

Coordination Matters: Process-Aware Evaluation of Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning

Maria Ana Cardei

cbr8ru@virginia.edu

University of Virginia

Charlottesville, Virginia, USA

Matthew Landers

University of Virginia

Charlottesville, Virginia, USA

Afsaneh Doryab

University of Virginia

Charlottesville, Virginia, USA

Abstract

Cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) benchmarks commonly emphasize aggregate outcomes such as return, success rate, or completion time. While essential, these metrics can obscure how agents coordinate and fail to distinguish policies that achieve similar outcomes through different interaction processes. We propose a *process-aware evaluation framework* that complements aggregate performance with diagnostics of interference, coordinated task completion, participation, and coordination efficiency. We evaluate the framework in STAT, a controlled spatial task-allocation testbed, and examine its broader applicability in two established cooperative MARL benchmarks. Across diverse value-based and actor-critic methods, we find policies with nearly identical return can exhibit substantial differences in coordination behavior. Controlled scaling in STAT reveals distinct process signatures for spatial, task, and agent scaling, while a reward-shaping ablation shows that explicitly penalizing assignment conflicts can alter coordination behavior with little change in task return. Results in the established benchmarks further show that the framework remains informative under different coordination mechanisms. These findings support process-aware evaluation as a complement to outcome-based benchmarking. The framework provides a common structure for selecting and interpreting environment-specific diagnostics that characterize not only what cooperative policies achieve, but how they coordinate to achieve it. ¹

Keywords

Cooperative MARL, MARL, Coordination, Process Diagnostics, Benchmarking, Evaluation, Multi-agent Systems

1 Introduction

Cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) involves multiple agents learning to act in a shared environment toward a common objective [6, 23]. Success depends not only on individual capabilities, but also on how effectively agents coordinate. Agents must avoid redundant behavior, synchronize interdependent actions, divide work, and adapt to one another. Yet cooperative MARL methods are still commonly evaluated primarily through aggregate outcomes such as return, success rate, or completion time [17, 18, 26, 27, 32]. This emphasis is also evident in evaluation practice, where a meta-analysis of cooperative MARL studies found that return, reward, and win rate dominate reported benchmark metrics, with many environments evaluated using only a single metric type [13].

Aggregate outcomes measure task performance but provide limited insight into the coordination processes that produce it. Policies with similar return can exhibit substantially different patterns of interference, participation, synchronization, and coordination efficiency. Similar outcomes therefore do not necessarily imply similar coordination behavior. Process-level diagnostics provide a more interpretable account of MARL performance by exposing the behaviors and failure modes underlying aggregate outcomes. Evaluating cooperative MARL thus requires examining not only *what* a team achieves, but also *how* agents coordinate to achieve it.

We introduce a *process-aware evaluation framework* that complements aggregate outcomes with environment-specific diagnostics of coordination behavior. The framework organizes diagnostics around four general coordination dimensions: *interference and redundancy*, *coordinated task completion*, *participation and division of labor*, and *coordination efficiency*. These dimensions provide a common basis for identifying and interpreting process measures across environments with different coordination mechanisms.

The framework also distinguishes coordination behavior from its downstream consequences. Coordination opportunities produce agent behaviors and intermediate effects, such as redundant actions, successful joint task execution, inactivity, or delay, that ultimately influence throughput, duration, and return. Examining these intermediate stages helps separate coordination failures from other sources of performance variation that aggregate outcomes may conflate.

We instantiate the framework first in STAT, the Spatial Task Allocation Testbed, a configurable commitment-constrained environment designed to isolate assignment coordination. We then evaluate broader applicability in Level-Based Foraging (LBF) [10] and Robotic Warehouse (RWARE) [25], which introduce distinct coordination demands including capability matching, coordinated loading, navigation, congestion, and partial observability. Across these settings, process diagnostics reveal behavioral differences and failure modes that aggregate return alone does not capture, providing evidence that process-aware evaluation is informative across distinct coordination mechanisms and benchmark settings.

Our contributions are as follows:

- (1) We introduce a process-aware evaluation framework for cooperative MARL that complements aggregate outcomes with environment-specific diagnostics organized around four coordination dimensions: 1) interference and redundancy, 2) coordinated task completion, 3) participation and division of labor, and 4) coordination efficiency.
- (2) We establish a complementary evaluation design that combines controlled diagnostic depth with cross-environment validation. STAT isolates assignment coordination under

¹Code is available at https://github.com/mariacardei/coordination_aware_MARL.

systematic interventions, while LBF [10] and RWARE [25] test whether the framework remains informative under different coordination mechanisms.

- (3) Across value-based and actor-critic MARL methods, we show that policies with similar aggregate return can exhibit substantially different coordination processes. Controlled scaling across configurations reveals distinct process signatures for spatial, task, and agent scaling, while a reward-shaping ablation shows that explicit coordination penalties can alter learned behavior with little change in task return.

2 Related Work

Coordination and Process-Level Evaluation. Prior work has shown that aggregate performance alone does not fully characterize multi-agent coordination. The broader multi-agent systems literature has proposed coordination-specific measures for complex team behavior [19], while MARL research has examined behavioral properties such as role diversity [14] and agent-level coordination [36]. Related work in human-AI and human-team collaboration similarly emphasizes interaction processes such as communication, interdependence, control sharing, and division of labor as important complements to task outcomes [4, 5, 29]. Building on this foundation, we develop a process-aware evaluation framework for cooperative MARL that organizes environment-specific diagnostics around common dimensions of coordination and uses them to complement aggregate benchmark outcomes.

Spatial Task Allocation. Spatial task allocation is a longstanding problem in multi-agent systems and robotics, where agents must service spatially distributed tasks under assignment, movement, and execution constraints. Prior work studies scalable planning [11], spatial and temporal constraints such as deadlines and sequential execution [3], geographic worker-task matching in spatial crowdsourcing [12, 16, 34, 37], and reinforcement-learning approaches to multi-robot task allocation and joint allocation-navigation [1, 2]. This literature primarily focuses on improving allocation or planning policies. In contrast, we use spatial task allocation as a controlled setting for making coordination processes directly observable and systematically varying the pressures under which coordination occurs.

Cooperative MARL Benchmarks. Cooperative MARL benchmarks provide standardized testbeds across domains including StarCraft micromanagement [27], particle-world coordination [17], Level-Based Foraging [10], Overcooked-style collaboration [9], and robotic warehouse coordination [25]. These environments expose challenges such as partial observability, credit assignment, navigation, collaborative planning, capability matching, and congestion. However, benchmark comparisons are still commonly summarized through aggregate outcomes such as return, win rate, or success rate [13, 25, 27]. Such metrics characterize what a policy achieves but provide limited insight into how coordination succeeds or fails. We therefore complement aggregate benchmark outcomes with environment-specific process diagnostics and evaluate this perspective across settings with distinct coordination mechanisms.

3 Preliminaries

We model cooperative MARL as a decentralized partially observable Markov decision process (Dec-POMDP) with n agents [22]. The environment is defined by

$$\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i=1}^n, P, R, \{\mathcal{O}_i\}_{i=1}^n, O, \gamma \rangle,$$

where $\mathcal{S}$ is the global state space, $\mathcal{A}_i$ is the action space of agent i , $P(s_{t+1} | s_t, \mathbf{a}_t)$ is the transition function, $R(s_t, \mathbf{a}_t)$ is the shared team reward, $\mathcal{O}_i$ is the observation space of agent i , O is the observation function, and $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ is the discount factor.

At timestep t , each agent i receives an observation $o_t^i \in \mathcal{O}_i$ and selects an action $a_t^i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ according to its policy π_i . The resulting joint action is

$$\mathbf{a}_t = (a_t^1, \dots, a_t^n) \in \mathcal{A}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_n.$$

Under partial observability, π_i may condition on the agent’s local action-observation history τ_t^i , such that $\pi_i(a_t^i | \tau_t^i)$. Under full observability, each agent can observe the global state.

The joint policy $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)$ maximizes expected discounted team return,

$$J(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi, P} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t R(s_t, \mathbf{a}_t) \right], \quad \pi^* = \arg \max_{\pi} J(\pi).$$

4 Process-Aware Evaluation of Coordination

Aggregate outcomes characterize *what* a cooperative team achieves, but provide limited information about *how* agents interact to produce that outcome. We introduce a process-aware evaluation framework that complements task-level performance with environment-specific diagnostics of coordination behavior and its intermediate consequences.

For a policy π , let $O(\pi)$ denote an aggregate outcome measure, such as return, and let

$$\mathbf{D}(\pi) = [D_1(\pi), \dots, D_K(\pi)]$$

denote process diagnostics computed from trajectories generated by π . Whereas $O(\pi)$ summarizes downstream task performance, $\mathbf{D}(\pi)$ retains information about the interactions and behaviors through which that performance is produced.

This distinction is useful whether outcomes are similar or different. Policies with similar outcomes may coordinate in substantially different ways, while changes in outcome may arise from different underlying coordination processes. We characterize two policies π_i and π_j as *outcome-similar* when

$$\Delta_O(\pi_i, \pi_j) = |O(\pi_i) - O(\pi_j)| \leq \epsilon_O,$$

yet their process diagnostics may still differ substantially. Conversely, coordination behavior may change with little corresponding change in aggregate outcome. Process and outcome evidence should therefore be interpreted jointly, rather than treating either as a complete description of cooperative performance.

4.1 Coordination Dimensions

Coordination manifests through different observable events across environments. We organize diagnostics around four general coordination dimensions:

- **Interference and redundancy.** Measures overlapping, conflicting, or obstructive behavior that wastes coordination opportunities, such as duplicate task selection or movement interference.
- **Coordinated task completion.** Measures whether interdependent agent behavior successfully produces progress on shared tasks, including successful joint actions and task completion.
- **Participation and division of labor.** Measures how useful work is distributed across agents, tasks, or interaction partners.
- **Coordination efficiency.** Measures the cost of converting coordinated behavior into useful progress, including wasted actions, inactivity, delays, and throughput.

These dimensions are not mutually exclusive, and a single diagnostic may inform more than one dimension. Their purpose is to provide a common interpretive structure for environment-specific measures, rather than a universal scalar measure of coordination quality.

4.2 Applying the Framework

Applying the framework involves three steps.

- (1) **Identify coordination opportunities.** Identify states or events in which agents' decisions are interdependent and coordinated behavior can affect task progress. Where possible, diagnostics should be normalized by relevant coordination opportunities or exposure so that differences in length, activity level, or decision frequency do not confound comparison.
- (2) **Operationalize observable coordination processes.** Select diagnostics that capture the relevant coordination dimensions at those opportunities. The same dimension may require different observable measures across environments because the underlying coordination mechanisms differ.
- (3) **Interpret process diagnostics jointly with task outcomes.** No individual diagnostic defines coordination quality in isolation. For example, low interference may indicate effective coordination, but may also reflect low task engagement or inactivity. Diagnostics should therefore be interpreted together with task completion and aggregate outcomes. Agreement strengthens behavioral conclusions, while disagreement exposes coordination patterns that outcome-only evaluation would conceal.

Conceptually, process-aware evaluation traces the progression from *coordination opportunity* to *behavior*, *immediate consequence*, and ultimately *task outcome*. Aggregate metrics summarize the downstream result of this process, while process diagnostics preserve information about how that result was produced.

5 Evaluation Environments and Process Diagnostics

We instantiate the framework across three complementary environments. We introduce STAT as a controlled testbed for isolating assignment coordination, and use the established LBF [10] and

RWARE [25] benchmarks to examine whether the same coordination dimensions remain informative under distinct interaction mechanisms. Table 4 in Appendix B summarizes the environments and their distinct coordination mechanisms.

5.1 STAT: Controlled Assignment Coordination

The Spatial Task Allocation Testbed (STAT) is a configurable cooperative multi-agent environment for controlled analysis of coordination. STAT generalizes a prior emergency-response task-allocation environment [7, 8] into a domain-agnostic setting in which agents coordinate over spatially distributed tasks. Low-level path planning and collision dynamics are abstracted away so that assignment-level interactions and their consequences are directly observable.

A team of agents selects tasks, travels to them, and executes them with the goal of completing the full task set efficiently. STAT uses action masking and a finite-state commitment structure (Figure 5) to isolate high-level task-allocation coordination. Once an assignment is retained, an agent remains committed to it through movement and task execution before becoming available for another assignment. Action masking restricts each agent to actions valid for its current mode and removes tasks that are already assigned or completed from the selectable set. As a result, meaningful coordination is concentrated at discrete assignment opportunities rather than continuously across all timesteps.

When more than one agent selects the same task at an assignment opportunity, STAT applies retrospective conflict resolution. The agent closest to the selected task retains the assignment, while the others lose that assignment opportunity and are forced to *idle* for that timestep. The retained task is then marked as assigned and removed from the selectable set in subsequent timesteps. This fixed rule resolves duplicate assignments after agents have made their choices without changing that they selected the same task. Conflicts therefore remain directly observable as incompatible assignment decisions and impose an immediate process-level consequence by wasting assignment opportunities.

Let n_t denote the number of agents currently making assignment decisions and m_t the number of currently selectable tasks at assignment opportunity t . Although the total numbers of agents and tasks are fixed within a STAT configuration, n_t and m_t vary over the course of an episode as agents become committed and tasks are assigned or completed. The corresponding assignment-level joint action space is

$$|\mathcal{A}_{\text{assign}}(t)| = m_t^{n_t},$$

yielding a state-dependent assignment problem whose coordination demands are concentrated at sparse, high-impact decision points. STAT uses a fixed task-level reward across configurations that encourages timely task completion through a per-step cost and time-dependent task-completion rewards. The complete reward specification and additional environment formulation details are provided in Appendix B.

5.1.1 STAT Process Diagnostics. STAT makes assignment coordination directly observable, allowing process diagnostics to be defined at the decision points where coordination occurs. Let $\mathcal{T}_{\text{opp}}$ denote the set of assignment opportunities encountered during an episode. We instantiate the four coordination dimensions introduced in Section 4 using measures of assignment interference, task completion,




Figure 1: Illustration of STAT assignment diagnostics. The top row shows task selections before conflict resolution, and the bottom row shows the retained assignments after resolution.

division of labor, and coordination efficiency. Figure 1 illustrates the relationship between assignment conflicts and retained assignment diversity.

