

# Heterogeneous Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning for Distributed Channel Access in WLANs

Jiaming Yu, Le Liang, *Member, IEEE*, Chongtao Guo, *Member, IEEE*, Ziyang Guo, *Member, IEEE*, Shi Jin, *Fellow, IEEE*, and Geoffrey Ye Li, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—This paper investigates the use of multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) to address distributed channel access in wireless local area networks. In particular, we consider the challenging yet more practical case where the agents heterogeneously adopt value-based or policy-based reinforcement learning algorithms to train the model. We propose a heterogeneous MARL training framework, named QPMIX, which adopts a centralized training with distributed execution paradigm to enable heterogeneous agents to collaborate. Moreover, we theoretically prove the convergence of the proposed heterogeneous MARL method when using the linear value function approximation. Our method maximizes the network throughput and ensures fairness among stations, therefore, enhancing the overall network performance. Simulation results demonstrate that the proposed QPMIX algorithm improves throughput, mean delay, delay jitter, and collision rates compared with conventional carrier-sense multiple access with collision avoidance in the saturated traffic scenario. Furthermore, the QPMIX is shown to be robust in unsaturated and delay-sensitive traffic scenarios, and promotes cooperation among heterogeneous agents.

**Index Terms**—Distributed channel access, heterogeneous multi-agent reinforcement learning, multiple access.

## I. INTRODUCTION

WI-FI has become an important technology in wireless local area networks (WLANs), and has been widely used in personal, home and enterprise environments, with Wi-Fi 6 [1] and Wi-Fi 7 [2] as the latest commercially available technology. However, achieving seamless connectivity across diverse devices and applications, such as virtual reality/augmented reality, remote surgery, and online gaming, remains a substantial challenge for Wi-Fi 6 and 7. These applications require higher data rates, lower latency, and higher reliability than the current Wi-Fi technology can provide. As a result, developing the next generation of Wi-Fi technology, i.e., Wi-Fi 8, has attracted increasing attention from both industry and academia [3].

To meet the demands of the aforementioned applications, it is crucial not only to enhance the physical layer rate but also

Jiaming Yu, Le Liang, and Shi Jin are with the National Mobile Communications Research Laboratory, Southeast University, Nanjing 210096, China (e-mail: jiaming@seu.edu.cn; lliang@seu.edu.cn; jinshi@seu.edu.cn). Le Liang is also with Purple Mountain Laboratories, Nanjing 211111, China.

Chongtao Guo is with the College of Electronics and Information Engineering, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen 518060, China (e-mail: ctguo@szu.edu.cn).

Ziyang Guo is with the Wireless Technology Lab, 2012 Laboratories, Huawei Technologies Company Ltd., Shenzhen 518129, China (e-mail: guoziyang@huawei.com).

Geoffrey Ye Li is with the ITP Lab, the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Imperial College London, SW7 2BX London, U.K. (e-mail: geoffrey.li@imperial.ac.uk).

to improve the throughput of the media access control (MAC) layer. A fundamental aspect of MAC layer design is distributed channel access (DCA), where multiple users utilize a shared channel in a fully decentralized manner without any centralized scheduling mechanism. One of the most popular DCA schemes is the carrier-sense multiple access with collision avoidance (CSMA/CA) [4], which utilizes random access to avoid collisions. However, it exhibits unsatisfactory throughput performance due to its reliance on the binary exponential back-off (BEB) algorithm. In this algorithm, stations (STAs) are required to wait for a random back-off period determined by the contention window (CW) size before initiating a transmission. Furthermore, the CW size doubles following each collision, which can lead to increased latency and reduced efficiency. To address these issues, enhancements to the BEB mechanism have been proposed in prior research works [5]–[8]. In [7], a deterministic BEB mechanism applied twice consecutively after successful transmissions is introduced to avoid collisions in WLANs, particularly in lossy channels and scenarios with high frame error rates. Additionally, a semi-distributed BEB algorithm has been proposed to further reduce frame collisions [8]. These approaches aim to improve the efficiency of CSMA/CA by mitigating some of the limitations of the traditional BEB mechanism while maintaining simplicity in implementation. Nevertheless, these methods are still inadequate. On the one hand, due to the nonlinear impact of parameter dependencies on network performance, it is often necessary to jointly optimize multiple parameters, which is a challenging task [9]. On the other hand, the increasing diversity of service requirements raised by new applications, such as ultra-low latency and ultra-high reliability, increases the complexity of conventional DCA mechanism and cannot be easily satisfied by the traditional CSMA/CA mechanism.

To overcome the limitations of traditional methods, a multitude of studies have utilized artificial intelligence (AI) techniques to optimize parameters on top of the CSMA/CA framework to improve the throughput performance. For example, a supervised-learning-based scheme using a random forest approach has been proposed to dynamically adjust CW values, effectively reducing collisions and idle periods while significantly improving throughput, latency, and fairness [10]. Based on machine learning, a simple yet effective method based on the fixed-share algorithm [11] is developed in [12] to optimize CW values, which utilizes a modified fixed-share algorithm to adjust CW values based on current and past network contention conditions, thereby improving channel utilization. Furthermore, recent advancements in reinforcement

learning (RL) provide a more intelligent and efficient solution for future wireless communication systems [13]–[15]. In particular, an RL-based approach has been proposed in [16] to learn the appropriate CW value under varying network conditions. In this approach, the access point (AP) acts as an agent to control the CW values of STAs. Moreover, a learning algorithm that utilizes the post-decision state [17] can expedite the learning process by leveraging the past knowledge of system components such as CW and the transmission buffer occupancy. Building upon these advancements, a hierarchical RL approach has been proposed [18], where the AP learns the optimal transmit power at the high-level policy and the clear channel assessment (CCA) threshold at the low-level policy.

In addition to optimizing parameters on top of the CSMA/CA framework, recent studies have explored novel channel access schemes based on single agent reinforcement learning (SARL) and multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL). For example, a SARL-based multiple access algorithm has been proposed in [19] to maximize network the throughput while keeping  $\alpha$  fairness among different users. Expanding upon SARL, MARL-based DCA algorithms have gained attention. However, current MARL-based DCA methods predominantly rely on value-based algorithms. For instance, in [20], each STA operates as a deep Q-network (DQN) agent [21] to make transmission or waiting decisions based on historical channel states and feedback from the AP. Additionally, a federated learning framework is utilized to aggregate models, therefore, ensuring fairness among users. A similar network coexistence problem with imperfect feedback channels has been addressed by an MARL algorithm in [22], which utilizes a feedback recovery mechanism to retrieve the missing feedback information. It employs a two-stage action selection mechanism to facilitate the coherent decision-making, thereby mitigating transmission collisions among the agents. Furthermore, a distributed multichannel access protocol based on dueling Q-network architecture has been proposed in [23] to improve both throughput and fairness in a dynamic network environment. Moreover, based on the well known value-based QMIX algorithm [24], a MAC protocol, named QMIX-advanced listen-before-talk (QLBT), has been developed in [25]. In the QLBT protocol, each STA is considered as an agent with the ability to make decisions on transmitting or not based on its local observations and historical data.

While the aforementioned studies focusing on the value-based MARL algorithm, a few policy-based MARL algorithms have also been proposed to solve the DCA problem. In [26], a deep actor-critic RL framework has been proposed for dynamic multichannel access in both single-user and multi-user scenarios, which addresses the challenges of partial observability and channel uncertainty. Additionally, inspired by mean-field games theory, a novel mean-field-based MARL algorithm for uplink orthogonal frequency-division multiple access in IEEE 802.11ax networks has been proposed to learn the optimal channel access strategy, thereby enhancing network performance in high-density environments [27].

The aforementioned MARL-based DCA algorithms presuppose that all nodes employ the same type of RL algorithm, i.e.,

either value-based or policy-based algorithms. However, given the dynamic nature of Wi-Fi and the variety of RL algorithms, there may exist both value-based and policy-based MARL agents within a basic service set (BSS), which we refer to as the heterogeneous MARL scenario. Unique challenges exist in such heterogeneous scenarios since many existing techniques to stabilize MARL training are tailored to homogeneous MARL scenarios where all RL agents use the same type of RL algorithms, mostly value-based methods. There is no known work studying the coexistence of these heterogeneous MARL agents and no training convergence is guaranteed thereof.

To solve the aforementioned heterogeneous MARL problem, this article primarily focuses on designing an effective heterogeneous MARL framework to promote seamless cooperation among STAs. To support diverse service requirements in next-generation WLANs, heterogeneous MARL simultaneously maximize the throughput for high bandwidth efficiency and ensure fairness among STAs. The contributions and main results of this work are summarized as follows:

- We develop a novel heterogeneous MARL framework, named QPMIX for the DCA problem in next-generation WLANs. QPMIX adopts the paradigm of centralized training with distributed execution (CTDE). During the training phase, the global information is implicitly introduced to promote better cooperation among agents. In contrast, during the deployment phase, agents make distributed decisions based on their local observations.
- We theoretically analyze the convergence of the proposed heterogeneous MARL framework and characterize its convergence property when using the linear value function approximation.
- We provide extensive simulation results to demonstrate the effectiveness of our framework in a variety of scenarios, including the saturated traffic, unsaturated traffic, and delay-sensitive traffic scenarios. We also conduct an experiment to contrast independent learning against using the QPMIX framework, and verify that QPMIX can promote better collaboration among the heterogeneous agents.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. The system model and RL formulation are described in Section II. Section III provides the proposed QPMIX algorithm and protocol. The convergence of the proposed heterogeneous MARL is characterized in Section IV for the special case of linear value function approximation. Finally, simulation results are discussed in Section V, followed by the conclusion and discussion of the future work in Section VI.

