

Improper Reinforcement Learning with Gradient-based Policy Optimization

Mohammadi Zaki¹, Avinash Mohan², Aditya Gopalan¹, and Shie Mannor²

¹Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru

²Technion, Haifa

Email: mohammadi@iisc.ac.in, avinashmohan@campus.technion.ac.il,
aditya@iisc.ac.in, shie@ee.technion.ac.il

Abstract

We consider an improper reinforcement learning setting where a learner is given M base controllers for an unknown Markov decision process, and wishes to combine them optimally to produce a potentially new controller that can outperform each of the base ones. This can be useful in tuning across controllers, learnt possibly in mismatched or simulated environments, to obtain a good controller for a given target environment with relatively few trials.

We propose a gradient-based approach that operates over a class of improper mixtures of the controllers. We derive convergence rate guarantees for the approach assuming access to a gradient oracle. The value function of the mixture and its gradient may not be available in closed-form; however, we show that we can employ rollouts and simultaneous perturbation stochastic approximation (SPSA) for explicit gradient descent optimization. Numerical results on (i) the standard control theoretic benchmark of stabilizing an inverted pendulum and (ii) a constrained queueing task show that our improper policy optimization algorithm can stabilize the system even when the base policies at its disposal are unstable¹.

1 Introduction

A natural approach to design effective controllers for large, complex systems is to first approximate the system using a tried-and-true Markov decision process (MDP) model, such as the Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) [15] or tabular MDPs [5], and then compute (near-) optimal policies for the assumed model. Though this yields favorable results in principle, it is quite possible that errors in describing or understanding the system – leading to misspecified models – may lead to ‘overfitting’, resulting in subpar controllers in practice. An alternative to this is to construct an optimal controller in an *online* fashion using a single (or multiple) chain of black-box interactions with the system. However, recent results on regret performance uncover exponential dependence on system parameters even for a system as simple as an LQR [12], casting a shadow on online optimization as a viable option.

Moreover, in many cases, the stability of the designed controller may be crucial or more desirable than optimizing a fine-grained cost function. From the controller design standpoint, it is often easier, cheaper

¹Under review. Please do not distribute.

and more interpretable to specify or hardcode control policies based on domain-specific principles, e.g., anti-lock braking system (ABS) controllers [36]. For these reasons, we investigate in this paper a promising, *general-purpose* reinforcement learning (RL) approach towards designing controllers² given pre-designed ensembles of *basic* or *atomic* controllers, which (a) allows for flexibly combining the given controllers to obtain richer policies than the atomic policies, and, at the same time, (b) can preserve the basic structure of the given class of controllers and confer a high degree of interpretability on the resulting hybrid policy.

Overview of the approach. We consider a situation where we are given ‘black-box’ access to M controllers (maps from state to action distributions) $\{k_1, \dots, k_M\}$ for an unknown MDP. By this we mean that we can choose to invoke any of the given controllers at any point during the operation of the system. With the understanding that the given family of controllers is reasonable, we frame the problem of learning the best combination of the controllers by trial and error. We first set up an *improper policy class* of all randomized mixtures of the M given controllers – each such mixture is parameterized by a probability distribution over the M base controllers. Applying an improper policy in this class amounts to selecting independently at each time a base controller according to this distribution and implementing the recommended action as a function of the present state of the system.

The learner’s goal, therefore, is to find the best performing mixture policy by iteratively testing from the pool of given controllers and observing the resulting state-action-reward trajectory. To this end we develop a new gradient-based RL optimization algorithm that operates on a softmax parameterization of each mixture (probability distribution) of the M basic controllers, and takes steps by following the gradient of the return of the current probability distribution to reach the optimum mixture. This is reminiscent of the standard policy gradient (PG) method with a softmax parameterization of the policy over a discrete state and action space.

However, there is a basic difference in that the underlying parameterization in our setting is over a set of given *controllers* which could be potentially abstract and defined for complex MDPs with continuous state/action spaces, instead of the PG view where the parameterization directly defines the policy in terms of the state-action map. Our algorithm, therefore, hews more closely to a *meta RL* framework, in that we operate over a set of controllers that have themselves been designed using some optimization framework to which we are agnostic. This confers a great deal of generality to our approach since the class of controllers can now be chosen to promote any desirable secondary characteristic such as interpretability, ease of implementation or cost effectiveness.

It is also worth noting that our approach is different from treating each of the base controllers as an ‘expert’ and applying standard mixture-of-experts algorithms, e.g., Hedge or Exponentiated Gradient [26, 4, 22, 33]. Whereas the latter approach is tailored to converge to the best single controller (under the usual gradient approximation framework) and hence qualifies as a ‘proper’ learning algorithm, the former optimization problem is in the improper class of mixture policies which not only contains each atomic controller but also allows for a true mixture (i.e., one which puts positive probability on at least two elements) of many atomic controllers to achieve optimality; we exhibit concrete examples where this is indeed possible.

Our Contributions. We make the following contributions in this context:

1. We develop a gradient-based RL algorithm to iteratively tune a softmax parameterization of an improper (mixture) policy defined over the base controllers (Algorithm 1). While this algorithm, *Softmax Policy Gradient* (or Softmax PG), relies on the availability of value function gradients, we later propose a modification that we call *GradEst* (Algorithm 4) to Softmax PG to rectify this. GradEst uses a combination of rollouts and Simultaneously Perturbed Stochastic Approximation (SPSA) [10] to estimate the value gradient at the current mixture distribution.
2. We show a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ to the optimal value function for the finite state-action MDPs. To

²We use the terms ‘policy’ and ‘controller’ interchangeably in this article.

do this, we employ a novel Non-uniform Lojaseiwicz-type inequality [27], that lower bounds the 2-norm of the value gradient in terms of the suboptimality of the current mixture policy’s value. Essentially, this helps establish that when the gradient of the value function hits zero, the value function is itself close to the optimum. Along the way, we also establish the β -smoothness of value function of our *improper* controller, which may be of independent interest.

3. We demonstrate the performance of Softmax PG with the instructive special case of Multi-armed Bandits (Sec. 5.2). For a horizon of T steps, we recover the well-known $\mathcal{O}(\log(T))$ bound on regret [24] with both perfect and estimated value function gradients. Further, when perfect value gradients are available, we show a $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ rate of convergence to the optimal value function, t being the current round.
4. We corroborate our theory using extensive simulation studies in two different settings (a) the well-known *Inverted Pendulum* system and (b) a scheduling task in constrained queueing system. We discuss both these settings in detail in Sec. 2, where we also demonstrate the power of our improper learning approach in finding control policies with provably good performance. In our experiments (see Sec. 6), we eschew access to exact value gradients and instead rely on a combination of roll outs and SPSSA to *estimate* them. Results show that our algorithm quickly converges to the correct mixture of available atomic controllers.

1.1 Related Work

Before we delve into our problem, it is vital to first distinguish the approach investigated in the present paper from the plethora of existing algorithms based on ‘proper learning’. Essentially, these algorithms try to find an (approximately) optimal policy for the MDP under investigation. In stochastic control parlance, these proposals try to get close to the Bellman fixed point of the MDP. These approaches can broadly be classified in two groups: *model-based* and *model-free*.

The former is based on first learning the dynamics of the unknown MDP followed by planning for this learnt model. Algorithms in this class include Thompson Sampling-based approaches [34, 35, 19], Optimism-based approaches such as the UCRL algorithm [5], both achieving order-wise optimal $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret bound.

A particular class of MDPs which has been studied extensively is the Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) which is a continuous state-action MDP with linear state dynamics and quadratic cost [15]. Let $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the current state and let $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the action applied at time t . The infinite horizon average cost minimization problem for LQR is to find a policy to choose actions $\{u_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ so as to

$$\text{minimize } \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_t^\top Q x_t + u_t^\top R u_t \right]$$

such that $x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t + n(t)$, $n(t)$ is iid zero-mean noise. Here the matrices A and B are unknown to the learner. Earlier works like [1, 20] proposed algorithms based on the well-known optimism principle (with confidence ellipsoids around estimates of A and B). These show regret bounds of $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$.

However, these approaches do not focus on the stability of the closed-loop system. [15] describe a robust controller design which seeks to minimize the worst-case performance of the system given the error in the estimation process. They show a sample complexity analysis guaranteeing convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N})$ to the optimal policy for the given LQR, N being the number of rollouts. More recently, certainty equivalence [29] was shown to achieve $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret for LQRs. Further, [11] show that it is possible to achieve $\mathcal{O}(\log T)$

regret if either one of the matrices A or B are known to the learner, and also provided a lower bound showing that $\Omega(\sqrt{T})$ regret is unavoidable when both are unknown.

The model-free approach on the other hand, bypasses model estimation and directly learns the value function of the unknown MDP. While the most popular among these have historically been Q-learning, TD-learning [43] and SARSA [37], algorithms based on gradient-based policy optimization have been gaining considerable attention of late, following their stunning success with playing the game of Go which has long been viewed as the most challenging of classic games for artificial intelligence owing to its enormous search space and the difficulty of evaluating board positions and moves. [41] and more recently [42] use policy gradient method combined with a neural network representation to beat human experts. Indeed, the Policy Gradient method has become the cornerstone of modern RL and given birth to an entire class of highly efficient policy search algorithms such as TRPO [38], PPO[39], and MADDPG [28].

Despite its excellent empirical performance, not much was known about theoretical guarantees for this approach until recently. There is now a growing body of promising results showing convergence rates for PG algorithms over finite state-action MDPs [2, 40, 8, 30], where the parameterization is over the entire space of state-action pairs, i.e., $\mathbb{R}^{S \times A}$. In particular, [8] show that projected gradient descent does not suffer from spurious local optima on the simplex, [2] show that the with softmax parameterization PG converges to the global optima asymptotically. [40] show a $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{t})$ convergence rate for mirror descent. [30] show that with softmax policy gradient convergence to the global optima occurs at a rate $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ and at $\mathcal{O}(e^{-t})$ with entropy regularization. These advantages, however, are partially offset by negative results such as those in [25], which show that the convergence time is $\Omega\left(|\mathcal{S}|^{2^{1/(1-\gamma)}}\right)$, where \mathcal{S} is the state space of the MDP and γ the discount factor, even when exact gradient knowledge is assumed.

We are thus left with a model-free technique, whose convergence rate shows desirable dependence on the number of iterations, but is exponential in system parameters. Our objective in this paper, therefore, is to attempt to alleviate precisely this latter issue.

We end this section noting once again that all of the above works concern *proper* learning. Improper learning, on the other hand, has been separately studied in statistical learning theory in the iid setting [14, 13]. In this framework, which is also called *Representation Independent* learning, the learning algorithm is not restricted to output a hypothesis from a given set of hypotheses.

To our knowledge, [3] is the only existing work that attempts to frame and solve policy optimization over an improper class via boosting a given class of controllers. However, the paper is situated in the rather different context of non-stochastic control and assumes perfect knowledge of (i) the memory-boundedness of the MDP, and (ii) the state noise vector in every round, which amounts to essentially knowing the MDP transition dynamics. We work in the stochastic MDP setting and moreover assume no access to the MDP's transition kernel. Further, [3] also assumes that all the atomic controllers available to them are *stabilizing* which, when working with an unknown MDP, is a very strong assumption to make. We make no such assumptions on our atomic controller class and, as we show in Sec. 2.2 and Sec. 6, our algorithms even begin with provably unstable controllers and yet succeed in stabilizing the system.

In summary, the problem that we address concerns finding the best among a *given* class of controllers. None of these need be optimal for the MDP at hand. Moreover, our PG algorithm could very well converge to an improper mixture of these controllers meaning that the output of our algorithms need not be any of the atomic controllers we are provided with. This setting, to the best of our knowledge has not been investigated in the RL literature hitherto.

2 Motivating Examples

Given the novelty of our paradigm, we begin with examples that help illustrate the need for improper learning over a given set of atomic controllers. The two simple examples below concretely demonstrate power of this approach to find (improper) control policies that go well beyond what the atomic set can accomplish, while retaining some of their desirable properties (such as interpretability and simplicity of implementation).

2.1 Ergodic Control of the Inverted Pendulum System




Figure 1: Motivating example: The Inverted Pendulum. The mass of the pendulum is denoted by m_p , that of the cart by m_k , the force used to drive the cart by F , and the distance of the center of mass of the cart from its starting position by s . θ denotes the angle the pendulum makes with the normal and its length is denoted by $2l$. Gravity is denoted by g .

One of the most famous examples of the aforementioned “approximate-and-optimize” paradigm is the Inverted Pendulum system which has, over the years, become a benchmark for testing control strategies [21]. As shown in Fig. 1, it comprises a pendulum (mass= m_p) whose pivot is mounted on a cart (mass= m_k). The cart can be moved in the horizontal direction by applying a force F . The objective is to modulate the direction and magnitude of this force F to keep the pendulum from keeling over under the influence of gravity.

The state of the system at time t , is given by the 4-tuple $\mathbf{x}(t) := [s, \dot{s}, \theta, \dot{\theta}]$, with $\mathbf{x}(\cdot) = \mathbf{0}$ corresponding to the pendulum being upright and stationary. One of the strategies used to design control policies for this system is by first approximating the dynamics around $\mathbf{x}(\cdot) = \mathbf{0}$ with a linear, quadratic cost model and designing a linear controller for these approximate dynamics. This, after time discretization, reduces to finding a (potentially randomized) control

policy $u \equiv \{u(t), t \geq 0\}$ that solves

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_u J(\mathbf{x}(0)) &= \mathbb{E}_u \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{x}^\top(t) Q \mathbf{x}(t) + R u^2(t), \\ s.t. \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{g}{l(\frac{4}{3} - \frac{m_p}{m_p+m_k})} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{g}{l(\frac{4}{3} - \frac{m_p}{m_p+m_k})} & 0 \end{pmatrix}}_{A_{open}} \mathbf{x}(t) + \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{m_p+m_k} \\ 0 \\ \frac{1}{l(\frac{4}{3} - \frac{m_p}{m_p+m_k})} \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{b}} u(t). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Under standard assumptions of controllability and observability, (1) has a stationary, linear solution $u^*(t) = -\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{x}(t)$ (details are available in [7, Chap. 3]). Moreover, setting $A := A_{open} - \mathbf{b} \mathbf{K}^\top$, it is well known that the dynamics $\mathbf{x}(t+1) = A \mathbf{x}(t)$ are stable. Now, a typical design strategy for a given Inverted Pendulum involves a combination of system identification, followed by linearization and computing the controller gain \mathbf{K} . This would typically produce a controller with tolerable performance fairly quickly, but would also suffer from

nonidealities that parameter estimation invariably entails. To alleviate this problem, first consider a generic (ergodic) control policy that builds on this strategy by switching across a menu of controllers $\{K_1, \dots, K_N\}$ produced via the above procedure. That is, at any time t , it chooses controller K_i , $i \in [N]$, w.p. p_i , so that the control input at time t is $u(t) = -\mathbf{K}_i^\top \mathbf{x}(t)$ w.p. p_i . Let $A(i) := A_{open} - \mathbf{b}\mathbf{K}_i^\top$. The resulting controlled dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= A(r(t))\mathbf{x}(t) \\ \mathbf{x}(0) &= \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $r(t) = i$ w.p. p_i , IID across time. In the literature, this belongs to a class of systems known as *Ergodic Parameter Linear Systems* (EPLS) [9], which are said to be *Exponentially Almost Surely Stable* (EAS) if there exists $\rho > 0$ such that for any $\mathbf{x}(0)$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \left| \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\mathbf{x}(t, \omega)\| \leq -\rho \right. \right\} = 1. \quad (3)$$

In other words, w.p. 1, the trajectories of the system decay to the origin exponentially fast. The random variable $\lambda(\omega) := \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\mathbf{x}(t, \omega)\|$ is called the Lyapunov Exponent of the system. For the EPLS in (2),

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\omega) &= \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\mathbf{x}(t, \omega)\| = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \left\| \prod_{s=1}^t A(r(s, \omega)) \mathbf{x}(0) \right\| \\ &\leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\mathbf{x}(0)\| + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \left\| \prod_{s=1}^t A(r(s, \omega)) \right\| \\ &\leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \log \|A(r(s, \omega))\| \stackrel{(*)}{=} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \log \|A(r(s, \omega))\| \\ &\stackrel{(\dagger)}{=} \mathbb{E} \log \|A(r)\| = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \log \|A(i)\|, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where the equalities $(*)$ and (\dagger) are due to the ergodic law of large numbers. A good mixture controller can now be designed by choosing $\{p_1, \dots, p_N\}$ such that $\lambda(\omega) < -\rho$ for some $\rho > 0$, ensuring exponentially almost sure stability (subject to $\log \|A(i)\| < 0$ for some i). As we show in the sequel, our policy gradient algorithm (SoftMax PG) learns an improper mixture $\{p_1, \dots, p_N\}$ that (i) can stabilize the system even when a majority of the constituent *atomic* controllers $\{K_1, \dots, K_N\}$ are *unstable*, i.e., converges to a mixture that ensures that the average exponent $\lambda(\omega) < 0$, and (ii) shows better performance than that each of the atomic controllers. Stability corresponds to a specific, coarse-grained, cost measure, so we can expect to see a similar phenomenon for more general cost structures.


2.2 Scheduling in Constrained Queueing Networks

Another ideal example that helps motivate the the need for improper learning, while simultaneously illustrating its capabilities, is the problem of scheduling in a constrained queueing network. Such systems are widely used to model communication networks in the literature [6].