Assignment Conflicts. To measure interference and redundant assignment, let S_t denote the multiset of tasks selected by decision-active agents at assignment opportunity t . For each task j ,

$$n_t(j) = \sum_{s \in S_t} \mathbf{1}[s = j]$$

denotes the number of agents selecting that task. The number of assignment conflicts at opportunity t is

$$K_t = \sum_j \mathbf{1}[n_t(j) > 1].$$

Thus, K_t counts the number of distinct tasks redundantly selected by multiple agents before conflict resolution. Summing K_t across assignment opportunities yields the episode-level conflict count.

We additionally report normalized variants to support comparisons across policies and configurations with different levels of coordination exposure. Conflicts per decision opportunity normalize by $|\mathcal{T}_{\text{opp}}|$ and capture how frequently conflicts occur when assignment decisions are made. Conflicts per task normalize by the total number of tasks in the configuration and capture redundant assignment relative to the size of the task set.

Forced Idle. Assignment conflicts impose an immediate consequence on agents that lose conflict resolution. Let F_t denote the number of agents forced to idle at assignment opportunity t . Summing across assignment opportunities gives the episode-level forced-idle count,

$$F = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{opp}}} F_t.$$

We report two normalized variants depending on the comparison of interest. Forced idle per decision opportunity is

$$F_{\text{opp}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}_{\text{opp}}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{opp}}} F_t,$$

which measures the average number of agents that lose an assignment opportunity when coordination decisions occur. We also

report the forced-idle rate per timestep, which measures conflict-induced inactivity relative to total episode duration.

Because the *idle* action is masked while selectable tasks remain, forced idle reflects inactivity induced by conflict resolution rather than voluntary non-participation. Assignment conflicts measure the occurrence of redundant task selection, whereas forced idle measures its immediate severity in lost agent participation.

Assignment Diversity. To characterize participation and division of labor, let A_t^{ret} denote the retained task assignments after conflict resolution. Assignment diversity is

$$D_t = |A_t^{\text{ret}}|,$$

the number of distinct task assignments retained at opportunity t . Higher values indicate that simultaneously decision-active agents distribute themselves across a broader set of tasks. When comparing different team sizes, we additionally normalize assignment diversity by the number of decision-active agents.

Task Throughput. To measure how efficiently assignment decisions translate into task progress, we report

$$\rho_{\text{STAT}} = \frac{M_{\text{completed}}}{H},$$

where $M_{\text{completed}}$ is the number of tasks completed during an episode of length H . Throughput captures downstream completion efficiency and, when interpreted jointly with assignment-level diagnostics, helps distinguish assignment failures from slower completion associated with travel or commitment duration.

These diagnostics instantiate complementary dimensions of the process-aware framework. Assignment conflicts capture interference and redundancy, forced idle captures the immediate efficiency cost of incompatible decisions, assignment diversity characterizes participation and division of labor, and throughput captures coordinated task completion and downstream efficiency. We interpret these diagnostics jointly with aggregate return.

5.2 Established Benchmark Environments

To complement STAT’s controlled diagnostic setting, we evaluate the framework in two established cooperative MARL benchmarks with distinct coordination mechanisms.

Level-Based Foraging. LBF [10] is a cooperative grid-world in which agents collect food subject to capability constraints. Some food items require multiple agents whose combined levels are sufficient, creating coordination through capability matching and synchronized loading.

Robotic Warehouse. RWARE [25] is a partially observable warehouse environment in which agents navigate shared aisles and transport requested shelves to delivery locations. Coordination arises through shared-space navigation, movement interference, congestion, and delivery behavior.

Table 1 summarizes the environment-specific diagnostics used to instantiate each process-aware dimension. Exact metric definitions are provided in Appendix C.

Table 1: Environment-specific instantiations of the process-aware coordination dimensions. Aggregate return is reported separately as an outcome measure.

Dimension	STAT	LBF	RWARE
Interference and redundancy	Assignment conflicts	Failed load-rate; synchronization failures	Canceled movements
Coordinated task completion	Task throughput	Foods collected; collection throughput	Delivery events; delivery throughput
Participation and division of labor	Assignment diversity	Participation balance; partner diversity	Delivery contribution CV
Coordination efficiency	Forced idle	Synchronization delay	Steps per delivery; NO-OP rate

Table 2: STAT configurations used for controlled scaling analysis.

Scale	Agents	Tasks	Size	Train Steps
Baseline	3	6	5×3	2M
	3	6	10×6	2M
	3	12	10×6	2M
	5	12	10×6	2M
Extreme	5	25	25×15	20M
	5	25	50×30	20M
	5	50	50×30	20M
	5	100	50×30	20M
	9	25	50×30	20M

6 Experimental Evaluation

6.1 Experimental Setup

6.1.1 Algorithms. We evaluate methods spanning centralized value learning, value decomposition, independent learning, and actor-critic approaches. STAT includes DQN [21], FDQN [8], VDN [30], QMIX [26], QTRAN [28], IQL [31], MAPPO and IPPO [35], and MAA2C [20, 25]. LBF evaluates MAPPO, IPPO, QMIX, and IQL, while RWARE evaluates MAPPO and IPPO. Method details and hyperparameters are provided in Appendices D and E.

6.1.2 Configurations. For STAT, we evaluate nine configurations that independently vary spatial extent, task count, or agent count while preserving the underlying assignment and commitment mechanisms. Increasing spatial extent changes travel burden, increasing task count expands assignment availability, and increasing agent count increases simultaneous assignment pressure. Table 2 summarizes the controlled comparisons.

For LBF, we evaluate two- and three-agent settings under full and partial observability. For RWARE, we evaluate `rware-tiny-2ag-v2`, `rware-tiny-4ag-v2`, and `rware-small-4ag-v2`. Exact environment identifiers, episode limits, reward settings, and additional implementation details are provided in Appendices B and C.

Table 3: Process differences among outcome-similar STAT policy pairs. Counts indicate pairs with at least a $2\times$ gap in the corresponding diagnostic.

Return Threshold	Outcome-Similar	$\geq 2\times$ Conflicts	$\geq 2\times$ Forced Idle
1%	121	31	38
2%	199	58	80
3%	244	76	103

6.1.3 Training and Evaluation. All experiments use five random seeds. During evaluation, learning is disabled and policies use their deterministic evaluation rule. Unless otherwise stated, we report means with 95% confidence intervals. STAT uses 2M training steps for Baseline configurations and 20M for Extreme configurations; RWARE uses 40M steps, while LBF training budgets vary by setting. Full training budgets, evaluation frequencies, reward scalarization settings, and hyperparameters are reported in Appendix E.

6.2 Similar Outcomes Conceal Different Coordination Processes

We first test whether policies with similar aggregate performance exhibit different coordination behavior. For each STAT configuration, we compare all unordered pairs of evaluated methods, yielding 276 method-pair-configuration comparisons. Two policies are considered *outcome-similar* when their mean returns differ by at most 1%, 2%, or 3%. For each such pair, process differences are measured as the ratio between the larger and smaller mean diagnostic values.

Table 3 shows that substantial process differences are common even under strict return-similarity criteria. At the 1% threshold, 121 of 276 comparisons are outcome-similar. Among these, 38 (31.4%) differ by at least $2\times$ in forced idle and 31 (25.6%) by at least $2\times$ in assignment conflicts. More stringent process-gap thresholds show that 26 pairs differ by at least $3\times$ in one or both diagnostics and 9 by at least $5\times$ (Table 9). Similar patterns persist at the 2% and 3% return thresholds. Figure 2 illustrates representative examples. Nearly identical returns can coexist with several-fold differences in assignment conflicts and forced idle. Although related, these diagnostics capture different aspects of the same failure mode. Conflicts measure redundant task selections, while forced idle measures the resulting loss of agent participation.

Overall, these results show that aggregate return can obscure variation in assignment interference and its immediate efficiency cost. Assignment diversity and throughput vary less among outcome-similar pairs, indicating that the strongest hidden differences in this analysis lie in redundant assignment and conflict-induced inactivity.

6.3 Process-Aware Metrics Can Characterize Scale Changes

We next examine whether process-aware diagnostics help characterize how coordination changes under controlled scaling. Using paired STAT configurations from Table 2, we vary spatial extent, task count, or agent count while holding the remaining configuration factors fixed. Figure 3 shows that these interventions produce distinct process signatures that are not apparent from return alone.




Figure 2: Example outcome-similar STAT policy pairs. Each row compares two methods whose mean returns differ by less than 1%, while assignment conflicts and forced idle differ substantially. Bars show means across five seeds with 95% confidence intervals.

A) Spatial extent

□ Baseline: 3A 6T 10×6 → 3A 6T 10×6
 ▨ Extreme: 5A 25T 25×15 → 5A 25T 50×30




Figure 3: Process-aware analysis under controlled STAT scaling. Each row varies one configuration factor while holding the others fixed: (A) spatial extent, (B) task count, and (C) agent count. Bars show mean changes across five seeds with 95% confidence intervals.

Increasing spatial extent raises travel burden without changing team or task size. As shown in Figure 3A, return and throughput decrease substantially, while conflict-rate changes are comparatively small and often negative. This pattern indicates that the primary effect of spatial scaling is reduced completion efficiency and fewer assignment opportunities, rather than increased redundant assignment.

Increasing task count expands the assignment choice set and creates additional opportunities for task completion. Figure 3B shows that return generally increases, but total assignment conflicts also

rise. Conflicts per task change more modestly and can decrease, indicating that some of the increase in absolute conflict is attributable to the larger task set. Thus, improved aggregate performance can coexist with greater redundant assignment.

Increasing agent count adds parallel capacity while also increasing the number of simultaneous assignment decisions. Figure 3C shows that the effect on return is method-dependent, whereas conflict pressure generally increases and per-agent assignment diversity decreases. Additional agents therefore do not automatically




Figure 4: Reward-shaping ablation with an explicit conflict penalty in STAT. FDQN, QMIX, and IQL are trained with $\lambda = 0$ or $\lambda = 1$, where λ penalizes agents that lose conflict resolution. Reported task return excludes the conflict penalty so that both conditions are compared under the same task-level objective. Bars show means across five seeds with 95% confidence intervals.

translate into proportionally broader division of labor; they can also amplify redundant decision-making.

The three interventions show that scale does not induce a single coordination failure mode. Spatial scaling primarily affects completion efficiency, task scaling increases absolute assignment pressure, and agent scaling introduces a tradeoff between parallel capacity and coordination interference. Process-aware diagnostics therefore provide a more specific account of scaling behavior than aggregate return alone. Statistical tests for all controlled scaling comparisons, with Holm correction within each comparison block, are reported in Tables 19-21 in Appendix F.

6.4 Explicit Coordination Penalties Change Behavior More Than Task Return

A possible explanation for the process differences observed above is that STAT’s task reward does not explicitly penalize assignment conflicts. To test this explanation, we conduct a reward-shaping ablation that adds an explicit coordination penalty while holding the remaining training and evaluation conditions fixed. In the 5-agent, 12-task, 10×6 STAT configuration, we retrain FDQN, QMIX, and IQL using

$$r_{\text{train}} = r_{\text{task}} - \lambda N_{\text{loss}},$$

where N_{loss} is the number of agents that lose conflict resolution at a timestep. We compare the original objective ($\lambda = 0$) with explicit conflict penalization ($\lambda = 1$) using the same training budget, seeds, layouts, and evaluation protocol.

Both conditions are evaluated using the task return r_{task} , with the conflict penalty excluded. As shown in Figure 4, explicitly penalizing conflict-losing agents changes coordination behavior while leaving task-level performance nearly unchanged. Conflict rate decreases by 22.4% for FDQN, 11.7% for QMIX, and 3.8% for IQL, with corresponding reductions in forced-idle rate. In contrast, task return changes by less than 0.4% for every method.

The explicit coordination signal also does not eliminate differences across methods. Under $\lambda = 1$, conflict rates remain 0.0756 for FDQN, 0.1241 for QMIX, and 0.2334 for IQL. Reward design therefore influences conflict behavior, but does not fully explain the method-dependent coordination patterns observed in STAT.

These results show that the outcome-process disconnect is not solely a consequence of omitting an explicit coordination signal

from the training objective. Conflict shaping can reduce redundant assignment and conflict-induced inactivity, yet these changes remain largely invisible to task return. Process-aware diagnostics therefore reveal the effects of coordination-focused interventions that return-only evaluation would largely miss.

6.5 Process-Aware Evaluation Remains Informative Across Environments

Finally, we test whether the process-aware framework remains informative under coordination mechanisms that differ from STAT. We instantiate the dimensions from Section 4 using environment-specific diagnostics in LBF and RWARE. Full results across all evaluated configurations are reported in Tables 17 and 18 in Appendix G.

Level-Based Foraging. In the two-agent fully observable setting, MAPPO and IQL achieve similar return (0.984 versus 0.994), yet IQL exhibits 65% fewer failed loads and 16% higher throughput. Under partial observability, MAPPO, IPPO, and IQL all achieve returns between 0.981 and 0.990, while IQL has approximately half the failed-load rate, substantially fewer synchronization failures, and about 20% higher throughput (Table 17). Thus, nearly identical task-level outcomes can arise from substantially different coordination processes. In the three-agent settings, participation balance and partner diversity additionally characterize how successful cooperation is distributed across the team. Under full observability, MAPPO and IPPO achieve similarly strong outcomes and similar participation profiles, whereas under partial observability, MAPPO achieves higher return, throughput, participation balance, and partner diversity than IPPO. These results show that process diagnostics remain informative both when aggregate outcomes are similar and when they diverge.

Robotic Warehouse. RWARE provides a complementary case in which low interference alone does not imply effective coordination. In *rware-small-4ag-v2*, MAPPO exhibits a very low canceled-movement rate (0.0016) but produces only 0.120 delivery events per episode and near-zero throughput (0.00024), whereas IPPO has higher movement contention (0.0227) yet substantially more delivery events (2.708) and throughput (0.00542). A similar pattern appears in *rware-tiny-4ag-v2* (Table 18). These results show that low contention may reflect efficient coordination, but can also indicate limited task engagement, and should therefore be interpreted jointly with task completion and inactivity.

7 Discussion

7.1 Similar Outcomes Do Not Imply Similar Coordination

Aggregate task performance provides an essential measure of whether a cooperative policy succeeds, but it is a compressed representation of the interaction process that produced that outcome. Our results show that policies with similar outcomes may not be behaviorally equivalent. Different methods can achieve comparable task performance while exhibiting substantially different patterns of interference, synchronization, participation, and coordination efficiency. This distinction changes how close benchmark results

should be interpreted. When several methods achieve similar aggregate performance, this does not necessarily imply that they have learned equivalent coordination strategies or that meaningful behavioral differences have disappeared. Process-level diagnostics can instead reveal tradeoffs that are hidden by a single outcome measure. Algorithm comparisons should therefore consider both what policies achieve and the interaction processes through which they achieve it.

