

Self-Play Ensemble Q-learning enabled Resource Allocation for Network Slicing

Shavbo Salehi, Student Member, IEEE¹, Pedro Enrique Iturria-Rivera¹, Medhat Elsayed²,
Majid Bavand², Raimundas Gaigalas³, Yigit Ozcan², and Melike Erol-Kantarci, Senior Member, IEEE¹

¹School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

²Ericsson Canada Inc., Ottawa, Canada

³Ericsson AB, Stockholm, Sweden

Emails: {ssale038, pitur008, melike.erolkantarci}@uottawa.ca
{medhat.elsayed,majid.bavand, raimundas.gaigalas,yigit.ozcan}@ericsson.com

Abstract—In 5G networks, network slicing has emerged as a pivotal paradigm to address diverse user demands and service requirements. To meet the requirements, reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms have been utilized widely, but this method has the problem of overestimation and exploration-exploitation trade-offs. To tackle these problems, this paper explores the application of self-play ensemble Q-learning, an extended version of the RL-based technique. Self-play ensemble Q-learning utilizes multiple Q-tables with various exploration-exploitation rates leading to different observations for choosing the most suitable action for each state. Moreover, through self-play, each model endeavors to enhance its performance compared to its previous iterations, boosting system efficiency, and decreasing the effect of overestimation. For performance evaluation, we consider three RL-based algorithms; self-play ensemble Q-learning, double Q-learning, and Q-learning, and compare their performance under different network traffic. Through simulations, we demonstrate the effectiveness of self-play ensemble Q-learning in meeting the diverse demands within 21.92% in latency, 24.22% in throughput, and 23.63% in packet drop rate in comparison with the baseline methods. Furthermore, we evaluate the robustness of self-play ensemble Q-learning and double Q-learning in situations where one of the Q-tables is affected by a malicious user. Our results depicted that the self-play ensemble Q-learning method is more robust against adversarial users and prevents a noticeable drop in system performance, mitigating the impact of users manipulating policies.

Index Terms—ensemble Q-learning, intelligent resource allocation, network slicing, self-play

I. INTRODUCTION

Network slicing stands as a key feature in the 5G networks domain, offering an effective and efficient approach to addressing various services' specific demands [1]. In this context, ultra-reliable low latency communication (URLLC), enhanced mobile broadband (eMBB), and massive machine-type communications (mMTC) are fundamental use cases [2] which demand low-latency, high throughput, and supporting a massive number of connected devices, respectively. Using the network slicing strategy, 5G networks can address the requirements of URLLC, eMBB, and mMTC seamlessly in various slices [2]. As a means of optimizing these slices' performance, machine learning-based (ML-based) algorithms, in particular reinforcement learning (RL), present promising

solutions. Q-learning, as a type of RL, empowers algorithms to make intelligent decisions by learning from interactions with the environment. Furthermore Q-learning adapts to dynamic network conditions acquires optimal strategies over time, and provides efficient resource allocation [3].

While the RL-based methods have a considerable effect on meeting the requirements of network slicing, they face some challenges such as overestimation bias, slow learning, complexity in large-scale network scenarios, and the need for extensive training data [4]. In determining optimal resource allocations for diverse slices, the RL algorithm encounters difficulty with the exploration-exploitation trade-off [6]. The high-dimensional state spaces inherent in network slicing, representing various service requirements and dynamic network conditions, also lead to the challenge of effectiveness in complex environments [4]. To address these weaknesses, appropriate modifications to Q-learning are necessary to increase the efficiency and adaptability of resource allocation [7].

Addressing the challenges raised by Q-learning for resource allocation in network slicing, alternative approaches such as double Q-learning, deep Q-learning (DQN), and double DQN [8], [9] emerge as promising solutions. By utilizing two separate value functions for action selection and evaluation, double Q-learning mitigates the algorithm's exploration-exploitation trade-off, thereby improving its ability to determine optimal resource allocations [10]. DQN uses neural networks to handle high-dimensional state spaces, which provides a scalable solution for network slicing [11]. Beyond these methods, ensemble Q-learning, which employs multiple Q-tables, is proposed to address overestimation bias and the handling of complex interactions in Q-learning [12].

