

Privacy Preserving Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning in Supply Chains

Ananta Mukherjee
t-mukherjee@microsoft.com
Microsoft Research India
Microsoft
India

Peeyush Kumar
peeyush.kumar@microsoft.com
Microsoft Research Redmond
Microsoft
USA

Boling Yang
bolingy@cs.washington.edu
University of Washington Seattle
USA

Nishanth Chandran
nichandr@microsoft.com
Microsoft Research Redmond
Microsoft
India

Divya Gupta
divya.gupta@microsoft.com
Microsoft Research Redmond
Microsoft
India

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses privacy concerns in multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL), specifically within the context of supply chains where individual strategic data must remain confidential. Organizations within the supply chain are modeled as agents, each seeking to optimize their own objectives while interacting with others. As each organization's strategy is contingent on neighboring strategies, maintaining privacy of state and action-related information is crucial. To tackle this challenge, we propose a game-theoretic, privacy-preserving mechanism, utilizing a secure multi-party computation (MPC) framework in MARL settings. Our major contribution is the successful implementation of a secure MPC framework, SecFloat on EzPC to solve this problem. However, simply implementing policy gradient methods such as MADDPG operations using SecFloat while conceptually feasible, would be programmatically intractable. To overcome this hurdle, we devise a novel approach that breaks down the forward and backward pass of the neural network into elementary operations compatible with SecFloat, creating efficient and secure versions of the MADDPG algorithm. Furthermore, we present a learning mechanism that carries out *floating point* operations in a privacy-preserving manner, an important feature for successful learning in MARL framework. Experiments reveal that there is on average 68.19% less supply chain wastage in 2 PC compared to no data share, while also giving on average 42.27% better average cumulative revenue for each player. This work paves the way for practical, privacy-preserving MARL, promising significant improvements in secure computation within supply chain contexts and broadly.

KEYWORDS

Privacy, Secure Multi-Party Computation, Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning, Supply Chain

ACM Reference Format:

Ananta Mukherjee, Peeyush Kumar, Boling Yang, Nishanth Chandran, and Divya Gupta. 2023. Privacy Preserving Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning in Supply Chains. In *Proceedings of Privacy Preserving Multi Agent Systems (PP-MAS)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 15 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Supply chains are integral to modern commerce, ensuring the smooth transition of goods and services from production to the consumer. However, operating an efficient supply chain necessitates close coordination and decision-making among multiple organizations. In this context, each organization must often calibrate its strategies based on those of others to ensure effective operational functioning. Despite the clear advantages of such close coordination, it presents significant challenges. One of the primary issues concerns the sharing of private data between organizations. This data is vital for ensuring efficiency, as evidenced by the multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) model proposed by Zhang et al. [39] and further explored by Li et al. [15] and Lowe et al. [22]. Their research showed improved outcomes in a supply chain game when parties shared states and actions. However, in practice, many supply chain organizations are reluctant to share private data, fearing potential security risks, the possibility of unfair competitive practices, and potential regulatory and legal issues [5]. This reluctance forms a significant barrier to the full realization of the benefits of data-driven decision-making in supply chain operations. Given this context, our research aims to bridge this gap by addressing a critical question: How can we facilitate effective data sharing in supply chains without compromising privacy and security?

To address this problem, the paper propose a solution that utilizes a novel adaptation of secure multi-party computation (MPC) within a multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) framework. In our model, we consider a simplified scenario involving a 2-player, where each player wants to optimize towards their objectives separately. We use multi-agent deep deterministic policy gradient (MADDPG) method to simulate this scenario and derive optimal strategies.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
PP-MAS, 2023, USA

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

This approach seeks to enhance supply chain efficiency while preserving data privacy, thereby addressing the prevalent concerns over data sharing in supply chain organizations. Secure multi-party computation (MPC; [7]) allows parties to collaboratively perform computations on their combined data sets without revealing the data they possess to each other. We develop secure 32-bit single-precision floating-point gadgets for MADDPG based on SECFLOAT framework by Rathee et al. [30], a secure 2PC framework for 32-bit single-precision floating-point operations and math functions. To aid easy development we use EzPC a high-level C-like language that allows developers to express functions to be computed using 2PC (2 Party Computation) without requiring the developer to have any cryptographic knowledge.

It is conceptually possible to execute every primitive arithmetic operation of the underlying MADDPG scheme via equivalent operations of any secure 2PC framework and obtain a privacy preserving MARL framework. However, implementing every primitive arithmetic operation of the underlying MADDPG scheme via equivalent operations of any secure 2PC framework becomes intractable due to the complexity of machine learning programming and high-level maintenance (see Lindell [20]). Overcoming this hurdle, we devise a novel approach. We break down the forward and backward pass of the neural network into elementary operations. These operations are compatible with the SecFloat API, thus creating efficient and secure versions of the MADDPG algorithm. These methods include a forward pass gadget (F-SecFloat) and a backpropagation gadget (B-SecFloat), allowing for secure computation of policy gradient methods such as MADDPG. These gadgets are built for a floating-point model enabling learning using MADDPG. The generalization of this work beyond supply chains and 2 player setting is discussed in Section 6. We believe this work sets a new course for practical, privacy-preserving MARL and presents substantial improvements in secure computation. As such, this framework enables previously unavailable data sharing solutions, marking a significant contribution to both the field of privacy-preserving machine learning and application research related to industrial operations.

1.1 Related Work

Privacy-preserving machine learning is a field that aims to develop machine learning algorithms that can train models on sensitive data without compromising privacy. Common approaches include differential privacy, which adds noise to data to preserve privacy [8, 36], and federated learning [16], which trains models on local devices and only shares model updates, not raw data. However, Bagdasaryan et al. [1] showed how attackers can potentially add hidden back doors in these models to make it behave in a desired way. Our proposed MPC-based method offers a different approach that allows for direct computation on encrypted data. Secure MPC unlocks a variety of machine-learning applications that are currently infeasible because of data privacy concerns. Although a range of studies implements machine-learning models via secure MPC, mainstream adoption is relatively low. Application to Secure MPC includes domain-specific tasks such as in medical research [6] or studying the gender gap in organization salaries [14]. Juvekar et al. [10], Riazi et al. [32], Tan et al. [37] study rigorous privacy and security guarantees for secure MPC frameworks for machine learning

tasks. Some work achieved secure deep learning (majorly inference with some scope for training) by converting floating-point models to fixed-point models [3, 4, 12, 13, 21, 24, 26, 29]. This is not suitable for learning in large or complex MARL setup because of the compounding of errors involved in the conversion from floating point to fixed point. Considering broadly, the adoption of secure MPC is hampered by the complexity of secure MPC and cryptographic techniques for machine learning scientists & engineers, see [11].

MPC in RL: The computational intricacies inherent in reinforcement learning (RL) methods pose additional challenges when attempting to integrate secure MPC techniques. This research for using a secure MPC framework with RL methods is far and few in between. Sakuma et al. [33] showed that the on-line learning method SARSA (state-action-reward-state-action) can be implemented in a privacy-preserving manner. Miyajima et al. [25] proposes a secure MPC framework for Q-learning methods. Yet, both SARSA and Q-learning are RL algorithms that are designed for single-agent systems, and they are insufficient for applications in a multi-agent setting such as pricing and inventory management in a supply chain system. Unlike these frameworks, the MADDPG framework [23] used here solves MARL where each agent has their own objectives and with no exchange of private information in the clear. There has been more work using federated learning approaches for privacy preservation in reinforcement learning applications [17, 19]. Federated learning allows multiple actors to learn a common model from local datasets without explicitly exchanging training data samples. Unlike federated learning in RL, which require a universal trustworthy server, our method allows the MARL process to stably converge to a high-quality equilibrium through a secure usage of shared information, yet none of the agents have access to the true information of others since all shared data is encrypted.

1.2 Key Technical Contributions

This pioneering work addresses the privacy-preserving Markov game problem in a secure multi-party computation (MPC) framework using a policy gradient learning mechanism. Key contributions include:

- **New SecFloat gadgets:** A novel approach that simplifies the input handling and learning processes of the neural network into basic operations, which can be executed using the SecFloat API. These methods include a forward-pass gadget (F-SecFloat) and a backpropagation gadget (B-SecFloat). We show that these gadgets have a significant less computational overhead than native implementation of SecFloat. Additionally from a programmatic perspective, we also show that the development of these gadgets makes it feasible to implement a secure MPC framework for MADDPG setting. Thus, this technique enables secure computation of policy gradient methods like MADDPG, overcoming limitations of previous methods and making this approach privacy-preserving, computationally feasible, and more widely accessible to developers.
- **End-to-end Secure Learning Faith-fullness:** The B-SecFloat module facilitates privacy-preserving gradient optimization in the presence of strategic agents using MADDPG. Our

floating-point secure model based on SecFloat preserves accuracy of the learning mechanism suitable for large number iterations of the backward pass. Unlike previous fixed-point models, we empirically show that the mechanism involving both inferences and gradient updates during learning remains end-to-end faithful in the secure universe compared to the clear-text analogue.

- **Efficacy Proven by Experiments:** Testing in a 2-player supply chain setting demonstrated resource wastage reduced by an average of 68.19% and improved average cumulative revenue by 42.27% for each player when compared to no data sharing systems. By significantly reducing wastage and improving revenue in industries involving multi-party decision making, these findings could lead to more efficient and secure operations, thereby benefiting the economy and society as a whole.

