
Efficient Reinforcement Learning for Global Decision Making in the Presence of Local Agents at Scale

Emile Anand*

California Institute of Technology
 Computing and Mathematical Sciences
 Pasadena, CA, 91125
 eanand@caltech.edu

Guannan Qu

Carnegie Mellon University
 Electrical and Computer Engineering,
 Pittsburgh, PA, 15213,
 gqu@andrew.cmu.edu

Abstract

We study reinforcement learning for global decision-making in the presence of many local agents, where the global decision-maker makes decisions affecting all local agents, and the objective is to learn a policy that maximizes the rewards of both the global and the local agents. Such problems find many applications, e.g. demand response, EV charging, queueing, etc. In this setting, scalability has been a long-standing challenge due to the size of the state/action space which can be exponential in the number of agents. This work proposes the SUB-SAMPLE-Q algorithm where the global agent subsamples $k \leq n$ local agents to compute an optimal policy in time that is only exponential in k , providing an exponential speedup from standard methods that are exponential in n . We show that the learned policy converges to the optimal policy in the order of $\tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{k} + \epsilon_{k,m})$ as the number of sub-sampled agents k increases, where $\epsilon_{k,m}$ is the Bellman noise, by proving a novel generalization of the Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz inequality to the regime of sampling without replacement. We also conduct numerical simulations in a demand-response setting and a queueing setting.

1 Introduction

Global decision-making for local agents, where a global agent makes decisions that affect a large number of local agents, is a classical problem that has been widely studied in many forms [1–3] and can be found in many applications, e.g. network optimization, power management, and electric vehicle charging [4–8]. However, a critical challenge is the uncertain nature of the underlying system, which can be very hard to model precisely. Reinforcement Learning (RL) has seen an impressive performance in a wide array of applications, such as the game of Go [9], autonomous driving [10], and robotics [11]. More recently, RL has emerged as a powerful tool for learning to control unknown systems [12–15], and hence has great potential for decision-making for multi-agent systems, including the problem of global decision making for local agents.

However, RL for multi-agent systems, where the number of agents increases, is intractable due to the curse of dimensionality [16]. Specifically, even if the individual agents’ state space is small, the global state space can take values from a set of size exponentially large in the number of agents. For example, RL algorithms such as tabular Q -learning and temporal difference (TD) learning require storing a Q -function [17, 18] that is as large as the state-action space. Unfortunately, the state-action space is exponentially large in the number of agents. In the case where the system’s rewards are not discounted, reinforcement learning on multi-agent systems is provably NP-hard [19, 20], and this problem of scalability has been observed in a variety of settings [21, 22]. A promising line of research

*Work done while a research assistant at Carnegie Mellon University

that has emerged over recent years constrains the problem to a networked instance to enforce local interactions between agents [19, 23–28]. This has led to scalable algorithms where each agent only needs to consider the agents in its neighborhood to derive approximately optimal solutions. However, these results do not apply to our setting which can be viewed as a star graph, where the neighborhood of the central decision-making agent is large.

Beyond the networked formulation, another line of work addressing the intractability is mean-field RL [29, 30]. The mean-field RL approach assumes that all the agents are homogeneous in their state and action spaces, which allows the interactions between agents to be approximated by a representative “mean” agent. This efficiently approximates the optimal policy where the approximation error decays with the number of agents [28, 31]. However, mean-field RL does not apply to our setting as the global decision-making agent is heterogeneous to the local agents. Therefore, this motivates the following fundamental question: *Can we design an efficient and approximately optimal policy-learning algorithm for a global decision-making agent in a system with many local agents?* In this paper, we answer the question in the affirmative. Our key contributions are outlined below.

Contributions. We propose an efficient and scalable algorithm SUB-SAMPLE-Q for making global decisions for controlling a large number of pseudo-heterogeneous local agents. We first model the problem as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) with a global decision-making agent and n local agents. Then, we propose SUB-SAMPLE-Q (Algorithms 1 and 2) to learn and deploy an approximately optimal policy $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ where $k \leq n$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ are tunable parameters.

Our algorithm learns $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ by performing value iteration on a subset of k local agents to learn $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$, which can be viewed as a smaller Q function, in complexity exponential in k instead of n . It then chooses k uniformly random samples of the local agents’ states to find an action for the global agent using $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$. Our theoretical result in Theorem 3.2 shows that the performance gap between policies $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ and π^* is $O(1/\sqrt{k} + \epsilon_{k,m})$, where $\epsilon_{k,m}$ is the Bellman noise in $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$. The choice of k reveals a fundamental trade-off between the complexity of the Q -table to be stored and the optimality of $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$.

The key technical contribution underlying our results is Theorem C.5 which is a generalization of the Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz (DKW) concentration inequality [32] to bound the rate of convergence of an empirical distribution of a population to its true distribution when the random variables are sampled *without* replacement from a finite population. We then apply this result to our global decision-making problem by studying the rate of decay of the objective function between our approximated policy $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ and the optimal policy π^* (Theorem 3.2).

Finally, to demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach, we illustrate its performance in a power system demand-response problem in Example 2.3, and in a queueing problem in Example 2.4. One key inspiration of our approach is the power-of-two-choices in the queueing theory literature [5, 33, 34], where a dispatcher subsamples two queues to make decisions. In this regard, our work can be viewed as a generalization of this idea in a broader decision-making problem.

Related Work. This paper relates to two major lines of work which we describe below.

Multi-agent RL (MARL). MARL has a rich history starting with early works on Markov games used to characterize the decision-making process [35, 36], which can be regarded as a multi-agent extension to the Markov Decision Process (MDP). MARL has since been actively studied [37] in a broad range of settings, such as cooperative and competitive agents. MARL is most similar to the category of “succinctly described” MDPs [18, 20, 21] where the state/action space is a product space formed by the individual state/action spaces of multiple agents, and where the agents interact to maximize an objective function. Our work is similar to MARL since it shares the curse of dimensionality.

A line of celebrated works [23–27, 38] constrain the problem to networked instances to enforce local agent interactions and find policies that maximize the objective function which is the expected cumulative discounted reward. By exploiting Gamarnik’s spatial exponential decay property from combinatorial optimization [39], they overcome the curse of dimensionality by truncating the problem to only searching over the policy space derived from the local neighborhood of agents that are almost κ away from each other to find an $O(\rho^{\kappa+1})$ approximation of the maximized objective function for $\rho \in (0, 1)$. However, since their algorithms have a complexity that is exponential in the size of the neighborhood, they are only tractable for sparse graphs. Therefore, these algorithms do not apply to our decision-making problem which can be viewed as a dense star graph (see Appendix A). The recently popular work on V-learning [40] reduces the dependence of the product action space to an

additive dependence. However, since our work focuses on the action of the global decision-maker, the complexity in the action space is already minimal. Instead, our work focuses on reducing the complexity of the joint state space which has not been generally accomplished for dense networks.

Mean-Field RL. Under the assumption of homogeneity in the state and action spaces of all the agents, the problem of densely networked multi-agent RL was recently answered in [29–31, 41] which approximates the learning problem with a mean-field control approach where the approximation error scales in $O(1/\sqrt{N})$. To overcome the problem of designing algorithms on probability measure spaces, they study MARL under Pareto optimality and use the (functional) strong law of large numbers to consider a lifted state/action space [42] with a representative agent where the rewards and dynamics of the system are aggregated. See [43] for an excellent survey on mean-field games. A more recent work [28] considers a setting with k classes of homogeneous agents, but their mean-field analytic approach does not converge to the optimal solution in this problem when we introduce a global decision-making agent. Additionally, these works require Lipschitz continuity assumptions on the reward functions which we can relax in this work.

Some recent works [44–46] introduce heterogeneity to the mean-field approach using graphon mean-field games [47]; however, there is a loss in topological information when using graphons to approximate finite graphs, as graphons correspond to infinitely large adjacency matrices. Additionally, graphon mean-field RL imposes a critical assumption of the existence of graphon sequences that converge in cut-norm to the problem instance. Another mean-field RL approach that partially introduces heterogeneity is in a line of work that considers major and minor agents. This has been well studied in the competitive setting [48, 49]. In the cooperative setting, the recent [38] is most related to our work. However, a key difference is that these works do not have theoretical guarantees that their approximated policy converges to the optimal policy.

Other Related Works. Recent works have similarly exploited the star-shaped network in cooperative multi-agent systems. [50] studies the communication complexity in episodic MDPs with purely homogeneous agents; however, the central node here is a communication repository for local data and is not an agent. [51] studies the setting with heterogeneous linear contextual bandits to yield a no-regret guarantee. We extend this work to the more challenging setting in reinforcement learning.

2 Preliminaries

Notations. For $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let $[m] = \{1, \dots, m\}$. For any vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\|z\|_1$ and $\|z\|_\infty$ denote the standard ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ norms of z respectively. For any matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, let $\|A\|_1$ denote the matrix ℓ_1 -norm. We use $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ to hide polylogarithmic factors in all problem parameters except n . For any measurable space $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$ with probability measures μ_1 and μ_2 , the total variation distance between μ_1 and μ_2 is defined by $\text{TV}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}} |\mu_1(X) - \mu_2(X)|$. Over discrete domains, $\text{TV}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |\mu_1(s) - \mu_2(s)|$. Next, $x \sim \mathcal{U}[\Omega]$ denotes that x is a uniformly random element chosen from a finite set Ω , and $x \sim P(\cdot)$ denotes that x is a random element sampled from a probability distribution P . For integers $k \leq m$, $\binom{[m]}{k}$ denotes the set of k -sized subsets of $[m]$. Given a collection of variables s_1, \dots, s_n the shorthand s_Δ denotes the set $\{s_i : i \in \Delta\}$ for $\Delta \subseteq [n]$. Finally, given a set $C \subset \mathbb{R}$, $\Pi^C : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow C$ denotes the projection onto C in ℓ_1 -norm.

Problem Statement. We consider a system of $n + 1$ agents given by $\mathcal{N} = \{0\} \cup [n]$. Let agent 0 be the “global” decision-maker, and agents $[n]$ be the “local” agents. In this model, each agent $i \in [n]$ is associated with a state $s_i \in \mathcal{S}_i$, where \mathcal{S}_i is the local agent’s state space. The global agent is associated with a state $s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g$ and action $a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$, where \mathcal{S}_g is the global agent’s state space and \mathcal{A}_g is the global agent’s action space. The global state of all agents is given by $(s_g, s_1, \dots, s_n) \in \mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$. At each time-step t , the next state for all the agents is independently generated by stochastic transition kernels $P_g : \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{A}_g \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $P_l : \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{S}_g \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as follows:

$$s_g(t+1) \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g(t), a_g(t)), \quad (1)$$

$$s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t)), \forall i \in [n]. \quad (2)$$

The global agent then selects $a_g(t) \in \mathcal{A}_g$. Following this, the system incurs a reward $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_g \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which has the following structure in Equation (3), where the choice of reward functions r_g and r_l is

typically application-specific.

$$r(s, a_g) = \underbrace{r_g(s_g, a_g)}_{\text{global component}} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \underbrace{r_l(s_i, s_g)}_{\text{local component}} \quad (3)$$

Remark 2.1. While this model requires the n local agents to have homogeneous transition and reward functions, it allows heterogeneous initial states, which captures a pseudo-heterogeneous setting. To capture this, we assign a type to each local agent by letting $\mathcal{S}_l = \mathcal{Z} \times \bar{\mathcal{S}}_l$, where \mathcal{Z} is a set of different types for each local agent, and the “type” variable is treated as part of the state for each local agent. This “type” state will be heterogeneous and will remain unchanged throughout the transitions. Therefore, because of the “type” variable, the transition and reward function will be different for different types of agents. Further, by letting $s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g := \prod_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} [\bar{\mathcal{S}}_g]_z$ and $a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g := \prod_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} [\bar{\mathcal{A}}_g]_z$ correspond to a state/action vector where each element corresponds to a type $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, the global agent can uniquely signal agents of each type.

We define a policy π by the map $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_g$ such that $a_g \sim \pi(\cdot|s)$. The goal of the problem is to then learn a policy π that maximizes the value function $V : \pi \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is the expected discounted reward for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$ given by $V^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a_g(t) \sim \pi(\cdot|s)} [\sum_{t=0}^T \gamma^t r(s(t), a_g(t)) | s(0) = s]$, where $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is a discounting factor. This model characterizes a decision-making process in the presence of multiple agents where the information of all local agents is concentrated towards the decision maker, the global agent. This problem can be viewed as a generalization of the network setting to a specific type of dense graph: the star graph. We remark on this connection in Appendix A.

The size of the simplex containing the optimal policy is $|\mathcal{S}_g| |\mathcal{S}_l|^n |\mathcal{A}_g|$, which is exponential in the number of agents. Therefore, the goal of the problem is to learn an approximately optimal policy with subexponential sample complexity, thereby overcoming the curse of dimensionality. We make the following standard assumptions:

Assumption 2.1 (Finite state/action spaces). We assume that the state and action spaces of all the agents in the MARL game are finite: $|\mathcal{S}_l|, |\mathcal{S}_g|, |\mathcal{A}_g|, |\mathcal{A}_l| < \infty$.

Assumption 2.2 (Bounded rewards). The global and local components of the reward function are bounded. Specifically, $\|r_g(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq \tilde{r}_g$, and $\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq \tilde{r}_l$. Then, $\|r(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq \tilde{r}_g + \tilde{r}_l := \tilde{r}$.

Definition 2.2 (ϵ -optimal policy). Given a policy simplex Π , a policy $\pi \in \Pi$ is ϵ -optimal if for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $V^\pi(s) \geq \sup_{\pi^* \in \Pi} V^{\pi^*}(s) - \epsilon$.

Background. To provide a background for the analysis in this paper, we review a few key concepts in RL. At the core of the standard Q-learning framework for offline-RL is the notion of the Q -function [52] which is given by $Q : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Intuitively, Q -learning seeks to produce a policy $\pi^*(\cdot|s)$ which maximizes the expected infinite horizon discounted reward. For any policy π , $Q^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_{a(t) \sim \pi(\cdot|s(t))} [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s(t), a(t)) | s(0) = s, a(0) = a]$. One way to learn the optimal policy $\pi^*(\cdot|s)$ is dynamic programming where the Q function is iteratively updated using value-iteration: $Q^0(s, a) = 0, \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_g$. Then, $\forall t \in [T], Q^{t+1}(s, a) = \mathcal{T}Q^t(s, a)$, where \mathcal{T} is the Bellman operator given by $\mathcal{T}Q^t(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot|s_g, a_g), s'_i \sim P_l(\cdot|s_i, s_g), \forall i \in [n]} \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}_g} Q^t(s', a')$. \mathcal{T} satisfies a γ -contractive property [52, 53], which guarantees the existence of a unique fixed-point Q^* such that $\mathcal{T}Q^* = Q^*$ by the Banach-Caccioppoli fixed-point theorem [54]. Here, an optimal policy is the greedy policy $\pi^* : \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n \times \mathcal{A}_g$ where $\pi^*(s) = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}_g} Q^*(s, a)$.

