
Is Centralized Training with Decentralized Execution Framework Centralized Enough for MARL?

Yihe Zhou^{1*}, Shunyu Liu^{1*}, Qing Yunpeng¹, Kaixuan Chen¹,
Yanhao Huang², Jie Song¹, Mingli Song^{1†}

¹Zhejiang University, ²China Electric Power Research Institute

zhouyihe@zju.edu.cn liushunyu@zju.edu.cn qingyunpeng@zju.edu.cn
chenkx@zju.edu.cn hyhao@epri.sgcc.com.cn sjie@zju.edu.cn
brooksong@zju.edu.cn

Abstract

Centralized Training with Decentralized Execution (CTDE) has recently emerged as a popular framework for cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (MARL), where agents can use additional global state information to guide training in a centralized way and make their own decisions only based on decentralized local policies. Despite the encouraging results achieved, CTDE makes an independence assumption on agent policies, which limits agents from adopting global cooperative information from each other during centralized training. Therefore, we argue that the existing CTDE framework cannot fully utilize global information for training, leading to an inefficient joint-policy exploration and even suboptimal results. In this paper, we introduce a novel Centralized Advising and Decentralized Pruning (CADP) framework for multi-agent reinforcement learning, that not only enables an efficacious message exchange among agents during training but also guarantees the independent policies for execution. Firstly, CADP endows agents the explicit communication channel to seek and take advice from different agents for more centralized training. To further ensure the decentralized execution, we propose a smooth model pruning mechanism to progressively constrain the agent communication into a closed one without degradation in agent cooperation capability. Empirical evaluations on StarCraft II micromanagement challenge and Google Research Football benchmarks and across different MARL backbones demonstrate that the proposed framework achieves superior performance compared with the state-of-the-art counterparts. Our code is available at <https://github.com/zyh1999/CADP>.

1 Introduction

Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (MARL) has recently been attracting increasing attention from research communities, attributed to its capability on training autonomous agents to solve many real-world tasks, such as video games [12, 33], traffic light systems [41], and smart grid control [36, 42]. However, learning cooperative policies for various complex multi-agent systems remains a major challenge. Firstly, the joint action-observation space grows exponentially with the number of agents, leading to a scalability problem when considering the multi-agent system as a single-agent one to search for the optimal joint policy. Moreover, optimizing agent policies individually also suffers from non-stationarity due to the partial observability constraint. To tackle these problems, Centralized Training with Decentralized Execution (CTDE) is proposed as a popular

*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding author.




Figure 1: Comparisons of different frameworks for MARL. (a) Basic CTDE framework. Each agent learns its individual policy by optimizing the joint value of the centralized mixing module with the global state. (b) Teacher-student CTDE framework. This framework introduces knowledge distillation to improve agent learning, where teacher agents use global information and student agents use local information. (c) Our CADP framework. Agents can exchange their advice during centralized training and then prune the dependence relationship for decentralized execution.

learning framework for MARL [16]. In CTDE, as depicted in Figure 1a, decentralized agent policies are trained by a centralized mixing module with additional global state information, while agents select actions only based on their own local observation.

In recent years, the CTDE framework has been widely used in MARL, including value decomposition methods [22, 23, 26, 30, 35] and policy gradient methods [7, 14, 16, 43], which achieves the state-of-the-art performance in different benchmarks. Despite its promising success, we argue that *the centralized training in CTDE is not centralized enough*. This is to say, the existing methods under CTDE framework cannot take full advantage of global information for centralized training. Specifically, agent policies are assumed to be independent of each other. The CTDE framework only introduces global information in the mix module, while agents are not granted direct access to global information even when centralized training. This partial observability limits agents to search and converge to the global optimal joint policy [34].

To remedy this issue, several prior efforts propose to design a teacher-student CTDE framework [2, 10, 34, 45], as depicted in Figure 1b. These works enable teacher agents to use the global state information during centralized training, while student agents with local observation can imitate the behaviors from teacher agents via knowledge distillation. However, these works just simply take the additional state information as the input of agent policy, which follows the independence assumption on agent policies. Therefore, the agents still make their own decision without considering the policies of other agents during centralized training. In this way, the expressiveness of the joint policy is inevitably limited, leading to inefficient exploration and even suboptimal results.

In this paper, we propose a novel Centralized Advising and Decentralized Pruning framework, termed as CADP, to enhance basic CTDE with global cooperative information. As depicted in Figure 1c, CADP enables agents to exchange advice with each other instead of only using global state information during centralized training. This approach is aligned with a common way of human communication, where humans often offer helpful and tailored advice based on their knowledge and beliefs instead of simply providing their own information [27]. Therefore, the centralized advising mechanism allows agents to deliver team-oriented actions for better cooperation. To generate the final decentralized policies, we further propose to smoothly prune the dependence relationship among agents via a dedicated auxiliary loss function.

In short, our main contribution is the first dedicated attempt towards fully centralized training for CTDE, a highly practical yet largely overlooked problem, achieved through adopting a prunable agent communication mechanism. We propose a novel Centralized Advising and Decentralized Pruning (CADP) framework to promote explicit agent cooperation during training while still ensure the independent policies for execution. *CADP is designed to provide a new general training framework for different MARL methods based on CTDE*. Experiments conducted on the StarCraft II micromanagement challenge and Google Research Football benchmark show that various MARL methods equipped with the proposed CADP framework yields results superior to the state-of-the-arts.

2 Related Works

CTDE Framework. Early learning frameworks in cooperative MARL can be mainly categorized into two classes: centralized learning and decentralized learning. Centralized learning [3] learns a single policy to directly produce the joint actions of all agents, but in many real-world scenarios, the partial observability and communication constraints among agents limit the feasibility of this framework. In decentralized learning [31], each agent can optimize its reward independently. Thus, it can be used in most of real-world scenarios. However, non-stationarity still remains a significant challenge in decentralized learning [28]. CTDE combines the advantages of these two frameworks, where agents can enjoy centralized training with additional global information and deliver actions only based on their local observation in a decentralized way. The CTDE framework has been widely studied in MARL, including value decomposition methods [22, 23, 26, 30, 35] and policy gradient methods [7, 14, 16, 43]. Please refer to Appendix A for more details.

