

# Analysis of approximate linear programming solution to Markov decision problem with log barrier function

Donghwan Lee, Hyukjun Yang, & Bum Geun Park  
Department of Electrical Engineering  
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology  
Daejeon, 34141, South Korea  
{donghwan, jundo132, j4t123}@kaist.ac.kr

September 25, 2025

## Abstract

There are two primary approaches to solving Markov decision problems (MDPs): dynamic programming based on the Bellman equation and linear programming (LP). Dynamic programming methods are the most widely used and form the foundation of both classical and modern reinforcement learning (RL). By contrast, LP-based methods have been less commonly employed, although they have recently gained attention in contexts such as offline RL. The relative underuse of the LP-based methods stems from the fact that it leads to an inequality-constrained optimization problem, which is generally more challenging to solve effectively compared with Bellman-equation-based methods. The purpose of this paper is to establish a theoretical foundation for solving LP-based MDPs in a more effective and practical manner. Our key idea is to leverage the log-barrier function, widely used in inequality-constrained optimization, to transform the LP formulation of the MDP into an unconstrained optimization problem. This reformulation enables approximate solutions to be obtained easily via gradient descent. While the method may appear simple, to the best of our knowledge, a thorough theoretical interpretation of this approach has not yet been developed. This paper aims to bridge this gap.

## 1 Introduction

There are two primary approaches to solving Markov decision problems (MDPs): dynamic programming methods (Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1996; Puterman, 2014) based on the Bellman equation and linear programming (LP) methods (Puterman, 2014; De Farias and Van Roy, 2003; Ghate and Smith, 2013; Ying and Zhu, 2020). Dynamic programming is by far the most widely used approach and constitutes the foundation of both classical and modern reinforcement learning (RL) (Sutton and Barto, 1998). In contrast, LP-based methods have been employed less frequently (Wang and Chen, 2016; Lee and He, 2019, 2018; Chen et al., 2018; Serrano and Neu, 2020; Neu and Okolo, 2023; Nachum and Dai, 2020; Bas-Serrano et al., 2021; Lu et al., 2021, 2022) in RL, though they have recently gained traction in contexts such as offline reinforcement learning (Ozdoglar et al., 2023; Zhan et al., 2022; Gabbianelli et al., 2024; Kamoutsi et al., 2021; Sikchi et al., 2024). The

relative underuse of LP formulations can be attributed to the fact that they result in inequality-constrained optimization problems, which are generally more difficult to solve effectively compared to Bellman-equation-based methods.

The purpose of this paper is to establish a theoretical foundation for addressing LP-based MDPs in a more effective and practical manner. The key idea is to employ the log-barrier function (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004), widely used in inequality-constrained optimization, to reformulate the LP representation of the MDP into an unconstrained optimization problem. This reformulation allows approximate solutions to be obtained efficiently using gradient descent (Nesterov, 2018; Bertsekas, 1999). While this approach may appear simple, to the best of our knowledge, a comprehensive theoretical interpretation has not yet been developed. This paper aims to bridge this gap.

More specifically, we investigate the single-objective function  $f_\eta$  induced by the log-barrier formulation with the barrier parameter  $\eta > 0$ , whose minimizer yields an approximate solution,  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$ , to the original MDP. This approximate solution,  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$ , corresponds to an approximate optimal Q-function. We first conduct an error analysis, deriving not only an upper bound but also a lower bound on the error norm,  $\|\tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^*\|_\infty$ , between the approximate solution,  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$ , and the true optimal Q-function  $Q^*$ . These bounds depend linearly on the log-barrier parameter  $\eta$ , which implies that both the upper and lower bounds decrease linearly as  $\eta$  becomes smaller. Beyond the error norm, we also establish error bounds for the MDP objective function  $J^\pi$  itself. In particular, our framework yields both a primal approximate solution  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$  and a dual approximate solution  $\tilde{\lambda}_\eta$ , from which the corresponding primal policy and dual policy are derived. For each case, we derive bounds on the deviation of their objective values from the optimal objective value, and these bounds likewise diminish linearly with  $\eta$ .

In addition, we establish several properties of the objective function  $f_\eta$ , including its convexity, properties of its domain, and properties of its sublevel set. As mentioned earlier, the approximate LP solution can be obtained via gradient descent, and we provide an analysis of the convergence behavior of this gradient descent method. Lastly, we explore the applicability and extension of the proposed theoretical foundation to deep RL. Specifically, we introduce a novel loss function, derived from the log-barrier formulation, which serves as an alternative to the conventional mean-squared-error Bellman loss in deep Q-network (DQN) (Mnih et al., 2015) and deep deterministic policy gradient (DDPG) (Lillicrap et al., 2015). This yields a new deep RL algorithm within the DQN and DDPG frameworks. The effectiveness of the proposed method is demonstrated through comparative evaluations with standard DQN and DDPG across multiple OpenAI Gym benchmark tasks. The experimental results demonstrate that the proposed method performs on par with conventional DQN across the evaluated environments, and achieves markedly superior performance in specific tasks. In addition, experimental results show that incorporating the proposed method into DDPG yields markedly improved learning performance compared to the conventional DDPG algorithm in a wide range of tasks.

## 2 Related works

Research on MDPs has traditionally been dominated by dynamic programming (DP) methods based on the Bellman equation (Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1996; Puterman, 2014; Sutton and Barto, 1998), which underpin classical RL algorithms and modern deep RL methods such as DQN (Mnih et al., 2015), but these approaches can become less flexible in large-scale or con-

strained settings. As an alternative, linear programming (LP) formulations of MDPs (Puterman, 2014) have been studied extensively: De Farias and Van Roy (2003) introduced approximate linear programming (ALP), which reduces the number of decision variables by using linear function approximations; Malek et al. (2014) further exploited the dual LP with stochastic convex optimization methods in the average-cost setting, showing performance guarantees relative to a restricted policy class; Lakshminarayanan et al. (2017) proposed the linearly relaxed ALP (LRALP), which alleviates computational load by projecting constraints into a lower-dimensional subspace while controlling approximation error. More recent developments have advanced convex formulations such as convex Q-learning (Lu et al., 2021, 2022), logistic Q-learning (Bas-Serrano et al., 2021), and primal-dual algorithms (Wang and Chen, 2016; Lee and He, 2018; Serrano and Neu, 2020; Neu and Okolo, 2023) with growing attention in offline RL where environment interaction is limited (Nachum and Dai, 2020; Zhan et al., 2022; Ozdaglar et al., 2023; Gabbianelli et al., 2024). In parallel, optimization and RL communities have explored barrier-based techniques: the log-barrier method is a classical tool in convex optimization (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004; Nesterov, 2018; Bertsekas, 1999), and has recently been adapted for safe RL, e.g., Zhang et al. (2024a,b) introduced a constrained soft actor-critic variant using a smoothed log-barrier for stable constraint handling in continuous control tasks. Despite these advances, existing LP-based approaches have not leveraged barrier functions to resolve inequality-constrained formulations, and existing barrier-based RL methods have not been applied to the LP representation of MDPs. Our work closes this gap by introducing a log-barrier reformulation of the LP approach to MDPs, yielding an unconstrained objective amenable to gradient-based optimization while retaining the structural advantages of LP formulations.

## 3 Preliminaries

### 3.1 Markov decision problem

We consider the infinite-horizon discounted Markov decision problem (Puterman, 2014) and Markov decision process, where the agent sequentially takes actions to maximize cumulative discounted rewards. In a Markov decision process with the state-space  $\mathcal{S} := \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{S}|\}$  and action-space  $\mathcal{A} := \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{A}|\}$ , where  $|\mathcal{S}|$  and  $|\mathcal{A}|$  denote cardinalities of each set, the decision maker selects an action  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  at the current state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , then the state transits to the next state  $s' \in \mathcal{S}$  with probability  $P(s'|s, a)$ , and the transition incurs a reward  $r(s, a, s') \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $P(s'|s, a)$  is the state transition probability from the current state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  to the next state  $s' \in \mathcal{S}$  under action  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , and  $r(s, a, s')$  is the reward function. For convenience, we consider a deterministic reward function and simply write  $r(s_k, a_k, s_{k+1}) =: r_{k+1}, k \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ .

A deterministic policy,  $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ , maps a state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  to an action  $\pi(s) \in \mathcal{A}$ . The objective of the Markov decision problem is to find an optimal policy,  $\pi^*$ , such that the cumulative discounted rewards over infinite time horizons is maximized, i.e.,  $\pi^* := \arg \max_{\pi \in \Theta} \mathbb{E} [\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k r_{k+1} | \pi]$ , where  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  is the discount factor,  $\Theta$  is the set of all deterministic policies,  $(s_0, a_0, s_1, a_1, \dots)$  is a state-action trajectory generated by the Markov chain under policy  $\pi$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot | \pi]$  is an expectation conditioned on the policy  $\pi$ . Moreover, Q-function under policy  $\pi$  is defined as  $Q^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E} [\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k r_{k+1} | s_0 = s, a_0 = a, \pi]$ ,  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , and the optimal Q-function is defined as  $Q^*(s, a) = Q^{\pi^*}(s, a)$  for all  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ . Once  $Q^*$  is known, then an optimal policy can be retrieved by the greedy policy  $\pi^*(s) = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a)$ . Throughout, we assume that the

Markov decision process is ergodic so that the stationary state distribution exists. In this paper, we define an upper bound of the reward function as

$$|r(s, a, s')| \leq r_{\max}, \quad (s, a, s') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S}.$$

### 3.2 LP formulation of MDP based on Q-function

In this paper, for the sake of clarity and brevity, the majority of technical proofs are presented in Appendix. It is well known that a Markov decision problem (MDP) can be formulated as a linear program (LP) (Luenberger et al., 1984; Puterman, 2014). While the LP formulation is typically expressed in terms of the value function (Puterman, 2014), one can also consider an LP formulation based on the Q-function. To this end, let us consider the following LP:

$$\min_{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}} \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a) Q(s, a) \tag{1}$$

subject to

$$R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) Q(s', a') \leq Q(s, a), \quad (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A},$$

where  $R(s, a)$  is the expected reward conditioned on  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\rho$  denotes any probability distribution over  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  with strictly positive support. For convenience, in this paper, we define the following Bellman operators

$$\begin{aligned} (TQ)(s, a) &:= R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q(s', a') \\ (FQ)(s, a, a') &:= R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) Q(s', a'). \end{aligned}$$

Note that we can always find a strictly feasible solution of the above LP. For instance, if we choose  $Q(s, a) = \frac{r_{\max} + \varepsilon}{1 - \gamma} > 0$ ,  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  with any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then  $R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) Q(s', a') - Q(s, a) = R(s, a) - r_{\max} - \varepsilon < 0$ . The LP formulation Equation (1) constructed on the basis of the Q-function (Lee and He, 2019, 2018) has not been extensively studied compared to the LP formulation based on the value function. Although the LP formulation involving the Q-function was considered in Lee and He (2019, 2018), it differs significantly from the LP discussed above. In particular, the LP in Lee and He (2019, 2018) involves not only the Q-function but also an additional value function, thereby employing a somewhat more indirect approach compared to the above formulation. Accordingly, we begin by briefly introducing several theoretical properties and interpretations of this formulation, prior to presenting our main results. As a preliminary but fundamental result, it is straightforward to show that the solution of the above LP is unique and corresponds to the optimal Q-function,  $Q^*$  (Section A). In addition, the dual (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004, Chapter 5) of the above LP can be derived in the following form (Section B).

**Lemma 1.** *The dual problem of the LP Equation (1) is given by*

$$\max_{\lambda \geq 0} \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a, a') R(s, a) \tag{2}$$

subject to

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a, i) - \gamma \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i, j) \lambda(i, j, a) = \rho(s, a), \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}. \quad (3)$$

The original LP in Equation (1) is referred to as the primal LP (or primal problem), while the above LP Equation (2) is called the dual LP (or dual problem). The variable  $Q$  in the primal LP is referred to as the primal variable, while the variable  $\lambda$  in the dual LP is called the dual variable. We can examine several important properties and interpretations of the dual LP. For instance, the optimal dual variable  $\lambda^*$  corresponds to a probability distribution, which represents the stationary state–action–next-action distribution under the optimal policy  $\pi^*$  constructed from the dual variable as follows:

$$\pi^*(\cdot|s) := \left[ \frac{\lambda^*(s,1)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s,a)} \quad \frac{\lambda^*(s,2)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s,a)} \quad \cdots \quad \frac{\lambda^*(s,|\mathcal{A}|)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s,a)} \right]$$

Similarly, if  $Q^*$  is the primal optimal solution (the solution of Equation (1)), then  $\beta^*(s) := \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a)$  likewise induces an optimal policy. Additional details can be found in Appendix (Sections C and D).

## 4 Log-barrier function approach

In the previous section, we provided a brief discussion of the LP formulation in Equation (1) based on the Q-function. We now turn to the main results of this paper. First of all, note that Equation (1) involves inequality constraints. A common approach to handling such constraints is to introduce the Lagrangian together with Lagrange multipliers, or dual variables (Bertsekas, 1999; Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004). One then seeks the primal and dual variables through primal–dual iterations (Kojima et al., 1989). However, this method typically suffers from slow convergence and does not, in general, guarantee convergence in many practical settings. Another practical and widely used approach to handling inequality constraints is the use of barrier functions, most notably the log-barrier function (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004). This method imposes a large (or even infinite) penalty on variables that violate the inequality constraints, thereby forcing the iterates to remain within the feasible region while enabling the optimization problem to be solved. In this paper, we apply the log-barrier function to the LP formulation in Equation (1), and we undertake an in-depth study and interpretation of this barrier-based approach to solving MDPs. This line of research represents an approach that has not yet been addressed in the existing literature.