While double Q-learning, DQN, and ensemble Q-learning significantly contribute to mitigating challenges in Q-learning, there remain unresolved issues related to efficient exploration and adaptability in dynamic environments and heterogeneous objectives optimization. Moreover, their susceptibility to adversarial users is related to their concentration on the current state and experience for action selection. To tackle these challenges, in this paper self-play ensemble Q-learning is proposed,

offering a solution that uses diverse learning strategies through iterative interactions with the agent’s previous versions, in the context of resource allocation. Different from existing algorithms such as double Q-learning and Q-learning according to our simulation results, self-play ensemble Q-learning provides more efficient, scalable, and adaptive allocation strategies that address the limitations of Q-learning when applied to evolving and complex scenarios. While RL-based methods have a considerable effect on improving network slicing performance [17], they are quite vulnerable to malicious users [15]. In this paper, to evaluate the robustness of methods against malicious users, such as double Q-learning and self-play ensemble Q-learning, we considered a scenario in which one of the tables is affected by a malicious user who chooses the action that leads to the lowest Q-value. While the double Q-learning algorithm performance drops considerably, self-play ensemble Q-learning, due to the agent’s interaction with its previous steps and using several Q-tables, the method is more robust against adversarial users who have malicious aims in the system.

II. RELATED WORK

ML-based methods have emerged as powerful tools to optimize resource allocation within network slices, dynamically allocating resources while considering latency and throughput requirements [13]. This adaptive approach enhances the efficiency and responsiveness of the network slicing, ensuring that resources are allocated optimally to meet various slice demands, and offering improved performance, reliability, and adaptability to different applications [14]. Q-learning proves to be a valuable approach to resource allocation in network slicing and provides an adaptive and intelligent mechanism for allocating resources effectively [17].

While Q-learning is a powerful tool for 5G communications, it has several drawbacks such as the tendency to overestimate Q-values, exploration-exploitation trade-off, and slow learning in large state spaces, leading to suboptimal decision-making and slower convergence [4]. In [13], a DQN-based method is proposed for resource allocation to approximate Q-values, enabling the algorithm to handle more complex state-action spaces. In [7], an ensemble Q-learning is employed by multiple Q-learners, aggregating their predictions to improve overall performance and robustness. In [12], an ensemble bootstrapped Q-learning method is proposed as a bias-reduced algorithm, extending double Q-learning to ensembles to mitigate both over-estimation and under-estimation biases, demonstrating superior performance in deep reinforcement learning (DRL). In [7], an adaptive ensemble Q-learning method is proposed to address the overestimation issue in Q-learning by adjusting ensemble size based on upper and lower bounds of estimation bias, which demonstrates an improvement in model learning. While ensemble Q-learning enhances robustness and promotes continuous improvement, it encounters difficulties dealing with overestimation bias, leading to suboptimal decision-making. Additionally, the interdependence of Q-values across different models limits the efficient learning of multiple models simultaneously. As a solution, self-play ensemble Q-learning




Fig. 1: Network Slicing Scenario.

is proposed, in which agents interact with themselves and the environment simultaneously by playing against previous versions of themselves, leading to learning and improvement action selection, rather than exploring random actions.

These advancements in Q-learning variants demonstrate a collective effort to overcome its limitations, offering more effective and adaptive resource allocation strategies in dynamic and complex environments of network slicing for 5G and beyond. While ML algorithms have considerable effects on improving the quality of services and meeting requirements, they have some issues related to the exploration-exploitation trade and they are also vulnerable to malicious users [15]. Malicious users attempt to perturb the system and degrade its performance by altering the policy for resource allocation [15] or introduce interference to the signal, leading to signal degradation in Q-learning scenarios [16]. The goal of this paper is to employ self-play ensemble Q-learning for the first time to enhance resource allocation performance in network slicing and improve robustness against adversarial users.

