Spring Simulation Conference*, Fairfax, Virginia. Society for Computer Simulation International.
- Max Lamparth, Anthony Corso, Jacob Ganz, Oriana Skylar Mastro, Jacquelyn Schneider, and Harold Trinkunas. 2024. **Human vs. Machine: Behavioral Differences between Expert Humans and Language Models in Wargame Simulations**. *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, 7:807–817.
- Yihuai Lan, Zhiqiang Hu, Lei Wang, Yang Wang, Deheng Ye, Peilin Zhao, Ee-Peng Lim, Hui Xiong, and Hao Wang. 2024. **LLM-Based Agent Society Investigation: Collaboration and Confrontation in Avalon Gameplay**. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen, editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 128–145, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tamera Lanham, Anna Chen, Ansh Radhakrishnan, Benoit Steiner, Carson Denison, Danny Hernandez,

- Dustin Li, Esin Durmus, Evan Hubinger, Jackson Kernion, Kamilë Lukošiušė, Karina Nguyen, Newton Cheng, Nicholas Joseph, Nicholas Schiefer, Oliver Rausch, Robin Larson, Sam McCandlish, Sandipan Kundu, et al. 2023. [Measuring Faithfulness in Chain-of-Thought Reasoning](#).
- Haitao Li, Qian Dong, Junjie Chen, Huixue Su, Yujia Zhou, Qingyao Ai, Ziyi Ye, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. [LLMs-as-Judges: A Comprehensive Survey on LLM-based Evaluation Methods](#).
- Hung-Xin Li. 2025. [Exploration of Wargaming and AI Applications in Military Decision-Making](#). In *2025 International Conference on Military Technologies (ICMT)*, pages 1–5, Brno, Czech Republic. IEEE.
- Shiyu Liang, Yixuan Li, and R. Srikant. 2018. [Enhancing the reliability of out-of-distribution image detection in neural networks](#). In *International conference on learning representations*.
- Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Wenxiang Jiao, Xing Wang, Yan Wang, Rui Wang, Yujiu Yang, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2024. [Encouraging Divergent Thinking in Large Language Models through Multi-Agent Debate](#). In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen, editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 17889–17904, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jonathan Light, Min Cai, Weiqin Chen, Guanzhi Wang, Xiuxi Chen, Wei Cheng, Yisong Yue, and Ziniu Hu. 2025. [Strategist: Self-improvement of LLM decision making via bi-level tree search](#). In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jonathan Light, Min Cai, Sheng Shen, and Ziniu Hu. 2023. [AvalonBench: Evaluating LLMs Playing the Game of Avalon](#). In *NeurIPS 2023 foundation models for decision making workshop*.
- Erik Lin-Greenberg. 2022. [Wargame of Drones: Remotely Piloted Aircraft and Crisis Escalation](#). *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 66(10):1737–1765. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Erik Lin-Greenberg, Reid B.C. Pauly, and Jacquelyn G. Schneider. 2022. [Wargaming for International Relations research](#). *European Journal of International Relations*, 28(1):83–109.
- Nelson F. Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. 2024. [Lost in the Middle: How Language Models Use Long Contexts](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173. Place: Cambridge, MA Publisher: MIT Press.
- Xiaou Liu, Tiejun Chen, Longchao Da, Chacha Chen, Zhen Lin, and Hua Wei. 2025. [Uncertainty Quantification and Confidence Calibration in Large Language Models: a Survey](#). In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 6107–6117, Toronto ON, Canada. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Nash London. 1915. *Practical Warfare: Chapters on Armies and Navies in Action*. Eveleigh Nash, London.
- Leonardo Lorusso. 2024. *Introduction to Wargaming*. NATO Science, Technology Organization, Zagreb, Croatia.
- Nunzio Lorè and Babak Heydari. 2024. [Strategic Behavior of Large Language Models and the Role of Game Structure Versus Contextual Framing](#). *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):18490.
- Qun Ma, Xiao Xue, Deyu Zhou, Xiangning Yu, Donghua Liu, Xuwen Zhang, Zihan Zhao, Yifan Shen, Peilin Ji, Juanjuan Li, Gang Wang, and Wanpeng Ma. 2024. [Computational Experiments Meet Large Language Model Based Agents: A Survey and Perspective](#).
- Weiyu Ma, Dongyu Xu, Shu Lin, Haifeng Zhang, and Jun Wang. 2025. [Adaptive Command: Real-Time Policy Adjustment via Language Models in StarCraft II](#).
- Tyler Di Maggio and Robert Santiago. 2024. [Game Theory Approach to Identifying Deception in Large Language Models](#).
- Shiva Maharaj, Nick Polson, and Alex Turk. 2022. [Chess AI: Competing Paradigms for Machine Intelligence](#). *Entropy*, 24(4):550.
- Ulrich Mans, Gideon Shimshon, and Leonard Suransky. 2010. [Training the Warrior-Diplomat: Enhancing Negotiation and Conflict Management Skills through Experiential Learning](#). *International Negotiation*, 15(2):247–280. Publisher: Brill Academic Publishers.
- Lara J. Martin, Srijan Sood, and Mark O. Riedl. 2018. [Dungeons and DQNs: Toward Reinforcement Learning Agents that Play Tabletop Roleplaying Games](#). In *Proceedings of the Joint Workshop on Intelligent Narrative Technologies and Workshop on Intelligent Cinematography and Editing*, Edmonton, Canada.
- Andrea Martinenghi, Gregor Donabauer, Simona Amenta, Sathya Bursic, Mathyas Giudici, Udo Kruschwitz, Franca Garzotto, and Dimitri Ognibene. 2024. [LLMs of Catan: Exploring Pragmatic Capabilities of Generative Chatbots Through Prediction and Classification of Dialogue Acts in Boardgames' Multi-party Dialogues](#). In Chris Madge, Jon Chamberlain, Karen Fort, Udo Kruschwitz, and Stephanie Lukin, editors, *Proceedings of the 10th Workshop on Games and Natural Language Processing @ LREC-COLING 2024*, pages 107–118, Torino, Italia. ELRA, ICCL.
- Mantas Mazeika, Xuwang Yin, Rishub Tamirisa, Jaehyuk Lim, Bruce W. Lee, Richard Ren, Long Phan, Norman Mu, Adam Khoja, Oliver Zhang, and Dan Hendrycks. 2025. [Utility Engineering: Analyzing and Controlling Emergent Value Systems in AIs](#).