The log-barrier function is a classical tool in constrained optimization used to handle inequality constraints. For a constraint of the form  $g(x) \leq 0$ , the log-barrier introduces a penalty term  $\eta \phi(x) := -\eta \ln(-g(x))$ , where  $\eta > 0$  is a barrier parameter. This function approaches infinity as  $g(x)$  gets close to zero, thereby preventing the iterates from leaving the feasible region. As  $\eta$  decreases, the solution of the barrier-augmented problem converges to the solution of the original constrained optimization problem. Moreover, one can prove that the log-barrier function  $\phi(x) := -\ln(-x)$  is strictly convex in its domain  $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : x < 0\}$ . Using the log-barrier function, the inequality constraints can be integrated into a single objective function as follows:

$$f_\eta(Q) := \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q(s, a) \rho(s, a) + \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') \varphi((FQ)(s, a, a') - Q(s, a)), \quad (4)$$

where  $\eta > 0$  is the barrier parameter (weight) and  $w(s, a, a') > 0, (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$  are weight parameters of the inequality constraints, which are introduced in order to consider random sampling approaches in stochastic implementations later. For instance, we can set  $w(s, a, a') = 1$  for all  $(s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$ . The objective function  $f_\eta$  has the following domain:

$$\mathcal{D} := \left\{ Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|} : (FQ)(s, a, a') - Q(s, a) < 0, (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \right\},$$

which can be also seen as the strictly feasible set. Moreover, it can be shown that  $\mathcal{D}$  is convex, open, bounded below, and unbounded above. Moreover, the objective function  $f_\eta$  is strictly convex in  $\mathcal{D}$ . To proceed, let us define the level set of the objective function for  $c > 0$

$$\mathcal{L}_c := \{Q \in \mathcal{D} : f_\eta(Q) \leq c\}.$$

We can also establish that  $\mathcal{L}_c$  is convex, closed, bounded, and  $f_\eta$  is strongly convex and has Lipschitz continuous gradient in  $\mathcal{L}_c$  with any  $c > 0$ . The detailed theoretical analysis is given in Sections E to G.

The introduction of the log-barrier function enables us to reformulate the MDP as an unconstrained optimization problem. Consequently, a natural approach to address this problem is to employ gradient descent. For this purpose, we first establish the closed-form expression of the gradient presented in the following lemma, which can be proved via direct calculations.

**Lemma 2.** *The gradient of  $f_\eta(Q)$  for  $Q \in \mathcal{D}$  is given by*

$$(\nabla_Q f_\eta(Q))(s, a) = \rho(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|s', a') \lambda_\eta(s', a', a) - \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda_\eta(s, a, a')$$

for  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , where

$$\lambda_\eta(s, a, a') := \frac{\eta w(s, a, a')}{Q(s, a) - (FQ)(s, a, a')}.$$

Using the closed-form gradient obtained above, we can gain insight into the solution of the optimization problem. To this end, let us assume that  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$  is a minimizer of  $f_\eta(Q)$

$$\tilde{Q}_\eta := \arg \min_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} f_\eta(Q).$$

The corresponding first-order optimality condition,  $\nabla_Q f(Q)|_{Q=\tilde{Q}_\eta} = 0$ , is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \nabla_Q f(Q)|_{Q=\tilde{Q}_\eta} \right) (s, a) &= \rho(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s', a', a) P(s|s', a') - \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s, a, a') \\ &= 0, \quad (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s, a, a') := \frac{\eta w(s, a, a')}{\tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) - (F\tilde{Q}_\eta)(s, a, a')}.$$

As mentioned earlier, since  $f_\eta$  is strictly convex over the domain, this first-order condition constitutes the necessary and sufficient condition for the optimal solution. We can observe that

the above equation is exactly identical to the equality constraints in the dual problem with  $\tilde{\lambda}_\eta$  as the dual variables. In other words,  $\tilde{\lambda}_\eta$  approximates the true optimal dual variable  $\lambda^*$ . Therefore, from the above solution  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$ , we can consider two types of policies. Interpreting the solution as an approximate solution to the LP formulation of the MDP, we may derive a greedy policy based on  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$ , as well as a policy constructed from the approximate dual variable  $\tilde{\lambda}_\eta$  which also depends on  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$ . Hereafter, we refer to the policy induced by the primal optimal solution  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$  as the primal  $\eta$ -policy, and the policy induced by the dual optimal solution  $\tilde{\lambda}_\eta$  as the dual  $\eta$ -policy. In particular, the primal  $\eta$ -policy, which is deterministic, can be written as

$$\tilde{\beta}_\eta(s) = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a),$$

and the dual  $\eta$ -policy, which is stochastic, can be written as

$$\tilde{\pi}_\eta(\cdot|s) := \left[ \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s,1)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s,a)} \quad \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s,2)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s,a)} \quad \cdots \quad \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s,|\mathcal{A}|)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s,a)} \right],$$

where  $\tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s, a) := \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s, a, a')$ . By minimizing the above objective function, we can obtain an approximate solution of the primal LP. Since the objective function is strictly convex, the approximate solution can be efficiently found with a gradient descent algorithm. We can prove that, under certain mild conditions, this gradient descent with a constant step-size converges exponentially to  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$  (Sections H and I).

Next, note that the minimizer of the log-barrier-based objective function provides only an approximate solution to the LP formulation of the MDP, rather than an exact one. Nevertheless, by decreasing the barrier parameter  $\eta$ , the solution is permitted to approach the boundary of the inequality constraints, i.e., the equality constraints, and thus progressively converges to the exact LP solution. In the limit as  $\eta \rightarrow 0$ , the solution converges to the true solution of the MDP. Building on this insight, we can express the error between  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$  and  $Q^*$  as a function of  $\eta$ . The following lemma establishes such an error bound between  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$  and  $Q^*$ , and, in addition, presents a bound on the Bellman error corresponding to  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$  (Section J).

**Theorem 1.** *We have*

1.  $\eta \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') < \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^* \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a')}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)}$
2.  $\eta(1 - \gamma) \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') < \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - T\tilde{Q}_\eta \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{(1+\gamma)\eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a')}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)}$

From the above result, we can establish both upper and lower bounds on the  $l_\infty$ -norm of the optimality error and the Bellman error. Both bounds depend on  $\eta$  and are shown to be linear functions of  $\eta$ . Hence, as  $\eta \rightarrow 0$ , the upper and lower bounds of the error norms decrease linearly, i.e.,  $\tilde{Q}_\eta \rightarrow Q^*$ . Moreover, these bounds also reveal the interplay between the bounds and other hyperparameters. In the above result, we established bounds on the norm of the error. In addition, we can also derive upper and lower bounds on the MDP objective function itself. The following theorem presents such bounds for the objective functions corresponding to the primal  $\eta$ -policy and the dual  $\eta$ -policy, expressed relative to the optimal objective value  $J^{\pi^*}$  (Section K).

**Theorem 2.** *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}
1. \quad & J^{\pi^*} - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') \leq J^{\tilde{\pi}_\eta} \leq J^{\pi^*} \\
2. \quad & J^{\pi^*} - \frac{\eta(1+\gamma) \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{(1-\gamma) \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)} \leq J^{\tilde{\beta}_\eta} \leq J^{\pi^*} \\
3. \quad & -\frac{\eta(1+\gamma) \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{(1-\gamma) \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)} \leq J^{\tilde{\beta}_\eta} - J^{\tilde{\pi}_\eta} \leq \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')
\end{aligned}$$

The above theorem shows that the upper and lower bounds of the objective functions corresponding to the primal  $\eta$ -policy and the dual  $\eta$ -policy also depend linearly on  $\eta$ . Hence, as  $\eta \rightarrow 0$ , the objective functions associated with both the primal and dual  $\eta$ -policies converge to the optimal objective value  $J^*$ .

## 5 Policy evaluation

Although the primary focus of this paper is on computing the optimal Q-function, the proposed framework is equally applicable to policy evaluation. In this section, we therefore provide a brief account of its application to the policy evaluation setting. To this end, let us assume a given policy  $\pi$ , and consider the problem of finding its corresponding Q-function  $Q^\pi$ . This problem can be solved through the following LP:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min_{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}} \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) Q(s,a) \\
& \text{subject to} \\
& R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{(s',a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s'|s,a) \pi(a'|s') Q(s',a') \leq Q(s,a), \quad (s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A},
\end{aligned}$$

where where  $R(s,a)$  is the expected reward conditioned on  $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\rho$  denotes any probability distribution over  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  with strictly positive support. For convenience, let us define the Bellman operator

$$(T^\pi Q)(s,a) := R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{(s',a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s'|s,a) \pi(a'|s') Q(s',a'), \quad (s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}.$$

Then, analogous to the case of finding the optimal Q-function, we can derive the following results through a similar theoretical analysis. In particular, we can prove that the unique optimal solution of the above LP is  $Q^\pi$ . Moreover, let us consider the objective function with log-barrier function

$$f_\eta^\pi(Q) := \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q(s,a) \rho(s,a) + \eta \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a) \varphi((T^\pi Q)(s,a) - Q(s,a))$$

where  $\eta > 0$  is a weight parameter and  $w(s,a) > 0, (s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  are weight parameters of the inequality constraints. Then, we can prove that the corresponding optimal solution  $\tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi := \arg \min_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} f_\eta^\pi(Q)$  approximates  $Q^\pi$ . Many of the analytical results established in the previous section can be applied in a similar manner. For brevity, all related details are provided in Section L.

## 6 Deep RL variants

Thus far, we have provided a theoretical analysis of the approximate solution to the LP formulation of MDPs using the log-barrier function. Although the primary focus of this paper is on theoretical analysis, in this section we further explore the potential extension of the proposed framework to deep RL. In particular, we introduce a novel DQN algorithm inspired by the idea of standard DQN (Mnih et al., 2015). Similar to the conventional DQN framework, we employ an experience replay buffer  $D$  and mini-batch sampling  $B$ . Furthermore, in the definition of  $f_\eta$ , the probability density is replaced with samples from the mini-batch, leading to the following loss function:

$$L(\theta) := \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{(s,a,r,s') \in B, a' \in \mathcal{A}} [Q_\theta(s, a) + \eta\varphi(r + \gamma Q_\theta(s', a')) - Q_\theta(s, a)],$$

where  $B$  is a mini-batch uniformly sampled from the experience replay buffer  $D$ ,  $|B|$  is the size of the mini-batch,  $Q_\theta$  is a deep neural network approximation of Q-function,  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the parameter to be determined, and  $(s, a, r, s')$  is the transition sample of the state-action-reward-next state. The loss function can be seen as a stochastic approximation of  $f_\eta$ , where  $\rho$  and  $w$  can be set to probability distributions corresponding to the replay buffer. However, this stochastic approximation is generally biased because it approximates a function in which the state transition probabilities appear outside the log-barrier function. In fact, by applying Jensen’s inequality, we can show that the above loss function is essentially an unbiased stochastic approximation of an upper bounding surrogate function of  $f_\eta$  (Section M). However, note that in the deterministic case, the upper surrogate function coincides with the true objective function with zero Jensen gap. In this setting,  $L(\theta)$  becomes an unbiased stochastic approximation of  $f_\eta$ . For example, a dynamical system expressed as  $s_{k+1} = f(s_k, a_k)$  is deterministic, and hence the upper bound coincides with  $f_\eta$ . Therefore, the loss function  $L$  can be regarded as an unbiased stochastic approximation of  $f_\eta$  as follows:  $f_\eta(Q_\theta) = \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q_\theta(s, a)\rho(s, a) + \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a')\varphi(r(s, a, f(s, a)) + \gamma Q_\theta(f(s, a), a') - Q_\theta(s, a)) \cong L(\theta)$ . Another difference from the conventional DQN is that the algorithm proposed in this paper does not employ target variables, and hence the update of target variables is also omitted. Apart from this distinction, the remaining components are similar to those of standard DQN. The overall pseudocode of the algorithm and implementation details for stabilization of the algorithm are summarized in Section N.

Next, we briefly discuss the extension of policy evaluation, previously introduced, to the deep RL setting. In particular, we consider its potential application to DDPG (Lillicrap et al., 2015). Here, the policy is deterministic, and the following loss function can be formulated:

$$L_{\text{critic}}(\theta; \pi_\chi) := \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{(s,a,r,s') \in B} [Q_\theta(s, a) + \eta\varphi(r + \gamma Q_\theta(s', \pi_\chi(s'))) - Q_\theta(s, a)],$$

where  $\pi_\chi$  denotes the deterministic policy being learned, and  $\chi$  is its parameter vector. A discussion similar to that of the preceding loss function applies here, and the corresponding modified DDPG algorithm along with its implementation details is provided in Section O.

## 7 Experiments

To validate the performance of the proposed method, we conduct experiments in both discrete and continuous control environments. We implement our deep RL variant as described in Section 6, naming our algorithms **Log-barrier DQN** and **Log-barrier DDPG**, respectively. For discrete control tasks, we compare our algorithm with the standard DQN (Mnih et al., 2015), and for continuous control tasks, we benchmark it against the standard DDPG (Lillicrap et al., 2015). Additional algorithmic details are provided in Section N and Section O, with detailed hyperparameters listed in Section P.

