

Semantic-Aware Remote Estimation of Multiple Markov Sources Under Constraints

Jiping Luo, Nikolaos Pappas, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—This paper studies semantic-aware communication for remote estimation of multiple Markov sources over a lossy and rate-constrained channel. Unlike most existing studies that treat all source states equally, we exploit the semantics of information and consider that the remote actuator has different tolerances for the estimation errors of different states. We aim to find an optimal scheduling policy that minimizes the long-term state-dependent costs of estimation errors under a transmission frequency constraint. We theoretically show the structure of the optimal policy by leveraging the *average-cost Constrained Markov Decision Process (CMDP)* theory and the Lagrangian dynamic programming. By exploiting the optimal structural results, we develop a novel policy search algorithm, termed *intersection search plus relative value iteration (Insec-RVI)*, that can find the optimal policy using only a few iterations. To avoid the “curse of dimensionality” of MDPs, we propose an online low-complexity *drift-plus-penalty (DPP)* scheduling algorithm based on the *Lyapunov optimization theorem*. We also design an efficient *average-cost Q-learning* algorithm to estimate the optimal policy without knowing *a priori* the channel and source statistics. Numerical results show that continuous transmission is inefficient, and remarkably, our semantic-aware policies can attain the optimum by strategically utilizing fewer transmissions by exploiting the timing of the important information.

Index Terms—Semantic communication, remote estimation, networked control systems, constrained Markov Decision Process, Lyapunov optimization, reinforcement learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

REMOTE estimation of stochastic processes is a fundamental problem in networked control systems (NCSs) [1], [2]. Scale support of such applications confronts challenges due to the scarcity of communication resources and the immensity of sensory data [3]. Therefore, there is a need to reduce the amount of data communicated between sensors, plants, and actuators. This is often done through various metrics that capture the *value* of communicating and determine whether a new data packet has a positive impact on the control system [4], [5]. Despite significant research efforts, most existing communication protocols are context- and content-agnostic, leading to inefficient communications and degraded performance [5].

The primary objective has been to minimize the estimation error (i.e., the *distortion* between the source state at the sensor

side and the reconstructed state at the remote end [1], [6]–[9]), indicating that information is valuable when it is accurate. However, in reality, this is not always the case, as *the actuator may have different tolerance for estimation errors of different states or in different situations*. Consider, for example, a remotely controlled vehicle sending status messages to a central node and following instructions to ensure safe and successful operations. While inaccurate estimates of normal status are somewhat acceptable, estimate errors of emergent messages (such as being off-track or close to obstacles) can cause significant safety hazards and must be avoided. Therefore, it is essential to factor into the communication process the *semantics* (i.e., state-dependent significance, context-aware requirements, and goal-oriented usefulness) of status updates and prioritize the information flow efficiently according to application demands [5], [10].

Information *freshness*, measured by the Age of Information (AoI), that is, the time elapsed since the newest received update at the destination [11], has recently been employed in NCSs [12]–[17]. It implies that status updates are more valuable when the destination has not been updated for a while. However, AoI alone cannot fully characterize the estimation error or meet the requirements of NCSs [15], [16]. For discrete-time linear time-invariant (LTI) systems, the trace of the estimation error covariance, also known as the Value of Information (VoI) [15], is a monotonically increasing, non-linear function of AoI [6], [7]. For Wiener processes, the discrepancy between the source signal and the newest received sample follows a Gaussian distribution with AoI as its covariance [17]. Although AoI is closely related to estimation error in the above systems, the age-optimal policy is not optimal in minimizing the estimation error [15], [17]. Furthermore, AoI ignores the source evolution and the context of the application.

Several metrics have been introduced to address the shortcomings of AoI and distortion [14], [18]–[23]. Age of Incorrect Information (AoII) [18], [19], defined as a composite of distortion and age penalties, captures the cost of not having a correct estimate at the destination for some time. The authors in [14], [20] defined state-dependent AoI variables to account for the state-dependent significance of stochastic processes. The Urgency of Information (UoI) [21], a weighted distortion metric, incorporates context awareness through adaptive weights. However, these metrics do not directly capture the ultimate goal of communication — actuation. In [23], the authors defined the Age of Actuation (AoA), a more general metric than AoI and becomes relevant when the information is utilized to perform actions in a timely manner.

A new semantic-empowered metric, namely *Cost of Ac-*

This work has been supported in part by the Swedish Research Council (VR), Excellence Center at Linköping – Lund in Information Technology (ELLIIT), Graduate School in Computer Science (CUGS), the European Union (ETHER, 101096526), and the European Union’s Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Grant Agreement No 101131481 (SOVEREIGN).

J. Luo and N. Pappas are with the Department of Computer and Information Science, Linköping University, Linköping 58183, Sweden (e-mail: {jiping.luo, nikolaos.pappas}@liu.se).

tuation Error (CAE), was first introduced in [2] to account for *state-dependent* actuation costs. Specifically, the CAE prioritizes information flow according to the significance of states, or more precisely, *the potential control risks or costs incurred without correct estimates of these states*. The problem of remote estimation of a single discrete-time finite-state Markov source was further studied in [24]–[27]. The work in [24], [25] analyzed a low-complexity, sub-optimal, stationary randomized policy that takes probabilistic actions independent of the source evolution and the real-time estimation errors. An optimal policy in a resource-constrained system was presented in [26]. However, these works consider a single-source scenario, assuming that the source or channel statistics are known *a priori*. In reality, acquiring such information before deployment may be costly or even not feasible. Moreover, theoretical results regarding the existence and structure of the optimal policy have not been developed.

This paper considers a more general case where an agent schedules the update time of multiple Markov sources over a lossy and rate-constrained channel. The system consists of *slowly* and *rapidly evolving* sources. Unlike the single-source scenario, where the sampling decision is solely based on state importance, the multi-source system has a *two-level significance*: state importance and source significance, which is relevant in multi-modal scenarios. The source significance can vary depending on the channel condition, the source evolution patterns, and the transmission constraint, making it more difficult to cater to system requirements. We aim to find an optimal schedule to minimize the long-term average CAE while satisfying a transmission frequency constraint. This problem is challenging as it can be classified as an *average-cost constrained Markov Decision Process* (CMDP), which is proven to be computationally prohibitive [28]. Moreover, the design of such a policy in unknown environments is significantly more complicated.

The main contributions of this paper are outlined as follows.

- We formulate the semantic-aware multi-source scheduling problem as an average-cost CMDP, then we relax it as an unconstrained two-layer problem using the *Lagrangian technique*. Our analysis reveals that the optimal Lagrangian cost follows a piece-wise linear and concave (PWLC) function, and the optimal policy is, at most, a randomized mixture of two simple deterministic policies. Based on these results, we propose a new policy search method called *intersection search*, which can find the optimal policy using only a few iterations.
- To address the “curse of dimensionality” of MDPs, we propose a low-complexity online scheduling policy based on the *Lyapunov optimization theorem*. We demonstrate that this policy satisfies the transmission frequency constraint and show its near-optimality.
- We further extend the results to unknown environments by developing an efficient *Q-learning* policy that can asymptotically attain the minimum with an appropriately chosen learning rate.
- We conduct extensive simulations to validate and compare the performance of the proposed policies. An important consequence of our study is that continuous

transmission is inefficient and yields minimal (even no) performance gains for the communication goal; instead, transmitting less but more significant information can also lead to an optimal outcome.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. We provide the mathematical model of the scheduling problem in Sec. II and formulate it as an average-cost CMDP in Sec. III. In Sec. IV, we show the structure of the optimal policy and propose an efficient search algorithm to solve the problem optimally. In Sec. V, we propose an online low-complexity policy based on the Lyapunov optimization theorem. In Sec. VI, we present the Q-learning algorithm for unknown environments. Numerical results are provided in Sec. VII. Sec. VIII concludes the paper.