2 BACKGROUND: CRYPTOGRAPHIC PRIMITIVES

Secure Multi-party Computation (MPC) is a protocol that facilitates joint computation over private inputs from multiple parties. Think of it as a method that allows companies to collaborate on optimizing revenue without revealing individual data. Our research uses MPC to enable agents to learn from others while keeping their own information private. Suppose we have parties P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n each with secret inputs x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n . They want to compute a function $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ together. The ideal scenario would involve a universally trusted party T that calculates f and shares the output with all parties, but nothing more. However, such a trusted entity often doesn't exist in real-life scenarios. Cryptography resolves this with MPC, which facilitates a protocol that involves regular information exchange. This protocol ensures **Correctness** (output as if computed by T) and **Input Privacy** (no additional information beyond the output is disclosed). For more information, see Lindell [20].

Secret sharing: A $(t+1)$ -out-of- n secret sharing scheme is a method by which a dealer can distribute a secret s amongst n parties. This scheme is designed in such a way that any subset of $(t+1)$ or more parties can reconstruct the secret uniquely by combining their shares, but any subset of t or fewer parties can't glean anything about the secret [34]. Please refer to the supplementary material and Ben-Or et al. [2] for more details.

Invariants in MPC: An important feature of most MPC protocols is their ability to maintain an invariant: the parties can start with secret shares of values x_1, \dots, x_n and execute a protocol such that they end up with secret shares of $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$. This invariant is maintained for several simple functions. Once this is available for a set of functions f_1, \dots, f_k , these functions can be composed to compute the composition of these functions.

SecFloat and EzPC: When it comes to secure training of machine learning models, we often need to compute functions such as addition, multiplications, comparisons, division, tangent, and so on. While theoretically, all functions can be expressed in terms of additions and multiplications, doing so securely would be computationally expensive. SecFloat [30] is a state-of-art framework that performs secure 2PC of 32-bit single-precision floating-point

operations and mathematical functions like comparison, addition, multiplication, division, and other transcendental functions in an efficient manner. EzPC is a user-friendly, high-level C-like language that allows developers to express functions to be computed using 2PC, particularly using SecFloat, without requiring the developer to have deep knowledge of cryptography. The EzPC compiler generates a secure computation protocol for the entire function based on SecFloat. The SecFloat protocol ensures that the ULP (units in last place) errors between floating-point values obtained by elementary SecFloat operations and the corresponding exact real results are less than 1. This result is important to preserve the integrity of our learning algorithm.

LEMMA 1. [Precision Guarantee [31]] If r^- is the floating-point number just below r and r^+ is the floating-point number just above r , then $ULP(r, r^+) = \frac{|r-r^+|}{r^+ - r^-}$, where r^+ is the floating point number and r is the real number

3 SECFLOAT BASED SECURE NEURAL NETWORK COMPUTATIONS

We will illustrate the development of secure modules on MAD-DPG using the SECFLOAT API using a three-layer neural network as an example. Let $N(X|W) : \mathbb{R}^{B \times 2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{B \times z}$ be a 3 layered feed forward neural network with input dimension $2d$, output dimension z , hidden dimension h and batch size B . The layers are fully connected. $W = \{W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times 2d}, b_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times h}, W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times h}, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times h}, W_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{z \times h}, b_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times z}\}$ where W_i and b_i are the weight matrix and the bias vector, respectively for the i 'th layer. Let f_i denote the activation function for the i 'th layer, and let b_i^B represent a matrix with B rows where each row is b_i . The forward pass for N is

$$N(X) = \underbrace{f_3}_{\text{layer3Act}} \left[\underbrace{\left(\underbrace{f_2}_{\text{layer2Act}} \left[\underbrace{\left(\underbrace{f_1}_{\text{layer1Act}} \left[\underbrace{\left(\underbrace{X}_{\text{layer1In}} W_1^T + b_1^B \right)}_{\text{layer1Out}} W_2^T + b_2^B \right)}_{\text{layer2Out}} \right) W_3^T + b_3^B \right]}_{\text{layer3Out}} \right]}_{\text{layer2In}} \right]}_{\text{layer3In}} \quad (1)$$

For layer number $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ we define: $layer-i-In$: Input of layer "i", $layer-i-Out$: Output of layer "i", $layer-i-Act$: Activation Function on top of layer "i", $layer-i-Der$: Gradient of $N(X)$ with respect to the output of layer "i" and $layer-i-ActDer$: Gradient of $N(X)$ with respect to the output of the activation function on top of layer "i". For $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $layer-i-In$, $layer-i-Out$ and $layer-i-Act$ are shown in equation 1.

Within a 2-party setting, our objective is to construct two modules using the SecFloat framework: the forward-pass gadget (F-SecFloat API) and the backpropagation gadget (B-SecFloat API). This requires preprocessing the data and defining certain configurations:

Input Distribution between 2 Parties: Let, x^j is the j 'th row vector of X for $j = 1, 2, \dots, B$. Each input vector in the batch, represented as x^j , is divided into two halves. These halves serve as secret vectors for Party 0 and Party 1 respectively, meaning $x^j = x_0^j \parallel x_1^j$ where $x_i^j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $i = 1, 2$. Here \parallel is the vector concatenation operator.




Figure 1: Input Pre-processing and SecFloat based Secure Forward and Backward Pass Framework for Player 0. Red and Blue denote private data of Player 0 and encrypted data of Player 1 respectively. \otimes , \otimes , ACT and ACT' respectively denote SecFloat modules for Matrix Addition, Matrix Multiplication, Various Activation Functions (viz ReLU, Sigmoid etc) and derivative of Activation Functions.

$X_0 = [x_0^i \forall i \in [1, B]]_{B \times d}$; $X_1 = [x_1^i \forall i \in [1, B]]_{B \times d}$ represent the secret matrices held by party 0 and 1. Effectively $X = X_0 \parallel X_1$, where \parallel is the row wise matrix concatenation operator. A specific Party i holds all the weights and biases of the neural network i.e., $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_i$.

Output: Party i should receive both the forward pass prediction, represented as $N(X|\mathcal{W})$, and the desired gradient for the backward pass. In contrast, Party $(1 - i)$ should not receive anything.

Adversarial model: Semi-honest i.e., the parties don't deviate from the prescribed protocols but they are keen to tap sensitive information of the other. SecFloat provides security against a static probabilistic polynomial time semi-honest adversary.

3.1 High-level APIs for Privacy-preserving Forward and Backward Passes

Input Pre-processing: For every input vector in the batch, the first half is possessed by the Party 0 and the second half is possessed by Party 1, they need to pre-process the input matrices to make them compatible for the secure forward and backward pass APIs. Here on, we denote the pre-processed matrices by an overhead tilde sign. Party 0 and 1 prepare respectively, $\tilde{X}_0 = X_0 \parallel [0^{B \times d}]$, $\tilde{X}_1 = [0^{B \times d}] \parallel X_1$. Here, $0^{B \times d}$ is an all-zero matrix. We precisely get, $(\tilde{X}_0 + \tilde{X}_1) = X$. Left Part of figure 1 captures this.

Construction Details of the APIs: Next, we will delineate the construction of secure forward and backward pass APIs, designed to be executed by each player. With SecFloat ensuring the security of basic mathematical operations, functions, and their compositions, we can combine them in a hierarchical manner to develop secure high-level functionalities.

For Forward Pass: For our current setting, without loss of generality, let in equation 1, f_1 and f_2 are ReLU and f_3 is identity, then:

THEOREM 1. Let \otimes and \oplus denote the SecFloat APIs for matrix multiplication and addition respectively. Denote the ReLU API in SecFloat by RELU . The forward-pass gadget, with respect to equation 1,

$$F\text{-SecFloat}(\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \mathcal{W}) = \left[\text{RELU} \left(\left[\text{RELU}(\tilde{X}_0 \otimes \tilde{X}_1) \otimes W_1^T \oplus b_1 \right] \otimes W_2^T \oplus b_2 \right) \right] \otimes W_3^T \oplus b_3 \quad (2)$$

Thus **F-SecFloat** $(\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \mathcal{W})$ provides an abstraction for forward-pass in a secure manner.