However, in this problem, the complexity of a single update to the Q -function is $O(|\mathcal{S}_g| |\mathcal{S}_l|^n |\mathcal{A}_g|)$, which is exponential in the number of local agents. For practical purposes, even for small n , the update complexity renders Q -learning impractical (Example 2.4). To overcome the problem of learning the exponentially large Q -function, we introduce the SUB-SAMPLE-Q algorithm in Section 3.

Example 2.3 (Demand-Response (DR)). DR is a pathway in the transformation towards a sustainable electricity grid where users (local agents) are compensated to lower their electricity consumption to a level set by a regulator (global agent). To model this, let each local agent $i \in [n]$ have a state $s_i(t) \in \mathcal{S}_l := \Psi \times \mathcal{D}_a \times \mathcal{D}_c \subset \mathbb{Z}^3$ with $s_i(t) = (\psi_i, s_i^*(t), \bar{s}_i(t))$. Here, ψ_i is the agent’s type, $s_i^*(t)$ is agent i ’s consumption, and $\bar{s}_i(t)$ is its desired consumption level. Let $(s_g(t), a_g(t)) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{A}_g$ where $s_g(t)$ is the DR signal, i.e. target consumption that the regulator sets for each agent. The global agent transition is given by $s_g(t+1) = \Pi^{\mathcal{S}_g}(s_g(t) + a_g(t))$, i.e., $a_g(t)$ is the

change in the DR signal. Then, $s_i(t+1) = (\psi_i, \bar{s}_i(t+1), s_i^*(t+1))$, where $\bar{s}_i(t+1) \sim f(\bar{s}_i(t), \psi_i)$ and $s_i^*(t+1) = g(\bar{s}_i(t), s_g(t), s_i^*(t))$ where f and g are stochastic maps. Intuitively, $\bar{s}_i(t+1)$ fluctuates based on ψ_i and $\bar{s}_i(t)$. If $\bar{s}_i(t) < s_g(t)$, then $s_i^*(t+1) = \bar{s}_i(t)$ (the local agent chases the desired consumption). Otherwise, the local agent either continues to follow $\bar{s}_i(t)$ or reduces its consumption to match $s_g(t)$. Finally, the reward of the system at each time-step is given in Equation (3), where we describe the exact forms of r_g, r_l, f , and g along with our numerical simulations in Section 5. Beyond this setting, DR has applications ranging from pricing strategies for EV charging stations, regulating the supply of any product in a market with fluctuating demands, and maximizing the efficiency of allocating resources.

Example 2.4 (Queueing). In this example, our algorithm generalizes the power-of-two-choices in the queueing theory literature [5, 33, 34] where a global dispatcher subsamples two queues and chooses the shortest queue to send incoming jobs to. We model a system with n queues, $s_i(t) \in \mathcal{S}_i := \mathbb{N}$ at time t denotes the number of jobs at time t for queue $i \in [n]$. We model the job allocation mechanism as a global agent where $s_g(t) \in \mathcal{S}_g = \mathcal{A}_g = [n]$, where $s_g(t)$ denotes the queue to which the next job should be delivered. We choose the state transitions $s_g(t+1) = a_g(t)$, and $s_i(t+1) = f(s_i(t), s_g(t))$ where f is a stochastic function that captures the stochastic job arrival and departure. We denote the cost incurred by the system by the reward in Equation (3), where the choice of r_g, r_l , and f is presented in Section 5 along with our numerical experiments.

3 Method and Theoretical Results

In this work, we propose algorithm SUB-SAMPLE-Q to overcome the exponential update time of Q -learning. In our algorithm, the global agent randomly samples a subset of local agents $\Delta \in \mathcal{U}(\binom{[n]}{k})$ for $k \in [n]$. It ignores all other agents $[n] \setminus \Delta$ and uses an empirical value iteration to learn the Q -function and policy $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ for this surrogate system of k local agents. Here, the surrogate reward incurred by the system at each time step is $r_\Delta : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_g \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined in Equation (4):

$$r_\Delta(s, a_g) = r_g(s_g, a_g) + \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s_g, s_i). \quad (4)$$

We then derive a greedy policy $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ which works by randomly sampling $\Delta \in \mathcal{U}(\binom{[n]}{k})$ at each time-step, and deriving action $a_g \leftarrow \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta)$. We show that the policy $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ converges to the optimal policy π^* as $k \rightarrow n$ and $m \rightarrow \infty$ in Theorem 3.2. More formally, we present Algorithm 1 (SUB-SAMPLE-Q: Learning) and Algorithm 2 (SUB-SAMPLE-Q: Execution), which we describe below.

Algorithm 1 (Offline learning). We empirically learn the optimal Q -function for a subsystem with k local agents that we denote by $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} : \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^k \times \mathcal{A}_g \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where m is the sample size. As in Section 2, we set $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^0(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) = 0$ for all $s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, s_\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_l^k, a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$. For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{t+1}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) = \hat{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$ where $\hat{T}_{k,m}$ is the *empirically adapted* Bellman operator defined for $k \leq n$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ in Equation (5). $\hat{T}_{k,m}$ draws m random samples $s_g^j \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g)$ for $j \in [m]$ and $s_i^j \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g)$ for $j \in [m], i \in \Delta$. The update equation for $\hat{T}_{k,m}$ is given by:

$$\hat{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) = r_\Delta(s, a_g) + \frac{\gamma}{m} \sum_{j \in [m]} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g^j, s_\Delta^j, a'_g). \quad (5)$$

$\hat{T}_{k,m}$ satisfies a γ -contraction property (see Lemma A.10 for a proof). Algorithm 1 (SUB-SAMPLE-Q: Learning) performs value iteration where it repeatedly applies $\hat{T}_{k,m}$ to the same $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ until $\hat{Q}_{k,m}$ converges to its fixed point $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ which satisfies $\hat{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} = \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$. We then obtain a deterministic policy $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} : \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^k$ given by $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta) = \arg \max_{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$.

Algorithm 2 (Online implementation). Here, Algorithm 2 (SUB-SAMPLE-Q: Execution) randomly samples $\Delta \sim \mathcal{U}(\binom{[n]}{k})$ at each time step and uses action $a_g \leftarrow \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta)$ to get reward $r(s, a_g)$. We write this procedure of first sampling Δ and then applying $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ as a stochastic policy $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(a|s)$:

$$\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(a|s) = \frac{1}{\binom{[n]}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \mathbb{1}(\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta) = a). \quad (6)$$

Then, each agent transitions to their next state based on Equations (1) and (2).

Algorithm 1 SUB-SAMPLE-Q: Learning

Require: A multi-agent system as described in Section 2. Parameter T for the number of iterations in the initial value iteration step. Hyperparameter $k \in [n]$. Discount parameter $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Oracle \mathcal{O} to sample $s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot|s_g, a_g)$ and $s_i \sim P_l(\cdot|s_i, s_g)$ for all $i \in [n]$.

- 1: Uniformly choose $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ such that $|\Delta| = k$.
- 2: Set $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^0(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) = 0$ for $s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, s_\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_l^k, a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$.
- 3: **for** $t = 1$ to T **do**
- 4: $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{t+1}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g), \forall s_g, s_\Delta, a_g \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^k \times \mathcal{A}_g$
- 5: **end for**
- 6: $\forall (s_g, s_\Delta) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^{|\Delta|}$, let $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^T(s_g, s_\Delta) = \arg \max_{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^T(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$.

Algorithm 2 SUB-SAMPLE-Q: Execution

Require: A multi-agent system as described in Section 2. A distribution s_0 on the initial global state $s_0 = (s_g, s_{[n]})$. Parameter T' for the number of iterations for the decision-making sequence. Hyperparameter $k \in [n]$. Discount parameter γ . Policy $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta)$.

- 1: Sample $(s_g(0), s_{[n]}(0)) \sim s_0$.
- 2: **Policy** $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta)$:
- 3: **for** $t = 0$ to T' **do**
- 4: Choose Δ uniformly from $\binom{[n]}{k}$.
- 5: Let $a_g(t) \sim \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g(t), s_\Delta(t))$.
- 6: Let $s_g(t+1) \sim P_g(\cdot|s_g(t), a_g(t))$.
- 7: Let $s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot|s_i(t), s_g(t))$, for all $i \in [n]$.
- 8: **end for**

Remark 3.1. Algorithm 1 assumes the existence of a generative model \mathcal{O} [55, 56] to sample $s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot|s_g, a_g)$ and $s_i \sim P_l(\cdot|s_i, s_g)$, for some $i \in [n]$. We can also generalize this to the online reinforcement learning setting by using the techniques in [57].

We show that the value of the objective function (the expected discounted cumulative reward) produced by $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ is approximately optimal, where the optimality gap decays as $k \rightarrow n$ and $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Firstly, clearly $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$ is an unbiased estimator of the adapted Bellman operator $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ in Equation (7).

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) = r_\Delta(s, a_g) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot|s_g, a_g), s'_i \sim P_l(\cdot|s_i, s_g), \forall i \in \Delta} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g). \quad (7)$$

For all $s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, s_\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_l^k, a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$, set $\hat{Q}_k(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) = 0$. For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\hat{Q}_k^{t+1} = \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k^t$, where $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ is defined for $k \leq n$ in Equation (7). Similarly to $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$, $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ satisfies a γ -contraction property (Lemma A.9) with fixed-point \hat{Q}_k^* . By the law of large numbers, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m} = \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$. Therefore, we make the following statistical assumption to control their ℓ_∞ -normed difference:

Assumption 3.1. For all $k \in [n]$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a Bellman noise $\epsilon_{k,m}$ such that

$$\|\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} - \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k^*\|_\infty = \|\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} - \hat{Q}_k^*\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_{k,m}. \quad (8)$$

By the Chernoff bound, $\epsilon_{k,m} \in O(1/\sqrt{m})$ with high probability, where m is the number of samples used in $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$. Such bounds are common in the literature [58, 59].

We now present our main result, a bound on the optimality gap for our learned policy $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ that decays with k . and Section 4 outlines the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 3.2. For any state $s \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$,

$$V^{\pi^*}(s) - V^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s) \leq \frac{2\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{2nk} \ln(2|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_g|\sqrt{k})} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \right) + \frac{2\epsilon_{k,m}}{1-\gamma}.$$

Corollary 3.3. *Theorem 3.2 implies an asymptotically decaying optimality gap for our learned policy $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$. Further, if $\epsilon_{k,m} \leq O(1/\sqrt{m})$, then*

$$V^{\pi^*}(s) - V^{\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s) \leq \tilde{O}\left(1/\sqrt{k} + 1/\sqrt{m}\right). \quad (9)$$

Discussion 3.4. *The complexity to initialize and update $\hat{Q}_{k,m}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$ is $O(|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{S}_l|^k|\mathcal{A}_g|)$. For $k \ll n$, this yields exponential savings on the complexity from classical value-iteration. As $k \rightarrow n$ and $m \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} \rightarrow Q^*$ from which the optimal policy can be derived. From Theorem 3.2, this further implies the decay in the optimality gap $V^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}} \rightarrow V^{\pi^*}$. This reveals the existence of an important trade-off, through the choice of k , between the computational efficiency of the algorithm and the optimality of the learned policy $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$. This trade-off is further demonstrated in our experiments.*

Discussion 3.5. *In practice, one could further replace the Q -learning algorithm with an arbitrary value-based RL method that learns \hat{Q}_k with function approximation [60] such as deep Q -networks [9, 61–64]. Doing so will introduce an additional function approximation error that factors into the final bound in Corollary 3.3.*

4 Proof Outline

This section details an outline for the proof of Theorem 3.2, as well as some key ideas. At a high level, our SUB-SAMPLE- Q framework in Algorithms 1 and 2 recovers exact Q learning when $k = n$ and as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Further, as $k \rightarrow n$, \hat{Q}_k^* should intuitively get closer to Q^* from which the optimal policy is derived. A characterization that is crucial to our proof is the notion of empirical distribution which we analyze in Definition 4.1.

Definition 4.1 (Empirical Distribution Function). *For any population of size n given by $\mathcal{X} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ where $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{S}_l^n$, define the empirical distribution function $F_{s_\Delta} : \mathcal{S}_l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ by:*

$$F_{s_\Delta}(x) := \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\}. \quad (10)$$

Since the local agents in the system are homogeneous in their state/action spaces, transition probabilities, and reward functions, the Q function is permutation-invariant in the local agents as permuting the labels of local agents with the same state does not matter. Therefore, Q -function only depends on $s_{[n]}$ through its empirical distribution $F_{s_{[n]}}$. By the same argument, \hat{Q}_k only depends on s_Δ through its empirical distribution F_{s_Δ} . We denote these properties by Equations (11) and (12):

$$Q(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g) = \hat{Q}_n(s_g, F_{s_{[n]}}, a_g), \quad (11)$$

$$\hat{Q}_k(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) = \hat{Q}_k(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g). \quad (12)$$

With the above preparations, the proof is divided into three steps. We first prove a Lipschitz continuity bound between \hat{Q}_k^* and \hat{Q}_n^* in terms of the total variation distance between F_{s_Δ} and $F_{s_{[n]}}$. Secondly, we bound the total variation (TV) distance between F_{s_Δ} and $F_{s_{[n]}}$. Finally, we bound the value differences between $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ and π^* by bounding $Q^*(s, \pi^*) - Q^*(s, \tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}})$ and then using the performance difference lemma [65].

Step 1: Lipschitz Continuity Bound. To compare $\hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g)$ with $Q^*(s, a_g)$, we prove a Lipschitz continuity bound between $\hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g)$ and $\hat{Q}_{k'}^*(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a_g)$ with respect to the TV distance measure between $s_\Delta \in \binom{s_{[n]}}{k}$ and $s_{\Delta'} \in \binom{s_{[n]}}{k'}$. Specifically, we show:

Theorem 4.2 (Lipschitz continuity in \hat{Q}_k^*). *For all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_g$, $\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ and $\Delta' \in \binom{[n]}{k'}$,*

$$|\hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_{k'}^*(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a_g)| \leq 2(1 - \gamma)^{-1} \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}})$$

We defer the proof of Theorem 4.2 to Appendix C.6. See Figure 3 for a comparison between the \hat{Q}_k^* learning and estimation process, and the exact Q -learning framework.

