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Abstract

Deep Q-learning has achieved a significant success in single-agent decision making tasks. However, it is challenging to extend Q-learning to large-scale multi-agent scenarios, due to the explosion of action space resulting from the complex dynamics between the environment and the agents. In this paper, we propose to make the computation of multi-agent Q-learning tractable by treating the Q-function (w.r.t. state and joint-action) as a high-order high-dimensional tensor and then approximate it with factorized pairwise interactions. Furthermore, we utilize a composite deep neural network architecture for computing the factorized Q-function, share the model parameters among all the agents within the same group, and estimate the agents’ optimal joint actions through a coordinate descent type algorithm. All these simplifications greatly reduce the model complexity and accelerate the learning process. Extensive experiments on two different multi-agent problems have demonstrated the performance gain of our proposed approach in comparison with strong baselines, particularly when there are a large number of agents.

Introduction

Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (MARL) studies a group of autonomous agents in a shared environment from which they learn what to do according to the received reward signals while interacting with each other. For many real-world applications, it is appealing to employ multiple agents which they learn what to do according to the received reward signals while interacting with each other. For many real-world applications, it is appealing to employ multiple agents because they could accomplish tasks that a standalone agent could not do or would do in a costly manner.

The great obstacle for applying single-agent reinforcement learning algorithms such as Q-learning (Watkins 1989) directly to the multi-agent setting is that with the presence of other agents taking actions, the environment for each individual agent can no longer be regarded as stationary. To address the difficult decision problems arising from MARL, researchers have tried to borrow techniques from game theory, in particular, the framework of stochastic games (Littman 1994; Junling Hu 1998; Littman 2001a; Littman 2001b; [Hu and Wellman 2003]). However, such algorithms are computationally expensive and therefore only able to deal with a few agents.

In this paper, we aim to make Q-learning for MARL scalable to a large number of agents. Inspired by the Factorization Machines (Rendle 2012; Rendle and Schmidt-Thieme 2010) widely used in recommender systems, we model the complex relationship between the environment and the agents as a high-order high-dimensional tensor and then approximate it through factorization. Specifically, the multi-agent Q-function (w.r.t. state and joint-actions) is decomposed into independent components plus pairwise interactions (between any two agents). As indicated in (Blume 1993), focusing on pairwise interactions could greatly reduce the complexity of a multi-agent system while maintaining the essence of the multidimensional complex relationship among different agents. Moreover, such a factorized Q-function is going to be shared among different agents within the same group (or the entire system when there is no grouping of agents), which further cuts down the complexity of the multi-agent system and also helps to speed up the deep learning process. It is also worth noting that the agents’ last actions are leveraged to estimate their current strategies in the optimization algorithm, which effectively mitigates the combinatorial explosion of joint actions. In summary, we propose a computationally efficient Q-function approximation for MARL named “Factorized Q-learning (FQL)” which is capable of handling large-scale multi-agent systems.

Related Work

Single-Agent Q-Learning

Q-Learning (Watkins 1989; Watkins and Dayan 1992; Melo 2001) is a model-free off-policy reinforcement learning method that estimates the long-term expected return of executing an action $a$ from a given state $s$. The estimated returns, known as Q-values, can be learned iteratively by updating the current Q-value estimate towards the observed reward $r_t$ plus the maximum possible Q-value over all actions $a$ in the next state $s_{t+1}$:

$$Q(s_t, a_t) \leftarrow (1-\alpha)Q(s_t, a_t) + \alpha \left(r_t + \gamma \cdot \max_a Q(s_{t+1}, a)\right),$$

with $\alpha$ being the learning rate.
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where $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ is the discount factor and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ is the learning rate.

For challenging domains like Atari games, there are too many states to allow us maintain all the Q-values in a table, so a model is needed instead for the computation of the Q-function. The state of the art solution is the Deep Q-Network (DQN) algorithm (Mnih et al. 2013; Mnih et al. 2015) which approximates as well as generalizes the relationship between states (inputs) and actions (outputs) with a deep neural network $Q(s, a; \theta)$ parameterized by $\theta$. The network parameters are learned via back propagation to minimize a differentiable loss function — the squared temporal difference error

$$L(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1}) \sim \text{Unif}(D)} \left[ (Y_t - Q(s_t, a_t; \theta))^2 \right]$$

with

$$Y_t = r_t + \gamma \cdot \max_a Q(s_{t+1}, a; \bar{\theta})$$

where $(s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$ are the past experiences recorded in a “replay memory” $D$ and then sampled uniformly from $D$ to train the network in a supervised manner, while $\bar{\theta}$ represents the parameters of a “target network” $\bar{\theta}$ that are periodically copied from $\theta$ and kept constant for a number of iterations in order to make the DQN training stable.