The system, shown in Fig. 2a, comprises two queues fed by independent, stochastic arrival processes $A_i(t), i \in \{1, 2\}, t \in \mathbb{N}$. The length of Queue i , measured at the beginning of time slot t , is denoted by $Q_i(t) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. A common server serves both queues and can drain at most one packet from the system in a time slot³. The server, therefore, needs to decide which of the two queues it intends to serve in a given slot

³Hence, a *constrained* queueing system.

(we assume that once the server chooses to serve a packet, service succeeds with probability 1). The server's decision is denoted by the vector $\mathbf{D}(t) \in \mathcal{A} := \{[0, 0], [1, 0], [0, 1]\}$, where a “1” denotes service and a “0” denotes lack thereof.



(a) $Q_i(t)$ is the length of Queue i ($i \in \{1, 2\}$) at the beginning of time slot t , $A_i(t)$ is its packet arrival process and $\mathbf{D}(t) \in \{[0, 0], [1, 0], [0, 1]\}$.

(b) K_1 and K_2 by themselves can only stabilize $\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$ (gray rectangles). With improper learning, however, we enlarge the set of stabilizable arrival rates by the triangle ΔABC shown in purple, above.

Figure 2: Motivating example: Constrained queueing network with 2 queues. The capacity region of this network (see Fig. 2b) is given by $\Lambda := \{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 < 1\}$.

For simplicity, we assume that the processes $(A_i(t))_{t=0}^\infty$ are both IID Bernoulli, with $\mathbb{E}A_i(t) = \lambda_i$. Note that the arrival rate $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$ is **unknown** to the learner. Defining $(x)^+ := \max\{0, x\}$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$, queue length evolution is given by the equations

$$Q_i(t+1) = (Q_i(t) - D_i(t))^+ + A_i(t+1), \quad i \in \{1, 2\}. \quad (5)$$

Let \mathcal{F}_t denote the state-action history until time t , and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ the space of all probability distributions on \mathcal{A} . We aim to find a policy $\pi : \mathcal{F}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ to minimize the discounted system backlog given by

$$J_\pi(\mathbf{Q}(0)) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Q}(0)}^\pi \sum_{t=0}^\infty \gamma^t (Q_1(t) + Q_2(t)). \quad (6)$$

Any policy π with $J_\pi(\mathbf{Q}(0)) < \infty$, $\forall \mathbf{Q}(0) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$ is said to be **stabilizing** (or, equivalently, a *stable* policy). It is well known that there exist stabilizing policies iff $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 < 1$ [45]. A *stationary* policy π_{μ_1, μ_2} defined by

$$\pi_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}(\mathbf{Q}) = \begin{cases} [1, 0], & \text{w.p. } \mu_1, \\ [0, 1], & \text{w.p. } \mu_2, \text{ and} \\ [0, 0], & \text{w.p. } 1 - \mu_1 - \mu_2, \end{cases} \quad \forall \mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2 \quad (7)$$

can provably stabilize a system iff $\mu_i > \lambda_i, \forall i \in \{1, 2\}$. Now, assume our control set consists of two stationary policies K_1, K_2 with $K_1 \equiv \pi_{\varepsilon, 1-\varepsilon}$, $K_2 \equiv \pi_{1-\varepsilon, \varepsilon}$ and sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. That is, we have $M = 2$ controllers K_1, K_2 . Clearly, neither of these can, by itself, stabilize a network with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = [0.49, 0.49]$.

However, an *improper* mixture of the two that selects K_1 and K_2 each with probability $1/2$ can. In fact, as Fig. 2b shows, our improper learning algorithm can stabilize all arrival rates in $\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2 \cup \Delta ABC$, without prior knowledge of $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$. In other words, our algorithm enlarges the stability region by the triangle ΔABC , over and above $\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$.

We will return to these examples in Sec. 6, and show, using experiments, (1) how our improper learner converges to the stabilizing mixture of the available policies and (2) if the optimal policy is among the available controllers, our algorithm can find and converge to it. In addition, we will also demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach towards more complicated path interference graphs.

3 Problem Statement and Notation

A (finite) Markov Decision Process $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P}, r, \rho, \gamma)$ is specified by a finite state space \mathcal{S} , a finite action space \mathcal{A} , a transition probability matrix \mathbf{P} , where $\mathbf{P}(\tilde{s}|s, a)$ is the probability of transitioning into state \tilde{s} upon taking action $a \in \mathcal{A}$ in state s , a single stage reward function $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a starting state distribution ρ over \mathcal{S} and a discount factor $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.

A (stationary) *policy* or *controller* $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ specifies a decision-making strategy in which the learner chooses actions (a_t) adaptively based on the current state (s_t) , i.e., $a_t \sim \pi(s_t)$. π and ρ , together with \mathbf{P} , induce a probability measure \mathbb{P}_ρ^π on the space of all sample paths of the underlying Markov process and we denote by \mathbb{E}_ρ^π the associated expectation operator. The *value function* of policy π (also called the value of policy π), denoted by V^π is the total discounted reward obtained by following π , i.e.,

$$V^\pi(\rho) := \mathbb{E}_\rho^\pi \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) \quad (8)$$

Improper Learning. We assume that the learner is provided with a finite number of (stationary) controllers $\mathcal{C} := \{K_1, \dots, K_M\}$ and, as described below, set up a parameterized improper policy class $\mathcal{I}_{soft}(\mathcal{C})$ that depends on \mathcal{C} . The aim therefore, is to identify the best policy for the given MDP within this class, i.e.,

$$\pi^* = \underset{\pi \in \mathcal{I}_{soft}(\mathcal{C})}{\operatorname{argmax}} V^\pi(\rho). \quad (9)$$

We now describe the construction of the class $\mathcal{I}_{soft}(\mathcal{C})$.

The Softmax Policy Class. We assign weights $\theta_m \in \mathbb{R}$, to each controller $K_m \in \mathcal{C}$ and define $\theta := [\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M]$. The improper class \mathcal{I}_{soft} is parameterized by θ as follows. In each round, the policy $\pi_\theta \in \mathcal{I}_{soft}(\mathcal{C})$ chooses a controller drawn from *softmax*(θ), i.e., the probability of choosing Controller K_m is given by,

$$\pi_\theta(m) := \frac{e^{\theta_m}}{\sum_{m'=1}^M e^{\theta_{m'}}}. \quad (10)$$

Note, therefore, that in every round, our algorithm interacts with the MDP only *through* the controller sampled in that round (see Figure 3). In the rest of the paper, we will deal exclusively with a fixed and given \mathcal{C} and the resultant \mathcal{I}_{soft} . therefore, we overload the notation $\pi_{\theta_t}(a|s)$ for any $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$ to denote the probability with which the algorithm chooses action a in state s at time t . For ease of notation, whenever the context is clear, we will also drop the subscript θ i.e., $\pi_{\theta_t} \equiv \pi_t$. Hence, we have at any time $t \geq 0$:

$$\pi_{\theta_t}(a|s) = \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_{\theta_t}(m) K_m(s, a). \quad (11)$$

Since we deal with gradient-based methods in the sequel, we define the *value gradient* of policy $\pi_\theta \in \mathcal{I}_{soft}$, by $\nabla_\theta V^{\pi_\theta} \equiv \frac{dV^{\pi_{\theta_t}}}{d\theta_t}$. We say that V^{π_θ} is *β -smooth* if $\nabla_\theta V^{\pi_\theta}$ is β -Lipschitz [2]. Finally, let for any two integers a and b , \mathbb{I}_{ab} denote the indicator that $a = b$.




Figure 3: A black-box view of our improper learning approach through softmax policy gradient.

Contrast with traditional the PG approach: We emphasize that this problem is fundamentally different from the traditional policy gradient approach where the parameterization completely defines the policy in terms of the state-action mapping. One can use the methodology followed in [30], by assigning a parameter $\theta_{s,m}$ for every $s \in \mathcal{S}, m \in [M]$. With some calculation, it can be shown that this is equivalent to the tabular setting with S states and M actions, with the new ‘reward’ defined by $r(s, m) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} K_m(s, a) r(s, a)$ where $r(s, a)$ is the usual expected reward obtained at state s and playing action $a \in \mathcal{A}$. By following the approach in [30] on this modified setting, it can be shown that the policy converges for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $\pi_\theta(m^*(s) \mid s) \rightarrow 1$, for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$, which is the optimum policy.

However, the problem that we address, is to select a *single* controller (from within \mathcal{I}_{soft} , the convex hull of the given M controllers), which would guarantee maximum return if one plays that single mixture for all time, from among the given set of controllers.

4 Improper Learning using Gradients

In this and the following sections, we propose and analyze a policy gradient-based algorithm that provably finds the best, potentially improper, mixture of controllers for the given MDP. While we employ gradient ascent to optimize the mixture weights, the fact that this procedure works at all is far from obvious. We begin by noting that V^{π_θ} , as described in Section 3, is *nonconcave* in θ for both direct and softmax parameterizations, which renders analysis with standard tools of convex optimization inapplicable. Formally,

Lemma 4.1. *(Non-concavity of Value function) There is an MDP and a set of controllers, for which the maximization problem of the value function (i.e. (9)) is non-concave for both the SoftMax and direct parameterizations, i.e., $\theta \mapsto V^{\pi_\theta}$ is non-concave.*

The proof follows from a simple counterexample whose construction we show in Sec. C in the Appendix.

Algorithm 1 Softmax Policy Gradient (SoftMax PG)

Input: learning rate $\eta > 0$, initial state distribution μ
Initialize each $\theta_m^1 = 1$, for all $m \in [M]$, $s_1 \sim \mu$
for $t = 1$ **to** T **do**
 Choose controller $m_t \sim \pi_t$.
 Play action $a_t \sim K_{m_t}(s_t, \cdot)$.
 Observe $s_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot | s_t, a_t)$.
 Update: $\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \eta \cdot \nabla_{\theta_t} V^{\pi_{\theta_t}}(\mu)$.
end for

Our policy gradient algorithm, [SoftMax PG](#), is shown in Algorithm 1. The parameters $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^M$ which define the policy are updated by following the gradient of the value function at the current policy parameters. The policy $\pi_\theta(m)$ is defined as in (10). The algorithm proceeds by first choosing a controller $m_t \in [M]$ drawn according to π_t and then playing an action drawn from $K_{m_t}(s_t, \cdot)$. The parameters are updated via a gradient descent step based on the derivative of the value function evaluated with the current parameters θ_t .

Note 1. Although Lemma 4.1 suggests that the value function is non-concave in the parameter θ , the motivating examples in Sec. 2 of an inverted pendulum and a simple queuing network, show situations where a pure mixture of the base controllers can perform strictly better than each them individually.

5 Theoretical Convergence Results

In this section, we provide performance guarantees for SoftMaxPG, in terms of the rate of convergence to the optimal mixture. Notice that the *Update* step requires knowledge of the value gradient $\nabla_{\theta_t} V^{\pi_{\theta_t}}$, which may not be available/computable in closed form. We divide this section into two parts depending on whether or not the exact value function gradient is available to the learner.

5.1 Convergence Guarantees With Perfect Gradient Knowledge

The following result shows that with SoftMax PG, the value function converges to that of the *best in-class* policy at a rate $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$. Furthermore, the theorem shows an explicit dependence on the number of controllers M , in place of the usual $|\mathcal{S}|$.

Theorem 5.1 (Convergence of Policy Gradient). *With $\{\theta_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ generated as in Algorithm 1 and using a learning rate $\eta = \frac{(1-\gamma)^2}{7\gamma^2 + 4\gamma + 5}$, for all $t \geq 1$,*

$$V^*(\rho) - V^{\pi_{\theta_t}}(\rho) \leq \frac{1}{t} M \left(\frac{7\gamma^2 + 4\gamma + 5}{c^2(1-\gamma)^3} \right) \left\| \frac{d_\mu^{\pi^*}}{\mu} \right\|_\infty^2 \left\| \frac{1}{\mu} \right\|_\infty. \quad (12)$$

Note 2. The quantity c in the statement is the minimum probability that SoftMax PG puts on the controllers for which the best mixture π^* puts positive probability mass, i.e., $c := \inf_{t \geq 1} \min_{m \in \{m' \in [M] : \pi^*(m') > 0\}} \pi_{\theta_t}(m)$. While we currently do not supply a lower bound for c , empirical studies presented in Sec. 6 clearly show that c is indeed strictly positively lower bounded, rendering the bound in (12) non vacuous.

Proof sketch of Theorem 5.1. We highlight here the main steps of the proof. We begin by showing that $V^{\pi_\theta}(\mu)$ is β -smooth, for some $\beta > 0$.

Lemma 5.2. $V^{\pi_\theta}(\mu)$ is $\frac{7\gamma^2+4\gamma+5}{2(1-\gamma)^2}$ -smooth.

Next, we derive a new Lojaseiwicz-type inequality for our probabilistic mixture class, which lower bounds the magnitude of the gradient of the value function.

Lemma 5.3 (Non-uniform Lojaseiwicz inequality).

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} V^{\pi_\theta}(\mu) \right\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \left(\min_{m: \pi_{\theta_m}^* > 0} \pi_{\theta_m} \right) \times \left\| \frac{d_{\rho}^{\pi^*}}{d_{\mu}^{\pi_\theta}} \right\|_{\infty}^{-1} [V^*(\rho) - V^{\pi_\theta}(\rho)].$$

The proof of Theorem 5.1, then follows by combining Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 followed by an induction argument over $t \geq 1$. Please see the appendix for details of the proof. \square

- **Analytical Novelties.** We note here that while the basic recipe for the analysis of Theorem 5.1 is similar to [30], we stress that our setting does not directly inherit the intuition of standard PG (sPG) analysis.
 - With $|\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}| < \infty$, the sPG analysis critically depends on the fact that a deterministic optimal policy exists and shows convergence to it. Our setting enjoys no such guarantee.
 - The value function gradient in sPG has no ‘cross contamination’ from other states, so modifying the parameter of one state does not affect the values of the others. Our setting cannot leverage this since the value function gradient possesses contributions from *all* states (see Lemma E.2 in appendix). Hence, our analysis becomes more intricate than existing techniques or simple modifications thereof.
- **Bandit-over-bandits.** For the special case of $S = 1$, which is the Multiarmed Bandits, each controller is a probability distribution over the A arms of the bandit. This is different from the standard MABs because the learner cannot choose the actions directly, instead chooses from a *given* set of controllers, to play actions. We call this special case as *bandits-over-bandits*. We obtain a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(M^2/t)$ to the optimum and recover the well-known $M^2 \log T$ regret bound when our softmax PG algorithm is applied to this special case. We refer the readers to the appendix for details of this result, and move to the special case of MAB when the learner uses estimates of the gradient of the value function.

5.2 Convergence Guarantees With Estimated Gradients

For the bandits-over-bandits case when exact value gradients are unavailable, we parameterize the policy simplex $\mathcal{P}([M])$ *directly*, i.e., $\pi_t(m) = \theta_t(m)$, $\forall m \in [M]$ (see Algorithm 2). At each round $t \geq 1$, the learning rate for η is chosen asynchronously for each controller m , to be $\alpha \pi_t(m)^2$, to ensure that we remain inside the simplex, for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. To justify its name as a policy gradient algorithm, observe that in order to minimize regret, we need to solve the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M])} \sum_{m=1}^M \pi(m) (\mathbf{r}_\mu(m^*) - \mathbf{r}_\mu(m)).$$

A direct gradient with respect to the parameters $\pi(m)$ gives us a rule for the policy gradient algorithm. The other changes in the update step (eq 13), stem from the fact that true means of the arms are unavailable and importance sampling.

Algorithm 2 Projection-free Policy Gradient (for MABs)

Input: learning rate $\eta \in (0, 1)$
Initialize each $\pi_1(m) = \frac{1}{M}$, for all $m \in [M]$.
for $t = 1$ **to** T **do**
 $m_*(t) \leftarrow \underset{m \in [M]}{\operatorname{argmax}} \pi_t(m)$
 Choose controller $m_t \sim \pi_t$.
 Play action $a_t \sim K_{m_t}$.
 Receive reward R_{m_t} by pulling arm a_t .
 Update $\forall m \in [M], m \neq m_*(t)$:

$$\pi_{t+1}(m) = \pi_t(m) + \eta \left(\frac{R_m \mathbb{I}_m}{\pi_t(m)} - \frac{R_{m_*(t)} \mathbb{I}_{m_*(t)}}{\pi_t(m_*(t))} \right) \quad (13)$$

Set $\pi_{t+1}(m_*(t)) = 1 - \sum_{m \neq m_*(t)} \pi_{t+1}(m)$.

end for

We have the following result for the bandit-over-bandits improper learning problem (the proof appears in the Appendix).

Theorem 5.4. *For α chosen sufficiently small, (π_t) is a Markov process, with $\pi_t(m^*) \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, a.s.*

Further the regret till any time T is bounded as $\mathcal{R}(T) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{m \neq m^} \frac{\Delta_m}{\alpha \Delta_{\min}^2} \log T \right)$, where $\Delta_j := r(m^*) - r(j), j \in [M]$ and $\Delta_{\min} := \min_{m \in [M]} \Delta_m$.*

Although we obtain a similar $\log T$ regret bound for the case of noisy gradient estimates, we note that the techniques used are quite different from those used in Theorem 5.1. The proof proceeds by showing that the expected time for $\pi_t(m^*)$ to cross any fixed threshold in $(0, 1]$ is finite. This, along with showing that the process $\{\pi_t(m^*)\}$ is a supermartingale and invoking Doob's convergence theorem, helps to prove the regret bound.

