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Abstract—In this paper, we analyze a network of agents that communicates through word of mouth. In a word-of-mouth communication system, every agent communicates with its neighbors with delays in communication. This is a non-classical information structure where the topological and temporal restrictions in communication mean that information propagates slowly through the network. We present the prescription approach to derive structural results for this class of problems. The structural results lead to optimal control policies with time invariant domain-sizes, and are used to present a dynamic programming decomposition of the corresponding optimization problem.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. Motivation

The interdependence of many engineering systems can enable the development of a novel framework to process large amounts of data and deliver real-time control actions that optimize associated benefits. As we move to increasingly complex systems [1], new decentralized control approaches are needed to optimize the impact on system behavior of the interaction between its entities [2]. Centralized stochastic control [3] has been ubiquitous approach to control complex systems [4]. Centralized stochastic control refers to multi-stage optimization problems of systems with external disturbances and noisy observations by a single decision maker. A key assumption in deriving solutions of centralized stochastic control problems is that the decision maker perfectly recalls all past control actions and observations. The information available to an agent when making a decision is called the information structure of the system. If every agent has access to the same information and a perfect recall of the information, the information structure is called classical information structure. While centralized systems have been extensively studied, their core assumption does not hold for many applications involving multiple agents, e.g., connected automated vehicles [5], a swarm of drones [6], and smart grids [7]. In such systems, all agents simultaneously make a decision based only on their memory and local information received through communication with other agents. Such agent-to-agent communication might be generally delayed or costly [8]. Thus, it is not possible to compute a centralized estimate of the complete state of the system from the observation history of a single agent [9]. Such multi-stage optimization problems [10] are known as decentralized stochastic control problems.

In this paper, we study one particular decentralized system with multiple agents who make decisions to affect the state of the system. In the absence of any entity facilitating transmittal of information among the agents (known as a shared memory or a designer in existing literature), the communication among the agents is limited by their own capacities to transmit and receive data to (and from) other agents. We call this mode of communication between agents word-of-mouth communication.

In word-of-mouth communication, we model the system as a network of agents with each node representing an agent, and each link connecting two agents representing a path for communication. An agent may directly communicate only with its neighbors in the network. Thus, information from each agent propagates in the network through its neighbors who share it with their neighbors, and so on. Each link has a delay associated with it, which can be thought of as the time it takes for the information to transmit from an agent to its neighbor. This problem has a non-classical information structure because of the delays in communication.

The model analyzed in this paper can describe many different decentralized systems with limited communication. As an example, consider a discrete time problem where a team of drones must conduct a rescue operation at an inaccessible location. At every time step, all drones need to simultaneously, although independently, make the best possible decision given the information available at that time. Due to hardware limitations, a drone can only communicate with other drones within a given range. The range of the entire team of drones, however, may need to extend far beyond the communication range of any single drone. In this situation, the drones need to communicate through “word of mouth” to make optimal decisions.

B. Related Work

Centralized stochastic control is very well studied in the literature [3]. Decentralized stochastic control is fundamentally different from and significantly more challenging than centralized stochastic control. The most common approach in centralized stochastic control, dynamic programming (DP),
The designer’s planning problem is assigning a control strategy to each agent for each time step \( t \) for which the time the system is expected to run. DP ensures global optimality of these assignments because there is only one decision maker. The problem with this approach is the associated computational complexity as the number of agents increases. This approach was first introduced by Witsenhausen \[21\] for a centralized system with one agent and, later on, it was extended to systems with multiple agents \[13, 22\], where one agent is assigned to be the designer who prescribes a control strategy to the other agents, and thus transforming the problem into a centralized stochastic control problem. The person-by-person approach can compliment the designer’s approach by identifying structural properties of globally optimal control policies. The designer can then use DP to search within a smaller set of possible optimal strategies. Examples of this approach have appeared in real-time communication problems \[13, 23\], in systems with a broadcast information structure \[24\], and in networked control systems \[19\].

The most recent development in the field is the common information approach developed for problems with partial history sharing \[25, 26\]. It was first derived with respect to situations of decentralized stochastic control where each agent shares a subset of its past observations and control actions to a shared memory accessible to every agent in the system. Every agent then makes a decision using information in the shared memory (the common information) and the recall of its own history. The solution is derived by reformulating the system from the viewpoint of a fictitious coordinator with access only to the shared information. The coordinator’s task is to prescribe control strategies to each agent in the system which the agents use to generate control actions. This approach has been used to derive structural results and a DP decomposition for problems with delayed information sharing from the agents to the shared memory \[26\]. It has been also used in problems with sharing information structure \[27\], stochastic games with asymmetric information \[28\] and teams with mean-field sharing \[29\]. There have been also some earlier papers that used similar ideas in analyzing specific information structures \[30–33\].

C. Contributions of This Paper

We consider the common information approach to be the standard approach in solving a wide variety of decentralized stochastic control problems, including the word-of-mouth information structure. However, we find that in problems with asymmetric information sharing among the agents, there may not be a lot of “common information” available to the agents in the system. The word-of-mouth information structure includes such systems with asymmetric sharing which may not have a lot of common information depending on the topology of the network. Another well known example of such a system is the partially nested information structure \[11, 34\] which has no common information due to its unidirectional communication among agents. The presence of such problems has motivated us to investigate the existence for structural results that can improve on the performance of the common information.
approach by taking into account the asymmetries in a system. The contributions of this paper are:

1) We introduce and analyze a problem with a word-of-mouth information structure and present the prescription approach to reformulate the problem into several equivalent problems.
2) We derive structural results for optimal control policies by compressing information into a sufficient statistic and present a corresponding dynamic program.

D. Organization

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: In Section II, we present the model of the decentralized stochastic problem with a word-of-mouth information structure. In section III, we introduce the prescription approach along with the associated properties. In Section IV, we apply the prescription approach to the word-of-mouth communication problem to derive structural results and a DP decomposition. Finally, we conclude with some observations and potential future directions in Section V.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Notation

Random variables are denoted with upper case letters and their realization by the corresponding lower case letters. For integers $a < b$, $X_{a:b}$ is shorthand for the vector $(X_a, X_{a+1}, \ldots, X_b)$ and $X^{a:b}$ is shorthand for the vector $(X_a, X_{a+1}, \ldots, X_b)$. When $a > b$, the dimension of $X^{a:b}$ is 0. The combined notation with $c < d$ and $a < b$, $X^{c:d}_{a:b}$ is short for the vector $(X^c : i = a, a+1, \ldots, b, j = c, c+1, \ldots, d)$.

The lower-case letters $i, j$ and $k$ refer to the index of an agent and the lower-case letters $p, q$ and $r$ refer to the position of an agent in a given permutation of agents. A random variable $X_{t,k}$ refers to agent $k$ at time $t$. For a given permutation of agents such that agent $k$ is at position $p$, the same random variable is written as $X^{[p]}_t$ with respect to the position $p$ instead of the index of the agent. A random variable, $X^{[k,j]}_t$, associated with agents $k$ and $j$ is written equivalently as $X^{[p,r]}_t$ with respect to the agents’ position $p$ and $r$ respectively.

For sets $A$ and $B$, $\{A, B\}$ is the set $A \cup B$. For a singleton $a$ and set $B$, $\{a, B\}$ is the set $\{a\} \cup B$, and $|\cdot|$ is the cardinality of a set. The null set is represented by $\emptyset$. The indicator function is denoted by $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$. We have attempted to use notation consistent with [25] as our work is related to the common information approach.

B. The Network of Agents

Consider a network of $K \in \mathbb{N}$ agents represented by a strongly connected graph $G = (\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{K} := \{1, \cdots, K\}$ is the set of agents and $\mathcal{E}$ is the set of links. A direct link from an agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$ to an agent $j \in \mathcal{K}$ is denoted by $(k, j) \in \mathcal{E}$. Every link $(k, j)$ represents a communication link from agent $k$ to $j$ which is characterized by a delay of $\delta^{(k,j)} \in \mathbb{N}$ time steps for transferring information from $k$ to $j$.

When agent $k$ sends out information to agent $j$ through link $(k, j)$, we call it transmission of information. The information transmitted by agent $k$ at time $t$ is received by agent $j$ at time $t + \delta^{(k,j)}$. For any agent $k$, the acts of receiving and transmission of information occur at different instances within every time step as discussed in Section II-D.

Definition 1. Let $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \cdots, m : m \in \mathcal{K}\}$ be a set of indices. For any $k, j \in \mathcal{K}$, a path $q^k_a{(k,j)}$, $a \in \mathbb{N}$, from $k$ to $j$ is given by the sequence $\{k_n\}_{n \in \mathcal{N}}$ such that: (1) $k_1 = k$ and $k_m = j$, (2) $k_n \in \mathcal{K}$ for $n \in \mathcal{N}$, and (3) there exists a link $(k_{n-1}, k_n) \in \mathcal{E}$ for $n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{1\}$.

The set $Q^{(k,j)} = \{q^k_a{(k,j)} : a = 1, \cdots, b; b \in \mathbb{N}\}$ includes all paths from agent $k$ to agent $j$.

Definition 2. Let agents $k, j \in \mathcal{K}$ with a path $q^k_{a}{(k,j)}$ from $k$ to $j$. The communication delay $d^k_a{(k,j)} \in \mathbb{N}$ for $q^k_{a}{(k,j)}$ is defined as

$$d^k_a{(k,j)} = \delta^{(k,k_2)} + \cdots + \delta^{(k_{n-1},j)},$$

where $\delta^{(k_{n-1},k_n)}$ is the delay in information transfer through the link $(k_{n-1}, k_n) \in \mathcal{E}$.

The communication path from agent $k$ to agent $j$ in the network is the path with the least possible delay. We call this the information path.

Definition 3. The information path from $k$ to $j$ denoted by $(k \rightarrow j)$ is given by a path $q^k_{a}{(k,j)} \in Q^{(k,j)}$ such that,

$$d^k_a{(k,j)} = \min \\{d^k_{a_1}{(k,j)}, \cdots, d^k_{a_b}{(k,j)}\},$$

where $b := |Q^{(k,j)}|$.

The strongly connected nature of the network ensures that there is always an information path $(k \rightarrow j)$ from every other agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$ to every agent $j \in \mathcal{K}$. We denote the associated delay simply by $d^{(k,j)}$ and, by convention, we set $d^{(k,k)} = 0$. Because the links in the network are directed the delay $d^{(k,j)}$ in communication from $k$ to $j$ is not necessarily the same as the delay $d^{(j,k)}$ in communication from $j$ to $k$.

C. System Description

The network of agents is considered a discrete time system that evolves up to a finite time horizon $T \in \mathbb{N}$. At time $t = 0, 1, \cdots, T$, the state of the system $X_t$ takes values in a finite set $X_t$ and the control variable $U^{k}_t$ associated with agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$, takes values in a finite set $U^{k}_t$. Let $U^{1:K}_t$ denote the vector $(U^{1}_t, \cdots, U^{K}_t)$. Starting at the initial state $X_0$, the evolution of the system follows the state equation

$$X_{t+1} = f_t (X_t, U_{t+1}^{1:K} , W_t),$$

where $W_t$ is the uncontrolled disturbance to the system represented as a random variable taking values in a finite set $\mathcal{W}$. At time $t$ every agent $k$ makes an observation $Y^{k}_t$,

$$Y^{k}_t = h_t (X_t, V^{k}_t),$$

taking values in a finite set $\mathcal{Y}^{k}$ through a noisy sensor, where $V^{k}_t$ takes values in the finite set $\mathcal{V}^{k}$ and represents the noise in measurement.
Agent $k$ selects a control action $U^k_t$ from the set of feasible control actions $U^k_t$ as a function of its information structure. The information structure is different for each agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$ because of the means of communication and topology of the network. We discuss the information structure in Section II-E. After each agent $k$ generates a control action $U^k_t$, the system incurs a cost $c_t(X_t, U^1_t, \cdots, U^K_t) \in \mathbb{R}$.

**D. Assumptions**

In our modeling framework above, we impose the following assumptions:

**Assumption 1.** The network topology is arbitrary, known a priori, and does not change with time.

With a known and invariant network topology, every agent can keep track of what information is accessible to other agents in the network.

**Assumption 2.** The external disturbance $\{W_t : t = 0, \cdots, T\}$ and the noise in measurement $\{V^k_t : t = 0, \cdots, T; k = 1, \cdots, K\}$ are sequences of independent random variables that are also independent of each other and of the initial state $X_0$.

The external disturbance, noise in measurement, and initial state are referred to as the primitive random variables, and they have known probability distributions.

