

# A Convex Optimization Approach to Dynamic Programming in Continuous State and Action Spaces

Insoon Yang\*

## Abstract

A convex optimization-based method is proposed to numerically solve dynamic programs in continuous state and action spaces. This approach using a discretization of the state space has the following salient features. First, by introducing an auxiliary optimization variable that assigns the contribution of each grid point, it does not require an interpolation in solving an associated Bellman equation and constructing a control policy. Second, the proposed method allows us to solve the Bellman equation with a desired level of precision via convex programming in the case of linear systems and convex costs. We can also construct a control policy of which performance converges to the optimum as the grid resolution becomes finer in this case. Third, when a nonlinear control-affine system is considered, the convex optimization approach provides an approximate control policy with a provable suboptimality bound. Fourth, for general cases, the proposed convex formulation of dynamic programming operators can be simply modified as a nonconvex bi-level program, in which the inner problem is a linear program, without losing convergence properties. From our convex methods and analyses, we observe that convexity in dynamic programming deserves attention as it can play a critical role in obtaining a tractable and convergent numerical solution.

**Key words.** Dynamic programming, convex optimization, optimal control, stochastic systems, numerical analysis.

## 1 Introduction

Dynamic programming has been a popular tool used to solve and analyze several sequential decision-making problems, including optimal control and dynamic games [1, 2]. By using dynamic programming, we can decompose a complicated sequential decision-making problem into multiple tractable subproblems of which optimal solutions are used to construct an optimal policy of the original problem. Numerical methods for dynamic programs are the most well studied for discrete-time Markov decision processes (MDPs) with discrete state and action spaces (e.g., [3, 4]) and continuous-time deterministic and stochastic optimal control problems in continuous state spaces (e.g., [5]). The focus of this paper is the discrete-time case with continuous state and action spaces in both the infinite-horizon discounted and finite-horizon setting. Unlike infinite-dimensional linear programming (LP) methods (e.g., [6, 7, 8, 9]), which require a finite-dimensional approximation of the LP problems, we develop a finite-dimensional convex optimization-based method that uses a discretization of the state space.

---

\*Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Automation and Systems Research Institute, Seoul National University (insoonyang@snu.ac.kr). Supported in part by NSF under ECCS-1708906 and CNS-1657100, Research Resettlement Fund for the new faculty of Seoul National University (SNU), and Creative-Pioneering Researchers Program through SNU.

## 1.1 Related Work

Several discretization methods have been developed for discrete-time dynamic programming problems in continuous (Borel) state and action spaces. These methods can be assigned to two categories. The first category discretizes both state and action spaces. Bertsekas [10] proposes two discretization methods and proves their convergence under a set of assumptions, including Lipschitz type continuity conditions. Langen [11] studies the weak convergence of an approximation procedure, although no explicit error bound is provided. However, the discretization method proposed by Whitt [12] and Hinderer [13] is shown to be convergent and to have error bounds. Unfortunately, these error bounds are sensitive to the choice of partitions, and additional compactness and continuity assumptions are needed to reduce the sensitivity. Chow and Tsitsiklis [14] develops a multi-grid algorithm, which could be more efficient than its single-grid counterpart in achieving a desired level of accuracy. The discretization procedure proposed by Dufour and Prieto-Rumeau [15] can handle unbounded cost functions and locally compact state spaces. However, it still requires the Lipschitz continuity of some components of dynamic programs. Unlike the aforementioned approaches, the finite-state and finite-action approximation method for MDPs with locally compact state spaces proposed by Saldi *et al.* does not rely on Lipschitz-type continuity conditions [16, 17].

The second category of discretization methods uses computational grids only for the state space, i.e., this class of methods does not discretize the action space. These approaches have a computational advantage over the methods in the first category, particularly when the action space dimension is large. The state space discretization procedures proposed by Hernández-Lerma [18] are shown to have a convergence guarantee with an error bound under Lipschitz continuity conditions on elements of control models. However, they are subject to the issue of local optimality in solving the nonconvex optimization problem over the action space involved in the Bellman equation. Johnson *et al.* [19] suggests spline interpolation methods, which are computationally efficient in high-dimensional state and action spaces. Unfortunately, these spline-based approaches do not have a convergence guarantee or an explicit suboptimality bound. Furthermore, the Bellman equation approximated by these methods involves nonconvex optimization problems. A careful review on a broader class of methods including approximate value or policy iteration, approximate linear programming and state aggregation can be found in a recent monograph [20].

## 1.2 Contributions

The method proposed in this paper is classified into the second category of discretization procedures. Specifically, our approach only discretizes the state space. The key idea is to use an auxiliary optimization variable that assigns the contribution of each grid point when evaluating the value function at a particular state. By doing so, we can avoid an explicit interpolation of the value function and a control policy evaluated at (discrete) grid points in the state space unlike most existing methods. The contributions of this work are threefold. First, we propose an approximate version of the dynamic programming (DP) operator and show that its fixed point converges to the optimal value function  $v^*$  point-wise when  $v^*$  is convex. The proposed approximate DP operator has a computational advantage because it involves a convex optimization problem in the case of linear systems and convex costs. Thus, we can construct a near-optimal control policy with an explicit error bound by solving  $M$  convex programs in each iteration of our value iteration algorithm, where  $M$  is the number of grid points required for the desired accuracy. Second, we show that the proposed convex optimization approach provides an approximate policy with a provable suboptimality bound in the case of control-affine systems. This error bound is useful when gauging the performance of the approximate policy relative to an optimal policy. Third, we propose a modified version of

our approximation method for general cases by localizing the effect of the auxiliary variable. The modified DP operator involves a nonconvex bi-level optimization problem wherein the inner problem is a linear program. We show that both the approximate value function and the cost-to-go function of a policy obtained by this method converge to the optimal value function point-wise if a globally optimal solution to the nonconvex bilevel problem can be evaluated; related error bounds are also characterized.

We extend all the aforementioned results to the case of finite-horizon problems. From our convex formulation and analysis, we observe that convexity in dynamic programming deserves attention as it can play a critical role in designing a tractable numerical method that provides a convergent solution.

### 1.3 Organization

In Section 2, we introduce the problem setup and basic assumptions required for our convergence analysis. The convex optimization-based method is proposed in Section 3. We show that it provides a convergent solution to dynamic programs with linear systems and convex costs. In Section 4, we characterize an error bound for cases with control-affine systems and present a modified bi-level version of our approximation method for general cases. All the error bounds and convergence analyses established for infinite-horizon discounted problems are extended to the finite-horizon setting in Section 5. Section 6 contains numerical experiments that demonstrate the convergence property and utility of our method.

## 2 The Setup

Consider a discrete-time Markov control system of the form

$$x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, w_t),$$

where  $x_t \in \mathbb{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is the system state, and  $u_t \in \mathbb{U}(x_t) \subseteq \mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  is the control input. The stochastic disturbance process  $\{w_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is i.i.d. and defined on a standard filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$  and  $w_t \in \mathbb{W} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^l$ . The function  $f : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$  is assumed to be measurable.

A *history* up to stage  $t$  is defined as  $h_t := (x_0, u_0, \dots, x_{t-1}, u_{t-1}, x_t)$ . Let  $H_t$  be the set of histories up to stage  $t$  and  $\pi_t$  be a stochastic kernel from  $H_t$  to  $\mathbb{U}$ . The set of admissible control policies is chosen as  $\Pi := \{\pi := (\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots) \mid \pi_t(\mathbb{U}(x_t) | h_t) = 1 \forall h_t \in H_t\}$ . Our goal is to solve the following infinite-horizon discounted stochastic optimal control problem:

$$v^*(\mathbf{x}) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}^\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \alpha^t r(x_t, u_t) \mid x_0 = \mathbf{x} \right], \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  is a discount factor,  $r : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a stage-wise cost function of interest, and  $\mathbb{E}^\pi$  represents the expectation taken with respect to the probability measure induced by a policy  $\pi$ . Under the standard assumptions for a semi-continuous model or a semi-continuous semi-compact model, there exists a *deterministic stationary* policy, which is optimal (e.g., [6, 21]). In other words, we can find an optimal policy  $\pi^*$  such that  $\pi^* \in \Pi^{DS} := \{\pi : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{U} \mid \pi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x}) \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}\} \subset \Pi$ . In this paper, we impose a sufficient condition for the existence and optimality of deterministic stationary policies.

**Assumption 1** (Semi-continuous model). *Let  $\mathbb{K} := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U} \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})\}$  be the set of feasible state-action pairs.*

1. The control set  $\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})$  is compact for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ ;
2. The function  $\mathbf{u} \mapsto r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  is lower semicontinuous on  $\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})$  for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ ;
3. The function  $\mathbf{u} \mapsto v'(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) := \mathbb{E}[v(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, w))]$  is continuous on  $\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})$  for every bounded measurable function  $v : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ;
4. There exist nonnegative constants  $\bar{r}$  and  $\beta$ , with  $1 \leq \beta < 1/\alpha$ , and a measurable weight function  $\xi : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  such that  $|r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})| \leq \bar{r}\xi(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\xi'(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) := \mathbb{E}[\xi(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, w))] \leq \beta\xi(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{K}$ ;
5. The function  $\mathbf{u} \mapsto \xi'(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) := \mathbb{E}[\xi(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, w))]$  is continuous on  $\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})$  for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ .

