

HyperMARL: Adaptive Hypernetworks for Multi-Agent RL

Kale-ab Abebe Tessler
University of Edinburgh
United Kingdom
k.tessler@ed.ac.uk

Arrasy Rahman
University of Texas at Austin
United States
array@cs.utexas.edu

Stefano V. Albrecht
University of Edinburgh
United Kingdom
s.albrecht@ed.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Balancing individual specialisation and shared behaviours is a critical challenge in multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL). Existing methods typically focus on encouraging diversity or leveraging shared representations. Full parameter sharing (FuPS) improves sample efficiency but struggles to learn diverse behaviours when required, while no parameter sharing (NoPS) enables diversity but is computationally expensive and sample inefficient. To address these challenges, we introduce *HyperMARL*, a novel approach using hypernetworks to balance efficiency and specialisation. HyperMARL generates agent-specific actor and critic parameters, enabling agents to adaptively exhibit diverse or homogeneous behaviours as needed, without modifying the learning objective or requiring prior knowledge of the optimal diversity. Furthermore, HyperMARL decouples agent-specific and state-based gradients, which empirically correlates with reduced policy gradient variance, potentially offering insights into its ability to capture diverse behaviours. Across MARL benchmarks requiring homogeneous, heterogeneous, or mixed behaviours, HyperMARL consistently matches or outperforms FuPS, NoPS, and diversity-focused methods, achieving NoPS-level diversity with a shared architecture. These results highlight the potential of hypernetworks as a versatile approach to the trade-off between specialisation and shared behaviours in MARL.¹

KEYWORDS

Parameter Sharing, Specialisation, Behavioural Diversity, Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning.

1 INTRODUCTION

Balancing individual and shared behaviours is critical to collective intelligence. Individual-level specialisation in a population helps improve the performance of these systems, whether in biological fitness or decision-making processes [35, 36, 45]. However, shared behaviours, i.e. behaviours consistent among agents, play a crucial role in ensuring adaptability and efficiency [23, 43]. This trade-off between specialised and shared behaviours is also pertinent in the context of Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (MARL), where a balance between these behaviours is essential.

Although the importance of balancing individual and shared behaviours in MARL is well-recognised [5, 25], achieving this balance is challenging. On the one end of the spectrum, when we want individual agents to specialise and behave differently, a straightforward approach is for each agent to have their own policy and critic networks, which is referred to as no parameter sharing (NoPS) [28]. This allows each agent to develop specialised policies tailored to specific tasks or roles. While NoPS enables diverse behaviours, it is computationally expensive and scales poorly as the number of




Figure 1: Common Agent-ID conditioned MARL policy (left) vs HyperMARL (right).

agents increases, as it requires N sets of parameters for N agents. Furthermore, NoPS is sample inefficient [10], as agents learn independently without sharing information with one another.

On the other end of the spectrum, full parameter sharing (FuPS) [16, 18, 37]² is a widely used approach when similar behaviour across agents is desired. In FuPS, all agents share the same policy and critic parameters, which improves sample efficiency by allowing agents to learn from each other’s experiences [10, 38]. Additionally, FuPS enhances memory efficiency, requiring fewer parameters, and is computationally efficient due to the parallelisation of the agents’ learning process. Although parameter-shared networks conditioned on unique agent IDs are theoretically capable of representing diverse behaviours [20], they often exhibit limited expressive capacity in practice. This limitation leads to underperformance compared to NoPS in scenarios that require diverse behaviours [10, 17, 24, 25]. Christianos et al. [10] attributed this underperformance to the inherent challenges of using a single neural network to represent multiple diverse agent behaviours effectively.

Balancing the efficiency of parameter sharing with the ability to learn diverse behaviours is a fundamental challenge in MARL. Intrinsic reward methods based on mutual information (MI) promote diversity by modifying the learning objective to encourage diverse policies [22, 25]. However, this can result in suboptimal behaviour, as agents may prioritize distinguishing themselves in states rather than optimising task performance. Furthermore, it has been shown that these methods can be outperformed by simpler approaches like FuPS and NoPS [17]. Role-based methods, like ROMA and RODE, [41, 42] assign agents to subtasks but rely on MI objectives for diversity, with limited practical success [11]. Architectural methods [24] require careful tuning of hyperparameters, such as pruning rates per layer and have not shown statistically significant

¹All code will be made available soon.

²The terms FuPS and NoPS were first introduced by [10].

improvements over FuPS. Recent diversity-based methods, such as Diversity Control (DiCo) [5], enable the adjustment of desired diversity levels, measured by the average Wasserstein distance between agent policy pairs. However, they rely on prior knowledge of the optimal diversity level, making performance highly sensitive to these predefined choices.

In this work, we propose *HyperMARL*, a novel method leveraging hypernetworks [19] to balance the efficiency benefits of parameter sharing with the ability to enable specialisation in MARL. *HyperMARL* generates agent-specific actor and critic weights based on agent IDs or embeddings. This enables HyperMARL to learn diverse or homogeneous behaviours as required without altering the learning objective or requiring prior knowledge of the optimal diversity level for the task. We validate HyperMARL across a variety of MARL benchmarks, including Dispersion and Navigation from the Vectorized Multi-Agent Simulator (VMAS)[4] and maps in SMAX[32]. Experiments span two to twenty agents and encompass environments that require homogeneous, heterogeneous, or mixed behaviours. In all settings, HyperMARL consistently matches or surpasses NoPS, FuPS, and diversity-encouraging methods like DiCo.

Moreover, HyperMARL demonstrates empirically lower policy gradient variance compared to standard FuPS approaches. This may result from HyperMARL’s decoupling of agent-based and state-based gradients via hypernetworks (Section 4.4), which aligns with prior findings in Meta-RL [34]. Additionally, we show that HyperMARL achieves NoPS-level behavioural diversity while using a shared architecture – a challenge for FuPS methods.

Overall, HyperMARL offers a versatile architecture that enables diverse behaviours while maintaining a shared architecture. Its adaptability across a wide range of settings establishes it as an effective approach for MARL tasks.

Our contributions are as follows:

- We introduce *HyperMARL*, a method utilising hypernetworks conditioned on agent IDs or embeddings to balance parameter sharing and specialisation in MARL, without altering the learning objective or requiring prior knowledge of necessary diversity.
- We empirically validate HyperMARL across various environments, including tasks that require homogeneous, heterogeneous, or mixed behaviours, outperforming NoPS, FuPS, and diversity-promoting methods like DiCo.
- We show that HyperMARL learns diverse policies comparable to NoPS, while also exhibiting lower policy gradient variance than FuPS. Ablation studies also confirm HyperMARL’s robustness against variations in architecture size, initialisation, and conditioning. Furthermore, we show that HyperMARL scales efficiently by maintaining a near-constant number of parameters, as the number of agents increases.

2 BACKGROUND

We formulate the fully cooperative multiagent systems addressed in our work as a Dec-POMDP [30]. A Dec-POMDP is a tuple, $\langle I, S, \{A^i\}_{i \in I}, R, \{O^i\}_{i \in I}, \{\Omega^i\}_{i \in I}, P, \rho_0, \gamma \rangle$, where I denotes the set of agents, S is the global state space, A^i is the action space for agent

i , $R : S \times A \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the shared reward function, O^i is the observation space for agent i , $\Omega^i : A \times S \times O^i \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the observation function for agent i , $P : S \times A \times S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the state transition function, ρ_0 is the initial state distribution, and γ is the discount factor.