Notation: We use uppercase letters to denote random variables (e.g., X , Y , etc.) and corresponding lowercase letters to denote their realizations (e.g., x , y , etc.). $|\mathcal{A}|$ denotes the cardinality of set \mathcal{A} . $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$, $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$, and $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ denote the probability of an event, the expectation of a random variable, and the indicator function of a statement, respectively. $S_{1:t}$ is a short hand notation for the vector (S_1, \dots, S_t) . $\mathbf{P}_{i,j}$ denotes the (i, j) -th element of the matrix \mathbf{P} , $v(i)$ denotes the i -th entry of the vector \mathbf{v} , and \mathbf{v}^T is the transpose of \mathbf{v} .




Fig. 1. Remote estimation of multiple Markov sources with feedback.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

A. System Description

We consider a slotted-time communication system shown in Fig. 1, where the destination remotely tracks the states of multiple stochastic processes for achieving a specific control task. We illustrate each component as follows.

1) *Sources:* Denote $\mathcal{M} = \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ as the index set of the sources. Each source $m \in \mathcal{M}$ is modeled by a N_m -state homogeneous discrete-time Markov chain (DTMC)¹, $\{X_t^m\}_{t \geq 1}$, where $t = 1, 2, \dots$ is the discrete time index. The slot length is defined as the interval between two successive state changes. The value of X_t^m is chosen from a finite set $\mathcal{X}^m = \{1, 2, \dots, N_m\}$. The state transition probabilities of each source m are represented by a stochastic matrix \mathbf{Q}^m , where $\mathbf{Q}_{i,j}^m = \mathbb{P}(X_{t+1}^m = j | X_t^m = i)$ is the transition probability from state i to state j between two consecutive time slots. A DTMC is said to be *slowly evolving* if it tends to stay in the same state across two consecutive time slots, i.e., \mathbf{Q} is diagonally dominant. Otherwise, we call it *rapidly*

¹DTMC is widely applied in safety-critical systems, such as autonomous driving [29], [30] and cyber-physical security [31], for modeling operation modes, control risks, and working conditions. A prominent feature of these applications is the state-dependent and context-aware costs or risks.

evolving. We consider that the system consists of slowly and rapidly evolving sources.

2) *Agent*: An agent observes the sources' states and decides at the beginning of each time slot which source to sample². After generating a status update of some source, the transmitter sends the packet to the destination over a wireless channel. We assume that only one packet can be sent at a time. Each packet contains the state of the source and a header with two fields: a timestamp and an index. The timestamp shows the generation time of the packet, and the index indicates the source from which the packet is sampled. Thus, the receiver knows exactly each packet's generation time and origin.

We denote the sampling decision at time t by an integer variable $A_t \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$, where $A_t = 0$ means no source is selected and the transmitter remains salient, while $A_t = m, m \neq 0$ means taking a sample from source m and transmitting it immediately. In practice, the transmitter can only transmit packets intermittently due to resource constraints and network contentions. So we impose a constraint on the transmission frequency that is no larger than $F_{\max} \in (0, 1]$.

3) *Channel*: We consider an unreliable channel with *i.i.d.* packet-drops and (possibly) transmission delays. The channel state H_t is 1 if the packet is successfully decoded at the receiver and 0 otherwise. We assume that the channel state information (CSI) is available only at the destination node. Therefore, the agent does not know whether a status update will reach the destination before a transmission attempt. We define the success transmission probability as $p_s = \mathbb{E}[H_t]$. In this paper, we consider two specific delay cases:

- *Zero-delay*: The sampling and transmission process is negligible compared to the slot length (the interval between two successive state changes). Consequently, a sampled packet reaches its destination immediately after being generated.
- *One-delay*: A transmission attempt occupies one slot. Thus, the receiver receives an update from the transmitter with a delay of one slot.

We denote zero-delay as $d = 0$ and one-delay as $d = 1$. We analyze each case independently.

4) *Receiver*: The receiver sends an acknowledgment (ACK)/NACK signal to the transmitter after each transmission to indicate the transmission success or failure. We assume that these feedback packets are delivered instantly and error-free³. The receiver needs to reconstruct the states of the sources from under-sampled and (possibly) delayed measurements, and then forward them to the controller/actuator for control. We assume that the receiver does not know the sources' evolution patterns and updates its estimate using the latest received packet, i.e.,

$$\hat{X}_t^m = \begin{cases} X_t^m, & \text{if } d = 0, A_t = m, H_t = 1 \\ X_{t-1}^m, & \text{if } d = 1, A_{t-1} = m, H_t = 1 \\ \hat{X}_{t-1}^m, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

²This type of source is referred to as a *generate-at-will* or a *controllable* source, by which the sampling time is controlled by an external agent [32].

³This is a common assumption in the literature, as ACK/NACK packets are usually smaller than data packets and may be sent over a separate channel.

5) *Cost of Actuation Error*: We denote the system state at the beginning of each time slot t by S_t . In the zero-delay case, the agent observes the sources' states $X_t = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^M)$ at the beginning of slot t and it knows the previous reconstructed states \hat{X}_{t-1} through ACK/NACK packets. But it does not know \hat{X}_t before making a sampling decision due to the lack of CSI. Thus, we define $S_t = (X_t, \hat{X}_{t-1})$ for the zero-delay case. On the other hand, in the one-delay case, the agent knows \hat{X}_t because the feedback signal was received at the end of slot $t - 1$, and the receiver will update its estimate at the beginning of slot t using either X_{t-1} or \hat{X}_{t-1} . Thus, we define $S_t = (X_t, \hat{X}_t)$ for the one-delay case. We also define the state of subsystem m at time t as $S_t^m = (X_t^m, \hat{X}_{t-1}^m)$ for zero-delay case and $S_t^m = (X_t^m, \hat{X}_t^m)$ for one-delay case.

The discrepancy between the source states and the reconstructed states can cause actuation errors. In practice, some source states are more important than others, and thus some actuation errors may have a larger impact than others. Let $\delta_{i,j}^m \triangleq \delta^m(X^m = i, \hat{X}^m = j)$ denote the potential control cost of the sub-system m being at state $s^m = (i, j)$, where $\delta^m : \mathcal{X}^m \times \mathcal{X}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a pre-determined non-commutative function⁴ capturing *state-dependent significance* of estimation errors [2]. Then, the *cost of actuation error* (CAE) of taking an action in a certain system state is defined as the weighted sum of all subsystems' control costs

$$c(S_t, A_t, S_{t+1}) = \begin{cases} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \omega_m \delta^m(X_t^m, \hat{X}_t^m), & \text{if } d = 0 \\ \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \omega_m \delta^m(X_{t+1}^m, \hat{X}_{t+1}^m), & \text{if } d = 1 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $\omega_m \in \mathbb{R}^+$ represents the relative *significance* of source m to the overall system.

Remark 1. *Although the cost function c considered here is decomposable, the approach proposed in this paper can deal with coupled collective costs. Moreover, the cost function depends on the subsequent system state, so the agent can only evaluate the effectiveness of sampling actions after receiving feedback packets. It implies that the agent should know a priori the expected CAE of taking an action in certain state.*

Remark 2. *The system has a two-level significance, namely the source significance and the state importance. The significance of information depends on several factors, such as the weight (ω_m), the channel conditions (d and p_s), the source evolution pattern (\mathbf{Q}^m), and the system resource constraint (F_{\max}). We will discuss how these aspects affect the source and state significance using numerical results in Section VII.*

B. Performance Measures

At each time t , the information available at the agent is $I_t = (S_{1:t}, A_{1:t-1})$. Let \mathcal{I}_t and \mathcal{S} denote the set of all information leading up to time t and the system state space, respectively. A *decision rule* is a function that maps the information set into

⁴Function δ^m is non-commutative, i.e., for any $i, j \in \mathcal{X}^m$, $\delta_{i,j}^m$ is not necessarily equal to $\delta_{j,i}^m$. Moreover, we consider that $\delta_{i,j}^m$ needs not equal to $\delta_{i,k}^m$, for any $k \neq j$. This is because different actuation errors may have different repercussions for the system performance.

the set of probability distributions on the action space, that is $\pi_t : \mathcal{I}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$. A decision rule is said to be *Markovian* if it depends only on the current system state, that is $\pi_t : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$. Moreover, a decision rule is *deterministic* if it chooses a unique action in each state, i.e., $\pi_t : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$.