- Meta Fundamental AI Research Diplomacy Team, Anton Bakhtin, Noam Brown, Emily Dinan, Gabriele Farina, Colin Flaherty, Daniel Fried, Andrew Goff, Jonathan Gray, Hengyuan Hu, Athul Paul Jacob, Mojtaba Komeili, Karthik Konath, Minae Kwon, Adam Lerer, Mike Lewis, Alexander H Miller, Sasha Mitts, Adithya Renduchintala, et al. 2022. [Human-level play in the game of Diplomacy by combining language models with strategic reasoning](#). *Science*, 378(6624):1067–1074. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS).
- Marvin Minsky. 1968. [Semantic Information Processing](#). MIT Press.
- Ali Modarressi, Hanieh Deilamsalehy, Franck Dernoncourt, Trung Bui, Ryan A. Rossi, Seunghyun Yoon, and Hinrich Schuetze. 2025. [NoLiMa: Long-Context Evaluation Beyond Literal Matching](#). In *Forty-second international Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Alexander McFarlane Mood. 1954. [War Gaming as a Technique of Analysis](#). Technical Report P-899.
- Thomas D. Morgan. 1991. [Wargames: Training for War](#). *Army History*(19):32–35. Publisher: U.S. Army Center of Military History.
- Mikhail Mozikov, Nikita Severin, Valeria Bodishtianu, Maria Glushanina, Ivan Nasonov, Daniil Orekhov, Vladislav Pekhotin, Ivan Makovetskiy, Mikhail Baklashkin, Vasily Lavrentyev, Akim Tsvigun, Denis Turdakov, Tatiana Shavrina, Andrey Savchenko, and Ilya Makarov. 2025. [EAI: Emotional Decision-Making of LLMs in Strategic Games and Ethical Dilemmas](#). In *Proceedings of the 38th international Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vancouver, BC, Canada. Curran Associates Inc.
- Gabriel Mukobi, Hannah Erlebach, Niklas Lauffer, Lewis Hammond, Alan Chan, and Jesse Clifton. 2023. [Welfare Diplomacy: Benchmarking Language Model Cooperation](#).
- Grigor Nalbandyan, Rima Shahbazyan, and Evelina Bakhturina. 2025. [SCORE: Systematic Consistency and Robustness Evaluation for Large Language Models](#). In Weizhu Chen, Yi Yang, Mohammad Kachuee, and Xue-Yong Fu, editors, *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 3: Industry Track)*, pages 470–484, Albuquerque, New Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- NATO. 2023. [Wargaming Handbook](#). Allied Command Transformation.
- Joe Needham, Giles Edkins, Govind Pimpale, Henning Bartsch, and Marius Hobbhahn. 2025. [Large Language Models Often Know When They Are Being Evaluated](#).
- Albert Nofi. 2010. [HM 18: To Train the Fleet for War: The U.S. Navy Fleet Problems, 1923-1940](#). *Historical Monographs*.
- Jan Oliver Schwarz. 2011. [Ex ante strategy evaluation: the case for business wargaming](#). *Business Strategy Series*, 12(3):122–135. Publisher: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Davide Paglieri, Bartłomiej Cupiał, Samuel Coward, Ulyana Piterbarg, Maciej Wolczyk, Akbir Khan, Eduardo Pignatelli, Łukasz Kuciński, Lerrel Pinto, Rob Fergus, Jakob Nicolaus Foerster, Jack Parker-Holder, and Tim Rocktäschel. 2025. [BALROG: Benchmarking Agentic LLM and VLM Reasoning on Games](#). In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Philip Paquette, Yuchen Lu, Steven Bocco, Max O. Smith, Satya Ortiz-Gagne, Jonathan K. Kummerfeld, Satinder Singh, Joelle Pineau, and Aaron Courville. 2019. [No Press Diplomacy: Modeling Multi-Agent Gameplay](#). In arXiv.
- Peter S. Park, Simon Goldstein, Aidan O’Gara, Michael Chen, and Dan Hendrycks. 2024. [AI deception: A survey of examples, risks, and potential solutions](#). *Patterns*, 5(5). Publisher: Elsevier.
- Peter P Perla and ED McGrady. 2011. [Why Wargaming Works](#). *Naval War College Review*, 64(3).
- Peter P. Perla. 1985. [What Wargaming is and is Not](#). *Naval War College Review*, 38(5):70–78. Publisher: U.S. Naval War College Press.
- Peter P. Perla. 1987. [War Games, Analyses, and Exercises](#). *Naval War College Review*, 40(2):44–52. Publisher: U.S. Naval War College Press.
- Julien Perolat, Bart de Vylder, Daniel Hennes, Eugene Tarassov, Florian Strub, Vincent de Boer, Paul Muller, Jerome T. Connor, Neil Burch, Thomas Anthony, Stephen McAleer, Romuald Elie, Sarah H. Cen, Zhe Wang, Audrunas Gruslys, Aleksandra Malysheva, Mina Khan, Sherjil Ozair, Finbarr Timbers, et al. 2022. [Mastering the Game of Stratego with Model-Free Multiagent Reinforcement Learning](#). *Science*, 378(6623):990–996.
- Pradyumna Shyama Prasad and Minh Nhat Nguyen. 2025. [When Two LLMs Debate, Both Think They’ll Win](#).
- Siyuan Qi, Shuo Chen, Yexin Li, Xiangyu Kong, Junqi Wang, Bangcheng Yang, Pring Wong, Yifan Zhong, Xiaoyuan Zhang, Zhaowei Zhang, Nian Liu, Yaodong Yang, and Song-Chun Zhu. 2024. [CivRealm: a Learning and Reasoning Odyssey in Civilization for Decision-Making Agents](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Santhosh Kumar Ravindran. 2025. [Adversarial Activation Patching: A Framework for Detecting and Mitigat-](#)

- ing Emergent Deception in Safety-Aligned Transformers.
- Andrew W Reddie and Bethany L Goldblum. 2023. Evidence of the unthinkable: Experimental wargaming at the nuclear threshold. *Journal of Peace Research*, 60(5):760–776.
- Andrew W. Reddie, Ruby E. Booth, Bethany L. Goldblum, Kiran Lakkaraju, and Jason Reinhardt. 2023. Wargames as Data: Addressing the Wargamer's Trilemma.
- Andrew W. Reddie, Bethany L. Goldblum, Kiran Lakkaraju, Jason Reinhardt, Michael Nacht, and Laura Epifanovskaya. 2018. Next-generation wargames. *Science*, 362(6421):1362–1364.
- Luis Maurício Martins de Resende, Isabela Volski, Leozenir Mendes Betim, Gustavo Dambiski Gomes de Carvalho, Rodrigo de Barros, and Fabio Pietrobelli Senger. 2018. Critical success factors in coopetition: Evidence on a business network. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 68:177–187.
- Christina H. Rinaudo, William B. Leonard, Jaylen E. Hopson, Theresa R. Coumbe, James A. Pettitt, and Christian Darken. 2024. Applying Deep Reinforcement Learning to Train AI Agents in a Wargaming Framework. *SoutheastCon 2024*:1131–1136. Conference Name: SoutheastCon 2024 ISBN: 9798350317107 Place: Atlanta, GA, USA Publisher: IEEE.
- Juan-Pablo Rivera, Gabriel Mukobi, Anka Reuel, Max Lamparth, Chandler Smith, and Jacquelyn Schneider. 2024. Escalation Risks from Language Models in Military and Diplomatic Decision-Making. In *The 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness Accountability and Transparency*, pages 836–898.
- Robert C Rubel. 2006. The Epistemology of War Gaming. *Naval War College Review*, 59(2).
- Yasmeen Saleh, Manar Abu Talib, Qassim Nasir, and Fatima Dakalbab. 2025. Evaluating large language models: a systematic review of efficiency, applications, and future directions. *Frontiers in Computer Science*, 7. Publisher: Frontiers.
- Douglas A. Samuelson. 2018. Wargaming Cybersecurity: O.R., data science and wargaming empower military analysts to do more with less in cyber-conflict. *OR/MS Today*, 45(5):20–24. Publisher: Institute for Operations Research and the Management Sciences.
- Benjamin Schechter, Jacquelyn Schneider, and Rachael Shaffer. 2021. Wargaming as a Methodology: The International Crisis Wargame and Experimental Wargaming. *Simulation & Gaming*, 52(4):513–526. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Christopher M. Scherpereel. 2003. The Impact of Business War Games: Quantifying Training Effectiveness. *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning*, 30.
- Christopher M. Scherpereel. 2005a. Changing mental models: Business simulation exercises. *Simulation & Gaming*, 36(3):388–403. Publisher: Sage PublicationsSage CA: Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Christopher M. Scherpereel. 2005b. Decision Making in Business Simulation Design. *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning*, 32.
- Philipp Schoenegger, Francesco Salvi, Jiacheng Liu, Xiaoli Nan, Ramit Debnath, Barbara Fasolo, Evelina Leivada, Gabriel Recchia, Fritz Günther, Ali Zarifhonarvar, Joe Kwon, Zahoor Ul Islam, Marco Dehnert, Daryl Y. H. Lee, Madeline G. Reinecke, David G. Kamper, Mert Kobaş, Adam Sandford, Jonas Kgomo, et al. 2025. Large Language Models Are More Persuasive Than Incentivized Human Persuaders. Version Number: 2.
- Paul Schuurman. 2021. A Game of Contexts: Prussian-German Professional Wargames and the Leadership Concept of Mission Tactics 1870–1880. *War in History*, 28(3):504–524. Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Jan Oliver Schwarz. 2013. Business wargaming for teaching strategy making. *Futures*, 51:59–66.
- Jan Oliver Schwarz, Camelia Ram, and René Rohrbeck. 2019. Combining scenario planning and business wargaming to better anticipate future competitive dynamics. *Futures*, 105:133–142.
- Anand Shah, Kehang Zhu, Yanchen Jiang, Jeffrey G. Wang, Arif K. Dayi, John J. Horton, and David C. Parkes. 2025. Learning from Synthetic Labs: Language Models as Auction Participants.
- Xiao Shao, Weifu Jiang, Fei Zuo, and Mengqing Liu. 2024. SwarmBrain: Embodied agent for real-time strategy game StarCraft II via large language models.
- Manasi Sharma, Ho Chit Siu, Rohan Paleja, and Jaime D. Peña. 2024b. Why Would You Suggest That? Human Trust in Language Model Responses.
- Mrinank Sharma, Meg Tong, Tomasz Korbak, David Duvenaud, Amanda Askill, Samuel R. Bowman, Esin DURMUS, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Scott R Johnston, Shauna M Kravec, Timothy Maxwell, Sam McCandlish, Kamal Ndousse, Oliver Rausch, Nicholas Schiefer, Da Yan, Miranda Zhang, and Ethan Perez. 2024a. Towards Understanding Sycophancy in Language Models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Pengbo Shen, Yaqing Wang, Ni Mu, Yao Luan, Runpeng Xie, Senhao Yang, Lexiang Wang, Hao Hu, Shuang Xu, Yiqin Yang, and Bo Xu. 2025. SC2Arena and StarEvolve: Benchmark and Self-Improvement Framework for LLMs in Complex Decision-Making Tasks.
- Aryan Shrivastava, Jessica Hullman, and Max Lamparth. 2024. Measuring Free-Form Decision-Making