Teacher-student CTDE Framework. However, traditional CTDE-based methods fall short of fully utilizing global information for training, leading to an inefficient exploration of the joint-policy, and resulting in suboptimal outcomes. Therefore, several works recently improve CTDE with the teacher-student framework. IGM-DA [10] firstly proposes centralized teacher with decentralized student frameworks, where the teacher models use the global state while the student models use the partial observation. It adds an additional knowledge distillation loss(imitation loss) to enable the teacher model to assist in training the student model. In CTDS [45], the teacher model still uses the agent observation, but the field of view is set to infinite during centralized training. PTDE [2] trains a neural network to aggregate local observation and global state, resulting in a better representation of agent-specific global information. The teacher model in MACPF [34] considers the execution order of different agents, and takes executed actions of previous agents as input. Most of these frameworks focus on distillation to transfer the knowledge from the teacher agent to the student agent for decentralized execution, which is essentially an offline imitation learning. Thus, the agents still ignore the policies of other agents and make their own decision during centralized training, resulting in an inefficient cooperative exploration.

Communication. Communication [6, 9, 29, 37] is also widely used in MARL. Communication facilitates information transmission between agents, which is crucial for effective collaboration when each agent has access only to their own observations. Due to the recent prevalence of attention architectures in deep learning, many methods have recently used attention as the main mechanism of communication [4, 11, 13, 18, 20, 44], where cross-attention can be considered as a message exchange mechanism with other agents. There are also some works that represent the communication framework using coordination graphs [1, 17, 40]. The communication paradigm allows agents to communicate during both the training and execution stages, in contrast, CTDE emphasizes centralized training of agents while they execute their individual policies in a decentralized no-communication manner. Furthermore, to address communication constraints, various message pruning methods have been proposed. IMAC [38], GACML [19], NDQ [39], and I2C [5] propose methods to compress and refine communication information or choose with whom to communicate. However, these methods typically cannot achieve satisfactory results in a totally decentralized execution environment where any communication is not allowed at all.

3 Preliminary

Dec-POMDP. In this work, we consider a fully cooperative multi-agent task as the *Decentralized Partially Observable Markov Decision Process* (Dec-POMDP), which is formally defined as a tuple $\langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U}, P, r, \Omega, O, \gamma \rangle$, where $\mathcal{A} = \{a_n\}_{n=1}^N$ is the set of N agents and $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is the global state of the environment. At each time step t , each agent $a_n \in \mathcal{A}$ receives an individual partial observation $o_t^n \in \Omega$ drawn from the observation function $O(s_t, a_n)$, then each agent chooses an action $u_t^n \in \mathcal{U}$ which forms joint action $\mathbf{u}_t \in \mathcal{U}^N$. This causes a transition to the next state s_{t+1} according to the state transition function $P(s_{t+1}|s_t, \mathbf{u}_t) : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{U}^N \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. The reward function which is modeled as $r(s_t, \mathbf{u}_t) : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{U}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ is the discount factor. Each agent a_n has an action-observation history $\tau^n \in \mathcal{T} \equiv (\Omega \times \mathcal{U})^*$, on which it conditions a stochastic policy $\pi^n(u^n|\tau^n) : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. The joint action-observation history is defined as $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^N$. In this work, the joint policy π is based




Figure 2: An illustrative diagram of the proposed Centralized Advising and Decentralized Pruning (CADP) framework. At the centralized training stage, the agent model will use the Q , K and V modules, while at the decentralized execution stage, the agent model only uses the V module.

on joint action-value function $Q_t^{tot}(s_t, \mathbf{u}_t) = \mathbb{E}_{s_{t+1:\infty}, \mathbf{u}_{t+1:\infty}} \left[\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma^i r_{t+i} \mid s_t, \mathbf{u}_t \right]$. The final goal is to get the optimal policy π^* that maximizes the joint action value.

Value Decomposition. Value Decomposition (VD) has attracted substantial attention in cooperative MARL to achieve effective Q-learning [23, 30, 35]. This method aims to learn a joint action-value function Q^{tot} to estimate the expected return given current global state s_t and joint action \mathbf{u}_t . To realize VD, a mixing network $f(\cdot; \theta_v)$ with parameters θ_v is adopted as an approximator to estimate the joint action-value function Q^{tot} . $f(\cdot; \theta_v)$ is introduced to merge all individual action values into a joint one $Q^{tot} = f(\mathbf{q}; \theta_v)$, where $\mathbf{q} = [Q^n]_{n=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and Q^n with shared parameters θ_a is the policy network of each agent a_n . Usually, $f(\cdot; \theta_v)$ is enforced to satisfy the Individual-Global-Max (IGM) [26] principle. Therefore, the optimal joint action can be easily derived by independently choosing a local optimal action from each local Q-function Q^n , which enables Centralized Training and Decentralized Execution (CTDE). The learnable parameter $\theta = \{\theta_a, \theta_v\}$ can be updated by minimizing the following Temporal-Difference (TD) loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{TD}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} \left[(y^{tot} - Q^{tot})^2 \right]. \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation function, \mathcal{D} is the replay buffer of the transitions, $y^{tot} = r + \gamma \hat{Q}^{tot}$ is the one-step target and \hat{Q}^{tot} is the target network [21]. Additionally, owing to the fact that the partial observability often limits the agent in the acquisition of information, the agent policy usually incorporates past observations from the history [30].

4 Method

To introduce global cooperative information for agent training, we propose the Centralized Advising and Decentralized Pruning (CADP) framework, as shown in Figure 2. In general, CADP performs CTDE to enable each agent to learn its individual policy network. At the heart of our design is introducing the explicit advice exchanging of agents for fully centralized training to enhance the agent policy network. To cope with the decentralized execution paradigm, we design a model self-pruning mechanism, which prompts the centralized model to evolve into a decentralized model smoothly. The overall framework is finally summarized.

4.1 Advice Exchanging

The widely adopted CTDE framework only introduces the global state information for agents in the mixing module, leading to that an agent policy network only perceives its local observation instead of the global states. The decentralized agent policy networks contrast to the communication and message exchanging of human beings in the cooperative tasks [27], where humans exchange their cognition and intention to obtain their goals. Similarly, an agent of MARL strives for the final success of tasks with the input state information, where the input state information can be regarded as the

cognition of the agent and the final success of task can be regarded as the intention of the agent. Motivated by the cooperative message exchanging of human beings, we design a novel centralized training scheme to augment the agent policy network from the local cognition of an individual agent to the global cognition from all agents.