## II. SYSTEM MODEL AND RL FORMULATION

As illustrated in Fig. 1, we consider the uplink channel access problem in a time-slotted BSS where  $N$  STAs attempt to communicate with an AP, known as the DCA problem. For simplicity, we assume that there are no hidden nodes, implying that each STA performs carrier sensing before accessing the channel and they can listen to one another. Each STA is equipped with a finite queue buffer and determines whether to access the channel based on its own observations. The




Fig. 1. Scenario of a BSS: multiple STAs share one common channel and determine data transmission in a distributed manner.

packets arrive at the STA according to a specified distribution while they would be discarded when the buffer is full. After a successful transmission, the AP sends an acknowledgment (ACK) signal to the corresponding STA. The STA decides whether to send packets only when it detects that the channel is idle, which is known as the listen-before-talk mechanism in CSMA/CA. Once the transmission begins, the channel will convert to the busy state, and other STAs will wait until the end of transmission for attempting channel access. But if two or more STAs sense the idle channel in the previous time slot and decide to transmit in the current time slot, then they will not be aware of the collision until they fail to receive the ACK signal from the AP in time.

The objective of the DCA problem is to maximize the network throughput while ensure fairness among STAs. Then how to coordinate access of multiple STAs such that they neither occupy the channel selfishly nor keep waiting due to collisions remains challenging. Fortunately, MARL algorithms have proven effective in addressing distributed decision-making in similar scenarios [20], [22], [23], [25]. However, these approaches are only applicable to value-based agents. When both value-based and policy-based agents are present in a BSS, existing algorithms are not able to train the heterogeneous agents effectively to achieve cooperation, which is a challenging yet more practical case. Motivated by this, our goal is to design a heterogeneous MARL-based DCA algorithm so that both value-based and policy-based agents can maintain fair access to the channel and maximize the network throughput. To this end, we first introduce preliminaries on RL before presenting the underlying heterogeneous decentralized partially observable Markov decision process (Dec-POMDP) model and our RL elements design for the DCA problem.

### A. Single Agent Reinforcement Learning

In SARL problems, an agent continuously interacts with the environment and updates its policy. At each time step  $t$ , the agent obtains its observation of the current state of environment  $s_t$  and chooses an action  $a_t$  according to its policy  $\pi$ . The environment then responds to the agent with a reward  $r_t$  and moves to the next state  $s_{t+1}$  with probability  $P(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$ . The objective of the agent is to update its policy based on its historical experience to maximize the expected discounted return  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t]$ , where  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$  is a discount factor.

To solve this problem, a variety of value-based algorithms and policy-based algorithms have been proposed. Value-based

algorithms learn and optimize the action-value function, i.e., the Q-function  $Q(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_\pi[\sum_{k=0}^T \gamma^k r_{t+k} | s_t = s, a_t = a]$ . The optimal Q-function is progressively obtained by updating the Q-function using the Bellman equation,

$$Q^*(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[r_t + \gamma \max_{a'} Q^*(s_{t+1}, a') | s_t = s, a_t = a]. \quad (1)$$

Then the agent obtains the optimal policy  $\pi^*$  indirectly through the Q-function, i.e.,  $\pi^*(s) = \arg \max_a Q^*(s, a)$ . DQN [21] is a classical value-based algorithm that employs a neural network to approximate the Q-function, thereby addressing the curse of dimensionality faced by tabular methods.

The value-based algorithm derives the optimal policy by estimating the value function, while the policy-based algorithm learns the optimal policy directly. As an agent interacts with its environment, it records a sequence of trajectories. Given the agent policy  $\pi$ , the probability of a specific trajectory  $\tau = \{s_0, a_0, r_0, s_1, a_1, r_1, \dots, s_T, a_T, r_T\}$  can be computed as

$$P(\tau) = p(s_0) \prod_{t=0}^{T-1} \pi(a_t | s_t) P(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t), \quad (2)$$

and the expected discounted return is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi[\sum_{t=0}^T \gamma^t r_t] = \sum_{\tau} R(\tau) P(\tau), \quad (3)$$

where  $R(\tau) = \sum_{t=0}^T \gamma^t r_t$ . The policy is improved by updating the policy parameters using gradient ascent to maximize the expected return. The actor-critic algorithms are an important family of policy-based algorithms, where the actor selects actions and the critic estimates the expected return. Proximal policy optimization (PPO) [28] is a well-known actor-critic algorithm that utilizes the importance sampling to improve the data efficiency and an advantage function to estimate advantage value of each action.

### B. Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning

In MARL problems, each agent independently selects its actions based on its local observations of the environment to maximize the overall expected reward. Different from SARL, the main challenge of MARL is the non-stationarity and partial observability of the environment. A key factor driving the growth of MARL algorithms is the adoption of the CTDE paradigm [29] to mitigate these challenges. During the centralized training phase, agents have access to global information, while during execution, they rely only on local observations to make decisions [30], [31]. Similar to SARL algorithm, MARL algorithms can also be divided into value-based and policy-based algorithms. Among value-based algorithms, the value decomposition method [32], [33] is a popular algorithm that adopts CTDE. The basic concept of the value decomposition is to break down a complicated joint value function into individual value functions that each agent can understand and utilize as a foundation for decision-making. This decomposition adheres to the individual-global-max (IGM) principle [24], which ensures consistency between joint and individual optimal actions. QMIX [24], one of the most powerful value-based MARL value decomposition



algorithms, employs a hypernetwork to aggregate individual Q-value into a total Q-value.

Mathematically, the underlying heterogeneous Dec-POMDP model of the DCA problem can be described by a tuple  $\langle \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}, \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}, R, \gamma \rangle$ . Here,  $\mathcal{N}$  denotes the set of agents with  $|\mathcal{N}| = N$ .  $\mathcal{N}_1$  represents the set of value-based agents and  $\mathcal{N}_2$  represents the set of policy-based agents, with  $|\mathcal{N}_1| + |\mathcal{N}_2| = N$ .  $\mathcal{S}$  is the global state space. At each time step  $t$ , each agent  $i \in \mathcal{N}$  selects an action  $a_t^i$  from its action space  $\mathcal{A}^i$  after receiving its observation  $o_t^i \in \mathcal{O}$ . The combined actions form a joint action  $\mathbf{a}_t \in \mathcal{A}$ . Additionally,  $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  represents the state transition probability of the Markov decision process (MDP), and  $R : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the reward function. The corresponding RL elements for the DCA problem are introduced hereafter.

### C. RL Elements for DCA Problem

**Action:** At each time step  $t$ , agent  $i$  can take action  $a_t^i \in \{\text{Transmit}, \text{Wait}\}$ , where ‘Transmit’ means the agent transmits at the current time slot while ‘Wait’ means the agent waits for a time slot. Specifically, an agent only updates its action when the channel is sensed idle and its packet buffer is not empty; otherwise it directly takes the default waiting action. These actions are recorded as part of their trajectories. If an agent chooses to transmit, the transmission spans multiple time slots, corresponding to the packet length.

**Observation Space and Global State:** Inspired by [25], we set the observation of agent  $i$  at time step  $t$  as  $o_t^i \triangleq \{z_t^i, a_{t-1}^i, l_t^i, d_t^i, d_t^{-i}\}$ .  $z_t^i$  represents the carrier-sensing result, where  $z_t^i = 0$  if the channel is sensed idle; otherwise  $z_t^i = 1$ . The variable  $a_{t-1}^i$  denotes the action of agent  $i$  at time step  $t-1$ , and the variable  $l_t^i$  represents the number of time slots that the same  $(z_t^i, a_{t-1}^i)$  pair lasts to avoid storing a large amount of duplicated  $(z_t^i, a_{t-1}^i)$ . Each agent maintains two counters  $v_t^i$  and  $v_t^{-i}$ , which represent the number of time slots since the last successful transmission of agent  $i$  and any other agent, respectively. When agent  $i$  receives its own ACK frame at slot  $t$  replied by the AP,  $v_t^i$  is set to 0. If agent  $i$  receives the ACK frame at slot  $t$  sent by the AP to another agent,  $v_t^{-i}$  is set to 0. Otherwise, we have  $v_t^i = v_{t-1}^i + 1$  and  $v_t^{-i} = v_{t-1}^{-i} + 1$ . Furthermore, we define  $d_t^i \triangleq \frac{v_t^i}{v_t^i + v_t^{-i}}$  and  $d_t^{-i} \triangleq \frac{v_t^{-i}}{v_t^i + v_t^{-i}}$  as the normalized values of  $v_t^i$  and  $v_t^{-i}$ , respectively. To make better decisions, the historical observation information for agent  $i$  up to slot  $t$  is represented as  $\tau_t^i \triangleq \{o_{t-M+1}^i, \dots, o_{t-1}^i, o_t^i\}$ , where  $M$  is the length of the observation history. The global state at time  $t$  is  $s_t \triangleq [\mathbf{a}_{t-1}, \mathbf{D}_{t-1}]$ , where  $\mathbf{a}_{t-1}$  is the joint action of all agents, and  $\mathbf{D}_t \triangleq [D_t^1, D_t^2, \dots, D_t^N]$  with  $D_t^i \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{v_t^k}{v_t^i}$ .

