

Learning with Linear Function Approximations in Mean-Field Control*

Erhan Bayraktar and Ali Devran Kara[†]

August 5, 2024

Abstract

The paper focuses on mean-field type multi-agent control problems where the dynamics and cost structures are symmetric and homogeneous, and are affected by the distribution of the agents. A standard solution method for these problems is to consider the infinite population limit as an approximation and use symmetric solutions of the limit problem to achieve near optimality. The control policies, and in particular the dynamics, depend on the population distribution in the finite population setting, or the marginal distribution of the state variable of a representative agent for the infinite population setting. Hence, learning and planning for these control problems generally require estimating the reaction of the system to all possible state distributions of the agents. To overcome this issue, we consider linear function approximation for the control problem and provide several coordinated and independent learning methods. We rigorously establish error upper bounds for the performance of learned solutions. The performance gap stems from (i) the mismatch due to estimating the true model with a linear one, and (ii) using the infinite population solution in the finite population problem as an approximate control. The provided upper bounds quantify the impact of these error sources on the overall performance.

*E. Bayraktar is partially supported by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-2106556 and by the Susan M. Smith chair.

[†]E. Bayraktar is with the Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA, Email: erhan@umich.edu

A. D. Kara is with the Department of Mathematics, Florida State University, FL, USA, Email:alidevrnkara@gmail.com

1 Introduction

The goal of the paper is to present various learning methods for mean-field control problems under linear function approximations and to provide provable error bounds for the learned solutions.

The dynamics for the model are presented as follows: suppose N agents (decision-makers or controllers) act in a cooperative way to minimize a cost function, and the agents share a common state and an action space denoted by \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{U} . We assume that \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{U} are finite. We refer the reader to [5], for finite approximations of mean-field control problems where the state and actions spaces of the agents are continuous. For any time step t , and agent $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ we have

$$x_{t+1}^i = f(x_t^i, u_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}, w_t^i) \quad (1)$$

for a measurable function f , where $\{w_t^i\}$ denotes the i.i.d. idiosyncratic noise process. Furthermore, $\mu_{\mathbf{x}}$ denotes the empirical distribution of the agents on the state space \mathbb{X} such that for a given joint state $\mathbf{x} := \{x^1, \dots, x^N\} \in \mathbb{X}^N$

$$\mu_{\mathbf{x}} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x^i}.$$

Equivalently, the next state of the agent i is determined by some stochastic kernel, that is, a regular conditional probability distribution.

$$\mathcal{T}(\cdot | x_t^i, u_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}). \quad (2)$$

At each time stage t , each agent receives a cost determined by a measurable stage-wise cost function $c : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U} \times \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})$ is the set of all empirical measures in \mathbb{X} constructed using N dimensional state vectors. That is, if the state, action, and empirical distribution of the agents are given by $x_t^i, u_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}$, then the agent receives the cost.

$$c(x_t^i, u_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}).$$

For the remainder of the paper, by an abuse of notation, we will sometimes denote the dynamics in terms of the vector state and action variables, $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^N)$, and $\mathbf{u} = (u^1, \dots, u^N)$, and vector noise variables $\mathbf{w} = (w^1, \dots, w^N)$ such that

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{w}_t).$$

For the initial formulation, every agent is assumed to know the state and action variables of every other agent. We define an admissible policy for an agent i , as a sequence of functions $\gamma^i := \{\gamma_t^i\}_t$, where γ_t^i is a \mathbb{U} -valued (possibly randomized) function which is measurable with respect to the σ -algebra generated by

$$I_t = \{\mathbf{x}_0, \dots, \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_0, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{t-1}\}. \quad (3)$$

Accordingly, an admissible *team* policy, is defined as $\gamma := \{\gamma^1, \dots, \gamma^N\}$, where γ^i is an admissible policy for the agent i . In other words, agents share the complete information.

The objective of the agents is to minimize the following cost function

$$J_\beta^N(\mathbf{x}_0, \gamma) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t E_\gamma [\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t)]$$

where E_γ denotes the expectation with respect to the probability measure induced by the team policy γ , and where

$$\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N c(x_t^i, u_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}).$$

The optimal cost is defined by

$$J_\beta^{N,*}(\mathbf{x}_0) := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} J_\beta^N(\mathbf{y}_0, \gamma) \quad (4)$$

where Γ denotes the set of all admissible team policies.

We note that this information structure will be our benchmark for evaluating the performance of the approximate solutions that will be presented in the paper. In other words, the value function that is achieved when the agents share full information will be taken to be our reference point for simpler information structures.

The problem under this information structure can be reformulated as a centralized system since every agent has the full information. However, if the problem is modeled as an MDP with state space \mathbb{X}^N and action space \mathbb{U}^N , we then face some computational challenges:

- (i) the curse of dimensionality when N is large, since \mathbb{X}^N and \mathbb{U}^N might be too large even when \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{U} are manageable,

- (ii) the curse of coordination: even if we can solve the optimality problem for the team, realizing the optimal team policy at the agent level requires coordination between the agents. In particular, the agents may need to use asymmetric policies to achieve optimality, even though we assume full symmetry for the dynamics and the cost models.

A standard approach to deal with mean-field control problems when N is large is to consider the infinite population problem, i.e. $N \rightarrow \infty$. A propagation of chaos argument can be used to show that in the limit, the correlation between the agents breaks down. Hence, the problem can be formulated from the perspective of a representative single agent. This approach is suitable to deal with coordination challenges, as the correlation between the agents disappears in the limit, and thus the symmetric policies can achieve optimal performance for the infinite population control problem. We will introduce the the limit problem in Section 1.4 and make the connections between the limit problem and the finite population problem rigorous.

1.1 Literature Review

Learning for multi agent control problems is a practically relevant and a challenging problem where there has been as a growing interest in recent years. A general framework for multi-agent control problems is difficult to obtain and the solution, in general, is intractable except for special information structures between the agents. We refer the reader to the survey paper [39] for a substantive summary of learning methods in the context of multi-agent decision making problems.

In this paper, we study a particular case of multi-agent problems where the agents and the interactions between the agents are symmetrical and homogeneous. For mean-field type decision making problems, the agents are only related through the so-called mean-field term. The mean-field decision making problems can be broadly divided into two main categories; mean-field game problems where the agents are competitive and interested in optimizing their self objective functions, and mean-field control problems, where the agents are interested in a common objective function optimization. We cite [21, 12, 10, 38, 25, 1, 18, 19, 24, 32, 36, 34, 35] and references therein, for papers in mean-field game setting without going into much detail as our focus will be in the mean-field control problems which is significantly different in both analysis and the flavor of the problems of interest.

For team control problems, where the agents are cooperative and work together to minimize (or maximize) a common cost (or reward) function,

see [7, 17, 28, 14, 33, 13, 20, 6, 9] and references therein for the study of dynamic programming principle, learning methods in continuous time. In particular, we point out the papers [27, 17] which provide the justification for studying the centralized limit problem by rigorously connecting the large population decentralized setting and the infinite population limit problem.

For papers studying mean-field control in discrete time, we refer the reader to [31, 4, 22, 23, 30, 15]. [31, 30] study existence of solutions to the control problem in both infinite and finite population settings, and they rigorously establish the connection between the finite and infinite population problems. [4] studies the finite population mean-field control problems and the infinite population limit, and provide solutions of the ergodic control problems for some special cases.

In the context of learning, [22, 23] study dynamic programming principle and Q learning methods directly for the infinite population control problem. The value functions and the Q functions are defined for the lifted problem, where the state process is the measure-valued mean-field term. They consider dynamics without common noise, and thus the learning problem from the perspective of a coordinator becomes a deterministic one.

[15] also considers the limit (infinite population) problem and studies different classes of policies that achieve optimal performance for the infinite population (limit problem) and focuses on Q learning methods for the problem after establishing the optimality of randomized feedback policies for the agents. The learning problem considers the state problem as the measure valued mean-field term and defines a learning problem over the set of probability measures where various approximations are considered to deal with the high dimension issues.

[3, 2] have studied learning methods for the mean-field game and control problems from a joint lens. However, for the control setup, they consider a different control objective compared to the previous cited papers. In particular, they aim to optimize the asymptotic phase of the control problem where the agents are assumed to reach to their stationary distributions under joint symmetric policies. Furthermore, the agents only use their local state variables, and thus the objective is to find a stationary measure for the agents where the cost is minimized under this stationary regime. Since the agents only use their local state variables (and not the mean-field term) for their control, the authors can define a Q function over the finite state and action spaces of the agents.

In this paper, we will consider the learning problem over an alternative formulation problem where the state is viewed to be the measure valued mean-field term. To approximate this uncountable space, and the cost and

transition functions, different from the previous works in the mean-field control setting, we will consider linear function approximation methods. These methods are studied well for single agent discrete time stochastic control problems. We cite [29, 16, 37, 26] in which reinforcement learning techniques are used to study Markov decision problems with continuous state spaces using linear function approximations.

Contributions.

- In Section 2, we present the learning methods using linear function approximation. We focus on various scenarios.
 - We first consider the ideal case where we assume that the team has infinitely many agents. For this case, we study; (i) learning by a coordinator who has access to information about the every agent in the team, and estimates a model from a data set by fitting a linear model that minimizes the L_2 distance between the training data and the estimate linear model, (ii) each agent estimates their own linear model using their local information via an iterative algorithm from a single sequence of data.
 - In Section 2.3, we consider the practical case, where the team has finitely many agents, and they aim to estimate a linear model from a single sequence of data, using their local information.
- The methods we study in Section 2, minimizes the L_2 distance between the linear estimate and an empirical model under a probability measure depending on the training data. However, in order to find upper bounds for the performance loss of the policies designed for the learned linear estimates in any scenario, we need uniform estimation errors rather than the l_2 estimation errors. In Section 3, we generalize the L_2 error bounds to uniform error bounds for certain important classes of models.
- The proposed learning methods do not match the true model perfectly in general, due to linear estimation mismatch. Therefore, finally, in Section 4, we provide upper bounds on the performance of the policies that are designed for the learned models when they are applied on the true control problem. We note that the flow of the mean-field term is deterministic for infinitely many agents, and thus can be estimated using the dynamics model without observing the mean-field term. Therefore, for the execution of the policies we focus on two methods, (i) *open loop control*, where the agents only observe their

local states and estimate the mean-field term with the learned dynamics, (ii) *closed loop control* where the agents observe both their local information and the mean-field term. For each of these execution procedures, we provide upper bounds for the performance loss. As before, we first consider the ideal case where it is assumed that the system has infinitely many agents present. For this case, the error bound depends on the uniform model mismatch between the learned model and the true model. We then consider the case where there are finitely many agents. We assume that each agent follows the policy that they calculate considering the limit model. In this case, the error upper bounds depend on the uniform model mismatch, and an empirical concentration bound since we estimate the finitely many agent model with the limit problem.

1.2 Preliminaries.

Recall that we assume that the state and action spaces of agents \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{U} are finite (see [5] for finite approximations of continuous space mean-field control problems).

Note. Even though we assume that \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{U} are finite, we will continue using integral signs instead of summation signs for expectation computations due to notation consistency, by simply considering Dirac delta measures.

We metrize \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{U} so that $d(x, x') = 1$ if $x \neq x'$ and $d(x, x') = 0$ otherwise. Note that with this metric, for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ and for any coupling Q of μ, ν , we have that

$$E_Q [|X - Y|] = P_Q(X \neq Y)$$

which in particular implies via the optimal coupling that

$$W_1(\mu, \nu) = \|\mu - \nu\|_{TV}$$

where W_1 denotes the first order Wasserstein distance, or the Kantorovich–Rubinstein metric, and $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$ denotes the total variation norm for signed measures.

Note further that for measures defined on finite spaces, we have that

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} = \frac{1}{2} \|\mu - \nu\|_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_x |\mu(x) - \nu(x)|.$$

Hence, in what follows we will simply write $\|\mu - \nu\|$ to refer to the distance between μ and ν , which may correspond to the total variation distance, the first order Wasserstein metric, or the normalized l_1 distance.

We also define the following Dobrushin coefficient for the kernel \mathcal{T} :

$$\sup_{\mu, \gamma, x, \hat{x}} \left\| \int_{\mathbb{U}} \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu) \gamma(du|x) - \int_{\mathbb{U}} \mathcal{T}(\cdot|\hat{x}, u, \mu) \gamma(du|\hat{x}) \right\| =: \delta_T \quad (5)$$

Realize that we always have $\delta_T \leq 1$. In certain cases, we can also have strict inequality, e.g. if

$$\mathcal{T}(x^*|x, u, \mu) < 1 - \alpha, \quad \forall x, u, \mu$$

and for some x^* , then one can show that $\delta_T \leq 1 - \alpha < 1$.

1.3 Measure Valued Formulation of the Finite Population Control Problem

For the remainder part of the paper, we will often consider an alternative formulation of the control problem for the finitely many agent case where the controlled process is the state distribution of the agents, rather than the state vector of the agents. We refer the reader to [5] for the full construction, in this section, we will give an overview.

We will define an MDP for the distribution of the agents, where the control actions are the joint distribution of the state and action vectors of the agents.

We let the state space to be $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})$ which is the set of all empirical measures on \mathbb{X} that can be constructed using the state vectors of N -agents. In other words, for a given state vector $\mathbf{x} = \{x^1, \dots, x^N\}$, we consider $\mu_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})$ to be the new state variable of the team control problem.

The admissible set of actions for some state $\mu \in \mathcal{Z}$, is denoted by $U(\mu)$, where

$$U(\mu) = \{\Theta \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{X}) | \Theta(\mathbb{U}, \cdot) = \mu(\cdot)\}, \quad (6)$$

that is, the set of actions for a state μ , is the set of all joint empirical measures on $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U}$ whose marginal on \mathbb{X} coincides with μ .

We equip the state space \mathcal{Z} , and the action sets $U(\mu)$, with the first order Wasserstein distance W_1 .

One can show that (see [5, 8]) the empirical distributions of the agents' states μ_t , and of the joint state and actions Θ_t define a controlled Markov chain such that

$$\begin{aligned} Pr(\mu_{t+1} \in B | \mu_t, \dots, \mu_0, \Theta_t, \dots, \Theta_0) &= Pr(\mu_{t+1} \in B | \mu_t, \Theta_t) \\ &:= \eta(B | \mu_t, \Theta_t) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\eta(\cdot|\mu, \Theta) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X}))$ is the transition kernel of the centralized measure valued MDP, which is induced by the dynamics of the team problem.

We define the stage-wise cost function $k(\mu, \Theta)$ by

$$k(\mu, \Theta) := \int c(x, u, \mu) \Theta(du, dx) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N c(x^i, u^i, \mu). \quad (8)$$

Thus, we have an MDP with state space \mathcal{Z} , action space $\cup_{\mu \in \mathcal{Z}} U(\mu)$, transition kernel η and the stage-wise cost function k .