A *policy* $\pi = \{\pi_t\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of decision rules. We call a policy *stationary* if the mapping π_t does not depend on t . The taxonomy of decision rules leads to three classes of policies, ranging in generality from stationary Markovian deterministic (MD), stationary Markovian randomized (MR), to non-stationary and/or history-dependent. We denote these classes of policies as Π^{MD} , Π^{MR} , and Π , respectively.

At each time t , the system incurs two costs: an actuation cost defined in (2), and a transmission cost given by

$$f(S_t, A_t) = \mathbb{1}(A_t \neq 0). \quad (3)$$

We define the *limsup*⁵ average CAE of a policy $\pi \in \Pi$ by

$$C_s(\pi) \triangleq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}^{\pi} \left[c(S_t, A_t, S_{t+1}) \middle| S_1 = s \right], \quad (4)$$

where \mathbb{E}^{π} represents the conditional expectation, given that policy π is employed with initial state $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Similarly, the *average transmission cost* can be defined as

$$F_s(\pi) \triangleq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}^{\pi} \left[f(S_t, A_t) \middle| S_1 = s \right]. \quad (5)$$

C. System Dynamics

We denote $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ the system transition function, where $P(s'|s, a) := \mathbb{P}(S_{t+1} = s' | S_t = s, A_t = a)$ is the probability that the system state becomes s' at time $t+1$ when the agent chooses action a in state s at time t . For a given sampling decision, each subsystem $m \in \mathcal{M}$ evolves independently. Thus, we have

$$P(s'|s, a) = \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} P^m(s'(m) | s(m), a), \quad (6)$$

where P^m is the transition function of subsystem m , given by

$$P^m(s'(m) | s(m), a) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{Q}_{i,k}^m p_s, & \text{if } a = m, s(m) = (i, j), s'(m) = (k, i) \\ \mathbf{Q}_{i,k}^m (1 - p_s), & \text{if } a = m, s(m) = (i, j), s'(m) = (k, j) \\ \mathbf{Q}_{i,k}^m, & \text{if } a = m, s(m) = (i, i), s'(m) = (k, i) \\ \mathbf{Q}_{i,k}^m, & \text{if } a \neq m, s(m) = (i, j), s'(m) = (k, j) \\ \mathbf{Q}_{i,k}^m, & \text{if } a \neq m, s(m) = (i, i), s'(m) = (k, i) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $\forall i, j, k \in \mathcal{X}^m, i \neq j$.

Remark 3. Eq. (7) is applicable for any finite-state DTMC and is common for both zero-delay and one-delay cases.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND ANALYSIS

A. CMDP Formulation

Our goal is to find a policy π in space Π that minimizes the average CAE while satisfying a transmission frequency constraint. We can formulate this as an optimization problem:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{CMDP}} : \inf_{\pi \in \Pi} C_s(\pi), \quad \text{s.t. } F_s(\pi) \leq F_{\max}. \quad (8)$$

The above problem is essentially an *average-cost constrained Markov Decision Process* (CMDP), which is, however, challenging to solve since it imposes a *global* constraint that involves the entire decision-making process.

Definition 1. (*Globally feasible policy*) A policy π is called *globally feasible*, or simply, *feasible*, if it satisfies the transmission constraint for all initial states, i.e., $F_s(\pi) \leq F_{\max}$ for all initial state $s \in \mathcal{S}$.

Definition 2. (*Constrained optimal policy*) Any feasible policy that attains $C_s^* = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi} C_s(\pi)$ for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is termed a *constrained optimal policy*.

B. Average Costs of Stationary Policies

There is no loss of optimality in restricting attention to stationary policies [34, Proposition 6.2.3]. Under a stationary Markovian policy π , the induced stochastic process $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is a time-homogeneous Markov chain with transition matrix $\mathbf{P}(\pi)$. The (s, s') -th entry of $\mathbf{P}(\pi)$ is given by

$$\mathbf{P}_{s,s'}(\pi) = \begin{cases} P(s'|s, \pi(s)), & \text{if } \pi \in \Pi^{\text{MD}} \\ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} P(s'|s, a) \pi(a|s), & \text{if } \pi \in \Pi^{\text{MR}}. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Since $\mathbf{P}(\pi)$ is stationary, the probability of the system transitioning to state s' at time t , given an initial state of s , can be represented as $\mathbf{P}_{s,s'}^{t-1}(\pi)$.

To simplify notation, we define the expected CAE of a policy $\pi \in \Pi^{\text{MR}}$ in state s as

$$\mathbf{c}^{\pi}(s) = \begin{cases} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} c(s, \pi(s), s') P(s'|s, \pi(s)), & \text{if } \pi \in \Pi^{\text{MD}} \\ \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} c(s, a, s') P(s'|s, a) \pi(a|s), & \text{if } \pi \in \Pi^{\text{MR}}. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Similarly, the expected transmission cost in state s is

$$\mathbf{f}^{\pi}(s) = \begin{cases} f(s, \pi(s)), & \text{if } \pi \in \Pi^{\text{MD}} \\ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} f(s, a) \pi(a|s), & \text{if } \pi \in \Pi^{\text{MR}}. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Then, the average costs can be rewritten as

$$C_s(\pi) = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{P}_{s,s'}^*(\pi) \mathbf{c}^{\pi}(s'), \quad (12)$$

$$F_s(\pi) = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{P}_{s,s'}^*(\pi) \mathbf{f}^{\pi}(s'), \quad (13)$$

where

$$\mathbf{P}^*(\pi) \triangleq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{P}^{t-1}(\pi) \quad (14)$$

⁵The *lim average costs* need not exist for non-stationary policies [33].

is the limiting matrix⁶.

In average cost problems, the limiting behavior of $\mathbf{P}(\pi)$ is fundamental. When $\mathbf{P}(\pi)$ is *unichain*, that is, it has a single recurrent class \mathcal{R} and a set \mathcal{T} of transient state, then $\mathbf{P}^*(\pi)$ has equal rows and satisfies [33, Theorem A.4]

$$\mathbf{P}_{s,s'}^*(\pi) = \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\nu}(s'), & s' \in \mathcal{R} \\ 0, & s' \in \mathcal{T}, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is the stationary distribution of \mathcal{R} . Consequently, the average CAE and the average transmission cost are *independent of initial states*, i.e., $C(\pi) = C_s(\pi)$, $F(\pi) = F_s(\pi)$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. When $\mathcal{T} = \emptyset$, then $\mathbf{P}(\pi)$ is *recurrent*, and the average costs satisfy $C(\pi) = \boldsymbol{\nu}^\top \mathbf{c}^\pi$ and $F(\pi) = \boldsymbol{\nu}^\top \mathbf{f}^\pi$.

C. Source-Agnostic Policy

Before discussing the constrained optimal policy, we first examine a special subclass of stationary randomized policies, termed *source-agnostic* (SA) policy. At each time t , the SA policy takes probabilistic actions independent of source states. Specifically, it selects each source m with a fixed probability f_m , where

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} f_m \leq F_{\max}. \quad (16)$$

The transition matrix of each subsystem m of an SA policy π_{sa} is given by

$$\mathbf{P}_{s(m),s'(m)}^m(\pi_{\text{sa}}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{Q}_{i,k}^m f_m p_s, & \text{if } s(m) = (i, j), s'(m) = (k, i) \\ \mathbf{Q}_{i,k}^m (1 - f_m p_s), & \text{if } s(m) = (i, j), s'(m) = (k, j) \\ \mathbf{Q}_{i,k}^m, & \text{if } s(m) = (i, i), s'(m) = (k, i) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where $i, j, k \in \mathcal{X}^m$, $i \neq j$. Then, the system transition matrix is given by

$$\mathbf{P}_{s,s'}(\pi_{\text{sa}}) = \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{P}_{s(m),s'(m)}^m(\pi_{\text{sa}}). \quad (18)$$

In the next proposition, we show that the Markov chain induced by an SA policy is recurrent and aperiodic. This result is very useful as we will rely on it to prove some important results in Section IV and Section V.