**Reward:** Recall that our goal is to balance the fairness among STAs and maximize the overall network throughput. Thus, we propose to encourage the agent with the largest delay to transmit. Specifically, the reward at time slot  $t$  can be represented by

$$r_t = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if agent } i = \arg \max_i \mathbf{D}_t \text{ transmits successfully,} \\ 0, & \text{if no transmission,} \\ -1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

## III. QPMIX ALGORITHM AND PROTOCOL

This section introduces the proposed QPMIX algorithm. We begin by presenting the design of the agent networks, followed by an explanation of the loss function utilized to train these networks. Finally, similar to the valued-based QMIX algorithm [24], we propose a novel MARL algorithmic framework, named QPMIX, to account for its valued-based and policy-based heterogeneity, which operates a CTDE paradigm.

### A. QPMIX Neural Network Architecture

As illustrated in Fig. 2 (a), the QPMIX architecture consists of three components: the value-based agent network, the policy-based agent network, and the mixing network. The value-based agent utilizes the DQN algorithm while the policy-based agent employs the PPO algorithm. Consequently, DQN and PPO are utilized to represent the value-based algorithm and the policy-based algorithm in the rest of the section for simplicity, respectively.

1) *DQN and PPO Network:* The left and right blocks in Fig. 2 (a) represent the neural networks of the DQN and PPO agents, respectively. DQN agent  $i$  utilizes its local historical information  $\tau_t^i$  as an input to a network comprising three multilayer perceptron (MLP) layers. The network outputs the Q-values for two actions,  $Q^i(\tau_t^i, \text{Wait})$  and  $Q^i(\tau_t^i, \text{Transmit})$ . The DQN agent then utilizes an  $\epsilon$ -greedy policy to select an action  $a_t^i$ , and inputs the corresponding Q-value  $Q^i(\tau_t^i, a_t^i)$  into the mixing network. Similarly, PPO agent  $j$  takes  $\tau_t^j$  into both the critic and actor networks, shown on the left and right sides of the PPO network, respectively. The critic network outputs the Q-values for the two actions, while the actor produces the policy  $\pi^j$ , representing the probability distribution over the two actions. The actor samples an action according to its policy  $\pi^j$ , and then inputs Q-value  $Q^j(\tau_t^j, a_t^j)$  into the mixing network.

2) *Mixing Network:* The mixing network utilizes the global state  $s_t$  as input to generate weights  $W_1, W_2$  and biases  $b_1, b_2$  to perform a weighted sum over the individual Q-values  $Q^i(\tau_t^i, a_t^i), \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$ , thereby producing the total Q-value  $Q_{\text{tot}}(\tau_t, \mathbf{a}_t, s_t)$ , where  $\tau_t$  is joint historical observations, defined as  $\tau_t = [\tau_t^1, \dots, \tau_t^N]$ . To satisfy the IGM properties, i.e.,  $\frac{\partial Q_{\text{tot}}}{\partial Q^i} \geq 0, \forall i$ , the absolute activation function is used when generating weights  $W_1$  and  $W_2$ . Therefore, the mixing network can be actually regarded as a two-layer MLP.

### B. Loss Function

The parameters of the individual Q-networks of all agents and the mixing network are collectively denoted by  $\theta_{\text{tot}}$ . We parameterize the actor network of PPO agent  $j$ , actor networks of all PPO agents, and the global state value  $V(s_t)$  by  $\theta_a^j$ ,  $\theta_a$ , and  $\theta_v$ , respectively. The loss function of the QPMIX algorithm can be denoted by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{QPMIX}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{Qtot}} + \mathcal{L}_v + \mathcal{L}_{\text{actor}}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Qtot}}$  is utilized to update the mixing network and the individual Q-networks of all agents, defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Qtot}}(\theta_{\text{tot}}) = \sum_{bs} [y_{\text{tot}} - Q_{\text{tot}}(\tau_t, \mathbf{a}_t, s_t; \theta_{\text{tot}})]^2, \quad (6)$$




Fig. 2. QPMIX framework: (a) Agent network: The left and right block show the architecture of the value-based and policy-based networks, respectively. The middle block corresponds to hypernetworks that produce the weights and biases for the mixing network layers. (b) Training framework: The centralized training occurs at the AP based on the experiences reported by each STA. During the training phase, the AP distributes the gradients back to each STAs. During the decentralized execution phase, each STA independently decides whether to access the channel.

with  $y_{\text{tot}} = r_t + \gamma \max_{\mathbf{a}'} Q_{\text{tot}}(\tau_{t+1}, \mathbf{a}', s_{t+1}; \theta_{\text{tot}}^-)$ . Here,  $\theta_{\text{tot}}^-$  is the target network parameters, which is fixed for a couple of updates and duplicated periodically from  $\theta_{\text{tot}}$  to stabilize training, and  $b_s$  is the batch size. Moreover,  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{actor}}$  is utilized to update the actor network, defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{actor}}(\theta_{\mathbf{a}}) = - \sum_{b_s} \sum_j \min \left( \frac{\pi^j(a_t^j | \tau_t^j; \theta_{\mathbf{a}}^j)}{\pi^j(a_t^j | \tau_t^j; \theta_{\mathbf{a}, \text{old}}^j)} A(s_t; \theta_{\mathbf{V}}), \right. \\ \left. \text{clip} \left( \frac{\pi^j(a_t^j | \tau_t^j; \theta_{\mathbf{a}}^j)}{\pi^j(a_t^j | \tau_t^j; \theta_{\mathbf{a}, \text{old}}^j)}, 1 - \delta, 1 + \delta \right) A(s_t; \theta_{\mathbf{V}}) \right), \quad (7)$$

where  $\text{clip}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$  is the clipping function that clips the first input into the range determined by the second and third inputs, i.e.,  $[1 - \delta, 1 + \delta]$ , with  $\delta$  as the clipping factor, usually set to 0.2, and  $\theta_{\mathbf{a}, \text{old}}$  is copied from the actor parameter before the update, and set to the new  $\theta_{\mathbf{a}}$  after the update. Furthermore,  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{V}}$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{V}}(\theta_{\mathbf{V}}) = \sum_{b_s} (r_t + \gamma V(s_{t+1}; \theta_{\mathbf{V}}^-) - V(s_t; \theta_{\mathbf{V}}))^2, \quad (8)$$

where  $\theta_{\mathbf{V}}^-$  is the parameters of the target global state value function, and  $\theta_{\mathbf{V}}$  is the global state value function that will be used to estimate the advantage function  $A(s_t; \theta_{\mathbf{V}})$  in (7), which is defined as

$$A(s_t; \theta_{\mathbf{V}}) = \delta_t + \gamma \lambda \delta_{t+1} + \dots + (\gamma \lambda)^{T-t+1} \delta_{T-1}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a parameter to trade off between the bias and variance of the advantage function, and  $\delta_t$  is the temporal difference (TD) error given by

$$\delta_t = r_t + \gamma V(s_{t+1}; \theta_{\mathbf{V}}^-) - V(s_t; \theta_{\mathbf{V}}). \quad (10)$$

### C. Learning Algorithm

Based on the QPMIX architecture introduced above, we propose a training framework for addressing the DCA problem as illustrated in Fig. 2 (b). During the centralized training phase, the AP computes the reward  $r_t$  according to the reward function after each agent selects an action based on its own historical observation information  $\tau_t^i$ . Then, each agent records its own historical observation  $\tau_t^i$  and action  $a_t^i$ , and uploads

these recorded values  $\tau_t^i, a_t^i$  to the AP every  $N_c$  time steps, where  $N_c$  represents the networks update interval. The AP concatenates these into vectors  $\tau_t$  and  $\mathbf{a}_t$ . As the AP can determine the elapsed time since the last successful packet transmission from each STA, it computes  $D_t^i, \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$ , thereby obtaining global state  $s_t$ . Consequently, the AP maintains a replay buffer that consists of  $(\tau_t, s_t, \mathbf{a}_t, r_t, \tau_{t+1}, s_{t+1})$ , and samples experiences from the replay buffer to compute gradients of each agent network and mixing network parameters by computing the loss function in (5). As a result, the AP updates the mixing network model and offloads the gradients to each STA to update their the models. The AP also maintains a network update counter  $C_t$  to track the number of updates. Whenever  $C_t \bmod N_t == 0$ , the target network parameters  $\theta_{\text{tot}}^-$  and  $\theta_{\mathbf{V}}^-$  are copied as  $\theta_{\text{tot}}$  and  $\theta_{\mathbf{V}}$ , respectively, where  $N_t$  is the target networks update interval. During the decentralized execution phase, each STA independently decides when to access the channel based on its own observation history. The training procedure of the proposed QPMIX algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 1.

### IV. HETEROGENEOUS MARL CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

In this section, we provide a theoretical analysis of the proposed QPMIX algorithm. Specifically, we prove the convergence of the QPMIX algorithm when using the linear value function approximation. We focus on the cooperative task setting, where agents are trained to maximize the joint expected return. For simplicity, we assume that the global states are fully observable and the rewards are identical for all agents. The policy-based agent employs an actor-critic algorithm, so both the value-based agents and the policy-based agents need to estimate the joint-action value function  $Q(\cdot, \cdot; \omega): \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The Q-function of value-based agent  $l$  is approximated by a linear function  $Q^l(s, \mathbf{a}; \omega^l), \omega^l \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , and  $l \in \mathcal{N}_1$ , where  $s \in \mathcal{S}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}$  are the global state and joint action, respectively. Moreover, for a policy-based agent, both its critic and actor networks are represented by linear functions, denoted respectively as  $Q^j(s, \mathbf{a}; \omega^j)$ , with  $\omega^j \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , and  $\pi_p^j(s, a^j; \theta^j)$  with  $\theta^j \in \mathbb{R}^M$ , where  $j \in \mathcal{N}_2$ . Before proceeding

**Algorithm 1: QPMIX Algorithm**


---

**Initialization:**  $\epsilon, N_c, N_t, T, t = 0, C_t = 0, s = s_0,$   
 $\theta_{\text{tot}}^- = \theta_{\text{tot}}, \theta_V^- = \theta_V,$   
 $\theta_{\text{a,old}}^j = \theta_{\text{a}}^j, \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_2, \tau_0^i = \tau_0, \forall i \in \mathcal{N}.$

**while**  $t < T$  **do**

**for** Agent  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  **do**

**if** Channel is idle **then**

Agent  $i$  obtains  $\tau_t^i$  from  $\tau_{t-1}^i, a_{t-1}^i.$

**if** Agent is value-based **then**

Value-based agent chooses an action by  $\epsilon$ -greedy policy.

