

# Supplement to the paper: Distributed Reinforcement Learning via Aggregative Actor-Critic

Andrea Camisa, Lorenzo Sforzi, Giuseppe Notarstefano

## APPENDIX

### A. Proof of Proposition 3.2

Fix the initial states to  $\bar{x}_i$  and the policy parameters of  $\pi_i$  to some  $K_i, v_i$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ . Since each system follows the policy  $\pi_i$  such that  $u_{i,k} = K_i x_{i,k} + v_i + \eta_{i,k}$ , it holds

$$\begin{aligned} x_{i,k+1} &= A_i x_{i,k} + B_i (K_i x_{i,k} + v_i + \eta_{i,k}) + w_{i,k} \\ &= (A_i + B_i K_i) x_{i,k} + B_i v_i + B_i \eta_{i,k} + w_{i,k}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The evolution of each system  $i$  can be thus written in closed form as

$$x_{i,k} = \underbrace{(A_i + B_i K_i)^k}_{:=\Phi_{i,k}} \bar{x}_i + \underbrace{\sum_{\tau=0}^{k-1} A_i^{k-\tau-1} (B_i v_i + B_i \eta_{i,\tau} + w_{i,\tau})}_{:=\xi_{i,k}}$$

Similarly we can also express the input as a function of the initial state and of the noise realizations:

$$u_{i,k} = K_i x_{i,k} + v_i + \eta_{i,k} = K_i \Phi_{i,k} \bar{x}_i + \underbrace{K_i \xi_{i,k} + \eta_{i,k}}_{:=\psi_{i,k}}$$

Notice that, since we suppose  $\mathbb{E}[w_{i,k}] = 0, \mathbb{E}[\eta_{i,k}] = 0$  and both of them i.i.d. we have

$$\mathbb{E}[x_{i,k}] = \mathbb{E}[\Phi_{i,k} \bar{x}_i] + \mathbb{E}[\xi_{i,k}] = \Phi_{i,k} \bar{x}_i \quad (36)$$

and, similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}[u_{i,k}] = \mathbb{E}[K_i \Phi_{i,k} \bar{x}_i] + \mathbb{E}[\psi_{i,k}] = K_i \Phi_{i,k} \bar{x}_i. \quad (37)$$

For ease of exposition, let us assume that the linear terms in the cost are zero, i.e., that  $q_i = 0, r_i = 0, f_i = 0$  (the derivations that follow are similar for the case in which the linear terms are nonzero). Thus we must consider

$$\begin{aligned} J_\pi(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k (x_{i,k}^\top Q_i x_{i,k} + u_{i,k}^\top R_i u_{i,k} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sigma(x_k)^\top F_i \sigma(x_k)) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Considering the closed form evolution of each system, exploiting the linearity of the expected value and using the

definition of  $\sigma(x)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_\pi(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \bar{x}_i^\top \alpha^k \left( \Phi_{i,k}^\top Q_i \Phi_{i,k} \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \Phi_{i,k}^\top K_i^\top R_i K_i \Phi_{i,k} \right) \bar{x}_i \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ 2\alpha^k \left( \xi_{i,k}^\top Q_i \Phi_{i,k} + \psi_{i,k}^\top R_i K_i \Phi_{i,k} \right) \bar{x}_i \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \alpha^k \left( \xi_{i,k}^\top Q_i \xi_{i,k} + \psi_{i,k}^\top R_i \psi_{i,k} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \bar{x}_\ell^\top \alpha^k \left( \Phi_{\ell,k}^\top H_\ell^\top F_i H_j \Phi_{j,k} \right) \bar{x}_\ell \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[ 2\alpha^k \left( \xi_{\ell,k}^\top H_\ell^\top F_i H_j \Phi_{j,k} \right) \bar{x}_j \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[ \alpha^k \left( \xi_{\ell,k}^\top H_\ell^\top F_i H_j \xi_{j,k} \right) \right] \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, in light of (36) and (37) and defining

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_i &:= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k \left( \tilde{\Phi}_{i,k}^\top Q_i \tilde{\Phi}_{i,k} + \tilde{\Phi}_{i,k}^\top K_i^\top R_i K_i \tilde{\Phi}_{i,k} \right) \\ \tilde{S}_i &:= F_i \\ \tilde{\sigma}(\bar{x}) &:= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^N \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\alpha^k} H_i \Phi_{i,k} \bar{x}_i}_{:=\tilde{H}_i} \\ \zeta_i &:= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k \left( \xi_{i,k}^\top Q_i \xi_{i,k} + \psi_{i,k}^\top R_i \psi_{i,k} \right) \\ \varsigma &:= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\alpha^k} H_i \xi_{i,k}, \end{aligned}$$

we can finally write:

$$J_\pi(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\bar{x}_i^\top \tilde{P}_i \bar{x}_i + \tilde{\sigma}(\bar{x})^\top \tilde{S}_i \tilde{\sigma}(\bar{x}) + \tilde{\rho}_i), \quad (39)$$

with  $\tilde{\rho}_i = \mathbb{E}[\zeta_i] + \mathbb{E}[\varsigma^\top \tilde{S}_i \varsigma]$ . For the case in which the linear terms are nonzero, there will be additional linear terms in (39). The proof follows.  $\square$