Let  $\mathbb{B}_\xi$  be the Banach space of measurable functions  $v$  on  $\mathbb{X}$  such that  $\|v\|_\xi := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}} (|v(\mathbf{x})|/\xi(\mathbf{x})) < \infty$ . For all  $v \in \mathbb{B}_\xi$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ , let

$$(Tv)(\mathbf{x}) := \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})} r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) + \alpha \mathbb{E}[v(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, w))]. \quad (2.2)$$

Under Assumption 1, the dynamic programming (DP) operator  $T$  maps  $\mathbb{B}_\xi$  into itself and is a contraction mapping with respect to the weighted sup-norm  $\|\cdot\|_\xi$  [21]. By the Banach fixed point theorem, the Bellman equation

$$v = Tv \quad (2.3)$$

has the unique solution  $v^*$  (in  $\mathbb{B}_\xi$ ), which corresponds to the optimal value function defined by (2.1). After solving the Bellman equation (via value or policy iteration), an optimal policy  $\pi^* \in \Pi^{DS}$  can be obtained as

$$\pi^*(\mathbf{x}) \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})} r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) + \alpha \mathbb{E}[v^*(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, w))] \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}.$$

The existence of such a minimizer is guaranteed under Assumption 1.

For ease of exposition, we consider the case that the probability distribution of  $w_t$  has a finite support,  $\mathbb{W} := \{\hat{w}^{[1]}, \dots, \hat{w}^{[N]}\}$ , as in Bertsekas [10]. Specifically, we assume that

$$w_t \sim \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \delta_{\hat{w}^{[s]}} \quad \forall t,$$

where  $\delta_w$  is the Dirac measure concentrated at  $w$ . This case is practically important since empirical distributions directly obtained from data are finitely supported. Furthermore, a stochastic control problem in the case of an infinite support can be approximated by this finitely-supported distribution case via the popular sample average approximation (e.g., [22]). Also, by setting  $N = 1$ , we can consider deterministic optimal control problems. This assumption of a finite support can be relaxed in principle by extending our method to the context of semi-infinite programs.

## 2.1 Lipschitz Continuity

The convergence analysis of our numerical method uses the Lipschitz continuity of the optimal value function  $v^*$ . Lipschitz continuity plays an important role in most existing numerical methods used to solve dynamic programs and is employed as a standard assumption [10, 12, 13, 11, 18, 14, 15, 8, 9].<sup>1</sup> We record the following sufficient condition proposed by Bertsekas [10] for the optimal value function to be Lipschitz continuous:

<sup>1</sup> A notable exception is the work by Saldi *et al.* [17].

**Assumption 2** (Lipschitz Continuity). *The stochastic control problem satisfies the following:*

1. *There exist nonnegative constants  $L_f$  and  $L_r$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} |f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, w) - f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{u}', w)| &\leq L_f[\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| + \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}'\|] \\ |r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) - r(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{u}')| &\leq L_r[\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| + \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}'\|] \end{aligned}$$

*for all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{X}$ ,  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}' \in \mathbb{U}$ ,  $w \in \mathbb{W}$ .*

2. *The set  $\bigcup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}} \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})$  is compact, and*

$$\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x}) \subseteq \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x}') + \{\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{u} \leq L_{\mathbb{U}}\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|\} \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{X}$$

*for some nonnegative constant  $L_{\mathbb{U}}$ , where the set addition  $A + B$  represents  $\{a + b \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$ .*

**Proposition 1** (Bertsekas [10]). *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Then, the optimal value function  $v^*$  is Lipschitz continuous, i.e.,*

$$|v^*(\mathbf{x}) - v^*(\mathbf{x}')| \leq L\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{X}$$

*for some positive constant  $L$ .*

## 2.2 State Space Discretization

We assume that the state space  $\mathbb{X}$  is compact and convex. The compactness assumption is typical in discretization-based methods for continuous-state dynamic programming (e.g., [10, 12, 13, 18, 14, 9]), with a few notable exceptions (e.g., [15, 17]). This assumption may be relaxed by using the method proposed by Saldi *et al.* [17], which approximates an MDP with a locally compact state space as another MDP with a compact space in a convergent manner.<sup>2</sup> Our goal is to evaluate the optimal value function at pre-specified grid points in  $\mathbb{X}$ . We partition  $\mathbb{X}$  into mutually disjoint sets  $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_K$ , each of which is a convex hull of a subset of grid points  $\{\mathbf{x}^{[i]}\}_{i=1}^M$ . By definition, each  $\mathbf{x} \in \hat{\mathbb{X}}$  is contained in only one, denoted by  $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x})$ , of  $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_K$ . For every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ , we choose an index set  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x})$  such that  $i \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x})$  if and only if  $\mathbf{x}^{[i]} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x})$ . Let

$$\delta_{\mathbf{x}} := \max_{\mathbf{x}^{[i]}, \mathbf{x}^{[j]} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x})} \|\mathbf{x}^{[i]} - \mathbf{x}^{[j]}\| = \max_{i, j \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x})} \|\mathbf{x}^{[i]} - \mathbf{x}^{[j]}\|,$$

and

$$\delta := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \hat{\mathbb{X}}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}}.$$

We aim to study the convergence of our method as  $\delta$  tends to zero in the following sections.

---

<sup>2</sup>An alternative numerical method to relax the compactness assumption will be discussed later (Remark 2 in Section 6).

### 3 Convex Value Functions

#### 3.1 Approximation of the Dynamic Programming Operator

Let  $\mathbb{B}$  be the set of bounded measurable functions  $v : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Note that  $\mathbb{B}_\xi = \mathbb{B}$  due to the compactness of  $\mathbb{X}$ . Define an operator  $\hat{T} : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) &:= \inf_{\mathbf{u}, \gamma} r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^M \gamma_{s,i} v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) \\ \text{s.t. } f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{w}^{[s]}) &= \sum_{i=1}^M \gamma_{s,i} \mathbf{x}^{[i]} \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \\ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x}), \gamma_s &\in \Delta \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ , where  $\Delta$  is the  $M$ -dimensional probability simplex, i.e.,  $\Delta := \{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^M \mid \sum_{i=1}^M \gamma_i = 1, \gamma_i \geq 0 \forall i = 1, \dots, M\}$ , and  $\mathcal{S} := \{1, \dots, N\}$ . Our goal is to use this operator  $\hat{T}$  (or its variant) to approximately solve the original dynamic program in a convergent manner. Note that the term  $v(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{w}^{[s]}))$  in the original DP operator is approximated by  $\sum_{i=1}^M \gamma_{s,i} v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]})$ , where the auxiliary variable  $\gamma_{s,i}$  can be interpreted as the degree to which  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{w}^{[s]})$  is represented by  $\mathbf{x}^{[i]}$ . By definition,  $\hat{T}$  critically depends on the discretization parameter  $\delta$ . For notational simplicity, however, we suppress the dependence on  $\delta$  throughout this paper.

To identify conditions under which this approximation is useful when computing a convergent solution as  $\delta$  tends to zero, we first examine some analytical properties of  $\hat{T}$ . Let  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  denote the sup-norm defined by  $\|v\|_\infty := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}} |v(\mathbf{x})|$ . Our first observation is the contraction property and monotonicity of  $\hat{T}$ .

**Proposition 2.** *The operator  $\hat{T} : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  is an  $\alpha$ -contraction mapping with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ , i.e.,*

$$\|\hat{T}v - \hat{T}v'\|_\infty \leq \alpha \|v - v'\|_\infty \quad \forall v, v' \in \mathbb{B}.$$

Furthermore, it is monotone, i.e., if  $v(\mathbf{x}) \leq v'(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ , where  $v, v' \in \mathbb{B}$ , then

$$(\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) \leq (\hat{T}v')(\mathbf{x}) \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}.$$

*Proof.* Fix an arbitrary state  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$  and arbitrary functions  $v, v' \in \mathbb{B}$ . For an arbitrary  $\epsilon > 0$ , let  $(\mathbf{u}', \gamma')$  be an  $\epsilon$ -optimal solution of the optimization problem (3.1) when  $v'$  is used. More precisely,

$$(\hat{T}v')(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon > r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}') + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^M \gamma'_{s,i} v'(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}). \quad (3.2)$$

Since  $\mathbf{u}' \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}', w^{[s]}) = \sum_{i=1}^M \gamma'_{s,i} \mathbf{x}^{[i]}$  and  $\gamma'_s \in \Delta$  for each  $s$ ,

$$r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}') + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^M \gamma'_{s,i} v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) \geq (\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}).$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{T}v')(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon &> r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}') + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^M \gamma'_{s,i} v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) - \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^M \gamma'_{s,i} (v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) - v'(\mathbf{x}^{[i]})) \\ &\geq (\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) - \alpha \|v - v'\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

As  $\epsilon$  tends to zero, we have  $(\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) - (\hat{T}v')(\mathbf{x}) \leq \alpha\|v - v'\|_\infty$ . By switching the role of  $v$  and  $v'$ , we obtain  $(\hat{T}v')(\mathbf{x}) - (\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) \leq \alpha\|v - v'\|_\infty$ . Since these inequalities hold for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ , we conclude that

$$\|\hat{T}v - \hat{T}v'\|_\infty \leq \alpha\|v - v'\|_\infty.$$

By the definition (3.1) of  $\hat{T}$  and the non-negativity of  $\gamma_{s,i}$ 's, it is clear that  $\hat{T}$  is monotone.  $\square$

Note that the contraction property and monotonicity are valid even when the value function  $v$  is nonconvex.

### 3.2 Error Bound and Convergence

We now assume the convexity and Lipschitz continuity of  $v$  and show that  $\hat{T}v$  converges to  $Tv$  point-wise as  $\delta$  tends to zero.