**Assumption 3.** The state functions $(f_t : t = 0, \cdots, T)$, observation functions $(h^k_t : t = 0, \cdots, T; k = 1, \cdots, K)$, the cost functions $(c_t : t = 0, \cdots, T)$, and the set of all feasible control policies $G$ are known to all agents.

These functions and the set of feasible control policies (defined in Section II-E) form the basis of the decision making problem.

**Assumption 4.** Each agent has perfect recall.

Perfect recall of the data from the memory of every agent is an essential assumption for the structural results derived in this paper.

**E. Information Structure of the System**

The information structure of the system is characterized by the graph topology and delays along communication paths described in Section I-B. In the word-of-mouth information structure, every agent $j \in \mathcal{K}$ at time $t$ transmits the information $T^j_t := \{Y^j_t, U^j_{t-1}\}$ to every other agent in the network through the relevant information paths. Agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$ receives information $T^j_t$ at time $t + d^{(j,k)}$, where $d^{(j,k)}$ is the communication delay from $j$ to $k$. Then, the information available to agent $k$ at time $t$ is the collection of information he received from every agent $j \in \mathcal{K}$ at time steps 0 through $t$.

**Definition 4.** The memory of agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$ is defined as the random variable $M^k_t$ that takes values in the finite set $\mathcal{M}^k_t$ and is given by

$$M^k_t := \left\{ Y^j_{0:t-d^{(j,k)}}, U^j_{0:t-d^{(j,k)}-1} : j \in \mathcal{K} \right\},$$

where $d^{(j,k)}$ is the delay in information transfer from every agent $j \in \mathcal{K}$ to agent $k$.

At time $t$, agent $k$ accesses his memory $M^k_t$ to generate a control action, namely,

$$U^k_t := g^k_t(M^k_t),$$

where $g^k_t$ is the control policy of agent $k$ at time $t$. We define the control policy for each agent as $g^k := (g^k_0, \cdots, g^k_T)$ and the strategy of the system as $g := (g^1, \cdots, g^K)$. The set of all feasible control policies is denoted by $G$.

The performance criterion for the system is given by the total expected cost:

**Problem 1:**

$$J(g) = \mathbb{E}_g \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T} c_t(X_t, U^1_t, \cdots, U^K_t) \right],$$

where the expectation is with respect to the joint probability measure on the random variables $X_t, U^1_t, \cdots, U^K_t$.

The optimization problem is to select the optimal strategy $g^* \in G$ that minimizes the performance criterion in (6), given the probability distributions of the primitive random variables $\{X_0, W^1_0, V^1_{0:T}, \cdots, V^K_{0:T}\}$, and functions $\{c_t, f_t, h^k_t : t = 0, \cdots, T\}$.

**III. THE PRESCRIPTION APPROACH**

In this section, we present the prescription approach to deriving sufficient statistics for our model. After establishing the information structure in Section II-E, the prescription approach is described using only the memory $M^k_t$ of every agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$.
A. Permutations of the Agents

The first step in our analysis is the construction of $K$ permutations (or orders) of agents in set $\mathcal{K}$.

**Definition 5.** The permutation corresponding to agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$ is defined as a $K$-tuple ordered list $o_k = (o_{k,1}, \ldots, o_{k,K})$ with $o_{k,1} = k$.

In a permutation $o_k$, the first component $o_{k,1}$ always refers to agent $k$. Let $\mathcal{P} := \{1, \ldots, K\}$ be the set of possible positions in a permutation. Then, the agent located at position $p \in \mathcal{P}$ in the permutation $o_k$ is denoted by the component $o_{k,p}$. As an example, consider a system with three agents that has a permutation given by $o_3 = (3, 1, 2)$. In this permutation, we say that agent 1 is located at position 2, denoted by $o_{3,2} = 1$.

**Remark 1.** We use the indices $i$, $j$, and $k$ to refer to agents in $\mathcal{K}$, while we use the indices $p$, $r$, and $q$ to refer to the positions the occupied by the agents in a given permutation $o_k = (o_{k,1}, \ldots, o_{k,K})$.

**Remark 2.** When agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$ occupies position $p \in \mathcal{P}$ in permutation $o_k$, we write any random variable corresponding to $k$, i.e., $U^k_t$, $X^k_t$, equivalently as $U^{[p]}_t$, $X^{[p]}_t$. When agent $j \in \mathcal{K}$ also occupies position $r \in \mathcal{P}$ in permutation $o_k$, we write any variable of the form $d^{(k,j)}$ equivalently as $d^{[p,r]}$.

We also define the set of agents located at positions beyond $p$ in a permutation $o_k$ of $k \in \mathcal{K}$.

**Definition 6.** For a position $p$ in permutation $o_k$, the set of positions beyond $p$ is given by $B^{[p]} := \{r \in \mathcal{P} : r \geq p\}$.

To systematically construct permutation $o_k$ corresponding to an agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$, we select each agent in $\mathcal{K}$ to occupy positions $p \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{1\}$ satisfying the following property

$$\left| \left( \bigcap_{q=1}^{p-1} M^{[q]}_t \right) \cap M^{[p]}_t \right| \geq \left| \left( \bigcap_{q=1}^{p-1} M^{[q]}_t \right) \cap M^{[r]}_t \right|, \quad \forall r \in B^{[p]}, \forall p \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{1\},$$

where $M^{[1]}_t = M^k_t$ corresponds to the memory of agent $k$ that occupies position 1 in permutation $o_k$. For example, the agent located at position 2 in permutation $o_k$ must satisfy the property

$$|M^{[1]}_t \cap M^{[2]}_t| \geq |M^{[1]}_t \cap M^{[r]}_t|, \quad \forall r \in \{2, \ldots, K\}. \quad (7)$$

For the agent located at position $p = 3$ we have

$$|M^{[1]}_t \cap M^{[2]}_t \cap M^{[3]}_t| \geq |M^{[1]}_t \cap M^{[2]}_t \cap M^{[r]}_t|, \quad \forall r \in \{3, \ldots, K\}. \quad (8)$$

We consider, without loss of generality, that the trivial permutation given by $o_1 = (1, 2, \cdots, K)$ satisfies (7).

To this end, we select permutation $o_1 \in \mathcal{O}$ as the default permutation to derive the results in the subsequent sections.

B. Construction of Prescriptions

For an agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$ at position $p \in \mathcal{P}$ in a permutation $o_1$, we consider a scenario where the control action $U^k_t = U^{[p]}_t \left( g^k_t(M^k_t) = g^{[p]}_t(M^{[p]}_t) \right)$ is generated in two stages:

1. Agent $k$, located at position $p$ in permutation $o_1$, generates a function based on information which is a subset of the information available in its memory $M^{[p]}_t$.

2. This function takes as an input the compliment of the subset used to generate it, and yields the control action $U^{[p]}_t$.

We call these functions *prescriptions*. They allow us to construct an optimization problem of selecting the optimal prescription strategy that is equivalent to the problem of selecting the optimal strategy $g^{*k}$ as we show next. In this section, we construct the subset of the memory $M^{[p]}_t$ and prescriptions for agents at every position $p$ in permutation $o_1$ without changing the information structure of the system.

**Definition 7.** Let $k \in \mathcal{K}$ be at position $p$ in permutation $o_1$, and $M^{[p]}_t$ be the agent’s memory at time $t$. The *accessible information* of the agent located at $p$ is defined as the set $A^{[p]}_t$ that takes values in the finite collection of sets $A^{[p]}_t$ such that

$$A^{[p]}_t = \bigcap_{q=1}^{p} \left( M^{[q]}_t \right). \quad (10)$$

For example, in a permutation $o_1 = (1, \cdots, K)$ we can write $A^{[1]}_t = M^{[1]}_t$, $A^{[2]}_t = M^{[1]}_t \cap M^{[2]}_t$, and for the agent located at position $p = 2$ as

$$A^{[2]}_t = M^{[1]}_t \cap M^{[2]}_t. \quad (11)$$

Based on Definition 7, the accessible information $A^{[p]}_t$ has the following properties:

$$A^{[p]}_{t-1} \subset A^{[p]}_t, \quad A^{[r]}_t \subset A^{[r]}_t, \quad \forall r \in B^{[p]}, \quad (12)$$

where $B^{[p]}$ is the set of positions beyond $p$ (Definition 6). Property (13) motivates the introduction of a new term to denote the new information added to accessible information $A^{[p]}_t$ at time $t$.

**Definition 8.** The *new information* for agent $k$ at position $p$ in permutation $o_1$ at time $t$ is defined as the set $Z^{[p]}_t$ that takes values in a finite collection of sets $Z^{[p]}_t$ such that

$$Z^{[p]}_t := A^{[p]}_t \setminus A^{[p]}_{t-1}. \quad (15)$$

We observe in (14) that the accessible information $A^{[r]}_t$ of an agent located at any position $r \in B^{[p]}$ is a subset of the memory $M^{[p]}_t$ of the agent located at position $p$ in permutation $o_1$. Thus, we can define the *inaccessible information* of the agent located at $p$ with respect to the accessible information $A^{[r]}_t$ for every $r \in B^{[p]}$.

**Definition 9.** The *inaccessible information* of an agent located at position $p$ in permutation $o_1$ with respect to inaccessible information $A^{[r]}_t$, $r \in B^{[p]}$, is defined as the set of random variables $L^{[p,r]}_t$ that takes values in the finite collection of sets $L^{[p,r]}_t$ such that

$$L^{[p,r]}_t := M^{[p]}_t \setminus A^{[r]}_t. \quad (16)$$
Note that the inaccessible information of an agent located at \( p \) with respect to its own accessible information \( A_{t[p]} \) is given by
\[
L_t^{[p,p]} := M_t^{[p]} \setminus A_{t[p]}.
\] (17)

The pair of sets \( A_t^{[r]} \) and \( L_t^{[p,r]} \) forms a partition of the set \( M_t^{[p]} \), such that
\[
M_t^{[p]} = (L_t^{[p,r]}, A_t^{[r]}), \forall r \in \mathcal{B}[p].
\] (18)

As an example, consider a system with three agents Fig. 2. The trivial permutation is given by \( o \) such that
\[
\Gamma_{t[p]} := \{\psi_{t[p],r}(A_t^{[p]}), \text{ if } r \notin \mathcal{B}[p], \psi_{t[p],r}(A_t^{[r]}), \text{ if } r \in \mathcal{B}[p],
\]
where we call \( \psi_{t[p],r} \) the prescription strategy of the agent located at position \( p \) for the agent located at position \( r \) given by the mapping
\[
\psi_{t[p],r} : A_t^{[p]} \mapsto \theta_t^{[p,r]}, \text{ if } r \notin \mathcal{B}[p],
\]
and
\[
\psi_{t[p],r} : A_t^{[r]} \mapsto \theta_t^{[p,r]}, \text{ if } r \in \mathcal{B}[p].
\] (21)

We call \( \psi_{t[p],r} = (\psi_{t[p,1]}, \ldots, \psi_{t[p,K]}) \) the prescription strategy of the agent located at \( p \). The set of feasible prescription strategies for the agent located at \( p \) is denoted by \( \Psi_t^{[p]} \).

**Remark 4.** The prescription \( \Gamma_{t[p]} \) of agent \( k \), located at position \( p \), for agent \( j \), located at position \( r \), in permutation \( o_1 \) is only available to agent \( k \). The equivalent prescription available to agent \( j \) is \( \Gamma_{t[r]} \). The relationship between the two is given in Lemmas 2 and 3.

**Remark 5.** Every agent needs to generate prescriptions corresponding to every other agent in the system in order to utilize the structural result presented in this paper. This is highlighted in section III-D when we define the information state.

Next, we define the complete prescription of an agent located at \( p \) below.

**Definition 11.** The complete prescription for an agent located at position \( p \) in permutation \( o_1 \) is defined by the function
\[
\Theta_t^{[p]} : \mathcal{L}_t^{[1,p]} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{L}_t^{[p,p]} \times \mathcal{L}_t^{[p+1,p+1]} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{L}_t^{[K,K]} \mapsto \mathcal{U}_t^{[1]} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{U}_t^{[K]},
\] (23)
which takes values in the set of functions \( \theta_t^{[p]} \).

The complete prescription for an agent located at position \( p \) in permutation \( o_1 \) is constructed as \( \Theta_t^{[p]} = (\Gamma_t^{[p,1]}, \ldots, \Gamma_t^{[p,K]}) \).