Step 2: Bounding Total Variation (TV) Distance. We bound the TV distance between F_{s_Δ} and $F_{s_{[n]}}$, where $\Delta \in \mathcal{U}^{\binom{[n]}{k}}$. Bounding this TV distance is equivalent to bounding the discrepancy between the empirical distribution and the distribution of the underlying finite population.

Since each $i \in \Delta$ is chosen uniformly at random and *without* replacement, standard concentration inequalities do not apply as they require the random variables to be i.i.d. Further, standard TV distance bounds that use the KL divergence (Bretagnolle-Huber’s inequality) only produces a suboptimal decay as $|\Delta| \rightarrow n$ (see Lemma C.7). Therefore, we prove the following probabilistic result (which generalizes the Dvoretzky–Kiefer–Wolfowitz (DKW) inequality [32]):

Theorem 4.3. *Given a finite population $\mathcal{X} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{S}_l^n$, let $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ be a uniformly random sample from \mathcal{X} of size k chosen without replacement. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Then, for all $x \in \mathcal{S}_l$:*

$$\Pr \left[\sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \left| \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{x_i = x\} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{x_i = x\} \right| \leq \epsilon \right] \geq 1 - 2|\mathcal{S}_l| e^{-\frac{2|\Delta|n\epsilon^2}{n-|\Delta|+1}}.$$

By reparameterizing this inequality and using the definition of TV distance from Section 2, this is equivalent to the statement that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for $\delta \in (0, 1]$,

$$\text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{[n]}}) \leq \sqrt{\frac{n - |\Delta| + 1}{8n|\Delta|} \ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta}}. \quad (13)$$

This novel generalization of the DKW inequality is crucial to the main result in Theorem 3.2, as the theory cannot otherwise be derived by standard concentration inequalities. We defer the proof of Theorem 4.3 to Section C.5 in the appendix. We believe that this result will be of independent interest beyond the setting of our work.

Step 3: Performance Difference Lemma to Complete the Proof. As a consequence of the prior two steps and the assumption in Assumption 3.1, $Q^*(s, a'_g)$ and $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta, a'_g)$ are very close (which we prove in Theorem C.6). We further prove that the value generated by their policies π^* and $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ must also be very close (where the residue shrinks as k approaches n). We then use the well-known performance difference lemma [65] which we restate and explain in D.2 in the appendix.

A crucial theorem needed to use the performance difference lemma is a bound on $Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta))$. Therefore, we formulate and prove Theorem 4.4 which yields a probabilistic bound on this difference, where the randomness is over the choice of $\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}$.

Theorem 4.4. *For a fixed $s' \in \mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$ and for $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, 1]^2$, with probability at least $1 - |\mathcal{A}_g|(\delta_1 + \delta_2)$:*

$$Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta)) \leq \frac{2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty}{1 - \gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n - k + 1}{8nk}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_1}} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_2}} \right) + 2\epsilon_{k,m}.$$

We defer the proof of Theorem 4.4 and finding optimal value of the parameters δ_1, δ_2 to D.5 in the Appendix. Using Theorem 4.4 and the performance difference lemma directly leads to Theorem 3.2.

5 Experiments

This section provides simulation results for the examples outlined in Section 5 for demand-response and queuing. All numerical experiments were run on a 3-core CPU server equipped with a 12GB RAM. We chose a complexity for the parameters of each simulation that was sufficient to emphasize characteristics of the theory, such as the exponential complexity improvement of Algorithm 1, the pseudo-heterogeneity and homogeneity of each local agent, and the decaying optimality gap.

Demand-Response. We ran a small-scale simulation with $n = 8$ local agents, and a large-scale simulation with $n = 50$ local agents, where the goal was to learn an approximately optimal policy for the global agent to moderate a supply in the presence of randomly fluctuating demand. For both experiments, we set $\Psi = \{1, 2\}$, $\mathcal{D}_a = \mathcal{D}_c = [5]$, $f(\bar{s}_i(t), \psi) = \mathbb{1}\{\psi = 1\}(\bar{s}_i(t) \pm 1) + \mathbb{1}\{\psi = 2\}\mathcal{U}\{\mathcal{D}_c\}$, $g(s_i^*(t), \bar{s}_i(t), s_g(t)) = \mathbb{1}\{\bar{s}_i(t) \leq s_g(t)\} \cdot \bar{s}_i(t) + \mathbb{1}\{\bar{s}_i(t) > s_g(t)\} \cdot \Pi^{\mathcal{D}_a}[\bar{s}_i(t) +$




Figure 1: Demand-Response simulation. a) Computation time (in hours) to learn $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ for $k \leq n = 8$. b) Reward optimality gap (log scale) with $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ running 300 iterations for $k \leq n = 6$, c) Discounted cumulative rewards for $k \leq 22$ where $n = 50$.

$(s_g(t) - s_i^*(t)y_i(t))$ where $y_i(t) \sim \mathcal{U}\{0, 1\}$. Next, let $r_g(s_g, a_g) = 15/s_g - \mathbb{1}\{a_g = -1\}$ and $r_l(s_i, s_g) = s_i^* - 0.5 \cdot \mathbb{1}\{s_i^* > s_g\}$. Then, let $\gamma = 0.9$, $m = 50$, and the length of the decision-making period T' to 300. For the small-scale simulation (Figure 1ab), we ran the system for $T = 300$ empirical adapted Bellman iterations for $k \leq 6$. For the large-scale simulation (Figure 1c), we ran Algorithm 1 for $T = 50$ empirical adapted Bellman iterations for $k \leq 22$.

For the small-scale simulation, Figure 1a illustrates the exponential (in k) computational complexity of Algorithm 1 (note that $k = 6 = n$ corresponds to the standard Q -learning value iteration complexity when run on the entire system), and Figure 1b plots the log-scale reward-optimality gap for varying k , illustrating that the gap decreases monotonically as $k \rightarrow n$ as proven in Theorem 3.2. This highlights the tradeoff in the choice of k from Discussion 3.4. Figure 1c plots the true cumulative discounted reward of the large-scale system. We observe that the rewards (on average) grow monotonically as they obey our worst-case guarantee in Theorem 3.2.

Queueing Theory. This simulation ran on a system of $n = 50$ local agents, where the goal was to learn an approximately optimal policy for a dispatcher to send incoming jobs to. For this experiment (Figure 2), we set $s_g(t+1) = a_g(t)$, $s_i(t+1) = \min\{c, \max\{0, s_i(t) + \mathbb{1}\{s_g(t) = i\} - \text{Bern}(p)\}\}$, $r_g(s_g(t), a_g(t)) = 0$, $r_l(s_i(t), s_g(t)) = -s_i(t) - 10 \cdot \mathbb{1}\{s_i(t) > c\}$. Here, $p = 0.8$, $c = 30$, $\gamma = 0.9$, and ran Algorithm 1 for $T = 300$ empirical adapted Bellman value iterations with $m = 30$. We then ran Algorithm 2 for a decision-making period of $T' = 100$. Figure 2 illustrates the log-scale reward-optimality gap for varying k , showing that the gap decreases monotonically as $k \rightarrow n$ with decay rate, consistent with the $1/\sqrt{k}$ upper bound in Theorem 3.2.




Figure 2: Reward optimality gap (log scale) with $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ running 300 iterations.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, we consider a global decision-making agent in the presence of n local homogeneous agents. We propose a method SUB-SAMPLE-Q which derives a policy $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ where $k \leq n$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ are tunable parameters, and show that $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ converges to the optimal policy π^* with a decay rate of $1/\sqrt{k} + \epsilon_{k,m}$, where $\epsilon_{k,m}$ is the Bellman noise. To establish the result, we develop an adapted

Bellman operator \hat{T}_k and prove a contraction property. The key technical novelties of our work lie in the showing of a Lipschitz-continuity result for \hat{Q}_k^* and the proof of a concentration inequality where the random variables are sampled without replacement. We recognize several future directions.

One potential future direction is to extend this model beyond the star graph network. We believe expander-decomposition methods [66–68] are amenable to this problem. Another direction is to find connections between our novel sub-sampling method to algorithms in federated learning. Finally, another direction is to allow the rewards to be stochastic functions and incorporate learning rates [25] to guarantee numerical stability which would find novel applications for the model.

7 Acknowledgements

This work is supported by a research assistantship at Carnegie Mellon University and a fellowship from the Caltech Associates. We thank ComputeX for allowing usage of their server to run numerical experiments and gratefully acknowledge insightful conversations with Yiheng Lin, Elia Gorokhovsky, and Sai Maddipatla.

References

- [1] Dylan J Foster, Alexander Rakhlin, Ayush Sekhari, and Karthik Sridharan. On the Complexity of Adversarial Decision Making. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=pgBpQYss2ba>.
- [2] Aoyang Qin, Feng Gao, Qing Li, Song-Chun Zhu, and Sirui Xie. Learning non-Markovian Decision-Making from State-only Sequences. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=cdlmsnQkZ9>.
- [3] Dylan J Foster, Noah Golowich, Jian Qian, Alexander Rakhlin, and Ayush Sekhari. Model-Free Reinforcement Learning with the Decision-Estimation Coefficient. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Ay3WvSrtp0>.
- [4] Seung-Jun Kim and Geogios B. Giannakis. An Online Convex Optimization Approach to Real-time Energy Pricing for Demand Response. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 8(6):2784–2793, 2017. doi: 10.1109/TSG.2016.2539948. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7438918>.
- [5] Rick Zhang and Marco Pavone. Control of Robotic Mobility-on-Demand Systems: A Queueing-Theoretical Perspective. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 35(1-3):186–203, 2016. doi: 10.1177/0278364915581863. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/0278364915581863>.
- [6] Daniel K. Molzahn, Florian Dörfler, Henrik Sandberg, Steven H. Low, Sambuddha Chakrabarti, Ross Baldick, and Javad Lavaei. A Survey of Distributed Optimization and Control Algorithms for Electric Power Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 8(6):2941–2962, 2017. doi: 10.1109/TSG.2017.2720471. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7990560>.
- [7] Yiheng Lin, James A Preiss, Emile Timothy Anand, Yingying Li, Yisong Yue, and Adam Wierman. Learning-augmented Control via Online Adaptive Policy Selection: No Regret via contractive Perturbations. In *ACM SIGMETRICS, Workshop on Learning-augmented Algorithms: Theory and Applications 2023*, 2023. URL <https://learning-augmented-algorithms.github.io/papers/sigmetrics23-lata-posters-paper5.pdf>.
- [8] Gautam Goel, Niangjun Chen, and Adam Wierman. Thinking Fast and Slow: Optimization Decomposition Across Timescales. *SIGMETRICS Perform. Eval. Rev.*, 45(2):27–29, oct 2017. ISSN 0163-5999. doi: 10.1145/3152042.3152052. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3152042.3152052>.
- [9] David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J. Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George van den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot,

- Sander Dieleman, Dominik Grewe, John Nham, Nal Kalchbrenner, Ilya Sutskever, Timothy Lillicrap, Madeleine Leach, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Thore Graepel, and Demis Hassabis. Mastering the Game of Go with Deep Neural Networks and Tree Search. *Nature*, 529(7587):484–489, January 2016. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/nature16961. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/nature16961>.
- [10] B Ravi Kiran, Ibrahim Sobh, Victor Talpaert, Patrick Mannion, Ahmad A. Al Sallab, Senthil Yogamani, and Patrick Pérez. Deep Reinforcement Learning for Autonomous Driving: A Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(6):4909–4926, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TITS.2021.3054625. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9351818>.
- [11] Jens Kober, J. Andrew Bagnell, and Jan Peters. Reinforcement Learning in Robotics: A Survey. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 32(11):1238–1274, 2013. doi: 10.1177/0278364913495721. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/0278364913495721>.
- [12] Udaya Ghai, Arushi Gupta, Wenhan Xia, Karan Singh, and Elad Hazan. Online Nonstochastic Model-Free Reinforcement Learning. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=B5LpWaaBVA>.
- [13] Yiheng Lin, James A. Preiss, Emile Anand, Yingying Li, Yisong Yue, and Adam Wierman. Online adaptive policy selection in time-varying systems: No-regret via contractive perturbations. In A. Oh, T. Neumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 53508–53521. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/a7a7180fe7f82ff98eee0827c5e9c141-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- [14] Tongxin Li, Yiheng Lin, Shaolei Ren, and Adam Wierman. Beyond Black-Box Advice: Learning-Augmented Algorithms for MDPs with Q-Value Predictions. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=RACcp8Zbr9>.
- [15] Yiheng Lin, James A Preiss, Fengze Xie, Emile Anand, Soon-Jo Chung, Yisong Yue, and Adam Wierman. Online policy optimization in unknown nonlinear systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13009*, 2024.
- [16] Muhammed O. Sayin, Kaiqing Zhang, David S. Leslie, Tamer Basar, and Asuman E. Ozdaglar. Decentralized Q-learning in Zero-sum Markov Games. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=nhkbYh30T1>.
- [17] Dimitri P. Bertsekas and John N. Tsitsiklis. *Neuro-Dynamic Programming*. Athena Scientific, 1st edition, 1996. ISBN 1886529108. URL https://www.mit.edu/~dimitrib/NDP_Encycl.pdf.
- [18] Warren B. Powell. *Approximate Dynamic Programming: Solving the Curses of Dimensionality (Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics)*. Wiley-Interscience, USA, 2007. ISBN 0470171553. URL https://castle.princeton.edu/Presentations/Powell_ADP_tutorialOctober2008.pdf.
- [19] Guannan Qu, Yiheng Lin, Adam Wierman, and Na Li. Scalable Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning for Networked Systems with Average Reward. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’20*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2020. Curran Associates Inc. ISBN 9781713829546. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/168efc366c449fab9c2843e9b54e2a18-Paper.pdf>.
- [20] Vincent D. Blondel and John N. Tsitsiklis. A Survey of Computational Complexity Results in Systems and Control. *Automatica*, 36(9):1249–1274, 2000. ISSN 0005-1098. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-1098\(00\)00050-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-1098(00)00050-9). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0005109800000509>.
- [21] Carlos Guestrin, Daphne Koller, Ronald Parr, and Shobha Venkataraman. Efficient Solution Algorithms for Factored MDPs. *J. Artif. Int. Res.*, 19(1):399–468, oct 2003. ISSN 1076-9757. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/1622434.1622447>.

