
Mean-Field Sampling for Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning

Emile Anand^{1,2} Ishani Karmarkar³ Guannan Qu²

Abstract

Designing efficient algorithms for multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) is fundamentally challenging because the size of the joint state and action spaces grows exponentially in the number of agents. These difficulties are exacerbated when balancing sequential global decision-making with local agent interactions. In this work, we propose a new algorithm `SUBSAMPLE-MFQ` (**Subsample-Mean-Field-Q-learning**) and a decentralized randomized policy for a system with n agents. For $k \leq n$, our algorithm learns a policy for the system in time polynomial in k . We show that this learned policy converges to the optimal policy on the order of $\tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{k})$ as the number of subsampled agents k increases. We empirically validate our method in Gaussian squeeze and global exploration settings.

1. Introduction

Reinforcement Learning (RL) has become a popular framework to solve sequential decision making problems in unknown environments and has achieved tremendous success in a wide array of domains such as playing the game of Go (Silver et al., 2016), robotic control (Kober et al., 2013), and autonomous driving (Kiran et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2023). A key feature of most real-world systems is their uncertain nature, and thus, RL has emerged as a powerful tool for learning optimal policies for multi-agent systems to operate in unknown environments (Kim & Giannakis, 2017; Zhang et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2024; Anand & Qu, 2024). While early RL works focused on the single-agent setting, recently, multi-agent RL (MARL) has achieved impressive success for many applications, such as coordinating robotic swarms (Preiss et al., 2017), self-driving vehicles (DeWeese & Qu, 2024), real-time bidding (Jin et al., 2018), ride-sharing (Li et al., 2019), and stochastic games (Jin et al., 2020).

Despite growing interest in multi-agent RL (MARL), extending RL to multi-agent settings poses significant computational challenges due to the *curse of dimensionality* (Sayin et al., 2021): even if the individual agents’ state or action spaces are small, the global state space or action space can take values from a set with size that is exponentially large as a function of the number of agents. For example, even *model-free* RL algorithms such as temporal difference (TD) learning (Sutton et al., 1999) or tabular Q -learning require computing and storing a Q -function (Bertsekas & Tsitsiklis, 1996) that is as large as the state-action space, which is exponential in the number of agents. These scalability issues have been observed in the multi-agent reinforcement learning literature in a variety of settings (Blondel & Tsitsiklis, 2000; Papadimitriou & Tsitsiklis, 1999; Littman, 1994). To overcome this challenge, Tan (1997) proposes to perform independent Q -learning, where each agent models other agents as part of the *environment* to decouple decision-making and reduce the state-action space; however, this simplification often fails to capture a fundamental feature of MARL: *inter-agent interactions*.

MARL is fundamentally difficult because agents in the real-world not only interact with the environment but also with each other (Shapley, 1953). An exciting line of work that addresses this intractability is mean-field MARL (Lasry & Lions, 2007; Yang et al., 2018; Gu et al., 2021; 2022; Hu et al., 2023). The mean-field approach assumes all agents are homogeneous in their state and action spaces, enabling their interactions to be approximated by a two-agent setting: here, each agent interacts with a representative “mean agent” which evolves as the empirical distribution of states of all other agents. Under these assumptions, mean-field MARL allows learning of optimal policies with a sample complexity that is polynomial in the number of agents. However, if the number of homogeneous agents is large, storing a polynomially-large Q table (where the polynomial’s degree depends on the size of the state space of a single agent) may remain infeasible. In this paper, we study the cooperative setting—where agents work collaboratively to maximize a structured global reward—and ask: *Can we design an efficient and approximately optimal MARL algorithm for policy-learning in a cooperative multi-agent system as the number of agents increases asymptotically?*

Contributions. We answer this question affirmatively. Our

¹School of Computer Science, GeorgiaTech, Atlanta, GA, USA
²Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA ³Institute of Computational and Mathematical Engineering, Stanford University, CA, USA. Correspondence to: Emile Anand <eanand6@gatech.edu>.

key contributions are outlined below.

Subsampling Algorithm. We propose `SUBSAMPLE-MFQ` to address the challenge of MARL with a large number of local agents. We model the problem as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) with a global agent and n local agents. `SUBSAMPLE-MFQ` selects $k \leq n$ local agents to learn a deterministic policy $\hat{\pi}_k^{\text{est}}$. It does this by applying mean-field value iteration on the k -local-agent subsystem to learn \hat{Q}_k^{est} , which can be viewed as a smaller Q function. It then deploys a stochastic policy π_k^{est} , where the global agent samples k local agents uniformly at each step and uses $\hat{\pi}_k^{\text{est}}$ to determine its action, while each local agent samples $k-1$ other local agents and uses $\hat{\pi}_k^{\text{est}}$ to determine its action.

Sample Complexity and Theoretical Guarantee. As the number of local agents increases, the size of \hat{Q}_k scales polynomially with k , rather than polynomially with n as in mean-field MARL. Analogously, when the size of the local agent’s state space grows, the size of \hat{Q}_k scales exponentially with k , rather than exponentially with n , as in traditional Q -learning. The key analytic technique underlying our results is a novel MDP sampling result. Through it, we show that the performance gap between π_k^{est} and the optimal policy π^* is $\tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{k})$. The choice of k reveals a fundamental trade-off between the size of the Q -table and the optimality of π_k^{est} . When $k = O(\log n)$, `SUBSAMPLE-MFQ` is the first centralized MARL algorithm to achieve a polylogarithmic run-time in n , representing an exponential speedup over the previously best-known polytime mean-field MARL methods, while maintaining a decaying optimality gap.

Numerical Simulations. We evaluate the effectiveness of `SUBSAMPLE-MFQ` in a bounding box problem, and a Gaussian squeeze problem. Our experiments reveal a monotonic improvement in the learned policies as $k \rightarrow n$, while providing a substantial speedup over mean-field Q -learning.

While our results are theoretical in nature, it is our hope that `SUBSAMPLE-MFQ` will lead to a further exploration of sampling in Markov games, and inspire the development of practical algorithms for multi-agent settings.

2. Preliminaries

Notation. For $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ where $k \leq n$, let $\binom{[n]}{k}$ denote the set of k -sized subsets of $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For any vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\|z\|_1$ and $\|z\|_\infty$ denote the standard ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ norms of z respectively. Let $\|\mathbf{A}\|_1$ denote the matrix ℓ_1 -norm of $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$. Given a collection of variables s_1, \dots, s_n the shorthand s_Δ denotes the set $\{s_i : i \in \Delta\}$ for $\Delta \subseteq [n]$. We use $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ to suppress polylogarithmic factors in all problem parameters except n . For a discrete measurable space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$, the total variation distance between probability measures ρ_1, ρ_2 is given by $\text{TV}(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\rho_1(x) - \rho_2(x)|$. Next, $x \sim \mathcal{D}(\cdot)$

denotes that x is a random element sampled from a distribution \mathcal{D} , and we denote that x is a random sample from the uniform distribution over a finite set Ω by $x \sim \mathcal{U}(\Omega)$. For the readers’ convenience, we include a detailed notation table in Table 1 in the Appendix A.

Problem Formulation. We consider a system of $n+1$ agents, where agent g is a “global decision making agent” and the remaining n agents, denoted by $[n]$, are “local agents.” At time t , the agents are in state $s(t) = (s_g(t), s_1(t), \dots, s_n(t)) \in \mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$, where $s_g(t) \in \mathcal{S}_g$ denotes the global agent’s state, and for each $i \in [n]$, $s_i(t) \in \mathcal{S}_l$ denotes the state of the i ’th local agent. The agents cooperatively select actions $a(t) = (a_g(t), a_1(t), \dots, a_n(t)) \in \mathcal{A}$ where $a_g(t) \in \mathcal{A}_g$ denotes the global agent’s action and $a_i(t) \in \mathcal{A}_l$ denotes the i ’th local agent’s action. At time $t+1$, the next state for all the agents is independently generated by stochastic transition kernels $P_g : \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{A}_g \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $P_l : \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{A}_g \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as follows:

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

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

The system then collects a structured stage reward $r(s(t), a(t))$ where the reward $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ depends on $s(t)$ and $a(t)$ through Equation (3), and where the choice of functions r_g and r_l is typically application specific.

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

We define a policy $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ as a map from states to distributions of actions such that $a \sim \pi(\cdot | s)$. We seek to learn a policy π that maximizes the value function which is defined for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$ as the expected discounted reward

$$V^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a(t) \sim \pi(\cdot | s)} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s(t), a(t)) | s(0) = s \right], \quad (4)$$

where $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is a discounting factor.

Notably, the cardinality of the search space simplex for the optimal policy is $|\mathcal{S}_g| |\mathcal{S}_l|^n |\mathcal{A}_g| |\mathcal{A}_l|^n$, which is exponential in the number of agents. When noting that the local agents are all homogeneous, and therefore permutation-invariant with respect to the rewards of the system (the order of the other agents does not matter to any single decision-making agent), techniques from mean-field MARL restrict the cardinality of the search space simplex for the optimal policy to $|\mathcal{S}_g| |\mathcal{A}_g| |\mathcal{S}_l| |\mathcal{A}_l|^{n-1} |\mathcal{S}_l|^{n-1} |\mathcal{A}_l|^{n-1}$, reducing the complexity’s exponential dependence on n to a polynomial dependence on n . In practical systems, when n is large, the $\text{poly}(n)$ sample-complexity may still be computationally infeasible. Therefore, the goal of this problem is to learn an approximately optimal policy with *subpolynomial sample complexity*, further overcoming the curse of dimensionality.

Example 2.1 (Gaussian Squeeze). In this task, n homogeneous agents determine individual actions a_i to jointly maximize the objective $r(x) = xe^{-(x-\mu)^2/\sigma^2}$, where $x = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$, and μ and σ are the pre-defined mean and variance of the system. In scenarios of traffic congestion, each agent $i \in [n]$ is a controller trying to send a_i vehicles into the main road, where controllers coordinate with each other to avoid congestion, hence avoiding either over-use or under-use, thereby contributing to the entire system. This GS problem is previously studied in Yang et al. (2018), and serves as an ablation study on the impact of subsampling for MARL.

Example 2.2 (Constrained Exploration). Consider an $M \times M$ grid. Each agent’s state is a coordinate in $[M] \times [M]$. The state represents the *center of a $d \times d$ box* where the global agent wishes to constrain the local agents’ movements. Initially, all agents are in the same location. At each time-step, the local agents take actions $a_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ (e.g., up, down, left, right) to transition between states and collect rewards. The transition kernel ensures that local agents remain within the $d \times d$ box dictated by the global agent, using knowledge of $a_i(t)$, $s_g(t)$, and $s_i(t)$. In warehouse settings where some shelves have collapsed, creating hazardous or inaccessible areas, we want agents to clean these areas. However, exploration in these regions may be challenging due to physical constraints or safety concerns. Therefore, through an appropriate design of the reward and transition functions, the global agent could guide the local agents to focus on specific $d \times d$ grids, allowing efficient cleanup while avoiding unnecessary risk or inefficiency.




Figure 1. Constrained exploration for warehouse accidents.




Figure 2. Traffic congestion settings with Gaussian squeeze.

To efficiently learn policies that maximize the objective, we make the following standard assumptions:

Assumption 2.3 (Finite state/action spaces). We assume that the state and action spaces of all the agents in the MARL game are finite: $|\mathcal{S}_i|, |\mathcal{S}_g|, |\mathcal{A}_g|, |\mathcal{A}_i| < \infty$. Appendix H of the supplementary material weakens this assumption to the non-tabular setting with infinite sets.

Assumption 2.4 (Bounded rewards). The global and local components of the reward function are bounded. Specifically, $\|r_g(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq \tilde{r}_g$, and $\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq \tilde{r}_l$. Together, this implies that $\|r(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq \tilde{r}_g + \tilde{r}_l := \tilde{r}$.

Definition 2.5 (ϵ -optimal policy). Given an objective function V and policy simplex Π , a policy $\pi \in \Pi$ is ϵ -optimal if $V(\pi) \geq \sup_{\pi^* \in \Pi} V(\pi^*) - \epsilon$.

Remark 2.6. Following Mondal et al. (2022); Xu & Klabjan (2023), our model captures heterogeneity among the local agents by modeling agent types as part of the agent state: assign a type $\varepsilon_i \in \mathcal{E}$ to each local agent $i \in [n]$ by letting $\mathcal{S}_i = \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{S}'_i$, where \mathcal{E} is a set of possible types that are treated as a fixed part of the agent’s state. The transition and reward functions can vary depending on the agent’s type. The global agent can provide unique signals to local agents of each type by letting $s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g$ and $a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$ denote a state/action vector where each element matches to a type.

Related Literature. MARL. MARL has a rich history, starting with early works on Markov games (Littman, 1994; Sutton et al., 1999), which can be regarded as a multi-agent extension of the MDP. MARL has since been actively studied (Zhang et al., 2021) in a broad range of settings. MARL is most similar to the category of “succinctly described” MDPs (Blondel & Tsitsiklis, 2000), where the state/action space is a product space formed by the individual state/action spaces of multiple agents, and where the agents interact to maximize an objective. A promising line of research that has emerged over recent years constrains the problem to sparse networked instances to enforce local interactions between agents (Qu et al., 2020a; Lin et al., 2020; Mondal et al., 2022). In this formulation, the agents correspond to vertices on a graph who only interact with nearby agents. By exploiting Gamarnik’s correlation decay property from combinatorial optimization (Gamarnik et al., 2009), they overcome the curse of dimensionality by simplifying the problem to only search over the policy space derived from the truncated graph to learn approximately optimal solutions. However, as the underlying network structure becomes dense with many local interactions, the neighborhood of each agent gets large, causing these algorithms to become intractable.

Mean-Field RL. Under assumptions of homogeneity in the state/action spaces of the agents, the problem of densely networked multi-agent RL was answered in Yang et al. (2018); Gu et al. (2021) by approximating the solution with a mean-field approach where the approximation error scales

in $O(1/\sqrt{n})$. To avoid designing algorithms on probability spaces, they study MARL under Pareto optimality and consider a lifted space with a *mean* agent that aggregates the system’s rewards and dynamics. It then applies kernel regression on ϵ -nets of the lifted space to design policies in time polynomial in n . In contrast, our work achieves *subpolynomial* runtimes by directly sampling from this mean-field distribution. Cui & Koepl (2022) introduce heterogeneity to mean-field MARL by modeling non-uniform interactions through graphons; however, these methods make critical assumptions on the existence of a sequence of graphons converging in cut-norm to the finite instance. In the cooperative setting, Cui et al. (2023) considers a mean-field setting with q types of homogeneous agents; however, their learned policy does not provably converge to the optimum policy.

Structured RL. Our work is related to factored MDPs and exogenous MDPs. In factored MDPs, there is a global action affecting every agent whereas in our case, each agent has its own action (Min et al., 2023; Lauer & Riedmiller, 2000). Our result has a similar flavor to MDPs with exogenous inputs from learning theory, (Dietterich et al., 2018; Foster et al., 2022; Anand & Qu, 2024), wherein our subsampling algorithm treats each sampled state as an endogenous state, but where the exogenous dependencies can be dynamic.

Other related works. Jin et al. (2020) reduces the dependence of the product action space to an additive dependence using V-learning. In contrast, our work *further* reduces the complexity of the joint state space, which has not been previously accomplished. Our work adds to the growing literature on the Centralized Training with Decentralized Execution regime (Zhou et al., 2023), as our algorithm learns a provably approximately optimal policy using centralized information, but makes decisions using only local information during execution. Finally, one can efficiently approximate the Q -table through function approximation (Jin et al., 2020). However, achieving theoretical bounds on the performance loss due to function approximation is intractable without making strong assumptions such as linear Bellman completeness (Golowich & Moitra, 2024) or low Bellman-Eluder dimension (Jin et al., 2021a). While our work primarily considers the finite tabular setting, we extend it to the non-tabular linear MDP setting in Appendix H.

2.1. Background in Reinforcement Learning

Q-learning. At the core of the standard Q-learning framework (Watkins & Dayan, 1992) for offline-RL is the Q -function $Q : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Q-learning seeks to produce a policy $\pi^*(\cdot|s)$ that maximizes the expected infinite horizon discounted reward. For any policy π , $Q^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E}^\pi[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s(t), a(t)) | s(0) = s, a(0) = a]$. One approach to learning the optimal policy $\pi^*(\cdot|s)$ is dynamic programming, where the Q -function is iteratively updated using

value-iteration: $Q^0(s, a) = 0$, for all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$. Then, for all $t \in [T]$, $Q^{t+1}(s, a) = \mathcal{T}Q^t(s, a)$, where \mathcal{T} is the Bellman operator defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}Q^t(s, a) &= r(s, a) \\ &+ \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot|s_g, a), s'_i \sim P_i(\cdot|s_i, s_g), \forall i \in [n]} \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q^t(s', a'). \end{aligned}$$

The Bellman operator \mathcal{T} is γ -contractive, which ensures the existence of a unique fixed-point Q^* such that $\mathcal{T}Q^* = Q^*$, by the Banach fixed-point theorem (Banach, 1922). Here, the optimal policy is the deterministic greedy map $\pi^* : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, where $\pi^*(s) = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a)$. However, the update complexity for the Q -function is $O(|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|) = O(|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{S}_l|^n|\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{A}_l|^n)$, which grows exponentially with n . As the number of local agents increases ($n \gg |\mathcal{S}_l|$), this update complexity renders Q -learning impractical.

Mean-field transformation. To address this, mean-field MARL (Yang et al., 2018) (under homogeneity assumptions) studies the distribution function $F_{z_{[n]}} : \mathcal{Z}_l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathcal{Z}_l := \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{A}_l$, defined for all $z := (z_s, z_a) \in \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{A}_l$ by

$$F_{z_{[n]}}(z) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{s_i = z_s, a_i = z_a\}. \quad (5)$$

Let $\mu_n(\mathcal{Z}_l) = \{\frac{b}{n} | b \in \{0, \dots, n\}\}^{|\mathcal{S}_l| \times |\mathcal{A}_l|}$ be the space of $|\mathcal{S}_l| \times |\mathcal{A}_l|$ -sized tables, where each entry is an element of $\{0, \frac{1}{n}, \frac{2}{n}, \dots, 1\}$. Then, $F_{z_{[n]}} \in \mu_n(\mathcal{Z}_l)$ represents the proportion of agents in each state/action pair. The Q -function is permutation-invariant in the local agents, since permuting the labels of homogeneous local agents with the same state will not change the action of the decision-making agent. So, $Q(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g, a_{[n]}) = \hat{Q}(s_g, s_1, a_g, a_1, F_{z_{[n] \setminus 1}})$. Here, $\hat{Q} : \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l \times \mu_{n-1}(\mathcal{Z}_l) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an equivalent reparameterized Q -function learned by mean-field value iteration: one initializes $\hat{Q}^0(s_g, s_1, a_g, a_1, F_{z_{[n] \setminus 1}}) = 0$. At time t , we update \hat{Q} as $\hat{Q}^{t+1} = \hat{\mathcal{T}}\hat{Q}^t$, where $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ is the Bellman operator in distribution space, given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{T}}\hat{Q}^t(s_g, s_1, a_g, a_1, F_{z_{[n] \setminus 1}}) &= r(s, a) \\ &+ \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot|s_g, a_g) \\ s'_i \sim P_i(\cdot|s_i, s_g, a_i) \\ \forall i \in [n]}} \max_{\substack{(a'_g, a'_1, a'_{[n] \setminus 1}) \\ \in \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l \times \mathcal{A}_l^{n-1}}} \hat{Q}^t(s'_g, s'_1, a'_g, a'_1, F_{z'_{[n] \setminus 1}}) \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{T} is a γ -contraction, so is $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$. Hence, $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ has a unique fixed-point \hat{Q}^* such that $\hat{Q}^*(s_g, s_1, a_g, a_1, F_{z_{[n] \setminus 1}}) = Q^*(s_g, s_{[n]}, a_g, a_{[n]})$. The optimal policy is the deterministic greedy policy given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}^*(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{[n] \setminus 1}}) &= \\ \arg \max_{\substack{(a_g, a_1, a_{[n] \setminus 1}) \\ \in \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l \times \mathcal{A}_l^{n-1}}} \hat{Q}^*(s_g, s_1, a_g, a_1, F_{z_{[n] \setminus 1}, a_{[n] \setminus 1}}, a_g). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the update complexity of \hat{Q} is $O(|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{Z}_l|^n|z_l|)$, which scales polynomially with the number of agents n .

Remark 2.7. Existing solutions require a sample complexity of $\min\{\tilde{O}(|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{Z}_l|^n), \tilde{O}(|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{Z}_l|n^{|\mathcal{Z}_l|})\}$. Here, one uses Q -learning if $|\mathcal{Z}_l|^{n-1} < n^{|\mathcal{Z}_l|}$, and mean-field value iteration otherwise. In each regime, as n scales, the update complexity becomes computationally infeasible.

