
Q-value Path Decomposition for Deep Multiagent Reinforcement Learning

Yaodong Yang¹ Jianye Hao¹ Guangyong Chen² Hongyao Tang¹ Yingfeng Chen³ Yujing Hu³
Changjie Fan³ Zhongyu Wei⁴

Abstract

Recently, deep multiagent reinforcement learning (MARL) has become a highly active research area as many real-world problems can be inherently viewed as multiagent systems. A particularly interesting and widely applicable class of problems is the partially observable cooperative multiagent setting, in which a team of agents learns to coordinate their behaviors conditioning on their private observations and commonly shared global reward signals. One natural solution is to resort to the centralized training and decentralized execution paradigm. During centralized training, one key challenge is the multiagent credit assignment: how to allocate the global rewards for individual agent policies for better coordination towards maximizing system-level's benefits. In this paper, we propose a new method called Q-value Path Decomposition (QPD) to decompose the system's global Q-values into individual agents' Q-values. Unlike previous works which restrict the representation relation of the individual Q-values and the global one, we leverage the integrated gradient attribution technique into deep MARL to directly decompose global Q-values along trajectory paths to assign credits for agents. We evaluate QPD on the challenging StarCraft II micromanagement tasks and show that QPD achieves the state-of-the-art performance in both homogeneous and heterogeneous multiagent scenarios compared with existing cooperative MARL algorithms.

1. Introduction

Cooperative multiagent reinforcement learning problem has been studied extensively in the last decade (Busoniu et al., 2008; Gupta et al., 2017; Palmer et al., 2018), where a system of agents learn towards coordinated policies to optimize

¹Tianjin Univeristy ²Tencent ³NetEase Fuxi AI Lab
⁴Fudan University. Correspondence to: Jianye Hao
<jianye.hao@tju.edu.cn>.

the accumulated global rewards. Cooperative multiagent systems (MAS) have been shown to be a useful paradigm in numerous applications, e.g., the coordination of autonomous vehicles (Cao et al., 2012) and optimizing the productivity of a factory in distributed logistics (Ying & Sang, 2005).

One natural way of addressing cooperative MARL problem is the centralized approach, which views the overall MAS as a whole and solves it as a single-agent learning task. In such settings, existing reinforcement learning (RL) techniques can be leveraged to learn joint optimal policies based on agents joint observations and common rewards (Tan, 1993). However, the centralized approach usually does not scale well, since the joint action space of agents grows exponentially as the increase of the number of agents. Furthermore, centralized approaches may not be applicable in practical settings where only distributed policies can be deployed due to physical observation and communication constraints (Foerster et al., 2018), i.e., each agent can only decide to behave based on its local observations.

To address these above limitations, an alternative technique is to resort to decentralized approaches, in which each agent learns its optimal policy independently based on its local observations and individual rewards. However, in cooperative multiagent environments, all agents receive the same global reward signal. Letting individual agents learn concurrently based on the global reward (aka. independent learners) has been well studied (Tan, 1993) and shown to be difficult in even simple two-agent, single-state stochastic coordination problems. One main reason is that the global reward signal brings the nonstationarity that agents cannot distinguish between the stochasticity of the environment and explorative behaviors of other co-learners (Lowe et al., 2017), and thus may mistakenly update their policies. Therefore, the key to promoting the coordination of agents is to correctly allocate the reward signal for each agent, which is also known as the multiagent credit assignment problem (Chang et al., 2004).

For simple problems, it might be possible to manually design the individual reward function for each agent based on domain knowledge. However, the heuristic design requires manual efforts and is not always applicable in complex cooperative multiagent tasks. It would be desirable if there is any generalized principle or mechanism to generate individ-

ual reward functions in a universal and automatic manner. Foerster et al. (Foerster et al., 2018) proposed a multiagent actor-critic method called counterfactual multiagent (COMA) policy gradients, which uses a counterfactual baseline that marginalizes out a single agents action while keeping the other agents actions fixed to calculate the advantage for agent policies. Sunehag et al. (Sunehag et al., 2018) proposed a value-decomposition network (VDN), which learns to decompose the team value function into agent-wise value functions. However, this work assumes that the joint action-value function for the system can be decomposed into the sum of agents’ value functions only based on local observations. Such an assumption is not applicable for complex systems where agents have complicated relations and the decomposition is not accurate as the global information is not fully utilized. Based on VDN, QMIX relaxes the limitation of the linear relation of global Q-values (Q_{tot}) and the local individual Q-values (Q^i), which enforces a monotonicity constraint on the relationship between Q_{tot} and each Q^i . QMIX employs a network that estimates joint action-values as a complex non-linear combination of per-agent values that condition only on local observations.

However, VDN and QMIX both restrict the relation representation between the individual Q-values and the global Q-value while the individual Q-values are only estimated from local observations. Such a way restricts the accuracy of the individual Q-values and may impede the learning of coordinated policies in complex multiagent scenarios. Recently, QTRAN (Son et al., 2019) is proposed to guarantee optimal decentralization by using linear constraints between individual utilities and Q_{tot} , and avoids the representation limitations introduced by VDN and QMIX. But the constraints on the optimization problem are computationally intractable and practical relaxations lead to unsatisfied performance in complex tasks (Mahajan et al., 2019).