**C. Relationships Between Prescriptions and Control Policies**

In this section we present the relationships between prescriptions in different permutations and different control policies. The first result states that for an agent \( k \) at position \( p \) in permutation \( o_1 \), we can use the complete prescription \( \Theta_t^{[p]} \) to generate control action \( U_t^k \) instead of the strategy \( g_t^k \).

**Lemma 1.** Let agent \( k \in \mathcal{K} \) be located at position \( p \) in permutation \( o_1 \) and let \( \Theta_t^{[p]} \) be its complete prescription. For any given strategy \( g \in G \), there exists a prescription strategy \( \psi_t^{[p]} \in \Psi_t^{[p]} \) such that
\[
U_t^k = \Gamma_t^{[p]} \left( \mathcal{L}_t^{[p]} \right).
\] (24)

**Proof.** Let \( A_t^{[p]} \) and \( L_t^{[p,p]} \) be the accessible and inaccessible information respectively of agent \( k \) at position \( p \) in \( o_1 \). For
any strategy $g$ that generates $U_t^{[p]}$ from $[5]$, we can select a prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p]} : A_t^{[p]} \rightarrow g_t^{[p,p]}$ such that
\[
\Gamma_t^{[p,p]}(\cdot) = \psi_t^{[p]}(A_t^{[p]}) = g_t^{[p,p]}(A_t^{[p]}, \cdot). \tag{25}
\]
Then, the control action $U_t^{[p]} = U_t^{[k]}$ is
\[
U_t^{[p]} = \gamma_t^{[p,p]}(L_t^{[p,p]}) = g_t^{[p]}(A_t^{[p]}, L_t^{[p,p]}) = g_t^{[p]}(M_t^{[p]}) = g_t^{[k]}(M_t^{[k]}). \tag{26}
\]
Similarly, for any prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p]}$, we can construct an appropriate strategy $g$ that generates the same control actions $U_t^{[p]}$ for agents at all positions $p = 1, \ldots, K$, as we show next.

**Lemma 2.** Let agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$ be located at position $p$ in permutation $\omega_1$, and let $\Theta_t^{[p]}$ be its complete prescription. For any given prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p]} \in \Psi_t^{[p]}$, there exists a strategy $g \in G$ such that
\[
U_t^{[p]} = \Gamma_t^{[p,p]}(L_t^{[p,p]}) = g_t^{[p]}(M_t^{[p]}). \tag{27}
\]

**Proof.** For any prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p]}$, we can construct the a control policy $g_t^{[p]}$ such that
\[
U_t^{[p]} = g_t^{[p]}(M_t^{[p]}) = g_t^{[p]}(A_t^{[p]}, L_t^{[p,p]}) = \psi_t^{[p,p]}(A_t^{[p]})(L_t^{[p,p]}). \tag{28}
\]

Lemmas 1 and 2 imply that every control action $U_t^{[p]}$ of an agent located at $p$ generated through a prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p]}$, can also be generated through an appropriate strategy $g$ and vice versa.

**Definition 12.** Let two agents $k, j \in \mathcal{K}$ be located at positions $p, r \in \mathcal{P}$ respectively in a permutation $\omega_1$. A positional relationship from position $p$ to position $r$ is given by the function
\[
e^{[r,p]} : \Psi_t^{[p]} \rightarrow \Psi_t^{[r]}. \tag{29}
\]

Next we show the existence of a positional relationship $e^{[r,p]}$ from any position $p$ to any position $r$ in permutation $\omega_1$ with desirable properties that allow us to construct optimal control policies of all agents in $\mathcal{K}$ from the optimal prescription strategy of just one agent, located at any position in $\omega_1$. The following result establishes that using a positional relationship $e^{[r,p]} = (e_t^{[r,p]}, \ldots, e_T^{[r,p]})$, an agent located at the position $p$ can derive the prescription strategy of an agent located at the position $q$, using the prescription strategy of the agent at $p$ with respect to the agent at $q$, namely
\[
\psi_t^{[q]} := e_t^{[r,p]}(\psi_t^{[p,q]}), \forall q \in \mathcal{P}. \tag{30}
\]

**Lemma 3.** Let $k, j \in \mathcal{K}$ be two agents at positions $p$ and $r$ respectively in permutation $\omega_1$ with $r \in \mathcal{B}^{[k]}$. For any given prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p]}$, for the agent located at $p$, there exists a positional relationship $e^{[r,p]} : \Psi_t^{[p]} \rightarrow \Psi_t^{[r]}$ with $e^{[r,p]} = \psi_t^{[p]}(A_t^{[p]})(L_t^{[p,p]}) = \psi_t^{[r]}(A_t^{[r]})(L_t^{[r,p]})$. 

**Proof.** Let $i \in \mathcal{P}$ be an agent located at a position $q \in \mathcal{P}$ and $g_t^{[q]}$ denote the control policy of agent $i$ at time $t$. To prove the result, we construct $g_t^{[q]}$ and the prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[r]}$ for three cases, given a prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p]}$.

1. If $q \in \mathcal{B}^{[r]}$, the control policy $g_t^{[q]}$ can be constructed from the prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p,q]}$, namely,
\[
g_t^{[q]}(A_t^{[q]}, L_t^{[q,q]}) = \psi_t^{[p,q]}(A_t^{[q]})(L_t^{[q,q]}). \tag{32}
\]

From (21) we have
\[
\Gamma_t^{[r,q]} = \psi_t^{[r,q]}(A_t^{[r]}), \forall q \in \mathcal{B}^{[r]}, \tag{33}
\]
and thus,
\[
\psi_t^{[r,q]}(A_t^{[r]})(L_t^{[q,q]}) = g_t^{[q]}(A_t^{[q]}, L_t^{[q,q]}). \tag{34}
\]

Hence
\[
\psi_t^{[r,q]}(A_t^{[q]})(L_t^{[q,q]}) = \psi_t^{[r,q]}(A_t^{[q]})(L_t^{[q,q]}). \tag{35}
\]

2. If $q \in \mathcal{B}^{[p]}$ and $q \notin \mathcal{B}^{[r]}$, the control policy $g_t^{[q]}$ can be constructed by the prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p,q]}$, namely,
\[
g_t^{[q]}(A_t^{[q]}, L_t^{[q,q]}) = \psi_t^{[p,q]}(A_t^{[q]})(L_t^{[q,q]}). \tag{36}
\]

$q \in \mathcal{B}^{[p]}$ and $r \in \mathcal{B}^{[p]}$ implies $q \notin \mathcal{B}^{[r]}$. From (21) we have
\[
\Gamma_t^{[r,q]} = \psi_t^{[r,q]}(A_t^{[r]}), \forall q \notin \mathcal{B}^{[r]}, \tag{37}
\]
Thus,
\[
\psi_t^{[r,q]}(A_t^{[r]})(L_t^{[q,q]}) = g_t^{[q]}(A_t^{[q]}, L_t^{[q,q]}). \tag{38}
\]

Hence
\[
\psi_t^{[r,q]}(A_t^{[q]})(L_t^{[q,q]}) = \psi_t^{[r,q]}(A_t^{[r]})(L_t^{[q,q]}). \tag{39}
\]

3. If $q \notin \mathcal{B}^{[p]}$, the control policy $g_t^{[q]}$ can be constructed by the prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p,q]}$, namely,
\[
g_t^{[q]}(A_t^{[q]}, L_t^{[q,q]}) = \psi_t^{[p,q]}(A_t^{[q]})(L_t^{[q,q]}). \tag{40}
\]

From (21) we have
\[
\Gamma_t^{[r,q]} = \psi_t^{[r,q]}(A_t^{[r]}), \forall q \notin \mathcal{B}^{[r]}, \tag{41}
\]
Thus,
\[
\psi_t^{[r,q]}(A_t^{[r]})(L_t^{[q,q]}) = g_t^{[q]}(A_t^{[q]}, L_t^{[q,q]}). \tag{42}
\]

Hence,
\[
\psi_t^{[r,q]}(A_t^{[q]})(L_t^{[q,q]}) = \psi_t^{[r,q]}(A_t^{[r]})(L_t^{[q,q]}). \tag{43}
\]

To complete the proof, note that we can define a positional relationship $e^{[r,p]} : \Psi_t^{[p]} \rightarrow \Psi_t^{[r]}$ with $e^{[r,p]} =$
Theorem 1. Let $k, j \in K$ be two agents at positions $p$ and $r$ respectively in permutation $\sigma_1$ with $r \notin B[p]$. For any given prescription strategy $\psi[p]$ of the agent located at $p$, there exists a positional relationship $e[r,p]$ such that a prescription strategy $\psi[r]$ of an agent located at $r$ generated from (30) yields:

1. $\Gamma[p,q](L_t[q,p]) = \psi[p,q](A_t[p])(L_t[q,p])$, if $q \in B[p]$,
2. $\Gamma[p,q](L_t[q,p]) = \psi[p,q](A_t[q])(L_t[q,p])$, if $q \notin B[p]$,
3. $\Gamma[p,q](L_t[q,p]) = \psi[p,q](A_t[q])(L_t[q,p])$, if $q \notin B[p]$.

(44)

Proof. Let $i \in K$ be an agent located at a position $q \in P$ and $g_t[q]$ denote the control policy of agent $i$ at time $t$. To prove the result, we construct $g_t[q]$ and the prescription strategy $\psi[r]$ for three cases, given a prescription strategy $\psi[p]$.

1) If $q \in B[p]$, the control policy $g_t[q]$ can be constructed by the prescription strategy $\psi[p]$, namely

$g_t[q](A_t[q], L_t[q,p]) = \psi[t,q](A_t[q])(L_t[q,p])$.

(45)

$q \in B[p]$ and $r \notin B[p]$ implies $q \in B[r]$

From (44), we have

$\Gamma[r,q] = \psi[t,q](A_t[p]), \forall q \in B[r]$.

(46)

Thus,

$\psi[r,q](A_t[q])(L_t[q,p]) = \psi[p,q](A_t[q], L_t[q,p])$.

(47)

Hence,

$\psi[p,q](A_t[q])(L_t[q,p]) = \psi[r,q](A_t[q])(L_t[q,p])$.

(48)

2) If $q \in B[r]$, $q \notin B[p]$, the control policy $g_t[q]$ can be constructed by the prescription strategy $\psi[p]$, namely

$g_t[q](A_t[r], L_t[q,p]) = \psi[p,q](A_t[r], L_t[q,p])$.

(49)

From (44), we have

$\Gamma[r,q] = \psi[r,q](A_t[q]), \forall q \in B[r]$.

(50)

Thus,

$\psi[r,q](A_t[q])(L_t[q,p]) = \psi[p,q](A_t[q], L_t[q,p])$.

(51)

Hence,

$\psi[p,q](A_t[q], L_t[q,p]) = \psi[r,q](A_t[q], L_t[q,p])$.

(52)

3) If $q \notin B[p]$, the control policy $g_t[q]$ can be constructed by the prescription strategy $\psi[p]$, namely

$g_t[q](A_t[p], L_t[q,p]) = \psi[p,q](A_t[p], L_t[q,p])$.

(53)

From (44), we have

$\Gamma[r,q] = \psi[t,q](A_t[r]), \forall q \notin B[r]$.

(54)

Thus,

$\psi[r,q](A_t[r], L_t[q,p]) = \psi[p,q](A_t[r], L_t[q,p])$.

(55)

Hence,

$\psi[p,q](A_t[r], L_t[q,p]) = \psi[r,q](A_t[r], L_t[q,p])$.

(56)

To complete the proof, note that we can define a positional relationship $e[r,p] : \psi[p] \rightarrow \psi[r]$ with $e[r,p] = (e[r,p], \ldots, e[r,p])$ such that (30) implies (48), (52) and (56) when $r \notin B[p]$.

To this end, we use a relationship function $e[r,p]$ from every position $p \in P$ to every position $r \in P$ in a permutation $\sigma_1$ which satisfies the properties in Lemmas 1 and 2. This implies that for any two agents located at $p$ and $r$ in permutation $\sigma_1$, we have the relation,

$U_t[r] = \Gamma[r,q](L_t[q,r]) = \begin{cases} \Gamma[p,r](L_t[p,r]), & r \notin B[p], \\ \Gamma[p,r](L_t[p,r]), & r \in B[p]. \end{cases}$

(57)

Next, we relate the prescription strategies of an agent $k$ that are defined with respect to two different permutations $\sigma_m, \sigma_n \in O$. We let agent $k$ be located at position $p$ in permutation $\sigma_m$ and at position $p'$ in permutation $\sigma_n$. Before we proceed, we define a function that maps the set of feasible prescription strategies $\Psi[p]$ of agent $k$ in permutation $\sigma_m$ with the set of feasible prescription strategies $\Psi[p']$ of agent $k$ in permutation $\sigma_n$.