For Backward Pass: Before jumping into the gradient expressions

we define 2 things. The gradient of ReLU as $\text{ReLU}'(x)$. A function GetBiasDer that will help us to calculate gradients with respect to biases:

$$\text{GetBiasDer}(M^{B \times n}) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^B M_{i1}, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^B M_{ij}, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^B M_{in} \right]^{1 \times n} \quad (3)$$

SecFloat supports for ReLU' and GetBiasDer are available. Let \circ denotes element wise product. By chain rule, we have the following system:

$$\text{layer3Der} = \frac{1^{B \times z}}{B.z} \quad (4)$$

$$\nabla_{W_3} N = (\text{layer3Der})^T \cdot (\text{layer3In}) \quad (5)$$

$$\nabla_{b_3} N = \text{GetBiasDer}(\text{layer3Der}) \quad (6)$$

$$\text{layer2ActDer} = (\text{layer3Der}) \cdot W_3 \quad (7)$$

$$\text{layer2Der} = \text{ReLU}'(\text{layer2Out}) \circ (\text{layer2ActDer}) \quad (8)$$

$$\nabla_{W_2} N = (\text{layer2Der})^T \cdot (\text{layer2In}) \quad (9)$$

$$\nabla_{b_2} N = \text{GetBiasDer}(\text{layer2Der}) \quad (10)$$

$$\text{layer1ActDer} = (\text{layer2Der}) \cdot W_2 \quad (11)$$

$$\text{layer1Der} = \text{ReLU}'(\text{layer1Out}) \circ (\text{layer1ActDer}) \quad (12)$$

$$\nabla_{W_1} N = (\text{layer1Der})^T \cdot (\text{layer1In}) \quad (13)$$

$$\nabla_{b_1} N = \text{GetBiasDer}(\text{layer1Der}) \quad (14)$$

$$\nabla_{X} N = (\text{layer1Der}) \cdot W_1 \quad (15)$$

THEOREM 2. Following equations 13, 14, 9, 10, 5, 6 and evaluating all intermediate entities by secure SecFloat APIs, we get the first kind of back propagation gadget **B-SecFloat** $_{\mathcal{W}}(\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \mathcal{W})$ that is the privacy preserving analogue of $\nabla_{\mathcal{W}} N$. Equation 15 gives the gadget **B-SecFloat** $_{\tilde{X}_i}(\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \mathcal{W})$ analogous to $\nabla_{\tilde{X}_i} N$. For $\nabla_{\mathcal{W}} L(N, t)$ where t is the target and L is the loss function, we get **BL-SecFloat** $_{\mathcal{W}}(\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \mathcal{W}, t)$ by substituting the right hand side of equation 4 by $\nabla_{\text{layer3Out}} L(\text{layer3Out}, t)$ followed by using the equations 13, 14, 9, 10, 5, 6.

Figure 1 shows the architecture of input distribution, pre-processing, secure computation of the forward and backward passes and outputs.

Generalizing to larger networks: Here we use a 3 layered fully connected neural networks with activation functions ReLU and Sigmoid. While for our case this was sufficient to achieve stable equilibria for the parties, the gadgets allow generalization of the secure 2PC to more complex architectures in terms of size or convolutions or activations. Corresponding forward and backward

passes can be achieved using appropriate combination of developed SecFloat gadgets in a similar fashion to what we did. Forward pass is straightforward and backward pass modules can be built by carefully analysing the chain rule, using the template defined in equations 13, 14, 9, 10, 5, 6 and 15 for back propagation. We omit detailed descriptions for the sake of brevity.

4 SECURE MADDPG ON SUPPLY CHAIN GAME

Li et al. [15] gives a general sum stochastic game description for an N party networked supply chain. We build on a 2 player supply chain setup to analyze the secured MPC framework. Player 0 purchases from the raw material market and sells to Player 1, while Player 1 sells to the consumer market.

State: Player i 's internal state is $s_i = [c_i, \mu_i, x_i, y_i]$. $c_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is the purchasing cost per unit product from i 's supplier. $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is the demand anticipated by Player i from her retailer. The current stock level of Player i is $x_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and the incoming stock replenishment in the next l_i time steps is $y_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{l_i}$. So, at time t , $[y_i(t)]_n$ is the replenishment that arrives at time $t + n$.

Action: Player i 's action is $a_i = [q_i, p_i]$. $q_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is the quantity of product that Player i decides to purchase from her supplier and $p_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is the price per unit product that Player i decides to charge from her retailer.

Realized and Anticipated Demand: If Player i receives a total order of D_i to supply and x_i is her current stock level, then in the two-player setup, realized demand by Player i is given by $d_i = \min(D_i, x_i)$. Anticipated demand is computed on the basis of historical demand trends i.e., $\mu_i(t) = f_i(D_i(0), D_i(1), \dots, D_i(t-1))$ where f_i is a suitable forecasting method like the ARMAX by [38]

Stock Level and Replenishment Transitions: The stock level at time $t + 1$ is given by, $x_i(t + 1) = x_i(t) - d_i(t) + [y_i(t)]_1$. The incoming stock replenishment transitions are given by $[y_i(t + 1)]_k = [y_i(t)]_{k+1}$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, l_i - 1$. The last incoming replenishment $[y_i(t + 1)]_{l_i}$ is the available supply from Player i 's supplier.

Rewards: After a specific transition the total reward of Player i is:

$$r_i(t) = \underbrace{p_i(t)d_i(t)}_{\text{Total Revenue}} - \underbrace{c_i(t)z_i(t)}_{\text{Total Purchasing Cost}} - \underbrace{h_i(x_i(t) - d_i(t))}_{\text{Holding Cost}} - \underbrace{w_i(D_i(t) - d_i(t))}_{\text{Loss of Goodwill Cost}}, \quad (16)$$

where $h_i, w_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ are proportionality constants, and z_i is the quantity delivered by Player i 's supplier. Player 0 and Player 1 solve for different reward structure. For detailed expression, please see the supplementary material.

Wastage: Since Player 0 fully gets her ordered quantity (q_0) delivered from the raw materials market, the quantity procured by this supply chain equals q_0 . Player 1 delivers a quantity of d_{c1} to the consumer market. So the wastage due to this supply chain can be characterized as $(q_0 - d_{c1})$. For a healthy supply chain, this wastage should be as low as possible.

Each player engages in a stochastic asymmetric information game [27] through a Markov Decision Processes (MDP). Each player intends to find an optimal policy for an MDP $(\mathcal{S}_i, \mathcal{A}_i, P_i, R_i, \gamma_i)$. For Player i , \mathcal{S}_i is the set of valid states, \mathcal{A}_i is the set of all valid actions, P_i and R_i are the transition probability and reward functions. γ_i is discount factor in time.

4.1 Secure MADDPG

MADDPG is an extension of Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (DDPG) [18], which is a policy-based reinforcement learning algorithm. MADDPG differs from DDPG by catering to multi-agent environments where multiple learning agents interact with each other. In a MADDPG setup with mutual information sharing, four neural networks exist for every each Player i , namely Actor (π_i), Critic (Q_i), Actor Target (π'_i) and Critic Target (Q'_i). They are parameterized by $\theta_i, \phi_i, \theta'_i$ and ϕ'_i respectively. Let's consider here only the 2 party version. For Player i , apart from her own states and actions s_i and a_i , the states and actions of the other player i.e., s_{1-i} and a_{1-i} are also accessible. Under that circumstances, Player i picks up her action according to $a_i = \pi_i(s_i, s_{1-i}|\theta_i)$. The Critic Network, Q_i gives the expected reward for Player i if Player i starts from state and action s_i and a_i for $i \in \{0, 1\}$ both and then Player i forever follows a trajectory τ according to her current policy. The expected reward is given by $Q_i(s_i, a_i, s_{1-i}, a_{1-i}|\phi_i)$. Actor Target and Critic Target networks are $\pi'_i(\cdot, \cdot|\theta'_i)$ and $Q'_i(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot|\phi'_i)$ respectively. When Player i for $i \in \{0, 1\}$ both, makes a transition from a state s_i to s'_i by an action a_i with a reward r_i , the target expected return is updated independently as $Q_i^{targ}(r_i, s'_i) = r_i + \gamma Q'_i(s'_i, \pi'_i(s'_i, s'_{1-i}|\theta'_i), s'_{1-i}, \pi'_{1-i}(s'_{1-i}, s'_i|\theta'_{1-i})|\phi'_i)$. For a mini batch of transitions, $B_i = \{(s_i, a_i, r_i, s'_i)_k\}$ (for $k = 1, 2, \dots, |B|$) both with the sampling randomness being the same for both B_0 and B_1 , the gradient of the MSBE (Mean squared Bellman Error) is:

$$\nabla_{\phi_i} L = \frac{2}{|B_i|} \sum_{(s_i, a_i, r_i, s'_i) \sim B_i} [(Q_i(s_i, a_i, s_{1-i}, a_{1-i}|\phi_i) - Q_i^{targ}(r_i, s'_i)) \nabla_{\phi_i} Q_i(s_i, a_i, s_{1-i}, a_{1-i}|\phi_i)] \quad (17)$$

The policy gradient according to [35] is:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta_i} \frac{1}{|B_i|} \sum_{s_i \sim B_i} Q_i(s_i, \pi_i(s_i, s_{1-i}|\theta_i), s_{1-i}, \pi_{1-i}(s_{1-i}, s_i|\theta_{1-i})|\phi_i) \\ = \frac{1}{|B_i|} \sum_{s_i \sim B_i} [\nabla_{a_i} Q_i(s_i, a_i, s_{1-i}, a_{1-i}|\phi_i)|_{a_i=\pi_i(s_i, s_{1-i}|\theta_i)} \\ \nabla_{\theta_i} \pi_i(s_i, s_{1-i}|\theta_i)] \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

When direct exchange of data is not allowed, then we cannot compute a_i, Q_i, Q_i^{targ} and Equations 17, 18 directly. This is where we integrate the privacy preserving SecFloat based modules developed in Theorems 1 & 2 of section 3.1 generate hybrid integrated APIs for MADDPG updates.

THEOREM 3. For Party i , the updated version of Q_i^{targ} and equations 17, 18 are:

$$Q_i^{targ} = R_i + \gamma F\text{-SecFloat}(\tilde{V}'_i, \tilde{V}'_{1-i}, \phi'_i) \quad (19)$$

$$\nabla_{\phi_i} L = BL\text{-SecFloat}_{\phi_i}(\tilde{V}_i, \tilde{V}_{1-i}, \phi_i, Q_i^{targ}) \quad (20)$$

$$\text{Policy Gradient} = B\text{-SecFloat}_{A_i}(\tilde{V}_i, \tilde{V}_{1-i}, \phi_i) \circ B\text{-SecFloat}_{\theta_i}(\tilde{S}_i, \tilde{S}_{1-i}, \theta_i) \quad (21)$$




Figure 2: Mechanism of information sharing when invoking the developed SecFloat gadgets.