Note 3. *The “cost” of not knowing the true gradient seems to cause the dependence on Δ_{\min} in the regret, as is not the case when true gradient is available (see Theorem D.1 and Corollary D.1.1). The dependence on Δ_{\min} as is well known from the work of [23], is unavoidable.*

Note 4. *The dependence of α on Δ_{\min} can be removed by a more sophisticated choice of learning rate, at the cost of an extra $\log T$ dependence on regret [16].*

We note that it is an open and challenging task to show convergence guarantees for our policy gradient approach over improper mixtures for general MDPs with estimated (noisy) gradients; indeed, such rates are not yet known even for the basic softmax PG scheme for the tabular MDP setting. The difficulty primarily seems to lie in the fact that the constant c for the perfect gradient case now becomes stochastic, and showing that it stays bounded away from 0 in some probabilistic sense is non-trivial.

6 Simulation results

We now discuss the results of implementing our algorithms on the inverted pendulum and the constrained queueing examples described in Sec. 2. Since neither value functions nor value gradients for these problems

are available in closed-form, we modify SoftMax PG (Algorithm 1) to make it generally implementable using a combination of (1) *rollouts* to estimate the value function of the current (improper) policy and (2) *simultaneous perturbation stochastic approximation* (SPSA) to estimate its value gradient. The gradient estimation algorithm, *GradEst*, is shown in Algorithm 4.

6.1 Approximation of Softmax PG

In order to estimate the value gradient, we use the approach in [18], noting that for a function $V : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the gradient, ∇V ,

$$\nabla V(\theta) \approx \mathbb{E}[(V(\theta + \alpha u) - V(\theta)) u] \cdot \frac{M}{\alpha}. \quad (14)$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. If u is chosen to be uniformly random on unit sphere, the second term is zero, ie., $\mathbb{E}[(V(\theta + \alpha u) - V(\theta)) u] \cdot \frac{M}{\alpha} = \mathbb{E}[(V(\theta + \alpha u)) u] \cdot \frac{M}{\alpha}$.

The expression above requires evaluation of the value function at the point $(\theta + \alpha u)$. Since the value function may not be explicitly computable, we employ rollouts, for its evaluation.

Algorithm 3 Softmax PG with Gradient Estimation (SPGE)

- 1: **Input:** learning rate $\eta > 0$, perturbation parameter $\alpha > 0$, Initial state distribution μ
 - 2: Initialize each $\theta_m^1 = 1$, for all $m \in [M]$,
 $s_1 \sim \mu$
 - 3: **for** $t = 1$ **to** T **do**
 - 4: Choose controller $m_t \sim \pi_t$.
 - 5: Play action $a_t \sim K_{m_t}(s_t, \cdot)$.
 - 6: Observe $s_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot | s_t, a_t)$.
 - 7: $\nabla_{\theta^t} \widehat{V^{\pi_{\theta^t}}}(\mu) = \text{GradEst}(\theta_t, \alpha, \mu)$
 - 8: Update:
 $\theta^{t+1} = \theta^t + \eta \cdot \nabla_{\theta^t} \widehat{V^{\pi_{\theta^t}}}(\mu)$.
 - 9: **end for**
-


Algorithm 4 GradEst (subroutine for SPGE)

- 1: **Input:** Policy parameters θ , parameter $\alpha > 0$, Initial state distribution μ .
 - 2: **for** $i = 1$ **to** $\#runs$ **do**
 - 3: $u^i \sim \text{Unif}(\mathbb{S}^{M-1})$.
 - 4: $\theta_\alpha = \theta + \alpha u^i$
 - 5: $\pi_\alpha = \text{softmax}(\theta_\alpha)$
 - 6: **for** $l = 1$ **to** $\#rollouts$ **do**
 - 7: Generate $(s_0, a_0, r_0, s_1, a_1, r_1, \dots, s_{1t}, a_{1t}, r_{1t})$ trajectory using the policy π_α : and $s_0 \sim \mu$.
 - 8: $\text{reward}^l = \sum_{j=0}^{1t} \gamma^j r_j$
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: $\text{mr}(i) = \text{mean}(\text{reward})$
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: $\text{GradValue} = \frac{1}{\#runs} \sum_{i=1}^{\#runs} \text{mr}(i) \cdot u^i \cdot \frac{M}{\alpha}$.
 - 13: **Return:** GradValue.
-


Note that all of the simulations shown have been averaged over $\#L = 20$ trials, and the mean and standard deviations plotted. We also show empirically that the constant c in Theorem 5.1 is indeed strictly positive.

In the sequel, for every trial $l \in [\#L]$, let $\bar{c}_t^l := \inf_{1 \leq s \leq t} \min_{m \in \{m' \in [M] : \pi^*(m') > 0\}} \pi_{\theta_s}(m)$, and $\bar{c}_t := \frac{1}{\#L} \sum_{l=1}^{\#L} \bar{c}_t^l$. Also let $\bar{c} := \min_{l \in [\#L]} \min_{1 \leq t \leq T} \bar{c}_t^l$. That is the sequences $\{\bar{c}_t^l\}_{t=1, l=1}^{T, \#L}$ define the minimum probabilities that the algorithm puts, over rounds $1 : t$ in trial l , on controllers with $\pi^*(\cdot) > 0$. $\{\bar{c}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ represents its average across the different trials, and \bar{c} is the minimum such probability that the algorithm learns across all rounds $1 \leq t \leq T$ and across trials. We note her that in all the simulations, the empirical trajectories of \bar{c}_t and \bar{c} become flat after some initial rounds and are bounded away from zero, supporting our conjecture that the constant c in Theorem 5.1 does not decay to zero.

6.2 The Inverted Pendulum System



(a) Cartpole simulation with $\{K_1 = K_{opt}, K_2 = K_{opt} + \Delta\}$. our algorithm converging to the best controller.



(b) Cartpole simulation with $\{K_1 = K_{opt} - \Delta, K_2 = K_{opt} + \Delta\}$. Softmax PG algorithm converges to a improper mixture of the two base controllers.

Figure 4: Softmax policy gradient algorithm applied to the cartpole control. Each plot shows (a) the learnt probabilities of various base controllers over time, and (b) the minimum probability \bar{c}_t and \bar{c} as described in the text.

We study two different settings for the Inverted Pendulum example. Let K_{opt} be the optimal controller for the given system, computed via standard procedures (details can be found in [7]). We set $M = 2$ and consider two scenarios: (i) the two base controllers are $\mathcal{C} \equiv \{K_{opt}, K_{opt} + \Delta\}$, where Δ is a random matrix, each entry of which is drawn IID $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$, (ii) $\mathcal{C} \equiv \{K_{opt} - \Delta, K_{opt} + \Delta\}$. In the first case a corner point of the simplex is optimal. In the second case a strict improper mixture of the available controllers is optimum. As we can see in Fig. 4a and 4b our policy gradient algorithm converges to the best controller/mixture in both the cases. The details of all the hyperparameters for this setting are provided in the appendix. We note here that in the second setting even though none of the controllers, applied individually, stabilizes the system, our Softmax PG algorithm finds and follows a improper mixture of the controllers which stabilizes the given Inverted Pendulum.

We investigate further the example in our simulation in which the two constituent controllers are $K_{opt} + \Delta$ and $K_{opt} - \Delta$. We use OpenAI gym to simulate this situation. In the Figure 4b, it was shown our Softmax PG algorithm (with estimated values and gradients) converged to a improper mixture of the two controllers, i.e., $\approx (0.53, 0.47)$. Let K_{conv} be defined as the (randomized) controller which chooses K_1 with probability 0.53, and K_2 with probability 0.47. Recall from Sec. 2.1 that this control law converts the linearized cartpole into an Ergodic Parameter Linear System (EPLS). In Table 1 we report the average number of rounds the pendulum stays upright when different controllers are applied for all time, over trajectories of length 500 rounds. The third column displays an interesting feature of our algorithm. Over 100 trials, the base controllers do not stabilize the pendulum for a relatively large number of trials, however, K_{conv} successfully does so most of the times.

We mention here that if one follows K^* , which is the optimum controller matrix one obtains by solving the standard Discrete-time Algebraic Riccati Equation (DARE) [7], the inverted pendulum does not fall over 100 trials. However, as indicated in Sec.1, constructing the optimum controller for this system from scratch requires exponential, in the number of state dimension, sample complexity [12]. On the other hand K_{conv} performs very close to the optimum, while being sample efficient.

Table 1: A table showing the number of rounds the constituent controllers manage to keep the inverted pendulum upright.

Controller	Mean number of rounds before the pendulum falls \wedge 500	# Trials out of 100 in which the pendulum falls before 500 rounds
$K_1(K_{opt} + \Delta)$	403	38
$K_2(K_{opt} - \Delta)$	355	46
K_{conv}	465	8

6.3 Constrained Queueing Network

We present simulation results for the following networks.

A Two Queue Network With Fixed Arrival Rates. We study two different settings here: (1) in the first case the optimal policy is a strict improper combination of the available controllers and second (2) where it is at a corner point, i.e., one of the available controllers itself is optimal. Our simulations show that in both the cases, PG converges to the correct controller distribution. We provide all details about hyperparameters in Sec. F in the Appendix.

Recall the example that we discussed in Sec. 2.2. We consider the case with Bernoulli arrivals with rates $\lambda = [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$ and are given two base/atomic controllers $\{K_1, K_2\}$, where controller K_i serves Queue i with probability 1, $i = 1, 2$. As can be seen in Fig. 5a when $\lambda = [0.49, 0.49]$ (equal arrival rates), GradEst converges to an improper mixture policy that serves each queue with probability $[0.5, 0.5]$. Note that this strategy will also stabilize the system whereas both the base controllers lead to instability (the queue length of the unserved queue would obviously increase without bound). Figure 5b, shows that with unequal arrival rates too, GradEst quickly converges to the best policy.

Fig. 5c shows the evolution of the value function of GradEst (in blue) compared with those of the base controllers (red) and the *Longest Queue First* policy (LQF) which, as the name suggests, always serves the longest queue in the system (black). LQF, like any policy that always serves a nonempty queue in the system whenever there is one⁴, is known to be optimal in the sense of delay minimization for this system [31]. See Sec. F in the Appendix for more details about this experiment.

Finally, Fig. 5d shows the result of the second experimental setting with three base controllers, one of which is delay optimal. The first two are K_1, K_2 as before and the third controller, K_3 , is LQF. Notice that K_1, K_2 are both queue length-agnostic, meaning they could attempt to serve empty queues as well. LQF, on the other hand, always and only serves nonempty queues. Hence, in this case the optimal policy is attained at one of the corner points, i.e., $[0, 0, 1]$. The plot shows the PG algorithm converging to the correct point on the simplex.

Non-stationary arrival rates. Recall the example that we discussed in Sec. 2.2 of two queues. The scheduler there is now given two base/atomic controllers $\mathcal{C} := \{K_1, K_2\}$, i.e. $M = 2$. Controller K_i serves Queue i with probability 1, $i = 1, 2$. As can be seen in Fig. 7b, the arrival rates λ to the two queues vary over time (adversarially) during the learning. In particular, λ varies from $(0.3, 0.6) \rightarrow (0.6, 0.3) \rightarrow (0.49, 0.49)$. Our PG algorithm successfully *tracks* this change and *adapts* to the optimal improper stationary policies in each case. In all three cases a mixed controller is optimal, and is correctly tracked by our PG algorithm.

Path Graph Networks. Consider a system of parallel transmitter-receiver pairs as shown in Figure 6a. Due to the physical arrangement of the Tx-Rx pairs, no two adjacent systems can be served simultaneously because of interference. This type of communication system is commonly referred to as a *path graph network*

⁴Tie-breaking rule is irrelevant.






Figure 5: Softmax policy gradient algorithm applies show convergence to the best mixture policy.

[32]. Figure 6b shows the corresponding *conflict graph*. Each Tx-Rx pair can be thought of as a queue, and the edges between them represent that the two connecting queues, cannot be served simultaneously. On the other hand, the sets of queues which can be served simultaneously are called *independent sets* in the queuing theory literature. In the figure above, the independent sets are $\{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{4\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 4\}, \{1, 4\}\}$.

The scheduling constraints here dictate that Queues i and $i+1$ cannot be served simultaneously for $i \in [N-1]$ in any round $t \geq 0$. In each round t , the scheduler selects an independent set to serve the queues therein.



(a) A basic path-graph interference system with $N = 4$ communication links.



(b) The associated conflict (interference) graph is a *path-graph*.

Figure 6: An example of a path graph network. The interference constraints are such that physically adjacent queues cannot be served simultaneously.


Let $Q_j(t)$ be the backlog of Queue j at time t . We use the following base controllers: (i) K_1 : Max Weight (MW) controller [45] chooses a set $s_t := \arg\max_{\substack{S \subseteq \mathcal{A} \\ j \in S}} \sum Q_j(t)$, i.e, the set with the largest backlog, (ii) K_2 : Maximum Egress Rate (MER) controller chooses a set $s_t := \arg\max_{\substack{S \subseteq \mathcal{A} \\ j \in S}} \sum \mathbb{I}\{Q_j(t) > 0\}$, i.e, the set which has the maximum number of non-empty queues. We also choose K_3, K_4 and K_5 which serve the sets $\{1, 3\}, \{2, 4\}, \{1, 4\}$ respectively with probability 1. We fix the arrival rates to the queues $(0.495, 0.495, 0.495, 0.495)$. It is well known that the MER rule is mean-delay optimal in this case [32]. In Fig. 7a, we plot the probability of choosing $K_i, i \in [5]$, learnt by our algorithm. The probability of choosing MER indeed converges to 1.

Finally, in Table 2, we report the mean delay values of the 5 base controllers we used in our simulation Fig. 7a, Sec.6. We see the controller K_2 which was chosen to be MER, indeed has the lowest cost associated, and


as shown in Fig. 7a, our Softmax PG algorithm (with estimated value functions and gradients) converges to it.

Table 2: Mean Packet Delay Values of Path Graph Network Simulation.

Controller	Mean delay (# time slots) over 200 trials	Standard deviation
$K_1(MW)$	22.11	0.63
$K_2(MER)$	20.96	0.65
$K_3(\{1, 3\})$	80.10	0.92
$K_4(\{2, 4\})$	80.22	0.90
$K_5(\{1, 4\})$	80.13	0.91



(a) Softmax PG applied to a Path Graph Network, shows our algorithm converging to the best controller.



(b) Softmax PG applied to a simple 2 queue system with time-varying arrival rates


Figure 7: Softmax policy gradient algorithm applied to the path graph scheduling task and 2-queue example with non-stationary arrival rates. Each plot shows (a) the learnt probabilities of various base controllers over time, and (b) the minimum probability \bar{c}_t and \bar{c} as described in the text.

6.4 State Dependent controllers – Chain MDP


We consider a linear chain MDP as shown in Figure 8a. As evident from the figure, $|\mathcal{S}| = 10$ and the learner has only two actions available, which are $\mathcal{A} = \{\text{left}, \text{right}\}$. Hence the name ‘chain’. The numbers on the arrows represent the reward obtained with the transition. The initial state is s_1 . We let s_{10} as the terminal state. Let us define 2 base controllers, K_1 and K_2 , as follows.

$$K_1(\text{left} \mid \mathbf{s}_j) = \begin{cases} 1, & j \in [9] \setminus \{5\} \\ 0.1, & j = 5 \\ 0, & j = 10. \end{cases}$$

$$K_2(\text{left} \mid \mathbf{s}_j) = \begin{cases} 1, & j \in [9] \setminus \{6\} \\ 0.1, & j = 6 \\ 0, & j = 10. \end{cases}$$



(a) A chain MDP with 10 states.



(b) Softmax PG alg applied to the linear Chain MDP with various randomly chosen initial distribution. Plot shows probability of choosing controller K_1 averaged over #trials

Figure 8: An example where the optimum controller is state-dependent.

and obviously $K_i(\text{right}|s_j) = 1 - K_i(\text{left}|s_j)$ for $i = 1, 2$. An improper mixture of the two controllers, i.e., $(K_1 + K_2)/2$ is the optimal in this case. We show that our policy gradient indeed converges to the ‘correct’ combination, see Figure 8b. We here provide an elementary calculation of our claim that the mixture $K_{\text{mix}} := (K_1 + K_2)/2$ is indeed better than applying K_1 or K_2 for all time. We first analyze the value function due to $K_i, i = 1, 2$ (which are the same due to *symmetry* of the problem and the probability values described).

$$\begin{aligned} V^{K_i}(s_1) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t r_t(a_t, s_t) \right] = 0.1 \times \gamma^9 + 0.1 \times 0.9 \times 0.1 \times \gamma^{11} + 0.1 \times 0.9 \times 0.1 \times 0.9 \times 0.1 \times \gamma^{13} \dots \\ &= 0.1 \times \gamma^9 \left(1 + (0.1 \times 0.9 \gamma^2) + (0.1 \times 0.9 \gamma^2)^2 + \dots \right) = \frac{0.1 \times \gamma^9}{1 - 0.1 \times 0.9 \times \gamma^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We will next analyze the value if a true mixture controller i.e., K_{mix} is applied to the above MDP. The analysis is a little more intricate than the above. We make use of the following key observations, which are elementary but crucial.

