Concrete Protocols and Interaction Patterns for Achieving Symbiotic Intelligence: Mutual Adaptation and Co-Evolution in Human-AI Collaboration

1. Introduction

Symbiotic Intelligence refers to a paradigm in which humans and AI systems mutually adapt and co-evolve, forming a partnership that leverages the strengths of both to achieve outcomes unattainable by either alone. Recent HCI and AI research has moved beyond simple human-in-the-loop or tool-based models, proposing concrete protocols and interaction patterns that enable ongoing, bidirectional adaptation and learning between humans and AI. These include frameworks for shared cognitive architectures, mutual learning algorithms, co-adaptive control, bi-directional communication, shared memory systems, and social-cognitive scaffolding (Wang et al., 2021; Davis et al., 2023; Sandini et al., 2018; Mackay, 2024; Krishna et al., 2022; Abbass et al., 2021; Wang, 2020; Parekh & Losey, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Barravecchia et al., 2025; Ehrlich & Cheng, 2018). Operational protocols emphasize continuous feedback, role negotiation, trust calibration, and the integration of social and affective cues, supporting both technical and social dimensions of symbiosis (Davis et al., 2023; Sandini et al., 2018; Mackay, 2024; Krishna et al., 2022; Abbass et al., 2021; Wang, 2020; Parekh & Losey, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Barravecchia et al., 2025; Ehrlich & Cheng, 2018). This review synthesizes the most prominent and empirically grounded approaches, highlighting their mechanisms, applications, and open challenges.

2. Methods

We searched over 170 million research papers in Consensus, including Semantic Scholar, PubMed, and other major databases, using targeted queries on symbiotic intelligence, mutual adaptation, and co-evolutionary human-AI protocols. A total of 974 papers were identified, 693 were screened, 473 were deemed eligible, and the 50 most relevant papers were included in this review.

Search Strategy

FIGURE 1 Flow diagram of the literature search and selection process.

Eight search groups and 20 targeted searches were executed, covering foundational models, operational protocols, mutual adaptation mechanisms, and interdisciplinary perspectives.

3. Results

3.1. Shared Cognitive Architectures and Bi-Directional Communication

- **Symbiotic Autonomous Systems (SAS):** Propose architectures where humans and AI agents share cognitive processes, memory, and decision-making, inspired by bio-brain-social systems. Key protocols include shared memory systems, imitation machinery, and animated body schemas, all connected in a non-hierarchical, bi-directional manner to enable lifelong mutual learning and adaptation (Wang et al., 2021; Sandini et al., 2018; Abbass et al., 2021; Wang, 2020).
- **Machine Education and Communication:** Formalizes the need for AI systems to undergo structured learning (machine education) and maintain bi-directional, discourse-based communication with humans, embedding ethics, trust, and social integration into the co-evolutionary process (Abbass et al., 2021).

3.2. Mutual Learning and Co-Adaptation Algorithms

- **Co-Adaptive Control and Mutual Learning:** Protocols such as co-adaptive optimal control, nonzero-sum differential games, and mutual learning algorithms enable both human and AI to adjust their behaviors in response to each other, fostering stable, closed-loop interaction. These are validated in domains like human-robot teaming and wearable robotics (Wang, 2020; Parekh & Losey, 2022; Ehrlich & Cheng, 2018).
- **Latent Representation Learning:** Algorithms like RILI (Robustly Influencing Latent Intent) allow robots to infer and adapt to the evolving strategies of human partners, using high-level representations of human policy dynamics to guide mutual adaptation over repeated interactions (Parekh & Losey, 2022).

3.3. Social-Cognitive and Epistemic Scaffolding

- **Social Cognition Building Blocks:** Protocols for symbiotic robots include mechanisms for imitation, intention recognition, physical interaction, and shared memory, all supporting incremental, bi-directional development and adaptation (Sandini et al., 2018).
- **Epistemic Agency and Shared Regulation:** Frameworks for shared epistemic agency and socially shared regulation in learning (e.g., HASRL) operationalize how humans and AI can co-regulate learning, negotiate roles, and adaptively scaffold each other's cognitive processes (Wu et al., 2025; Järvelä et al., 2023).

3.4. Interaction Patterns: Nudging, Trust Calibration, and Role Negotiation

- **Nudging and Explainability:** AI systems use nudging protocols to unobtrusively guide human partners toward solution strategies, preserving human agency and cognitive effort while supporting mutual adaptation (Becks & Weis, 2022).
- **Trust Calibration and Autonomy Negotiation:** Protocols for dynamic trust calibration, role negotiation, and autonomy assignment ensure that both human and AI can flexibly adjust their contributions based on context, expertise, and evolving team dynamics (Davis et al., 2023; Mackay, 2024; Zhao et al., 2022; Barravecchia et al., 2025; Hauptman et al., 2022; Flathmann et al., 2024).