**Definition 13.** Let agent $k \in K$ be located at position $p \in P$ in permutation $\sigma_m \in O$ and at position $p' \in P$ in permutation $\sigma_n \in O$. A permutation relationship for agent $k$ from permutation $\sigma_m$ to permutation $\sigma_n$ is given by a function

$e[p',p] : \Psi[p] \rightarrow \Psi[p']$.

(58)

The following result proves the existence of a permutation relationship $e[p',p] = (e[p',p], \ldots, e[p',p])$, where

$\psi[p',r'] = \psi[p,r](A_t[r]), \forall r', r' \in P$.

(59)

and $r$ and $r'$ are the positions of another agent $j \in K$ in permutations $\sigma_m$ and $\sigma_n$ respectively.

**Lemma 5.** Let $\sigma_m, \sigma_n \in O$ be two permutations of the set $K$ such that two agents $k, j \in K$ are located at $p, r \in P$ in $\sigma_m$ and at $p', r' \in P$ in $\sigma_n$ respectively. For a given prescription strategy $\psi[r]$ of agent $k$ for agent $j$ in permutation $\sigma_m$, there exists a permutation relationship $e[p',p]$ such that the prescription strategy $\psi[p',r']$ of agent $k$ for agent $j$ in permutation $\sigma_n$ constructed using (59) satisfies the property,

$U_t[r] = \begin{cases} \Gamma[p,r](L_t[p,r]), & r \notin B[p], \\ \Gamma[p,r](L_t[p,r]), & r \in B[p]. \end{cases}$

(60)

**Proof.** Let $A_t[p]$ and $A_t[p']$ be the accessible information for agent $k$ at time $t$ with respect to permutations $\sigma_m$ and $\sigma_n$ respectively. From (57), the control policy $g_t[q]$ for agent $j$ located at $r$ in permutation $\sigma_m$ is

$U_t[r] = \begin{cases} g_t[q](A_t[p]), & q \notin B[p], \\ g_t[q](A_t[p]), & q \in B[p]. \end{cases}$

(61)

The same agent $j$ is located at $r'$ in permutation $\sigma_n$. We can construct a prescription strategy $\psi[p',r']$ of agent $k$ located at
\( p' \) in permutation \( o_n \) for \( j \) located at \( r' \) in permutation \( o_n \), namely,

\[
U_j^p = \psi_{t}^{[p',r']}(A_{t}^{[r',r']})(L_{t}^{[r',r']}) = g_{t}^{p} \left( M_{t}^{j} \right), \quad \text{if } r' \notin B_{[p']},
\]

or

\[
U_j^p = \psi_{t}^{[p',r']}(A_{t}^{[r']})(L_{t}^{[r',r']}) = g_{t}^{p} \left( M_{t}^{j} \right), \quad \text{if } r' \in B_{[p']}. \tag{63}
\]

To complete the proof, note that given a prescription strategy \( \psi_{t}^{[p,r']} \) for permutation \( o_n \), we can construct a prescription strategy \( \psi_{t}^{[p',r']} \) using \( (61), \ (62) \) and \( (63) \) that implies \( (60) \). Thus, there exists a permutation relationship \( \epsilon^{[p,p']} : \psi_{t}^{[p]} \rightarrow \psi_{t}^{[p']} \) with \( \epsilon^{[p,p']} = (\epsilon_{t}^{[p,1]}, \ldots, \epsilon_{t}^{[p,p']}) \) such that \( (59) \) implies \( (60) \).

Lemma 5 establishes that all permutations are equivalent for the purpose of deriving prescription strategies. This also justifies our selection of permutation \( o_1 \in O \) in deriving the results. We revisit the idea behind multiple permutations in Section IV-E.

![Fig. 3: A summary of the relationships established in Section III-C.](image)

The relationships established in this section are summarized in Fig. 3 with two agents \( k, j \in K \) located at \( p, r \in P \) in permutation \( o_m \) and located at \( p', r' \in P \) in a second permutation \( o_n \) respectively.

**D. The Prescription Problem**

In permutation \( o_1 \in O \), Lemmas 1 through 3 lead to \( (57) \). This implies that the control action \( U_j^p = U_j^{p'} \) for an agent \( j \in K \) located at position \( r \in P \) in permutation \( o_1 \) can be equivalently obtained through the prescription function \( \Gamma_{t}^{[p,r]} \) of an agent located at any other position \( p \in P \) in permutation \( o_1 \), if the corresponding inaccessible information were made available.

Thus, using \( (57) \), we can write the cost incurred by the system at time \( t \) in with respect to permutation \( o_1 \) as

\[
c_t(X_t, U_1^1, \ldots, U_K^K) = c_t^f(X_t, \Gamma_{t}^{[p,1]}(L_{t}^{[1,p]}), \ldots, \Gamma_{t}^{[p,p]}(L_{t}^{[p,p]}), \Gamma_{t}^{[p,p+1]}(L_{t}^{[p+1,p+1]}), \ldots, \Gamma_{t}^{[p,K]}(L_{t}^{[K,K]})). \tag{64}
\]

where the inputs \( U_1^1, \ldots, U_K^K \) of the function \( c_t^f(\cdot) \) are taken in the order of the permutation \( o_1 \).

We can then reformulate Problem 1 in terms of the prescription strategy of an agent located at \( p \) in permutation \( o_1 \). The optimization problem is to select the optimal prescription strategy \( \psi^*[p] \in \psi[p] \) that minimizes the performance criterion given by the total expected cost:

**Problem 2:**

\[
\mathcal{J}^*[p](\psi^*[p]) =
\mathbb{E}_{\psi^*[p]} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T} c_t^f(X_t, \Gamma_{t}^{[p,1]}(L_{t}^{[1,p]}), \ldots, \Gamma_{t}^{[p,p]}(L_{t}^{[p,p]}), \Gamma_{t}^{[p,p+1]}(L_{t}^{[p+1,p+1]}), \ldots, \Gamma_{t}^{[p,K]}(L_{t}^{[K,K]})) \right]. \tag{65}
\]

The task of deriving optimal prescription strategy \( \psi^*[p] \), and subsequently, the complete prescription \( \Theta^*[p] \) for the agent located at \( p \) in permutation \( o_1 \) is assigned to a fictitious designer that can only access memory \( M_{t}^{[p]} \). Note that this maintains the decentralized nature of the problem as the strategies are implemented by the agents in real time with asymmetric information. The next result shows that Problem 2 for position \( p \) is equivalent to Problem 1.

**Lemma 6.** For any position \( p \in P \) in permutation \( o_1 \), Problem 2 is equivalent to Problem 1.

**Proof.** Eq. \((64)\) implies that the performance criterion \( \mathcal{J}^*[p](\psi^*[p]) \) in \((65)\) is equal to the performance criterion \( \mathcal{J}(g) \) in \((6)\). Thus, given the optimal prescription strategy \( \psi^*[p] \), from Lemmas 1 and 2 we can derive the optimal policy \( g^* \) in Problem 1.

Next, we present a state sufficient for input-output mapping in Problem 2 for position \( p \) following the exposition presented in \((35)\).

**Lemma 7.** A state sufficient for input-output mapping for an agent located at a position \( p \) in permutation \( o_1 \) is

\[
S_{t+1}^{[p]} := \left\{ X_t, L_{t+1}^{[1,p]}, \ldots, L_{t+1}^{[p-1,p]}, L_{t+1}^{[p,p]}, \ldots, L_{t+1}^{[K,K]} \right\}. \tag{66}
\]

**Proof.** The state \( S_{t+1}^{[p]} \) satisfies the three properties stated by Witsenhausen [36]:

1) There exist functions \( f_{t}^{[p]} \), \( t = 0, \ldots, T \) such that

\[
S_{t+1}^{[p]} = f_{t}^{[p]}(S_{t}^{[p]}, W_t, V_{t+1}^{[1]}, \ldots, V_{t+1}^{[K]}, \Theta_{t}^{[p]}). \tag{67}
\]

2) There exist functions \( h_{t}^{[p]} \), \( t = 0, \ldots, T \) such that

\[
Z_{t+1}^{[p]} = h_{t}^{[p]}(S_{t}^{[p]}, \Theta_{t}^{[p]}, V_{t+1}^{[1]}, \ldots, V_{t+1}^{[K]}). \tag{68}
\]

3) There exist functions \( c_{t}^{[p]} \), \( t = 0, \ldots, T \) such that

\[
c_{t}^{[p]}(X_t, U_{t}^{[1]}, \ldots, U_{t}^{[K]}) = c_{t}^{[p]}(S_{t}^{[p]}, \Theta_{t}^{[p]}). \tag{69}
\]
The three equations above can each be verified by substitution of variables on the LHS to bring them in a form that is a function of the variables of the RHS as summarized below.

1) We have that \( S_t^{k+1} = \{ X_t^{r+1}, L_t^{[r+1]}, \ldots, \hat{L}_t^{[r+1]} \} \). We analyze each term here individually. First, for \( X_t^{r+1} \) we have the following relation,

\[
X_t^{r+1} = f_t(X_t, U_t^{[r+1]}, \ldots, U_t^{[K]}),
\]

\[
= f_t(X_t, \Gamma_t^{[r+1]}(L_t^{[r+1]}), \ldots, \hat{L}_t^{[K]}(L_t^{[K]})), \quad \text{(70)}
\]

We know that the new information added to the memory \( M_t^{[r]} \) is a subset of all previously inaccessible information \( \{ L_t^{[r+1]}, \ldots, \hat{L}_t^{[r+1]} \} \) and the most recent control actions and observations \( \{ Y_t^{[1]}, U_t^{[1]}, \ldots, Y_t^{[r]}, U_t^{[r]} \} \). For \( L_t^{[r]} \) for any \( r \in \mathcal{P} \) this gives us

\[
L_t^{[r]} \cup \{ L_t^{[r+1]} \setminus Z_t^{[r+1]}, U_t^{[r+1]}, \ldots, Y_t^{[1]}, U_t^{[1]} \}, \quad \text{(71)}
\]

which can be simplified as follows,

\[
L_t^{[r]} \cup \{ L_t^{[r]}, L_t^{[r+1]}, \ldots, Y_t^{[1]}, U_t^{[1]} \}, \quad \text{(72)}
\]

We can further simplify the final term in \( (72) \) as follows,

\[
\{ Y_t^{[1]}, \ldots, Y_t^{[r]}, U_t^{[1]}, \ldots, U_t^{[r]} \} \subset \{ L_t^{[r]}, \ldots, \hat{L}_t^{[r]} \setminus \hat{L}_t^{[r+1]}, \ldots, \hat{L}_t^{[K]} \setminus \hat{L}_t^{[K+1]}, X_t^{r+1}, V_t^{[1]}, \ldots, V_t^{[K]}, Y_t^{[r]}, U_t^{[r]} \},
\]

\[
\Gamma_t^{[r]}(L_t^{[r+1]}), \ldots, \hat{L}_t^{[K]}(L_t^{[K]}), \quad \text{(73)}
\]

This completes the proof of \( (67) \).

2) For \( Z_t^{[r+1]} \), we have the relation,

\[
Z_t^{[r+1]} \subset \{ L_t^{[r+1]}, \ldots, \hat{L}_t^{[r+1]} \setminus \hat{L}_t^{[r+1]}, \ldots, \hat{L}_t^{[K]} \setminus \hat{L}_t^{[K+1]}, X_t^{r+1}, V_t^{[1]}, \ldots, V_t^{[K]}, Y_t^{[r]}, U_t^{[r]} \}, \quad \text{(74)}
\]

The proof of \( (67) \) is completed through a procedure similar to the one in part 1.

3) We have already shown in part 1 that \( U_t^{[r]} \) can be written as a function of \( S_t^{[r]} \) and \( \Theta_t^{[r]} \) for any positions \( p \) and \( r \) in permutation \( \pi_0 \). This completes the proof of \( (69) \).

We also establish a relationship between the states sufficient for input-output mapping \( S_t^{[r]} \) of an agent located at the position \( p \in \mathcal{P} \) and \( S_t^{[r]} \) of an agent located at the position \( r \in \mathcal{B}^{[r]} \) in permutation \( \pi_0 \).