In this setting, agents receive partial observations and select actions based on their decentralized policies $\pi^i(a^i|\tau^i)$, where τ^i is the action-observation history of agent i . The goal is to learn a joint policy $\pi = (\pi^1, \dots, \pi^n)$ that maximizes the expected return $\mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} [G(\tau)]$, where the trajectory $\tau = (s_0, \mathbf{o}_0, \mathbf{a}_0, s_1, \dots)$ is generated by the joint policy, with $s_0 \sim \rho_0$, and $G(\tau) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R(s_t, \mathbf{a}_t, s_{t+1})$.

2.1 Specialised Policies and Environments

Specialisation plays a key role in MARL, yet remains under-defined, hindering consistent evaluation. To address this, we define *specialised environments* and *specialised policies*.

Definition 2.1. An environment is *specialised* if:

- (1) The optimal joint policy π^* consists of at least two distinct agent policies, i.e., $\exists i, j \in I$ such that $\pi^i \neq \pi^j$, where I is the set of agents.
- (2) Any permutation σ of the policies in π^* produces an expected return that is weakly lower or equivalent to that of the original joint policy:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi^\sigma} [G(\tau)] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi^*} [G(\tau)],$$

with strict inequality when agents’ policies are not symmetric.³

For example, in a specialised environment like a football game, agents adopt distinct roles—e.g., "attackers" and "defenders"—to optimise team performance. Permuting their roles (policies) results in suboptimal outcomes, demonstrating the need for complementary behaviours.

In such environments, agents develop *specialised policies* when they learn distinct, complementary behaviours necessary for the optimal joint policy. By definition, heterogeneous agents—those with different action or observation spaces—are naturally specialised, as their distinct capabilities require unique policies. However, homogeneous agents, which share identical capabilities, can also develop specialised policies by adopting distinct roles that are necessary for the team’s success. We work with specialised environments in Sections 3.1 and 5.2.

2.2 Quantifying Team Diversity

We quantify policy diversity using System Neural Diversity (SND) [6], which measures behavioural diversity based on differences in policy outputs:

$$\text{SND} \left(\{\pi^i\}_{i \in I} \right) = \frac{2}{n(n-1)|O|} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i+1}^n \sum_{o \in O} D \left(\pi^i(o), \pi^j(o) \right), \quad (1)$$

where n is the number of agents, O is a set of observations typically collected via policy rollouts, $\pi^i(o_t)$ and $\pi^j(o_t)$ are the outputs of policies i and j for observation o_t , and D is our distance function.

³Policies are deemed symmetric if exchanging them does not alter the expected return of the joint policy.

In contrast to [6], we use Jensen-Shannon Distance (JSD) [14, 26] as D , rather than the Wasserstein metric [39]. As shown in Appendix A, JSD is a robust metric for both continuous and discrete cases, and provides a more reliable measure of policy distance.

3 CHALLENGES IN BALANCING SPECIALISED AND SHARED BEHAVIOURS

Balancing specialised agent behaviours and shared policy representations is challenging in MARL. In this section, we introduce two simple matrix games that illustrate the challenges of achieving this balance, even in basic settings. Through analysis and empirical validation, we demonstrate the limitations of both fully shared and fully independent policies, highlighting the need for more nuanced approaches in MARL.

3.1 Specialisation and Synchronisation Game

Specialisation Game

		Player 2	
		A	B
Player 1	A	(0.5, 0.5)	(1, 1)
	B	(1, 1)	(0.5, 0.5)

Table 1: 2-player specialisation game. Nash Equilibria in blue.

The Specialisation Game, inspired by the XOR game [17] and VMAS’s Dispersion [4], is a stateless, two-player matrix game where each agent selects one of two food items. Payoffs are 0.5 for matching choices and 1 for different choices, as shown in the payoff matrix in Table 1.

This game has two symmetric Nash equilibria, both along the anti-diagonal of the payoff matrix. It differs from the XOR game by assigning non-zero payoffs for matching actions. The game can be extended to n agents, with payoffs of 1 for unique actions and $1/n$ for matching actions. This satisfies the conditions of a Specialised Environment as defined in Definition 2.1.

Synchronisation Game This is the inverse of the Specialisation Game, where players aim to choose the same food item. Payoffs are 1 for matching choices and 0.5 for different choices, resulting in Nash equilibria along the diagonal. In the n -agent version, matching actions receive a payoff of 1, while different choices receive $1/n$.

3.2 Limits of Shared Policies

Next, we provide a formal proof showing that a shared policy cannot learn the optimal behaviour in the 2-player Specialisation game, following from the proof that a shared policy cannot learn the optimal policy in the XOR game.

THEOREM 3.1. *A shared policy cannot learn the optimal behaviour for the two-player Specialisation Game.*

PROOF. Let π be a shared policy for both agents, and let $\alpha = \mathbb{P}(a_i = 0)$ represent the probability of any agent choosing action 0. The expected return of π for each agent is:

$$E[R(\pi)] = \mathbb{P}(a_0 = 0, a_1 = 0) \cdot 0.5 + \mathbb{P}(a_0 = 0, a_1 = 1) \cdot 1 \quad (2)$$

$$+ \mathbb{P}(a_0 = 1, a_1 = 0) \cdot 1 + \mathbb{P}(a_0 = 1, a_1 = 1) \cdot 0.5 \quad (3)$$

$$= 0.5\alpha^2 + 2\alpha(1 - \alpha) + 0.5(1 - \alpha)^2 \quad (4)$$

$$= -\alpha^2 + \alpha + 0.5 \quad (5)$$

$$= -(\alpha - 0.5)^2 + 0.75 \quad (6)$$

Table 2: Average Reward (mean \pm std) for REINFORCE variants in the Specialisation Game (top) and Synchronisation Game (bottom), across 2, 4, and 8 Agents.

Specialisation Game			
Method	2	4	8
NoPS	.9996 \pm .0004	.9988 \pm .0007	.9989 \pm .0008
FuPS	.7493 \pm .0062	.6826 \pm .0039	.6545 \pm .0025
FuPS+ID	.9999 \pm .0002	.9995 \pm .0003	.7275 \pm .0293
Synchronisation Game			
Method	2	4	8
NoPS	.9993 \pm .0004	.9976 \pm .0022	.1250 \pm 0
FuPS	.9999 \pm .0002	1.0 \pm 0	.3000 \pm .3500
FuPS+ID	.9999 \pm 0	.9999 \pm .0003	.1250 \pm 0

Thus, $E[R(\pi)] \leq 0.75 < 1$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, with the maximum at $\alpha = 0.5$. Therefore, a shared policy cannot achieve the optimal return of 1, confirming the need for specialised behaviour to optimise rewards. \square

3.3 Empirical Validation using Function Approximation

To empirically validate the challenges in balancing specialisation and shared behaviours when using function approximation, we conduct empirical experiments on the Specialisation and Synchronisation Games, extending the analysis to $n = 2, 4$, and 8 agents. We compare three approaches: independent policies (NoPS), fully shared policies (FuPS), and shared policies conditioned on one-hot encoded agent IDs (FuPS+ID One-Hot), using REINFORCE [44]. All variants used single-layer neural networks for the policy, and we controlled for the number of parameters across NoPS and FuPS approaches. Hyperparameters were kept constant across experiments, with results averaged over five seeds. We provide the full hyperparameters in Table 4 in Appendix B.

