

## MASTER'S THESIS

# The relationship between local behavior and global characteristics in multi-agent systems

Hu, Bingcheng

*Date of Award:*  
2006

[Link to publication](#)

### General rights

Copyright and intellectual property rights for the publications made accessible in HKBU Scholars are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners. In addition to the restrictions prescribed by the Copyright Ordinance of Hong Kong, all users and readers must also observe the following terms of use:

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from HKBU Scholars for the purpose of private study or research
- Users cannot further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- To share publications in HKBU Scholars with others, users are welcome to freely distribute the permanent URL assigned to the publication

**The Relationship between Local Behavior and Global Characteristics  
in Multi-Agent Systems**

**Hu Bingcheng**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

**Master of Philosophy**

**Principal Supervisor: Prof. Jiming Liu**

Hong Kong Baptist University  
Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong

January, 2006

# Abstract

In a multi-agent system (MAS), there usually exist several system-level goals that agents need to attain. In most cases, we can only directly control and engineer individual agents rather than an MAS. For example, in RoboCup, two teams of players play a soccer game. We need to design and implement autonomous players that understand how to organize effective attack and defense maneuvers with their teammates to win the game. In order to attain the system-level goals, understanding the relationship between the local behavior of players and the global characteristics of the team is crucial. Generally speaking, agent local behavior refers to the behavior of an agent that has only local influences on the global characteristics of an MAS. Global characteristics include global performance and global patterns. Global performance corresponds to the overall performance of a team. Global patterns refer to the fashion in which an agent team attempts to execute its actions to fulfill its goals.

Usually the local-global relationship is not very obvious nor straightforward. In some way, the global characteristics of an MAS emerge from the local behavior of agents. Nonetheless, there is no general means to figure out such a relationship.

At present, there are some specific studies devoted to the local-global relationship, e.g., concerning cellular automata computation, multi-agent negotiation, collective robots behavior, Self-Organized Criticality (SOC), and phase transitions. In our present work, we attempt to study the local-global relationship in two distinct yet interrelated types of MAS: RoboNBA and Self-Organizing Multi-Agent System (SOMAS).

For RoboNBA, we have designed, implemented, and tested a RoboNBA platform. Two different sources of local behavior have been introduced: decision-making mechanisms and agent strategies. Two decision-making mechanisms have been proposed for RoboNBA. One adopts a top-down design while another uses a bottom-up design. We have compared the two decision-making mechanisms with respect to global characteristics and have obtained some interesting observations. We have also defined some strategies for players, such as how to pass and defend. Besides, we have addressed the problem of how to quantitatively measure the global performance and global patterns in RoboNBA. For global patterns, we have focused on the diversity of attack patterns of a team. In addition, we have gained some understanding on how the global patterns of a team emerge from the decision-making mechanisms of agents. Furthermore, we have investigated how global characteristics and global performance correlate in different scenarios. Particularly, we have found that the diversity of attack patterns in a team increases as its opponent team becomes weaker.

Our research work on RoboNBA can be beneficial to some research problems, such as RoboCup and multi-agent pursuit and evasion game. However, it is not applicable to a generalized scenario. In order to address this issue, we have developed SOMAS to study the local-global relationship in a more generalized scenario.

For SOMAS, to study the local-global relationship, we need to understand two issues. The first is how to quantitatively define and measure the global characteristics of an MAS. The global characteristics include many attributes, such as the performance of an MAS, the global functioning patterns of an MAS, and most importantly, the complex behavior of an MAS. The second is how to produce different global characteristics from the local behavior of individual agents in an MAS.

In our present work of SOMAS, we have achieved the following objectives to address the aforementioned issues. We have provided SOMAS to describe more general competitive scenarios in MAS applications, such as RobNBA and RoboCup matches. Based

on the model, we have carried out some experiments. By comparing and analyzing the experimental results, we have gained some understanding on the Self-Organized Criticality (SOC) phenomena that occur in SOMAS. The avalanches of player performance and team morale follow a power-law distribution under a particular setting. More importantly SOC phenomena in the team morale avalanche are robust against all  $k$  values while the player performance avalanche may demonstrate exponential characteristics for some  $k$  values. In addition, we have adopted a probability based mechanism in the opponent selection process and have discovered that it can outperform a greedy algorithm when the information of players is limited. Furthermore, we have explained the SOC phenomena by demonstrating that the SOC occurrence in team patterns is positively correlated to the good performance of a team under different experimental settings. Finally, we have identified that a parameter  $k$  in  $Y(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  can have a great impact on the scaling structures of player performance and team morale as well as maximum size of avalanches. Based on Shannon's entropy theory, we have provided a conjecture that gives some insights into the phase transitions produced by the critical parameter  $k$ .

# Contents

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>Declaration</b>   | <b>i</b>   |
| <b>Abstract</b>  | <b>ii</b>  |
| <b>Acknowledgements</b>                                      | <b>v</b>   |
| <b>Table of Contents</b>                                     | <b>vi</b>  |
| <b>List of Figures</b>                                       | <b>x</b>   |
| <b>List of Tables</b>  | <b>xiv</b> |
| <b>1 Background</b>  | <b>1</b>   |
| 1.1 Motivation . . . . .                                     | 1          |
| 1.2 Survey on MAS Applications . . . . .                     | 3          |
| 1.2.1 CA Computation . . . . .                               | 4          |
| 1.2.2 Multi-Agent Negotiation . . . . .                      | 5          |
| 1.2.3 Collective Robots . . . . .                            | 7          |
| 1.2.4 RoboCup . . . . .                                      | 7          |
| 1.2.5 Summary of Previous Work on MAS Applications . . . . . | 8          |
| 1.3 Survey on Complex Phenomena within MAS . . . . .         | 9          |
| 1.3.1 Self-Organized Criticality . . . . .                   | 9          |