3. Method and Theoretical Results

In this section, we propose the SUBSAMPLE-MFQ algorithm to overcome the polynomial (in n) sample complexity of mean-field value iteration and the exponential (in n) sample complexity of traditional Q -learning. In the algorithm, the global agent randomly samples a subset of local agents $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ such that $|\Delta| = k$, for $k \leq n$. It ignores all other local agents $[n] \setminus \Delta$, and performs value iteration to learn the Q -function $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ and policy $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ for this surrogate subsystem of k local agents, where m is the number of samples used to update the Q -functions' estimates of the unknown system. When $|\mathcal{Z}_l|^{k-1} < k^{|\mathcal{Z}_l|}$, the algorithm uses traditional value-iteration (Algorithm 1), and when $|\mathcal{Z}_l|^{k-1} > k^{|\mathcal{Z}_l|}$, it uses mean-field value iteration (Algorithm 2). We denote the surrogate reward gained by this subsystem at each time step by $r_\Delta : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where

$$r_\Delta(s, a) = r_g(s_g, a_g) + \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s_g, s_i, a_i). \quad (6)$$

To convert the optimality of each agent's action in the k local-agent subsystem to an approximate optimality guarantee on the full n -agent system, we use a randomized policy $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ (Algorithm 3), where the global agent samples $\Delta \in \mathcal{U}\binom{[n]}{k}$ at each time-step to derive an action $a_g \leftarrow \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta)$, and where each local i agent samples $k-1$ other local agents Δ_i to derive a action $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, s_{\Delta_i})$. Finally, Theorem 3.4 shows that the policy $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ converges to the optimal policy π^* as $k \rightarrow n$. We first present Algorithms 1 and 2 (SUBSAMPLE-MFQ: Learning) and Algorithm 3 (SUBSAMPLE-MFQ: Execution), which we describe below. For this, a crucial characterization is the notion of the empirical distribution function:

Definition 3.1 (Empirical Distribution Function). *For any population $(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathcal{Z}_l^n$, where $\mathcal{Z}_l := \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{A}_l$, define the empirical distribution function $F_{z_\Delta} : \mathcal{Z}_l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ for all $z := (z_s, z_a) \in \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{A}_l$ and for all $\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ by:*

$$F_{z_\Delta}(x) := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbf{1}\{s_i = z_s, a_i = z_a\}. \quad (7)$$

Let $\mu_k(\mathcal{Z}_l) := \left\{ \frac{b}{k} \mid b \in \{0, \dots, k\} \right\}^{|\mathcal{S}_l| \times |\mathcal{A}_l|}$ be the space of $|\mathcal{S}_l| \times |\mathcal{A}_l|$ -length vectors where each entry is an element of $\{0, \frac{1}{k}, \frac{2}{k}, \dots, 1\}$. Here, $F_{z_\Delta} \in \mu_k(\mathcal{Z}_l)$ is the proportion of agents in the k -local-agent subsystem at each state.

Algorithm 1 SUB-SAMPLE-MFQ: Learning (if $|\mathcal{Z}_l|^{k-1} \leq k^{|\mathcal{Z}_l|}$)

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

- 1: Uniformly sample $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ such that $|\Delta| = k$.
- 2: Initialize $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^0(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g, a_\Delta) = 0, \forall (s_g, a_g, z_\Delta)$.
- 3: **for** $t = 1$ to T **do**
- 4: **for** $(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g, a_\Delta) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^k \times \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l^k$ **do**
- 5: $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{t+1}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g, a_\Delta) = \tilde{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g, a_\Delta)$
- 6: **end for**
- 7: **end for**
- 8: Return $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^T$.
- 9: For all $s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g$ and $s_\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_l^k$, define the greedy argmax policy by $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta)$ such that $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta) = \arg \max_{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, a_\Delta \in \mathcal{A}_l^k} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^T(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g, a_\Delta)$.

Algorithms 1 and 2 (Offline learning). Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the sample size for the learning algorithm with sampling parameter $k \leq n$. When $|\mathcal{Z}_l|^{k-1} \leq k^{|\mathcal{Z}_l|}$, we iteratively learn the optimal Q -function for a subsystem with k -local agents denoted by $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^t : \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^k \times \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which is initialized to 0. At time t , we update $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{t+1}(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g, a_\Delta) = \tilde{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g, a_\Delta)$, where $\tilde{T}_{k,m}$ is the *empirically adapted Bellman operator* in Equation (8).

When $|\mathcal{Z}_l|^{k-1} > k^{|\mathcal{Z}_l|}$, we learn the optimal mean-field Q -function for a k local agent system, denoted by $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^t : \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{Z}_l) \times \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which is initialized to 0. At time t , we update $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{t+1}(s_g, s_1, F_{z_\Delta}, a_1, a_g) = \hat{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_1, F_{z_\Delta}, a_1, a_g)$, where $\hat{T}_{k,m}$ is the *empirically adapted mean-field Bellman operator* in Equation (9).

Since the system is unknown, $\tilde{T}_{k,m}$ and $\hat{T}_{k,m}$ cannot directly perform the Bellman update and instead use m random samples $s_g^j \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g)$ and $s_i^j \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g, a_i)$ for each $j \in [m]$, $i \in \Delta$ to approximate the system:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g, a_\Delta) &= r_\Delta(s, a) \\ &+ \frac{\gamma}{m} \sum_{j \in [m]} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, a'_\Delta \in \mathcal{A}_l^k} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g^j, s_\Delta^j, a'_g, a'_\Delta) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_1, F_{z_\Delta}, a_1, a_g) &= r_\Delta(s, a) + \\ \frac{\gamma}{m} \sum_{j \in [m]} \max_{\substack{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, a'_1 \in \mathcal{A}_l, \\ F_{a'_\Delta} \in \mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{A}_l)}} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g^j, s_1^j, F_{s_\Delta^j, a_\Delta^j}, a'_1, a'_g). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$\hat{Q}_{k,m}^t$ depends on s_Δ and a_Δ through F_{z_Δ} , and $\tilde{T}_{k,m}/\hat{T}_{k,m}$ are γ -contractive. So, Algorithms 1 and 2 apply value iteration with their respective Bellman operators \tilde{T} and \hat{T} until $\hat{Q}_{k,m}$ converges to a fixed point satisfying $\tilde{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} =$

Algorithm 2 SUBSAMPLE-MFQ: Learning (if $|\mathcal{Z}_l|^{k-1} > k^{|\mathcal{Z}_l|}$)

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

- 1: Set $\hat{\Delta} = \{2, \dots, k\}$.
- 2: Set $\mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{Z}_l) = \{\frac{b}{k-1} : b \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}\}^{|\mathcal{S}_l| \times |\mathcal{A}_l|}$.
- 3: Set $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^0(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\hat{\Delta}}}, a_1, a_g) = 0, \forall (s_g, s_{[k]}, a_{[k]}, a_g)$.
- 4: **for** $t = 1$ to T **do**
- 5: **for** $(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\hat{\Delta}}}, a_1, a_g) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l \times \mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{Z}_l) \times \mathcal{A}_l \times \mathcal{A}_g$ **do**
- 6: $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{t+1}(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\hat{\Delta}}}, a_1, a_g)$
- 7: $= \hat{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\hat{\Delta}}}, a_1, a_g)$
- 8: **end for**
- 9: **end for**
- 10: $\forall (s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\hat{\Delta}}}) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l \times \mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{S}_l)$, let

$$\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\hat{\Delta}}}) := \arg \max_{\substack{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, a_i \in \mathcal{A}_l, \\ F_{a_{\hat{\Delta}}} \in \mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{A}_l)}} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^T(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\hat{\Delta}}}, a_1, a_g)$$

$\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ and $\hat{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} = \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$, yielding equivalent deterministic policies $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_{\Delta})$ and $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_1, F_{s_{\hat{\Delta}}})$:

$$\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_{\Delta}) = \arg \max_{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, a_{\Delta} \in \mathcal{A}_l^k} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g, a_{\Delta})$$

$$\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_1, F_{s_{\hat{\Delta}}}) = \arg \max_{\substack{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, a_1 \in \mathcal{A}_l, \\ F_{a_{\hat{\Delta}}} \in \mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{A}_l)}} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\hat{\Delta}}}, a_1, a_g)$$

For $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, s_{\Delta \setminus i}) = a_g^*, a_i^*, a_{\Delta \setminus i}^*$, let $[\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_{\Delta})]_g = a_g^*$ and $[\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, s_{\Delta \setminus i})]_l = a_i^*$.

Algorithm 3 (Online implementation). In Algorithm 3, (SUBSAMPLE-MFQ: Execution) the global agent samples local agents $\Delta(t) \sim \mathcal{U}(\binom{[n]}{k})$ at each time step to derive action $a_g(t) = [\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_{\Delta}(t))]_g$, and each local agent i samples other local agents $\Delta_i(t) \sim \mathcal{U}(\binom{[n] \setminus i}{k-1})$ to derive action $a_i(t) = [\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, s_{\Delta}(t))]_l$. The system then incurs a reward $r(s, a)$. This procedure of first sampling agents and then applying $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ is denoted by a stochastic policy $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(a|s)$, where $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(a_g|s)$ is the global agent's action distribution and $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(a_l|s)$ is the local agent's action distribution:

$$\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(a_g|s) = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \mathbf{1}(\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_{\Delta}) = a) \quad (10)$$

$$\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(a_i|s) = \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{k-1}} \sum_{\hat{\Delta} \in \binom{[n] \setminus i}{k-1}} \mathbf{1}(\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\hat{\Delta}}}) = a_i) \quad (11)$$

The agents then transition to their next states.

Algorithm 3 SUB-SAMPLE-MFQ: Execution

Require: A multi-agent system as described in Section 2.

Parameter T' for the number of iterations for the decision-making sequence. Hyperparameter $k \in [n]$. Discount parameter γ . Policy $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta}})$.

- 1: If $|\mathcal{Z}_l|^{k-1} \leq k^{|\mathcal{Z}_l|}$, learn $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ from Algorithm 1.
- 2: If $|\mathcal{Z}_l|^{k-1} > k^{|\mathcal{Z}_l|}$, learn $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ from Algorithm 2.
- 3: Sample $(s_g(0), s_{[n]}(0)) \sim s_0$, where s_0 is a distribution on the initial global state $(s_g, s_{[n]})$.
- 4: Initialize the total reward $R_0 = 0$.
- 5: **Policy** $\pi_k^{\text{est}}(s)$ is defined as follows:
- 6: **for** $t = 0$ to T' **do**
- 7: Choose Δ uniformly at random from $\binom{[n]}{k}$ and let $a_g(t) = [\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g(t), s_{\Delta}(t))]_g$.
- 8: **for** $i = 1$ to n **do**
- 9: Choose Δ_i uniformly at random from $\binom{[n] \setminus i}{k-1}$ and let $a_i(t) = [\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g(t), s_i(t), s_{\Delta_i}(t))]_l$.
- 10: **end for**
- 11: Let $s_g(t+1) \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g(t), a_g(t))$.
- 12: Let $s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t), a_i(t))$, $\forall i \in [n]$.
- 13: $R_{t+1} = R_t + \gamma^t \cdot r(s, a)$
- 14: **end for**

3.1. Theoretical Guarantee

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

Bellman noise. We introduce the notion of Bellman noise, which is used in the main theorem. Note that $\hat{T}_{k,m}$ is an unbiased estimator of the adapted Bellman operator \hat{T}_k ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}_k \hat{Q}_k(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g, a_{\Delta}) &= r_{\Delta}(s, a) \\ &+ \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), \\ s'_i \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g, a_i), \\ \forall i \in \Delta}} \max_{\substack{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, \\ a'_{\Delta} \in \mathcal{A}_l^k}} \hat{Q}_k(s'_g, s'_{\Delta}, a'_g, a'_{\Delta}). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Initialize $\hat{Q}_k^0(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g, a_{\Delta}) = 0$. For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\hat{Q}_k^{t+1} = \hat{T}_k \hat{Q}_k^t$, where \hat{T}_k is defined for $k \leq n$ in Equation (12). Then, \hat{T}_k is also a γ -contraction with fixed-point \hat{Q}_k^* . By the law of large numbers, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \hat{T}_{k,m} = \hat{T}_k$ and $\|\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} - \hat{Q}_k^*\|_{\infty} \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. For finite m , $\epsilon_{k,m} := \|\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} - \hat{Q}_k^*\|_{\infty}$ is the well-studied Bellman noise.

Lemma 3.2. For $k \in [n]$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where m is the number of samples in Equation (9), if $T \geq \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \log \frac{\sqrt{k}}{1-\gamma}$ then $\|\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}} - \hat{Q}_k^*\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon_{k,m} \leq \tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{k})$, when $m = m^* = \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|k^{2.5+|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}}{(1-\gamma)^5} \log(|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{A}_l||\mathcal{S}_l|) \log \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2}$.

We defer the proof of Lemma 3.2 to Appendix F.1.

Let $\pi_k^{\text{est}} := \tilde{\pi}_{k,m^*}^{\text{est}}$. To compare the performance between π^* and π_k^{est} , we define the value function of a policy π :

Definition 3.3. For a given policy π , the value function $V^\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$ is given by:

$$V^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a(t) \sim \pi(\cdot|s(t))} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s(t), a(t)) \mid s(0) = s \right]. \quad (13)$$

Intuitively, $V^\pi(s)$ is the expected discounted cumulative reward when starting from state s and applying actions from the policy π across an infinite horizon.

With the above preparations, we are primed to present our main result: a bound on the optimality gap for our learned policy π_k^{est} that decays with rate $\tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{k})$.

Theorem 3.4. Let π_k^{est} denote the learned policy from SUBSAMPLE-MFQ. Suppose $T \geq \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \log \frac{\tilde{r}\sqrt{k}}{1-\gamma}$. Then, $\forall s \in \mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & V^{\pi^*}(s) - V^{\pi_k^{\text{est}}}(s) \\ & \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{2nk} \ln \frac{40\tilde{r}|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l||\mathcal{A}_g|k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|+\frac{1}{2}}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + \frac{4}{\sqrt{k}}. \end{aligned}$$

We defer the proof of Theorem 3.4 to Appendix C, and generalize the result to stochastic rewards in Appendix G.

Remark 3.5. Between Algorithms 1 and 2, the asymptotic sample complexity to learn $\hat{\pi}_k^{\text{est}}$ for a fixed k is $\min\{\tilde{O}(|\mathcal{Z}_l|^k), \tilde{O}(k^{|\mathcal{Z}_l|})\}$. By Theorem 3.4, as $k \rightarrow n$, the optimality gap decays, revealing a fundamental trade-off in the choice of k : increasing k improves the performance of the policy, but increases the size of the Q -function. We explore this trade-off further in our experiments. For $k = O(\log n)$, this leads to an asymptotic runtime of $\min\{\tilde{O}(n^{\log|\mathcal{Z}_l|}), \tilde{O}((\log n)^{|\mathcal{Z}_l|})\}$. This is an exponential speedup on the complexity from mean-field value iteration (from $\text{poly}(n)$ to $\text{poly}(\log n)$), as well as over traditional value-iteration (from $\text{exp}(n)$ to $\text{poly}(n)$), where the optimality gap decays to 0 with rate $O(1/\sqrt{\log n})$.

Remark 3.6. If $k = O(\log n)$, SUBSAMPLE-MFQ handles $|\mathcal{E}| \leq O(\log n / \log \log n)$ types of local agents, since the run-time of the learning algorithm becomes $\text{poly}(n)$. This surpasses the previous heterogeneity capacity from Mondal et al. (2022), which only handles constant $|\mathcal{E}| \leq O(1)$.

In the non-tabular setting with infinite state/action spaces, one could replace the Q -learning algorithm with any arbitrary value-based RL method that learns \hat{Q}_k with function approximation (Sutton et al., 1999) such as deep Q -networks (Silver et al., 2016). Doing so raises an additional error that factors into Theorem 3.4. We formalize this below.

Assumption 3.7 (Linear MDP with infinite state spaces). Suppose \mathcal{S}_g and \mathcal{S}_l are infinite compact sets. Furthermore, suppose there exists a feature map $\phi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and d unknown (signed) measures $\mu = (\mu^1, \dots, \mu^d)$ over \mathcal{S} and

a vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for any $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\cdot|s, a) = \langle \phi(s, a), \mu(\cdot) \rangle$ and $r(s, a) = \langle \phi(s, a), \theta \rangle$.

By assuming the existence of $\phi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, we can approximate the Q -function of any policy as a linear function. This assumption is commonly used in conjunction with policy iteration algorithms (Lattimore et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2023) and allows one to obtain sample complexity bounds that are independent of the cardinality of the state and action spaces of the agents. We also make an assumption of bounded feature-norm which is standard in the RL literature (Tkachuk et al., 2023; Abbasi Yadkori et al., 2013):

Assumption 3.8 (Bounded features). We assume that $\|\phi(s, a)\|_2 \leq 1$ for all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$.

Then, through a reduction from Ren et al. (2024) that uses function approximation to learn the spectral features ϕ_k for \hat{Q}_k , we derive a performance guarantee for the learned policy π_k^{est} , where the optimality gap decays with k .

Theorem 3.9. When π_k^{est} is derived from the spectral features ϕ_k learned in \hat{Q}_k , and M is the number of samples used in the function approximation, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[V^{\pi^*}(s) - V^{\pi_k^{\text{est}}}(s) \leq \tilde{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} + \frac{\|\phi_k\|^5 \log 2k^2}{\sqrt{M}} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{2\gamma\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)\sqrt{k}} \|\phi_k\| \right) \right] \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{100\sqrt{k}} \right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{k}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

We defer the proof of Theorem 3.9 to Appendix H in the supplementary material, under assumptions of a linear MDP.

4. Numerical Experiments

This section provides numerical simulations for the examples outlined in Section 2. All experiments were run on a 2-core CPU server with 12GB RAM. We chose a parameter complexity for each simulation that was sufficient to emphasize characteristics of the theory, such as the complexity improvement and the decaying optimality gap.

4.1. Constrained Exploration

Let $\mathcal{S}_g = \mathcal{S}_l = [6]^2$ where for $s_a \in \{\mathcal{S}_g, \mathcal{S}_l\}$, $s_a^{(i)}$ denotes the projection of s_a onto its i 'th coordinate. Further, let $\mathcal{A}_l = \mathcal{A}_g = \{\text{"up"}, \text{"down"}, \text{"right"}, \text{"left"}\}$ given formally by $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$. Let $\Pi_D(x)$ denote the ℓ_1 -projection of x onto set D . Then, let $s_g^{t+1}(s_g^t, a_g^t) = \Pi_{\mathcal{S}_g}(s_g^t + a_g^t)$, $s_l^{t+1}(s_l^t, s_g^t, a_l^t) = \Pi_{\mathcal{S}_l}(s_l^t + |s_l^t - s_g^t| + a_l^t)$. We let the global agent's reward be $r_g(s_g, a_g) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbb{1}\{a_g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, s_g^{(1)} \leq i\} + 2 \sum_{i=3}^6 \mathbb{1}\{a_g = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, s_g^{(1)} > i\}$, and the local agent's rewards be $r_l(s_l, s_g, a_l) = \mathbb{1}\{a_l^t \neq 0\} + 6 \cdot \mathbb{1}\{s_l^{(1)} = s_g^{(1)}\} + 2 \cdot \|s_l^t - s_g^t\|_1$.




Figure 3. a) Reward optimality gap (log scale) with $\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ running 300 iterations. b) Computation time (in minutes) against sampling parameter k , for $k \leq n = 8$, to learn policy $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$. c) Discounted cumulative rewards for $k \leq n = 50$.

Intuitively, the reward function is designed to force the global agent to oscillate vertically in the grid, while forcing the local agents to oscillate horizontally around the global agent, thereby simulating a constrained exploration.

For this task, we ran a simulation with $n = 8$ agents, with $m = 20$ samples in the empirically adapted Bellman operator. We provide simulation results in Figure 3a. We observe monotonic improvements in the cumulative discounted rewards as $k \rightarrow n$. Since $k = n$ recovers value-iteration and mean-field MARL algorithms, the reward at $k = n$ is the baseline we compare our algorithm to. When $k < n$, we observe that the reward accrued by SUBSAMPLE-MFQ is only marginally less than the reward gained by value-iteration.

4.2. Gaussian Squeeze

In this task, n homogeneous agents determine their individual action a_i to jointly maximize the objective $r(x) = xe^{-(x-\mu)^2/\sigma^2}$, where $x = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$, $a_i \in \{0, \dots, 9\}$, and μ and σ are the pre-defined mean and variance of the system. We consider a homogeneous system devoid of a global agent to match the mean-field setting in Yang et al. (2018), where the richness of our model setting can still express GS. We use the global agent to model the state of the system, given by the number of vehicles in each controller’s lane.