- [22] Christos H. Papadimitriou and John N. Tsitsiklis. The Complexity of Optimal Queuing Network Control. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 24(2):293–305, 1999. ISSN 0364765X, 15265471. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3690486>.
- [23] Yiheng Lin, Guannan Qu, Longbo Huang, and Adam Wierman. Distributed Reinforcement Learning in Multi-Agent Networked Systems. *CoRR*, abs/2006.06555, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.06555>.
- [24] Guannan Qu, Adam Wierman, and Na Li. Scalable Reinforcement Learning of Localized Policies for Multi-Agent Networked Systems. In Alexandre M. Bayen, Ali Jadbabaie, George Pappas, Pablo A. Parrilo, Benjamin Recht, Claire Tomlin, and Melanie Zeilinger, editors, *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Learning for Dynamics and Control*, volume 120 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 256–266. PMLR, 10–11 Jun 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v120/qu20a.html>.
- [25] Yiheng Lin, Guannan Qu, Longbo Huang, and Adam Wierman. Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning in Stochastic Networked Systems. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2021/hash/412604be30f701b1b1e312\4c252065e6-Abstract.html>.
- [26] Gangshan Jing, He Bai, Jemin George, Aranya Chakraborty, and Piyush. K. Sharma. Distributed Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning with Directed Coordination Graph. In *2022 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 3273–3278, 2022. doi: 10.23919/ACC53348.2022.9867152.
- [27] Tianshu Chu, Sandeep Chinchali, and Sachin Katti. Multi-agent Reinforcement Learning for Networked System Control. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Syx7A3NFvH>.
- [28] Washim Uddin Mondal, Mridul Agarwal, Vaneet Aggarwal, and Satish V. Ukkusuri. On the Approximation of Cooperative Heterogeneous Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (MARL) Using Mean Field Control (MFC). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(1), jan 2022. ISSN 1532-4435. URL <https://jmlr.org/papers/volume23/21-1312/21-1312.pdf>.
- [29] Haotian Gu, Xin Guo, Xiaoli Wei, and Renyuan Xu. Mean-Field Controls with Q-Learning for Cooperative MARL: Convergence and Complexity Analysis. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 3(4):1168–1196, 2021. doi: 10.1137/20M1360700. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1360700>.
- [30] Haotian Gu, Xin Guo, Xiaoli Wei, and Renyuan Xu. Mean-Field Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning: A Decentralized Network Approach, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2108.02731.pdf>.
- [31] Haotian Gu, Xin Guo, Xiaoli Wei, and Renyuan Xu. Dynamic Programming Principles for Mean-Field Controls with Learning, 2022. URL <https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/opre.2022.2395?journalCode=opre>.
- [32] A. Dvoretzky, J. Kiefer, and J. Wolfowitz. Asymptotic Minimax Character of the Sample Distribution Function and of the Classical Multinomial Estimator. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 27(3):642 – 669, 1956. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177728174. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177728174>.
- [33] Michael David Mitzenmacher and Alistair Sinclair. *The Power of Two Choices in Randomized Load Balancing*. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1996. AAI9723118.
- [34] Aravind Srinivasan. Probability and Computing. *SIGACT News*, 49(3):20–22, Oct 2018. ISSN 0163-5700. doi: 10.1145/3289137.3289142. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3289137.3289142>.
- [35] L. S. Shapley. Stochastic Games*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 39(10):1095–1100, 1953. doi: 10.1073/pnas.39.10.1095. URL <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.39.10.1095>.

- [36] Michael L. Littman. Markov Games as a Framework for Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *Machine learning proceedings*, Elsevier, page 157–163, 1994. URL <https://courses.cs.duke.edu/spring07/cps296.3/littman94markov.pdf>.
- [37] Kaiqing Zhang, Zhuoran Yang, and Tamer Başar. Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning: A Selective Overview of Theories and Algorithms, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.10635>.
- [38] Kai Cui, Christian Fabian, and Heinz Koepl. Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning via Mean Field Control: Common Noise, Major Agents and Approximation Properties, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.10665>.
- [39] David Gamarnik, David Goldberg, and Theophane Weber. Correlation Decay in Random Decision Networks, 2009. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/0912.0338>.
- [40] Chi Jin, Qinghua Liu, Yuanhao Wang, and Tiancheng Yu. V-learning – a simple, efficient, decentralized algorithm for multiagent rl, 2021.
- [41] Sriram Ganapathi Subramanian, Matthew E. Taylor, Mark Crowley, and Pascal Poupart. Decentralized mean field games, 2022.
- [42] Yunbum Kook, Matthew S. Zhang, Sinho Chewi, Murat A. Erdogdu, and Mufan Bill Li. Sampling from the mean-field stationary distribution, 2024.
- [43] Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Mean Field Games. *Japanese Journal of Mathematics*, 2(1):229–260, March 2007. ISSN 1861-3624. doi: 10.1007/s11537-007-0657-8. URL <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11537-007-0657-8>.
- [44] Kai Cui and Heinz Koepl. Learning Graphon Mean Field Games and Approximate Nash Equilibria. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=0sgnt1pKD0z>.
- [45] Yuanquan Hu, Xiaoli Wei, Junji Yan, and Hengxi Zhang. Graphon Mean-Field Control for Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 360(18):14783–14805, 2023. ISSN 0016-0032. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfranklin.2023.09.002>.
- [46] René Carmona, Mathieu Laurière, and Zongjun Tan. Model-free Mean-Field Reinforcement Learning: Mean-field MDP and mean-field Q-learning. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 33(6B):5334 – 5381, 2023. doi: 10.1214/23-AAP1949. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/23-AAP1949>.
- [47] Yaodong Yang, Rui Luo, Minne Li, Ming Zhou, Weinan Zhang, and Jun Wang. Mean Field Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In Jennifer Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5571–5580. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/yang18d.html>.
- [48] René Carmona and Xiuneng Zhu. A Probabilistic Approach to Mean Field Games with Major and Minor Players, 2014. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.7141>.
- [49] René Carmona and Peiqi Wang. Finite State Mean Field Games with Major and Minor Players, 2016. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1610.05408>.
- [50] Yifei Min, Jiafan He, Tianhao Wang, and Quanquan Gu. Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning: Asynchronous Communication and Linear Function Approximation. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 24785–24811. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/min23a.html>.
- [51] Anh Do, Thanh Nguyen-Tang, and Raman Arora. Multi-Agent Learning with Heterogeneous Linear Contextual Bandits. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=7f6vH3mmhr>.

- [52] Christopher J. C. H. Watkins and Peter Dayan. Q-learning. *Machine Learning*, 8(3):279–292, May 1992. ISSN 1573-0565. doi: 10.1007/BF00992698. URL <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00992698>.
- [53] Prashant Mehta and Sean Meyn. Q-learning and Pontryagin’s Minimum Principle. In *Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC) held jointly with 2009 28th Chinese Control Conference*, pages 3598–3605, 2009. doi: 10.1109/CDC.2009.5399753. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/5399753>.
- [54] Stefan Banach. Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations intégrales. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 3(1):133–181, 1922. URL <http://eudml.org/doc/213289>.
- [55] Michael Kearns and Satinder Singh. Finite-Sample Convergence Rates for Q-Learning and Indirect Algorithms. In M. Kearns, S. Solla, and D. Cohn, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 11. MIT Press, 1998. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/1998/file/99adff456950dd9629a5260c4de21858-Paper.pdf.
- [56] Aaron Sidford, Mengdi Wang, Xian Wu, Lin Yang, and Yinyu Ye. Near-optimal time and sample complexities for solving markov decision processes with a generative model. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2018/file/bb03e43ffe34eeb242a2ee4a4f125e56-Paper.pdf.
- [57] Chi Jin, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Sebastien Bubeck, and Michael I Jordan. Is q-learning provably efficient? In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2018/file/d3b1fb02964aa64e257f9f26a31f72cf-Paper.pdf.
- [58] Gen Li, Yuting Wei, Yuejie Chi, Yuantao Gu, and Yuxin Chen. Sample Complexity of Asynchronous Q-Learning: Sharper Analysis and Variance Reduction. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(1):448–473, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2021.3120096.
- [59] Xiang Li, Wenhao Yang, Jiadong Liang, Zhihua Zhang, and Michael I. Jordan. A Statistical Analysis of Polyak-Ruppert Averaged Q-Learning. In Francisco Ruiz, Jennifer Dy, and Jan-Willem van de Meent, editors, *Proceedings of The 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 206 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2207–2261. PMLR, 25–27 Apr 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v206/li23b.html>.
- [60] Richard S Sutton, David McAllester, Satinder Singh, and Yishay Mansour. Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation. In S. Solla, T. Leen, and K. Müller, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 12. MIT Press, 1999. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/1999/file/464d828b85b0bed98e80ade0a5c43b0f-Paper.pdf.
- [61] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A. Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G. Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin A. Riedmiller, Andreas Kirkeby Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, Stig Petersen, Charlie Beattie, Amir Sadik, Ioannis Antonoglou, Helen King, Dharshan Kumaran, Daan Wierstra, Shane Legg, and Demis Hassabis. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518:529–533, 2015. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:205242740>.
- [62] Zichen Liu, Siyi Li, Wee Sun Lee, Shuicheng YAN, and Zhongwen Xu. Efficient offline policy optimization with a learned model. In *Deep Reinforcement Learning Workshop NeurIPS 2022*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=nyo7Y-CJRGf>.
- [63] Oren Neumann and Claudius Gros. Scaling laws for a multi-agent reinforcement learning model. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ZrEbZL9eQ3W>.

- [64] Hao Sun, Zhenghao Peng, Bo Dai, Dahua Lin, and Bolei Zhou. Novel policy seeking with constrained optimization. In *Deep Reinforcement Learning Workshop NeurIPS 2022*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=j1Tb5di9Eg8>.
- [65] Sham Kakade and John Langford. Approximately Optimal Approximate Reinforcement Learning. In Claude Sammut and Achim Hoffman, editors, *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2002)*, pages 267–274, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2002. Morgan Kaufman. ISBN 1-55860-873-7. URL <http://ttic.uchicago.edu/~sham/papers/rl/aoarl.pdf>.
- [66] Omer Reingold. Undirected Connectivity in Log-Space. *J. ACM*, 55(4), sep 2008. ISSN 0004-5411. doi: 10.1145/1391289.1391291. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1391289.1391291>.
- [67] Rajat Vadiraj Dwaraknath, Ishani Karmarkar, and Aaron Sidford. Towards Optimal Effective Resistance Estimation. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Kffe8iXAw7>.
- [68] Emile Anand and Chris Umans. Pseudorandomness of the sticky random walk. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11104*, 2023.
- [69] Devavrat Shah and Qiaomin Xie. Q-learning with Nearest Neighbors. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2018/file/309fee4e541e51de2e41f21bebb342aa-Paper.pdf.
- [70] Emile Anand, Jan van den Brand, Mehrdad Ghadiri, and Daniel Zhang. The Bit Complexity of Dynamic Algebraic Formulas and their Determinants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.11127*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.11127>.
- [71] Zaiwei Chen and Siva Theja Maguluri. Sample complexity of policy-based methods under off-policy sampling and linear function approximation. In Gustau Camps-Valls, Francisco J. R. Ruiz, and Isabel Valera, editors, *Proceedings of The 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 151 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 11195–11214. PMLR, 28–30 Mar 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v151/chen22i.html>.
- [72] P. Massart. The Tight Constant in the Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz Inequality. *The Annals of Probability*, 18(3):1269 – 1283, 1990. doi: 10.1214/aop/1176990746. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1176990746>.
- [73] Michael Naaman. On the Tight Constant in the Multivariate Dvoretzky–Kiefer–Wolfowitz Inequality. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 173:109088, 2021. ISSN 0167-7152. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spl.2021.109088>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016771522100050X>.
- [74] Wassily Hoeffding. Probability Inequalities for Sums of Bounded Random Variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301):13–30, 1963. ISSN 01621459. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2282952>.
- [75] R. J. Serfling. Probability Inequalities for the Sum in Sampling without Replacement. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2(1):39–48, 1974. ISSN 00905364. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2958379>.
- [76] Alexandre B. Tsybakov. *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 1st edition, 2008. ISBN 0387790519. URL <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/b13794>.

Outline of the Appendices.

- Appendix A presents additional definitions and remarks that support the main body.
- Appendix B-C contains a detailed proof of the Lipschitz continuity bound in Theorem 4.2 and total variation distance bound in Theorem 4.3.
- Appendix D contains a detailed proof of the main result in Theorem 3.2.

A Mathematical Background and Additional Remarks

Definition A.1 (Lipschitz continuity). *Given two metric spaces $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, d_{\mathcal{Y}})$ and a constant $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$, a mapping $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is L -Lipschitz continuous if for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, $d_{\mathcal{Y}}(f(x), f(y)) \leq L \cdot d_{\mathcal{X}}(x, y)$.*

Theorem A.2 (Banach-Caccioppoli fixed point theorem [54]). *Consider the metric space $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$, and $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that T is a γ -Lipschitz continuous mapping for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Then, by the Banach-Caccioppoli fixed-point theorem, there exists a unique fixed point $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ for which $T(x^*) = x^*$. Additionally, $x^* = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} T^s(x_0)$ for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Notably, Q -learning and value iteration were originally proposed and widely studied for single-agent RL. However, in contrast to the single-agent setting (where Q -learning has a robust theoretical foundation [53]), the multi-agent setting is still an active research topic [37, 69], where a prominent direction studies whether Q -learning can generalize in the presence of many agents while overcoming the curse of dimensionality. Building on this line of research, our work empirically learns a smaller Q function, which we call $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and uses the greedy policy derived from the $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ to make decisions. For convenience, we restate below the various Bellman operators under consideration.