Proposition 1. (*recurrence and aperiodicity of SA policies*) Suppose \mathbf{Q}^m is a positive stochastic matrix and $0 < f_m < F_{\max}$. Then $\mathbf{P}^m(\pi_{\text{sa}})$ forms a recurrent and aperiodic chain.

Proof. Since the self-transition probability of each state in \mathcal{S}^m is positive, i.e., $\mathbf{P}_{s,s}^m(\pi_{\text{sa}}) > 0, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}^m$, then $\mathbf{P}^m(\pi_{\text{sa}})$ is aperiodic. To prove the recurrence of $\mathbf{P}^m(\pi_{\text{sa}})$, we need to show that every state $s \in \mathcal{S}^m$ communicates with every other state $s' \in \mathcal{S}^m \setminus \{s\}$ [35, Chapter 4]. Suppose the chain is at state $s = (i, j)$, it can change to state $s' = (k, j)$ with a positive probability $\mathbf{Q}_{i,k}^m (1 - f_m p_s)$. Then, the chain can access state $s'' = (l, k)$ with a probability of $\mathbf{Q}_{k,l}^m f_m p_s$. So, s'' is

accessible from s . Likewise, we can show that s is accessible from s'' . Hence, s communicates with s'' . This holds for any $s, s'' \in \mathcal{S}^m$, which completes the proof. ■

Corollary 1. *It follows from Proposition 1 that $\mathbf{P}(\pi_{\text{sa}})$ is also recurrent and aperiodic.*

IV. LAGRANGIAN MULTIPLIER TECHNIQUES AND THE OPTIMAL POLICY

In this section, we first relax the original CMDP as an unconstrained Lagrangian MDP with a multiplier $\lambda \geq 0$, termed $\mathcal{P}_{\text{L-MDP}}^\lambda$. We show in Theorem 1 that the Lagrangian MDP for any given $\lambda \geq 0$ is *communicating*, and consequently, the corresponding λ -optimal policy is *Markovian deterministic*. We use the *relative value iteration* algorithm (see Algorithm 1) to optimally solve $\mathcal{P}_{\text{L-MDP}}^\lambda$ and prove its convergence in Proposition 2. Proposition 3 shows some important properties of the cost functions, based on which we establish the structure of the constrained optimal policy in Theorem 2. Then, we propose a novel algorithm called Insec-RVI (see Algorithm 2), that can find the constrained optimal policy in a few iterations.

A. The Lagrangian MDP

Now we derive the structure of constrained optimal policies based on the Lagrangian technique [28]. We start with rewriting $\mathcal{P}_{\text{CMDP}}$ in its (unconstrained) Lagrangian form. The *Lagrangian average cost* of a policy π with multiplier $\lambda \geq 0$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_s^\lambda(\pi) &\triangleq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}^\pi [l^\lambda(S_t, A_t, S_{t+1}) | S_1 = s] \\ &= C_s(\pi) + \lambda F_s(\pi), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the *Lagrangian instantaneous cost*, $l^\lambda(s, a, s')$, is

$$l^\lambda(s, a, s') = c(s, a, s') + \lambda f(s, a). \quad (20)$$

Given any $\lambda \geq 0$, define the unconstrained *Lagrangian MDP*

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{L-MDP}}^\lambda : \inf_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathcal{L}_s^\lambda(\pi). \quad (21)$$

The above problem is a standard MDP with an average cost criterion. We note that the case $\lambda = 0$ corresponds to the trivial case where the constraint in (8) is not active.

The Lagrangian approach thereafter solves the following two-layer unconstrained “sup-inf” problem [28]

$$\sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \inf_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathcal{L}_s^\lambda(\pi) - \lambda F_{\max}. \quad (22)$$

The inner layer solves a standard MDP with a fixed multiplier λ , and the outer layer searches for the largest multiplier that produces a feasible policy. Note that in the remaining of this paper, we will refer to $\mathcal{P}_{\text{L-MDP}}^\lambda$ as the inner problem since λF_{\max} is constant.

In what follows we prove that, for any $\lambda \geq 0$ and $F_{\max} \in (0, 1]$, there exists an unconstrained optimal policy for the inner problem, that is stationary and Markovian deterministic. We also show in Sec. IV-B the structural results of Lagrangian MDPs, based on which the supremum of the outer problem can be easily achieved. It is known that the *duality gap*, defined as

⁶Note that we replace \limsup with \lim since they converge to the same value for stationary policies [33, Proposition 8.1.1].

the difference between the optimal values obtained in problems (8) and (22), is generally non-zero. An important consequence of Theorem 2 is that our approach leads to a constrained optimal policy, i.e., achieving zero duality gap.

Definition 3. (λ -optimal policy) A policy π is called λ -optimal if it solves $\mathcal{P}_{L\text{-MDP}}^\lambda$ and the average costs \mathcal{L}^λ , C^λ , and F^λ are independent of initial states.

Theorem 1. (Existence of the λ -optimal policy) For any given $\lambda \geq 0$, there exists a vector \mathbf{h}^λ that satisfies the following Bellman's optimality equation

$$\mathcal{L}^\lambda + \mathbf{h}^\lambda(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) (l^\lambda(s, a, s') + \mathbf{h}^\lambda(s')), \quad (23)$$

for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. The quantities \mathcal{L}^λ , F^λ , and C^λ are independent of initial states. Furthermore, the λ -optimal policy belongs to Π^{MD} and can be obtained by

$$\pi_\lambda^*(s) = \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) (l^\lambda(s, a, s') + \mathbf{h}^\lambda(s')) \quad (24)$$

Proof. According to [33, Theorem 8.3.2] and [36, Chapter 4.2], it is sufficient to show that the controlled Markov chain with transition function P is (weakly) communicating. By [33, Proposition 8.3.1], this holds if there exists a randomized stationary policy that induces a recurrent Markov chain. Clearly, the SA policy satisfies this condition (see Proposition 1 and Corollary 1), thus completing the proof. ■

Algorithm 1: RVI for solving $\mathcal{P}_{L\text{-MDP}}^\lambda$.

Input: $\lambda, c, f, P, \epsilon$
Output: $\pi_\lambda^*, F^\lambda, C^\lambda, \mathcal{L}^\lambda$

```

1  $s_{\text{ref}} = 0, \mathbf{v}^0 = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^0 = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ 
2 for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  do
3     /* update Bellman's equation */
4     for each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  do
5          $\mathbf{v}^k(s) \leftarrow \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) (l^\lambda(s, a, s') + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k-1}(s'))$ 
6          $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^k(s) \leftarrow \mathbf{v}^k(s) - \mathbf{v}^k(s_{\text{ref}})$ 
7     end
8     if  $\|\mathbf{v}^k - \mathbf{v}^{k-1}\|_\infty < \epsilon$  then
9         /* compute optimal policy */
10        for each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  do
11             $\pi_\lambda^*(s) \leftarrow \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) (l^\lambda(s, a, s') + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^k(s'))$ 
12        end
13        /* compute average cost */
14         $F^\lambda \leftarrow \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^{\pi_\lambda^*}(s) f^{\pi_\lambda^*}(s)$ 
15         $C^\lambda \leftarrow \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^{\pi_\lambda^*}(s) c^{\pi_\lambda^*}(s)$ 
16         $\mathcal{L}^\lambda \leftarrow C^\lambda + \lambda F^\lambda$ 
17        return  $\pi_\lambda^*, F^\lambda, C^\lambda, \mathcal{L}^\lambda$ 
18    end
19 end

```

We can use the *relative value iteration* (RVI) [33, Section 8.5.5] to solve $\mathcal{P}_{L\text{-MDP}}^\lambda$ for any given $\lambda \geq 0$, as shown in Algorithm 1. Let $s_{\text{ref}} \in \mathcal{S}$ denote an arbitrarily chosen reference state, \mathbf{v}^k and $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^k$ denote the value function and the relative value function for iteration k , respectively. In the beginning, we set $\mathbf{v}^0 = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^0 = \mathbf{0}$. Then, for each $k \geq 1$, the RVI updates the value functions as follows:

$$\mathbf{v}^{k+1}(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) (l^\lambda(s, a, s') + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^k(s')), \quad (25)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{k+1}(s) = \mathbf{v}^{k+1}(s) - \mathbf{v}^{k+1}(s_{\text{ref}}). \quad (26)$$

As stated in Proposition 2 below, the sequences $\{\mathbf{v}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ converge to \mathbf{v}^* and \mathbf{h}^λ , respectively. Then, the λ -optimal policy can be obtained by solving (24), and the average costs can be given by

$$C^\lambda = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^{\pi_\lambda^*}(s) c^{\pi_\lambda^*}(s) \quad (27)$$

$$F^\lambda = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^{\pi_\lambda^*}(s) f^{\pi_\lambda^*}(s) \quad (28)$$

$$\mathcal{L}^\lambda = C^\lambda + \lambda F^\lambda \quad (29)$$

where $\nu^{\pi_\lambda^*}$ is the stationary distribution of $\mathbf{P}(\pi_\lambda^*)$, and $\nu^{\pi_\lambda^*}(s)$ can be interpreted as the fraction of time the system is in s .