We set $\mathcal{S}_l = [4]$, $\mathcal{A}_l = \{0, \dots, 4\}$, and $\mathcal{S}_g = \mathcal{S}_l$ such that $s_g = \lceil \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_i \rceil$, and $\mathcal{A}_g = \{0\}$. The transition functions are given by $s_i(t+1) = s_i(t) - 1 \cdot \mathbb{1}\{s_i(t) > s_g(t)\} + \text{Ber}(p)$ and $s_g(t+1) = \lceil \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_i(t+1) \rceil$, where $\text{Ber}(p)$ is a Bernoulli random variable with parameter $p > 0$. Finally, the global agent’s reward function is given by $r_g(s_g, a_g) = -s_g$ and the local agent’s reward function is given by $r_l(s_i, s_g, a_i) = 4 \cdot \mathbb{1}\{s_i > s_g\} - 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}\{a_i > s_g\}$.

For this task, we ran a small-scale simulation with $n = 8$ agents, and a large-scale simulation with $n = 50$ agents, and used $m = 20$ samples in the empirical Bellman operator. We provide simulation results in Figure 3b and Figure 3c,

where Figure 3b demonstrates the exponential improvement in computational complexity of SUBSAMPLE-MFQ, and Figure 3c demonstrates a monotonic improvement in the cumulative rewards, consistent with Theorem 3.4. Here, both metrics beat the mean-field value iteration benchmark.

5. Conclusion and Future Works

This work develops subsampling for mean field MARL in a cooperative system with a global decision-making agent and n homogeneous local agents. We propose SUBSAMPLE-MFQ which learns each agent’s best response to the mean effect from a sample of its neighbors, allowing an exponential reduction on the sample complexity of approximating a solution to the MDP. We provide a theoretical analysis on the optimality gap of the learned policy, showing that the learned policy converges to the optimal policy with the number of agents k sampled at the rate $\tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{k})$ validate our theoretical results through numerical experiments. We further extend this result to the non-tabular setting with infinite state and action spaces.

We recognize several future directions. One direction would be to extend this subsampling framework to general networks. We believe expander-graph decompositions (Anand & Umans, 2023) are amenable for this. A second direction would be to apply the subsampling framework to federated learning algorithms. Another direction would be to extend the subsampling framework to the model-free actor-critic algorithm (Schulman et al., 2016). A limitation of our work is that it only incorporates mild heterogeneity among the agents; so, a third future direction would be to consider the setting of truly heterogeneous local agents or competitive settings. Lastly, it would be very exciting to generalize this work to the online setting without a generative oracle: we conjecture that tools from recent works on stochastic approximation (Chen & Maguluri, 2022) and no-regret RL (Jin et al., 2021b; Pasztor et al., 2021) might be valuable.

6. Impact Statement

This paper contributes to the theoretical foundations of multi-agent reinforcement learning, with the goal of developing mean-field tools that can apply to the control of networked systems. The work can potentially lead to RL-based algorithms for the adaptive control of cyber-physical systems, such as the power grid, smart traffic systems, and other smart infrastructure systems (Bichuch et al., 2024). While the subsampling approach we describe is promising, it is limited by its assumptions. Furthermore, any applications of the proposed algorithm in its current form should be considered cautiously since the analysis here focuses on efficiency and optimality, and does not consider the issue of fairness (Jusup et al., 2023).

References

- Abbasi Yadkori, Y., Bartlett, P. L., Kanade, V., Seldin, Y., and Szepesvari, C. Online learning in markov decision processes with adversarially chosen transition probability distributions. In Burges, C., Bottou, L., Welling, M., Ghahramani, Z., and Weinberger, K. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 26. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2013/file/4f284803bd0966cc24fa8683a34afc6e-Paper.pdf.
- Anand, E. and Qu, G. Efficient reinforcement learning for global decision making in the presence of local agents at scale. *arXiv*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.00222>.
- Anand, E. and Umans, C. Pseudorandomness of the Sticky Random Walk. *Caltech Undergraduate Thesis*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.11104>.
- Anand, E., van den Brand, J., Ghadiri, M., and Zhang, D. J. The Bit Complexity of Dynamic Algebraic Formulas and Their Determinants. In Bringmann, K., Grohe, M., Puppis, G., and Svensson, O. (eds.), *51st International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2024)*, volume 297 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pp. 10:1–10:20, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2024. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. ISBN 978-3-95977-322-5. doi: 10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2024.10.
- Banach, S. Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations intégrales. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 3(1):133–181, 1922. URL <http://eudml.org/doc/213289>.
- Bertsekas, D. P. and Tsitsiklis, J. N. *Neuro-Dynamic Programming*. Athena Scientific, 1st edition, 1996. ISBN 1886529108.
- Bichuch, M., Dayanıklı, G., and Lauriere, M. A stackelberg mean field game for green regulator with a large number of prosumers. *Available at SSRN 4985557*, 2024.
- Blondel, V. D. and Tsitsiklis, J. N. A Survey of Computational Complexity Results in Systems and Control. *Automatica*, 36(9):1249–1274, 2000. ISSN 0005-1098. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-1098\(00\)00050-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-1098(00)00050-9). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0005109800000509>.
- Chaudhari, S., Pranav, S., Anand, E., and Moura, J. M. F. Peer-to-peer learning dynamics of wide neural networks. *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing 2025*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.15267>.
- Chen, Z. and Maguluri, S. T. Sample complexity of policy-based methods under off-policy sampling and linear function approximation. In Camps-Valls, G., Ruiz, F. J. R., and Valera, I. (eds.), *Proceedings of The 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 151 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 11195–11214. PMLR, 28–30 Mar 2022.
- Cui, K. and Koepl, H. Learning Graphon Mean Field Games and Approximate Nash Equilibria. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=0sgntlpKDOz>.
- Cui, K., Fabian, C., and Koepl, H. Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning via Mean Field Control: Common Noise, Major Agents and Approximation Properties, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.10665>.
- DeWeese, A. and Qu, G. Locally interdependent multi-agent MDP: Theoretical framework for decentralized agents with dynamic dependencies. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Dietterich, T. G., Trimponias, G., and Chen, Z. Discovering and removing exogenous state variables and rewards for reinforcement learning, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.01584>.
- Dvoretzky, A., Kiefer, J., and Wolfowitz, J. Asymptotic Minimax Character of the Sample Distribution Function and of the Classical Multinomial Estimator. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 27(3):642 – 669, 1956. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177728174. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177728174>.

- Foster, D. J., Rakhlin, A., Sekhari, A., and Sridharan, K. On the Complexity of Adversarial Decision Making. In Oh, A. H., Agarwal, A., Belgrave, D., and Cho, K. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=pgBpQYss2ba>.
- Gamarnik, D., Goldberg, D., and Weber, T. Correlation Decay in Random Decision Networks, 2009.
- Ghosal, S. and van der Vaart, A. *Fundamentals of Nonparametric Bayesian Inference: Space of Probability Densities*, pp. 516–527. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Golowich, N. and Moitra, A. The role of inherent bellman error in offline reinforcement learning with linear function approximation, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.11686>.
- Gu, H., Guo, X., Wei, X., and Xu, R. Mean-Field Controls with Q-Learning for Cooperative MARL: Convergence and Complexity Analysis. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 3(4):1168–1196, 2021. doi: 10.1137/20M1360700. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1360700>.
- Gu, H., Guo, X., Wei, X., and Xu, R. Mean-Field Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning: A Decentralized Network Approach, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2108.02731.pdf>.
- Hu, Y., Wei, X., Yan, J., and Zhang, H. Graphon Mean-Field Control for Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 360(18):14783–14805, 2023. ISSN 0016-0032. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfranklin.2023.09.002>.
- Jin, C., Yang, Z., Wang, Z., and Jordan, M. I. Provably efficient reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. In Abernethy, J. and Agarwal, S. (eds.), *Proceedings of Thirty Third Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 2137–2143. PMLR, 09–12 Jul 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v125/jin20a.html>.
- Jin, C., Liu, Q., and Miryoosefi, S. Bellman eluder dimension: New rich classes of rl problems, and sample-efficient algorithms, 2021a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.00815>.
- Jin, C., Liu, Q., Wang, Y., and Yu, T. V-learning – a simple, efficient, decentralized algorithm for multiagent rl, 2021b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14555>.
- Jin, J., Song, C., Li, H., Gai, K., Wang, J., and Zhang, W. Real-time bidding with multi-agent reinforcement learning in display advertising. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM '18*, pp. 2193–2201, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450360142. doi: 10.1145/3269206.3272021.
- Jin, Y., Karmarkar, I., Sidford, A., and Wang, J. Truncated variance reduced value iteration. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=BiikUm6pLu>.
- Jusup, M., Pásztor, B., Janik, T., Zhang, K., Corman, F., Krause, A., and Bogunovic, I. Safe model-based multi-agent mean-field reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.17052*, 2023.
- Kakade, S. and Langford, J. Approximately Optimal Approximate Reinforcement Learning. In Sammut, C. and Hoffman, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2002)*, pp. 267–274, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2002. Morgan Kaufman. ISBN 1-55860-873-7. URL <http://ttic.uchicago.edu/~sham/papers/rl/aoarl.pdf>.
- Kim, S.-J. and Giannakis, G. B. An Online Convex Optimization Approach to Real-time Energy Pricing for Demand Response. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 8(6):2784–2793, 2017. doi: 10.1109/TSG.2016.2539948. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7438918>.
- Kiran, B. R., Sobh, I., Talpaert, V., Mannion, P., Sallab, A. A. A., Yogamani, S., and Pérez, P. Deep Reinforcement Learning for Autonomous Driving: A Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(6):4909–4926, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TITS.2021.3054625. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9351818>.
- Kleinberg, R. A multiple-choice secretary algorithm with applications to online auctions. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '05*, pp. 630–631, USA, 2005. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics. ISBN 0898715857.
- Kober, J., Bagnell, J. A., and Peters, J. Reinforcement Learning in Robotics: A Survey. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 32(11):1238–1274, 2013. doi: 10.1177/0278364913495721. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/0278364913495721>.

- Larsen, K. G., Montasser, O., and Zhivotovskiy, N. Derandomizing multi-distribution learning. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=twYE75Mnkt>.
- Lasry, J.-M. and Lions, P.-L. Mean Field Games. *Japanese Journal of Mathematics*, 2(1):229–260, March 2007. ISSN 1861-3624. doi: 10.1007/s11537-007-0657-8. URL <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11537-007-0657-8>.
- Lattimore, T., Szepesvari, C., and Weisz, G. Learning with good feature representations in bandits and in RL with a generative model. In III, H. D. and Singh, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 5662–5670. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/lattimore20a.html>.
- Lauer, M. and Riedmiller, M. A. An algorithm for distributed reinforcement learning in cooperative multi-agent systems. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML '00, pp. 535–542, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2000. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc. ISBN 1558607072.
- Li, G., Wei, Y., Chi, Y., Gu, Y., and Chen, Y. Sample Complexity of Asynchronous Q-Learning: Sharper Analysis and Variance Reduction. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(1):448–473, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2021.3120096. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.03041>.
- Li, M., Qin, Z., Jiao, Y., Yang, Y., Wang, J., Wang, C., Wu, G., and Ye, J. Efficient ridesharing order dispatching with mean field multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *The World Wide Web Conference, WWW '19*, pp. 983–994, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450366748. doi: 10.1145/3308558.3313433. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3308558.3313433>.
- Lin, Y., Qu, G., Huang, L., and Wierman, A. Distributed Reinforcement Learning in Multi-Agent Networked Systems. *CoRR*, abs/2006.06555, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.06555>.
- Lin, Y., Preiss, J. A., Anand, E. T., Li, Y., Yue, Y., and Wierman, A. Online Adaptive Policy Selection in Time-Varying Systems: No-Regret via Contractive Perturbations. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=hDajsofjRM>.
- Lin, Y., Preiss, J. A., Xie, F., Anand, E., Chung, S.-J., Yue, Y., and Wierman, A. Online policy optimization in unknown nonlinear systems. In Agrawal, S. and Roth, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of Thirty Seventh Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 247 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 3475–3522. PMLR, 30 Jun–03 Jul 2024. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v247/lin24a.html>.
- Littman, M. L. Markov Games as a Framework for Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *Machine learning proceedings*, Elsevier, pp. 157–163, 1994.
- Massart, P. The Tight Constant in the Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz Inequality. *The Annals of Probability*, 18(3): 1269 – 1283, 1990. doi: 10.1214/aop/1176990746.
- Min, Y., He, J., Wang, T., and Gu, Q. Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning: Asynchronous Communication and Linear Function Approximation. In Krause, A., Brunskill, E., Cho, K., Engelhardt, B., Sabato, S., and Scarlett, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 24785–24811. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/min23a.html>.
- Mondal, W. U., Agarwal, M., Aggarwal, V., and Ukkusuri, S. V. On the Approximation of Cooperative Heterogeneous Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (MARL) Using Mean Field Control (MFC). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(1), jan 2022. ISSN 1532-4435.
- Naaman, M. On the Tight Constant in the Multivariate Dvoretzky–Kiefer–Wolfowitz Inequality. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 173:109088, 2021. ISSN 0167-7152. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spl.2021.109088>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016771522100050X>.
- Papadimitriou, C. H. and Tsitsiklis, J. N. The Complexity of Optimal Queuing Network Control. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 24(2):293–305, 1999. ISSN 0364765X, 15265471.
- Pasztor, B., Bogunovic, I., and Krause, A. Efficient model-based multi-agent mean-field reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.04050*, 2021.
- Preiss, J. A., Honig, W., Sukhatme, G. S., and Ayanian, N. CrazySwarm: A large nano-quadcopter swarm. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 3299–3304, 2017. doi: 10.1109/ICRA.2017.7989376.

- Qu, G., Lin, Y., Wierman, A., and Li, N. Scalable Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning for Networked Systems with Average Reward. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS'20, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2020a. Curran Associates Inc. ISBN 9781713829546.
- Qu, G., Wierman, A., and Li, N. Scalable Reinforcement Learning of Localized Policies for Multi-Agent Networked Systems. In Bayen, A. M., Jadbabaie, A., Pappas, G., Parrilo, P. A., Recht, B., Tomlin, C., and Zeilinger, M. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Learning for Dynamics and Control*, volume 120 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 256–266. PMLR, 10–11 Jun 2020b.
- Ren, Z., Runyu, Zhang, Dai, B., and Li, N. Scalable spectral representations for network multiagent control, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.17221>.
- Sayin, M. O., Zhang, K., Leslie, D. S., Basar, T., and Ozdaglar, A. E. Decentralized Q-learning in Zero-sum Markov Games. In Beygelzimer, A., Dauphin, Y., Liang, P., and Vaughan, J. W. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=nhkbYh30Tl>.
- Schulman, J., Moritz, P., Levine, S., Jordan, M., and Abbeel, P. High-dimensional continuous control using generalized advantage estimation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2016.
- Shachter, R. D. Bayes-ball: The rational pastime (for determining irrelevance and requisite information in belief networks and influence diagrams), 2013.
- Shapley, L. S. A value for n-person games. In *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, 1953.
- Silver, D., Huang, A., Maddison, C. J., Guez, A., Sifre, L., van den Driessche, G., Schrittwieser, J., Antonoglou, I., Panneershelvam, V., Lanctot, M., Dieleman, S., Grewe, D., Nham, J., Kalchbrenner, N., Sutskever, I., Lillicrap, T., Leach, M., Kavukcuoglu, K., Graepel, T., and Hassabis, D. Mastering the Game of Go with Deep Neural Networks and Tree Search. *Nature*, 529 (7587):484–489, January 2016. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/nature16961. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/nature16961>.
- Sutton, R. S., McAllester, D., Singh, S., and Mansour, Y. Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation. In Solla, S., Leen, T., and Müller, K. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 12. MIT Press, 1999. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/1999/file/464d828b85b0bed98e80ade0a5c43b0f-Paper.pdf.
- Tan, M. *Multi-agent reinforcement learning: independent vs. cooperative agents*, pp. 487–494. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA, 1997. ISBN 1558604952.
- Tkachuk, V., Bakhtiari, S. A., Kirschner, J., Jusup, M., Bogunovic, I., and Szepesvári, C. Efficient planning in combinatorial action spaces with applications to cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning. *arXiv*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.04376>.
- Tsybakov, A. B. *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 1st edition, 2008. ISBN 0387790519. URL <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/b13794>.
- Wang, J., Ye, D., and Lu, Z. More centralized training, still decentralized execution: Multi-agent conditional policy factorization, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.12681>.
- Watkins, C. J. C. H. and Dayan, P. Q-learning. *Machine Learning*, 8(3):279–292, May 1992. ISSN 1573-0565. doi: 10.1007/BF00992698. URL <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00992698>.
- Xu, M. and Klabjan, D. Decentralized randomly distributed multi-agent multi-armed bandit with heterogeneous rewards. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=DqfdhM64LI>.
- Yang, Y., Luo, R., Li, M., Zhou, M., Zhang, W., and Wang, J. Mean Field Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In Dy, J. and Krause, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 5571–5580. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/yang18d.html>.
- Zhang, K., Yang, Z., and Başar, T. Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning: A Selective Overview of Theories and Algorithms, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.10635>.
- Zhou, Y., Liu, S., Qing, Y., Chen, K., Zheng, T., Huang, Y., Song, J., and Song, M. Is centralized training with decentralized execution framework centralized enough for marl?, 2023.

A. Mathematical Background and Additional Remarks

Outline of the Appendices.

- Section 5 presents the proof of the Lipschitz continuity between \hat{Q}_k and Q^*
- Section 6 presents the TV distance bound
- Section 7 proves the bound on the optimality gap between the learned policy $\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ and the optimal policy π^*

Table 1. Important notations in this paper.

Notation	Meaning
$\ \cdot\ _1$	ℓ_1 (Manhattan) norm;
$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	ℓ_∞ norm;
\mathbb{Z}_+	The set of strictly positive integers;
\mathbb{R}^d	The set of d -dimensional reals;
$[m]$	The set $\{1, \dots, m\}$, where $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$;
$\binom{m}{k}$	The set of k -sized subsets of $\{1, \dots, m\}$;
a_g	$a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g$ is the action of the global agent;
s_g	$s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g$ is the state of the global agent;
a_1, \dots, a_n	$a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathcal{A}_l^n$ are the actions of the local agents $1, \dots, n$
s_1, \dots, s_n	$s_1, \dots, s_n \in \mathcal{S}_l^n$ are the states of the local agents $1, \dots, n$
a	$a = (a_g, a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l^n$ is the tuple of actions of all agents
s	$s = (s_g, s_1, \dots, s_n) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$ is the tuple of states of all agents
z_i	$z_i = (s_i, a_i) \in \mathcal{Z}_l$, for $i \in [n]$
$\mu_k(\mathcal{Z}_l)$	$\mu_k(\mathcal{Z}_l) = \{0, 1/k, 2/k, \dots, 1\}^{ \mathcal{Z}_l }$
$\mu(\mathcal{Z}_l)$	$\mu(\mathcal{Z}_l) := \mu_n(\mathcal{Z}_l) \{0, 1/n, 2/n, \dots, 1\}^{ \mathcal{Z}_l }$
s_Δ	For $\Delta \subseteq [n]$, and a collection of variables $\{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$, $s_\Delta := \{s_i : i \in \Delta\}$
$\sigma(z_\Delta, z'_\Delta)$	Product sigma-algebra generated by sequences z_Δ and z'_Δ ;
π^*	π^* is the optimal deterministic policy function such that $a = \pi^*(s)$;
$\hat{\pi}_k^*$	$\hat{\pi}_k^*$ is the optimal deterministic policy function on a constrained system of $ \Delta = k$ local agents
$\tilde{\pi}_k^{\text{est}}$	$\tilde{\pi}_k^{\text{est}}$ is the stochastic policy mapping learned with parameter k such that $a \sim \tilde{\pi}_k^{\text{est}}(s)$
$P_g(\cdot s_g, a_g)$	$P_g(\cdot s_g, a_g)$ is the stochastic transition kernel for the state of the global agent
$P_l(\cdot a_i, s_i, s_g)$	$P_l(\cdot a_i, s_i, s_g)$ is the stochastic transition kernel for the state of any local agent $i \in [n]$
$r_g(s_g, a_g)$	r_g is the global agent's component of the reward
$r_l(s_i, s_g, a_i)$	r_l is the component of the reward for local agent $i \in [n]$
$r(s, a)$	$r(s, a) := r_{[n]}(s, a) = r_g(s_g, a_g) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} r_l(s_i, s_g, a_i)$ is the reward of the system
$r_\Delta(s, a)$	$r_\Delta(s, a) = r_g(s_g, a_g) + \frac{1}{ \Delta } \sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s_i, s_g, a_i)$ is the constrained system's reward with $ \Delta = k$ local agents
\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T} is the centralized Bellman operator
$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$	$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ is the Bellman operator on a constrained system of $ \Delta = k$ local agents
$\Pi^\Theta(y)$	ℓ_1 projection of y onto set Θ ;

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

Theorem A.2 (Banach-Caccioppoli fixed point theorem (Banach, 1922)). Consider the metric space $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$, and $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that T is a γ -Lipschitz continuous mapping for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Then, by the Banach-Caccioppoli fixed-point theorem, there exists a unique fixed point $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ for which $T(x^*) = x^*$. Additionally, $x^* = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} T^s(x_0)$ for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$.