Please see Algorithm 1 and supplementary material for development details of the above theorem and the pseudo-code for an iteration of the secure MADDPG¹.

4.2 SecFloat High-Level Gadgets vs Native Implementation

It is theoretically possible to execute each arithmetic operation of the MADDPG scheme natively via a secure 2PC, without using the high-level gadgets developed. Yet, implementation becomes infeasible due to machine learning complexity and high-level maintenance (see Lindell [20] for discussion on limitations of maintenance). The fundamental challenge for the native implementation arises during the backward pass. The agent requires cryptographic information or the secret share from the forward pass of the other agent for every primitive computation. This cross dependence is inherent in equations 17 and 18. This exchange cannot be reliably achieved as we do not have control over the other agent’s computational paradigm and architecture. A single failure in this exchange disrupts the entire MARL computation. Contrarily, when utilizing the developed high-level gadgets, agents’ decision-making aligns exactly at crucial iteration stages, avoiding this issue. Using Theorem 3, one can replace the clear-text forward and backward pass directly with the F-SecFloat and B-SecFloat gadgets, enabling the computations to become accessible. For every forward and backward pass we need to pre-process data once and call these gadgets. There are only a constant number of preprocessing in each pass (as shown in line no 2, 16 and 20 in Algorithm 1). Figure 3 shows the interaction pattern that is needed to be managed during native implementation of the SecFloat on MADDPG. We show this for the purpose of illustration but note that it is infeasible to implement this in practice due to reasons highlighted earlier in this section. Contrarily, Figure 2 shows the interaction pattern with the developed SecFloat gadgets which makes the implementation of secure 2PC feasible on MADDPG.

On Timing and Complexity: Even in the hypothetical scenario where native computations are feasible, the temporal complexity increases quite significantly, lending the native implementation infeasible in practice. Programmatically, the source of this overhead




Figure 3: Gradient update phase of the native algorithm additionally requires sharing of encrypted weights of the other party’s Actor Network

is the pre-processing step. Pre-processing of input data is required everytime before invoking the SecFloat APIs for each party. During pre-processing no other computation can happen because of cross-dependency. Theorems 6 and 7 formally captures the computational complexity for both cases. The proof is provided in the supplementary material Section F. Given that for MADDPG f is the number of computations for one pass of clear-text without any cryptography computation, $|S|$ is the state-space size, $|A|$ the action space size, l is the number of actor-network nodes, and n the total number of iterations (Number of epochs \times Iterations per epoch):

THEOREM 4. *Computational complexity for the entire lifetime of the 2 party secure MADDPG using F-SecFloat and B-SecFloat gadgets is $O(f(|S| + |A|)n)$.*


THEOREM 5. *Computational complexity for the entire lifetime of the 2 party MADDPG using native SecFloat implementation is $O(fln)$ in the best case scenario and $O(f^2(|S| + |A|)n)$ in the worst case scenario.*

We see that the naive native implementation exhibits computational complexity that can increase exponentially under worst-case conditions. Even in the best-case scenario, the complexity remains high. Given that we cannot dictate or predict the computational approach and architecture used by the other agent, it’s uncertain which scenario will manifest. This unpredictability renders computations in the native scenario impractical. Additionally, SecFloat support both correct floating-point primitive operations (addition, multiplication, division, and comparison) and precise math functions (trigonometric functions, exponentiation, and logarithm), see Rathee et al. [31]. This ensures floating point capability for high level secure MADDPG operations, unlike previous privacy preserving mechanisms for MARL settings.

5 EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

Based on the setup in Section 4, we assume $z_0 = P(q_0) = 0.5$, where $P(q_0)$ is the pre-defined raw material price; $D_1 = Q(p_1) = 10 - 2p_1 + 0.05\epsilon$ where $Q(p_1)$ is the consumer demand and $\epsilon \in \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$; we set $h_0 = h_1 = 0.01$ and $w_0 = w_1 = 0.1$. We share detailed configurations and experimental settings of actor and critic networks in supplementary material. In the 2PC scenario with

¹Code is made open-source at <https://github.com/anonymous-secure-marl/PrivacyPreservingSupplyGame>

Figure 4: "Go-Live" reward, quantity and wastage plots in different modes of execution (Fixed Randomness 1)

privacy preserved data sharing (as shown in Figure 4 and Table 6), the average rewards and costs are as follows: Reward0 is 2.496, Reward1 is 0.167, and the average wastage of the network is 1.085. The raw material cost is 0.5, and the average normalized cumulative profit (Total normalized revenue - operational cost - opportunity cost) stands at 2.1205. In No data share scenario: Avg reward0 is 6.129, avg reward1 = -2.933, avg wastage of the network is 3.411, raw mat cost is 0.5, normalized cumulative revenue is 1.4905. Therefore we observe that avg cumulative reward is 42.27% better in 2PC than no data share. While, there is on average 68.19% less wastage in 2 PC compared to no data share.

Each agent undergoes an initial training phase using simulated data, without collaborating with the other agent. In practice, this simulation mimics market dynamics and is a feature in many enterprise supply chain management systems. The objective of this phase is to familiarize the agent with the MARL environment and to preliminarily train the actor-critic networks. This initial training allows the network to learn and explore without being directly exposed to the real-world, or the "go-live", environment. As illustrated in Figure 4, even before agents transition to using confidential data without explicit sharing, this preliminary training yields notable benefits, such as reduced wastage and increased cumulative revenue. For our study, we ran this simulated training for 9900 epochs. Once an agent has gained sufficient knowledge from this initial phase, it's ready to operate in the "go-live" environment, where all data is confidential. Here, the privacy-preserving mechanisms are essential. After the initial training, the "go-live" phase can continue indefinitely. In our tests, we operated in this environment for 20 epochs, striking a balance between comprehensive presentation and result sufficiency. For experimental purposes, the data in the "go-live" phase comes from a different simulation than the initial data, to emulate "out-of-distribution" samples, mirroring real-world scenarios.

On Faithfulness: To prove equivalence of secure computation and explicit exchange of private data we run the "go-live" simulation in 2 modes: *Explicit Data Exchange (EDE)* and *Secure 2PC*. All external randomnesses were kept the exact same in different modes

of runs. The intention is to show that for a fixed set of external randomnesses (say *Randomness 1*) the results are equivalent. Table 6 shows the closeness of various metric averages in 2 modes across all iterations with respect to Randomness 1. For a metric M , since individual values of $M(t)$ for $t \in [800]$, are subject to a lot of noise, pictorially we plotted the moving averages with a smoothing interval of 200. Figure 4 shows these moving averages of various metrics. Figure 4 also hints at the fact that, not only, the final average metric results are close in Secure 2PC and EDE, the learning trajectories are equivalent throughout the entire training time. Lemma 1 binds the deviations between floating point operations between secure and the non-secure runs. Table 7 shows a comparison of $M'(t)$ values for different metrics obtained from 2 different modes. Table 8 shows the MAE and RMSE estimates of the final weights and biases of various NN's obtained via 2 different modes: Secure 2PC and EDE. We report more experimental results in supplementary material.

Limitations and Future Work: The secure privacy-preserving version of computation comes up with significant overhead in terms of time and communication due to cryptographic overheads. Table 4 shows the time and communication of the frequently occurring NN operations in the secure 2PC mode. One complete iteration of training took 545.73 seconds in Secure 2PC and 0.035 seconds in EDE. Now a typical MARL set up should be run a significantly high number of epochs to obtain a reasonable equilibrium. If all the epochs are run with secure 2 PC in a brute force way, there will be huge computation and communication overhead. To address this in our current set up we first let the agents run an initial simulation where simulated data (not private sensitive data) are shared in the clear between them. This simulation step helps the agents to explore the game environment, gather enough experience and properly initialize their decision making neural networks. After that a relatively smaller number of epochs are run in secure 2 PC format with proper secret information. The high level API designs (F-SecFloat and B-SecFloat) really come good here. This strategy only partly solves this issue. Improving over time and communication complexities of secure operations and lowering the deviation

Algorithm 1: An iteration of 2PC with MADDPG SecFloat gadgets

Input: States s_i , Actor-network weights θ_i , Critic-network weights ϕ_i , Target actor-network weights θ'_i , Target critic-network weights ϕ'_i - for each Player $i \in \{0, 1\}$