7.2 Process Diagnostics Require Joint and Contextual Interpretation

The three environments provide complementary evidence for the framework. STAT offers controlled diagnostic depth by isolating assignment coordination and making conflicts and their immediate consequences directly observable, while LBF and RWARE test the framework under distinct coordination mechanisms. Accordingly, the same coordination dimensions manifest through different observable processes: STAT exposes redundant assignment and conflict-induced inactivity, LBF exposes failed or poorly synchronized joint actions, and RWARE exposes movement interference, inactivity, and delivery efficiency. Across all three environments, these diagnostics provide information beyond aggregate performance by revealing how coordination succeeds, fails, or remains underutilized.

This variation motivates the use of environment-specific diagnostics within a common interpretive framework rather than a universal set of coordination metrics. For the same reason, process-aware evaluation should not replace return with a single alternative “coordination score.” Individual diagnostics capture specific aspects of interaction and can be ambiguous when considered in isolation. Low interference, for example, may reflect efficient coordination, but the RWARE results show that it can also accompany limited task engagement.

Diagnostics may also capture different stages of the same coordination process. In STAT, assignment conflicts measure the occurrence of redundant task selection, while forced idle measures its immediate consequence in lost agent participation. Although related, the two distinguish the frequency of a coordination failure from its severity. Process diagnostics should therefore be interpreted jointly with one another and with task outcomes. When comparing settings with different scales or decision frequencies, they should also be normalized by the relevant coordination opportunities.

7.3 Separating Optimization from Evaluation

A coordination behavior that appears undesirable during evaluation could be encoded directly into the learning objective, but doing so does not eliminate the need to measure it separately. Our conflict-penalty ablation shows that explicitly penalizing assignment conflicts changes learned coordination behavior while producing little change in the original task return, with method-dependent behavioral differences persisting across conditions. Learning objectives and evaluation diagnostics therefore serve different roles. The objective specifies what agents are optimized to achieve, whereas diagnostics characterize how they behave while doing so. Requiring every behavior of interest to appear in the reward risks conflating

these roles and may obscure tradeoffs among coordination processes. This separation has implications for benchmark design. A process-aware benchmark should identify the coordination opportunities created by the environment, measure observable behaviors and consequences at those opportunities, and retain aggregate task performance as a complementary outcome measure. Controlled interventions, such as changing spatial extent, task count, team size, or reward incentives, can then help determine which parts of the coordination process are sensitive to particular environmental or algorithmic changes.

7.4 Limitations and Future Directions

Our evaluation spans three environments with distinct coordination mechanisms, but all are spatially grounded cooperative tasks. These settings provide complementary evidence for the framework, but do not cover the full range of cooperative interaction. Future work should examine communication-heavy coordination, negotiation, distributed planning, heterogeneous roles and capabilities, and collaborative decision-making without explicit spatial structure.

The framework also does not automatically determine the appropriate diagnostics for a new environment. Its dimensions provide a common interpretive structure, but operationalization still requires identifying the relevant coordination opportunities and observable interaction mechanisms. This flexibility supports application across domains, but introduces researcher judgment into metric selection. More systematic procedures for selecting and validating diagnostics across benchmark variants remain an important direction.

Finally, most cross-method and cross-environment comparisons are observational and should not be interpreted as causal explanations of performance differences. Controlled STAT scaling and the reward-shaping ablation provide targeted interventions on specific sources of coordination pressure, but do not establish general causal relationships between individual process measures and downstream outcomes. Establishing such relationships is an important direction for future work.

8 Conclusion

We introduced a process-aware framework for evaluating cooperative MARL that complements aggregate task performance with diagnostics of interference, coordinated task completion, participation, and coordination efficiency. Across STAT, Level-Based Foraging, and Robotic Warehouse, process diagnostics reveal coordination differences that aggregate return can obscure, including among policies with similar outcomes and under controlled changes in scale and reward shaping. The same coordination dimensions remain informative across distinct interaction mechanisms, while requiring environment-specific operationalization and joint interpretation with task outcomes. The framework provides a structure for understanding not only what cooperative policies achieve, but how agents coordinate to achieve it.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under grant number 2234693. We used an icon from FlatIcon by author Freepik.

References

- [1] Aakriti Agrawal, Amrit Singh Bedi, and Dinesh Manocha. 2022. RTAW: An Attention Inspired Reinforcement Learning Method for Multi-Robot Task Allocation in Warehouse Environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.05738* (2022). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.05738>
- [2] Aakriti Agrawal, Senthil Hariharan, Amrit Singh Bedi, and Dinesh Manocha. 2022. DC-MRTA: Decentralized Multi-Robot Task Allocation and Navigation in Complex Environments. In *2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. arXiv:2209.02865 [cs.RO] doi:10.48550/arXiv.2209.02865
- [3] Sofia Amador, Steven Okamoto, and Roie Zivan. 2014. Dynamic Multi-Agent Task Allocation with Spatial and Temporal Constraints. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 1384–1390. doi:10.1609/aaai.v28i1.8889
- [4] Sree Deeksha Bethapuri, Maria Cardei, Hannah Sprague, Salonee Verma, and Afsaneh Doryab. 2026. Toward Human-Inspired Collaborative Intelligence for Human-AI Team Decision-Making: A Survey. SSRN. doi:10.2139/ssrn.6754660
- [5] Upasana Biswas, Vardhan Palod, Siddhant Bhambri, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2026. Who Is Helping Whom? Analyzing Inter-Dependencies to Evaluate Cooperation in Human-AI Teaming. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 40, 21 (2026), 17347–17356. doi:10.1609/aaai.v40i21.38787
- [6] Lorenzo Canese, Gian Carlo Cardarilli, Luca Di Nunzio, Rocco Fazzolari, Daniele Giardino, Marco Re, and Sergio Spanò. 2021. Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning: A Review of Challenges and Applications. *Applied Sciences* 11, 11 (2021), 4948. doi:10.3390/app11114948
- [7] Maria Ana Cardei and Afsaneh Doryab. 2024. Practical Heuristics for Victim Tagging During a Mass Casualty Incident Emergency Medical Response. In *2024 IEEE 20th International Conference on Automation Science and Engineering (CASE)*. 165–172. doi:10.1109/CASE59546.2024.10711469
- [8] Maria Ana Cardei and Afsaneh Doryab. 2026. Factorized Deep Q-Network for Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning in Victim Tagging. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering* 23 (2026), 3109–3120. doi:10.1109/TASE.2025.3627429
- [9] Micah Carroll, Rohin Shah, Mark K. Ho, Thomas L. Griffiths, Sanjit A. Seshia, Pieter Abbeel, and Anca Dragan. 2019. *On the utility of learning about humans for human-AI coordination*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA.
- [10] Filippos Christianos, Lukas Schäfer, and Stefano V. Albrecht. 2020. Shared Experience Actor-Critic for Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- [11] Daniel Claes, Philipp Robbel, Frans A. Oliehoek, Karl Tuyls, Daniel Hennes, and Wiebe van der Hoek. 2015. Effective Approximations for Multi-Robot Coordination in Spatially Distributed Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, Richland, SC, 881–890. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/2772879.2773265>
- [12] Zhenhui Feng, Renbin Xiao, and Mingzhi Xiao. 2025. Spatial Crowdsourcing Task Allocation for Heterogeneous Multi-Task Hybrid Scenarios: A Model-Embedded Role Division Approach. *Frontiers of Information Technology & Electronic Engineering* 26 (2025), 1144–1163. doi:10.1631/FITEE.2500035
- [13] Rihab Gorsane, Omayma Mahjoub, Ruan de Kock, Roland Dubb, Siddarth Singh, and Arnū Pretorius. 2022. Towards a Standardised Performance Evaluation Protocol for Cooperative MARL. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 35. 5510–5521.
- [14] Siyi Hu, Fengda Zhu, Xiaojun Chang, and Xiaodan Liang. 2022. Policy Diagnosis via Measuring Role Diversity in Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 162)*. PMLR, 9041–9071.
- [15] Aleksandar Krnjaic, Raul D. Stealec, Jonathan D. Thomas, Georgios Papoudakis, Lukas Schäfer, Andrew Wing Keung To, Kuan-Ho Lao, Murat Cubuktepe, Matthew Haley, Peter Börsting, and Stefano V. Albrecht. 2024. Scalable Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning for Warehouse Logistics with Robotic and Human Co-Workers. In *2024 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. 677–684. doi:10.1109/IROS58592.2024.10802813
- [16] Kun Li, Shengling Wang, Hongwei Shi, Xiuzhen Cheng, and Minghui Xu. 2023. Spatial Crowdsourcing Task Allocation Scheme for Massive Data with Spatial Heterogeneity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12433* (2023). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2310.12433
- [17] Ryan Lowe, Yi Wu, Aviv Tamar, Jean Harb, Pieter Abbeel, and Igor Mordatch. 2017. Multi-agent actor-critic for mixed cooperative-competitive environments. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (Long Beach, California, USA) (NIPS’17)*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, 6382–6393.
- [18] Anuj Mahajan, Tabish Rashid, Mikayel Samvelyan, and Shimon Whiteson. 2019. MAVEN: Multi-Agent Variational Exploration. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 32.
- [19] Rajiv T. Maheswaran, Pedro A. Szekely, Marcel Becker, Stephen Fitzpatrick, Gergely Gati, Jing Jin, Robert Neches, Narges Noori, Craig Milo Rogers, Romeo Sanchez, Kevin Smyth, and Chris VanBuskirk. 2008. Predictability and Criticality Metrics for Coordination in Complex Environments. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, Vol. 2. 647–654.
- [20] Volodymyr Mnih, Adrià Puigdomènech Badia, Mehdi Mirza, Alex Graves, Timothy Lillicrap, Tim Harley, David Silver, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. 2016. Asynchronous Methods for Deep Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 48)*. PMLR, 1928–1937.
- [21] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A. Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G. Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K. Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, Stig Petersen, Charles Beattie, Amir Sadik, Ioannis Antonoglou, Helen King, Dharmashan Kumaran, Daan Wierstra, Shane Legg, and Demis Hassabis. 2015. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature* 518, 7540 (2015), 529–533.
- [22] Frans A. Oliehoek, Christopher Amato, et al. 2016. *A concise introduction to decentralized POMDPs*. Vol. 1. Springer.
- [23] Afshin Oroojlooy and Davood Hajinezhad. 2023. A review of cooperative multi-agent deep reinforcement learning. *Applied Intelligence* 53 (2023), 13677–13722. doi:10.1007/s10489-022-04105-y
- [24] George Papadopoulos, Andreas Kontogiannis, Foteini Papadopoulou, Chaido Pouladianou, Ioannis Kountentis, and George Vouros. 2025. An Extended Benchmarking of Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning Algorithms in Complex Fully Cooperative Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (Detroit, MI, USA) (AAMAS ’25)*. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, Richland, SC, 1613–1622.
- [25] Georgios Papoudakis, Filippos Christianos, Lukas Schäfer, and Stefano V. Albrecht. 2021. Benchmarking Multi-Agent Deep Reinforcement Learning Algorithms in Cooperative Tasks. In *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks (NeurIPS)*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.07869>
- [26] Tabish Rashid, Mikayel Samvelyan, Christopher de Witt, Gregory Farquhar, Jakob N. Foerster, and Shimon Whiteson. 2018. QMIX: Monotonic value function factorisation for deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, Vol. 80. PMLR, 4295–4304.
- [27] Mikayel Samvelyan, Tabish Rashid, Christian Schroeder de Witt, Gregory Farquhar, Nantas Nardelli, Tim G. J. Rudner, Philip H. S. Torr, Jakob Foerster, and Shimon Whiteson. 2019. The StarCraft Multi-Agent Challenge. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS)*. 2186–2188.
- [28] Kyunghwan Son, Daewoo Kim, Wan Ju Kang, David Hostallero, and Yung Yi. 2019. QTRAN: Learning to Factorize with Transformation for Cooperative Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. PMLR, 5887–5896.
- [29] Younes Strittmatter, Rachael Skye, Samuel Lozano Iglesias, Samuel Lieban, Andrew Saxe, Miguel Ruiz-Garcia, Erin Teich, and Markus Spitzer. 2026. When Collaboration Beats Ability: Mixed-Ability Teams Can Outperform High-Ability Teams Under Coordination Demands. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*.
- [30] Peter Sunehag, Guy Lever, Audrunas Gruslys, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Vinicius Flores Zambaldi, Max Jaderberg, Marc Lanctot, Nicolas Sonnerat, Joel Z. Leibo, Karl Tuyls, and Thore Graepel. 2017. Value-Decomposition Networks For Cooperative Multi-Agent Learning. *ArXiv abs/1706.05296* (2017). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:25026734>
- [31] Ming Tan. 1993. Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning: Independent vs. Cooperative Agents. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 1993)*. Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, CA, USA, 330–337. <http://web.media.mit.edu/~cynthiaab/Readings/tan-MAS-reinLearn.pdf>
- [32] Jianhao Wang, Zhizhou Ren, Terry Liu, Yang Yu, and Chongjie Zhang. 2021. QPLEX: Duplex Dueling Multi-Agent Q-Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.01062>
- [33] B. L. Welch. 1947. The Generalization of Student’s Problem when Several Different Population Variances are Involved. *Biometrika* 34, 1/2 (1947), 28–35. doi:10.2307/2332510
- [34] Guanyu Ye, Yan Zhao, Xuanhao Chen, and Kai Zheng. 2021. Task Allocation with Geographic Partition in Spatial Crowdsourcing. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 2404–2413. doi:10.1145/3459637.3482300
- [35] Chao Yu, Akash Velu, Eugene Vinytsky, Jiaxuan Gao, Yu Wang, Alexandre Bayen, and Yi Wu. 2022. The Surprising Effectiveness of PPO in Cooperative Multi-Agent Games. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 35. 24611–24624.
- [36] Yongchao Zhang, Qingyu Yang, Dou An, and Weidong Chen. 2021. Coordination Between Individual Agents in Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 11387–11394.

- [37] Yan Zhao, Xuanlei Chen, Guanyu Ye, Fangda Guo, Kai Zheng, and Xiaofang Zhou. 2024. Task Allocation in Spatial Crowdsourcing: An Efficient Geographic Partition Framework. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 36, 9 (2024), 4943–4955. doi:10.1109/TKDE.2024.3374086
- [38] Yiheng Zhu, Yang Zhan, Xuankun Huang, Yuwei Chen, Jiangwen Wei, Wei Feng, Yinzi Zhou, Haoyuan Hu, Jieping Ye, et al. 2023. Ofcourse: A multi-agent reinforcement learning environment for order fulfillment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 34765–34777.