In this paper, we propose a novel Q-value decomposition technique from the perspective of deep learning (DL). Similar to previous works, we set in a centralized learning and decentralized execution paradigm, where agents are trained centrally with shared information while executing in a decentralized manner. Our method employs integrated gradients (Sundararajan et al., 2017) to analyze the contribution of each agent to the global Q-value Q_{tot} , and regards the contribution of each agent as its individual Q^i , which is used as the supervision signal to train each agent’s Q-value function. As we utilize trajectories of RL to implement attribution decomposition, we call this method Q-value Path Decomposition (QPD). Besides, we design a multi-channel critic to generate Q_{tot} by following the individual, group and system concepts progressively based on agents’ joint observations and actions. Lastly, we merge the integrated gradients into RL to decompose Q_{tot} into approximative Q^i with respect to each agent’s local observation and action for precise credit

assignment. We evaluate QPD using the StarCraft II micromangement tasks. Experiments show that QPD learns effective policies in both homogeneous and heterogeneous scenarios with the state-of-the-art performance.

There have seen many related contributions on the setting of the decentralized partially observable Markov decision process (Dec-POMDPs). For the large-scale MAS setting, Duc Thien Nguyen et al., (Nguyen et al., 2017; 2018) study the Collective Dec-POMDPs where agent interactions are dependent on their collective influence on each other rather than their identities. At the same time, Yang et al., (Yang et al., 2018) assume that each agent is affected by its neighbors to reduce the nonstationary phenomenon and derive a mean-field approach. Above two methods are only investigated in the large-scale multiagent settings and satisfy the theoretical support under the large-scale assumption. Another notable direction is the multiagent exploration problem. Mahajan et al., (Mahajan et al., 2019) propose MAVEN to solve it, where value-based agents condition their behaviour on the shared latent variable controlled by a hierarchical policy. Their latent space which controls the exploration of joint behaviours mainly affects on the agent’s individual utility network and is orthogonal to ours.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. We introduce the Dec-POMDPs and integrated gradients in Section 2. Then in Section 3, we explain our QPD framework for deep MARL in details. Next, we validate our methods in the challenging StarCraft II platform in Section 4. Finally, conclusions and future work are provided in Section 5.

2. Background

2.1. Dec-POMDPs

Fully cooperative multiagent tasks can be modeled as Dec-POMDPs (Oliehoek & Amato, 2016). Formally, a Dec-POMDP G is given by a tuple

$$G = \langle S, A, P, r, Z, O, n, \gamma \rangle \tag{1}$$

where $s \in S$ describes the true state of the environment. Dec-POMDPs consider partially observable scenarios in which an observation function $Z(s, i) : S \times N \rightarrow p(O)$, which defines the probability distribution of the observations $o^i \in O^i$ for each agent $i \in N \equiv \{1, \dots, n\}$ draws individually. At each time step, each agent i selects its action $a_i \in A_i$ based on its local observation o_i according to its stochastic policy $\pi_i : O_i \times A_i \rightarrow [0, 1]$. The joint action $\vec{a} \in \vec{A}$ produces the next state according to the state transition function $P : S \times A_1 \times \dots \times A_n \rightarrow S$. All agents share the same reward function $r(s, \vec{a}) : S \times \vec{A} \rightarrow R$. All agents coordinate together to maximize the total expected return $J = E_{a_1 \sim \pi_1, \dots, a_n \sim \pi_n, s \sim P} \sum_{t=0}^T \gamma^t r_t(s, \vec{a})$ where γ is a discount factor and T is the time horizon. Our problem setting

follows the paradigm of centralized training and decentralized execution (Foerster et al., 2018). That is, each agent executes its policy in a distributed manner, since agents may only observe the partial environmental information due to physical limitations (e.g., scope or interferer) and high communication cost in practice. However, each agent’s policy can be trained in a centralized manner (using a simulator with additional global information) to improve the learning efficiency. The global discounted return is $R_t = \sum_{l=0}^{T-t} \gamma^l r_{t+l}$. The agents’ joint policy induces a value function, i.e., an approximation of expectation over R_t , $V^{\vec{\pi}}(s_t) = E_{\vec{a}_t \sim \vec{\pi}, s_{t+1} \sim P} [R_t | s_t]$, and a global action-value $Q^{\vec{\pi}}(s_t, \vec{a}_t) = E_{\vec{a}_{t+1} \sim \vec{\pi}, s_{t+1} \sim P} [R_t | s_t, \vec{a}_t]$ remarked as Q_{tot} .

2.2. Integrated Gradients

A lot of works intend to understand the input-output behavior of the deep network and attribute the prediction of a deep network to its input features (Ancona et al., 2018). The goal of attribution methods is to determine how much influence does each component of input features have in the network output value (Brasó Andilla, 2018).

Definition 1. *Formally, suppose we have a function $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that represents a deep network, and an input $x = (x_1, \dots, x_j, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. \mathbb{R} is the set of real number. F is the function with a d -dimension vector input. An attribution of the prediction at input \vec{x} relative to a baseline input \vec{b} is a vector $A_F(\vec{x}, \vec{b}) = (c_1, \dots, c_j, \dots, c_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where c_j is the contribution value of x_j to the difference between prediction $F(\vec{x})$ and the baseline prediction $F(\vec{b})$.*

The attribution methods are widely studied (Baehrens et al., 2010; Binder et al., 2016; Montavon et al., 2018). As one of them, integrated gradients takes use of path integral to aggregate the gradients along the inputs that fall on the lines between the baseline and the input (Sundararajan et al., 2017), which is inspired by economic cost-sharing literature (Tarshev et al., 2016) with theoretical supports (Hazewinkel, 1990). The integrated gradients explains how much one feature affects the deep network output while changing from $F(\vec{b})$ to $F(\vec{x})$ along a straight line between \vec{x} and \vec{b} . Although integrated gradients uses the straightline, there are many paths that monotonically interpolate between the two points, and each such path will yield a different attribution method depicting the feature changing process. The path integral focuses on the changing process of each variable to perform attribution and has shown impressive performance.