**else**

Policy-based agent chooses an action by policy  $\pi^i.$

**else**

**if**  $a_{t-1}^i$  is the Transmit action **then**

**if** Agent  $i$  does not finish transmission **then**

Agent  $i$  transmits.

**else**

Agent  $i$  waits.

**else**

Agent  $i$  waits.

Update the channel state, reward  $r_t$ , and the global state  $s_{t+1}$  based on joint action  $\mathbf{a}_t.$

Store  $(\tau_t, s_t, \mathbf{a}_t, r_t, \tau_{t+1}, s_{t+1})$  to replay buffer.

**if**  $t \bmod N_c == 0$  **then**

Sample experiences from replay buffer and compute (5).

Update  $\theta_{\text{tot}}, \theta_V,$  and  $\theta_{\text{a}}^j, \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_2$  by gradient descent.

$C_t \leftarrow C_t + 1, \tau_t \leftarrow \tau_{t+1}, s_t \leftarrow s_{t+1},$   
 $\theta_{\text{a,old}}^j \leftarrow \theta_{\text{a}}^j, \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_2.$

**if**  $C_t \bmod N_t == 0$  **then**

$\theta_{\text{tot}}^- \leftarrow \theta_{\text{tot}}, \theta_V^- \leftarrow \theta_V.$

---

to demonstrate the convergence of heterogeneous MARL, we make the following assumptions.

**Assumption 1.** The Q-function is defined as a linear function,  $Q(s, \mathbf{a}; \omega) = \omega^\top \phi(s, \mathbf{a})$ , where  $\phi(s, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathbb{R}^K$  represents the feature vector of the  $(s, \mathbf{a})$  pair and is uniformly bounded for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}$ . Moreover, feature matrix  $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}| \times K}$  has full column rank and reward function  $R(s, \mathbf{a})$  is uniformly bounded for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}$ , where  $|\mathcal{S}|, |\mathcal{A}|$  denote the cardinality of the set  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$ , respectively.

**Assumption 2.** The joint policy of all agents is given by  $\pi_\Theta(s, \mathbf{a}) = \prod_{l \in \mathcal{N}_1} \pi_v^l(s, \mathbf{a}^l; \omega^l) \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_2} \pi_p^j(s, \mathbf{a}^j; \theta^j)$ , where  $\pi_p^j(s, \mathbf{a}^j; \theta^j)$  is continuously differentiable with respect to the parameter  $\theta^j$ , and  $\pi_v^l(s, \mathbf{a}^l; \omega^l)$  is the  $\epsilon$ -greedy policy of value-based agent  $l$  derived by its Q-function. Suppose  $P^\Theta$  is the Markov transition probability matrix derived from the policy  $\Theta$ . Then for any state  $s_t, s_{t+1} \in \mathcal{S}$  we have:

$$P^\Theta(s_{t+1}|s_t) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}_t \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_\Theta(s_t, \mathbf{a}_t) P(s_{t+1}|s_t, \mathbf{a}_t), \quad (11)$$

where  $P(s_{t+1}|s_t, \mathbf{a}_t)$  is the state transition probability of the

MDP. Furthermore, we assume that Markov chain  $\{s_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is irreducible and aperiodic under any joint policy  $\pi_\Theta$ , with its stationary distribution denoted by  $d_\Theta(s)$  [34].

**Assumption 3.** The step size of the Q-function update for the value-based agent and the policy-based agent, denoted by  $\beta_{\omega,t}$ , and the step size of the actor network update for the policy-based agent, denoted by  $\beta_{\theta,t}$ , satisfy the following conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_t \beta_{\omega,t} &= \infty, \sum_t \beta_{\theta,t} = \infty, \sum_t \beta_{\omega,t}^2 < \infty, \\ \sum_t \beta_{\theta,t}^2 < \infty, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{\theta,t}}{\beta_{\omega,t}} &\rightarrow 0, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{\omega,t+1}}{\beta_{\omega,t}} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

*Remark 1.* Assumption 3 is to ensure that the update of the Q-function occurs much faster than that of the actor, thus enabling us to utilize the two-time-scale stochastic approximation theorem [35].

To analyze the progressive behavior of agents, the heterogeneous MARL algorithm is divided into two steps: the Q-function update step for both value-based and policy-based agents, and the actor update step for policy-based agents. In the Q-function update step, each agent performs an update based on TD learning to estimate  $Q(\cdot, \cdot; \omega^i)$ . For simplicity, we use  $Q_t^i(\omega_t^i)$  to represent  $Q^i(s_t, \mathbf{a}_t; \omega_t^i)$ . The iteration proceeds as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \omega_{t+1}^i = \omega_t^i + \beta_{\omega,t} \cdot \hat{\delta}_t^i \cdot \nabla_{\omega} Q_t^i(\omega_t^i), \\ \hat{\delta}_t^i = r_t + N^{-1} \sum_k c_t(i, k) [\gamma Q_{t+1}^k(\omega_{t+1}^k) - Q_t^k(\omega_t^k)], \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where  $\beta_{\omega,t} > 0$  is the step size, and  $c_t(i, k)$  is the weight of the TD-error information transmitted from agent  $k$  to the agent  $i$  at time  $t$ . The weight matrix  $C_t = [c_t(i, k)] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  is assumed to be column stochastic, i.e.,  $\mathbf{1}^\top C_t = \mathbf{1}$ , where  $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is a vector with all elements equal to one. In fact, when we take the partial derivative of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Qtot}}$  with respect to the individual Q-function parameter of agent  $i$  in (6),  $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{Qtot}}}{\partial Q^i}$  contains a weighted sum over the Q-values of all agents. Hence, minimizing  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Qtot}}$  aligns with the operation in (13).

As for the actor update step, each policy-based agent  $j$  improves its policy using policy gradient

$$\begin{cases} \theta_{t+1}^j = \theta_t^j + \beta_{\theta,t} \cdot A_t^j \cdot \nabla_{\theta^j} \log \pi^j(\theta^j), \\ A_t^j = Q_t^j(\omega_t^j) - \sum_{\mathbf{a}^j \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_t^j(s_t, \mathbf{a}^j; \theta_t^j) \cdot Q_t^j(s_t, \mathbf{a}^j, \mathbf{a}^{-j}; \omega_t^j), \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where  $\beta_{\theta,t} > 0$  is the step size. Please note that the process of updating the PPO model parameters using the loss function in (7), along with the advantage function defined in (9), represents a variation of the policy update method and the advantage function used in the original policy gradient algorithm in (14).

Next we utilize the two-time-scale stochastic approximation technique [36] to analyze the convergence of  $\omega_t^i$  in (13) and  $\theta_t^j$  in (14). Assume that the policy of the value-based agent is periodically derived from its Q-function. Specifically, the Q-function parameters in (13) are periodically duplicated, and the policy is determined using  $\epsilon$ -greedy based on this copied Q-function. Consequently, the policy update of the value-based agent is slower than the Q-function update. Furthermore, given that the policy updates of policy-based agents are also considerably slower compared to the updates of the Q-function

under Assumption 3, the joint policy  $\pi_\Theta$  update can be considered static relative to the Q-function. As a result, the general idea of the proof is to establish the convergence of  $\omega_t^i$  at a faster time scale, during which  $\theta_t^j$  can be regarded as fixed, and subsequently demonstrate the gradual convergence of  $\theta_t^j$ , inspired by [37]. This ensures the eventual convergence of both Q-functions and actors.

**Theorem 1.** *Under Assumptions 1-3, we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_t^i = \omega_\Theta, \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$  almost surely (a.s., i.e., convergence with probability 1), for any given joint policy parameters  $\Theta$ .  $\omega_\Theta$  is the unique solution to*

$$\Phi^\top D_\Theta [R + (\gamma P^\pi - I) \Phi \omega_\Theta] = 0, \quad (15)$$

where  $D_\Theta = \text{diag}[d_\Theta(s)\pi_\Theta(s, \mathbf{a}), s \in \mathcal{S}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$  is a diagonal matrix, and  $d_\Theta(s)\pi_\Theta(s, \mathbf{a})$  is an element on the diagonal.  $I \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$  is the identity matrix,  $R$  is short for reward function  $[R(s, \mathbf{a}), s \in \mathcal{S}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$ , and  $P^\pi$  is short for  $P^\pi(s_{t+1}, \mathbf{a}_{t+1} | s_t, \mathbf{a}_t) = P(s_{t+1} | s_t, \mathbf{a}_t)\pi_\Theta(s_{t+1}, \mathbf{a}_{t+1})$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix A.

**Remark 2.** Theorem 1 ensures that the parameters of Q-function  $\omega^i$  for each agent, including both value-based and policy-based agents, will converge to the same point over time a.s. with the sequence  $\omega_t^i$  generated from (13), for a given joint policy.