Formally, we employ an agent’s confidence c for all agents to highlight its personalized confidence weights of other agents when receiving interchangeable cognition messages from them, where the higher confidence corresponds to the more useful advice of agents. The whole process can be well reduced to a cross-attention mechanism [32], where we set the cognition and intention as key k and value v , respectively, while confidence c is considered as the dot product of the key k of other agents and query q of itself. q , k and v are all linear projections of the local observation o . The formula is written as follows:

$$\alpha_{i,j} = \frac{q_i \cdot k_j}{\sqrt{d_x}}, \quad (2)$$

$$c_{i,j} = \frac{\exp(\alpha_{i,j})}{\sum_{k=1}^N \exp(\alpha_{i,k})}, \quad (3)$$

where k_j means the cognition of agent j , d_x is the scaling coefficient and $c_{i,j}$ is the confidence from agent i to agent j . Finally, the collective intention z_i of the agent i is obtained by taking the weighted sum of the advice according to the confidence $c_{i,1:N} \triangleq (c_{i,1}, c_{i,2}, \dots, c_{i,N})$:

$$z_i = \sum_{j=1}^N c_{i,j} \cdot v_j, \quad (4)$$

where v_j means the advice of agent j . Through this step, each agent refers to the advice of others, and aggregates to a more team-oriented intention.

Then, we combine the collective intention z in the previous step with the agent’s own information h , and finally output the action value Q :

$$h_i^t = GRU(o_i, h_i^{t-1}), \quad (5)$$

$$Q^i = MLP([h_i^t, f(z_i)]), \quad (6)$$

where $GRU(\cdot, \cdot)$ stands for Gated Recurrent Unit, $f(\cdot)$ means a full connection layer neural network. Since the agent itself does not play an essential role in computing the collective intention, predicting solely based on the collective intention z from other agents deviates from the decentralized execution. Thus, we further refine the information of the individual agent based on the collective intention z and agent’s own historical information h by attentively extracting the insightful information with the MLP network. Since our work focuses on the agent policy module, we can adopt different mix modules such as VDN [30], QMIX [23] and QPLEX [35] to generate Q^{tot} and execute gradient descent algorithm by TD loss.

4.2 Model Self-Pruning

As we ultimately serve the decentralized execution, the current agent model needs to evolve into the decentralized model depending only on itself, rather than global information. In this step, we design a simple yet effective model self-pruning method to achieve this. We claim that if the following conditions are met:

$$c_{i,1:N} = \mathbf{e}^i, \forall i \in [1, N], \quad (7)$$

where \mathbf{e}^i means the i -th standard basis vector (an one-hot vector). In this way, we can directly apply the agent model to decentralized execution as there is no advice from other agents adopted. Furthermore, we can just apply the intention v to produce the output z without cognition k and other components. For the convenience of expression, we refer to the model that only requires V without the cross-attention mechanism as the decentralized model (CADP(D)). On the other hand, the model using the cross-attention mechanism is referred to as the centralized model (CADP(C)). A decentralized model actually presents that the agent’s confidence $c_{i,1:N}$ of all agents is equal to the one-hot vector \mathbf{e}^i in the execution stage. It is required to smoothly swap from the centralized training with exchanging confidence to the decentralized execution with the one-hot confidence $c_{i,1:N}$.

Therefore, we design an auxiliary loss function named pruning loss \mathcal{L}_p to help the decentralized agent gradually alleviate the dependence of other agents, which is given as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_p(\theta_a) = \sum_{i=1}^N D_{KL}(c_{i,1:N} \| \mathbf{e}^i), \quad (8)$$

where θ_a means the parameters in the agent policy module, and D_{KL} means the Kullback Leibler (KL) Divergence. In the pruning loss, smaller \mathcal{L}_p means that agents rely less on the other agents.

4.3 Overall Framework

In our framework, we first adopt message exchanging step at agent policy module to produce more thoughtful and team-oriented action decisions. This approach is aligned with a common way humans communicate. After the model converges to a low-level loss, we start to use the pruning loss \mathcal{L}_p , prompting the centralized model to evolve into a decentralized one smoothly. Our mix module implementation uses QMIX [23] as a basic backbone for its robust performance and its simplicity of architecture, but it is readily applicable to the other mixing method since our framework focuses on the agent policy module. The mixing module is a feed-forward neural network that merges all individual action values into a joint one Q_{tot} .

To sum up, training our CADP framework contains two main loss functions. Since our method adopts the VD technique, the first one is naturally the original TD loss \mathcal{L}_{TD} mentioned on Equation 1, which enables each agent to learn its individual agent policy by optimizing the joint-action value of the mix module. Unlike IGM-DA [10] and CTDS [45], to avoid performance degradation and reduce computing costs, our pruning loss \mathcal{L}_p is not introduced at the very beginning. We add pruning loss when the centralized model reaches a high level. Therefore, the total loss of our framework is formulated as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{tot}(\theta) = \mathcal{L}_{TD}(\theta_v, \theta_a) + \sigma(t)\mathcal{L}_p(\theta_a), \quad (9)$$

where θ_v stands for the parameters of mixing network in our method and t is the timestep of the training. $\sigma(\cdot)$ is a threshold function which is defined as follows:

$$\sigma(t) = \begin{cases} \alpha & \text{if } t \geq T, \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where T is a hyperparameter and α is the coefficient for trading off loss term. The overall framework is trained in an end-to-end centralized manner. To make the proposed method clearer for readers, we provide pseudocode and visualization in Appendix D and E, respectively.

5 Experiments

To demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed CADP framework, we conduct experiments on the StarCraft II micromanagement challenge and Google Research Football benchmark. We aim to answer the following questions: (1) Can CADP outperforms the methods under traditional CTDE framework? (Section 5.1) (2) Can CADP outperforms the methods under teacher-student CTDE framework? (Section 5.1) (3) Can CADP, as a universal framework, be applied to different methods and achieve improvement in all of them? (Section 5.2.1) (4) Can CADP perform better than the message pruning method under the CTDE constraints? (Appendix C).

We select several CTDE-based methods: VDN [30], QMIX [23], QTRAN [26], QPLEX [35], CWQMIX [22], OWQMIX [22] and one DTDE-based methods: IQL [31] for comparison. Besides, we also compare with 2 teacher-student CTDE framework methods: CTDS [45] and IGM-DA [10]. Furthermore, we compare with two message pruning methods: GACML[19] and NDQ[39] in Appendix C. Our CADP framework uses QMIX [23] as a basic backbone for its robust performance and its simplicity of architecture, but it is readily applicable to the other mixing method. The detailed hyperparameters are given in Appendix B, where the common training parameters across different methods are consistent to ensure comparability.




Figure 3: Learning curves of our method and baselines on the SMAC scenarios. (Upper) Comparison with the methods under the CTDE and DTDE frameworks. (Lower) Comparison with the methods under the teacher-student CTDE framework. CADP(C) means our centralized model, while CADP(D) means our decentralized model which will be used for decentralized execution.