Definition A.3 (Bellman Operator \mathcal{T}).

$$\mathcal{T}Q^t(s, a_g) := r_{[n]}(s, a_g) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), \\ s'_i \sim P_i(\cdot | s_i, s_g), \forall i \in [n]}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} Q^t(s', a'_g) \quad (14)$$

Definition A.4 (Adapted Bellman Operator $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$). *The adapted Bellman operator updates a smaller Q function (which we denote by \hat{Q}_k) for a surrogate system with the global agent and k local agents, for $1 \leq k \leq n$.*

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k^t(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g) := r_{\Delta}(s, a_g) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), \\ s'_i \sim P_i(\cdot | s_i, s_g), \forall i \in \Delta}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^t(s'_g, s'_{\Delta}, a'_g) \quad (15)$$

Definition A.5 (Empirical Adapted Bellman Operator $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$). *The empirical adapted Bellman operator $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$ empirically estimates the adapted Bellman operator update by drawing m random samples of $s_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g)$ and $s_i \sim P_i(\cdot | s_i, s_g)$ for $i \in \Delta$, where for $j \in [m]$, the j 'th random sample is given by s_g^j and s_{Δ}^j :*

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g) := r_{\Delta}(s, a_g) + \frac{\gamma}{m} \sum_{j \in [m]} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g^j, s_{\Delta}^j, a'_g) \quad (16)$$

Remark A.6. *We remark on the following relationships between the variants of the Bellman operators from Definitions A.3 to A.5. First, by the law of large numbers, we have $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m} = \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$, where the error decays in $O(1/\sqrt{m})$ by the Chernoff bound. Secondly, by comparing Definition A.4 and Definition A.3, we have $\mathcal{T}_n = \mathcal{T}$.*

Lemma A.7. *For any $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ such that $|\Delta| = k$, suppose $0 \leq r_{\Delta}(s, a_g) \leq \tilde{r}$. Then, $\hat{Q}_k^t \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma}$.*

Proof. We prove this by induction on $t \in \mathbb{N}$. The base case is satisfied as $\hat{Q}_k^0 = 0$. Assume that $\|\hat{Q}_k^{t-1}\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma}$. We bound \hat{Q}_k^{t+1} from the Bellman update at each time step as follows, for all $s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, s_{\Delta} \in \mathcal{S}_l^{|\Delta|}, a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$:

$$\hat{Q}_k^{t+1}(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g) = r_{\Delta}(s, a_g) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), \\ s'_i \sim P_i(\cdot | s_i, s_g), \forall i \in \Delta}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^t(s'_g, s'_{\Delta}, a'_g)$$

$$\leq \tilde{r} + \gamma \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, s'_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, s'_\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_i^k} \hat{Q}_k^t(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g) \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{1 - \gamma}$$

Here, the first inequality follows by noting that the maximum value of a random variable is at least as large as its expectation. The second inequality follows from the inductive hypothesis. \square

Remark A.8. Lemma A.7 is independent of the choice of k . Therefore, for $k = n$, this implies an identical bound on Q^t . A similar argument as Lemma A.7 implies an identical bound on $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^t$.

Recall that the original Bellman operator \mathcal{T} satisfies a γ -contractive property under the infinity norm. We similarly show that $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ and $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$ satisfy a γ -contractive property under infinity norm in Lemma A.9 and Lemma A.10.

Lemma A.9. $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ satisfies the γ -contractive property under infinity norm:

$$\|\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}'_k - \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k\|_\infty \leq \gamma \|\hat{Q}'_k - \hat{Q}_k\|_\infty$$

Proof. Suppose we apply $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ to $\hat{Q}_k(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$ and $\hat{Q}'_k(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$ for $|\Delta| = k$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}'_k - \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k\|_\infty \\ &= \gamma \max_{\substack{s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, \\ a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, \\ s_\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_i^k}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), s'_i \sim P_i(\cdot | s_i, s_g), \forall s'_i \in \mathcal{S}_\Delta} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}'_k(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), s'_i \sim P_i(\cdot | s_i, s_g), \forall s'_i \in \mathcal{S}_\Delta} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g) \right| \\ &\leq \gamma \max_{s'_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, s'_\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_i^k, a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \left| \hat{Q}'_k(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g) - \hat{Q}_k(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g) \right| \\ &= \gamma \|\hat{Q}'_k - \hat{Q}_k\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

The equality implicitly cancels the common $r_\Delta(s, a_g)$ terms from each application of the adapted-Bellman operator. The inequality follows from Jensen's inequality, maximizing over the actions, and bounding the expected value with the maximizers of the random variables. The last line recovers the definition of infinity norm. \square

Lemma A.10. $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$ satisfies the γ -contractive property under infinity norm.

Proof. Similarly to Lemma A.9, suppose we apply $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$ to $\hat{Q}_{k,m}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$ and $\hat{Q}'_{k,m}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_k - \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m} \hat{Q}'_k\|_\infty &= \frac{\gamma}{m} \left\| \sum_{j \in [m]} \left(\max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k(s_g^j, s_\Delta^j, a'_g) - \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}'_k(s_g^j, s_\Delta^j, a'_g) \right) \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \gamma \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, s'_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, s_\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_i^k} |\hat{Q}_k(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g) - \hat{Q}'_k(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g)| \\ &\leq \gamma \|\hat{Q}_k - \hat{Q}'_k\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality uses the triangle inequality and the general property $|\max_{a \in A} f(a) - \max_{b \in A} f(b)| \leq \max_{c \in A} |f(a) - f(b)|$. In the last line, we recover the definition of infinity norm. \square

Remark A.11. Intuitively, the γ -contractive property of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ and $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$ causes the trajectory of two \hat{Q}_k and $\hat{Q}_{k,m}$ functions on the same state-action tuple to decay by γ at each time step such that repeated applications of their corresponding Bellman operators produce a unique fixed-point from the Banach-Cacciopoli fixed-point theorem which we introduce in Definitions A.12 and A.13.

Definition A.12 (\hat{Q}_k^*). Suppose $\hat{Q}_k^0 := 0$ and let $\hat{Q}_k^{t+1}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) = \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k^t(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote the fixed-point of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ by \hat{Q}_k^* such that $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) = \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$.

Definition A.13 ($\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$). Suppose $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^0 := 0$ and let $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{t+1}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) = \hat{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote the fixed-point of $\hat{T}_{k,m}$ by $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ such that $\hat{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) = \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$.

Furthermore, recall the assumption on our empirical approximation of \hat{Q}_k^* :

Assumption 3.1. For all $k \in [n]$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we assume that:

$$\|\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} - \hat{Q}_k^*\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_{k,m}$$

Corollary A.14. Observe that by backpropagating results of the γ -contractive property for T time steps:

$$\|\hat{Q}_k^* - \hat{Q}_k^T\|_\infty \leq \gamma^T \cdot \|\hat{Q}_k^* - \hat{Q}_k^0\|_\infty \quad (17)$$

$$\|\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^T\|_\infty \leq \gamma^T \cdot \|\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^0\|_\infty \quad (18)$$

Further, noting that $\hat{Q}_k^0 = \hat{Q}_{k,m}^0 := 0$, $\|\hat{Q}_k^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma}$, and $\|\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma}$ from Lemma A.7:

$$\|\hat{Q}_k^* - \hat{Q}_k^T\|_\infty \leq \gamma^T \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma} \quad (19)$$

$$\|\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^T\|_\infty \leq \gamma^T \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma} \quad (20)$$

Remark A.15. Corollary A.14 characterizes the error decay between \hat{Q}_k^T and \hat{Q}_k^* as well as between $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^T$ and $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ and shows that it decays exponentially in the number of corresponding Bellman iterations with the γ^T multiplicative factor.

Furthermore, we characterize the maximal policies greedy policies obtained from Q^* , \hat{Q}_k^* , and $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$.

Definition A.16 (π^*). The greedy policy derived from Q^* is $\pi^*(s) := \arg \max_{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} Q^*(s, a_g)$.

Definition A.17 ($\hat{\pi}_k^*$). The greedy policy from \hat{Q}_k^* is $\hat{\pi}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta) := \arg \max_{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$.

Definition A.18 ($\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$). The greedy policy from $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ is given by $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta) := \arg \max_{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$.

Figure 3 details the analytic flow on how we use the empirical adapted Bellman operator to perform value iteration on $\hat{Q}_{k,m}$ to get $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ which approximates Q^* .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^0(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) & & & & & & \\ \downarrow (1) & & & & & & \\ \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) & \xrightarrow{(2)} & \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) & \xrightarrow{(3)} & \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) & \xrightarrow{(4)} & \hat{Q}_n^*(s_g, F_{s_{[n]}}, a_g) \\ & & & & & & \downarrow (5) \\ & & & & Q^*(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g) & \xleftarrow{(6)} & Q^*(s_g, F_{s_{[n]}}, a_g) \end{array}$$

Figure 3: Flow of the algorithm and relevant analyses in learning Q^* . Here, (1) follows by performing Algorithm 1 (SUB-SAMPLE-Q: Learning) on $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^0$. (2) follows from Assumption 3.1. (3) and (6) follow from Equation (11) which writes the dependency of $s_{[n]}$ and s_Δ in the Q^* and \hat{Q}_k^* functions to the empirical distribution functions $F_{s_{[n]}}$ and F_{s_Δ} , respectively. (4) follows from the Lipschitz continuity and total variation distance bounds in Theorems 4.2 and 4.3. Finally, (5) follows from noting that $\hat{Q}_n^* = Q^*$.

In Algorithm 3, we provide a stable implementation of Algorithm 1: SUB-SAMPLE-Q: Learning, where we incorporate a sequence of learning rates $\{\eta_t\}_{t \in [T]}$ into the framework [52]. Algorithm 3 is also provably numerical stable under fixed-point arithmetic [70].

Algorithm 3 Stable (Practical) Implementation of Algorithm 1: SUB-SAMPLE-Q: Learning

Require: A multi-agent system as described in Section 2. Parameter T for the number of iterations in the initial value iteration step. Hyperparameter $k \in [n]$. Discount parameter $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Oracle \mathcal{O} to sample $s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot|s_g, a_g)$ and $s_i \sim P_l(\cdot|s_i, s_g)$ for all $i \in [n]$. Sequence of learning rates $\{\eta_t\}_{t \in [T]}$ where $\eta_t \in (0, 1]$.

- 1: Choose any $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ such that $|\Delta| = k$.
- 2: Set $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^0(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) = 0$ for $s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, s_\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_l^k, a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$.
- 3: **for** $t = 1$ to T **do**
- 4: **for** $(s_g, s_\Delta) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^{|\Delta|}$ **do**
- 5: **for** $a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$ **do**
- 6: $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{t+1}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) \leftarrow (1 - \eta_t)\hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) + \eta_t \hat{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$
- 7: **end for**
- 8: **end for**
- 9: **end for**
- 10: For all $(s_g, s_\Delta) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^{|\Delta|}$, let the approximate policy be $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^T(s_g, s_\Delta) = \arg \max_{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^T(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$.

Notably, $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^t$ in Algorithm 3 converges to a fixed point [52] due to a similar γ -contractive property as Lemma A.9, given an appropriately conditioned sequence of learning rates η_t :

Theorem A.19. *As $T \rightarrow \infty$, if $\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t = \infty$, and $\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2 < \infty$, then Q -learning converges to the optimal Q function asymptotically with probability 1.*

Furthermore, finite-time guarantees with the learning rate and sample complexity have been shown recently in [71], which when adapted to our $\hat{Q}_{k,m}$ framework in Algorithm 3 yields:

Theorem A.20 ([71]). *For all $t \in [T]$ and $\epsilon > 0$, if $\eta_t = (1 - \gamma)^4 \epsilon^2$ and $T = |\mathcal{S}_l|^k |\mathcal{A}_g| / (1 - \gamma)^5 \epsilon^2$,*

$$\|\hat{Q}_{k,m}^T - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}\| \leq \epsilon.$$

This global decision-making problem can be viewed as a generalization of the network setting to a specific type of dense graph: the star graph (Figure 4). We briefly elaborate more on this connection below.

Definition A.21 (Star Graph S_n). *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the star graph S_n is the complete bipartite graph $K_{1,n}$.*

S_n captures the graph density notion by saturating the set of neighbors for the central node. Furthermore, it models interactions between agents identically to our setting, where the central node is a global agent and the peripheral nodes are local agents. The cardinality of the search space simplex for the optimal policy is $|\mathcal{S}_g| |\mathcal{S}_l|^n |\mathcal{A}_g|$, which is exponential in n . Hence, this problem cannot be naively modeled by an MDP.

Further, works that leverage the exponential decaying property that truncates the search space for policies over immediate neighborhoods of agents still rely on the assumption that the graph neighborhood for the agent is sparse [19, 23–25]. Clearly, the graph S_n violates this local sparsity condition; hence, previous methods do not apply to this problem instance.




Figure 4: Star graph S_n

B Proof of Lipschitz-Continuity Bound in Theorem 4.2

This section proves the Lipschitz-continuity bound Theorem 4.2 between \hat{Q}_k^* and Q^* in Theorem B.2 and includes a framework to compare $\frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$ and $Q^*(s, a_g)$ in Lemma B.12. The following definition will be relevant to the proof of Theorem 4.2.

Definition B.1. [Joint Stochastic Kernels] The joint stochastic kernel on (s_g, s_Δ) for $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ where $|\Delta| = k$ is defined as $\mathcal{J}_k : \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^k \times \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^k \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where

$$\mathcal{J}_k(s'_g, s'_\Delta | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta) := \Pr[(s'_g, s'_\Delta) | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta] \quad (21)$$

Theorem B.2 (\hat{Q}_k^T is $(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} 2\gamma^t) \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty$ -Lipschitz continuous with respect to F_{s_Δ} in total variation distance). Suppose $\Delta, \Delta' \subseteq [n]$ such that $|\Delta| = k$ and $|\Delta'| = k'$. Then:

$$\left| \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a_g) \right| \leq \left(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} 2\gamma^t \right) \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}})$$

Proof. We prove this inductively. Note that $\hat{Q}_k^0(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) = \hat{Q}_{k'}^0(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) = 0$ from the initialization step in Algorithm 1, which proves the lemma for $T = 0$ since $\text{TV}(\cdot, \cdot) \geq 0$. For the remainder of this proof, we adopt the shorthand $\mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_\Delta}$ to refer to $\mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), s'_l \sim P_l(\cdot | s_l, s_g), \forall i \in \Delta}$.

Then, at $T = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \hat{Q}_k^1(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_{k'}^1(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a_g) \right| \\ &= \left| \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k^0(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) - \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k'} \hat{Q}_{k'}^0(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a_g) \right| \\ &= \left| r(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_\Delta} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^0(s'_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - r(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a_g) - \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_\Delta} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k'}^0(s'_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right| \\ &= \left| r(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) - r(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a_g) \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s_g, s_i) - \frac{1}{k'} \sum_{i \in \Delta'} r_l(s_g, s_i) \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{s_l \sim F_{s_\Delta}} r_l(s_g, s_l) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_l \sim F_{s_{\Delta'}}} r_l(s_g, s'_l) \right| \end{aligned}$$

In the first and second equalities, we use the time evolution property of \hat{Q}_k^1 and $\hat{Q}_{k'}^1$ by applying the adapted Bellman operators $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ and $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k'}$ to \hat{Q}_k^0 and $\hat{Q}_{k'}^0$, respectively, and expanding. In the third and fourth equalities, we note that $\hat{Q}_k^0(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) = \hat{Q}_{k'}^0(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) = 0$, and subtract the common ‘global component’ of the reward function.

