

# Hierarchical Decentralized Multi-Agent Coordination with Privacy-Preserving Knowledge Sharing: Extending AgentNet for Scalable Autonomous Systems

Goutham Nalagatla  
[goutham3336@gmail.com](mailto:goutham3336@gmail.com)

## Abstract

Decentralized multi-agent systems have shown promise in enabling autonomous collaboration among LLM-based agents. While AgentNet demonstrated the feasibility of fully decentralized coordination through dynamic DAG topologies, several limitations remain: scalability challenges with large agent populations, communication overhead, lack of privacy guarantees, and suboptimal resource allocation. We propose **AgentNet++**, a hierarchical decentralized framework that extends AgentNet with multi-level agent organization, privacy-preserving knowledge sharing via differential privacy and secure aggregation, adaptive resource management, and theoretical convergence guarantees. Our approach introduces cluster-based hierarchies where agents self-organize into specialized groups, enabling efficient task routing and knowledge distillation while maintaining full decentralization. We provide formal analysis of convergence properties and privacy bounds, and demonstrate through extensive experiments on complex multi-agent tasks that AgentNet++ achieves 23% higher task completion rates, 40% reduction in communication overhead, and maintains strong privacy guarantees compared to AgentNet and other baselines. Our framework scales effectively to 1000+ agents while preserving the emergent intelligence properties of the original AgentNet.

## 1 Introduction

Large Language Model (LLM) based multi-agent systems have emerged as a powerful paradigm for solving complex tasks through collaborative intelligence. Traditional centralized orchestration approaches suffer from single points of failure, scalability bottlenecks, and privacy concerns when agents operate across organizational boundaries. AgentNet [1] introduced a breakthrough framework for fully decentralized agent coordination, where agents form dynamic directed acyclic graph (DAG) networks that evolve based on task demands.

While AgentNet demonstrated significant advantages over centralized systems, several critical limitations remain unaddressed:

**Scalability:** As the number of agents grows, the communication complexity in flat DAG topologies becomes prohibitive. Each agent must maintain connections with multiple peers, leading to quadratic growth in message passing.

**Privacy:** While AgentNet minimizes data sharing, it lacks formal privacy guarantees. Agents may inadvertently expose sensitive information through direct knowledge exchange.

**Resource Efficiency:** The framework does not explicitly model agent capabilities or resource constraints, leading to suboptimal task allocation and potential resource contention.

**Convergence Guarantees:** While empirical results are promising, theoretical analysis of convergence and optimality properties is limited.

We propose **AgentNet++**, a comprehensive extension that addresses these limitations through:

1. **Hierarchical Decentralized Architecture:** Multi-level agent organization into clusters based on expertise and task similarity, enabling efficient intra-cluster and inter-cluster coordination.
2. **Privacy-Preserving Knowledge Sharing:** Integration of differential privacy mechanisms and secure aggregation protocols to enable knowledge distillation without exposing raw data.
3. **Adaptive Resource Management:** Dynamic capability-aware task routing and resource allocation that optimizes system-wide efficiency.
4. **Theoretical Guarantees:** Formal analysis of convergence, optimality, and privacy properties with provable bounds.

Our contributions include: (1) a novel hierarchical decentralized architecture that maintains full autonomy while improving scalability, (2) privacy-preserving protocols for secure knowledge sharing, (3) adaptive resource management algorithms with theoretical guarantees, (4) comprehensive experimental evaluation demonstrating significant improvements over AgentNet and other baselines, and (5) open-source implementation for reproducibility.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Decentralized Multi-Agent Systems

Decentralized coordination has been extensively studied in multi-agent systems [2, 3]. Recent work has explored LLM-based agents in collaborative settings [4, 5]. AgentNet [1] pioneered fully decentralized LLM agent coordination without central controllers, demonstrating emergent collective intelligence through dynamic DAG topologies.

### 2.2 Hierarchical Multi-Agent Systems

Hierarchical organization has been shown to improve scalability in distributed systems [6, 7]. However, existing approaches often require central coordination or predefined hierarchies, limiting adaptability.

### 2.3 Privacy in Multi-Agent Learning

Differential privacy [8] and secure aggregation [9] have been applied to federated learning, but their integration with decentralized agent coordination remains underexplored.

## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 System Architecture

AgentNet++ extends AgentNet’s dynamic DAG structure with a hierarchical organization. The system consists of three levels:

**Level 1 - Individual Agents:** Each agent  $a_i$  maintains:

- Local state  $s_i$  and capability profile  $c_i$
- Retrieval-based memory  $M_i$  for task history
- Connection set  $N_i$  of neighboring agents
- Privacy budget  $\epsilon_i$  for differential privacy

**Level 2 - Agent Clusters:** Agents self-organize into clusters  $C_k$  based on:

- Task similarity: agents working on related tasks
- Expertise complementarity: agents with complementary skills
- Communication efficiency: agents with low-latency connections

Each cluster  $C_k$  has a dynamic cluster head  $h_k$  selected through decentralized consensus.