5.1 Performance

SMAC Benchmark. The StarCraft Multi-Agent Challenge (SMAC)³ [24] has become a common benchmark for evaluating state-of-the-art MARL methods. SMAC focuses on challenging micro-management tasks where the control of ally entities is managed by individual learning agents while the control of adversary entities is managed by the game engine. The objective of the agents is to maximize harm to the enemy. Therefore, effective strategies such as surprise attack and distraction are necessary during battles. Learning these diverse interaction behaviors under partial observation is a challenging task. Since many easy SMAC scenarios [24] already can be solved well by existing CTDE-based methods, we conduct experiments on 3 challenging SMAC scenarios [24], which are classified into **Hard** (*5m_vs_6m*) and **Super Hard** (*corridor*, *3s5z_vs_3s6z*) to validate the effectiveness of our methods under challenging tasks. Two of these scenarios are heterogeneous (*corridor*, *3s5z_vs_3s6z*), where each army is composed of more than one unit type, while the other (*5m_vs_6m*) is homogeneous.

The experimental results on different scenarios are shown in Figure 3. It can be seen that our proposed method successfully improves the final performance in the challenging tasks, not only compared with the methods under traditional CTDE framework, but also compared with the methods under teacher-student CTDE framework. Especially in the most difficult homogeneous scenario (*3s5z_vs_3s6z*) due to the different unit types, the large number of entities and the great disparity in strength between the two teams, our method outperforms baselines by a large margin. In addition, after adding the pruning loss, the performance of our decentralized model rises dramatically from almost zero to near the performance of our centralized model. By contrast, in methods teacher-student CTDE framework, the performances of student models and teacher models climb together slowly and even sometimes the teacher models fail for training, not to mention the student models. Furthermore, our CADP method is the only method which can ultimately reach almost consistent performance for decentralized model and centralized model in all three SMAC scenarios.

GRF Benchmark. Google Research Football (GRF) [15] is another MARL benchmark based on open-source game Gameplay Football. In our experiments, we control left-side players except the goalkeeper. The right-side players are rule-based bots controlled by the game engine.


³We use SC2.4.10 version instead of the older SC2.4.6. Performance is not comparable across versions.

Table 1: The test win rate of different MARL methods with the CTDE framework and the CADP framework. \pm corresponds to one standard deviation of the average evaluation over 5 trials.

Method	5m_vs_6m	corridor	3s5z_vs_3s6z
VDN (CTDE)	0.54 \pm 0.09	0.65 \pm 0.32	0.25 \pm 0.18
VDN (CADP)	0.66 \pm 0.07	0.72 \pm 0.51	0.85 \pm 0.20
QMIX (CTDE)	0.43 \pm 0.13	0.70 \pm 0.35	0.24 \pm 0.36
QMIX (CADP)	0.68 \pm 0.08	0.84 \pm 0.03	0.93 \pm 0.03
QPLEX (CTDE)	0.57 \pm 0.13	0.20 \pm 0.12	0.08 \pm 0.11
QPLEX (CADP)	0.73 \pm 0.04	0.37 \pm 0.36	0.96 \pm 0.02
MAPPO (CTDE)	0.85 \pm 0.07	0.96 \pm 0.03	0.35 \pm 0.39
MAPPO (CADP)	0.97 \pm 0.03	0.98 \pm 0.02	0.90 \pm 0.16

We test our approach on two challenging Google Research Football (GRF) offensive scenarios: *academy_3_vs_1_with_keeper* and *academy_counterattack_easy*. Unlike StarCraft II, individual observations in the Google Research Football (GRF) are not partial observation, which contains as much information as global state, but the global state uses absolute coordinates, while personal observations use relative coordinates based on the own positions of agents. In this case, the teacher-student CTDE framework will no longer have a significant advantage over methods under traditional CTDE framework theoretically, since the teacher model does not have more input information than the student model and has no ability to instruct the student model.

The experimental results on different scenarios are shown in Figure 8. It can be seen that only our method can significantly outperform QMIX [23]. In addition, in the method of the teacher-student framework, the student model has always maintained almost the same performance as the teacher model, which verifies that the teacher model does not have the ability to guide the student model in this case and also shows that advice exchanging is more powerful than simply providing more observation information. In Google Research Football (GRF) benchmark, we set $T = 3M$ in *academy_3_vs_1_with_keeper* scenario and $T = 6M$ in *academy_counterattack_easy* scenario respectively. We can still see an obvious performance improvement of our method after adding the pruning loss \mathcal{L}_p at timestep T in both scenarios.



(a) *academy_3_vs_1_with_keeper* (b) *academy_counterattack_easy*

Figure 4: Learning curves of our method and baselines on the Google Research Football (GRF) scenarios.

5.2 Ablation Study

5.2.1 Generability Analysis

To further verify the generability of our CADP framework, we test value-based methods: VDN [30], QMIX [23], QPLEX [35] and policy-based method: MAPPO [43] under the CADP framework. Experimental results in Table 1 indicate that all these methods have shown an improvement when using the CADP framework. Especially in the most difficult homogeneous scenario (*3s5z_vs_3s6z*), methods with our CADP framework outperform baselines by a large margin. This observation clearly indicates the versatility and effectiveness of our proposed CADP framework in catering to various CTDE-based methods, particularly in scenarios with high levels of difficulty and complexity.

5.2.2 Sensitive Analysis

Different sight range. We first test methods in the complex *3s5z_vs_3s6z* scenario with different sight range of 9, 5, and 0. Sight range represents the radius of field of view for each agent in the game. Figure 5 shows the experimental results. We can see that as the sight range becomes smaller,




Figure 5: Ablation study on different sight ranges.

the performance of most methods decline. It is very intuitive because smaller sight range means less information will be collected by agents but the performance of QMIX and IGM-DA with sight range 5 is higher than with sight range 9, which may be because in some situations, "Limiting the value function input dimensionality can further improve performance" [43]. Anyway, our method still has the best performance with all different sight ranges and our method still is the only one which can ultimately reach almost consistent performance for decentralized model and centralized model in all three settings. Since there may be an inevitable information gap between teacher with global information and student with partial observation especially when the sight range of student is very small. Then teacher may teach beyond the student's ability. But our pruning loss enables our centralized model (teacher) to adjust strategy based on the abilities of decentralized model (student) instead of blindly imitation learning.

Different hyperparameter σ .