Then, noting the general property that for any function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ for $|\mathcal{X}| < \infty$ we can write $f(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} f(y) \mathbb{1}\{y = x\}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \hat{Q}_k^1(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_{k'}^1(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a_g) \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{s_l \sim F_{s_\Delta}} \left[\sum_{z \in \mathcal{S}_l} r_l(s_g, z) \mathbb{1}\{s_l = z\} \right] - \mathbb{E}_{s'_l \sim F_{s_{\Delta'}}} \left[\sum_{z \in \mathcal{S}_l} r_l(s_g, z) \mathbb{1}\{s'_l = z\} \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{z \in \mathcal{S}_l} r_l(s_g, z) \cdot (\mathbb{E}_{s_l \sim F_{s_\Delta}} \mathbb{1}\{s_l = z\} - \mathbb{E}_{s'_l \sim F_{s_{\Delta'}}} \mathbb{1}\{s'_l = z\}) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{z \in \mathcal{S}_l} r_l(s_g, z) \cdot (F_{s_\Delta}(z) - F_{s_{\Delta'}}(z)) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \max_{z \in \mathcal{S}_l} r_l(s_g, z) \right| \cdot \sum_{z \in \mathcal{S}_l} |F_{s_\Delta}(z) - F_{s_{\Delta'}}(z)| \\ &\leq 2 \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from the linearity of expectations, and the third equality follows by noting that for any random variable $X \sim \mathcal{X}$, $\mathbb{E}_X \mathbb{1}[X = x] = \Pr[X = x]$. Then, the first inequality follows from an application of the triangle inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the second inequality follows by the definition of total variation distance. Thus, when $T = 1$, \hat{Q} is $(2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty)$ -Lipschitz continuous with respect to total variation distance, proving the base case. We now assume that for $T \leq t' \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\left| \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a_g) \right| \leq \left(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} 2\gamma^t \right) \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}})$$

Then, inductively we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \hat{Q}_k^{T+1}(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_{k'}^{T+1}(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a_g) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s_g, s_i) - \frac{1}{|\Delta'|} \sum_{i \in \Delta'} r_l(s_g, s_i) \right| \\ & \quad + \gamma \left| \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_\Delta} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_\Delta}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_\Delta'} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right| \\ & \leq 2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) \\ & \quad + \gamma \left| \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_\Delta} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_\Delta}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_\Delta'} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right| \end{aligned}$$

In the first equality, we use the time evolution property of \hat{Q}_k^{T+1} and $\hat{Q}_{k'}^{T+1}$ by applying the adapted-Bellman operators \hat{T}_k and $\hat{T}_{k'}$ to \hat{Q}_k^T and $\hat{Q}_{k'}^T$, respectively. We then expand and use the triangle inequality. In the first term of the second inequality, we use our Lipschitz bound from the base case. For the second term, we now rewrite the expectation over the states $s'_g, s'_\Delta, s'_{\Delta'}$ into an expectation over the joint transition probabilities \mathcal{J}_k and $\mathcal{J}_{k'}$ from Definition B.1.

Therefore, using the shorthand $\mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k}$ to denote $\mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta)}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \hat{Q}_k^{T+1}(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_{k'}^{T+1}(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta'}}, a_g) \right| \\ & \leq 2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) \\ & \quad + \gamma \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_\Delta}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right| \\ & \leq 2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) \\ & \quad + \gamma \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_\Delta}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right| \\ & \leq 2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) + \gamma \left(\sum_{\tau=0}^{T-1} 2\gamma^\tau \right) \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) \\ & = \left(\sum_{\tau=0}^T 2\gamma^\tau \right) \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) \end{aligned}$$

In the first inequality, we rewrite the expectations over the states as the expectation over the joint transition probabilities. The second inequality then follows from Lemma B.9. To apply it to Lemma B.9, we superficially conflate the joint expectation over $(s_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})$ and reduce it back to the original form of its expectation. Finally, the third inequality follows from Lemma B.3. Then, by the inductive hypothesis, the claim is proven. \square

Lemma B.3. *For all $T \in \mathbb{N}$, for any $a_g, a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$, $s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g$, $s_\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_l^k$, and for all joint stochastic kernels \mathcal{J}_k as defined in Definition B.1, we have that $\mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta)} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_\Delta}, a'_g)$ is $(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} 2\gamma^t) \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty$ -Lipschitz continuous with respect to F_{s_Δ} in total variation distance:*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta)} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_\Delta}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'})} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right|$$

$$\leq \left(\sum_{\tau=0}^{T-1} 2\gamma^\tau \right) \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}})$$

Proof. We prove this inductively. At $T = 0$, the statement is true since $\hat{Q}_k^0(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) = \hat{Q}_{k'}^0(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) = 0$ and $\text{TV}(\cdot, \cdot) \geq 0$. For $T = 1$, applying the adapted Bellman operator yields:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta)} \hat{Q}_k^1(s'_g, F_{s'_\Delta}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'})} \hat{Q}_{k'}^1(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} \left[\frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s'_g, s'_i) - \frac{1}{|\Delta'|} \sum_{i \in \Delta'} r_l(s'_g, s'_i) \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} \left[\sum_{z \in \mathcal{S}_l} r_l(s'_g, z) \cdot (F_{s'_\Delta}(z) - F_{s'_{\Delta'}}(z)) \right] \right| \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to Theorem B.2, we implicitly write the result as an expectation over the reward functions and use the general property that for any function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ for $|\mathcal{X}| < \infty$, we can write $f(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} f(y) \mathbb{1}\{y = x\}$. Then, taking the expectation over the indicator variable yields the second equality. As a shorthand, let \mathfrak{D} denote the distribution of $s'_g \sim \sum_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \in \mathcal{S}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}} \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})$. Then, by the law of total expectation,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta)} \hat{Q}_k^1(s'_g, F_{s'_\Delta}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'})} \hat{Q}_{k'}^1(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim \mathfrak{D}} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{S}_l} r_l(s'_g, z) \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} (F_{s'_\Delta}(z) - F_{s'_{\Delta'}}(z)) \right| \\ &\leq \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim \mathfrak{D}} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{S}_l} \left| \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} (F_{s'_\Delta}(z) - F_{s'_{\Delta'}}(z)) \right| \\ &\leq 2 \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim \mathfrak{D}} \text{TV}(\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s'_g} F_{s'_\Delta}, \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s'_g} F_{s'_{\Delta'}}) \\ &\leq 2 \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) \end{aligned}$$

In the ensuing inequalities, we first use Jensen's inequality and the triangle inequality to pull out $\mathbb{E}_{s'_g} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{S}_l}$ from the absolute value, and then use Cauchy-Schwarz to further factor $\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty$. The second inequality follows from Lemma B.5 and does not have a dependence on s'_g thus eliminating $\mathbb{E}_{s'_g}$ and proving the base case.

We now assume that for $T \leq t' \in \mathbb{N}$, for all joint stochastic kernels \mathcal{J}_k and $\mathcal{J}_{k'}$, and for all $a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta)} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_\Delta}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'})} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right| \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} 2\gamma^t \right) \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) \end{aligned}$$

For the remainder of the proof, we adopt the shorthand $\mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}}$ to denote $\mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta|}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta)}$, and $\mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}}$ to denote $\mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta|}(\cdot, \cdot | s'_g, a'_g, s'_\Delta)}$.

Then, inductively, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}} \hat{Q}_k^{T+1}(s'_g, F_{s'_\Delta}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}} \hat{Q}_{k'}^{T+1}(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}} [r(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g) - r(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}, a'_g)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}} \left[\max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_\Delta, a''_g) - \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s''_g, s''_{\Delta'}, a''_g) \right] \right| \\ &\leq 2 \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) \\ &\quad + \gamma \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}} \left[\max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_\Delta, a''_g) - \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s''_g, s''_{\Delta'}, a''_g) \right] \right] \right| \end{aligned}$$

Here, we expand out \hat{Q}_k^{T+1} and $\hat{Q}_{k'}^{T+1}$ using the adapted Bellman operator. In the ensuing inequality, we apply the triangle inequality and bound the first term using the base case.

Then, note that $\mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} \mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}(\cdot, \cdot | s'_g, a'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_{\Delta}, a''_g)$ is, for some stochastic function $\mathcal{J}'_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}$, equal to

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}'_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_{\Delta}, a''_g),$$

where \mathcal{J}' is implicitly a function of a'_g which is fixed from the beginning.

In the special case where $a_g = a'_g$, we can derive an explicit form of \mathcal{J}' which we show in Lemma B.11. As a shorthand, we denote $\mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}'_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})}$ by $\mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}'}$.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta}) \sim \mathcal{J}} \hat{Q}_k^{T+1}(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta}}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}} \hat{Q}_{k'}^{T+1}(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g)| \\ & \leq 2 \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_{\Delta}}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) + \gamma |\mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}'} \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_{\Delta}, a''_g) \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}'} \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s''_g, s''_{\Delta'}, a''_g)| \\ & \leq 2 \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_{\Delta}}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) + \gamma \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} |\mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}'} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_{\Delta}, a''_g) \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}'} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s''_g, s''_{\Delta'}, a''_g)| \\ & \leq 2 \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_{\Delta}}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) + \gamma \left(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} 2\gamma^t \right) \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_{\Delta}}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) \\ & = \left(\sum_{t=0}^T 2\gamma^t \right) \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_{\Delta}}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows from Lemma B.9 where we set the joint stochastic kernel to be $\mathcal{J}'_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}$. In the ensuing lines, we concentrate the expectation towards the relevant terms and use the induction assumption for the transition probability functions \mathcal{J}'_k and $\mathcal{J}'_{k'}$. This proves the lemma. \square

Remark B.4. Given a joint transition probability function $\mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}$ as defined in Definition B.1, we can recover the transition function for a single agent $i \in \Delta \cup \Delta'$ given by \mathcal{J}_1 using the law of total probability and the conditional independence between s_i and $s_g \cup s_{[n] \setminus i}$ in Equation (22). This characterization is crucial in Lemma B.5 and Lemma B.6.

$$\mathcal{J}_1(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_i) = \sum_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta' \setminus i} \sim \mathcal{S}_i^{|\Delta \cup \Delta'| - 1}} \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta' \setminus i}, s'_i | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \quad (22)$$

Lemma B.5. Given a joint transition probability $\mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}$ as defined in Definition B.1,

$$\text{TV}(\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} F_{s'_{\Delta}}, \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} F_{s'_{\Delta'}}) \leq \text{TV}(F_{s_{\Delta}}, F_{s_{\Delta'}})$$

Proof. Note that from Lemma B.6:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} F_{s'_{\Delta}} &= \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta} \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta|}(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta})} F_{s'_{\Delta}} \\ &= \mathcal{J}_1(\cdot | s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), \cdot) F_{s_{\Delta}} \end{aligned}$$

Then, by expanding the TV distance in ℓ_1 -norm:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{TV}(\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} F_{s'_{\Delta}}, \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} F_{s'_{\Delta'}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{J}_1(\cdot | s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), \cdot) F_{s_{\Delta}} - \mathcal{J}_1(\cdot | s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), \cdot) F_{s_{\Delta'}}\|_1 \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{J}_1(\cdot | s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), \cdot)\|_1 \cdot \frac{1}{2} \|F_{s_{\Delta}} - F_{s_{\Delta'}}\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|F_{s_{\Delta}} - F_{s_{\Delta'}}\|_1 \\ &= \text{TV}(F_{s_{\Delta}}, F_{s_{\Delta'}}) \end{aligned}$$

In the first inequality, we factorize $\|\mathcal{J}_1(\cdot|s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t))\|_1$ from the ℓ_1 -normed expression by the sub-multiplicativity of the matrix norm. Finally, since \mathcal{J}_1 is a column-stochastic matrix, we bound its norm by 1 to recover the total variation distance between F_{s_Δ} and $F_{s_{\Delta'}}$. \square

Lemma B.6. *Given the joint transition probability \mathcal{J}_k from Definition B.1:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}(t+1) \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot|s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}(t))} F_{s_{\Delta}(t+1)} := \mathcal{J}_1(\cdot|s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), \cdot) F_{s_{\Delta}}(t)$$

Proof. First, observe that for all $x \in \mathcal{S}_l$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}(t+1) \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot|s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}(t))} F_{s_{\Delta}(t+1)}(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{E}_{s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}(t+1) \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot|s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}(t))} \mathbb{1}(s_i(t+1) = x) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \Pr[s_i(t+1) = x | s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}(t)] \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \Pr[s_i(t+1) = x | s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), s_i(t)] \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathcal{J}_1(x | s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), s_i(t)) \end{aligned}$$

In the first line, we expand on the definition of $F_{s_{\Delta}(t+1)}(x)$. Finally, we note that $s_i(t+1)$ is conditionally independent to $s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \setminus i$, which yields the equality above. Then, aggregating across every entry $x \in \mathcal{S}_l$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}(t+1) \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot|s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}(t))} F_{s_{\Delta}(t+1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathcal{J}_1(\cdot | s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), \cdot) \vec{\mathbb{1}}_{s_i(t)} \\ &= \mathcal{J}_1(\cdot | s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), \cdot) F_{s_{\Delta}} \end{aligned}$$

Notably, every x corresponds to a choice of rows in $\mathcal{J}_1(\cdot | s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), \cdot)$ and every choice of $s_i(t)$ corresponds to a choice of columns in $\mathcal{J}_1(\cdot | s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), \cdot)$, making $\mathcal{J}_1(\cdot | s_g(t+1), s_g(t), a_g(t), \cdot)$ column-stochastic. This yields the claim. \square

Lemma B.7. *The total variation distance between the expected empirical distribution of $s_\Delta(t+1)$ and $s_{\Delta'}(t+1)$ is linearly bounded by the total variation distance of the empirical distributions of $s_\Delta(t)$ and $s_{\Delta'}(t)$, for $\Delta, \Delta' \subseteq [n]$:*

$$\text{TV} \left(\mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t))} F_{s_\Delta(t+1)}, \mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t))} F_{s_{\Delta'}(t+1)} \right) \leq \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta(t)}, F_{s_{\Delta'}(t)})$$

Proof. We expand the total variation distance measure in ℓ_1 -norm and utilize the result from Lemma B.10 that $\mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t))} F_{s_\Delta(t+1)} = P_l(\cdot | s_g(t)) F_{s_\Delta(t)}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{TV} \left(\mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t))} F_{s_\Delta(t+1)}, \mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t))} F_{s_{\Delta'}(t+1)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t))} F_{s_\Delta(t+1)} - \mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t))} F_{s_{\Delta'}(t+1)} \right\|_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\| P_l(\cdot | \cdot, s_g(t)) F_{s_\Delta(t)} - P_l(\cdot | \cdot, s_g(t)) F_{s_{\Delta'}(t)} \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \|P_l(\cdot | \cdot, s_g(t))\|_1 \cdot \frac{1}{2} |F_{s_\Delta(t)} - F_{s_{\Delta'}(t)}|_1 \\ &= \|P_l(\cdot | \cdot, s_g(t))\|_1 \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta(t)}, F_{s_{\Delta'}(t)}) \end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we recover the total variation distance from the ℓ_1 norm. Finally, by the column stochasticity of $P_l(\cdot|\cdot, s_g)$, we have that $\|P_l(\cdot|\cdot, s_g)\|_1 \leq 1$, which then implies

$$\text{TV} \left(\mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot|s_i(t), s_g(t))} F_{s_\Delta(t+1)}, \mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot|s_i(t), s_g(t))} F_{s_{\Delta'}(t+1)} \right) \leq \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta(t)}, F_{s_{\Delta'}(t)})$$

This proves the lemma. \square

Remark B.8. Lemma B.7 can be viewed as an irreducibility and aperiodicity result on the finite-state Markov chain whose state space is given by $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$. Let $\{s_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the sequence of states visited by this Markov chain where the transitions are induced by the transition functions P_g, P_l . Through this, Lemma B.7 describes an ergodic behavior of the Markov chain.