III. SYSTEM MODEL

A. System Scenario

In this paper, a network-slicing scenario is considered for supporting two distinct types of slices, namely eMBB and URLLC slices [17]. As illustrated in Fig. 1, a two-step resource allocation scheme is employed on a gNodeB (eNB). The eNB is equipped with a mobile edge computing (MEC) server which provides the capability of offloading tasks to a cloud server. During the inter-slice phase, the eNB intelligently distributes radio resources among two slices. Subsequently, these allocated resources are utilized within each specific slice during the intra-slice phase. The primary objective is to assign radio resources which refers to time-frequency resource blocks between two slices to meet the latency and throughput requirements of URLLC and eMBB slices. For meeting the requirements of slices, decreasing the latency is pivotal which is evaluated by the equation below:

$$d = d^{Tx} + d^{rTx} + d^{que} + d^{edge}, \quad (1)$$

where d^{Tx} is the transmission delay, d^{rTx} is the re-transmission delay, d^{que} is the queuing delay, and d^{edge} is the processing delay in the MEC server. d^{Tx} is affected by the size of packets sent by a user equipment (UE) and the link capacity between UE u and its connected eNB j , denoted as $C_{j,u}$. The value of $C_{j,u}$ is calculated using the equation below:

$$C_{j,u} = \sum_{r \in N_u} b_{RB} \log \left(1 + \frac{p_{j,r} x_{j,u,r} q_{j,u,r}}{b_{RB} N_0 + \sum_{j' \in J-j} \sum_{u' \in u_{j'}} \sum_{r' \in N_{j'}} p_{j',r'} X_{j',u',r'} g_{j',u',r'}} \right), \quad (2)$$

where N_u is the set of allocated resource blocks to the UE u , b_{RB} is a RB's bandwidth, N_0 is noise power density, $p_{j,r}$ is the transmission power of RB r in the eNB j . $x_{j,u,r}$ indicates a binary variable that illustrates whether RB r is assigned to the UE u or not, $q_{j,u,r}$ refers to the channel gain between eNB j and UE u over resource block r , $J-j$ indicates the set of eNBs, except the j^{th} , $u_{j'}$ is the set of UEs in the eNB j' , and $N_{j'}$ is the set of total resource blocks in eNB j' . It is noteworthy to mention that computation decisions and task management functionalities can be deployed in the eNB or the non-real-time RAN Intelligent Controller from the O-RAN architecture. The readers are referred to [18] for details of O-RAN architecture. To meet UEs requirements, the URLLC slice seeks to reduce latency, while the eMBB slice aims to increase throughput. Given these considerations, the allocation of resource blocks could be formulated as follows:

$$\max_j \quad w^{eMBB} \left(\frac{\sum_{u \in M_j^{eMBB}} B_{j,u}^{eMBB}}{|M_j^{eMBB}|} \right) + w^{URLLC} \left(D^{tar} - \frac{\sum_{v \in M_j^{URLLC}} D_{j,v}^{URLLC}}{|M_j^{URLLC}|} \right), \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{u \in M_j^{eMBB}} x_{j,u,r'} + \sum_{v \in M_j^{URLLC}} x_{j,v,r'} = 1, \quad (3.a)$$

$$\sum_{r' \in N_{j'}} \left(\sum_{u \in M_j^{eMBB}} x_{j,u,r'} + \sum_{v \in M_j^{URLLC}} x_{j,v,r'} \right), \quad (3.b)$$

$$C_{eMBB}^j + C_{URLLC}^j \leq C_j, \quad (3.c)$$

where w^{eMBB} and w^{URLLC} are the weighting factors of eMBB and URLLC slices to make throughput and latency comparable. $B_{j,u}^{eMBB}$ represent the throughput of the UE u in the eMBB slice of eNB j . D^{tar} refers to the target delay of the URLLC slice, and $D_{j,v}^{URLLC}$ identifies the UE latency within the URLLC slice of eNB j . M_j^{eMBB} and M_j^{URLLC} are indicators of how many eMBB and URLLC slices are available in eNB j . Using eq. (3a) ensures that each RB is allocated to a single UE. According to eq. (3b) and eq. (3c), the total number of eNBs and computation capacity allocated to the eNB should not be greater than the number of resources available within the eNB.