We examine the effect of the coefficient α in $3s5z_vs_3s6z$ scenarios in the upper row of Figure 6. We observe that there is not much difference in performance except the coefficient is too small ($\alpha = 0.001$) to affect the training of the model. Even when we set $\alpha = 100.0$, The final performance is also not far behind the best ($\alpha = 0.5$). This means our method is very robust for the coefficient α .

The performance of our method is also influenced by the timestep T . We consider five T values: 0, 1M, 2M, 3M, and 3.5M. A T value indicates that we add \mathcal{L}_p into \mathcal{L}_{tot} to run gradient descent at timestep T . The lower row of Figure 6 demonstrates that using smaller T for training, the




Figure 6: (Upper) Ablation study on different coefficients α . (Lower) Ablation study on different timestep T . The left is the learning curves for 4M timesteps and the right is the average win rate and standard deviation for last 0.1M timesteps.

performance of decentralized will start to improve earlier but will take longer time from the beginning of improvement to convergence which will waste some computing resources while using bigger T for training, the performance of decentralized model will improve more quickly but the convergence time may delay since we add \mathcal{L}_p later. It is worth mentioning that the experiment shows that different values have little impact on the final performance, which may be because \mathcal{L}_{TD} is always dominant in training before the convergence of the centralized model.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we argue that the traditional CTDE framework is not centralized enough, since it falls short of fully utilizing global information for training, leading to an inefficient exploration of the joint-

policy, and resulting in suboptimal outcomes. Thus, we propose a novel Centralized Advising and Decentralized Pruning framework, termed as CADP, to enhance basic CTDE with global cooperative information. We validate CADP over the common-used StarCraft II micromanagement benchmark and Google Research Football (GRF) benchmark, and showcase that it yields results significantly superior to the state-of-the-art techniques. CADP can provide a more efficient training framework for any traditional CTDE-based method. As we just adopt simple and light network architecture, we believe there will be more discussion and exploration under CADP framework in the future.

References

- [1] Wendelin Böhmer, Vitaly Kurin, and Shimon Whiteson. Deep coordination graphs. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- [2] Yiqun Chen, Hangyu Mao, Tianle Zhang, Shiguang Wu, Bin Zhang, Jianye Hao, Dong Li, Bin Wang, and Hongxing Chang. Ptdc: Personalized training with distilled execution for multi-agent reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.08872*, 2022.
- [3] Caroline Claus and Craig Boutilier. The dynamics of reinforcement learning in cooperative multiagent systems. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 1998.
- [4] Abhishek Das, Théophile Gervet, Joshua Romoff, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, Mike Rabbat, and Joelle Pineau. Tarmac: Targeted multi-agent communication. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019.
- [5] Ziluo Ding, Tiejun Huang, and Zongqing Lu. Learning individually inferred communication for multi-agent cooperation. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- [6] Jakob Foerster, Ioannis Alexandros Assael, Nando De Freitas, and Shimon Whiteson. Learning to communicate with deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016.
- [7] Jakob N. Foerster, Gregory Farquhar, Triantafyllos Afouras, Nantas Nardelli, and Shimon Whiteson. Counterfactual multi-agent policy gradients. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- [8] Wei Fu, Chao Yu, Zelai Xu, Jiaqi Yang, and Yi Wu. Revisiting some common practices in cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022.
- [9] C Lee Giles and Kam-Chuen Jim. Learning communication for multi-agent systems. In *International Workshop on Radical Agent Concepts*, 2003.
- [10] Yitian Hong, Yaochu Jin, and Yang Tang. Rethinking individual global max in cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.09640*, 2022.
- [11] Shariq Iqbal and Fei Sha. Actor-attention-critic for multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019.
- [12] Max Jaderberg, Wojciech Marian Czarnecki, Iain Dunning, Luke Marris, et al. Human-level performance in 3d multiplayer games with population-based reinforcement learning. *Science*, 364(6443):859–865, 2019.
- [13] Jiechuan Jiang and Zongqing Lu. Learning attentional communication for multi-agent cooperation. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018.
- [14] Jakub Grudzien Kuba, Ruiqing Chen, Muning Wen, Ying Wen, Fanglei Sun, Jun Wang, and Yaodong Yang. Trust region policy optimisation in multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [15] Karol Kurach, Anton Raichuk, Piotr Stańczyk, Michał Zajac, Olivier Bachem, Lasse Espeholt, Carlos Riquelme, Damien Vincent, Marcin Michalski, Olivier Bousquet, et al. Google research football: A novel reinforcement learning environment. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.

- [16] Ryan Lowe, Yi Wu, Aviv Tamar, Jean Harb, Pieter Abbeel, and Igor Mordatch. Multi-agent actor-critic for mixed cooperative-competitive environments. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [17] Hangyu Mao, Wulong Liu, Jianye Hao, Jun Luo, Dong Li, Zhengchao Zhang, Jun Wang, and Zhen Xiao. Neighborhood cognition consistent multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.
- [18] Hangyu Mao, Zhengchao Zhang, Zhen Xiao, and Zhibo Gong. Modelling the dynamic joint policy of teammates with attention multi-agent ddpg. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.07029*, 2018.
- [19] Hangyu Mao, Zhengchao Zhang, Zhen Xiao, Zhibo Gong, and Yan Ni. Learning agent communication under limited bandwidth by message pruning. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.
- [20] Hangyu Mao, Zhengchao Zhang, Zhen Xiao, Zhibo Gong, and Yan Ni. Learning multi-agent communication with double attentional deep reinforcement learning. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 2020.
- [21] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A. Rusu, et al. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- [22] Tabish Rashid, Gregory Farquhar, Bei Peng, and Shimon Whiteson. Weighted QMIX: expanding monotonic value function factorisation for deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- [23] Tabish Rashid, Mikayel Samvelyan, Christian Schröder de Witt, Gregory Farquhar, Jakob N. Foerster, and Shimon Whiteson. QMIX: monotonic value function factorisation for deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018.
- [24] Mikayel Samvelyan, Tabish Rashid, Christian Schröder de Witt, Gregory Farquhar, Nantas Nardelli, Tim G. J. Rudner, Chia-Man Hung, Philip H. S. Torr, Jakob N. Foerster, and Shimon Whiteson. The starcraft multi-agent challenge. In *International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-agent Systems*, 2019.
- [25] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [26] Kyunghwan Son, Daewoo Kim, Wan Ju Kang, David Hostallero, and Yung Yi. QTRAN: learning to factorize with transformation for cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019.
- [27] Keith Stenning, Jo Calder, and Alex Lascarides. *Introduction to cognition and communication*. MIT Press, 2006.
- [28] Kefan Su, Siyuan Zhou, Chuang Gan, Xiangjun Wang, and Zongqing Lu. Ma2ql: A minimalist approach to fully decentralized multi-agent reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.08244*, 2022.
- [29] Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Rob Fergus, et al. Learning multiagent communication with backpropagation. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016.
- [30] Peter Sunehag, Guy Lever, Audrunas Gruslys, Wojciech Marian Czarnecki, et al. Value-decomposition networks for cooperative multi-agent learning based on team reward. In *International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-agent Systems*, 2018.
- [31] Ming Tan. Multi-agent reinforcement learning: Independent vs. cooperative agents. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 1993.
- [32] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [33] Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M Czarnecki, Michaël Mathieu, et al. Grandmaster level in starcraft ii using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 575(7782):350–354, 2019.