A Code Release

We release the STAT environment together with executable training and evaluation code for the methods and environment configurations used in this study. The release includes DQN and FDQN implementations, PyMARL/EPyMARL-based implementations of IQL, VDN, QMIX, QTRAN, MAPPO, IPPO, and MAA2C [25, 27], configurable STAT instances, LBF and RWARE experiment configurations, process-diagnostic logging, smoke-test settings, and example commands for reproducing the main experiments. The artifact is intended to support reproducibility, executable verification, and future extensions with additional methods, diagnostics, or environment variants. Code is available at https://github.com/mariacardei/coordination_aware_MARL.

B STAT Environment Details

We provide additional details on STAT, the Spatial Task Allocation Testbed, used to instantiate process-aware evaluation in commitment-constrained spatial task allocation. STAT generalizes the victim-tagging environment used in prior work [7, 8] into a domain-general task-allocation testbed. Unlike the prior application-specific formulation, STAT systematically varies agent count, task count, and spatial extent while preserving the underlying assignment mechanism, allowing coordination processes to be analyzed under controlled changes in problem structure.

B.1 Environment Parameters, State, and Observability

A STAT instance is specified by

$$\mathcal{E} = \langle n, m, W, H, K, v, \Theta_R \rangle,$$

where n is the number of agents, m is the number of tasks, $W \times H$ defines the spatial grid, K is the number of timesteps required to execute a task after arrival, v is the agent movement speed, and $\Theta_R = \{R_0, \eta, \beta, \alpha, \lambda_{\text{step}}\}$ denotes the reward parameters. The current benchmark is fully observable, and agents and tasks are homogeneous, but the same formulation can be extended to agent-specific speeds, task-specific execution times, heterogeneous task requirements, or partial observability in future work.

Let $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ denote the set of agents and $\mathcal{M} = \{1, \dots, m\}$ denote the set of tasks. All agents begin from a fixed origin, and tasks are spatially distributed across a 2D grid. At timestep t , agent $i \in \mathcal{N}$ has position $x_i(t) \in [0, W] \times [0, H]$, mode $q_i(t)$, and current assignment $g_i(t) \in \mathcal{M} \cup \{\emptyset\}$. Each task $j \in \mathcal{M}$ has a fixed location y_j and status

$$z_j(t) \in \{\text{AVAILABLE}, \text{ASSIGNED}, \text{COMPLETED}\}.$$

The team objective is to complete all tasks efficiently. Task execution is abstracted as the agent remaining at the task location for a fixed number of timesteps. An episode terminates when all tasks are completed or when the environment reaches the maximum episode length.

We use a fully observable setting so that comparisons across training and execution paradigms are not confounded by differences in information access. The global state includes agent–task distance information, each agent’s current mode, and task status variables

indicating whether each task is available, assigned, or completed. Although STAT is fully observable in this benchmark, its structure naturally supports partially observable variants in future work.

B.2 Action Space and Finite-State Commitment




Figure 5: Finite-state commitment structure representing agent modes and valid transitions.

Each agent has a discrete action space consisting of IDLE, MOVE, EXECUTE, and SELECT actions. The SELECT action expands into one action for each task:

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \{\text{IDLE}, \text{MOVE}, \text{EXECUTE}\} \cup \{\text{SELECT}(j) : j \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

Thus, the nominal action set has size $3 + m$. The valid action set is state-dependent and is enforced through action masking, as described in the next subsection.

Agents are governed by a finite-state commitment structure (Figure 5). We represent each agent’s mode as

$$q_i(t) \in \{\text{IDLE}, \text{SELECT TASK}, \text{MOVE}, \text{EXECUTE TASK}\}.$$

The SELECT TASK mode is the decision mode in which an agent may choose among currently selectable tasks. Once a task is selected and retained after conflict resolution, the agent becomes committed to that task and transitions to MOVE. The agent remains in MOVE while it advances toward the assigned task. Once the assigned task is reached, the agent transitions to EXECUTE TASK, where it remains for a fixed number of timesteps K until the task is completed. After execution, the agent returns to SELECT TASK if incomplete selectable tasks remain, or transitions to IDLE if no selectable tasks remain. If an agent loses conflict resolution after selecting a task, it transitions to IDLE for that timestep.

This design makes STAT a commitment-constrained task-allocation problem. The nominal assignment space is combinatorial, but the effective action space is state-dependent. As agents commit to tasks and as tasks become assigned or completed, the set of selectable tasks decreases. Therefore, the complexity of the assignment problem changes over the episode as early timesteps may contain many feasible task assignments, while later timesteps contain fewer meaningful choices. This property concentrates coordination pressure at sparse, high-impact decision points.

B.3 Action Masking and State-Dependent Assignment Complexity

STAT uses action masks to enforce the finite-state commitment structure and remove invalid actions. Let $\mathcal{V}_i(s_t) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_i$ denote the valid action set for agent i in state s_t . If agent i is in SELECT TASK mode, then its valid task-selection actions are $\mathcal{V}_i(s_t) = \{\text{SELECT}(j) : z_j(t) = \text{AVAILABLE}\}$. If agent i is in MOVE mode and has not yet reached its assigned task, then the valid action set is restricted to $\mathcal{V}_i(s_t) = \{\text{MOVE}\}$. If agent i is in EXECUTE TASK mode, then the valid action set is restricted to $\mathcal{V}_i(s_t) = \{\text{EXECUTE}\}$. If no selectable tasks remain, the valid action set is restricted to $\mathcal{V}_i(s_t) = \{\text{IDLE}\}$. Completed or already assigned tasks are removed from the set of selectable task actions.

The masking removes invalid low-level choices so that the benchmark focuses on the high-level coordination problem of distributing agents across tasks. Without masking, a substantial part of the learning problem would involve discovering which actions are invalid in each state. With masking, the core challenge becomes whether agents make compatible assignment decisions when meaningful choices are available.

At an assignment decision point, let m_t be the number of selectable tasks and n_t be the number of agents currently in SELECT TASK mode. The effective assignment-level joint action space is

$$|\mathcal{A}_{\text{assign}}(t)| = m_t^{n_t}.$$

Thus, the assignment space grows combinatorially with the number of agents simultaneously making assignment decisions and the number of selectable tasks. Unlike settings with a fixed joint action space, both m_t and n_t change throughout an episode. Tasks become assigned or completed, and agents become temporarily committed to movement or execution. STAT therefore induces a state-dependent combinatorial action space whose complexity generally decreases as tasks are assigned and completed.

B.4 Conflict Resolution

Multiple agents may select the same task at the same assignment timestep. STAT resolves these assignment conflicts retrospectively. Let

$$S_j(t) = \{i \in \mathcal{N} : a_i(t) = \text{SELECT}(j)\}$$

be the set of agents that select task j at timestep t . If $|S_j(t)| > 1$, the retained agent is

$$i^*(j, t) = \arg \min_{i \in S_j(t)} d(x_i(t), y_j),$$

with ties broken deterministically by agent index. Agent $i^*(j, t)$ receives assignment $g_{i^*}(t) = j$, while all other agents in $S_j(t) \setminus \{i^*(j, t)\}$ default to IDLE. The selected task is then marked as ASSIGNED and is no longer available for future selection.

This conflict-resolution rule makes coordination failures explicit and measurable. In STAT, a conflict is not only reflected indirectly through lower reward, it is an observable process-level event that reveals redundant allocation. Agents that lose conflict resolution do not make progress during that timestep, making redundant assignment costly through lost opportunity and delayed task completion. This allows the benchmark to distinguish policies that achieve similar return but differ in how efficiently they distribute agents across tasks.

B.5 Movement, Execution, and Abstractions

After an agent receives a task assignment, it moves toward the selected task. For an agent in `MOVE` mode, the position update is

$$x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + \min\{v, d(x_i(t), y_{g_i(t)})\} \frac{y_{g_i(t)} - x_i(t)}{d(x_i(t), y_{g_i(t)})},$$

where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes Euclidean distance. When the agent reaches the assigned task location, it enters `EXECUTING`. After K execution timesteps, the task is marked `COMPLETED`, and the agent becomes available to select another task if any remain.

STAT abstracts away explicit agent-agent collision dynamics and low-level path-planning constraints. Agents move toward their assigned tasks without needing to solve a separate pathfinding problem. This abstraction prevents collision avoidance or complex navigation from becoming the dominant source of difficulty. The benchmark instead isolates spatial task-assignment coordination under combinatorial scaling.

B.6 Reward Function

We use a fixed reward function across all STAT configurations to provide a consistent task objective as problem complexity scales. Each agent $i \in \mathcal{N}$ receives an individual reward $\mathcal{R}_i(t)$ at time t , and the total team reward is

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{total}}(t) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{R}_i(t).$$

At each timestep, an agent receives a step penalty $\mathcal{R}_i(t) = -\lambda_{\text{step}}$, unless it completes a task. When an agent completes a task, it instead receives

$$\mathcal{R}_i(t) = \mathcal{R}^b(t) (1 + \alpha T_{\text{completed}}(t)),$$

where $T_{\text{completed}}(t)$ is the total number of tasks completed by time t , and α controls the progressive bonus for cumulative task completion. The base reward decays with elapsed time:

$$\mathcal{R}^b(t) = R_0 - \eta \left\lfloor \frac{\text{steps}_t}{\beta} \right\rfloor,$$

where R_0 is the initial base reward, η is the penalty applied at each decay interval, and β is the interval length in timesteps. In our experiments, we set $R_0 = 30$, $\eta = 0.5$, $\beta = 10$, $\alpha = 0.1$, and $\lambda_{\text{step}} = 1$, following prior work [8]. We keep these reward parameters fixed across all benchmark settings so that methods optimize the same task objective.

B.7 Environment Scope

STAT has the broad structure of a grid-based cooperative task-allocation problem, making it relevant to domains such as warehouse logistics, order fulfillment, delivery, victim tagging, and search and rescue [8, 15, 24, 38]. The current benchmark intentionally uses homogeneous agents, homogeneous tasks, full observability, and simplified movement. This controlled scope is chosen to isolate structured combinatorial coordination without introducing additional confounds such as heterogeneous capabilities, partial observability, complex perception, collision avoidance, or domain-specific execution mechanics.

These simplifications are also natural extension points. STAT could be extended to heterogeneous agents by varying speed, specialization, or sensing capabilities; to heterogeneous tasks by varying execution time, priority, or completion requirements; and to partially observable settings by restricting each agent’s access to the global state. In this work, we keep these factors fixed so that STAT isolates assignment coordination and supports controlled analysis of how coordination processes change as agent count, task count, and spatial extent are varied.

Table 4 summarizes the three cooperative environments used in our evaluation and the distinct coordination challenges they expose. STAT provides controlled diagnostic depth by isolating commitment-constrained task assignment and supporting systematic variation in agent count, task count, and spatial extent. LBF introduces capability-constrained synchronized cooperation under both full and partial observability, while RWARE introduces partially observable multi-agent navigation, movement interference, congestion, and sparse rewards. These environments provide complementary settings for evaluating whether the process-aware framework remains informative across distinct coordination mechanisms and experimental conditions.

C Established Environment Details

C.1 Level-Based Foraging

We use the Level-Based Foraging (LBF) environments through EPyMAREL [25] with the standard LBF environment implementation. We evaluate two- and three-agent settings under both full and partial observability. The exact environment identifiers and configuration parameters used for each experiment are reported in Table 5. The corresponding environment IDs are `Foraging-8x8-2p-2f-coop-v3`, `Foraging-2s-8x8-2p-2f-coop-v3`, `Foraging-10x10-3p-3f-v3`, and `Foraging-2s-10x10-3p-3f-v3`, respectively.

Agents navigate a grid containing food items with associated levels. A food item can be collected only when the combined level of participating agents is sufficient for that item, creating capability-matching and synchronization requirements. Agents use the environment’s native movement, load, and NO-OP actions. Episodes terminate according to the configured LBF episode limit or when the task terminates naturally.

For all LBF experiments, we use a cooperative team reward by summing individual environment rewards through the EPyMAREL interface. We do not modify the native transition, observation, or reward mechanics. Our only modifications are non-invasive logging hooks used to record movement, loading, synchronization, and participation events for the process diagnostics defined below; the native transition, observation, termination, and reward mechanics are unchanged. Random seeds control both learning and environment stochasticity.

C.1.1 Process-Aware Metrics. The LBF logging wrapper records process events at the food-target level rather than treating each individual agent action as a separate coordination event.

Load Events. For each food item, a load event is counted once at a timestep when at least one adjacent agent selects the `LOAD` action. Thus, the denominator for load-based rates is the number of

Table 4: Overview of the cooperative environments and experimental variations used in our evaluation.

Environment	Observability	Agents	Coordination Mechanism	Studied Variation
STAT	Full	3, 5, 9	Commitment-constrained task assignment with directly observable assignment conflicts	Agent count, task count, and spatial extent
LBF [10]	Full / Partial	2, 3	Capability matching and synchronized loading	Agent count and observability
RWARE [25]	Partial	2, 4	Multi-agent navigation, movement interference, congestion, and shelf delivery	Agent count and warehouse layout

Table 5: LBF configurations used in the experiments.

Setting	Agents	Observability	Episode Limit
2-agent full	2	Full	50
2-agent partial	2	Partial	50
3-agent full	3	Full	50
3-agent partial	3	Partial	50

food-target load events rather than the number of individual agent LOAD actions.

Failed-Load Rate. A failed load is a food-target load event for which the agents adjacent to the food that select LOAD do not jointly meet the food’s level requirement. We compute

$$\text{FailedLoadRate} = \frac{N_{\text{failed load}}}{N_{\text{load events}}}.$$

This measures unsuccessful capability-constrained loading relative to the number of opportunities in which agents attempted to collect a food item.

Successful Collection and Throughput. We report the number of food items actually removed from the environment, $N_{\text{collected}}$, as the number of successfully collected foods. Collection throughput is

$$\rho_{\text{LBF}} = \frac{N_{\text{collected}}}{H},$$

where H is the episode length. We additionally record `SuccessfulLoadEvents_sum`, defined as the number of food-target load events for which the summed level of the agents selecting LOAD satisfies the food’s level requirement before the environment transition.