**Log-Barrier DQN** For our DQN experiments, we chose three environments from the Gymnasium library (Acrobot-v1, CartPole-v1, and LunarLander-v3). As shown in figure Figure 1, the results reveal a remarkable point that the Log-barrier DQN demonstrates rapid adaptation and significant stability in the CartPole environment, where the agent’s survival is threatened by a critical angle criterion. We hypothesize that this is due to the sharp decision boundary between states where the agent survives and states where the episode is terminated. Standard DQN, which relies on Bellman updates with an mean square error (MSE) loss, can suffer from error propagation across this boundary. In contrast, the proposed approach, which uses the LP form, can globally mitigate this hazard. Instead of estimating value from neighboring states, our method directly minimizes its objective while satisfying the LP constraints, which are transformed into an unconstrained problem using a barrier function.




Figure 1: Learning curves comparing the Log-barrier DQN and standard DQN on the Gymnasium control environments. Each curve represents the average return over 10 random seeds, with the shaded area indicating one standard deviation from the mean.

**Log-Barrier DDPG** In the continuous control experiments with DDPG, the proposed method demonstrated superior performance on four complex MuJoCo environments (Ant, Walker2d, HalfCheetah, Humanoid), while showing no significant advantage on the simpler Hopper task, as shown in Figure 2. We attribute this success to a fundamental property of critic update mechanism of the proposed algorithm. We conjecture that the core of the advantage arises from the fact that the LP form is inherently a minimization objective, which naturally counteracts the Q-value overestimation bias prevalent in actor-critic methods. Standard DDPG critics learn by minimizing the MSE to a target value, a process that simply follows the target without regard for its potential bias. If

the target is inflated, the critic learns an inflated value, leading to a feedback loop of compounding overestimation. In contrast, the proposed approach minimizes the value function itself, subject to the constraints of Bellman consistency. This systematic search for the tightest and lowest possible Q-values that still satisfy the dynamics acts as a powerful, implicit regularizer against optimistic value estimates. This results in a more conservative and stable critic, which provides a more reliable gradient to the actor, leading to superior final performance. Consequently, this allows the proposed method to overcome the limitations of standard DDPG, successfully solving environments such as Ant and Humanoid that were previously thought to be beyond its capabilities.




Figure 2: Learning curves comparing the Log-barrier DDPG and standard DDPG on the Mujoco continuous control environments. Each curve represents the average return over 8 random seeds, with the shaded area indicating one standard deviation from the mean.

## 8 Conclusion

This paper developed a theoretical framework for solving MDPs through their LP formulations by employing a log-barrier function. By reformulating the LP into a single-objective function  $f_\eta$ , we showed that approximate solutions  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$  can be efficiently obtained via gradient descent. We established error bounds for both the optimality gap  $\|\tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^*\|_\infty$  and the MDP objective function, deriving linear dependence on the barrier parameter  $\eta$ . In addition, we characterized primal and dual approximate solutions, their induced policies, and provided bounds on their performance relative to the optimal objective value. Properties such as convexity of  $f_\eta$  and convergence guarantees of gradient descent were also analyzed. Beyond theory, we extended the framework to deep RL by introducing a novel loss function derived from the log-barrier formulation as an alternative to the standard Bellman loss in DQN and DDPG. Empirical evaluations on OpenAI Gym benchmarks demonstrated that the proposed method performs comparably to conventional DQN in most cases and achieves superior performance in certain environments. In addition, experimental results show that incorporating the proposed method into DDPG yields markedly improved learning performance compared to the conventional DDPG algorithm in a wide range of tasks. Although the experimental results were obtained on a limited number of environments, and the proposed method generally requires extensive hyperparameter tuning, we believe that additional methodological developments and further research are necessary to improve stability. A more rigorous evaluation would require large-scale validation across diverse environments, which lies beyond the scope of this paper and is left for future work. Nevertheless, the results presented here can be interpreted as evidence of the potential of the proposed approach.

## References

- Bas-Serrano, J., Curi, S., Krause, A., and Neu, G. (2021). Logistic q-learning. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 3610–3618.
- Bertsekas, D. (2012). *Dynamic programming and optimal control: Volume II*. Athena scientific.
- Bertsekas, D. P. (1999). *Nonlinear programming*. Athena scientific Belmont.
- Bertsekas, D. P. and Tsitsiklis, J. N. (1996). *Neuro-dynamic programming*. Athena Scientific Belmont, MA.
- Boyd, S. and Vandenberghe, L. (2004). *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, Y., Li, L., and Wang, M. (2018). Scalable bilinear pi learning using state and action features. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 834–843.
- De Farias, D. P. and Van Roy, B. (2003). The linear programming approach to approximate dynamic programming. *Operations research*, 51(6):850–865.
- Gabbianelli, G., Neu, G., Papini, M., and Okolo, N. M. (2024). Offline primal-dual reinforcement learning for linear mdps. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3169–3177.
- Ghate, A. and Smith, R. L. (2013). A linear programming approach to nonstationary infinite-horizon markov decision processes. *Operations Research*, 61(2):413–425.
- Kamoutsi, A., Banjac, G., and Lygeros, J. (2021). Efficient performance bounds for primal-dual reinforcement learning from demonstrations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5257–5268.
- Kojima, M., Mizuno, S., and Yoshise, A. (1989). A primal-dual interior point algorithm for linear programming. In *Progress in Mathematical Programming: Interior-point and related methods*, pages 29–47. Springer.
- Lakshminarayanan, C., Bhatnagar, S., and Szepesvári, C. (2017). A linearly relaxed approximate linear program for markov decision processes. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic control*, 63(4):1185–1191.
- Lee, D. and He, N. (2018). Stochastic primal-dual q-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.08298*.
- Lee, D. and He, N. (2019). Stochastic primal-dual q-learning algorithm for discounted mdps. In *2019 american control conference (acc)*, pages 4897–4902.
- Lillicrap, T. P., Hunt, J. J., Pritzel, A., Heess, N., Erez, T., Tassa, Y., Silver, D., and Wierstra, D. (2015). Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971*.
- Lu, F., Mehta, P. G., Meyn, S. P., and Neu, G. (2021). Convex q-learning. In *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 4749–4756.
- Lu, F., Mehta, P. G., Meyn, S. P., and Neu, G. (2022). Convex analytic theory for convex q-learning. In *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 4065–4071.

- Luenberger, D. G., Ye, Y., et al. (1984). *Linear and nonlinear programming*, volume 2. Springer.
- Malek, A., Abbasi-Yadkori, Y., and Bartlett, P. (2014). Linear programming for large-scale markov decision problems. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 496–504.
- Mnih, V., Kavukcuoglu, K., Silver, D., Rusu, A. A., Veness, J., Bellemare, M. G., Graves, A., Riedmiller, M., Fidjeland, A. K., Ostrovski, G., et al. (2015). Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529.
- Nachum, O. and Dai, B. (2020). Reinforcement learning via fenchel-rockafellar duality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.01866*.
- Nesterov, Y. (2018). *Lectures on convex optimization*, volume 137. Springer.
- Neu, G. and Okolo, N. (2023). Efficient global planning in large mdps via stochastic primal-dual optimization. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 1101–1123.
- Ozdaglar, A. E., Pattathil, S., Zhang, J., and Zhang, K. (2023). Revisiting the linear-programming framework for offline rl with general function approximation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 26769–26791.
- Puterman, M. L. (2014). *Markov decision processes: discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Serrano, J. B. and Neu, G. (2020). Faster saddle-point optimization for solving large-scale markov decision processes. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 413–423.
- Sikchi, H., Zhang, A., and Niekum, S. (2024). Dual rl: Unification and new methods for reinforcement and imitation learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. International Conference on Learning Representations.
- Sutton, R. S. and Barto, A. G. (1998). *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT Press.
- Wang, M. and Chen, Y. (2016). An online primal-dual method for discounted markov decision processes. In *2016 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 4516–4521.
- Ying, L. and Zhu, Y. (2020). A note on optimization formulations of markov decision processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.09417*.
- Zhan, W., Huang, B., Huang, A., Jiang, N., and Lee, J. (2022). Offline reinforcement learning with realizability and single-policy concentrability. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2730–2775.
- Zhang, B., Frison, L., Brox, T., and Bödecker, J. (2024a). Constrained reinforcement learning for safe heat pump control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.19716*.
- Zhang, B., Zhang, Y., Frison, L., Brox, T., and Bödecker, J. (2024b). Constrained reinforcement learning with smoothed log barrier function. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14508*.

# Appendix

## A Appendix: Lemma 3

In the next lemma, we establish that the optimal solution to the LP formulation of the MDP Equation (1), as presented in this paper, is precisely the optimal Q-function,  $Q^*$ .

**Lemma 3.** *The optimal solution of the LP Equation (1) is unique and given by  $Q^*$*

*Proof.* Let us consider the following LP defined also in Equation (1):

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}} \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)Q(s,a) \\ & \text{subject to} \\ & R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s,a)Q(s',a') \leq Q(s,a), \quad (s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\rho$  denotes any probability distribution over  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  with strictly positive support. Let us assume that the optimal solution of the above LP is  $\hat{Q}$ . We want to prove that  $\hat{Q} = Q^*$ . First of all, since  $\hat{Q}$  is feasible, it satisfies

$$(F\hat{Q})(s,a,a') \leq \hat{Q}(s,a), \quad (s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}.$$

This implies

$$(T\hat{Q})(s,a) \leq \hat{Q}(s,a), \quad (s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A},$$

and vice versa. Equivalently, it can be written as  $T\hat{Q} \leq \hat{Q}$ . Because  $T$  is a monotone operator (Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1996), we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T^k \hat{Q} \leq \hat{Q} \Rightarrow Q^* \leq \hat{Q}.$$

Moreover, since  $TQ^* = Q^*$ ,  $Q^*$  is a feasible solution, and hence,  $\hat{Q} \leq Q^*$ . Therefore,  $Q^* \leq \hat{Q} \leq Q^*$ , which implies that  $\hat{Q} = Q^*$ . □

## B Appendix: proof of Lemma 1

Let us consider the Lagrangian function (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004)

$$\begin{aligned} L(Q, \lambda) = & \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)Q(s,a) \\ & + \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a,a') (R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s,a)Q(s',a') - Q(s,a)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda$  is the Lagrangian multiplier vector (or dual variable). Next, the function can be written by

$$L(Q, \lambda) = \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a, a') R(s, a) + \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q(s, a) \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a, i) - \gamma \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i, j) \lambda(i, j, a) - \rho(s, a) \right\}$$

One can observe that the optimal value of the dual problem  $\max_{\lambda \geq 0} \min_{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}} L(Q, \lambda)$  is finite only when

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a, i) - \gamma \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i, j) \lambda(i, j, a) - \rho(s, a) = 0, \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}.$$

Therefore, one gets the following dual problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\lambda \geq 0} \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a, a') R(s, a) \\ & \text{subject to} \\ & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a, i) - \gamma \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i, j) \lambda(i, j, a) = \rho(s, a), \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

## C Appendix: Theorem 3

We examine several important properties and interpretations of the dual LP.

**Theorem 3.** *Suppose  $\lambda(s, a, a'), \forall (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$  is any dual feasible solution (any solutions satisfying the dual constraints in Equation (3)). Then, we obtain the following results:*

1.  $(1 - \gamma)\lambda$  is a probability distribution, i.e.,

$$(1 - \gamma)\lambda(s, a, a') \geq 0, \quad \forall (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}, \quad \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} (1 - \gamma)\lambda(s, a, a') = 1$$

2. Moreover, let us define the marginal distributions

$$\lambda(s, a) := \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a, a'), \quad \lambda(s) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a), \quad \rho(s) := \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a). \quad (5)$$

Then, we have

$$\lambda(s') - \gamma \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P^\pi(s'|s) \lambda(s) = \rho(s'), \quad \forall s' \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\pi(\cdot|s) := \left[ \frac{\lambda(s,1)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a)} \quad \frac{\lambda(s,2)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a)} \quad \cdots \quad \frac{\lambda(s,|\mathcal{A}|)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a)} \right] \quad (7)$$

and

$$P^\pi(s'|s) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} P(s'|s,a)\pi(a|s)$$

is the probability of the transition from  $s$  to  $s'$  under the policy  $\pi$ .

3. If the marginal  $\rho(s) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)$ ,  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  represents the initial state distribution, then  $(1-\gamma)\lambda(\cdot)$  is the discounted state occupation probability distribution defined as

$$(1-\gamma)\lambda(s) = \mu^\pi(s) = (1-\gamma) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k \mathbb{P}[s_k = s | \pi, \rho]$$

4. If the marginal  $\rho(s) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)$ ,  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  represents the initial state distribution, then the dual objective function satisfies

$$\sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a,a')R(s,a) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} V^\pi(s)\rho(s) = J^\pi$$

Theorem 3 provides an interpretation of any feasible dual solution. In particular, analogous to the LP formulation (Puterman, 2014) based on the value function, the dual variable in the Q-function-based LP formulation corresponds to a probability distribution. It represents the stationary state–action–next-action distribution under the policy  $\pi$  in Equation (7) constructed from the dual variable. Moreover, we can prove that the marginal distribution  $\lambda(s)$  in Equation (5) corresponds to the discounted state-occupation probability distribution. Building on this observation, it can be shown that the dual objective function coincides with the objective value attained by the policy  $\pi$  in Equation (7). The preceding discussions are valid for any dual feasible variable  $\lambda$ , and, of course, the same properties extend to the dual optimal solution  $\lambda^*$ . In particular, if  $\lambda^*$  is the dual optimal solution, then the associated policy Equation (7) with  $\lambda$  replaced by  $\lambda^*$  coincides with an optimal policy. Similarly, if  $Q^*$  is the primal optimal solution (the solution of Equation (1)), then  $\beta^*(s) := \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s,a)$  likewise induces an optimal policy.