Proposition 2. (Convergence of the RVI) For any $\lambda \geq 0$, the sequences $\{\mathbf{v}^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ generated by Eqs. (25)-(26) converges, i.e., $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{v}^*$. Moreover, $\mathcal{L}^\lambda = \mathbf{v}^*(s_{\text{ref}})$ and $\mathbf{h}^\lambda = \mathbf{v}^* - \mathbf{v}^*(s_{\text{ref}})$ is a solution to (23).

Proof. A sufficient condition for the convergence of the RVI is the recurrence and aperiodicity of the Markov chain induced by optimal stationary policies [36, Proposition 4.3.2], [34, Proposition 6.6.3]. The recurrence of the optimal policy follows directly from Theorem 1. Moreover, the self-transition probabilities satisfy $P(s|s, a) > 0$ for any $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Therefore, the aperiodicity can always be achieved. ■

B. Structure of the Optimal Policy

Until now, we have shown the existence of an optimal deterministic policy for the inner problem. In what follows we show that there exists a constrained optimal policy that is in no case more complex than a randomized mixture of two Markovian deterministic policies. Before stating that, we first present some important properties of the cost functions \mathcal{L}^λ , C^λ , and F^λ . These properties provide the basis for solving the outer problem in (22) and the structure of the constrained optimal policy.

Proposition 3. (Properties of the optimal cost functions) \mathcal{L}^λ is a piecewise linear, concave, and monotonically increasing function of λ . $F^\lambda(C^\lambda)$ is piece-wise constant, monotonically non-increasing (non-decreasing).

Proof. The monotonicity of \mathcal{L}^λ and F^λ is demonstrated in [37, Lemma 3.1] and [38, Lemma 3.5]. It only remains to show that \mathcal{L}^λ is piecewise-linear and concave (PWLC) and $F^\lambda(C^\lambda)$ is piecewise constant.

We give a proof by induction based on the recursive formulas (25)-(26). Since $l^\lambda(s, a, s') = c(s, a, s') + \lambda f(s, a')$ is a linear function, then for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$

$$v^1(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) l^\lambda(s, a, s')$$

is a PWLC function of λ . Then, the function $\tilde{v}^1(s) = v^1(s) - v^1(s_{\text{ref}})$ is also PWLC. Now, assume the following induction hypothesis: $\tilde{v}^k(s)$ is PWLC for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Consequently, $\sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \tilde{v}^k(s')$ is PWLC since the summation of PWLC functions is PWLC. It follows that

$$v^{k+1}(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) (l^\lambda(s, a, s') + \tilde{v}^k(s'))$$

is still PWLC since the min of PWLC functions is PWLC. By Proposition 2, v^k converges to a vector v^* . Consequently, $\mathcal{L}^\lambda = v^*(s_{\text{ref}})$ is PWLC. Additionally, F^λ is the derivative of \mathcal{L}^λ and it is therefore piecewise constant. ■

Definition 4. (γ value) By the monotonicity of F^λ and \mathcal{L}^λ , the solution to the outer problem in (22) can be defined by

$$\gamma \triangleq \inf\{\lambda : \lambda \geq 0, F^\lambda \leq F_{\max}\}. \quad (30)$$

Proposition 4. (Feasibility of the Lagrangian problem) For any $F_{\max} \in (0, 1]$, the unconstrained problem in (22) always returns a solution, that is $0 \leq \gamma < \infty$.

Proof. Suppose that the assertion of the Lemma is false. Then $\gamma = \infty$ and $F^\lambda > F_{\max}$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$. Consequently, $\mathcal{L}^\lambda = C^\lambda + \lambda F^\lambda > C^\lambda + \lambda F_{\max}$. On the other hand, we can construct an SA policy π_{sa} that satisfies $F_s(\pi_{\text{sa}}) = F_{\max} - \sigma$, where $0 \leq \sigma < F_{\max}$. This can be achieved by setting $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} f_m = F_{\max} - \sigma$. For this π_{sa} , we have $\mathcal{L}_s^\lambda(\pi_{\text{sa}}) = C_s(\pi_{\text{sa}}) + \lambda F_s(\pi_{\text{sa}}) = C_s(\pi_{\text{sa}}) + \lambda(F_{\max} - \sigma)$. Hence, $\mathcal{L}^\lambda > \mathcal{L}_s^\lambda(\pi_{\text{sa}})$ for sufficient large λ , which is clearly a contradiction as \mathcal{L}^λ attains the infimum. The above holds for any $0 < F_{\max} \leq 1$, which completes the proof. ■

Although the above propositions ensure the existence of an optimal solution to problem (22), it may not be optimal to the original CMDP since the duality gap can be non-zero. The authors in [37, Theorem 4.3] provide the sufficient conditions under which an optimal policy π^* for a Lagrangian MDP is also optimal for the original constrained problem $\mathcal{P}_{\text{CMDP}}$, i.e., zero duality gap. Specifically, the policy π^* must solve $\mathcal{P}_{\text{L-MDP}}^\lambda$ for some $\lambda > 0$, and in addition, the average costs satisfy $F^\lambda = F_s(\pi^*) = F_{\max}$, $C^\lambda = C_s(\pi^*)$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Notice that π^* needs not to be deterministic. We verify that these conditions are valid and establish the structure of the optimal policy in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. (Structure of the optimal policy) The optimal policy π^* belongs to Π^{MD} if the following condition holds

$$\gamma(F^\gamma - F_{\max}) = 0. \quad (31)$$

Otherwise, the optimal policy is a mixture of two policies in space Π^{MD} , i.e.,

$$\pi^* = q\pi_{\gamma^-}^* + (1 - q)\pi_{\gamma^+}^* \quad (32)$$

where $q = (F_{\max} - F^{\gamma^+}) / (F^{\gamma^-} - F^{\gamma^+})$, F^{γ^-} and F^{γ^+} are the left-hand limit and right-hand limit at point γ . Notice that $\pi_{\gamma^-}^*$ is infeasible while $\pi_{\gamma^+}^*$ is feasible⁷.

Proof. Since F^λ is a piecewise constant and non-increasing function of λ (see Proposition 3), it can be expressed as

$$F^\lambda = \begin{cases} F^0, & \lambda \in [0, \lambda_1) \\ F^{\lambda_1}, & \lambda \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \\ \vdots & \\ F^{\lambda_N}, & \lambda \in [\lambda_N, \infty) \end{cases}$$

where $0 < \lambda_1 < \dots < \lambda_N$ are the breakpoints of F^λ , $F^0 > F^{\lambda_1} > \dots > F^{\lambda_N}$ are the possible values of F^λ . Since $\gamma < \infty$ for any $F_{\max} \in (0, 1]$ (see Proposition 4), we prove the theorem by distinguishing between three cases:

(1): When $F^0 \leq F_{\max}$, it implies that $\gamma = 0$ and the unconstrained policy π_0^* is feasible. By [37, Lemma 3.1], C^λ is monotonically non-decreasing in λ . Hence, π_0^* achieves the minimum average CAE, C^0 , and it is therefore optimal.