Synchronization Failures. A synchronization failure is a failed load event for which the full set of agents adjacent to the targeted food collectively has sufficient level to collect it, but the subset of adjacent agents that selects LOAD does not. We compute

$$\text{SynchronizationFailureRate} = \frac{N_{\text{sync failure}}}{N_{\text{load events}}}.$$

This distinguishes failures caused by insufficient synchronized participation from failures in which the locally available agent capacity is itself insufficient.

Synchronization Delay. For each collected food item, we record the first timestep at which the agents adjacent to that food collectively have sufficient level to satisfy its collection requirement. Synchronization delay is the number of timesteps from this first feasible timestep to the timestep at which the food is removed from

Table 6: RWARE configurations used in the experiments.

Setting	Agents	Episode Limit
rware-tiny-2ag-v2	2	500
rware-tiny-4ag-v2	4	500
rware-small-4ag-v2	4	500

the environment. We average this quantity across collected food items for which a feasible timestep was recorded.

Participation Balance. Let c_i denote the number of successfully collected-food events in which agent i selects LOAD as part of the successful loading group. We define

$$p_i = \frac{c_i}{\sum_j c_j}, \quad \text{ParticipationBalance} = \frac{-\sum_i p_i \log p_i}{\log N},$$

where N is the number of agents. The score ranges from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating more evenly distributed successful participation. If there is no successful participation in an episode, the score is set to zero.

Partner Diversity. For each agent i , let $\mathcal{P}_i$ denote the set of distinct teammates with whom the agent participates in at least one successfully collected-food event. We report the mean number of distinct partners per agent and its normalized form,

$$\text{PartnerDiversityFrac} = \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_i |\mathcal{P}_i|}{N - 1}.$$

The normalized value ranges from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating that successful cooperation is distributed across a broader set of teammate pairings.

C.2 Robotic Warehouse

We use Robotic Warehouse (RWARE) through EPyMARL [25] with the standard registered warehouse environments. We evaluate `rware-tiny-2ag-v2`, `rware-tiny-4ag-v2`, and `rware-small-4ag-v2`. The corresponding agent counts and episode limits are reported in Table 6. All experiments use EPyMARL’s Gymnasium interface with `common_reward=True`, `reward_scalarisation=sum`, and `env_args.time_limit`.

RWARE is partially observable and requires agents to navigate shared warehouse aisles, retrieve requested shelves, and transport them to delivery locations. Agents use the environment’s native movement, rotation, shelf-interaction, and NO-OP actions. Because the native environment provides individual rewards, we use EPyMARL’s sum scalarization to form a shared team reward. We otherwise retain the native transition, observation, reward, and termination mechanics.

Our only modifications are non-invasive logging hooks used to record movement interference, inactivity, shelf-delivery behavior, and agent contributions for the process diagnostics defined below. Random seeds control both learning and environment stochasticity.

C.2.1 Process-Aware Metrics. The RWARE diagnostics are derived from forward-movement requests, inactivity, and delivery-reward events recorded during evaluation.

Canceled Movements. We record a movement request when an agent selects the native FORWARD action. A canceled movement is counted when the requested forward target differs from the agent’s current cell, but after the environment resolves the transition the agent remains in its original cell. Thus, canceled movements capture blocked forward progress under the environment’s native movement-resolution rules.

Canceled-Movement Rate. We normalize canceled movements by the number of forward requests,

$$\text{CanceledMovementRate} = \frac{N_{\text{canceled forward}}}{N_{\text{forward requests}}}.$$

This metric captures how often attempted forward navigation fails to make progress.

Shelf Deliveries. We infer delivery events from the per-agent reward vector before common-reward aggregation. At each timestep, each agent receiving a positive reward contributes one delivery event, and the resulting episode total is logged as

$$N_{\text{delivered}}.$$

This quantity corresponds to ShelvesDelivered_sum. Because the count is derived from positive per-agent rewards rather than directly from unique shelf identifiers, it should be interpreted according to the reward convention of the underlying RWARE environment.

Delivery Throughput. We normalize delivery events by episode length,

$$\rho_{\text{RWARE}} = \frac{N_{\text{delivered}}}{H},$$

where H is the number of timesteps in the episode.

NO-OP Rate. We measure inactivity as the fraction of agent-timestep actions that are the native NOOP action,

$$\text{NoOpRate} = \frac{N_{\text{NOOP}}}{HN},$$

where N is the number of agents.

Steps Per Delivery. We log

$$\text{StepsPerDelivery} = \frac{H}{N_{\text{delivered}}},$$

using a safe-division convention that returns 0 when no delivery events occur. We therefore interpret this metric jointly with delivery count and throughput, rather than treating a zero value as indicating efficient task completion.

Per-Agent Delivery Contribution. Let c_i denote the number of positive-reward delivery events attributed to agent i . The wrapper logs the per-agent counts $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^N$, their mean, and their coefficient of variation,

$$\text{CV} = \frac{\text{std}(c_1, \dots, c_N)}{\text{mean}(c_1, \dots, c_N)},$$

with the coefficient of variation set to zero when the mean contribution is zero. Lower CV indicates more even delivery contribution across agents to zero.

D Methods Evaluated

Table 7 summarizes the methods evaluated in this study. The method set spans centralized joint-action learning, value decomposition, independent learning, and actor-critic approaches with different training and execution structures. This breadth allows us to examine whether process-level coordination differences arise across substantially different MARL paradigms rather than being specific to a single algorithm family. Method coverage varies across environments according to benchmark characteristics and the experimental design described in Section 6.1.

Centralized Training and Centralized Execution. In the CTCE paradigm, both learning and action selection are performed centrally over the full multi-agent system. We evaluate DQN and FDQN.

DQN. We extend Deep Q-Networks (DQN) [21] to a fully centralized multi-agent setting by treating the global state and joint action as the input and output of a single learner. The centralized Q-network directly estimates the value of joint actions without factorization assumptions, but the output space grows exponentially with the number of agents and available actions.

FDQN. Factorized Deep Q-Networks (FDQN) [8] retain centralized training and execution while factorizing the representation of the joint action space. This reduces the computational burden of enumerating all joint actions while preserving centralized reasoning over multi-agent decisions.

Centralized Training and Decentralized Execution. In the CTDE paradigm, agents may use centralized or joint information during training while selecting actions independently at execution time. We evaluate VDN, QMIX, QTRAN, MAPPO, and MAA2C.

VDN. Value Decomposition Networks (VDN) [30] represent the joint action-value function as the sum of individual agent utilities. The joint value is optimized using a temporal-difference objective, while each agent selects actions from its local utility function at execution time.

QMIX. QMIX [26] combines individual agent utilities through a monotonic mixing network conditioned on global information. The monotonicity constraint preserves consistency between the joint action-value maximization and decentralized per-agent action selection.

QTRAN. QTRAN [28] relaxes the monotonicity restriction of QMIX by learning a centralized joint action-value function together with constraints that preserve decentralized action selection. This allows a more expressive representation of inter-agent dependencies.

Table 7: Overview of the MARL methods evaluated in this study. The methods span centralized, centralized-training/decentralized-execution, and independent learning approaches across value-based and actor-critic families.

Method	Method Family	Train./Exec.	Policy	Coordination Structure	Evaluated In
DQN [21]	Value-based	CTCE	Off	Centralized Q -learning over the joint action space	STAT
FDQN [8]	Value-based	CTCE	Off	Factorized centralized representation of the joint action space	STAT
VDN [30]	Value decomposition	CTDE	Off	Additive decomposition of the joint value into agent utilities	STAT
QMIX [26]	Value decomposition	CTDE	Off	Monotonic mixing of individual agent utilities	STAT, LBF
QTRAN [28]	Value decomposition	CTDE	Off	Joint value learning with constraints for decentralized execution	STAT
IQL [31]	Independent value learning	DTDE	Off	Independent per-agent Q -learning	STAT, LBF
MAPPO [35]	Actor-critic	CTDE	On	Decentralized actors with centralized value information during training	STAT, LBF, RWARE
IPPO [35]	Actor-critic	DTDE	On	Independent PPO optimization for each agent	STAT, LBF, RWARE
MAA2C [20, 25]	Actor-critic	CTDE	On	Decentralized actors with a centralized state-value critic	STAT

MAPPO. Multi-Agent Proximal Policy Optimization (MAPPO) [35] extends PPO to cooperative multi-agent settings using decentralized actors and centralized value information during training. The centralized critic can condition on global state information while each agent executes its own policy independently.

MAA2C. Multi-Agent A2C (MAA2C) [20, 25] is an on-policy actor-critic method with decentralized actors and a centralized state-value critic. It provides a centralized-critic counterpart to MAPPO using the A2C optimization framework.

Decentralized Training and Decentralized Execution. In the DTDE paradigm, agents learn and act independently using their own observations and learning signals. We evaluate IQL and IPPO.

IQL. Independent Q -Learning (IQL) [31] trains a separate action-value function for each agent using only that agent’s local input. Each learner updates independently and treats the behavior of the other agents as part of the environment.

IPPO. Independent Proximal Policy Optimization (IPPO) [35] applies PPO independently to each agent without a centralized critic. Each agent learns its own policy from local information, providing an independent actor-critic baseline for comparison with MAPPO.

E Implementation and Hyperparameter Tuning

Implementation. The value-based STAT baselines IQL, VDN, QMIX, and QTRAN are implemented using a PyMARL-style codebase [27]. FDQN follows the factorized deep Q -network implementation of [8], and DQN is implemented as the corresponding non-factorized centralized joint-action baseline. MAPPO, IPPO, and MAA2C are implemented using EPyMARL [25]. LBF and RWARE are accessed through the corresponding EPyMARL environment adapters, with non-invasive logging wrappers added to record the process diagnostics defined in Appendix C. Within each environment and configuration, methods use the same reward specification, training budget, seed set, and evaluation protocol. Each training run uses a single NVIDIA A100 GPU.

Table 8: Selected hyperparameters across representative benchmark settings. Small, Medium, and Large denote representative tuning settings used to select hyperparameters for the full benchmark suite. LR denotes learning rate, and ϵ -decay denotes the fraction of training over which ϵ is decayed.

Algorithm	Small		Medium		Large	
	LR	ϵ -decay	LR	ϵ -decay	LR	ϵ -decay
DQN	0.0003	0.2	–	–	–	–
FDQN	0.0003	0.2	0.001	0.2	0.0003	0.4
VDN	0.001	0.2	0.001	0.2	0.001	0.2
QMIX	0.001	0.2	0.001	0.4	0.001	0.4
QTRAN	0.001	0.2	0.001	0.4	0.001	0.4
IQL	0.001	0.2	0.001	0.4	0.001	0.2

STAT Value-Based Hyperparameter Selection. We perform a controlled, lightweight hyperparameter search over two optimization parameters: learning rate and ϵ -decay fraction (Table 8). For each algorithm, we evaluate learning rates of 3×10^{-4} and 10^{-3} , and ϵ -decay fractions of 0.2 and 0.4. Hyperparameter tuning is performed on three representative problem scales: Small, Medium, and Large. The hyperparameters selected on the Small setting are used for all 3-agent STAT experiments. Medium-setting hyperparameters are used for 5-agent experiments with environment sizes below 50×30 , while Large-setting hyperparameters are used for all 50×30 experiments. DQN is evaluated only on the first three 3-agent configurations because its centralized joint-action output becomes computationally infeasible at larger scales. This scheme adapts hyperparameters to broad problem scale without tuning separately for every configuration. For each algorithm and representative setting, we select the hyperparameter configuration that maximizes mean evaluation return over the final 20% of evaluation checkpoints, averaged across training seeds. This criterion emphasizes stable late-stage evaluation performance rather than transient

peaks during training. When multiple configurations produce similar final return, we break ties using average return over the full training trajectory, favoring stability and sample efficiency.

The hyperparameters selected from the Small setting are used for experiments with 3 agents, those selected from the Medium setting are used for experiments with 5 agents and environment sizes smaller than 50×30 , and those selected from the Large setting are used for experiments with environment size 50×30 . For DQN, it was only computationally feasible to run the first three experiments with 3 agents. This strategy adapts hyperparameters to broad changes in problem scale while avoiding per-configuration overfitting and maintaining a consistent evaluation protocol across the benchmark.

EPyMARL Hyperparameters. For MAPPO, IPPO, and MAA2C, we use the corresponding EPyMARL algorithm configurations as the starting point, without per-environment hyperparameter search. Unless otherwise stated, we keep the EPyMARL optimizer, network, entropy, critic, and PPO/A2C update settings fixed across environments, and vary only the experimental factors required by the study: environment configuration, training budget, random seed, evaluation schedule, and, for RWARE, the cooperative team-reward scalarization. Exact configurations used in each environment are reported in Appendix E.

F Full Results in STAT

F.1 Additional Outcome-Similarity Analysis

Table 9: Magnitude of process differences among outcome-similar STAT policy pairs. Process gaps are computed as the ratio of the larger to smaller mean value for assignment conflicts or forced idle. A pair is counted when at least one of the two diagnostics reaches the specified threshold.

Return-Difference Threshold	Outcome-Similar Pairs	$\geq 2\times$	$\geq 3\times$	$\geq 5\times$
1%	121	38	26	9
2%	199	80	47	20
3%	244	103	65	27

The main text reports how often outcome-similar policy pairs differ by at least $2\times$ in assignment conflicts or forced idle. To characterize the magnitude of these hidden process differences more fully, Table 9 reports increasingly stringent process-gap thresholds. Even under the strictest 1% return-similarity criterion, 26 pairs differ by at least $3\times$ in one or both diagnostics and 9 differ by at least $5\times$.

F.2 Additional STAT Results

We report full final-policy results for all STAT configurations and methods. Table 10 reports episodic return, Table 11 reports conflicts per decision opportunity, Table 12 reports task throughput, Table 13 reports per-agent assignment diversity, and Table 14 reports forced idle per decision opportunity. These metrics correspond to the outcome and process diagnostics shown in the learning curves in Figures 7 and 8.

Values are reported as mean $\pm$ 95% confidence interval across five seeds. For ease of comparison, bold indicates the best value

according to the direction of each metric, and † indicates methods that are not significantly different from that value under Welch’s two-sample t -test at $\alpha = 0.05$ [33]. Higher episodic return and task throughput are preferred, while lower conflicts and forced idle indicate less coordination interference. Assignment diversity is interpreted jointly with the other diagnostics rather than as a standalone measure of coordination quality.