**Multi-Agent Q-Learning**

Generally speaking, the MARL algorithms that try to solve the multi-agent stochastic games can be divided into two paradigms: equilibrium learning and best-response learning.

In the equilibrium learning paradigm, the agents try to learn policies which form the Nash equilibrium (Littman 2001b). Specifically, each agent attempts to get at least the amount of payoff indicated by the Nash equilibrium, i.e., the lower-bound of performance, regardless of the policies being played by the other players. Since it is usually difficult to find such equilibria, existing algorithms focus on a small class of stochastic games, e.g., zero-sum games or two-person general-sum games. For example, Nash-Q (Junling Hu 1998; Hu and Wellman 2003) and Friend-or-Foe (Littman 2001a) extend the classic Q-learning (Watkins and Dayan 1992) by encoding the interactions between environment and agents in a so-called Nash Q function. It is proved that Nash Q learning converges to the optimal policy under some restrictive assumptions. This is also the case for the recently emerged mean-field Q-learning (MF-Q) algorithm (Yang et al. 2018) which equips each agent with one Q-function and approximates it by the average effects in the agent’s neighborhood. However, such algorithms are not practical in a complex environment with a large number of agents because of the expensive computation required to estimate other agents’ policies at each state and find the equilibria. Besides, when there are many agents, the estimated policies of different agents might not belong to the same Nash equilibrium, thus the convergence will become invalid (Tesauro 2003).

In the best-response learning paradigm, each agent just tries to learn a policy that is optimal with respect to the joint policy of the other players (Claus and Boutilier 1999; Uther and Veloso 1997). On one hand, such methods are not assured of the lower-bound of performance, especially when the other agents do not have stationary policies. On the other hand, it is possible for an agent to take advantage of the fact that the policies being played by the other players may not be their best responses and thus obtain more reward than that guaranteed by the equilibrium. The simplest algorithms in this category back off to the single-agent case and just conduct independent Q-learning (IQL) in which each agent independently learns its own Q-function by treating the other agents as part of the environment without considering the interactions among different agents (Tan 1993; Tampuu et al. 2017). RIAL (Reinforced Inter-Agent Learning) (Froester et al. 2016) combines the idea of IQL with DRQN (Lample and Chaplot 2017) to learn communication protocols in a cooperative multi-agent environment. Similarly, multi-agent DQN (MA-DQN) (Tampuu et al. 2017) carries out IQL with an autonomous DQN for each agent to investigate the interaction between two agents in the video game Pong. Although the IQL style algorithms are computationally efficient and therefore can accommodate a large number of agents, they are often sub-optimal because, as we have mentioned above, the environment would be non-stationary from each agent’s point of view. Noticeably, the additional knowledge about the other agents should be beneficial to the effectiveness of learning, and sharing policies or episodes among the agents could speed up the learning process (Tan 1993). Value-Decomposition Networks (VDN) (Sunehag et al. 2017) goes a little bit beyond IQL by summing over all the independent Q-functions for cooperative tasks, but the complex interactions in MARL are unlikely to be captured by simplistic linear summations. Monotonic Value Function Factorization (QMIX) (Rashid et al. 2018) mixes the per-agent action-value Q-functions into a rich joint action-value function which provides extra state information for learning. However, the QMIX architecture will become more and more complicated and difficult to compute as the number of agents increases. In contrast, the complexity of our proposed method depends not on the number of agents but on the number of agent-groups which usually remains to be small even for large-scale MARL problems.

**Multi-Agent Factorized Q-Learning**

Here we extend the Deep Q-Network (DQN) (Mnih et al. 2013; Mnih et al. 2015) to multi-agent environments with an approximate Q-function based on Factorization Machines (Rendle 2012; Rendle and Schmidt-Thieme 2010). Specifically, we first reformulate the multi-agent joint-action Q-function in a factorized form, then present the optimization algorithm for learning such factorized Q-functions through deep neural networks, and finally provide an analysis of this algorithm’s computational complexity.