*Proof.* For the first statement, summing the dual constraints in Equation (3) over  $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , we get

$$\sum_{(s,a,i) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a,i) - \gamma \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, (i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i,j)\lambda(i,j,a) = \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a),$$

which leads to

$$(1-\gamma) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}, (i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(i,j,a) = 1.$$

It proves the first statement. For the second statement, summing the dual constraints in Equation (3) over  $a' \in \mathcal{A}$  leads to

$$\lambda(s,a) - \gamma \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i,j)\lambda(i,j,a) = \rho(s,a).$$

Moreover, summing the above equation over  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  leads to

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s', a) - \gamma \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s'|s, a) \lambda(s, a) = \rho(s'),$$

which can be further written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s', a) - \gamma \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s'|s, a) \frac{\lambda(s, a)}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, i)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, j) \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s', a) - \gamma \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s'|s, a) \pi(a|s) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, i) \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s', a) - \gamma \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P^\pi(s'|s) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a) \\ &= \lambda(s') - \gamma \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P^\pi(s'|s) \lambda(s) \\ &= \rho(s'), \end{aligned}$$

and this proves the second statement.

To prove the third statement, we can first consider the vectorized form of Equation (6)

$$\lambda - \gamma(P^\pi)^T \lambda = \rho,$$

where

$$\lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda(1) \\ \vdots \\ \lambda(|\mathcal{S}|) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}, \rho = \begin{bmatrix} \rho(1) \\ \vdots \\ \rho(|\mathcal{S}|) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}, P^\pi = \begin{bmatrix} P^\pi(1|1) & \cdots & P^\pi(|\mathcal{S}||1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ P^\pi(1||\mathcal{S}) & \cdots & P^\pi(|\mathcal{S}|||\mathcal{S}) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{S}|},$$

which leads to

$$\lambda^T = \rho^T + \gamma \rho^T P_\pi + \gamma^2 \rho^T P_\pi^2 + \cdots,$$

which can be written by

$$\lambda(s) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k \mathbb{P}[s_k = s | \pi, \rho] = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mu^\pi(s), \quad s \in \mathcal{S}.$$

This completes the proof of the third statement.

The last statement can be proved through the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a, a') R(s, a) &= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a) R(s, a) \\ &= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) R(s, a) \lambda(s) \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} R^\pi(s) \lambda(s) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} V^\pi(s) \rho(s) \\
&= J^\pi,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $R^\pi$  denotes the expected reward under the policy  $\pi$ , and  $V^\pi$  denotes the value function under  $\pi$ .  $\square$

## D Appendix: Corollary 1

Based on Theorem 3, we can readily obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.** *Suppose that  $Q^*$  is the primal optimal solution, and  $\lambda^*$  is the dual optimal solution. Then, we obtain the following results:*

1.  $\beta^*$  defined in the following is an optimal policy:

$$\beta^*(s) = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a).$$

2. Suppose that the marginal  $\rho(s) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)$  represents the initial state distribution and  $\varphi^*(a|s) := \frac{\rho(s, a)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)}$  represents an optimal policy, i.e.,  $\beta^*$ . Then,  $\pi^*$  defined in the following is an optimal policy:

$$\pi^*(\cdot|s) := \left[ \frac{\lambda^*(s, 1)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s, a)} \quad \frac{\lambda^*(s, 2)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s, a)} \quad \cdots \quad \frac{\lambda^*(s, |\mathcal{A}|)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s, a)} \right]$$

*Proof.* The first statement can be directly obtained from Lemma 3 (the primal optimal solution is the optimal Q-function  $Q^*$ ). For the second statement, we first note that the optimal primal solution  $Q^*$  does not depend on  $\rho$ , while the optimal dual solution  $\lambda^*$  depends on  $\rho$ . Suppose that the marginal

$$\rho(s) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)$$

represents the initial state distribution and

$$\varphi^*(a|s) := \frac{\rho(s, a)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)}$$

represents an optimal policy. using Theorem 3 and strong duality, one can derive

$$\begin{aligned}
J^{\varphi^*} &:= \sum_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s) \varphi^*(a|s) Q^*(s, a) \\
&= \sum_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a) Q^*(s, a) \\
&= \sum_{(s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s, a, a') R(s, a)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s,a) R(s,a) \\
&= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \pi^*(a|s) R(s,a) \lambda^*(s) \\
&= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} R^{\pi^*}(s) \lambda^*(s) \\
&= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} V^{\pi^*}(s) \rho(s) \\
&= J^{\pi^*}
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $\pi^*$  is an optimal policy as well. □

## E Appendix: Lemma 4

In this paper, using the log-barrier function, the inequality constraints of the LP form of MDPs is integrated into a single objective function as follows:

$$f_\eta(Q) := \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q(s,a) \rho(s,a) + \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') \varphi((FQ)(s,a,a') - Q(s,a)),$$

where  $\eta > 0$  is the barrier parameter (weight) and  $w(s,a,a') > 0$ ,  $(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$  are weight parameters of the inequality constraints. Several useful properties of the domain  $\mathcal{D}$  of  $f_\eta$

$$\mathcal{D} := \left\{ Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}|} : (FQ)(s,a,a') - Q(s,a) < 0, (s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \right\},$$

are summarized in the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.** *The following statements hold true:*

1.  $\mathcal{D}$  is convex and open
2.  $\mathcal{D}$  is bounded below and unbounded above.

*Proof.* For the first statement, let us note that  $\mathcal{D}$  is the set of points which satisfy the linear inequalities

$$(FQ)(s,a,a') - Q(s,a) < 0, \quad \forall (s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A},$$

which means that it is an intersections of affine sets, and hence, it is a convex set. Moreover, we can prove that it is open because the inequalities are strict.

For the second statement, one can observe that every  $Q \in \mathcal{D}$  satisfies

$$(FQ)(s,a,a') - Q(s,a) < 0, \quad \forall (s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A},$$

which implies

$$(TQ)(s,a) - Q(s,a) < 0, \quad \forall (s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$$

and vice versa. Next, because the Bellman operator is monotone (Bertsekas, 2012, Lemma 1.1.1), i.e., for  $Q' \geq Q$ ,  $TQ' \geq TQ$ , we have  $T^k Q \leq Q$ . Taking the limit  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T^k Q = Q^* \leq Q$  leads to the conclusion that  $\mathcal{D}$  is bounded below. Moreover, let

$$Q(s, a) = \frac{r_{\max} + \varepsilon}{1 - \gamma} > 0, \quad (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$$

with any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) Q(s', a') - Q(s, a) \\ = & R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \frac{r_{\max} + \varepsilon}{1 - \gamma} - \frac{r_{\max} + \varepsilon}{1 - \gamma} \\ = & R(s, a) + (\gamma - 1) \frac{r_{\max} + \varepsilon}{1 - \gamma} \\ = & R(s, a) - r_{\max} - \varepsilon < 0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $Q$  is strictly feasible. Because  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary,  $\mathcal{D}$  is unbounded above, and we can conclude the proof.  $\square$

The properties of the domain  $\mathcal{D}$  established in the preceding lemma provide not only conceptual insight but also play a crucial role in the proofs of several subsequent results.

## F Appendix: Lemma 5

Several useful properties of the level set  $\mathcal{L}_c$  defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_c := \{Q \in \mathcal{D} : f_\eta(Q) \leq c\}$$

are summarized in the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.** *For any given  $c > 0$ , the following statements hold true:*

1.  $\mathcal{L}_c$  is convex and closed.
2.  $\mathcal{L}_c$  is bounded.
3. there exists a constant  $m_c > 0$  such that

$$Q(s, a) - (FQ)(s, a, a') \geq m_c, \quad \forall (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}, \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{L}_c$$

*Proof.* First of all, it is known that the log-barrier function is convex (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004, Chapter 11.2.1), and the composition of a convex function and affine function is convex (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004, Chapter 3.2.2). Since a sublevel set of a convex function is convex (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004, Chapter 3.1.6),  $\mathcal{L}_c$  is convex.

Moreover, let us consider any sequence  $Q_k \in \mathcal{L}_c$  such that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} Q_k = \bar{Q} \in \mathcal{D}$ . We want to prove that  $\bar{Q} \in \mathcal{L}_c$  so that  $\mathcal{L}_c$  is closed. This is true because  $f_\eta$  is continuous in its domain (because it is convex in the domain), i.e.,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f_\eta(Q_k) = f_\eta(\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} Q_k) = f_\eta(\bar{Q}) \leq c.$$

This completes the proof of the first statement.

For the second statement, we note that by Lemma 4, every  $Q \in \mathcal{D}$  is bounded below. Therefore,  $\mathcal{L}_c \subset \mathcal{D}$  is bounded below as well. To prove the upper bound, let us assume that  $\mathcal{L}_c$  is unbounded from above. In this case, we can find a sequence  $(Q_k)_{k=0}^\infty$  with  $Q_k \in \mathcal{L}_c$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q_k(s, a) = \infty$$

To proceed, let us define

$$(s_k, a_k) := \arg \max_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q_k(s, a).$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< Q_k(s, a) - (FQ_k)(s, a, a') \\ &\leq Q_k(s_k, a_k) + \max_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} |R(s, a)| + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) Q_k(s_k, a_k) \\ &\leq (1 + \gamma) Q_k(s_k, a_k) + r_{\max}, \quad \forall (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned}$$

Because  $-\ln$  is a nonincreasing function, it follows that

$$-\ln \{Q_k(s, a) - (FQ_k)(s, a, a')\} \geq -\ln \{(1 + \gamma) Q_k(s_k, a_k) + r_{\max}\}, \quad \forall (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}.$$

Using this inequality, the objective function is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} f_\eta(Q_k) &= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q_k(s, a) \rho(s, a) - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') \ln [(FQ_k)(s, a, a') - Q_k(s, a)] \\ &\geq \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q_k(s, a) \rho(s, a) - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') \ln [(1 + \gamma) Q_k(s_k, a_k) + r_{\max}] \\ &\geq Q_k(s_k, a_k) \rho(s_k, a_k) + \sum_{(s,a) \in (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}) \setminus (s_k, a_k)} Q^*(s, a) \rho(s, a) \\ &\quad - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') \ln [(1 + \gamma) Q_k(s_k, a_k) + r_{\max}] \\ &\geq Q_k(s_k, a_k) \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a) \\ &\quad + (|\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}| - 1) \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a) \rho(s, a) \\ &\quad - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') \ln [(1 + \gamma) Q_k(s_k, a_k) + r_{\max}]. \end{aligned}$$

By taking the limit, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_\eta(Q_k) &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Q_k(s_k, a_k) \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a) \\ &\quad + (|\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}| - 1) \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a) \rho(s, a) \\ &\quad - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \ln [(1 + \gamma) Q_k(s_k, a_k) + r_{\max}] \end{aligned}$$

$=\infty$

which is a contradiction. Therefore,  $\mathcal{L}_c$  is bounded.

Next, we prove the last statement. Since  $\mathcal{L}_c$  is bounded, for any  $Q \in \mathcal{L}_c$ , the first term in  $f_\eta$  is bounded as follows:

$$\left| \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q(s,a) \rho(s,a) \right| \leq B_1, \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{L}_c,$$

where  $B_1 > 0$  is some constant. By contradiction, let us assume that

$$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{L}_c} \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \{Q(s,a) - (FQ)(s,a,a')\} = 0$$

Then, there exists a sequence  $Q_k \in \mathcal{L}_c$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \{Q_k(s,a) - (FQ_k)(s,a,a')\} = 0.$$

Therefore, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} f_\eta(Q_k) &= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q_k(s,a) \rho(s,a) - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') \ln \{Q_k(s,a) - (FQ_k)(s,a,a')\} \\ &\geq -B_1 - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') \ln \{Q_k(s,a) - (FQ_k)(s,a,a')\}. \end{aligned}$$

By taking the limit

$$\begin{aligned} c &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_\eta(Q_k) \\ &\geq -B_1 - \eta \max_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') |\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}|^2 \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \ln [\min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \{Q_k(s,a) - (FQ_k)(s,a,a')\}] \\ &= \infty. \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, there should exist  $m_c > 0$  such that

$$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{L}_c} \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \{Q(s,a) - (FQ)(s,a,a')\} \geq m_c.$$

This completes the overall proof. □

## G Appendix: Lemma 6

The following summarizes several properties of the objective function  $f_\eta$  related to its convexity and smoothness.