The results in Table 2 show that while NoPS consistently learns the optimal policy in the Specialisation Game, FuPS struggles, especially with $n = 8$ agents. Conversely, in the Synchronisation Game, FuPS performs better⁴, while NoPS struggles with sample efficiency as the number of agents increases (detailed sample efficiency plots in 13 in Appendix C). FuPS+ID shows promising results in balancing specialised and shared representations, but its performance deteriorates at larger scales, suggesting that ID conditioning alone is insufficient for fully distinct behaviours.

The results demonstrate that while shared policies face significant challenges in environments requiring agent specialisation, independent policies struggle with efficiency in environments demanding synchronisation. In Section 5.2, we extend this analysis to temporal MARL environments, where modern MARL algorithms like IPPO and MAPPO encounter similar issues.

These findings underscore the need for more nuanced methods that can effectively leverage shared knowledge while still enabling

⁴The drop in performance of FuPS at $n = 8$ agents is simply because we sample actions for each agent independently, if we took the actions with the highest probability we achieve an average reward of 1.

agent-specific adaptations. In the following section, we introduce *HyperMARL*, a novel approach designed to address these challenges by combining the strengths of both shared and independent policies in a fully learnable, end-to-end manner.

4 HYPERMARL: HYPERNETWORKS FOR ENABLING SPECIALISATION IN MARL

As shown in the previous section, balancing specialised and shared behaviours is a challenging task. To address this challenge, we introduce *HyperMARL*, a simple yet effective approach to enable agent specialisation in MARL through agent-conditioned hypernetworks, trained in a fully end-to-end manner.

4.1 Hypernetworks for MARL

Hypernetworks [19] are neural networks that generate the weights of another neural network (the target network) based on an input context vector. They have proven effective in meta-learning and multi-task learning within single-agent RL settings [2, 3].

In HyperMARL, hypernetworks are used to enable specialisation among agents. Specifically, a hypernetwork h takes a context vector e and outputs the weights for both the policy and critic networks:

$$\theta = h_{\psi}^{\pi}(e) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi = h_{\psi}^V(e) \quad (7)$$

where h_{ψ}^{π} and h_{ψ}^V are the hypernetworks for the policy and critic, respectively, and e is either the agent’s one-hot encoded ID or a learned embedding.

This design allows the hypernetwork to produce agent-specific policies and critics as:

$$\theta^i = h_{\psi}^{\pi}(e^i) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi^i = h_{\psi}^V(e^i) \quad (8)$$

where e^i represents the context vector for agent i , and θ^i , ϕ^i denote the agent-specific policy and critic parameters, as illustrated in Figure 1. This mechanism allows a single hypernetwork to generate unique policy and critic parameters for each agent, enabling individual specialisation when needed. In tasks that require uniform behaviour across agents, the hypernetwork can adapt by learning similar agent embeddings or producing similar policies for different agent IDs. This flexibility ensures that both specialised and uniform behaviours are captured within the same framework.

4.2 Linear Hypernetworks

Linear hypernetworks with one-hot agent IDs effectively create separate parameters for each agent. Given a one-hot agent ID, $\mathbb{1}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$, a linear hypernetwork h_{ψ} generates agent-specific parameters θ^i as:

$$\theta^i = h_{\psi}^{\pi}(\mathbb{1}^i) = \mathbb{1}^i \cdot W + b \quad (9)$$

where $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is the weight matrix (m being the number of parameters for each agent’s policy and n is the number of agents), and $b \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times m}$ is a bias vector. Since $\mathbb{1}^i$ is one-hot encoded, each θ^i corresponds to a specific row of W plus the shared bias b . If there is no shared bias term, this effectively replicates training of separate policies for each task (in our case for each agent) [2] since there are no shared parameters and gradient updates are independent.

While linear hypernetworks are conceptually straightforward, their effectiveness has been demonstrated in single-agent RL scenarios [2, 7].

4.3 Non-linear Hypernetworks for Expressiveness

Multilayer perceptron (MLP) hypernetworks extend linear hypernetworks, by including one or more non-linear layers, as follows:

$$\theta = h_{\psi}^{\pi}(e) = f_{\psi_1}^{\pi}(g_{\psi_2}^{\pi}(e)) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi = h_{\psi}^V(e) = f_{\psi_1}^V(g_{\psi_2}^V(e)) \quad (10)$$

where e is the context vector, f_{ψ_1} represents the linear transformation of the output layer, and g_{ψ_2} represents the preceding layers, which contain non-linear activation functions such as ReLU.

These non-linear transforms provide additional flexibility, allowing the hypernetworks to generalise beyond linear mappings of the context to the policy and critic weights. This could be beneficial when agents need to learn intricate specialisation patterns.

However, unlike linear hypernetworks with one-hot agent IDs, non-linear hypernetworks do not guarantee distinct weights for each agent. Additionally, they increase the total number of trainable parameters, necessitating a careful balance between expressiveness and computational efficiency.

4.4 Decoupling Agent and State-based Gradients in HyperMARL

HyperMARL decouples gradients arising from state-action dynamics and agent-specific features by leveraging hypernetworks. This decoupling allows agents to learn unique behaviours while mitigating interference during training.

In HyperMARL, the policy for agent i is defined as:

$$\pi^i(a^i | o^i) = \pi_{\theta^i}(a^i | o^i), \quad \text{where} \quad \theta^i = h_{\psi}^{\pi}(e^i), \quad (11)$$

where h_{ψ}^{π} is the policy hypernetwork parameterized by weights ψ , and e^i is the embedding for agent i .

For a shared policy, the policy gradient can be expressed as follows:

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{i=1}^I A(o_t^i, a_t^i) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(a_t^i | o_t^i) \right], \quad (12)$$

where τ is the trajectory sampled from the joint policy π , $A(o_t^i, a_t^i)$ is the advantage for agent i and I is our set of agents.

In HyperMARL, policy parameters θ^i are defined by the hypernetwork h_{ψ}^{π} . The policy gradient with respect to ψ becomes:

$$\nabla_{\psi} J(\psi) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi_{\theta^i}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{i=1}^I A(o_t^i, a_t^i) \nabla_{\psi} \log \pi_{\theta^i}(a_t^i | o_t^i) \right] \quad (13)$$

Applying the chain rule:

$$\nabla_{\psi} \log \pi_{\theta^i}(a_t^i | o_t^i) = \nabla_{\theta^i} \log \pi_{\theta^i}(a_t^i | o_t^i) \cdot \nabla_{\psi} h_{\psi}^{\pi}(e^i) \quad (14)$$

where $\nabla_{\psi} h_{\psi}^{\pi}(e^i) = \nabla_{\psi} \theta^i$, since $\theta^i = h_{\psi}^{\pi}(e^i)$.

Substituting this into the policy gradient:

$$\nabla_{\psi} J(\psi) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi_{\theta^i}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{i=1}^I A(o_t^i, a_t^i) \nabla_{\theta^i} \log \pi_{\theta^i}(a_t^i | o_t^i) \cdot \nabla_{\psi} h_{\psi}^{\pi}(e^i) \right] \quad (15)$$

This formulation separates the gradient into two components:

- $\nabla_{\theta^i} \log \pi_{\theta^i}(a_t^i | o_t^i)$: **State-dependent gradients** - captures how state-action dynamics affect the policy. This term is independent across agents because θ^i is unique for each agent.
- $\nabla_{\psi} h_{\psi}^{\pi}(e^i)$: **Agent-specific gradient** – captures how the hypernetwork parameters ψ influence the policy parameters θ^i via the agent embedding e^i .