Include: SecFloat API's F-SecFloat, B-SecFloat, BL-SecFloat as developed in section 3.1

```

1 for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$  do
2    $\tilde{s}_i \leftarrow$  Input pre-processing of states  $s_i$  with Batch Size 1,
   according to section 3.1;
3   Action  $a_i \leftarrow \text{clip}(\text{F-SecFloat}(\tilde{s}_i, \tilde{s}_{1-i}, \theta_i) + \epsilon, \text{low}, \text{high})$ 
   where  $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and  $\text{low}, \text{high}$  are bounds;
4    $s'_i \leftarrow$  the next state reached due to action  $a_i$ ;
5    $r_i \leftarrow$  reward associated to the state transition;
6    $(s_i, a_i, r_i, s'_i)$  is stored in  $\mathcal{D}_i$  (replay buffer);
7 end
8 Each Player for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$  do
9   Player  $i$  samples an index set  $\mathcal{I}_i \subset |\mathcal{D}_i|$  and sends  $\mathcal{I}_i$  explicitly
   to Player  $(1 - i)$  where  $|\mathcal{I}_i|$  is the batch size;
10  for  $j \in \{0, 1\}$  do
11    Batch  $B_j \leftarrow \{(s_j, a_j, r_j, s'_j)_k \in \mathcal{D}_j\}$  where  $k \in \mathcal{I}_i$ ;
12     $B \leftarrow |B_j| = |\mathcal{I}_i|$ ;
13     $S_j \leftarrow$  stack  $(s_j)_1, \dots, (s_j)_B$ 's row wise;
14    Similarly stack  $A_j, R_j, S'_j$  row wise;
15     $V_j = S_j \parallel A_j$  (concatenated state-action);
16     $\tilde{S}_j, \tilde{V}_j, \tilde{S}'_j \leftarrow$  Input pre-processing of  $S_j, V_j, S'_j$  according
    to section 3.1
17  end
18  for  $j \in \{0, 1\}$  do
19    Next Actions:  $A'_j \leftarrow \text{F-SecFloat}(\tilde{S}_j, \tilde{S}'_j, \theta'_j)$ ;
20     $V'_j \leftarrow S'_j \parallel A'_j$  (concatenated next-state, next-action);
21     $\tilde{V}'_j \leftarrow$  Input pre-processing of  $V'_j$  according to section 3.1;
22  end
23  Critic:
24     $Q_i^{\text{targ}} \leftarrow R_i + \gamma \text{F-SecFloat}(\tilde{V}'_i, \tilde{V}'_{1-i}, \phi'_i)$  [equation 19]
25     $\nabla_{\phi_i} L \leftarrow \text{BL-SecFloat}_{\phi_i}(\tilde{V}_i, \tilde{V}_{1-i}, \phi_i, Q_i^{\text{targ}})$  [equation 20];
26  Actor:
27     $\nabla_a Q \leftarrow \text{B-SecFloat}_{A_i}(\tilde{V}_i, \tilde{V}_{1-i}, \phi_i)$ 
28    Policy gradient  $\leftarrow \nabla_a Q \circ \text{B-SecFloat}_{\theta_i}(\tilde{S}_i, \tilde{S}_{1-i}, \theta_i)$  [ $\circ$  is
    element-wise product. Above 2 steps follow from
    equation 21];
29     $\theta_i \leftarrow \theta_i + lr_a[\text{Policy gradient}]$ ;
30     $\phi_i \leftarrow \phi_i - lr_c[\nabla_{\phi_i} L]$ , where  $lr_a$  and  $lr_c$  are actor and critic
    learning rates;
31 end
32  $\theta'_i \leftarrow \rho\theta'_i + (1 - \rho)\theta_i$ ;
33  $\phi'_i \leftarrow \rho\phi'_i + (1 - \rho)\phi_i$ . Target network updates at fixed intervals
   with hyperparameter  $\rho$ ;

```

magnitudes of secure and non-secure versions further can open up more applications.

6 GENERALIZATION AND CONCLUSION

This paper presents a secure multi-party computation (MPC) framework using floating-point operations for policy gradient approaches,

Table 1: Averages (across 800 iterations) of Reward and Quantity metrics in EDE and Secure 2PC modes keeping all external randomnesses the exact same (Randomness 1). R: reward, D: demand, W: wastage, subscript: Player Id

	R_0	R_1	D_0	D_1	W
EDE	2.750	-0.07	2.030	1.665	0.940
Secure 2PC	2.496	0.167	2.207	1.604	1.085

Table 2: Comparison of moving averages of rewards and demand quantities across the entire learning trajectory in Secure 2PC vs EDE mode. Metrics are same as table 6

	R_0	R_1	D_0	D_1
MAE	0.346	0.378	0.249	0.137
RMSE	0.424	0.483	0.277	0.156

Table 3: Comparison of the final weights and biases of the neural networks in Secure 2PC mode vs EDE mode

	MAE	RMSE
Actor Player 0	2.37×10^{-3}	3.84×10^{-3}
Critic Player 0	7.21×10^{-3}	1.66×10^{-2}
Actor Target Player 0	9.69×10^{-4}	1.56×10^{-3}
Critic Target Player 0	3.11×10^{-3}	7.34×10^{-3}
Actor Player 1	2.69×10^{-3}	4.24×10^{-3}
Critic Player 1	6.01×10^{-3}	1.67×10^{-2}
Actor Target Player 1	1.14×10^{-3}	1.90×10^{-3}
Critic Target Player 1	2.61×10^{-3}	7.59×10^{-3}

Table 4: Time and Communication of secure neural network operations (1 pass)

	Batch Size	Time (sec)	Comm (GB)
Action prediction	1	1.014	0.04
Actor Grad Update	128	79.812	17.87
Critic Grad Update	128	66.540	14.43

specifically MADDPG. Specifically, the privacy preserving modules for MADDPG framework presented in this paper has demonstrated its effectiveness in a 2-party supply chain game. This paper empirically shows the integrity of such a solution. By significantly reducing wastage and improving revenue in industries involving multi-party decision making, these findings could lead to more efficient and secure operations, thereby benefiting the economy and society as a whole. As such, this framework enables previously unavailable data sharing solutions, marking a significant contribution to both the field of privacy-preserving machine learning and application research related to industrial operations.

It is important to note that its applicability extends to other 2-party MARL scenario that can be efficiently modeled in a similar game-theoretic fashion. In scenarios involving more than two parties, our framework can still be directly applied if all interactions among the parties can be reduced to a series of 2-party interactions. This is often the case in real-world supply chain scenarios, where most interactions occur pairwise and can therefore be modeled as a series of 2-party setups. If more than 2-party interaction is unavoidable, a non-colluding universal client-server model could be adopted. In this model, all parties secretly share their private data between a client and a server, who then follow the 2-party privacy preserving algorithm. One may argue that if a trustworthy universal server is available then why can't all send their data in the clear to that universal server, get the computation done by the server and obtain the results? This will rule out the need of MPC. In the client-server setup, neither the client nor the server can extract any clear information as they only receive a share of every data. This is a less strict and more realistic assumption compared to the universal trustworthy server model. It's worth noting that this model contrasts with frameworks like federated learning, which require a universal trustworthy server. In this model, the server cannot see all data in the clear, thus providing an additional layer of privacy. Beyond its direct application in supply chain scenarios, the proposed framework also holds potential for broader industrial applications, such as data center task management [28], energy grid supply [40], communication networks [41], media and entertainment [9], among others.