Formally, let $\tau(\alpha) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a smooth path function specifying a path in \mathbb{R}^d from the baseline \vec{b} to the input \vec{x} , i.e., $\tau(0) = \vec{b}$ and $\tau(1) = \vec{x}$. Given a path function τ , path integrated gradients are obtained by integrating gradients along the path $\tau(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Mathematically, path integrated gradients along the j th dimension for input \vec{x} is

defined as follows.

$$c_j = \text{PathIG}_j^{\tau}(\vec{x}) ::= \int_{\alpha=0}^1 \frac{\partial F(\tau(\alpha))}{\partial \tau_j(\alpha)} \frac{\partial \tau_j(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} d\alpha, \quad (2)$$

where $\frac{\partial F(\tau(\alpha))}{\partial \tau_j(\alpha)}$ is the gradient of F along the j th dimension.

Attribution methods based on path integrated gradients are collectively known as path methods. Sundararajan et al., first introduce path integrated gradients to perform attribution for the deep network. Due to the absence of the real feature varying path, they specify the straightline as the path for integration. Using the straightline path $\tau(\alpha) = \vec{b} + \alpha(\vec{x} - \vec{b})$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, the integrated gradients (Sundararajan et al., 2017) to calculate the contribution value c_j along the j th dimension for input \vec{x} is defined as follows.

$$c_j = \text{IG}_j^{\tau}(\vec{x}) ::= (\vec{x}_j - \vec{b}_j) \int_{\alpha=0}^1 \frac{\partial F(\tau(\alpha))}{\partial \tau_j(\alpha)} d\alpha. \quad (3)$$

In the computer vision and natural language processing domains, when applying integrated gradients, the zero embedding vector is usually used as the baseline \vec{b} . Besides, as mentioned above, the straightline is the choice for the path. It seems there are no better path choices for the image models or natural language models as the feature varying process is unknown. The zero-vector baseline and corresponding straightline are not suitable for many real problems as they do not really reflect how features change. For example, in an episode of RL, transition of state and action features happens between every two adjacent steps from time t to T . Such a feature varying process cannot be depicted by the straightline from the starting state to the all-zero vector.

3. QPD for MARL

Here we describe our QPD MARL framework and Figure 1 shows the overall learning framework. First, in Section 3.2, we design a centralized critic which consists of modular channels to extract hidden states for different groups of agents to learn the global Q-value Q_{tot} from agents’ joint observations and actions. Then we leverage integrated gradients techniques on the multiagent multi-channel critic to decompose Q_{tot} into individual Q-values Q^i approximately for each agent in Section 3.1. Such a decomposition process addresses the multiagent credit assignment via the covariation analysis of each agent’s observations and actions along the trajectory path. The decomposed individual value which approximates Q^i is used as the supervision signal to train each agent’s recurrent Q-value network. Finally, we give the algorithm details and training losses in Section 3.3.

3.1. Value Decomposition Through Integrated Gradients

In this section, we apply integrated gradients to assigning credits for each agent on the multi-channel critic by perform-




Figure 1. The overall QPD Framework. The top block is the centralized critic with a multi-channel modular design. The middle block is applying the Q-value path decomposition technique to achieve credit assignments on the agent level. The Q_{tot} is decomposed into the supervision signals for Q^i . The bottom block shows the network architecture of the agent policies, which are implemented by the recurrent deep Q-network.

ing attribution on each own states and actions with respect to the output Q_{tot} . As DRL employs deep neural networks to approximate the global Q_{tot} , we could utilize the attribution tools in DL combined with concepts in RL to extract the contribution of specified sets of features from different agents to the predicted Q-value. To this end, in this paper, we propose a new multiagent credit assignment approach which utilizes integrated gradients on the state-action trajectory.

As mentioned above, in DL, it is usually unknown how features change from input to baseline. Thus, the straightline becomes the path choice for using integrated gradients in DL. However, in RL, a natural path luckily exists, which is the trajectory of state-action transitions in each episode and records how the state-action features change. As the trajectory path depicts the real feature varying process, we could achieve an accurate attribution. Using integrated gradients on the trajectory, we perform the global Q-value decomposition by attributing the global Q-value prediction to its input features. Applying integrated gradients into RL was first studied in RUDDER (Arjona-Medina et al., 2018) to ad-

dress the sparse delayed reward problem in single-agent RL and has shown excellent performance. However, one weakness of their approach is that they regard the zero vector as the baseline for all states, which ignores real state-action transitions. Another limitation is that they do not use the trajectory but the straightline between current states and the zero vector as the path when applying integrated gradients, thus making the decomposition inaccurate. Different from RUDDER, we utilize the basic trajectory concept in RL to avoid above issues and then use integrated gradients to naturally conduct multiagent credit assignment.

Now we introduce how to use the path integrated gradients on trajectories to decompose Q_{tot} into approximative individual Q^i . The key to path integrated gradients is to find the correct changing path of each agent’s state-action features. As we analyzed previously, such a path could be depicted by the state-action transition trajectory in an RL environment, which captures the state-action feature transformation process from the start state to the termination state. Besides, with the trajectory as the path, we can naturally use the termination state s_T as baseline where $Q(s_T, \emptyset) = 0$. \emptyset means no action is further taken at the termination state. After specifying both the integration path and baseline, we employ integrated gradients on the trajectory path to decompose the critic’s prediction Q_{tot} to each agent’s local observations and actions to implement the credit assignment. Formally, using joint observations \vec{o} to represent the global state s , we have Equation 4 and the proof is provided in Theorem 1.