B. Notation and Basic Lemmas

For convenience, we restate below the various Bellman operators under consideration.

Definition B.1 (Bellman Operator \mathcal{T}).

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

Definition B.2 (Adapted Bellman Operator $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$). The adapted Bellman operator updates a smaller Q function (which we denote by \hat{Q}_k), for a surrogate system with the global agent and $k \in [n]$ local agents denoted by Δ , using mean-field value iteration and $j \in \Delta$ such that:

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k^t(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta \setminus j}}, a_j, a_g) := r_{\Delta}(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), \\ s'_i \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g, a_i), \forall i \in \Delta}} \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \hat{Q}_k^t(s'_g, s'_j, F_{z'_{\Delta \setminus j}}, a'_j, a'_g) \quad (15)$$

Definition B.3 (Empirical Adapted Bellman Operator $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$). The empirical adapted Bellman operator $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$ empirically estimates the adapted Bellman operator update using mean-field value iteration by drawing m random samples of $s_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g)$ and $s_i \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g, a_i)$ for $i \in \Delta$, where for $\ell \in [m]$, the ℓ 'th random sample is given by s_g^ℓ and s_{Δ}^ℓ , and $j \in \Delta$:

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

Remark B.4. Since the local agents $1, \dots, n$ are all homogeneous in their state/action spaces, the \hat{Q}_k -function only depends on them through their empirical distribution $F_{z_{\Delta}}$. Therefore, throughout the remainder of the paper, we will use $\hat{Q}_k(s_g, F_{z_{\Delta}}, a_g) := \hat{Q}_k(s_g, s_i, F_{z_{\Delta \setminus i}}, a_g, a_i) := \hat{Q}_k(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g, a_{\Delta})$ interchangeably, unless making a remark about the computational complexity of learning each function.

Lemma B.5. For any $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ such that $|\Delta| = k$, suppose $0 \leq r_{\Delta}(s, a) \leq \tilde{r}$. Then, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $\hat{Q}_k^t \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma}$.

Proof. The proof follows by induction on t . The base case follows from $\hat{Q}_k^0 := 0$. For the induction, note that by the triangle inequality $\|\hat{Q}_k^{t+1}\|_{\infty} \leq \|r_{\Delta}\|_{\infty} + \gamma \|\hat{Q}_k^t\|_{\infty} \leq \tilde{r} + \gamma \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma} = \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma}$. \square

Remark B.6. By the law of large numbers, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m} = \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$, where the error decays in $O(1/\sqrt{m})$ by the Chernoff bound. Also, $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_n := \mathcal{T}$. Further, Lemma B.5 is independent of the choice of k . Therefore, for $k = n$, this implies an identical bound on Q^t . An identical argument implies the same bound on $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^t$.

\mathcal{T} satisfies a γ -contractive property under the infinity norm (Watkins & Dayan, 1992). We similarly show that $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ and $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$ satisfy a γ -contractive property under infinity norm in Lemmas B.7 and B.8.

Lemma B.7. $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ satisfies the γ -contractive property under infinity norm:

$$\|\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}'_k - \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k\|_{\infty} \leq \gamma \|\hat{Q}'_k - \hat{Q}_k\|_{\infty} \quad (17)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}'_k - \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k \hat{Q}_k\|_{\infty} &= \gamma \max_{\substack{s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, \\ a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, \\ F_{z_{\Delta}} \in \mu_k(\mathcal{Z}_l)}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), \\ s'_i \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g, a_i), \\ \forall i \in \Delta}} \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \hat{Q}'_k(s'_g, F_{z'_{\Delta}}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s'_g \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g, a_g), \\ s'_i \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i, s_g, a_i), \\ \forall i \in \Delta'}} \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \hat{Q}_k(s'_g, F_{z'_{\Delta}}, a'_g) \right| \\ &\leq \gamma \max_{s'_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, F_{z'_{\Delta}} \in \mu_k(\mathcal{Z}_l), a'_g \in \mathcal{A}} \left| \hat{Q}'_k(s'_g, F_{z'_{\Delta}}, a'_g) - \hat{Q}_k(s'_g, F_{z'_{\Delta}}, a'_g) \right| = \gamma \|\hat{Q}'_k - \hat{Q}_k\|_{\infty} \end{aligned}$$

The equality cancels common $r_{\Delta}(s, a)$ terms in each operator. The second line uses Jensen's inequality, maximizes over actions, and bounds expected values with the maximizers of the random variables. \square

Lemma B.8. $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$ satisfies the γ -contractive property under infinity norm.

Proof. Similarly to Lemma B.7, suppose we apply $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}$ to $\hat{Q}_{k,m}(s_g, F_{z_{\Delta}}, a_g)$ and $\hat{Q}'_{k,m}(s_g, F_{z_{\Delta}}, a_g)$. Then:

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

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

Remark B.9. The γ -contractivity of \hat{T}_k and $\hat{T}_{k,m}$ attracts the trajectory between two \hat{Q}_k and $\hat{Q}_{k,m}$ functions on the same state-action tuple by γ at each step. Repeatedly applying the Bellman operators produces a unique fixed-point from the Banach fixed-point theorem which we introduce in Definitions B.10 and B.11.

Definition B.10 (\hat{Q}_k^* -function). Suppose $\hat{Q}_k^0 := 0$ and let $\hat{Q}_k^{t+1}(s_g, F_{z_\Delta}, a_g) = \hat{T}_k \hat{Q}_k^t(s_g, F_{z_\Delta}, a_g)$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote the fixed-point of \hat{T}_k by \hat{Q}_k^* such that $\hat{T}_k \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, F_{z_\Delta}, a_g) = \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, F_{z_\Delta}, a_g)$.

Definition B.11 ($\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ -function). Suppose $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^0 := 0$ and let $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{t+1}(s_g, F_{z_\Delta}, a_g) = \hat{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, F_{z_\Delta}, a_g)$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote the fixed-point of $\hat{T}_{k,m}$ by $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ such that $\hat{T}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{z_\Delta}, a_g) = \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{z_\Delta}, a_g)$.

Corollary B.12. Observe that by backpropagating results of the γ -contractive property for T time steps:

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

Further, noting that $\hat{Q}_k^0 = \hat{Q}_{k,m}^0 := 0$, $\|\hat{Q}_k^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma}$, and $\|\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma}$ from Lemma B.5:

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

Remark B.13. Corollary B.12 characterizes the error decay between \hat{Q}_k^T and \hat{Q}_k^* and shows that it decays exponentially in the number of Bellman iterations by a γ^T multiplicative factor.

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

Definition B.14 (Optimal policy π^*). The greedy policy derived from Q^* is

$$\pi^*(s) := \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a). \quad (20)$$

Definition B.15 (Optimal subsampled policy $\hat{\pi}_k^*$). The greedy policy from \hat{Q}_k^* is

$$\hat{\pi}_k^*(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta \setminus i}}) := \arg \max_{(a_g, a_i, F_{a_{\Delta \setminus i}}) \in \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_i \times \mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{A}_i)} \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_i, F_{z_{\Delta \setminus i}}, a_i, a_g). \quad (21)$$

Definition B.16 (Optimal empirically subsampled policy $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$). The greedy policy from $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ is given by

$$\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}) := \arg \max_{(a_g, a_i, F_{a_{\Delta \setminus i}}) \in \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_i \times \mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{A}_i)} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{z_{\Delta \setminus i}}, a_i, a_g). \quad (22)$$

Figure 5 details the analytic flow on how we use the empirical adapted Bellman operator to perform value iteration on $\hat{Q}_{k,m}$ to get $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ which approximates Q^* .

Algorithm 4 gives a stable implementation of Algorithm 2 with learning rates $\{\eta_t\}_{t \in [T]}$. Algorithm 4 is provably numerical stable under fixed-point arithmetic (Anand et al., 2024). $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^t$ in Algorithm 4 follows the γ -contractivity as in Lemma B.7, given an appropriately conditioned sequence of learning rates η_t :

Theorem B.17. As $T \rightarrow \infty$, if $\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t = \infty$, and $\sum_{t=1}^T \eta_t^2 < \infty$, then Q -learning converges to the optimal Q function asymptotically with probability 1.

Furthermore, finite-time guarantees with the learning rate and sample complexity have been shown recently in (Chen & Maguluri, 2022), which when adapted to our $\hat{Q}_{k,m}$ framework in Algorithm 4 yields:

Theorem B.18 ((Chen & Maguluri, 2022)). For all $t = \{1, \dots, T\}$ and for any $\epsilon > 0$, if the learning rate sequence η_t satisfies $\eta_t = (1-\gamma)^4 \epsilon^2$ and $T = |\mathcal{S}_l| |\mathcal{A}_l| k^{|\mathcal{S}_l| |\mathcal{A}_l|} |\mathcal{S}_g| |\mathcal{A}_g| / (1-\gamma)^5 \epsilon^2$, then

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

Algorithm 4 Stable (Practical) Implementation of Algorithm 2: SUBSAMPLE-Q: Learning

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

- 1: Let $\Delta = [k]$.
- 2: Set $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^0(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\Delta \setminus 1}}, a_1, a_g) = 0$ for $(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\Delta \setminus 1}}, a_1, a_g) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l \times \mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{Z}_l) \times \mathcal{A}_l \times \mathcal{S}_g$.
- 3: **for** $t = 1$ to T **do**
- 4: **for** $(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\Delta \setminus 1}}) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l \times \mu_{k-1}^{(\mathcal{Z}_l)}$ **do**
- 5: **for** $(a_g, a_1) \in \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l$ **do**
- 6: $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{t+1}(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\Delta \setminus 1}}, a_g, a_1) \leftarrow (1 - \eta_t)\hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\Delta \setminus 1}}, a_g, a_1) + \eta_t \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\Delta \setminus 1}}, a_g, a_1)$
- 7: **end for**
- 8: **end for**
- 9: **end for**
- 10: Let the approximate policy be

$$\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^T(s_g, s_1, F_{s_{\Delta \setminus 1}}) = \underset{(a_g, a_1, a_{\Delta \setminus 1}) \in \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l \times \mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{A}_l)}{\arg \max} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^T(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\Delta \setminus 1}}, a_g, a_1).$$

Definition B.19 (Star Graph S_n). For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the star graph S_n is the complete bipartite graph $K_{1,n}$.

S_n captures the graph density notion by saturating the set of neighbors of the central node. Such settings find applications beyond reinforcement learning as well (Chaudhari et al., 2024; Anand & Qu, 2024; Li et al., 2019). The cardinality of the search space simplex for the optimal policy is exponential in n , so it cannot be naively modeled by an MDP: we need to exploit the symmetry of the local agents. This intuition allows our subsampling algorithm to run in polylogarithmic time (in n). Some works leverage an exponential decaying property that truncates the search space for policies over immediate neighborhoods of agents; however, this still relies on the assumption that the graph neighborhood for the agent is sparse (Qu et al., 2020a;b); however, S_n is not locally sparse; hence, previous methods do not apply to this problem instance.




Figure 4. Star graph S_n

C. Proof Sketch

This section details an outline for the proof of Theorem 3.4, as well as some key ideas. At a high level, our SUBSAMPLE-MFQ framework recovers exact mean-field Q learning and traditional value iteration when $k = n$ and as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Further, as $k \rightarrow n$, \hat{Q}_k^* should intuitively get closer to Q^* from which the optimal policy is derived. Thus, the proof is divided into three major steps: firstly, we prove a Lipschitz continuity bound between \hat{Q}_k^* and \hat{Q}_n^* in terms of the total variation (TV) distance between $F_{z_{\Delta}}$ and $F_{z_{[n]}}$. Next, we bound the TV distance between $F_{z_{\Delta}}$ and $F_{z_{[n]}}$. Finally, we bound the value differences between π_k^{est} and π^* by bounding $Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) - Q^*(s, \pi_k^{\text{est}}(s))$ and then using the performance difference lemma from Kakade & Langford (2002).

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

Theorem C.1 (Lipschitz continuity in \hat{Q}_k^*). For all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, $\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ and $\Delta' \in \binom{[n]}{k'}$,

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

We defer the proof of Theorem C.1 to Appendix D. See Figure 5 for a comparison between the \hat{Q}_k^* learning and estimation process, and the exact Q -learning framework.

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

Figure 5. Flow of the algorithm and relevant analyses in learning Q^* . Here, (1) follows by performing Algorithm 2 (SUBSAMPLE-MFQ: Learning) on $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^0$. (2) follows from Lemma 3.2. (3) follows from the Lipschitz continuity and total variation distance bounds in Theorems C.1 and C.2. Finally, (4) follows from noting that $\hat{Q}_n^* = Q^*$.

Step 2: Bounding Total Variation (TV) Distance. We bound the TV distance between F_{z_Δ} and $F_{z_{[n]}}$, where $\Delta \in \mathcal{U}\left(\binom{[n]}{k}\right)$. This task is equivalent to bounding the discrepancy between the empirical distribution and the distribution of the underlying finite population. When each $i \in \Delta$ is uniformly sampled *without* replacement, we use Lemma E.3 from (Anand & Qu, 2024) which generalizes the Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz (DKW) concentration inequality for empirical distribution functions. Using this, we show:

Theorem C.2. Given a finite population $\mathcal{Z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ for $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{Z}_l^n$, let $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ be a uniformly random sample from \mathcal{Z} of size k chosen without replacement. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Then, for all $x \in \mathcal{Z}_l$:

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

Then, by Theorem C.2 and the definition of total variation distance from Section 2, we have that for $\delta \in (0, 1]$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\text{TV}(F_{s_\Delta}, F_{s_{[n]}}) \leq \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8nk} \ln \frac{2|\mathcal{Z}_l|}{\delta}} \quad (23)$$

We then apply this result to our MARL setting by studying the rate of decay of the objective function between the learned policy π_k^{est} and the optimal policy π^* (Theorem 3.4).

Step 3: Performance Difference Lemma to Complete the Proof. As a consequence of the prior two steps and Lemma 3.2, $Q^*(s, a')$ and $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{z_\Delta}, a'_g)$ become similar as $k \rightarrow n$. We further prove that the value generated by the policies π^* and π_k^{est} must also be very close (where the residue shrinks as $k \rightarrow n$). We then use the well-known performance difference lemma (Kakade & Langford, 2002) which we restate in Appendix F.1. A crucial theorem needed to use the performance difference lemma is a bound on $Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - Q^*(s', \hat{\pi}_k^{\text{est}}(s'_g, F_{s'_\Delta}))$. Therefore, we formulate and prove Theorem C.3 which yields a probabilistic bound on this difference, where the randomness is over the choice of $\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}$:

Theorem C.3. For a fixed $s' \in \mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$ and for $\delta \in (0, 1]$, with probability at least $1 - 2|\mathcal{A}_g|k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|}\delta$:

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

We defer the proof of Theorem C.3 and finding optimal value of δ to Lemma F.8 in the Appendix. Using Theorem C.3 and the performance difference lemma leads to Theorem 3.4.

D. Proof of Lipschitz-continuity Bound

This section proves a Lipschitz-continuity bound between \hat{Q}_k^* and Q^* and includes a framework to compare $\frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g)$ and $Q^*(s, a_g)$ in Lemma D.11.

Let $z_i := (s_i, a_i) \in \mathcal{Z}_l := \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{A}_l$ and $z_\Delta = \{z_i : i \in \Delta\} \in \mathcal{Z}_l^k$. For $z_i = (s_i, a_i)$, let $z_i(s) = s_i$, and $z_i(a) = a_i$. With abuse of notation, note that $\hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta)$ is equal to $\hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, a_g, z_\Delta)$.

The following definitions will be relevant to the proof of Theorem D.3.

Definition D.1 (Empirical Distribution Function). For all $z \in \mathcal{Z}_l^{|\Delta|}$ and $s', a' \in \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{A}_l$, where $\Delta \subseteq [n]$,

$$F_{z_\Delta}(s', a') = \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{z_i(s) = s', z_i(a) = a'\}$$

Definition D.2 (Total Variation Distance). Let P and Q be discrete probability distribution over some domain Ω . Then,

$$\text{TV}(P, Q) = \frac{1}{2} \|P - Q\|_1 = \sup_{E \subseteq \Omega} \left| \Pr_P(E) - \Pr_Q(E) \right|$$

Theorem D.3 (\hat{Q}_k^T is $\frac{2}{1-\gamma} \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty$ -Lipschitz continuous with respect to F_{z_Δ} in total variation distance). Suppose $\Delta, \Delta' \subseteq [n]$ such that $|\Delta| = k$ and $|\Delta'| = k'$. Then:

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

Proof. We prove this inductively. First, note that $\hat{Q}_k^0(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) = \hat{Q}_{k'}^0(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) = 0$ from the initialization step, which proves the lemma for $T = 0$, since $\text{TV}(\cdot, \cdot) \geq 0$. At $T = 1$:

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

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \hat{Q}_k^1(s_g, a_g, F_{z_\Delta}) - \hat{Q}_{k'}^1(s_g, a_g, F_{z_{\Delta'}}) \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{z_l \sim F_{z_\Delta}} \left[\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} r_l(s_g, z) \mathbb{1}\{z_l = z\} \right] - \mathbb{E}_{z'_l \sim F_{z_{\Delta'}}} \left[\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} r_l(s_g, z) \mathbb{1}\{z'_l = z\} \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} r_l(s_g, z) \cdot (\mathbb{E}_{z_l \sim F_{z_\Delta}} \mathbb{1}\{z_l = z\} - \mathbb{E}_{z'_l \sim F_{z_{\Delta'}}} \mathbb{1}\{z'_l = z\}) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} r_l(s_g, z) \cdot (F_{z_\Delta}(z) - F_{z_{\Delta'}}(z)) \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left| \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} r_l(s_g, z) \cdot \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |F_{z_\Delta}(z) - F_{z_{\Delta'}}(z)| \right| \\ &\leq 2 \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \cdot \text{TV}(F_{z_\Delta}, F_{z_{\Delta'}}) \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from the linearity of expectations, and the third equality follows by noting that for any random variable $X \sim \mathcal{X}$, $\mathbb{E}_X \mathbb{1}[X = x] = \Pr[X = x]$. The first inequality follows from an application of the triangle inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the second inequality uses the definition of TV distance. Thus, at $T = 1$, \hat{Q} is $(2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty)$ -Lipschitz continuous in TV distance, proving the base case.

Assume that for $T \leq t' \in \mathbb{N}$:

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

Then, inductively:

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

In the first inequality, we rewrite the expectations over the states as the expectation over the joint transition probabilities. The second inequality then follows from Lemma D.13. To apply it to Lemma D.13, we conflate the joint expectation over $(s_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})$ and reduce it back to the original form of its expectation. Finally, the third inequality follows from Lemma D.5.

By the inductive hypothesis, the claim is proven. \square

Definition D.4. [Joint Stochastic Kernels] The joint stochastic kernel on (s_g, s_Δ) for $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ where $|\Delta| = k$ is defined as $\mathcal{J}_k : \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^k \times \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^k \times \mathcal{A}_l^k \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where

$$\mathcal{J}_k(s'_g, s'_\Delta | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta) := \Pr[(s'_g, s'_\Delta) | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta] \quad (24)$$

Lemma D.5. For all $T \in \mathbb{N}$, for any $a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, s_\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_l^k, a_\Delta \in \mathcal{A}_l^k, a'_{\Delta'} \in \mathcal{A}_l^k$, and for all joint stochastic kernels \mathcal{J}_k as defined in Definition D.4:

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

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

At $T = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta}) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta}, a_{\Delta})} \max_{a'_g, a'_{\Delta}} \hat{Q}_k^1(s'_g, a'_g, s'_{\Delta}, a'_{\Delta}) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'}, a_{\Delta'})} \max_{a'_g, a'_{\Delta'}} \hat{Q}_{k'}^1(s'_g, a'_g, s'_{\Delta'}, a'_{\Delta'}) \right| \\
 &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta}) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta}, a_{\Delta})} \max_{a'_g, a'_{\Delta}} \left[r_g(s'_g, a'_g) + \frac{\sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s'_i, a'_i, s'_g)}{k} \right] \right. \\
 & \quad \left. - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'}, a_{\Delta'})} \max_{a'_g, a'_{\Delta'}} \left[r_g(s'_g, a'_g) + \frac{\sum_{i \in \Delta'} r_l(s'_i, a'_i, s'_g)}{k'} \right] \right| \\
 &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta}) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta}, a_{\Delta})} \max_{a'_{\Delta}} \frac{\sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s'_i, a'_i, s'_g)}{k} - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'}, a_{\Delta'})} \max_{a'_{\Delta'}} \frac{\sum_{i \in \Delta'} r_l(s'_i, a'_i, s'_g)}{k'} \right| \\
 &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta}) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta}, a_{\Delta})} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \tilde{r}_l(s'_i, s'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'}, a_{\Delta'})} \frac{1}{k'} \sum_{i \in \Delta'} \tilde{r}_l(s'_i, s'_g) \right|
 \end{aligned}$$

In the last equality, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max_{a'_{\Delta}} \sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s'_i, a'_i, s'_g) &= \sum_{i \in \Delta} \max_{a'_i} r_l(s'_i, a'_i, s'_g) \\
 &= \sum_{i \in \Delta} \max_{a'_i} r_l(s'_i, a'_i, s'_g) \\
 &= \sum_{i \in \Delta} \tilde{r}_l(s'_i, s'_g)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{r}_l(s'_i, s'_g) := \max_{a'_i} r_l(s'_i, a'_i, s'_g)$.

Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta}) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta}, a_{\Delta})} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \tilde{r}_l(s'_i, s'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'}, a_{\Delta'})} \frac{1}{k'} \sum_{i \in \Delta'} \tilde{r}_l(s'_i, s'_g) \right| \\
 &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta}) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta}, a_{\Delta})} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \tilde{r}_l(x, s'_g) F_{s'_{\Delta}}(x) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'}, a_{\Delta'})} \frac{1}{k'} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \tilde{r}_l(x, s'_g) F_{s'_{\Delta'}}(x) \right| \\
 &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim \sum_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \in \mathcal{S}_l^{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}, a_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} \tilde{r}_l(x, s'_g) \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}, a_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} [F_{s'_{\Delta}}(x) - F_{s'_{\Delta'}}(x)] \right| \\
 &\leq \|\tilde{r}_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim \sum_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \in \mathcal{S}_l^{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}, a_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} \\
 & \quad \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} |\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s'_g} F_{s'_{\Delta}}(x) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s'_g} F_{s'_{\Delta'}}(x)| \\
 &\leq \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim \sum_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \in \mathcal{S}_l^{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}, a_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} \\
 & \quad \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_l} |\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s'_g} F_{s'_{\Delta}}(x) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s'_g} F_{s'_{\Delta'}}(x)| \\
 &\leq 2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{s'_g \sim \sum_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \in \mathcal{S}_l^{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}, a_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} \text{TV}(\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s'_g} F_{s'_{\Delta}}, \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s'_g} F_{s'_{\Delta'}}) \\
 &\leq 2\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \cdot \text{TV}(F_{z_{\Delta}}, F_{z'_{\Delta}})
 \end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from noting that $f(x) = \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} f(x') \mathbb{1}\{x = x'\}$ and from Fubini-Tonelli's inequality which allows us to swap the order of summations as the summand is finite. The second equality uses the law of total expectation.

The first inequality uses Jensen's inequality and the triangle inequality. The second inequality uses $\|\tilde{r}_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty$ which holds as $\|r_l\|_\infty$ is the infinite-norm of the local reward functions and is therefore atleast as large any other element in the image of r_l . The third inequality follows from the definition of total variation distance, and the final inequality follows from Lemma D.7. This proves the base case.

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

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

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

Then, inductively, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta)} \max_{a'_g, a'_\Delta} \hat{Q}_k^{T+1}(s'_g, a'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_\Delta) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'}, a_{\Delta'})} \max_{a'_g, a'_{\Delta'}} \hat{Q}_{k'}^{T+1}(s'_g, a'_g, s'_{\Delta'}, a'_{\Delta'}) \right| \\ & = \underbrace{\left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta)} \max_{a'_g, a'_\Delta} \left[r_\Delta(s'_g, a'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_\Delta) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s'_g, a'_g, s'_{\Delta'}, a'_{\Delta'})} \max_{a''_g, a''_{\Delta'}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_\Delta, a''_g, a''_{\Delta'}) \right] \right|}_{\text{(I)}} \\ & - \underbrace{\left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'}, a_{\Delta'})} \max_{a'_g, a'_{\Delta'}} \left[r_{\Delta'}(s'_g, a'_g, s'_{\Delta'}, a'_{\Delta'}) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s'_g, a'_g, s'_{\Delta'}, a'_{\Delta'})} \max_{a''_g, a''_{\Delta'}} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s''_g, s''_{\Delta'}, a''_g, a''_{\Delta'}) \right] \right|}_{\text{(II)}} \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\tilde{a}_g, \tilde{a}_\Delta = \arg \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, a'_\Delta \in \mathcal{A}_l^k} \left[r_\Delta(s'_g, a'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_\Delta) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s'_g, a'_g, s'_{\Delta'}, a'_{\Delta'})} \max_{a''_g, a''_{\Delta'}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s''_g, s''_\Delta, a''_g, a''_{\Delta'}) \right],$$

and

$$\hat{a}_g, \hat{a}_{\Delta'} = \arg \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, a'_{\Delta'} \in \mathcal{A}_l^k} \left[r_{\Delta'}(s'_g, a'_g, s'_{\Delta'}, a'_{\Delta'}) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s'_g, a'_g, s'_{\Delta'}, a'_{\Delta'})} \max_{a''_g, a''_{\Delta'}} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s''_g, s''_{\Delta'}, a''_g, a''_{\Delta'}) \right]$$

Then, define $\tilde{a}_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \in \mathcal{A}_l^{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}$ by

$$\tilde{a}_i = \begin{cases} \tilde{a}_i, & \text{if } i \in \Delta, \\ \hat{a}_i, & \text{if } i \in \Delta' \setminus \Delta \end{cases}$$

Similarly, define $\hat{a}_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \in \mathcal{A}_l^{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}$ by

$$\hat{a}_i = \begin{cases} \hat{a}_i, & i \in \Delta' \\ \tilde{a}_i, & i \in \Delta \setminus \Delta' \end{cases}$$

Suppose (I) \geq (II). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta)} \max_{a'_g, a'_\Delta} \hat{Q}_k^{T+1}(s'_g, a'_g, s'_\Delta, a'_\Delta) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'}, a_{\Delta'})} \max_{a'_g, a'_{\Delta'}} \hat{Q}_{k'}^{T+1}(s'_g, a'_g, s'_{\Delta'}, a'_{\Delta'}) \right| \\ & = \left| \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta)} \hat{Q}_k^{T+1}(s'_g, \tilde{a}_g, s'_\Delta, \tilde{a}_\Delta) - \mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta'}, a_{\Delta'})} \hat{Q}_{k'}^{T+1}(s'_g, \hat{a}_g, s'_{\Delta'}, \hat{a}_{\Delta'}) \right| \end{aligned}$$

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

The first equality rewrites the equations with their respective maximizing actions. The first inequality upper-bounds this difference by allowing all terms to share the common action \tilde{a} . Using the Bellman equation, the second equality expands \hat{Q}_k^{T+1} and $\hat{Q}_{k'}^{T+1}$. The second inequality follows from the triangle inequality. The third equality follows by subtracting the common $r_g(s'_g, \tilde{a}_g)$ terms from the reward and noting that the two expectation terms $\mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \sim \mathcal{J}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta)} \mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{k'}(\cdot, \cdot | s'_g, \tilde{a}_g, s'_{\Delta'}, \tilde{a}_{\Delta'})}$ can be combined into a single expectation $\mathbb{E}_{(s''_g, s''_{\Delta'}) \sim \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_k(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta)}$.

In the special case where $a_\Delta = \tilde{a}_\Delta$, we derive a closed form expression for $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_k$ in Lemma D.10. To justify the third inequality, the second term follows from the induction hypothesis and the first term follows from the following derivation:

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

The above derivation follows from the same argument as in the base case where $r_l^{\tilde{a}}(s'_i, s'_g) := r_l(s'_i, s'_g, \tilde{a}_i)$ for any $i \in \Delta \cup \Delta'$. Similarly, if (I) < (II), an analogous argument that replaces \tilde{a}_Δ with \hat{a}_Δ yields the same result.

Therefore, by the induction hypothesis, the claim is proven. \square

Remark D.6. Given a joint transition probability function $\mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}$ as defined in Definition D.4, we can recover the transition function for a single agent $i \in \Delta \cup \Delta'$ given by \mathcal{J}_1 using the law of total probability and the conditional independence between s_i and $s_g \cup s_{[n] \setminus i}$ in Equation (25). This characterization is crucial in Lemma D.7 and Lemma D.5:

$$\mathcal{J}_1(s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_i, a_i) = \sum_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \setminus i \sim \mathcal{S}_l^{|\Delta \cup \Delta'| - 1}} \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \setminus i \circ s'_i | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}, a_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \quad (25)$$

Here, we use a conditional independence property proven in Lemma D.9.

Lemma D.7.

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

Proof. From the definition of total variation distance, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{TV}\left(\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta\cup\Delta'}|s'_g\sim\mathcal{J}_{|\Delta\cup\Delta'}(\cdot|s'_g,s_g,a_g,s_{\Delta\cup\Delta'},a_{\Delta\cup\Delta'})}F_{s'_{\Delta}},\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta\cup\Delta'}|s'_g\sim\mathcal{J}_{|\Delta\cup\Delta'}(\cdot|s'_g,s_g,a_g,s_{\Delta\cup\Delta'},a_{\Delta\cup\Delta'})}F_{s'_{\Delta'}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{S}_l}\left|\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta\cup\Delta'}|s'_g\sim\mathcal{J}_{|\Delta\cup\Delta'}(\cdot|s'_g,s_g,a_g,s_{\Delta\cup\Delta'},a_{\Delta\cup\Delta'})}F_{s'_{\Delta}}(x)-\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta\cup\Delta'}|s'_g\sim\mathcal{J}_{|\Delta\cup\Delta'}(\cdot|s'_g,s_g,a_g,s_{\Delta\cup\Delta'},a_{\Delta\cup\Delta'})}F_{s'_{\Delta'}}(x)\right| \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{S}_l}\left|\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i\in\Delta}\mathcal{J}_1(x|s'_g,s_g,a_g,s_i,a_i)-\frac{1}{k'}\sum_{i\in\Delta'}\mathcal{J}_1(x|s'_g,s_g,a_g,s_i,a_i)\right| \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{S}_l}\left|\frac{1}{k}\sum_{a_l\in\mathcal{A}_l}\sum_{s_l\in\mathcal{S}_l}\sum_{i\in\Delta}\mathcal{J}_1(x|s'_g,s_g,a_g,s_i,a_i)\mathbb{1}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}-\frac{1}{k'}\sum_{a_l\in\mathcal{A}_l}\sum_{s_l\in\mathcal{S}_l}\sum_{i\in\Delta'}\mathcal{J}_1(x|s'_g,s_g,a_g,s_i,a_i)\mathbb{1}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}\right| \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{S}_l}\left|\frac{1}{k}\sum_{a_l\in\mathcal{A}_l}\sum_{s_l\in\mathcal{S}_l}\sum_{i\in\Delta}\mathcal{J}_1(x|s'_g,s_g,a_g,\cdot,\cdot)\vec{\mathbb{1}}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}-\frac{1}{k'}\sum_{a_l\in\mathcal{A}_l}\sum_{s_l\in\mathcal{S}_l}\sum_{i\in\Delta'}\mathcal{J}_1(x|s'_g,s_g,a_g,\cdot,\cdot)\vec{\mathbb{1}}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}\right| \end{aligned}$$

The second equality uses Lemma D.8. The third equality uses the property that each local agent can only have one state/action pair, and the fourth equality vectorizes the indicator random variables.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{TV}\left(\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta\cup\Delta'}|s'_g\sim\mathcal{J}_{|\Delta\cup\Delta'}(\cdot|s'_g,s_g,a_g,s_{\Delta\cup\Delta'},a_{\Delta\cup\Delta'})}F_{s'_{\Delta}},\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta\cup\Delta'}|s'_g\sim\mathcal{J}_{|\Delta\cup\Delta'}(\cdot|s'_g,s_g,a_g,s_{\Delta\cup\Delta'},a_{\Delta\cup\Delta'})}F_{s'_{\Delta'}}\right) \\ &\leq\frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{S}_l}\sum_{a_l\in\mathcal{A}_l}\sum_{s_l\in\mathcal{S}_l}\left|\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i\in\Delta}\mathcal{J}_1(x|s'_g,s_g,a_g,\cdot,\cdot)\vec{\mathbb{1}}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}-\frac{1}{k'}\sum_{i\in\Delta'}\mathcal{J}_1(x|s'_g,s_g,a_g,\cdot,\cdot)\vec{\mathbb{1}}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}\right| \\ &=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{a_l\in\mathcal{A}_l}\sum_{s_l\in\mathcal{S}_l}\left\|\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i\in\Delta}\mathcal{J}_1(\cdot|s'_g,s_g,a_g,\cdot,\cdot)\vec{\mathbb{1}}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}-\frac{1}{k'}\sum_{i\in\Delta'}\mathcal{J}_1(\cdot|s'_g,s_g,a_g,\cdot,\cdot)\vec{\mathbb{1}}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}\right\|_1 \\ &\leq\frac{1}{2}\sum_{a_l\in\mathcal{A}_l}\sum_{s_l\in\mathcal{S}_l}\left\|\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i\in\Delta}\vec{\mathbb{1}}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}-\frac{1}{k'}\sum_{i\in\Delta'}\vec{\mathbb{1}}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}\right\|_1\cdot\|\mathcal{J}_1(\cdot|s'_g,s_g,a_g,\cdot,\cdot)\|_1 \\ &=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{a_l\in\mathcal{A}_l}\sum_{s_l\in\mathcal{S}_l}\left\|\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i\in\Delta}\mathbb{1}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}-\frac{1}{k'}\sum_{i\in\Delta'}\mathbb{1}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}\right\|_1 \\ &=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(s_l,a_l)\in\mathcal{S}_l\times\mathcal{A}_l}\left|\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i\in\Delta}\mathbb{1}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}-\frac{1}{k'}\sum_{i\in\Delta'}\mathbb{1}_{\{s_i=a_l\}}\right| \\ &=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{z_l\in\mathcal{S}_l\times\mathcal{A}_l}|F_{z_{\Delta}}(z_l)-F_{z_{\Delta'}}(z_l)| \\ &:=\text{TV}(F_{z_{\Delta}},F_{z_{\Delta'}}) \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality uses the triangle inequality. The second inequality and fifth equality follow from Hölder's inequality and the sum of the probabilities from the stochastic transition function \mathcal{J}_1 being equal to 1. The sixth equality uses Fubini-Tonelli's theorem which applies as the total variation distance measure is bounded from above by 1. The final equality recovers the total variation distance for the variable $z = (s, a) \in \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{A}_l$ across agents Δ and Δ' , which proves the claim. \square

Lemma D.8.

$$\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s'_g \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'}(\cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}, a_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} F_{s'_{\Delta}}(x) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathcal{J}_1(x | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_i, a_i)$$

Proof. By expanding on the definition of the empirical distribution function $F_{s'_{\Delta}}(x) = \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{s_i = x\}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s'_g \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'}(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}, a_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} F_{s'_{\Delta}}(x) &= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{E}_{s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s'_g \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'}(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}, a_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})} \mathbb{1}\{s'_i = x\} \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{E}_{s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} | s'_g \sim \mathcal{J}_1(\cdot | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_i, a_i)} \mathbb{1}\{s'_i = x\} \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathcal{J}_1(x | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_i, a_i) \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from the conditional independence of s'_i from $s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \setminus i$ from Lemma D.9, and the final equality uses the fact that the expectation of an indicator random variable is the probability distribution function of the random variable. \square

Lemma D.9. *The distribution $s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'} \setminus i | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}, a_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}$ is conditionally independent to the distribution $s'_i | s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_i, a_i$ for any $i \in \Delta \cup \Delta'$.*

Proof. We direct the interested reader to the Bayes-Ball theorem in (Shachter, 2013) for proving conditional independence. For ease of exposition, we restate the two rules in (Shachter, 2013) that introduce the notion of d -separations which implies conditional independence. Suppose we have a causal graph $G = (V, E)$ where the vertex set $V = [p]$ for $p \in \mathbb{N}$ is a set of variables and the edge set $E \subseteq 2^V$ denotes dependence through connectivity. Then, the two rules that establish d -separations are as follows:

1. For $x, y \in V$, we say that x, y are d -connected if there exists a path (x, \dots, y) that can be traced without traversing a pair of arrows that point at the same vertex.
2. We say that $x, y \in V$ are d -connected, conditioned on a set of variables $Z \subseteq V$, if there is a path (x, \dots, y) that does not contain an event $z \in Z$ that can be traced without traversing a pair of arrows that point at the same vertex.

If $x, y \in V$ is not d -connected through any such path, then x, y is d -separated, which implies conditional independence.

Let $Z = \{s'_g, s_g, a_g, s_i, a_i\}$ be the set of variables we condition on. Then, the below figure demonstrates the causal graph for the events of interest.




Figure 6. Causal graph to demonstrate the dependencies between variables.

1. Observe that all paths (through undirected edges) stemming from $s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta' \setminus i} \rightarrow s_{\Delta \cup \Delta' \setminus i}$ pass through $s_i \in Z$ which is blocked.
2. All other paths from $s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta' \setminus i}$ to s'_i pass through $s_g \cup s'_g \in Z$.

Therefore, $s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta' \setminus i}$ and s'_i are d -separated by Z . Hence, by (Shachter, 2013), $s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta' \setminus i}$ and s'_i are conditionally independent. \square

Lemma D.10. For any joint transition probability function \mathcal{J}_k on $s_g \in \mathcal{S}_g, s_\Delta \in \mathcal{S}_\Delta^k, a_\Delta \in \mathcal{A}_\Delta^k$ where $|\Delta| = k$, given by $\mathcal{J}_k : \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_\Delta^{|\Delta|} \times \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{S}_\Delta^{|\Delta|} \times \mathcal{A}_\Delta^{|\Delta|} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we have:

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

Proof. We start by expanding the expectations:

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

In the second equality, we note that the right-stochasticity of \mathcal{J}_k implies the right-stochasticity of \mathcal{J}_k^2 . Further, observe that $\mathcal{J}_k[s'_g, s'_\Delta, s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta] \mathcal{J}_k[s''_g, s''_\Delta, s'_g, a_g, s'_\Delta, a_\Delta]$ denotes the probability of the transitions $(s_g, s_\Delta) \rightarrow (s'_g, s'_\Delta) \rightarrow (s''_g, s''_\Delta)$ with actions a_g, a_Δ at each step, where the joint state evolution is governed by \mathcal{J}_k . Thus,

$$\sum_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_\Delta^{|\Delta|}} \mathcal{J}_k[s'_g, s'_\Delta, s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta] \mathcal{J}_k[s''_g, s''_\Delta, s'_g, a_g, s'_\Delta, a_\Delta] = \mathcal{J}_k^2[s''_g, s''_\Delta, s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta]$$

since $\sum_{(s'_g, s'_\Delta) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_\Delta^{|\Delta|}} \mathcal{J}_k[s'_g, s'_\Delta, s_g, a_g, s_\Delta, a_\Delta] \mathcal{J}_k[s''_g, s''_\Delta, s'_g, a_g, s'_\Delta, a_\Delta]$ is the stochastic probability function corresponding to the two-step evolution of the joint states from (s_g, s_Δ) to (s''_g, s''_Δ) under actions a_g, a_Δ . This can be thought of as an analogously to the fact that a 1 on the (i, j) 'th entry on the square of a 0/1 adjacency matrix of a graph represents the fact that there is a path of distance 2 between vertices i and j . Finally, the third equality recovers the definition of the expectation, with respect to the joint probability function \mathcal{J}_k^2 . \square

We next show that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g, a_\Delta) = \mathbb{E}_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g, a_\Delta) = Q^*(s, a)$.

Lemma D.11.

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

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

Note that:

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

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

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

In the second equality, we reparameterized the sum to count the number of times each $r_l(s_i, s_g)$ was added for each $i \in \Delta$. To do this, we count the number of $(k-1)$ other agents that could form a k -tuple with agent i , and there are $(n-1)$ candidates from which we choose the $(k-1)$ agents. In the last equality, we expanded and simplified the binomial coefficients.

So, we have that:

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

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

from the triangle inequality:

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

Thus, applying this bound recursively, we get:

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

The first inequality follows from the γ -contraction property of the update procedure, and the ensuing equality follows from our bound on the maximum possible value of Q from Lemma B.5 and noting that $\hat{Q}_k^0 := 0$.