The full results reinforce that aggregate task performance and coordination processes do not induce the same method ranking. In several configurations, MAPPO and MAA2C achieve among the highest episodic returns and task throughput, while methods with lower return can exhibit fewer assignment conflicts or less forced idle. Conversely, low interference does not necessarily correspond to high task performance or broad division of labor. These patterns show that no single process diagnostic serves as a substitute for return and motivate interpreting interference, task completion, participation, and coordination efficiency jointly.

F.3 STAT Learning Curves

For each STAT configuration, we plot evaluation return together with the four process-level diagnostics over training. Baseline configurations are shown in Figure 7, and Extreme configurations are shown in Figure 8. The curves illustrate how task performance, assignment interference, task throughput, division of labor, and conflict-induced inactivity evolve as policies are learned.

Across the Baseline configurations, improvements in return are often accompanied by higher throughput and assignment diversity, but not necessarily by lower interference. In particular, some high-return policies retain non-negligible conflicts and forced idle, while other methods achieve lower interference without attaining the highest return. This further illustrates that individual process metrics do not provide interchangeable measures of policy quality and should be interpreted jointly. For example, MAPPO and MAA2C often achieve strong return and throughput while retaining non-negligible conflict and forced-idle levels.

The Extreme configurations amplify these differences. As task sets, spatial extent, or team size increase, methods exhibit increasingly distinct learning trajectories across the process diagnostics, even when their return trajectories are comparatively similar. Conflict and forced-idle behavior also vary substantially across methods and configurations, while throughput and assignment diversity reveal differences in how effectively additional scale is converted into useful task progress. These trajectories provide the training-time context for the final-policy and controlled-scaling analyses reported in the main paper.

F.4 Controlled Scaling Significance Tests

Tables 19-21 report statistical tests for the controlled STAT scaling comparisons used in Section 6.3. Each comparison varies one problem factor while holding the others fixed. We report the direction of change for return and the four core STAT process diagnostics, with Holm correction applied within each comparison block.

F.5 Computational Efficiency

We report computational efficiency as additional context for interpreting scalability. Table 15 reports wall-clock training time,




Figure 6: Final performance across all STAT configurations. Points show means across five seeds with 95% confidence intervals. Alongside episodic return, we report conflicts per decision opportunity, task throughput, per-agent assignment diversity, and forced idle per decision opportunity. The resulting profiles illustrate that strong aggregate performance does not necessarily correspond to uniformly favorable values across all coordination processes.

Table 10: Final episodic return over 5 seeds, reported as mean $\pm$ 95% CI. Higher is better. Bold indicates the best method and † indicates methods not significantly different from the best under Welch’s two-sample t -test at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Training Paradigm Environments/Methods	CTCE		CTDE					DTDE	
	DQN	FDQN	VDN	QMIX	QTRAN	MAPPO	MAA2C	IQL	IPPO
3A-6T-5x3	215.05 $\pm$ 0.7 †	214.97 $\pm$ 0.7 †	214.59 $\pm$ 1.1 †	215.06 $\pm$ 0.4 †	212.31 $\pm$ 1.0	215.23 $\pm$ 0.9	213.81 $\pm$ 1.2	211.73 $\pm$ 1.4	214.86 $\pm$ 0.9 †
3A-6T-10x6	199.94 $\pm$ 1.4	199.87 $\pm$ 0.7 †	199.76 $\pm$ 0.8 †	199.61 $\pm$ 0.8 †	196.90 $\pm$ 1.5	199.64 $\pm$ 0.7 †	199.14 $\pm$ 1.9 †	195.52 $\pm$ 0.7	199.64 $\pm$ 0.7 †
3A-12T-10x6	504.20 $\pm$ 2.5	499.72 $\pm$ 2.2	499.14 $\pm$ 2.6	502.07 $\pm$ 3.7	495.87 $\pm$ 3.4	512.93 $\pm$ 1.2 †	513.22 $\pm$ 1.5	496.29 $\pm$ 1.9	512.93 $\pm$ 1.2 †
5A-12T-10x6	–	503.68 $\pm$ 2.5	501.31 $\pm$ 3.2	500.11 $\pm$ 2.2	492.66 $\pm$ 1.8	507.39 $\pm$ 2.7	506.78 $\pm$ 1.4 †	487.81 $\pm$ 3.0	507.39 $\pm$ 2.7 †
5A-25T-25x15	–	1263.87 $\pm$ 14.2	1266.00 $\pm$ 5.3	1261.98 $\pm$ 8.5	1248.16 $\pm$ 7.9	1290.53 $\pm$ 5.1	1303.45 $\pm$ 9.7	1245.52 $\pm$ 5.4	1288.61 $\pm$ 9.9
5A-25T-50x30	–	857.58 $\pm$ 32.5 †	866.89 $\pm$ 26.3 †	856.06 $\pm$ 17.1 †	853.16 $\pm$ 16.9 †	845.74 $\pm$ 18.5 †	872.14 $\pm$ 30.7	854.01 $\pm$ 9.0 †	845.74 $\pm$ 18.5 †
5A-50T-50x30	–	2697.84 $\pm$ 19.6 †	2666.88 $\pm$ 46.6 †	2664.23 $\pm$ 66.7 †	2648.79 $\pm$ 52.4 †	2700.71 $\pm$ 47.9	2671.79 $\pm$ 49.6 †	2674.91 $\pm$ 35.8 †	2700.71 $\pm$ 47.9 †
5A-100T-50x30	–	6075.01 $\pm$ 198.8 †	5900.39 $\pm$ 194.1 †	5934.09 $\pm$ 207.3 †	6144.00 $\pm$ 268.8	5974.01 $\pm$ 128.0 †	6090.18 $\pm$ 223.2 †	6106.37 $\pm$ 206.3 †	5974.01 $\pm$ 128.0 †
9A-25T-50x30	–	909.51 $\pm$ 28.6 †	909.08 $\pm$ 21.1 †	899.69 $\pm$ 22.8	888.71 $\pm$ 25.6	907.66 $\pm$ 30.8 †	928.70 $\pm$ 14.9	872.16 $\pm$ 11.6	907.66 $\pm$ 30.8 †

Table 11: Final conflicts / decision opportunity over 5 seeds, reported as mean $\pm$ 95% CI. Lower is better. Bold indicates the best method and † indicates methods not significantly different from the best under Welch’s two-sample t -test at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Training Paradigm Environments/Methods	CTCE		CTDE					DTDE	
	DQN	FDQN	VDN	QMIX	QTRAN	MAPPO	MAA2C	IQL	IPPO
3A-6T-5x3	0.093 $\pm$ 0.073 †	0.156 $\pm$ 0.064	0.072 $\pm$ 0.034 †	0.059 $\pm$ 0.026 †	0.209 $\pm$ 0.044	0.053 $\pm$ 0.042 †	0.207 $\pm$ 0.016	0.260 $\pm$ 0.054	0.040 $\pm$ 0.020
3A-6T-10x6	0.080 $\pm$ 0.071	0.199 $\pm$ 0.099	0.110 $\pm$ 0.037 †	0.096 $\pm$ 0.036 †	0.201 $\pm$ 0.035	0.124 $\pm$ 0.094 †	0.181 $\pm$ 0.020	0.286 $\pm$ 0.018	0.124 $\pm$ 0.094 †
3A-12T-10x6	0.120 $\pm$ 0.043	0.143 $\pm$ 0.027 †	0.159 $\pm$ 0.030 †	0.141 $\pm$ 0.032 †	0.170 $\pm$ 0.023	0.141 $\pm$ 0.020 †	0.121 $\pm$ 0.017 †	0.208 $\pm$ 0.012	0.141 $\pm$ 0.020 †
5A-12T-10x6	–	0.260 $\pm$ 0.034	0.204 $\pm$ 0.026 †	0.210 $\pm$ 0.020	0.271 $\pm$ 0.020	0.217 $\pm$ 0.028	0.183 $\pm$ 0.012	0.260 $\pm$ 0.010	0.217 $\pm$ 0.028
5A-25T-25x15	–	0.143 $\pm$ 0.008	0.152 $\pm$ 0.012	0.137 $\pm$ 0.011	0.182 $\pm$ 0.005	0.127 $\pm$ 0.019 †	0.109 $\pm$ 0.016	0.189 $\pm$ 0.007	0.129 $\pm$ 0.019 †
5A-25T-50x30	–	0.089 $\pm$ 0.025 †	0.107 $\pm$ 0.011	0.108 $\pm$ 0.011	0.140 $\pm$ 0.008	0.089 $\pm$ 0.007	0.074 $\pm$ 0.012	0.164 $\pm$ 0.014	0.089 $\pm$ 0.007
5A-50T-50x30	–	0.054 $\pm$ 0.005	0.088 $\pm$ 0.013	0.088 $\pm$ 0.009	0.110 $\pm$ 0.012	0.052 $\pm$ 0.011	0.032 $\pm$ 0.002	0.124 $\pm$ 0.006	0.052 $\pm$ 0.011
5A-100T-50x30	–	0.025 $\pm$ 0.006	0.086 $\pm$ 0.007	0.069 $\pm$ 0.017	0.088 $\pm$ 0.008	0.029 $\pm$ 0.005	0.016 $\pm$ 0.005	0.101 $\pm$ 0.007	0.029 $\pm$ 0.005
9A-25T-50x30	–	0.209 $\pm$ 0.041	0.176 $\pm$ 0.008 †	0.173 $\pm$ 0.015 †	0.185 $\pm$ 0.014	0.181 $\pm$ 0.012	0.148 $\pm$ 0.030	0.173 $\pm$ 0.005 †	0.181 $\pm$ 0.012

while Table 16 reports environment timesteps processed per second. These measurements complement the coordination analysis by distinguishing behavioral scalability from the computational cost of learning.

Standard centralized DQN’s training throughput decreases substantially as the number of joint actions grows, illustrating the computational limitation of direct centralized joint-action enumeration. FDQN avoids this failure mode through its factorized action representation and remains tractable across all STAT configurations.

Among the methods evaluated across the full benchmark, computational profiles also differ substantially. The actor-critic implementations, particularly MAA2C, generally achieve higher training

throughput and shorter wall-clock times than the value-learning methods, while throughput for all methods tends to decrease as task or agent scale increases. Because these methods are implemented using different software frameworks, however, wall-clock and throughput differences should not be interpreted as controlled comparisons of algorithmic computational complexity. We report them primarily to document the practical computational cost of the experiments and to show that the evaluated methods remain tractable at the reported scales.

F.6 Additional Method-Level Observations

We summarize additional method-level patterns observed across the full set of STAT configurations. These observations provide

Table 12: Final task throughput over 5 seeds, reported as mean $\pm$ 95% CI. Higher is better. Bold indicates the best method and $\dagger$ indicates methods not significantly different from the best under Welch’s two-sample t -test at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Training Paradigm	CTCE		CTDE				DTDE		
Environments/Methods	DQN	FDQN	VDN	QMIX	QTRAN	MAPPO	MAA2C	IQL	IPPO
3A-6T-5x3	0.505 $\pm$ 0.013	0.501 $\pm$ 0.015 $\dagger$	0.497 $\pm$ 0.015 $\dagger$	0.498 $\pm$ 0.011 $\dagger$	0.457 $\pm$ 0.011	0.502 $\pm$ 0.015 $\dagger$	0.475 $\pm$ 0.008	0.447 $\pm$ 0.017	0.503 $\pm$ 0.015 $\dagger$
3A-6T-10x6	0.347 $\pm$ 0.013	0.340 $\pm$ 0.007 $\dagger$	0.340 $\pm$ 0.008 $\dagger$	0.340 $\pm$ 0.007 $\dagger$	0.322 $\pm$ 0.011	0.335 $\pm$ 0.007 $\dagger$	0.329 $\pm$ 0.015	0.313 $\pm$ 0.010	0.335 $\pm$ 0.007 $\dagger$
3A-12T-10x6	0.376 $\pm$ 0.010	0.364 $\pm$ 0.008	0.361 $\pm$ 0.006	0.369 $\pm$ 0.015	0.353 $\pm$ 0.010	0.408 $\pm$ 0.010 $\dagger$	0.410 $\pm$ 0.009	0.354 $\pm$ 0.007	0.408 $\pm$ 0.010 $\dagger$
5A-12T-10x6	–	0.541 $\pm$ 0.019 $\dagger$	0.540 $\pm$ 0.014	0.530 $\pm$ 0.015	0.503 $\pm$ 0.009	0.557 $\pm$ 0.010	0.541 $\pm$ 0.015	0.486 $\pm$ 0.015	0.557 $\pm$ 0.010 $\dagger$
5A-25T-25x15	–	0.318 $\pm$ 0.008	0.318 $\pm$ 0.003	0.314 $\pm$ 0.005	0.309 $\pm$ 0.005	0.330 $\pm$ 0.003	0.339 $\pm$ 0.004	0.307 $\pm$ 0.004	0.329 $\pm$ 0.005
5A-25T-50x30	–	0.174 $\pm$ 0.007 $\dagger$	0.175 $\pm$ 0.006 $\dagger$	0.174 $\pm$ 0.003 $\dagger$	0.173 $\pm$ 0.002 $\dagger$	0.174 $\pm$ 0.004 $\dagger$	0.176 $\pm$ 0.005	0.174 $\pm$ 0.004 $\dagger$	0.174 $\pm$ 0.004 $\dagger$
5A-50T-50x30	–	0.190 $\pm$ 0.002 $\dagger$	0.189 $\pm$ 0.003 $\dagger$	0.189 $\pm$ 0.004 $\dagger$	0.189 $\pm$ 0.003 $\dagger$	0.191 $\pm$ 0.003	0.189 $\pm$ 0.002 $\dagger$	0.189 $\pm$ 0.003 $\dagger$	0.191 $\pm$ 0.003 $\dagger$
5A-100T-50x30	–	0.198 $\pm$ 0.003	0.202 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.203 $\pm$ 0.002 $\dagger$	0.205 $\pm$ 0.003	0.197 $\pm$ 0.002	0.198 $\pm$ 0.003	0.203 $\pm$ 0.002 $\dagger$	0.197 $\pm$ 0.002
9A-25T-50x30	–	0.266 $\pm$ 0.009 $\dagger$	0.268 $\pm$ 0.006 $\dagger$	0.262 $\pm$ 0.005	0.265 $\pm$ 0.009 $\dagger$	0.265 $\pm$ 0.006 $\dagger$	0.271 $\pm$ 0.006	0.258 $\pm$ 0.005	0.265 $\pm$ 0.006 $\dagger$