- [34] Jiangxing Wang, Deheng Ye, and Zongqing Lu. More centralized training, still decentralized execution: Multi-agent conditional policy factorization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.12681*, 2022.
- [35] Jianhao Wang, Zhizhou Ren, Terry Liu, Yang Yu, and Chongjie Zhang. QPLEX: duplex dueling multi-agent q-learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [36] Jianhong Wang, Wangkun Xu, Yunjie Gu, Wenbin Song, and Tim Green. Multi-agent reinforcement learning for active voltage control on power distribution networks. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [37] Rundong Wang, Xu He, Runsheng Yu, Wei Qiu, Bo An, and Zinovi Rabinovich. Learning efficient multi-agent communication: An information bottleneck approach. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- [38] Rundong Wang, Xu He, Runsheng Yu, Wei Qiu, Bo An, and Zinovi Rabinovich. Learning efficient multi-agent communication: An information bottleneck approach. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- [39] Tonghan Wang*, Jianhao Wang*, Chongyi Zheng, and Chongjie Zhang. Learning nearly decomposable value functions via communication minimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [40] Tonghan Wang, Liang Zeng, Weijun Dong, Qianlan Yang, Yang Yu, and Chongjie Zhang. Context-aware sparse deep coordination graphs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [41] Tong Wu, Pan Zhou, Kai Liu, Yali Yuan, Xiumin Wang, Huawei Huang, and Dapeng Oliver Wu. Multi-agent deep reinforcement learning for urban traffic light control in vehicular networks. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 69(8):8243–8256, 2020.
- [42] Xu Xu, Youwei Jia, Yan Xu, Zhao Xu, Songjian Chai, and Chun Sing Lai. A multi-agent reinforcement learning-based data-driven method for home energy management. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 11(4):3201–3211, 2020.
- [43] Chao Yu, Akash Velu, Eugene Vinitzky, Yu Wang, Alexandre Bayen, and Yi Wu. The surprising effectiveness of ppo in cooperative, multi-agent games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.01955*, 2021.
- [44] Lei Yuan, Jianhao Wang, Fuxiang Zhang, Chenghe Wang, Zongzhang Zhang, Yang Yu, and Chongjie Zhang. Multi-agent incentive communication via decentralized teammate modeling. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2022.
- [45] Jian Zhao, Xunhan Hu, Mingyu Yang, Wengang Zhou, Jiangcheng Zhu, and Houqiang Li. Ctds: Centralized teacher with decentralized student for multi-agent reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.08412*, 2022.

A Additional Related Work

Value Decomposition (VD) is a well-established technique for cooperative MARL problems under CTDE framework. VD is supposed to decompose the joint value into the individual value properly. To achieve efficient VD, it is necessary to satisfy the Individual-Global-Max (IGM) principle that the global optimal action should be consistent with the collection of individual optimal actions of agents [26]. Following the IGM principle, VDN [30] proposes to represent the joint value function as a sum of individual value functions, while QMIX [23] changes the simple sum function of VDN to a deep neural network that satisfies monotonicity constraints. QMIX is considered as the earliest form of credit assignment. To further alleviate the risk of suboptimal results, WQMIX [22] improves QMIX by a weighted projection that allows more emphasis to be placed on underestimated actions. However, both VDN and QMIX use stricter constraints than IGM, which limit their representation capability for joint action-value function classes. Thus, QTRAN [26] and QPLEX [35] propose some novel methods whose constraints is looser than VDN and QMIX, but still satisfy the IGM principle.

Several conventional CTDE-based methods, such as COMA [7] and MADDPG [16], adopt another algorithm called Policy Gradient (PG), which learns local agent policies as the actor and learns a

centralized value function as the mixing module. Because of the on-policy fashion, PG methods are typically believed to be less sample efficient and therefore less applied in challenging tasks with limited computation resources [8]. Whereas, MAPPO [43] and HAPPO [14] demonstrate that with appropriate implementation tricks of PPO algorithm [25], PG method can achieve strong performance and sample efficiency in many cooperative MARL benchmarks compared to the VD method.

B Detailed Hyperparameters

We adopt the Python MARL framework (PyMARL) [24] to implement our method and all baselines. The detailed hyperparameters in the SMAC benchmark and GRF benchmark are given as follows, where the common hyperparameters across different methods are consistent for a fair comparison. We modify several hyperparameters in some difficult scenarios and also detail them below. All experimental results are illustrated with the mean and variance of the performance over five random seeds for a fair comparison. To make the results in figures clearer for readers, we adopt a 50% confidence interval to plot the error bar. Batches of 32 episodes are sampled from the replay buffer with the size of 5K for every training iteration. The target update interval is set to 200, and the discount factor is set to 0.99. We use the Adam Optimizer with a learning rate of 5×10^{-4} for SMAC scenarios, while use the RMSprop Optimizer with a learning rate of 5×10^{-4} , a smoothing constant of 0.99, and with no momentum or weight decay for GRF scenarios. For exploration, ϵ -greedy is used with ϵ annealed linearly from 1.0 to 0.05 over 50K training steps and kept constant for the rest of the training. In several super hard SMAC scenarios (*corridor*, *3s5z_vs_3s6z*) that require more exploration. In this way, we extend the epsilon anneal time to 500K for all the compared methods. For the CADP module, the additional hyperparameters are the trade-off coefficient α of the pruning loss \mathcal{L}_p and the timestep T when the pruning loss \mathcal{L}_p is used. We search α over $\{0.001, 0.1, 0.5, 1.0, 10.0, 100.0\}$ in the SMAC benchmark. The coefficient α of the pruning loss \mathcal{L}_p is set to 1.0, 0.5, and 0.5 for *5m_vs_6m*, *corridor* and *3s5z_vs_3s6z*, respectively and the timestep T is set to about three-quarters of the total timesteps. We search α over $\{0.5, 1.0, 10.0, 30.0, 50.0, 100.0\}$ in the GRF benchmark, while the coefficient α of the pruning loss \mathcal{L}_p is set to 50.0 and 30.0 for *academy_3_vs_1_with_keeper* and *academy_counterattack_easy*, respectively and the timestep T is set to about three-fifths of the total timesteps. That is because GRF benchmark is harder than SMAC benchmark for model-pruning. In the ablation study, the coefficient α is consistent with the above. Experiments are carried out on NVIDIA Quadro P5000 GPU. Besides, in GRF scenarios, some methods are not supported by their original source code. So we follow the design in their papers and add some code to support running GRF scenarios.