Therefore, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$Q^*(s, a) - \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g) \rightarrow 0,$$

which proves the lemma. \square

Corollary D.12. Since $\frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g, a_{\Delta}) := \mathbb{E}_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g, a_{\Delta})$, we therefore get:

$$Q^*(s, a) - \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^T(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g, a_{\Delta}) \leq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \gamma^T \cdot \frac{\tilde{r}}{1 - \gamma}$$

Consequently,

$$Q^*(s, a) - \mathbb{E}_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g, a_{\Delta}) \leq 0$$

Further, we have that

$$Q^*(s, a) - \mathbb{E}_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g, a_{\Delta}) = 0,$$

since $\hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_{\Delta}, a_g, a_{\Delta}) \leq Q^*(s, a)$.

Lemma D.13. The absolute difference between the expected maximums between \hat{Q}_k and $\hat{Q}_{k'}$ is at most the maximum of the absolute difference between \hat{Q}_k and $\hat{Q}_{k'}$, where the expectations are taken over any joint distributions of states \mathcal{J} , and the maximums are taken over the actions.

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

Proof. Denote:

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

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

We extend a_Δ^* to $a_{\Delta'}^*$, by letting $a_{\Delta'}^* \setminus \Delta$ be the corresponding $\Delta \setminus \Delta'$ variables from $\tilde{a}_{\Delta'}^*$, in $\mathcal{A}_\Delta^{\Delta' \setminus \Delta}$. For the remainder of this proof, we adopt the shorthand $\mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}}$ to refer to $\mathbb{E}_{(s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}) \sim \mathcal{J}_{|\Delta \cup \Delta'|}(\cdot, \cdot | s_g, a_g, s_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}, a_{\Delta \cup \Delta'})}$. Then, if $\mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, a'_\Delta \in \mathcal{A}_\Delta^k} \hat{Q}_k^T(s'_g, F_{z'_\Delta}, a'_g) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_{\Delta \cup \Delta'}} \max_{a'_g \in \mathcal{A}_g, a'_{\Delta'} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Delta'}^{k'}} \hat{Q}_{k'}^T(s'_g, F_{z'_{\Delta'}}, a'_g) > 0$, we have:

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

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

Lemma D.14. Suppose $z, z' \geq 1$. Consider functions $\Gamma : \Theta_1 \times \Theta_2 \times \dots \times \Theta_z \times \Theta^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\Gamma' : \Theta_1 \times \Theta_2 \times \dots \times \Theta_{z'} \times \Theta^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_z$ and $\Theta_1', \dots, \Theta_{z'}$ are finite sets. Consider a probability distribution function μ_{Θ_i} for $i \in [z]$ and μ'_{Θ_i} for $i \in [z']$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\theta_1 \sim \mu_{\Theta_1} \\ \dots \\ \theta_z \sim \mu_{\Theta_z}}} \max_{\theta^* \in \Theta^*} \Gamma(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_z, \theta^*) - \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\theta_1 \sim \mu'_{\Theta_1} \\ \dots \\ \theta_{z'} \sim \mu'_{\Theta_{z'}}}} \max_{\theta^* \in \Theta^*} \Gamma'(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{z'}, \theta^*) \right| \\ &\leq \max_{\theta^* \in \Theta^*} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\theta_1 \sim \mu_{\Theta_1} \\ \dots \\ \theta_z \sim \mu_{\Theta_z}}} \Gamma(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_z, \theta^*) - \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\theta_1 \sim \mu'_{\Theta_1} \\ \dots \\ \theta_{z'} \sim \mu'_{\Theta_{z'}}}} \Gamma'(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{z'}, \theta^*) \right| \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\theta}^* := \arg \max_{\theta^* \in \Theta^*} \Gamma(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_z, \theta^*)$ and $\tilde{\theta}^* := \arg \max_{\theta^* \in \Theta^*} \Gamma'(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{z'}, \theta^*)$.

If $\mathbb{E}_{\theta_1 \sim \mu_{\Theta_1}, \dots, \theta_z \sim \mu_{\Theta_z}} \max_{\theta^* \in \Theta^*} \Gamma(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_z, \theta^*) - \mathbb{E}_{\theta_1 \sim \mu'_{\Theta_1}, \dots, \theta_{z'} \sim \mu'_{\Theta_{z'}}} \max_{\theta^* \in \Theta^*} \Gamma'(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{z'}, \theta^*) > 0$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\theta_1 \sim \mu_{\Theta_1} \\ \dots \\ \theta_z \sim \mu_{\Theta_z}}} \max_{\theta^* \in \Theta^*} \Gamma(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_z, \theta^*) - \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\theta_1 \sim \mu'_{\Theta_1} \\ \dots \\ \theta_{z'} \sim \mu'_{\Theta_{z'}}}} \max_{\theta^* \in \Theta^*} \Gamma'(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{z'}, \theta^*) \right| \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\theta_1 \sim \mu_{\Theta_1} \\ \dots \\ \theta_z \sim \mu_{\Theta_z}}} \Gamma(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_z, \hat{\theta}^*) - \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\theta_1 \sim \mu'_{\Theta_1} \\ \dots \\ \theta_{z'} \sim \mu'_{\Theta_{z'}}}} \Gamma'(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{z'}, \tilde{\theta}^*) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\theta_1 \sim \mu_{\Theta_1} \\ \dots \\ \theta_z \sim \mu_{\Theta_z}}} \Gamma(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_z, \hat{\theta}^*) - \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\theta_1 \sim \mu'_{\Theta_1} \\ \dots \\ \theta_{z'} \sim \mu'_{\Theta_{z'}}}} \Gamma'(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{z'}, \tilde{\theta}^*) \\ &\leq \max_{\theta^* \in \Theta^*} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\theta_1 \sim \mu_{\Theta_1} \\ \dots \\ \theta_z \sim \mu_{\Theta_z}}} \Gamma(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_z, \theta^*) - \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\theta_1 \sim \mu'_{\Theta_1} \\ \dots \\ \theta_{z'} \sim \mu'_{\Theta_{z'}}}} \Gamma'(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{z'}, \theta^*) \right| \end{aligned}$$

Here, we replace each θ^* with the maximizers of their corresponding terms, and upper bound them by the maximizer of the larger term. Next, we replace $\hat{\theta}^*$ in both expressions with the maximizer choice θ^* from Θ^* , and further bound the expression by its absolute value.

If $\mathbb{E}_{\theta_1 \sim \mu_{\Theta_1}, \dots, \theta_z \sim \mu_{\Theta_z}} \max_{\theta^* \in \Theta^*} \Gamma(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_z, \theta^*) - \mathbb{E}_{\theta_1 \sim \mu'_{\Theta_1}, \dots, \theta_{z'} \sim \mu'_{\Theta_{z'}}} \max_{\theta^* \in \Theta^*} \Gamma'(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{z'}, \theta^*) < 0$, then an analogous argument that replaces $\hat{\theta}^*$ with $\tilde{\theta}^*$ yields the same result. \square

E. Bounding Total Variation Distance

As $|\Delta| \rightarrow n$, we prove that the total variation (TV) distance between the empirical distribution of z_Δ and $z_{[n]}$ goes to 0. Here, recall that $z_i \in \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{A}_l$, and $z_\Delta = \{z_i : i \in \Delta\}$ for $\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}$. Before bounding the total variation distance between F_{z_Δ} and $F_{z_{[n]}}$, we first introduce Lemma C.5 of Anand & Qu (2024) which can be viewed as a generalization of the Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz concentration inequality, for sampling without replacement. We first make an important remark.

Remark E.1. First, observe that if Δ is an independent random variable uniformly supported on $\binom{[n]}{k}$, then s_Δ and a_Δ are also independent random variables uniformly supported on the global state $\binom{\mathcal{S}^{[n]}}{k}$ and the global action $\binom{\mathcal{A}^{[n]}}{k}$. To see this, let $\psi_1 : [n] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_l$ where $\psi_1(i) = s_i$ and $\xi_1 : [n] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_l$ where $\xi_1(i) = a_i$. This naturally extends to $\psi_k : [n]^k \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_l^k$, where $\psi_k(i_1, \dots, i_k) = (s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_k})$ and $\xi_k : [n]^k \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_l^k$, where $\xi_k(i_1, \dots, i_k) = (a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_k})$ for all $k \in [n]$. Then, the independence of Δ implies the independence of the generated σ -algebra. Further, ψ_k and ξ_k (which are a Lebesgue measurable function of a σ -algebra) are sub-algebras, implying that s_Δ and a_Δ must also be independent random variables.

For reference, we present the multidimensional Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz (DKW) inequality (Dvoretzky et al., 1956; Massart, 1990; Naaman, 2021) which bounds the difference between an empirical distribution function for a set B_Δ and $B_{[n]}$ when each element of Δ for $|\Delta| = k$ is sampled uniformly at random from $[n]$ with replacement.

Theorem E.2 (Multi-dimensional Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz (DFW) inequality (Dvoretzky et al., 1956; Naaman, 2021)). *Suppose $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\epsilon > 0$. If $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ is sampled uniformly with replacement, then*

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

Lemma C.5 of (Anand & Qu, 2024) generalizes the DKW inequality for sampling without replacement:

Lemma E.3 (Sampling without replacement analogue of the DKW inequality, Lemma C.5 in (Anand & Qu, 2024)). *Consider a finite population $\mathcal{X} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{B}_l^n$ where \mathcal{B}_l is a finite set. Let $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ be a random sample of size k chosen uniformly and without replacement. Then, for all $x \in \mathcal{B}_l$:*

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

Lemma E.4. *With probability at least $1 - 2|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|e^{-\frac{8kn\epsilon^2}{n-k+1}}$,*

$$\text{TV}(F_{z_\Delta}, F_{z_{[n]}}) \leq \epsilon$$

Proof. Recall that $z := (s_l, a_l) \in \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{A}_l$. From Lemma E.3, substituting $\mathcal{B}_l = \mathcal{Z}_l$ yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\sup_{z_l \in \mathcal{Z}_l} |F_{z_\Delta}(z_l) - F_{z_{[n]}}(z_l)| \leq 2\epsilon \right] &\geq 1 - 2|\mathcal{Z}_l| e^{-\frac{8kn\epsilon^2}{n-k+1}} \\ &= 1 - 2|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l| e^{-\frac{8kn\epsilon^2}{n-k+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the proof. \square

We now present an alternate bound for the total variation distance, where the distance *actually goes* to 0 as $|\Delta| \rightarrow n$. For this, we use the fact that the total variation distance between two product distributions is subadditive.

Lemma E.5 (Lemma B.8.1 of (Ghosal & van der Vaart, 2017). Subadditivity of TV distance for Product Distributions). *Let P and Q be product distributions over some domain S . Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d$ be the marginal distributions of P and β_1, \dots, β_d be the marginal distributions of Q . Then,*

$$\|P - Q\|_1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \|\alpha_i - \beta_i\|_1$$

Furthermore, we will need the following lemma.

Lemma E.6 (Data Processing Inequality). *Let A and B be random variables over some domain S . Let f be some function (not necessarily deterministically) mapping from S to any codomain T . Then,*

$$\text{TV}(f(A), f(B)) \leq \text{TV}(A, B)$$

Lemma E.7.

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

Proof. By the symmetry of the total variation distance metric, we have that

$$\text{TV}(F_{z_{[n]}}, F_{z_\Delta}) = \text{TV}(F_{z_\Delta}, F_{z_{[n]}}).$$

From the Bretagnolle-Huber inequality (Tsybakov, 2008) we have that

$$\text{TV}(f, g) = \sqrt{1 - e^{-D_{\text{KL}}(f\|g)}}.$$

Here, $D_{\text{KL}}(f\|g)$ is the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence metric between probability distributions f and g over the sample space, which we denote by \mathcal{X} and is given by

$$D_{\text{KL}}(f\|g) := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x) \ln \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} \quad (26)$$

Thus, from Equation (26):

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}(F_{z_\Delta} \| F_{z_{[n]}}) &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_l} \left(\frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\} \right) \ln \frac{n \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\}}{|\Delta| \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\}} \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_l} \left(\sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\} \right) \ln \frac{n}{|\Delta|} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_l} \left(\sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\} \right) \ln \frac{\sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\}}{\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\}} \\ &= \ln \frac{n}{|\Delta|} + \frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_l} \left(\sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\} \right) \ln \frac{\sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\}}{\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\}} \\ &\leq \ln \left(\frac{n}{|\Delta|} \right) \end{aligned}$$

In the third line, we note that $\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_l} \sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\} = |\Delta|$ since each local agent contained in Δ must have some state/action pair contained in \mathcal{Z}_l . In the last line, we note that $\sum_{i \in \Delta} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\} \leq \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{z_i = z\}$, For all $z \in \mathcal{Z}_l$, and thus the summation of logarithmic terms in the third line is negative.

Finally, using this bound in the Bretagnolle-Huber inequality yields the lemma. \square

Corollary E.8. From Lemma E.7, setting $\Delta = [n]$ also recovers $\text{TV}(F_{z_\Delta}, F_{z_{[n]}}) = 0$.

Theorem E.9. With probability atleast $1 - \delta$ for $\delta \in (0, 1)^2$:

$$\left| \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g, F_{a_\Delta}) - \hat{Q}_n^*(s_g, F_{s_{[n]}}, a_g, F_{a_{[n]}}) \right| \leq \frac{\ln \frac{2|S_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta}}{1 - \gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n - k + 1}{8kn}} \cdot \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty$$

Proof. From combining the total variation distance bound in Lemma E.4 and the Lipschitz continuity bound in Theorem D.3 with $\sum_{t=0}^T \gamma^t \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we have:

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

We then reparameterize $1 - 2|S_l||\mathcal{A}_l| e^{-\frac{8kn\epsilon^2}{n-k+1}}$ into $1 - \delta$ to get $\epsilon = \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8kn} \ln \left(\frac{2|S_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta} \right)}$ which gives:

$$\Pr \left[\left| \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g, F_{a_\Delta}) - \hat{Q}_n^*(s_g, F_{s_{[n]}}, a_g, F_{a_{[n]}}) \right| \leq \frac{\ln \frac{2|S_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta}}{1 - \gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n - k + 1}{8kn}} \cdot \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \right] \geq 1 - \delta,$$

proving the claim. \square

F. Using the Performance Difference Lemma

In general, convergence analysis requires the guarantee that a stationary optimal policy exists. Fortunately, when working with the empirical distribution function, the existence of a stationary optimal policy is guaranteed when the state/action spaces are finite or countably infinite. However, lifting the knowledge of states onto the continuous empirical distribution function space, and designing a policy on the lifted space is still analytically challenging. To circumvent this, (Gu et al., 2021) creates lifted ϵ -nets and does kernel regression to obtain convergence guarantees.

Here, our analytic approach bears a stark difference, wherein we analyze the *sampled* structure of the mean-field empirical distribution function, rather than studying the structure of the lifted space. For this, we leverage the classical Performance Difference Lemma, which we restate below for completeness.

Lemma F.1 (Performance Difference Lemma, (Kakade & Langford, 2002)). *Given policies π_1, π_2 , with corresponding value functions V^{π_1}, V^{π_2} :*

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

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

We denote our learned policy $\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ where:

$$\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_{[n]}) = (\pi_{k,m}^{g,\text{est}}(s_g, s_{[n]}), \pi_{k,m}^{1,\text{est}}(s_g, s_{[n]}), \dots, \pi_{k,m}^{n,\text{est}}(s_g, s_{[n]})) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_g) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_l)^n,$$

where $\pi_{k,m}^{g,\text{est}}(s_g, s_{[n]}) = \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{g,\text{est}}(s_g, s_u, F_{s_{\Delta \setminus u}})$ is the global agent's action and $\pi_{k,m}^{i,\text{est}}(s_g, s_{[n]}) := \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{i,\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta_i}})$ is the action of the i 'th local agent. Here, Δ_i is a random variable supported on $\binom{[n] \setminus i}{k-1}$, u is a random variable uniformly distributed on $[n]$, and Δ is a random variable uniformly distributed on $[n] \setminus u$. Then, denote the optimal policy π^* given by

$$\pi^*(s) = (\pi_g^*(s_g, s_{[n]}), \pi_1^*(s_g, s_{[n]}), \dots, \pi_n^*(s_g, s_{[n]})) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_g) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_l)^n,$$

where $\pi_g^*(s_g, s_{[n]})$ is the global agent's action, and $\pi_i^*(s_g, s_{[n]}) := \pi^*(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta_i}})$ is the action of the i 'th local agent. Next, to compare the difference in the performance of $\pi^*(s)$ and $\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_{[n]})$, we define the value function of a policy π to be the infinite-horizon γ -discounted rewards, (denoted V^π) as follows:

Definition F.2. The value function $V^\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of a given policy π , for $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$ is:

$$V^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a(t) \sim \pi(\cdot|s(t))} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s(t), a(t)) | s(0) = s \right]. \quad (27)$$

Theorem F.3. For the optimal policy π^* and the learned policy $\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$, for any state $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, we have:

$$V^{\pi^*}(s_0) - V^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s_0) \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{2nk}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta}} + 2\epsilon_{k,m} + \frac{\tilde{2r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} |\mathcal{A}_g| k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|} \delta$$

Proof. Applying the performance difference lemma to the policies gives us:

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi^*}(s_0) - V^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s_0) &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_{s_0}^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s)} [V^{\pi^*}(s) - Q^{\pi^*}(s, a)] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_{s_0}^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s)} Q^{\pi^*}(s, a') - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s)} Q^{\pi^*}(s, a) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_{s_0}^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}} \left[Q^{\pi^*}(s, \pi^*(\cdot|s)) - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s)} Q^{\pi^*}(s, a) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Next, by the law of total expectation,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s)} [Q^*(s, a)] \\ &= \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \sum_{\Delta^1 \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{1\}}{k-1}} \sum_{\Delta^2 \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{2\}}{k-1}} \cdots \sum_{\Delta^n \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{n\}}{k-1}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{k-1}^n} Q^*(s, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_\Delta})_g, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_1, F_{s_{\Delta^1}}), \dots, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_n, F_{s_{\Delta^n}})) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &Q^{\pi^*}(s, \pi^*(\cdot|s)) - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s)} Q^*(s, a) \\ &= \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \sum_{\Delta^1 \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{1\}}{k-1}} \sum_{\Delta^2 \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{2\}}{k-1}} \cdots \sum_{\Delta^n \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{n\}}{k-1}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{k-1}^n} \left(Q^*(s, \pi^*(\cdot|s)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - Q^*(s, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_\Delta})_g, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_1, F_{s_{\Delta^1}}), \dots, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_n, F_{s_{\Delta^n}})) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by grouping the equations above, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &V^{\pi^*}(s_0) - V^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s_0) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_{s_0}^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s)} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \sum_{\substack{\Delta^i \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{i\}}{k-1} \\ \forall i \in [n]}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k} \binom{n-1}{k-1}^n} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \left| Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k} \binom{n-1}{k-1}^n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left| \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_\Delta})_g, \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, \Delta^j)\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - Q^*(s, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_\Delta)_g, \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{s_{\Delta^j}})\}_{j \in [n]}) \right| \right) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma F.4 shows a uniform bound on

$$Q^*(s, \pi^*(\cdot|s)) - Q^*(s, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_\Delta})_g, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_1, F_{s_{\Delta^1}}), \dots, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_n, F_{s_{\Delta^n}}))$$