**Multi-Agent Q-Function Approximation**

DQN combines Q-learning and deep neural networks to conduct single-agent reinforcement learning and has achieved
This implies that there is only one unique optimal policy, Assumption 1. The $Q$-function for each agent in MARL (PoE) (Sallans and Hinton 2004), and Robust Principle Component Analysis (RPCA) (Ong 2015). It is reasonable to believe that the low-dimensionality assumption holds for multi-agent Q-learning as well. Considering the particular structure of the multi-agent $Q$-function which involves the complex relationship among many agents, we hereby propose to find its low-dimensional approximation by borrowing the idea from the Factorization Machines (Rendle and Schmidt-Thieme 2010) which captures the complex relationship among many users (items) with only independent components plus pairwise interactions.

**Assumption 2.** The optimal policies for two different rational agents in MARL, “ceteris paribus” (all other things being equal), should be identical, i.e., given the same environment they will take the same action to maximize their respective rewards if they are in the same state.

This implies that there is only one unique optimal policy, which is probably true in most situations. Even if in the rare case where multiple optimal policies exist, requiring the agents to stick with one of them is not likely to hurt the multi-agent system’s performance much. Thus, we could consider all the agents in the same group homogeneous and let them share the same model ($Q$-function) rather than maintaining a separate model for each individual agent, which would obviously reduce the computational complexity a lot. Note that at any particular time-step, it is possible for the agents sharing the same $Q$-function (or following the same policy) to carry out different actions as they could be in different states.

Note that when there exist multiple groups (e.g., two armies in a battle), the group label would be incorporated into each agent’s state variable.

Under the above two assumptions, we are able to greatly simplify the multi-agent $Q$-function as follows.

\[ Q'(s,a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_N;\Theta) \approx Q'(s,a_1;\theta) + \lambda \cdot \sum_{j \in -i} V'(s,a_j;\beta_1)^T U'(s,a_j;\beta_2) \]

\[ \approx Q(s^t,a^t;\theta) + \lambda \cdot \sum_{j \in -i} V(s^t,a_j;\beta_1)^T U(s^t,a_j;\beta_2) \]

\[ \approx Q(s^t,a^t;\theta) + \lambda \cdot V(s^t,a^t;\beta_1)^T \sum_{j \in -i} U(s^t,a^t;\beta_2) \]

\[ = Q(s^t,a^t;\theta) + \lambda \cdot V(s^t,a^t;\beta_1)^T \frac{\sum_{j \in -i} U(s^t,a^t;\beta_2)}{N-1} \]

\[ = Q(s^t,a^t;\theta) + \lambda \cdot V(s^t,a^t;\beta_1)^T \frac{\sum_{j \in -i} U(s^t,a^t;\beta_2)}{N-1} \]

where $-i$ is an index set ranging from 1 to $N$ with $i$ removed, the learnable parameters $\Theta = \{\theta,\beta_1,\beta_2\}$, the hyper-parameter $\lambda = \lambda^o(N-1)$, and $U(s^t,a^t;\beta_2) = \sum_{j \in -i} U(s^t,a^t;\beta_2)/(N-1)$.

The approximation made from Eq. (3) to Eq. (4) is of course based on Assumption 1. Eq. (4) contains two terms which correspond to the independent component and the pairwise interactions respectively, while the high-order interactions (among three or more agents) have been ignored. The approximation made from Eq. (4) to Eq. (5) rests on Assumption 2: agent $i$’s individual model ($Q^i$, $V^i$, and $U^i$) is replaced by the shared model ($Q$, $V$, and $U$). The remaining derivations from Eq. (5) to Eq. (8) simplify the mathematical expression step by step. In the end, the other agents’ overall influence on agent $i$ is summarized into a compact form $\sum_{j \in -i} U(s^t,a^t;\beta_2)/(N-1)$.

Note that here we have used two separate vectors to represent agent $i$ in its pairwise interactions with other agents, the $i$-th column vector of $V$ and the $i$-th column vector of $U$, to facilitate the learning of factorization. This is in the same spirit of word2vec (Mikolov et al. 2013) which learns two separate embeddings, one target embedding and one context embedding, for each word.