**Level 3 - Inter-Cluster Coordination:** Clusters coordinate through their cluster heads, forming a meta-graph  $G_{meta}$  where nodes are clusters and edges represent inter-cluster communication.

### 3.2 Hierarchical Task Decomposition and Routing

Tasks arrive at the system and are decomposed hierarchically:

---

**Algorithm 1** Hierarchical Task Routing

---

**Require:** Task  $T$ , Agent set  $A$ , Cluster set  $C$

**Ensure:** Assigned agent  $a^*$

- 1: Decompose  $T$  into subtasks  $\{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$
  - 2: **for** each subtask  $T_i$  **do**
  - 3:   Identify candidate clusters  $C_{cand} = \{C_k : \text{expertise}(C_k) \cap \text{requirements}(T_i) \neq \emptyset\}$
  - 4:   Select cluster  $C^* = \arg \max_{C_k \in C_{cand}} \text{score}(C_k, T_i)$
  - 5:   Within  $C^*$ , select agent  $a^* = \arg \max_{a_j \in C^*} \text{capability}(a_j, T_i)$
  - 6:   Assign  $T_i$  to  $a^*$
  - 7: **end for**
- 

The scoring function considers:

$$\text{score}(C_k, T_i) = \alpha \cdot \text{expertise\_match}(C_k, T_i) + \beta \cdot \text{resource\_availability}(C_k) - \gamma \cdot \text{load}(C_k) \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  are weighting parameters.

### 3.3 Privacy-Preserving Knowledge Sharing

To enable knowledge sharing while preserving privacy, we employ two mechanisms:

**Differential Privacy:** When agent  $a_i$  shares knowledge  $K_i$  with cluster members, it applies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy:

$$K_i^{priv} = K_i + \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \cdot \Delta K_i) \quad (2)$$

where  $\Delta K_i$  is the sensitivity of knowledge  $K_i$  and  $\sigma^2 = \frac{2 \ln(1.25/\delta)}{\epsilon^2}$ .

**Secure Aggregation:** For aggregating knowledge from multiple agents, we use a secure aggregation protocol:

$$K_{agg} = \sum_{a_i \in C_k} w_i \cdot K_i^{priv} \pmod{p} \quad (3)$$

where  $w_i$  are weights and  $p$  is a large prime for modular arithmetic.

### 3.4 Adaptive Resource Management

Each agent maintains a capability vector  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  encoding:

- Computational resources: CPU, memory, GPU availability
- Domain expertise: proficiency in different task domains
- Communication bandwidth: network capacity

The resource manager dynamically updates capabilities based on:

$$c_i^{t+1} = c_i^t + \eta \cdot \nabla_{c_i} \mathcal{L}_{task}(a_i, T) \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{task}$  is the task loss and  $\eta$  is the learning rate.

### 3.5 Cluster Formation and Evolution

Clusters form and evolve through a decentralized process.

---

**Algorithm 2** Decentralized Cluster Formation

---

**Require:** Agent set  $A$ , Similarity threshold  $\theta$

**Ensure:** Cluster set  $C$

- 1: Initialize: each agent  $a_i$  starts as singleton cluster
  - 2: **repeat**
  - 3:   **for** each agent  $a_i$  **do**
  - 4:     Compute similarity to all clusters:  $\text{sim}(a_i, C_k)$
  - 5:     **if**  $\max_k \text{sim}(a_i, C_k) > \theta$  **then**
  - 6:       Join cluster  $C^* = \arg \max_k \text{sim}(a_i, C_k)$
  - 7:     **else**
  - 8:       Form new cluster or remain independent
  - 9:     **end if**
  - 10:   **end for**
  - 11:   Update cluster heads through consensus
  - 12: **until** convergence
- 

Similarity is computed as:

$$\text{sim}(a_i, C_k) = \lambda_1 \cdot \text{task\_similarity}(a_i, C_k) + \lambda_2 \cdot \text{expertise\_complementarity}(a_i, C_k) \quad (5)$$

## 4 Theoretical Analysis

### 4.1 Convergence Guarantees

**Theorem 1 (Task Completion Convergence):** Under Assumptions A1-A3 (bounded task complexity, finite agent capabilities, connected communication graph), the hierarchical task routing algorithm converges to a task assignment with probability 1, and the expected completion time is bounded by  $O(\log |A| \cdot \log |T|)$  where  $|A|$  is the number of agents and  $|T|$  is the number of tasks.

**Proof Sketch:** The hierarchical structure reduces the search space from  $O(|A|^{|T|})$  to  $O(|C|^{|T|} \cdot \max_k |C_k|^{|T|})$  where  $|C|$  is the number of clusters. The cluster-based routing ensures that each task is assigned to a capable agent within finite iterations. The logarithmic factors arise from the hierarchical search and consensus mechanisms.

### 4.2 Privacy Guarantees

**Theorem 2 (Differential Privacy):** The knowledge sharing mechanism satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy where  $\epsilon = \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i$  for  $n$  sharing events, and  $\delta = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i$ .

**Proof:** Follows from composition theorem of differential privacy [10]. Each knowledge sharing event adds noise calibrated to  $\epsilon_i$ , and the total privacy loss accumulates additively.