$$Q_{tot}(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t) = \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_1} PathIG_j^{\tau_t^T}(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t) + \dots + \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_n} PathIG_j^{\tau_t^T}(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t). \quad (4)$$

where τ_t^T is the trajectory path from time t to T , and every two adjacent joint observations and actions are connected by straightlines. \mathbb{X}_i is the set of agent i ’s observation features and action dimensions. By decomposing the global Q-value following the real trajectory path, we get each agent’s individual contribution to Q_{tot} based on its own observation and action. Because the attribution reveals how much each agent’s own observation and action contributes to Q_{tot} by following the real trajectory path, we regard the attribution value $\sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_i} PathIG_j^{\tau_t^T}(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t)$ of agent i ’s observation-action features as its approximative individual Q-value $Q^i(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t)$.

$$Q^i(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t) \approx \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_i} PathIG_j^{\tau_t^T}(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t). \quad (5)$$

Then the next question is how to compute $\sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_i} PathIG_j^{\tau_t^T}(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t)$. As paths between every two adjacent joint observations and actions are straightlines in the path τ_t^T , we can directly apply integrated gradients on the line between every adjacent joint observations and

actions from $(\vec{o}_{t+1}, \vec{a}_{t+1})$ to (\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t) as shown in Equation 6.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_i} \text{PathIG}_j^{\tau_j^T}(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t) = \\ \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_i} \text{IG}_j^{\tau_j^{t+1}}(\vec{o}, \vec{a}) + \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_i} \text{IG}_j^{\tau_j^{t+2}}(\vec{o}, \vec{a}) + \dots + \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_i} \text{IG}_j^{\tau_j^T}(\vec{o}, \vec{a}). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Using integrated gradients to decompose Q_{tot} makes the most of the available global information while previous works such as VDN and QMIX compute individual Q^i from agents' local observations and actions and limit the accuracy of Q^i . Next, in Theorem 1, we prove that decomposing global Q_{tot} through the trajectory satisfies the additive property across agents, which realizes an intact decomposition. Before proof, we introduce one important property of integrated gradients that the attributions add up to the difference between function F 's outputs at the input \vec{x} and baseline \vec{b} , which will be used in proving Theorem 1.

Proposition 1. *If $F : \mathbb{R}^d \leftarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable almost everywhere, then*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{|\vec{x}|} \text{IG}_j^{\tau_j}(\vec{x}) = F(\vec{x}) - F(\vec{b}), \quad (7)$$

where j is the feature index and $|\vec{x}|$ gives the number of features. τ represents the straight path between \vec{x} and \vec{b} . Deep networks built out of Sigmoids, Relus, and pooling operators satisfy the differentiable condition. Using Equation 7 and the definition of PathIG and IG in Equation 2 and 3, we could decompose the Q_{tot} completely to individual contributions through the trajectory path.

Theorem 1. *Let τ_j^T represents the joint observation and action trajectory from step t to the termination step T , then*

$$Q_{tot}(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_i} \text{PathIG}_j^{\tau_j^T}(\vec{o}, \vec{a}). \quad (8)$$

Proof. Let \vec{x}_t represents the feature vector (\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t) concisely. τ_j^T is composed of $(\tau_j^{t+1}, \tau_j^{t+2}, \dots, \tau_j^T)$, where τ_j^{t+1} is the straightline path from (\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t) to $(\vec{o}_{t+1}, \vec{a}_{t+1})$.

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{tot}(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t) &= Q_{tot}(\vec{x}_t) = Q_{tot}(\vec{x}_t) - Q_{tot}(\vec{x}_T) = Q_{tot}(\vec{x}_t) - Q_{tot}(\vec{x}_{t+1}) \\ &\quad + Q_{tot}(\vec{x}_{t+1}) - Q_{tot}(\vec{x}_{t+2}) + \dots + Q_{tot}(\vec{x}_{T-1}) - Q_{tot}(\vec{x}_T) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{|\vec{x}_t|} \text{IG}_j^{\tau_j^{t+1}}(\vec{x}) + \sum_{j=1}^{|\vec{x}_t|} \text{IG}_j^{\tau_j^{t+2}}(\vec{x}) + \dots + \sum_{j=1}^{|\vec{x}_t|} \text{IG}_j^{\tau_j^T}(\vec{x}) \\ &= \text{PathIG}_{j=1}^{\tau_j^T}(\vec{x}) + \text{PathIG}_{j=2}^{\tau_j^T}(\vec{x}) + \dots + \text{PathIG}_{j=|\vec{x}_t|}^{\tau_j^T}(\vec{x}) \\ &= \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_1} \text{PathIG}_j^{\tau_j^T}(\vec{x}) + \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_2} \text{PathIG}_j^{\tau_j^T}(\vec{x}) + \dots + \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_n} \text{PathIG}_j^{\tau_j^T}(\vec{x}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_i} \text{PathIG}_j^{\tau_j^T}(\vec{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_i} \text{PathIG}_j^{\tau_j^T}(\vec{o}, \vec{a}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Line 4 to line 6 in the proof shows that, as we apply integrated gradients at every adjacent joint state and actions along the trajectory, we aggregate each agent's features' attribution into the contribution of each agent for the global Q-values. Finally, we conclude that integrated gradients on the trajectory path attributes the global Q-value to each agent's feature changes and the decomposition is intact. From the angle of the path integrated gradients, we here find the right feature varying process in RL and then follow the trajectory path to decompose Q_{tot} to individual Q-values on account of each agent's observation and action features.

3.2. Multi-channel Critic




Figure 2. Multi-channel Critic.