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1.3.2    | Phase Transitions . . . . .                                     | 10        |
| 1.3.3    | Summary of Previous Work on Complex Phenomena of MAS . . .      | 10        |
| 1.4      | Methodology . . . . .   | 11        |
| 1.4.1    | Natural System Identification . . . . .                         | 11        |
| 1.4.2    | Artificial System Construction . . . . .                        | 12        |
| 1.4.3    | Performance Measurement . . . . .                               | 12        |
| 1.5      | Organization of the Thesis . . . . .                            | 12        |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Problem Statement</b>  | <b>14</b> |
| 2.1      | Problems . . . . .  | 14        |
| 2.2      | Objectives . . . . .  | 16        |
| 2.3      | Assumptions . . . . .   | 18        |
| 2.4      | Significance . . . . .  | 18        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>An Overview of the RoboNBA Simulation Platform</b>           | <b>21</b> |
| 3.1      | RoboNBA Platform . . . . .                                      | 21        |
| 3.2      | Motivation of Using RoboNBA and a Simulation Platform . . . . . | 22        |
| 3.3      | RoboNBA Components . . . . .                                    | 23        |
| 3.3.1    | The Server Environment . . . . .                                | 23        |
| 3.3.2    | Player Actions . . . . .  | 23        |
| 3.3.3    | The Sensor Model . . . . .                                      | 25        |
| 3.4      | Summary . . . . .   | 27        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Local Behavior</b>   | <b>28</b> |
| 4.1      | Information Received by Players in RoboNBA . . . . .            | 28        |
| 4.2      | Decision-Making Mechanisms in RoboNBA . . . . .                 | 31        |
| 4.2.1    | Top-Down Design: Simple Reactive Agents . . . . .               | 31        |
| 4.2.2    | Bottom-Up Design: Rational Agents . . . . .                     | 35        |
| 4.3      | Agent Strategies in RoboNBA . . . . .                           | 39        |

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 4.3.1    | Pass Strategy . . . . .   | 40        |
| 4.3.2    | Prediction Strategy . . . . .   | 40        |
| 4.3.3    | Defense Strategy . . . . .  | 42        |
| 4.4      | Discussion . . . . .  | 44        |
| 4.5      | Summary . . . . .   | 45        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>The Relationship between Local Behavior and Global Performance</b>     | <b>46</b> |
| 5.1      | Introduction . . . . .  | 46        |
| 5.2      | Global Performance in RoboNBA . . . . .                                   | 47        |
| 5.3      | Balanced Pass vs. Greedy Pass . . . . .                                   | 48        |
| 5.4      | Ball State Prediction . . . . .   | 50        |
| 5.5      | Adaptive Mark Defense vs. Fixed Mark Defense . . . . .                    | 51        |
| 5.6      | Summary . . . . .   | 53        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>The Relationship between Local Behavior and Global Characteristics</b> | <b>54</b> |
| 6.1      | Introduction . . . . .  | 54        |
| 6.2      | Global Patterns in RoboNBA . . . . .                                      | 55        |
| 6.3      | Simple Reactive Agent vs. Rational Agent . . . . .                        | 56        |
| 6.4      | Greedy Defense vs. Fixed Mark Defense . . . . .                           | 62        |
| 6.5      | Greedy Defense vs. Adaptive Mark Defense . . . . .                        | 67        |
| 6.6      | Critical Observations . . . . .   | 72        |
| 6.7      | Validation Efforts . . . . .  | 75        |
| 6.8      | Parameters . . . . .  | 76        |
| 6.9      | Summary . . . . .   | 76        |
| <b>7</b> | <b>SOMAS: Our Approach in Modelling Complex Behavior</b>                  | <b>78</b> |
| 7.1      | Introduction . . . . .  | 78        |
| 7.1.1    | Motivation for the Transition . . . . .                                   | 78        |
| 7.1.2    | Background . . . . .  | 79        |



|          |  |            |
|----------|--|------------|
| 7.1.3    | Problem Statements . . . . .                                   | 79         |
| 7.2      | Formulation . . . . .  | 82         |
| 7.2.1    | Non-Self-Organizing Multi-Agent Systems (NonSOMAS) . . . . .   | 82         |
| 7.2.2    | Self-Organizing Multi-Agent Systems (SOMAS) . . . . .          | 84         |
| 7.3      | Comparisons between RoboNBA and SOMAS . . . . .                | 90         |
| 7.4      | Summary . . . . .  | 91         |
| <b>8</b> | <b>Complex Behavior in SOMAS</b>                               | <b>93</b>  |
| 8.1      | Introduction . . . . .   | 93         |
| 8.1.1    | Measurements . . . . .   | 93         |
| 8.2      | Experiment on NonSOMAS . . . . .                               | 94         |
| 8.3      | Self-Organized Criticality in SOMAS . . . . .                  | 95         |
| 8.3.1    | Discovery of SOC in SOMAS . . . . .                            | 95         |
| 8.3.2    | Utilization of SOC . . . . .                                   | 101        |
| 8.3.3    | The Relationship between SOC Phenomena and Team Performance    | 104        |
| 8.4      | Phase Transitions in SOMAS . . . . .                           | 107        |
| 8.4.1    | The Impact of $k$ Value on the SOC Phenomena . . . . .         | 107        |
| 8.4.2    | The Impact of $k$ Value on Avalanche Characteristics . . . . . | 108        |
| 8.5      | Summary . . . . .  | 114        |
| <b>9</b> | <b>Summary and Future Work</b>                                 | <b>115</b> |
| 9.1      | Summary on Present Work . . . . .                              | 115        |
| 9.2      | Future Work . . . . .  | 117        |
|          | <b>CURRICULUM VITAE</b>  | <b>129</b> |