We refer to the final formula Eq. (8) as the factorized $Q$-function for agent $i$, and name our proposed approach to MARL “Factorized Q-learning (FQL)”. Since the factorized $Q$-function for each agent requires the knowledge of the other agents’ current states and their last actions for both training and execution, our proposed FQL technique mainly addresses the MARL problems with a central controller that communicates the global information to all the agents. Nevertheless, at any particular moment each agent
is not supposed to know the other agents’ current action choices, which makes our setting much more realistic than a completely centralized one (Kok and Vlassis 2004). The requirement of global knowledge will be further relaxed to the requirement of local neighborhood knowledge in the last game of our experiments.

Neural Architecture
Similar to the DQN algorithm that we have described before, our proposed FQL approach employs a deep neural network to fit the Q-function for MARL. The difference is that the FQL network is a composite one consisting of three sub-networks: Q-network, V-network and U-network corresponding to \(Q(s, a; \Theta)\), \(V(s, a; \beta_1)\) and \(\bar{U}(s, \cdot; \beta_2)\) respectively in Eq. (8). The architecture of such a composite network is depicted in Fig. 1. The structural decomposition of the FQL network into three sub-networks makes its learning and inference much easier than a single big DQN network, in the MARL context.

Optimization Algorithm
Theoretically, for each agent \(i\) at non-terminal time-step \(t\), the target value \(Y^i_t\) should be estimated as

\[
Y^i_t = r^i_t + \gamma \max_{a^1, \ldots, a^i} \bar{Q}^i(s^t_{t+1}, \underbrace{a^1, \ldots, a^{i-1}}_{\text{joint action}}, a^{i-1} ; \Theta) ,
\]

where \(\bar{Q}^i\) is the target network copied from \(Q^i\) with parameters \(\Theta\) which denotes a duplicate of \(\Theta\) for every \(C\) steps, and \(a^i\) and \(a^{i-1}\) represent the available actions for agents given the state \(s^t_{t+1}\). However, it is infeasible to directly search for the optimal joint action for state \(s^t_{t+1}\) when there are many agents, as the size of the joint action space grows exponentially with \(N\), the number of the agents in the system.

In order to make the computation tractable, we get the idea from coordinate descent that the optimization of a multivariate function can be achieved by successively optimizing it along one coordinate direction at a time, i.e., solving much simpler univariate optimization problems in a loop (Wright 2015). Specifically, for each state \(s\), we would need to identify the joint action that can maximize the multivariate function \(F_s(a^1, a^2, \ldots, a^N) \equiv \bar{Q}(s, a^1, a^2, \ldots, a^N; \Theta)\) which, as we have explained above, is shared by all the agents (in the same group). Using the standard technique of coordinate descent (or more accurately coordinate ascent in our context), the current solution to the \(F_s\) optimization problem, \((a^{i_1}_1, a^{i_2}_2, \ldots, a^{i_N}_N)\), can be iteratively improved by finding

\[
a^{i+1}_i = \arg \max_a F_s(a^1, \ldots, a^{i+1}_i, \ldots, a^N ; \Theta) \\
= \arg \max_a \bar{Q}(s^t_{t+1}, a^1, \ldots, a^{i-1}_i, a^{i+1}_i, \ldots, a^N ; \Theta)
\]

for each variable \(a^i (i = 1, \ldots, N)\). From the perspective of agent \(i\), the action to perform at time-step \(t + 1\), \(a^{i+1}_i\), is obtained by fixing the other agents’ actions \(a^{i-1}_i\) and optimizing the objective with respect to its own action \(a^i\) only. Since all the agents simultaneously carry out such coordinate descent updates in parallel at each time-step and the experience replay mechanism from DQN (Mnih et al. 2015) is adopted, the concrete method to estimate the optimal joint action for

Figure 1: The composite deep neural network architecture for multi-agent Factorized Q-Learning (FQL).
each state is somewhat similar to the “asynchronous (parallel) stochastic coordinate descent” (AsySCD) algorithm which has been proved to have sublinear convergence rate on general convex functions (Liu et al. 2015), though Q-functions are of course not necessarily convex. To summarize, the FQL learning process has two kinds of iterative updates interwoven with each other: the temporal difference updates of Q-learning and the asynchronous parallel updates of stochastic coordinate descent.