(independent of $\Delta^i, \forall i \in [n]$), allowing the sums and the counts in the denominator will cancel out. Observe that $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^* : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ and $\pi^* : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ are deterministic functions. Therefore, denote $a = \pi^*(s)$. Then, from Lemma F.6,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_{s_0}^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(\cdot|s)} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \sum_{\Delta^1 \in \binom{[n] \setminus 1}{k-1}} \cdots \sum_{\Delta^n \in \binom{[n] \setminus n}{k-1}} \frac{1}{n \binom{n}{k} \binom{n-1}{k-1}^n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left| Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \\
 &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_{s_0}^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \sum_{\Delta^1 \in \binom{[n] \setminus 1}{k-1}} \cdots \sum_{\Delta^n \in \binom{[n] \setminus n}{k-1}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k} \binom{n-1}{k-1}^n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left| \hat{Q}_n^*(s_g, F_{s_{[n]}}) \hat{\pi}_n^*(s_g, F_{s_{[n]}})_g, \hat{\pi}_n^*(s_g, F_{s_{[n]}})_{1:n} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \\
 &\leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8nk}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta}} + \epsilon_{k,m} + \frac{\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} |\mathcal{A}_g| k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|} \delta
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, from Corollary F.7, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_{s_0}^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}} \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \sum_{\Delta^1 \in \binom{[n] \setminus 1}{k-1}} \cdots \sum_{\Delta^n \in \binom{[n] \setminus n}{k-1}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k} \binom{n-1}{k-1}^n} \left| \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_{\Delta})_g, \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{s_{\Delta^j}})\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. - Q^*(s, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_{\Delta})_g, \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{s_{\Delta^j}})\}_{j \in [n]}) \right| \\
 &\leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8nk}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta}} + \epsilon_{k,m} + \frac{\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} |\mathcal{A}_g| k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|} \delta
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, combining the above inequalities, we get:

$$V^{\pi^*}(s_0) - V^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s_0) \leq \frac{2\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8nk}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta}} + 2\epsilon_{k,m} + \frac{2\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} |\mathcal{A}_g| k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|} \delta$$

which yields the claim. We defer parameter optimization to Lemma F.8. \square

Lemma F.4 (Uniform Bound on Q^* with different actions). *For all $s \in \mathcal{S}, \Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ and $\Delta^i \in \binom{[n] \setminus i}{k-1}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & Q^*(s, \pi^*(\cdot|s)) - Q^*(s, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta}})_g, \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}})\}_{i \in [n]}) \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left| Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \\
 &+ \left| \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta}})_g, \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{s_{\Delta^j}})\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) - Q^*(s, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_{\Delta})_g, \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{s_{\Delta^j}})\}_{j \in [n]}) \right|
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & Q^*(s, \pi^*(\cdot|s)) - Q^*(s, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta}})_g, \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}})\}_{i \in [n]}) \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta}})_g, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}), \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{s_{\Delta^j}})\}_{j \in \Delta^i}) \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta}})_g, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}), \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{s_{\Delta^j}})\}_{j \in \Delta^i}) \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \pi^*(s)_i, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \Delta^k}) \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \pi^*(s)_i, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \Delta^k})
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \left| Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \pi^*(s)_i, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \Delta^i}) \right| \\
 &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta}})_g, \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{s_{\Delta^j}})\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right. \\
 &\quad \quad \left. - Q^*(s, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta}})_g, \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{s_{\Delta^j}})\}_{j \in [n]}) \right| \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left| Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left| \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, F_{s_{\Delta}})_g, \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, \Delta^j)\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right. \\
 &\quad \quad \left. - Q^*(s, \hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_{\Delta})_g, \{\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{s_{\Delta^j}})\}_{j \in [n]}) \right|,
 \end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim. \square

Lemma F.5. Fix $s \in \mathcal{S} := S_g \times S_l^n$. For each $j \in [n]$, suppose we are given T -length sequences of random variables $\{\Delta_1^j, \dots, \Delta_T^j\}_{j \in [n]}$, distributed uniformly over the support $\binom{[n] \setminus j}{k-1}$. Further, suppose we are given a fixed sequence $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_T$, where each $\delta_t \in (0, 1]$ for $t \in [T]$. Then, for each action $a = (a_g, a_{[n]}) = \pi^*(s)$, for $t \in [T]$ and $j \in [n]$, define deviation events $B_t^{a_g, a_j, \Delta_t^j}$ such that:

$$B_t^{a_g, a_j, \Delta_t^j} := \left\{ \left| Q^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{[n] \setminus j}}, a_j, a_g) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_j, a_g) \right| > \frac{\sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8kn} \ln \frac{2|S_l| |\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta_t}}}{1-\gamma} \cdot \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty + \epsilon_{k,m} \right\} \quad (28)$$

For $i \in [T]$, we define bad-events B_t (which unifies the deviation events) such that

$$B_t = \bigcup_{j \in [n]} \bigcup_{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \bigcup_{a_j, \Delta_t^j \in \mathcal{A}_l^k} B_t^{a_g, a_j, \Delta_t^j}$$

Next, denote $B = \bigcup_{i=1}^T B_i$. Then, the probability that no bad event B_t occurs is:

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

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
 &|Q^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{[n] \setminus j}}, a_g, a_j) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j)| \\
 &= \left| Q^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{[n] \setminus j}}, a_g, a_j) - \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j) \right| \\
 &\leq \left| Q^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{[n] \setminus j}}, a_g, a_j) - \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j) \right| \\
 &\quad + \left| \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j) \right| \\
 &\leq \left| Q^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{[n] \setminus j}}, a_g, a_j) - \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j) \right| + \epsilon_{k,m}
 \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality above follows from the triangle inequality, and the second inequality uses

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j) \right| &\leq \left\| \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j) \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \epsilon_{k,m}, \end{aligned}$$

where the $\epsilon_{k,m}$ follows from Lemma 3.2. From Theorem E.9, we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta_t$,

$$\left| Q^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{[n]\setminus j}}, a_g, a_j) - \hat{Q}_k^*(s_g, s_j, F_{z_{\Delta_t^j}}, a_g, a_j) \right| \leq \frac{\ln \frac{2|S_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta_t}}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8kn}} \cdot \|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty}$$

So, event $B_t^{a_g, a_j, \Delta_t^j}$ occurs with probability at most δ_t .

Here, observe that if we union bound across all the events parameterized by the empirical distributions of $a_g, a_{j, \Delta_t^j} \in \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l^k$ given by $F_{a_{\Delta_t^j}}$, this also forms a covering of the choice of variables $F_{s_{\Delta_t^j}}$ by agents $j \in [m]$, and therefore across all choices of $\Delta_t^1, \dots, \Delta_t^n$ (subject to the permutation invariance of local agents) for a fixed t .

Thus, from the union bound, we get:

$$\Pr[B_t] \leq \sum_{a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g} \sum_{F_{a_{\Delta_t}} \in \mu_k(\mathcal{A}_l)} \Pr[B_t^{a_g, a_1, \Delta_t^1}] \leq |\mathcal{A}_g| k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|} \Pr[B_t^{a_g, a_1, \Delta_t^1}]$$

Applying the union bound again proves the lemma:

$$\Pr[\bar{B}] \geq 1 - \sum_{t=1}^T \Pr[B_t] \geq 1 - |\mathcal{A}_g| k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|} \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_t,$$

which proves the claim. \square

Lemma F.6. For any arbitrary distribution \mathcal{D} of states $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l^n$, for any $\Delta^i \in \binom{[n]\setminus i}{k-1}$ for $i \in [n]$ and for $\delta \in (0, 1]$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \sum_{\Delta^1 \in \binom{[n]\setminus 1}{k-1}} \cdots \sum_{\Delta^n \in \binom{[n]\setminus n}{k-1}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{k-1}^n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{1}{n} \left| Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \right] \\ \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8nk}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|S_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta}} + \epsilon_{k,m} + \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma} |\mathcal{A}_g| k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|} \delta \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the linearity of expectations, observe that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \sum_{\Delta^1 \in \binom{[n]\setminus 1}{k-1}} \cdots \sum_{\Delta^n \in \binom{[n]\setminus n}{k-1}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{k-1}^n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{1}{n} \left| Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \right] \\ = \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \sum_{\Delta^1 \in \binom{[n]\setminus 1}{k-1}} \cdots \sum_{\Delta^n \in \binom{[n]\setminus n}{k-1}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{k-1}^n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \left| Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \end{aligned}$$

Then, define the indicator function $\mathcal{I} : [n] \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{N} \times (0, 1] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by:

$\mathcal{I}(i, s, k, \delta) :=$

$$\mathbb{1} \left\{ \left| Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \leq \frac{\|r_l(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\infty}}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{8nk}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|S_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta}} + \epsilon_{k,m} \right\}$$

We then study the expected difference between $Q^*(s', \pi^*(s'))$ and $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}})$.

Observe that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \left| Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\mathcal{I}(i, s, k, \delta) \left| Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[(1 - \mathcal{I}(i, s, k, \delta)) \left| Q^*(s', \pi^*(s')) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \right] \end{aligned}$$

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

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

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

Since this is a uniform bound that is independent of Δ^j for $j \in [n]$ and $i \in [n]$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \sum_{\Delta^1 \in \binom{[n] \setminus \Delta^1}{k-1}} \cdots \sum_{\Delta^n \in \binom{[n] \setminus \Delta^n}{k-1}} \frac{1}{\binom{[n]}{k}} \frac{1}{\binom{[n-1]}{k-1}^n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \left| Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, \pi^*(s)_g, \{\pi^*(s)_j\}_{j \in \{i, \Delta^i\}}) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{1 - \gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n - k + 1}{8nk}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta}} + \epsilon_{k,m} + \frac{\tilde{r}}{1 - \gamma} |\mathcal{A}_g| k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|} \delta \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. \square

Corollary F.7. *Changing the notation of the policy to $\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ in the proofs of Lemmas F.5 and F.6, such that $a \sim \tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ then yields that:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{\Delta \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \sum_{\Delta^1 \in \binom{[n] \setminus \Delta^1}{k-1}} \sum_{\Delta^2 \in \binom{[n] \setminus \Delta^2}{k-1}} \cdots \sum_{\Delta^n \in \binom{[n] \setminus \Delta^n}{k-1}} \frac{1}{\binom{[n]}{k}} \frac{1}{\binom{[n-1]}{k-1}^n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{1}{n} \left| Q^*(s, a) - \hat{Q}_{k,m}^*(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta^i}}, a_g, a_{i, \Delta^i}) \right| \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{1 - \gamma} \sqrt{\frac{n - k + 1}{8nk}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta}} + \epsilon_{k,m} + \frac{\tilde{r}}{1 - \gamma} |\mathcal{A}_g| k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|} \delta \end{aligned}$$

Lemma F.8 (Optimizing Parameters).

$$V^{\pi^*}(s_0) - V^{\pi_{k,m}}(s_0) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$$

Proof. Setting $\delta = \frac{(1-\gamma)^2}{2\tilde{r}\varepsilon|\mathcal{A}_g|k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|}}$ in the bound for the optimality gap in Theorem F.3 gives:

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi^*}(s_0) - V^{\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s_0) &\leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{2nk}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{2|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}{\delta}} + 2\epsilon_{k,m} + \frac{2\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} |\mathcal{A}_g|k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|}\delta \\ &= \frac{\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{2nk}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{4\tilde{r}\varepsilon|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l||\mathcal{A}_g|k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + 2\epsilon_{k,m} \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\varepsilon = 10\sqrt{k}$ for any $c > 0$ recovers a decaying optimality gap of the order

$$V^{\pi^*}(s_0) - V^{\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s_0) \leq \frac{\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{n-k+1}{2nk}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{40\tilde{r}|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l||\mathcal{A}_g|k^{|\mathcal{A}_l|+\frac{1}{2}}}{(1-\gamma)^2}} + \frac{1}{10\sqrt{k}} + 2\epsilon_{k,m}$$

Finally, setting $\epsilon_{k,m} \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)$ from Lemma F.10 yields that

$$V^{\pi^*}(s_0) - V^{\tilde{\pi}_{k,m}}(s_0) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right),$$

which proves the claim. \square

F.1. Bounding the Bellman Error

This section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 3.2.

Theorem F.9 (Theorem 2 of (Li et al., 2022)). *If $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number of samples in the Bellman update, there exists a universal constant $0 < c_0 < 2$ and a Bellman noise $0 < \epsilon_{k,m} \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ such that*

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

where $\epsilon_{k,m}$ satisfies

$$m = \frac{c_0 \cdot \tilde{r} \cdot t_{\text{cover}}}{(1-\gamma)^5 \epsilon_{k,m}^2} \log^2(|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|) \log\left(\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2}\right), \quad (29)$$

where t_{cover} stands for the cover time, and is the time taken for the trajectory to visit all state-action pairs at least once. Formally,

$$t_{\text{cover}} := \min \left\{ t \mid \min_{(s_0, a_0) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_t | s_0, a_0) \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\}, \quad (30)$$

where \mathcal{B}_t denotes the event that all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ have been visited at least once between time 0 and time t , and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_t | s_0, a_0)$ denotes the probability of \mathcal{B}_t conditioned on the initial state (s_0, a_0) .

Lemma F.10. *Suppose $T = \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \log \frac{\tilde{r}\sqrt{k}}{1-\gamma}$. Then, the SUB-SAMPLE-MFQ: Learning algorithm runs in time $\tilde{O}(T|\mathcal{S}_g|^2|\mathcal{A}_g|^2|\mathcal{A}_l|^2|\mathcal{S}_l|^2k^{2.5+2|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}\tilde{r})$, while attaining a Bellman noise $\epsilon_{k,m}$ of $\tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{k})$.*

Proof. We first prove that $\|\hat{Q}_k^T - \hat{Q}_k^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}$. For this, it suffices to show $\gamma^T \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \implies \gamma^T \leq \frac{1-\gamma}{\tilde{r}\sqrt{k}}$. Then, using $\gamma = 1 - (1-\gamma) \leq e^{-(1-\gamma)}$, it again suffices to show $e^{-(1-\gamma)T} \leq \frac{1-\gamma}{\tilde{r}\sqrt{k}}$. Taking logarithms, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-T(1-\gamma)) &\leq \frac{1-\gamma}{\tilde{r}\sqrt{k}} \\ -T(1-\gamma) &\leq \log \frac{1-\gamma}{\tilde{r}\sqrt{k}} \\ T &\geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \log \frac{\tilde{r}\sqrt{k}}{1-\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

Since $T = \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \log \frac{\tilde{r}\sqrt{k}}{1-\gamma} > \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \log \frac{\tilde{r}\sqrt{k}}{1-\gamma}$, the condition holds and $\|\hat{Q}_k^T - \hat{Q}_k^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}$. Then, rearranging Equation (29) and incorporating the convergence error of the \hat{Q}_k -function, one has

$$\epsilon_{k,m} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} + \frac{k\sqrt{2\tilde{r}t_{\text{cover}}}}{(1-\gamma)^{2.5}\sqrt{m}} \log(|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{A}_l||\mathcal{S}_l|) \log\left(\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2}\right) \quad (31)$$

Then, using the naïve bound t_{cover} (since we are doing offline learning), we have

$$t_{\text{cover}} \leq |\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|k^{|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}.$$

Substituting this in Equation (31) gives

$$\epsilon_{k,m} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} + \frac{k\sqrt{2\tilde{r}}|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|k^{2.5+|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}}{(1-\gamma)^{2.5}\sqrt{m}} \log(|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{A}_l||\mathcal{S}_l|) \log\left(\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2}\right) \quad (32)$$

Therefore, setting

$$m = \frac{2\tilde{r}|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|k^{2.5+|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}}{(1-\gamma)^5} \log(|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{A}_l||\mathcal{S}_l|) \log\left(\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2}\right) \quad (33)$$

attains a Bellman error of $\epsilon_{k,m} \leq \tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{k})$. Finally, the runtime of our learning algorithm is

$$O(mT|\mathcal{S}_g||\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_g||\mathcal{A}_l|k^{|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}) = \tilde{O}(|\mathcal{S}_g|^2|\mathcal{A}_g|^2|\mathcal{A}_l|^2|\mathcal{S}_l|^2k^{2.5+2|\mathcal{S}_l||\mathcal{A}_l|}\tilde{r}),$$

which is still polynomial in k , proving the claim. \square

G. Generalization to Stochastic Rewards

Suppose we are given two families of distributions, $\{\mathcal{G}_{s_g, a_g}\}_{s_g, a_g \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{A}_g}$ and $\{\mathcal{L}_{s_i, s_g, a_i}\}_{s_i, s_g, a_i \in \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l}$. Let $R(s, a)$ denote a stochastic reward of the form

$$R(s, a) = r_g(s_g, a_g) + \sum_{i \in [n]} r_l(s_i, s_g, a_i), \quad (34)$$

where the rewards of the global agent r_g emerge from a distribution $r_g(s_g, a_g) \sim \mathcal{G}_{s_g, a_g}$, and the rewards of the local agents r_l emerge from a distribution $r_l(s_i, s_g, a_i) \sim \mathcal{L}_{s_i, s_g, a_i}$. For $\Delta \subseteq [n]$, let $R_\Delta(s, a)$ be defined as:

$$R_\Delta(s, a) = r_g(s_g, a_g) + \sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s_i, s_g, a_i) \quad (35)$$

We make some standard assumptions of boundedness on \mathcal{G}_{s_g, a_g} and $\mathcal{L}_{s_i, s_g, a_i}$.

Assumption G.1. Define

$$\bar{\mathcal{G}} = \bigcup_{(s_g, a_g) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{A}_g} \text{supp}(\mathcal{G}_{s_g, a_g}), \quad \bar{\mathcal{L}} = \bigcup_{(s_i, s_g, a_i) \in \mathcal{S}_l \times \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l} \text{supp}(\mathcal{L}_{s_i, s_g, a_i}), \quad (36)$$

where for any distribution \mathcal{D} , $\text{supp}(\mathcal{D})$ is the support (set of all random variables \mathcal{D} that can be sampled with probability strictly larger than 0) of \mathcal{D} . Then, let $\hat{\mathcal{G}} = \sup(\bar{\mathcal{G}})$, $\hat{\mathcal{L}} = \sup(\bar{\mathcal{L}})$, $\check{\mathcal{G}} = \inf(\bar{\mathcal{G}})$, and $\check{\mathcal{L}} = \inf(\bar{\mathcal{L}})$. We assume that $\hat{\mathcal{G}} < \infty$, $\hat{\mathcal{L}} < \infty$, $\check{\mathcal{G}} > -\infty$, $\check{\mathcal{L}} > -\infty$, and that $\hat{\mathcal{G}}, \hat{\mathcal{L}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}, \check{\mathcal{L}}$ are all known in advance.

Definition G.2. Let the randomized empirical adapted Bellman operator be $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}^{\text{random}}$ such that:

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}^{\text{random}} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_l, F_{z_\Delta}, a_g, a_l) = R_\Delta(s, a) + \frac{\gamma}{m} \sum_{\ell \in [m]} \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^\ell(s_g, s_l, F_{z_\Delta}, a'_g, a'_l), \quad (37)$$

SUBSAMPLE-MFQ: Learning with Stochastic Rewards. The proposed algorithm averages Ξ samples of the adapted randomized empirical adapted Bellman operator, $\mathcal{T}_{k,m}^{\text{random}}$ and updates the $\hat{Q}_{k,m}$ function using with the average. One can show that $\mathcal{T}_{k,m}^{\text{random}}$ is a contraction operator with module γ .

By Banach's fixed point theorem, $\mathcal{T}_{k,m}^{\text{random}}$ admits a unique fixed point $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{random}}$.

Algorithm 5 SUBSAMPLE-MFQ: Learning with Stochastic Rewards

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

- 1: Set $\tilde{\Delta} = \{2, \dots, k\}$.
- 2: Set $\mu_{k-1}(Z_l) = \{0, \frac{1}{k-1}, \frac{2}{k-1}, \dots, 1\}^{|S_l| \times |A_l|}$.
- 3: Set $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^0(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\tilde{\Delta}}}, a_g, a_1) = 0$, for $(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\tilde{\Delta}}}, a_1, a_g) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l \times \mu_{k-1}(Z_l) \times \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l$.
- 4: **for** $t = 1$ to T **do**
- 5: **for** $(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\tilde{\Delta}}}, a_g, a_1) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l \times \mu_{k-1}(Z_l) \times \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l$ **do**
- 6: $\rho = 0$
- 7: **for** $\xi \in \{1, \dots, \Xi\}$ **do**
- 8: $\rho = \rho + \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{k,m}^{\text{random}} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^t(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\tilde{\Delta}}}, a_g, a_1)$
- 9: **end for**
- 10: $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{t+1}(s_g, s_1, F_{z_{\tilde{\Delta}}}, a_g, a_1) = \rho / \Xi$
- 11: **end for**
- 12: **end for**
- 13: For all $(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta \setminus i}}) \in \mathcal{S}_g \times \mathcal{S}_l \times \mu_{k-1}(S_l)$, let

$$\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g, s_i, F_{s_{\Delta \setminus i}}) = \arg \max_{(a_g, a_i, F_{a_{\Delta \setminus i}}) \in \mathcal{A}_g \times \mathcal{A}_l \times \mu_{k-1}(Z_l)} \hat{Q}_{k,m}^T(s_g, s_i, F_{z_{\Delta \setminus i}}, a_g, a_i).$$

Theorem G.3 (Hoeffding's Theorem (Tsybakov, 2008)). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent random variables such that $a_i \leq X_i \leq b_i$ almost surely. Then, let $S_n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$. Then, for all $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}[|S_n - \mathbb{E}[S_n]| \geq \epsilon] \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2}\right) \quad (38)$$

Lemma G.4. *When $\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ is derived from the randomized empirical value iteration operation and applying our online subsampling execution in Algorithm 3, we get*

$$\Pr\left[V^{\pi^*}(s_0) - V^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s_0) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)\right] \geq 1 - \frac{1}{100\sqrt{k}}. \quad (39)$$

Proof.

$$\Pr\left[\left|\frac{\rho}{\Xi} - \mathbb{E}[R_{\Delta}(s, a)]\right| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{\Xi}\right] \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{\Xi} |\hat{\mathcal{G}} + \hat{\mathcal{L}} - \check{\mathcal{G}} - \check{\mathcal{L}}|^2}\right) = 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2}{\Xi |\hat{\mathcal{G}} + \hat{\mathcal{L}} - \check{\mathcal{G}} - \check{\mathcal{L}}|^2}\right) \quad (40)$$

Rearranging this, we get:

$$\Pr\left[\left|\frac{\rho}{\Xi} - \mathbb{E}[R_{\Delta}(s, a)]\right| \leq \sqrt{\ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \frac{|\hat{\mathcal{G}} + \hat{\mathcal{L}} - \check{\mathcal{G}} - \check{\mathcal{L}}|^2}{2\Xi^2}}\right] \geq 1 - \delta \quad (41)$$

Then, setting $\delta = \frac{1}{100\sqrt{k}}$, and setting $\Xi = 10|\hat{\mathcal{G}} + \hat{\mathcal{L}} - \check{\mathcal{G}} - \check{\mathcal{L}}|k^{1/4} \sqrt{\ln(200\sqrt{k})}$ gives:

$$\Pr\left[\left|\frac{\rho}{\Xi} - \mathbb{E}[R_{\Delta}(s, a)]\right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{200k}}\right] \geq 1 - \frac{1}{100\sqrt{k}}$$

Then, applying the triangle inequality to $\epsilon_{k,m}$ allows us to derive a probabilistic bound on the optimality gap between $\hat{Q}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ and Q^* , where the gap is increased by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{200k}}$, and where the randomness is over the stochasticity of the rewards. Then, the optimality gap between V^{π^*} and $V^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}$, for when the policy $\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}$ is learned using Algorithm 5 in the presence of stochastic rewards obeying Assumption G.1 follows

$$\Pr \left[V^{\pi^*}(s_0) - V^{\pi_{k,m}^{\text{est}}}(s_0) \leq \tilde{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \right) \right] \geq 1 - \frac{1}{100\sqrt{k}}, \quad (42)$$

which proves the lemma. \square

Remark G.5. First, note that that through the naïve averaging argument, the optimality gap above still decays to 0 with probability decaying to 1, as k increases.