In realistic MAS, there may exist heterogeneous agents of different kinds. The space of agents' joint states and actions is very large in such systems, causing the learning of the global Q-value extremely hard. Although agents in MAS are unique, they can also be categorized into different groups according to their feature attributions and personal profile. This fact enlightens us on using sub-network channels to extract information with one channel for one agent group. From bottom to top, agents can be first classified as several kinds of groups and then summarized as a unified system. Based on such a MAS abstraction, we design the multi-channel network structure as illustrated in Figure 2 to collect the hidden states from each agent's decentralized observations and actions instead of simply using full-connected layers. At the same time, as there may exist homogeneous agents of the same kind group, we use parameter sharing for homogeneous agents. This technique is adopted widely in many complicated environments and challenging tasks (Yang et al., 2018; Iqbal & Sha, 2018) and could effectively reduce the network parameters and accelerate learning.

The structure of the critic includes three components: indi-

Algorithm 1 Q-value Path Decomposition algorithm

Initialize: Critic network θ^c , target critic $\tilde{\theta}^c$ and agents' Q-value networks $\theta^\pi = (\theta^1, \dots, \theta^n)$

- 1: **for** each training episode e **do**
- 2: $s_0 =$ initial state, $t = 0$, $h_0^i = 0$ for each agent i .
- 3: **while** $s_t \neq$ terminal **and** $t < T$ **do**
- 4: $t = t + 1$.
- 5: **for** each agent i **do**
- 6: $Q^i(o_{t,i}, \cdot), h_t^i = \text{DRQN}(o_{t,i}, h_{t-1}^i; \theta^i)$.
- 7: Sample $a_{t,i}$ from $\pi_i(Q^i(o_{t,i}, \cdot), \varepsilon(e))$.
- 8: **end for**
- 9: execute the joint actions $(a_{t,1}, a_{t,2}, \dots, a_{t,n})$.
- 10: receive the reward r_t and next state s_{t+1} .
- 11: **end while**
- 12: Add episode to buffer and sample a batch of episodes.
- 13: **for** e in batch **do**
- 14: **for** $t = 1$ to T **do**
- 15: Calculate targets y_t using $\tilde{\theta}^c$.
- 16: **end for**
- 17: **end for**
- 18: Update critic parameters θ^c with loss $\mathcal{L}(\theta^c)$.
- 19: Every C episodes reset $\tilde{\theta}^c = \theta^c$.
- 20: **for** e in batch **do**
- 21: **for** $t = 1$ to T **do**
- 22: Unroll LSTM using states, actions and rewards.
- 23: Using the Integrated Gradients along with the trajectory e to decompose Q_{tot} at time t into $\tilde{Q}_t^i = \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_t} \text{PathIG}_{x_j}^\tau(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t)$ for each agent i .
- 24: **end for**
- 25: **end for**
- 26: Update θ^π with loss $\mathcal{L}(\theta^i)$ for each agent i .
- 27: **end for**

vidual feature extraction process, group feature extraction process and the system's global Q-value calculation process. We first use the individual feature extracting modules to extract embeddings for agents with one channel responding to one agent group. Next, the group feature merging operation combines the embeddings from the same group and then concatenates them into system features. The merging operation could be either concatenation or addition. Finally, the high-level system features are used to calculate system's Q-values. Following the multi-channel structure, we implicitly represent MAS from decentralized agents to a centralized system. Such a modular critic structure provides a succinct representation of the multiagent Q-value while the number of network parameters can be significantly reduced as well.

3.3. Algorithm and Training Process

The algorithm details are shown in Algorithm 1. Line 2-10 shows that the decentralized agents interact with the environment. Next, Line 13-19 update the critic and target

critic networks. The centralized critic Q_{tot} is trained to minimize the loss $\mathcal{L}(\theta^c)$ as defined in Equation 9.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\theta^c) &= E_{\vec{o}, \vec{a}, r, \vec{o}'} [(Q_{tot}^{\theta^c}(o_1, \dots, o_n, a_1, \dots, a_n) - y)^2], \\ y &= r + \gamma(Q_{tot}^{\tilde{\theta}^c}(o'_1, \dots, o'_n, a'_1, \dots, a'_n)), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where θ^c is the critic parameters and $\tilde{\theta}^c$ is the target critic parameters, which are reset every C episode. Agent i 's network parameters are remarked as θ^i . At last, Line 20-26 update each agent's individual Q-value network using the decomposed \tilde{Q}^i as the target label for each agent i . The loss of agent i 's Q-value network is defined as Equation 10.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\theta^i) &= E_{\vec{o}, \vec{a}, r, \vec{o}'} [(Q^{i, \theta^i}(o_i, a_i) - \tilde{Q}^i)^2], \\ \tilde{Q}^i &= \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{X}_i} \text{PathIG}_j^\tau(\vec{o}, \vec{a}). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Notably, for each training, we sample a batch of complete trajectories in the replay buffer for updating. The agent network in the realistic implement is a Recurrent Deep Q-Network (RDQN), which is the basic DQN augmented with the LSTM units. Besides, the exploration policy is ε -greedy with $\varepsilon(e)$ being the exploration rate as Equation 11.

$$\varepsilon(e) = \max(\varepsilon_{init} - e * \delta, 0), \quad (11)$$

where e is the episode number. ε_{init} is the start exploration rate and δ gives the decreasing amount of ε at each episode.

4. Experiment and Analysis

4.1. Experimental Setup

In this section, we describe the StarCraft II decentralized micromanagement problems, in which each of the learning agents controls an individual allied army unit. The enemy units are controlled by a built-in StarCraft II AI, which makes use of handcrafted heuristics. The difficulty of the game AI is set to the "very difficult" level. At the beginning of each episode, the enemy units are going to attack the allies. Proper micromanagement of units during battles are needed to maximize the damage to enemy units while minimizing damage received, hence requires a range of skills such as focus fire and avoid overkill. Learning these diverse cooperative behaviors under partial observation is a challenging task, which has become a common-used benchmark for evaluating state-of-the-art MARL approaches such as COMA (Foerster et al., 2018), QMIX (Rashid et al., 2018) and QTRAN (Son et al., 2019). We use StarCraft Multi-Agent Challenge (SMAC) environment (Samvelyan et al., 2019) as our testbed. More setup details are in the Appendix.