**Lemma 8.** Let \( S_t^{[p]} \) be the state sufficient for input-output mapping of the agent located at the position \( p \in \mathcal{P} \) in permutation \( \pi_0 \). The state sufficient for input-output mapping \( S_t^{[r]} \) of the agent located at the position \( r \in \mathcal{B}^{[r]} \) in permutation \( \pi_0 \) satisfies the following property,

\[
S_t^{[r]} = \{ S_t^{[p]}, A_t^{[p]} \setminus A_t^{[r]} \}, \quad \text{(75)}
\]

**Proof.** From Lemma \( (7) \) the state sufficient for input-output mapping for any agent located at the position \( r \in \mathcal{P} \) is

\[
S_t^{[r]} = \{ X_t, L_t^{[1]}, \ldots, L_t^{[r]}, L_t^{[r+1]}, \ldots, L_t^{[K]} \}. \quad \text{(76)}
\]

For any \( r \in \mathcal{B}^{[p]} \) and \( q \notin \mathcal{B}^{[r]} \), we have the following properties for the inaccessible information \( L_t^{[q]} \)

1. \( L_t^{[q]} = L_t^{[q+p]} \cup \{ A_t^{[p]} \setminus A_t^{[r]} \}, \forall q \notin \mathcal{B}^{[p]} \),

2. \( L_t^{[q]} = L_t^{[q+p]} \cup \{ A_t^{[p]} \setminus A_t^{[r]} \}, \forall q \in \mathcal{B}^{[q]}, q \notin \mathcal{B}^{[r]} \). \quad \text{(77)}

Substituting \( (77) \) in \( (75) \), we have

\[
S_t^{[r]} = \{ X_t, L_t^{[1]}, A_t^{[1]} \setminus A_t^{[r]}, \ldots, L_t^{[r]}, A_t^{[p]} \setminus A_t^{[r]}, \ldots, L_t^{[K]} \}, \quad \text{(78)}
\]

From \( (14) \)

\[
A_t^{[K]} \subset A_t^{[K-1]} \ldots \subset A_t^{[p]}, \quad \text{(79)}
\]

Using \( (79) \) in \( (78) \) implies

\[
S_t^{[r]} = \{ S_t^{[p]}, A_t^{[p]} \setminus A_t^{[r]} \}, \quad \text{(80)}
\]

From the designer’s point of view, the system behaves like a Partially Observed Markov Decision Process (POMDP) with state \( S_t^{[p]} \), control input \( \Theta_t^{[p]} \), output \( Z_t^{[p]} \) and cost \( c_t^{[p]}(S_t^{[p]}, \Theta_t^{[p]}) \) at time \( t \). The history of outputs up to time \( t \) is given by \( Z_t^{[p]} = A_t^{[p]} \). The big deviation is because the prescription functions \( \Gamma_t^{[r]} \), \( r \in \mathcal{B}^{[p]} \), are generated as functions of the accessible information \( A_t^{[r]} \) instead of \( A_t^{[p]} \). Thus, structural results for POMDP problems cannot be directly applied to Problem 2. Before proceeding to structural results, we define the information state for an agent located at position \( p \) in permutation \( \pi_0 \).

**Definition 14.** Let \( S_t^{[p]} \) be the state, \( A_t^{[p]} \) the accessible information, and \( \Theta_t^{[p]} \) the control inputs at time \( t \) for an agent located at a position \( p \) in permutation \( \pi_0 \). The information state is defined as a probability distribution \( \Pi_t^{[p]} \) that takes values in the possible realizations \( \vartheta_t^{[p]} : = \Delta(S_t^{[p]}) \) such that,

\[
\Pi_t^{[p]}(s_t^{[p]}, \vartheta_t^{[p]} : = \Delta(S_t^{[p]})) = \Delta(S_t^{[p]}), \quad \text{(81)}
\]

**IV. Structural Results**

**A. Properties of the Information States**

In this section we present standard results establishing properties of the information state \( \Pi_t^{[p]} \) for an agent located at any position \( p \in \mathcal{P} \). The first property establishes that the information state \( \Pi_t^{[p]} \) is independent from the prescription strategy \( \psi_t^{[p]} \).

**Lemma 9.** At time \( t \), there exists a function \( F_t^{[p]} \) independent from the prescription strategy \( \psi_t^{[p]} \) such that

\[
\Pi_t^{[p]} = F_t^{[p]}(\Pi_t^{[p]}, \Theta_t^{[p]}, Z_t^{[p]}). \quad \text{(82)}
\]
Proof. See Appendix A for the proof.

The second property of the information state $\Pi_t[p]$ is that its evolution is Markovian as it is shown next.

Lemma 10. The evolution of the information state $\Pi_t[p]$ is a controlled Markov Chain with $\Theta_t[p]$ as the control action at time $t$

$$\mathbb{P}(\Pi_{t+1}[p], \Pi_{0:p}, \Theta_{0:t}) = \mathbb{P}(\Pi_{t+1}[p], \Pi_{0:t}, \Theta_{0:t}).$$

(83)

Proof. See Appendix B for the proof.

The third property of the information state $\Pi_t[p]$ is that the expected cost incurred by the system at time $t$ can be written as a function of $\Pi_t[p]$.

Lemma 11. There exists a function $C_t[p]$ independent of the prescription strategy $\psi[p]$, such that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\psi[p]}[C_t[p](\Pi_t[p], \Theta_t[p])]_0:p = C_t[p](\Pi_t[p], \Theta_t[p]).$$

(84)

Proof. See Appendix B for the proof.

In Lemmas 9 through 11 we established that the information state $\Pi_t[p]$ evolves as a controlled Markov chain with control inputs $\Theta_t[p]$.

B. Structural Results

We start by presenting a structural result for an agent located at position $K$ in permutation $o_1$. By definition, the set of positions beyond $K$ is empty, i.e., $B[K] = \emptyset$. Using (21), this implies that for all positions $p \in P$ in permutation $o_1$, the prescription component $A_t[p,K]$ is a function of the accessible information $A_t[p]$. This leads to the following result derived in [26] through the common information approach.

Lemma 12. Consider the agent located at position $K$. There exists an optimal prescription strategy $\psi^*[K]$ of the form

$$\Gamma_t^*[K,p] = \psi^*[K](\Pi_t^*[K]),$$

(85)

that optimizes the performance criterion (65) in Problem 2.

Proof. See Appendix C for the proof.

Lemma 14. (Three-Stage Lemma) Consider an agent located at the position $p$ of permutation $o_1$ in a system with the time horizon $T = 2$. Given that the optimal prescription strategy $\psi^*_2[p]$ has the form

$$\Gamma^*_2[p,r](\Pi_t^*[p], \Pi_t^*[K]),$$

(87)

there exists an optimal prescription strategy $\psi^*_1[p]$ of the form

$$\Gamma^*_1[p,r](\Pi_t^*[r], \Pi_t^*[K]),$$

(88)

that optimizes the performance criterion (65) in Problem 2.

Proof. See Appendix D for the proof.

This leads us to the following structural result for the optimal prescription strategy $\psi^*[p]$.

Theorem 1. Consider an agent located at the position $p$ of permutation $o_1$. There exists an optimal prescription strategy $\psi^*[p]$ of the form

$$\Gamma^*[p,r](\Pi_t^*[r], \Pi_t^*[K]),$$

(89)

that optimizes the performance criterion (65) in Problem 2.

Proof. For a system with a time horizon $T$, we can prove the result sequentially as follows:

Step 1. To prove the result for time $t = T$, we consider a two-stage system for which we consider:

1) The first stage corresponds to time $t = 0, \ldots , T - 1$.

2) The second stage corresponds to time $t = T$.

We fix the prescription strategy $(\psi^*_0[p], \ldots, \psi^*_{T-2}[p])$ of the agent located at the position $p \in P$ in permutation $o_1$ for the first stage. Then from Lemma 13 there exists an optimal prescription strategy $\psi^*_{T-1}[p]$ of the agent located at the position $p$ such that

$$\Gamma^*_{T-1}[p,r](\Pi_t^*[r], \Pi_t^*[K]),$$

(90)

Step 2. To prove the result for time $t = T - 1$, we consider a three-stage system for which we consider:

1) The first stage corresponds to time $t = 0, \ldots , T - 2$.

2) The second stage corresponds to time $t = T - 1$.

3) The third stage corresponds to time $t = T$.

We fix the prescription strategy $(\psi^*_0[p], \ldots, \psi^*_T[p])$ of the agent located at the position $p \in P$ in permutation $o_1$ for the first stage. From Step 1, we know that the optimal prescription strategy $\psi^*_T[p]$ of the agent located at the position $p$ for the third stage satisfies the structural result. Then, from Lemma 14 there exists an optimal prescription strategy $\psi^*_T[p]$ such that

$$\Gamma^*_T[p,r](\Pi_t^*[r], \Pi_t^*[K]),$$

(91)
Step 3. To prove the result for time $t = T - 2$, we consider a three-stage system for which we consider:

1) The first stage corresponds to time $t = 0, \cdots , T - 3$.
2) The second stage corresponds to time $t = T - 2$.
3) The third stage corresponds to time $t = T - 1, T$.

We fix the prescription strategy $(\psi_0^{[p, \cdots , \psi_{T-3}]}^{[p]})$ of the agent located at the position $p \in \mathcal{P}$ in permutation $\pi_1$ for the first stage. From Steps 1 and 2, we know that the optimal prescription strategy $(\psi_{T-1}^{[p, \cdots , \psi_{T-3}]}^{[p]})$ of the agent located at the position $p$ for the third stage satisfies the structural result.

Let $\Pi_t^{[p]} = (\Pi_t^{[p]}, \cdots , \Pi_t^{[K]})$. We can use a procedure similar to the proof of Lemma [1] to show that there exist functions

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{c}_t^{[p]} : \mathcal{P}_t^{[p]} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{P}_t^{[K]} \times \mathcal{G}_t^{[p]} \to \mathbb{R},
\tilde{c}_t^{[p]} : \mathcal{P}_t^{[p]} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{P}_t^{[K]} \times \mathcal{G}_t^{[p]} \to \mathbb{R},
\end{align*}
$$

such that the cost influenced by the prescription strategy $\psi_{T-2}^{[p]}$ can be written as

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}^{\psi_t^{[p]}} \left[ C_t^{[p]}(\Pi_t^{[p]}, \Theta_t^{[p]}) + C_t^{[p]}(\Pi_t^{[p]}, \Theta_t^{[p]}) + C_t^{[p]}(\Pi_t^{[p]}, \Theta_t^{[p]}) \right] = \mathbb{E}^{\psi_t^{[p]}} \left[ c_t^{[p]}(\Pi_t^{[p]}, \Theta_t^{[p]}) \right].
\end{align*}
$$

This result can be used to derive the optimal control policy $g^* \in G$ in Problem 1 using Lemmas [1] and [2].

Theorem 2. Let agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$ be located at position $p \in \mathcal{P}$ in permutation $\pi_1$, and consider Problem 1. There exists an optimal strategy $g_1^*$ of the form

$$
U_t^{[p]} = \Phi_t^{[p]}(\Pi_t^{[p]}, \cdots , \Pi_t^{[K]}, L_t^{[p, p]}).
$$

Proof. Let $\psi_t^{[1]}$ be the optimal prescription strategy for the agent located at position 1 in permutation $\pi_1$. For any agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$ located at position $p \in \mathcal{P}$, the optimal prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p]}$ is given by (93). Every position $p \in \mathcal{P}$ is beyond position 1, i.e., $B^{[1]} = \mathcal{P}$. Using (35) this implies

$$
\begin{align*}
\psi_t^{[p]}(\cdot) = \psi_t^{[1]}(\cdot).
\end{align*}
$$

From Lemma 1 we can select the optimal strategy $g_t^{[1]} = (g_0^{[1]}, \cdots , g_T^{[1]}), \cdots , (g_0^{[K]}, \cdots , g_T^{[K]})$ as follows,

$$
\begin{align*}
U_t^{[p]} = \Phi_t^{[p]}(\Pi_t^{[p]}, \cdots , \Pi_t^{[K]}, L_t^{[p, p]})
\end{align*}
$$

Note that both structural results presented above lead to prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p]}$ and control policy $g_t^{[K]}$ that have time-invariant domains, i.e., domains that stay the same size as time increases. This is in contrast with the domain of the control policy $g_t^{[K]}$ of agent $k \in \mathcal{K}$ in Section-II where the domain $\mathcal{M}_t^{[K]}$ grows in size with time. This implies that we can use the results of Theorems [1] and [2] to write a dynamic program to find the optimal control policies in permutation $\pi_1 \in \mathcal{P}$. Below, we present a dynamic program that solves Problem 2 for position 1 in permutation $\pi_1$.