C Additional Experiments

C.1 Detailed Results of SMAC and GRF

SMAC. The StarCraft Multi-Agent Challenge (SMAC)⁴ [24] has become a common-used benchmark for evaluating state-of-the-art MARL methods. SMAC focuses on micromanagement challenges where each of the ally entities is controlled by an individual learning agent, and enemy entities are controlled by a built-in AI. At each time step, agents can move in four cardinal directions, stop, take no-operation, or choose an enemy to attack. Thus, if there are N_e enemies in the scenario, the action space for each ally unit consists of $N_e + 6$ discrete actions. Figure 7 shows the initial state of three SMAC scenarios. The goal of the agents is to maximize the damage to enemies. Hence, proper tactics such as sneaking attack and drawing fire are required during battles. Learning these diverse interaction behaviors under partial observation is a challenging task. To validate the effectiveness of our methods, we conduct experiments on 3 SMAC scenarios [24] which are classified into **Hard** (*5m_vs_6m*) and **Super Hard** (*corridor*, *3s5z_vs_3s6z*), since many easy SMAC scenarios already can be solved well by existing basic CTDE-based methods.

GRF. Google Research Football (GRF) [15] is another MARL benchmark based on open-source game Gameplay Football. Figure 8 shows two GRF scenarios. In our experiments, we control left-side players except the goalkeeper. The right-side players are rule-based bots controlled by the game engine. Agents have a discrete action space of 19, including moving in 8 directions, sliding, shooting,

⁴We use SC2.4.10 version instead of the older SC2.4.6. Performance is not comparable across versions.




Figure 7: The initial state of three SMAC scenarios.



Figure 8: Two scenarios of Google Research Football game.

and passing. The observation contains the positions and moving directions of the ego-agent, other agents, and the ball. The z-coordinate of the ball is also included. We test our approach on two challenging Google Research Football (GRF) offensive scenarios: *academy_3_vs_1_with_keeper* (three of our players try to score from the edge of the box, one on each side, and the other at the center. Initially, the player at the center has the ball and is facing the defender. There is an opponent keeper) and *academy_counterattack_easy* (4 versus 1 counter-attack with keeper; all the remaining players of both teams run back towards the ball). Unlike StarCraft II, individual observations in the Google Research Football (GRF) are not partial observation, which contains as much information as global state, but the global state uses absolute coordinates, while personal observations use relative coordinates based on the own positions of agents.

Please refer to the main manuscript for the learning curves of compared methods. Here we provide another quantitative metric to compare different methods. We calculate the average test win rate over the last 100K training steps for each model due to the unstable fluctuation of performance. The additional quantitative results are reported in Table 2 and Table 3. Our method outperforms various baselines by a large margin.

C.2 Comparison with Message Pruning Methods

We additionally test two message pruning methods, GACML [19] and NDQ [39]. The former is an attention-based method, while the latter is not. During training, we allow them to communicate and apply message pruning, but during execution, we cut off all communication. To ensure a fair comparison, we also used QMIX [23] as the backbone for these two methods. The experimental results in the table 4 show that these methods are almost not better than basic QMIX [23]. Additionally, the experiments conducted in the papers of GACML [19] and NDQ [39] also show that: when communication is completely cut off, the model’s performance is not good.

These experimental results indicate that although message pruning can reduce communication, it is not suitable for CTDE scenarios where there is no communication at all. These message pruning methods often focus on compressing and refining communication information or selecting who to communicate with, which results in smaller bandwidth. In contrast, our CADP framework is designed to enhance the CTDE framework, which does not allow any communication at all during the

decentralized execution phase. Our CADP framework first trains a well-performing communication model, and then gradually and dynamically distills its knowledge into a non-communication model.

Table 2: The test win rate of compared methods on the SMAC scenarios (*5m_vs_6m*, *corridor* and *3s5z_vs_3s6z*). \pm corresponds to one standard deviation of the average evaluation over 5 trials.

Method	5m_vs_6m	corridor	3s5z_vs_3s6z
IQL [31]	0.13 \pm 0.06	0.50 \pm 0.15	0.00 \pm 0.00
VDN [30]	0.54 \pm 0.09	0.65 \pm 0.32	0.25 \pm 0.18
QMIX [23]	0.43 \pm 0.13	0.70 \pm 0.35	0.24 \pm 0.36
QPLEX [35]	0.57 \pm 0.13	0.20 \pm 0.12	0.08 \pm 0.11
QTRAN [26]	0.28 \pm 0.08	0.00 \pm 0.00	0.00 \pm 0.00
OWQMIX [22]	0.52 \pm 0.08	0.16 \pm 0.33	0.30 \pm 0.23
CWQMIX [22]	0.44 \pm 0.15	0.00 \pm 0.00	0.19 \pm 0.16
IGM-DA (Teacher) [10]	0.31 \pm 0.07	0.00 \pm 0.00	0.06 \pm 0.09
IGM-DA (Student) [10]	0.54 \pm 0.09	0.00 \pm 0.00	0.18 \pm 0.22
CTDS (Teacher) [45]	0.55 \pm 0.13	0.36 \pm 0.44	0.69 \pm 0.35
CTDS (Student) [45]	0.51 \pm 0.13	0.34 \pm 0.42	0.57 \pm 0.30
CADP (C)	0.68 \pm 0.08	0.85 \pm 0.04	0.94 \pm 0.03
CADP (D)	0.68 \pm 0.08	0.84 \pm 0.03	0.93 \pm 0.03

Table 3: The test win rate of compared methods on the GRF scenarios (*academy_3_vs_1_with_keeper* and *academy_counterattack_easy*).