(2): When $F^{\lambda_n} = F_{\max}$ for some n , then any $\lambda \in [\lambda_n, \infty)$ can result in a feasible λ -optimal policy. So we have $\gamma = \lambda_n$. The corresponding γ -optimal policy π_γ^* satisfies $F(\pi_\gamma^*) = F_{\max}$ and $\mathcal{L}(\pi_\gamma^*) = \mathcal{L}^\gamma$. Therefore, π_γ^* is constrained optimal.

(3): When $F^{\lambda_{n-1}} < F_{\max} < F^{\lambda_n}$ for some n , then $[\lambda_{n-1}, \lambda_n)$ is a infeasible region and $[\lambda_n, \infty)$ is a feasible region. So we have $\gamma = \lambda_n$. For this case, it is proved in [37, Theorem 4.4] that the policy in (32) satisfies the sufficient conditions and it is therefore constrained optimal. ■

Corollary 2. γ is a corner of \mathcal{L}^λ and a breakpoint of F^λ .

Proof. This follows from the proof of Theorem 2. ■

C. An Efficient Search Method for CMDP

Fig. 2 gives a schematic representation of the flow diagram of the two-timescale solution approach [39], [40]. Specifically, on the faster time scale, finding a λ -optimal policy for any given λ , while on the slower timescale, λ is updated until γ is found. In practice, however, finding γ and the corresponding optimal policies is computationally demanding [41].

A commonly used method in the literature is the *Bisection search plus RVI* (Bisec-RVI) method [18], [42]. It leverages the monotonicity of the function F^λ to determine γ , or more precisely, the “root” of the function $F^\lambda - F_{\max}$ in a predetermined interval $[0, \lambda_{\max}]$. Here, λ_{\max} is a reasonably large constant chosen such that $F^{\lambda_{\max}} < F_{\max}$. Notice that the “root” needs not to exist because of the discontinuity of F^λ . However, we can bracket γ within an arbitrarily small interval.

At each iteration, the Bisec-RVI method divides the interval into two halves and selects the subinterval that brackets the root. We denote the interval at the n -th iteration as $I_n = [\lambda_n^-, \lambda_n^+]$ and the middle point of I_n as γ^n , where $I_0 = [0, \lambda_{\max}]$ and $\gamma^n = (\lambda_n^- + \lambda_n^+) / 2$. The Bisec-RVI uses the RVI to solve the problem $\mathcal{P}_{\text{L-MDP}}^{\gamma^n}$. If the average transmission

⁷Recall that F^λ and C^λ may have a jump discontinuity at point γ , so $\pi_{\gamma^-}^*$ and $\pi_{\gamma^+}^*$ can behave quite differently. Hence, we cannot simply apply the feasible policy $\pi_{\gamma^+}^*$ since it may result in undesirable performance.




Fig. 2. Schematic representation of the flow diagram of finding the constrained optimal policy of CMDPs. The RVI algorithm is applied to solve Lagrangian MDPs with a fixed λ . We will develop a Q-learning algorithm for unknown environments in Sec. VI. The Lagrangian multiplier is updated until the γ value is found. Then, the constrained optimal policy is constructed as a mixture of two deterministic policies.

cost at point γ^n is larger than F_{\max} , it implies that the root γ is located within the subinterval $[\gamma^n, \lambda_+^n]$. Therefore, we can update the interval as $I_{n+1} = [\gamma^n, \lambda_+^n]$. On the other hand, if the average transmission cost at point γ^n is smaller than F_{\max} , then we have $I_{n+1} = [\lambda_-^n, \gamma^n]$. This process continues until a desired accuracy is achieved, i.e., $|\lambda_-^n - \lambda_+^n| < \xi$. Then, the optimal policy is given by

$$\pi^* = \mu \pi_{\lambda_-^n}^* + (1 - \mu) \pi_{\lambda_+^n}^*, \quad (33)$$

where μ is a randomization factor given by

$$\mu = \frac{F_{\max} - F^{\lambda_+^n}}{F^{\lambda_-^n} - F^{\lambda_+^n}}. \quad (34)$$

Remark 4. The time complexity of the *Bisec-RVI* is $\mathcal{O}(T_{MDP} \log_2 \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\xi})$, where $T_{MDP} = \mathcal{O}(I_{RVI} |\mathcal{S}|^2 |\mathcal{A}|)$ is the time complexity of the RVI, I_{RVI} is the number of iterations required for the RVI. So the bisection search has logarithmic complexity and requires a large number of iterations to reach a desired accuracy. Additionally, the algorithm exhibits a slow convergence rate near the breakpoint γ because the derivative of F^λ is zero.

Next, we propose a novel method, called *Intersection search plus RVI* (Insec-RVI), that efficiently solves \mathcal{P}_{CMDP} by exploiting the concavity and piecewise linearity of \mathcal{L}^λ . In this method, γ^n is no longer the middle point of I_n but an intersection point of two tangents to the function \mathcal{L}^λ , as shown in Fig 3. More specifically, one tangent is formed by a point $(\lambda_-^n, \mathcal{L}^{\lambda_-^n})$ with a slope of $F^{\lambda_-^n}$, and another tangent is formed by a point $(\lambda_+^n, \mathcal{L}^{\lambda_+^n})$ with a slope of $F^{\lambda_+^n}$. Then, the intersection point of these two lines, $(\gamma^n, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\gamma^n})$, is given by

$$\gamma^n = \frac{C^{\lambda_+^n} - C^{\lambda_-^n}}{F^{\lambda_-^n} - F^{\lambda_+^n}}, \quad (35)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\gamma^n} = F^{\lambda_-^n} (\gamma^n - \lambda_-^n) + \mathcal{L}^{\lambda_-^n}. \quad (36)$$

Analogous to the *Bisec-RVI* method, if $F^{\gamma^n} \geq F_{\max}$, then $\lambda_-^{n+1} = \gamma^n$, otherwise $\lambda_+^{n+1} = \gamma^n$.

According to Corollary 2, γ is a corner of \mathcal{L}^λ . Therefore, the algorithm converges when the intersection point is located on \mathcal{L}^λ , that is $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\gamma^n} = \mathcal{L}^{\gamma^n}$. To compute the optimal policy, we can simply use Eqs. (33)-(34) by setting $\lambda_-^n = \gamma^n - \zeta/4$, $\lambda_+^n = \gamma^n + \zeta/4$, where ζ is an arbitrarily chosen small perturbation. Recall that the stopping criterion of the *Bisec-RVI* is $|\lambda_-^n - \lambda_+^n| < \xi$. Therefore, the *Insec-RVI* can achieve comparable performance to the *Bisec-RVI* by setting $\zeta = \xi$,




Fig. 3. An illustration of the *Insec-RVI* method. Consider that function \mathcal{L}^λ has 4 segments within the interval $[0, \lambda_{\max}]$ and γ is the second corner of \mathcal{L}^λ . The red dots represent the intersection points at each iteration, while the black dots are the corresponding projected points onto curve \mathcal{L}^λ .

without introducing any additional computations. In addition, choosing an appropriate λ_{\max} value can be problematic when using *Bisec-RVI* since it can either be too large (leading to excessive computation time) or too small (rendering it infeasible). Fortunately, in our *Insec-RVI* algorithm, we can simply initialize the costs as $F^{\lambda_+} \leftarrow 0$ and $C^{\lambda_+} \leftarrow C_{\max}$, where C_{\max} is the average CAE induced by the non-transmission policy. The pseudo-code is summarized in Algorithm 2.

Remark 5. To the best of our knowledge, the intersection search method is the first to solve single-constraint CMDPs by leveraging the piece-wise linearity of \mathcal{L}^λ . Suppose \mathcal{L}^λ has W segments in the range $[0, \lambda_{\max}]$. The *Insec-RVI* method requires at most $W - 1$ iterations, which is much fewer compared to the *Bisec-RVI* method as $W - 1 \ll \log_2(\frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\xi})$ when $\xi \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 6. Although the *Insec-RVI* algorithm is computationally efficient, using RVI in each iteration may still result in significant convergence times and increased complexity. This is known as the “curse of dimensionality” for MDPs. In the next section, we develop a low-complexity online policy.