- Inconsistency of Language Models in Military Crisis Simulations. In *Workshop on Socially Responsible Language Modelling Research*.
- David Silver, Julian Schrittwieser, Karen Simonyan, Ioannis Antonoglou, Aja Huang, Arthur Guez, Thomas Hubert, Lucas Baker, Matthew Lai, Adrian Bolton, Yutian Chen, Timothy Lillicrap, Fan Hui, Laurent Sifre, George Van Den Driessche, Thore Graepel, and Demis Hassabis. 2017. [Mastering the game of Go without human knowledge](#). *Nature*, 550(7676):354–359.
- Alexander Smith, William Martinez, Sophia Garcia, Benjamin Thomas, Olivia Davis, and Weimang Ye. 2024. [Understanding Distribution Shift in LLMs: Methods, Evaluations, and Challenges](#).
- Julia Smith, Nathan Sears, Ben Taylor, and Madeline Johnson. 2020. [Serious games for serious crises: reflections from an infectious disease outbreak matrix game](#). *Globalization and Health*, 16(1):18.
- Haoran Sun, Yusen Wu, Peng Wang, Wei Chen, Yukun Cheng, Xiaotie Deng, and Xu Chu. 2025. [Game Theory Meets Large Language Models: A Systematic Survey with Taxonomy and New Frontiers](#).
- Y. Sun, J. Zhao, C. Yu, W. Wang, and X. Zhou. 2023b. [Self Generated Wargame AI: Double Layer Agent Task Planning Based on Large Language Model](#).
- Yuxiang Sun, Yuanbai Li, Huaxiong Li, Jiubing Liu, and Xianzhong Zhou. 2024. [Intuitionistic Fuzzy MADM in Wargame Leveraging With Deep Reinforcement Learning](#). *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, 32(9):5033–5045.
- Yuxiang Sun, Bo Yuan, Qi Xiang, Jiawei Zhou, Jiahui Yu, Di Dai, and Xianzhong Zhou. 2023a. [Intelligent Decision-Making and Human Language Communication Based on Deep Reinforcement Learning in a Wargame Environment](#). *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, 53(1):201–214.
- Daniel Tan, David Chanin, Aengus Lynch, Brooks Paige, Dimitrios Kanoulas, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, and Robert Kirk. 2024. [Analysing the Generalisation and Reliability of Steering Vectors](#). In A. Globerson, L. Mackey, D. Belgrave, A. Fan, U. Paquet, J. Tomczak, and C. Zhang, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, pages 139179–139212. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Wenjie Tang, Yuan Zhou, Erqiang Xu, Keyan Cheng, Minne Li, and Liquan Xiao. 2025. [DSGBench: A Diverse Strategic Game Benchmark for Evaluating LLM-based Agents in Complex Decision-Making Environments](#).
- Zhenwei Tang, Difan Jiao, Reid McIlroy-Young, Jon Kleinberg, Siddhartha Sen, and Ashton Anderson. 2024. [Maia-2: a Unified Model for Human-AI Alignment in Chess](#). In A. Globerson, L. Mackey, D. Belgrave, A. Fan, U. Paquet, J. Tomczak, and C. Zhang, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, pages 20919–20944. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Danielle C Tarraf, J Michael Gilmore, D Sean Barnett, Scott Boston, David R Frelinger, Daniel Gonzales, Alexander C Hou, and Peter Whitehead. 2025. [An experiment in tactical wargaming with platforms enabled by artificial intelligence](#). *The Journal of Defense Modeling and Simulation: Applications, Methodology, Technology*, 22(1):59–76.
- Amir Taubenfeld, Yaniv Dover, Roi Reichart, and Ariel Goldstein. 2024. [Systematic Biases in LLM Simulations of Debates](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 251–267.
- Samuel Thudium, Federico Cimini, Rut Vyas, Kyle Sullivan, Louis Petro, Andrew Zhu, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2024. [Outwit, Outplay, Out-Generate: a Framework for Designing Strategic Generative Agents in Competitive Environments](#). In *Proceedings of the 4th Wordplay: When Language Meets Games Workshop (Wordplay 2024)*, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Filippo Tonini and Lukas Galke. 2025. [Super-additive Cooperation in Language Model Agents](#).
- Andrea C. Tricco, Erin Lillie, Wasifa Zarin, Kelly K. O'Brien, Heather Colquhoun, Danielle Levac, David Moher, Micah D. J. Peters, Tanya Horsley, and Laura Weeks. 2018. [PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews \(PRISMA-ScR\): Checklist and Explanation](#). *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7):467–473.
- Dillon Tryhorn, Richard Dill, Douglas D Hodson, Michael R Grimaila, and Christopher W Myers. 2023. [Modeling fog of war effects in AFSIM](#). *The Journal of Defense Modeling and Simulation: Applications, Methodology, Technology*, 20(2):131–146.
- Miles Turpin, Julian Michael, Ethan Perez, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2023. [Language models don't always say what they think: unfaithful explanations in chain-of-thought prompting](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 74952–74965, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- UK Ministry of Defence. 2023. [Influence Wargaming Handbook](#). Development, Concepts, Doctrine Centre, United Kingdom.
- UK Ministry of Defense. 2017. [Wargaming Handbook](#). Development, Concepts, Doctrine Centre.
- US Army. 2023. [How to Master Wargaming: Commander and Staff Guide to Improving Course of Action Analysis](#). Center for Army Lessons Learned.
- US Army War College. 2015. [Strategic Wargaming Handbook](#). Center for Strategic Leadership, Development, 1st ed.