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose that  $v : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex and Lipschitz continuous (with Lipschitz constant  $L_v$ ). Then, we have*

$$(\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) - \alpha L_v \delta \leq (Tv)(\mathbf{x}) \leq (\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}.$$

*Proof.* Fix an arbitrary  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ . Let  $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\gamma})$  be an  $\epsilon$ -optimal solution of (3.1) for an arbitrary  $\epsilon > 0$ , i.e.,  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})$ ,

$$(\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon > r(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]})$$

and

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{w}^{[s]}) = \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} \mathbf{x}^{[i]}, \quad \hat{\gamma}_s \in \Delta \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Due to the convexity of  $v$ , we have

$$v\left(\sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} \mathbf{x}^{[i]}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}). \quad (3.4)$$

Thus, by the definition of  $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\gamma})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon &\geq r(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N v\left(\sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} \mathbf{x}^{[i]}\right) \\ &= r(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N v(f(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{w}^{[s]})) \\ &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})} \left[ r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N v(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{w}^{[s]})) \right] \\ &= (Tv)(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\epsilon$  tend to zero, we have  $(\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) \geq (Tv)(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ .

We now let  $\mathbf{u}^*$  be an  $\epsilon$ -optimal solution to the minimization problem in  $(Tv)(\mathbf{x})$  for an arbitrary  $\epsilon > 0$ , i.e.,  $(Tv)(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon > r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}^*) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N v(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}^*, \hat{w}^{[s]}))$ . Let

$$y_s := f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}^*, \hat{w}^{[s]}) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.$$

For each  $s$ , choose  $\gamma_s^* \in \Delta$  such that  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}^*, \hat{w}^{[s]}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \gamma_{s,i}^* \mathbf{x}^{[i]}$  and  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \gamma_{s,i}^* = 1$ . Note that  $\gamma_{s,i}^* = 0$  for all  $i \notin \mathcal{N}(y_s)$ . Such a vector  $\gamma_s^*$  must exist because  $y_s = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}^*, \hat{w}^{[s]})$  lies in the convex hull  $\mathcal{C}(y_s)$  of  $\mathcal{N}(y_s)$ . By the definition of  $\mathbf{u}^*$  and  $\gamma_s^*$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (Tv)(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon &> r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}^*) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N v(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}^*, \hat{w}^{[s]})) \\ &= r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}^*) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N v\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \gamma_{s,i}^* \mathbf{x}^{[i]}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Due to the Lipschitz continuity of  $v$ ,

$$v\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \gamma_{s,i}^* \mathbf{x}^{[i]}\right) \geq v(\mathbf{x}^{[j]}) - L_v \left\| \mathbf{x}^{[j]} - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \gamma_{s,i}^* \mathbf{x}^{[i]} \right\|$$

for all  $j \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)$ . This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} v\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \gamma_{s,i}^* \mathbf{x}^{[i]}\right) &\geq \max_{j \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \left[ v(\mathbf{x}^{[j]}) - L_v \left\| \mathbf{x}^{[j]} - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \gamma_{s,i}^* \mathbf{x}^{[i]} \right\| \right] \\ &\geq \max_{j \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \left[ v(\mathbf{x}^{[j]}) - L_v \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \gamma_{s,i}^* \|\mathbf{x}^{[j]} - \mathbf{x}^{[i]}\| \right] \\ &\geq \max_{j \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \left[ v(\mathbf{x}^{[j]}) - L_v \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \gamma_{s,i}^* \delta \right] \\ &\geq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \gamma_{s,j}^* (v(\mathbf{x}^{[j]}) - L_v \delta) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^M \gamma_{s,j}^* v(\mathbf{x}^{[j]}) - L_v \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where the third inequality holds by the definition of  $\mathcal{N}(y_s)$ , and the last inequality holds because  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(y_s)} \gamma_{s,j}^* = 1$ . Combining (3.5) and (3.6), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} (Tv)(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon &> r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}^*) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_{s,i}^* v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) - \alpha L_v \delta \\ &\geq (\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) - \alpha L_v \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds because  $(\mathbf{u}^*, \gamma^*)$  is a feasible solution to (3.1). By letting  $\epsilon$  tend to zero, we obtain that  $(Tv)(\mathbf{x}) \geq (\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) - \alpha L_v \delta$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ .  $\square$

Note that this proposition is valid without Assumption 1; in the proof, we do not assume that the minimization problem in the DP operator 2.2 admits an optimal solution.

As a result of Proposition 3, for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$

$$(\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow (Tv)(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0$$

when  $v$  is convex and Lipschitz continuous. On the other hand, by the Banach fixed point theorem, the contraction mapping  $\hat{T}$  has a unique fixed point  $\hat{v}$  in  $\mathbb{B}$ , i.e.,

$$\hat{v} = \hat{T}\hat{v}, \quad (3.7)$$



and this fixed point can be obtained by

$$\hat{v} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{T}^k v$$

for an arbitrary  $v \in \mathbb{B}$ . Note that  $\hat{v}$  depends on  $\delta$  as so does  $\hat{T}$ . We show that the solution  $\hat{v}$  to the *approximate Bellman equation* (3.7) converges point-wise to the optimal value function as  $\delta$  tends to zero if  $v^*$  is convex and Lipschitz continuous. Recall that the Lipschitz continuity of  $v^*$  is guaranteed under Assumption 2. A sufficient condition for the convexity of  $v^*$  is provided in Section 3.3.

**Theorem 1** (Convergence and Error Bound I). *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and that the optimal value function  $v^* : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex. Then, for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$*

$$\hat{v}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} L\delta \leq v^*(\mathbf{x}) \leq \hat{v}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where  $L$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $v^*$ , and therefore

$$\hat{v}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow v^*(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

*Proof.* Fix an arbitrary  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ . We first show that

$$(\hat{T}^k v^*)(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{t=1}^k \alpha^t L\delta \leq v^*(\mathbf{x}) \leq (\hat{T}^k v^*)(\mathbf{x}) \quad (3.8)$$

by using mathematical induction. For  $k = 0$ , the inequalities above clearly hold. Suppose now that the induction hypothesis holds for some  $k$ . If we apply the operator  $\hat{T}$  on all sides of (3.8), then we have

$$(\hat{T}^{k+1} v^*)(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{t=1}^k \alpha^{t+1} L\delta \leq (\hat{T} v^*)(\mathbf{x}) \leq (\hat{T}^{k+1} v^*)(\mathbf{x})$$

due to the monotonicity of  $\hat{T}$ . We use Proposition 3 to obtain the following bounds:

$$(\hat{T} v^*)(\mathbf{x}) - \alpha L\delta \leq (T v^*)(\mathbf{x}) \leq (\hat{T} v^*)(\mathbf{x}).$$

Therefore, we have

$$(\hat{T}^{k+1} v^*)(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{t=1}^{k+1} \alpha^t L\delta \leq (T v^*)(\mathbf{x}) \leq (\hat{T}^{k+1} v^*)(\mathbf{x}).$$

Since  $v^* = T v^*$  under Assumption 1, the induction hypothesis is valid for  $k + 1$ .

By the Banach fixed point theorem

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\hat{T}^k v^*)(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{v}(\mathbf{x})$$

because  $\hat{T}$  is a contraction mapping (Proposition 2) and  $\hat{v}$  is its unique fixed point in  $\mathbb{B}$ . We let  $k$  tend to  $\infty$  on all sides of (3.8) to obtain that

$$\hat{v}(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha^t L\delta \leq v^*(\mathbf{x}) \leq \hat{v}(\mathbf{x})$$

as desired. Since  $\mathbf{x}$  was arbitrarily chosen in  $\mathbb{X}$ ,  $\hat{v}(\mathbf{x})$  converges to  $v^*(\mathbf{x})$  for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$  as  $\delta$  tends to zero.  $\square$

The approximate value function  $\hat{v}$  can be used to construct a deterministic stationary policy,  $\hat{\pi} \in \Pi^{DS}$ , such that  $\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{x})$  consists of an optimal solution to the optimization problem (3.1) with  $v = \hat{v}$ .<sup>3</sup> The performance of  $\hat{\pi}$  can be measured by the total expected cost incurred when adopting this policy,

$$v^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \alpha^t r(x_t, \hat{\pi}(x_t)) \mid x_0 = \mathbf{x} \right].$$

Note that it is the unique fixed point of  $T^{\hat{\pi}}$ , defined by

$$(T^{\hat{\pi}}v)(\mathbf{x}) := r(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\pi}(\mathbf{x})) + \alpha \mathbb{E}[v(f(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\pi}(\mathbf{x}), w))]$$

under Assumption 1. It is well known that  $\hat{T}$  is a monotone contraction mapping. By using one of the fundamental results in approximate dynamic programming (e.g., Proposition 2.5.3 in [23]), we have the following performance guarantee:

**Corollary 1.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and that the optimal value function  $v^*$  is convex. Then, for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$*

$$0 \leq v^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) - v^*(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{2\alpha^2}{(1-\alpha)^2} L\delta$$

and therefore

$$v^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow v^*(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

In words, as the computational grid becomes finer, the performance of  $\hat{\pi}$  tends to the optimum. The convergence rate is linear in  $\delta$ . The contraction property of  $T$  and  $T^{\hat{\pi}}$  plays a critical role in obtaining the bound in Corollary 1. In fact, we can obtain a tighter error bound by using the convexity of  $v^*$  and  $\hat{v}$ . To show this, we first record the following lemma:

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and that  $\hat{v}$  is convex. Then, for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ ,*

$$v^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \hat{v}(\mathbf{x}).$$

*Proof.* Fix  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ . By the definition (3.1) of  $\hat{T}$ , for an arbitrary  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\hat{\gamma} \in \Delta^N$  such that

$$(\hat{T}\hat{v})(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon > r(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\pi}(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} \hat{v}(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) \quad (3.9)$$

and  $f(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\pi}(\mathbf{x}), \hat{w}^{[s]}) = \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} \mathbf{x}^{[i]}$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Due to the convexity of  $\hat{v}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} \hat{v}(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) &\geq \hat{v} \left( \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} \mathbf{x}^{[i]} \right) \\ &= \hat{v}(f(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\pi}(\mathbf{x}), \hat{w}^{[s]})). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

By combining the inequalities (B.2) and (B.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{T}\hat{v})(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon &> r(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\pi}(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \hat{v}(f(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\pi}(\mathbf{x}), \hat{w}^{[s]})) \\ &= (T^{\hat{\pi}}\hat{v})(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>3</sup>If an optimal solution to (3.1) does not exist, an  $\epsilon$ -optimal solution can be used to construct a suboptimal policy, of which performance is arbitrarily close to the optimum.