We define the set of admissible policies for this measured valued MDP as a sequence of functions $g = \{g_0, g_1, g_2, \dots\}$ such that at every time t , g_t is measurable with respect to the σ -algebra generated by the information variables

$$I_t = \{\mu_0, \dots, \mu_t, \Theta_0, \dots, \Theta_{t-1}\}.$$

We denote the set of all admissible control policies by G for the measure valued MDP.

In particular, we define the infinite horizon average expected cost function under a policy g by

$$K_\beta^N(\mu_0, g) = E_{\mu_0}^\eta \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t k(\mu_t, \Theta_t) \right].$$

We also define the optimal cost by

$$K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu_0) = \inf_{g \in G} K_\beta^N(\mu_0, g). \quad (9)$$

We now introduce the limit problem.

1.4 Mean-field Limit Problem

We now introduce the control problem for infinite population teams, i.e. for $N \rightarrow \infty$. For some agent $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the dynamics as

$$x_{t+1}^i = f(x_t^i, u_t^i, \mu_t^i, w_t^i)$$

where $x_0 \sim \mu_0$ and $\mu_t^i = \mathcal{L}(X_t^i)$ is the law of the state at time t . The agent tries to minimize the following cost function:

$$J_\beta^\infty(\mu_0, \gamma) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t E [c(X_t^i, U_t^i, \mu_t^i)]$$

where $\gamma = \{\gamma_t\}_t$ is an admissible policy such that γ_t is measurable with respect to the information variables

$$I_t^i = \{x_0^i, \dots, x_t^i, u_0^i, \dots, u_{t-1}^i, \mu_0^i, \dots, \mu_t^i\}.$$

Note that the agents are no longer correlated and they are indistinguishable. Hence, in what follows we will drop the dependence on i when we refer to the infinite population problem.

The problem is now a single agent control problem; however, the state variable is not Markovian. However, we can reformulate the problem as an MDP by viewing the state variable as the measure valued μ_t .

We let the state space to be $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$. Different from the measure valued construction we have introduced in Section 1.3, we let the action space to $\Gamma = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U})^{|\mathbb{X}|}$. In particular, an action $\gamma(\cdot|x) \in \Gamma$ for the team is a randomized policy at the agent level. We equip Γ with the product topology, where we use the weak convergence for each coordinate. We note that each action $\gamma(du|x)$ and state $\mu(dx)$ induce a distribution on $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U}$, which we denote by $\Theta(du, dx) = \gamma(du|x)\mu(dx)$.

Recall the notation in (2), such that at time t , we can use the following stochastic kernel for the dynamics:

$$x_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x_t, u_t, \mu_t)$$

which is induced by the idiosyncratic noise w_t^i . Hence, we can define

$$\mu_{t+1} = F(\mu_t, \gamma_t) := \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_t) \gamma_t(du|x) \mu_t(dx). \quad (10)$$

Note that the dynamics are deterministic for the infinite population measure valued problem. Furthermore, we can define the stage-wise cost function as

$$k(\mu, \gamma) := \int c(x, u, \mu) \gamma(du|x) \mu(dx). \quad (11)$$

Hence, the problem is a deterministic MDP for the measure valued state process μ_t . A policy, say $g : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X}) \rightarrow \Gamma$ for the measure-valued MDP, can be written as

$$g(\mu) = \gamma(du|x)$$

for some $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$. That is, an agent observes μ and chooses their actions as an agent-level randomized policy $\gamma(du|x)$.

We reintroduce the infinite horizon discounted cost of the agents for the measure valued formulation:

$$K_\beta(\mu_0, g) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t k(\mu_t, \gamma_t)$$

for some initial mean-field term μ_0 and under some policy g . Furthermore, the optimal policy is denoted by

$$K_\beta^*(\mu_0) = \inf_g K_\beta(\mu_0, g)$$

At a given time t , the pair (x_t, μ_t) can be used as sufficient information for decision making by the agent i . Furthermore, if the model is fully known by the agents, then the mean-field flow μ_t can be perfectly estimated if every agent agrees and follows the same policy $g(\mu)$, since the dynamics of μ_t is deterministic.

We note that for the infinite population control problem, the coordination requirement between the agents may be relaxed, though cannot be fully abandoned in general (see Section 1.5). In particular, if the agents agree on a common policy $g(\mu) = \gamma(du|x, \mu)$, then for the execution of this policy, no coordination or communication is needed since every agent can estimate the mean-field term μ_t independently and perfectly. Furthermore, every agent can use the same agent-level policy $\gamma(du|x, \mu)$ symmetrically, without any coordination with the other agents.

The following result makes the connection between the finite population and the infinite population control problem rigorous (see [30, 4, 8]).

Assumption 1. *i. For the transition kernel $\mathcal{T}(dx_1|x, u, \mu)$ (see (2))*

$$\|\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu) - \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu')\| \leq K_f \|\mu - \mu'\|$$

for some $K_f < \infty$, for each x, u and for every $\mu, \mu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$.

ii c is Lipschitz in μ such that

$$|c(x, u, \mu) - c(x, u, \mu')| \leq K_c \|\mu - \mu'\|$$

for some $K_c < \infty$.

Theorem 1. *Under Assumption 1, the following holds:*

i. For any $\mu_0^N \rightarrow \mu_0$ weakly,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu_0^N) = K_\beta^{\infty,*}(\mu_0).$$

That is, the optimal value function of the finite population control problem converges to that of the infinite population control problem as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

ii. Suppose each agent solves the infinite population control problem given in (10) and (11), and constructs their policies, say

$$g_\infty(\mu) = \gamma_\infty(du|x, \mu).$$

If they follow the infinite population solution in the finite population control problem, we then have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} K_\beta^N(\mu_0^N, g_\infty) = K_\beta^{\infty,*}(\mu_0).$$

That is, the symmetric policy constructed using the infinite population problem is near optimal for finite but sufficiently large populations.

Remark 1. The result has significant implications for the computational challenges we have mentioned earlier. Firstly, the second part of the result states that if the number of agents is large enough, then the symmetric policy obtained from the limit problem is near optimal. Hence, the curse of coordination can be handled, since the agents can use symmetric policies without coordination, solving their control problems as long as they have access to the mean-field term and their local state. Secondly, note that the flow of the mean-field term μ_t (10) is deterministic if there is no common noise affecting the dynamics. Thus, agents can estimate the marginal distribution of their local state variables x_t^i , without observing the mean-field term if they know the dynamics model. In particular, without the common noise, the local state of the agents and the initial mean-field term μ_0 are sufficient information for near optimality.

However, as we will see in what follows, to achieve near optimal performance, agents must agree on a particular policy $g(\mu) = \gamma(du|x, \mu)\mu(dx)$. In particular, if the optimal infinite population policy is not unique, and the agents apply different optimal policies without coordination, the results of the previous results might fail. Hence, coordination cannot be fully ignored.

1.5 Limitations of Full Decentralization

We have argued in the previous section that the team control problem can be solved near optimally by using the infinite population control solution. Furthermore, if the agents agree on the application of a common optimal policy, the resulting team policy can be executed independently in a decentralized way and achieves near-optimal performance.

The following example shows that if the agents do not coordinate on which policy to follow, i.e. if they are fully decentralized, then the resulting team policy will not achieve the desired outcome.

Example 1.1. Consider a team control problem where $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{U} = \{0, 1\}$. The stage wise cost function of the agents is defined as

$$c(x, u, \mu) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mu = \bar{\mu}_1 \text{ or } \mu = \bar{\mu}_2 \\ 10 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mu}_1 &= \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_1 \\ \bar{\mu}_2 &= \delta_0. \end{aligned}$$

In words, the state distribution should be either be distributed equally over the state space $\{0, 1\}$ or it should fully concentrate in state 0 for minimal stage-wise cost. For the dynamics we assume a deterministic model such that

$$x_{t+1} = u_t.$$

In words, the action of an agent purely determines the next state of the same agent. The goal of the agents is to minimize

$$K_\beta(\mu_0, g) = \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t E\left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N c(x_t^i, u_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t})\right]$$

where the initial distribution is given by $\mu_0 = \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_1$.

It is easy to see that there are two possible optimal policies for the agents $g_1(\mu) = \gamma_1(du|x, \mu)\mu(dx)$ and $g_2(\mu) = \gamma_2(du|x, \mu)\mu(dx)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1(\cdot|x) &= \frac{1}{2}\delta_0(\cdot) + \frac{1}{2}\delta_1(\cdot) \\ \gamma_2(\cdot|x) &= \delta_0(\cdot). \end{aligned}$$

If all the agents coordinate and apply either g_1 or g_2 all together, the realized costs will be 0, i.e.

$$K_\beta(\mu_0, g_1) = K_\beta(\mu_0, g_2) = 0.$$

However, if the agents do not coordinate and pick their policies from g_1, g_2 randomly, the cost incurred will be strictly greater than 0. For example, assume that any given agent decides to use g_1 with probability 0.5 and the policy g_2 with probability 0.5. Then the resulting policy, say \hat{g} will be such that

$$\hat{g}(\mu) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\gamma_1(du|x) + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_2(du|x) \right) \mu(dx)$$

Thus, at every time step $t \geq 1$, $\frac{1}{4}$ of the agents will be in state 1 and $\frac{3}{4}$ of the agents will be in state 0, hence the total accumulated cost of the resulting policy \hat{g} will be

$$K_\beta(\mu_0, \hat{g}) = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \beta^t 10 = \frac{10\beta}{1-\beta} > 0.$$

Thus, we see that if the optimal policy for the mean-field control problem is not unique, the agents cannot follow fully decentralized policies, and they need to coordinate at some level. For this problem, if they agree initially on which policy to follow, then no other communication is needed afterwards for the execution of the decided policy. Nonetheless, an initial agreement and coordination is needed to achieve the optimal performance.

We note that the issue with the previous example results from the fact that the optimal policy is not unique. If the optimal policy can be guaranteed to be unique, then the agents can act fully independently.

2 Learning for Mean-field Control with Linear Approximations

We have seen in the previous sections that in general there are limitations for full decentralization, and that a certain level of coordination is required for optimal or near optimal performance during control. In this section, we will study the learning problem in which neither the agents nor the coordinator know the dynamics and aims to learn the model or optimal decision strategies from the data.

We have observed that the limit problem introduced in Section 1.4 can be seen as a deterministic centralized control problem. In particular, if the model is known, and once it is coordinated which control strategy to follow, the agents do not need further communication or coordination to execute the optimal control. Each agent can simply apply an open-loop policy using only their local state information, and the mean-field term can be estimated perfectly, if every agent is following the same policy. However, to estimate the deterministic mean-field flow μ_t , the model must be known. For problems where the model is not fully known, the open-loop policies will not be applicable.

Our goal in this section is to present various learning algorithms to learn the dynamics and cost model of the control problem. We will first focus on the idealized scenario, where we assume that there exist infinitely many agents on the team. For this case, we provide two methods; (i) the first one where a coordinator has access to all information of every agent, and decides on the exploration policy, and (ii) the second one where each agent learns the model on their own by tracking their local state and the mean-field term. However, the agents need to coordinate for the exploration policy through a common randomness variable to induce stochastic dynamics for better exploration. Next, we study the realistic setting where the team has large but finitely many agents. For this case, we only consider an independent learning method where the agents learn the model on their own using their local information variables.

Before we present our learning algorithms, we note that the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ is uncountable even under the assumption that \mathbb{X} is finite. Therefore, we will focus on finite representations of the cost function $c(x, u, \mu)$ and the kernel $\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu)$. In particular, we will try to learn the functions of the following form

$$\begin{aligned} c(x, u, \mu) &= \Phi_{(x,u)}^\top(\mu)\theta_{(x,u)} \\ \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu) &= \Phi_{(x,u)}^\top(\mu)\mathbf{Q}_{(x,u)}(\cdot) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\Phi_{(x,u)}(\mu) = [\Phi_{x,u}^1(\mu), \dots, \Phi_{(x,u)}^d(\mu)]^\top$, for a set of linearly independent functions $\Phi_{x,u}^j(\mu) : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for each pair (x, u) , for some $d < \infty$. We assume that the basis functions $\Phi_{(x,u)}(\mu)$ are known and the goal is to learn the parameters $\theta_{x,u}(\mu)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{(x,u)}(\cdot)$. We assume $\theta_{x,u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\mathbf{Q}_{(x,u)}(\cdot) = [Q_{(x,u)}^1(\cdot), \dots, Q_{(x,u)}^d(\cdot)]$ is a vector of unknown signed measures on \mathbb{X} .

In what follows, we will assume that the basis functions, $\Phi_{(x,u)}^j(\cdot)$ are uniformly bounded. Note that this is without loss of generality.

Assumption 2. We assume that

$$\|\Phi_{(x,u)}^j(\cdot)\|_\infty \leq 1$$

for every (x, u) pair, and for all $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.

Remark 2. We note that we **do not** assume that the model and the cost function have the linear form given in (12). However, we will aim to learn and estimate models among the class of linear functions presented in (12). We will later analyze error bounds for the case where the actual model is not linear and thus the learned model does not perfectly match the true model and the performance loss when we apply policies that are learned for the linear model.

2.1 Coordinated Learning with Linear Function Approximation for Infinitely Many Players

In this section, we will consider an idealized scenario, where there are infinitely many agents, and a coordinator learns the model and the solution of the control problem by linear function approximation.

For this section, we assume that there exists a training set T of data points of size M . Every data point contains $\{x^i, u^i, X_1^i, c(x^i, u^i, \mu), \mu\}_{i=1}^\infty$ for every agent. That is every data point includes the current state and action, the one-step ahead state, the stage-wise cost realization, and the mean-field term for every agent $i \in \{1, \dots, N, \dots\}$. For every $(x, u) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U}$ pair, the coordinator aims to find $\theta_{(x,u)}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{(x,u)}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left| c(x, u, \mu_j) - \Phi_{(x,u)}^\top(\mu_j) \theta_{(x,u)} \right|^2 \\ & \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left\| \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_j) - \Phi_{(x,u)}^\top(\mu_j) \mathbf{Q}_{(x,u)}(\cdot) \right\| \end{aligned}$$

is minimized for every $(x, u) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U}$, that is we are looking for the linear least square minimizer for the cost and the transition kernel.

Note that we assume there are infinitely many agents, and the spaces \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{U} are finite. For a single data point of some agent i , say $(x^i, u^i, X_1^i, c(x^i, u^i, \mu), \mu)$ where $(x^i, u^i) = (x, u)$ for some $(x, u) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U}$, one only gets a point estimate, X_1^i , for $\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu)$. However, since, in this section we assume that the coordinator has access to the information of infinitely many agents, the coordinator, in turn, have access to infinitely many

empirical realizations of $\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu)$, and thus, the kernel $\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu)$ can be perfectly estimated for every x such that $\mu(x) > 0$, via empirical measures.

Therefore, for every data point in the training set, with corresponding mean-field term μ , the coordinator perfectly estimates $c(x, u, \mu)$ and $\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu)$ for all x where $\mu(x) > 0$.