- Michelle Vaccaro, Michael Caosun, Harang Ju, Sinan Aral, and Jared R. Curhan. 2025. [Advancing AI Negotiations: New Theory and Evidence from a Large-Scale Autonomous Negotiations Competition.](#)
- Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Michaël Mathieu, Andrew Dudzik, Junyoung Chung, David H. Choi, Richard Powell, Timo Ewalds, and Petko Georgiev. 2019. [Grandmaster level in StarCraft II using multi-agent reinforcement learning.](#) *Nature*, 575:350–354.
- Von Reisswitz-Kaderzin und Grabowska and Georg Heinrich Leopold. 1989. *Kriegsspiel : instructions for the representation of military manoeuvres with the Kriegsspiel apparatus.* [Hemel Hempstead] : Bill Lee-son, England, United Kingdom, 2nd rev. ed.
- Viktor Voss, Liudmyla Nechepurenko, Rudi Schaefer, and Steffen Bauer. 2020. [Playing a Strategy Game with Knowledge-Based Reinforcement Learning.](#) *SN Computer Science*, 1(2):78.
- Jim Wallman. 1995. [It's Only A Game: Game Design Methodology.](#)
- Sara Walton, Paula O’Kane, and Diane Ruwhiu. 2019. [Developing a theory of plausibility in scenario building: Designing plausible scenarios.](#) *Futures*, 111:42–56.
- Ziyu Wan, Xidong Feng, Muning Wen, Ying Wen, Weinan Zhang, and Jun Wang. 2023. [Alphazero-like Tree-Search can guide large language model decoding and training.](#)
- Jiawei Wang, Kai Wang, Shaojie Lin, Runze Wu, Bihan Xu, Lingeng Jiang, Shiwei Zhao, Renyu Zhu, Haoyu Liu, Zhipeng Hu, Zhong Fan, Le Li, Tangjie Lyu, and Changjie Fan. 2025b. [Digital Player: Evaluating Large Language Models based Human-like Agent in Games.](#)
- Wei Wang, Dan Zhang, Tao Feng, Boyan Wang, and Jie Tang. 2024. [BattleAgentBench: A Benchmark for Evaluating Cooperation and Competition Capabilities of Language Models in Multi-Agent Systems.](#) Version Number: 1.
- Xiaofeng Wang, Zhixin Zhang, Jin Guang Zheng, Yiming Ai, and Rui Wang. 2025a. [Debt Collection Negotiations with Large Language Models: An Evaluation System and Optimizing Decision Making with Multi-Agent.](#) In Wanxiang Che, Joyce Nabende, Ekaterina Shutova, and Mohammad Taher Pilehvar, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 9555–9577, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Becca Wasser, Jenny Oberholtzer, Stacie L. Pettyjohn, and William Mackenzie. 2019. [Gaming Gray Zone Tactics: Design Considerations for a Structured Strategic Game.](#) Technical Report 978–1–9774–401–5, Santa Monica, CA.
- Kevin Wei, Patricia Paskov, Sunishchal Dev, Michael J. Byun, Anka Reuel, Xavier Roberts-Gaal, Rachel Calcott, Evie Coxon, and Chinmay Deshpande. 2025. [Position: Human Baselines in Model Evaluations Need Rigor and Transparency \(With Recommendations & Reporting Checklist\).](#) In
- Xiaolong Wei, Lifang Yang, Gang Cao, Tao Lu, and Bing Wang. 2020. [Recurrent MADDPG for Object Detection and Assignment in Combat Tasks.](#) *IEEE Access*, 8:163334–163343.
- Kristan J. Wheaton, Megan Hennessey, and Abram Trosky. 2020. [Making the Case for a Bigger, Better Widget.](#)
- Wichayaporn Wongkamjan, Feng Gu, Yanze Wang, Ulf Hermjakob, Jonathan May, Brandon M. Stewart, Jonathan K. Kummerfeld, Denis Peskoff, and Jordan Lee Boyd-Graber. 2024. [More Victories, Less Cooperation: Assessing Cicero's Diplomacy Play.](#) In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 12423–12441, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wichayaporn Wongkamjan, Yanze Wang, Feng Gu, Denis Peskoff, Jonathan K. Kummerfeld, Jonathan May, and Jordan Lee Boyd-Graber. 2025. [Should I Trust You? Detecting Deception in Negotiations Using Counterfactual RL.](#) In Wanxiang Che, Joyce Nabende, Ekaterina Shutova, and Mohammad Taher Pilehvar, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 25099–25113, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Stephen M. Worman, David R. Frelinger, David A. Shlapak, Katherine Pfrommer, Kelly Elizabeth Eusebi, and Jenny Oberholtzer. 2023. [Designing A Strange Game: A Nuclear Wargame for the 21st Century.](#) Technical Report RR-A1204-1.
- Zengqing Wu, Run Peng, Shuyuan Zheng, Qianying Liu, Xu Han, Brian I. Kwon, Makoto Onizuka, Shaojie Tang, and Chuan Xiao. 2024. [Shall We Team Up: Exploring Spontaneous Cooperation of Competing LLM Agents.](#) In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 5163–5186, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shuai Xu, Sijia Cui, Yanna Wang, Bo Xu, and Qi Wang. 2025. [Strategy-Augmented Planning for Large Language Models via Opponent Exploitation.](#)
- Xinrun Xu, Yuxin Wang, Chaoyi Xu, Ziluo Ding, Jiechuan Jiang, Zhiming Ding, and Börje F. Karlsson. 2024. [A Survey on Game Playing Agents and Large Models: Methods, Applications, and Challenges.](#)
- Yufan Xue, Yuxiang Sun, Jiawei Zhou, Lisha Peng, and Xianzhong Zhou. 2024. [Multiattribute Decision-Making in Wargames Leveraging the Entropy-Weight](#)