IV. PROPOSED METHOD

The varying number of UEs belonging to URLLC and eMBB slices request access to radio resources. In the considered scenario, resource blocks are assigned in a centralized manner based on Q-learning, wherein the Q-table is updated using the equation below:

$$Q(s_t, a_t) = Q_{past}(s_t, a_t) + \alpha(r + \gamma \max_a Q(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) - Q_{past}(s_t, a_t)), \quad (4)$$

where s_{t+1} is the next state after taking action a_t at state s_t , and α and γ are the learning rate and discount factor, respectively. For using the Q-learning algorithm for RB allocation, the following components of the Markov decision process (MDP) are taken into account for the agent:

- **States:** States for the agent is (q^{eMBB}, q^{URLLC}) , indicating the number of eMBB and URLLC tasks in the queue.
- **Action:** The agent has access to the radio resources, and its action is dictated by the number of resource blocks allocated to the eMBB and URLLC slices. The action set is defined by (r^{eMBB}, r^{URLLC}) .
- **Reward:** The reward function, as defined in Eq. 3, is calculated based on the average throughput and delay experienced by the eMBB and URLLC slices.

Q-learning involves updating the Q-values based on the maximum Q-value of the next state. Furthermore, Q-learning focuses on updating Q-values based on the agent's interactions with the environment, and the update rule considers the immediate reward obtained from taking an action in a given state and the estimated future rewards. However, this can result in an overestimation of Q-values, especially when the eNB has not sufficiently explored the environment. Furthermore, Q-learning has the challenges of hyperparameter fine-tuning. Foremost, adversarial agents have a significant and detrimental impact on Q-learning performance, leading to substantial degradation. For this reason, the self-play ensemble Q-learning algorithm has been suggested as a method for handling these challenges and improving the RB allocation.

A. Self-play Ensemble Q-learning

The ensemble Q-learning approach involves maintaining several Q-tables, denoted as Q_i , where i represents the number of tables. In the considered approach, decisions from multiple Q-tables are aggregated using a majority voting (MV) mechanism. Each agent provides its Q-values for a specific state-action pair, and the action with the majority of votes is selected as the final decision. $Q_i(s_t, a_t)$ represent the Q-value predicted by the i -th Q-learning agent for state s_t and action a_t . The MV function can be defined as *Algorithm 1* where N is the number of Q-tables which is equal to 3, and a^* is the selected action based on MV. While increasing the number of Q-tables improves the method's exploration capabilities, it also increases the method's complexity and energy consumption. Therefore, we select $N = 3$ to balance these factors.

Algorithm 1: MV Function of Self-Play Ensemble Q-learning Method

```
for Each state  $s_t$  do
  Initialize a counter for each possible action  $a_t$ ;
  for  $i$  to  $N$  do
    Compute  $Q_i(s_t, a_t)$  for all actions  $a_t$ ;
    Find the action  $a_t^*$  with the highest Q-value
       $Q_i(s_t, a_t)$ ;
    Increment the counter for action  $a_t^*$ ;
  end
  Select the action  $a_t^*$  with the highest count as the
  final decision for state  $s_t$ ;
end
```

When implementing MV for Q-learning, it's crucial to address ties when there is no clear majority. A random selection strategy is employed for this purpose. It must be noted that the weights of all considered Q_i are assumed to be the same, then the system is affected by all of them equally.

Ensemble Q-learning, while effective in some scenarios, faces several challenges that can hinder its performance in dynamic network slicing environments. One of the challenges is its exploration, which increases the probability of convergence to local optima. To address this, self-play ensemble Q-learning considers its previous values, always striving to select the best action encountered thus far and avoiding getting stuck in local optima. Additionally, handling complex state spaces poses a difficulty for ensemble Q-learning. Self-play ensemble Q-learning introduces mechanisms to better understand and learn from all Q-values by the explicit consideration of the agent's interactions with its past versions. Furthermore, the Q-values are updated not only based on the immediate rewards from the environment but also the outcomes of self-play experiences against its past versions. The update involves a weighted average of the current Q-values and the past versions of Q-values, which are calculated by the equation below.

$$Q_i(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) \leftarrow (1 - \beta)Q_i(s_t, a_t) + \beta Q_{past,i}(s_t, a_t), \quad (5)$$

where the weight β determines how much influence the past version has on the current Q-values. This ensures a balance between incorporating new experiences from the current episode and leveraging knowledge from the past version. Using this equation leads to observing the performance of the current agent's observations from the environment against its previous strategies and controlling the influence of the past versions on the updating of current Q-values. This part of the algorithm focuses on enhancing the current agent's Q-values by considering its past strategies, allowing it to adapt and improve over time through self-play. For each (s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) , iterate through all (s_t, a_t) in the Q-table.