Remark G.6. This method of analysis could be strengthened by obtaining estimates of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}, \hat{\mathcal{L}}, \check{\mathcal{G}}, \check{\mathcal{L}}$ and using methods from order statistics to bound the errors of the estimates and use the deviations between estimates to determine an optimal online stopping time (Kleinberg, 2005) as is done in the online secretary problem. This, more sophisticated, argument would become an essential step in converting this to a truly online learning, with a stochastic approximation scheme. Furthermore, one could incorporate variance-based analysis in the algorithm, where we use information derived from higher-order moments to do a weighted update of the Bellman update (Jin et al., 2024), thereby taking advantage of the skewedness of the distribution, and allowing us the freedom to assign an optimism/pessimism score to our estimate of the reward.

H. Extension to Continuous State/Action Spaces

Multi-agent settings where each agent handles a continuous state/action space find many applications in optimization, control, and synchronization.

Example H.1 (Quadcopter Swarm Drone (Preiss et al., 2017)). Consider a system of drones with a global controller, where each drone has to chase the controller, and the controller is designed to follow a bounded trajectory. Here, the state of each local agent $i \in [n]$ is its position and velocity in the bounded region, and the state of the global agent g is a signal on its position and direction. The action of each local agent is a velocity vector $a_l \in \mathcal{A}_l \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ which is a bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^3 , and the action of the global agent is a vector $a_g \in \mathcal{A}_g \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ which is a bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^2 .

Hence, this section is devoted to extending our algorithm and theoretical results to the case where the state and action spaces can be continuous (and therefore have infinite cardinality).

Preliminaries. For a measurable space $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B})$, where \mathcal{B} is a σ -algebra on \mathcal{S} , let $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$ denote the set of all real-valued \mathcal{B} -measurable functions on \mathcal{S} . Let (X, d) be a metric space, where X is a set and d is a metric on X . A set $S \subseteq X$ is *dense* in X if every element of X is either in S or a limit point of S . A set is *nowhere dense* in X if the interior of its closure in X is empty. A set $S \subseteq X$ is of Baire first category if S is a union of countably many nowhere dense sets. A set $S \subseteq X$ is of Baire second category if $X \setminus S$ is of first category.

Theorem H.2 (Baire Category Theorem (Jin et al., 2020)). Let (X, d) be a complete metric space. Then any countable intersection of dense open subsets of X is dense.

Definition H.3. MDP($\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}, r$) is a linear MDP with feature map $\phi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ if there exist d unknown (signed) measures $\mu = (\mu^1, \dots, \mu^d)$ over \mathcal{S} and a vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for any $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\cdot | s, a) = \langle \phi(s, a), \mu(\cdot) \rangle, \quad r(s, a) = \langle \phi(s, a), \theta \rangle \quad (43)$$

Without loss of generality, assume $\|\phi(s, a)\| \leq 1, \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ and $\max\{\|\mu(S)\|, \|\theta\|\} \leq \sqrt{d}$.

We motivate our analysis by reviewing representation learning in RL via spectral decompositions. For instance, if $P(s' | s, a)$ admits a linear decomposition in terms of some spectral features $\phi(s, a)$ and $\mu(s')$, then the $Q(s, a)$ -function can be linearly represented in terms of the spectral features $\phi(s, a)$.

Then, through a reduction from Ren et al. (2024) that uses function approximation to learn the spectral features ϕ_k for \hat{Q}_k , we derive a performance guarantee for the learned policy π_k^{est} , where the optimality gap decays with k .

Theorem H.4. When π_k^{est} is derived from the spectral features ϕ_k learned in \hat{Q}_k , and M is the number of samples used in the function approximation, then

$$\Pr \left[V^{\pi^*}(s) - V^{\pi_k^{\text{est}}}(s) \leq \tilde{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} + \frac{\|\phi_k\|^5 \log 2k^2}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{2\gamma\tilde{r}}{(1-\gamma)\sqrt{k}} \|\phi_k\| \right) \right] \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{100\sqrt{k}} \right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{k}} \right)$$

Suppose the system is a linear MDP, where \mathcal{S}_g and \mathcal{S}_l are infinite compact sets. By a reduction from (Ren et al., 2024) and using function approximation to learn the spectral features ϕ_k for \hat{Q}_k , we derive a performance guarantee for the learned policy π_k^{est} , where the optimality gap decays with k .

Assumption H.5. Suppose $\mathcal{S}_g \subset \mathbb{R}^{\sigma_g}$, $\mathcal{S}_l \subset \mathbb{R}^{\sigma_l}$, $\mathcal{A}_g \subset \mathbb{R}^{\alpha_g}$, $\mathcal{A}_l \subset \mathbb{R}^{\alpha_l}$ are bounded compact sets. From the Baire category theorem, the underlying field \mathbb{R} can be replaced to any set of Baire first category, which satisfies the property that there exists a dense open subset. In particular, replace Assumption 2.3 with a boundedness assumption.

Multi-agent settings where each agent handles a continuous state/action space find many applications in optimization, control, and synchronization.

Lemma H.6 (Proposition 2.3 in (Jin et al., 2020)). For any linear MDP, for any policy π , there exist weights $\{w^\pi\}$ such that for any $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, we have $Q^\pi(s, a) = \langle \phi(s, a), \mathbf{w}^\pi \rangle$.

Lemma H.7 (Proposition A.1 in (Jin et al., 2020)). For any linear MDP, for any $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, and for any measurable subset $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, we have that

$$\phi(s, a)^\top \mu(\mathcal{S}) = 1, \quad \phi(s, a)^\top \mu(\mathcal{B}) \geq 0.$$

Property H.8. Suppose that there exist spectral representation $\mu_g(s'_g) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mu_l(s'_l) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that the probability transitions $P_g(s'_g | s_g, a_g)$ and $P_l(s'_l | s_l, a_l)$ can be linearly decomposed by

$$P_g(s'_g | s_g, a_g) = \phi_g(s_g, a_g)^\top \mu_g(s'_g) \quad (44)$$

$$P_l(s'_l | s_l, a_l) = \phi_l(s_l, a_l)^\top \mu_l(s'_l) \quad (45)$$

for some features $\phi_g(s_g, a_g) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\phi_l(s_l, a_l) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, the dynamics are amenable to the following spectral factorization, as in (Ren et al., 2024).

Lemma H.9. \hat{Q}_k admits a linear representation.

Proof. Given the factorization of the dynamics of the multi-agent system, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(s' | s, a) &= P_g(s'_g | s_g, a_g) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n P_l(s'_l | s_l, a_l) \\ &= \langle \phi_g(s_g, a_g), \mu_g(s'_g) \rangle \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n \langle \phi_l(s_l, a_l), \mu_l(s'_l) \rangle \\ &= \phi_g(s_g, a_g), \mu_g(s'_g) \rangle \cdot \langle \otimes_{i=1}^n \phi_l(s_l, a_l), \otimes_{i=1}^n \mu_l(s'_l) \rangle := \langle \bar{\phi}_n(s, a), \bar{\mu}_n(s') \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for any $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ where $|\Delta| = k$, the subsystem consisting of k local agents Δ has a subsystem dynamics given by

$$\mathbb{P}(s'_\Delta | s_\Delta, a_\Delta) = \langle \bar{\phi}_k(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g, a_\Delta), \bar{\mu}_k(s'_\Delta) \rangle.$$

Therefore, \hat{Q}_k admits the linear representation:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_k^{\pi_k}(s_g, F_{z_\Delta}, a_g) &= r_g(s_g, a_g) + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s_i, s_g, a_i) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s'_g, s'_\Delta} \max_{a'_g, a'_\Delta} \hat{Q}_k^{\pi_k}(s'_g, F_{z'_\Delta}, a'_g) \\ &= r_g(s_g, a_g) + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \Delta} r_l(s_i, s_g, a_i) + (\mathbb{P}V^{\pi_k}(s_g, F_{s_\Delta}, a_g)) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} r_\Delta(s, a) \\ \bar{\phi}_k(s_g, s_\Delta, a_g, a_\Delta) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \gamma \int_{s'_\Delta} \mu_k(s'_\Delta) V^{\pi_k}(s'_\Delta) ds'_\Delta \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

proving the claim. \square

Therefore, $\bar{\phi}_k$ serves as a good representation for the \hat{Q}_k -function making the problem amenable to the classic linear functional approximation algorithms, consisting of *feature generation* and *policy gradients*.

In feature generation, we generate the appropriate features ϕ , comprising of the local reward functions and the spectral features coming from the factorization of the dynamics. In applying the policy gradient, we perform a gradient step to update the local policy weights θ_i and update the new policy. For this, we update the weight w via the TD(0) target semi-gradient method (with step size α), to get

$$w_{t+1} = w_t + \alpha(r_\Delta(s^t, a^t) + \gamma \bar{\phi}_k(s_\Delta^{t+1})^\top w_t - \bar{\phi}_k(s_\Delta^t)^\top w_t) \bar{\phi}_k(s_\Delta^t) \quad (46)$$

Definition H.10. Let the complete feature map be denoted by $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{|S| \times d}$, where

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} \phi(1) \\ \phi(2) \\ \vdots \\ \phi(S) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times d} \quad (47)$$

Similarly, let the subsampled feature map be denoted by $\hat{\Phi}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}_g| \times |\mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{S}_l)| \times d}$, where

$$\hat{\Phi}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\phi}_k(1) \\ \bar{\phi}_k(2) \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\phi}_k(|\mathcal{S}_g| \times |\mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{S}_l)|) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}_g| \times |\mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{S}_l)| \times d} \quad (48)$$

Here, the system's stage rewards are given by :

$$r = [r(1) \quad \dots \quad r(S)] \in \mathbb{R}^S, \quad (49)$$

$$r_k = [r_k(1), \dots, r_k(|\mathcal{S}_g| \times |\mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{S}_l)|)] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}_g| \times |\mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{S}_l)|}, \quad (50)$$

where d is a low-dimensional embedding we wish to learn.

Agnostically, the goal is to approximate the value function through the approximation

$$V_w \approx \hat{\Phi}_k w = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Phi}_k(1) \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\Phi}_k(|\mathcal{S}_g| \times |\mu_{k-1}(\mathcal{S}_l)|) \end{bmatrix} w \in \text{span}(\hat{\Phi}_k)$$

This manner of updating the weights can be considered via the projected Bellman equation $\hat{\Phi}_k w = \Pi_\mu \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Phi}_k w)$, where $\Pi_\mu(v) = \arg \min_{z \in \hat{\Phi}_k w} \|z - v\|_\mu^2$. Notably, the fixed point of the the projected Bellman equation satisfies

$$w = (\hat{\Phi}_k^\top D_\mu \hat{\Phi}_k)^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_k^\top D_\mu (r + \gamma P^\pi \hat{\Phi}_k w),$$

where D_μ is a diagonal matrix comprising of μ 's. In other words, $D_\mu = \text{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$. Then,

$$(\hat{\Phi}_k^\top D_\mu \hat{\Phi}_k) w = \hat{\Phi}_k^\top D_\mu (r + \gamma P^\pi \hat{\Phi}_k w)$$

In turn, this implies

$$\hat{\Phi}_k^\top D_\mu (I - \gamma P^\pi) \Phi w = \hat{\Phi}_k^\top D_\mu r.$$

Therefore, the problem is amenable to Algorithm 1 in Ren et al. (2024). To bound the error of using linear function approximation to learn \hat{Q}_k , we use a result from Ren et al. (2024).

Lemma H.11 (Policy Evaluation Error, Theorem 6 of Ren et al. (2024)). *Suppose the sample size $M \geq \log(\frac{4n}{\delta})$, where n is the number of agents and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is an error parameter. Then, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, the ground truth $\hat{Q}_k^\pi(s, a)$ function and the approximated \hat{Q}_k^{LFA} -function $\hat{Q}_k^{\text{LFA}}(s, a)$ satisfies, for any $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \hat{Q}_k^\pi(s, a) - \hat{Q}_k^{\text{LFA}}(s, a) \right| \right] \leq O \left(\underbrace{\log \left(\frac{2k}{\delta} \right) \frac{\|\bar{\phi}_k\|^5}{\sqrt{M}}}_{\text{statistical error}} + \underbrace{2\epsilon_P \gamma \cdot \frac{\tilde{r}}{1-\gamma} \cdot \|\bar{\phi}_k\|}_{\text{approximation error}} \right),$$

where ϵ_P is the error in approximating the spectral features ϕ_g, ϕ_l .

Corollary H.12. Therefore, when $\pi_{k,m}$ is derived from the spectral features learned in \hat{Q}_k^{LFA} , applying the triangle inequality on the Bellman noise and setting $\delta = \epsilon_P = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}$ yields¹

$$\Pr \left[V^{\pi^*}(s_0) - V^{\pi_{k,m}}(s_0) \leq \tilde{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} + \log(2k^2) \frac{\|\bar{\phi}_k\|^5}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{k}} \cdot \frac{\gamma \tilde{r}}{1-\gamma} \|\bar{\phi}_k\| \right) \right] \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{100\sqrt{k}} \right) \left(1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{k}} \right) \quad (51)$$

Using $\|\bar{\phi}_k\| \leq 1$ gives

$$\Pr \left[V^{\pi^*}(s_0) - V^{\pi_{k,m}}(s_0) \leq \tilde{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} + \frac{\log(2k^2)}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{2\gamma\tilde{r}}{\sqrt{k}(1-\gamma)} \right) \right] \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{100\sqrt{k}} \right) \left(1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{k}} \right)$$

Remark H.13. Hence, in the continuous state/action space setting, as $k \rightarrow n$ and $M \rightarrow \infty$, $V^{\tilde{\pi}_k}(s_0) \rightarrow V^{\tilde{\pi}_n}(s_0) = V^{\pi^*}(s_0)$. Intuitively, as $k \rightarrow n$, the optimality gap diminishes following the arguments in Corollary F.7. As $M \rightarrow \infty$, the number of samples obtained allows for more effective learning of the spectral features.

I. Towards Deterministic Algorithms: Sharing Randomness

In this section, we propose algorithms `RANDOM-SUB-SAMPLE-MFQ` and `RANDOM-SUB-SAMPLE-MFQ+`, which shares randomness between agents through various careful groupings and using shared randomness within each groups. Through this, we establish progress towards the optimal partial derandomization of inherently stochastic and approximately optimal policies.

Algorithm 6 (Execution with weakly shared randomness). The local agents are heuristically divided into arbitrary groups of size k . For each group h_i , the $k - 1$ local agents sampled are the same at each iteration. The global agent's action is then the majority global agent action determined by each group of local agents. At each round, this requires $O(\lceil n^2/k \rceil (n - k))$ random numbers.

Algorithm 7 (Execution with strongly shared randomness). The local agents are randomly divided in to groups of size k . For each group, each agent uses the other agents in the group as the $k - 1$ other sampled states. Similarly, the global agent's action is then the majority global agent action determined by each group of local agents. Here, at each round, this requires $O(\lceil n^2/k \rceil)$ random numbers.

The probability of a bad event (the policy causing the Q -function to exceed the Lipschitz bound) scales with the $O(n^k)$ independent random variables, which is polynomially large. Agnostically, some randomness is always needed to avoid periodic dynamics that may occur when the underlying Markov chain is not irreducible. In this case, an adversarial reward function could be designed such that the system does not minimize the optimality gap, thereby penalizing excessive determinism.

This ties into an open problem of interest, which has been recently explored (Larsen et al., 2024). What is the minimum amount of randomness required for `SUBSAMPLE-MFQ` (or general mean-field or multi-agent RL algorithms) to perform well? Can we derive a theoretical result that demonstrates and balances the tradeoff between the amount of random bits and the performance of the subsampled policy when using the greedy action from the k -agent subsystem derived from \hat{Q}_k^* ? We leave this problem as an exciting direction for future research.

¹Following (Ren et al., 2024), the result easily generalizes to any positive-definite transition Kernel noise (e.g. Laplacian, Cauchy, Matérn, etc).

Algorithm 6 SUB-SAMPLE-MFQ: Execution with weakly shared randomness

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

- 1: Sample $(s_g(0), s_{[n]}(0)) \sim s_0$.
- 2: Define groups h_1, \dots, h_x of agents where $x := \lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$ and $|h_1| = |h_2| = \dots = |h_{x-1}| = k$ and $|h_x| = n \bmod k$.
- 3: **for** $t = 0$ to $T' - 1$ **do**
- 4: **for** $i \in [x]$ **do**
- 5: Let Δ_i be a uniform sample of $\binom{[n] \setminus g_i}{k-1}$, and let $a_{g_i}(t) = [\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g(t), s_{\Delta_i}(t))]_{1:k}$.
- 6: **end for**
- 7: Let $a_g(t) = \text{majority} \left(\left\{ [\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g(t), s_{\Delta_i}(t))]_g \right\}_{i \in [x]} \right)$.
- 8: Let $s_g(t+1) \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g(t), a_g(t))$
- 9: Let $s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i(t))$
- 10: $s_g(t), a_i(t)$, for all $i \in [n]$.
- 11: Get reward $r(s, a) = r_g(s_g, a_g) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} r_l(s_i, a_i, s_g)$
- 12: **end for**

Algorithm 7 SUB-SAMPLE-MFQ: Execution with strongly shared randomness

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

- 1: Sample $(s_g(0), s_{[n]}(0)) \sim s_0$.
- 2: Define groups h_1, \dots, h_x of agents where $x := \lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$ and $|h_1| = |h_2| = \dots = |h_{x-1}| = k$ and $|h_x| = n \bmod k$.
- 3: **for** $t = 0$ to $T' - 1$ **do**
- 4: **for** $i \in [x-1]$ **do**
- 5: Let $a_{h_i}(t) = [\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g(t), s_{h_i}(t))]_{1:k}$.
- 6: Let $a_{h_i}^g(t) = [\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g(t), s_{h_i}(t))]_g$.
- 7: **end for**
- 8: Let $\Delta_{\text{residual}} := \binom{[n] \setminus h_x}{k - (n - \lceil n/k \rceil k)}$.
- 9: Let $a_{h_x}(t) = [\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g(t), s_{h_x \cup \Delta_{\text{residual}}}(t))]_{1:n - \lceil n/k \rceil k}$
- 10: Let $a_{h_x}^g(t) = [\hat{\pi}_{k,m}^{\text{est}}(s_g(t), s_{h_x \cup \Delta_{\text{residual}}}(t))]_g$
- 11: Let $a_g(t) = \text{majority}(\{a_{h_i}^g(t) : i \in [x]\})$.
- 12: Let $s_g(t+1) \sim P_g(\cdot | s_g(t), a_g(t))$, $s_i(t+1) \sim P_l(\cdot | s_i(t), s_g(t), a_i(t))$, for all $i \in [n]$.
- 13: Get reward $r(s, a) = r_g(s_g, a_g) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} r_l(s_i, a_i, s_g)$
- 14: **end for**