- Method in Conjunction With Deep Reinforcement Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Games*, 16(1):151–161.
- Zhaoqian Xue, Beichen Wang, Suiyuan Zhu, Kai Mei, Hua Tang, Wenyue Hua, Mengnan Du, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2025. [What if LLMs Have Different World Views: Simulating Alien Civilizations with LLM-based Agents](#).
- Yingxuan Yang, Ying Wen, Jun Wang, and Weinan Zhang. 2025. [Agent Exchange: Shaping the Future of AI Agent Economics](#).
- Jianzhu Yao, Kevin Wang, Ryan Hsieh, Haisu Zhou, Tianqing Zou, Zerui Cheng, Zhangyang Wang, and Pramod Viswanath. 2025. [SPIN-bench: How well do LLMs Plan Strategically and Reason Socially?](#). In *Second Conference on Language Modeling*.
- Qiyue Yin, Pei Xu, Qiaozhe Li, Shengda Liu, Shengqi Shen, Tong Wang, Yihong Han, Xiaonan Zhao, Likun Yang, Shiyue Cao, Shiyu Qiu, Yuxuan Liu, Shizhao Yu, Lei Cui, Chengxin Yan, Jie Sun, Xiangquan Tang, and Kaiqi Huang. 2025. [WGSR-Bench: Wargame-based Game-theoretic Strategic Reasoning Benchmark for Large Language Models](#).
- Byunghwa Yoo and Kyung-Joong Kim. 2024. [Finding deceivers in social context with large language models and how to find them: the case of the Mafia game](#). *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):30946. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- Chao Yu, Akash Velu, Eugene Vinytsky, Jiakuan Gao, Yu Wang, Alexandre Bayen, and Yi Wu. 2022. [The Surprising Effectiveness of PPO in Cooperative Multi-Agent Games](#). In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 24611–24624, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Sheng Yu, Wei Zhu, and Yong Wang. 2023. [Research on Wargame Decision-Making Method Based on Multi-Agent Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient](#). *Applied Sciences*, 13(7):4569.
- Xiaopeng Yuan, Xingjian Zhang, Ke Xu, Yifan Xu, Lijun Yu, Jindong Wang, Yushun Dong, and Haohan Wang. 2025. [Tracing LLM Reasoning Processes with Strategic Games: A Framework for Planning, Revision, and Resource-Constrained Decision Making](#).
- Tom Zahavy, Vivek Veeriah, Shaobo Hou, Kevin Waugh, Matthew Lai, Edouard Leurent, Nenad Tomasev, Lisa Schut, Demis Hassabis, and Satinder Singh. 2024. [Diversifying AI: Towards Creative Chess with AlphaZero](#).
- Antony Zegers. 2011. [Matrix Game Methodology: Support to V2010 Olympic Marine Security Planners](#). Technical Report DRDC CORA TR 2011-016.
- Junfeng Zhang and Qing Xue. 2022. [Actor-critic-based decision-making method for the artificial intelligence commander in tactical wargames](#). *The Journal of Defense Modeling and Simulation: Applications, Methodology, Technology*, 19(3):467–480.
- Xinrong Zhang, Yingfa Chen, Shengding Hu, Zihang Xu, Junhao Chen, Moo Hao, Xu Han, Zhen Thai, Shuo Wang, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2024a. [infty-Bench: Extending Long Context Evaluation Beyond 100K Tokens](#). In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15262–15277, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yadong Zhang, Shaoguang Mao, Tao Ge, Xun Wang, Yan Xia, Wenshan Wu, Ting Song, Man Lan, and Furu Wei. 2024b. [LLM as a Mastermind: a Survey of Strategic Reasoning with Large Language Models](#). In *First Conference on Language Modeling*.
- Zheng Zhang, Nuoqian Xiao, Qi Chai, Deheng Ye, and Hao Wang. 2025. [MultiMind: Enhancing Werewolf Agents with Multimodal Reasoning and Theory of Mind](#).
- Weigui Jair Zhou, Budhitama Subagdja, Ah-Hwee Tan, and Darren Wee-Sze Ong. 2021. [Hierarchical control of multi-agent reinforcement learning team in real-time strategy \(RTS\) games](#). *Expert Systems with Applications*, 186:115707.
- Andrew Zhu, Karmanya Aggarwal, Alexander Feng, Lara Martin, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023b. [FIREBALL: A Dataset of Dungeons and Dragons Actual-Play with Structured Game State Information](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4171–4193, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andrew Zhu, Lara Martin, Andrew Head, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023a. [CALYPSO: LLMs as Dungeon Master's Assistants](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment*, 19(1):380–390.
- Shenzhe Zhu, Jiao Sun, Yi Nian, Tobin South, Alex Pentland, and Jiaxin Pei. 2025. [The Automated but Risky Game: Modeling Agent-to-Agent Negotiations and Transactions in Consumer Markets](#).
- Geigh Zollicoffer, Kenneth Eaton, Jonathan C Balloch, Julia Kim, Wei Zhou, Robert Wright, and Mark Riedl. 2025. [Novelty Detection in Reinforcement Learning with World Models](#). In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*.

A Impact Statement

This research provides a novel taxonomy for categorizing and evaluating AI applications in wargaming, directly supporting organizations seeking to leverage LMs for strategic analysis. The safety considerations and mitigation strategies we outline are essential for preventing potential failures when AI systems inform real-world policy decisions through wargaming exercises. The domain-specific guidance offers immediate practical value for practitioners, while the open research questions establish technical priorities for advancing LM strategic reasoning capabilities.

B Wargames

B.1 Selected Wargame Papers

Title	Quadrant
“A Land-Based War-Gaming Simulation Method Based on Multi-Agent Proximal Policy Optimization” (Gao et al., 2024a)	I
“Actor-critic-based decision-making method for the artificial intelligence commander in tactical wargames” (Zhang and Xue, 2022)	II
“Adaptive Command: Real-Time Policy Adjustment via Language Models in Star-Craft II” (Ma et al., 2025)	I
“Advancing AI Negotiations: New Theory and Evidence from an International AI Negotiation Competition” (Vaccaro et al., 2025)	III
“Agent Exchange: Shaping the Future of AI Agent Economics” (Yang et al., 2025)	III
“Agents of Change: Self-Evolving LLM Agents for Strategic Planning” (Belle et al., 2025)	III
“AMONGAGENTS: Evaluating Large Language Models in the Interactive Text-Based Social Deduction Game” (Chi et al., 2024)	III
“An experiment in tactical wargaming with platforms enabled by artificial intelligence” (Tarraf et al., 2025)	II
“Applying Deep Reinforcement Learning to Train AI Agents in a Wargaming Framework” (Rinaudo et al., 2024)	I
“Ares: A System-Oriented Wargame Framework for Adversarial ML” (Ahmed et al., 2022)	I
“AvalonBench: Evaluating LLMs Playing the Game of Avalon” (Light et al., 2023)	III

Title	Quadrant
“BALROG: Benchmarking Agentic LLM and VLM Reasoning On Games” (Paglieri et al., 2025)	I
“BattleAgent: Multi-modal Dynamic Emulation on Historical Battles to Complement Historical Analysis” lin-etal-2024-battleagent	II
“BattleAgentBench: A Benchmark for Evaluating Cooperation and Competition Capabilities of Language Models in Multi-Agent Systems” (Wang et al., 2024)	I
“Battlefield information and tactics engine (BITE): a multimodal large language model approach for battlespace management” (Connolly, 2024)	III
“Can Large Language Models Play Games? A Case Study of A Self-Play Approach” (Guo et al., 2024)	I
“Chess AI: Competing Paradigms for Machine Intelligence” (Maharaj et al., 2022)	I
“ChessGPT: Bridging Policy Learning and Language Modeling” (Feng et al., 2023)	I
“CivRealm: A Learning and Reasoning Odyssey in Civilization for Decision-Making Agents” (Qi et al., 2024)	I
“Collaboration and Confrontation in Avalon Gameplay” (Lan et al., 2024)	III
“Debt Collection Negotiations with Large Language Models” (Wang et al., 2025a)	III
“Democratizing Diplomacy: A Harness for Evaluating Any Large Language Model on Full-Press Diplomacy” (Duffy et al., 2025)	III
“Developing Combat Behavior through Reinforcement Learning in Wargames and Simulations” (Boron and Darken, 2020)	I
“Digital Player: Evaluating Large Language Models based Human-like Agent in Games” (Wang et al., 2025b)	III
“Diversifying AI: Towards Creative Chess with AlphaZero” (Zahavy et al., 2024)	I
“DSGBench: A Diverse Strategic Game Benchmark for Evaluating LLM-based Agents in Complex Decision-Making Environments” (Tang et al., 2025)	III
“Dungeons and Dragons as a Dialogue Challenge for Artificial Intelligence” (Callison-Burch et al., 2022)	III
“EAI: Emotional Decision-Making of LLMs in Strategic Games and Ethical Dilemmas” (Mozikov et al., 2025)	III