Letting  $\epsilon$  tend to zero, we have

$$T^{\hat{\pi}} \hat{v} \leq \hat{T} \hat{v} = \hat{v}.$$

Due to the monotonicity of  $T^{\hat{\pi}}$ ,

$$(T^{\hat{\pi}})^2 \hat{v} \leq T^{\hat{\pi}} \hat{v} \leq \hat{v}.$$

Iteratively applying these inequalities, we obtain that

$$(T^{\hat{\pi}})^k \hat{v} \leq \hat{v}$$

for any  $k$ . By the contraction property of  $T^{\hat{\pi}}$  under Assumption 1, we conclude that

$$v^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} ((T^{\hat{\pi}})^k \hat{v})(\mathbf{x}) \leq \hat{v}(\mathbf{x})$$

for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ . □

**Theorem 2** (Tighter error bound). *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and that  $v^*$  and  $\hat{v}$  are convex. Then, for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$*

$$0 \leq v^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) - v^*(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} L\delta.$$

*Proof.* By the optimality of  $v^*$ , it is clear that  $v^* \leq v^{\hat{\pi}}$ . In addition, Theorem 1 and Lemma 1 imply that

$$v^{\hat{\pi}} - v^* \leq \hat{v} - v^* \leq \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} L\delta.$$

□

This theorem improves the error bound in Corollary 1 by the factor of  $2\alpha/(1 - \alpha)$ , which increases with  $\alpha$ . A surprising result of our convex approximation method is that  $v^{\hat{\pi}}$  is closer to the optimal value function than  $\hat{v}$ ; whereas it is common that, compared to an approximate value function, the actual cost-to-go of the corresponding approximate policy deviates further from  $v^*$  as the loose bound in Corollary 1 indicates. It is worth emphasizing the role of convexity in obtaining such a desirable improved error bound.

### 3.3 Convexity-Preserving, Interpolation-Free Value Iteration

The error bounds and convergence results established in the previous subsection are valid provided that the optimal value function  $v^*$  is convex. We now introduce a sufficient condition for the convexity  $v^*$ .

**Assumption 3** (Linear-Convex Control). *The function*

$$(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \mapsto f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, w^{[s]})$$

*is affine on  $\mathbb{K} := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})\}$  for each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and, the stage-wise cost function  $r$  is convex. In addition, if  $\mathbf{u}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , then  $\lambda \mathbf{u}^{(1)} + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{u}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{U}(\lambda \mathbf{x}^{(1)} + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{x}^{(2)})$  for any  $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{X}$  and any  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ .*

**Lemma 2.** *Under Assumption 3, the operators  $T$  and  $\hat{T}$  preserve convexity, i.e., if a function  $v : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex, then so are  $Tv, \hat{T}v : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .*

A proof of this lemma is contained in Appendix A. An immediate observation obtained using Lemma 2 is the convexity of  $v^*$  and  $\hat{v}$ .

**Proposition 4.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 3,  $v^*, \hat{v} : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are convex.*

*Proof.* Choose an arbitrary convex function  $v_0 : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . For  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ , let  $v_{k+1} := Tv_k$ . By Lemma 2,  $v_k$ 's are convex for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ . Recall that  $T$  is a contraction mapping under Assumption 1. By the Banach fixed point theorem,  $v_k \rightarrow v^*$  point-wise as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore,  $v^*$  is convex. Similarly, we can show that  $\hat{v}$  is a convex function.  $\square$

Due to this proposition, the error bounds and convergence results in Theorems 1 and 2, and Corollary 1 are valid under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3. Note, however, that Assumption 3 is merely a *sufficient* condition for convexity.

Due to the contraction property of  $\hat{T}$  shown in Proposition 2, the following value iteration algorithm generates a sequence  $\{v_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ , which converges to  $\hat{v}$  point-wise:

1. Initialize  $v_0$  as an arbitrary function in  $\mathbb{B}$ , and set  $k \leftarrow 0$ ;
2. At iteration  $k$ , set  $v_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) := (\hat{T}v_k)(\mathbf{x}^{[i]})$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, M$ ;
3. If  $\sup_{i=1, \dots, M} |v_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) - v_k(\mathbf{x}^{[i]})| < \text{threshold}$ , stop and return  $\hat{v} := v_{k+1}$ ; Otherwise, set  $k \leftarrow k + 1$  and go to Step 2);

If the function  $v_0$  is initialized as a convex function, this value iteration algorithm also preserves convexity by Lemma 2 as the standard value iteration method with the DP operator  $T$ . However, the convexity of  $v_k$  does not matter in this approximate version of value iteration unless  $Tv_k$  needs to be compared with  $\hat{T}v_k$  by using Proposition 3. In fact, the optimization problem in (3.1) used to evaluate  $(\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x})$  is convex regardless of the convexity of  $v$ .

**Proposition 5.** *Under Assumption 3, the optimization problem in (3.1) is a convex program.*

*Proof.* Fix an arbitrary state  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ . The objective function is convex in  $\mathbf{u}$  and linear in  $\gamma$  (even when  $v$  is nonconvex). Furthermore, the equality constraints are linear in  $(\mathbf{u}, \gamma)$ . Assumption 3 implies that  $\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})$  is convex. Also, the probability simplex  $\Delta$  is convex. Therefore, this optimization problem is convex.  $\square$

In each iteration of the value iteration method, it suffices to solve  $M$  convex optimization problems, each of which is for  $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x}^{[i]}$ , by using several existing convex optimization algorithms (e.g., [24, 25, 26]).

**Remark 1** (Interpolation-free property). *Note that we can evaluate  $\hat{v}$  at an arbitrary  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$  by using the definition (3.1) of  $\hat{T}$  without any explicit interpolation that may introduce additional numerical errors. This feature is also useful when the output of the approximate policy  $\hat{\pi}$  needs to be specified at particular states that are different from the grid points  $\{\mathbf{x}^{[i]}\}_{i=1}^M$ . Unlike most existing discretization-based methods, our approach does not require any interpolation in constructing both the optimal value function and control policy.*

## 4 Nonconvex Value Functions

The convexity of the optimal value function plays a critical role in obtaining the convergence results in the previous section. To relax the convexity condition (e.g., Assumption 3), we first show that the proposed approximation method is useful when constructing a suboptimal policy with a provable error bound in the case of nonlinear control-affine systems with convex stage-wise cost functions. For further general cases, we propose a modified approximation method based on nonconvex bi-level optimization problems, where the inner problem is a linear program.

## 4.1 Control-Affine Systems: Error Bound

Consider a control-affine system of the form

$$x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, w_t) := g(x_t, w_t) + h(x_t, w_t)u_t. \quad (4.1)$$

More precisely, we assume the following:

**Assumption 4.** *The function  $f : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$  can be expressed as (4.1), where  $g : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $h : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  are (possibly nonlinear) measurable functions. In addition,  $\mathbf{u} \mapsto r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  is convex on  $\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})$  for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ .*

Note that the condition on  $r$  imposed by this assumption is weaker than Assumption 3 which requires the joint convexity of  $r$ . In this setting, each iteration of the value iteration algorithm in Section 3.3 still involves  $M$  convex optimization problems. This can be shown by using the same argument as the proof of Proposition 5.

**Proposition 6.** *Under Assumption 4, the optimization problem in (3.1) is a convex program.*

In addition to the convexity of optimization problems, the value iteration algorithm in Section 3.3 benefits from the contraction property of  $\hat{T}$ , which is valid regardless of the convexity of  $v$  (Proposition 2). Thus, by the Banach fixed point theorem, this algorithm converges to the desired value function  $\hat{v}$ , which is the unique solution (in  $\mathbb{B}$ ) to the approximate Bellman equation (3.7).

In cases with control-affine systems, however, the optimal value function  $v^*$  is nonconvex. Thus, we cannot use the convergence results and error bounds in Theorem 1 and Corollary 1. Due to the nonconvexity,  $\hat{v}$  obtained by value iteration in the previous section is no longer guaranteed to converge to the optimal value function as  $\delta$  tends to zero. However, we are still able to characterize an error bound for an approximate policy  $\hat{\pi}$  as follows:

**Theorem 3** (Error Bound). *Suppose that Assumptions 2 and 4 hold. Then, for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq v^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) - v^*(\mathbf{x}) \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{2\alpha^2}{(1-\alpha)^2} L\delta, \frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha} |v^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{v}(\mathbf{x})| \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where  $L$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $v^*$ .

*Proof.* Fix an arbitrary state  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ . We first note that in the second part of the proof of Proposition 3, the convexity of  $v$  is unused. Thus, the following inequality is valid even when  $v^*$  is nonconvex:

$$(\hat{T}v^*)(\mathbf{x}) - \alpha L\delta \leq (Tv^*)(\mathbf{x}).$$

By using the inductive argument in the proof of Theorem 1, we obtain that

$$\hat{v}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} L\delta \leq v^*(\mathbf{x}).$$

On the other hand, the optimality of  $v^*$  implies that

$$v^*(\mathbf{x}) \leq v^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Thus, we have

$$|\hat{v}(\mathbf{x}) - v^*(\mathbf{x})| \leq \max \left\{ \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} L\delta, |v^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{v}(\mathbf{x})| \right\}.$$

By using Proposition 2.5.3 in [23], we conclude that the inequalities (4.2) hold as desired.  $\square$

This theorem implies that the performance of  $\hat{\pi}$  converges to the optimum as  $\delta$  tends to zero only if its cost-to-go function  $v^{\hat{\pi}}$  converges to the approximate value function  $\hat{v}$ . Such convergence may be rare in the case of nonlinear control-affine systems. However, this error bound is useful when we need to design a controller with a provable performance guarantee, for example, in safety-critical systems where the objective is to maximize the probability of safety (e.g., [27]), as this problem is subject to nonconvexity issues [28].