Table 13: Final per-agent assignment diversity over 5 seeds, reported as mean $\pm$ 95% CI. Higher is better. Bold indicates the best method and $\dagger$ indicates methods not significantly different from the best under Welch’s two-sample t -test at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Training Paradigm	CTCE		CTDE				DTDE		
Environments/Methods	DQN	FDQN	VDN	QMIX	QTRAN	MAPPO	MAA2C	IQL	IPPO
3A-6T-5x3	0.170 $\pm$ 0.004	0.168 $\pm$ 0.005 $\dagger$	0.167 $\pm$ 0.005 $\dagger$	0.167 $\pm$ 0.004 $\dagger$	0.154 $\pm$ 0.003	0.169 $\pm$ 0.005 $\dagger$	0.160 $\pm$ 0.003	0.150 $\pm$ 0.006	0.169 $\pm$ 0.005 $\dagger$
3A-6T-10x6	0.117 $\pm$ 0.004	0.115 $\pm$ 0.002 $\dagger$	0.115 $\pm$ 0.003 $\dagger$	0.115 $\pm$ 0.002 $\dagger$	0.109 $\pm$ 0.003	0.113 $\pm$ 0.002 $\dagger$	0.111 $\pm$ 0.005	0.106 $\pm$ 0.003	0.113 $\pm$ 0.002 $\dagger$
3A-12T-10x6	0.126 $\pm$ 0.004	0.122 $\pm$ 0.002	0.121 $\pm$ 0.002	0.124 $\pm$ 0.005	0.119 $\pm$ 0.003	0.137 $\pm$ 0.003 $\dagger$	0.137 $\pm$ 0.003	0.119 $\pm$ 0.003	0.137 $\pm$ 0.003 $\dagger$
5A-12T-10x6	–	0.109 $\pm$ 0.004 $\dagger$	0.109 $\pm$ 0.003 $\dagger$	0.107 $\pm$ 0.003	0.102 $\pm$ 0.002	0.112 $\pm$ 0.002	0.109 $\pm$ 0.003	0.098 $\pm$ 0.003	0.112 $\pm$ 0.002 $\dagger$
5A-25T-25x15	–	0.064 $\pm$ 0.001	0.064 $\pm$ 0.001	0.063 $\pm$ 0.001	0.062 $\pm$ 0.001	0.067 $\pm$ 0.000	0.068 $\pm$ 0.001	0.062 $\pm$ 0.001	0.066 $\pm$ 0.001
5A-25T-50x30	–	0.035 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.035 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.035 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.035 $\pm$ 0.000 $\dagger$	0.035 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.036 $\pm$ 0.001	0.035 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.035 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$
5A-50T-50x30	–	0.038 $\pm$ 0.000 $\dagger$	0.038 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.038 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.038 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.038 $\pm$ 0.001	0.038 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.038 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.038 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$
5A-100T-50x30	–	0.040 $\pm$ 0.001	0.040 $\pm$ 0.000 $\dagger$	0.040 $\pm$ 0.000 $\dagger$	0.041 $\pm$ 0.001	0.039 $\pm$ 0.000	0.040 $\pm$ 0.001	0.041 $\pm$ 0.000 $\dagger$	0.039 $\pm$ 0.000
9A-25T-50x30	–	0.030 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.030 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.029 $\pm$ 0.001	0.030 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.030 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$	0.030 $\pm$ 0.001	0.029 $\pm$ 0.001	0.030 $\pm$ 0.001 $\dagger$

Table 14: Final forced idle / decision opportunity over 5 seeds, reported as mean $\pm$ 95% CI. Lower is better. Bold indicates the best method and $\dagger$ indicates methods not significantly different from the best under Welch’s two-sample t -test at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Training Paradigm	CTCE		CTDE				DTDE		
Environments/Methods	DQN	FDQN	VDN	QMIX	QTRAN	MAPPO	MAA2C	IQL	IPPO
3A-6T-5x3	0.093 $\pm$ 0.073 $\dagger$	0.163 $\pm$ 0.073	0.074 $\pm$ 0.033	0.060 $\pm$ 0.027 $\dagger$	0.243 $\pm$ 0.072	0.054 $\pm$ 0.047 $\dagger$	0.226 $\pm$ 0.012	0.341 $\pm$ 0.117	0.040 $\pm$ 0.020
3A-6T-10x6	0.084 $\pm$ 0.076	0.203 $\pm$ 0.098	0.113 $\pm$ 0.041 $\dagger$	0.098 $\pm$ 0.033 $\dagger$	0.235 $\pm$ 0.060	0.137 $\pm$ 0.107 $\dagger$	0.199 $\pm$ 0.018	0.405 $\pm$ 0.021	0.137 $\pm$ 0.107 $\dagger$
3A-12T-10x6	0.132 $\pm$ 0.039	0.147 $\pm$ 0.027 $\dagger$	0.173 $\pm$ 0.043 $\dagger$	0.154 $\pm$ 0.039 $\dagger$	0.243 $\pm$ 0.023	0.165 $\pm$ 0.027 $\dagger$	0.136 $\pm$ 0.021 $\dagger$	0.271 $\pm$ 0.018	0.165 $\pm$ 0.027 $\dagger$
5A-12T-10x6	–	0.303 $\pm$ 0.033	0.249 $\pm$ 0.034 $\dagger$	0.284 $\pm$ 0.033	0.414 $\pm$ 0.055	0.269 $\pm$ 0.031	0.223 $\pm$ 0.019	0.533 $\pm$ 0.014	0.269 $\pm$ 0.031
5A-25T-25x15	–	0.171 $\pm$ 0.015	0.180 $\pm$ 0.014	0.197 $\pm$ 0.034	0.299 $\pm$ 0.021	0.158 $\pm$ 0.022	0.126 $\pm$ 0.020	0.346 $\pm$ 0.010	0.161 $\pm$ 0.021
5A-25T-50x30	–	0.099 $\pm$ 0.026 $\dagger$	0.148 $\pm$ 0.026	0.178 $\pm$ 0.035	0.256 $\pm$ 0.010	0.107 $\pm$ 0.008	0.084 $\pm$ 0.018	0.328 $\pm$ 0.013	0.107 $\pm$ 0.008
5A-50T-50x30	–	0.059 $\pm$ 0.008	0.131 $\pm$ 0.027	0.137 $\pm$ 0.027	0.192 $\pm$ 0.022	0.061 $\pm$ 0.007	0.033 $\pm$ 0.003	0.218 $\pm$ 0.006	0.061 $\pm$ 0.007
5A-100T-50x30	–	0.027 $\pm$ 0.007	0.132 $\pm$ 0.010	0.102 $\pm$ 0.033	0.135 $\pm$ 0.011	0.036 $\pm$ 0.009	0.017 $\pm$ 0.005	0.154 $\pm$ 0.007	0.036 $\pm$ 0.009
9A-25T-50x30	–	0.270 $\pm$ 0.080	0.360 $\pm$ 0.033	0.365 $\pm$ 0.051	0.470 $\pm$ 0.033	0.241 $\pm$ 0.031	0.171 $\pm$ 0.037	0.615 $\pm$ 0.005	0.241 $\pm$ 0.031

Table 15: Wall-clock training time across STAT configurations, reported in hours as mean $\pm$ 95% CI over five seeds. Lower is better.

Training Paradigm	CTCE		CTDE				DTDE		
Environments/Methods	DQN	FDQN	VDN	QMIX	QTRAN	MAPPO	MAA2C	IQL	IPPO
3A-6T-5x3	1.87 $\pm$ 0.15	0.91 $\pm$ 0.02	2.93 $\pm$ 1.09	2.62 $\pm$ 0.22	2.74 $\pm$ 0.64	0.64 $\pm$ 0.02	0.35 $\pm$ 0.02	2.33 $\pm$ 0.04	0.61 $\pm$ 0.06
3A-6T-10x6	1.84 $\pm$ 0.12	1.00 $\pm$ 0.09	2.70 $\pm$ 0.72	2.25 $\pm$ 0.04	2.42 $\pm$ 0.42	0.63 $\pm$ 0.02	0.35 $\pm$ 0.03	2.27 $\pm$ 0.12	0.66 $\pm$ 0.04
3A-12T-10x6	3.45 $\pm$ 0.03	0.86 $\pm$ 0.03	2.10 $\pm$ 0.20	2.07 $\pm$ 0.09	2.21 $\pm$ 0.44	0.64 $\pm$ 0.04	0.34 $\pm$ 0.02	2.07 $\pm$ 0.10	0.60 $\pm$ 0.01
5A-12T-10x6	–	1.09 $\pm$ 0.02	2.21 $\pm$ 0.07	2.41 $\pm$ 0.11	2.31 $\pm$ 0.05	0.67 $\pm$ 0.04	0.37 $\pm$ 0.03	2.54 $\pm$ 0.52	0.67 $\pm$ 0.03
5A-25T-25x15	–	11.22 $\pm$ 0.46	29.42 $\pm$ 0.68	30.69 $\pm$ 2.26	30.70 $\pm$ 0.97	7.93 $\pm$ 0.40	4.66 $\pm$ 0.31	29.44 $\pm$ 0.57	7.94 $\pm$ 0.84
5A-25T-50x30	–	11.76 $\pm$ 0.41	28.92 $\pm$ 1.48	28.91 $\pm$ 0.43	29.33 $\pm$ 0.57	8.28 $\pm$ 0.26	5.01 $\pm$ 0.44	28.94 $\pm$ 0.87	7.87 $\pm$ 0.29
5A-50T-50x30	–	13.68 $\pm$ 0.13	32.25 $\pm$ 0.48	32.54 $\pm$ 0.40	32.80 $\pm$ 0.49	9.73 $\pm$ 0.55	6.61 $\pm$ 0.78	32.20 $\pm$ 0.49	10.59 $\pm$ 0.73
5A-100T-50x30	–	17.77 $\pm$ 0.11	41.73 $\pm$ 0.70	41.91 $\pm$ 0.53	42.03 $\pm$ 0.69	14.27 $\pm$ 0.87	11.19 $\pm$ 0.87	41.43 $\pm$ 0.70	14.12 $\pm$ 1.93
9A-25T-50x30	–	16.01 $\pm$ 0.23	33.74 $\pm$ 2.85	33.69 $\pm$ 0.96	33.38 $\pm$ 0.71	8.67 $\pm$ 0.63	6.10 $\pm$ 0.81	33.13 $\pm$ 0.70	8.89 $\pm$ 0.52




Figure 7: Learning curves for the Baseline STAT configurations. Curves show mean evaluation performance across five seeds, with shaded regions denoting 95% confidence intervals. We report episodic return as the aggregate outcome measure together with four process diagnostics: conflicts per decision opportunity, task throughput, per-agent assignment diversity, and forced idle per decision opportunity. These diagnostics capture complementary aspects of assignment interference, task-completion efficiency, division of labor, and the immediate cost of coordination failures.

Table 16: Training throughput across STAT configurations, reported as environment timesteps per second and averaged over five seeds with 95% CI. Higher is better.

Training Paradigm Environments/Methods	CTCE				CTDE				DTDE	
	DQN	FDQN	VDN	QMIX	QTRAN	MAPPO	MAA2C	IQL	IPPO	
3A-6T-5x3	304.95 ± 8.4	651.25 ± 1.8	585.28 ± 12.8	588.79 ± 6.4	591.51 ± 10.3	864.88 ± 27.1	1572.54 ± 82.3	581.50 ± 15.0	911.89 ± 91.0	
3A-6T-10x6	326.63 ± 3.1	698.67 ± 62.0	594.15 ± 23.6	603.12 ± 5.7	599.77 ± 8.9	879.79 ± 29.9	1572.55 ± 136.6	584.02 ± 26.4	842.96 ± 57.4	
3A-12T-10x6	164.04 ± 1.9	708.92 ± 17.9	595.63 ± 30.4	605.16 ± 6.3	592.36 ± 22.3	866.52 ± 49.7	1615.03 ± 92.6	590.13 ± 26.3	926.16 ± 20.9	
5A-12T-10x6	–	556.31 ± 20.3	575.19 ± 7.8	573.94 ± 4.0	569.53 ± 9.8	827.83 ± 51.6	1488.55 ± 127.8	566.40 ± 23.3	833.04 ± 39.5	
5A-25T-25x15	–	526.52 ± 22.1	548.01 ± 4.3	540.53 ± 11.4	539.69 ± 6.8	701.38 ± 35.3	1195.72 ± 80.9	545.24 ± 5.3	703.86 ± 75.4	
5A-25T-50x30	–	515.07 ± 18.5	541.62 ± 14.6	538.73 ± 7.6	539.68 ± 9.3	671.59 ± 21.4	1114.03 ± 96.3	539.20 ± 8.1	706.24 ± 26.5	
5A-50T-50x30	–	473.66 ± 6.8	472.20 ± 7.0	469.93 ± 2.1	472.72 ± 6.6	572.06 ± 32.5	846.30 ± 91.8	471.41 ± 7.5	525.82 ± 35.3	
5A-100T-50x30	–	421.39 ± 2.8	375.49 ± 7.0	375.01 ± 5.7	377.34 ± 7.0	390.07 ± 23.2	498.18 ± 38.2	376.93 ± 6.3	396.96 ± 48.1	
9A-25T-50x30	–	369.71 ± 5.7	486.53 ± 11.0	484.76 ± 5.1	487.88 ± 3.0	642.39 ± 46.5	919.82 ± 124.6	485.53 ± 6.4	625.81 ± 37.6	

context for the main results but should be interpreted descriptively rather than as causal effects of algorithm architecture.

Centralized Training and Centralized Execution Methods. The centralized methods illustrate the trade-off between joint-action reasoning and computational tractability. Standard DQN performs competitively in the smallest configurations, where explicit centralized joint-action reasoning remains feasible, but becomes intractable at larger scales because its output layer enumerates the

full joint action space. FDQN avoids this failure mode through a factorized centralized representation and remains tractable across all STAT configurations. Across the benchmark, FDQN often exhibits relatively low assignment interference while maintaining competitive task performance, showing that structured centralized reasoning can support effective coordination without requiring explicit enumeration of all joint actions.




Figure 8: Learning curves for the Extreme STAT configurations. Curves show mean evaluation performance across five seeds, with shaded regions denoting 95% confidence intervals.

Centralized Training and Decentralized Execution Methods. The CTDE methods span both value-decomposition approaches (VDN, QMIX, and QTRAN) and centralized-critic actor-critic methods (MAPPO and MAA2C). These methods remain tractable across the evaluated STAT configurations but exhibit distinct process profiles. In particular, MAPPO and MAA2C often achieve among the strongest returns, throughput, and assignment diversity, while not always minimizing conflicts or forced idle. The value-decomposition methods show different trade-offs across configurations, with comparable task performance sometimes arising from substantially different levels of assignment interference. These results illustrate that strong aggregate performance does not imply uniformly favorable coordination behavior across all process dimensions.