The self-play ensemble Q-learning method can improve the learning process in the following ways:

- **Monitoring:** In the ensemble part, the agent attempts to consider various aspects of the system, choosing different

actions in each state to receive diverse rewards. This process helps the agent generate diverse experiences.

- **Adaptability:** Self-play enables the agent to adapt its strategy over time. As it encounters different situations, it learns to respond to a variety of states, making it more robust and adaptable.
- **Continuous Improvement:** The agent improves its policies and strategies by repeatedly playing against its current or past versions, refining its decision-making process, discovering new tactics, and enhancing performance.
- **Reduced Dependency on External Data:** Since the agent generates its training data by self-play, it becomes less dependent on external data. This is useful when external data is poisoned, limited, or not readily available.
- **Exploration of Strategies:** During self-play, the agent explores various strategies, enhancing its understanding of the environment and potentially discovering optimal or near-optimal policies.

This process allows the current agent to learn from its recent experiences in the network slicing system, and also its history of playing against earlier versions. It introduces a form of memory or hindsight learning, potentially improving the agent's strategy over time. *Algorithm 2* provides information about the self-play ensemble Q-learning on the RL algorithm.

B. Adversarial Agent

In resource allocation for network slicing using RL algorithms, one of the Q-tables, denoted as Q_i , may be manipulated by a malicious user. The malicious user strategically alters the Q-values to introduce a deliberate bias in the learning process. The intentional manipulation introduced by the malicious user is denoted by the equation below:

$$Q_i(s, a) \leftarrow Q_i(s, a) + \alpha (r + \gamma \min(Q_i(s', \cdot), Q_{i'}(s', \cdot)) - Q_i(s, a)), \quad (6)$$

in which malicious influence disrupts the integrity of the learning process. The algorithm, which aims to converge towards optimal policies based on accurate Q-value estimates, is misled by the distorted information provided by the adversarial agent. This adversarial interference can lead to suboptimal resource allocation decisions as the algorithm's learning dynamics are compromised. The impact is significant in dynamic environments where the learning agent relies on accurate Q-value estimations to adapt to changing network conditions.

C. Baselines Learning Algorithms

In this paper, we considered two baselines, double Q-learning, and Q-learning, to evaluate the performance of the self-play ensemble Q-learning methods.

1) *Q-learning:* We employ Q-learning, a foundational RL algorithm, as the baseline model for evaluating the effectiveness of the self-play ensemble Q-learning method. Q-learning, renowned for its robustness and versatility, serves as a benchmark in assessing the performance and advancements achieved by the proposed ensemble technique.

Algorithm 2: Self-Play Ensemble Q-learning Method

MDP Parameters: $Q_i, s, a, r, \epsilon, \gamma, \alpha_i, \beta$ **for** $t = 1$ **to** TTI **do**Initialize $Q_i(s, a) = 0$ and state s ;**while** not end of episode **do**Choose action a_t based on ϵ -greedy policy from $Q_i(s_t, \cdot)$;Take action a_t , observe reward r_t , and transition to next state s_{t+1} ;

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

*Self-Play Update;***for** each state s **do****for** each action a **do**Simulate a game against a past version of the agent using Q_i ;Observe the outcomes and update Q_i using weighted averages:

$$Q_i(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) \leftarrow (1 - \beta)Q_i(s_t, a_t) + \beta Q_{\text{past},i}(s_t, a_t)$$

end**end***Majority Voting;*

Choose the action with the majority votes

among $Q_i(s_t, \cdot)$ as the final action for state s_t ;**end****end**

2) *Double Q-learning*: Double Q-learning is a model-free RL algorithm that uses two sets of Q-values, commonly referred to as Q_A and Q_B . The selection of the best action should be decoupled from the estimation of its value. Rather than always using the same set of Q-values to determine the best action and to estimate its value, it uses one to select the best action and the other to estimate it. Double Q-learning reduces the overestimation bias associated with traditional Q-learning by using two sets of Q-values and updating them alternately.