## 4.2 General Case

In the case of general nonlinear systems with nonlinear stage-wise cost functions, we modify the operator  $\hat{T}$  as follows. Define a new operator  $\tilde{T} : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  by

$$(\tilde{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) := \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})} \{r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) + (Hv)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})\} \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (Hv)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) &:= \min_{\gamma} \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{w}^{[s]}))} \gamma_{s,i} v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) \\ \text{s.t. } f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{w}^{[s]}) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{w}^{[s]}))} \gamma_{s,i} \mathbf{x}^{[i]} \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \\ \gamma_s &\in \Delta \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \\ \gamma_{s,i} &= 0 \quad \forall i \notin \mathcal{N}(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{w}^{[s]})) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

for each  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{K}$ . The inner optimization problem (4.4) for  $Hv$  is a linear program given any fixed  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ . However, the outer problem (4.3) is nonconvex in general. The nonconvexity originates from the local representation of  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{w}^{[s]})$  by only using the grid points in the convex hull  $\mathcal{C}(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{w}^{[s]}))$ . However, such a local representation allows us to show that  $\tilde{T}v$  converges to  $Tv$  point-wise as  $\delta$  tends to zero by using the Lipschitz continuity of  $v$ .

**Proposition 7.** *Suppose that  $v : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz continuous (with Lipschitz constant  $L_v$ ). Then, we have*

$$|(\tilde{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) - (Tv)(\mathbf{x})| \leq \alpha L_v \delta \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}.$$

*Proof.* Fix an arbitrary  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -optimal solution of (4.3) for an arbitrary  $\epsilon > 0$ , and let  $\tilde{\gamma}$  be a corresponding optimal solution of (4.4) given  $\mathbf{u} = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ . We also let  $\tilde{y}_s := f(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{w}^{[s]})$  for each  $s$ . Then,

$$\tilde{y}_s = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{y}_s)} \tilde{\gamma}_{s,i} \mathbf{x}^{[i]}.$$

By the Lipschitz continuity of  $v$ , for every  $i \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{y}_s)$

$$|v(\tilde{y}_s) - v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]})| \leq L_v \|\tilde{y}_s - \mathbf{x}^{[i]}\| \leq L_v \delta.$$

Since  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{y}_s)} \tilde{\gamma}_{s,i} = 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| v(\tilde{y}_s) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{y}_s)} \tilde{\gamma}_{s,i} v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) \right| &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{y}_s)} |\tilde{\gamma}_{s,i} v(\tilde{y}_s) - \tilde{\gamma}_{s,i} v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]})| \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{y}_s)} \tilde{\gamma}_{s,i} L_v \delta = L_v \delta. \end{aligned}$$

By using this bound, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon &> r(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{y}_s)} \tilde{\gamma}_{s,i} v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) \\
&\geq r(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N v(\tilde{y}_s) - \alpha L_v \delta \\
&= r(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N v(f(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}, w^{[s]})) - \alpha L_v \delta \\
&\geq (Tv)(\mathbf{x}) - \alpha L_v \delta,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  is a feasible solution to the minimization problem in the original Bellman equation (2.3). By letting  $\epsilon$  tend to zero, we conclude that  $(\tilde{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) \geq (Tv)(\mathbf{x}) - \alpha L_v \delta$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ .

The other inequality,  $(\tilde{T}v)(\mathbf{x}) - \alpha L_v \delta \leq (Tv)(\mathbf{x})$ , can be shown by using the second part of the proof of Proposition 3.<sup>4</sup>  $\square$

We can also show the contraction property and monotonicity of  $\tilde{T}$  by using the same argument as the proof of Proposition 2.

**Proposition 8.** *The operator  $\tilde{T} : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  is an  $\alpha$ -contraction mapping with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ , and it is monotone.*

Due to the contraction property, the following approximate Bellman equation has a unique solution in  $\mathbb{B}$ :

$$\tilde{v} = \tilde{T}\tilde{v}$$

and the fixed point can be computed by value iteration, i.e.,  $\tilde{v} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{T}^k v$  for an arbitrary  $v \in \mathbb{B}$ . The inductive argument in the proof of Theorem 1 in conjunction with Proposition 7 and the contraction property of  $\tilde{T}$  can be used to show that  $\tilde{v}$  converges to the optimal value function point-wise as the computational grid becomes finer.

**Theorem 4** (Convergence and Error Bound II). *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Then, for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$*

$$|\tilde{v}(\mathbf{x}) - v^*(\mathbf{x})| \leq \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} L \delta,$$

where  $L$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $v^*$ , and therefore

$$\tilde{v}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow v^*(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

As before, an approximate control policy  $\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi^{DS}$  can be constructed by using  $\tilde{v}$  such that  $\tilde{\pi}(\mathbf{x})$  is an optimal solution of the outer problem (4.3) with  $v := \tilde{v}$  for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ . Then, the total cost  $v^{\tilde{\pi}}(\mathbf{x})$  incurred by the policy  $\tilde{\pi}$  when  $x_0 = \mathbf{x}$  converges to the minimal cost  $v^*(\mathbf{x})$  by Theorem 4 and Proposition 2.5.3 in [23].

**Corollary 2.** *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Then, for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$*

$$0 \leq v^{\tilde{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) - v^*(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{2\alpha^2}{(1 - \alpha)^2} L \delta,$$

---

<sup>4</sup>Note that the convexity of  $v$  is unused in the second part of the proof of Proposition 3. Thus, it is valid in the nonconvex case.

where  $L$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $v^*$ , and therefore

$$v^{\tilde{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow v^*(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

From the computational perspective, it is generally difficult to obtain a globally optimal solution of (4.3) due to nonconvexity. Thus, over-approximating  $\tilde{T}v$  is inevitable in practice, and the quality of an approximate policy  $\tilde{\pi}$  from an over-approximation of  $\tilde{v}$  depends on the quality of locally optimal solutions to (4.3) evaluated in the process of value iteration. As in Section 4.1, one may be able to characterize a suboptimality bound for the approximate policy, for example, by using a convex relaxation of (4.3). In fact, the optimization problem (3.1) can be interpreted as a convex relaxation of (4.3) in the case of control-affine systems. On the other hand, when the action space is discrete and finite, we can find an optimal solution of (4.3) by solving the convex optimization problem (4.4) for all actions.

## 5 Finite-Horizon Problems

We now consider the following finite-horizon problem:

$$\inf_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}^{\pi} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{K-1} r(x_t, u_t) + q(x_K) \mid x_0 = \mathbf{x} \right], \quad (5.1)$$

where  $K$  is the terminal stage, and  $q : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a measurable terminal cost function of interest. Let  $\mathcal{T} := \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$ . Here, the strategy space  $\Pi$  is suitably redefined for the finite-horizon setting. Define the optimal value function  $v_t^* : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of this problem for  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  recursively as follows: for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$

$$v_K^*(\mathbf{x}) := q(\mathbf{x})$$

and

$$v_t^*(\mathbf{x}) := T v_{t+1}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x})} r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) + \mathbb{E}[v_{t+1}^*(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, w_t))]$$

for  $t = K - 1, \dots, 0$ . The minimization problem above admits an optimal solution  $\pi_t^*(\mathbf{x})$  for each  $(t, \mathbf{x})$  under Assumption 1 1)–3). By the dynamic programming principle, the deterministic Markov policy  $\pi^* := (\pi_0^*, \dots, \pi_{K-1}^*)$  is optimal. Furthermore,  $v_t^*(\mathbf{x}) = \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}^{\pi} [\sum_{k=t}^{K-1} r(x_k, u_k) + q(x_K) \mid x_t = \mathbf{x}]$ . The finite-time horizon counterpart of Proposition 1 is also valid: under Assumption 2,  $v_t^*$  is Lipschitz continuous for each  $t$  as shown in [10].

### 5.1 Convex Value Functions

We first use the approximation method proposed in Section 3. Let

$$\hat{v}_K := q, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{v}_t := \hat{T} \hat{v}_{t+1} \quad \forall t = K - 1, \dots, 0$$

with  $\alpha = 1$ . Analogous to Theorem 1, the approximate value function  $\hat{v}_t$  converges to the optimal value function  $v_t^*$  point-wise for each  $t$  as  $\delta$  tends to zero.