Decoupling these gradients reduces interference during training, as the state-based gradients remain independent, enabling agents to adapt unique parameters for their policies. This approach has shown benefits in Meta-RL [34], where hypernetworks reduced policy gradient variance, leading to more stable training. Similarly, in Section 5.2.3, we observe lower gradient variance with HyperMAREL. This could provide insight into the benefits of using hypernetworks in MARL, especially for learning diverse behaviour using a shared policy.

4.5 Initialisation

HyperMAREL’s hypernetwork initialisation ensures the generated weights for each agent match the distribution of those in a standard network without hypernetworks. For example, PPO commonly uses orthogonal initialisation [15], so HyperMAREL generates orthogonal initial weights for each agent with the same scaling/gain. This approach is adaptable to any initialisation strategy.

4.6 Agent Embedding

For our linear hypernetworks, we use one-hot encoded agent IDs as they result a mix of agent independent weights and shared weights as discussed in Section 4.2. For our MLP hypernetworks, we used learned agent embeddings e^i , initialised orthogonally. These embeddings are learned parameters, optimized during training independently of observations. This setup allows agents to learn distinct or similar embeddings as needed, enabling specialisation while training in an end-to-end fashion.

5 EXPERIMENTS

We evaluate the effectiveness of *HyperMAREL* in various MARL environments, testing its ability to handle homogeneous, heterogeneous, and mixed behaviours.

5.1 Experimental Setup

5.1.1 MARL Algorithms. We compare *HyperMAREL* with strong baselines IPPO [12] and MAPPO [46]. IPPO conditions each agent’s actor and critic on individual observations, while MAPPO uses a centralized critic conditioned on the global state or concatenated agent observations. We use NoPS and FuPS variants of these methods, with all FuPS variants being conditioned on one-hot encoded agent IDs.

For the experiments in Sections 5.2 and 5.3, we use feedforward architectures, while for Section 5.4, we use recurrent GRU networks [9]. In all cases, HyperMAREL generates the actor and critic weights based on the agent’s embedding. For recurrent PPO variants, HyperMAREL maintains the same architecture as for feedforward methods, generating only the actor and critic feedforward weights, not the GRU weights.

As described in Section 4.6, we use one-hot encoded IDs for linear hypernetworks and learned embeddings for MLP hypernetworks. All hyperparameters match the baselines unless otherwise stated, with all the hyperparameters in Appendix B.


5.1.2 Environments. We test our methods in the following environments:

- **Dispersion (VMAS) [4]:** n agents and n food particles are randomly placed in a 2D space. Agents observe their relative distance to all food particles and receive a reward for collecting food and incur a step penalty. The optimal policy requires each agent to go to different food particles, i.e. learn heterogeneous behaviour, and hence this environment is a strong failure case for parameter-sharing methods. We use the discrete version of this environment, with $n = 4$ agents. This can be seen as a temporal and stateful version of the Specialisation Game from Section 3.1.
- **Navigation (VMAS) [4]:** Agents are spawned at random locations and must navigate to their assigned goals and receive dense rewards based on the relative distance to their goals. We test three settings: all agents sharing the same goal (homogeneous behaviour), different goals (heterogeneous behaviour), and a mix of shared and individual goals. We experiment with 2, 4, and 8 agents. We use the same setting of this environment from the DiCo paper [5], i.e. continuous control.
- **SMAX (JaxMAREL) [32]:** We test on four maps from JaxMAREL’s SMAX, a Jax-accelerated version of SMAC [33] and SMACv2 [13]. Although SMAX has simplified dynamics compared to SMAC, it presents a significant challenge due to its high-dimensional observation space, intricate unit interactions, and sophisticated heuristic agents. We test on both SMACv1-style maps (2s3z, 3s5z) and SMACv2-style maps, which include randomized ally/enemy units and initial positions (smacv2_10, smacv2_20).


5.1.3 Training and Evaluation.

- **Training:** For Section 5.2, we run 5 seeds and train for 20 million steps. For Sections 5.3 and 5.4, we train for 10 million timesteps as per the baselines.
- **Evaluation:** In Section 5.2, we evaluate every 100k steps across 32 episodes. In Section 5.3, following [5], we evaluate every 120k steps for 200 episodes. In Section 5.4, evaluation occurs every 500k steps across 32 episodes.


5.1.4 Measuring Policy Diversity. We measure team diversity using the System Neural Diversity (SND) metric [Equation 1, [6]] with Jensen-Shannon distance. SND ranges from 0 (identical policies across all agents) to 1 (maximum diversity). We collect a dataset of observations from IPPO-NoPS and IPPO-FuPS policies checkpointed at 5 and 20 million training steps. Each policy is rolled out



(a) IPPO Sample Efficiency (b) MAPPO Sample Efficiency



(c) IPPO at Convergence



(d) MAPPO at Convergence


Figure 2: Comparison of IPPO and MAPPO performance on the Dispersion environment. We show the Interquartile Mean (IQM) of Mean Episode Return and the 95% Stratified Bootstrap Confidence Intervals using [1]. Our shared Hypernetworks learn policies comparable to NoPS, while FuPS struggle to learn diverse policies.

for 10,000 episodes, generating 16 million observations. We then sample 1 million observations from this dataset to calculate the SND for each method tested.

5.2 Learning Diverse Behaviour (Dispersion)

5.2.1 Performance on Dispersion. From the results, in Figures 2a and 2b we see that both parameter sharing variants (IPPO-FuPS, MAPPO-FuPS - (●)) fail to learn the diverse policies required to solve the Dispersion task, while their non-parameter sharing counterparts (IPPO-NoPS, MAPPO-NoPS - (●)) are able to converge to the optimal policy. Although MAPPO-FuPS does appear to be trending towards the optimal mean episode return, its slower rate of convergence suggests that it would require substantially more samples to achieve competitive performance. These results confirm that parameter-sharing methods struggle to learn the diverse policies in environments requiring a high degree of agent specialisation.

In comparison, both our linear and MLP hypernetworks (●, ●) match the performance of NoPS across mean return and sample efficiency. In some cases, such as IPPO-MLP hypernetworks, we observe higher confidence intervals during training than NoPS, indicating more variability. This could be attributed to the learning of useful agent embeddings. However, at convergence (Figures 2c



(a) IPPO Variants (b) MAPPO Variants

Figure 3: Policy Diversity using SND [6] with Jensen-Shannon distance. Hypernetworks achieve NoPS-level diverse policies with a shared architecture.

and 2d), the performance stabilizes, and the confidence intervals shrink to levels comparable with NoPS.

5.2.2 Diversity of Policies Learned. We measure policy diversity as discussed in Section 5.1.4. Figure 3 illustrates that IPPO-FuPS and MAPPO-FuPS exhibit lower diversity compared to their NoPS counterparts, aligning with performance results. Notably, both our linear and MLP hypernetworks achieve diversity levels comparable to NoPS methods, despite utilizing a shared architecture. Linear hypernetworks enforce weight and gradient separation via one-hot encoded agent IDs, but retain some parameter sharing through shared biases. In contrast, MLP hypernetworks dynamically learn agent ID embeddings and apply non-linear functions to generate weights, facilitating end-to-end learning of diverse policies, without enforcing any separation of weights and gradients.