**Theorem 2.** *Under Assumptions 1-3,  $\theta_t^j$  converges a.s. to a point in the set of the asymptotically stable equilibria of*

$$\dot{\theta}^j = \lim_{0 < \eta \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \Gamma^j [\theta^j + \eta \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim d_\Theta, \mathbf{a}_t \sim \pi_\Theta} (A_{t,\theta}^j \cdot \psi_t^j)] - \theta^j \right\} / \eta, \quad (16)$$

where  $\Gamma^j(\cdot)$  is a projection function,  $\psi_t^j = \nabla_{\theta^j} \log \pi^j(\theta_t^j)$ , and  $A_{t,\theta}^j$  is the advantage function when  $\omega_t^j$  converges to  $\omega_\Theta$ , i.e.,  $A_{t,\theta}^j = Q^j(\omega_\Theta) - \sum_{\mathbf{a}^j \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_t^j(s_t, \mathbf{a}_t^j; \theta_t^j) \cdot Q_t^j(s_t, \mathbf{a}_t^j, \mathbf{a}_t^{-j}; \omega_\Theta)$

*Proof.* See Appendix C.

**Remark 3.** Theorem 2 states that as the Q-function of each agent converges, the advantage function computed by the policy-based agent also converges, which allows  $\theta_t^j$  for  $j \in \mathcal{N}_2$  to gradually approach a stationary point of the ordinary differential equation in (16). Since all agents receive the same reward and each Q-function estimates the value for the global state and joint actions, both value-based and policy-based agents update their policies in a manner that maximizes the Q-function. Combining Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, we establish the convergence of the QPMIX algorithm.

## V. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

This section provides simulation results of the proposed QPMIX algorithm in different scenarios, including saturated traffic, unsaturated traffic and delay-sensitive traffic scenarios. We use the throughput, mean delay, delay jitter and collision rate metrics to evaluate the performance of the proposed QPMIX algorithm as characterized as follows.

- **Throughput:** Throughput is defined as the proportion of the successful transmission slots to the total time slots.

TABLE I  
SIMULATION PARAMETERS OF EDCA

Parameters	AC_VO	AV_VI	AC_BE
Time Slot ( $\mu s$ )	9		
Short Interframe Space ( $\mu s$ )	18		
Distributed Interframe Space ( $\mu s$ )	36		
Packet Length ( $\mu s$ )	1080		
CW <sub>min</sub>	7	15	31
CW <sub>max</sub>	15	31	1023

TABLE II  
HYPER-PARAMETERS OF QPMIX

Parameters	value
Agent update interval $N_c$	10
Target network update interval $N_t$	1000
Replay buffer size	500
DQN batch size	32
Discount factor $\gamma$	0.5
Range of $\epsilon$	1 to 0.01
Decay rate of $\epsilon$	0.998
DQN and mixing network learning rate	$5 \times 10^{-4}$
PPO learning rate	$1 \times 10^{-5}$
Neurons of DQN agent Q-network	250, 120, 120
Neurons of PPO agent critic	250, 120, 120
Neurons of PPO agent actor	250, 120, 120
Neurons of mixing network	16

- **Real-time throughput:** Real-time throughput is the instantaneous throughput at time slot  $t$ , calculated as the ratio of the successful transmission slots over the past 0.5 s.
- **Mean delay:** Delay of a packet is defined as the number of time slots from its generation to successful transmission, and mean delay is the average delay of all successfully transmitted packets.
- **Delay jitter:** Delay jitter is defined as the variance of delay of all successfully transmitted packets.
- **Collision rate:** Collision rate is defined as the proportion of packets that collide relative to all packets sent.

### A. Simulation Setup

1) **Simulation Scenario:** We consider a channel access scenario for a Wi-Fi BSS, as shown in Fig. 1. Each STA is equipped with a packet buffer of length 10, operating on a first-in, first-out basis. Both saturated traffic and unsaturated traffic scenarios are considered, where packets arrive following Poisson distribution and the arrival rates are  $\lambda_1 = 2000/s$  and  $\lambda_2 = 400/s$ , respectively. In addition, we also consider a delay-sensitive traffic scenario, where packets are generated periodically with a generation period of  $T = 5$  ms.

2) **Benchmarks:** We compare the proposed QPMIX algorithm with the QLBT algorithm [25] and the conventional Wi-Fi enhanced distributed channel access (EDCA) methods. EDCA includes different access categories (ACs), such as AC voice (AC\_VO), AC video (AC\_VI) and AC best effort (AC\_BE), each with distinct channel access parameters. The detailed parameters are shown in Table I.

3) **Parameters of QPMIX:** The rectified linear unit (ReLU) is used as the activation function for each layer of neurons, except for the last layer in DQN agents. Similarly, for PPO agents, ReLU is used for all neuron layers, except the last layer, which utilizes a softmax function to generate the probability distribution of actions. The RMSProp optimizer






Fig. 3. Performance comparison under saturated Poisson traffic. For QPMIX, the even number in network size axis indicates the same number of the DQN and PPO STAs, while the odd number indicates one more DQN than PPO STAs.

is employed to update the network parameters. Note that the learning rate for DQN agents is set to  $5 \times 10^{-4}$ , significantly higher than that of PPO agents,  $1 \times 10^{-5}$ . This setting is to ensure maximum compliance with Assumption 3. The hyperparameters of the QPMIX algorithm are shown in Table II.

### B. Scenario I: Saturated Traffic

Fig. 3 shows the throughput, mean delay, delay jitter and collision rate performance of the proposed QPMIX algorithm as compared against the benchmarks. From Fig. 3 (a), as the number of STAs increases, the throughputs drop for all EDCA ACs, QLBT [25], and the proposed QPMIX algorithm. This reduction is due to the increased collision rate as the number of STAs increases, as shown in Fig. 3 (d). Notably, the proposed algorithm achieves similar performance to the QLBT algorithm, as QLBT is actually a special case of the QPMIX framework, i.e., only the DQN agents are involved. When the number of the STAs increases, the collision rate of the QPMIX algorithm is significantly lower than that of the EDCA ACs. Specifically, the collision rate of the QPMIX algorithm is reduced by 50% compared to that of AC\_BE (the best in the EDCA categories) in the 9-STA case. We also observe from Fig. 3 (b) and 3 (c) that the proposed QPMIX algorithm achieves lower mean delay and delay jitter, which becomes increasingly apparent as the number of STAs increases.

### C. Scenario II: Unsaturated Traffic

In this subsection, we evaluate the robustness of the proposed QPMIX by training in a saturated traffic scenario and testing in an unsaturated traffic scenario. We consider a




Fig. 4. Delay CDF comparison between QPMIX and AC\_BE under unsaturated traffic scenario.

network comprising four STAs, each with an identical packet arrival rate following a Poisson distribution of  $\lambda = 400/s$ . We plot in Fig. 4 the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the delay experienced by each STA when using QPMIX and AC\_BE, which achieves the best performance for Poisson traffic among different EDCA ACs as demonstrated in Section V-B. As illustrated in Fig. 4, the delay upper bound for QPMIX is only 0.042 s, which is significantly lower than the delay upper bound of 0.12 s for AC\_BE. Moreover, the CDF curves for the QPMIX algorithm are notably steeper and more concentrated than those of AC\_BE, indicating that the QPMIX algorithm achieves lower mean delay and delay jitter. Therefore, we conclude that the QPMIX algorithm outperforms the traditional EDCA method in terms of the delay performance, even when the traffic density in the testing phase differs from that of the training.






Fig. 5. Delay CDF comparison between QPMIX and AC\_VO under delay-sensitive traffic.

#### D. Scenario III: Delay-Sensitive Traffic

Fig. 5 shows the delay performance of nine STAs for delay-sensitive periodic traffic when using QPMIX and AC\_VO. The packet generation period is set to 5 ms and the model is trained using the saturated Poisson traffic for robustness evaluation. It can be observed that the delay upper bounds of the QPMIX algorithm and AC\_VO are 0.15 s and 0.45 s, respectively, indicating that the QPMIX algorithm has a lower mean delay. Furthermore, the CDF curves for DQN and PPO agents are more concentrated than those of AC\_VO, suggesting that the trained agents outperform traditional random access methods. The evaluation of both the unsaturated and delay-sensitive traffic scenarios demonstrates that the proposed QPMIX algorithm maintains its effectiveness across various scenarios, even when the training and testing conditions are different.

#### E. Scenario IV: Different Mixing of Valued- and Policy-based Agents


In this subsection, we evaluate the performance for different mixing of DQN and PPO agents to assess the adaptability of the proposed algorithm in heterogeneous MARL, where the numbers of DQN and PPO agents differ. Fig. 6 shows the real-time throughput during the training phase for two distinct asymmetric agents configurations under saturated traffic: three DQN agents with one PPO agent, and one DQN agent with three PPO agents. From the figure, despite the disparity in the numbers of DQN and PPO STAs within the network, the throughput of each STA remains nearly identical. As the time approaches approximately 25 s, the total throughput stabilizes at around 98%. This observation indicates that the QPMIX algorithm is capable of training agents to cooperate fairly in different combinations of DQN and PPO agents.