**Theorem 5.** *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds and that the optimal value functions  $v_t^*$ 's are convex for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ . Then, for each  $(t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathbb{X}$*

$$\hat{v}_t(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{k=t+1}^K L_k \delta \leq v_t^*(\mathbf{x}) \leq \hat{v}_t(\mathbf{x}), \quad (5.2)$$



where  $L_k$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $v_k^*$ , and therefore

$$\hat{v}_t(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow v_t^*(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

*Proof.* We use mathematical induction to prove both inequalities in (5.2). For  $t = K$ ,  $\hat{v}_K \equiv v_K^* \equiv q$ , and thus (5.2) holds. Suppose that the induction hypothesis holds for some  $t$ . By applying the operator  $\hat{T}$  on all sides of (5.2), we have

$$\hat{T}\hat{v}_t - \sum_{k=t+1}^K L_k \delta \leq \hat{T}v_t^* \leq \hat{T}\hat{v}_t$$

due to the monotonicity of  $\hat{T}$ . On the other hand, by Proposition 3,

$$\hat{T}v_t^* - L_t \delta \leq Tv_t^* \leq \hat{T}v_t^*.$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\hat{T}\hat{v}_t - \sum_{k=t}^K L_k \delta \leq Tv_t^* \leq \hat{T}\hat{v}_t.$$

Note that  $\hat{v}_{t-1} = \hat{T}v_t$  and  $v_{t-1}^* = Tv_t^*$  by definition. This implies that  $\hat{v}_{t-1} - \sum_{k=t}^K L_k \delta \leq v_{t-1}^* \leq \hat{v}_{t-1}$  as desired.  $\square$

For each  $(t, \mathbf{x})$ , let  $\hat{\pi}_t(\mathbf{x})$  be an optimal solution of (3.1) by setting  $v := \hat{v}_{t+1}$  and  $\alpha = 1$ . We construct an approximate policy,  $\hat{\pi} := (\hat{\pi}_0, \dots, \hat{\pi}_{T-1})$ , which is deterministic and Markov. Given any deterministic Markov policy  $\pi := (\pi_0, \dots, \pi_{K-1})$ , define an operator  $T^{\pi t} : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  by

$$(T^{\pi t}v)(\mathbf{x}) := r(\mathbf{x}, \pi_t(\mathbf{x})) + \mathbb{E}[v(f(\mathbf{x}, \pi_t(\mathbf{x}), w_t))]$$

for all  $(t, \mathbf{x})$ . The cost-to-go  $v_t^{\hat{\pi}}$  incurred by this policy from stage  $t$  can then be recursively calculated as

$$v_K^{\hat{\pi}} := q, \quad \text{and} \quad v_t^{\hat{\pi}} := T^{\hat{\pi}t}v_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}} \quad \forall t = K-1, \dots, 0.$$

Our next result is that  $v_t^{\hat{\pi}}$  converges to  $v_t^*$  point-wise for each  $t$  as  $\delta$  tends to zero. In other words, we can construct a control policy  $\hat{\pi}$  of which performance is arbitrarily close to the optimum.

**Corollary 3.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1 1)–3) and 2) hold and that  $v_t^*$ 's and  $\hat{v}_t$ 's are convex for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ . Then, for each  $(t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathbb{X}$*

$$0 \leq v_t^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) - v_t^*(\mathbf{x}) \leq \sum_{k=t+1}^K L_k \delta, \tag{5.3}$$

where  $L_k$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $v_k^*$ , and therefore and

$$v_t^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow v_t^*(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

Its proof is contained in Appendix B.

When  $f$  is affine in  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ , and  $r$  and  $q$  are convex, we can show that  $v_t^*$ 's and  $\hat{v}_t$ 's are convex by using the argument in the proof of Lemma 2. In this case, the optimization problem (3.1) to be solved to obtain  $\hat{\pi}_t$  is a convex program as emphasized in Proposition 5, and the suboptimality bound in Corollary 3 is valid due to the convexity-preserving property of  $T$  and  $\hat{T}$ . Note that, even in the finite-horizon setting, the proposed method enjoys its interpolation-free property (see Remark 1).

## 5.2 Control-Affine Systems with Convex Costs

The optimization problem (3.1) involved in  $\hat{T}$  is convex, as emphasized in Proposition 6, when Assumption 4 holds, i.e.,  $f$  is affine in  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $r$  is convex in  $\mathbf{u}$ . Thus, the approximate policy  $\hat{\pi}$  can be constructed by solving the convex optimization problems involved in  $\hat{v}_t = \hat{T}\hat{v}_{t+1}$  with  $\hat{v}_T = q$ . As in the case of infinite-horizon problems, the cost-to-go function  $v_t^{\hat{\pi}}$  of  $\hat{\pi}$  is not guaranteed to converge to  $v_t^*$ . However, the following error bound is valid in the finite-horizon setting:

**Theorem 6.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2 and 4 hold. Then, for each  $(t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathbb{X}$*

$$0 \leq v_t^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) - v_t^*(\mathbf{x}) \leq v_t^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{v}_t(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{k=t+1}^K L_k \delta, \quad (5.4)$$

where  $L_t$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $v_t^*$ .

*Proof.* Since  $v_t^*$  is the optimal value function of (5.1) and  $\hat{\pi} \in \Pi$ , we have

$$v_t^* \leq v_t^{\hat{\pi}}.$$

Note that the first inequality of (5.2) in Theorem 5 holds even when  $v_t^*$  is not convex. Therefore,

$$\hat{v}_t - \sum_{k=t+1}^K L_k \delta \leq v_t^*,$$

which implies that

$$v_t^{\hat{\pi}} - v_t^* \leq v_t^{\hat{\pi}} - \hat{v}_t + \sum_{k=t+1}^K L_k \delta.$$

□

As in the infinite-horizon case (Theorem 3),  $v_t^{\hat{\pi}}$  does not converge to  $v_t^*$  unless the gap between  $v_t^{\hat{\pi}}$  and  $\hat{v}_t$  tends to zero. Nevertheless, the *a posteriori* error bounds (4.2) and (5.4) are useful to characterize the suboptimality of the proposed approximate policy as demonstrated in Section 6.2.

## 5.3 General Case

When the system dynamics and cost function are fully nonlinear (without any convexity property), the approximation method described in Section 4.2 can be used. Define the approximate value functions  $\tilde{v}_t : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $t = K, \dots, 0$ , as follows:

$$\tilde{v}_K = q \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v}_t = \tilde{T}\tilde{v}_{t+1} \quad \forall t = K-1, \dots, 0,$$

where  $\tilde{T} : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  is given by (4.3) with  $\alpha = 1$ . By using Proposition 7 and the inductive argument in the proof of Theorem 5, we can show that  $\tilde{v}_t$  converges to the optimal value function point-wise as  $\delta$  tends to zero.

**Theorem 7.** *Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Then, for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$*

$$|v_t^*(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{v}_t(\mathbf{x})| \leq \sum_{k=t+1}^K L_k \delta, \quad (5.5)$$

where  $L_k$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $v_k^*$ , and therefore

$$\tilde{v}_t(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow v_t^*(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

We now show that this approximation method provides an approximate policy,  $\tilde{\pi}$ , of which performance is arbitrarily close to the optimum with a guaranteed error bound. We construct a deterministic and Markov policy  $\tilde{\pi} := (\tilde{\pi}_0, \dots, \tilde{\pi}_{K-1})$  by setting  $\tilde{\pi}_t(\mathbf{x})$  to be an optimal solution of (4.3) with  $v := \tilde{v}_{t+1}$  and  $\alpha = 1$ . Then, the cost-to-go function  $v_t^{\tilde{\pi}}$  under this policy can be evaluated by solving the following Bellman equation:

$$v_K^{\tilde{\pi}} := q, \quad \text{and} \quad v_t^{\tilde{\pi}} := T^{\tilde{\pi}t} v_{t+1}^{\tilde{\pi}} \quad \forall t = K-1, \dots, 0.$$

This cost  $v_t^{\tilde{\pi}}$  incurred by the approximate policy  $\tilde{\pi}$  converges to the minimal cost  $v_t^*$  as the grid resolution becomes finer.

**Corollary 4.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1 1)–3) and 2 hold. Then, for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$*

$$0 \leq v_t^{\tilde{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) - v_t^*(\mathbf{x}) \leq \sum_{k=t+1}^K 2L_k \delta, \quad (5.6)$$

where  $L_k$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $v_k^*$ , and therefore

$$v_t^{\tilde{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow v_t^*(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

*Proof.* By the optimality of  $v_t^*$  under Assumption 1 1)–3), we have  $v_t^* \leq v_t^{\tilde{\pi}}$  for any  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ . We now show that  $v_t^{\tilde{\pi}} \leq v_t^* + \sum_{k=t+1}^K 2L_k \delta$  by using mathematical induction. For  $t = K$ ,  $v_K^{\tilde{\pi}} = v_K^*$ , and thus the induction hypothesis holds. Suppose that the induction hypothesis is valid for some  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ . Then, due to the monotonicity of  $T^{\tilde{\pi}}$ ,

$$T^{\tilde{\pi}} v_t^{\tilde{\pi}} \leq T^{\tilde{\pi}} v_t^* + \sum_{k=t+1}^K 2L_k \delta. \quad (5.7)$$

Fix an arbitrary state  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ . By the definition of  $\tilde{T}$ , for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Delta^N$  such that

$$(\tilde{T} v_t^*)(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon > r(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\pi}_t(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{y}_s)} \tilde{\gamma}_{s,i} v_t^*(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}),$$

where  $\tilde{y}_s := f(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\pi}(\mathbf{x}), \hat{w}^{[s]})$ , and

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\pi}(\mathbf{x}), \hat{w}^{[s]}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{y}_s)} \tilde{\gamma}_{s,i} \mathbf{x}^{[i]}.$$

Since  $v_t^*$  is Lipschitz continuous under Assumption 2,

$$|v_t^*(\tilde{y}_s) - v_t^*(\mathbf{x}^{[i]})| \leq L_t \|\tilde{y}_s - \mathbf{x}^{[i]}\| \leq L_t \delta.$$

Note that  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{y}_s)} \tilde{\gamma}_{s,i} = 1$ , we have

$$\left| v_t^*(\tilde{y}_s) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{y}_s)} v_t^*(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) \right| \leq L_t \delta.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{T}v_t^*)(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon &> r(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\pi}_t(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N v_t^*(\tilde{y}_s) - L_t \delta \\
&= r(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\pi}_t(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N v_t^*(f(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\pi}_t(\mathbf{x}), \hat{w}^{[s]})) - L_t \delta \\
&\geq (T^{\tilde{\pi}}v_t^*)(\mathbf{x}) - L_t \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

By letting  $\epsilon$  tend to zero, we obtain that

$$T^{\tilde{\pi}}v_t^* \leq \tilde{T}v_t^* + L_t \delta. \quad (5.8)$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 7, we have

$$\tilde{T}v_t^* \leq Tv_t^* + L_t \delta. \quad (5.9)$$

By combining inequalities (5.7), (5.8) and (5.9), we conclude that

$$v_{t-1}^{\tilde{\pi}} = T^{\tilde{\pi}}v_t^{\tilde{\pi}} \leq Tv_t^* + \sum_{k=t}^K 2L_k \delta = v_{t-1}^* + \sum_{k=t}^K 2L_k \delta,$$

which implies that the induction hypothesis is valid for  $t - 1$  as desired.  $\square$

## 6 Numerical Experiments

### 6.1 Linear Systems with Convex Costs

We first demonstrate the performance of the proposed method via a three-dimensional linear-quadratic (LQ) control problem. The LQ setting is chosen because we can compare our numerical solution to a globally optimal solution obtained by solving a Riccati equation. Consider a linear system of the form

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t,$$

where  $A = I + \begin{bmatrix} d-2 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & d-3 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & d-2 \end{bmatrix} \Delta t$ ,  $B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ . The stage-wise cost function  $r$  is given by

$r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{x}^\top Q \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}^\top R \mathbf{u}$ , where  $Q = I$  and  $R = \lambda I$ . Note that  $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{R}^2$ , and the optimal value function of this problem is convex.