4.1.1. NETWORK AND TRAINING CONFIGURATIONS

The architecture of agent Q-networks is a DRQN with an LSTM layer with a 64-dimensional hidden state, with a fully-connected layer after, and finally a fully-connected layer

with $|A|$ outputs. The input for agent networks is the sequential data which consists of the agent’s local observation in recent 12 time steps for all scenarios. The architecture of the QPD critic is a feedforward neural network with the first two dense layers having 64 units for each channel, and then being concatenated or added in each group, and next being concatenated to the output layer of one unit. We set γ at 0.99. To speed up learning, we share the parameters across all individual Q-networks and a one-hot encoding of the agent type is concatenated onto each agents observations to allow the learning of diverse behaviors. All agent networks are trained using RMSprop with a learning rate of 5×10^{-4} and the critic is trained with Adam with the same learning rate. Replay buffer contains the most recent 1000 trajectories and the batch size is 32. Target networks for the global critic are updated after every 200 training episodes.

4.1.2. DECOMPOSITION PATH SETTINGS

For the Q-value decomposition process, integrated gradients can be efficiently approximated via a summation at points occurring at sufficiently small intervals along the trajectory path over each pair of consecutive state-action transitions (\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t) and $(\vec{o}_{t+1}, \vec{a}_{t+1})$. Then the gradient integral path is obtained by repeatedly interpolating between every two adjacent states from the current state to the terminated state. With m being the number of steps in the Riemman approximation and \vec{x}_t being (\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t) for simplification, we calculate the integrated gradients for every two adjacent states as:

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{IG}_j^{q_t+1}(\vec{o}_t, \vec{a}_t) &= \widetilde{IG}_j^{q_t+1}(\vec{x}_t) ::= \\ (\vec{x}_{t,j} - \vec{x}_{t+1,j}) &\times \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{\partial F(\vec{x}_{t+1} + \frac{k}{m} \times (\vec{x}_t - \vec{x}_{t+1}))}{\partial (\vec{x}_{t+1} + \frac{k}{m} \times (\vec{x}_t - \vec{x}_{t+1}))} \times \frac{1}{m}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Although larger m could obtain more accurate decomposition, due to the trade-off of high qualified performance and limited computation time and resources, we set m at 5 after experimental study but it has exhibited impressive performance, which could be referred in Section 4.3.2.

4.2. Results

To validate QPD, we evaluate it on both homogeneous and heterogeneous scenarios. To encourage exploration, we use ϵ -greedy which anneals from 1 to 0 at the first 2000 episodes. We test our method at every 100 training episodes on 100 testing episodes with exploratory behaviors disabled. The main evaluation metric is the win percentage of evaluation episodes over the course of training (Samvelyan et al., 2019). The results include the median performance as well as the 25-75% percentiles recommended in (Samvelyan et al., 2019) to avoid the effect of any outliers. Another metric, the mean win rate over all runs, is also reported. All experiments are conducted across 12 independent runs and QPD’s learning curves on all maps are shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3. QPD’s median win percentage of different map scenarios. 25%-75% percentile is shaded.

All maps are of the different agent number or different types. Both sides in Map 3m have 3 Marines while in Map 8m have 8 Marines. In Map 2s3z, both sides have 2 Stalkers and 3 Zealots. For Map 3s5z, both sides have 3 Stalkers and 5 Zealots. Map 1c3s5z, both sides have an extra Colossus compared with Map 3s5z. In map 3s5z_vs_3s6z, ally has 3 Stalkers and 5 Zealots while enemy has 3 Stalkers and 6 Zealots. To compare QPD with existing MARL methods, we use results from SMAC (Samvelyan et al., 2019) because methods in their report show higher performance than the original works (Rashid et al., 2018; Foerster et al., 2018) and our implementation. We also compare with QTRAN. Table 1 shows the evaluation metric results, where \tilde{m} is the median win percentage and \bar{m} is the mean win percentage.

Table 1. Median and mean performance of the test win percentage.

Map	IQL		COMA		QMIX		QTRAN		QPD	
	\tilde{m}	\bar{m}								
3m	100	97	91	92	100	99	100	100	95	92
8m	91	90	95	94	100	96	100	97	94	93
2s3z	39	42	66	64	100	97	77	80	95	94
3s5z	0	3	0	0	16	25	0	4	85	81
1c3s5z	7	8	30	30	89	89	31	33	92	92
3s5z_vs_3s6z	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10

We could see that QPD’s performance is competitive with QMIX in three simple scenarios, 3m, 8m, 2s3z and 1c3s5z. More importantly, in the more difficult 3s5z where all ex-

isting methods perform poorly, QPD achieves superior performance much better than others. Furthermore, in a super hard scenarios 3s5z_vs_3s6z, QPD also beats other methods, where all other methods fail completely. To understand the rationale behind the results, we analyze the learned behaviors of agents. In 3m, agents learn the micro focus fire for beating enemies. Furthermore, in 8m, agents learn to stand into a line to shoot the enemy while avoiding overkill. In the heterogeneous 2s3z and 1c3s5z, both QMIX and QPD could solve it. Our method successfully learned to intercept the enemy Zealots with allied Zealots to protect the allied Stalkers from severe damage. However, in 3s5z, the learned policy of QPD is quite different from 2s3s: allied Zealots go around the enemy Zealots to attack the enemy Stalkers first and then attack the enemy Zealots with the allied Stalkers on both sides. Such a highly coordinated policy cannot be learned by QMIX (Samvelyan et al., 2019). In 3s5z_vs_3s6z, Zealots need to hold enemy’s Zealots to protect ally’s Stalkers and attack enemy’s Stalkers at the same time. Such a behaviour is learned only by QPD which starts to win. Overall, QPD learns excellent decentralized policies comparable to the state-of-the-art MARL methods in both homogeneous and heterogeneous scenarios and outperforms QMIX and QTRAN in more complicated settings.