Title	Quadrant	Title	Quadrant
“Encouraging Divergent Thinking in Large Language Models through Multi-Agent Debate” (Liang et al., 2024)	IV	“Intelligent Decision-Making and Human Language Communication Based on Deep Reinforcement Learning in a Wargame Environment” (Sun et al., 2023a)	I
“Escalation Risks from Language Models in Military and Diplomatic Decision-Making” (Rivera et al., 2024)	II	“Intuitionistic Fuzzy MADM in Wargame Leveraging With Deep Reinforcement Learning” (Sun et al., 2024)	I
“Evaluating LLM Agent Collusion in Double Auctions” (Agrawal et al., 2025)	III	“It Takes Two to Negotiate: Modeling Social Exchange in Online Multiplayer Games” (Jaidka et al., 2024)	III
“Experimental wargames to address the complexity: scarcity gap” (Lakkaraju et al., 2020)	II	“Large Language Models in Wargaming: Methodology, Application, and Robustness” (Chen and Chu, 2024)	IV
“Exploration of Wargaming and AI Applications in Military Decision-Making” (Li, 2025)	I	“Large Language Models on the Chessboard: A Study on ChatGPT’s Formal Language Comprehension and Complex Reasoning Skills” (Kuo et al., 2023)	I
“Finding deceivers in social context with large language models: the case of the Mafia game” (Yoo and Kim, 2024)	III	“Large Language Models Play StarCraft II: Benchmarks and A Chain of Summarization Approach” (Ma et al., 2024)	I
“FishBargain: An LLM-Empowered Bargaining Agent for Online Flea-Market Platform Sellers” (Kong et al., 2025)	III	“Learning from Synthetic Labs: Language Models as Experimental Subjects in Auctions” (Shah et al., 2025)	III
“Game Reasoning Arena: A Framework and Benchmark for Assessing Reasoning Capabilities of Large Language Models via Game Play” (Cipolina-Kun et al., 2025)	I	“Learning to Play No-Press Diplomacy with Best Response Policy Iteration” (Anthony et al., 2020)	I
“Game Theory Approach to Identifying Deception in Large Language Models” (Maggio and Santiago, 2024)	I	“Leveraging Generative AI to Create Lightweight Simulations for Far-Future Autonomous Teammates” (Flathmann et al., 2025)	I
“GameBench: Evaluating Strategic Reasoning Abilities of LLM Agents” (Costarelli et al., 2024)	I	“LLM-Based Agent Society Investigation: Collaboration and Confrontation in Avalon Gameplay” (Lan et al., 2024)	I
“Game-Theoretic LLM: Agent Workflow for Negotiation Games” (Hua et al., 2024a)	I	“LLMs of Catan: Exploring Pragmatic Capabilities of Generative Chatbots” (Martinenghi et al., 2024)	III
“HARBOR: Exploring Persona Dynamics in Multi-Agent Competition” (Jiang et al., 2025)	III	“Maia-2: A Unified Model for Human-AI Alignment in Chess” (Tang et al., 2024)	I
“Harnessing Language for Coordination: A Framework and Benchmark for LLM-Driven Multi-Agent Control” (Anne et al., 2025)	I	“Managing Escalation in Off-the-Shelf Large Language Models” (Elbaum and Panter, 2025)	IV
“Hierarchical control of multi-agent reinforcement learning team in real-time strategy (RTS) games” (Zhou et al., 2021)	I	“Mastering the Digital Art of War: Developing Intelligent Combat Simulation Agents for Wargaming Using Hierarchical Reinforcement Learning” (Black, 2024)	I
“Human vs. Machine: Behavioral Differences Between Expert Humans and Language Models in Wargame Simulations” (Lamparth et al., 2024)	III	“Mastering the Game of No-Press Diplomacy via Human-Regularized Reinforcement Learning and Planning” (Bakhtin et al., 2022)	I
“Human-level play in the game of Diplomacy by combining language models with strategic reasoning” (Meta Fundamental AI Research Diplomacy Team et al., 2022)	III	“Mastering the Game of Stratego with Model-Free Multiagent Reinforcement Learning” (Perolat et al., 2022)	I

Title	Quadrant	Title	Quadrant
“Measuring Free-Form Decision-Making Inconsistency of Language Models in Military Crisis Simulations” (Shrivastava et al., 2024)	III	“Research on Wargame Decision-Making Method Based on Multi-Agent Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient” (Yu et al., 2023)	I
“Microscopic Analysis on LLM Players via Social Deduction Game” (Kim et al., 2024)	III	“Richelieu: Self-Evolving LLM-Based Agents for AI Diplomacy” (Guan et al., 2024)	III
“Modeling fog of war effects in AF-SIM” (Tryhorn et al., 2023)	I	“SC2Arena and StarEvolve: Benchmark and Self-Improvement Framework for LLMs in Complex Decision-Making Tasks” (Shen et al., 2025)	I
“More Victories, Less Cooperation: Assessing Cicero’s Diplomacy Play” (Wongkamjan et al., 2024)	III	“Scaling Laws For Scalable Oversight” (Engels et al., 2025)	IV
“Multiattribute Decision-Making in Wargames Leveraging the Entropy-Weight Method in Conjunction With Deep Reinforcement Learning” (Xue et al., 2024)	I	“SC-Phi2: A Fine-tuned Small Language Model for StarCraft II Macromanagement Tasks” (Khan and Sukthankar, 2024)	I
“MultiMind: Enhancing Werewolf Agents with Multimodal Memory” (Zhang et al., 2025)	III	“Self Generated Wargame AI: Double Layer Agent Task Planning Based on Large Language Model” (Sun et al., 2023b)	I
“Naval Wargame Prototyping: Multiplayer Real-Time Strategy Game Simulation Using Unreal Engine” (Chavanit et al., 2023)	I	“Self Generated Wargame AI: Double Layer Agent Task Planning Based on Large Language Model” (Sun et al., 2023b)	III
“Negotiation and honesty in artificial intelligence methods for the board game of Diplomacy” (Kramár et al., 2022)	III	“Shall We Team Up: Exploring Spontaneous Cooperation of Competing LLM Agents” (Wu et al., 2024)	I
“No Press Diplomacy: Modeling Multi-Agent Gameplay” (Paquette et al., 2019)	I	“Should I Trust You? Detecting Deception in Negotiations using Counterfactual RL” (Wongkamjan et al., 2025)	III
“Open-Ended Wargames with Large Language Models” (Hogan and Brennen, 2024)	IV	“SPIN-Bench: How Well Do LLMs Plan Strategically and Reason Socially?” (Yao et al., 2025)	III
“Outwit, Outplay, Out-Generate: A Framework for Designing Strategic Generative Agents in Competitive Environments” (Thudium et al., 2024)	IV	“Strategic behavior of large language models and the role of game structure versus contextual framing” (Lorè and Heydari, 2024)	I
“Playing a Strategy Game with Knowledge-Based Reinforcement Learning” (Voss et al., 2020)	I	“Strategy-Augmented Planning for Large Language Models via Opponent Exploitation” (Xu et al., 2025)	I
“Playing Games With GPT: What Can We Learn About a Large Language Model From Canonical Strategic Games?” (Brookins and DeBacker, 2023)	I	“Super-additive Cooperation in Language Model Agents” (Tonini and Galke, 2025)	III
“Playing repeated games with large language models” (Akata et al., 2025)	III	“SwarmBrain: Embodied agent for real-time strategy game StarCraft II via large language models.” (Shao et al., 2024)	I
“PokeLLMon: A Human-Parity Agent for Pokemon Battles with Large Language Models” (Hu et al., 2024)	I	“The Automated but Risky Game: Modeling Agent-to-Agent Negotiations and Transactions in Consumer Markets” (Zhu et al., 2025)	I
“Project Sid: Many-agent simulations toward AI civilization” (AL et al., 2024)	I	“The Surprising Effectiveness of PPO in Cooperative Multi-Agent Games” (Yu et al., 2022)	I
“Recurrent MADDPG for Object Detection and Assignment in Combat Tasks” (Wei et al., 2020)	I		

Title	Quadrant
“The Traitors: Deception and Trust in Multi-Agent Language Systems” (Curvo, 2025)	III
“Tracing LLM Reasoning Processes with Strategic Games: A Framework for Planning, Revision, and Resource-Constrained Decision Making” (Yuan et al., 2025)	I
“War and Peace (WarAgent): Large Language Model-based Multi-Agent Simulation of World Wars” (Hua et al., 2024b)	II
“Welfare Diplomacy: Benchmarking Language Model Cooperation” (Mukobi et al., 2023)	I
“What if LLMs Have Different World Views: Simulating Alien Civilizations with LLM-based Agents” (Xue et al., 2025)	IV
“When Two LLMs Debate, Both Think They’ll Win” (Prasad and Nguyen, 2025)	IV
“Rethinking Adversarial Examples in Wargames” (Chen, 2022)	I

Table 1 Legend
Total papers: 100
Quadrant I: 52
Quadrant II: 6
Quadrant III: 34
Quadrant IV: 8

B.2 Domains in Wargames

This section synthesizes key design principles for developing and evaluating LM-driven agents in open-ended wargames. Drawing from our comprehensive survey, we distill a set of core methodological considerations—such as turn structure, evidence requirements, human facilitation, and adjudication protocols—that influence the validity and analytical utility of language-based strategic simulations (Downes-Martin et al., 2017). We then contextualize these principles within specific domains to provide actionable guidance for researchers.