**Remark 2.** *Due to the non-compactness of  $\mathbb{X}$ , a compact subset  $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$  of  $\mathbb{X}$  needs to be chosen and discretized. Then,  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{w}^{[s]}) \notin \tilde{\mathbb{X}}$  for some  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{w}^{[s]}) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{W}$ , and thus an optimal action may not be a feasible solution to the optimization problem (3.1). In the worst case, (3.1) has no feasible solution. To resolve this issue, several numerical methods for handling boundary conditions of partial differential equations (particularly, Hamilton-Jacobi equations) may be applicable. For example, we can extrapolate  $v(\mathbf{x})$  normal to its  $\mathbf{x}$ -level set to approximately define  $v$  on an extended state space (e.g., [29]). Additionally, when the numerical construction of  $v^*(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \tilde{\mathbb{X}}$ , (via value iteration) depends only on the information on  $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$ , a Neumann-type boundary condition  $\nabla v(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \partial \tilde{\mathbb{X}}$ , can be used to neglect the information from the outside of  $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$  (e.g., [30]).*




Figure 1: Empirical convergence rates of (a)  $\hat{v}$  and (b)  $v^{\hat{\pi}}$  for the linear quadratic problem with grid size  $M = 6^3, 11^3, 21^3, 41^3$  (grid spacing  $\delta = 0.4, 0.2, 0.1, 0.05$ , respectively). The errors  $\|\hat{v} - v^*\|$  and  $\|v^{\hat{\pi}} - v^*\|$  are measured by the 1( $\diamond$ )-, 2( $\circ$ )- and  $\infty$ ( $\square$ )-norm.

In this LQ example, for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \tilde{\mathbb{X}} := [-1, 1]^3$  an optimal solution to (3.1) can always be found by only using the information from  $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$ . Thus, the Neumann boundary condition  $\nabla v(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0, \mathbf{x} \in \partial\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$ , is used. Regular cubic grids are chosen to discretize  $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$  with grid spacing  $\delta = 0.4, 0.2, 0.1$  and  $0.05$ . All the optimization problems are numerically solved using CPLEX. The following parameters are used in the infinite-horizon setting:  $d = 0.9$ ,  $\lambda = 10^{-8}$ ,  $\Delta t = 0.1$ , and  $\alpha = 0.7$ .

Recall that  $\hat{v}$  denotes the value function evaluated by the proposed method. The true optimal value function  $v^*$  is computed by the standard Riccati equation. The errors  $\|\hat{v} - v^*\|$  with grid size  $M = 6^3, 11^3, 21^3, 41^3$  are shown in Fig. 1 (a). In this example, the empirical convergence rate of our method is beyond the second order. Furthermore, the relative error  $\|(\hat{v} - v^*)/v^*\|_2$  is 0.36% in the case of  $M = 41^3$ .

The total expected cost  $v^{\hat{\pi}}$  incurred by the approximate policy  $\hat{\pi}$  also converges to  $v^*$  as shown in Fig. 1 (b). Note that the error  $\|v^{\hat{\pi}} - v^*\|$  is uniformly smaller than  $\|\hat{v} - v^*\|$ ; this observation is consistent with Theorem 2, which is valid due to the convexity of  $v^*$  and  $\hat{v}$ . More precisely, the relative error  $\|(v^{\hat{\pi}} - v^*)/v^*\|_2$  is only 0.1% when  $M = 41^3$ . This error is about 28% of  $\|(\hat{v} - v^*)/v^*\|_2$ .




Figure 2: The suboptimality ratio computed using Theorem 3 in the control-affine system example.

## 6.2 Control-Affine Systems with Convex Costs

We consider the following nonlinear, control-affine system:

$$x_{t+1} = x_t + [c(1 - x_t)x_t - x_t u_t + w_t] \Delta t,$$

which models the outbreak of an infectious disease [31]. Here, the system state  $x_t \in [0, 1]$  represents the ratio of infected people in a given population, the control input  $u_t \in [0, u_{\max}]$  represents a public treatment action, and  $c > 0$  is an infectivity parameter. The random disturbance  $w_t$  is assumed to be Gaussian with mean 1 and variance  $0.1^2$ , and  $\{w_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is i.i.d. The stage-wise cost function is chosen as

$$r(x_t, u_t) = x_t + \lambda u_t^2,$$

where  $\lambda > 0$  is the intervention cost. We choose  $c = 10$ ,  $u_{\max} = 20$ ,  $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$ ,  $\lambda = 10^{-4}$ ,  $\alpha = 0.7$ , and  $N = 51$  in the infinite-horizon setting. Also,  $N = 1000$  samples of  $w_t$  are generated from  $\mathcal{N}(1, 0.1^2)$ .

By using Theorem 3, we compute an error bound  $e(\mathbf{x}) := \max \left\{ \frac{2\alpha^2}{(1-\alpha)^2} L\delta, \frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha} |v^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{v}(\mathbf{x})| \right\}$  for each initial state  $\mathbf{x} = 0, 0.02, \dots, 1$ , where  $\hat{\pi}$  is an approximate policy obtained from  $\hat{v}$  as discussed in Section 4.1. The suboptimality ratio is defined by

$$1 - \frac{e(\mathbf{x})}{v^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x})}.$$

As shown in Fig. 2, the suboptimality ratio is between 0.83 and 1 in this control-affine system example. Note that this *a posteriori* suboptimality bound is problem-dependent. It is useful to gauge the degree of performance degradation by the proposed approximation algorithm in the case of nonlinear control affine systems.

## 7 Conclusions

We have proposed and analyzed a convex optimization-based method designed to solve dynamic programs in continuous state and action spaces. This interpolation-free approach provides a control policy of which performance converges to the optimum as the computational grid becomes finer in the case of linear systems and convex costs. When the system dynamics are affine in control input, the proposed bound on the gap between the cost-to-go function of the approximate policy and the optimal value function is useful to gauge the degree of suboptimality. In general cases with nonlinear systems and cost functions, a simple modification to a bi-level optimization formulation, of which inner problem is a linear program, maintains the desired convergence properties. The numerical experiment results suggest that the proposed method is valid even when some assumptions, such

as Lipschitz continuity and compactness, are not in place. Relaxing the assumptions imposed for convergence analysis remains an important topic of future research.

The proposed method can be extended in several directions. First, stochastic or incremental methods can be used to solve convex optimization problems involved in the approximate Bellman equation, particularly when the number of samples is large. Second, the modified bi-level version for general cases can be parallelized when the action space is discrete. For each discrete action, it suffices to solve the inner problem, which is convex. Third, it is worth considering convex relaxation methods for the proposed bi-level formulation and characterizing associated suboptimality bounds.

## A Proof of Lemma 2

*Proof.* Suppose that  $v \in \mathbb{B}$  is convex. Fix two arbitrary states  $\mathbf{x}^k \in \mathbb{X}$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ .

We first show that  $Tv$  is convex on  $\mathbb{X}$ . By the definition (2.2) of  $T$ , for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exist  $\mathbf{u}^k \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x}^k)$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , such that

$$(Tv)(\mathbf{x}^k) + \epsilon > r(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{u}^k) + \mathbb{E}[v(f(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{u}^k), w)].$$

Fix an arbitrary  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ , and let  $\mathbf{x}^{(\lambda)} := \lambda\mathbf{x}^{(1)} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{x}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{X}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{(\lambda)} := \lambda\mathbf{u}^{(1)} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{u}^{(2)}$ . By Assumption 3, we note that  $\mathbf{u}^{(\lambda)} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x}^{(\lambda)})$ . Thus, we have

$$(Tv)(\mathbf{x}^{(\lambda)}) \leq r(\mathbf{x}^{(\lambda)}, \mathbf{u}^{(\lambda)}) + \mathbb{E}[v(f(\mathbf{x}^{(\lambda)}, \mathbf{u}^{(\lambda)}), w)]. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Since  $r$  and  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \mapsto v(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, w))$  are convex on  $\mathbb{K}$  for each  $w \in \mathbb{W}$ ,

$$(Tv)(\mathbf{x}^{(\lambda)}) \leq \lambda r(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathbf{u}^{(1)}) + (1 - \lambda)r(\mathbf{x}^{(2)}, \mathbf{u}^{(2)}) + \mathbb{E}[\lambda v(f(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathbf{u}^{(1)}), w) + (1 - \lambda)v(f(\mathbf{x}^{(2)}, \mathbf{u}^{(2)}), w)].$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$(Tv)(\mathbf{x}^{(\lambda)}) < \lambda(Tv)(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}) + (1 - \lambda)(Tv)(\mathbf{x}^{(2)}) + \epsilon.$$

By letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we conclude that  $(Tv)(\mathbf{x}^{(\lambda)}) \leq \lambda(Tv)(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}) + (1 - \lambda)(Tv)(\mathbf{x}^{(2)})$ , which implies that  $Tv$  is convex on  $\mathbb{X}$ .