The least squares linear models can be estimated in closed form for $\theta_{(x,u)}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{(x,u)}(\cdot)$ using the whole data set. We define the following vector and matrices to present the closed form solution in a more compact form: for each $(x, u) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U}$ we introduce $\mathbf{b}_{(x,u)} \in \mathbb{R}^M$, and $\mathbf{d}_{(x,u)} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times |\mathbb{X}|}$,

$$\mathbf{b}_{(x,u)} = \begin{bmatrix} c(x, u, \mu_1) \\ c(x, u, \mu_2) \\ \vdots \\ c(x, u, \mu_M) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{d}_{(x,u)} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{T}(x^1|x, u, \mu_1) & \mathcal{T}(x^2|x, u, \mu_1) & \dots & \mathcal{T}(x^{|\mathbb{X}|}|x, u, \mu_1) \\ \mathcal{T}(x^1|x, u, \mu_2) & \mathcal{T}(x^2|x, u, \mu_2) & \dots & \mathcal{T}(x^{|\mathbb{X}|}|x, u, \mu_2) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{T}(x^1|x, u, \mu_M) & \mathcal{T}(x^2|x, u, \mu_M) & \dots & \mathcal{T}(x^{|\mathbb{X}|}|x, u, \mu_M) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

Furthermore, we also define $\mathbf{A}_{(x,u)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times M}$

$$\mathbf{A}_{(x,u)} = [\Phi_{(x,u)}(\mu_1), \dots, \Phi_{(x,u)}(\mu_M)]. \quad (14)$$

Assuming that $\mathbf{A}_{(x,u)}$ has linearly independent columns, i.e. $\Phi_{(x,u)}(\mu_i)$ and $\Phi_{(x,u)}(\mu_j)$ are linearly independent for $\mu_i \neq \mu_j$, then the estimates for $\theta_{(x,u)}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{(x,u)}$ can be written as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{(x,u)} &= \left(\mathbf{A}_{(x,u)}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(x,u)} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{A}_{(x,u)}^\top \mathbf{b}_{(x,u)} \\ \mathbf{Q}_{(x,u)} &= \left(\mathbf{A}_{(x,u)}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(x,u)} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{A}_{(x,u)}^\top \mathbf{d}_{(x,u)}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Note that above, each row of $\mathbf{Q}_{(x,u)}$ represents a signed measure on \mathbb{X} .

2.2 Independent Learning with Linear Function Approximation for Infinitely Many Players

In this section, we will introduce a learning method where the agents perform independent learning to an extend. Here, rather than using a training set, we will focus on an online learning algorithm where at every time step, the agent i observe $x^i, u^i, X_1^i, c(x^i, u^i, \mu), \mu$. That is, each agent has access to their local state, action, cost realizations, one-step ahead state, and the mean-field term. However, they do not have access to local information about the other agents.

We first argue that full decentralization is usually not possible in the context of learning either. Recall that the mean-field flow is deterministic if every agent follows the same independently randomized agent-level policy. Furthermore, the flow of the mean-field terms remains deterministic even when the agents choose different exploration policies if the randomization is independent. To see this, assume that each agent picks some policy $\gamma_w(du|x)$ randomly by choosing $w \in \mathbb{W}$ from some arbitrary distribution, where the mapping $w \rightarrow \gamma_w(du|x)$ is predetermined. If the agents pick $w \in \mathbb{W}$ independently, the mean-field dynamics is given by

$$\mu_{t+1}(\cdot) = \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_t) \gamma_w(du|x) P(dw) \mu_t(dx)$$

where $P(dw)$ is an arbitrary distribution by which the agents perform their independent randomization for the policy selection. Hence, the mean-field term dynamics follow a deterministic flow. Note that for the above example, for simplicity, we assume that the agents pick according to the same distribution. In general, even if the agents follow different distributions for $w \in \mathbb{W}$, the dynamics of the mean-field flow would remain deterministic according to a mixture distribution.

Deterministic behavior might cause poor exploration performance. There might be cases where the flow gets stuck at a fixed distribution without learning or exploring the ‘important’ parts of the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ sufficiently. To overcome this issue, and to make sure that the system is stirred sufficiently well during the exploration, one option is to introduce a common randomness for the selection of the exploration policies. In particular, suppose that instead of choosing $w \in \mathbb{W}$ independently, a coordinator picks $w \in \mathbb{W}$ at every step and lets the agents know about the selection which introduces a common randomness into the dynamics since every agent uses the same w . As a result, the flow of the mean-field term becomes stochastic. In particular, the dynamics during the exploration becomes

$$\mu_{t+1}(\cdot) = F(\mu_t, w) := \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_t) \gamma_w(du|x) \mu_t(dx). \quad (16)$$

We assume the following for the mean-field flow during the exploration:

Assumption 3. *Consider the Markov chain $\{\mu_t\}_t \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ whose dynamics are given by (16) We assume that μ_t has geometric ergodicity with unique invariant probability measure $P(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X}))$ such that*

$$\|Pr(\mu_t \in \cdot) - P(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq K\rho^t$$

for some $K < \infty$ and some $\rho < 1$.

We now summarize the algorithm used for each agent. We drop the dependence on agent identity i , and summarize the steps for a generic agent. At every time step t , every agent performs the following steps:

- Observe the common randomness w given by the coordinator, and pick an action such that $u_t \sim \gamma_w(\cdot|x_t)$
- Collect $x_t, u_t, x_{t+1}, \mu_t, c$ where $c = c(x_t, u_t, \mu_t)$
- For all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U}$

$$\theta_{t+1}(x, u) = \theta_t(x, u) - \alpha_t(x, u) \Phi(x, u, \mu_t) [c - \Phi^\top(x, u, \mu_t) \theta_t(x, u)] \quad (17)$$

- Note that the signed measure vector $\mathbf{Q}_t(\cdot|x, u)$ consists d signed measures defined on \mathbb{X} , we denote by $\mathbf{Q}_t^j(x, u)$ the vector values of $\mathbf{Q}_t(x^j|x, u)$ for $x^j \in \mathbb{X}$ where $j \in \{1 \dots, |\mathbb{X}|\}$. For all (x, u) and $j \in \{1 \dots, |\mathbb{X}|\}$

$$\mathbf{Q}_{t+1}^j(x, u) = \mathbf{Q}_t^j(x, u) - \alpha_t(x, u) \Phi(x, u, \mu_t) \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{x_{t+1}=x^j\}} - \Phi^\top(x, u, \mu_t) \mathbf{Q}_t^j(x, u) \right]. \quad (18)$$

We next show that the above algorithm converges if the learning rates are chosen properly. To show the convergence, we first present a convergence result for stochastic gradient descent algorithms with quadratic cost, where the error is Markov and stationary:

Proposition 1. *Let $\{s_t\} \subset \mathbb{S}$ denote a Markov chain with the invariant probability measure $\pi(\cdot)$ where \mathbb{S} be a standard Borel space. We assume that s_t has geometric ergodicity such that $\|Pr(s_t \in \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq K \rho^t$ for some $K < \infty$ and some $\rho < 1$. Let $g(s, v)$ be such that*

$$g(s, v) = (k(s)^\top v - h(s))^2$$

for some $k, h : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and for $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We assume that k, h are uniformly bounded. We denote by

$$\begin{aligned} G_t(v) &= E[g(S_t, v)] \\ G(v) &= \int g(s, v) \pi(ds). \end{aligned}$$

Consider the iterations

$$v_{t+1} = v_t - \alpha_t \nabla g(s_t, v_t)$$

where the gradient is with respect to v_t and where $\alpha_t = \frac{1}{t}$. We then have that $G_t(v_t) \rightarrow \min_v G(v) = G(v^*)$ almost surely.

Proof. The proof can be found in the appendix B. □

Corollary 1. *Let Assumption 3 hold and let the learning rates be chosen such that $\alpha_t(x, u) = 0$ unless $(X_t, U_t) = (x, u)$. Furthermore,*

$$\alpha_t(x, u) = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=0}^t \mathbb{1}_{\{X_k=x, U_k=u\}}}$$

and with probability 1, $\sum_t \alpha_t(x, u) = \infty$. Then, the iterations given in (17) and (18) converge with probability 1. Furthermore, the limit points, say $\theta^*(x, u)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^*(\cdot)$ are such that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^*(x, u) &= \arg \min_{\theta} \int |c(x, u, \mu) - \Phi^\top(x, u, \mu)\theta(x, u)|^2 P(d\mu) \\ \mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^*(\cdot) &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{Q}} \int \|\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu)\mathbf{Q}_{x,u}(\cdot)\|_{TV}^2 P(d\mu) \end{aligned}$$

for every (x, u) pair where $P(\cdot)$ is the invariant measure of the mean-field flow under the extrapolation policy with common-randomness.

Proof. For the iterations (17), Proposition 1 applies such that for each (x, u) , $v_t \equiv \theta_t(x, u)$, $k(\mu) \equiv \Phi^\top(x, u, \mu)$ and $h(\mu) \equiv c(x, u, \mu)$ and finally the noise process $s_t \equiv \mu_t$. Note that Φ and c are assumed to be uniformly bounded which also agrees with the assumptions in Propositions 1.

For the iterations (18), Proposition 1 applies such that for each (x, u) and each j , $v_t \equiv \mathbf{Q}_t^j(x, u)$, $k(\mu) \equiv \Phi^\top(x, u, \mu)$ and $h(\mu) \equiv \mathbb{1}_{\{X_1=x^j\}}$. We note that $X_1 = f(x, u, \mu, w)$ (see (1)) where w is the i.i.d. noise for the dynamics of agents. Thus, the noise process for iterations (18) can be taken to be the joint process (μ_t, w_t) where μ_t is an ergodic Markov process, and w_t is an i.i.d. process. In particular, for every (x, u) pair and for every x^j , if we consider the expectation over (μ, w) where $\mu \sim P(\cdot)$, P being the invariant measure, we get

$$E [\mathbb{1}_{\{X_1=x^j\}}] = E [\mathbb{1}_{\{f(x,u,\mu,w)=x^j\}}] = \int \mathcal{T}(x^j|x, u, \mu)P(d\mu)$$

for every $x^j \in \mathbb{X}$. Thus, the algorithm in (18) minimizes the

$$\int |\mathcal{T}(x^j|x, u, \mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu) \mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^j(\cdot)|^2 P(d\mu)$$

for each j , and in particular the algorithm as a result minimizes

$$\int \|\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu) \mathbf{Q}_{x,u}(\cdot)\|_{TV}^2 P(d\mu)$$

over all $\mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^j(\cdot)$. □

2.3 Learning for Finitely Many Players

In this section, we will study the more realistic scenario in which the number of agents is large but finite. The learning methods presented in the previous sections have focused on the ideal case where the system has infinitely many players. Although the setting with the infinitely many agents helps us to fix the ideas for the learning in the mean-field control setup, we should note that it is only an artificial setup, and the infinite population setup is only used as an approximation for large population control problems. Hence, we need to study the actual setup for which the limit problem is argued to be a well approximation, that is the problem with very large but finitely many agents.

We will apply the independent learning algorithm presented for the infinite agent case, and study the performance of the learned solutions for the finitely many player setting. In particular, we will assume the agents follow the iterations given in (17) and (18). We note, however, that the agents will not need to use common randomness during exploration as the flow of the mean-field term is stochastic for finite populations without common randomness. The method remains valid under common randomness as well; in fact, the common randomness, in general, encourages the extrapolation of the state space. The method is identical to the one presented in Section 2.2. However, we present the method again since it has some subtle differences.

At every time step t , agent i performs the following steps:

- Pick an action such that $u_t^i \sim \gamma^i(\cdot|x_t^i)$
- Collect $x_t^i, u_t^i, x_{t+1}^i, \mu_t^N = \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}, c$ where $c = c(x_t^i, u_t^i, \mu_t^N)$
- For all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U}$

$$\theta_{t+1}(x, u) = \theta_t(x, u) - \alpha_t(x, u) \Phi_{x,u}(\mu_t^N) [c - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu_t^N) \theta_t(x, u)] \quad (19)$$

- Denoting by $\mathbf{Q}_t^j(x, u)$ the vector values of $\mathbf{Q}_t(x^j|x, u)$ for all $x^j \in \mathbb{X}$ where $j \in \{1 \dots, |\mathbb{X}|\}$. For all (x, u) and $j \in \{1 \dots, |\mathbb{X}|\}$

$$\mathbf{Q}_{t+1}^j(x, u) = \mathbf{Q}_t^j(x, u) - \alpha_t(x, u) \Phi_{x,u}(\mu_t^N) \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{x_{t+1}^i = x^j\}} - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu_t^N) \mathbf{Q}_t^j(x, u) \right] \quad (20)$$

Assumption 4. Under the team policy $\gamma(\cdot|\mathbf{x}) = [\gamma^1(\cdot|x^1), \dots, \gamma^N(\cdot|x^N)]^\top$, the state vector process $\mathbf{x}_t = [x_t^1, \dots, x_t^N]$ of the agents is irreducible and aperiodic and in particular admits a unique invariant measure, and thus the mean-field flow $\mu_t^N = \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}$ admits a unique invariant measure, say $P^N(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})$, as well.

Remark 3. We note that a sufficient condition for the above assumption to hold is that there exists some $x' \in \mathbb{X}$ such that $\mathcal{T}(x'|x, u, \mu_t^N) > 0$ for any x, u and for any μ_t^N .

Proposition 2. Let Assumption 4 hold, and let the learning rates be chosen such that $\alpha_t(x, u) = 0$ unless $(X_t, U_t) = (x, u)$. Furthermore,

$$\alpha_t(x, u) = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=0}^t \mathbb{1}_{\{X_k=x, U_k=u\}}}$$

and with probability 1 $\sum_t \alpha_t(x, u) = \infty$. Then, the iterations given in (19) and (20) converge with probability 1. Furthermore, the limit points, say $\theta^*(x, u)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^*(\cdot)$ are such that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^*(x, u) &= \arg \min_{\theta} \int |c(x, u, \mu) - \Phi^\top(x, u, \mu)\theta(x, u)|^2 P^N(d\mu) \\ \mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^*(\cdot) &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{Q}} \int \|\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu)\mathbf{Q}_{x,u}(\cdot)\|^2 P^N(d\mu) \end{aligned}$$

for every (x, u) pair where $P^N(\cdot)$ is the invariant measure of the mean-field flow under the team extrapolation policy $\gamma(\cdot|\mathbf{x}) = [\gamma^1(\cdot|x^1), \dots, \gamma^N(\cdot|x^N)]^\top$.