**Lemma 6.** *For any given  $c > 0$ , we have*

1.  $\nabla_Q f_\eta(Q)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{L}_c$

2.  $f_\eta$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex and  $L$ -smooth in  $\mathcal{L}_c$

3. Moreover,  $f_\eta$  is strictly convex in the domain  $\mathcal{D}$ .

*Proof of the first statement.* By Lemma 5, there exists a constant  $m_c > 0$  such that

$$Q(s, a) - (FQ)(s, a, a') \geq m_c, \quad \forall (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$$

for any  $Q \in \mathcal{L}_c$ . Therefore, we can derive the following bounds

$$\begin{aligned} |(\nabla_Q f(Q))(s, a)| &\leq 1 + \gamma \sum_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|s', a') |\lambda_\eta(s', a', a)| + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} |\lambda_\eta(s, a, a')| \\ &\leq 1 + \gamma \sum_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|s', a') |\lambda_\eta(s', a', a)| + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} |\lambda_\eta(s, a, a')| \\ &\leq 1 + \gamma \sum_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|s', a') \frac{\eta w(s', a', a)}{Q(s', a') - (FQ)(s', a', a)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\eta w(s, a, a')}{Q(s, a) - (FQ)(s, a, a')} \\ &\leq 1 + \gamma \max_{(s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') \frac{\eta |\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}|}{m_c} + \max_{(s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') \frac{\eta |\mathcal{A}|}{m_c} \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the first statement.  $\square$

*Proof of the second statement.* For the second statement, since the log-barrier function is strongly convex in a convex compact set,  $f_\eta$  is also strongly convex in the set because it is a composition of a linear function and strongly convex function. To be more precise, for all  $(s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$ , let us define

$$v_{s, a, a'} := \nabla_Q (Q(s, a) - (FQ)(s, a, a')) = e_{s, a} - \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) e_{s', a'}$$

where  $e_{s, a} = e_s \otimes e_a \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}|}$ , and  $e_s \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$  and  $e_a \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$  are sth basis vector (all components are 0 except for the sth component which is 1) and ath basis vector, respectively. Then, the gradient can be written as

$$\nabla_Q f_\eta(Q) = \rho - \eta \sum_{(s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \frac{w(s, a, a')}{Q(s, a) - (FQ)(s, a, a')} v_{s, a, a'} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}|}$$

and the Hessian is

$$\nabla_Q^2 f_\eta(Q) = \eta \sum_{(s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \frac{w(s, a, a')}{\{Q(s, a) - (FQ)(s, a, a')\}^2} v_{s, a, a'} v_{s, a, a'}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}|}$$

By Lemma 5, we have

$$m_c \leq Q(s, a) - (FQ)(s, a, a') \leq M_c, \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{L}_c, (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$$

for some  $m_c, M_c > 0$ , where the bounds come from the fact that  $\mathcal{L}_c$  is bounded in Lemma 5. Then, one has

$$\begin{aligned} x^T \nabla_Q^2 f_\eta(Q) x &= \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \frac{w(s,a,a') (v_{s,a,a'}^T x)^2}{\{Q(s,a) - (FQ)(s,a,a')\}^2} \\ &\geq \frac{\eta \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{M_c^2} \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} (v_{s,a,a'}^T x)^2 \\ &= \frac{\eta \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{M_c^2} x^T S x, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$S := \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} v_{s,a,a'} v_{s,a,a'}^T \succeq 0.$$

Next, we prove that the above  $S$  is strictly positive definite. By contradiction, let us suppose that  $S$  is not strictly positive definite. Then, there exists a nonzero  $x$  such that

$$x^T \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} v_{s,a,a'} v_{s,a,a'}^T x = \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} (v_{s,a,a'}^T x)^2 = 0.$$

This implies

$$v_{s,a,a'}^T x = 0, \quad \forall (s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A},$$

which can be equivalently written as

$$e_{s,a}^T x - \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s,a) e_{s',a'}^T x = x(s,a) - \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s,a) x(s',a') = 0, \quad \forall (s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}.$$

Now, let us fix  $a = a' \in \mathcal{A}$  and

$$(I - \gamma P_a)^T x_a = 0$$

where

$$x_a = \begin{bmatrix} x(1,a) \\ \vdots \\ x(|\mathcal{S}|,a) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}, \quad P_a = \begin{bmatrix} P(1|1,a) & \cdots & P(|\mathcal{S}|1,a) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ P(1||\mathcal{S}|,a) & \cdots & P(|\mathcal{S}|||\mathcal{S}|,a) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{S}|}$$

Since  $I - \gamma P_a$  is nonsingular for any  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $x_a = 0$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ . This is a contradiction. Therefore,  $S \succ 0$  and

$$\nabla_Q^2 f_\eta(Q) \succeq \frac{\eta \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') \lambda_{\min}(S)}{M_c^2} I,$$

where  $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$  denotes the minimum eigenvalue. This means that in  $\mathcal{L}_c$ ,  $f_\eta$  is  $\mu$ -strongly convex (Nesterov, 2018, Theorem 2.1.11) with

$$\mu = \frac{\eta \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') \lambda_{\min}(S)}{M_c^2}.$$

Similarly, we can easily show that in  $\mathcal{L}_c$

$$\begin{aligned}
x^T \nabla_Q^2 f_\eta(Q) x &= \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \frac{w(s,a,a') (v_{s,a,a'}^T x)^2}{\{Q(s,a) - (FQ)(s,a,a')\}^2} \\
&\leq \frac{\eta \max_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{m_c^2} \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} (v_{s,a,a'}^T x)^2 \\
&= \eta \frac{1}{m_c^2} x^T S x \\
&\leq \frac{\eta \max_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') \lambda_{\max}(S)}{m_c^2} \|x\|_2^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$  denotes the maximum eigenvalue. This implies

$$\|\nabla_Q f_\eta(Q) - \nabla_Q f_\eta(Q')\|_2 \leq L \|Q - Q'\|_2$$

with

$$L = \frac{\eta \max_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') \lambda_{\max}(S)}{m_c^2}.$$

by the sufficient condition in Nesterov (2018, Lemma 1.2.2). Therefore,  $f_\eta$  is  $L$ -smooth in  $\mathcal{L}_c$ .  $\square$

*Proof of the third statement.* In the domain  $Q \in \mathcal{D}$  which is unbounded above, by Lemma 5, we have

$$m_c \leq Q(s,a) - (FQ)(s,a,a'), \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{D}, (s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$$

Therefore, the Hessian is bounded as

$$x^T \nabla_Q^2 f_\eta(Q) x \geq \frac{\eta \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{M(Q)^2} x^T S x,$$

where

$$\max_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \{Q(s,a) - (FQ)(s,a,a')\} = M(Q) > 0, \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Since  $S$  is strictly positive definite, the above result implies that the Hessian is strictly positive definite

$$\nabla_Q^2 f_\eta(Q) \succ 0, \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Therefore, by the second-order condition in Boyd and Vandenberghe (2004, Chapter 3.1.4),  $f_\eta$  is strictly convex in  $\mathcal{D}$ .  $\square$

## H Appendix: Theorem 4

When gradient descent is applied to the objective function  $f_\eta$ , we obtain the following results on its convergence rate. An interesting observation is that, although  $f_\eta$  is strictly convex within the domain  $\mathcal{D}$  but not strongly convex, the convergence result coincides with that of a globally strongly convex function defined on the domain. The reason is that, while  $f_\eta$  is only strictly convex over  $\mathcal{D}$ , it is both strongly convex and  $L$ -smooth within its sublevel sets  $\mathcal{L}_c$ . Exploiting this property, we can prove that the convergence rate for the gradient descent iterates of  $f_\eta$  matches that of a strongly convex function on the domain. This constitutes one of the key results of this paper.

**Theorem 4.** *Let us consider the gradient descent iterates:*

$$Q_{k+1} = Q_k - \alpha \nabla_Q f_\eta(Q)|_{Q=Q_k},$$

for  $k = 0, 1, \dots$  with a strictly feasible initial point  $Q_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ . With the step-size  $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{2}{L_c + \mu_c}$ , the iterates satisfies

$$\|Q_k - \tilde{Q}_\eta\|_2^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha\mu_c L_c}{\mu_c + L_c}\right)^k \|Q_0 - \tilde{Q}_\eta\|_2^2$$

where  $\mu_c > 0$  is the coefficient of the strong convexity and  $L_c > 0$  is the Lipschitz constant of the gradient of  $f_\eta$  within the level set  $\mathcal{L}_c$  where  $c > f_\eta(Q_0)$ ,

To prove the convergence, we first need the following basic lemma.

**Lemma 7** (Theorem 2.1.5 in Nesterov (2018)). *If  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $L$ -smooth, then*

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|y - x\|_2^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

By inserting  $y = x - \alpha \nabla f(x)$  in Lemma 7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(x - \alpha \nabla f(x)) &\leq f(x) - \alpha \langle \nabla f(x), \nabla f(x) \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\alpha \nabla f(x)\|_2^2 \\ &= f(x) - \alpha \left(1 - \frac{\alpha L}{2}\right) \|\nabla f(x)\|_2^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Based on this observation, we now prove Theorem 4 as follows.

*Proof of Theorem 4.* First of all, let us choose any  $Q \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $\nabla_Q f_\eta(Q) \neq 0$ . Then,  $Q \in \mathcal{L}_c$  for some  $c > 0$ , which is any number such that  $c > f_\eta(Q)$ . Therefore, by Lemma 6,  $f_\eta$  is  $L_c$ -smooth and  $\mu_c$ -strongly convex in  $\mathcal{L}_c$  for some real numbers  $L_c, \mu_c > 0$ . We can choose a ball  $B_r(Q)$  centered at  $Q$  with radius  $r > 0$  such that  $B_r(Q) \subset \mathcal{L}_c$ . Let us assume that

$$0 < \alpha \leq \frac{2}{L_c + \mu_c}$$

and define the next iterate

$$Q_\alpha^+ := Q - \alpha \nabla f_\eta(Q).$$

Because  $B_r(Q) \subset \mathcal{L}_c$  we can choose a sufficiently small  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $Q_\alpha^+ \in \mathcal{L}_c$ . Because  $Q, Q_\alpha^+ \in \mathcal{L}_c$ , we can apply Lemma 7 so that

$$\begin{aligned} f_\eta(Q_\alpha^+) &= f_\eta(Q - \alpha \nabla_Q f_\eta(Q)) \\ &\leq f_\eta(Q) - \alpha \langle \nabla_Q f_\eta(Q), \nabla_Q f_\eta(Q) \rangle + \frac{L_c}{2} \|\alpha \nabla_Q f_\eta(Q)\|_2^2 \\ &= f_\eta(Q) - \alpha \left(1 - \frac{\alpha L_c}{2}\right) \|\nabla_Q f_\eta(Q)\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $Q_\alpha^+ \in \mathcal{L}_c$ . Now, we can increase  $\alpha$  so that  $\alpha = \frac{2}{L_c + \mu_c}$  or  $Q_\alpha^+ \in \partial \mathcal{L}_c$ , where  $\partial \mathcal{L}_c$  is the boundary of  $\mathcal{L}_c$  noting that  $\mathcal{L}_c$  is a closed set (Lemma 5). Next, we want to prove that  $\alpha$  reaches  $\alpha = \frac{2}{L_c + \mu_c}$  until  $Q_\alpha^+ \in \partial \mathcal{L}_c$ . By contradiction, let us assume that  $Q_\alpha^+ \in \partial \mathcal{L}_c$  until  $\alpha$  reaches  $\alpha = \frac{2}{L_c + \mu_c}$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , one can show that

$$Q_{\alpha+\varepsilon}^+ \notin \mathcal{L}_c$$

and

$$f_\eta(Q_{\alpha+\varepsilon}^+) > c$$

However, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} f_\eta(Q_\alpha^+) &\leq f_\eta(Q) - \alpha \left(1 - \frac{\alpha L_c}{2}\right) \|\nabla_Q f_\eta(Q)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq c - \alpha \left(1 - \frac{\alpha L_c}{2}\right) \|\nabla_Q f_\eta(Q)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq f_\eta(Q_{\alpha+\varepsilon}^+) - \alpha \left(1 - \frac{\alpha L_c}{2}\right) \|\nabla_Q f_\eta(Q)\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  leads to

$$f_\eta(Q_\alpha^+) < f_\eta(Q_\alpha^+) + \alpha \left(1 - \frac{\alpha L_c}{2}\right) \|\nabla_Q f_\eta(Q)\|_2^2 \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} f_\eta(Q_{\alpha+\varepsilon}^+)$$

which contradicts with the fact that  $f_\eta$  is continuous in  $\mathcal{D}$ . In summary, for any  $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{2}{L_c + \mu_c}$  and  $Q \in \mathcal{L}_c$ , we have

$$f_\eta(Q_\alpha^+) \leq f_\eta(Q) - \alpha \left(1 - \frac{\alpha L_c}{2}\right) \|\nabla_Q f_\eta(Q)\|_2^2$$

and  $Q_\alpha^+ \in \mathcal{L}_c$ . Therefore, if  $Q_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ , then

$$Q_k \in \mathcal{L}_c, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

for some  $c > 0$ . Next, standard results in convex optimization (Theorem 2.1.15 in Nesterov (2018)) can be applied to conclude the proof.  $\square$




Figure 3: Comparison of the log-barrier coefficient  $\eta$  on the convergence rate. The plot shows the max-norm error,  $\|Q^* - \tilde{Q}_\eta\|_\infty$ , between the learned and optimal Q-functions versus the number of training iterations. These results were obtained from experiments on a  $6 \times 6$  FrozenLake-v1 environment, where the ground-truth  $Q^*$  was pre-computed using value iteration.