#### F. Independent learning and Convergence


We conduct an experiment involving independent learning to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed QPMIX framework. Independent learning follows a distributed training with distributed execution paradigm, where agents train their own networks based solely on their own experience, with no information interaction among them. This means that there is no mixing network for training in Fig. 2 (b). The reward

function and agent networks are the same as the design in QPMIX. Fig. 7 illustrates the real-time throughput and the average reward over the past 500 time steps during training of both the QPMIX algorithm and independent learning under saturated traffic in the 4-STA and 5-STA cases. Independent DQN and independent PPO are marked as IDQN and IPPO, respectively. From Fig. 7 (a) and 7 (b), the total throughput of the QPMIX algorithm can reach approximately 100% as training progresses while ensuring the fairness among all agents. In contrast, for the independent learning method, the total throughput increases at the beginning of training due to the exploratory behaviors of the agents. However, the agents eventually converge to a waiting strategy, causing a steady decline in the throughput performance.

We further present in Fig. 7 (c) and 7 (d) the rewards of the proposed QPMIX algorithm and the independent learning approach as training progresses. The upper part and lower part of each subplot correspond to QPMIX and independent learning, respectively. Due to the exploration behaviors of the agents during the early stages of training, which causes the reward values to oscillate between 1 and -1, we average every 500 reward values for the ease of exposition. From Fig. 7 (c) and 7 (d), the average rewards of the QPMIX algorithm improve as training progresses, demonstrating the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm. The performance gradually converges at approximately 25 s for four STAs and 30 s for five STAs. The extended training time for five STAs compared to four is due to the additional time required for agents to explore and learn effective collaboration strategies. However, the average rewards of the independent learning approach converge to zero, indicating that the agents have converged to the Wait action. Since the policies of other agents change over time, the environment is non-stationary for the independent learners, making it challenging to cooperate with one another, leading to the suboptimal solution. The QPMIX algorithm incorporates a mixing network that implicitly shares global information among agents, facilitating collaborative behaviors and enhancing overall performance. Although the proposed QPMIX algorithm increases the training time compared with the CSMA/CA mechanism, the improvements in throughput, mean delay, delay jitter and collision rate make it a compelling alternative. The additional training time is acceptable, especially considering that the advancements in



(a) QPMIX with 3 DQN and 1 PPO



(b) QPMIX with 1 DQN and 3 PPO

Fig. 6. Real-throughput comparison in the asymmetric networks.









(a) Real-time throughput when  $N = 4$ .(b) Real-time throughput when  $N = 5$ .(c) Average reward when  $N = 4$ .(d) Average reward when  $N = 5$ .

Fig. 7. Real-time throughput and average reward comparison between the QPMIX and independent learning when STAs number is 4 and 5. The upper part and lower part of each subplot are the QPMIX and independent learning, respectively.

AI technology allow for the utilization of pre-trained models, which can significantly accelerate the training through online fine-tuning. In summary, the proposed QPMIX algorithm not only encourages cooperative behaviors among value-based and policy-based agents, but also prevents converging to local suboptimal solutions.

## VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we have introduced a distributed channel access scheme based on heterogeneous MARL for next-generation WLANs. We have proposed a novel training framework, named QPMIX, which adopts a CTDE paradigm to address the challenges inherent in heterogeneous MARL. Additionally, we have established that heterogeneous MARL can ensure convergence when employing the linear value function approximation. Simulation results indicated that QPMIX outperforms CSMA/CA in throughput, mean delay, delay jitter, and collision rates performance. Furthermore, it exhibits robustness in both unsaturated and delay-sensitive traffic scenarios, even when trained in saturated traffic conditions. Moreover, QPMIX is effective in encouraging the cooperation among the heterogeneous agents, compared to independent learning. Future work will explore the extension of the proposed QPMIX framework to scenarios with overlapping BSSs.

### APPENDIX A

#### PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Two projection operators  $\mathcal{J} : \mathbb{R}^{KN} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{KN}$  and  $\mathcal{J}_\perp : \mathbb{R}^{KN} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{KN}$  are defined to project the parameter  $\omega_t$  to the consensus subspace and the disagreement subspace, where  $\omega_t = [(\omega_t^1)^\top, \dots, (\omega_t^N)^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{KN}$ . Specifically, the projection operation  $\mathcal{J}$  and  $\mathcal{J}_\perp$  are defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{J}\omega = \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{\omega}, \\ \mathcal{J}_\perp\omega = \omega - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{\omega} = \omega_\perp, \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where  $\otimes$  denotes the Kronecker product,  $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is a vector with all elements equal to one, and  $\bar{\omega} = N^{-1} \sum_i \omega_t^i$ . The concrete proof process is divided into two steps. First, we prove that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_{\perp,t} = 0$ , which means  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_t^i = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\omega}_t$ . Then, we demonstrate the convergence of the consensus subspace of the agents, which implies  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\omega}_t = \omega_\Theta$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Under Assumptions 1-3, the parameters of the Q-function  $\omega_t$  are stable, i.e.,  $\sup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\omega_t\| < \infty$ .*

**Lemma 2.** *Under Assumptions 1-3 and Lemma 1, for any  $M > 0$ , we have*

$$\sup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(\|\beta_{\omega,t}^{-1} \omega_{\perp,t}\|^2 \mathbb{I}_{\{\sup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\omega_t\| \leq M\}}) < \infty, \quad (18)$$

where  $\mathbb{I}_{\{\cdot\}}$  is the indicator function.

**Step 1. Convergence of  $\omega_{\perp,t}$   $\xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ .**

Under Lemma 2 and Assumption 3, for any  $M > 0$ , there exists a constant  $G_1$  such that

$$\sum_t \mathbb{E}(\|\omega_{\perp,t}\|^2 \mathbb{I}_{\{\sup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\omega_t\| \leq M\}}) < G_1 \cdot \sum_t \beta_{\omega,t}^2 < \infty, \quad (19)$$

which implies  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_{\perp,t} \stackrel{\mathbb{P}}{\mathbb{I}_{\{\sup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\omega_t\| \leq M\}}} = 0$ . According to Lemma 1,  $\{\sup_t \|\omega_t\| < \infty\}$  holds a.s, which means  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_{\perp,t} = 0$ .

**Step 2. Convergence of  $\bar{\omega}_t \xrightarrow{a.s.} \omega_\Theta$ .**

The update of  $\omega_t^i$  in (13) can be rewrite in a compact form as

$$\begin{cases} \omega_{t+1} = \omega_t + \beta_{\omega,t} \cdot y_{t+1}, \\ y_{t+1} = (\hat{\delta}_t^1 \phi_t^\top, \dots, \hat{\delta}_t^N \phi_t^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{KN}. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Projecting  $\omega_t$  into the consensus subspace, the iteration of  $\bar{\omega}_t$  has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\omega}_{t+1} &= \bar{\omega}_t + \beta_{\omega,t} (\bar{y}_{t+1} + \beta_{\omega,t}^{-1} \bar{\omega}_{\perp,t}), \\ &= \bar{\omega}_t + \beta_{\omega,t} \cdot \mathbb{E}(\bar{\delta}_t \phi_t | \mathcal{F}_{t,1}) + \beta_{\omega,t} \cdot \xi_{t+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_{t,1} = \sigma(r_t, s_t, a_t, \omega_t; t \leq t)$  is an increasing  $\sigma$ -algebra over time  $t$  and  $\xi_{t+1} = (\bar{y}_{t+1} + \beta_{\omega,t}^{-1} \bar{\omega}_{\perp,t}) - \mathbb{E}(\bar{\delta}_t \phi_t | \mathcal{F}_{t,1})$  is a martingale difference sequence since

$$\mathbb{E}[(\bar{y}_{t+1} + \beta_{\omega,t}^{-1} \bar{\omega}_{\perp,t}) | \mathcal{F}_{t,1}] = \mathbb{E}(\bar{y}_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_{t,1}) = \mathbb{E}(\bar{\delta}_t \phi_t | \mathcal{F}_{t,1}). \quad (22)$$

(21) is a  $K$ -dimensional stochastic approximation iteration, which we can verify as satisfying the following lemmas.

**Lemma 3.**  *$\mathbb{E}(\bar{\delta}_t \phi_t | \mathcal{F}_{t,1})$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $\bar{\omega}_t$ .*

**Lemma 4.** *The martingale difference sequence  $\xi_{t+1}$  satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_{t+1}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq G_2(1 + \|\bar{\omega}_t\|^2)$  for some constant  $G_2$ .*

The proof of Lemma 1-4 will be given in Appendix B.

Under Assumptions 1-3, Lemmas 1, 3 and 4, according to conclusion of Borkar et al. [36] and Theorem D.2 in [37], the behavior of (21) is related to its corresponding ordinary differential equation (ODE):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\bar{\omega}} &= \sum_s \sum_a d_\Theta(s) \pi_\Theta(s, \mathbf{a}) \mathbb{E}[\bar{\delta} \phi | \mathcal{F}_{t,1}] \\ &= \sum_s \sum_a d_\Theta(s) \pi_\Theta(s, \mathbf{a}) \mathbb{E}[(r_t + (\gamma \phi_{t+1} - \phi_t) \bar{\omega}_t) \phi | \mathcal{F}_{t,1}] \\ &= \Phi^\top D_\Theta [R + (\gamma P^\pi - I) \Phi \bar{\omega}]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Note that  $P^\pi$  has a simple eigenvalue of 1 and its remaining eigenvalues have real parts less than 1 by the Perron-Frobenius theorem and Assumption 2 [37], [38]. Hence, all the real parts of the eigenvalues of  $(\gamma P^\pi - I)$  are negative, as are those of  $\Phi^\top D_\Theta (\gamma P^\pi - I) \Phi$  since  $\Phi$  is assumed to be full column rank. Therefore, the ODE achieves global asymptotic stability, and its equilibrium point  $\bar{\omega}$  fulfills

$$\Phi^\top D_\Theta [R + (\gamma P^\pi - I) \Phi \bar{\omega}] = 0. \quad (24)$$

This concludes the convergence of  $\bar{\omega}_t \xrightarrow{a.s.} \omega_\Theta$ . With step 1 and 2 established, Theorem 1 is proven.