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

A. Simulation Settings

Considered scenario has three independent eNBs, with a cell radius of 125 meters and a bandwidth of 20 MHz, supporting 13 resource block groups. The network environment is based on the 3GPP Urban Macro network model. The eNBs operate with a PHY configuration that includes a 15 kHz subcarrier spacing, 12 subcarriers per resource block, and a transmission power of up to 40 dBm. The antenna gain is set at 15 dB, and the system operates at a carrier frequency of 30 GHz.

Each eNB includes URLLC and eMBB slices with 10 UEs and 5 UEs, respectively. Packet sizes are 50 bytes for URLLC and 100 bytes for eMBB, with traffic generated according to a Poisson distribution. The TTI size is 2 OFDM




Fig. 2: Average reward of the system

symbols, equating to 0.1429 ms. Hybrid automatic repeat request (HARQ) processes are asynchronous, featuring a round trip delay of 4 TTIs, 6 HARQ processes, and a maximum of 1 HARQ re-transmission.

Propagation characteristics include a path loss model defined as $128.1 + 37.6 \log_{10}(D[\text{Km}])$, Log-Normal Shadowing with an 8 dB standard deviation, a noise figure of 5 dB, and a penetration loss of 5 dB. In terms of learning algorithm parameters, α , β , γ , and ϵ are set to 0.5, 0.5, 0.2, and 0.3, respectively. The specific learning rates for the self-play ensemble Q-learning, denoted as α_a , α_b , and α_c , are 0.7, 0.8, and 0.9, respectively.

B. Results

We evaluate the performance of three algorithms, namely Q-learning, double Q-learning, and self-play ensemble Q-learning in meeting the requirements of URLLC and eMBB slices. We then evaluate the robustness of self-play ensemble Q-learning and double Q-learning methods when one of the Q-tables is affected by a malicious user. Fig. 2 illustrates the convergence speed of the algorithms. The figure highlights that self-play ensemble Q-learning exhibits higher rewards compared to the other two algorithms. Moreover, this method achieves convergence to optimal rewards quicker than alternative approaches due to benefiting from multiple Q-value ensemble learning and competition with its past knowledge in self-play.

Fig. 3 presents the latency of the URLLC slice when using Q-learning, double Q-learning, and self-play ensemble Q-learning. According to the results, the system delay with Q-learning is more significant than other algorithms, while self-play ensemble Q-learning exhibits the lowest delay. This method demonstrates 21.92% improvement in latency. Similarly, as depicted in Fig. 4, self-play ensemble Q-learning exhibits a substantial enhancement, achieving 24.22% improvement in throughput for the eMBB slice. Finally, Fig. 5 showcases notable progress, boasting 23.63% improvement in the packet drop rate (PDR) of self-play ensemble Q-learning is considerably lower than Q-learning and double Q-learning.