In other words, for each agent \( i \) at non-terminal time-step \( t \), the target value \( Y_{t}^{i} \) is heuristically estimated with the target network \( \tilde{Q}^{i} \) by keeping all the other agents’ actions fixed at their \( t \)-th time-step:

\[
Y_{t}^{i} = r_{t}^{i} + \gamma \cdot \max_{a^{i}} \tilde{Q}^{i}(s_{t+1}, a^{i}, a_{-i}^{i}; \Theta). \tag{11}
\]

This would significantly reduce the computational complexity from \( O\left( \prod_{i} |A^{i}| \right) \) for the combinatorial optimization in Eq. (9) to \( O\left( \sum_{i} |A^{i}| \right) \) for the simple linear scan of each agent’s possible actions in Eq. (11). Although such an aggressive method for action estimation is introduced for efficiency purposes, it turns out to be also empirically very effective for different kinds of MARL tasks, as shown later by our experiments.

The widely-used \( \epsilon \)-greedy strategy (Sutton and Barto 1998) for exploration-exploitation is adopted as the behavior policy in the FQL process. The full details of our FQL algorithm is included in the appendix.

Computational Complexity
As we have explained above, all the agents in the same group would share the same factorized Q-function. Therefore, a multi-agent system with \( G \) groups would only need to maintain \( G \) Q-functions, and thus the whole complexity of computation would be merely \( G \) times that for one agent’s Q-function, no matter how many agents there are in the system. In practice, \( G \) is usually a very small number, and \( G = 1 \) for pure cooperative tasks.

The factorized Q-function for one agent in a group of size \( N \) would behave just like a single-agent DQN (Mnih et al. 2013; Mnih et al. 2015), except that in the former there are \( N \) joint actions to be evaluated for the next state at each step of learning while in the latter there is just one single action. Nevertheless, using the previously described approximate optimization algorithm, an agent’s best action at the next state \( s_{t+1} \) is estimated with the other agents’ actions fixed at their current choices \( a_{-i}^{t} \), so at time-step \( t \) we could efficiently construct \( N \) training examples \( \{Y_{t}^{i}, Q^{i}(s_{t}, a_{t}^{i}, a_{-i}^{i}; \Theta)\}_{i=1}^{N} \) for the deep neural network. Although at each step our proposed multi-agent FQL approach would generate \( N \) times more training examples than a single-agent DQN, the total number of training examples required to reach convergence should be quite similar. So, the overall computational complexity of training one group of agents in FQL seems to be comparable to that of training a single agent in DQN.

Experiments
We evaluate our proposed FQL approach to MARL on two different problems both involving quite a number of agents: the first is a pure cooperative task while the second is a mixed cooperative-competitive task.

The Traffic Game
Environment. Let us consider a resource allocation problem called Gaussian Squeeze (Holmes-Parker et al. 2014) which is inspired by the traffic control task where we want to let as many cars as possible use the available road without causing traffic congestion. Specifically, \( N \) agents need to work together to allocate resources in such a way that the total allocated resources \( x = \sum_{i} x_{i} \) is neither too many nor too few, where \( x_{i} \) is the quantity of resources allocated by agent \( i \) (\( 1 \leq i \leq N \)). Given a target quantity of the total allocation \( \mu \), we define the reward by the scaled Gaussian function \( x \cdot e^{-\left( x - \mu \right)^{2}/\sigma^{2}} \) where the parameter \( \sigma \) controls the penalty for the deviation of \( x \) from the desired value \( \mu \). In the gener-
alized version of this problem, we could have $K$ allocation targets each of which is defined by its own pair of $\mu_k$ and $\sigma_k$ parameters ($1 \leq k \leq K$). The complete reward function is then given by the sum of the rewards for those $K$ allocation targets $\sum_k x \cdot e^{-(x-\mu_k)^2/\sigma_k^2}$.

Since in this traffic game the agents do not have state transitions, it is simply a one-state Markov Decision Process aka a Multi-Armed Bandit (MAB) problem. Nevertheless, it is still very challenging for many agents to cooperate with each other in this game.

In our experiments, each agent can choose an integer value from 0 to 9 as its action (allocation of resources), and the objective consists of two prefixed allocation targets with ($\mu_1 = 0, \sigma_1 = 100$) and ($\mu_2 = 400, \sigma_2 = 200$).