1. Let **Paths** be the set of all sequence of states starting from s_1 , which terminate at s_{10} which can be generated under the policy K_{mix} . Observe that

$$V^{K_{\text{mix}}}(s_1) = \sum_{p \in \text{Paths}} \gamma^{\text{length}(p)} \mathbb{P}[p]. \quad (15)$$

Recall that reward obtained from the transition $s_9 \rightarrow s_{10}$ is 1.

2. Number of distinct paths with exactly n loops: 2^n .
3. Probability of each such distinct path with n cycles:

$$\begin{aligned} &= \underbrace{(0.55 \times 0.45) \times (0.55 \times 0.45) \times \dots (0.55 \times 0.45)}_{n \text{ times}} \times 0.55 \times 0.55 \times \gamma^{9+2n} \\ &= (0.55)^2 \times \gamma^9 (0.55 \times 0.45 \times \gamma^2)^n. \end{aligned}$$

4. Finally, we put everything together to get:

$$\begin{aligned} V^{K_{\text{mix}}}(s_1) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n \times (0.55)^2 \times \gamma^9 \times (0.55 \times 0.45 \times \gamma^2)^n \\ &= \frac{(0.55)^2 \times \gamma^9}{1 - 2 \times 0.55 \times 0.45 \times \gamma^2} > V^{K_i}(s_1). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that a mixture performs better than the constituent controllers. The plot shown in Fig. 8b shows the Softmax PG algorithm (even with estimated gradients and value functions) converges to a (0.5,0.5) mixture correctly.

In all the simulations shown above we note that the empirical trajectories of \bar{c}_t and \bar{c} become flat after some initial rounds and are bounded away from zero. This supports our conjecture that the constant c in Theorem 5.1 does not decay to zero, rendering the theorem statement non-vacuous.

We further note that our algorithm performs well in challenging scenarios, *even* with estimates of the value function and its gradient. Analyzing convergence with estimated gradients will form part of future work.

We thus see that our algorithm performs well in challenging scenarios, even with estimates of the value function and its gradient. Analyzing convergence with estimated gradients will form part of future work.

7 Conclusion and Discussion

In this paper, we considered the problem of choosing the best mixture of controllers for Reinforcement Learning and made the first attempt at improper learning in the RL setting. One natural option in this case is to run each controller separately for a long time and then choose the best one based on estimated returns. While quite plausible, this “explore-then-exploit” approach is likely to be severely suboptimal in terms of rates. Moreover, it is not clear how to obtain the best mixture of base controllers as opposed to the best base controller. We recall the queuing example (Sec. 2.2) where the best mixture may be strictly superior each base controller.

This work opens up a plethora of avenues. One can consider a richer class of mixtures that can look at the current state and mix accordingly. For example, an attention model can be used to choose which controller to use, or other state-dependent models can be relevant. The learning architecture should not change dramatically since we are using gradients for the selection process which currently is simple, but may be replaced by a more complex architecture. Another example is to artificially force switching across controllers to occur less frequently than in every round. This can help create *momentum* and allow the controlled process to ‘mix’ better, when using complex controllers.

Finally, in the present setting, the base controllers are fixed. It would be interesting to consider adding adaptive, or ‘learning’ controllers as well as the fixed ones. Including the base controllers can provide baseline performance below which the performance of the learning controllers would not drop.

References

- [1] Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori and Csaba Szepesvári. Regret bounds for the adaptive control of linear quadratic systems. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 19 of *Proceedings of*

Machine Learning Research, pages 1–26, Budapest, Hungary, 09–11 Jun 2011. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings.

- [2] Alekh Agarwal, Sham M Kakade, Jason D Lee, and Gaurav Mahajan. Optimality and approximation with policy gradient methods in markov decision processes. In *Proceedings of Thirty Third Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 64–66. PMLR, 2020.
- [3] Naman Agarwal, Nataly Brukhim, Elad Hazan, and Zhou Lu. Boosting for control of dynamical systems. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 96–103. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020.
- [4] P. Auer, N. Cesa-Bianchi, Y. Freund, and R. E. Schapire. Gambling in a rigged casino: The adversarial multi-armed bandit problem. In *Proceedings of IEEE 36th Annual Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 322–331, 1995.
- [5] Peter Auer, Thomas Jaksch, and Ronald Ortner. Near-optimal regret bounds for reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 21, pages 89–96. Curran Associates, Inc., 2009.
- [6] Dimitri Bertsekas and Robert Gallager. *Data Networks (2nd Ed.)*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., USA, 1992.
- [7] Dimitri P Bertsekas. Dynamic programming and optimal control 3rd edition, volume ii. *Belmont, MA: Athena Scientific*, 2011.
- [8] Jalaj Bhandari and D. Russo. Global optimality guarantees for policy gradient methods. *ArXiv*, abs/1906.01786, 2019.
- [9] Paolo Bolzern, Patrizio Colaneri, and Giuseppe De Nicolao. Almost sure stability of stochastic linear systems with ergodic parameters. *European Journal of Control*, 14(2):114–123, 2008.
- [10] Vivek S. Borkar. *Stochastic Approximation*. Cambridge Books. Cambridge University Press, December 2008.
- [11] Asaf Cassel, Alon Cohen, and Tomer Koren. Logarithmic regret for learning linear quadratic regulators efficiently. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1328–1337. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020.
- [12] Xinyi Chen and Elad Hazan. Black-box control for linear dynamical systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.06650*, 2020.
- [13] Amit Daniely, Nati Linial, and Shai Shalev-Shwartz. More data speeds up training time in learning halfspaces over sparse vectors. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 26, pages 145–153. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.
- [14] Amit Daniely, Nati Linial, and Shai Shalev-Shwartz. From average case complexity to improper learning complexity. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC ’14, page 441–448, New York, NY, USA, 2014. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [15] Sarah Dean, Horia Mania, Nikolai Matni, Benjamin Recht, and Stephen Tu. On the Sample Complexity of the Linear Quadratic Regulator. *arXiv e-prints*, October 2017.
- [16] D. Denisov and N. Walton. Regret analysis of a markov policy gradient algorithm for multi-arm bandits. *ArXiv*, abs/2007.10229, 2020.

- [17] Rick Durrett. *Probability: Theory and examples*, 2011.
- [18] Abraham D. Flaxman, Adam Tauman Kalai, and H. Brendan McMahan. Online convex optimization in the bandit setting: Gradient descent without a gradient. *SODA '05*, page 385–394, USA, 2005. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [19] Aditya Gopalan and Shie Mannor. Thompson Sampling for Learning Parameterized Markov Decision Processes. In *Proceedings of The 28th Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 40 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 861–898, Paris, France, 03–06 Jul 2015. PMLR.
- [20] Morteza Ibrahimi, Adel Javanmard, and Benjamin Roy. Efficient reinforcement learning for high dimensional linear quadratic systems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 25, pages 2636–2644. Curran Associates, Inc., 2012.
- [21] Hassan K. Khalil. *Nonlinear Control*. Pearson, 2015.
- [22] Tomáš Kocák, Gergely Neu, Michal Valko, and Remi Munos. Efficient learning by implicit exploration in bandit problems with side observations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27, pages 613–621. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014.
- [23] T.L Lai and Herbert Robbins. Asymptotically efficient adaptive allocation rules. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 6(1):4 – 22, 1985.
- [24] Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [25] Gen Li, Yuting Wei, Yuejie Chi, Yuantao Gu, and Yuxin Chen. Softmax policy gradient methods can take exponential time to converge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.11270*, 2021.
- [26] N. Littlestone and M. K. Warmuth. The weighted majority algorithm. *Inform. Comput.*, 108(2):212–261, 1994.
- [27] S Łojasiewicz. *Les équations aux dérivées partielles (paris, 1962)*, 1963.
- [28] Ryan Lowe, Yi Wu, Aviv Tamar, Jean Harb, Pieter Abbeel, and Igor Mordatch. Multi-agent actor-critic for mixed cooperative-competitive environments, 2020.
- [29] Horia Mania, Stephen Tu, and Benjamin Recht. Certainty equivalence is efficient for linear quadratic control. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 10154–10164. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [30] Jincheng Mei, Chenjun Xiao, Csaba Szepesvari, and Dale Schuurmans. On the global convergence rates of softmax policy gradient methods. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6820–6829. PMLR, 2020.
- [31] A. Mohan, A. Chattopadhyay, and A. Kumar. Hybrid mac protocols for low-delay scheduling. In *2016 IEEE 13th International Conference on Mobile Ad Hoc and Sensor Systems (MASS)*, pages 47–55, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, oct 2016. IEEE Computer Society.
- [32] Avinash Mohan, Aditya Gopalan, and Anurag Kumar. Throughput optimal decentralized scheduling with single-bit state feedback for a class of queueing systems. *ArXiv*, abs/2002.08141, 2020.
- [33] Gergely Neu. Explore no more: Improved high-probability regret bounds for non-stochastic bandits. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28, pages 3168–3176. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015.

- [34] Ian Osband, Daniel Russo, and Benjamin Van Roy. (more) efficient reinforcement learning via posterior sampling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 26, pages 3003–3011. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.
- [35] Y. Ouyang, Mukul Gagrani, A. Nayyar, and R. Jain. Learning unknown markov decision processes: A thompson sampling approach. In *NIPS*, 2017.
- [36] Mircea-Bogdan Radac and Radu-Emil Precup. Data-driven model-free slip control of anti-lock braking systems using reinforcement q-learning. *Neurocomput.*, 275(C):317–329, January 2018.
- [37] G. A. Rummery and M. Niranjan. On-line q-learning using connectionist systems. Technical report, 1994.
- [38] John Schulman, Sergey Levine, Pieter Abbeel, Michael Jordan, and Philipp Moritz. Trust region policy optimization. In Francis Bach and David Blei, editors, *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 37 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1889–1897, Lille, France, 07–09 Jul 2015. PMLR.
- [39] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms, 2017.
- [40] Lior Shani, Yonathan Efroni, and Shie Mannor. Adaptive trust region policy optimization: Global convergence and faster rates for regularized mdps. *ArXiv*, abs/1909.02769, 2020.
- [41] David Silver, Aja Huang, Christopher J. Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George van den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot, Sander Dieleman, Dominik Grewe, John Nham, Nal Kalchbrenner, Ilya Sutskever, Timothy Lillicrap, Madeleine Leach, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Thore Graepel, and Demis Hassabis. Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 529:484–503, 2016.
- [42] Satinder Singh, Andy Okun, and Andrew Jackson. Artificial intelligence: Learning to play Go from scratch. 550(7676):336–337, October 2017.
- [43] Richard S. Sutton and Andrew G. Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. The MIT Press, second edition, 2018.
- [44] Richard S Sutton, David McAllester, Satinder Singh, and Yishay Mansour. Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 12, pages 1057–1063. MIT Press, 2000.
- [45] L. Tassiulas and A. Ephremides. Stability properties of constrained queueing systems and scheduling policies for maximum throughput in multihop radio networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 37(12):1936–1948, 1992.

A Glossary of Symbols

1. \mathcal{S} : State space
2. \mathcal{A} : Action space
3. S : Cardinality of \mathcal{S}
4. A : Cardinality of \mathcal{A}
5. M : Number of controllers
6. K_i Controller i , $i = 1, \dots, M$. For finite SA space MDP, K_i is a matrix of size $S \times A$, where each row is a probability distribution over the actions.
7. \mathcal{C} : Given collection of M controllers.
8. $\mathcal{I}_{soft}(\mathcal{C})$: Improper policy class setup by the learner.
9. $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^M$: Parameter assigned to the controllers to controllers, representing weights, updated each round by the learner.
10. $\pi(\cdot)$: Probability of choosing controllers
11. $\pi(\cdot \mid s)$ Probability of choosing action given state s . Note that in our setting, given $\pi(\cdot)$ over controllers (see previous item) and the set of controllers, $\pi(\cdot \mid s)$ is completely defined, i.e., $\pi(a \mid s) = \sum_{m=1}^M \pi(m) K_m(s, a)$. Hence we use simply π to denote the policy followed, whenever the context is clear.
12. $r(s, a)$: Immediate (one-step) reward obtained if action a is played in state s .
13. $P(s' \mid s, a)$ Probability of transitioning to state s' from state s having taken action a .
14. $V^\pi(\rho) := \mathbb{E}_{s_0 \sim \rho} [V^\pi(s_0)] = \mathbb{E}_\rho \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t)$ Value function starting with initial distribution ρ over states, and following policy π .
15. $Q^\pi(s, a) := \mathbb{E} \left[r(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s' \mid s, a) V^\pi(s') \right]$.
16. $\tilde{Q}^\pi(s, m) := \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} K_m(s, a) r(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s' \mid s, a) V^\pi(s') \right]$.
17. $A^\pi(s, a) := Q^\pi(s, a) - V^\pi(s)$
18. $\tilde{A}(s, m) := \tilde{Q}^\pi(s, m) - V^\pi(s)$.
19. $d_\nu^\pi := \mathbb{E}_{s_0 \sim \nu} \left[(1 - \gamma) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[s_t = s \mid s_0, \pi, P] \right]$. Denotes a distribution over the states, is called the “discounted state visitation measure”
20. $c := \inf_{t \geq 1} \min_{m \in \{m' \in [M] : \pi^*(m') > 0\}} \pi_{\theta_t}(m)$.
21. $\left\| \frac{d_\mu^{\pi^*}}{\mu} \right\|_\infty = \max_s \frac{d_\mu^{\pi^*}(s)}{\mu(s)}$.
22. $\left\| \frac{1}{\mu} \right\|_\infty = \max_s \frac{1}{\mu(s)}$.




Figure 9: An example of an MDP with controllers as defined in (16) having a non-concave value function. The MDP has $S = 5$ states and $A = 2$ actions. States s_3, s_4 and s_5 are terminal states. The only transition with nonzero reward is $s_2 \rightarrow s_4$.

B Details of simulations settings for the inverted pendulum system

In this section we supply the adjustments we made for specifically for the cartpole experiments. We first mention that we scale down the estimated gradient of the value function returned by the GradEst subroutine (Algorithm 4) (in the inverted pendulum simulation only). The scaling that worked for us is $\frac{10}{\|\nabla V^\pi(\mu)\|}$.

Next, we provide the values of the constants that were described in Sec. 2.1 in Table 3.

Parameter	Value
Gravity g	9.8
Mass of pole m_p	0.1
Length of pole l	1
Mass of cart m_k	1
Total mass m_t	1.1

Table 3: Values of the hyperparameters used for the Inverted Pendulum simulation

C Non-concavity of the Value function

We show here that the value function, over improper mixtures, is in general non-concave, and hence standard convex optimization techniques for maximization may get stuck in local optima. We note once again that this is *different* from the non-concavity of V^π when the parameterization is over the entire state-action space, i.e., $\mathbb{R}^{S \times A}$.

We show here that for both SoftMax and direct parameterization, the value function is non-concave where, by “direct” parameterization we mean that the controllers K_m are parameterized by weights $\theta_m \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\theta_i \geq 0$, $\forall i \in [M]$ and $\sum_{i=1}^M \theta_i = 1$. A similar argument holds for softmax parameterization, which we outline in Note 5.

Lemma C.1. *(Non-concavity of Value function) There is an MDP and a set of controllers, for which the maximization problem of the value function (i.e. (9)) is non-concave for SoftMax parameterization, i.e., $\theta \mapsto V^{\pi_\theta}$ is non-concave.*

Proof. Consider the MDP shown in Figure 9 with 5 states, s_1, \dots, s_5 . States s_3, s_4 and s_5 are terminal

states. In the figure we also show the allowed transitions and the rewards obtained by those transitions. Let the action set \mathcal{A} consists of only three actions $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\} \equiv \{\mathbf{right}, \mathbf{up}, \mathbf{null}\}$, where 'null' is a dummy action included to accommodate the three terminal states. Let us consider the case when $M = 2$. The two controllers $K_i \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times A}$, $i = 1, 2$ (where each row is probability distribution over \mathcal{A}) are shown below.

$$K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1/4 & 3/4 & 0 \\ 3/4 & 1/4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 3/4 & 1/4 & 0 \\ 1/4 & 3/4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

Let $\theta^{(1)} = (1, 0)^T$ and $\theta^{(2)} = (0, 1)^T$. Let us fix the initial state to be s_1 . Since a nonzero reward is only earned during a $s_2 \rightarrow s_4$ transition, we note for any policy $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ that $V^\pi(s_1) = \pi(a_1|s_1)\pi(a_2|s_2)r$. We also have,

$$(K_1 + K_2)/2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We will show that $\frac{1}{2}V^{\pi_{\theta^{(1)}}} + \frac{1}{2}V^{\pi_{\theta^{(2)}}} > V^{\pi_{(\theta^{(1)} + \theta^{(2)})/2}}$. We observe the following.

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi_{\theta^{(1)}}}(s_1) &= V^{K_1}(s_1) = (1/4).(1/4).r = r/16. \\ V^{\pi_{\theta^{(2)}}}(s_1) &= V^{K_2}(s_1) = (3/4).(3/4).r = 9r/16. \end{aligned}$$

where $V^K(s)$ denotes the value obtained by starting from state s and following a controller matrix K for all time.

Also, on the other hand we have,

$$V^{\pi_{(\theta^{(1)} + \theta^{(2)})/2}} = V^{(K_1 + K_2)/2}(s_1) = (1/2).(1/2).r = r/4.$$

Hence we see that,

$$\frac{1}{2}V^{\pi_{\theta^{(1)}}} + \frac{1}{2}V^{\pi_{\theta^{(2)}}} = r/32 + 9r/32 = 10r/32 = 1.25r/4 > r/4 = V^{\pi_{(\theta^{(1)} + \theta^{(2)})/2}}.$$

This shows that $\theta \mapsto V^{\pi_\theta}$ is non-concave, which concludes the proof for direct parameterization.