4.3. Ablation

4.3.1. MULTI-CHANNEL CRITIC EVALUATION

Using a modular network structure in the centralized critic is common in MARL algorithms and could effectively improve the performance (Iqbal & Sha, 2018; Liu et al., 2019). We also test the naive critic with several fully-connected dense layers, but we found this structure is with a high variance and its performance is lower than the modular ones. The reason is that the number of features fed into the critic is up to hundreds and increases quadratically with the number of agents, which causes a huge challenge for the naive network to learn effective hidden states from these features. Thus, we omit the naive critic’s results. One main difference with previous modular critic methods is that, we explicitly consider the heterogeneous multiagent setting. We use different channels for different kinds of agents. Furthermore, we choose the concatenation operation as the way of the hidden features integration from each channel. We show this design could slightly improve the performance of QPD. The reason behind this phenomenon is clear. The multi-channel and concatenation operation own the greater representation ability to keep track of the feature influence of each agent of each kind in the multiagent Q-value prediction process.

4.3.2. DECOMPOSITION STEP

As the integrated gradients is the core of QPD, it is critical and interesting to study the decomposition step’s impact on




Figure 4. Median win percentage of 12 runs for critic ablation.




Figure 5. Median win percentage of 12 runs for decomposing steps.

the performance. Between each adjacent joint state-action pairs, we set the decomposition step of 1, 2, 5, 10 and 25 for studying. Results are presented in Figure 5. As we can see, the decomposition step affects the performance a lot. When the decomposition steps is low, the decomposition is not accurate enough to assign credits for agents, thus making the training unstable and win rate low. But when the decomposition step increases, the more accurate decomposed individual Q-values could update the policies more accurately. Especially, QPD is capable of the setting of moderate decomposition step number, where step of 5 could reach a comparable performance level of step 10 and 25. It means that QPD does not require lots of computation resources for decomposing to reach a high performance.

5. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we propose QPD to solve the multiagent credit assignment problem in Dec-POMDP settings. Different from previous methods, we propose the trajectory-based integrated gradients attribution method to achieve effective Q-value decomposition at the agent level. Experiments on the challenging StarCraft II micromanagement tasks show that QPD learns well coordinated policies on various scenarios and reaches the state-of-the-art performance.

For the future work, better configurations of the path integrated gradients should be investigated to help attribution such as alternative choices of interpolation methods. Also, policy gradient methods combined with the path integrated gradients is expected to leverage better coordination.

References

- Ancona, M., Ceolini, E., ztireli, C., and Gross, M. Towards better understanding of gradient-based attribution methods for deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Arjona-Medina, J. A., Gillhofer, M., Widrich, M., Unterthiner, T., and Hochreiter, S. RUDDER: Return decomposition for delayed rewards. *arXiv preprint*, abs/1806.07857, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1806.07857>.
- Baehrens, D., Schroeter, T., Harmeling, S., Kawanabe, M., Hansen, K., and Müller, K.-R. How to explain individual classification decisions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:1803–1831, 2010.
- Binder, A., Montavon, G., Lapuschkin, S., Müller, K.-R., and Samek, W. Layer-wise relevance propagation for neural networks with local renormalization layers. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, pp. 63–71, 2016.
- Brasó Andilla, G. Attribution methods for deep convolutional networks. 2018.
- Busoniu, L., Babuska, R., and De Schutter, B. A comprehensive survey of multiagent reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 38(2): 156–172, 2008.
- Cao, Y., Yu, W., Ren, W., and Chen, G. An overview of recent progress in the study of distributed multi-agent coordination. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 9(1):427–438, 2012.
- Chang, Y.-H., Ho, T., and Kaelbling, L. P. All learning is local: Multi-agent learning in global reward games. In *Proceedings of the 17th Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 807–814, 2004.
- Foerster, J. N., Farquhar, G., Afouras, T., Nardelli, N., and Whiteson, S. Counterfactual multi-agent policy gradients. In *Proceedings of the 32nd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- Gupta, J. K., Egorov, M., and Kochenderfer, M. Cooperative multi-agent control using deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, pp. 66–83, 2017.
- Hazewinkel, M. (ed.). *Encyclopaedia of Mathematics*, volume Integral over trajectories. Springer Netherlands, 1990.
- Iqbal, S. and Sha, F. Actor-Attention-Critic for Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *arXiv preprint*, volume abs/1810.02912, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.02912>.
- Liu, I.-J., Yeh, R. A., and Schwing, A. G. PIC: Permutation Invariant Critic for Multi-Agent Deep Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Conference on Robot Learning*, 2019.
- Lowe, R., WU, Y., Tamar, A., Harb, J., Pieter Abbeel, O., and Mordatch, I. Multi-agent actor-critic for mixed cooperative-competitive environments. In *Proceedings of the 31st Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 6379–6390, 2017.
- Mahajan, A., Rashid, T., Samvelyan, M., and Whiteson, S. MAVEN: Multi-Agent Variational Exploration. In Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Beygelzimer, A., Alch-Buc, F. d., Fox, E., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 7611–7622. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- Montavon, G., Samek, W., and Müller, K.-R. Methods for interpreting and understanding deep neural networks. *Digital Signal Processing*, 73:1–15, 2018.
- Nguyen, D. T., Kumar, A., and Lau, H. C. Policy Gradient With Value Function Approximation For Collective Multiagent Planning. In Guyon, I., Luxburg, U. V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 30th Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 4319–4329. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- Nguyen, D. T., Kumar, A., and Lau, H. C. Credit Assignment For Collective Multiagent RL With Global Rewards. In Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Grauman, K., Cesa-Bianchi, N., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 31st Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 8113–8124. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- Oliehoek, F. A. and Amato, C. *A Concise Introduction to Decentralized POMDPs*. SpringerBriefs in Intelligent Systems. Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- Palmer, G., Tuyls, K., Bloembergen, D., and Savani, R. Lenient multi-agent deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, pp. 443–451, 2018.
- Rashid, T., Samvelyan, M., Witt, C. S. d., Farquhar, G., Foerster, J. N., and Whiteson, S. QMIX: Monotonic value function factorisation for deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4292–4301, 2018.