Theorem 3. Let $\theta_t^{[1]}$ be the realization of the complete prescription $\Theta_t^{[1]}$ and $\pi_1^{[1]}(\cdot) = (\pi_1^{[1]}, \cdots , \pi_1^{[K]})$ be the vector of information states $\Pi_t^{[p]} = (\Pi_t^{[p]}, \cdots , \Pi_t^{[K]})$ in a given permutation $\pi_1$. For $t = T - 1, \cdots , 1$, and all $\pi_1^{[1]} = \cdots = \pi_1^{[K]}$ in $\mathcal{R}^{[1]} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{R}^{[K]}$, we define the cost-to-go function $J_t^{[1]}(\pi_1^{[1]})$ for $t = T$ as follows

$$
\begin{align*}
J_T^{[1]}(\pi_1^{[1]}) := \inf_{\theta_T^{[1]} \in \mathcal{R}^{[1]}} \left\{ C_T^{[1]}(\pi_T^{[1]}, \theta_T^{[1]}) \right\},
\end{align*}
$$

and for $t = 1, \cdots , T - 1$ as

$$
\begin{align*}
J_t^{[1]}(\pi_1^{[1]}) := \inf_{\theta_t^{[1]} \in \mathcal{R}^{[1]}} \left\{ C_t^{[1]}(\pi_t^{[1]}, \theta_t^{[1]}) + \mathbb{E}\left( J_{t+1}^{[1]}(\Pi_{t+1}^{[1]}, \cdots , \Pi_t^{[K]}) \right) \right\},
\end{align*}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{align*}
\theta_t^{[1]}(\cdot) = (\gamma_t^{[1], \cdots , \gamma_t^{[1,K]}}, \cdots , \gamma_t^{[1,K]}),
\end{align*}
$$

is the optimal prescription selected using (93) at time $t$.

Proof. We start by noting that at time $t$, we write the cost-to-go $J_t^{[1]}$ as a function of $\pi_t^{[1]}$ to highlight the fact that the prescriptions $\pi_t^{[1]}$ in $\Theta_t^{[1]}$ are functions of the information states $\Pi_t^{[K]}$, as established in (39) in Theorem 1. For the agent located at position 1 in permutation $\pi_1$, the evolution of the information states $(\Pi_t^{[1]}, \cdots , \Pi_t^{[K]})$ is a controlled fully
observed Markov decision process (MDP) with input $\Theta_t^{[p]}$. For such an MDP, this is a standard dynamic program. The optimality of the strategies selected using (89) is guaranteed by Theorem 1.

The equivalence between Problem 1 and Problem 2, established in Lemma [5] implies that the optimal prescription strategy for Problem 2 selected through the dynamic program in Theorem 3 has a corresponding optimal control policy for Problem 1.

C. An Example

In this section, we illustrate our structural results through an example of a system with three controller ($K = 3$). The state of the system at time $t$ is a 3-dimensional vector $X_t = (X^1_t, X^2_t, X^3_t)$, where each $X^k_t$ is the state of a local subsystem of agent $k \in K$. The state evolves according to:

$$X_{t+1} = f_t(X_t, U^1_t, U^2_t, U^3_t, W_t),$$

where $\{W_t : t = 0, \cdots, T\}$ denotes the set of mutually independent disturbances that are also independent from the initial state $X_0$. The observation of agent $k$ at time $t$ is given by $Y^k_t = X^k_t$. The communication delays among the agents are given by:

$$d^{(1,2)} = d^{(2,1)} = 1, \quad d^{(1,3)} = d^{(3,1)} = 1, \quad d^{(2,3)} = d^{(3,2)} = 2.$$

Thus, the memories of the three agents at time $t$ are given by:

$$M^1_t = \{X^1_{0:t}, U^1_{0:t-1}, X^2_{0:t-1}, U^2_{0:t-2}, X^3_{0:t-1}, U^3_{0:t-2}\},$$

$$M^2_t = \{X^1_{0:t-1}, U^1_{0:t-2}, X^2_{0:t-1}, U^2_{0:t-2}, X^3_{0:t-2}, U^3_{0:t-3}\},$$

$$M^3_t = \{X^1_{0:t-1}, U^1_{0:t-2}, X^2_{0:t-2}, U^2_{0:t-3}, X^3_{0:t-3}, U^3_{0:t-4}\}.$$

We conduct our analysis with respect to the trivial permutation $o_1 = (1, 2, 3)$. Then the accessible information of the three agents is given by:

$$A^{[1]}_t = \{X^1_{0:t-1}, U^1_{0:t-1}, X^2_{0:t-2}, U^2_{0:t-2}, X^3_{0:t-1}, U^3_{0:t-2}\},$$

$$A^{[2]}_t = \{X^1_{0:t-1}, U^1_{0:t-2}, X^2_{0:t-1}, U^2_{0:t-2}, X^3_{0:t-2}, U^3_{0:t-3}\},$$

$$A^{[3]}_t = \{X^1_{0:t-1}, U^1_{0:t-2}, X^2_{0:t-2}, U^2_{0:t-3}, X^3_{0:t-3}, U^3_{0:t-4}\}.$$

The inaccessible information of agent 1 can be written as,

$$L^{[1,1]}_t = \emptyset,$$

$$L^{[1,2]}_t = \{X^1_{0:t-1}, U^1_{0:t-1}, X^3_{0:t-1}, U^3_{0:t-2}\},$$

$$L^{[1,3]}_t = \{X^1_{0:t-1}, U^1_{0:t-1}, X^2_{0:t-2}, U^2_{0:t-2}, X^3_{0:t-1}, U^3_{0:t-2}\}.$$

Similarly, the inaccessible information for agent 2 can be written as,

$$L^{[2,2]}_t = \{X^2_{0:t-1}, U^2_{0:t-1}\},$$

$$L^{[2,3]}_t = \{X^2_{0:t-1}, U^2_{0:t-2}, X^3_{0:t-1}, U^3_{0:t-2}\},$$

and the accessible information for agent 3 can be written as,

$$L^{[3,3]}_t = \{X^3_{0:t-1}, U^3_{0:t-2}\}.$$

We can define the information states for positions $p \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ for permutation $o_1 = (1, 2, 3)$ as follows,

$$\Pi^{[1]}_t := \left[\psi^{[1]}(X^1_t, U^2_{t-1}, X^3_{t-1}, U^3_{t-2}) \cup A^{[1]}_t, \Theta^{[1]}_t \right],$$

$$\Pi^{[2]}_t := \left[\psi^{[2]}(X^1_t, U^1_{t-1}, X^2_{t-1}, U^3_{t-2}) \cup A^{[2]}_t, \Theta^{[2]}_t \right],$$

$$\Pi^{[3]}_t := \left[\psi^{[3]}(X^1_t, U^1_{t-1}, X^2_{t-1}, U^1_{t-2}) \cup A^{[3]}_t, \Theta^{[3]}_t \right],$$

which can be simplified using (102) and the fact that the distribution of the disturbance $W_t$ is for every time step $t$ is known a priori. The simplified information states are given by,

$$\Pi^{[1]}_t := \left[\psi^{[1]}(U^1_{t-1}, X^3_{t-1}, U^3_{t-2}) \cup A^{[1]}_t, \Theta^{[1]}_t \right],$$

$$\Pi^{[2]}_t := \left[\psi^{[2]}(U^1_{t-1}, U^2_{t-1}, X^3_{t-1}, U^3_{t-2}) \cup A^{[2]}_t, \Theta^{[2]}_t \right],$$

$$\Pi^{[3]}_t := \left[\psi^{[3]}(U^1_{t-1}, X^2_{t-1}, U^2_{t-2}) \cup A^{[3]}_t, \Theta^{[3]}_t \right].$$

Using Theorem 1, we can write the optimal prescriptions of the three agents as,

$$\Gamma^{[1]}_t = \psi^{[1]}(\Pi^{[1]}_t), \quad \Gamma^{[2]}_t = \psi^{[2]}(\Pi^{[2]}_t), \quad \Gamma^{[3]}_t = \psi^{[3]}(\Pi^{[3]}_t),$$

which give us the following optimal control actions,

$$U^{[1]}_t = \Gamma^{[1]}_t,$$

$$U^{[2]}_t = \Gamma^{[2]}_t,$$

$$U^{[3]}_t = \Gamma^{[3]}_t.$$
Now, from the definition of the inaccessible information, we note that,
\[ M^p_t = \{ A^p_t, L^p_t \} = \{ A^K_t, L^K_t \}, \]
and from (14) we have the relation,
\[ A^K_t \subset A^p_t, \]
because \( K \in B^p \) for all \( p \in \mathcal{P} \). We have that (105) and (106)
imply,
\[ L^{[p,p]}_t \subset L^{[p,K]}_t. \]

In the example given in Section IV-C, we can observe this relationship as,
\[ L^{[1,1]}_t \subset L^{[1,3]}_t, \]
\[ L^{[2,2]}_t \subset L^{[2,3]}_t. \]

Thus, the prescription functions generated through the prescription approach have a domain with smaller size than those generated through the common information approach. The two domain sizes will be equal in the worst case.

E. Aspects of Computation and Implementation

We chose to present a dynamic program for the agent located at position 1 in prescription \( o_1 \) since the size of every component of complete prescription \( \Theta_1 \) has the smallest size in Problem 2 for position \( p \in \mathcal{P} \) for \( o_1 \). For example, for the agent located at position 1 we have,
\[ L^{[1,1]}_t \subset L^{[1,2]}_t \subset \cdots \subset L^{[1,K]}_t. \]

Similarly for the agent located at position 2 we have,
\[ L^{[2,2]}_t \subset L^{[2,3]}_t \subset \cdots \subset L^{[2,K]}_t. \]

Lemma 5 establishes the equivalence of optimal prescription strategies derived in different permutations. Thus, for the most efficient computation of the optimal control policies, it is ideal to select a permutation \( o_k \in \mathcal{O} \) that minimizes the size of the domains of the maximum number of prescription components. When implementing the prescription strategy, the permutations allow us to achieve better memory efficiency for the agents. Lemma 5 also implies that for any agent \( k \in \mathcal{K} \), we can implement the optimal prescription strategy corresponding to the permutation \( o_k \) from its optimal permutation strategy corresponding to any other permutation \( o_j \in \mathcal{O} \), \( j \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{k\} \). Because \( o_{k,1} = k \), this ensures that every agent \( k \) only needs to remember the information states \( (\Pi^{[1]}_t, \cdots, \Pi^{[K]}_t) \) for permutation \( o_k \) at time \( t \). Each of these can be updated through the new information \( Z_{t+1}^{[k,1]} \), the current complete prescription \( \Theta^{[1]}_t \) and the positional functions \( (e^{[2,1]}, \cdots, e^{[K,1]}) \) for permutation \( o_k \).

V. Discussion and Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we analyzed a decentralized stochastic control problem with a word-of-mouth information structure and established a structural result for optimal control policies with time-invariant domain sizes. We presented this structural result by formulating an alternative problem through the prescription approach for various permutations of the agents. We showed that the result of the common information approach is a special case of the prescription approach and that it is possible to compress larger amounts of data in asymmetric information sharing structures like the word-of-mouth information structure than currently accepted.

An observation on our result is that it leads to a large probabilistic state space in the argument of the prescription strategy due to the number of information states incorporated there. We believe that there is room to improve this by utilizing the relationships between various information states and the positional relationship functions.

We established that a prescription strategy in one permutation has a corresponding prescription strategy in every other permutation such that all of them lead to the same control action for a given agent. This opens up possibilities of introducing dynamic programs that simultaneously try to derive an amalgamated prescription comprising of prescription functions from different permutations. For example, consider a system with 2 agents. The possible permutations are labeled \( o_1 \) and \( o_2 \). The positions of agents 1 and 2 are \( p = 1 \) and \( r = 2 \) in permutation \( o_1 \), and \( p' = 2 \) and \( r' = 1 \) in permutation \( o_2 \) respectively. Then it may be possible to formulate a dynamic program to simultaneously find the prescription strategies \( (\psi_t^{[p,p]}, \psi_t^{[r',r']}) \) by picking the prescription strategy \( \psi_t^{[p,p]} \) for agent 1 in permutation \( o_1 \) and the prescription strategy \( \psi_t^{[r',r']} \) for agent 2 in permutation \( o_2 \).

Finally, we observe that the prescription approach does not depend on the information structure of the system beyond the definition of the memory of the agents. This indicates that it should be possible to translate these results to different information structures without being constrained by the assumptions made for word-of-mouth communication. Ongoing work includes extending these results to more general and interesting decentralized control problems.