Note 5. For softmax parametrization, we choose the same 2 controllers K_1, K_2 as above. Fix some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and set $\theta^{(1)} = (\log(1 - \varepsilon), \log \varepsilon)^T$ and $\theta^{(2)} = (\log \varepsilon, \log(1 - \varepsilon))^T$. A similar calculation using softmax projection, and using the fact that $\pi_\theta(a|s) = \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_\theta(m)K_m(s, a)$, shows that under $\theta^{(1)}$ we follow matrix $(1 - \varepsilon)K_1 + \varepsilon K_2$, which yields a Value of $(1/4 + \varepsilon/2)^2 r$. Under $\theta^{(2)}$ we follow matrix $\varepsilon K_1 + (1 - \varepsilon)K_2$, which yields a Value of $(3/4 - \varepsilon/2)^2 r$. On the other hand, $(\theta^{(1)} + \theta^{(2)})/2$ amounts to playing the matrix $(K_1 + K_2)/2$, yielding the a value of $r/4$, as above. One can verify easily that $(1/4 + \varepsilon/2)^2 r + (3/4 - \varepsilon/2)^2 r > 2.r/4$. This shows the non-concavity of $\theta \mapsto V^{\pi_\theta}$ under softmax parameterization.

□

D Proof details for Bandit-over-bandits

In this section we consider the instructive sub-case when $S = 1$, which is also called the Multiarmed Bandit. We provide regret bounds for two cases (1) when the value gradient $\frac{dV^{\pi_{\theta_t}(\mu)}}{d\theta^t}$ (in the gradient update) is available in each round, and (2) when it needs to be estimated.

Note that each controller in this case, is a probability distribution over the A arms of the bandit. We consider the scenario where the agent at each time $t \geq 1$, has to choose a probability distribution K_{m_t} from a set of M probability distributions over actions \mathcal{A} . She then plays an action $a_t \sim K_{m_t}$. This is different from the standard MABs because the learner cannot choose the actions directly, instead chooses from a *given* set of controllers, to play actions. Note the V function has no argument as $S = 1$. Let $\mu \in [0, 1]^A$ be the mean vector of the arms \mathcal{A} . The value function for any given mixture $\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M])$,

$$\begin{aligned} V^\pi &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t \mid \pi \right] = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E} [r_t \mid \pi] \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=1}^M \pi(m) K_m(a) \mu_a. \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m \mu^T K_m = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m \mathbf{r}_m^\mu. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the interpretation of \mathbf{r}_m^μ is that it is the mean reward one obtains if the controller m is chosen at any round t . Since V^π is linear in π , the maximum is attained at one of the base controllers π^* puts mass 1 on m^* where $m^* := \operatorname{argmax}_{m \in [M]} V^{K_m}$, and V^{K_m} is the value obtained using K_m for all time. In the sequel, we assume $\Delta_i := \mathbf{r}_{m^*}^\mu - \mathbf{r}_i^\mu > 0$.

D.1 Proofs for MABs with perfect gradient knowledge

With access to the exact value gradient at each step, we have the following result, when Softmax PG (Algorithm 1) is applied for the bandits-over-bandits case.

Theorem D.1. *With $\eta = \frac{2(1-\gamma)}{5}$ and with $\theta_m^{(1)} = 1/M$ for all $m \in [M]$, with the availability for true gradient, we have $\forall t \geq 1$,*

$$V^{\pi^*} - V^{\pi_{\theta_t}} \leq \frac{5}{1-\gamma} \frac{M^2}{t}.$$

Also, defining regret for a time horizon of T rounds as

$$\mathcal{R}(T) := \sum_{t=1}^T V^{\pi^*} - V^{\pi_{\theta_t}}, \tag{18}$$

we show as a corollary to Thm. D.1 that,

Corollary D.1.1.

$$\mathcal{R}(T) \leq \min \left\{ \frac{5M^2}{1-\gamma} \log T, \sqrt{\frac{5}{1-\gamma}} M \sqrt{T} \right\}.$$

Proof. Recall from eq (17), that the value function for any given policy $\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M])$, that is a distribution over the given M controllers (which are itself distributions over actions \mathcal{A}) can be simplified as:

$$V^\pi = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m \mu^\top K_m = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m \mathbf{r}_m^\mu$$

where μ here is the (unknown) vector of mean rewards of the arms \mathcal{A} . Here, $\mathbf{r}_m^\mu := \mu^\top K_m$, $i = 1, \dots, M$, represents the mean reward obtained by choosing to play controller $K_m, m \in M$. For ease of notation, we will drop the superscript μ in the proofs of this section. We first show a simplification of the gradient of the value function w.r.t. the parameter θ . Fix a $m \in [M]$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{m'}} V^{\pi_\theta} = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_m} \pi_\theta(m) \mathbf{r}_m = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_\theta(m') \{\mathbb{I}_{mm'} - \pi_\theta(m)\} \mathbf{r}_m. \quad (19)$$

Next we show that V^π is β -smooth. A function $f : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is β -smooth, if $\forall \theta', \theta \in \mathbb{R}^M$

$$\left| f(\theta') - f(\theta) - \left\langle \frac{d}{d\theta} f(\theta), \theta' - \theta \right\rangle \right| \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \|\theta' - \theta\|_2^2.$$

Let $S := \frac{d^2}{d\theta^2} V^{\pi_\theta}$. This is a matrix of size $M \times M$. Let $1 \leq i, j \leq M$.

$$S_{i,j} = \left(\frac{d}{d\theta} \left(\frac{d}{d\theta} V^{\pi_\theta} \right) \right)_{i,j} \quad (20)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \frac{d(\pi_\theta(i)(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}))}{d\theta_j} \quad (21)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{d\pi_\theta(i)}{d\theta_j} (\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) + \pi_\theta(i) \frac{d(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r})}{d\theta_j} \right) \quad (22)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} (\pi_\theta(j)(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) - \pi_\theta(i)\pi_\theta(j)(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) - \pi_\theta(i)\pi_\theta(j)(\mathbf{r}(j) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r})). \quad (23)$$

Next, let $y \in \mathbb{R}^M$,

$$\begin{aligned} |y^\top S y| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M S_{ij} y(i) y(j) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left| \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M (\pi_\theta(j)(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) - \pi_\theta(i)\pi_\theta(j)(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) - \pi_\theta(i)\pi_\theta(j)(\mathbf{r}(j) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r})) y(i) y(j) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left| \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_\theta(i)(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) y(i)^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M \pi_\theta(i)\pi_\theta(j)(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) y(i) y(j) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left| \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_\theta(i)(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) y(i)^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_\theta(i)(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) y(i) \sum_{j=1}^M \pi_\theta(j) y(j) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left| \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_\theta(i)(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) y(i)^2 \right| + \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \left| \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_\theta(i)(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) y(i) \sum_{j=1}^M \pi_\theta(j) y(j) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \|\pi_\theta \odot (\mathbf{r} - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r})\|_\infty \|y \odot y\|_1 + \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \|\pi_\theta \odot (\mathbf{r} - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r})\|_1 \cdot \|y\|_\infty \cdot \|\pi_\theta\|_1 \|y\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality is by the assumption that reward are bounded in $[0,1]$. We observe that,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\pi_\theta \odot (\mathbf{r} - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r})\|_1 &= \sum_{m=1}^M |\pi_\theta(m)(\mathbf{r}(m) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r})| \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_\theta(m) |\mathbf{r}(m) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}| \\ &= \max_{i=1, \dots, M} |\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}| \leq 1.\end{aligned}$$

Next, for any $i \in [M]$,

$$\begin{aligned}|\pi_\theta(i)(\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r})| &= \left| \pi_\theta(i)\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta(i)^2 r(i) - \sum_{j \neq i} \pi_\theta(i)\pi_\theta(j)\mathbf{r}(j) \right| \\ &= \pi_\theta(i)(1 - \pi_\theta(i)) + \pi_\theta(i)(1 - \pi_\theta(i)) \leq 2.1/4 = 1/2.\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities with the fact that $\|\pi_\theta\|_1 = 1$ and $\|y\|_\infty \leq \|y\|_2$, we get,

$$|y^\top S y| \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \|\pi_\theta \odot (\mathbf{r} - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r})\|_\infty \|y \odot y\|_1 + \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \|\pi_\theta \odot (\mathbf{r} - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r})\|_1 \cdot \|y\|_\infty \cdot \|\pi_\theta\|_1 \|y\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} (1/2+2) \|y\|_2^2.$$

Hence V^{π_θ} is β -smooth with $\beta = \frac{5}{2(1-\gamma)}$.

We establish a lower bound on the norm of the gradient of the value function at every step t as below (these type of inequalities are called Lojaseiwicz inequalities [27])

Lemma D.2. [Lower bound on norm of gradient]

$$\left\| \frac{\partial V^{\pi_\theta}}{\partial \theta} \right\|_2 \geq \pi_{\theta^*} \left(V^{\pi^*} - V^{\pi_\theta} \right).$$

Proof of Lemma D.2.

Proof. Recall from the simplification of gradient of V^π , i.e., eq (19):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_m} V^{\pi_\theta} &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{m'=1}^M \pi_\theta(m) \{ \mathbb{I}_{mm'} - \pi_\theta(m') \} \mathbf{r}'_m \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \pi(m) (\mathbf{r}(m) - \pi^\top \mathbf{r}).\end{aligned}$$

Taking norm both sides,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} V^{\pi_\theta} \right\| &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\sum_{m=1}^M (\pi(m))^2 (\mathbf{r}(m) - \pi^\top \mathbf{r})^2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{(\pi(m^*))^2 (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi^\top \mathbf{r})^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} (\pi(m^*)) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi^\top \mathbf{r}) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} (\pi(m^*)) (\pi^* - \pi)^\top \mathbf{r} \\ &= (\pi(m^*)) [V^{\pi^*} - V^{\pi_\theta}].\end{aligned}$$

where $\pi^* = e_{m^*}$. □

We will now prove Theorem D.1 and corollary D.1.1.

Proof. First, note that since V^π is smooth we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
V^{\pi_{\theta_t}} - V^{\pi_{\theta_{t+1}}} &\leq - \left\langle \frac{d}{d\theta_t} V^{\pi_{\theta_t}}, \theta_{t+1} - \theta_t \right\rangle + \frac{5}{2(1-\gamma)} \|\theta_{t+1} - \theta_t\|_2^2 \\
&= -\eta \left\| \frac{d}{d\theta_t} V^{\pi_{\theta_t}} \right\|_2^2 + \frac{5}{4(1-\gamma)} \eta^2 \left\| \frac{d}{d\theta_t} V^{\pi_{\theta_t}} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \left\| \frac{d}{d\theta_t} V^{\pi_{\theta_t}} \right\|_2^2 \left(\frac{5\eta^2}{4(1-\gamma)} - \eta \right) \\
&= - \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{5} \right) \left\| \frac{d}{d\theta_t} V^{\pi_{\theta_t}} \right\|_2^2 \\
&\leq - \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{5} \right) (\pi_{\theta_t}(m^*))^2 \left[V^{\pi^*} - V^{\pi_{\theta_t}} \right]^2 \quad \text{Lemma D.2} \\
&\leq - \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{5} \right) \underbrace{\left(\inf_{1 \leq s \leq t} \pi_{\theta_s}(m^*) \right)^2}_{=: c_t} \left[V^{\pi^*} - V^{\pi_{\theta_t}} \right]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality is by smoothness, second inequality is by the update equation in algorithm 1.

Next, let $\delta_t := V^{\pi^*} - V^{\pi_{\theta_t}}$. We have,

$$\delta_{t+1} - \delta_t \leq - \frac{(1-\gamma)}{5} c_t^2 \delta_t^2. \quad (24)$$

Claim: $\forall t \geq 1, \delta_t \leq \frac{5}{c_t^2(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{t}$.

We prove the claim by using induction on $t \geq 1$.

Base case. Since $\delta_t \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$, the claim is true for all $t \leq 5$.

Induction step: Let $\varphi_t := \frac{5}{c_t^2(1-\gamma)}$. Fix a $t \geq 2$, assume $\delta_t \leq \frac{\varphi_t}{t}$.

Let $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function defined as $g(x) = x - \frac{1}{\varphi_t} x^2$. One can verify easily that g is monotonically increasing in $[0, \frac{\varphi_t}{2}]$. Next with equation 25, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{t+1} &\leq \delta_t - \frac{1}{\varphi_t} \delta_t^2 \\
&= g(\delta_t) \\
&\leq g\left(\frac{\varphi_t}{t}\right) \\
&\leq \frac{\varphi_t}{t} - \frac{\varphi_t}{t^2} \\
&= \varphi_t \left(\frac{1}{t} - \frac{1}{t^2} \right) \\
&\leq \varphi_t \left(\frac{1}{t+1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the claim. We will show that $c_t \geq 1/M$ in the next lemma. We first complete the proof of the corollary assuming this.

We fix a $T \geq 1$. Observe that, $\delta_t \leq \frac{5}{(1-\gamma)c_t^2} \frac{1}{t} \leq \frac{5}{(1-\gamma)c_T^2} \frac{1}{t}$.

$$\sum_{t=1}^T V^{\pi^*} - V^{\pi_{\theta_t}} = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{t=1}^T (\pi^* - \pi_{\theta_t})^\top \mathbf{r} \leq \frac{5 \log T}{(1-\gamma)c_T^2} + 1.$$

Also we have that,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T V^{\pi^*} - V^{\pi_{\theta_t}} = \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_t \leq \sqrt{T} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \delta_t^2} \leq \sqrt{T} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{5}{(1-\gamma)c_T^2} (\delta_t - \delta_{t+1})} \leq \frac{1}{c_T} \sqrt{\frac{5T}{(1-\gamma)}}.$$

We next show that with $\theta_m^{(1)} = 1/M, \forall m$, i.e., uniform initialization, $\inf_{t \geq 1} c_t = 1/M$, which will then complete the proof of Theorem D.1 and of corollary D.1.1.

Lemma D.3. *We have $\inf_{t \geq 1} \pi_{\theta_t}(m^*) > 0$. Furthermore, with uniform initialization of the parameters $\theta_m^{(1)}$, i.e., $1/M, \forall m \in [M]$, we have $\inf_{t \geq 1} \pi_{\theta_t}(m^*) = \frac{1}{M}$.*

Proof. We will show that there exists t_0 such that $\inf_{t \geq 1} \pi_{\theta_t}(m^*) = \min_{1 \leq t \leq t_0} \pi_{\theta_t}(m^*)$, where $t_0 = \min \{t : \pi_{\theta_t}(m^*) \geq C\}$. We define the following sets.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_1 &= \left\{ \theta : \frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta_{m^*}} \geq \frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta_m}, \forall m \neq m^* \right\} \\ \mathcal{S}_2 &= \{ \theta : \pi_\theta(m^*) \geq \pi_\theta(m), \forall m \neq m^* \} \\ \mathcal{S}_3 &= \{ \theta : \pi_\theta(m^*) \geq C \} \end{aligned}$$

Note that \mathcal{S}_3 depends on the choice of C . Let $C := \frac{M-\Delta}{M+\Delta}$. We claim the following:

Claim 2. (i) $\theta_t \in \mathcal{S}_1 \implies \theta_{t+1} \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and (ii) $\theta_t \in \mathcal{S}_1 \implies \pi_{\theta_{t+1}}(m^*) \geq \pi_{\theta_t}(m^*)$.

Proof of Claim 2. (i) Fix a $m \neq m^*$. We will show that if $\frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta_t(m^*)} \geq \frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta_t(m)}$, then $\frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta_{t+1}(m^*)} \geq \frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta_{t+1}(m)}$. This will prove the first part.

Case (a): $\pi_{\theta_t}(m^*) \geq \pi_{\theta_t}(m)$. This implies, by the softmax property, that $\theta_t(m^*) \geq \theta_t(m)$. After gradient ascent update step we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{t+1}(m^*) &= \theta_t(m^*) + \eta \frac{dV^{\pi_{\theta_t}}}{d\theta_t(m^*)} \\ &\geq \theta_t(m) + \eta \frac{dV^{\pi_{\theta_t}}}{d\theta_t(m)} \\ &= \theta_{t+1}(m). \end{aligned}$$

This again implies that $\theta_{t+1}(m^*) \geq \theta_{t+1}(m)$. By the definition of derivative of V^{π_θ} w.r.t θ_t (see eq (19)),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta_{t+1}(m^*)} &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \pi_{\theta_{t+1}(m^*)} (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_{\theta_{t+1}}^\top \mathbf{r}) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \pi_{\theta_{t+1}(m)} (\mathbf{r}(m) - \pi_{\theta_{t+1}}^\top \mathbf{r}) \\ &= \frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta_{t+1}(m)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\theta_{t+1} \in \mathcal{S}_1$.