REFERENCES

- [1] Eugene Bagdasaryan, Andreas Veit, Yiqing Hua, Deborah Estrin, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2018. How To Backdoor Federated Learning. *ArXiv abs/1807.00459* (2018).
- [2] Michael Ben-Or, Shafi Goldwasser, and Avi Wigderson. 1988. Completeness Theorems for Non-Cryptographic Fault-Tolerant Distributed Computation. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* (Chicago, Illinois, USA) (STOC '88). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/62212.62213>
- [3] Fabian Boemer, Rosario Cammarota, Daniel Demmler, T. Schneider, and Hossein Yalame. 2020. MP2ML: a mixed-protocol machine learning framework for privacy inference. *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security* (2020).
- [4] Nishanth Chandran, Divya Gupta, Sai Lakshmi Bhavana Obbattu, and Akash Shah. 2021. SIMC: ML Inference Secure Against Malicious Clients at Semi-Honest Cost. In *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive*.
- [5] Claudia Colicchia, Alessandro Creazza, Carlo Noè, and Fernanda Strozzi. 2019. Information sharing in supply chains: a review of risks and opportunities using the systematic literature network analysis (SLNA). *Supply chain management: an international journal* 24, 1 (2019), 5–21.
- [6] Tamara M. Dugan and Xukai Zou. 2016. A Survey of Secure Multiparty Computation Protocols for Privacy Preserving Genetic Tests. *2016 IEEE First International Conference on Connected Health: Applications, Systems and Engineering Technologies (CHASE)* (2016), 173–182.
- [7] David Evans, Vladimir Kolesnikov, Mike Rosulek, et al. 2018. A pragmatic introduction to secure multi-party computation. *Foundations and Trends® in Privacy and Security* 2, 2-3 (2018), 70–246.
- [8] Robin C. Geyer, Tassilo Klein, and Moin Nabi. 2017. Differentially Private Federated Learning: A Client Level Perspective. *ArXiv abs/1712.07557* (2017).
- [9] Huilin Jin, Qi Wang, Shuai Li, and Jianan Chen. 2020. Joint QoS Control and Bitrate Selection for Video Streaming based on Multi-agent Reinforcement Learning. *2020 IEEE 16th International Conference on Control & Automation (ICCA)* (2020), 1360–1365.
- [10] Chiraag Juvekar, Vinod Vaikuntanathan, and Anantha Chandrakasan. 2018. {GAZELLE}: A low latency framework for secure neural network inference. In *27th {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 18)*. 1651–1669.
- [11] Brian Knott, Shobha Venkataraman, Awni Hannun, Shubho Sengupta, Mark Ibrahim, and Laurens van der Maaten. 2021. Crypten: Secure multi-party computation meets machine learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 4961–4973.
- [12] Brian Knott, Shobha Venkataraman, Awni Y. Hannun, Shubho Sengupta, Mark Ibrahim, and Laurens van der Maaten. 2021. CryptTen: Secure Multi-Party Computation Meets Machine Learning. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [13] Nishant Kumar, Mayank Rathee, Nishanth Chandran, Divya Gupta, Aseem Rastogi, and Rahul Sharma. 2019. CryptFlow: Secure TensorFlow Inference. *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)* (2019), 336–353.
- [14] Andrei Lapets, Frederick Jansen, Kinan Dak Albab, Rawane Issa, Lucy Qin, Mayank Varia, and Azer Bestavros. 2018. Accessible Privacy-Preserving Web-Based Data Analysis for Assessing and Addressing Economic Inequalities. *Proceedings of the 1st ACM SIGCAS Conference on Computing and Sustainable Societies* (2018).
- [15] Sarah Li, Lillian J Ratliff, and Peeyush Kumar. 2022. General sum stochastic games with networked information flow. In *ICLR 2022 Workshop on Gamification and Multiagent Solutions*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rGLOi91pgq>
- [16] Yang Li, Rui Wang, Yuanzheng Li, Meng Zhang, and Chao Long. 2022. Wind Power Forecasting Considering Data Privacy Protection: A Federated Deep Reinforcement Learning Approach. *ArXiv abs/2211.02674* (2022).
- [17] Yang Li, Ruinong Wang, Yuanzheng Li, Meng Zhang, and Chao Long. 2023. Wind power forecasting considering data privacy protection: A federated deep reinforcement learning approach. *Applied Energy* 329 (2023), 120291.
- [18] Timothy P. Lillicrap, Jonathan J. Hunt, Alexander Pritzel, Nicolas Manfred Otto Heess, Tom Erez, Yuval Tassa, David Silver, and Daan Wierstra. 2015. Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *CoRR abs/1509.02971* (2015).
- [19] Yan Lin, Jiming Bao, Yijin Zhang, Jun Li, Feng Shu, and Lajos Hanzo. 2023. Privacy-Preserving Joint Edge Association and Power Optimization for the Internet of Vehicles via Federated Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* (2023).
- [20] Yehuda Lindell. 2020. Secure Multiparty Computation (MPC). *Cryptology ePrint Archive, Paper 2020/300*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3387108> <https://eprint.iacr.org/2020/300>.
- [21] Jian Liu, Mika Juuti, Yao Lu, and N. Asokan. 2017. Oblivious Neural Network Predictions via MiniONN Transformations. *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security* (2017).
- [22] Ryan Lowe, Yi Wu, Aviv Tamar, Jean Harb, P. Abbeel, and Igor Mordatch. 2017. Multi-Agent Actor-Critic for Mixed Cooperative-Competitive Environments. *ArXiv abs/1706.02275* (2017).
- [23] 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).
- [24] Pratyush Mishra, Ryan T. Lehmkuhl, Akshayaram Srinivasan, Wenting Zheng, and Raluca A. Popa. 2020. Delphi: A Cryptographic Inference Service for Neural Networks. In *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive*.
- [25] Hirofumi Miyajima, Noritaka Shigei, Syunki Makino, Hiromi Miyajima, Yohtaro Miyanishi, Shinji Kitagami, and Norio Shiratori. 2017. A proposal of privacy preserving reinforcement learning for secure multiparty computation. *Artif. Intell. Res.* 6, 2 (2017), 57–68.
- [26] Payman Mohassel and Yupeng Zhang. 2017. SecureML: A System for Scalable Privacy-Preserving Machine Learning. *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)* (2017), 19–38.
- [27] Ashutosh Nayyar, Abhishek Gupta, Cedric Langbort, and Tamer Başar. 2013. Common information based Markov perfect equilibria for stochastic games with asymmetric information: Finite games. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* 59, 3 (2013), 555–570.
- [28] Rajiv Nishtala, V. Petrucci, Paul M. Carpenter, and Magnus Själander. 2020. Twig: Multi-Agent Task Management for Colocated Latency-Critical Cloud Services. *2020 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)* (2020), 167–179.
- [29] Arpita Patra, T. Schneider, Ajith Suresh, and Hossein Yalame. 2020. ABY2.0: Improved Mixed-Protocol Secure Two-Party Computation. In *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive*.
- [30] Deevashwer Rathee, Anwesh Bhattacharya, Rahul Sharma, Divya Gupta, Nishanth Chandran, and Aseem Rastogi. 2022. SecFloat: Accurate Floating-Point meets Secure 2-Party Computation. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*. 576–595. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP46214.2022.9833697>
- [31] Deevashwer Rathee, Anwesh Bhattacharya, Rahul Sharma, Divya Gupta, Nishanth Chandran, and Aseem Rastogi. 2022. SecFloat: Accurate Floating-Point meets Secure 2-Party Computation. *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)* (2022), 576–595.
- [32] M Sadegh Riazi, Christian Weinert, Oleksandr Tkachenko, Ebrahim M Songhori, Thomas Schneider, and Farinaz Koushanfar. 2018. Chameleon: A hybrid secure computation framework for machine learning applications. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Asia conference on computer and communications security*. 707–721.
- [33] Jun Sakuma, Shigenobu Kobayashi, and Rebecca N. Wright. 2008. Privacy-preserving reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [34] Adi Shamir. 1979. How to share a secret. *Commun. ACM* 22 (1979), 612–613.
- [35] David Silver, Guy Lever, Nicolas Manfred Otto Heess, Thomas Degris, Daan Wierstra, and Martin A. Riedmiller. 2014. Deterministic Policy Gradient Algorithms. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [36] Oana Stan, Vincent Thouvenot, Aymen Boudguiga, Katarzyna Kapusta, Martin Zuber, and Renaud Sirdey. 2022. A Secure Federated Learning: Analysis of Different Cryptographic Tools. In *International Conference on Security and Cryptography*.
- [37] Sijun Tan, Brian Knott, Yuan Tian, and David J Wu. 2021. CryptGPU: Fast privacy-preserving machine learning on the GPU. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 1021–1038.
- [38] Sébastien Thomassey. 2010. Sales forecasts in clothing industry: The key success factor of the supply chain management. *International Journal of Production Economics* 128, 2 (2010), 470–483. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2010.07.018> Supply Chain Forecasting Systems.
- [39] Kaiqing Zhang, Zhuoran Yang, and Tamer Başar. 2021. Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning: A Selective Overview of Theories and Algorithms. In *Handbook of Reinforcement Learning and Control*, Kyriakos G. Vamvoudakis, Yan Wan, Frank L. Lewis, and Derya Cansever (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 321–384. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60990-0_12
- [40] Yang Zhang, Qingyu Yang, Dou An, Donghe Li, and Zongze Wu. 2022. Multistep Multiagent Reinforcement Learning for Optimal Energy Schedule Strategy of Charging Stations in Smart Grid. *IEEE transactions on cybernetics* PP (2022).
- [41] Quan Zhou, Yonggui Li, and Yingtao Niu. 2021. Intelligent Anti-Jamming Communication for Wireless Sensor Networks: A Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning Approach. *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society* 2 (2021), 775–784.

Supplemental Materials

Ananta Mukherjee
t-mukherjee@microsoft.com
Microsoft Research India
Microsoft
India

Peeyush Kumar
peeyush.kumar@microsoft.com
Microsoft Research Redmond
Microsoft
USA

Boling Yang
bolingy@cs.washington.edu
University of Washington Seattle
USA

Nishanth Chandran
nichandr@microsoft.com
Microsoft Research Redmond
Microsoft
India

Divya Gupta
divya.gupta@microsoft.com
Microsoft Research Redmond
Microsoft
India

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses privacy concerns in multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL), specifically within the context of supply chains where individual strategic data must remain confidential. Organizations within the supply chain are modeled as agents, each seeking to optimize their own objectives while interacting with others. As each organization's strategy is contingent on neighboring strategies, maintaining privacy of state and action-related information is crucial. To tackle this challenge, we propose a game-theoretic, privacy-preserving mechanism, utilizing a secure multi-party computation (MPC) framework in MARL settings. Our major contribution is the successful implementation of a secure MPC framework, SecFloat on EzPC to solve this problem. However, simply implementing policy gradient methods such as MADDPG operations using SecFloat while conceptually feasible, would be programmatically intractable. To overcome this hurdle, we devise a novel approach that breaks down the forward and backward pass of the neural network into elementary operations compatible with SecFloat, creating efficient and secure versions of the MADDPG algorithm. Furthermore, we present a learning mechanism that carries out *floating point* operations in a privacy-preserving manner, an important feature for successful learning in MARL framework. Experiments reveal that there is on average 68.19% less supply chain wastage in 2 PC compared to no data share, while also giving on average 42.27% better average cumulative revenue for each player. This work paves the way for practical, privacy-preserving MARL, promising significant improvements in secure computation within supply chain contexts and broadly.

KEYWORDS

Privacy, Secure Multi-Party Computation, Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning, Supply Chain

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
PP-MAS, 2023, USA

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

ACM Reference Format:

Ananta Mukherjee, Peeyush Kumar, Boling Yang, Nishanth Chandran, and Divya Gupta. 2023. Supplemental Materials. In *Proceedings of Privacy Preserving Multi Agent Systems (PP-MAS)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 15 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

7 ORGANIZATION OF THE PAPER

The cryptographic background of MPC and SecFloat are described in Section 2. Section 3 builds a set of high-level privacy-preserving secure neural network modules, a forward-pass gadget (F-SecFloat API) and a backpropagation gadget (B-SecFloat API). These modules (APIs) secure the computation of forward and backward passes. Section 4 sets up the two-player supply chain model as described in Li et al. [15]. Section 4 also describes the game setup between the 2 supply chain players sharing data within a MARL framework. Here each player is optimizing towards their own objectives while responding strategically to other player's actions using MADDPG. This section illustrates how this is achieved in a secure-privacy preserving way by invoking suitable SecFloat-based neural network modules as developed in Section 3. In section 5, we present results for secure computation on the private data of 2 parties using our framework. Comparisons are made against the baseline case where the players explicitly exchange their private data, demonstrating the integrity of our solution that achieves equivalent results. The increased computation time and communication complexity associated with secure computation are also discussed. Section 6 discusses the generalization of the 2PC setup to an MPC setup and also beyond supply chains.