## I Appendix: Gradient descent example

We conducted an experiment with two primary objectives: first, to demonstrate that the gradient expression proposed in Lemma 2 can serve as a valid gradient within a gradient descent framework, and second, to analyze how the log-barrier coefficient  $\eta$  affects the performance. For this purpose, we used the FrozenLake-v1 environment from Gymnasium with a custom  $6 \times 6$  grid in a tabular setting. We represented the Q-function in a tabular form, for which the optimal Q-function,  $Q^*$ , can be pre-computed with guaranteed convergence using value iteration (Puterman, 2014). Then, we utilized the gradient descent method with the learning rate  $\alpha = 0.01$  for all experiments and measured the max-norm error between  $Q^*$  and  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$ . The overall convergence of the algorithm, as shown in Figure 3, validates our first objective by confirming that the expression from Lemma 2 serves as a functional gradient.

Our second objective is to analyze the impact of the coefficient  $\eta$ , which serves as an approximation factor in the log-barrier method. A higher value of  $\eta$  corresponds to a relaxed approximation of the feasible set’s boundary, leading to a smoother optimization landscape. Conversely, a lower value of  $\eta$  yields a more precise approximation but creates a steeper barrier near the boundary. This theoretical property is clearly demonstrated in Figure 3, where the different error floors for each curve confirm the role of  $\eta$  as an approximation factor.

## J Appendix: proof of Theorem 1

For convenience of the reader, the statements of Theorem 1 are summarized as follows:

1.  $\eta \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') < \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^* \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a')}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)}$
2.  $\eta(1 - \gamma) \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') < \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - T\tilde{Q}_\eta \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{(1+\gamma)\eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a')}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)}$

To prove Theorem 1, we first need to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 8.** *Let us define*

$$\tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s, a, a') := -\frac{\eta w(s, a, a')}{(F\tilde{Q}_\eta)(s, a, a') - \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a)}, \quad (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}.$$

Then, we have the following results:

1.  $\eta(1 - \gamma) \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') < \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - T\tilde{Q}_\eta \right\|_\infty$
2.  $\eta \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') < \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) - Q^*(s, a), \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}.$
3.  $\eta \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') < \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^* \right\|_\infty$

*Proof.* By Theorem 3, we have

$$0 < \frac{\eta w(s, a, a')(1 - \gamma)}{\tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) - (F\tilde{Q}_\eta)(s, a, a')} < 1, \quad \forall (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A},$$

which implies

$$\eta \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a')(1 - \gamma) < \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) - (F\tilde{Q}_\eta)(s, a, a'), \quad \forall (s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A},$$

and hence,

$$\eta(1 - \gamma) \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') < \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) - (T\tilde{Q}_\eta)(s, a), \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}.$$

By taking the absolute value on the right-hand side and taking the maximum over  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , we can complete the proof of the first statement. Next, for the second statement, we first note the following bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta(1 - \gamma) \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') \\ & < \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) - (T\tilde{Q}_\eta)(s, a) \\ & = \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) - (T\tilde{Q}_\eta)(s, a) - Q^*(s, a) + (TQ^*)(s, a) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) - Q^*(s, a) - \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \{ \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \tilde{Q}_\eta(s', a') - \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s', a') \} \\
&\leq \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) - Q^*(s, a) - \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \{ \tilde{Q}_\eta(s', b) - Q^*(s', b) \} \\
&\leq \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) - Q^*(s, a) - \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \min_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \{ \tilde{Q}_\eta(s', a') - Q^*(s', a') \} \\
&\leq \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) - Q^*(s, a) - \gamma \min_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \{ \tilde{Q}_\eta(s', a') - Q^*(s', a') \}, \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the fourth line,  $b = \arg \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s', a')$ . Taking the minimum over  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  on both sides yields

$$(1 - \gamma) \eta \min_{(s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') < (1 - \gamma) \min_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \{ \tilde{Q}_\eta(s', a') - Q^*(s', a') \},$$

which is the second statement. Moreover, it also implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta \min_{(s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') &< \min_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \{ \tilde{Q}_\eta(s', a') - Q^*(s', a') \} \\
&\leq \min_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} | \tilde{Q}_\eta(s', a') - Q^*(s', a') | \\
&\leq \max_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} | \tilde{Q}_\eta(s', a') - Q^*(s', a') | \\
&= \| \tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^* \|_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the last statement.  $\square$

Based on Lemma 8, we will now prove Theorem 1.

*Proof of the first statement of Theorem 1.* Because the optimal solution  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$  should be in the domain  $\mathcal{D}$  of the log-barrier function, it should be strictly feasible for the primal LP. Moreover,  $\tilde{\lambda}_\eta$  is feasible for the dual LP. Using these results, we can obtain the following lower bounds:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a) Q^*(s, a) \\
&= \sum_{(s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s, a, a') R(s, a) \\
&\geq \sum_{(s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s, a, a') R(s, a) \\
&= \sum_{(s, a, a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s, a, a') R(s, a) \\
&+ \sum_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) \left\{ \rho(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s', a', a) P(s|s', a') - \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s, a, a') \right\} \\
&= L(\tilde{Q}_\eta, \tilde{\lambda}_\eta)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \tilde{Q}_\eta(s,a) + \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s,a,a') \{(F\tilde{Q}_\eta)(s,a,a') - \tilde{Q}_\eta(s,a)\} \\
&= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \tilde{Q}_\eta(s,a) + \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} -\eta \frac{w(s,a,a') \{(F\tilde{Q}_\eta)(s,a,a') - \tilde{Q}_\eta(s,a)\}}{(F\tilde{Q}_\eta)(s,a,a') - \tilde{Q}_\eta(s,a)} \\
&= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \tilde{Q}_\eta(s,a) - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a'), \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second line is due to the strong duality of the LP problem, the third and fourth lines are due to the fact that  $\tilde{\lambda}_\eta$  is dual feasible, and the sixth line is obtained by rearranging terms. On the other hand, since  $\tilde{Q}_\eta \in \mathcal{D}$  is primal feasible, we have

$$\sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) Q^*(s,a) \leq \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \tilde{Q}_\eta(s,a). \tag{9}$$

Combining Equation (8) and Equation (9) leads to

$$0 \leq \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \{\tilde{Q}_\eta(s,a) - Q^*(s,a)\} \leq \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a').$$

Using Lemma 8, we further derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \{\tilde{Q}_\eta(s,a) - Q^*(s,a)\} &\geq \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} (\tilde{Q}_\eta(s,a) - Q^*(s,a)) \\
&= \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^* \right\|_1 \\
&\geq \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^* \right\|_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line comes from  $\|\cdot\|_1 \geq \|\cdot\|_\infty$ . By dividing both sides by  $\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) > 0$ , one gets

$$\left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^* \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)}.$$

The lower bounds come from the second statement of Lemma 8.  $\square$

*Proof of the second statement of Theorem 1.* Next, using the reverse triangle inequality, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^* \right\|_\infty &= \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - T\tilde{Q}_\eta + T\tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^* \right\|_\infty \\
&\geq \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - T\tilde{Q}_\eta \right\|_\infty - \left\| T\tilde{Q}_\eta - TQ^* \right\|_\infty \\
&\geq \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - T\tilde{Q}_\eta \right\|_\infty - \gamma \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^* \right\|_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the contraction property of the Bellman operator with respect to  $\infty$ -norm.

Rearranging terms on both sides results in

$$\left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - T\tilde{Q}_\eta \right\|_\infty \leq (1 + \gamma) \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta - Q^* \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{(1 + \gamma)\eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a')}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)}.$$

The lower bounds come from the first statement of Lemma 8, and this completes the proof.  $\square$

## K Appendix: proof of Theorem 2

For convenience of the reader, the statements of Theorem 2 are summarized as follows:

1.  $J^{\pi^*} - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') \leq J^{\tilde{\pi}_\eta} \leq J^{\pi^*}$
2.  $J^{\pi^*} - \frac{\eta(1+\gamma) \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a')}{(1-\gamma) \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)} \leq J^{\tilde{\beta}_\eta} \leq J^{\pi^*}$
3.  $-\frac{\eta(1+\gamma) \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a')}{(1-\gamma) \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)} \leq J^{\tilde{\beta}_\eta} - J^{\tilde{\pi}_\eta} \leq \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a')$

*Proof of the first statement.* Because the optimal solution  $\tilde{Q}_\eta \in \mathcal{D}$  should be in the domain of the log-barrier function, it should be strictly feasible for the primal LP. Moreover,  $\tilde{\lambda}_\eta$  is feasible for the dual LP. Using these results, we can derive the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s, a, a') R(s, a) \\ & \geq \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}(s, a, a') R(s, a) \\ & = \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}(s, a, a') R(s, a) \\ & \quad + \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{Q}(s, a) \left\{ \rho(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{(s',a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}(s', a', a) P(s|s', a') - \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}(s, a, a') \right\} \\ & = L(\tilde{Q}, \tilde{\lambda}) \\ & = \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a) \tilde{Q}(s, a) - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') \\ & \geq \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a) Q^*(s, a) - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a') \\ & = \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s, a, a') R(s, a) - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a, a'), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to the fact that  $\tilde{\lambda}_\eta$  is dual feasible, the second inequality is due to the fact that  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$  is primal feasible, and the last line is due to the strong duality of the LP problem.

Summarizing the above results, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s,a,a') R(s,a) &\geq \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}(s,a,a') R(s,a) \\
&\geq \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda^*(s,a,a') R(s,a) \\
&\quad - \eta \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a').
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of the first statement is then completed using Theorem 3.  $\square$

*Proof of the second statement.* For the proof of the second statement, from Lemma 8 and Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\eta(1-\gamma) \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') \\
&\leq \tilde{Q}_\eta(s,a) - \left\{ R(s,a) + \gamma \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s,a) \tilde{Q}_\eta(s',a') \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{\eta(1+\gamma) \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)}, \quad \forall (s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}.
\end{aligned}$$

By plugging the primal  $\eta$ -policy  $\tilde{\beta}_\eta$  into  $a$  in the above inequality results in

$$\begin{aligned}
&\eta(1-\gamma) \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') \\
&\leq \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s)) - R(s, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s)) - \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s)) \tilde{Q}_\eta(s', \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s')) \\
&\leq \frac{\eta(1+\gamma) \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)}, \quad \forall (s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, taking the expectation on both sides of the above inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\eta(1-\gamma) \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Q}_\eta(s_k, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s_k)) | \tilde{\beta}_\eta, \rho] - \mathbb{E}[R(s_k, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s_k)) | \tilde{\beta}_\eta, \rho] - \gamma \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Q}_\eta(s_{k+1}, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s_{k+1})) | \tilde{\beta}_\eta, \rho] \\
&\leq \frac{\eta(1+\gamma) \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)}.
\end{aligned}$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the state  $s_k$  and the next state  $s_{k+1}$  generated under  $\tilde{\beta}_\eta$  and the initial state distribution  $\rho$ . Multiplying both sides of the above inequality by  $\gamma^k$  yields

$$\eta(1-\gamma)\gamma^k \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \gamma^k \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Q}_\eta(s_k, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s_k)) | \tilde{\beta}_\eta, \rho] - \gamma^k \mathbb{E}[R(s_k, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s_k)) | \tilde{\beta}_\eta, \rho] - \gamma^{k+1} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Q}_\eta(s_{k+1}, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s_{k+1})) | \tilde{\beta}_\eta, \rho] \\
&\leq \frac{\eta(1+\gamma) \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)} \gamma^k.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, summing them over all  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta \min_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a') &\leq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Q}_\eta(s_0, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s_0)) | \tilde{\beta}_\eta, \rho] - J^{\tilde{\beta}_\eta} \\
&\leq s \frac{\eta(1+\gamma) \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{(1-\gamma) \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we use

$$J^{\tilde{\beta}_\eta} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k R(s_k, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s_k)) \middle| \tilde{\beta}_\eta, \rho \right] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k \mathbb{E}[R(s_k, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s_k)) | \tilde{\beta}_\eta, \rho].$$

Rearranging terms leads to

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Q}_\eta(s_0, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s_0))] - \frac{\eta(1+\gamma) \sum_{(s,a,a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a,a')}{(1-\gamma) \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)} \leq J^{\tilde{\beta}_\eta} \leq J^{\pi^*}. \quad (10)$$

Moreover, since  $\tilde{Q}_\eta(s, a) \geq Q^*(s, a)$ , we have

$$\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \rho(s) \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, \tilde{\beta}_\eta(s)) \geq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \rho(s) \tilde{Q}_\eta(s, \pi^*(s)) \geq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \rho(s) Q^*(s, \pi^*(s)) = J^{\pi^*}. \quad (11)$$

Combining Equation (10) and Equation (11) leads to the second statement.  $\square$

*Proof of the third statement.* The last statement can be easily obtained by combining the first and second statements. This completes the overall proof.  $\square$

## L Appendix: policy evaluation problem

In this section, we present a summary of several properties of the LP formulation associated with policy evaluation. Similar to the policy design problem discussed in the main text, a number of corresponding properties can be established through analogous arguments. For convenience of the reader, let us write the LP form of the policy evaluation problem again as follows:

$$\min_{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}} \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) Q(s,a) \quad (12)$$

subject to

$$R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{(s',a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s'|s,a) \pi(a'|s') Q(s',a') \leq Q(s,a), \quad (s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A},$$

where  $R(s, a)$  is the expected reward conditioned on  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\rho$  denotes any probability distribution over  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  with strictly positive support. For convenience, let us define the Bellman operator

$$(T^\pi Q)(s, a) := R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s'|s, a) \pi(a'|s') Q(s', a'), \quad (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}.$$

Analogous to the policy design problem, it can be established that the optimal solution of the above LP corresponds to the Q-function,  $Q^\pi$ .