Fig. 3: Latency of URLLC slices




Fig. 4: Throughput of eMBB slices




Fig. 5: PDR of URLLC slices

In the context of a scenario where one of the tables is affected by a malicious user, as depicted in Fig. 3 to Fig. 5, the adversarial agent intentionally manipulates Q-values to mislead the resource allocation decisions of the learning algorithm. Such manipulation can significantly impact the overall performance of the system. It must be noted that double Q-learning relies on two separate Q-tables to estimate action values, the malicious agent's influence directly skews the learning process and can misguide the algorithm's decision-making. Then the results of resource allocation become suboptimal and deviate from the system's desired objectives. In self-play ensemble Q-learning, degradation of the system performance occurs when the affected Q-value misleads the system with intentionally biased information. Self-play ensemble Q-learning is less affected by malicious users than double Q-learning because it uses multiple Q-tables to cross-check and detect irregular values, helping the agent avoid actions influenced by malicious behavior. This approach improves robustness by leveraging historical Q-values to identify and correct deviations, ensuring more stable learning and decision-making processes in the presence of adversarial interference.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose a novel self-play ensemble Q-learning approach for resource allocation in a network slicing scenario, aiming to meet the requirements of two different slices. With self-play ensemble Q-learning, the system utilizes the Q-values from three Q-tables and incorporates the agent's knowledge from previous steps. This method successfully fulfills a range of requirements, achieving improvements of 21.92% in latency, 24.22% in throughput, and 23.63% in PDR compared to Q-learning. Additionally, through the voting of three different agents for action selection, the method demonstrates greater robustness against malicious users.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work has been supported by MITACS and Ericsson Canada Inc., and NSERC Canada Research Chairs Program.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Babbar, et al, "Role of network slicing in software-defined networking for 5G: Use cases and future directions," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 112-118, Jan. 2022.
- [2] Y. Liu, et al, "Network slicing for eMBB, URLLC, and mMTC: An uplink rate-splitting multiple access approach," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2023, IEEE.
- [3] H. Zhou, et al, "RAN resource slicing in 5G using multi-agent correlated Q-learning," *2021 IEEE 32nd Annual International Symposium on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications (PIMRC)*, pp. 1179-1184, Sep. 2021.
- [4] M. Elsayed, et al, "AI-Enabled Future Wireless Networks: Challenges, Opportunities, and Open Issues," *IEEE Vehicular Technology Magazine*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 70-77, Sept. 2019.
- [5] Z. Xiong, et al, "Deep reinforcement learning for mobile 5G and beyond: Fundamentals, applications, and challenges," *IEEE Vehicular Technology Magazine*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 44-52, 2019, IEEE.
- [6] M. M. Alam, et al, "Q-learning-based routing inspired by adaptive flocking control for collaborative unmanned aerial vehicle swarms," *Vehicular Communications*, vol. 40, p. 100572, 2023, Elsevier.
- [7] H. Wang, et al, "Adaptive Ensemble Q-Learning: Minimizing Estimation Bias via Error Feedback," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 24778-24790, 2021.
- [8] Y. Chiang, et al, "Deep Q-Learning-Based Dynamic Network Slicing and Task Offloading in Edge Network," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 369-384, 2023.
- [9] S. Majumdar, et al, "Towards Massive Distribution of Intelligence for 6G Network Management using Double Deep Q-Networks," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, 2023, IEEE.
- [10] F. Rezazadeh, et al, "Zero-touch continuous network slicing control via scalable actor-critic learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.06654*, 2021.
- [11] Y. Chiang, et al, "Deep Q-Learning-Based Dynamic Network Slicing and Task Offloading in Edge Network," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 369-384, 2022, IEEE.
- [12] O. Peer, et al, "Ensemble Bootstrapping for Q-learning," *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 8454-8463, 2021, PMLR.
- [13] H. Zhou, et al, "Learning from peers: Deep transfer reinforcement learning for joint radio and cache resource allocation in 5G RAN slicing," *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 1925-1941, Sep. 2022.
- [14] R. Dangi, et al, "ML-based 5G Network Slicing Security: A Comprehensive Survey," *Future Internet*, vol. 14, no. 4, p. 116, 2022, MDPI.
- [15] S. Salehi, et al, "Policy Poisoning Attacks on Transfer Learning enabled Resource Allocation for Network Slicing," *GLOBECOM 2023 - 2023 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pp. 6364-6370, Dec. 2023.
- [16] S. Salehi, et al, "Jamming Attacks and Mitigation in Transfer Learning Enabled 5G RAN Slicing," *2024 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, 2023.
- [17] H. Zhou, et al, "Knowledge Transfer based Radio and Computation Resource Allocation for 5G RAN Slicing," *2022 IEEE 19th Annual Consumer Communications & Networking Conference (CCNC)*, pp. 617-623, Jan. 2022.
- [18] M. Polese, et al, "Empowering the 6G Cellular Architecture with Open RAN," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, Nov. 2023.