V. LYAPUNOV OPTIMIZATION TECHNIQUES AND A LOW-COMPLEXITY SUBOPTIMAL POLICY

In this section, we propose a low-complexity online method, namely *drift-plus-penalty* (DPP), based on the *Lyapunov optimization* technique [43]. Instead of a brute-force search of optimal policies in the policy space, the Lyapunov optimization method makes real-time decisions by solving a simple “MinWeight” problem. Specifically, it converts the average-

Algorithm 2: Insec-RVI for solving $\mathcal{P}_{\text{CMDP}}$.

Input: $c, f, P, \lambda_{\max}, \epsilon, \xi$
Output: γ, π^*

```

/* check if  $\gamma = 0$  */
1  $\pi_{\lambda_-}^*, F^{\lambda_-}, C^{\lambda_-}, \mathcal{L}^{\lambda_-} \leftarrow \text{RVI}(0, f, d, P, \epsilon)$ 
2 if  $F^{\lambda_-} \leq F_{\max}$  then
3    $\gamma \leftarrow 0, \pi^* \leftarrow \pi_{\lambda_-}^*$ 
4   return  $\gamma, \pi^*$ 
5 end

/* find a  $\gamma > 0$  with  $F^\gamma = F_{\max}$  */
6  $F^{\lambda_+} \leftarrow 0, C^{\lambda_+} \leftarrow C_{\max}, \mathcal{L}^{\lambda_+} \leftarrow C_{\max}$ 
7 while True do
  // Compute the intersection point
  8  $\gamma = (C^{\lambda_+} - C^{\lambda_-}) / (F^{\lambda_-} - F^{\lambda_+})$ 
  9  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\gamma = F^{\lambda_-}(\gamma - \lambda_-) + \mathcal{L}^{\lambda_-}$ 
  // Check the stopping condition
  10  $F^\gamma, C^\gamma, \mathcal{L}^\gamma \leftarrow \text{RVI}(\gamma, f, d, P, \epsilon)$ 
  11 if  $\mathcal{L}^\gamma = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\gamma$  then
    // Compute the optimal policy
    12 if  $F^\gamma = F_{\max}$  then
      13    $\pi^* \leftarrow \pi_\gamma^*$ 
    14 else
      15    $\pi_{\lambda_-}^*, F^{\lambda_-} \leftarrow \text{RVI}(\gamma - \xi/4, f, d, P, \epsilon)$ 
      16    $\pi_{\lambda_+}^*, F^{\lambda_+} \leftarrow \text{RVI}(\gamma + \xi/4, f, d, P, \epsilon)$ 
      17    $\mu \leftarrow (F_{\max} - F^{\lambda_+}) / (F^{\lambda_-} - F^{\lambda_+})$ 
      18    $\pi^* \leftarrow \mu\pi_{\lambda_-}^* + (1 - \mu)\pi_{\lambda_+}^*$ 
    19 end
    20 return  $\gamma, \pi^*$ 
  21 else
    // Shrink the interval
    22 if  $F^\gamma \leq F_{\max}$  then
      23    $\lambda_+ \leftarrow \gamma, C_+^\lambda \leftarrow C^\gamma, F_+^\lambda \leftarrow F^\gamma, \mathcal{L}_+^\lambda \leftarrow \mathcal{L}^\gamma$ 
    24 else
      25    $\lambda_- \leftarrow \gamma, C_-^\lambda \leftarrow C^\gamma, F_-^\lambda \leftarrow F^\gamma, \mathcal{L}_-^\lambda \leftarrow \mathcal{L}^\gamma$ 
    26 end
  27 end
28 end

```

cost constraint satisfaction problem into the pure queue stability problem and greedily trades between queue stability and CAE minimization at each time slot. Theorem 3 shows that the proposed DPP policy satisfies the average-cost constraint. Moreover, our simulation results in Section VII-B show that the DPP policy achieves optimal performance in the one-delay case and near-optimal performance in the zero-delay case.

A. Problem Transformation

We first define a *virtual queue* associated with the constraint in (8) in such a way that a stable virtual queue implies a constraint-satisfying result. Let Z_t denote the virtual queue with update equation

$$Z_{t+1} = \max[Z_t - F_{\max}, 0] + f_t, \quad (37)$$

where $Z_0 = 0$, $f_t = \mathbb{1}(A_t \neq 0)$. Herein, F_{\max} acts as a virtual service rate, and d_t acts as a virtual arrival process.

Lemma 1. *If virtual queue Z_t is mean rate stable, then the constraint in (8) is satisfied with probability 1.*

Proof. Given that $Z_{\tau+1} \geq Z_\tau + f_\tau - F_{\max}$ for any $\tau \geq 0$, summing over $\tau \in \{0, 1, \dots, t-1\}$ yields

$$Z_t - Z_0 \geq \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} (f_\tau - F_{\max}). \quad (38)$$

Taking expectations and letting $t \rightarrow \infty$ yields

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}\{f_\tau - F_{\max}\} \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}\{Z_t\}}{t} = 0. \quad (39)$$

It follows that the constraint in (8) is satisfied and Z_t is mean rate stable. ■

We can use the quadratic *Lyapunov function* $\Gamma(Z_t) = \frac{1}{2}Z_t^2$ as a scalar measure of queue congestion. The (one-slot) conditional *Lyapunov drift* for slot t is defined as

$$\Delta(Z_t) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_a\{\Gamma(Z_{t+1}) - \Gamma(Z_t) | Z_t\}, \quad (40)$$

where the expectation is with respect to the (possibly random) sampling actions. By using the inequality $(\max[W - b, 0] + a)^2 \leq W^2 + a^2 + b^2 + 2W(a - b)$, we have that $\Delta(Z_t)$ for a general policy satisfies

$$\Delta(Z_t) \leq B + \mathbb{E}_a\{Z_t(f_t - F_{\max}) | Z_t\}, \quad (41)$$

where $B = (1 + F_{\max}^2)/2$.

To stabilize the virtual queue and minimize the average CAE, we can seek a policy to minimize the upper bound on the following expression

$$\mathbb{E}_a\{Z_t(f_t - F_{\max}) | Z_t\} + V \mathbb{E}_{\text{sa}}\{c_t | Z_t\} \quad (42)$$

where c_t is the CAE at time t , $V \geq 0$ is the weight factor that represents how much emphasis we put on CAE minimization. Notice that the expectation of the second term is with respect to the system dynamics and the (possibly random) actions.

B. Drift-Plus-Penalty Policy

The DPP method operates as follows. Let \bar{c}_t denote the (one-step) expected CAE given by Lemma 2. Every slot t , given current queue backlog Z_t and system state S_t , it chooses an action by solving the following problem

$$\min_{\alpha_t \in \mathcal{A}} Z_t(f_t - F_{\max}) + V\bar{c}_t. \quad (43)$$

The proposed DPP method is summarized in Algorithm 3. In Theorem 3, we show that the proposed DPP policy satisfies the transmission frequency constraint.

Lemma 2. *The one-step expected CAE is given by*

$$\bar{c}_t = \mathbb{E}_s\{c_t | Z_t\} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \omega_m \bar{\delta}_t^m \quad (44)$$

where the expectation is with respect to the system dynamics, $\bar{\delta}_t^m$ is the one-slot expected CAE of subsystem m . For one-delay case, $\bar{\delta}_t^m$ is given as

$$\bar{\delta}_t^m = \begin{cases} \sum_{k \neq i} \delta_{k,i}^m \mathbf{Q}_{i,k}^m p_s + \sum_{k \neq j} \delta_{k,j}^m \mathbf{Q}_{i,k}^m (1 - p_s), & \text{if } \alpha_t = m \\ \sum_{k \neq j} \delta_{k,j}^m \mathbf{Q}_{i,k}^m, & \text{if } \alpha_t \neq m. \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

where $i, j, k \in \mathcal{X}^m$. Similarly, for zero-delay case we have

$$\bar{\delta}_t^m = \begin{cases} \delta_{i,j}^m (1 - p_s), & \text{if } \alpha_t = m \\ \delta_{i,j}^m, & \text{if } \alpha_t \neq m. \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

Theorem 3. For any $V \geq 0$, the DPP policy satisfies the transmission frequency constraint in (8).