**Settings.** The following popular Q-learning based multi-agent reinforcement learning methods have been used in the experiments to compare with our proposed factorized Q-learning (FQL) (Tan 1993; Tampuu et al. 2017), multi-agent actor-critic (MAAC) (Lowe et al. 2017), and mean-field Q-learning (MF-Q) (Yang et al. 2018). All the competitors employ three-layer perceptrons (feed-forward neural networks) to approximate their Q-functions. In particular, our FQL model involves three sub-networks ($Q$, $V$, and $U$) each of which is realized as a three-layer perceptron in exactly the same way. The full description of the implementation details are provided in the appendix.

**Results.** Fig. 2 shows the experimental results of different algorithms in two scenarios: one with a relatively small number of agents ($N = 100$) and the other with a relatively large number of agents ($N = 500$). As we can see, IQL performed quite well in the former scenario with 100 agents. It is because when $N = 100$ agents are independent of each other the sum of their allocations would have the expected value $E[x] = \sum_{i=1}^{N} E[x_i] = N \times E[x_i] = 100 \times \frac{10(1+1+\cdots+9)}{10} = 450$ which happens to be close to one of the allocation targets ($\mu_2 = 400$). However, IQL failed miserably for this cooperative task with 500 agents. These two contrary outcomes confirm that IQL does not have any ability to let multiple agents cooperate with each other. With respect to the MF-Q algorithm, its performance is the worst (even inferior to IQL) when there are just 100 agents, but it becomes almost the best when there are 500 agents. This is reasonable, as the MF-Q algorithm estimates the average effect of actions using the mean-field theory which would be more accurate with more agents according to the law of large numbers. The opposite phenomenon is observed for the MAAC algorithm, its performance is one of the best with 100 agents, but one of the worst (similar to IQL) with 500 agents. This is probably due to the fact that the policy gradients used by MAAC would be harder and harder to be estimated accurately with more and more agents in the system. Finally, it is clear that our proposed FQL algorithm is the only one that has achieved the top performance in both scenarios. We believe that the advantage of FQL for such a cooperative task can be attributed to its preservation of pairwise interactions among agents in its factorized Q-function formulation.

**The Battle Game**

**Environment.** The recently emerged open source multi-agent reinforcement learning platform MAgent (Zheng et al. 2018) enable us to simulate battles between two armies (groups) in which the soldiers from one army would cooperate with each other to fight against their enemies, i.e., the soldiers from the other army. In our experiments, each army consists of 64 soldiers who would be arrayed in the battlefield (a grid world). At each time-step, a soldier would attempt to either move to or attack one of the 8 neighboring grids. The overall objective of an army
Figure 4: The performance of FQL competing against each baseline algorithm in the Battle Game (when each agent considers all the other agents). The reported results are the average values over 100 battles for each comparative experiment.

Figure 5: The performance of FQL competing against each baseline algorithm in the Battle Game (when each agent considers the neighboring agents). The reported results are the average values over 100 battles for each comparative experiment.

is to destroy as many enemies as possible. The rewards for different actions are set to their default values in MAgent: $-0.005$ for moving one step, $5.0$ for killing an enemy, $0.2$ for attacking an enemy, $-0.1$ for attacking a blank grid, and $-0.1$ for being attacked or killed.

Settings. The following popular Q-learning based multi-agent reinforcement learning methods have been used in the experiments to compare with our proposed factorized Q-learning (FQL) approach: independent Q-learning (IQL) (Tan 1993; Tampuu et al. 2017), independent Q-learning with the dueling network architecture (D-IQL) (Wang et al. 2016), and mean-field Q-learning (MF-Q) (Yang et al. 2018). The MAAC algorithm appeared in the previous game turned out to be incapable of learning to handle a large number of agents in this game (cf. Fig. 2), therefore we consider D-IQL instead. The state of each agent consists of the agent’s own feature vector which contains its group label, its observation of the grid world, its last reward received, and its last action taken. Encoding the group label in the state enables the agent to distinguish friends from foes. To approximate the Q-functions, all the competitors including our FQL model employ convolutional neural networks (CNN) with the same structure where the local observation is embedded by two convolutional layers plus one fully-connected layer while the feature vector is handled by just one fully-connected layer. All the models will be trained with 2000 rounds of self-play, and then put into one-vs-one battles against each other. The full description of the implementation details are provided in the appendix.