5.2.3 Gradient Variance. To investigate HyperMRL’s effect on training stability, we compute the average policy gradient variance by calculating the variance across all actor parameters at each update and averaging it over the training period. As shown in Figure 4, hypernetworks in both IPPO and MAPPO exhibit lower mean policy gradient variance than FuPS. This reduction, which aligns with the hypernetworks’ ability to learn diverse behaviors, may stem from decoupling agent-specific and state-based gradients




Figure 4: policy gradient Variance across shared IPPO (left) and MAPPO (right) variants. Bars show mean values; error bars indicate standard error. Our hypernetworks have lower average policy gradient variance than FuPS.




Figure 5: IQM and 95% CI of mean reward comparing of IPPO Baselines, HyperMARL and DiCo in the Navigation environment under different goal configurations.

(see Section 4.4)—a phenomenon similarly observed in Meta-RL [34].

5.3 Balancing Diverse and Shared Behaviours (Navigation)

We evaluate HyperMARL against DiCo [5] in the Navigation environment [4], using DiCo’s best diversity targets for $n = 2$ agents ($SND_{des} = 1.2$ for different goals, $SND_{des} = 0$ for the same goals) and matching its hyperparameters. Since DiCo only tested with $n = 2$ agents, we sweep diversity levels for more agents, and for all methods we sweep the same learning hyperparameters (details in Tables 10 and 11 in Appendix B). While better diversity levels may exist for more agents, finding the right level becomes challenging, even when known for the same task with fewer agents.

Figure 5 presents IQM of the mean reward across different goal setups. HyperMARL consistently demonstrates strong performance across all configurations, outperforming DiCo and achieving comparable or better performance than the NoPS and FuPS baselines in most scenarios. In scenarios that require diverse behaviours, such as mixed or different goal configurations (Figures 5c and 5b), IPPO-FuPS shows competitive results with two and four agents, closely matching the performance of NoPS and HyperMARL. We hypothesize that this is due to the dense reward structure in the Navigation environment, which contrasts with the sparse reward signals found in environments like Dispersion, where agents are rewarded only when collecting food.

As we scale to $n = 8$ agents, where more complex specialisation patterns are necessary, we observe that HyperMARL outperforms all other methods. This highlights its ability to effectively handle increased agent diversity and coordination challenges, adapting well to larger, more complex environments.

5.4 SMAX

From the results in Figure 6, we see across simple maps (2s3z), hard maps (3s5z) and SMACv2-style maps (smacv2_10 and smacv2_20), that HyperMARL matches the performance of the baseline FuPS implementation from JaxMARL. These results are consistent with

prior findings in SMAC [17, 46], which identified FuPS as the optimal architecture for such environments. Our findings suggest that HyperMARL is similarly effective in settings requiring homogeneous behaviours, large observation spaces, and coordination among many agents, further demonstrating its applicability across diverse multi-agent scenarios.

6 ABLATIONS

We perform ablation studies to evaluate the impact of some design choices in our MLP hypernetworks. Specifically, we compare our HyperMARL approach with the MAPPO-MLP hypernetwork and MAPPO FuPS feedforward baselines (with one-hot agent IDs) from Section 5.2. The ablations focus on three key variations: (1) *HyperMARL (Small)*, which reduces the hidden layer size of the hypernetworks from 64 to 32; (2) *HyperMARL w/ One-Hot IDs*, which replaces learned ID embeddings with one-hot encoded IDs; and (3) *HyperMARL w/ Hyperfan Init*, where the simple initialisation from Section 4.5 is substituted with Hyperfan initialisation [7].

The results in Figure 7 show that network capacity affects hypernetwork performance. *HyperMARL (Small)* converges more slowly but ultimately reaches similar performance to the baseline HyperMARL. A similar pattern is seen with *HyperMARL w/ Hyperfan Init*, which also converges slower but matches the final performance. In contrast, *HyperMARL w/ One-Hot IDs* converges faster than the baseline, suggesting that learned ID embeddings require more training time, whereas one-hot embeddings can be effective immediately. However, learned embeddings might offer more robustness across different kinds of tasks.

This demonstrates that while design choices influence sample efficiency, they do not degrade final performance, with all variants consistently outperforming the FuPS method with one-hot agent IDs.

7 RELATED WORK

Hypernetworks in RL and MARL. Hypernetworks have proven effective in meta-learning, multi-task learning, and continual learning in single-agent settings [2, 3, 21, 34]. In MARL, QMIX [31] used hypernetworks conditioned on a global state to generate the




Figure 6: Performance of Recurrent IPPO and MAPPO from on SMAX. HyperMARTL performs comparably to these baselines.

weights of a mixing network, combining per-agent Q-values into a joint Q-value. However, the agent networks that generated Q-values in QMIX were standard MLPs combined with GRUs, not hypernetworks.

Variants of Parameter Sharing. While Full Parameter Sharing (FuPS) is the most common approach, several other variants exist. Selective Parameter Sharing (SePS) [10] shares weights only between similar groups of agents, identified by clustering agent trajectories during pre-training. Structured Network Pruning for Parameter Sharing (SNP-PS) [24] shares a single network among agents but restricts each agent to a subnetwork, defined by pruning the shared network with a random mask. Though not strictly parameter sharing, methods like Shared Experience Actor-Critic (SEAC) [11] explore sharing experiences across agents, updating each agent’s policy using weighted gradients from others’ experiences.

Learning Diverse Policies. In MARL, parameter sharing often leads to a lack of policy diversity [10, 17, 24, 25]. To address this, three main approaches have emerged: (1) information-theoretic methods that encourage diversity by maximizing mutual information between agent identities and trajectories [25], (2) role-based methods that assign distinct roles to agents, indirectly promoting

diverse behaviours [41, 42], and (3) architectural methods that use structural modifications or constraints to induce diversity in agent policies [5, 24]. While there exists another category of algorithms designed for heterogeneous agents with different state and action spaces, such as HAPPO and HASAC [27, 47], these fall outside the FuPS/NoPS framework that forms the basis of our analysis.

8 SCALABILITY AND PARAMETER EFFICIENCY

Hypernetworks generate weights for the target network, which can lead to high-dimensional outputs and many parameters for deep target networks. This challenge is amplified in MLP-based hypernetworks, which include additional hidden layers. Figure 8 shows scaling trends:

- **NoPS and linear hypernetworks:** Parameter count grows linearly with the number of agents.
- **FuPS:** More efficient, as growth depends on one-hot vector size.
- **MLP hypernetworks:** Scale better with larger populations, since they only require embeddings of fixed size for each new agent.

To reduce parameter count, techniques like shared hypernetworks, chunked hypernetworks [8, 40], or producing low-rank weight approximations, can be used. While naive implementations are parameter-intensive, this might be less critical in RL and MARL which commonly have smaller actor-critic networks. Moreover, HyperMARTL’s near-constant scaling with agents suggests strong potential for large-scale MARL applications.

To isolate the effects of parameter count, we scaled the FuPS networks (Figure 9) to match the number of trainable parameters in HyperMARTL. Despite generating 10x smaller networks, HyperMARTL consistently outperforms FuPS variants, showing its advantages extend beyond parameter count.

9 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

We present *HyperMARTL*, an approach using agent-conditioned hypernetworks to generate unique actor and critic parameters per agent in MARL. Our results demonstrate that HyperMARTL effectively learns diverse policies in environments requiring varied behaviors, while also performing well in scenarios needing homogeneous or mixed strategies. This adaptability is achieved without




Figure 7: Ablation results comparing the performance of HyperMARTL and its variants.