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof of Corollary 1, and is an application of Proposition 1. The only difference is the ergodicity of the mean-field process μ_t^N , which does not require common randomness for exploration policies. \square

3 Uniform Error Bounds for Model Approximation

The learning methods we have presented in Section 2 minimize the L_2 distance between the true model and the linear approximate model, under the probability measure induced by the training data. In particular, denoting the learned parameters by $\theta_{x,u}^*$, and $\mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^*(\cdot)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^*(x, u) &= \arg \min_{\theta} \int \left| c(x, u, \mu) - \Phi_{(x,u)}^\top(\mu) \theta(x, u) \right|^2 P(d\mu) \\ \mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^*(\cdot) &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{Q}} \int \left\| \mathcal{T}(\cdot | x, u, \mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu) \mathbf{Q}_{x,u}(\cdot) \right\|^2 P(d\mu)\end{aligned}\quad (21)$$

for some measure $P(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$. The measure $P(\cdot)$ depends on the learning method used.

- For the coordinated learning methods presented in Section 2.1 $P(\cdot)$ represents the empirical distribution of the mean-field terms in the training data.
- For the individual learning method presented in Section 2.2 for infinite populations, $P(\cdot)$ represents the invariant measure of the mean-field flow under the randomized exploration policies.
- Finally, for the individual learning method for finite populations in Section 2.3, $P(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ represents the invariant measure of the process $\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}$, where \mathbf{x}_t is the N dimensional vector state of the team of N agents.

However, when the learned policy is executed, the flow of the mean-field is not guaranteed to stay in the support of the training measure $P(\cdot)$. Hence, in what follows, we aim to generalize the L_2 performance of the learned models over the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$.

In what follows, we will sometimes refer to $P(\cdot)$ as the *training measure*.

3.1 Ideal Case: Perfectly Linear Model

If the cost and the kernel are fully linear for a given set of basis functions $\Phi_{x,u}(\mu) = [\Phi_{x,u}^1(\mu), \dots, \Phi_{x,u}^d(\mu)]^\top$ then the linear model can be learned perfectly. That is, for the given basis functions $\Phi_{x,u}(\mu)$, there exist $\theta_{x,u}^*$ and

$\mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^*(\cdot)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} c(x, u, \mu) &= \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu) \theta_{x,u}^* \\ \mathcal{T}(\cdot | x, u, \mu) &= \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu) \mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^*(\cdot) \end{aligned}$$

The model can be learned perfectly with a coordinator under the method presented in Section 2.1 if

- the training set T is such that for each pair (x, u) , there exist at least d different data points. Furthermore, for a given data point of the form $(x^i, u^i, X_1^i, \mu, c^i)_{i=1}^\infty$, the state-action distribution for this point is such that $Pr(x, u) > 0$
- and if the basis functions $\Phi_{x,u}(\mu)$ and $\Phi_{x,u}(\mu')$ are linearly independent for every $\mu \neq \mu'$ that is if $\mathbf{A}_{x,u}$ (see (2.1)) has independent columns.

For the independent learning methods given in Section 2.2 and Section 2.3, the learned model will be the true model with no error if the iterations converge.

3.2 Nearly Linear Models with Lipschitz Basis Functions

In this section, we provide a result that states that if the true model can be approximated ϵ close to a linear model, then the models learned with the least square method can approximate the true model uniformly on the order of $\sqrt{\epsilon}$ if the training set is informative enough.

The following assumption states that the true model is nearly linear.

Assumption 5. *We assume that there exist $\bar{\theta}_{x,u}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{x,u}(\cdot)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x,u,\mu} \|\mathcal{T}(\cdot | x, u, \mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu) \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{x,u}(\cdot)\| &\leq \epsilon \\ \sup_{x,u,\mu} |c(x, u, \mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu) \bar{\theta}_{x,u}(\cdot)| &\leq \epsilon \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

for every (x, u) pair and for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$.

Assumption 6. *For the basis functions $\Phi_{x,u}(\mu) = [\Phi_{x,u}^1(\mu), \dots, \Phi_{x,u}^d(\mu)]^\top$, we have that*

$$|\Phi_{x,u}^i(\mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^i(\mu')| \leq K \|\mu - \mu'\|$$

for some $K < \infty$, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and for every (x, u) pair.

Proposition 3. Let $P(\cdot) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X}))$ denote the training distribution of the mean-field terms. Let Assumption 5 hold such that there exist $\bar{\theta}_{x,u}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{x,u}(\cdot)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x,u,\mu} \|\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x,u,\mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu)\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{x,u}(\cdot)\| &\leq \epsilon \\ \sup_{x,u,\mu} |c(x,u,\mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu)\bar{\theta}_{x,u}(\cdot)| &\leq \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

for some $\epsilon < \infty$. Denote by $B_r(\mu) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ an open ball of diameter r around $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$. Under Assumption 6, for $\theta_{x,u}^*$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^*(\cdot)$ that is learned with the least square method under the training measure $P(\cdot)$ (see (21)), we then have that

$$\begin{aligned} |c(x,u,\mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu)\theta_{x,u}^*| &\leq K \left(\frac{\epsilon}{P(B_r)} + r \right) \\ \|\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x,u,\mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu)\mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^*(\cdot)\| &\leq K \left(\frac{\epsilon}{P(B_r)} + r \right) \end{aligned}$$

for any $r > 0$ where $K < \infty$ is some constant. In particular, letting $r = \sqrt{\epsilon}$

$$\begin{aligned} |c(x,u,\mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu)\theta_{x,u}^*| &\leq K\sqrt{\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{\kappa} + 1 \right) \\ \|\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x,u,\mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu)\mathbf{Q}_{x,u}^*(\cdot)\| &\leq K\sqrt{\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{\kappa} + 1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

and where $\kappa = \frac{P(B_{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(\mu))}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$.

Remark 4. The result states that if the true model can be modeled linearly with uniform ϵ error, then the learned models under L_2 minimization with training measure $P(\cdot)$, are also close to the true model uniformly if the basis functions are Lipschitz continuous. Furthermore, the distance between the learned model and the true model at some point μ depends on the quality of the training measure around that point μ via the constant $\kappa = \frac{P(B_{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(\mu))}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$. κ , in a way, measures the quality of the training measure around μ ; smaller κ means that the training set does not cover the space well enough around μ , higher values of κ implies better covering around μ .

Proof. The proof can be found in the appendix A. □

3.3 A Special Case: Linear Approximation via Discretization

In this section, we show that the discretization of the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ can be seen as a particular case of linear function approximation with a special class of basis functions. In particular, for this case, we can analyze the error bounds of the learned policy with mild conditions on the model.

Let $\{B_i\}_{i=1}^d \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ be a disjoint set of quantization bins of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ such that $\cup B_i = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$. We define the basis functions for the linear approximation such that

$$\Phi_{x,u}^i(\cdot) = \mathbb{1}_{B_i}(\cdot)$$

for all (x, u) pairs. Note that in general the quantization bins, B_i 's, can be chosen differently for every (x, u) , for the simplicity of the analysis, we will work with a discretization scheme which is same for every (x, u) . An important property of the discretization is that the basis functions form an orthonormal basis for any training measure $P(\cdot)$ with $P(B_i) > 0$ for each quantization bin B_i . That is

$$\int \langle \Phi_{x,u}^i(\mu), \Phi_{x,u}^j(\mu) \rangle P(d\mu) = \mathbb{1}_{\{i=j\}}$$

for every (x, u) pair. This property lets us to analyze the uniform error bounds of discretization method more directly.

The linear fitted model (see (21)) with the chosen basis functions becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{(x,u)}^i &= \frac{\int_{B_i} c(x, u, \mu) P(d\mu)}{P(B_i)} \\ Q_{(x,u)}^i(\cdot) &= \frac{\int_{B_i} \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu) P(d\mu)}{P(B_i)} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

In words, the learned coefficients are the averages of cost and transition realizations from the training set of the corresponding quantization bin.

The following then is an immediate result of Assumption 1.

Proposition 4. *Let $\theta_{x,u} = [\theta_{x,u}^1, \dots, \theta_{x,u}^d]^\top$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{x,u}(\cdot) = [Q_{x,u}^1(\cdot), \dots, Q_{x,u}^d(\cdot)]^\top$ be given by (23). If the training measure $P(\cdot)$ is such that $P(B_i) > 0$ for each quantization bin B_i , under Assumption 1, we then have that*

$$\begin{aligned} |c(x, u, \mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu) \theta_{x,u}| &\leq K_c L \\ \|\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu) - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu) \mathbf{Q}_{x,u}\| &\leq K_f L \end{aligned}$$

where L is the largest diameter of the quantizations bins such that

$$L = \max_i \sup_{\mu, \mu' \in B_i} \|\mu - \mu'\|.$$

4 Error Analysis for Control with Misspecified Models

In the previous section, we have studied the uniform mismatch bounds of the learned models. In this section, we will focus on what happens if the controllers designed for the linear estimates are used for the true dynamics. We will provide error bounds for the performance loss of the control designed for a possibly misspecified model.

We will analyze the infinite population and the finite population settings separately. We note that some of the following results have been studied in the literature to establish the connection between the N -agent control problems and the limit mean-field control problem without the model mismatch aspect. That is, there are already existing results on what happens if one uses the infinite population solution for the finite population control problem with perfectly known dynamics. However, we present the proofs of every result for completeness and because of the connections in the analysis we follow throughout the paper.

4.1 Error Bounds for Infinitely Many Agents

We assume that the team of agents collectively designs policies for the cost and transition models given by $\hat{c}(x, u, \mu)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \mu)$. We will assume that

$$\begin{aligned} |c(x, u, \mu) - \hat{c}(x, u, \mu)| &\leq \lambda \\ \left\| \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu) - \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \mu) \right\| &\leq \lambda \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

for some $\lambda < \infty$ and for all x, u, μ . λ represents the uniform model mismatch constant.

We will consider two different cases for the execution of the designed control.

- *Closed loop control:* The team decides on a policy $\hat{g} : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X}) \rightarrow \Gamma$, and uses their local states and the mean-field term to apply the policy \hat{g} . That is, an agent i observes the mean-field term μ_t , chooses $\hat{g}(\mu_t) =$

$\hat{\gamma}(\cdot|x^i, \mu_t)$ and applies their control action according to $\hat{\gamma}(\cdot|x^i, \mu_t)$ with the local state x^i . The important distinction is that the mean-field term μ_t is observed by every agent, and they decide on their agent-level policies with the observed mean-field term. Hence, we refer to this execution method to be the closed loop method since the mean-field term is given as a feedback variable.

- *Open loop control:* We have argued earlier that the flow of the mean-field term μ_t is deterministic for the infinitely many agent case, see (10). In particular, the mean-field term μ_t can be estimated with the model information. Hence, for this case, we will assume that the agents only observe their local states, and estimates the mean-field term independent instead of observing it. That is, an agent i estimates the mean-field term $\hat{\mu}_t$, and applies their control action according to $\hat{\gamma}(\cdot|x^i, \hat{\mu}_t)$ with the local state x^i . Note that if the model dynamics were perfectly known, this estimate would coincide with the true flow of the mean-field term. However, when the model is misspecified, the estimate $\hat{\mu}_t$ and the correct mean-field term will deviate from each other, and we will need to study the effects of this deviation on the control performance, in addition to the incorrect computation of the control policy.

In what follows, previously introduced constants K_c, K_f and δ_T will be used often. We refer the reader to Assumption 1 for K_c, K_f , and equation (5) for δ_T .

4.1.1 Error Bounds for Closed Loop Control

We assume that the agents calculate an optimal policy, say \hat{g} , for the incorrect model, and observe the *correct* mean-field term say μ_t , at every time step t . The agents then use

$$\hat{g}(\mu_t) = \hat{\gamma}(\cdot|x_t, \mu_t)$$

to select their control actions u_t at time t .

We denote the accumulated cost under this policy \hat{g} by $K_\beta(\mu_0, \hat{g})$, and we will compare this with the optimal cost that can be achieved, which is $K_\beta^*(\mu_0)$ for some initial distribution μ_0 .

Theorem 2. *Under Assumption 1, if $\beta K < 1$*

$$K_\beta(\mu_0, \hat{g}) - K_\beta^*(\mu_0) \leq 2\lambda \frac{(\beta C - \beta K + 1)}{(1 - \beta)^2(1 - \beta K)}$$

where $K = (K_f + \delta_T)$ and $C = (\|c\|_\infty + K_c)$.

Proof. We start with the following upper-bound

$$K_\beta(\mu, \hat{g}) - K_\beta^*(\mu) \leq \left| K_\beta(\mu, \hat{g}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) \right| + \left| \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) - K_\beta^*(\mu) \right| \quad (25)$$

where $\hat{K}_\beta(\mu)$ denotes the optimal value function for the mismatched model. We have an upper-bound for the second term by Lemma 1. We write the following Bellman equations for the first term:

$$\begin{aligned} K_\beta(\mu, \hat{g}) &= k(\mu, \hat{\gamma}) + \beta K_\beta(F(\mu, \hat{\gamma}), \hat{g}) \\ \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) &= \hat{k}(\mu, \hat{\gamma}) + \beta \hat{K}_\beta(\hat{F}(\mu, \hat{\gamma})). \end{aligned}$$

We can then write

$$\begin{aligned} \left| K_\beta(\mu, \hat{g}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) \right| &\leq \left| k(\mu, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{k}(\mu, \hat{\gamma}) \right| \\ &\quad + \beta \left| K_\beta(F(\mu, \hat{\gamma}), \hat{g}) - \hat{K}_\beta(F(\mu, \hat{\gamma})) \right| \\ &\quad + \beta \left| \hat{K}_\beta(F(\mu, \hat{\gamma})) - K_\beta^*(F(\mu, \hat{\gamma})) \right| \\ &\quad + \beta \left| K_\beta^*(F(\mu, \hat{\gamma})) - K_\beta^*(\hat{F}(\mu, \hat{\gamma})) \right| \\ &\quad + \beta \left| K_\beta^*(\hat{F}(\mu, \hat{\gamma})) - \hat{K}_\beta(\hat{F}(\mu, \hat{\gamma})) \right| \end{aligned}$$

We note that $\left| k(\mu, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{k}(\mu, \hat{\gamma}) \right| \leq \lambda$ and $\|F(\mu, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{F}(\mu, \hat{\gamma})\| \leq \lambda$. Using Lemma 1 for the third and the last terms above, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| K_\beta(\mu, \hat{g}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) \right| &\leq \lambda + \beta \sup_\mu \left| K_\beta(\mu, \hat{g}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) \right| \\ &\quad + 2\lambda\beta \left(\frac{\beta C - \beta K + 1}{(1 - \beta)(1 - \beta K)} \right) + \beta \|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms and taking the supremum on the left hand side over $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$, and noting that $\|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} \leq \frac{C}{1 - \beta K}$ we can then write

$$\begin{aligned} \left| K_\beta(\mu, \hat{g}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) \right| &\leq \frac{\lambda}{(1 - \beta)} \left(1 + 2\beta \left(\frac{\beta C - \beta K + 1}{(1 - \beta)(1 - \beta K)} \right) + \frac{\beta C}{(1 - \beta K)} \right) \\ &= \lambda \left(\frac{(1 + \beta)(\beta C - \beta K + 1)}{(1 - \beta)^2(1 - \beta K)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Combining this bound, and Lemma 1 with (25), we can conclude the proof. \square

4.1.2 Error Bounds for Open Loop Control

We assume that the agents calculate an optimal policy for the incorrect model, \hat{g} and estimate the mean-field flow under the incorrect model with the policy \hat{g} . That is, at every time step t , the agents use

$$\hat{g}(\hat{\mu}_t) = \hat{\gamma}(\cdot|x_t, \hat{\mu}_t)$$

to select their control actions u_t at time t . Furthermore, $\hat{\mu}_t$ is estimated with

$$\hat{\mu}_{t+1}(\cdot) = \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t)\hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t)\hat{\mu}_t(dx)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ is the learned and possibly incorrect model. We are then interested in the optimality gap given by

$$K_\beta(\mu_0, \hat{g}) - K_\beta^*(\mu_0)$$

where $K_\beta(\mu_0, \hat{g})$ denotes the accumulated cost when the agents follow the open loop policy $\hat{g}(\hat{\mu}_t) = \hat{\gamma}(\cdot|x_t, \hat{\mu}_t)$ at every time t . We note that the distinction from the closed loop control is that $\hat{\mu}_t$ is not observed but estimated using the model $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$.