APPENDIX A

Let \( a_{t+1}^{[p]} \), \( \theta_t^{[p]} \), and \( \pi_t^{[p]} \) be the realizations of the random variables \( A_t^{[p]} \), \( \Theta_t^{[p]} \), and the conditional probability \( \Pi_t^{[p]} \) respectively. Let \( \psi_t^{[p]} \) be the prescription strategy. Then the realization of \( \Pi_t^{[p]} \) is
\[ \pi_{t+1}^{[p]}(s_{t+1}) = \mathbb{P}_{\psi_t^{[p]}}(S_{t+1}^{[p]} = s_{t+1}^{[p]} | a_t^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}). \]
Since $S_t^{[p]}$ is a state sufficient for input-output mapping, (112) can be written as
\[
\pi_t^{[p]}(s_{t+1}) = \sum_{s_t^{[p]}, a_{t+1}^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}} I_{s_{t+1}}^t \left( f_{t+1}^{[p]}\left(s_t^{[p]}, w_t, v_t^{[1;K]}, \theta_t^{[p]}\right)\right) \prod_{p} P(V_t^{[p]} = v_t^{[p]}). P(W_t^{[p]} = w_t^{[p]}) \cdot \psi_t^{[p]}(S_t^{[p]} = s_t^{[p]} | a_{t+1}^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}).
\] (113)

The last term in (113) can be written as
\[
\psi_t^{[p]}(S_t^{[p]} = s_t^{[p]} | a_{t+1}^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}) = \psi_t^{[p]}(s_t^{[p]} | a_{t+1}^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}) = \Theta_t^{[p]} = \theta_t^{[p]}.
\]

(114)

However,
\[
\psi_t^{[p]}(S_t^{[p]} = s_t^{[p]} | a_{t+1}^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}) = \psi_t^{[p]}(s_t^{[p]} | a_{t+1}^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}) = \Theta_t^{[p]} = \theta_t^{[p]}
\]

(115)

We can drop $\theta_t^{[p]}$ from the prior in (115) since $\theta_t^{[p]}$ can be derived given $a_{t+1}^{[p]}$ and $\psi_t^{[p]}$. Substituting in (114), it yields
\[
\psi_t^{[p]}(S_t^{[p]} = s_t^{[p]} | a_{t+1}^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}) = \psi_t^{[p]}(s_t^{[p]} | a_{t+1}^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}) = \Theta_t^{[p]} = \theta_t^{[p]}
\]

(116)

However,
\[
\psi_t^{[p]}(S_t^{[p]} = s_t^{[p]} | a_{t+1}^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}) = \psi_t^{[p]}(s_t^{[p]} | a_{t+1}^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}) = \Theta_t^{[p]} = \theta_t^{[p]}
\]

(117)

and substituting in (116), we have
\[
\psi_t^{[p]}(S_t^{[p]} = s_t^{[p]} | a_{t+1}^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}) = \psi_t^{[p]}(s_t^{[p]} | a_{t+1}^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}) = \Theta_t^{[p]} = \theta_t^{[p]}
\]

(118)

From (112) and (118) it follows
\[
\Pi_t^{[p]} = F_{t+1}^{[p]}(\Pi_t^{[p]}, \Theta_t^{[p]}, Z_{t+1}).
\] (119)

**APPENDIX B**

In this section, we present the proofs of Lemma 10 and Lemma 11.

We start with the proof of Lemma 10. Let $a_t^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]},$ and $\pi_t^{[p]}$ be the realizations of the random variables $A_t^{[p]}, \Theta_t^{[p]},$ and the conditional probability $\Pi_t^{[p]}$ respectively. Let $\psi_t^{[p]}$ be the prescription strategy. Then, for some $P \in \mathcal{P}_t$
\[
\mathbb{P}(\Pi_t^{[p]} = P | \theta_t^{[p]}, \sigma_t^{[p]}) = \sum_{s_t^{[p]}} \mathbb{P}(F_{t+1}^{[p]}(\Pi_t^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}, Z_{t+1})) \cdot \mathbb{P}(Z_{t+1}^{[p]} = z_{t+1}^{[p]} | a_t^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}, \sigma_t^{[p]}).
\]

(120)

Then, the second term in (120) can be expanded
\[
\mathbb{P}(Z_{t+1}^{[p]} = z_{t+1}^{[p]} | a_t^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}, \sigma_t^{[p]}) = \sum_{s_t^{[p]}} \mathbb{P}^\theta_t^{[p]}(s_t^{[p]} | a_t^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}, \sigma_t^{[p]}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(S_t^{[p]} = s_t^{[p]} | a_t^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}, \sigma_t^{[p]})
\]

(121)

The last equality in (121) holds since given the realizations of the accessible information $a_t^{[p]}$ and prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p]}$, the realization of the complete prescription $\theta_t^{[p]}$ is determined, and thus, we can reduce the second term to $\Pi_t^{[p]}$. Substituting (121) into (120) we have
\[
\mathbb{P}(\Pi_t^{[p]} \in P | a_t^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}, \sigma_t^{[p]}) = \mathbb{P}(\Pi_t^{[p]} \in P | a_t^{[p]}, \sigma_t^{[p]}).
\] (122)

For the proof of Lemma 11 we expand the following expectation
\[
\mathbb{P}(\psi_t^{[p]} | c_t^{[p]}(s_t^{[p]}, \Theta_t^{[p]}), A_t^{[p]}, \Theta_t^{[p]}) = \sum_{s_t^{[p]}} c_t^{[p]}(s_t^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\psi_t^{[p]} | s_t^{[p]}| A_t^{[p]}, \Theta_t^{[p]})
\]

\[
= \sum_{s_t^{[p]}} c_t^{[p]}(s_t^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}) \cdot \Pi_t^{[p]}(s_t^{[p]} | a_t^{[p]}, \theta_t^{[p]}, \sigma_t^{[p]})
\]

(123)

where the term $\Theta_t^{[p]}$ was omitted since it can be derived given the accessible information $A_t^{[p]}$ and the prescription strategy $\psi_t^{[p]}$.

**APPENDIX C**

In this section, we use mathematical induction to develop the proof for Lemma 13 in four steps:

*Step 1.* We show that the result holds for the agent located at position $K$ in permutation $o_1$.

*Step 2.* We assume that the result holds for an agent located at the position $p + 1 \in \mathcal{P}$ in permutation $o_1$.

*Step 3.* Using the assumption in Step 2, we prove that the result holds for the agent located at the position $p \in \mathcal{P}$.

*Step 4.* Starting with the agent located at the position $K$ we can sequentially prove the result for the agents located at the positions $K, K − 1, K − 2, \ldots$ until the position $p$. Thus, using mathematical induction, our proof is complete.

Next, we present the four steps in detail.

*Step 1.* Lemma 12 establishes that Lemma 13 holds for the agent located at the position $K$ in permutation $o_1$. 
Step 2. We let $\psi_1^{[*p+1]}$ be an optimal prescription strategy for the agent located at position $p+1$ in permutation $o_1$, such that
\[
\Gamma_1^{[*p+1, r]} := \left\{ \psi_1^{[*p+1, r]} \left( \Pi_1^{[*p+1]}, \ldots, \Pi_1^{[K]} \right), \text{ if } r \not\in B^{[*p+1]}, \right.
\psi_1^{[*p+1, r]} \left( \Pi_1^{[*p+1]}, \ldots, \Pi_1^{[K]} \right), \text{ if } r \in B^{[*p+1]}, \right. \tag{124}
\]

Step 3.1. For the agent located at the position $p \in P$, from Lemma 3 we have the relation
\[
\psi_1^{[p, q]}(\cdot) = \psi_1^{[r, q]}(\cdot), \forall r \in B^{[p]}, \forall q \in B^{[r]} \tag{125}
\]
We substitute $q = p + 1$ in (125) to obtain the relation
\[
\psi_1^{[p, r]}(\cdot) = \psi_1^{[*p+1, r]}(\cdot), \forall r \in B^{[p+1]} \tag{126}
\]
This implies that
\[
\Gamma_1^{[p, r]} = \psi_1^{[*p, r]}(\Pi_1^{[r]}, \ldots, \Pi_1^{[K]}), \forall r \in B^{[p+1]} \tag{127}
\]
Note that the agent located at the position $p$ can derive the information state $\Pi_1^{[p]}$ for every $r \in B^{[p+1]}$ since
1. $A_1^{[r]} \subset A_1^{[p]}, \forall r \in B^{[p+1]} \tag{128}$
2. $\psi_1^{[p, q]} = e_1^{[r, q]}(\psi_1^{[p, q]}), \forall q \in P, \forall r \in B^{[p+1]} \tag{129}$

Step 3.2. For the agent located at the position $p \in P$, we fix the prescription strategy $\psi_1^{[p]}$. Then, in the total expected cost incurred by the system given by
\[
E \psi_1^{[p]} \left[ C_0^{[p]}(\Pi_0^{[p]}, \Theta_0^{[p]}), + C_1^{[p]}(\Pi_1^{[p]}, \Theta_1^{[p]}), + C_2^{[p]}(\Pi_2^{[p]}, \Theta_2^{[p]}) \right], \tag{130}
\]
the choice of the prescription strategy $\psi_1^{[p]}$ affects only the second term in (130). Using (127) in Step 3.1, we can write the second term as
\[
C_1^{[p]}(\Pi_1^{[p]}, \Theta_1^{[p]}) = C_1^{[p]}(\Pi_1^{[p]}, \Gamma_1^{[p-1]}, \ldots, \Gamma_1^{[p-p+1]}, \psi_1^{[*p+1, r]}(\Pi_1^{[p+1]}), \ldots, \Pi_1^{[K]})), \tag{131}
\]
Let $\Pi_1^{[K]} = (\Pi_1^{[p]}, \ldots, \Pi_1^{[K]})$. Then, the optimal prescriptions $\Gamma_1^{[p, r]}$ of the agent located at position $p$ for all agents located at positions $r \not\in B^{[p+1]}$ can be defined as
\[
(\Gamma_1^{[p, p]}, \ldots, \Gamma_1^{[p, p]}) := \arg \inf_{\gamma_1^{[p, p]}, \ldots, \gamma_1^{[p, p]}} \left\{ E \psi_1^{[p]} \left[ C_1^{[p]}(\Pi_1^{[p]}, \Gamma_1^{[p-1]}, \ldots, \Gamma_1^{[p-p+1]}, \psi_1^{[*p+1, r]}(\Pi_1^{[p+1]}), \ldots, \Pi_1^{[K]})), \right. \right.
\psi_1^{[*p+1, r]}(\Pi_1^{[p+1]}), \ldots, \Pi_1^{[K]})) \tag{132}
\]
given the functions $\{C_1^{[p]}(\cdot), \psi_1^{[*p+1, r]}(\cdot), \ldots, \psi_1^{[*p, K]}(\cdot)\}$. Thus, there exists a function $\psi_1^{[*p, r]} : \mathcal{S}_0 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{S}_K \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}^{[p, r]}$ for every $r \not\in B^{[p+1]}$ that gives us the optimal prescription
\[
\Gamma_1^{[p, r]} = \psi_1^{[*p, r]}(\Pi_1^{[p]}, \ldots, \Pi_1^{[K]})), \tag{133}
\]
Step 4. By reverse mathematical induction starting with the agent located at position $K$, the optimal prescription strategy $\psi_1^{[*p]}$ for the agent located at a position $p \in P$ satisfies the structural result
\[
\Gamma_1^{[p, r]} = \left\{ \psi_1^{[*p, r]}(\Pi_1^{[p]}, \ldots, \Pi_1^{[K]}), \text{ if } r \not\in B^{[p]} \right. \tag{134}
\}
\]

### APPENDIX D

In this section, we use mathematical induction to develop the proof for Lemma 14 in five steps:

Step 1. We show that the result holds for the agent located at position $K$ in permutation $o_1$.

Step 2. We assume that the result holds for all agents located at the positions $p+1, p+2, \ldots, K$, in permutation $o_1$.

Step 3. With the assumption in Step 2, we prove that the result holds for the prescription $\Gamma_1^{[p, q]}$ of the agent located at the position $p \in P$ for an agent located at a position $q \in B^{[p+1]}$.

Step 4. With the assumption in Step 2, we prove that the result holds for the prescription $\Gamma_1^{[p, q]}$ of the agent located at the position $p \in P$ for an agent located at a position $q \in B^{[p+1]}$.

Step 5. Starting with the agent located at the position $K$ we can sequentially prove the result for the agents located at the positions $K, K-1, K-2, \ldots, p$, until the position $p$. Thus, using mathematical induction, our proof is complete.

Next, we present the three steps in detail.