Figure 8: Parameter scaling for IPPO variants with increasing agents (4 to 1024). MLP Hypernetworks scale nearly constantly, while NoPS, Linear Hypernetworks, and FuPS+One-Hot grow linearly. Log scale on both axes.




Figure 9: Dispersion performance with four agents. FuPS variants match HyperMAREL in parameter count but still underperform.

altering the learning objective or requiring prior knowledge of optimal diversity levels. We observe a correlation between HyperMAREL’s performance and reduced policy gradient variance, potentially due to state and agent gradient decoupling. Ablation studies show that while certain design decisions can improve the sample efficiency, HyperMAREL’s final performance is robust to various design choices. These findings establish HyperMAREL as a versatile and promising architecture for robust MARL across diverse environments, opening avenues for future research in MARL.

However, challenges remain, particularly in scaling the parameter count of hypernetworks in naive implementations. Future work could explore more efficient hypernetwork architectures (e.g. chunked hypernetworks [8, 40]).

REFERENCES

- [1] Rishabh Agarwal, Max Schwarzer, Pablo Samuel Castro, Aaron Courville, and Marc G Bellemare. 2021. Deep Reinforcement Learning at the Edge of the Statistical Precipice. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2021).
- [2] Jacob Beck, Matthew Thomas Jackson, Risto Vuorio, and Shimon Whiteson. 2023. Hypernetworks in meta-reinforcement learning. In *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 1478–1487.
- [3] Jacob Beck, Risto Vuorio, Zheng Xiong, and Shimon Whiteson. 2024. Recurrent hypernetworks are surprisingly strong in meta-RL. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [4] Matteo Bettini, Ryan Kortvelesy, Jan Blumenkamp, and Amanda Prorok. 2022. VMAS: A Vectorized Multi-Agent Simulator for Collective Robot Learning. *The 16th International Symposium on Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems* (2022).
- [5] Matteo Bettini, Ryan Kortvelesy, and Amanda Prorok. 2024. Controlling Behavioral Diversity in Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=qJUGlTPq4>
- [6] Matteo Bettini, Ajay Shankar, and Amanda Prorok. 2023. System Neural Diversity: Measuring Behavioral Heterogeneity in Multi-Agent Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02128* (2023).
- [7] Oscar Chang, Lampros Flokas, and Hod Lipson. 2020. Principled Weight Initialization for Hypernetworks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=H1lma24tPB>

- [8] Vinod Kumar Chauhan, Jiandong Zhou, Ghadeer Ghosheh, Soheila Molaei, and David A Clifton. 2024. Dynamic Inter-treatment Information Sharing for Individualized Treatment Effects Estimation. In *Proceedings of The 27th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 238)*, Sanjoy Dasgupta, Stephan Mandt, and Yingzhen Li (Eds.). PMLR, 3529–3537. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v238/chauhan24a.html>
- [9] Kyunghyun Cho. 2014. Learning phrase representations using RNN encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1078* (2014).
- [10] Filippos Christianos, Georgios Papoudakis, Muhammad A Rahman, and Stefano V Albrecht. 2021. Scaling multi-agent reinforcement learning with selective parameter sharing. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 1989–1998.
- [11] Filippos Christianos, Lukas Schäfer, and Stefano V. Albrecht. 2020. Shared Experience Actor-Critic for Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *34th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [12] Christian Schroeder De Witt, Tarun Gupta, Denys Makoviichuk, Viktor Makoviichuk, Philip HS Torr, Mingfei Sun, and Shimon Whiteson. 2020. Is independent learning all you need in the starcraft multi-agent challenge? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.09533* (2020).
- [13] Benjamin Ellis, Jonathan Cook, Skander Moalla, Mikayel Samvelyan, Mingfei Sun, Anuj Mahajan, Jakob Foerster, and Shimon Whiteson. 2024. Smacv2: An improved benchmark for cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [14] Dominik Maria Endres and Johannes E Schindelin. 2003. A new metric for probability distributions. *IEEE Transactions on Information theory* 49, 7 (2003), 1858–1860.
- [15] Logan Engstrom, Andrew Ilyas, Shibani Santurkar, Dimitris Tsipras, Firdaus Janoos, Larry Rudolph, and Aleksander Madry. 2019. Implementation matters in deep rl: A case study on ppo and trpo. In *International conference on learning representations*.
- [16] Jakob Foerster, Ioannis Alexandros Assael, Nando De Freitas, and Shimon Whiteson. 2016. Learning to communicate with deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [17] Wei Fu, Chao Yu, Zelai Xu, Jiaqi Yang, and Yi Wu. 2022. Revisiting Some Common Practices in Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 6863–6877.
- [18] Jayesh K Gupta, Maxim Egorov, and Mykel Kochenderfer. 2017. Cooperative multi-agent control using deep reinforcement learning. In *Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems: AAMAS 2017 Workshops, Best Papers, São Paulo, Brazil, May 8–12, 2017, Revised Selected Papers* 16. Springer, 66–83.
- [19] David Ha, Andrew Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2016. Hypernetworks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.09106* (2016).
- [20] Kurt Hornik, Maxwell Stinchcombe, and Halbert White. 1989. Multilayer feed-forward networks are universal approximators. *Neural networks* 2, 5 (1989), 359–366.
- [21] Yizhou Huang, Kevin Xie, Homanga Bharadhwaj, and Florian Shkurti. 2021. Continual model-based reinforcement learning with hypernetworks. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 799–805.
- [22] Jiechuan Jiang and Zongqing Lu. 2021. The Emergence of Individuality. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 139)*, Marina Meila and Tong Zhang (Eds.). PMLR, 4992–5001. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/jiang21g.html>
- [23] R Kassen. 2002. The experimental evolution of specialists, generalists, and the maintenance of diversity. *Journal of evolutionary biology* 15, 2 (2002), 173–190.
- [24] Woojun Kim and Youngchul Sung. 2023. Parameter sharing with network pruning for scalable multi-agent deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.00912* (2023).
- [25] Chenghao Li, Tonghan Wang, Chengjie Wu, Qianchuan Zhao, Jun Yang, and Chongjie Zhang. 2021. Celebrating diversity in shared multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 3991–4002.
- [26] Jianhua Lin. 1991. Divergence measures based on the Shannon entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information theory* 37, 1 (1991), 145–151.
- [27] Jiarong Liu, Yifan Zhong, Siyi Hu, Haobo Fu, QIANG FU, Xiaojun Chang, and Yaodong Yang. 2024. Maximum Entropy Heterogeneous-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=tmqOhBC4a5>
- [28] Ryan Lowe, Yi I Wu, Aviv Tamar, Jean Harb, OpenAI Pieter Abbeel, and Igor Mordatch. 2017. Multi-agent actor-critic for mixed cooperative-competitive environments. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [29] Kevin R McKee, Joel Z Leibo, Charlie Beattie, and Richard Everett. 2022. Quantifying the effects of environment and population diversity in multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems* 36, 1 (2022), 21.
- [30] Frans A Oliehoek and Christopher Amato. 2016. *A concise introduction to decentralized POMDPs*. Springer.
- [31] Tabish Rashid, Mikayel Samvelyan, Christian Schroeder De Witt, Gregory Farquhar, Jakob Foerster, and Shimon Whiteson. 2020. Monotonic value function