Results. Fig. 3 shows the learning curves of different algorithms w.r.t. three different performance metrics: the number of enemies killed in the battle (“Killing Index”), the average reward obtained by each soldier (“Mean Rewards”), and the total reward for the entire army (“Total Rewards”). These three different metrics reflect different aspects of this mixed cooperative-competitive game. Specifically, the “Killing Index” indicates how fierce the battle was; the “Mean Rewards” defined as $R_{\text{mean}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (R_i/T_i)$ where $T_i$ is the survival time of agent $i$ and $R_i$ is the total reward during agent $i$’s survival time, represents how strong on average an individual soldier was; and the “Total Rewards” shows how effective the teamwork of the army was. It is clear that in the policy learning stage, the FQL model could be trained more quickly and also reach a higher capacity than the other models (i.e., IQL, D-IQL, and MF-Q) in terms of all the above mentioned metrics.
Fig. 4 further shows the cross-comparison experimental results between FQL and the three competitors in the policy execution stage (averaged over 100 one-vs-one battles). The competitive advantage of FQL over the other models can be seen clearly. It suggests that the factorized Q-function could indeed capture the most important interactions among agents and thus encourage cooperation within the group.

When the group size $N$ becomes larger, the training of the FQL model will become more computationally expensive, because each agent would need to know not only the current state but also the last actions of all the other $N - 1$ agents in the same group for each step of Q-function update. Therefore, we go further to investigate what happens if each agent can only remember the last actions of the neighboring agents (i.e., those within a radius of 13). In such a neighborhood-level decentralized paradigm, the learning and execution of the FQL model would be a lot more efficient than in the centralized paradigm. The experimental results in Fig. 5 demonstrate that this partially decentralized version of FQL could still achieve pretty good results in comparison with the other models. It suggests that FQL has the potential to scale up to even larger multi-agent systems.

Conclusions

The main contribution of this paper is a novel factorized formulation of the joint state-action Q-function which makes reinforcement learning with many agents computationally feasible. The experimental results suggest that although our proposed FQL model relies on several aggressive simplifications to ensure the efficiency, it is surprisingly effective as shown by its performance for both a pure cooperative task and a mixed cooperative-competitive task.

An open research question is whether the FQL algorithm is guaranteed to converge. The answer seems to be “yes” based on the empirical evidence that FQL has always converged in our experiments, but the theoretical proof is left for future work.
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Appendix

The Detailed “Factorized Q-Learning” Algorithm

Here we provide the detailed pseudo codes for Factorized Q-learning in Algorithm 1.

**Algorithm 1: Factorized Q-Learning**

**Input:** Hyper-parameters $\lambda$, $N$, $\epsilon$, $D_0$, and $C$.

**Output:** Learnable parameters $\Theta = \{\theta, \beta_1, \beta_2\}$.

**Begin**

1. Initialize replay buffer $D$ to capacity $D_0$;
2. Initialize model parameters of factorized Q-function with random weights $\Theta$;
3. Initialize target network $\tilde{Q}$ with weights $\tilde{\Theta} = \Theta$;
4. for $episode=1,2,\cdots,E$ do
5. Initialize sequence $s_1$ and select random actions $a_1$;
6. Execute actions $a_1$ in emulator and observe rewards $r_1$ and next state $s_2$;
7. Set $a_1$, $s_2$, and store transition $(s_1, a_1, r_1, s_2)$ in $D$;
8. for $t=2,3,\cdots,T$ do
9. With probability $\epsilon$ select random actions $a_i$, otherwise select $a^i = \arg \max_{a^i} Q^i_j(s_t, a^i, a_{i-1}; \Theta)$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$;
10. Execute actions $a_t$ in emulator and observe rewards $r_t$ and next state $s_{(t+1)}$;
11. Set $a_t$, $s_{(t+1)}$, and store transition $(s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{(t+1)})$ in $D$;
12. Sample a random mini-batch of $M$ transitions $\{s_j, a_j, r_j, s_{(j+1)}\}_{j=1}^M$ from $D$;
13. Set the target values $Y^i_j = \begin{cases} r^i_j, & \text{if } \epsilon \text{ terminates at timestep } (j + 1); \\ r^i_j + \gamma \max_{a^{\tilde{i}}} \tilde{Q}^i_j(s_{(j+1)}, a^{\tilde{j}}, a_{j}^{-i}; \tilde{\Theta}), & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$, where $i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, M$;
14. Update factorized Q-function parameters by minimizing the loss $\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ Y^i_j - Q^i_j(s_j, a^i_j, a^{-i}; \Theta) \right]^2$;
15. Reset target parameters $\tilde{\Theta} = \Theta$ every $C$ steps;
**End**