Method	3_vs_1_with_keeper	counterattack_easy
QMIX [23]	0.58 \pm 0.21	0.24 \pm 0.13
IGM-DA (Teacher) [10]	0.05 \pm 0.03	0.11 \pm 0.08
IGM-DA (Student) [10]	0.05 \pm 0.02	0.16 \pm 0.14
CTDS (Teacher) [45]	0.61 \pm 0.20	0.38 \pm 0.29
CTDS (Student) [45]	0.58 \pm 0.22	0.33 \pm 0.27
CADP (C)	0.77 \pm 0.00	0.64 \pm 0.15
CADP (D)	0.79 \pm 0.01	0.56 \pm 0.18

Table 4: The test win rate of different MARL methods with the CTDE framework and the CADP framework. \pm corresponds to one standard deviation of the average evaluation over 5 trials.

Method	5m_vs_6m	corridor	3s5z_vs_3s6z
GACML [19]	0.46 \pm 0.10	0.30 \pm 0.33	0.32 \pm 0.36
NDQ [39]	0.38 \pm 0.09	0.42 \pm 0.21	0.00 \pm 0.00
QMIX (CTDE) [23]	0.43 \pm 0.13	0.70 \pm 0.35	0.24 \pm 0.36
QMIX (CADP)	0.68 \pm 0.08	0.84 \pm 0.03	0.93 \pm 0.03

D Pseudocode of CADP

To make the proposed method clearer, the pseudocode is provided in Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 1 Centralized Training in CADP

Initialize: agent network θ_a , mixing network θ_v , target network $\theta_v^- = \theta_v$, replay buffer \mathcal{D}

```

1: repeat
2:    $\triangleright$  Collect the data
3:   Obtain the initial global state  $s_0$ 
4:   while not terminal do
5:     for each agent  $i$  do:
6:       Obtain the observation  $o_i^t = O(s_t, i)$ 
7:        $\triangleright$  Message Exchanging
8:       Calculate  $\{q_i^t, k_i^t, v_i^t\}$ 
9:       Send message  $\{k_i^t, v_i^t\}$  to other agents
10:      Receive message  $\{k_{1:N}^t, v_{1:N}^t\}$  from other agents
11:      Calculate  $z_i^t$ 
12:       $\triangleright$  Policy
13:      Calculate  $h_i^t = \text{GRU}(o_i^t, h_i^{t-1})$ 
14:      Calculate the action values  $Q_i^t([z_i^t, h_i^t], \cdot)$ 
15:      Sample  $u_i^t$  from  $Q_i^t([z_i^t, h_i^t], \cdot)$  based on  $\epsilon$ -greedy
16:    end for
17:    Execute the joint action  $\mathbf{u}_t = [u_t^1, \dots, u_t^N]$ 
18:    Receive the reward  $r_{t+1}$  and the next state  $s_{t+1}$ 
19:  end while
20:  Store the episode to the replay buffer  $\mathcal{D}$ 
21:   $\triangleright$  Train the networks
22:  Sample episodes from the replay buffer  $\mathcal{D}$ 
23:  Calculate joint action values with mixing network
24:  Compute  $\mathcal{L}_{TD}(\theta_v, \theta_a), \mathcal{L}_p(\theta_a)$ 
25:  Update the network parameters  $\theta$ 
26:  Update the target network  $\theta_v^- = \theta_v$  every  $C$  episodes
27: until converge

```


Algorithm 2 Decentralized Execution in CADP

Input: agent network θ_a

```

1: Obtain the initial global state  $s_0$ 
2: while not terminal do
3:   for each agent  $i$  do:
4:     Obtain the observation  $o_i^t = O(s_t, i)$ 
5:      $\triangleright$  without Message Exchanging
6:     Calculate  $\{v_i^t\}$ 
7:      $\triangleright$  Policy
8:     Calculate  $h_i^t = \text{GRU}(o_i^t, h_i^{t-1})$ 
9:     Calculate the action values  $Q_i^t([v_i^t, h_i^t], \cdot)$ 
10:     $u_i^t = \arg \max Q_i^t([v_i^t, h_i^t], \cdot)$ 
11:  end for
12:  Execute the joint action  $\mathbf{u}_t = [u_t^1, \dots, u_t^N]$ 
13:  Receive the reward  $r_{t+1}$  and the next state  $s_{t+1}$ 
14: end while

```



(a) The heat map of the attention matrix



(b) The behavior of the centralized model




(c) The behavior of the decentralized model

Figure 9: A visualization example of the attack strategies that emerge at timestep 3M. The top is the heat map of the attention matrix, the middle is the behavior of the centralized model and the bottom is the behavior of the decentralized model. Red and blue shadows indicate the agent and enemy formations, respectively. Red and blue arrows indicate the moving direction of the agent and enemy formations, respectively. White arrows indicate attack action from the agent units to the enemy units.

E Visualization

To further explain the working process of the pruning loss function \mathcal{L}_p , we designed a set of qualitative analysis in Figure 9 and 10.


We can find in $3s5z_vs_3s6z$ the centralized model quickly weans itself off the advising and the decentralized model learns the similar strategy to the centralized model within 0.5M timesteps. At timestep 3M, the centralized model already learns team-oriented strategy. To be specific, firstly deploy a Zealot to distract the enemy’s main force (5 Zealots). This zealot makes the enemy units give chase and maintain enough distance so that little damage is incurred while our main force splits the enemy into two parts and wipes them out in groups. After the enemy’s 5 Zealots kill our victim unit (a Zealot) and turn back, our force already occupies the numerical advantage. Then our force is divided into two groups, focusing fire on the enemy’s remaining troops. However, the decentralized model at the same timestep does not have a good strategy for actions. It shows that the victim unit does not work well as it be killed by the enemy’s main force quickly, meanwhile, our main force does not organize an effective attack. So that when the enemy’s main force turn back, they occupy the numerical advantage and soon they wipe out our army. We can see that although the decentralized model has some similarities in their action strategy with centralized model since the decentralized model is included in the centralized model, but the decentralized model does not work well as the pruning loss function \mathcal{L}_p still not be added and the model is now highly depended on suggestions of other agents as shown in Figure 9a.



(a) The heat map of the attention matrix



(b) The behavior of the centralized model



(c) The behavior of the decentralized model

Figure 10: A visualization example of the attack strategies that emerge in the $3s5z_vs_3s6z$ scenario at timestep 3.5M, after adding pruning loss \mathcal{L}_p for 0.5M timesteps.

Then after adding the \mathcal{L}_p for 0.5M timesteps, we can see that the model is now almost no need for the suggestions of other agents as shown in Figure 10a. The centralized model and the decentralized model at timesetp 3.5M almost execute highly consistent strategy which is also similar to the strategy of the centralized model at timestep 3M. In a word, by adding the pruning loss function \mathcal{L}_p , the decentralized model quickly learns the team-orient strategy of centralized model.