- factorisation for deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 21, 178 (2020), 1–51.
- [32] Alexander Rutherford, Benjamin Ellis, Matteo Gallici, Jonathan Cook, Andrei Lupu, Garðar Ingvarsson, Timon Willi, Akbir Khan, Christian Schroeder de Witt, Alexandra Souly, et al. 2024. JaxMARL: Multi-Agent RL Environments and Algorithms in JAX. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*. 2444–2446.
- [33] Mikayel Samvelyan, Tabish Rashid, Christian Schroeder de Witt, Gregory Farquhar, Nantas Nardelli, Tim G. J. Rudner, Chia-Man Hung, Philip H. S. Torr, Jakob Foerster, and Shimon Whiteson. 2019. The StarCraft Multi-Agent Challenge. *CoRR abs/1902.04043* (2019).
- [34] Elad Sarafian, Shai Keynan, and Sarit Kraus. 2021. Recomposing the reinforcement learning building blocks with hypernetworks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 9301–9312.
- [35] Chris R Smith, Amy L Toth, Andrew V Suarez, and Gene E Robinson. 2008. Genetic and genomic analyses of the division of labour in insect societies. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 9, 10 (2008), 735–748.
- [36] James Surowiecki. 2004. *The Wisdom of Crowds*. Doubleday, New York.
- [37] Ming Tan. 1993. Multi-agent reinforcement learning: Independent vs. cooperative agents. In *Proceedings of the tenth international conference on machine learning*. 330–337.
- [38] Jordan K Terry, Nathaniel Grammel, Sanghyun Son, Benjamin Black, and Aakriti Agrawal. 2020. Revisiting parameter sharing in multi-agent deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.13625* (2020).
- [39] Leonid Nisonovich Vaserstein. 1969. Markov processes over denumerable products of spaces, describing large systems of automata. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii* 5, 3 (1969), 64–72.
- [40] Johannes von Oswald, Christian Henning, Benjamin F. Grewe, and João Sacramento. 2020. Continual learning with hypernetworks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SJgwNerKvB>
- [41] Tonghan Wang, Heng Dong, Victor Lesser, and Chongjie Zhang. 2020. ROMA: multi-agent reinforcement learning with emergent roles. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 9876–9886.
- [42] Tonghan Wang, Tarun Gupta, Anuj Mahajan, Bei Peng, Shimon Whiteson, and Chongjie Zhang. 2020. Rode: Learning roles to decompose multi-agent tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.01523* (2020).
- [43] Katherine Y Williams and Charles A O’Reilly III. 1998. Demography and. *Research in organizational behavior* 20 (1998), 77–140.
- [44] Ronald J Williams. 1992. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine learning* 8 (1992), 229–256.
- [45] Anita Williams Woolley, Ishani Aggarwal, and Thomas W Malone. 2015. Collective intelligence and group performance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 24, 6 (2015), 420–424.
- [46] Chao Yu, Akash Velu, Eugene Vinitzky, Jiaxuan Gao, Yu Wang, Alexandre Bayen, and Yi Wu. 2022. The surprising effectiveness of ppo in cooperative multi-agent games. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 24611–24624.
- [47] Yifan Zhong, Jakub Grudzien Kuba, Xidong Feng, Siyi Hu, Jiaming Ji, and Yaodong Yang. 2024. Heterogeneous-Agent Reinforcement Learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 25, 32 (2024), 1–67. <http://jmlr.org/papers/v25/23-0488.html>

A FINDING A SUITABLE DISTANCE FUNCTION FOR POLICY DIVERSITY

The choice of distance function D in Equation 1 is crucial for accurately measuring policy diversity. In MARL, policies are often represented as probability distributions over actions, making the choice of distance function non-trivial.

[5] use the Wasserstein metric for continuous policies [39] as distance function D , while [29] use the total variation distance for discrete policies. For discrete policies, Wasserstein distance would require a cost function representing the cost of changing from one action to another, which might not be trivial to come up with. On the other hand, although well-suited for discrete policies, TVD might miss changes in action probabilities because it measures the largest difference assigned to an event (i.e. action) between two probability distributions.

We consider a simple example to illustrate this point. Suppose we have two policies π^1 and π^2 with action probabilities as shown in Figure 10. π^1 stays constant, while π^2 changes gradually over timesteps. We see that even as π^2 changes over time, the $TVD(\pi^1, \pi^2)$ between π^1 and π^2 remains constant. This is because TVD only measures the largest difference between the two distributions, and does not consider the overall difference between them. On the other hand, the Jensen-Shannon distance (JSD) [14], which is the square root of the Jensen-Shannon divergence, does not have this problem as it is a smooth distance function. Furthermore, it satisfies the conditions for being a metric – it is non-negative, symmetry, and it satisfies the triangle inequality.

For continuous policies, as shown in Figure 11, JSD exhibits similar trends to the Wasserstein distance. Since JSD is a reasonable metric for both continuous and discrete probability distributions, we will use it as the distance metric for all experiments and propose it as a suitable distance function for measuring policy diversity in MARL.

We also summarise the properties of the various distance metrics in Table 3.




Figure 10: Gradual changes in π^2 , result in gradual changes in the Jensen-Shannon distance (JSD), while the Total Variation Distance (TVD) can miss changes in action probabilities.




Figure 11: Jensen-Shannon distance (JSD) trends similarly to Wasserstein distance when we have continuous policies.

Method	Kinds of Actions	Metric	Smooth	Formula
Wasserstein Distance [39]	Continuous*	Metric	Yes	$W(p, q) = \left(\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma(p, q)} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} x - y d\gamma(x, y) \right)^{1/p}$
Total Variation Distance	Discrete	Metric	No	$TV(p, q) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_x \rho(x) - q(x) $
Jensen-Shannon Divergence [26]	Both	Divergence	Yes	$JSD(p \parallel q) = \frac{1}{2} D_{KL}(p \parallel m) + \frac{1}{2} D_{KL}(q \parallel m), m = \frac{1}{2}(p + q)$
Jensen-Shannon Distance [14]	Both	Metric	Yes	$\sqrt{JSD(p \parallel q)}$

Table 3: Measure Policy Diversity

B HYPERPARAMETERS

Table 4: Hyperparameters for Specialisation and Synchronisation Game

Hyperparameter	Value
Number of agents and foods	2, 4, 8
Number of foods	3
Number of seeds	5
Number of trials	10,000
Evaluation trials	1,000
Batch size	10
Learning rate	0.01
Activation function	ReLU
Output activation	Softmax
Optimizer	SGD
Total Number of Parameters	
2 Agents	NoPS: 36 FuPS: 34 FuPS+ID: 42
4 Agents	NoPS: 112 FuPS: 100 FuPS+ID: 148
8 Agents	NoPS: 384 FuPS: 328 FuPS+ID: 552

Table 5: IPPO and MAPPO Hyperparameters in Dispersion

Hyperparameter	Value
LR	0.0005
GAMMA	0.99
VF_COEF	0.5
CLIP_EPS	0.2
ENT_COEF	0.01
NUM_ENVS	16
NUM_STEPS	128
GAE_LAMBDA	0.95
NUM_UPDATES	9765
EVAL_EPISODES	32
EVAL_INTERVAL	100000
MAX_GRAD_NORM	0.5
UPDATE_EPOCHS	4
NUM_MINIBATCHES	2
TOTAL_TIMESTEPS	20000000
ANNEAL_LR	false
ACTOR_LAYERS	[64, 64]
CRITIC_LAYERS	[64, 64]
ACTIVATION	relu
SEEDS	30,1,42,72858,2300658
ACTION_SPACE_TYPE	discrete