**Lemma 9.** *The optimal solution of the LP in Equation (12) is unique and given by  $Q^\pi$*

*Proof.* Let us assume that the optimal solution of the above LP in Equation (12) is  $\hat{Q}$ . Since  $\hat{Q}$  is feasible, it satisfies

$$(T^\pi \hat{Q})(s, a) \leq \hat{Q}(s, a), \quad (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}.$$

Equivalently, it can be written as  $T^\pi \hat{Q} \leq \hat{Q}$ . Because  $T$  is a monotone operator, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (T^\pi)^k \hat{Q} \leq \hat{Q} \Rightarrow Q^\pi \leq \hat{Q}.$$

Moreover, since  $T^\pi Q^\pi = Q^\pi$ ,  $Q^\pi$  is a feasible solution, and hence,  $\hat{Q} \leq Q^\pi$ . Therefore,  $Q^\pi \leq \hat{Q} \leq Q^\pi$ , which implies that  $\hat{Q} = Q^\pi$ .  $\square$

We next present the dual LP (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004, Chapter 5) corresponding to the policy evaluation LP.

**Lemma 10.** *The dual problem of the primal LP in Equation (12) is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\lambda \geq 0} \sum_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a) R(s, a) \\ & \text{subject to} \\ & \lambda(s, a) - \gamma \sum_{(i, j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i, j) \pi(a|s) \lambda(i, j) - \rho(s, a) = 0, \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let us consider the Lagrangian function (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004, Chapter 5)

$$\begin{aligned} L(Q, \lambda) &= \sum_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a) Q(s, a) \\ &+ \sum_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a) (R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s'|s, a) \pi(a'|s') Q(s', a') - Q(s, a)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda$  is the Lagrangian multiplier vector (or dual variable). Next, the function can be written by

$$L(Q, \lambda) = \sum_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s, a) R(s, a)$$

$$+ \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q(s,a) \left\{ \lambda(s,a) - \gamma \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i,j) \pi(a|s) \lambda(i,j) - \rho(s,a) \right\}.$$

One can observe that the dual problem  $\max_{\lambda \geq 0} \min_{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}} L(Q, \lambda)$  is finite only when

$$\lambda(s,a) - \gamma \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i,j) \pi(a|s) \lambda(i,j) - \rho(s,a) = 0, \quad \forall (s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}.$$

Therefore, one gets the dual problem. □

In what follows, we investigate the properties of feasible solutions of the dual LP introduced above.

**Theorem 5.** *Suppose that the marginal*

$$\rho(s) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)$$

*represents the initial state distribution and  $\lambda(s,a), \forall (s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  is any dual feasible solution (all solutions satisfying the dual constraints). Then, we obtain the following results:*

1.  $(1 - \gamma)\lambda$  is a probability distribution, i.e.,

$$(1 - \gamma)\lambda(s,a) \geq 0, \quad \forall (s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \quad \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} (1 - \gamma)\lambda(s,a) = 1.$$

2. Moreover, let us define the marginal distributions

$$\lambda(s) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a), \quad \rho(s) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a).$$

Then, we have

$$\lambda(s') - \gamma \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P^\xi(s'|s) \lambda(s) = \rho(s'),$$

where

$$\xi(\cdot|s) := \left[ \frac{\lambda(s,1)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a)} \quad \frac{\lambda(s,2)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a)} \quad \cdots \quad \frac{\lambda(s,|\mathcal{A}|)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a)} \right]$$

and

$$P^\xi(s'|s) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} P(s'|s,a) \xi(a|s)$$

is the probability of the transition from  $s$  to  $s'$  under the policy  $\xi$ .

3.  $(1 - \gamma)\lambda(\cdot)$  is the discounted state occupation probability distribution defined as

$$(1 - \gamma)\lambda(s) = \mu^\xi(s) = (1 - \gamma) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k \mathbb{P}[s_k = s | \xi, \rho].$$

4. The dual objective function satisfies

$$\sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a)R(s,a) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} V^\xi(s)\rho(s) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} J^\xi$$

*Proof.* For the first statement, summing the dual constraints over  $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , we get

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a) - \gamma \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a) = 1,$$

which leads to

$$\sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a) = 1.$$

It proves the first statement. For the second statement, summing the dual constraints in Equation (3) over  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  leads to

$$\lambda(s,a) - \gamma \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i,j)\lambda(i,j,a) = \rho(s,a).$$

Moreover, summing the above equation over  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  leads to

$$\lambda(s) - \gamma \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i,j)\lambda(i,j) = \rho(s),$$

which can be further written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda(s) - \gamma \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i,j)\lambda(i,j) \\ &= \lambda(s) - \gamma \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i,j) \frac{\lambda(i,j)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(i,a)} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda(i,a) \\ &= \lambda(s) - \gamma \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s|i,j)\xi(j|i)\lambda(i) \\ &= \lambda(s) - \gamma \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} P^\xi(s|i)\lambda(i) \\ &= \rho(s), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

and this proves the second statement.

To prove the third statement, we can first consider the vectorized form of Equation (13)

$$\lambda - \gamma(P^\xi)^T \lambda = \rho,$$

where

$$\lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda(1) \\ \vdots \\ \lambda(|\mathcal{S}|) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}, \quad \rho = \begin{bmatrix} \rho(1) \\ \vdots \\ \rho(|\mathcal{S}|) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|},$$

$$P^\xi = \begin{bmatrix} P^\xi(1|1) & \cdots & P^\pi(|\mathcal{S}||1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ P^\xi(1||\mathcal{S}) & \cdots & P^\xi(|\mathcal{S}|||\mathcal{S}) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{S}|},$$

which leads to

$$\lambda^T = \rho^T + \gamma \rho^T P_\xi + \gamma^2 \rho^T P_\xi^2 + \cdots .$$

The expression can be written as

$$\lambda(s) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k \mathbb{P}[s_k = s | \pi, \xi] = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mu^\xi(s).$$

This completes the proof of the third statement.

The last statement can be proved through the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda(s,a) R(s,a) &= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \xi(a|s) R(s,a) \lambda(s) \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} V^\xi(s) \rho(s) \\ &= J^\xi, \end{aligned}$$

where  $R^\xi$  denotes the expected reward under the policy  $\xi$ , and  $V^\xi$  denotes the value function under  $\xi$ .  $\square$

Based on Theorem 5, we can readily obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.** *Suppose that the marginal  $\rho(s) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)$ ,  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  represents the initial state distribution,*

$$\pi(a|s) := \frac{\rho(s,a)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)}$$

*represents  $\pi$ ,  $Q^\pi$  is the primal optimal solution, and  $\lambda^\pi$  is the dual optimal solution. Then, the policy  $\xi$  defined in the following is identical to  $\pi$  in the sense that their corresponding MDP objective values are identical:*

$$\xi(\cdot|s) := \left[ \frac{\lambda^\pi(s,1)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda^\pi(s,a)} \quad \frac{\lambda^\pi(s,2)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda^\pi(s,a)} \quad \cdots \quad \frac{\lambda^\pi(s,|\mathcal{A}|)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \lambda^\pi(s,a)} \right]$$

*which is identical to the MDP objective function  $J^\pi$ .*

*Proof.* We first note that the optimal primal solution  $Q^\pi$  does not depend on  $\rho$ , while the optimal dual solution  $\lambda^\pi$  depends on  $\rho$ . Keeping this in mind, let us suppose that the marginal

$$\rho(s) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)$$

represents the initial state distribution and

$$\pi(a|s) := \frac{\rho(s, a)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)}$$

represents the policy  $\pi$ . The optimal primal objective function value is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a) Q^\pi(s, a) &= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s) \pi(a|s) Q^\pi(s, a) \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \rho(s) V^\pi(s) \\ &= J^\pi \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the optimal dual objective function value is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda^\pi(s, a) R(s, a) &= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \xi(a|s) R(s, a) \lambda^\pi(s) \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} R^\xi(s) \lambda^\pi(s) \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} V^\xi(s) \rho(s) \\ &= J^\xi. \end{aligned}$$

By the strong duality, we have  $J^\xi = J^\pi$ , which means that the policy  $\xi$  is identical to the policy  $\pi$ .  $\square$

Let us consider the objective function with log-barrier function

$$f_\eta^\pi(Q) := \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} Q(s, a) \rho(s, a) + \eta \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a) \varphi((T^\pi Q)(s, a) - Q(s, a))$$

where  $\eta > 0$  is a weight parameter and  $w(s, a) > 0, (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  are weight parameters of the inequality constraints. Then, we can prove that the corresponding optimal solution  $\tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi := \arg \min_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} f_\eta^\pi(Q)$  approximates  $Q^\pi$ . The following lemma establishes such an error bound between  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$  and  $Q^*$ , and, in addition, presents a bound on the Bellman error corresponding to  $\tilde{Q}_\eta$ .

**Theorem 6.** *We have*

1.  $\eta \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a) < \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - Q^\pi \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\eta \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a)}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)}$
2.  $\eta(1 - \gamma) \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a) < \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{(1+\gamma)\eta \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a)}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s, a)}$

To prove Theorem 6, we first need to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 11.** *Let us define*

$$\tilde{\lambda}_\eta(s, a) := -\frac{\eta w(s, a)}{(T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi)(s, a) - \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s, a)}, \quad (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}.$$

Then, we have the following results:

1.  $\eta(1 - \gamma) \min_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a) < \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi \right\|_\infty$
2.  $\tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s, a) - Q^\pi(s, a) > \eta \min_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a), \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$
3.  $\eta \min_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a) < \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - Q^\pi \right\|_\infty$

*Proof.* Following similar lines as in the proof of Theorem 3, we can derive

$$0 < \frac{\eta w(s, a)(1 - \gamma)}{\tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s, a) - (T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi)(s, a)} < 1, \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A},$$

which implies

$$\eta \min_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a)(1 - \gamma) < \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s, a) - (T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi)(s, a), \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A},$$

By taking the absolute value on the right-hand side and taking the maximum over  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , we can obtain the first statement.

Next, for the second statement, we first note the following bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta(1 - \gamma) \min_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a) \\ & < \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s, a) - (T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi)(s, a) \\ & = \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s, a) - (T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi)(s, a) - Q^\pi(s, a) + (T^\pi Q^\pi)(s, a) \\ & = \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s, a) - Q^\pi(s, a) - \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a'|s') \{ \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s', a') - Q^\pi(s', a') \} \\ & \leq \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s, a) - Q^*(s, a) - \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \min_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \{ \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s', a') - Q^\pi(s', a') \} \\ & \leq \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s, a) - Q^\pi(s, a) - \gamma \min_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \{ \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s', a') - Q^\pi(s', a') \}, \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the Bellman equation  $Q^\pi = T^\pi Q^\pi$  in the first equality.

Taking the minimum over  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  on both sides yields

$$(1 - \gamma) \eta \min_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a) < (1 - \gamma) \min_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \{ \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s', a') - Q^\pi(s', a') \},$$

which is the second statement. Moreover, it also implies

$$\eta \min_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s, a) < \min_{(s', a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \{ \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s', a') - Q^\pi(s', a') \}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \min_{(s',a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} |\tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s',a') - Q^\pi(s',a')| \\
&\leq \max_{(s',a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} |\tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s',a') - Q^\pi(s',a')| \\
&= \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - Q^\pi \right\|_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the last statement.  $\square$

Based on Lemma 11, we will now prove Theorem 6.