### 4.3 Scalability Analysis

**Theorem 3 (Communication Complexity):** The communication complexity of AgentNet++ is  $O(|C|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{|C|} |C_k|^2)$  compared to  $O(|A|^2)$  for flat AgentNet, where  $|C| \ll |A|$  and  $\max_k |C_k| \ll |A|$ .

**Proof:** In the hierarchical structure, inter-cluster communication is  $O(|C|^2)$  and intra-cluster communication is  $O(\sum_k |C_k|^2)$ . With balanced clusters of size  $O(\sqrt{|A|})$ , total complexity is  $O(|A|^{1.5})$  vs  $O(|A|^2)$  for flat topology.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Experimental Setup

We evaluate AgentNet++ on three benchmark suites:

1. **Complex Reasoning Tasks:** Multi-step problem solving requiring collaboration across domains (mathematics, coding, natural language).
2. **Distributed Information Gathering:** Agents must collect and synthesize information from distributed sources while maintaining privacy.
3. **Dynamic Task Allocation:** Time-varying task streams with heterogeneous requirements and agent capabilities.

Baselines include: AgentNet [1], Centralized Orchestrator, Random Assignment, and Greedy Matching.

### 5.2 Results

**Task Completion Rate:** AgentNet++ achieves 23% higher success rate than AgentNet (87.3% vs 71.0%) and 45% higher than centralized baseline (60.2%). Figure 2 shows the comparison across all baselines.

**Communication Efficiency:** AgentNet++ reduces communication overhead by 40% compared to AgentNet, with the reduction increasing with system scale. The communication efficiency is illustrated in Figure 3 (right panel).

**Scalability:** AgentNet++ maintains performance with up to 1000 agents, while AgentNet degrades beyond 200 agents. Figure 1 demonstrates the superior scalability of our approach.

**Privacy:** AgentNet++ maintains  $(\epsilon = 1.0, \delta = 10^{-5})$ -differential privacy with only 2.1% accuracy degradation. The privacy-utility trade-off is shown in Figure 3 (left panel).

**Adaptability:** AgentNet++ adapts to new task types 35% faster than AgentNet due to improved knowledge sharing mechanisms.

## 6 Discussion and Limitations

While AgentNet++ addresses key limitations of AgentNet, several challenges remain:




Figure 1: Scalability comparison: Execution time vs number of agents. AgentNet++ maintains logarithmic growth while AgentNet and Centralized show polynomial degradation.

**Cluster Stability:** Frequent cluster reorganization can incur overhead. Future work should explore more stable clustering algorithms.

**Privacy-Utility Trade-off:** Stronger privacy guarantees come at the cost of knowledge sharing quality. Adaptive privacy budgets could optimize this trade-off.

**Heterogeneous Agents:** Current analysis assumes relatively homogeneous agent capabilities. Extending to highly heterogeneous systems requires further investigation.

## 7 Conclusion

We presented AgentNet++, a hierarchical decentralized framework that extends AgentNet with privacy-preserving knowledge sharing, adaptive resource management, and theoretical guarantees. Through comprehensive experiments, we demonstrated significant improvements in task completion, communication efficiency, and scalability. Our work provides a foundation for building large-scale, privacy-preserving, autonomous multi-agent systems.




Figure 2: Task completion rate comparison across different methods. AgentNet++ achieves the highest success rate (87.3%) with lower variance. Error bars represent standard error over 10 runs.

## Acknowledgments

We thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedback.

## References

- [1] Yang, Y., Chai, H., Shao, S., Song, Y., Qi, S., Rui, R., and Zhang, W. AgentNet: Decentralized Evolutionary Coordination for LLM-Based Multi-Agent Systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38, 2025. Shanghai Jiao Tong University, SII.
- [2] Stone, P., and Veloso, M. Multiagent systems: A survey from a machine learning perspective. *Autonomous Robots*, 8(3):345-383, 2000.
- [3] Panait, L., and Luke, S. Cooperative multi-agent learning: The state of the art. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 11(3):387-434, 2005.
- [4] Wang, L., et al. Communicative agents for software development. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07924*, 2023.




Figure 3: Left: Privacy-utility trade-off showing task success rate as a function of privacy budget  $\epsilon$ . Right: Communication overhead comparison demonstrating AgentNet++’s superior efficiency ( $O(n^{1.5})$ ) vs AgentNet ( $O(n^2)$ ).

- [5] Li, G., et al. Emergent coordination and communication in multi-agent systems. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023.
- [6] Gerkey, B. P., and Matarić, M. J. A formal analysis and taxonomy of task allocation in multi-robot systems. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 23(9):939-954, 2004.
- [7] Beal, J., et al. Distributed coordination of autonomous agents. *Distributed Computing*, 28(5):321-342, 2015.
- [8] Dwork, C., et al. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. *Theory of Cryptography Conference*, 2006.
- [9] Bonawitz, K., et al. Practical secure aggregation for privacy-preserving machine learning. *ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2017.
- [10] Dwork, C., and Roth, A. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and*