Theorem 3. *Under Assumption 1, if $\beta K < 1$,*

$$K_\beta(\mu_0, \hat{g}) - K_\beta^*(\mu_0) \leq 2\lambda \frac{\beta(C - K) + 1}{(1 - \beta)(1 - \beta K)}$$

for any $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ where $C = \|c\|_\infty + K_c$ and $K = K_f + \delta_T$.

Proof. We start with the following upper-bound

$$K_\beta(\mu_0, \hat{g}) - K_\beta^*(\mu_0) \leq \left| K_\beta(\mu_0, \hat{g}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu_0) \right| + \left| \hat{K}_\beta(\mu_0) - K_\beta^*(\mu_0) \right| \quad (26)$$

We have an upper-bound for the second term by Lemma 1. We now focus on the first term:

$$\left| K_\beta(\mu_0, \hat{g}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu_0) \right| \leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \left| k(\mu'_t, \hat{\gamma}_t) - \hat{k}(\hat{\mu}_t, \hat{\gamma}_t) \right|$$

where we $\hat{\gamma}_t := \hat{\gamma}(\cdot|x, \hat{\mu}_t)$, and μ'_t denotes the measure flow under the true dynamics with the incorrect policy $\hat{\gamma}_t$, that is

$$\mu'_{t+1} = \hat{F}(\mu'_t, \hat{\gamma}_t) := \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu'_t)\hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t)\mu'_t(dx).$$

We next claim that

$$\|\mu'_t - \hat{\mu}_t\| \leq \lambda \sum_{n=0}^{t-1} (\delta_T + K_f)^n.$$

We show this by induction. For $t = 1$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu'_1 - \hat{\mu}_1\| &= \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_0) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \mu_0) \mu_0(dx) - \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_0) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \mu_0) \mu_0(dx) \right\| \\ &\leq \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

We now assume that the claim is true for t :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu'_{t+1} - \hat{\mu}_{t+1}\| &= \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu'_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu'_t(dx) - \int \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\mu}_t(dx) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu'_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu'_t(dx) - \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu'_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\mu}_t(dx) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu'_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\mu}_t(dx) - \int \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\mu}_t(dx) \right\| \\ &\leq \delta_T \|\mu'_t - \hat{\mu}_t\| + \sup_{x,u} \left\| \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu'_t) - \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \right\| \\ &\leq \delta_T \|\mu'_t - \hat{\mu}_t\| + \sup_{x,u} \left\| \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu'_t) - \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \right\| \\ &\quad + \sup_{x,u} \left\| \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) - \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \right\| \\ &\leq (\delta_T + K_f) \|\mu'_t - \hat{\mu}_t\| + \lambda \\ &\leq (\delta_T + K_f) \lambda \sum_{n=0}^{t-1} (\delta_T + K_f)^n + \lambda = \lambda \sum_{n=0}^t (\delta_T + K_f)^n. \end{aligned}$$

where we used the induction argument at the last inequality. We now go back to:

$$\left| K_\beta(\mu_0, \hat{g}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu_0) \right| \leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \left| k(\mu'_t, \hat{\gamma}_t) - \hat{k}(\hat{\mu}_t, \hat{\gamma}_t) \right|.$$

For the term inside the summation, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| k(\mu'_t, \hat{\gamma}_t) - \hat{k}(\hat{\mu}_t, \hat{\gamma}_t) \right| &= \left| \int c(x, u, \mu'_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu'_t(dx) - \int \hat{c}(x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\mu}_t(dx) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \int c(x, u, \mu'_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu'_t(dx) - \int c(x, u, \mu'_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\mu}_t(dx) \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \int c(x, u, \mu'_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\mu}_t(dx) - \int \hat{c}(x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\mu}_t(dx) \right| \\
&\leq \|c\|_\infty \|\mu'_t - \hat{\mu}_t\| + \sup_{x,u} |c(x, u, \mu'_t) - \hat{c}(x, u, \hat{\mu}_t)| \\
&\leq \|c\|_\infty \|\mu'_t - \hat{\mu}_t\| + \sup_{x,u} |c(x, u, \mu'_t) - c(x, u, \hat{\mu}_t)| \\
&\quad + \sup_{x,u} |c(x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) - \hat{c}(x, u, \hat{\mu}_t)| \\
&\leq (\|c\|_\infty + K_c) \|\mu'_t - \hat{\mu}_t\| + \lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Using this bound, we finalize our argument. In the following we denote by $K := (K_f + \delta_T)$ and $C := (\|c\|_\infty + K_c)$ to conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| K_\beta(\mu_0, \hat{g}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu_0) \right| &\leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \left| k(\mu'_t, \hat{\gamma}_t) - \hat{k}(\hat{\mu}_t, \hat{\gamma}_t) \right| \\
&\leq C \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \|\mu'_t - \hat{\mu}_t\| + \frac{\lambda}{1-\beta} \\
&\leq C\lambda \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \sum_{n=0}^{t-1} K^n + \frac{\lambda}{1-\beta} = C\lambda \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \frac{1-K^t}{1-K} + \frac{\lambda}{1-\beta} \\
&= \frac{C\lambda}{(1-\beta)(1-K)} - \frac{C\lambda}{(1-K)(1-\beta K)} + \frac{\lambda}{1-\beta} \\
&= \frac{C\lambda\beta}{(1-\beta)(1-\beta K)} + \frac{\lambda}{1-\beta} = \lambda \frac{\beta(C-K) + 1}{(1-\beta)(1-\beta K)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This is the bound for the first term in (26), combining this with the upper-bound on the second term in (26) by Lemma 1, we can complete the proof. \square

Lemma 1. *Under Assumption 1, if $\beta K < 1$*

$$\left| \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) - K_\beta^*(\mu) \right| \leq \lambda \left(\frac{\beta C - \beta K + 1}{(1-\beta)(1-\beta K)} \right)$$

for all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ where $C = \|c\|_\infty + K_c$ and $K = K_f + \delta_T$.

Proof. The proof can be found in the appendix C. \square

4.2 Error Bounds for Finitely Many Agents

We introduce the following constant to denote the expected distance of an empirical measure to its true distribution:

$$M_N := \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})} E [\|\mu^N - \mu\|] \quad (27)$$

$$\bar{M}_N = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U})} E [\|\mu^N - \mu\|] \quad (28)$$

where μ^N is an empirical measure of the distribution μ , and the expectation is with respect to the randomness over the realizations of μ^N .

Remark 5. *We note that the constants can be bounded in terms of the population size N . In particular, it is possible to write (see e.g. [11] for sharp bounds for distributions with finite support)*

$$M_N \leq \frac{K}{\sqrt{N}}$$

where $K < \infty$ in general depends on the underlying space \mathbb{X} (or the space $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U}$ for \bar{M}_N).

4.2.1 Error Bounds for Open Loop Control

In this section, we will study the case where each agent in an N -agent control system follows the open-loop control given by the solution of the infinite population control problem with mismatched model estimation. In other words, an agent i , at some time t , with local state x_t^i , will follow the randomized policy $\hat{\gamma}(\cdot | x_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t)$ where $\hat{\gamma}(\cdot | x_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t)$ is optimal for the model given by the cost function \hat{c} and the transition kernel $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$. Furthermore, the agents do not observe the mean-field term, but rather use $\hat{\mu}_t$ by estimating it via the dynamics of kernel $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ in an infinite population environment.

If every agent uses this policy, we have the following upperbound for the performance loss. compared to the optimal value of the N -population control problem,

Theorem 4. *Under Assumption 1*

$$K_\beta^N(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) \leq 2\lambda \left(\frac{\beta C - \beta K + 1}{(1 - \beta)(1 - \beta K)} \right) + M_N \frac{4\beta C}{(1 - \beta)(1 - \beta K)}.$$

where $C = (\|c\|_\infty + K_c)$, and $K = (K_f + \delta_T)$.

Proof. For some $\hat{\mu}_0 = \mu_0 = \mu_{\mathbf{x}_0} = \mu^N$

$$\begin{aligned} K_\beta^N(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) &\leq \left| K_\beta^N(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{K}_\beta^*(\mu^N) \right| + \left| \hat{K}_\beta^*(\mu^N) - K_\beta^*(\mu^N) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| K_\beta^*(\mu^N) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The second term above is bounded by Lemma 1, the last term is bounded by Lemma 3, finally for the first term we have

$$\left| K_\beta^N(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{K}_\beta^*(\mu^N) \right| \leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t E \left[\left| k(\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{k}(\hat{\mu}_t, \hat{\gamma}) \right| \right]$$

For the term inside of the expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| k(\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{k}(\hat{\mu}_t, \hat{\gamma}) \right| \\ &= \left| \int c(x, u, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}(dx) - \int \hat{c}(x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\gamma}(du|x, \hat{\mu}_t) \hat{\mu}_t(dx) \right| \\ &\leq \lambda + C \|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t} - \hat{\mu}_t\| \end{aligned}$$

where $C = (\|c\|_\infty + K_c)$. We can then write

$$\begin{aligned} \left| K_\beta^N(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{K}_\beta^*(\mu^N) \right| &\leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t E \left[\left| k(\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{k}(\hat{\mu}_t, \hat{\gamma}) \right| \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t (\lambda + CE \|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t} - \hat{\mu}_t\|) \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda}{1-\beta} + C \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \sum_{n=0}^{t-1} K^n (\lambda + 2M_N) \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{1-\beta} + \frac{\beta C (\lambda + 2M_N)}{(1-\beta)(1-\beta K)} \\ &= \lambda \left(\frac{\beta C - \beta K + 1}{(1-\beta)(1-\beta K)} \right) + M_N \frac{2\beta C}{(1-\beta)(1-\beta K)}. \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 2 which is presented below. \square

Lemma 2. *Let x_t^i be the state of the agent i at time t when each agent follows the open-loop policy $\hat{\gamma}(\cdot|x_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t)$ in an N -agent control dynamics. We denote by \mathbf{x}_t the vector of the states of N agents at time t . Under Assumption 1, we then have that*

$$E \|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t} - \hat{\mu}_t\| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{t-1} K^n (\lambda + 2M_N)$$

where $K = K_f + \delta_t$, and where the expectation is with respect to the random dynamics of the N player control system.

Proof. The proof can be found in Appendix D. □

Lemma 3. *Under Assumption 1,*

$$\left| K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) - K_\beta^*(\mu^N) \right| \leq \frac{2\beta C}{(1-\beta)(1-\beta K)} M_N$$

where $C = (\|c\|_\infty + K_c)$ and $K = (K_f + \delta_T)$, for any $\mu^N \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ that is for any μ^N that can be achieved with an empirical distribution of N agents.

Proof. The proof can be found in the appendix E. □

4.2.2 Error Bounds for Closed Loop Control

In this section, we will assume that each agent solves the optimal policy of the control problem using the mismatched model $\hat{c}, \hat{\mathcal{T}}$ with infinite agent dynamics. However, unlike open-loop control, to execute this policy, they observe the empirical state distribution of the team of N -agents, say μ_t^N at time t and apply $\hat{\gamma}(\cdot|x, \mu_t^N)$.

We denote the occurred cost under this policy by $K_\beta^N(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma})$ for some initial state distribution μ^N .

Theorem 5. *Under Assumption 1*

$$K_\beta^N(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) \leq \lambda \frac{2(\beta C - \beta K + 1)}{(1-\beta)^2(1-\beta K)} + M_N \frac{4\beta C}{(1-\beta)(1-\beta K)}$$

where $K = (K_f + \delta_T)$ and $C = (\|c\|_\infty + K_c)$.

Proof. The proof follows very similar steps to the results we have proved earlier. For some $\hat{\mu}_0 = \mu_0 = \mu_{\mathbf{x}_0} = \mu^N$

$$\begin{aligned} K_\beta^N(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) &\leq \left| K_\beta^N(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu^N) \right| + \left| \hat{K}_\beta(\mu^N) - K_\beta^*(\mu^N) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| K_\beta^*(\mu^N) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The second term above is bounded by Lemma 1, the last term is bounded by Lemma 3. For the first term we write the Bellman equations:

$$\begin{aligned} K_\beta^N(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) &= k(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) + \beta \int K_\beta^N(\mu_1^N, \hat{\gamma}) \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) \\ \hat{K}_\beta(\mu^N) &= \hat{k}(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) + \beta \hat{K}_\beta(\hat{F}(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma})). \end{aligned}$$

We can then write

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| K_\beta^N(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{K}_\beta^*(\mu^N) \right| &\leq \left| k(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{k}(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) \right| \\
&\quad + \beta \int \left| K_\beta^N(\mu_1^N, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu_1^N) \right| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) \\
&\quad + \beta \int \left| \hat{K}_\beta(\mu_1^N) - \hat{K}_\beta(\hat{F}(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma})) \right| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) \\
&\leq \lambda + \sup_\mu \left| K_\beta^N(\mu, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) \right| \\
&\quad + 2\beta\lambda \left(\frac{\beta C - \beta K + 1}{(1 - \beta)(1 - \beta K)} \right) \\
&\quad + \beta \int \left| K_\beta^*(\mu_1^N) - K_\beta^*(\hat{F}(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma})) \right| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \hat{\gamma})
\end{aligned}$$

Using almost identical arguments that we have used in the proof of Lemma 3 and Lemma 2, we can bound the last term as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta \int \left| K_\beta^*(\mu_1^N) - K_\beta^*(\hat{F}(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma})) \right| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) \\
&\leq \beta \|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} (M_N + \delta_T M_N + \lambda)
\end{aligned}$$

Re arranging the terms and noting that $\|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} \leq \frac{C}{1 - \beta K}$, we can write that

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})} \left| K_\beta^N(\mu, \hat{\gamma}) - \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) \right| \leq M_N \frac{2\beta C}{(1 - \beta)(1 - \beta K)} + \lambda \frac{(1 + \beta)(\beta C - \beta K + 1)}{(1 - \beta)^2(1 - \beta K)}.$$

Combining this bound with (29), one can show that

$$K_\beta^N(\mu^N, \hat{\gamma}) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) \leq \lambda \frac{2(\beta C - \beta K + 1)}{(1 - \beta)^2(1 - \beta K)} + M_N \frac{4\beta C}{(1 - \beta)(1 - \beta K)}$$

□

A Proof of Proposition 3

We start with a lemma:

Lemma 4. *For a Lipschitz continuous function $f(\mu)$ with Lipschitz constant $K < \infty$, we assume that*

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})} |f(\mu)| P(d\mu) < \epsilon$$

for some $P(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$. Denoting by $B_r(\mu')$ an open ball of diameter $r > 0$ around μ' , we then have that for any $\mu' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$

$$|f(\mu')| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{P(B_r(\mu'))} + Kr.$$

Proof. For any $\mu \in B_r(\mu')$, we have that

$$||f(\mu)| - |f(\mu')|| \leq |f(\mu) - f(\mu')| \leq Kr$$

which implies that

$$|f(\mu')| - Kr \leq f(\mu).$$

We can then write

$$\int_{B_r(\mu')} (|f(\mu')| - Kr) P(d\mu) \leq \int_{B_r(\mu')} |f(\mu)| P(d\mu) \leq \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})} |f(\mu)| P(d\mu) < \epsilon$$

which proves the result. \square

Let $P^M(\cdot) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X}))$ denote the empirical distribution of the mean-field terms in the training set T . (22) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \left| c(x, u, \mu_j) - \Phi_{(x,u)}^\top(\mu_j) \theta_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} \right|^2 \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})} \left| c(x, u, \mu) - \Phi_{(x,u)}^\top(\mu) \theta_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} \right|^2 P^M(d\mu) \leq \epsilon^2 \end{aligned}$$

since the learned $\theta_{x,u}$ minimizes the L_2 distance to the true model under the training measure P^M , and we assume the existence of a $\bar{\theta}$ which achieves ϵ distance uniformly.