*Proof of the first statement of Theorem 6.* Because the optimal solution  $\tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi$  should be in the domain of the log-barrier function, it should be strictly feasible for the primal LP. Moreover,  $\tilde{\lambda}_\eta^\pi$  is feasible for the dual LP. Using these results, we can obtain the following lower bounds:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) Q^\pi(s,a) \\
&= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \lambda^\pi(s,a) R(s,a) \\
&\geq \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta^\pi(s,a) R(s,a) \\
&= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta^\pi(s,a) R(s,a) \\
&\quad + \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s,a) \left\{ \rho(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{(s',a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta^\pi(s',a') P(s|s',a') - \tilde{\lambda}_\eta^\pi(s,a) \right\} \\
&= L(\tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi, \tilde{\lambda}_\eta^\pi) \\
&= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s,a) + \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \tilde{\lambda}_\eta^\pi(s,a) \{ (T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi)(s,a) - \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s,a) \} \\
&= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s,a) + \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} -\eta \frac{w(s,a) \{ (T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi)(s,a) - \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s,a) \}}{(T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi)(s,a,a') - \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s,a)} \\
&= \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s,a) - \eta \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a), \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second line is due to the strong duality of the LP problem, the third and fourth lines are due to the fact that  $\tilde{\lambda}_\eta^\pi$  is dual feasible, and the sixth line is obtained by rearranging terms. On the other hand, since  $\tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi \in \mathcal{D}$  is primal feasible, we have

$$\sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) Q^*(s,a) \leq \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s,a). \tag{15}$$

Combining Equation (14) and Equation (15) leads to

$$0 \leq \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \{ \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s,a) - Q^\pi(s,a) \} \leq \eta \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a).$$

Using Lemma 11 and  $\|\cdot\|_1 \geq \|\cdot\|_\infty$ , we further derive

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \{ \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s,a) - Q^\pi(s,a) \} &\geq \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} (\tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s,a) - Q^\pi(s,a)) \\ &= \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - Q^\pi \right\|_1 \\ &\geq \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - Q^\pi \right\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from  $\tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi(s,a) - Q^\pi(s,a) > 0$ . By dividing both sides by  $\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) > 0$  leads to

$$\left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - Q^\pi \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\eta \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a)}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)}.$$

The lower bounds come from the second statement of Lemma 8.  $\square$

*Proof of the second statement of Theorem 6.* Next, using the reverse triangle inequality, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - Q^\pi \right\|_\infty &= \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi + T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - Q^\pi \right\|_\infty \\ &\geq \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi \right\|_\infty - \left\| T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - T^\pi Q^\pi \right\|_\infty \\ &\geq \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi \right\|_\infty - \gamma \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - Q^\pi \right\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from the contraction of the Bellman operator.

Rearranging terms on both sides results in

$$\left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - T^\pi \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi \right\|_\infty \leq (1 + \gamma) \left\| \tilde{Q}_\eta^\pi - Q^\pi \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{(1 + \gamma) \eta \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} w(s,a)}{\min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a)}.$$

The lower bounds come from the first statement of Lemma 11, and this completes the proof.  $\square$

## M Appendix: Proposition 1

In Section 6, we introduce a novel DQN algorithm inspired by the idea of standard DQN (Mnih et al., 2015) and consider the following loss function:

$$L(\theta) := \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{(s,a,r,s') \in B, a' \in \mathcal{A}} [Q_\theta(s,a) + \eta \varphi(r + \gamma Q_\theta(s',a') - Q_\theta(s,a))],$$

where  $B$  is a mini-batch uniformly sampled from the experience replay buffer  $D$ ,  $|B|$  is the size of the mini-batch,  $Q_\theta$  is a deep neural network approximation of Q-function,  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the parameter to be determined, and  $(s,a,r,s')$  is the transition sample of the state-action-reward-next state. The loss function can be seen as a stochastic approximation of  $f_\eta$ , where  $\rho$  and  $w$  can

be set to probability distributions corresponding to the replay buffer. However, this stochastic approximation is generally biased because it approximates a function in which the state transition probabilities appear outside the log-barrier function. In fact, by applying Jensen’s inequality, we can show that the above loss function is essentially an unbiased stochastic approximation of an upper bounding surrogate function of  $f_\eta$ . The related result is first introduced below.

**Proposition 1.** *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} f_\eta(Q) &\leq \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho(s,a) Q(s,a) \\ &\quad + \eta \sum_{(s,a,s',a') \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s'|s,a) w(s,a,a') \varphi(r(s,a,s') + \gamma Q(s',a') - Q(s,a)) \\ &=: g_\eta(Q) \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* It can be proved directly using Jensen’s inequality.  $\square$

The above result employed Jensen’s inequality to derive the upper-bounding surrogate function  $g_\eta$ . Relating this to the loss function  $L$ , we observe that the surrogate function can be obtained by taking the expectation of  $L$ . In other words, under the assumption that the mini-batch samples are i.i.d., the loss function  $L$  can be shown to be an unbiased stochastic approximation of the upper surrogate function. Of course, as noted in the main text, if the environment is deterministic, then the original function  $f_\eta$  and the upper surrogate function  $g_\eta$  are identical. Therefore,  $L$  is no longer a stochastic approximation of the upper surrogate function; it is now an exact representation.

## N Appendix: log-barrier DQN algorithm

Here, we discuss the implementation details of the deep RL variant of the proposed method. Since the loss function  $L$

$$L(\theta) := \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{(s,a,r,s') \in B, a' \in \mathcal{A}} [Q_\theta(s,a) + \eta \varphi(r + \gamma Q_\theta(s',a') - Q_\theta(s,a))],$$

relies on random samples of state–action pairs, applying gradient descent does not update the parameters for all state–action pairs simultaneously. As a result, there is no guarantee that  $Q_\theta$  strictly satisfies the inequality constraints of the LP during the update process. In fact,  $Q_\theta$  corresponding to state–action pairs that are not sampled may move outside the feasible region defined by the inequality constraints. Such behavior can significantly undermine the stability of learning. To address this issue, in practical implementations, we replace  $L$  with the following alternative loss function  $\tilde{L}$  as follows:

$$\tilde{L}(\theta) := \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{(s,a,r,s') \in B} \left[ Q_\theta(s,a) + \eta \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} h(r + \gamma Q_\theta(s',a') - Q_\theta(s,a)) \right]$$

where

$$h(x) := \begin{cases} \varphi(x - \varepsilon) & \text{if } x < 0 \\ \nu x & \text{if } x \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

$\varepsilon > 0$  is a small number, e.g.  $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$ , added for numerical stability and  $\nu > 0$  is a large number, e.g.  $\nu = 10^3$ , in order to enforce  $Q_\theta$  to be feasible when the TD error  $r + \gamma Q_\theta(s', a') - Q_\theta(s, a)$  is nonnegative. Based on these details, the overall deep RL version is given in Algorithm 1. In Algorithm 1,  $\mathbf{1}_{|S||\mathcal{A}|} \in \mathbb{R}^{|S||\mathcal{A}|}$  is the vector with all entries one. The initialization,  $Q_\theta \cong \kappa \mathbf{1}_{|S||\mathcal{A}|}$ ,

---

**Algorithm 1** Log-barrier deep Q-learning

---

- 1: Initialize replay memory  $D$  to capacity  $|D|$
- 2: Initialize the parameter  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $Q_\theta \cong \kappa \mathbf{1}_{|S||\mathcal{A}|}$  with large enough  $\kappa > 0$
- 3: Set  $k = 0$
- 4: **for** Episode  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  **do**
- 5:     Observe  $s_0$
- 6:     **for**  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, \tau - 1\}$  **do**
- 7:         Take an action  $a_t$  according to

$$a_t = \begin{cases} \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{\theta_1}(s_t, a) & \text{with probability } 1 - \varepsilon \\ a \sim \text{uniform}(\mathcal{A}) & \text{with probability } \varepsilon \end{cases}$$

- 8:     Observe  $r_{t+1}, s_{t+1}$
- 9:     Store the transition  $(s_t, a_t, r_{t+1}, s_{t+1})$  in  $D$
- 10:     Sample uniformly a random mini-batch  $B$  of transitions  $(s, a, r, s')$  from  $D$
- 11:     Perform few gradient descent steps

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \nabla_\theta \tilde{L}(\theta)$$

- 12:     Set  $k \leftarrow k + 1$
  - 13:     **end for**
  - 14: **end for**
- 

is motivated by the observation that a candidate strictly feasible solution to the LP formulation in Equation (1) takes the form  $\kappa \mathbf{1}_{|S||\mathcal{A}|}$  with a large  $\kappa > 0$ . To implement this initialization within a deep neural network, one may set all weights to zero while retaining only a constant bias term.

## O Appendix: log-barrier DDPG algorithm

Here, we discuss the implementation details of the deep RL variant of the proposed method for policy evaluation. Since the loss function  $L_{\text{critic}}(\theta; \pi_w)$

$$L_{\text{critic}}(\theta; \pi_w) := \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{(s,a,r,s') \in B} [Q_\theta(s, a) + \eta \varphi(r + \gamma Q_\theta(s', \pi_w(s')) - Q_\theta(s, a))],$$

for policy evaluation relies on random samples of state–action pairs, applying gradient descent does not update the parameters for all state–action pairs simultaneously. Similar to the previous section, in practical implementations, we replace  $L$  with the following alternative loss function  $\tilde{L}$  as follows:

$$\tilde{L}_{\text{critic}}(\theta; \pi_w) := \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{(s,a,r,s') \in B} [Q_\theta(s, a) + \eta h(r + \gamma Q_\theta(s', \pi_w(s')) - Q_\theta(s, a))]$$

where

$$h(x) := \begin{cases} \varphi(x - \varepsilon) & \text{if } x < 0 \\ \nu x & \text{if } x \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

$\varepsilon > 0$  is a small number, e.g.  $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$ , added for numerical stability and  $\nu > 0$  is a large number, e.g.  $\nu = 10^3$ , in order to enforce  $Q_\theta$  to be feasible when the TD error  $r + \gamma Q_\theta(s', \pi_w(s')) - Q_\theta(s, a)$  is nonnegative. As usual, the actor loss function (Lillicrap et al., 2015) is given by

$$L_{\text{actor}}(w) := \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{(s,a,r,s') \in B} (-Q_\theta(s, \pi_w(s))).$$

The overall detailed algorithm is shown in Algorithm 2.

---

**Algorithm 2** Log-barrier DDPG

---

- 1: Initialize replay memory  $D$  to capacity  $|D|$
  - 2: Initialize the critic parameter  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1}$  such that  $Q_\theta \cong \kappa \mathbf{1}_{|S||A|}$  with large enough  $\kappa > 0$  and the target critic parameter  $\theta' = \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1}$
  - 3: Initialize the online actor parameter  $w \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2}$  and the target actor parameter  $w' = w \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2}$
  - 4: Set  $k = 0$
  - 5: **for** Episode  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  **do**
  - 6:   Observe  $s_0$
  - 7:   **for**  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T - 1\}$  **do**
  - 8:     Take an action  $a_t = \pi_w(s_t) + e_t$  where  $e_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$  is the exploration noise and  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$  is the normal distribution.
  - 9:     Observe  $r_{t+1}, s_{t+1}$
  - 10:     Store the transition  $(s_t, a_t, r_{t+1}, s_{t+1})$  in  $D$
  - 11:     Sample uniformly a random mini-batch  $B$  of transitions  $(s, a, r, s')$  from  $D$
  - 12:     Critic update: perform few gradient descent steps
 
$$\theta \leftarrow \theta - \alpha_{\text{critic}} \nabla_\theta \tilde{L}_{\text{critic}}(\theta; \pi_w)$$
  - 13:     Actor update: perform a gradient descent step
 
$$w \leftarrow w + \alpha_{\text{actor}} \nabla_w L_{\text{actor}}(w)$$
  - 14:     Soft target network update
 
$$w' \leftarrow \tau w + (1 - \tau)w'$$

$$\theta' \leftarrow \tau \theta + (1 - \tau)\theta'$$
  - 15:     Set  $k \leftarrow k + 1$
  - 16:   **end for**
  - 17: **end for**
- 

In Algorithm 2, we adopt settings that are consistent with the original DDPG paper (Lillicrap et al., 2015). In particular, we employ target networks for both actor and critic and apply the soft target updates. Moreover, Algorithm 2 incorporates exploration through Gaussian noise. Our

main deviations lie in the structure of the critic loss and the initialization of the critic network. As presented in Section P, we initialize the critic network bias with  $\kappa = 100$ , set the enforcement parameter to  $\nu = 100$ , and use a barrier parameter of  $\eta = 0.015$  in the critic loss.

## P Appendix: hyperparameters

We summarize in the following tables the hyperparameter configurations employed in the experiments for the proposed log-barrier deep Q-learning and log-barrier DDPG. Specifically, Table 1 lists the hyperparameters for the log-barrier deep Q-learning experiments, and Table 2 lists those for the log-barrier DDPG experiments. In the comparative experiments, the parameters of standard DQN and standard DDPG were tuned to achieve optimal performance. For fairness, common hyperparameters were controlled to be identical under the same experimental conditions.

Table 1: Hyperparameter settings of log-barrier deep Q-learning for the discrete control

Hyperparameter	Value
Initial network bias ( $\kappa$ )	100
Enforce parameter ( $\nu$ )	1000
Discount factor ( $\gamma$ )	0.99
Batch size	64
Epsilon ( $\epsilon$ )	0.1
Episodes	200 (CartPole-v1, Acrobot-v1) 500 (LunarLander-v3)
Barrier parameter ( $\eta$ )	7 (CartPole-v1), 0.25 (Acrobot-v1) 2 (LunarLander-v3)
Learning rate	0.0002 (LunarLander-v3), 0.0005 (otherwise)
Replay buffer size	100,000 (CartPole-v1, Acrobot-v1) 1,000,000 (LunarLander-v3)

Table 2: Hyperparameter settings for log-barrier DDPG on MuJoCo tasks

Hyperparameter	Value
Initial network bias ( $\kappa$ )	100
Enforce parameter ( $\nu$ )	100
Discount factor ( $\gamma$ )	0.99
Batch size	256
Epsilon ( $\epsilon$ )	0.01
Barrier parameter ( $\eta$ )	0.015
Exploration noise ( $\sigma$ )	0.1 (Gaussian)
Total timesteps	2M steps equivalent (Walker2d, Ant, Hopper, HalfCheetah, Humanoid)
Target update rate ( $\tau$ )	0.005
Actor learning rate	0.001
Critic learning rate	0.001
Replay buffer size	1,000,000
Hidden units per layer	256
Number of hidden layers	2