**Step 1.** Lemma 12 establishes that Lemma 13 holds for the agent located at the position $K$ in permutation $o_1$.

**Step 2.** We let $\psi_1^{[*q]}$ be an optimal prescription strategy of the agents located at every position $q \in B^{[p+1]}$ in permutation $o_1$, such that
\[
\Gamma_1^{[q, q]} := \left\{ \psi_1^{[*q, r]}(\Pi_1^{[q]}, \ldots, \Pi_1^{[K]}), \text{ if } r \not\in B^{[q]} \right. \tag{135}
\]

**Step 3.** For the agent located at the position $p \in P$, from Lemma 3 we have the relation
\[
\psi_1^{[p, q]}(\cdot) = \psi_1^{[r, q]}(\cdot), \forall r \in B^{[p]}, \forall q \in B^{[r]} \tag{136}
\]
We substitute $q = p + 1$ in (136) to obtain the relation
\[
\psi_1^{[p, r]}(\cdot) = \psi_1^{[*p+1, r]}(\cdot), \forall r \in B^{[p+1]} \tag{137}
\]
This implies that
\[
\Gamma_1^{[p, r]} := \psi_1^{[*p, r]}(\Pi_1^{[p]}, \ldots, \Pi_1^{[K]}), \forall r \in B^{[p+1]} \tag{138}
\]
Note that the agent located at the position $p$ can derive the information state $\Pi_1^{[p]}$ for every $r \in B^{[p+1]}$ since
1. $A_1^{[r]} \subset A_1^{[p]}, \forall r \in B^{[p+1]} \tag{139}$
2. $\psi_1^{[p, q]} = e_1^{[r, q]}(\psi_1^{[p, q]}), \forall q \in P, \forall r \in B^{[p+1]} \tag{140}$

**Step 4.1.** For the agent located at the position $p \in P$, we fix the prescription strategy $\psi_0^{[0]}$ and select the prescription strategy $\psi_2^{[*p]}$ using (87). Then, in the total expected cost incurred by the system given by
\[
E \psi_1^{[p]} \left[ C_0^{[p]}(\Pi_0^{[p]}, \Theta_0^{[p]}), + C_1^{[p]}(\Pi_1^{[p]}, \Theta_1^{[p]}), + C_2^{[p]}(\Pi_2^{[p]}, \Theta_2^{[p]}) \right], \tag{141}
\]
the choice of the strategy \( \psi_{1}^{[p]} \) affects only the second and third terms.

**Step 4.2.** Let \( s_{t}^{[p,K]} = (s_{t}^{[p]}, \ldots, s_{t}^{[K]}) \), \( \theta_{t}^{[p,K]} = (\theta_{t}^{[p]}, \ldots, \theta_{t}^{[K]}) \) and \( \pi_{t}^{[p,K]} = (\pi_{t}^{[p]}, \ldots, \pi_{t}^{[K]}) \) be the realizations of the random variables \( S_{t}^{[p,K]} = (S_{t}^{[p]}, \ldots, S_{t}^{[K]}) \), \( \Theta_{t}^{[p,K]} = (\Theta_{t}^{[p]}, \ldots, \Theta_{t}^{[K]}) \) and the conditional probability \( \Pi_{t}^{[p,K]} = (\Pi_{t}^{[p]}, \ldots, \Pi_{t}^{[K]}) \). We use the law of iterated expectations to expand the last term in (141) as follows,

\[
E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}[C_{2}^{[p]}(\Pi_{1}^{[p]}, \Theta_{1}^{[p]})] = E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}[E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}[C_{2}^{[p]}(\Pi_{2}^{[p]}, \Theta_{2}^{[p]})|\Pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, S_{1}^{[p,K]}, \Theta_{1}^{[p,K]}]].
\]

(142)

We can substitute the structural result for \( \psi_{2}^{[p]} \) using (87) and expand the conditional expectation to obtain the relation

\[
E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}[C_{2}^{[p]}(\Pi_{2}^{[p]}, \Theta_{2}^{[p]})] = \sum_{\pi_{2}^{[p]}, \ldots, \pi_{K}^{[p]}} C_{2}^{[p]}(\pi_{2}^{[p]}, \ldots, \pi_{K}^{[p]}), \psi_{2}^{[p]}(\pi_{2}^{[p]}, \ldots, \pi_{K}^{[p]}),
\]

(143)

For agents located at any position \( p \in \mathcal{P} \), we invoke Lemmas 7 and 9 to state the relations

1. \( \Pi_{2}^{[p]} = F_{2}^{[p]}(\Pi_{1}^{[p]}, \Theta_{1}^{[p]}, Z_{2}^{[p]}) \),
2. \( Z_{2}^{[p]} = \tilde{f}_{2}^{[p]}(\Pi_{1}^{[p]}, \Theta_{1}^{[p]}, V_{1}^{[p]}, \ldots, V_{2}^{[K]}) \). (144)

Using the relations in (144), we can define a function \( \tilde{F}_{2}^{[p]} : \mathcal{Q}_{1}^{[p]} \times \mathcal{Q}_{1}^{[K]} \times \mathcal{S}_{1}^{[p]} \times \mathcal{V}_{1}^{[1]} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{V}_{1}^{[K]} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{2}^{[p]} \) such that

\[
\Pi_{2}^{[p]} = \tilde{F}_{2}^{[p]}(\Pi_{1}^{[p]}, \Theta_{1}^{[p]}, S_{1}^{[p,K]}, V_{1}^{[1]}, \ldots, V_{2}^{[K]}).
\]

(145)

Then, using the relations in (144) and (145) we make substitutions in the last term in (141) as follows,

\[
E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}[\Pi_{2}^{[p,K]}] = \sum_{\pi_{2}^{[p,K]}, \ldots, \pi_{K}^{[p,K]}} \tilde{F}_{2}^{[p]}(\Pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, \Theta_{1}^{[p,K]}), S_{1}^{[p,K]}, V_{1}^{[1,K]} \times \pi_{2}^{[p,K]}, \ldots, \pi_{K}^{[p,K]}, \pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, \pi_{1}^{[1,K]}).
\]

(146)

From Assumption 2, the primitive random variables \( \{W_{1}, V_{1}^{[1]}, \ldots, V_{2}^{[K]}\} \) have known probability distributions and are mutually independent. Using this assumption in (146) implies that we can define a new function \( \tilde{C}_{1}^{[p]} : \mathcal{Q}_{1}^{[p]} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{Q}_{1}^{[K]} \times S_{1}^{[p]} \times \cdots \times S_{1}^{[K]} \times \pi_{1}^{[p,K]} \times \cdots \times \pi_{2}^{[p,K]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) such that

\[
\tilde{C}_{1}^{[p]}(\pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, \pi_{1}^{[1,K]}).
\]

(147)

**Step 4.3.** Let \( a_{1}^{[p]} \) be the realization of the random variable \( A_{1}^{[p]} \). We use the law of iterated expectations for a second time to write,

\[
E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}[\tilde{C}_{1}^{[p]}(\Pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, S_{1}^{[p,K]}, \Theta_{1}^{[p,K]}))] = E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}[E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}[\tilde{C}_{1}^{[p]}(\Pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, S_{1}^{[p,K]}, \Theta_{1}^{[p,K]})]]
\]

(148)

We can expand the conditional expectation as follows,

\[
E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}[\tilde{C}_{1}^{[p]}(\Pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, S_{1}^{[p,K]}, \Theta_{1}^{[p,K]}))|\pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, a_{1}^{[p]}, \theta_{1}^{[p]}] = \sum_{s_{1}^{[p,K]} \ldots, \pi_{K}^{[p,K]}} \tilde{C}_{1}^{[p]}(\pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, \pi_{1}^{[1,K]}).
\]

(149)

For the first term in (149), we use (138) to expand the realization \( \theta_{1}^{[p]} \) of the complete prescription \( \Theta_{1}^{[p]} \) of every agent located at a position \( q \in \mathcal{B}^{[p]} \) as follows,

\[
\theta_{1}^{[p]} = (\psi_{1}^{[q,1]}(\pi_{1}^{[p,K]}), \ldots, \psi_{1}^{[q,p]}(\pi_{1}^{[p,K]})), \psi_{1}^{[q,p+1]}(\pi_{1}^{[p,K]}), \ldots, \psi_{1}^{[q,K]}(\pi_{1}^{[p,K]}))
\]

(150)

For the second term in (149), we apply the result (75) of Lemma 8 for positions \( \{p+1, \ldots, K\} \) and simplify as follows,

\[
E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}(S_{1}^{[p,K]} = s_{1}^{[p,K]}|\pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, a_{1}^{[p]}), \theta_{1}^{[p]}) = E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}(S_{1}^{[p,K]} = s_{1}^{[p,K]}|A_{1}^{[p+1]} \cdots A_{1}^{[p+1]}, \ldots, A_{1}^{[p+1]} \cdots A_{1}^{[p+1]}, a_{1}^{[p]}), \theta_{0}^{[1]})
\]

(151)

for any realization \( (\pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, a_{1}^{[p]}), \theta_{0}^{[1]} \) of positive probability.

Note that in (151) we dropped the term \( \theta_{1}^{[p]} \) from the conditioning because it is a function of the other terms in the conditioning.

After substituting the results (150) and (151) in (149), we can define a new function \( \tilde{C}_{1}^{[p]} : \mathcal{Q}_{1}^{[p]} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{Q}_{1}^{[K]} \times \mathcal{Q}_{1}^{[K]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) such that

\[
\tilde{C}_{1}^{[p]}(\pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, \theta_{1}^{[p]}) := E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}[\tilde{C}_{1}^{[p]}(\Pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, S_{1}^{[p,K]}, \Theta_{1}^{[p,K]}))]|\pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, a_{1}^{[p]}, \theta_{1}^{[p]}].
\]

(152)

**Step 4.4.** The expected cost to be minimized by the optimal prescription strategy \( \psi_{1}^{[p]} \) is given by the second and third terms in (141). Using (152), we can simplify this as

\[
E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}[C_{1}^{[p]}(\Pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, \Theta_{1}^{[p]}) + C_{2}^{p} (\Pi_{2}^{[p,K]}, \Theta_{2}^{[p,K]})] = E^{\psi_{1}^{[p]}}[C_{1}^{[p]}(\Pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, \Theta_{1}^{[p]})] + C_{2}^{p} (\Pi_{2}^{[p,K]}, \Theta_{2}^{[p,K]})]
\]

(153)

for some function \( \tilde{c}_{1}^{[p]} : \mathcal{Q}_{1}^{[p]} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{Q}_{1}^{[K]} \times \mathcal{Q}_{1}^{[K]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \). Using (138) from Step 2, we can expand this cost as

\[
\tilde{c}_{1}^{[p]}(\Pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, \Gamma_{1}^{[p,1]}, \ldots, \Gamma_{1}^{[p,p+1]}, \Pi_{1}^{[p+1]}, \ldots, \Pi_{1}^{[K]}),
\]

(154)
Then, the optimal prescriptions $\Gamma_{1}^{[p,r]}$ of the agent located at position $p$ for all agents located at positions $r \not\in B^{[p+1]}$ can be defined as

$$
(\Gamma_{1}^{[p,1]}, \ldots, \Gamma_{1}^{[p,p]}) := \arg \inf_{\Gamma_{1}^{[p,1]}, \ldots, \Gamma_{1}^{[p,p]}} \left\{ c_{1}^{[p]} \left[ \Pi_{1}^{[p,K]}, \Gamma_{1}^{[p,1]}, \ldots, \Gamma_{1}^{[p,p]} \right], \right.
\left.
\psi_{1}^{[p,p+1]} \left( \Pi_{1}^{[p+1,K]} \right), \ldots, \psi_{1}^{[p,p]} \left( \Pi_{1}^{[p,K]} \right) \right\},
$$

(155)
given the functions $\psi_{1}^{[p,r]}$ for every $r \not\in B^{[p+1]}$ such that the optimal prescription is

$$
\Gamma_{1}^{[p,r]} = \psi_{1}^{[p,r]} \left( \Pi_{1}^{[p,r]}, \ldots, \Pi_{1}^{[p,K]} \right).
$$

(156)

Step 5. By reverse mathematical induction starting with the agent located at position $K$, the optimal prescription strategy $\psi_{1}^{[p,r]}$ for the agent located at a position $p \in P$ satisfies the structural result

$$
\Gamma_{1}^{[p,r]} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\psi_{1}^{[p,r]} & \text{if } r \not\in B^{[p]}, \\
\psi_{1}^{[p,r]} & \text{if } r \in B^{[p]}. 
\end{array} \right.
$$

(157)
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