### APPENDIX B

#### PROOF OF LEMMAS 1-4

##### A. Proof of Lemma 1

Since  $\omega_{t+1}^i = \omega_t^i + \beta_{\omega,t} \cdot \hat{\delta}_t^i \cdot \nabla_\omega Q_t^i(\omega_t^i)$  and  $Q_t^i(\omega_t^i) = \phi(s, \mathbf{a})^\top \omega_t^i$ , we have

$$\omega_{t+1}^i = \omega_t^i + \beta_{\omega,t} \cdot \hat{\delta}_t^i \cdot \phi(s, \mathbf{a}) = \omega_t^i + \beta_{\omega,t} \cdot h(\omega_t). \quad (25)$$

We define  $\dot{x}(t) = h_r(x(t)) = h(rx(t))/r$ , so the ODE for  $\omega_t^i$  is  $\dot{\omega}_t^i = h_r(\omega(t)) = \hat{\delta}_t^i \phi(s, \mathbf{a})$ . Because

$$\begin{aligned} h_\infty(\omega(t)) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} h_r(\omega(t)) \\ &= N^{-1}[(\gamma\phi_{t+1} - \phi_t)^\top \sum_k c_t(i, k)\omega_t^k] \phi_t^\top, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

the origin of  $\omega(t)$  is an asymptotically stable equilibrium for the ODE. Thus, under Theorem 2.1 in [35], the Lemma 1 holds.

### B. Proof of Lemma 2

The iteration of the disagreement subspace is

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{\perp, t+1} &= (I - \mathcal{J})\omega_{t+1} = (I - \mathcal{J})(\omega_t + \beta_{\omega, t}y_t) \\ &= (I - \mathcal{J})\left[(\mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{\omega}_t + \omega_{\perp, t} + \beta_{\omega, t}y_t)\right] \\ &= (I - \mathcal{J})\left[(\omega_{\perp, t} + \beta_{\omega, t}y_t)\right] \\ &= \left[\left((I - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top/N) \otimes I\right)(\omega_{\perp, t} + \beta_{\omega, t}y_t)\right], \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where  $I \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ . Because of the fact that  $(A \otimes B)^\top = A^\top \otimes B^\top$  and  $(A \otimes B)(C \otimes D) = (AC) \otimes (BD)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\|\beta_{\omega, t+1}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t+1}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1}\right] &= \frac{\beta_{\omega, t}^2}{\beta_{\omega, t+1}^2} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t} + y_t\right)^\top \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left((I - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top/N) \otimes I\right) \left(\beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t} + y_t\right) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1}\right] \\ &\leq \frac{\beta_{\omega, t}^2}{\beta_{\omega, t+1}^2} \rho \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t} + y_t\right)^\top \left(\beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t} + y_t\right) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1}\right] \\ &= \frac{\beta_{\omega, t}^2}{\beta_{\omega, t+1}^2} \rho \left( \|\beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t}\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t}, y_t \rangle \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1}\right] + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathbb{E}\left[\|y_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1}\right] \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\beta_{\omega, t}^2}{\beta_{\omega, t+1}^2} \rho \left( \|\beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t}\|^2 + 2\|\beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t}\| \left[\mathbb{E}\left[\|y_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1}\right]\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathbb{E}\left[\|y_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1}\right] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where  $\rho = 1$  is the spectral norm of  $((I - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top/N) \otimes I)$  because the maximum eigenvalue of  $(I - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top/N)$  is 1, and  $\|A \otimes B\|_2 = \|A\|_2 \cdot \|B\|_2$ . Since the rewards  $r_t$  and the feature  $\phi_t$  are uniformly bounded,  $\mathbb{E}\left[\|y_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1}\right]$  is bounded. Let  $v_t = \|\beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t}\|^2 \mathbb{I}_{\{\sup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\omega_t\| \leq M\}}$ . Since  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \beta_{\omega, t+1}\beta_{\omega, t}^{-1} = 1$ , there exists a large enough  $t_0$  such that for any  $t > t_0$ ,  $\frac{\beta_{\omega, t}^2}{\beta_{\omega, t+1}^2} \leq 1 + \mu$ , where  $\mu > 0$ . Hence, there exists a positive constant  $H$  such that for any  $t > t_0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(v_{t+1}) &\leq (1 + \mu) \left[ \mathbb{E}(\mu_t + 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(v_t) \cdot H} + H) \right] \\ &= (1 + \mu) \left[ \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(v_t)} + \sqrt{H} \right]^2 \\ &\leq 2(1 + \mu)(\mathbb{E}(v_t) + H). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

By induction, we can obtain that  $\mathbb{E}(v_{t+1}) \leq [2(1 + \mu)]^{t-t_0} (\mathbb{E}(v_{t_0}) + H)$ . Therefore, we obtain  $\sup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left(\|\beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t}\|^2 \mathbb{I}_{\{\sup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\omega_t\| \leq M\}}\right) < \infty$ , which concludes the proof.

### C. Proof of Lemma 3

Lemma 3 holds evidently because

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\delta}_t &= N^{-1} \sum_i \left[ r_t + N^{-1} \sum_k c_t(i, k)(\gamma\phi_{t+1} - \phi_t)^\top \omega_t^k \right] \\ &= r_t + (\gamma\phi_{t+1} - \phi_t)^\top N^{-2} \sum_k \omega_t^k \sum_i c_t(i, k) \\ &= r_t + (\gamma\phi_{t+1} - \phi_t)^\top N^{-2} \sum_k \omega_t^k \\ &= r_t + N^{-1}(\gamma\phi_{t+1} - \phi_t)^\top \bar{\omega}_t. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

### D. Proof of Lemma 4

Since  $\xi_{t+1} = (\bar{y}_{t+1} + \beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\bar{\omega}_{\perp, t}) - \mathbb{E}(\bar{\delta}_t \phi_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\|\xi_{t+1}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t\right] &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[\|\bar{y}_{t+1} + \beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\bar{\omega}_{\perp, t}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t\right] \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}\left[\|\bar{\delta}_t \phi_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1}\right]\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Because of the fact that  $(A \otimes B)^\top = A^\top \otimes B^\top$ , we then have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\bar{y}_t + \beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\bar{\omega}_{\perp, t}\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} [(\mathbf{1}^\top \otimes I)(y_t + \beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t})]^\top [(\mathbf{1}^\top \otimes I)(y_t + \beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t})] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} [(y_t + \beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t})^\top (\mathbf{1} \otimes I)(\mathbf{1}^\top \otimes I)(y_t + \beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t})] \\ &= \|(y_t + \beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t})\|_{G_t}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where  $G_t = \frac{1}{N^2}(\mathbf{1} \otimes I)(\mathbf{1}^\top \otimes I)$ . Under Lemma 1, the first term of (31) can be bounded over the set  $\{\sup_t \|\omega_t\| < K_1\}$ , for a constant  $K_1 > 0$ . Therefore, there exists  $K_2, K_3 < \infty$  that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left(\|y_{t+1} + \beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t}\|_{G_t}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1}\right) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{\sup_t \|z_t\| \leq K_1\}} \\ &\leq K_2 \mathbb{E}\left(\|y_{t+1}\|^2 + \|\beta_{\omega, t}^{-1}\omega_{\perp, t}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1}\right) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{\sup_t \|z_t\| \leq K_1\}} \\ &< K_3. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Moreover, under Lemma 3, there exists  $K_4 < \infty$  that

$$\|\mathbb{E}(\bar{\delta}_t \phi_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,1})\|^2 \leq K_4(1 + \|\bar{\omega}_t\|^2). \quad (34)$$

By applying (33) and (34) into (31), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\xi_{t+1}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t\right] \leq G_2(1 + \|\bar{\omega}_t\|^2). \quad (35)$$

This completes the proof.

## APPENDIX C PROOF OF THEOREM 2

Since the Q-functions converge under Theorem 1, the proof of Theorem 2 is the same as the techniques from Appendix B in [37]. We first define

$$\zeta_{t+1,1}^j = A_t^j \cdot \psi_t^j - \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim d_{\theta_t}, a_t^j \sim \pi_{\theta_t}} (A_t^j \cdot \psi_t^j \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,2}) \quad (36)$$

and

$$\zeta_{t+1,2}^j = \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim d_{\theta_t}, a_t^j} [(A_t^j - A_{t,\theta}^j) \psi_t^j \mid \mathcal{F}_{t,2}], \quad (37)$$

where  $A_{t,\theta}^j$  is the advantage function when  $\omega_t^j$  converges to  $\omega_\theta$ , i.e.,  $A_{t,\theta}^j = Q_p^j(\omega_\theta) - \sum_{a^j \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_t^j(s_t, a_t^j; \theta_t^j)$ .