In particular, we also have the following.

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})} \left| \Phi_{(x,u)}^\top(\mu) \bar{\theta}_{(x,u)} - \Phi_{(x,u)}^\top(\mu) \theta_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} \right| P^M(d\mu) \leq 2\epsilon$$

since $\Phi^i(\mu)$ is Lipschitz for every i , we can apply Lemma 4 to write

$$\left| \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu') \bar{\theta}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu') \theta_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} \right| \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{P^M(B_r)} + rK \|\bar{\theta}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} - \theta_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})}\|.$$

In particular, if we denote by \bar{K} an upper bound on $K \|\bar{\theta}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} - \theta_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})}\|$, by selecting the set B_r small enough with diameter $\sqrt{\epsilon}$, we can write

$$\left| \Phi_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}}^\top(\mu') \bar{\theta}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} - \Phi_{x,u}^\top(\mu') \theta_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} \right| \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{\kappa} + \bar{K} \right)$$

where $\kappa = \frac{P^M(B_{\sqrt{\epsilon}})}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$. The result then follows with Assumption 5. The proof of the error bound of $\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu)$ follows from identical steps.

B Proof of Proposition 1

Step 1. We first show that $E[\|v_t - v^*\|^2]$ remains uniformly bounded over t . We write

$$\|v_{t+1} - v^*\|^2 \leq \|v_t - v^*\|^2 - 2\alpha_t \langle \nabla g(s_t, v_t), v_t - v^* \rangle + \alpha^2 \nabla^2 g(s_t, v_t) \quad (30)$$

For $E[\nabla^2 g(s_t, v_t)]$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} E[\nabla^2 g(s_t, v_t)] &= E\left[|2k(s_t)(k(s_t)^\top v_t - h(s_t))|^2\right] \leq KE\left[2\|k(s_t)\|^2\|v_t\|^2 + 2\|h(s_t)\|^2\right] \\ &\leq KE\left[\|v_t\|^2 + 1\right] \leq K\left(E\left[\|v_t - v^*\|^2\right] + 1\right) \end{aligned}$$

where the generic constant $K < \infty$ may represent different values at different steps. Denoting by $A_t := E[\|v_t - v^*\|^2]$, if we take the expectation on both sides of (30) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} A_{t+1} &\leq A_t - 2\alpha_t E[\langle \nabla g(s_t, v_t), v_t - v^* \rangle] + \alpha_t^2 K A_t + \alpha_t^2 K \\ &\leq A_t - 2\alpha_t E[g(s_t, v_t) - g(s_t, v^*)] + \alpha_t^2 K A_t + \alpha_t^2 K \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where at the last step we used the convexity of $g(s_t, v_t)$ for every s_t . We now introduce \hat{s}_t which are independent over t and each \hat{s}_t is distributed according to $\pi(\cdot)$. For the middle term above we write

$$\begin{aligned} -2\alpha_t E[g(s_t, v_t) - g(s_t, v^*)] &= -2\alpha_t E[(g(s_t, v_t) - g(\hat{s}_t, v_t))] \\ &\quad - 2\alpha_t E[(g(\hat{s}_t, v_t) - g(\hat{s}_t, v^*))] \\ &\quad - 2\alpha_t E[(g(\hat{s}_t, v^*) - g(s_t, v^*))] \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where the expectation is with respect to the independent coupling between s_t, \hat{s}_t .

We denote by

$$\begin{aligned} b_t^1 &= -2\alpha_t E[(g(s_t, v_t) - g(\hat{s}_t, v_t))] \\ b_t^2 &= -2\alpha_t E[(g(\hat{s}_t, v_t) - g(\hat{s}_t, v^*))] \\ b_t^3 &= -2\alpha_t E[(g(\hat{s}_t, v^*) - g(s_t, v^*))]. \end{aligned}$$

For b_t^1 , we consider its absolute value to and write

$$\begin{aligned} |b_t^1| &\leq 2\alpha_t E[|g(s_t, v_t) - g(\hat{s}_t, v_t)|] \\ &\leq 2\alpha_t E\left[|(k(s_t)^\top v_t - h(s_t))^2 - (k(\hat{s}_t)^\top v_t - h(\hat{s}_t))^2|\right] \\ &\leq 2\alpha_t E\left[|(k(s_t)^\top - k(\hat{s}_t)^\top) v_t| |(k(s_t)^\top + k(\hat{s}_t)^\top) v_t - h(s_t) - h(\hat{s}_t)|\right] \\ &\leq 2\alpha_t E\left[(2\|k\|_\infty \|k(s_t) - k(\hat{s}_t)\| \|v_t\|^2 + 2\|h\|_\infty \|k(s_t) - k(\hat{s}_t)\| \|v_t\|)\right] \\ &\leq 2\alpha_t KE\left[\|k(s_t) - k(\hat{s}_t)\| E[\|v_t\|^2] + 2\alpha_t KE\left[K\|k(s_t) - k(\hat{s}_t)\| E[\|v_t\|]\right]\right] \\ &\leq 2\alpha_t KE\left[\|k(s_t) - k(\hat{s}_t)\| E[\|v_t - v^*\|^2]\right] \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where we used generic constant $K < \infty$ for the above analysis that might have different values at different steps. Furthermore, we used the inequality $\|v_t\|^2 \leq 2\|v_t - v^*\|^2 + 2\|v^*\|^2$. We also assume that $\|v_t\| \geq 1$ to use $\|v_t\| \leq \|v_t\|^2$, note that this is without loss of generality as we are trying to show that $E\|v_t - v^*\|^2$ is bounded, and for $\|v_t\| \leq 1$, the boundedness is immediate. For the following analysis, we will denote by

$$\epsilon_t := E[\|k(s_t) - k(\hat{s}_t)\|].$$

We now consider the series $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_t \epsilon_t$. Since s_t is ergodic with a geometric rate with invariant measure $\pi(\cdot)$ and $\hat{s}_t \sim \pi(\cdot)$, recalling that $\alpha_t = \frac{1}{t}$ we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_t \epsilon_t < \infty \quad (34)$$

We now go back to (31)

$$\begin{aligned} A_{t+1} &\leq A_t - 2\alpha_t E[g(s_t, v_t) - g(s_t, v^*)] + \alpha_t^2 K A_t + \alpha_t^2 K \\ &\leq A_t + |b_t^1| + b_t^2 + b_t^3 + \alpha_t^2 K A_t \\ &\leq A_t + 2\alpha_t K \epsilon_t A_t + 2\alpha_t K \epsilon_t + b_t^2 + b_t^3 + \alpha_t^2 K A_t + \alpha_t^2 K \\ &\leq (1 + 2\alpha_t K \epsilon_t + \alpha_t^2 K) A_t + b_t^2 + b_t^3 + \alpha_t^2 K. \end{aligned}$$

For the following we denote by

$$c_t = (1 + 2\alpha_t K \epsilon_t + \alpha_t^2 K)$$

Note that one can show the infinite product $\prod_{t=1}^{\infty} c_t$ converges if and only if the sum

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} 2\alpha_t K \epsilon_t + \alpha_t^2 K$$

converges. We have shown that the sum $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_t \epsilon_t$ is convergent due to geometric ergodicity, and we also have that α_t^2 is summable. Thus, we write

$$\prod_{t=1}^{\infty} c_t < C$$

for some $C < \infty$. One can then iteratively show that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{t+1} &\leq \prod_{n=1}^t c_n A_0 + C \sum_{n=1}^t (b_n^2 + b_n^3 + \alpha_n^2 K) \\ &\leq C A_0 + C \sum_{n=1}^t (b_n^2 + b_n^3 + \alpha_n^2 K). \end{aligned}$$

Consider $b_n^2 = -2\alpha_n E[g(\hat{s}_n, v_n) - g(\hat{s}_n, v^*)]$; since $\hat{s}_t \sim \pi(\cdot)$ for all t , and since $v^* = \arg \min_v G(v) = \arg \min_v \int g(s, v) \pi(ds)$, $b_n^2 \leq 0$ for all n . Thus, we can simply remove b_n^2 terms to get a further upperbound. For b_n^3 , we have that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |b_n^3| \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} 2\alpha_t |g(\hat{s}_t, v^*) - g(s_t, v^*)| < \infty$$

using an identical argument we used to show $\sum \alpha_t \epsilon_t < \infty$. In particular,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} A_t \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} C A_0 + C \sum_{n=1}^t (b_n^3 + \alpha_n^2 K) < \infty$$

which shows that $E\|v_t - v^*\|^2$ is bounded uniformly over t , which also implies that $E\|v_t\|^2$ is bounded.

Step 2. Now we have the boundedness, we go back to (31); using the bound on A_t (only for the second A_t in (31)), and summing over the terms, we can write

$$A_{N+1} - A_0 \leq \sum_{t=1}^N (A_{t+1} - A_t) \leq \sum_{t=1}^N -2\alpha_t E[g(s_t, v_t) - g(s_t, v^*)] + \sum_{t=1}^N \alpha_t^2 K$$

again using the boundedness of A_t , and the fact that $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_t^2 < \infty$ and sending $N \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$E \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} 2\alpha_t (g(s_t, v_t) - g(s_t, v^*)) \right] < \infty$$

We now introduce \hat{s}_t which are independent over t and each \hat{s}_t is distributed

according to $\pi(\cdot)$. We then write

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \underbrace{2\alpha_t (g(s_t, v_t) - g(\hat{s}_t, v_t))}_{b_t^1} \right] \\
& + E \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \underbrace{2\alpha_t (g(\hat{s}_t, v_t) - g(\hat{s}_t, v^*))}_{b_t^2} \right] \\
& + E \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \underbrace{2\alpha_t (g(\hat{s}_t, v^*) - g(s_t, v^*))}_{b_t^3} \right] < \infty \tag{35}
\end{aligned}$$

where we overwrite the definitions of b_t^1 , b_t^2 , and b_t^3 (only changing the signs of these terms, see (32)).

Recall the analysis for b_t^1 in (33), together with the uniform boundedness of $A_t = E \|v_t - v^*\|^2$ over t , we can write that

$$E \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} |b_t^1| \right] \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} 2\alpha_t K E [\|k(s_t) - k(\hat{s}_t)\|] < \infty$$

where we exchange the sum and expectation with monotone convergence theorem, and where the last step follows from what we have shown in (34).

For the last term similarly, we have that $E [\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} b_t^3] < \infty$, from (34), since s_t is geometrically ergodic with invariant measure π and $\hat{s}_t \sim \pi(\cdot)$ and v^* is fixed.

Going back to (35), now that we have shown the last and the first terms are finite, we can write

$$E \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} 2\alpha_t (g(\hat{s}_t, v_t) - g(\hat{s}_t, v^*)) \right] < \infty.$$

Since \hat{s}_t is i.i.d and distributed according to $\pi(\cdot)$, the above also implies that

$$E \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} 2\alpha_t (G(v_t) - G(v^*)) \right] < \infty$$

which in turn implies that

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} 2\alpha_t (G(v_t) - G(v^*)) < \infty$$

almost surely. Furthermore, since α_t is not summable, and $(G(v_t) - G(v^*)) \geq 0$ (as v^* achieves the minimum of $G(v)$), we must have that

$$G(v_t) \rightarrow G(v^*), \text{ almost surely.}$$

C Proof of Lemma 1

We begin the proof by writing the Bellman equations

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{K}_\beta(\mu) &= \hat{k}(\mu, \hat{\gamma}) + \beta \hat{K}_\beta(\hat{F}(\mu, \hat{\gamma})) \\ K_\beta^*(\mu) &= k(\mu, \gamma) + \beta K_\beta^*(F(\mu, \gamma))\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\gamma}$ and γ are optimal agent-level policies that achieves the minimum at the right hand side of the Bellman equations respectively. We can use then use the same agent level policies by exchanging them to get the following upper-bound

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) - K_\beta^*(\mu) \right| &\leq |\hat{k}(\mu, \gamma) - k(\mu, \gamma)| + \beta \left| \hat{K}_\beta(\hat{F}(\mu, \gamma)) - K_\beta^*(F(\mu, \gamma)) \right| \\ &\leq |\hat{k}(\mu, \gamma) - k(\mu, \gamma)| + \beta \left| \hat{K}_\beta(\hat{F}(\mu, \gamma)) - K_\beta^*(\hat{F}(\mu, \gamma)) \right| + \beta \left| K_\beta^*(\hat{F}(\mu, \gamma)) - K_\beta^*(F(\mu, \gamma)) \right| \\ &\leq \lambda + \beta \sup_\mu \left| \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) - K_\beta^*(\mu) \right| + \beta \|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} \|\hat{F}(\mu, \gamma) - F(\mu, \gamma)\| \quad (36)\end{aligned}$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{F}(\mu, \gamma) - F(\mu, \gamma)\| &\leq \left\| \int \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \mu) \gamma(du|x) \mu(dx) - \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu) \gamma(du|x) \mu(dx) \right\| \\ &\leq \lambda.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by rearranging the terms in (36), we can write

$$\left| \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) - K_\beta^*(\mu) \right| \leq \frac{\lambda}{1 - \beta} (1 + \beta \|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip}).$$

Finally, a slight modification of [5, Lemma 6] for finite \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{U} can be used to show that

$$\|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} \leq \frac{C}{1 - \beta K}$$

which completes the proof that

$$\left| \hat{K}_\beta(\mu) - K_\beta^*(\mu) \right| \leq \lambda \left(\frac{\beta C - \beta K + 1}{(1 - \beta)(1 - \beta K)} \right).$$

D Proof of Lemma 2

We use the notation $\mu_t = \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}$ for the following analysis. Note that with stochastic realization results, there exists a random variable v_t uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$, and a measurable function $\hat{\gamma}$ such that

$$\hat{\gamma}(x, v_t)$$

has the same distribution as $\hat{\gamma}(\cdot|x, \hat{\mu}_t)$, where we overwrite the notation for simplicity. Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t$ denote a vector of size N state variables that are distributed according to $\hat{\mu}_t$, i.e. $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t = [\hat{x}_t^1, \dots, \hat{x}_t^N]$ such that $\hat{x}_t^i \sim \hat{\mu}_t$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Furthermore, let \mathbf{v}_t denote a vector of size N where each element is independent and distributed according to the law of v_t . We then study the following conditional expected difference:

$$E [\|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_{t+1}} - \hat{\mu}_{t+1}\|] = E [E [\|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_{t+1}} - \hat{\mu}_{t+1}\| | \mathbf{x}_t, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \mathbf{v}_t]].$$

Let \mathbf{w}_t denote the vector of size N for the noise variables of the agents at time t . Note that we have $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{w}_t)$ where $u_t^i = \hat{\gamma}(x_t^i, v_t^i)$ for each i . We also introduce $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_t$ such that $\hat{u}_t^i = \hat{\gamma}(\hat{x}_t^i, v_t^i)$.