8 CRYPTOGRAPHIC PRIMITIVES - ADDENDUM

8.1 A bird's eye view of an MPC protocol

We shall first introduce the notion of secret sharing and then show how to compute any arithmetic circuit securely, for more details see [2].

Secret sharing. A $(t+1)$ -out-of- n secret sharing scheme is a scheme via which a dealer shares a secret s amongst n parties in such a way that any subset of $(t+1)$ or more parties can reconstruct the secret uniquely by combining their shares but any subset of t or fewer parties learn nothing about the secret. Shamir's secret sharing scheme [34] uses the fact that in a field (say \mathbb{Z}_p , for a prime $p > n$), given

$(t + 1)$ points on the 2-D plane $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_{t+1}, y_{t+1})$ with unique x_i 's, there exists a unique polynomial $q(x)$ of degree at most t such that $q(x_i) = y_i$ for all i and $q(x)$ can be efficiently reconstructed by interpolation using the Lagrange basis polynomials. So, in order to share a secret s among n parties in the $(t + 1)$ -out-of- n mode, a party first chooses a random polynomial $q(x)$ with a degree at most t with the constraint $q(0) = s$. So she basically randomly chooses $a_1, \dots, a_t \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, sets $a_0 = s$ and $q(x) = \sum_{i=0}^t a_i \cdot x^i$. Then, she sends the i 'th party $y_i = q(i)$, the i 'th share of s . Clearly, $(t + 1)$ or more number of parties can reconstruct $q(x)$ and thus $q(0) = s$ by interpolation of their shares but for t or less number of parties $q(x)$ remains random and therefore $s = q(0)$ as well.

Computing an arithmetic circuit. Now, let n parties hold the secret shares of 2 values s_a and s_b via 2 polynomials $a(x)$ and $b(x)$ respectively, i.e., $a(0) = s_a$, $b(0) = s_b$ and the shares of s_a and s_b held by the i 'th party are $a(i)$ and $b(i)$ respectively. We outline how they can compute the secret shares of $(s_a + s_b)$ and $s_a \cdot s_b$. Inductively, they can then use the same procedure to compute any arithmetic function securely.

For the addition gate, the i 'th party can just locally compute $a(i) + b(i)$, her share for $(s_a + s_b)$. Since, $c(x) = a(x) + b(x)$ is again a polynomial with degree at most t and $c(0) = a(0) + b(0) = s_a + s_b$, $c(i) = a(i) + b(i)$ for $i \in [n]$ give a valid $(t + 1)$ -out-of- n secret share for $c(0)$.

For the multiplication gate $s_a \cdot s_b$, for $i \in [n]$, $a(i) \cdot b(i)$ are secret shares in a $(2t + 1)$ -out-of- n mode (not in a desired $(t + 1)$ -out-of- n mode) since $c(x) = a(x) \cdot b(x)$ is now a polynomial with degree at max $2t$. A reduction step is required.

For degree reduction from $2t$ to t , the parties need to hold 2 independent secret sharing of an unknown random value r , the first via a degree $2t$ polynomial $R_{2t}(x)$ and the second via a degree t polynomial $R_t(x)$ with $R_{2t}(0) = R_t(0) = r$. They can then locally compute the shares of the degree $2t$ polynomial $d(x) = c(x) - R_{2t}(x)$ and can reconstruct $d(0) = c(0) - r$ by combining all $d(i)$'s for $i \in [n]$. Here, $t < \frac{n}{2}$ is required to ensure that all the n parties collectively can reconstruct the $2t$ degree polynomial. Now since, $c'(x) = R_t(x) + d(0)$ is a degree t polynomial and $c'(0) = r + c(0) - r = c(0) = a(0) \cdot b(0)$, $c'(i)$'s for $i \in [n]$ give a valid $(t + 1)$ -out-of- n secret sharing of $a(0) \cdot b(0)$, as desired. Now, in order to achieve the 2 independent secret sharing of a random unknown value r , for all $i \in [n]$, the i 'th party shares a random r_i via a degree $2t$ polynomial $R_{2t}^i(x)$ and a degree t polynomial $R_t^i(x)$. Then, $r = \sum_{j=1}^n r_j$ is unknown to all i and $R_{2t}(i) = \sum_{j=1}^n R_{2t}^j(i)$ and $R_t(i) = \sum_{j=1}^n R_t^j(i)$ become the secret shares of r for the degree $2t$ polynomial $R_{2t}(x)$ and the degree t polynomial $R_t(x)$ respectively.

MPC sub-protocol invariants. An important feature of most MPC protocols is that they provide a way for parties to begin with secret shares of values x_1, \dots, x_n and execute a protocol such that they end up with secret shares of $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$. This invariant is maintained for several simple functions. Once this is available for a set of functions f_1, \dots, f_k , they can be composed to compute the composition of these functions. In the above example, f_1 and f_2 were addition and multiplication respectively.

9 HIGH LEVEL APIS

High-Level APIs: SecFloat guarantees the security of elementary math operations - such as comparison, addition, multiplication, division, and functions of floating-point values - viz sine, tangent, logarithm, exponent, etc. Additionally it guarantees the security of arbitrary compositions of these operations and function. We then compose them in a hierarchical way to build secure high-level functionalities - matrix/vector multiplications, matrix/vector additions, various activation function calculations (for eg., relu, sigmoid, tanh, etc.), and exponentiation. Using this we then develop the high level secure APIs: For forward pass: F-SecFloat($\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \mathcal{W}$); For $\nabla_{\mathcal{W}} N$: B-SecFloat $_{\mathcal{W}}(\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \mathcal{W})$; For $\nabla_{\tilde{X}_j} N$: B-SecFloat $_{\tilde{X}_j}(\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \mathcal{W})$; For $\nabla_{\mathcal{W}} L(N, t)$: BL-SecFloat $_{\mathcal{W}}(\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \mathcal{W}, t)$, where t is the target.

10 REWARD STRUCTURES FOR INDIVIDUAL PLAYERS

At a given time stamp t , Fig 5 depicts the price, quantity and demand dynamics of the game. We assume the consumer market demand to be $Q(p_1)$, a function of price charged, and the raw material price to be $P(q_0)$, a function of quantity demanded. Moreover, $d_{10} = \min(q_1, x_0)$ and $d_{c1} = \min(Q(p_1), x_1)$ where x_i is the stock level of Player i at that time. Then reward expressions for Player 0 and 1 become:

$$r_0 = p_0 d_{10} - P(q_0) q_0 - h_0 (x_0 - d_{10}) - w_0 (q_1 - d_{10}) \quad (22)$$

$$r_1 = p_1 d_{c1} - p_0 d_{10} - h_1 (x_1 - d_{c1}) - w_1 (Q(p_1) - d_{c1}) \quad (23)$$

11 SECURE MADDPG: DETAILS

Let's consider the action inference step of Player i given by $a_i = \pi_i(s_i, s_{1-i} | \theta_i)$. Here s_i and s_{1-i} are held by Player i and $1 - i$ respectively and don't share it in the clear. Player i also holds the weights and biases of the NN given by θ_i . First they pre-process their data according pre-processing step in Section 3 to make the data compatible for the F-SecFloat API call. Essentially, Player 0 prepares $\tilde{s}_0 = s_0 || 0^d$ and Player 1 prepares $\tilde{s}_1 = 0^d || s_1$ where $s_0, s_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Now, updated version of the action inference equation becomes $a_i = \text{F-SecFloat}(\tilde{s}_i, \tilde{s}_{1-i}, \theta_i)$. We describe how the MADDPG gradient expressions for Player i transform in this secure hybrid API integrated framework. In the format we propose, which involves explicit data exchange, the process happens as follows: Player i samples a minibatch $B_i \subset \mathcal{D}_i$ from her local replay buffer. After this, she exchanges it with Player $-i$. It's important to note that both minibatches have the same sampling randomness. In no explicit data exchange realm, first Player i samples an index set $\mathcal{I}_i \subset |\mathcal{D}_i|$ and sends that explicitly to Player $(1 - i)$. This is essentially the set of indices that they sample for their minibatches. So, for both $j \in \{0, 1\}$, $B_j \leftarrow \{(s_j, a_j, r_j, s'_j)_k \in \mathcal{D}_j\}$ where $k \in \mathcal{I}_i$. Then they row wise stack up s_j, a_j, r_j, s'_j vectors to obtain S_j, A_j, R_j, S'_j matrices. The appended state-action matrix $V_j = S_j][A_j$. They pre-process these matrices, note pre-processed matrices have overhead tilde sign. Now, $j \in \{0, 1\}$ both predict their next actions by $A'_j = \text{F-SecFloat}(\tilde{S}'_j, \tilde{S}'_{1-j}, \theta'_j)$, followed by getting the appended next state, next action matrix $V'_j = S'_j][A'_j$ and pre-process that to obtain \tilde{V}'_j .