Case (b): $\pi_{\theta_t}(m^*) < \pi_{\theta_t}(m)$. We first note the following equivalence:

$$\frac{dV^{\pi_{\theta}}}{d\theta(m^*)} \geq \frac{dV^{\pi_{\theta}}}{d\theta(m)} \longleftrightarrow (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \mathbf{r}(m)) \left(1 - \frac{\pi_{\theta}(m^*)}{\pi_{\theta}(m)}\right) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_{\theta}^T \mathbf{r}).$$

which can be simplified as:

$$(\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \mathbf{r}(m)) \left(1 - \frac{\pi_{\theta}(m^*)}{\pi_{\theta}(m)}\right) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_{\theta}^T \mathbf{r}) = (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \mathbf{r}(m)) (1 - \exp(\theta_t(m^*) - \theta_t(m))) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_{\theta}^T \mathbf{r}).$$

The above condition can be rearranged as:

$$\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \mathbf{r}(m) \geq (1 - \exp(\theta_t(m^*) - \theta_t(m))) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_{\theta}^T \mathbf{r}).$$

By lemma E.7, we have that $V^{\pi_{\theta_{t+1}}} \geq V^{\pi_{\theta_t}} \implies \pi_{\theta_{t+1}}^T \mathbf{r} \geq \pi_{\theta_t}^T \mathbf{r}$. Hence,

$$0 < \mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_{\theta_{t+1}}^T \mathbf{r} \leq \pi_{\theta_t}^T \mathbf{r}.$$

Also, we note:

$$\theta_{t+1}(m^*) - \theta_{t+1}(m) = \theta_t(m^*) + \eta \frac{dV^{\pi_t}}{d\theta_t(m^*)} - \theta_{t+1}(m) - \eta \frac{dV^{\pi_t}}{d\theta_t(m)} \geq \theta_t(m^*) - \theta_t(m).$$

This implies, $1 - \exp(\theta_{t+1}(m^*) - \theta_{t+1}(m)) \leq 1 - \exp(\theta_t(m^*) - \theta_t(m))$.

Next, we observe that by the assumption $\pi_t(m^*) < \pi_t(m)$, we have

$$1 - \exp(\theta_t(m^*) - \theta_t(m)) = 1 - \frac{\pi_t(m^*)}{\pi_t(m)} > 0.$$

Hence we have,

$$(1 - \exp(\theta_{t+1}(m^*) - \theta_{t+1}(m))) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_{\theta_{t+1}}^T \mathbf{r}) \leq (1 - \exp(\theta_t(m^*) - \theta_t(m))) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_{\theta_t}^T \mathbf{r}) \leq \mathbf{r}(m^*) - \mathbf{r}(m).$$

Equivalently,

$$\left(1 - \frac{\pi_{t+1}(m^*)}{\pi_{t+1}(m)}\right) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_{t+1}^T \mathbf{r}) \leq \mathbf{r}(m^*) - \mathbf{r}(m).$$

Finishing the proof of the claim 2(i).

(ii) Let $\theta_t \in \mathcal{S}_1$. We observe that:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{t+1}(m^*) &= \frac{\exp(\theta_{t+1}(m^*))}{\sum_{m=1}^M \exp(\theta_{t+1}(m))} \\ &= \frac{\exp(\theta_t(m^*) + \eta \frac{dV^{\pi_t}}{d\theta_t(m^*)})}{\sum_{m=1}^M \exp(\theta_t(m) + \eta \frac{dV^{\pi_t}}{d\theta_t(m)})} \\ &\geq \frac{\exp(\theta_t(m^*) + \eta \frac{dV^{\pi_t}}{d\theta_t(m^*)})}{\sum_{m=1}^M \exp(\theta_t(m) + \eta \frac{dV^{\pi_t}}{d\theta_t(m^*)})} \\ &= \frac{\exp(\theta_t(m^*))}{\sum_{m=1}^M \exp(\theta_t(m))} = \pi_t(m^*) \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Claim 2(ii). □

Claim 3. $\mathcal{S}_2 \subset \mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_3 \subset \mathcal{S}_1$.

Proof. To show that $\mathcal{S}_2 \subset \mathcal{S}_1$, let $\theta \in c\mathcal{S}_2$. We have $\pi_\theta(m^*) \geq \pi_\theta(m), \forall m \neq m^*$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta(m^*)} &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \pi_\theta(m^*) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) \\ &> \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \pi_\theta(m) (\mathbf{r}(m) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) \\ &= \frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta(m)}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\theta \in \mathcal{S}_1$. For showing the second part of the claim, we assume $\theta \in \mathcal{S}_3 \cap \mathcal{S}_2^c$, because if $\theta \in \mathcal{S}_2$, we are done. Let $m \neq m^*$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta(m^*)} - \frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta(m)} &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} (\pi_\theta(m^*) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) - \pi_\theta(m) (\mathbf{r}(m) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r})) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left(2\pi_\theta(m^*) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) + \sum_{i \neq m^*, m}^M \pi_\theta(i) (\mathbf{r}(i) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left(\left(2\pi_\theta(m^*) + \sum_{i \neq m^*, m}^M \pi_\theta(i) \right) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) - \sum_{i \neq m^*, m}^M \pi_\theta(i) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \mathbf{r}(i)) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left(\left(2\pi_\theta(m^*) + \sum_{i \neq m^*, m}^M \pi_\theta(i) \right) (\mathbf{r}(m^*) - \pi_\theta^\top \mathbf{r}) - \sum_{i \neq m^*, m}^M \pi_\theta(i) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left(\left(2\pi_\theta(m^*) + \sum_{i \neq m^*, m}^M \pi_\theta(i) \right) \frac{\Delta}{M} - \sum_{i \neq m^*, m}^M \pi_\theta(i) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, $\sum_{i \neq m^*, m}^M \pi_\theta(i) = 1 - \pi(m^*) - \pi(m)$. Using this and rearranging we get,

$$\frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta(m^*)} - \frac{dV^{\pi_\theta}}{d\theta(m)} \geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left(\pi(m^*) \left(1 + \frac{\Delta}{M} \right) - \left(1 - \frac{\Delta}{M} \right) + \pi(m) \left(1 - \frac{\Delta}{M} \right) \right) \geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \pi(m) \left(1 - \frac{\Delta}{M} \right) \geq 0.$$

The last inequality follows because $\theta \in \mathcal{S}_3$ and the choice of C . This completes the proof of Claim 3. \square

Claim 4. There exists a finite t_0 , such that $\theta_{t_0} \in \mathcal{S}_3$.

Proof. The proof of this claim relies on the asymptotic convergence result of [2]. We note that their convergence result hold for our choice of $\eta = \frac{2(1-\gamma)}{5}$. As noted in [30], the choice of η is used to justify the gradient ascent lemma E.7. Hence we have $\pi_{\theta_t} \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, there exists a finite t_0 such that $\pi_{\theta_{t_0}}(m^*) \geq C$ and hence $\theta_{t_0} \in \mathcal{S}_3$. \square

This completes the proof that there exists a t_0 such that $\inf_{t \geq 1} \pi_{\theta_t}(m^*) = \inf_{1 \leq t \leq t_0} \pi_{\theta_t}(m^*)$, since once the $\theta_t \in \mathcal{S}_3$, by Claim 3, $\theta_t \in \mathcal{S}_1$. Further, by Claim 2, $\forall t \geq t_0$, $\theta_t \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and $\pi_{\theta_t}(m^*)$ is non-decreasing after t_0 . \square

With uniform initialization $\theta_1(m^*) = \frac{1}{M} \geq \theta_1(m)$, for all $m \neq m^*$. Hence, $\pi_{\theta_1}(m^*) \geq \pi_{\theta_1}(m)$ for all $m \neq m^*$. This implies $\theta_1 \in \mathcal{S}_2$, which implies $\theta_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$. As established in Claim 2, \mathcal{S}_1 remains invariant under gradient ascent updates, implying $t_0 = 1$. Hence we have that $\inf_{t \geq 1} \pi_{\theta_t}(m^*) = \pi_{\theta_1}(m^*) = 1/M$, completing the proof of Theorem D.1 and corollary D.1.1. \square

\square

D.2 Proofs for MABs with noisy gradients

When value gradients are unavailable, we follow a direct policy gradient algorithm instead of softmax projection as mentioned in Sec. 5.2. The full pseudo-code is provided here in Algorithm 2. At each round $t \geq 1$, the learning rate for η is chosen asynchronously for each controller m , to be $\alpha \pi_t(m)^2$, to ensure that we remain inside the simplex, for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. To justify its name as a policy gradient algorithm, observe that in order to minimize regret, we need to solve the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M])} \sum_{m=1}^M \pi(m) (\mathbf{r}_\mu(m^*) - \mathbf{r}_\mu(m)).$$

A direct gradient with respect to the parameters $\pi(m)$ gives us a rule for the policy gradient algorithm. The other changes in the update step (eq 13), stem from the fact that true means of the arms are unavailable and importance sampling.

We have the following result.

Theorem D.4. *With value of α chosen to be less than $\frac{\Delta_{\min}}{\mathbf{r}_{m^*}^\mu - \Delta_{\min}}$, (π_t) is a Markov process, with $\pi_t(m^*) \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, a.s. Further the regret till any time T is bounded as*

$$\mathcal{R}(T) \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{m \neq m^*} \frac{\Delta_m}{\alpha \Delta_{\min}^2} \log T + C,$$

where $C := \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{t \geq 1} \mathbb{P} \{ \pi_t(m^*(t)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \} < \infty$.

Proof. The proof is an extension of that of Theorem 1 of [16] for the setting that we have. The proof is divided into three main parts. In the first part we show that the recurrence time of the process $\{\pi_t(m^*)\}_{t \geq 1}$ is almost surely finite. Next we bound the expected value of the time taken by the process $\pi_t(m^*)$ to reach 1. Finally we show that almost surely, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \pi_t(m^*) \rightarrow 1$, in other words the process $\{\pi_t(m^*)\}_{t \geq 1}$ is transient.

We use all these facts to show a regret bound.

Recall $m_*(t) := \operatorname{argmax}_{m \in [M]} \pi_t(m)$. We start by defining the following quantity which will be useful for the analysis of algorithm 2.

Let $\tau := \min \{t \geq 1 : \pi_t(m^*) > \frac{1}{2}\}$.

Next, let $\mathcal{S} := \{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M]) : \frac{1-\alpha}{2} \leq \pi(m^*) < \frac{1}{2}\}$.

In addition, we define for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{S}_a := \{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([M]) : \frac{1-\alpha}{a} \leq \pi(m^*) < \frac{1}{x}\}$. Observe that if $\pi_1(m^*) \geq 1/a$ and $\pi_2(m^*) < 1/a$ then $\pi_1 \in \mathcal{S}_a$. This fact follows just by the update step of the algorithm 2, and choosing $\eta = \alpha \pi_t(m)$ for every $m \neq m^*$.

Lemma D.5. For $\alpha > 0$ such that $\alpha < \frac{\Delta_{\min}}{\mathfrak{r}(m^*) - \Delta_{\min}}$, we have that

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E} [\tau \mid \pi_1 = \pi] < \infty.$$

Proof. The proof here is for completeness. We first make note of the following useful result: For a sequence of positive real numbers $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that the following condition is met:

$$a(n+1) \leq a(n) - b.a(n)^2,$$

for some $b > 0$, the following is always true:

$$a_n \leq \frac{a_1}{1 + bt}.$$

This inequality follows by rearranging and observing the a_n is a non-increasing sequence. A complete proof can be found in eg. ([16], Appendix A.1). Returning to the proof of lemma, we proceed by showing that the sequence $1/\pi_t(m^*) - ct$ is a supermartingale for some $c > 0$. Let $\Delta_{\min} := \Delta$ for ease of notation. Note that if the condition on α holds then there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $(1 + \varepsilon)(1 + \alpha) < \mathfrak{r}^*/(\mathfrak{r}^* - \Delta)$, where $\mathfrak{r}^* := \mathfrak{r}(m^*)$. We choose c to be

$$c := \alpha \cdot \frac{\mathfrak{r}^*}{1 + \alpha} - \alpha(\mathfrak{r}^* - \Delta)(1 + \varepsilon) > 0.$$

Next, let x to be greater than M and satisfying:

$$\frac{x}{x - \alpha M} \leq 1 + \varepsilon.$$

Let $\xi_x := \min\{t \geq 1 : \pi_t(m^*) > 1/x\}$. Since for $t = 1, \dots, \xi_x - 1$, $m_*(t) \neq m^*$, we have $\pi_{t+1}(m^*) = (1 + \alpha)\pi_t(m^*)$ w.p. $\pi_t(m^*)\mathfrak{r}^*$ and $\pi_{t+1}(m^*) = \pi_t(m^*) + \alpha\pi_t(m^*)^2/\pi_t(m_*)^2$ w.p. $\pi_t(m_*)\mathfrak{r}_*(t)$, where $\mathfrak{r}_*(t) := \mathfrak{r}(m_*(t))$.

Let $y(t) := 1/\pi_t(m^*)$, then we observe by a short calculation that,

$$y(t+1) = \begin{cases} y(t) - \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}y(t), & w.p. \frac{\mathfrak{r}^*}{y(t)} \\ y(t) + \alpha \frac{y(t)}{\pi_t(m_*(t))y(t) - \alpha}, & w.p. \pi_t(m_*)\mathfrak{r}_*(t) \\ y(t) & otherwise. \end{cases}$$

We see that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [y(t+1) \mid H(t)] - y(t) \\ &= \frac{\mathfrak{r}^*}{y(t)} \cdot (y(t) - \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}y(t)) + \pi_t(m_*)\mathfrak{r}_*(t) \cdot (y(t) + \alpha \frac{y(t)}{\pi_t(m_*(t))y(t) - \alpha}) - y(t) \left(\frac{\mathfrak{r}^*}{y(t)} + \pi_t(m_*)\mathfrak{r}_*(t) \right) \\ &\leq \alpha(\mathfrak{r}^* - \Delta)(1 + \varepsilon) - \frac{\alpha\mathfrak{r}^*}{1 + \alpha} = -c. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality holds because $\mathfrak{r}_*(t) \leq \mathfrak{r}^*\Delta$ and that $\pi_t(m_*) > 1/M$. By the Optional Stopping Theorem [17],

$$-c\mathbb{E} [\xi_x \wedge t] \geq \mathbb{E} [y(\xi_x \wedge t) - \mathbb{E} [y(1)]] \geq -\frac{x}{1 - \alpha}.$$

The final inequality holds because $\pi_1(m^*) \geq \frac{1-\alpha}{x}$.

Next, applying the monotone convergence theorem gives $\mathbb{E} [\xi_x] \leq \frac{x}{c(1-\alpha)}$. Finally to show the result of lemma D.5, we refer the reader to (Appendix A.2, [16]), which follow from standard Markov chain arguments. \square

Next we define an embedded Markov Chain $\{p(s), s \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ as follows. First let $\sigma(k) := \min \{t \geq \tau(k) : \pi_t(m^*) < \frac{1}{2}\}$ and $\tau(k) := \min \{t \geq \sigma(k-1) : \pi_t(m^*) \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$. Note that within the region $[\tau(k), \sigma(k))$, $\pi_t(m^*) \geq 1/2$ and in $[\sigma(k), \tau(k+1))$, $\pi_t(m^*) < 1/2$. We next analyze the rate at which $\pi_t(m^*)$ approaches 1. Define

$$p(s) := \pi_{t_s}(m^*) \text{ where } t_s = s + \sum_{i=0}^k (\tau(i+1) - \sigma(i))$$

$$\text{for } s \in \left[\sum_{i=0}^k (\sigma(i) - \tau(i)), \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} (\sigma(i) - \tau(i)) \right)$$

Also let,

$$\sigma_s := \min \{t > 0 : \pi_{t+t_s}(m^*) > 1/2\}$$

and,

$$\tau_s := \min \{t > \sigma_s : \pi_{t+t_s}(m^*) \leq 1/2\}$$

Lemma D.6. *The process $\{p(s)\}_{s \geq 1}$, is a submartingale. Further, $p(s) \rightarrow 1$, as $s \rightarrow \infty$. Finally,*

$$\mathbb{E}[p(s)] \geq 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \alpha \frac{\Delta^2}{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'}\right)} s}.$$

Proof. We first observe that,

$$p(s+1) = \begin{cases} \pi_{t_s+1}(m^*) & \text{if } \pi_{t_s+1}(m^*) \geq 1/2 \\ \pi_{t_s+\tau+s}(m^*) & \text{if } \pi_{t_s+1}(m^*) < 1/2 \end{cases}$$

Since $\pi_{t_s+\tau_s}(m^*) \geq 1/2$, we have that,

$$p(s+1) \geq \pi_{t_s+1}(m^*) \text{ and } p(s) = \pi_{t_s}(m^*).$$

Since at times t_s , $\pi_{t_s}(m^*) > 1/2$, we know that m^* is the leading arm. Thus by the update step, for all $m \neq m^*$,

$$\pi_{t_s+1}(m) = \pi_{t_s}(m) + \alpha \pi_{t_s}(m)^2 \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}_m R_m(t_s)}{\pi_{t_s}(m)} - \frac{\mathbb{I}_{m^*} R_{m^*}(t_s)}{\pi_{t_s}(m^*)} \right].$$

Taking expectations both sides,

$$\mathbb{E}[\pi_{t_s+1}(m) \mid H(t_s)] - \pi_{t_s}(m) = \alpha \pi_{t_s}(m)^2 (\mathbf{r}_m - \mathbf{r}_{m^*}) = -\alpha \Delta_m \pi_{t_s}(m)^2.$$

Summing over all $m \neq m^*$:

$$-\mathbb{E}[\pi_{t_s+1}(m^*) \mid H(t_s)] + \pi_{t_s}(m^*) = -\alpha \sum_{m \neq m^*} \Delta_m \pi_{t_s}(m)^2.$$

By Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m \neq m^*} \Delta_m \pi_{t_s}(m)^2 &= \left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right) \sum_{m \neq m^*} \frac{\Delta_m}{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right)} \pi_{t_s}(m)^2 \\
&\geq \left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right) \left(\sum_{m \neq m^*} \frac{\Delta_m \pi_{t_s}(m)}{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right)} \right)^2 \\
&\geq \left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right) \frac{\Delta^2 \left(\sum_{m \neq m^*} \pi_{t_s}(m) \right)^2}{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right)^2} \\
&= \frac{\Delta^2 (1 - \pi_{t_s}(m^*))^2}{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we get,

$$p(s) - \mathbb{E}[p(s+1) \mid H(t_s)] \leq -\alpha \frac{\Delta^2 (1 - p(s))^2}{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right)} \implies \mathbb{E}[p(s+1) \mid H(t_s)] \geq p(s) + \alpha \frac{\Delta^2 (1 - p(s))^2}{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right)}.$$

This implies immediately that $\{p(s)\}_{s \geq 1}$ is a submartingale.