We further introduce another vector of noise variables $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t$ where each element is independently distributed, and the distribution of \hat{w}_t agrees with the kernel $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t)$. In other words, we use the functional representation of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t)$ where

$$\hat{f}(x, u, \hat{\mu}_t, \hat{w}_t) \sim \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t)$$

for some measurable \hat{f} .

We denote by $\mathbf{P}(d\mathbf{w}_t) = P(dw_t^1) \times \dots \times P(dw_t^N)$ denote the distribution of the vector \mathbf{w}_t where it is assumed that w_t^i and w_t^j are independent for all $i \neq j$. $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t$ is also distributed according to $\mathbf{P}(\cdot)$. For the joint distribution of $\mathbf{w}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t$, we use a coupling of the form

$$\Omega(d\mathbf{w}_t, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t) = \Omega^1(dw_t^1, d\hat{w}_t^1) \times \dots \times \Omega^N(dw_t^N, d\hat{w}_t^N).$$

That is, we assume independence over $i \in 1, \dots, N$, however, an arbitrary coupling is assumed between the distribution of w_t^i, \hat{w}_t^i . We will later specify the particular selection of coordinate wise couplings $\Omega^1, \dots, \Omega^N$, however, the following analysis will hold correct for a general selection of $\Omega^1, \dots, \Omega^N$.

For given realizations of $\mathbf{x}_t, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \mathbf{v}_t$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[\left\| \mu_{\mathbf{x}_{t+1}} - \hat{\mu}_{t+1} \right\| \middle| \mathbf{x}_t, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \mathbf{v}_t \right] &= \int \left\| \mu_{f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{w}_t)} - \hat{\mu}_{t+1} \right\| P(d\mathbf{w}_t) \\
&= \int \left\| \mu_{f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{w}_t)} - \hat{\mu}_{t+1} \right\| \Omega(d\mathbf{w}_t, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t) \\
&\leq \int \left\| \mu_{f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{w}_t)} - \mu_{\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)} \right\| \Omega(d\mathbf{w}_t, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t) + \int \left\| \mu_{\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)} - \hat{\mu}_{t+1} \right\| \Omega(d\mathbf{w}_t, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Note that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t$ is a vector of size N where each entry is independent and distributed according to $\hat{\mu}_t$. Furthermore, $\hat{u}_t^i = \hat{\gamma}(\hat{x}_t^i, v_t^i)$, and thus $\hat{u}_t^i \sim \hat{\gamma}(\cdot | \hat{x}_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t)$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Thus, $\mu_{\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)}$ is an empirical measure for $\hat{\mu}_{t+1}$. For the second term above, we then have:

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[\int \left\| \mu_{\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)} - \hat{\mu}_{t+1} \right\| \Omega(d\mathbf{w}_t, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t) \right] &= E \left[\int \left\| \mu_{\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)} - \hat{\mu}_{t+1} \right\| P(d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t) \right] \\
&= E \left[E \left[\left\| \mu_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}} - \hat{\mu}_{t+1} \right\| \middle| \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t \right] \right] = E \left[\left\| \mu_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}} - \hat{\mu}_{t+1} \right\| \right] \leq M_N
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

see (27) for the definition of M_N .

For the first term in (37); we note that $\mu_{f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{w}_t)}$ and $\mu_{\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)}$ are empirical measures, and thus for every given realization of \mathbf{w}_t and $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t$, the Wasserstein distance is achieved with a particular permutation of $f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{w}_t)$ and $\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)$ combined together. That is, letting σ denote a permutation map for the vector $\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)$. we have

$$\left\| \mu_{f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{w}_t)} - \mu_{\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)} \right\| = \inf_{\sigma} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |f(x_t^i, u_t^i, w_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) - \sigma(\hat{f}(\hat{x}_t^i, \hat{u}_t^i, \hat{w}_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t))|.$$

We will however, consider a particular permutation where

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot | x, u, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) \mu_{(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t)}(du, dx) - \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot | x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t)}(du, dx) \right\| \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \mathcal{T}(\cdot | x_t^i, u_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) - \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot | \hat{x}_t^i, \hat{u}_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t)) \right\|
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

For the following analysis, we will drop the permutation notation σ and assume that the given order of $\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)$ achieves the Wasserstein distance in (39). Furthermore, the coupling Ω is assumed to have the same order of coordinate-wise coupling.

We then write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \left\| \mu_{f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{w}_t)} - \mu_{\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)} \right\| \Omega(d\mathbf{w}_t, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t) \\
& \leq \int \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| f(x_t^i, u_t^i, w_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) - \hat{f}(\hat{x}_t^i, \hat{u}_t^i, \hat{w}_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t) \right| \Omega(d\mathbf{w}_t, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t) \\
& = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \int \left| f(x_t^i, u_t^i, w_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) - \hat{f}(\hat{x}_t^i, \hat{u}_t^i, \hat{w}_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t) \right| \Omega(d\mathbf{w}_t, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t) \\
& = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \int \left| f(x_t^i, u_t^i, w_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) - \hat{f}(\hat{x}_t^i, \hat{u}_t^i, \hat{w}_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t) \right| \Omega^i(dw_t^i, d\hat{w}_t^i). \quad (40)
\end{aligned}$$

The analysis thus far, works for any coupling $\Omega(d\mathbf{w}_t, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)$. In particular, the analysis holds for the coupling that satisfies

$$\|\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x_t, u_t, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) - \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|\hat{x}_t^i, \hat{u}_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t)\| = \int \left| f(x_t^i, u_t^i, w_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) - \hat{f}(\hat{x}_t^i, \hat{u}_t^i, \hat{w}_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t) \right| \Omega^i(dw_t^i, d\hat{w}_t^i).$$

for every i for some coordinate-wise coupling $\Omega^i(dw_t^i, d\hat{w}_t^i)$. Continuing from the term (40), we can then write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \left\| \mu_{f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{w}_t)} - \mu_{\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t)} \right\| \Omega(d\mathbf{w}_t, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \int \left| f(x_t^i, u_t^i, w_t^i, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) - \hat{f}(\hat{x}_t^i, \hat{u}_t^i, \hat{w}_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t) \right| \Omega^i(dw_t^i, d\hat{w}_t^i) \\
& = \int \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x_t, u_t, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) - \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|\hat{x}_t^i, \hat{u}_t^i, \hat{\mu}_t) \right\| \\
& = \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) \mu_{(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t)}(du, dx) - \int \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t)}(du, dx) \right\|
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the particular permutation we consider (see (39)).

Furthermore, we also have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) \mu_{(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t)}(du, dx) - \int \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t)}(du, dx) \right\| \\
& \leq \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) \mu_{(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t)}(du, dx) - \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) \mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t)}(du, dx) \right\| \\
& + \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) \mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t)}(du, dx) - \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t)}(du, dx) \right\| \\
& + \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t)}(du, dx) - \int \hat{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot|x, u, \hat{\mu}_t) \mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t)}(du, dx) \right\| \\
& \leq \delta_T \|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t} - \mu_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t}\| + K_f \|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t} - \hat{\mu}_t\| + \lambda \tag{41}
\end{aligned}$$

where for the first term we use the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) \mu_{(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t)}(du, dx) - \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) \mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t)}(du, dx) \right\| \\
& = \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, \hat{\gamma}(x, v^i), \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}(dx) - \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, \hat{\gamma}(x, v^i), \mu_{\mathbf{x}_t}) \mu_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t}(dx) \right\| \\
& \leq \delta_T \|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t} - \mu_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t}\|
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (37), (38), and (41), we can then write

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[\|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_{t+1}} - \hat{\mu}_{t+1}\| \right] & \leq M_N + \delta_T E[\|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t} - \mu_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t}\|] + K_f E[\|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t} - \hat{\mu}_t\|] + \lambda \\
& \leq (1 + \delta_T) M_N + K E[\|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t} - \hat{\mu}_t\|] + \lambda
\end{aligned}$$

where $K = (\delta_T + K_f)$. Noting that we have assumed $\mu_{\mathbf{x}_0} = \hat{\mu}_0$, this bound implies that

$$E[\|\mu_{\mathbf{x}_t} - \hat{\mu}_t\|] \leq \sum_{n=0}^{t-1} K^n (\lambda + 2M_N)$$

where we have used the fact that $\delta_T \leq 1$ to simplify the notation.

E Proof of Lemma 3

We start by writing the Bellman equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
K_\beta^*(\mu^N) & = k(\mu^N, \gamma_\infty) + \beta K_\beta^*(F(\mu^N, \gamma_\infty)) \\
K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) & = k(\mu^N, \Theta^N) + \beta \int K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu_1^N) \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \Theta^N)
\end{aligned}$$

where we assume that an optimal selector for the infinite population problem at μ^N is γ_∞ such that the agents should use the randomized agent-level policy $\gamma_\infty(\cdot|x, \mu^N)$. For the N -agent problem, we assume that an optimal state-action distribution at μ^N is given by some $\Theta^N \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U})$, which can be achieved by some \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} , such that $\mu_{\mathbf{x}} = \mu^N$ and $\mu_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} = \Theta^N$.

We first assume that $K_\beta^*(\mu^N) > K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N)$. For the infinite population problem, instead of using the optimal selector γ_∞ , we use a randomized agent-level policy from the finite population problem by writing $\Theta^N(du, dx) = \gamma^N(du|x)\mu^N(dx)$, and letting the agents use γ^N . We emphasize that the optimal state action distribution for N -agents is not achieved if each agent symmetrically use $\gamma^N(du|x)$, in other words, γ^N is not an optimal agent-level policy for the N -population problem. To have the equality $\Theta^N(du, dx) = \gamma_N(du|x)\mu^N(dx)$ the number of agents needs to tend to infinity. We can then write

$$\begin{aligned} K_\beta^*(\mu^N) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) &\leq K_\beta(\mu^N, \gamma^N) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) \\ &= k(\mu^N, \gamma^N) - k(\mu^N, \Theta^N) + \beta K_\beta^*(F(\mu^N, \gamma^N)) - \beta \int K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu_1^N) \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \Theta^N) \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$k(\mu^N, \gamma^N) = \int c(x, u, \mu^N) \gamma^N(du|x) \mu^N(dx) = \int c(x, u, \mu^N) \Theta^N(du, dx) = k(\mu^N, \Theta^N).$$

Hence, we can continue:

$$\begin{aligned} K_\beta^*(\mu^N) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) &\leq \beta K_\beta^*(F(\mu^N, \gamma^N)) - \beta \int K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu_1^N) \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \Theta^N) \\ &\leq \beta \int |K_\beta^*(F(\mu^N, \gamma^N)) - K_\beta^*(\mu_1^N)| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \Theta^N) \\ &\quad + \beta \int |K_\beta^*(\mu_1^N) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu_1^N)| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \Theta^N) \\ &\leq \beta \|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} \int \|F(\mu^N, \gamma^N) - \mu_1^N\| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \Theta^N) + \beta \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})} |K_\beta^*(\mu) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu)|. \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

We now focus on the term $\int \|F(\mu^N, \gamma^N) - \mu_1^N\| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \Theta^N)$. We will follow a very similar methodology as we have used in the proof of Lemma 2 with slight differences. We denote by $\mathbf{P}(d\mathbf{w}) = P(dw^1) \times \cdots \times P(dw^N)$ denote the distribution of the vector \mathbf{w} where it is assumed that w^i and w^j

are independent for all $i \neq j$. Let \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} such that $\mu_{\mathbf{x}} = \mu^N$ and $\mu_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} = \Theta^N$. We then have that

$$\int \|F(\mu^N, \gamma^N) - \mu_1^N\| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \Theta^N) = \int \|F(\mu^N, \gamma^N) - \mu_{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})}\| \mathbf{P}(d\mathbf{w})$$

where $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w}) = [f(x^1, u^1, w^1, \mu^N), \dots, f(x^N, u^N, w^N, \mu^N)]$. We now introduce $(\hat{x}^i, \hat{u}^i) \sim \Theta^N(du, dx)$ where $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, which are different than the state action vectors (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) and $\mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})}$ forms an empirical measure for Θ^N whereas $\mu_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$ forms an empirical measure for μ^N . We further introduce $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = [\hat{w}^1, \dots, \hat{w}^N]$. $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ is also distributed according to $\mathbf{P}(\cdot)$. For the joint distribution of $\mathbf{w}, \hat{\mathbf{w}}$, we use a coupling of the form

$$\mathbf{\Omega}(d\mathbf{w}, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}) = \Omega^1(dw^1, d\hat{w}^1) \times \dots \times \Omega^N(dw^N, d\hat{w}^N).$$

That is, we assume independence over $i \in 1, \dots, N$, however, an arbitrary coupling is assumed between the distribution of w^i, \hat{w}^i . We will later specify the particular selection of coordinate wise couplings $\Omega^1, \dots, \Omega^N$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \|F(\mu^N, \gamma^N) - \mu_{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})}\| \mathbf{P}(d\mathbf{w}) \\ & \leq E \left[\int \|F(\mu^N, \gamma^N) - \mu_{f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}})}\| + \|\mu_{f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}})} - \mu_{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})}\| \mathbf{\Omega}(d\mathbf{w}, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where the expectation is with respect to the random realizations of $(\hat{x}^i, \hat{u}^i) \sim \Theta^N(du, dx)$. The first term corresponds to the expected difference between the empirical measures of $\mu_1 = F(\mu^N, \gamma^N)$ and μ_1 itself, and thus is bounded by M_N .