B.2.1 Military and National Security

AI offers militaries and national security establishments several new training and planning methodologies. Multiple defense organizations are actively exploring how to use AI to provide experiential learning and establish strategic advantage through superior decision-making and judgment (Black and Darken, 2024).

Because wargames offer humans a simplified mental model that allows them to abstract away

particulars and navigate decision-making and analyze the results (College, 1966; US Army War College, 2015), they have been used in education and training, particularly in military contexts (College, 2015; Deutschland Bundeswehr, 2017; UK Ministry of Defense, 2017; UK Ministry of Defense, 2017; Lorusso, 2024; Forces, 2022a; Forces, 2022b; US Army, 2023; NATO, 2023; Armed Forces, 2024).

We have observed how both military SMEs and academic researchers are currently investigating how LMs can be used to help AI act as players and adjudicators in open-ended wargames (Black, 2024; Griffin and Zhu, 2024). This news comes at a time when the safety-critical nature of these systems is of high importance and is receiving considerable attention. However, there is not currently a resource to help bridge the understanding gap between AI researchers and SMEs for this domain. We believe that non-military scientists and academics have a major role to play in the effectiveness and alignment of AI systems, particularly those in safety-critical settings.

Finally, we have identified several examples of opportunities to infuse LMs into new and existing wargaming activities. At the tactical level, wargames primarily serve as individual, small-unit, and command and staff training experiences. While LMs are unlikely to take to the battlefield as an opposing force, LM wargaming software could be connected with existing battle command systems to increase staff engagement during field training exercises. At the operational level, staff wargaming activities (i.e., to evaluate plans) could be greatly enhanced with an LM agent playing the role of the opposing forces commander, LM agent adjudicators, and LM agents that play out branches and sequels from decision points that the human players do not explore themselves. This LM-powered exploration of branches and sequels offers significant value for planners at the strategic level, enabling the rapid exploration of possibilities to identify the probable. Stepping up from the strategic level to grand strategic, the use of LM agents to explore plans and policy outcomes could provide significant advantages to decision-makers compared to allies, adversaries, and other parties that perhaps do not have similar capabilities.

B.2.1.1 Cybersecurity

While cybersecurity is a distinct domain from military and national security, it is inherently adversarial. Cybersecurity wargames are easily

separated into technical, operational, and policy issues (Samuelson, 2018). Technical wargames test the knowledge and skills of a limited number of hands-on-keyboard operators against some type of problem, such as solving a technical problem or searching for vulnerabilities in a system. At this level, LMs provide value as AI teammates or adversaries, or as adjudicators for inputs beyond on-network or on-system computer commands. Operational wargames serve two audiences: technical teams and organizations, and non-technical organizations that include or work with technical teams and organizations. Technical teams use operational wargames as an extension of technical wargames, but with a larger group of players, longer time horizons, higher-level stakes, organizational context and impact, etc. Given the larger team size and the potential integration of skilled team members who are not on keyboard, LMs can extend the on-network narrative to include, for example, security and threat analysts, by generating digital content to represent or react to on-net activity. Non-technical organizations use operational cybersecurity wargames for business purposes such as testing, training, and evaluating operating procedures and incident response plans. These wargames face limitations from the challenges of generating meaningful wargame content at scale for all players. Organizations either must dedicate significant resources to developing wargame content or purchase a wargame from a vendor (potentially the same vendor selling cybersecurity products to your organization) (Benjamin Schechter, 2020). While LMs are useful tools for generating cohesive content across various formats and for different target audiences, such as system logs for technical analysts, blog posts for threat intelligence analysts, government advisories for organizational leaders, etc., they provide significant value by processing disparate player activities and computer networks and systems information for adjudication. Policy cybersecurity wargames present a particular challenge. Policymakers do not need to understand technical details, but the wargame must still be technically accurate, which forces either other players or facilitators to translate technical information, or requires the wargame to accurately abstract the details away without losing technical fidelity. LMs can maintain both an accurate representation of the technical state of the wargame and process plain language back and forth between players and the gaming platform.

B.2.2 International Relations

International Relations (IR) wargaming centers on language, signaling, and credibility rather than material force, and is used for communication, negotiation, and diplomacy. Open-ended, argument-driven formats (seminar, matrix) capture how positions evolve through persuasion, norm invocation, and threat–promise exchanges across multiple stakeholders (e.g., national states, non-government or industrial organizations) (Mans et al., 2010; Schechter et al., 2021; Lin-Greenberg et al., 2022). When LMs participate, their value is in maintaining coherent narratives over long horizons, proposing plausible options under contested facts, helping surface implicit assumptions in briefs and communiqués, processing scenarios, and aiding with adjudication on non-analytical rubrics and procedures. In a similar manner to how wargames are used extensively by the officer corps of a military, wargames are commonplace among IR professionals. Wargames present an opportunity for experiential learning for diplomatic training. Wargames are used both to support training and development, and to analyze and gain a deeper understanding of diplomatic crises that were previously unseen or extremely infrequent (i.e., nuclear crises). (Hersman et al., 2020; Lin-Greenberg et al., 2022; Reddie and Goldblum, 2023; Worman et al., 2023)

Compared with military applications, diplomatic games emphasize incomplete and asymmetric information, face-saving, issue linkage (security tied to trade, technology, or climate), and a shift away from material forces towards abstracted interests. Facilitation and adjudication must account for audience costs, domestic politics, and path dependence across rounds. LMs can assist by drafting position papers, back-channel messages, or press releases in different registers, while humans retain control of red lines, escalation ladders, and legitimacy constraints. Practical design choices that matter include: clear turn structure (front-channel vs. back-channel), explicit rules for information sharing and leaks, and rubrics that reward consistency and coalition-building rather than only “wins.” Artifact capture (transcripts, proposals, dissent notes) is crucial for after-action learning. Reproducibility improves when scenarios, prompts, and adjudication criteria are shared alongside model/version information. IR professionals in particular benefit from wargaming because of its creative and non-analytical

structure. With subjective rubrics and emphasis on cooperation and social interactions, innovative players and adjudications are nearly necessary and alleviate human cost from traditional executions of diplomatic wargames with human players and computers, whether it is through fully autonomous or human-aided.

B.2.3 Social Games

While wargames may contain elements of social reasoning or deception, they differ fundamentally from social deduction games in that deception is not the objective but a component of broader strategic reasoning. Wargames require agents to pursue defined goals through planning and decision-making within a structured conflict environment. In contrast, social deduction games are centered around identity discovery and psychological misdirection, making them categorically distinct. This distinction is critical for evaluating LMs in open-ended scenarios, as social deduction games test their ability to navigate dynamic, multi-agent interactions involving trust and deception (Chi et al., 2024).