Since, $\{p(s)\}$ is non-negative and bounded by 1, by Martingale Convergence Theorem, $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} p(s)$ exists. We will now show that the limit is 1. Clearly, it is sufficient to show that $\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} p(s) = 1$. For $a > 2$, let

$$\varphi_a := \min \left\{ s \geq 1 : p(s) \geq \frac{a-1}{a} \right\}.$$

As is shown in [16], it is sufficient to show $\varphi_a < \infty$, with probability 1, because then one can define a sequence of stopping times for increasing a , each finite w.p. 1. which implies that $p(s) \rightarrow 1$. By the previous display, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[p(s+1) \mid H(t_s)] - p(s) \geq \alpha \frac{\Delta^2}{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right) a^2}$$

as long as $p(s) \leq \frac{a-1}{a}$. Hence by applying Optional Stopping Theorem and rearranging we get,

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi_a] \leq \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\varphi_a \wedge s] \leq \frac{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right) a^2}{\alpha \Delta} (1 - \mathbb{E}[p(1)]) < \infty.$$

Since φ_a is a non-negative random variable with finite expectation, $\varphi_a < \infty a.s.$ Let $q(s) = 1 - p(s)$. We have :

$$\mathbb{E}[q(s+1)] - \mathbb{E}[q(s)] \leq -\alpha \frac{\Delta^2 (q(s))^2}{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'}\right)}.$$

By the useful result D.2, we get,

$$\mathbb{E}[q(s)] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[q(1)]}{1 + \alpha \frac{\Delta^2 \mathbb{E}[q(1)]}{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'}\right)} s} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \alpha \frac{\Delta^2}{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'}\right)} s}.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Finally we provide a lemma to tie the results above. We refer (Appendix A.5 [16]) for the proof of this lemma.

Lemma D.7.

$$\sum_{t \geq 1} \mathbb{P}[\pi_t(m^*) < 1/2] < \infty.$$

Also, with probability 1, $\pi_t(m^*) \rightarrow 1$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof of regret bound: Since $\mathbf{r}^* - \mathbf{r}(m) \leq 1$, we have by the definition of regret (see eq 18)

$$\mathcal{R}(T) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{m=1}^M \pi^*(m) \mathbf{r}_m - \pi_t(m) \mathbf{r}_m \right) \right].$$

Here we recall that $\pi^* = e_{m^*}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(T) &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{m=1}^M (\pi^*(m) \mathbf{r}_m - \pi_t(m) \mathbf{r}_m) \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^M \left(\sum_{t=1}^T (\pi^*(m) \mathbf{r}_m - \pi_t(m) \mathbf{r}_m) \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbf{r}^* - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_t(m) \mathbf{r}_m \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{r}^* - \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_t(m) \mathbf{r}_m \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{r}^* (1 - \pi_t(m^*)) - \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{m \neq m^*} \pi_t(m) \mathbf{r}_m \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{m \neq m^*} \mathbf{r}^* \pi_t(m) - \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{m \neq m^*} \pi_t(m) \mathbf{r}_m \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{m \neq m^*} (\mathbf{r}^* - \mathbf{r}_m) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \pi_t(m) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}(T) &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{m \neq m^*} (\mathfrak{r}^* - \mathfrak{r}_m) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \pi_t(m) \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{m \neq m^*} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \pi_t(m) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T (1 - \pi_t(m^*)) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

We analyze the following term:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T (1 - \pi_t(m^*)) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T (1 - \pi_t(m^*)) \mathbb{I}\{\pi_t(m^*) \geq 1/2\} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T (1 - \pi_t(m^*)) \mathbb{I}\{\pi_t(m^*) < 1/2\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T (1 - \pi_t(m^*)) \mathbb{I}\{\pi_t(m^*) \geq 1/2\} \right] + C_1.
\end{aligned}$$

where, $C_1 := \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[\pi_t(m^*) < 1/2] < \infty$ by Lemma D.7. Next we observe that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T (1 - \pi_t(m^*)) \mathbb{I}\{\pi_t(m^*) \geq 1/2\} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=1}^T q(s) \mathbb{I}\{\pi_t(m^*) \geq 1/2\} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=1}^T q(s) \right] \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{1 + \alpha \frac{\Delta^2}{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right) s}} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right)}{\alpha \Delta^2 s} \\
&\leq \frac{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right)}{\alpha \Delta^2} \log T.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting things together, we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}(T) &\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right)}{\alpha \Delta^2} \log T + C_1 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{\left(\sum_{m' \neq m^*} \Delta_{m'} \right)}{\alpha \Delta^2} \log T \right) + C.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem D.4.

□

E Proofs for MDPs

First we recall the policy gradient theorem.

Theorem E.1 (Policy Gradient Theorem [44]).

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} V^{\pi_\theta}(\mu) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\partial \pi_\theta(a|s)}{\partial \theta} Q^{\pi_\theta}(s, a).$$

Let $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $m \in [M]$. Let $\tilde{Q}^{\pi_\theta}(s, m) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} K_m(s, a) Q^{\pi_\theta}(s, a)$. Also let $\tilde{A}(s, m) := \tilde{Q}(s, m) - V(s)$.

Lemma E.2 (Gradient Simplification). *The softmax policy gradient with respect to the parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^M$ is $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_m} V^{\pi_\theta}(\mu) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \pi_\theta(m) \tilde{A}(s, m)$, where $\tilde{A}(s, m) := \tilde{Q}(s, m) - V(s)$ and $\tilde{Q}(s, m) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} K_m(s, a) Q^{\pi_\theta}(s, a)$, and $d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(\cdot)$ is the discounted state visitation measure starting with an initial distribution μ and following policy π_θ .*

The interpretation of $\tilde{A}(s, m)$ is the advantage of following controller m at state s and then following the policy π_θ for all time versus following π_θ always. As mentioned in section 5, we proceed by proving smoothness of the V^π function over the space \mathbb{R}^M .

Proof. From the policy gradient theorem E.1, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{m'}} V^{\pi_\theta}(\mu) &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\partial \pi_{\theta_{m'}}(a|s)}{\partial \theta} Q^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{m'}} \left(\sum_{m=1}^M \pi_\theta(m) K_m(s, a) \right) Q^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{m'}} \pi_\theta(m) \right) K_m(s, a) Q(s, a) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{m'} \left(K_{m'}(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m K_m(s, a) \right) Q(s, a) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \pi_{m'} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(K_{m'}(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m K_m(s, a) \right) Q(s, a) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \pi_{m'} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} K_{m'}(s, a) Q(s, a) - \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m K_m(s, a) Q(s, a) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \pi_{m'} [\tilde{Q}(s, m') - V(s)] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \pi_{m'} \tilde{A}^{\pi_\theta}(s, m'). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma E.3. $V^{\pi_\theta}(\mu)$ is $\frac{7\gamma^2+4\gamma+5}{2(1-\gamma)^2}$ -smooth.

Proof. The proof uses ideas from [2] and [30]. Let $\theta_\alpha = \theta + \alpha u$, where $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. For any $s \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_a \left| \frac{\partial \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a|s)}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=0} &= \sum_a \left| \left\langle \frac{\partial \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a|s)}{\partial \theta_\alpha} \right|_{\alpha=0}, \frac{\partial \theta_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} \right\rangle \right| = \sum_a \left| \left\langle \frac{\partial \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a|s)}{\partial \theta_\alpha} \right|_{\alpha=0}, u \right\rangle \right| \\
&= \sum_a \left| \sum_{m''=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_{\theta_{m''}} (\mathbb{I}_{mm''} - \pi_{\theta_m}) K_m(s, a) u(m'') \right| \\
&= \sum_a \left| \sum_{m''=1}^M \pi_{\theta_{m''}} \left(K_{m''}(s, a) u(m'') - \sum_{m=1}^M K_m(s, a) u(m'') \right) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_a \sum_{m''=1}^M \pi_{\theta_{m''}} K_{m''}(s, a) |u(m'')| + \sum_a \sum_{m''=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_{\theta_{m''}} \pi_{\theta_m} K_m(s, a) |u(m'')| \\
&= \sum_{m''=1}^M \pi_{\theta_{m''}} |u(m'')| \underbrace{\sum_a K_{m''}(s, a)}_{=1} + \sum_{m''=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_{\theta_{m''}} \pi_{\theta_m} |u(m'')| \underbrace{\sum_a K_m(s, a)}_{=1} \\
&= \sum_{m''=1}^M \pi_{\theta_{m''}} |u(m'')| + \sum_{m''=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_{\theta_{m''}} \pi_{\theta_m} |u(m'')| \\
&= 2 \sum_{m''=1}^M \pi_{\theta_{m''}} |u(m'')| \leq 2 \|u\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we bound the second derivative.

$$\sum_a \left| \frac{\partial^2 \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a|s)}{\partial \alpha^2} \right|_{\alpha=0} = \sum_a \left| \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_\alpha} \frac{\partial \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a|s)}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=0}, u \right\rangle \right| = \sum_a \left| \left\langle \frac{\partial^2 \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a|s)}{\partial \alpha^2} \right|_{\alpha=0} u, u \right\rangle \right|.$$

Let $H^{a,\theta} := \frac{\partial^2 \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a|s)}{\partial \theta^2} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{i,j}^{a,\theta} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \left(\sum_{m=1}^M \pi_{\theta_i} (\mathbb{I}_{mi} - \pi_{\theta_m}) K_m(s, a) \right) \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \left(\pi_{\theta_i} K_i(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_{\theta_i} \pi_{\theta_m} K_m(s, a) \right) \\
&= \pi_{\theta_j} (\mathbb{I}_{ij} - \pi_{\theta_i}) K_i(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M K_m(s, a) \frac{\partial \pi_{\theta_i} \pi_{\theta_m}}{\partial \theta_j} \\
&= \pi_j (\mathbb{I}_{ij} - \pi_i) K_i(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M K_m(s, a) (\pi_j (\mathbb{I}_{ij} - \pi_i) \pi_m + \pi_i \pi_j (\mathbb{I}_{mj} - \pi_m)) \\
&= \pi_j \left((\mathbb{I}_{ij} - \pi_i) K_i(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m (\mathbb{I}_{ij} - \pi_i) K_m(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_i (\mathbb{I}_{mj} - \pi_m) K_m(s, a) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into the second derivative, we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \left\langle \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \pi_\theta(a|s)u, u \right\rangle \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^M H_{i,j}^{a,\theta} u_i u_j \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_j \left((\mathbb{I}_{ij} - \pi_i) K_i(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m (\mathbb{I}_{ij} - \pi_i) K_m(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_i (\mathbb{I}_{mj} - \pi_m) K_m(s, a) \right) u_i u_j \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_i K_i(s, a) u_i^2 - \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M \pi_i \pi_j K_i(s, a) u_i u_j - \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_i \pi_m K_m(s, a) u_i^2 \right. \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_i \pi_j \pi_m K_m(s, a) u_i u_j - \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M \pi_i \pi_j K_j(s, a) u_i u_j \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_i \pi_j \pi_m K_m(s, a) u_i u_j \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_i K_i(s, a) u_i^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M \pi_i \pi_j K_i(s, a) u_i u_j \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_i \pi_m K_m(s, a) u_i^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_i \pi_j \pi_m K_m(s, a) u_i u_j \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_i u_i^2 \left(K_i(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m K_m(s, a) \right) - 2 \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_i u_i \sum_{j=1}^M \pi_j u_j \left(K_i(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m K_m(s, a) \right) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_i u_i^2 \underbrace{\left| K_i(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m K_m(s, a) \right|}_{\leq 1} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_i |u_i| \sum_{j=1}^M \pi_j |u_j| \underbrace{\left| K_i(s, a) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m K_m(s, a) \right|}_{\leq 1} \\
&\leq \|u\|_2^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_i |u_i| \sum_{j=1}^M \pi_j |u_j| \leq 3 \|u\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is similar to [30] and we include this for completeness. Define $P(\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times S}$, where $\forall (s, s')$,

$$[P(\alpha)]_{(s,s')} = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a | s) \cdot \mathbb{P}(s' | s, a).$$

The derivative w.r.t. α is,

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} P(\alpha) \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right]_{(s,s')} = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a | s) \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}(s' | s, a).$$

For any vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^S$,

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} P(\alpha) \Big|_{\alpha=0} x \right]_{(s)} = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a | s) \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}(s' | s, a) \cdot x(s').$$

The l_∞ norm can be upper-bounded as,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} P(\alpha) \Big|_{\alpha=0} x \right\|_\infty &= \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a | s) \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}(s' | s, a) \cdot x(s') \right| \\ &\leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a | s) \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right| \cdot \mathbb{P}(s' | s, a) \cdot \|x\|_\infty \\ &\leq 2 \|u\|_2 \|x\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now we find the second derivative,

$$\left[\frac{\partial^2 P(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha^2} \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right]_{(s, s')} = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left[\frac{\partial^2 \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a | s)}{\partial \alpha^2} \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right] \mathbb{P}(s' | s, a)$$

taking the l_∞ norm,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left[\frac{\partial^2 P(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha^2} \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right] x \right\|_\infty &= \max_s \left| \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left[\frac{\partial^2 \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a | s)}{\partial \alpha^2} \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right] \mathbb{P}(s' | s, a) x(s') \right| \\ &\leq \max_s \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \left[\left| \frac{\partial^2 \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a | s)}{\partial \alpha^2} \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right| \right] \mathbb{P}(s' | s, a) \|x\|_\infty \leq 3 \|u\|_2 \|x\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Next we observe that the value function of π_{θ_α} :

$$V^{\pi_{\theta_\alpha}}(s) = \underbrace{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a | s) r(s, a)}_{r_{\theta_\alpha}} + \gamma \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(a | s) \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{P}(s' | s, a) V^{\pi_{\theta_\alpha}}(s').$$

In matrix form,

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi_{\theta_\alpha}} &= r_{\theta_\alpha} + \gamma P(\alpha) V^{\pi_{\theta_\alpha}} \\ \implies (Id - \gamma P(\alpha)) V^{\pi_{\theta_\alpha}} &= r_{\theta_\alpha} \\ V^{\pi_{\theta_\alpha}} &= (Id - \gamma P(\alpha))^{-1} r_{\theta_\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $M(\alpha) := (Id - \gamma P(\alpha))^{-1} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t [P(\alpha)]^t$. Also, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1} &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} (Id - \gamma P(\alpha)) \mathbf{1} \implies M(\alpha) \mathbf{1} = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbf{1}. \\ \implies \forall i \ \| [M(\alpha)]_{i,:} \|_1 &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

where $[M(\alpha)]_{i,:}$ is the i^{th} row of $M(\alpha)$. Hence for any vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^S$, $\|M(\alpha)x\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \|x\|_\infty$.

By assumption 1, we have $\|r_{\theta_\alpha}\|_\infty = \max_s |r_{\theta_\alpha}(s)| \leq 1$. Next we find the derivative of r_{θ_α} w.r.t α .