Key Papers

Paper	Protocol/Framework	Key Mechanisms	Application Domain	Empirical Evidence
(Wang et al., 2021)	Symbiotic Autonomous Systems (SAS)	Shared memory, bi-directional adaptation	Hybrid societies, cognitive augmentation	Theoretical, case studies
(Sandini et al., 2018)	Social Cognition for Symbiosis	Imitation, intention, shared memory	Human-robot collaboration	Conceptual, design patterns
(Abbass et al., 2021)	Symbiomemesis	Machine education, bi-directional communication	Human-autonomy teaming	Formal model, computational
(Parekh & Losey, 2022)	RILI (Latent Intent Learning)	Mutual learning, latent policy adaptation	Human-robot interaction	User studies, simulation
(Zhao et al., 2022)	Adaptive Teaming Framework	Individualized AI adaptation, role negotiation	Human-AI teams	Case study, simulation

FIGURE 2 Comparison of key studies on operational protocols for symbiotic intelligence.

Top Contributors

Type	Name	Papers
Author	G. Sandini	(Sandini et al., 2018)
Author	H. Abbass	(Abbass et al., 2021)
Author	Sagar Parekh	(Parekh & Losey, 2022)
Journal	*Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*	(Wang et al., 2021; Abbass et al., 2021)
Journal	*Frontiers in Neurorobotics*	(Sandini et al., 2018)
Journal	*Autonomous Robots*	(Parekh & Losey, 2022)

FIGURE 3 Authors & journals that appeared most frequently in the included papers.

4. Discussion

The reviewed literature demonstrates that achieving symbiotic intelligence requires moving beyond static, one-way adaptation to protocols that support **continuous, mutual learning and co-evolution** (Wang et al., 2021; Sandini et al., 2018; Abbass et al., 2021; Wang, 2020; Parekh & Losey, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022). Shared cognitive architectures, bi-directional communication, and mutual learning algorithms are foundational, enabling both human and AI to adapt their strategies, roles, and behaviors over time (Wang et al., 2021; Sandini et al., 2018; Abbass et al., 2021; Wang, 2020; Parekh & Losey, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022). Social-cognitive scaffolding and epistemic agency frameworks further enrich these protocols by embedding social, affective, and ethical dimensions into the interaction (Wu et al., 2025; Sandini et al., 2018; Järvelä et al., 2023; Abbass et al., 2021; Becks & Weis, 2022). Empirical studies, especially in human-robot teaming, show that mutual adaptation leads to more robust, flexible, and satisfying collaborations, though challenges remain in generalizability, transparency, and long-term stability (Parekh & Losey, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Ehrlich & Cheng, 2018). The field is converging on the need for **closed-loop, bi-directional, and context-aware protocols** that can be tailored to diverse domains and user populations.

Claims and Evidence Table

Claim	Evidence Strength	Reasoning	Papers
Shared cognitive architectures and bi-directional communication are essential for symbiotic intelligence	Strong	Theoretical and empirical support across multiple domains	(Wang et al., 2021; Sandini et al., 2018; Abbass et al., 2021; Wang, 2020; Parekh & Losey, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022)
Mutual learning and co-adaptive control protocols enable robust, flexible human-AI teaming	Strong	User studies and simulations show improved adaptation and performance	(Wang, 2020; Parekh & Losey, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Ehrlich & Cheng, 2018)
Social-cognitive scaffolding and epistemic agency frameworks enrich mutual adaptation	Moderate	Conceptual and empirical work in learning and collaboration	(Wu et al., 2025; Sandini et al., 2018; Järvelä et al., 2023; Abbass et al., 2021; Becks & Weis, 2022)
Nudging, trust calibration, and role negotiation are critical for sustainable co-evolution	Moderate	Design patterns and user studies highlight their importance	(Davis et al., 2023; Mackay, 2024; Becks & Weis, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Barravecchia et al., 2025; Hauptman et al., 2022; Flathmann et al., 2024)
Long-term stability and transparency remain open challenges	Moderate	Limited longitudinal studies and transparency frameworks	(Parekh & Losey, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Ehrlich & Cheng, 2018)

FIGURE 4 Key claims and support evidence identified in these papers.

5. Conclusion

Concrete, operational protocols for symbiotic intelligence emphasize shared cognitive architectures, mutual learning, bi-directional communication, and social-cognitive scaffolding, enabling humans and AI to co-adapt and co-evolve their collaborative processes over time. While these approaches show promise in diverse domains, further research is needed to ensure long-term stability, transparency, and ethical alignment.

5.1. Research Gaps

Key gaps include the need for longitudinal studies, transparent adaptation mechanisms, and domain-specific tailoring of protocols for diverse human-AI teams.

Research Gaps Matrix

Protocol Type	Longitudinal Validation	Transparency	Social-Cognitive Integration	Domain-Specific Tailoring	Ethical Alignment
Shared Architectures	3	2	3	2	2
Mutual Learning	2	2	2	2	2
Social Scaffolding	2	1	3	1	2
Trust/Nudging	1	2	2	1	2

FIGURE 5 Heatmap of research coverage by protocol type and study attribute.