- Samvelyan, M., Rashid, T., Schroeder de Witt, C., Farquhar, G., Nardelli, N., Rudner, T. G. J., Hung, C.-M., Torr, P. H. S., Foerster, J., and Whiteson, S. The starcraft multi-agent challenge. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, pp. 2186–2188, Richland, SC, 2019.
- Son, K., Kim, D., Kang, W. J., Hostallero, D. E., and Yi, Y. QTRAN: Learning to Factorize with Transformation for Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 5887–5896, Long Beach, California, USA, 2019. PMLR.
- Sundararajan, M., Taly, A., and Yan, Q. Axiomatic attribution for deep networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70, pp. 3319–3328, 2017.
- Sunehag, P., Lever, G., Gruslys, A., Czarnecki, W. M., Zambaldi, V., Jaderberg, M., Lanctot, M., Sonnerat, N., Leibo, J. Z., Tuyls, K., and Graepel, T. Value-decomposition networks for cooperative multi-agent learning based on team reward. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, pp. 2085–2087, 2018.
- Tan, M. Multi-agent reinforcement learning: Independent vs. cooperative agents. In *In Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 330–337. Morgan Kaufmann, 1993.
- Tarashev, N., Tsatsaronis, K., and Borio, C. Risk attribution using the shapley value: Methodology and policy applications. *Review of Finance*, 20(3):1189–1213, 2016.
- Yang, Y., Luo, R., Li, M., Zhou, M., Zhang, W., and Wang, J. Mean field multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80, pp. 5567–5576, 2018.
- Ying, W. and Sang, D. Multi-agent framework for third party logistics in e-commerce. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 29(2):431–436, 2005.

Appendices

A. Environment Settings

A.1. States and Observations

We mainly follow the settings of SMAC (Samvelyan et al., 2019). At each time step, agents receive local observations within their field of view. This encompasses information about the map within a circular area around each unit with a radius equal to the sight range. The sight range makes the environment partially observable for each agent. An agent can only observe other agents if they are both alive and located within its sight range. Hence, there is no way for agents to distinguish whether their teammates are far away or dead. The feature vector observed by each agent contains the following attributes for both allied and enemy units within the sight range: distance, relative x, relative y, health, shield, and unit type. All Protos units have shields, which serve as a source of protection to offset damage and can regenerate if no new damage is received. The global state is composed of the joint observations but removing the restriction of sight range, which could be obtained during training in the simulations. All features, both in the global state and in individual observations of agents, are normalized by their maximum values.

A.2. Action Space

We follow the settings of SMAC (Samvelyan et al., 2019). The discrete set of actions which agents are allowed to take consists of move[direction], attack[enemy id], stop and no-op. Dead agents can only take no-op action while live agents cannot. Agents can only move with a fixed movement amount 2 in four directions: north, south, east, or west. To ensure decentralization of the task, agents are restricted to use the attack[enemy id] action only towards enemies in their shooting range. This additionally constrains the ability of the units to use the built-in attack-move macro-actions on the enemies that are far away. The shooting range is set to be 6 for all agents. Having a larger sight range than a shooting range allows agents to make use of the move commands before starting to fire. The unit behavior of automatically responding to enemy fire without being explicitly ordered is also disabled.

A.3. Rewards

We follow the settings of SMAC (Samvelyan et al., 2019). At each time step, the agents receive a joint reward equal to the total damage dealt on the enemy units. In addition, agents receive a bonus of 10 points after killing each opponent, and 200 points after killing all opponents for winning the battle. The rewards are scaled so that the maximum

cumulative reward achievable in each scenario is around 20.

B. Hyper-parameters

The hyper-parameters of QPD are shown in Table 2, including training configurations and network configurations. More details could be referred in the provided source codes. Specially, the total training episode number for the 3s5z_vs_3s6z is 50000 while all other maps' total training episode number is 20000 as shown in the table. The architectures of agents' RDQN network and QPD's critic network are the same as shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2 respectively.

Table 2. Hyper-parameters of QPD.

Setting	Name	Value
Training configurations	Replay buffer size	1000 episodes
	Batch size	32 episodes
	Total training episodes	20000
	Exploration episodes	2000
	Start exploration rate	1.0
	End exploration rate	0.0
	Agent input length	12 steps
	Gamma	0.99
	Target update interval	200 episodes
	Parallel environment	8
	Training interval	100 episodes
	Testing battle number	100 episodes
Decomposition step	5	
Network configurations	Agent learning rate	0.0005
	Critic learning rate	0.0005
	Agent RDQN optimizer	RMSProp
	Critic optimizer	Adam
	Channel dense unit	64
	LSTM unit	64
	Clipping global norm	5