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial r_{\theta_\alpha}(s)}{\partial \alpha} \right| &= \left| \left(\frac{\partial r_{\theta_\alpha}(s)}{\partial \theta_\alpha} \right)^\top \frac{\partial \theta_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{m''=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(m'') (\mathbb{I}_{mm''} - \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(m)) K_m(s, a) r(s, a) u(m'') \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left| \sum_{m''=1}^M \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(m'') K_{m''}(s, a) r(s, a) u(m'') - \sum_{m''=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(m'') \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(m) K_m(s, a) r(s, a) u(m'') \right| \\
&\leq \left| \sum_{m''=1}^M \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(m'') K_{m''}(s, a) r(s, a) - \sum_{m''=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(m'') \pi_{\theta_\alpha}(m) K_m(s, a) r(s, a) \right| \|u\|_\infty \leq \|u\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can calculate the upper-bound on second derivative,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{\partial r_{\theta_\alpha}}{\partial \alpha^2} \right\|_\infty &= \max_s \left| \frac{\partial r_{\theta_\alpha}(s)}{\partial \alpha^2} \right| \\
&= \max_s \left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \left\{ \frac{\partial r_{\theta_\alpha}(s)}{\partial \alpha} \right\} \right)^\top \frac{\partial \theta_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} \right| \\
&= \max_s \left| \left(\frac{\partial^2 r_{\theta_\alpha}(s)}{\partial \alpha^2} \frac{\partial \theta_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} \right)^\top \frac{\partial \theta_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} \right| \leq 5/2 \|u\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, the derivative of the value function w.r.t α is given by,

$$\frac{\partial V^{\pi_{\theta_\alpha}}(s)}{\partial \alpha} = \gamma e_s^\top M(\alpha) \frac{\partial P(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} M(\alpha) r_{\theta_\alpha} + e_s^\top M(\alpha) \frac{\partial r_{\theta_\alpha}}{\partial \alpha}.$$

And the second derivative,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 V^{\pi_{\theta_\alpha}}(s)}{\partial \alpha^2} &= \underbrace{2\gamma^2 e_s^\top M(\alpha) \frac{\partial P(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} M(\alpha) \frac{\partial P(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} M(\alpha) r_{\theta_\alpha}}_{T1} + \underbrace{\gamma e_s^\top M(\alpha) \frac{\partial^2 P(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha^2} M(\alpha) r_{\theta_\alpha}}_{T2} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{2\gamma e_s^\top M(\alpha) \frac{\partial P(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} M(\alpha) \frac{\partial r_{\theta_\alpha}}{\partial \alpha}}_{T3} + \underbrace{e_s^\top M(\alpha) \frac{\partial^2 r_{\theta_\alpha}}{\partial \alpha^2}}_{T4}.
\end{aligned}$$

We use the above derived bounds to bound each of the term in the above display. The calculations here are same as shown for Lemma 7 in [30], except for the particular values of the bounds. Hence we directly, mention the final bounds that we obtain and refer to [30] for the detailed but elementary calculations.

$$\begin{aligned}
|T1| &\leq \frac{4}{(1-\gamma)^3} \|u\|_2^2 \\
|T2| &\leq \frac{3}{(1-\gamma)^2} \|u\|_2^2 \\
|T3| &\leq \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)^2} \|u\|_2^2 \\
|T4| &\leq \frac{5/2}{(1-\gamma)} \|u\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above bounds we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{\partial^2 V^{\pi_{\theta_\alpha}}(s)}{\partial \alpha^2} \right|_{\alpha=0} &\leq \left(\frac{8\gamma^2}{(1-\gamma)^3} + \frac{3\gamma}{(1-\gamma)^2} + \frac{4\gamma}{(1-\gamma)^2} + \frac{5/2}{(1-\gamma)} \right) \|u\|_2^2 \\
&= \frac{7\gamma^2 + 4\gamma + 5}{2(1-\gamma)^3} \|u\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, let $y \in \mathbb{R}^M$ and fix a $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^M$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| y^\top \frac{\partial^2 V^{\pi_\theta}(s)}{\partial \theta^2} y \right| &= \left| \frac{y}{\|y\|_2}^\top \frac{\partial^2 V^{\pi_\theta}(s)}{\partial \theta^2} \frac{y}{\|y\|_2} \right| \cdot \|y\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \max_{\|u\|_2=1} \left| \left\langle \frac{\partial^2 V^{\pi_\theta}(s)}{\partial \theta^2} u, u \right\rangle \right| \cdot \|y\|_2^2 \\
&= \max_{\|u\|_2=1} \left| \left\langle \frac{\partial^2 V^{\pi_{\theta_\alpha}}(s)}{\partial \theta_\alpha^2} \Big|_{\alpha=0} \frac{\partial \theta_\alpha}{\partial \alpha}, \frac{\partial \theta_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} \right\rangle \right| \cdot \|y\|_2^2 \\
&= \max_{\|u\|_2=1} \left| \frac{\partial^2 V^{\pi_{\theta_\alpha}}(s)}{\partial \alpha^2} \Big|_{\alpha=0} \right| \cdot \|y\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \frac{7\gamma^2 + 4\gamma + 5}{2(1-\gamma)^3} \|y\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\theta_\xi := \theta + \xi(\theta' - \theta)$ where $\xi \in [0, 1]$. By Taylor's theorem $\forall s, \theta, \theta'$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| V^{\pi_{\theta'}}(s) - V^{\pi_\theta}(s) - \left\langle \frac{\partial V^{\pi_\theta}(s)}{\partial \theta} (\theta' - \theta), \theta' - \theta \right\rangle \right| &= \frac{1}{2} \left| (\theta' - \theta)^\top \frac{\partial^2 V^{\pi_{\theta_\xi}}(s)}{\partial \theta_\xi^2} (\theta' - \theta) \right| \\
&\leq \frac{7\gamma^2 + 4\gamma + 5}{4(1-\gamma)^3} \|\theta' - \theta\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $V^{\pi_\theta}(s)$ is $\frac{7\gamma^2+4\gamma+5}{2(1-\gamma)^3}$ smooth for every s , $V^{\pi_\theta}(\mu)$ is also $\frac{7\gamma^2+4\gamma+5}{2(1-\gamma)^3}$ smooth. \square

Lemma E.4 (Value Difference Lemma-1). *For any two policies π and π' , and for any state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the following is true.*

$$V^{\pi'}(s) - V^\pi(s) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} d_s^{\pi'}(s') \sum_{m=1}^M \pi'_m \tilde{A}(s', m).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
V^{\pi'}(s) - V^\pi(s) &= \sum_{m=1}^M \pi'_m \tilde{Q}'(s, m) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m \tilde{Q}(s, m) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^M \pi'_m (\tilde{Q}'(s, m) - \tilde{Q}(s, m)) + \sum_{m=1}^M (\pi'_m - \pi_m) \tilde{Q}(s, m) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^M (\pi'_m - \pi_m) \tilde{Q}(s, m) + \underbrace{\sum_{m=1}^M \pi'_m \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} K_m(s, a) \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{P}(s'|s, a) [V^{\pi'}(s') - V^\pi(s')]}_{= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_\theta(a|s)} \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} d_s^{\pi'}(s') \sum_{m'=1}^M (\pi'_{m'} - \pi_{m'}) \tilde{Q}(s', m') \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} d_s^{\pi'}(s') \sum_{m'=1}^M \pi'_{m'} (\tilde{Q}(s', m') - V(s')) \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} d_s^{\pi'}(s') \sum_{m'=1}^M \pi'_{m'} \tilde{A}(s', m').
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma E.5. (*Value Difference Lemma-2*) For any two policies π and π' and state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the following is true.

$$V^{\pi'}(s) - V^{\pi}(s) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} d_s^{\pi}(s') \sum_{m=1}^M (\pi'_m - \pi_m) \tilde{Q}^{\pi'}(s', m).$$

Proof. We will use \tilde{Q} for \tilde{Q}^{π} and \tilde{Q}' for $\tilde{Q}^{\pi'}$ as a shorthand.

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi'}(s) - V^{\pi}(s) &= \sum_{m=1}^M \pi'_m \tilde{Q}'(s, m) - \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m \tilde{Q}(s, m) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^M (\pi'_m - \pi_m) \tilde{Q}'(s, m) + \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m (\tilde{Q}'(s, m) - \tilde{Q}(s, m)) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^M (\pi'_m - \pi_m) \tilde{Q}'(s, m) + \\ &\quad \gamma \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} K_m(s, a) \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{P}(s'|s, a) V'(s') - \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} K_m(s, a) \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{P}(s'|s, a) V(s') \right) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^M (\pi'_m - \pi_m) \tilde{Q}'(s, m) + \gamma \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta}(a|s) \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{P}(s'|s, a) [V'(s') - V(s')] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} d_s^{\pi}(s') \sum_{m=1}^M (\pi'_m - \pi_m) \tilde{Q}'(s', m). \end{aligned}$$

□

Assumption 1. The reward $r(s, a) \in [0, 1]$, for all pairs $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$.

Assumption 2. Let $\pi^* := \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_M} V^{\pi}(s_0)$. We make the following assumption.

$$\mathbb{E}_{m \sim \pi^*} [Q^{\pi_{\theta}}(s, m)] - V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s) \geq 0, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \forall \pi_{\theta} \in \Pi.$$

Let the best controller be a point in the M -simplex, i.e., $K^* := \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m^* K_m$.

Lemma E.6 (Non-uniform Łojaseiwicz inequality).

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} V^{\pi_{\theta}}(\mu) \right\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \left(\min_{m: \pi_{\theta_m}^* > 0} \pi_{\theta_m} \right) \times \left\| \frac{d_{\rho}^{\pi^*}}{d_{\mu}^{\pi_{\theta}}} \right\|_{\infty}^{-1} [V^*(\rho) - V^{\pi_{\theta}}(\rho)].$$

Proof.

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} V^{\pi_{\theta}}(\mu) \right\|_2 = \left(\sum_{m=1}^M \left(\frac{\partial V^{\pi_{\theta}}(\mu)}{\partial \theta_m} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{m=1}^M \left| \frac{\partial V^{\pi_\theta}(\mu)}{\partial \theta_m} \right| \quad (\text{Cauchy-Schwarz}) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \pi_m \tilde{A}(s, m) \right| \quad \text{Lemma E.2} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\pi_m^* \pi_m}{1-\gamma} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \tilde{A}(s, m) \right| \\
&\geq \left(\min_{m: \pi_{\theta_m}^* > 0} \pi_{\theta_m} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\pi_m^*}{1-\gamma} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \tilde{A}(s, m) \right| \\
&\geq \left(\min_{m: \pi_{\theta_m}^* > 0} \pi_{\theta_m} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \left| \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\pi_m^*}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \tilde{A}(s, m) \right| \\
&= \left(\min_{m: \pi_{\theta_m}^* > 0} \pi_{\theta_m} \right) \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\pi_m^*}{1-\gamma} \tilde{A}(s, m) \right| \\
&= \left(\min_{m: \pi_{\theta_m}^* > 0} \pi_{\theta_m} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\pi_m^*}{1-\gamma} \tilde{A}(s, m) \quad \text{Assumption 2} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left(\min_{m: \pi_{\theta_m}^* > 0} \pi_{\theta_m} \right) \left\| \frac{d_\rho^{\pi^*}}{d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}} \right\|_\infty^{-1} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\rho^*(s) \sum_{m=1}^M \pi_m^* \tilde{A}(s, m) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \left(\min_{m: \pi_{\theta_m}^* > 0} \pi_{\theta_m} \right) \left\| \frac{d_\rho^{\pi^*}}{d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}} \right\|_\infty^{-1} [V^*(\rho) - V^{\pi_\theta}(\rho)] \quad \text{Lemma E.4.}
\end{aligned}$$

□

E.1 Proof of the Theorem 5.1

Theorem 5.1 (Convergence of Policy Gradient). *With $\{\theta_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ generated as in Algorithm 1 and using a learning rate $\eta = \frac{(1-\gamma)^2}{7\gamma^2+4\gamma+5}$, for all $t \geq 1$,*

$$V^*(\rho) - V^{\pi_{\theta_t}}(\rho) \leq \frac{1}{t} M \left(\frac{7\gamma^2 + 4\gamma + 5}{c^2(1-\gamma)^3} \right) \left\| \frac{d_\mu^{\pi^*}}{\mu} \right\|_\infty^2 \left\| \frac{1}{\mu} \right\|_\infty. \quad (12)$$

Let $\beta := \frac{7\gamma^2+4\gamma+5}{(1-\gamma)^2}$. We have that,

$$\begin{aligned}
V^*(\rho) - V^{\pi_\theta}(\rho) &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_\rho^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_{m=1}^M (\pi_m^* - \pi_m) \tilde{Q}^{\pi^*}(s, m) \quad (\text{Lemma E.5}) \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{d_\rho^{\pi_\theta}(s)}{d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s)} d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_{m=1}^M (\pi_m^* - \pi_m) \tilde{Q}^{\pi^*}(s, m) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left\| \frac{1}{d_\mu^{\pi_\theta}} \right\|_\infty \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{m=1}^M (\pi_m^* - \pi_m) \tilde{Q}^{\pi^*}(s, m)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left\| \frac{1}{\mu} \right\|_{\infty} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{m=1}^M (\pi_m^* - \pi_m) \tilde{Q}^{\pi^*}(s, m) \\
&= \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)} \left\| \frac{1}{\mu} \right\|_{\infty} [V^*(\mu) - V^{\pi_{\theta}}(\mu)] \quad (\text{Lemma E.5}).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\delta_t := V^*(\mu) - V^{\pi_{\theta_t}}(\mu)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{t+1} - \delta_t &= V^{\pi_{\theta_t}}(\mu) - V^{\pi_{\theta_{t+1}}}(\mu) \quad (\text{Lemma 5.2}) \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{2\beta} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} V^{\pi_{\theta_t}}(\mu) \right\|_2^2 \quad (\text{Lemma E.7}) \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{2\beta} \frac{1}{M} \left(\min_{m: \pi_{\theta_m}^* > 0} \pi_{\theta_m} \right)^2 \left\| \frac{d_{\rho}^{\pi^*}}{d_{\mu}^{\pi_{\theta}}} \right\|_{\infty}^{-2} \delta_t^2 \quad (\text{Lemma 5.3}) \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{2\beta} (1-\gamma)^2 \frac{1}{M} \left(\min_{m: \pi_{\theta_m}^* > 0} \pi_{\theta_m} \right)^2 \left\| \frac{d_{\rho}^{\pi^*}}{d_{\mu}^{\pi_{\theta}}} \right\|_{\infty}^{-2} \delta_t^2 \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{2\beta} (1-\gamma)^2 \frac{1}{M} \left(\inf_{t \geq 1} \min_{m: \pi_{\theta_m}^* > 0} \pi_{\theta_m} \right)^2 \left\| \frac{d_{\rho}^{\pi^*}}{d_{\mu}^{\pi_{\theta}}} \right\|_{\infty}^{-2} \delta_t^2 \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\beta} \frac{1}{M} (1-\gamma)^2 \left\| \frac{d_{\mu}^{\pi^*}}{\mu} \right\|_{\infty}^{-2} c^2 \delta_t^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $c := \inf_{t \geq 0} \min_{m: \pi_m^* > 0} \pi_{\theta_t}(m)$.

Assumption 3. We assume that the constant $c > 0$.

Hence we have that,

$$\delta_{t+1} \leq \delta_t - \frac{1}{2\beta} \frac{(1-\gamma)^2}{M} \left\| \frac{d_{\mu}^{\pi^*}}{\mu} \right\|_{\infty}^{-2} c^2 \delta_t^2. \quad (25)$$

The rest of the proof follows from a induction argument over $t \geq 1$.

Base case: Since $\delta_t \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$, and $c \in (0, 1)$, the result holds for all $t \leq \frac{2\beta M}{(1-\gamma)} \left\| \frac{d_{\mu}^{\pi^*}}{\mu} \right\|_{\infty}^2$.

For ease of notation, let $\varphi := \frac{2\beta M}{c^2(1-\gamma)^2} \left\| \frac{d_{\mu}^{\pi^*}}{\mu} \right\|_{\infty}^2$. We need to show that $\delta_t \leq \frac{\varphi}{t}$, for all $t \geq 1$.

Induction step: Fix a $t \geq 2$, assume $\delta_t \leq \frac{\varphi}{t}$.

Let $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function defined as $g(x) = x - \frac{1}{\varphi} x^2$. One can verify easily that g is monotonically increasing in $[0, \frac{\varphi}{2}]$. Next with equation 25, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{t+1} &\leq \delta_t - \frac{1}{\varphi} \delta_t^2 \\
&= g(\delta_t)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq g\left(\frac{\varphi}{t}\right) \\
&\leq \frac{\varphi}{t} - \frac{\varphi}{t^2} \\
&= \varphi \left(\frac{1}{t} - \frac{1}{t^2} \right) \\
&\leq \varphi \left(\frac{1}{t+1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

Lemma E.7. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be β -smooth. Then gradient ascent with learning rate $\frac{1}{\beta}$ guarantees, for all $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^M$:*

$$f(x) - f(x') \leq -\frac{1}{2\beta} \left\| \frac{df(x)}{dx} \right\|_2^2.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x) - f(x') &\leq -\left\langle \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x}, x' - x \right\rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|x' - x\|_2^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{\beta} \left\| \frac{df(x)}{dx} \right\|_2^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \frac{1}{\beta^2} \left\| \frac{df(x)}{dx} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\beta} \left\| \frac{df(x)}{dx} \right\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

F Simulation Details

In this section we describe some details of Sec. 6. Recall that since neither value functions nor value gradients are available in closed-form, we modify SoftMax PG (Algorithm 1) to make it generally implementable using a combination of (1) rollouts to estimate the value function of the current (improper) policy and (2) a stochastic approximation-based approach to estimate its value gradient.

Some particulars of the Stationary Queues simulations. Here, we justify the value of the two policies which always follow one fixed queue, that is plotted as straight line in Figure 5c. Let us find the value of the policy which always serves queue 1. The calculation for the other expert (serving queue 2 only) is similar. Let $q_i(t)$ denote the length of queue i at time t . We note that since the expert (policy) always recommends to serve one of the queue, the expected *cost* suffered in any round t is $c_t = q_1(t) + q_2(t) = 0 + t \cdot \lambda_2$. Let us start with empty queues at $t = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
V^{Expert1}(\mathbf{0}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \gamma^t c_t \mid Expert1 \right] \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^T \gamma^t \cdot t \cdot \lambda_2 \\
&\leq \lambda_2 \cdot \frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

With the values, $\gamma = 0.9$ and $\lambda_2 = 0.49$, we get $V^{Expert1}(\underline{\mathbf{0}}) \leq 44$, which is in good agreement with the bound shown in the figure.

Choice of hyperparameters. In the simulations, we set learning rate to be 10^{-4} , `#runs` = 10, `#rollouts` = 10, `lt` = 30, discount factor $\gamma = 0.9$ and $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{\text{\code{\#runs}}}$. All the simulations have been run for 20 trials and the results shown are averaged over them. We capped the queue sizes at $B = 500$.