$Q_t^j(s_t, a_t^j, a_t^{-j}; \omega_\Theta)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{t,2} = \sigma(\theta_\tau, \tau \leq t)$  is the  $\sigma$ -field generated by  $\{\theta_\tau, \tau \leq t\}$ . Then the actor update step in (14) with a local can be rewritten as

$$\theta_{t+1}^j = \Gamma^j \left[ \theta_t^j + \beta_{\theta,t} \left( \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim d_{\theta_t}, a_t \sim \pi_{\theta_t}^j} (A_{t,\theta_t}^i \psi_t^j | \mathcal{F}_{t,2}) + \zeta_{t+1,1}^j + \zeta_{t+1,2}^j \right) \right]. \quad (38)$$

Since  $\omega_t^j$  converges to  $\omega_\Theta$  at the faster step, the sequence  $\{\zeta_{t+1,2}^j\}$  converges to zero as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore,  $\{Z_t^j = \sum_{\tau=0}^t \beta_{\theta,\tau} \zeta_{\tau+1,1}^i\}$  is a martingale sequence that satisfies  $\sum_t \mathbb{E}(\|Z_{t+1}^j - Z_t^j\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t,2}) = \sum_{t \geq 1} \|\beta_{\theta,t} \zeta_{t+1,1}^i\|^2 < \infty$  under Assumption 3, which conducts that the martingale sequence  $\{Z_t^j\}$  converges. Thus, for any  $K_5 > 0$ , we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{n \geq t} \left\| \sum_{\tau=t}^n \beta_{\theta,\tau} \zeta_{\tau+1,1}^i \right\| \geq K_5 \right) = 0$ . Moreover,  $\mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim d_{\theta_t}, a_t \sim \pi_{\theta_t}^j} (A_{t,\theta_t}^i \psi_t^j | \mathcal{F}_{t,2})$  is continuous in  $\theta_t^j$  under Assumption 2. Therefore, the update in (14) converges to the set of asymptotically stable equilibria of the ODE (16) under Kushner-Clark lemma [37].

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. Khorov, A. Kiryanov, A. Lyakhov, and G. Bianchi, "A tutorial on IEEE 802.11 ax high efficiency WLANs," *IEEE Commun. Surv.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 197–216, Sep. 2018.
- [2] C. Deng, X. Fang, X. Han, X. Wang, L. Yan, R. He, Y. Long, and Y. Guo, "IEEE 802.11 be Wi-Fi 7: New challenges and opportunities," *IEEE Commun. Surv.*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 2136–2166, Jul. 2020.
- [3] L. Galati-Giordano, G. Geraci, M. Carrascosa, and B. Bellalta, "What will wi-fi 8 be? a primer on ieee 802.11 bn ultra high reliability," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 126–132, Aug. 2024.
- [4] A. Colvin, "CSMA with collision avoidance," *Comput. Commun.*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 227–235, Oct. 1983.
- [5] M. Heusse, F. Rousseau, R. Guillier, and A. Duda, "Idle sense: An optimal access method for high throughput and fairness in rate diverse wireless LANs," in *Proc. Conf. Appl., Technol., Archit., protocols Comput. Commun.*, 2005, pp. 121–132.
- [6] E. Magistretti, K. K. Chintalapudi, B. Radunovic, and R. Ramjee, "WiFinano: Reclaiming WiFi efficiency through 800 ns slots," in *Proc. 17th Annu. Int. Conf. Mobile Comput. Netw.*, Sep. 2011, pp. 37–48.
- [7] J. Barcelo, B. Bellalta, C. Cano, A. Sfairopoulou, M. Oliver, and K. Verma, "Towards a collision-free WLAN: Dynamic parameter adjustment in CSMA/ECCA," *EURASIP J. Wireless Commun. Netw.*, vol. 2011, pp. 1–11, Dec. 2011.
- [8] S. Misra and M. Khatua, "Semi-distributed backoff: Collision-aware migration from random to deterministic backoff," *IEEE Trans. Mob. Comput.*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 1071–1084, May 2015.
- [9] F. Wilhelmli, S. Barrachina-Muñoz, C. Cano, I. Selinis, and B. Bellalta, "Spatial reuse in IEEE 802.11 ax WLANs," *Comput. Commun.*, vol. 170, pp. 65–83, Mar. 2021.
- [10] A. H. Y. Abyaneh, M. Hirzallah, and M. Krunz, "Intelligent-CW: AI-based framework for controlling contention window in WLANs," in *Proc. IEEE DySPAN*, 2019, pp. 1–10.
- [11] M. Herbster and M. K. Warmuth, "Tracking the best expert," *Machine learning*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 151–178, 1998.
- [12] Y. Edalat and K. Obraczka, "Dynamically tuning IEEE 802.11's contention window using machine learning," in *Proc. 22nd Int. ACM Conf. Model. Anal. Simul. Wirel. Mobile Syst. (MSWiM)*, 2019, pp. 19–26.
- [13] L. Liang, H. Ye, G. Yu, and G. Y. Li, "Deep-learning-based wireless resource allocation with application to vehicular networks," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 108, no. 2, pp. 341–356, Feb. 2020.
- [14] Z. Qin, L. Liang, Z. Wang, S. Jin, X. Tao, W. Tong, and G. Y. Li, "AI empowered wireless communications: From bits to semantics," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 112, no. 7, pp. 621–652, Jul. 2024.
- [15] L. Liang, H. Ye, and G. Y. Li, "Spectrum sharing in vehicular networks based on multi-agent reinforcement learning," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 2282–2292, Oct. 2019.
- [16] W. Wydmański and S. Szott, "Contention window optimization in IEEE 802.11 ax networks with deep reinforcement learning," in *Proc. IEEE WCNC*, May 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [17] S. Amuru, Y. Xiao, M. van der Schaar, and R. M. Buehrer, "To send or not to send-learning MAC contention," in *Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM*, Dec. 2015, pp. 1–6.
- [18] Y. Huang and K.-W. Chin, "A hierarchical deep learning approach for optimizing cca threshold and transmit power in wi-fi networks," *IEEE Trans. Cogn. Commun. Netw.*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 1296–1307, Oct. 2023.
- [19] Y. Yu, S. C. Liew, and T. Wang, "Non-uniform time-step deep q-network for carrier-sense multiple access in heterogeneous wireless networks," *IEEE Trans. Mob. Comput.*, vol. 20, no. 9, pp. 2848–2861, Sep. 2020.
- [20] L. Zhang, H. Yin, Z. Zhou, S. Roy, and Y. Sun, "Enhancing WiFi multiple access performance with federated deep reinforcement learning," in *Proc. IEEE VTC-Fall*, Nov. 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [21] V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, A. A. Rusu, J. Veness, M. G. Bellemare, A. Graves, M. Riedmiller, A. K. Fidjeland, G. Ostrovski et al., "Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning," *nature*, vol. 518, no. 7540, pp. 529–533, Feb. 2015.
- [22] Y. Yu, S. C. Liew, and T. Wang, "Multi-agent deep reinforcement learning multiple access for heterogeneous wireless networks with imperfect channels," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 3718–3730, Oct. 2022.
- [23] M. Sohaib, J. Jeong, and S.-W. Jeon, "Dynamic multichannel access via multi-agent reinforcement learning: Throughput and fairness guarantees," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 3994–4008, Jun. 2022.
- [24] T. Rashid, M. Samvelyan, C. S. De Witt, G. Farquhar, J. Foerster, and S. Whiteson, "Monotonic value function factorisation for deep multi-agent reinforcement learning," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 21, no. 178, pp. 1–51, Jan. 2020.
- [25] Z. Guo, Z. Chen, P. Liu, J. Luo, X. Yang, and X. Sun, "Multi-agent reinforcement learning-based distributed channel access for next generation wireless networks," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 1587–1599, May. 2022.
- [26] C. Zhong, Z. Lu, M. C. Gursoy, and S. Velipasalar, "A deep actor-critic reinforcement learning framework for dynamic multichannel access," *IEEE Trans. Cogn. Commun. Netw.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 1125–1139, Dec. 2019.
- [27] M. Han, X. Sun, W. Zhan, Y. Gao, and Y. Jiang, "Multi-agent reinforcement learning based uplink ofdma for ieee 802.11 ax networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 8868–8882, Aug. 2024.
- [28] J. Schulman, F. Wolski, P. Dhariwal, A. Radford, and O. Klimov, "Proximal policy optimization algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [29] R. Lowe, Y. I. Wu, A. Tamar, J. Harb, O. Pieter Abbeel, and I. Mordatch, "Multi-agent actor-critic for mixed cooperative-competitive environments," in *Proc. Advances Neural Inf. Process. Syst. (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- [30] F. A. Oliehoek, M. T. Spaan, and N. Vlassis, "Optimal and approximate q-value functions for decentralized pomdps," *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, vol. 32, pp. 289–353, May. 2008.
- [31] L. Kraemer and B. Banerjee, "Multi-agent reinforcement learning as a rehearsal for decentralized planning," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 190, pp. 82–94, May. 2016.
- [32] J. Wang, Z. Ren, T. Liu, Y. Yu, and C. Zhang, "Qplex: Duplex dueling multi-agent q-learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.01062*, 2020.
- [33] K. Son, D. Kim, W. J. Kang, D. E. Hostallero, and Y. Yi, "Qtran: Learning to factorize with transformation for cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learning (ICML)*, 2019, pp. 5887–5896.
- [34] V. Konda and J. Tsitsiklis, "Actor-critic algorithms," in *Proc. Advances Neural Inf. Process. Syst. (NeurIPS)*, 1999.
- [35] V. S. Borkar and S. P. Meyn, "The ODE method for convergence of stochastic approximation and reinforcement learning," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 447–469, Jan. 2000.
- [36] V. S. Borkar, *Stochastic approximation: a dynamical systems viewpoint*. Springer, 2009, vol. 48.
- [37] K. Zhang, Z. Yang, H. Liu, T. Zhang, and T. Basar, "Fully decentralized multi-agent reinforcement learning with networked agents," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learning (ICML)*, 2018, pp. 5872–5881.
- [38] D. Chen, Y. Li, and Q. Zhang, "Communication-efficient actor-critic methods for homogeneous markov games," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.09422*, 2022.