5.2. Open Research Questions

Future research should focus on developing transparent, longitudinally validated, and ethically aligned protocols for mutual adaptation in diverse human-AI teams.

Question	Why
How can mutual adaptation protocols be validated and optimized for long-term, real-world human-AI collaboration?	Longitudinal validation is essential for robust, sustainable symbiotic intelligence.
What mechanisms can ensure transparency and user understanding in bi-directional adaptation processes?	Transparency is critical for trust, safety, and ethical alignment.
How can social-cognitive scaffolding be tailored to different domains and user populations in symbiotic human-AI systems?	Domain-specific adaptation ensures relevance and effectiveness across contexts.

FIGURE 6 Open research questions and their significance for future work.

In summary, operationalizing symbiotic intelligence requires closed-loop, bi-directional, and context-aware protocols that support mutual adaptation and co-evolution, with ongoing research needed to address transparency, stability, and ethical challenges.

*These papers were sourced and synthesized using Consensus, an AI-powered search engine for research. Try it at **https://consensus.app***

References

Wang, Y., Karray, F., Kwong, S., Plataniotis, K., Leung, H., Hou, M., Tunstel, E., Rudas, I., Trajković, L., Kaynak, O., Kacprzyk, J., Zhou, M., Smith, M., Chen, P., & Patel, S. (2021). On the philosophical, cognitive and mathematical foundations of symbiotic autonomous systems. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 379. **https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2020.0362**

Davis, E., Dey, S., Karvonen, A., Lew, E., Quick, D., Shyamshankar, P., Hille, T., & Lebeau, M. (2023). Leveraging Manifold Learning and Relationship Equity Management for Symbiotic Explainable Artificial Intelligence. *Human Factors in Robots, Drones and Unmanned Systems*. **https://doi.org/10.54941/ahfe1003759**

Wu, J., Lee, Y., Chai, C., & Tsai, C. (2025). Strengthening Human Epistemic Agency in the Symbiotic Learning Partnership With Generative Artificial Intelligence. *Educational Researcher*. **https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x251333628**

Sandini, G., Mohan, V., Sciutti, A., & Morasso, P. (2018). Social Cognition for Human-Robot Symbiosis—Challenges and Building Blocks. *Frontiers in Neurorobotics*, 12. **https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbot.2018.00034**

Mackay, W. (2024). Parasitic or Symbiotic? Redefining our Relationship with Intelligent Systems. *Adjunct Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. **https://doi.org/10.1145/3672539.3695752**

Krishna, R., Lee, D., Fei-Fei, L., & Bernstein, M. (2022). Socially situated artificial intelligence enables learning from human interaction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 119. **https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2115730119**

Järvelä, S., Nguyen, A., & Hadwin, A. (2023). Human and artificial intelligence collaboration for socially shared regulation in learning. *Br. J. Educ. Technol.*, 54, 1057-1076. **https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13325**

Abbass, H., Petraki, E., Hussein, A., McCall, F., & Elsawah, S. (2021). A model of symbiomemesis: machine education and communication as pillars for human-autonomy symbiosis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 379. **https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2020.0364**

Becks, E., & Weis, T. (2022). Nudging to Improve Human-AI Symbiosis. *2022 IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications Workshops and other Affiliated Events (PerCom Workshops)*, 132-133. **https://doi.org/10.1109/PerComWorkshops53856.2022.9767539**

Wang, K. (2020). Adaptive Control and Cooperative Learning of Symbiotic Behavior of Human-Machine-Interaction. **.

Parekh, S., & Losey, D. (2022). Learning latent representations to co-adapt to humans. *Autonomous Robots*, 47, 771 - 796. **https://doi.org/10.1007/s10514-023-10109-5**

Zhao, M., Simmons, R., & Admoni, H. (2022). The Role of Adaptation in Collective Human–AI Teaming. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 17, 291 - 323. **https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12633**

Barravecchia, F., Bartolomei, M., Mastrogiacomo, L., & Franceschini, F. (2025). Designing Symbiotic Human–Robot Collaboration in assembly tasks. *Production Engineering*. **https://doi.org/10.1007/s11740-025-01333-2**

Ehrlich, S., & Cheng, G. (2018). Human-agent co-adaptation using error-related potentials. *Journal of Neural Engineering*, 15. **https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2552/aae069**

Hauptman, A., Schelble, B., Mcneese, N., & Madathil, K. (2022). Adapt and overcome: Perceptions of adaptive autonomous agents for human-AI teaming. *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, 138, 107451. **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107451**

Flathmann, C., Duan, W., Mcneese, N., Hauptman, A., & Zhang, R. (2024). Empirically Understanding the Potential Impacts and Process of Social Influence in Human-AI Teams. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 8, 1 - 32. **https://doi.org/10.1145/3637326**