The Traffic Game

**IQL, MF-Q:** They all adopt a three-layer MLP to approximate Q-function. All agents share the same Q-network for each experiment. With respect to MF-Q, the average action approximation $\bar{a}$ is also preprocessed as part of the inputs. We use the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of $5.0 \times 10^{-5}$ and $\epsilon$-exploration ($\epsilon = 0.01$) unless otherwise specified.

**MAAC:** This method uses the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of $1.0 \times 10^{-3}$ and $1.0 \times 10^{-4}$ for Critics and Actors respectively, and $\tau = 1.0 \times 10^{-2}$ for updating the target networks. We share the Critic among all agents in each experiment and feed in an agent embedding as extra input. Actors are kept separate. The discounted factor $\gamma$ is set to be 0.95 and the mini-batch size is set to be 200. The size of replay buffer is $1.0 \times 10^9$ and we update the network parameters after every 500 samples added to the replay buffer.

**FQL:** We use the learning rate $1.0 \times 10^{-4}$ and Adam optimizer for $Q$, $V$ and $U$ networks. All of them apply three-layers MLP. We set the $\epsilon = 0.01$ and use $\epsilon$-greedy to do action-selection. Because it is stateless game, we do not need the target network.

The Battle Game

**IQL, MF-Q and D-IQL:** They have almost the same hyper-parameter settings. The learning rate is $\alpha = 1 \times 10^{-4}$, and the discounted factor $\gamma$ is set to be 0.95. The size of randomly selected mini-batch is 200, and the size of replay buffer is $5.0 \times 10^9$.

**FQL:** The learning rate of $Q$ and $V$ is $\alpha = 1 \times 10^{-4}$, and the one of $U$ is $\alpha = 7 \times 10^{-4}$, and the optimizer we used is Adam. FQL uses the target network to avoid overestimation like Double DQN. Reward decay is $\gamma = 0.95$, and we use $\epsilon$-greedy to do
action-selection. We let $\epsilon$ decays from 1.0 to 0.05 over the $1.7 \times 10^3$ epochs training (specifically, $\gamma$ will be reduced to 0.2 in the first 1400 rounds and to 0.05 in the next 300 rounds) and keep it constant in the rest of learning. The replay buffer contains the most recently 2.5 episodes experiences of all agents, and we use soft-update with $\tau = 1.0 \times 10^{-3}$ to update the target-network every 5 training steps.

**Model Settings**: All competitors and the three sub models of our model use the same structure of embedding. Then there is a concatenation of these two embedding layers followed by one-layer perception (MLP). In addition, MF-Q requires an embedding of the action distribution, this embedding layer is constructed with one-layer perception and then concatenates with the other two embedding layers (embedding layers of observation and feature vector). All of the sub models of our model are use the same embedding structure like the other competitors, then with two-layers perception after. Though we use parameters sharing, different agents will perform different policies with different feature vectors.

**Training Settings**: We use self-play to train all of the models under the Battle Game settings, and use soft-update to update another model with $\tau = 1.0 \times 10^{-3}$. The trained model will battle with the opponent model for 10 episodes before updating the opponent. We decide whether we need to update the opponent or not via 3 indicators, which are “win rate”, “total rewards” and “the average rewards” that each agent can obtain at each step, and we set weights for them with 4, 2, 1, respectively; if the trained model is weaker than the opponent score at an index of these three, the corresponding index will be set to 0, and we will update the opponent model if the total score is larger than 2. The capacity $M$ of replay buffer is set as follows: if the max steps of one episode is $N_{\text{game}}$, and the number of one agent group is $N_{\text{agent}}$, then the size of replay buffer will be $M = 3.0 \times N_{\text{agent}} \times N_{\text{game}}$.

For more specific details about the experimental settings, please refer to the codes of all the adopted methods, which will be cleaned up and released online.