Psychological misdirection is prolific in warfare, however, and history is rife with examples of cunning tacticians using it with great success. As the Chinese military strategist Sun Tzu famously wrote, “*All warfare is based on deception,*” exemplified by tactics like the Trojan Horse, the Empty Fort Strategy, and Hannibal’s crossing of the Alps to outmaneuver Roman forces through strategic diversions. For this literature review, social deduction games represent a complementary effort to wargames, as their focus on harnessing psychological misdirection in game scenarios can enhance LMs’ performance in real-life contexts where information may be unreliable, mislabeled, or intentionally deceptive (Maggio and Santiago, 2024; Lamparth et al., 2024). By studying LMs in these settings, researchers can improve their adaptability to ambiguous, deception-heavy scenarios critical to both wargaming and broader AI applications.

B.2.4 Economics and Business

In business and organizational contexts, wargaming draws on competitive strategy and scenario planning to stress-test hypotheses under adversarial dynamics, market shifts, and policy shocks (Hamel and Prahalad, 1994; Bradfield et al., 2005; Schwarz et al., 2019). Seminar-style sessions often combine narrative role-play (competitor, regulator, customer) with structured turns where teams pro-

pose moves (pricing, product launch, alliances) and facilitators adjudicate based on feasibility and consistency (Kurtz, 2003; HersHKovitz, 2019; Coyne and Horn, 2009). Unlike fully quantitative simulators, these games emphasize qualitative reasoning, internal alignment, and the articulation of assumptions (Scherpereel, 2005a; Schwarz, 2013). When LMs participate, their value is speed and breadth in ideation (enumerating strategic options), drafting memos in given styles, and probing counterfactuals (“what would a rational competitor do if...”) (Chussil, 2007). Because ungrounded extrapolations are a risk, prompts should enforce evidence requirements—claims cite assumptions, external signals, or benchmarks (Scherpereel, 2005b; Wheaton et al., 2020). Adjudication blends simple quantitative checks (unit economics, capacity) with narrative plausibility; human facilitators keep realism and ethics in scope (Oliver Schwarz, 2011). Empirical studies show these simulations reshape decision framing and yield measurable training gains (Scherpereel, 2005a; Scherpereel, 2003). For organizational adoption, reproducibility and governance are key: keep minimal artifacts (scenario text, prompts, seeds, facilitation script), log model/version and tool use (e.g., RAG, calculators), and separate confidential data from public scaffolds (Resende et al., 2018). Evaluation rubrics emphasize clarity of reasoning, sensitivity analysis, and decision traceability.

Wargames also model economic systems directly. Titles like Civilization IV require resource allocation, city management, and balancing short-term needs against long-term growth. Decisions operationalize core concepts—opportunity cost, inflation, deficit spending—while interactions among human and AI players produce emergent market behavior. Finance is likewise strategic: firms compete for share, policymakers set monetary regimes, and traders act under limited information. In-game markets, trade routes, and investment choices mirror commodity dominance and bilateral contracts. Deploying AI agents as firms, governments, or traders enables study of collusion, innovation, shocks, and equilibria under controlled yet dynamic conditions.

Concretely, resource scarcity and specialization drive negotiation and trade (comparative advantage, transaction costs). Budget constraints and inflation impose discipline on expansion, surfacing scaling frictions and the need for hedging. Investment in infrastructure illustrates opportunity

cost and delayed returns: capital committed to growth trades off with readiness elsewhere. Settlers of Catan provides a compact testbed for these dynamics under uncertainty: dice and development cards force risk management and adaptation; multi-party negotiation (offers, counteroffers, acceptance/refusal) elicits strategic communication and deception. Evaluating reinforcement-learning agents in such settings goes beyond win rate to include diversity of behavior, skill expression, and rare or emergent strategies (Alabdulkarim et al., 2021), which are useful for playtesting, balancing, and policy analysis.

Taken together, economics- and business-oriented wargames provide an experimental platform for testing assumptions, measuring policy interventions, and examining second-order effects, while LM assistance supports scale and reproducibility. Clear evidence requirements and artifact capture (transcripts, proposals, dissent notes) make results auditable and comparable across runs.

B.2.5 Medicine and Public Health

Wargaming is not limited to military and geopolitical conflicts. It has also been used to great effect in the fields of medicine and public health to prepare for and respond to health crises. A prominent example is the “Dark Winter” exercise, a 2001 simulation of a smallpox attack on the United States, which highlighted critical deficiencies in the nation’s preparedness for a bioterrorist attack.

Following the precedent of “Dark Winter”, numerous other wargames and simulation exercises have been conducted to address a variety of public health challenges. These exercises, often referred to as tabletop exercises (TTXs) or drills, are crucial tools for testing emergency plans, training personnel, and improving coordination between different agencies. For instance, “Event 201” simulated a global pandemic to identify and address the economic and societal challenges it would pose. These simulations have proven invaluable in preparing for real-world events like the COVID-19 pandemic, allowing policymakers and healthcare professionals to rehearse their responses in a controlled environment (Smith et al., 2020).

C Detailed Recommendations

Task-specific baselines comparison. Establishing control conditions using deterministic agents or human SME players or adjudicators enables

qualitative and quantitative measurements of LM agent performance in various conditions, and can help detect systematic biases or failure modes unique to LM reasoning (Yin et al., 2025). Existing human baselines in relevant task spaces (e.g. creative writing, strategic deception) are largely neither transparent nor rigorous enough to provide meaningful comparisons (Wei et al., 2025). High-stakes wargames therefore should prioritize bespoke evaluations with scenario-relevant metrics and adequate analysis to identify capability gaps and boundary conditions before operational use (Lin-Greenberg, 2022; Caballero and Jenkins, 2025; Chu et al., 2025; Tang et al., 2025).

Robustness testing. To measure LM reliability, running inference across paraphrased inputs, synonym substitutes, and varied prompt structures may surface inconsistent strategic reasoning (Shrivastava et al., 2024; Nalbandyan et al., 2025). Testing both surface-level, syntactic robustness and semantic equivalence can largely be automated through use of auxiliary and smaller LMs, and integrated into deployed workflows to inform user confidence in outputs.

Calibration assessment. Models with well-calibrated confidence help avoid overreliance on flawed strategic assessments and under-reliance on sound reasoning, providing an important auditing mechanism for understanding LM decisions; measurements of LM calibration allow external stakeholders of wargames to understand systematic flaws in LM decision-making. Additionally, requiring LMs to quantify uncertainty is likely to improve agent performance and make human review of key actions more efficient, particularly in high-stakes situations (Liu et al., 2025; Downes-Martin, 2020; Freeman, 2024).

Validation robustness. LMs reliably detect evaluation contexts and may perform differently when aware they are being tested (Needham et al., 2025; Abdelnabi and Salem, 2025), potentially masking real-world failure modes or displaying deceptive reasoning during assessment. Multiple model architectures should be tested on identical scenarios to identify points of high uncertainty and common failure modes, while evaluation awareness should be monitored through motivated questioning (“Do you believe you are being evaluated?”) and passive CoT analysis to improve performance. For instance, cross-model critique, while underperforming external feedback (Gou et al., 2024), outperforms self-correction in multi-

agent settings (Saleh et al., 2025). Episodes with evaluation awareness should be reevaluated, and significant consensus breakdowns may signal events requiring human oversight.

Human stakeholder training. LMs' non-intuitive failure modes do not align with the expectation of stakeholders, who are likely to ascribe moral intent to LM output and unlikely to question plain statements (Sharma et al., 2024b). Operators need technical understanding of when to trust, how to improve, and where to audit LM outputs. Key stakeholders, including decision-makers relying on LM-enabled wargames, should conceptually understand LM behavioral markers and be provided with confidence assessments of wargame conclusions (Ehsan and Riedl, 2020). **Parameter-efficient fine-tuning.** Techniques such as adapters and LoRA, combined with in-context learning (ICL), enable model tailoring for a wargaming context without costly retraining. Lightweight adapters stabilize role-specific behavior (e.g., adjudicator versus player), while prompt-only ICL provides scenario-specific styling and constraints. Both approaches reduce operational overhead and improve reproducibility.