Decentralized Training and Decentralized Execution Methods. IQL and IPPO provide independent-learning baselines without centralized training information. IQL frequently exhibits comparatively

high conflict and forced-idle levels, particularly in settings with stronger assignment interdependence, even when its return remains competitive. IPPO, by contrast, often achieves strong task performance in the evaluated STAT configurations, but its process behavior varies across settings. Together, these results show that decentralized learning does not produce a single coordination pattern and that outcome performance alone is insufficient to characterize how independent learners coordinate.

Overall, the method-level results reinforce the central motivation for process-aware evaluation. No training paradigm uniformly dominates across return, interference, task completion, participation, and coordination efficiency. Centralized, CTDE, and decentralized approaches instead exhibit different behavioral trade-offs across configurations, motivating evaluation of both task outcomes and the coordination processes through which those outcomes are achieved.

G Full Cross-Environment Results

G.1 Level-Based Foraging Results

Table 17 reports the complete LBF results across methods and configurations. The clearest outcome-similar comparisons occur in the two-agent settings. Under full observability, MAPPO and IQL achieve nearly identical return (0.984 and 0.994), yet IQL exhibits substantially lower failed-load rate (0.188 vs. 0.532), lower synchronization-failure rate (0.004 vs. 0.034), and higher collection throughput (0.194 vs. 0.167). Under partial observability, MAPPO, IPPO, and IQL again achieve similar return, while IQL shows lower failed-load and synchronization-failure rates together with higher throughput. These comparisons reinforce that similar task outcomes can arise from different coordination processes.

The three-agent settings provide complementary evidence. MAPPO and IPPO achieve similarly strong performance under full observability and also exhibit similar participation balance and partner diversity, whereas under partial observability MAPPO achieves higher return, throughput, participation balance, and partner diversity than IPPO. At the same time, QMIX attains comparatively low failed-load rates and synchronization delays in some settings despite poor task completion, showing that favorable values for

an individual process metric do not by themselves imply effective coordination.

G.2 Robotic Warehouse Results

Table 18 reports the complete RWARE results for the 40M-step MAPPO and IPPO runs. The process diagnostics reveal a different type of coordination tradeoff than in LBF. In `small-4ag`, MAPPO exhibits a much lower canceled-movement rate than IPPO (0.0016 vs. 0.0227), but also almost no delivery activity, with only 0.12 delivery events and near-zero throughput. IPPO experiences more blocked forward requests while completing substantially more delivery events and achieving much higher throughput.

A similar pattern appears in `tiny-4ag` where IPPO achieves substantially higher return and delivery throughput despite a higher canceled-movement rate than MAPPO. These results show that low movement interference can reflect efficient coordination, but can also reflect limited engagement with the task. The NO-OP and contribution diagnostics provide additional context for distinguishing these cases, supporting the broader framework principle that process metrics should be interpreted jointly with task completion rather than in isolation.

Table 17: Full Level-Based Foraging results. Values show mean performance across five seeds with 95% confidence intervals. Arrows indicate the generally preferred direction for each metric. Failed-load and synchronization-failure rates characterize unsuccessful coordination during loading, collection throughput measures successful task completion over time, and participation balance and partner diversity characterize how successful cooperation is distributed across agents when applicable. Bold indicates the best mean within each environment setting.

Setting	Method	Return $\uparrow$	Foods $\uparrow$ Collected	Throughput $\uparrow$	Failed Load $\downarrow$ Rate	Sync. Failure $\downarrow$ Rate	Sync. Delay $\downarrow$	Participation $\uparrow$ Balance	Partner Diversity $\uparrow$ Fraction
2-agent Full	MAPPO	0.984 $\pm$ 0.013	1.97 $\pm$ 0.03	0.167 $\pm$ 0.006	0.532 $\pm$ 0.058	0.034 $\pm$ 0.027	1.203 $\pm$ 0.099	–	–
	IPPO	0.908 $\pm$ 0.231	1.82 $\pm$ 0.46	0.139 $\pm$ 0.076	0.623 $\pm$ 0.206	0.042 $\pm$ 0.007	1.299 $\pm$ 0.381	–	–
	QMIX	0.442 $\pm$ 0.242	0.88 $\pm$ 0.48	0.036 $\pm$ 0.061	0.386 $\pm$ 0.061	0.052 $\pm$ 0.063	0.752 $\pm$ 0.134	–	–
	IQL	0.994 $\pm$ 0.011	1.99 $\pm$ 0.02	0.194 $\pm$ 0.011	0.188 $\pm$ 0.055	0.004 $\pm$ 0.009	1.027 $\pm$ 0.033	–	–
2-agent Partial	MAPPO	0.981 $\pm$ 0.018	1.96 $\pm$ 0.04	0.120 $\pm$ 0.009	0.505 $\pm$ 0.036	0.060 $\pm$ 0.036	1.352 $\pm$ 0.193	–	–
	IPPO	0.981 $\pm$ 0.012	1.96 $\pm$ 0.02	0.122 $\pm$ 0.008	0.507 $\pm$ 0.033	0.057 $\pm$ 0.023	1.385 $\pm$ 0.202	–	–
	QMIX	0.593 $\pm$ 0.162	1.19 $\pm$ 0.32	0.075 $\pm$ 0.023	0.330 $\pm$ 0.066	0.044 $\pm$ 0.038	0.852 $\pm$ 0.309	–	–
	IQL	0.990 $\pm$ 0.012	1.98 $\pm$ 0.02	0.146 $\pm$ 0.009	0.242 $\pm$ 0.057	0.009 $\pm$ 0.008	1.032 $\pm$ 0.023	–	–
3-agent Full	MAPPO	0.984 $\pm$ 0.013	2.96 $\pm$ 0.03	0.160 $\pm$ 0.006	0.563 $\pm$ 0.053	0.016 $\pm$ 0.012	2.443 $\pm$ 0.351	0.932 $\pm$ 0.012	0.853 $\pm$ 0.062
	IPPO	0.992 $\pm$ 0.009	2.97 $\pm$ 0.04	0.171 $\pm$ 0.011	0.571 $\pm$ 0.029	0.020 $\pm$ 0.011	2.286 $\pm$ 0.405	0.937 $\pm$ 0.021	0.853 $\pm$ 0.043
	QMIX	0.033 $\pm$ 0.015	0.16 $\pm$ 0.06	0.003 $\pm$ 0.001	0.206 $\pm$ 0.071	0.010 $\pm$ 0.010	0.327 $\pm$ 0.094	0.006 $\pm$ 0.006	0.003 $\pm$ 0.002
	IQL	0.303 $\pm$ 0.093	1.08 $\pm$ 0.30	0.033 $\pm$ 0.012	0.580 $\pm$ 0.156	0.022 $\pm$ 0.019	1.892 $\pm$ 1.097	0.287 $\pm$ 0.111	0.167 $\pm$ 0.107
3-agent Partial	MAPPO	0.872 $\pm$ 0.047	2.66 $\pm$ 0.13	0.123 $\pm$ 0.015	0.624 $\pm$ 0.096	0.017 $\pm$ 0.014	1.394 $\pm$ 0.202	0.854 $\pm$ 0.047	0.731 $\pm$ 0.054
	IPPO	0.785 $\pm$ 0.068	2.43 $\pm$ 0.16	0.102 $\pm$ 0.015	0.694 $\pm$ 0.060	0.023 $\pm$ 0.013	1.589 $\pm$ 0.334	0.781 $\pm$ 0.058	0.660 $\pm$ 0.055
	QMIX	0.239 $\pm$ 0.045	0.92 $\pm$ 0.15	0.031 $\pm$ 0.011	0.267 $\pm$ 0.048	0.033 $\pm$ 0.028	0.856 $\pm$ 0.051	0.226 $\pm$ 0.070	0.090 $\pm$ 0.025
	IQL	0.625 $\pm$ 0.055	2.01 $\pm$ 0.14	0.070 $\pm$ 0.004	0.520 $\pm$ 0.045	0.043 $\pm$ 0.028	1.948 $\pm$ 0.396	0.663 $\pm$ 0.055	0.467 $\pm$ 0.080

Table 18: Full Robotic Warehouse results for the 40M-step MAPPO and IPPO runs. Values show mean performance across five seeds with 95% confidence intervals. Delivery events are inferred from positive per-agent rewards before common-reward aggregation; canceled-movement rate measures blocked forward requests; NO-OP rate measures inactivity; and delivery contribution CV measures imbalance in per-agent delivery contributions. Bold indicates the best mean within each environment setting, except for steps per delivery, which is interpreted jointly with delivery count because zero-delivery episodes receive a value of zero under the logging convention.

Environment	Method	Return $\uparrow$	Delivery $\uparrow$ Events	Delivery $\uparrow$ Throughput	Canceled-Move $\downarrow$ Rate	NO-OP $\downarrow$ Rate	Steps/Delivery $\downarrow$	Contribution CV $\downarrow$
tiny-2ag	MAPPO	3.40 $\pm$ 5.12	3.40 $\pm$ 5.12	0.0068 $\pm$ 0.0102	0.0100 $\pm$ 0.0067	0.0232 $\pm$ 0.0577	231.8 $\pm$ 132.6	0.244 $\pm$ 0.178
	IPPO	2.72 $\pm$ 1.71	2.72 $\pm$ 1.71	0.0054 $\pm$ 0.0034	0.0142 $\pm$ 0.0242	0.0001 $\pm$ 0.0001	232.6 $\pm$ 80.9	0.186 $\pm$ 0.121
tiny-4ag	MAPPO	4.70 $\pm$ 6.22	4.70 $\pm$ 6.22	0.0094 $\pm$ 0.0124	0.0208 $\pm$ 0.0122	0.0672 $\pm$ 0.1436	49.6 $\pm$ 62.7	0.154 $\pm$ 0.212
	IPPO	18.53 $\pm$ 12.70	18.53 $\pm$ 12.70	0.0371 $\pm$ 0.0254	0.0290 $\pm$ 0.0051	0.0000 $\pm$ 0.0000	51.9 $\pm$ 55.9	0.285 $\pm$ 0.203
small-4ag	MAPPO	0.12 $\pm$ 0.31	0.12 $\pm$ 0.31	0.0002 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.0016 $\pm$ 0.0012	0.1899 $\pm$ 0.5252	42.3 $\pm$ 103.7	0.150 $\pm$ 0.370
	IPPO	2.71 $\pm$ 1.89	2.71 $\pm$ 1.89	0.0054 $\pm$ 0.0038	0.0227 $\pm$ 0.0225	0.0000 $\pm$ 0.0000	131.9 $\pm$ 93.6	0.280 $\pm$ 0.207

Table 19: Statistical tests for controlled spatial-extent scaling in STAT. Entries show the direction of change from the first configuration to the second. $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ indicate increases and decreases, respectively. * denotes Holm-corrected $p < 0.05$ under Welch’s two-sample t -test within each comparison block, and superscript ns denotes a non-significant change.

Comparison	Method	Return	Conflicts/Opp.	Throughput	Diversity/Agent	Forced Idle/Opp.
Baseline	DQN	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$
	FDQN	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
	VDN	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
	QMIX	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
	QTRAN	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$
	MAPPO	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
	MAA2C	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$
	IQL	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
	IPPO	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
Extreme	DQN	—	—	—	—	—
	FDQN	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	VDN	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	QMIX	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$
	QTRAN	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	MAPPO	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	MAA2C	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	IQL	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	IPPO	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$

Baseline compares 3A–6T–5x3 $\rightarrow$ 3A–6T–10x6. Extreme compares 5A–25T–25x15 $\rightarrow$ 5A–25T–50x30.

Table 20: Statistical tests for controlled task-count scaling in STAT. Entries show the direction of change from the first configuration to the second. $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ indicate increases and decreases, respectively. * denotes Holm-corrected $p < 0.05$ under Welch’s two-sample t -test within each comparison block, and superscript ns denotes a non-significant change.

Comparison	Method	Return	Conflicts/Opp.	Throughput	Diversity/Agent	Forced Idle/Opp.
Baseline	DQN	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
	FDQN	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$
	VDN	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
	QMIX	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
	QTRAN	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
	MAPPO	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
	MAA2C	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	IQL	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	IPPO	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
Extreme 25 $\rightarrow$ 50	DQN	—	—	—	—	—
	FDQN	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$
	VDN	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$
	QMIX	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$
	QTRAN	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	MAPPO	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	MAA2C	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	IQL	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	IPPO	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
Extreme 50 $\rightarrow$ 100	DQN	—	—	—	—	—
	FDQN	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	VDN	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{ns}$
	QMIX	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^{ns}$
	QTRAN	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	MAPPO	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	MAA2C	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	IQL	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$
	IPPO	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$

Baseline compares 3A–6T–10x6 $\rightarrow$ 3A–12T–10x6. Extreme 25 $\rightarrow$ 50 compares 5A–25T–50x30 $\rightarrow$ 5A–50T–50x30. Extreme 50 $\rightarrow$ 100 compares 5A–50T–50x30 $\rightarrow$ 5A–100T–50x30.

Table 21: Statistical tests for controlled agent-count scaling in STAT. Entries show the direction of change from the first configuration to the second. $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ indicate increases and decreases, respectively. * denotes Holm-corrected $p < 0.05$ under Welch’s two-sample t -test within each comparison block, and superscript ns denotes a non-significant change.

Comparison	Method	Return	Conflicts/Opp.	Throughput	Diversity/Agent	Forced Idle/Opp.
Baseline	DQN	—	—	—	—	—
	FDQN	$\uparrow^{\text{ns}}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	VDN	$\uparrow^{\text{ns}}$	$\uparrow^{\text{ns}}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	QMIX	$\downarrow^{\text{ns}}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	QTRAN	$\downarrow^{\text{ns}}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	MAPPO	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	MAA2C	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	IQL	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
Extreme	IPPO	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	DQN	—	—	—	—	—
	FDQN	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	VDN	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	QMIX	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	QTRAN	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	MAPPO	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	MAA2C	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	IQL	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^{\text{ns}}$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$
	IPPO	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$	$\downarrow^*$	$\uparrow^*$

Baseline compares 3A-12T-10x6 $\rightarrow$ 5A-12T-10x6. Extreme compares 5A-25T-50x30 $\rightarrow$ 9A-25T-50x30.