Lemma B.9. The absolute difference between the expected maximums between \hat{Q}_k and $\hat{Q}_{k'}$ is at most the maximum of the absolute difference between \hat{Q}_k and $\hat{Q}_{k'}$, where the expectations are taken over any joint distributions of states \mathcal{J} , and the maximums are taken over the actions.

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} \left[\max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, s'_{\Delta}, a'_g) - \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}, a'_g) \right] \right| \\ & \leq \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} \left[\hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, s'_{\Delta}, a'_g) - \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}, a'_g) \right] \right| \end{aligned}$$

Proof.

$$a_g^* := \arg \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta}}, a'_g), \quad \tilde{a}_g^* := \arg \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g)$$

For the remainder of this proof, we adopt the shorthand $\mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}}$ to refer to $\mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})}$.

Then, if $\mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta}}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) > 0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta}}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right| \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta}}, a_g^*) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, \tilde{a}_g^*) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta}}, a_g^*) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a_g^*) \\ & \leq \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \left| \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta}}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) \right| \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $\mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta}}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{s'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) < 0$, an analogous argument by replacing a_g^* with \tilde{a}_g^* yields an identical bound. \square

Lemma B.10. For all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Delta \subseteq [n]$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot|s_i(t), s_g(t))} [F_{s_\Delta(t+1)}] = P_l(\cdot|\cdot, s_g(t)) F_{s_\Delta(t)}$$

Proof. For all $x \in \mathcal{S}_l$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot|s_i(t), s_g(t))} [F_{s_\Delta(t+1)}(x)] & := \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(s_i(t), s_g(t))} [\mathbb{1}(s_i(t+1) = x)] \\ & = \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \Pr[s_i(t+1) = x | s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot|s_i(t), s_g(t))] \\ & = \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} P_l(x | s_i(t), s_g(t)) \end{aligned}$$

In the first line, we are writing out the definition of $F_{s_\Delta(t+1)}(x)$ and using the conditional independence in the evolutions of $\Delta \setminus i$ and i . In the second line, we use the fact that for any random variable

$X \in \mathcal{X}$, $\mathbb{E}_X \mathbb{1}[X = x] = \Pr[X = x]$. In line 3, we observe that the above probability can be written as an entry of the local transition matrix P_l . Then, aggregating across every entry $x \in \mathcal{S}_l$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t))} [F_{s_\Delta(t+1)}] &= \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t)) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} P_l(\cdot | \cdot, s_g(t)) \bar{\mathbb{1}}_{s_i(t)} =: P_l(\cdot | \cdot, s_g(t)) F_{s_\Delta(t)} \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\bar{\mathbb{1}}_{s_i(t)} \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{S}_l|}$ such that $\bar{\mathbb{1}}_{s_i(t)}$ is 1 at the index corresponding to $s_i(t)$, and is 0 everywhere else. The last equality follows since $P_l(\cdot | \cdot, s_g(t))$ is a column-stochastic matrix which yields that $P_l(\cdot | \cdot, s_g(t)) \bar{\mathbb{1}}_{s_i(t)} = P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t))$, thus proving the lemma. \square

Lemma B.11. *For any joint transition probability function on s_g, s_Δ , where $|\Delta| = k$, given by $\mathcal{J}_k : \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^{|\Delta|} \times \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^{|\Delta|} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s'_g, a_g, s'_\Delta)} \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_\Delta, a''_g) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k^2(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta)} \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_\Delta, a''_g) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We start by expanding the expectations:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s'_g, a_g, s'_\Delta)} \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_\Delta, a''_g) \right] \\ &= \sum_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^{|\Delta|}} \sum_{(s''_g, s''_\Delta) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^{|\Delta|}} \mathcal{J}_k[s'_g, s'_\Delta, s_g, a_g, s_\Delta] \mathcal{J}_k[s''_g, s''_\Delta, s'_g, a_g, s'_\Delta] \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_\Delta, a''_g) \\ &= \sum_{(s''_g, s''_\Delta) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^{|\Delta|}} \mathcal{J}_k^2[s''_g, s''_\Delta, s_g, a_g, s_\Delta] \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_\Delta, a''_g) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k^2(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta)} \max_{a''_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_\Delta, a''_g) \end{aligned}$$

The right-stochasticity of \mathcal{J}_k implies the right-stochasticity of \mathcal{J}_k^2 . Further, observe that $\mathcal{J}_k[s'_g, s'_\Delta, s_g, a_g, s_\Delta] \mathcal{J}_k[s''_g, s''_\Delta, s'_g, a_g, s'_\Delta]$ denotes the probability of the transitions $(s_g, s_\Delta) \rightarrow (s'_g, s'_\Delta) \rightarrow (s''_g, s''_\Delta)$ with actions a_g at each step, where the joint state evolution is governed by \mathcal{J}_k . Thus, $\sum_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^{|\Delta|}} \mathcal{J}_k[s'_g, s'_\Delta, s_g, a_g, s_\Delta] \mathcal{J}_k[s''_g, s''_\Delta, s'_g, a_g, s'_\Delta]$ is the stochastic probability function corresponding to the two-step evolution of the joint states from (s_g, s_Δ) to (s''_g, s''_Δ) under the action a_g , which is equivalent to $\mathcal{J}_k^2[s''_g, s''_\Delta, s_g, a_g, s_\Delta]$. In the third equality, we recover the definition of the expectation, where the joint probabilities are taken over \mathcal{J}_k^2 . \square

The following lemma bounds the average difference between \hat{Q}_k^T (across every choice of $\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}$) and Q^* and shows that the difference decays to 0 as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma B.12. *For all $s \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_{[n]}$, and for all $a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$, we have:*

$$Q^*(s, a_g) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) \leq \gamma^T \frac{\tilde{r}}{1 - \gamma}$$

Proof. We bound the differences between \hat{Q}_k^T at each Bellman iteration of our approximation to Q^* .

$$Q^*(s, a_g) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathcal{T}Q^*(s, a_g) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k^{T-1}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) \\
&= r_{[n]}(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), \\ s'_i \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g), \forall i \in [n]}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} Q^*(s', a'_g) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} [r_{[\Delta]}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), \\ s'_i \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g), \forall i \in \Delta}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} Q_k^T(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g)]
\end{aligned}$$

Next, observe that $r_{[n]}(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g) = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} r_{[\Delta]}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$. To prove this, we write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} r_{[\Delta]}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) &= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} (r_g(s_g, a_g) + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s_i, s_g)) \\
&= r_g(s_g, a_g) + \frac{\binom{n-1}{k-1}}{k \binom{n}{k}} \sum_{i \in [n]} r_l(s_i, s_g) \\
&= r_g(s_g, a_g) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} r_l(s_i, s_g) := r_{[n]}(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g)
\end{aligned}$$

In the second equality, we reparameterized the sum to count the number of times each $r_l(s_i, s_g)$ was added for each $i \in \Delta$, and in the last equality, we expanded and simplified the binomial coefficients. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{(s, a_g) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_g} [Q^*(s, a_g) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g)] \\
&= \sup_{(s, a_g) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_g} [\mathcal{T}Q^*(s, a_g) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k^{T-1}(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g)] \\
&= \gamma \sup_{(s, a_g) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_g} [\mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P(\cdot | s_g, a_g) \\ s'_i \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g), \forall i \in [n]}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} Q^*(s', a'_g) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g) \\ s'_i \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g), \forall i \in \Delta}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^{T-1}(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g)] \\
&= \gamma \sup_{(s, a_g) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_g} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), \\ s'_i \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g), \forall i \in [n]}} [\max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} Q^*(s', a'_g) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \hat{Q}_k^{T-1}(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g)] \\
&\leq \gamma \sup_{(s, a_g) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_g} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), \\ s'_i \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g), \forall i \in [n]}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} [Q^*(s', a'_g) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^{T-1}(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g)] \\
&\leq \gamma \sup_{(s', a'_g) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_g} [Q^*(s', a'_g) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^{T-1}(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g)]
\end{aligned}$$

We justify the first inequality by noting the general property that for positive vectors v, v' for which $v \succeq v'$ which follows from the triangle inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} v'\|_\infty &\geq \|v\|_\infty - \|\frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} v'\|_\infty \\
&= \|v\|_\infty - \|\frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} v'\|_\infty \\
&\geq \|v\|_\infty - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \|v'\|_\infty
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$Q^*(s, a_g) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \gamma^T \sup_{(s', a_g) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_g} [Q^*(s', a'_g) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^0(s'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_g)] \\
&= \frac{\gamma^T \tilde{r}}{1 - \gamma}
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from the γ -contraction property of the update procedure, and the ensuing equality follows from our bound on the maximum possible value of Q from Lemma A.7 and noting that $\hat{Q}_k^0 := 0$. Therefore, as $T \rightarrow \infty$, $Q^*(s, a_g) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}^T(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) \rightarrow 0$, which proves the lemma. \square

C Bounding Total Variation Distance

As $|\Delta| \rightarrow n$, the total variation (TV) distance between the empirical distribution of $s_{[n]}$ and s_Δ goes to 0. We formalize this notion and prove this statement by obtaining tight bounds on the difference and showing that this error decays quickly.

Remark C.1. *First, observe that if Δ is an independent random variable uniformly supported on $\binom{[n]}{k}$, then s_Δ is also an independent random variable uniformly supported on the global state $\binom{[n]}{k}$. To see this, let $\psi_1 : [n] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_1$ where $\psi(i) = s_i$. This naturally extends to $\psi_k : [n]^k \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_1^k$ given by $\psi_k(i_1, \dots, i_k) = (s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_k})$, for all $k \in [n]$. Then, the independence of Δ implies the independence of the generated σ -algebra. Further, ψ_k (which is a Lebesgue measurable function of a σ -algebra) is a sub-algebra, implying that s_Δ must also be an independent random variable.*

For reference, we present the multidimensional Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz (DKW) inequality [32, 72, 73] which bounds the difference between an empirical distribution function for s_Δ and $s_{[n]}$ when each element of Δ for $|\Delta| = k$ is sampled uniformly randomly from $[n]$ with replacement.

Theorem C.2 (Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz (DFW) inequality [32]). *By the multi-dimensional version of the DKW inequality [73], assume that $\mathcal{S}_l \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, the following statement holds for when $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ is sampled uniformly with replacement.*

$$\Pr \left[\sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \left| \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\} \right| < \epsilon \right] \geq 1 - d(n+1)e^{-2|\Delta|\epsilon^2}.$$

We give an analogous bound for the case when Δ is sampled uniformly from $[n]$ without replacement. However, our bound does *not* have a dependency on d , the dimension of \mathcal{S}_l which allows us to consider non-numerical state-spaces.

Before giving the proof, we add a remark on this problem. Intuitively, when samples are chosen without replacement from a finite population, the marginal distribution, when conditioned on the random variable chosen, takes the running empirical distribution closer to the true distribution with high probability. However, we need a uniform probabilistic bound on the error that adapts to *worst-case marginal distributions* and decays with k .

Recall the landmark results of Hoeffding and Serfling in [74] and [75] which we restate below.

Lemma C.3 (Lemma 4, Hoeffding). *Given a finite population, note that for any convex and continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ denotes a sample with replacement and $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ denotes a sample without replacement, then:*

$$\mathbb{E}f\left(\sum_{i \in X} i\right) \leq \mathbb{E}f\left(\sum_{i \in Y} i\right)$$

Lemma C.4 (Corollary 1.1, Serfling). *Suppose the finite subset $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\mathcal{X}| = n$ is bounded between $[a, b]$. Then, let $X = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ be a random sample of \mathcal{X} of size k chosen uniformly and without replacement. Denote $\mu := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$. Then:*

$$\Pr \left[\left| \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k x_i - \mu \right| > \epsilon \right] < 2e^{-\frac{2k\epsilon^2}{(b-a)^2(1-\frac{k-1}{n})}}$$

We now present a sampling *without* replacement analog of the DKW inequality.

Theorem C.5 (Sampling without replacement analogue of the DKW inequality). *Consider a finite population $\mathcal{X} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{S}_l^n$. Let $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ be a random sample of size k chosen uniformly and without replacement.*

Then, for all $x \in \mathcal{S}_l$:

$$\Pr \left[\sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \left| \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{x_i = x\} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{x_i = x\} \right| < \epsilon \right] \geq 1 - 2|\mathcal{S}_l| e^{-\frac{2|\Delta|n\epsilon^2}{n-|\Delta|+1}}$$

Proof. For each $x \in \mathcal{S}_l$, define the “ x -surrogate population” of indicator variables as

$$\bar{\mathcal{X}}_x = (\mathbb{1}_{\{x_1=x\}}, \dots, \mathbb{1}_{\{x_n=x\}}) \in \{0, 1\}^n \quad (23)$$

Since the maximal difference between each element in this surrogate population is 1, we set $b - a = 1$ in Lemma C.4 when applied to $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_x$ to get:

$$\Pr \left[\left| \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{x_i = x\} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{x_i = x\} \right| < \epsilon \right] \geq 1 - 2e^{-\frac{2|\Delta|n\epsilon^2}{n-|\Delta|+1}}$$

In the above equation, the probability is over $\Delta \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ and it holds for each $x \in \mathcal{S}_l$. Therefore, the randomness is only over Δ . Then, by a union bounding argument, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \left| \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{x_i = x\} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{x_i = x\} \right| < \epsilon \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[\bigcap_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{x_i = x\} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{x_i = x\} \right| < \epsilon \right\} \right] \\ &= 1 - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \Pr \left[\left| \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{x_i = x\} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{x_i = x\} \right| \geq \epsilon \right] \\ &\geq 1 - 2|\mathcal{S}_l| e^{-\frac{2|\Delta|n\epsilon^2}{n-|\Delta|+1}} \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. \square

Then, combining the Lipschitz continuity bound from Theorem 4.2 and the total variation distance bound from Theorem 4.3 yields Theorem C.6.