For the second term, we note that $\mu_{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})}$ and $\mu_{f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}})}$ are empirical measures, and thus for every given realization of \mathbf{w} and $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$, the Wasserstein distance is achieved with a particular permutation of $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})$ and $f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}})$ combined together. That is, letting σ denote a permutation map for the vector $f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}})$. we have

$$\left\| \mu_{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})} - \mu_{\hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}})} \right\| = \inf_{\sigma} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |f(x^i, u^i, w^i, \mu^N) - \sigma(f(\hat{x}^i, \hat{u}^i, \hat{w}^i, \mu^N))|.$$

We will however, consider a particular permutation where

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot | x, u, \mu^N) \mu_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})}(du, dx) - \mathcal{T}(\cdot | x, u, \mu^N) \mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})}(du, dx) \right\| \\ & = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \mathcal{T}(\cdot | x^i, u^i, \mu^N) - \sigma(\mathcal{T}(\cdot | \hat{x}^i, \hat{u}^i, \mu^N)) \right\| \end{aligned}$$

For the following analysis, we will drop the permutation notation σ and assume that the given order of $f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}})$ achieves the Wasserstein distance above. Furthermore, the coupling Ω is assumed to have the same order of coordinate-wise coupling.

We then write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \|\mu_{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})} - \mu_{f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}})}\| \Omega(d\mathbf{w}, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}) \\
& \leq \int \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |f(x^i, u^i, w^i, \mu^N) - f(\hat{x}^i, \hat{u}^i, \hat{w}^i, \mu^N)| \Omega(d\mathbf{w}, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}) \\
& = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \int |f(x^i, u^i, w^i, \mu^N) - f(\hat{x}^i, \hat{u}^i, \hat{w}^i, \mu^N)| \Omega(d\mathbf{w}, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}) \\
& = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \int |f(x^i, u^i, w^i, \mu^N) - f(\hat{x}^i, \hat{u}^i, \hat{w}^i, \mu^N)| \Omega^i(dw^i, d\hat{w}^i).
\end{aligned}$$

The analysis thus far, works for any coupling $\Omega(d\mathbf{w}, d\hat{\mathbf{w}})$. In particular, the analysis holds for the coupling that satisfies

$$\|\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu^N) - \mathcal{T}(\cdot|\hat{x}^i, \hat{u}^i, \mu^N)\| = \int |f(x^i, u^i, w^i, \mu^N) - f(\hat{x}^i, \hat{u}^i, \hat{w}^i, \mu^N)| \Omega^i(dw^i, d\hat{w}^i).$$

for every i for some coordinate-wise coupling $\Omega^i(dw^i, d\hat{w}^i)$. We can then write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \|\mu_{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})} - \mu_{f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}})}\| \Omega(d\mathbf{w}, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \int |f(x^i, u^i, w^i, \mu^N) - f(\hat{x}^i, \hat{u}^i, \hat{w}^i, \mu^N)| \Omega^i(dw^i, d\hat{w}^i) \\
& = \int \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu^N) - \mathcal{T}(\cdot|\hat{x}^i, \hat{u}^i, \mu^N)\| \\
& = \left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu^N) \mu_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})}(du, dx) - \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot|x, u, \mu^N) \mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})}(du, dx) \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

We can then write that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \|F(\mu^N, \gamma^N) - \mu_{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})}\| \mathbf{P}(d\mathbf{w}) \\
& \leq E \left[\int \|F(\mu^N, \gamma^N) - \mu_{f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}})}\| + \|\mu_{f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}})} - \mu_{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w})}\| \mathbf{\Omega}(d\mathbf{w}, d\hat{\mathbf{w}}) \right] \\
& \leq M_N + E \left[\left\| \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot | x, u, \mu^N) \mu_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})}(du, dx) - \int \mathcal{T}(\cdot | x, u, \mu^N) \mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})}(du, dx) \right\| \right] \\
& \leq M_N + E [\delta_T \|\mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})} - \mu_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})}\|] \leq M_N + \delta_T \bar{M}_N
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used the fact that $\mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})}$ is an empirical measure for $\mu_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})} = \Theta^N$.

We then conclude that for the term (42):

$$\begin{aligned}
& K_\beta^*(\mu^N) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) \\
& \leq \beta \|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} \int \|F(\mu^N, \gamma^N) - \mu_1^N\| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \Theta^N) + \beta \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})} |K_\beta^*(\mu) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu)| \\
& \leq \beta \|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} (M_N + \delta_T \bar{M}_N) + \beta \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})} |K_\beta^*(\mu) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu)| \quad (43)
\end{aligned}$$

We now assume that $K_\beta^*(\mu^N) < K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N)$. To get an upper bound similar to (42), for the finite population problem, we let agents to use the randomized policy γ_∞ that is optimal for the infinite population problem, instead of choosing actions that achieves Θ^N which is the optimal selection for the N population problem for the state distribution μ^N . Let \mathbf{x} be such that $\mu_{\mathbf{x}} = \mu^N$, we introduce $\mathbf{u} = [u^1, \dots, u^N]$ where $u^i = \gamma_\infty(x^i, v^i)$ for some i.i.d. v^i . Denoting by $\hat{\Theta}^N = \mu_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})}$, and following the steps leading to (42), we now write

$$\begin{aligned}
& K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) - K_\beta^*(\mu^N) \leq \beta \int K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu_1^N) \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \hat{\Theta}^N) - \beta K_\beta^*(F(\mu^N, \gamma_\infty)) \\
& \leq \beta \int |K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu_1^N) - K_\beta^*(\mu_1^N)| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \hat{\Theta}^N) \\
& \quad + \beta \int |K_\beta^*(\mu_1^N) - K_\beta^*(F(\mu^N, \gamma_\infty))| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \hat{\Theta}^N) \\
& \leq \beta \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})} |K_\beta^*(\mu) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu)| + \beta \|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} \int \|F(\mu^N, \gamma_\infty) - \mu_1^N\| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \hat{\Theta}^N) \quad (44)
\end{aligned}$$

Following almost identical steps as the first case, one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \|F(\mu^N, \gamma_\infty) - \mu_1^N\| \eta(d\mu_1^N | \mu^N, \hat{\Theta}^N) \\ & \leq M_N + \delta_T E [\|\mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})} - \mu_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})}\|] \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{x}^i \sim \mu^N$, $\mu_{\mathbf{x}} = \mu^N$ and $u^i = \gamma_\infty(x^i, v^i)$, $\hat{u}^i = \gamma_\infty(\hat{x}^i, v^i)$, and the expectation above is with respect to the random selections of \hat{x}^i and v^i . Note that u^i and \hat{u}^i uses the same randomization v^i , hence averaging over the distribution of v^i , we can write that

$$\begin{aligned} E [\|\mu_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})} - \mu_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})}\|] & \leq E [\|\gamma_\infty(du|x)\mu_{\mathbf{x}}(dx) - \gamma_\infty(du|x)\mu_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}(dx)\|] \\ & \leq E [\|\mu_{\mathbf{x}} - \mu_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}\|] \leq M_N. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we can conclude that the bound (44) can be concluded as:

$$K_\beta^*(\mu^N) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N) \leq \beta \|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} (M_N + \delta_T M_N) + \beta \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})} |K_\beta^*(\mu) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu)|. \quad (45)$$

Thus, noting that $M_N \leq \bar{M}_N$, and combining (43) and (45), we can write

$$|K_\beta^*(\mu^N) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu^N)| \leq \beta \|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} (\bar{M}_N + \delta_T \bar{M}_N) + \beta \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})} |K_\beta^*(\mu) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu)|.$$

Rearranging the terms and taking the supremum on the left hand side over $\mu^N \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})$, we can write

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathbb{X})} |K_\beta^*(\mu) - K_\beta^{N,*}(\mu)| \leq \frac{\beta \|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} (1 - \delta_T) \bar{M}_N}{1 - \beta}$$

which proves the result together with $\|K_\beta^*\|_{Lip} \leq \frac{C}{1 - \beta K}$ and $\delta_T \leq 1$.

References

- [1] Berkay Anahtarci, Can Deha Kariksiz, and Naci Saldi. Q-learning in regularized mean-field games. *Dynamic Games and Applications*, pages 1–29, 2022.
- [2] Andrea Angiuli, Jean-Pierre Fouque, and Mathieu Laurière. Unified reinforcement q-learning for mean field game and control problems. *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems*, 34(2):217–271, 2022.

- [3] Andrea Angiuli, Jean-Pierre Fouque, Mathieu Laurière, and Mengrui Zhang. Convergence of multi-scale reinforcement q-learning algorithms for mean field game and control problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06659*, 2023.
- [4] Nicole Bäuerle. Mean field Markov decision processes. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 88(1):12, 2023.
- [5] Erhan Bayraktar, Nicole Bauerle, and Ali Devran Kara. Finite approximations for mean field type multi-agent control and their near optimality, 2023.
- [6] Erhan Bayraktar, Alekos Cecchin, and Prakash Chakraborty. Mean field control and finite agent approximation for regime-switching jump diffusions. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 88(2):36, 2023.
- [7] Erhan Bayraktar, Andrea Cosso, and Huyên Pham. Randomized dynamic programming principle and Feynman-Kac representation for optimal control of McKean-Vlasov dynamics. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 370(3):2115–2160, 2018.
- [8] Erhan Bayraktar and Ali D Kara. Infinite horizon average cost optimality criteria for mean-field control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11744*, 2023.
- [9] Erhan Bayraktar and Xin Zhang. Solvability of infinite horizon McKean–Vlasov FBSDEs in mean field control problems and games. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 87(1):13, 2023.
- [10] Alain Bensoussan, Jens Frehse, and Phillip Yam. *Mean field games and mean field type control theory*, volume 101. Springer, 2013.
- [11] Daniel Berend and Aryeh Kontorovich. A sharp estimate of the binomial mean absolute deviation with applications. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 83(4):1254–1259, 2013.
- [12] René Carmona and François Delarue. Probabilistic analysis of mean-field games. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 51(4):2705–2734, 2013.
- [13] René Carmona and Mathieu Laurière. Convergence analysis of machine learning algorithms for the numerical solution of mean field control and games i: The ergodic case. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 59(3):1455–1485, 2021.

- [14] René Carmona and Mathieu Laurière. Convergence analysis of machine learning algorithms for the numerical solution of mean field control and games: Ii—the finite horizon case. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 32(6):4065–4105, 2022.
- [15] René Carmona, Mathieu Laurière, and Zongjun Tan. Model-free mean-field reinforcement learning: mean-field MDP and mean-field Q-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.12802*, 2019.
- [16] D. Carvalho, F. S. Melo, and P. Santos. A new convergent variant of q-learning with linear function approximation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:19412–19421, 2020.
- [17] Mao Fabrice Djete, Dylan Possamai, and Xiaolu Tan. McKean–Vlasov optimal control: the dynamic programming principle. *The Annals of Probability*, 50(2):791–833, 2022.
- [18] Romuald Elie, Julien Perolat, Mathieu Laurière, Matthieu Geist, and Olivier Pietquin. On the convergence of model free learning in mean field games. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7143–7150, 2020.
- [19] Zuyue Fu, Zhuoran Yang, Yongxin Chen, and Zhaoran Wang. Actor-critic provably finds Nash equilibria of linear-quadratic mean-field games. 2020.
- [20] Maximilien Germain, Joseph Mikael, and Xavier Warin. Numerical resolution of Mckean-Vlasov FBSDEs using neural networks. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability*, pages 1–30, 2022.
- [21] Diogo A Gomes and João Saúde. Mean field games models—a brief survey. *Dynamic Games and Applications*, 4(2):110–154, 2014.
- [22] 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.
- [23] Haotian Gu, Xin Guo, Xiaoli Wei, and Renyuan Xu. Dynamic programming principles for mean-field controls with learning. *Operations Research*, 2023.

- [24] Xin Guo, Anran Hu, Renyuan Xu, and Junzi Zhang. Learning mean-field games. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [25] Minyi Huang, Peter E Caines, and Roland P Malhamé. Large-population cost-coupled LQG problems with nonuniform agents: individual-mass behavior and decentralized epsilon -Nash equilibria. *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, 52(9):1560–1571, 2007.
- [26] Chi Jin, Zhuoran Yang, Zhaoran Wang, and Michael I Jordan. Provably efficient reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 2137–2143. PMLR, 2020.
- [27] Daniel Lacker. Limit theory for controlled McKean–Vlasov dynamics. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 55(3):1641–1672, 2017.
- [28] Mathieu Laurière and Olivier Pironneau. Dynamic programming for mean-field type control. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 352(9):707–713, 2014.
- [29] F. C. Melo, S. P. Meyn, and I. M. Ribeiro. An analysis of reinforcement learning with function approximation. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 664–671, 2008.
- [30] Médéric Motte and Huyên Pham. Mean-field Markov decision processes with common noise and open-loop controls. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 32(2):1421–1458, 2022.
- [31] Médéric Motte and Huyên Pham. Quantitative propagation of chaos for mean field Markov decision process with common noise. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 28:1–24, 2023.
- [32] Sarah Perrin, Julien Pérolat, Mathieu Laurière, Matthieu Geist, Romuald Elie, and Olivier Pietquin. Fictitious play for mean field games: Continuous time analysis and applications. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:13199–13213, 2020.
- [33] Huyên Pham and Xiaoli Wei. Dynamic programming for optimal control of stochastic McKean–Vlasov dynamics. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 55(2):1069–1101, 2017.
- [34] Naci Saldi, Tamer Basar, and Maxim Raginsky. Markov–nash equilibria in mean-field games with discounted cost. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 56(6):4256–4287, 2018.

- [35] Naci Saldi, Tamer Başar, and Maxim Raginsky. Approximate nash equilibria in partially observed stochastic games with mean-field interactions. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 44(3):1006–1033, 2019.
- [36] Jayakumar Subramanian and Aditya Mahajan. Reinforcement learning in stationary mean-field games. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, pages 251–259, 2019.
- [37] C. Szepesvári and William D. Smart. Interpolation-based q-learning.. 2004.
- [38] Hamidou Tembine, Quanyan Zhu, and Tamer Başar. Risk-sensitive mean-field games. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(4):835–850, 2013.
- [39] Kaiqing Zhang, Zhuoran Yang, and Tamer Başar. Multi-agent reinforcement learning: A selective overview of theories and algorithms. *Handbook of reinforcement learning and control*, pages 321–384, 2021.