Next we show that  $\hat{T}v$  is convex on  $\mathbb{X}$ . By the definition (3.1) of  $\hat{T}$ , there exist  $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(k)}, \hat{\gamma}^{(k)}) \in \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \times \Delta^N$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , such that

$$(\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \epsilon > r(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(k)}) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i}^{(k)} v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]})$$

and  $f(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(k)}, \hat{w}^{[s]}) = \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i}^{(k)} \mathbf{x}^{[i]}$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Given any fixed  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ , let  $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\lambda)}, \hat{\gamma}^{(\lambda)}) := \lambda(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(1)}, \hat{\gamma}^{(1)}) + (1 - \lambda)(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(2)}, \hat{\gamma}^{(2)})$ . Since  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \mapsto f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, w^{[s]})$  is affine on  $\mathbb{K}$  for each  $s$ ,

$$f(\mathbf{x}^{(\lambda)}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\lambda)}, \hat{w}^{[s]}) = \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i}^{(\lambda)} \mathbf{x}^{[i]}.$$

This implies that  $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\lambda)}, \hat{\gamma}^{(\lambda)})$  is a feasible solution to the minimization problem in the definition of  $(\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}^{(\lambda)})$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}^{(\lambda)}) &\leq r(\mathbf{x}^{(\lambda)}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\lambda)}) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i}^{(\lambda)} v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) \\ &\leq \lambda r(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(1)}) + (1 - \lambda)r(\mathbf{x}^{(2)}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(2)}) + \frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^M [\lambda \hat{\gamma}_{s,i}^{(1)} + (1 - \lambda)\hat{\gamma}_{s,i}^{(2)}] v(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) \\ &< \lambda(\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}) + (1 - \lambda)(\hat{T}v)(\mathbf{x}^{(2)}) + \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds due to the convexity of  $r$ . Letting  $\epsilon$  tend to zero, we confirm that  $\hat{T}v$  is convex on  $\mathbb{X}$ .  $\square$

## B Proof of Corollary 3

We begin by introducing the following lemma:

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose that  $\hat{v}_t$ 's are convex for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ . Then, for each  $(t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathbb{X}$*

$$v_t^{\hat{\pi}}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \hat{v}_t(\mathbf{x}).$$

*Proof.* We use mathematical induction. For  $t = T$ ,  $v_T^{\hat{\pi}} = \hat{v}_T = q$ , and thus the induction hypothesis holds. Suppose that  $v_t^{\hat{\pi}} \leq \hat{v}_t$  for some  $t$ . Due to the monotonicity of  $T^{\hat{\pi}t}$ , we have

$$T^{\hat{\pi}t}v_t^{\hat{\pi}} \leq T^{\hat{\pi}t}\hat{v}_t. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Fix  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ . By the definition (3.1) of  $\hat{T}$ , for an arbitrary  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\hat{\gamma} \in \Delta^N$  such that

$$(\hat{T}\hat{v}_t)(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon > r(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\pi}_t(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} \hat{v}_t(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

and

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\pi}_t(\mathbf{x}), \hat{w}^{[s]}) = \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} \mathbf{x}^{[i]}.$$

By the convexity of  $\hat{v}_t$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} \hat{v}_t(\mathbf{x}^{[i]}) &\geq \hat{v}_t\left(\sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\gamma}_{s,i} \mathbf{x}^{[i]}\right) \\ &= \hat{v}_t(f(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\pi}_t(\mathbf{x}), \hat{w}^{[s]})). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

By combining the inequalities (B.2) and (B.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{T}\hat{v}_t)(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon &> r(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\pi}_t(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s=1}^N \hat{v}_t(f(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\pi}_t(\mathbf{x}), \hat{w}^{[s]})) \\ &= (T^{\hat{\pi}t}\hat{v}_t)(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

By letting  $\epsilon$  tend to zero, we have  $(T^{\hat{\pi}t}\hat{v}_t)(\mathbf{x}) \leq (\hat{T}\hat{v}_t)(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ . Recall (B.1), we conclude that

$$v_{t-1}^{\hat{\pi}} = T^{\hat{\pi}t}v_t^{\hat{\pi}} \leq T^{\hat{\pi}t}\hat{v}_t \leq \hat{T}\hat{v}_t = \hat{v}_{t-1}.$$

This completes mathematical induction, and the result follows.  $\square$

To prove Corollary 3, we first observe that

$$v_t^{\hat{\pi}} - v_t^* \leq \hat{v}_t - v_t^* \leq \sum_{k=t+1}^K L_k \delta$$

by Theorem 5 and Lemma 3. In addition, we have  $v_t^* \leq v_t^{\hat{\pi}}$  since  $v_t^*$  is the minimal cost-to-go function under Assumption 1 1)–3). Thus, the result follows.



## References

- [1] R. Bellman, “On the theory of dynamic programming,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 38, no. 8, pp. 716–719, 1952.
- [2] L. S. Shapley, “Stochastic games,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 39, no. 10, pp. 1095–1100, 1953.
- [3] D. P. Bertsekas and J. N. Tsitsiklis, *Neuro-Dynamic Programming*. Athena Scientific, 1996.
- [4] M. L. Puterman, *Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [5] H. Kushner and P. G. Dupuis, *Numerical Methods for Stochastic Control Problems in Continuous Time*. Springer, 2013.
- [6] O. Hernández-Lerma and J. B. Lasserre, *Discrete-Time Markov Control Processes: Basic Optimality Criteria*. Springer, 2012.
- [7] C. Savorgnan, J. B. Lasserre, and M. Diehl, “Discrete-time stochastic optimal control via occupation measures and moment relaxations,” in *Proceedings of Joint 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and 28th Chinese Control Conference*, 2009.
- [8] F. Dufour and T. Prieto-Rumeau, “Finite linear programming approximations of constrained discounted Markov decision processes,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 1298–1324, 2013.
- [9] P. Mohajerin Esfahani, T. Sutter, D. Kuhn, and J. Lygeros, “From infinite to finite programs: Explicit error bounds with applications to approximate dynamic programming,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 1968–1998, 2018.
- [10] D. P. Bertsekas, “Convergence of discretization procedures in dynamic programming,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 415–419, 1975.
- [11] H.-J. Langen, “Convergence of dynamic programming models,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 493–512, 1981.
- [12] W. Whitt, “Approximations of dynamic programs, I,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 231–243, 1978.
- [13] K. Hinderer, “On approximate solutions of finite-stage dynamic programs,” in *Dynamic Programming and Its Applications*, M. L. Puterman, Ed. Academic Press, 1978, pp. 289–317.
- [14] C.-S. Chow and J. N. Tsitsiklis, “An optimal one-way multigrid algorithm for discrete-time stochastic control,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 36, no. 8, pp. 898–914, 1991.
- [15] F. Dufour and T. Prieto-Rumeau, “Approximation of Markov decision processes with general state space,” *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 388, pp. 1254–1267, 2012.
- [16] N. Saldi, T. Linder, and S. Yüksel, “Asymptotic optimality and rates of convergence of quantized stationary policies in stochastic control,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 553–558, 2015.

- [17] N. Saldi, S. Yüksel, and T. Linder, “On the asymptotic optimality of finite approximations to Markov decision processes with Borel spaces,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 945–978, 2017.
- [18] O. Hernández-Lerma, “Discretization procedures for adaptive Markov control processes,” *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 137, pp. 485–514, 1989.
- [19] S. A. Johnson, J. R. Stedinger, C. A. Shoemaker, Y. Li, and J. A. Tejada-Guibert, “Numerical solution of continuous-state dynamic programs using linear and spline interpolation,” *Operations Research*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 484–500, 1993.
- [20] N. Saldi, T. Linder, and S. Yüksel, *Finite Approximations in Discrete-Time Stochastic Control: Quantized Models and Asymptotic Optimality*. Birkhäuser, 2018.
- [21] O. Hernández-Lerma and J. B. Lasserre, *Further Topics on Discrete-Time Markov Control Processes*. Springer, 2012.
- [22] S. M. Robinson, “Analysis of sample-path optimization,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 513–528, 1996.
- [23] D. P. Bertsekas, *Dynamic Programming and Optimal Control*,, 4th ed. Athena Scientific, 2012, vol. 2.
- [24] Y. Nesterov, *Introductory Lectures on Convex Optimization: A Basic Course*. Springer, 2013.
- [25] D. P. Bertsekas, *Convex Optimization Algorithms*. Athena Scientific, 2015.
- [26] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [27] A. Abate, M. Prandini, J. Lygeros, and S. Sastry, “Probabilistic reachability and safety for controlled discrete time stochastic hybrid systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 44, pp. 2724–2734, 2008.
- [28] I. Yang, “A dynamic game approach to distributionally robust safety specifications for stochastic systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 94, pp. 94–101, 2018.
- [29] S. Osher and R. Fedkiw, *Level Set Methods and Dynamic Implicit Surfaces*. Springer, 2002.
- [30] R. J. LeVeque, *Finite Difference Methods for Ordinary and Partial Differential Equations: Steady-State and Time-Dependent Problems*. SIAM, 2007.
- [31] S. P. Sethi and G. L. Thompson, *Optimal Control Theory: Applications to Management Science and Economics*. Springer, 2000.