Table 6: MLP Hypernet Hyperparameters in Dispersion

Parameter	IPPO	MAPPO
HYPERNET_EMBEDDING_DIM	4	8
EMBEDDING_DIM Sweep	[4, 16, 64]	[4, 8, 16, 64]
HYPERNET_HIDDEN_DIMS	64	64

Table 7: Dispersion Settings

Setting	Value
n_food	4
n_agents	4
max_steps	100
food_radius	0.08
share_reward	false
penalise_by_time	true
continuous_actions	false

Table 8: IPPO Hyperparameters for Navigation

Hyperparameters	Value
LR	0.00005
NUM_ENVS	600
NUM_STEPS	100
TOTAL_TIMESTEPS	10^6
UPDATE_EPOCHS	45
NUM_MINIBATCHES	30
GAMMA	0.9
GAE_LAMBDA	0.9
CLIP_EPS	0.2
ENT_COEF	0.0
VF_COEF	1.0
MAX_GRAD_NORM	5
ACTIVATION	tanh
ANNEAL_LR	False
ACTOR_LAYERS	[256, 256]
CRITIC_LAYERS	[256, 256]
ACTION_SPACE_TYPE	continuous

Table 9: MLP Hypernet Hyperparameters in Navigation

Parameter	IPPO	MAPPO
HYPERNET_EMBEDDING_DIM	4	8
EMBEDDING_DIM Sweep	[4, 16, 64]	[4, 8, 16, 64]
HYPERNET_HIDDEN_DIMS	64	64

Table 10: DiCo Algorithm SND_{des} Hyperparameter

Goal Configuration	Number of Agents	SND_{des}
All agents same goal	2	0
	4	0
	8	0
All agents different goals	2	1.2 (From DiCo paper)
	4	[-1,1.2,2.4] -> -1 (Best)
	8	[-1,1.2,4.8] -> -1 (Best)
Some agents share goals	4	[-1,1.2] -> -1 (Best)
	8	[-1,2.4,1.2] -> -1 (Best)

Table 11: Parameter Sweeps for IPPO Variants in Navigation Tasks with Four and Eight Agents

Parameter Sweeps		
CLIP_EPS	0.2, 0.1	
LR	5e-5, 5e-4, 2.5e-4	

Algorithm	Setting	Selected Values
IPPO-FuPS	8 Agents (Same Goals)	0.2, 5e-5
	8 Agents (Different Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
	8 Agents (Four Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Same Goals)	0.2, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Different Goals)	0.2, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Two Goals)	0.2, 5e-5
IPPO-Linear Hypernetwork	8 Agents (Same Goals)	0.2, 5e-5
	8 Agents (Different Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
	8 Agents (Four Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Same Goals)	0.2, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Different Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Two Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
IPPO-MLP Hypernetwork	8 Agents (Same Goals)	0.2, 5e-5
	8 Agents (Different Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
	8 Agents (Four Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Same Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Different Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Two Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
IPPO-NoPS	8 Agents (Same Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
	8 Agents (Different Goals)	0.2, 5e-5
	8 Agents (Four Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Same Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Different Goals)	0.2, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Two Goals)	0.1, 5e-5
IPPO-Dico	8 Agents (Same Goals)	0.2, 5e-5
	8 Agents (Different Goals)	0.1, 2.5e-4
	8 Agents (Four Goals)	0.1, 2.5e-4
	4 Agents (Same Goals)	0.2, 5e-5
	4 Agents (Different Goals)	0.1, 2.5e-4
	4 Agents (Two Goals)	0.1, 5e-4

Table 12: Environment Settings for Navigation Task

Parameter	Value
n_agents	2,4,8
agents_with_same_goal	1, n_agents/2, n_agents
max_steps	100
collisions	False
split_goals	False
observe_all_goals	True
shared_rew	False
lidar_range	0.35
agent_radius	0.1
continuous_actions	True

Table 13: Recurrent IPPO and MAPPO Hyperparameters in SMAX (from JaxMARL paper)

Hyperparameter	IPPO Value	MAPPO Value
LR	0.004	0.002
NUM_ENVS	128	128
NUM_STEPS	128	128
GRU_HIDDEN_DIM	128	128
FC_DIM_SIZE	128	128
TOTAL_TIMESTEPS	1e7	1e7
UPDATE_EPOCHS	4	4
NUM_MINIBATCHES	4	4
GAMMA	0.99	0.99
GAE_LAMBDA	0.95	0.95
CLIP_EPS	0.05	0.2
SCALE_CLIP_EPS	False	False
ENT_COEF	0.01	0.0
VF_COEF	0.5	0.5
MAX_GRAD_NORM	0.25	0.25
ACTIVATION	relu	relu
SEED	30,1,42,72858,2300658	30,1,42,72858,2300658
ANNEAL_LR	True	True
OBS_WITH_AGENT_ID	-	True

Table 14: Hyperparameter Sweeps and Final Values for Different Maps in SMAX. H- refers to HyperMARL MLP Hypernetworks.

Map	Algorithm	LR Range	Chosen LR	HNET Embedding Dim	HNET Hidden Dims
2s3z	IPPO	0.004	0.004	-	-
	MAPPO	0.002	0.002	-	-
	H-IPPO	0.004	0.004	4	32
	H-MAPPO	0.002	0.002	64	16
3s5z	IPPO	0.004	0.004	-	-
	MAPPO	0.002,0.005,0.0003	0.002	-	-
	H-IPPO	0.004	0.004	64	16
	H-MAPPO	0.002,0.005,0.0003	0.0003	64	16
smacv2_10_units	IPPO	0.005,0.001,0.0003,0.004	0.001	-	-
	MAPPO	0.002,0.005,0.0003	0.0003	-	-
	H-IPPO	0.005,0.001,0.0003,0.004	0.005	4	64
	H-MAPPO	0.002,0.005,0.0003	0.0003	64	16
smacv2_20_units	IPPO	0.002,0.005,0.0003	0.005	-	-
	MAPPO	0.002,0.005,0.0003	0.0003	-	-
	H-IPPO	0.002,0.005,0.0003	0.005	64	64
	H-MAPPO	0.002,0.005,0.0003	0.0003	4	64

Note: HNET Embedding

Dim refers to the hypernetwork embedding dimension, chosen from the range {4, 16, 64}. HNET Hidden Dims refers to the hidden layer dimensions of the hypernetwork, chosen from the range {16, 32, 64}.

C DETAILED RESULTS

C.1 Specialisation and Synchronisation Game




Figure 12: Specialisation Game Results for 2, 4, and 8 Agents






Figure 13: Synchronisation Game Results for 2, 4, and 8 Agents


C.2 Navigation




(a) Same Goal (8 agents)




(b) Different Goals (8 agents)




(c) Four Goals (8 agents)




(e) Same Goal (4 agents)




(f) Different Goals (4 agents)



(g) Two Goals (4 agents)



(i) Same Goal (2 agents)



(j) Different Goals (2 agents)

(k) Scenarios with 2 Agents

— IPPO-FuPS — IPPO-Linear Hypernetwork — IPPO-MLP Hypernetwork — IPPO-NoPS — IPPO-Dico

Figure 14: Sample Efficiency of IPPO variants in the VMAS Navigation environment under different goal configurations and agent numbers.