Figure 5: Two Player Single Commodity Supply Chain

12 TIME COMPLEXITY THEOREMS DERIVATIONS

THEOREM 6. *Computational complexity for the entire lifetime of the 2 party secure MADDPG using F-SecFloat and B-SecFloat gadgets is $O(f(|S| + |A|)n)$ where $|S|$ represents the state-space size, $|A|$ the action space size, and 'n' the total number of iterations (Number of epochs \times Iterations per epoch).*

Proof: For the purpose of derivation we consider 2 key categories of computation for each iteration: a) Computation of the forward, backward pass; b) Pre-processing computation. Let number of computations for one pass of clear-text, without any cryptography computation, of the MADDPG be f . During pre-processing, the party has to sit idle for that entire time as no other computation can happen. Using high level gadgets, pre-processing is required for both the actor & critic networks. In case of critic network as shown in lines 24 and 25 of Algorithm 1 (main paper), there are 1 pre-processing steps on states (\tilde{S}_j line 16) and 2 pre-processing steps on state, action pairs (\tilde{V}_j in line 16 and \tilde{V}'_j in line 21). Then, for a single iteration the number of computations will be $c_{critic} = f \times (3|S| + 2|A|)$. In case of actor network (lines 27 and 28 of Algorithm 1 in main paper), there is one additional state pre-processing required on states (\tilde{S}_j in line 16). So, the computations will be $c_{actor} = f \times |S|$. The total computations are $c = f \times (3|S| + 2|A|) + f \times |S|$. Therefore, complexity for all the iteration becomes $O(f(|S| + |A|)n)$, where n is the number of iterations.

THEOREM 7. *Computational complexity for the entire lifetime of the 2 party MADDPG using native SecFloat implementation is $O(fln)$ in the best case scenario and $O(f^2(|S| + |A|)n)$ in the worst case scenario, where $|S|$ represents the state-space size, $|A|$ the action space size, l is the number of actor-network nodes, and 'n' the total number of iterations (Number of epochs \times Iterations per epoch).*

Proof: For this derivation, we follow a similar scheme as in the proof of Theorem 6. The key change in the native implementation is that in addition to all the pre-processing steps, least the other party also needs to share the weights of the entire actor network. This means that, without the high level gadgets, an additional pre-processing step would need to be included for all the weights of the actor network, as shown in Figure 3 (main paper). We have $c_{critic} = f \times (3|S| + 2|A|)$. In the best case scenario, where Party 2 already has computed the actor network weights when Party 1 requires it, then $c_{actor} = f \times (|S| + l)$, where l is the total number of nodes in the actor network. Total computations become $c = f \times (|S| + l) + f \times (3|S| + 2|A|)$. Since $l \gg |S| + |A|$ the computational complexity becomes $O(fln)$. In the worst case, in order for the

second party to share all the (cryptographic) weights of the actor network with the first party, the first party will have to wait for the second party to finish computing all the weights. Assuming both parties have the same (or similar) number of computations. The computations for actor network in this case will be:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Party 1 } c_{actor} &= f \times (|S| + l + \text{Party 2 } (c_{critic} + c_{actor})) \\ &= f \times (|S| + l + f \times (3|S| + 2|A|) + f \times |S| + \text{Party 1 } c^{\{1\}}), \end{aligned}$$

where $c^{\{1\}}$ is the total computations for Party 1 from the previous time step. Assuming that $c^{\{1\}}$ is already calculated and stored in the previous time step, and that lookup computations are much smaller than the multiplication & addition computations. Therefore the total computations become,

$$\begin{aligned} c &= f \times (3|S| + 2|A|) + f \times (|S| + l + f \times (3|S| + 2|A|) + f \times |S|) \\ &= f \times (3|S| + 2|A|) + f \times |S| + fl + f^2 \times (3|S| + 2|A|) + f^2 \times |S|. \end{aligned}$$

Now $f \gg |S| + |A|$, therefore the computational complexity becomes $O(f^2(|S| + |A|)n)$, where n is the number of iterations.

13 ACTOR CRITIC NETWORK CONFIGURATIONS, HYPER-PARAMETERS AND EXPERIMENTAL SETTINGS

Each party is hosted via a 16-core, 2.4 GHz VM CPU with 126 GB RAM, with the communication speed between the machines being 15.2 Gbps. With this setting, we first ran a 9900 epoch (with each epoch being a 40-step trajectory) simulation of 2 parties where only simulated data (and no secret data) were shared between the parties. The *external randomnesses* are random state initialization at the start of each epoch, random noises added to the actions, and random sampling of mini-batches. This initial 9900 epoch simulation was an "exploration" phase where the parties collected a lot of transition and reward history in their replay buffers and set up their neural networks. Table 5 shows configuration details, batch size, some other hyper-parameters of the Actor and Critic neural networks used in the 2 party supply game experiment set up described in section 5 of the main paper.

14 ADDITIONAL RESULTS FOR A DIFFERENT SET OF FIXED EXTERNAL RANDOMNESSES (RANDOMNESS 2)

In section 5.1 of the main paper, we provided plots and statistics to show that secure computation on private data yields equivalent results to the case of explicit data exchange in terms of the metrics of supply game when all external randomnesses are kept fixed. We showed plots and statistics for a fixed set of external randomnesses

	Actor	Critic
No of Linear Layers	3	3
Input Dimension	10	14
Hidden Dimension	128	128
Output Dimension	2	1
Activation Functions	ReLU, Sigmoid	ReLU, Identity
Batch size for Back-prop	128	128
Learning rate	10^{-4}	10^{-3}
Optimizer	Adam	Adam

Table 5: Actor Critic Network Configurations and Hyper-parameters

	R_0	R_1	D_0	D_1	W
EDE	2.616	-0.238	2.169	1.551	1.149
Secure 2PC	3.344	-0.828	2.114	1.654	1.057

Table 6: Averages (across 800 iterations) of Reward and Quantity metrics in EDE and Secure 2PC modes keeping all external randomnesses the exact same (Randomness 2). R: reward, D: demand, W: wastage, subscript: Player Id

	R_0	R_1	D_0	D_1
MAE	0.499	0.880	0.081	0.123
RMSE	0.578	1.011	0.105	0.164

Table 7: Comparison of moving averages of rewards and demand quantities across the entire learning trajectory in Secure 2PC vs EDE mode for a fixed set of external randomnesses (Randomness 2). Metrics are same as table 6

viz, Randomness 1. Here we give the same plots and statistics for a different set of all external randomnesses viz, Randomness 2. Figure 6 shows the moving averages of various metrics in different modes of execution. Table 6 shows the closeness of various metric averages across 800 iterations in 2 modes explicit data exchange (EDE) and secure 2PC across all iterations with respect to Randomness 2. Table 7 shows a comparison of moving averages of different metrics obtained from 2 different modes across the entire learning trajectory. Table 8 shows the MAE and RMSE estimates of the final weights and biases of various NN’s obtained via 2 different modes.

15 ADDITIONAL RESULTS FOR A DIFFERENT PRICE-DEMAND DISTRIBUTION

Here, we give another empirical evidence in a different price/demand experiment set up (compared to what we used in the main paper) to show that Explicit Data Exchange (EDE) brings significant advantages in cumulative revenue increment and waste minimization compared to No Data Sharing (NDS). Please refer to figure 7. We show graphs for 100 epochs of real data realm followed by initial crude pre-training using simulated data. All external randomness was kept the exact same. Moreover, secure 2 PC framework is computationally equivalent to the EDE realm as we claimed in section

	MAE	RMSE
Actor Player 0	2.63×10^{-3}	4.12×10^{-3}
Critic Player 0	7.84×10^{-3}	1.75×10^{-2}
Actor Target Player 0	1.22×10^{-3}	1.90×10^{-3}
Critic Target Player 0	3.41×10^{-3}	7.79×10^{-3}
Actor Player 1	2.55×10^{-3}	4.06×10^{-3}
Critic Player 1	5.69×10^{-3}	1.47×10^{-2}
Actor Target Player 1	1.02×10^{-3}	1.63×10^{-3}
Critic Target Player 1	2.31×10^{-3}	6.08×10^{-3}

Table 8: Comparison of the final weights and biases of the neural networks in Secure 2PC mode vs EDE mode for a fixed set of external randomnesses (Randomness2)

5 of the main paper.

The experimental set up for the above diagrams: Price upper limit of player 0: 10, Price upper limit of player 0: 18, Quantity limit for both of them: 20, Consumer demand dependence on price: $20 - 0.133p + 0.05(\text{standard normal})$, Raw material price per unit: 0.5. Normalized Cumulative Revenue = Total Reward – Wastage Cost.

So, there is 35.71% less wastage and 765.91% better normalized cumulative revenue on average over the entire 100 epochs in Explicit Data Exchange (EDE) compared to No Data Sharing (NDS). Please refer to table 9 for the details.




Figure 6: Reward and Quantity plots in different modes of execution keeping all external randomnesses the exact same across different modes (Fixed Randomness 2)

	Avg Reward 0	Avg Reward 0	Total Reward	Avg Wastage	Normalized Cumulative Revenue
NDS	-7.38	3.33	-4.05	13.27	-10.68
EDE	31.47	43.92	75.39	8.53	71.12

Table 9: Reward, Wastage and Cumulative Revenue for the different price-demand setup.




Figure 7: Additional Results for a Different Price-Demand Setup