Theorem C.6. *For all $s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, s_1, \dots, s_n \in \mathcal{S}_l^n, a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$, we have that with probability atleast $1 - \delta$:*

$$|\hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_n^T(s_g, F_{s_{[n]}}, a_g)| \leq \frac{2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty}{1 - \gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n - |\Delta| + 1}{8n|\Delta|} \ln(2|\mathcal{S}_l|/\delta)}$$

Proof. By the definition of total variation distance, observe that

$$\text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{[n]}}) \leq \epsilon \iff \sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} |F_{s_\Delta} - F_{s_{[n]}}| < 2\epsilon \quad (24)$$

Then, let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{S}_l$ be the finite population in Theorem C.5 and recall the Lipschitz-continuity of \hat{Q}_k^T from Theorem B.2:

$$\left| \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_n^T(s_g, F_{s_{[n]}}, a_g) \right| \leq \left(\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} 2\gamma^t \right) \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{[n]}})$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \epsilon$$

By setting the error parameter in Theorem C.5 to 2ϵ , we find that Equation (24) occurs with probability at least $1 - 2|\mathcal{S}_l|e^{-2|\Delta|n\epsilon^2/(n-|\Delta|+1)}$.

$$\Pr \left[\left| \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_n^T(s_g, F_{s_{[n]}}, a_g) \right| \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{1-\gamma} \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \right] \geq 1 - 2|\mathcal{S}_l|e^{-\frac{8n|\Delta|\epsilon^2}{n-|\Delta|+1}}$$

Finally, we parameterize the probability to $1 - \delta$ to solve for ϵ , which yields

$$\epsilon = \sqrt{\frac{n - |\Delta| + 1}{8n|\Delta|} \ln(2|\mathcal{S}_l|/\delta)}.$$

This proves the theorem. \square

The following lemma is not used in the main result; however, we include it to demonstrate why popular TV-distance bounding methods using the Kullback-Liebler (KL) divergence and the Bretagnolle-Huber inequality [76] only yield results with a suboptimal subtractive decay of $\sqrt{|\Delta|/n}$. In comparison, Theorem 4.3 achieves a stronger multiplicative decay of $1/\sqrt{|\Delta|}$.

Lemma C.7.

$$\text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{[n]}}) \leq \sqrt{1 - |\Delta|/n}$$

Proof. By the symmetry of the total variation distance, we have $\text{TV}(F_{s_{[n]}}, F_{s_\Delta}) = \text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{[n]}})$.

From the Bretagnolle-Huber inequality [76] we have that $\text{TV}(f, g) = \sqrt{1 - e^{-D_{\text{KL}}(f||g)}}$. Here, $D_{\text{KL}}(f||g)$ is the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence metric between probability distributions f and g over the sample space, which we denote by \mathcal{X} and is given by

$$D_{\text{KL}}(f||g) := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x) \ln \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} \quad (25)$$

Thus, from Equation (25):

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}(F_{s_\Delta} || F_{s_{[n]}}) &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \left(\frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\} \right) \ln \frac{n \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\}}{|\Delta| \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\}} \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \left(\sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\} \right) \ln \frac{n}{|\Delta|} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \left(\sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\} \right) \ln \frac{\sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\}}{\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\}} \\ &= \ln \frac{n}{|\Delta|} + \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \left(\sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\} \right) \ln \frac{\sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\}}{\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\}} \\ &\leq \ln(n/|\Delta|) \end{aligned}$$

In the third line, we note that $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\} = |\Delta|$ since each local agent contained in Δ must have some state contained in \mathcal{S}_l . In the last line, we note that $\sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\} \leq \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\}$, For all $x \in \mathcal{S}_l$, and thus the summation of logarithmic terms in the third line is negative. Finally, using this bound in the Bretagnolle-Huber inequality yields the lemma. \square

D Using the Performance Difference Lemma to Bound the Difference Between V^{π^*} and $V^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}$

Recall from Definition A.13 that the fixed-point of the empirical adapted Bellman operator $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$ is $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$. Further, recall from Assumption 3.1 that $\|\hat{Q}_k^* - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_{k,m}$.

Lemma D.1. Fix $s \in \mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$. Suppose we are given a T -length sequence of i.i.d. random variables $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_T$, distributed uniformly over the support $\binom{[n]}{k}$. Further, suppose we are given a fixed sequence $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_T \in (0, 1)$. Then, for each action $a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$ and for $i \in [T]$, define events $B_i^{a_g}$ such that:

$$B_i^{a_g} := \left\{ \left| Q^*(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) \right| > \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8kn}} \ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_i} \cdot \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty + \epsilon_{k,m} \right\}$$

Next, for $i \in [M]$, we define “bad-events” B_i such that $B_i = \bigcup_{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} B_i^{a_g}$. Next, denote $B = \bigcup_{i=1}^T B_i$. Then, the probability that no “bad event” occurs is:

$$\Pr[\bar{B}] \geq 1 - |\mathcal{A}_g| \sum_{i=1}^T \delta_i$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \left| Q^*(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) \right| &\leq \left| Q^*(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) \right| \\ &\leq \left| Q^*(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) \right| + \epsilon_{k,m} \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality above follows from the triangle inequality, and the second inequality uses $|Q^*(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)| \leq \|Q^*(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_{k,m}$, where $\epsilon_{k,m}$ is defined in Assumption 3.1. Then, from Theorem C.6, we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta_i$,

$$\left| Q^*(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g) - \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g) \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8nk}} \ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_i} \cdot \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty$$

So, event B_i occurs with probability at most δ_i . Thus, by repeated applications of the union bound, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\bar{B}] &\geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \Pr[B_i^{a_g}] \\ &\geq 1 - |\mathcal{A}_g| \sum_{i=1}^T \Pr[B_i^{a_g}] \end{aligned}$$

Finally, substituting $\Pr[\bar{B}_i^{a_g}] \leq \delta_i$ yields the lemma. \square

Recall that for any $s \in \mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$, the policy function $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s)$ is defined as a uniformly random element in the maximal set of $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ evaluated on all possible choices of Δ . Formally:

$$\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s) \sim \mathcal{U} \left\{ \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta) : \Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k} \right\} \quad (26)$$

We now use the celebrated performance difference lemma from [65], restated below for convenience in Theorem D.2, to bound the value functions generated between $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ and π^* .

Theorem D.2 (Performance Difference Lemma). *Given policies π_1, π_2 , with corresponding value functions V^{π_1}, V^{π_2} :*

$$V^{\pi_1}(s) - V^{\pi_2}(s) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s' \sim d_s^{\pi_1} \\ a' \sim \pi_1(\cdot|s')}} [A^{\pi_2}(s', a')]$$

Here, $A^{\pi_2}(s', a') := Q^{\pi_2}(s', a') - V^{\pi_2}(s')$ and $d_s^{\pi_1}(s') = (1-\gamma) \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \gamma^h \text{Pr}_h^{\pi_1}[s', s]$ where $\text{Pr}_h^{\pi_1}[s', s]$ is the probability of π_1 reaching state s' at time step h starting from state s .

Theorem D.3 (Bounding value difference). *For any $s \in \mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$ and $(\delta_1, \delta_2) \in (0, 1]^2$, we have:*

$$V^{\pi^*}(s) - V^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s) \leq \frac{2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{2nk}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_1}} + \frac{2\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} |\mathcal{A}_g| \delta_1 + \frac{2\epsilon_{k,m}}{1-\gamma}$$

Proof. Note that by definition of the advantage function, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s')} A^{\pi^*}(s', a') &= \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s')} [Q^{\pi^*}(s', a') - V^{\pi^*}(s')] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s')} [Q^{\pi^*}(s', a') - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s')} Q^{\pi^*}(s', a)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s')} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s')} [Q^{\pi^*}(s', a') - Q^{\pi^*}(s', a)] \end{aligned}$$

Since π^* is a deterministic policy, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s')} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s')} A^{\pi^*}(s', a') &= \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s')} [Q^{\pi^*}(s', a') - Q^{\pi^*}(s', \pi^*(s'))] \\ &= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} [Q^{\pi^*}(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta)) - Q^{\pi^*}(s', \pi^*(s'))] \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the linearity of expectations and the performance difference lemma (while noting that $Q^{\pi^*}(\cdot, \cdot) = Q^*(\cdot, \cdot)$):

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi^*}(s) - V^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s) &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_s^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}} [Q^{\pi^*}(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^{\pi^*}(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta))] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_s^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}} [Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta))] \end{aligned}$$

Next, we use Lemma D.4 to bound this difference (where the probability distribution function of \mathcal{D} is set as $d_s^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}$ as defined in Theorem D.2) while letting $\delta_1 = \delta_2$:

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi^*}(s) - V^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s) &\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \left[\frac{2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty}}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{2nk}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_1}} \right) + \frac{2\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma} |\mathcal{A}_g| \delta_1 + 2\epsilon_{k,m} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{2nk}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_1}} \right) + \frac{2\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} |\mathcal{A}_g| \delta_1 + \frac{2\epsilon_{k,m}}{1-\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

This proves the theorem. \square

Lemma D.4. *For any arbitrary distribution \mathcal{D} of states $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$, for any $\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ and for $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, 1]$, we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{D}} [Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta))] &\leq \frac{2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty}}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8nk}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_1}} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_2}} \right) + \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma} |\mathcal{A}_g| (\delta_1 + \delta_2) + 2\epsilon_{k,m} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Denote $\zeta_{k,m}^{s,\Delta} := Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) - Q^*(s, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta))$. We define the indicator function $\mathcal{I} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{N} \times (0, 1] \times (0, 1]$ by:

$$\mathcal{I}(s, k, \delta_1, \delta_2) = \mathbb{1} \left\{ \zeta_{k,m}^{s,\Delta} \leq \frac{2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8nk}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_1}} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_2}} \right) + 2\epsilon_{k,m} \right\}$$

We then study the expected difference between $Q^*(s', \pi^*(s'))$ and $Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta))$. Observe that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{D}}[\zeta_{k,m}^{s,\Delta}] &= \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{D}}[Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{D}}[\mathcal{I}(s', k, \delta_1, \delta_2)(Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta)))] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{D}}[(1 - \mathcal{I}(s', k, \delta_1, \delta_2))(Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta)))] \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the general property for a random variable X and constant c that $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[X \mathbb{1}\{X \leq c\}] + \mathbb{E}[(1 - \mathbb{1}\{X \leq c\})X]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{D}}[Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta))] &\leq \frac{2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8nk}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_1}} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_2}} \right) + 2\epsilon_{k,m} \\ &\quad + \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma} (1 - \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{I}(s', k, \delta_1, \delta_2)) \\ &\leq \frac{2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8nk}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_1}} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_2}} \right) + 2\epsilon_{k,m} \\ &\quad + \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma} |\mathcal{A}_g| (\delta_1 + \delta_2) \end{aligned}$$

For the first term in the first inequality, we use $\mathbb{E}[X \mathbb{1}\{X \leq c\}] \leq c$. For the second term, we trivially bound $Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta))$ by the maximum value Q^* can take, which is $\frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma}$ by Lemma A.7. In the second inequality, we use the fact that the expectation of an indicator function is the conditional probability of the underlying event. The second inequality follows from Lemma D.5 which yields the claim. \square

Lemma D.5. For a fixed $s' \in \mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$, for any $\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}$, and for $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, 1]$, we have that with probability at least $1 - |\mathcal{A}_g|(\delta_1 + \delta_2)$:

$$Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta)) \leq \frac{2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8nk}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_1}} + \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_2}} \right) + 2\epsilon_{k,m}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta)) &= Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta)) + \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta, \pi^*(s')) \\ &\quad - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta, \pi^*(s')) + \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta)) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta)) \end{aligned}$$

By the monotonicity of the absolute value and the triangle inequality, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta)) &\leq |Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta, \pi^*(s'))| \\ &\quad + |\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta)) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta))| \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality crucially uses the fact that the residual term $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta, \pi^*(s')) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s'_g, s'_\Delta)) \leq 0$, since $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ is the optimal greedy policy for $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$. Finally, applying the error bound derived in Lemma D.1 for two timesteps completes the proof. \square

Corollary D.6. *Optimizing parameters in Theorem D.3 yields:*

$$V^{\pi^*}(s) - V^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s) \leq \frac{2\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{2nk}} \ln(2|\mathcal{S}_l| |\mathcal{A}_g| \sqrt{k}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \right) + \frac{2\epsilon_{k,m}}{1-\gamma}$$

Proof. Recall from Theorem D.3 that:

$$V^{\pi^*}(s) - V^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s) \leq \frac{2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{2nk}} \left(\sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_1}} \right) + \frac{2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty}{(1-\gamma)^2} |\mathcal{A}_g| \delta_1 + \frac{2\epsilon_{k,m}}{1-\gamma}$$

Note $\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq \tilde{r}$ from Assumption 2.2. Then,

$$V^{\pi^*}(s) - V^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s) \leq \frac{2\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{2nk}} \ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l|}{\delta_1} + |\mathcal{A}_g| \delta_1 \right) + \frac{2\epsilon_{k,m}}{1-\gamma}$$

Finally, setting $\delta_1 = \frac{1}{k^{1/2} |\mathcal{A}_g|}$ yields the claim. \square

Corollary D.7. *Therefore, from Corollary D.6, we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi^*}(s) - V^{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s) &\leq O\left(\frac{\tilde{r}}{\sqrt{k}(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\ln(2|\mathcal{S}_l| |\mathcal{A}_g| \sqrt{k})} + \frac{\epsilon_{k,m}}{1-\gamma} \right) \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\tilde{r}(1-\gamma)^{-2}}{\sqrt{k}} + \frac{\epsilon_{k,m}}{1-\gamma} \right) \end{aligned}$$

This yields the bound from Theorem 3.2.