Proof. By Lemma 1, it is sufficient to show that the DPP policy stabilizes the virtual queue. Our proof relies on the SA policy discussed in III and the Lyapunov optimization theorem [43, Theorem 4.2]. Consider an SA policy π_{sa} with transmission frequency

$$f_m = \frac{F_{\max} - \sigma}{M}, \quad m = 1, \dots, M$$

where $\sigma \geq 0$ is a small constant. Clearly, it takes actions independent of the system state and the queue backlog. Moreover, it satisfies the slackness assumption of the Lyapunov optimization theorem

$$\mathbb{E}\{f_t(\pi_{\text{sa}}) - F_{\max} | Z_t\} = -\sigma.$$

Implementing both the SA policy and the DPP policy yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(Z_t) + V\bar{c}_t &\leq B + V\bar{c}_t(\pi_{\text{dpp}}) + \mathbb{E}\{Z_t(f_t(\pi_{\text{dpp}}) - F_{\max}) | Z_t\} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} B + V\bar{c}_t(\pi_{\text{sa}}) + Z_t \mathbb{E}\{f_t(\pi_{\text{sa}}) - F_{\max} | Z_t\} \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} B' - \sigma Z_t \end{aligned}$$

where (a) holds because the DPP policy chooses the best action, including the one taken by the SA policy; (b) holds because the SA policy is independent of queue backlog and it satisfies the slackness assumption. It follows directly from the Lyapunov optimization theorem [43, Theorem 4.2] that Z_t is mean rate stable. By Lemma 1, the average transmission constraint is satisfied with probability 1. ■

Remark 7. The DPP policy exhibits low complexity and can support large-scale systems. However, the DPP policy is sub-optimal because it greedily takes actions and ignores the long-term performance. Moreover, it needs to know the channel/source statistics before computing the expected costs of taking an action in a particular state. Of course, one can apply an estimation of the system statistics and then use this approach, but with a penalty on the performance that will depend on the estimate's accuracy.

VI. A LEARNING-BASED POLICY FOR UNKNOWN ENVIRONMENTS

Until now, we have focused on cases where the system transition probabilities are known *a priori*. We rely on this information to compute expected costs in both the RVI and

Algorithm 3: DPP policy for $\mathcal{P}_{\text{CMDP}}$.

```

1 Set  $V$ , and initialize virtual queue  $Z_0 = 0$ 
2 for  $t = 1, 2, \dots$  do
3   OBSERVE  $S_t$  and  $Z_t$  at the beginning of slot  $t$ .
4   CALCULATE  $\bar{c}_t$  using Lemma 2.
5   SELECT an action  $a^*$  according to (43).
6   APPLY action  $a^*$ . Update  $Z_t$  using (37) and  $S_t$ 
   according to (7)
7 end

```

the DPP algorithms. However, in real-world applications, it is common for this information to be unknown at the time of deployment or to change over time. To address this challenge, we propose a Reinforcement Learning (RL)-based algorithm.

However, our problem is challenging to solve in the RL framework because: (i) most existing RL algorithms are designed for unconstrained discounted cost problems [44]. They do not extend automatically to the average-cost problems, let alone constrained ones; (ii) average-cost constraint satisfaction is a non-trivial issue in the RL [39]. To handle the average-cost constraint, the two-timescale training method shown in Fig. 2 is widely adopted. However, existing algorithms may suffer from large convergence times due to the inefficiency of the parameter updating methods such as the bisection search and the Robbins–Monro [39], [40].

Our learning algorithm follows the two-timescale training procedure but improves convergence performance using our intersection search method. Moreover, to deal with average-cost MDPs, we replace the original RVI recursion (25)-(26) with a model-free (free of transition probabilities) iterates. This allows the agent to “learn” an optimal policy by interacting with the environment without prior information.

Now, we present the essence of the learning algorithm. Define the Q-factor $\mathbf{q}^\lambda(s, a)$ so that

$$\mathbf{h}^\lambda(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{q}^\lambda(s, a). \quad (47)$$

Then, the Bellman’s optimality equation (23) can be rewritten

$$\mathcal{L}^\lambda + \mathbf{q}^\lambda(s, a) = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s' | s, a) (l^\lambda(s, a, s') + \min_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{q}^\lambda(s', a')), \quad (48)$$

and the RVI for the Q-factors can be given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}^{k+1}(s, a) + \min_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{q}^k(s_{\text{ref}}, a') = \\ \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s' | s, a) (l^\lambda(s, a, s') + \min_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{q}^k(s', a')). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The sequence $\{\min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{q}^k(s, a)\}_{k \geq 0}$ is expected to converge to $\mathbf{h}^\lambda(s)$, and the sequence $\{\min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{q}^k(s_{\text{ref}}, a)\}_{k \geq 0}$ is expected to converge to \mathcal{L}^λ .

Then the Q-factor can be estimated via the model-free average-cost Q-learning algorithm [45] by the recursion

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}^{k+1}(s, a) = (1 - \alpha_k) \mathbf{q}^k(s, a) + \alpha_k (l^\lambda(s, a, s') + \\ \min_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{q}^k(s', a') - \min_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{q}^k(s_{\text{ref}}, a')), \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED POLICIES

Algorithm	Model-free	Optimality	Time complexity	
			Offline phase	Online phase
SA	×	Sub-optimal	—	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
Bisec-RVI	×	Optimal	$\mathcal{O}(\log_2(\frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\epsilon})I_{\text{RVI}} \mathcal{S} ^2 \mathcal{A})$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
Insec-RVI	×	Optimal	$\mathcal{O}((W-1)I_{\text{RVI}} \mathcal{S} ^2 \mathcal{A})$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
DPP	×	Sub-optimal	—	$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{A})$
Q-learning	✓	Optimal	$\mathcal{O}((W-1)I_{\text{QL}} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{A} ^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$

where s' is generated from the pair (s, a) by simulation, $\alpha_k \in (0, 1)$ is the learning rate that may be constant or diminishing over time. The sequence $\{\mathbf{q}^k\}$ remains bounded and converges to \mathbf{q}^* almost surely [45, Theorem 3.5].

The average-cost Q-learning algorithm for solving $\mathcal{P}_{\text{L-MDP}}^\lambda$ is presented in Algorithm 4. In Section VII-D, we show that the proposed RL method exhibits good convergence performance with an appropriately chosen learning rate.

Now we compare the complexity of the proposed policies. We note that the computational complexity of a policy includes two phases: (i) an offline phase (before deployment) that tunes the policy parameters using historical data or prior system information, and (ii) an online phase that interacts with the system and selects the best action using pre-determined rules or policies. The time complexity of the proposed policies is summarized in Table I, where I_{RVI} and I_{QL} ($I_{\text{RVI}} \ll I_{\text{QL}}$) are the number of iterations required for the RVI and the average-cost Q-learning, respectively. We note that, although the Insec-RVI and the Q-learning algorithms exhibit obvious complexity disadvantages in the offline phase, they can make decisions in real-time after deployment. In practice, one can choose a desired policy according to the availability of system dynamics and resources.

Algorithm 4: Average-cost Q-learning for $\mathcal{P}_{\text{L-MDP}}^\lambda$.

Input: λ, c, f
Output: $\pi_\lambda^*, \hat{F}^\lambda, \hat{C}^\lambda, \hat{\mathcal{L}}^\lambda$

```

1  $s_{\text{ref}} = 0, \mathbf{q}^0(s, a) = 0$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}$ 
2 for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$  do
3   /* update the Q-factor */
4   for  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  do
5     APPLY action  $a$  to the system and observe  $s'$ .
6     UPDATE the Q-factor using Eq. 50
7   end
8   /* compute optimal policy */
9   for each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  do
10     $\pi_\lambda^*(s) \leftarrow \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{q}^k(s, a)$ 
11 end
12 /* compute average costs */
13 APPLY policy  $\pi_\lambda^*$  to the system and calculate  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^\lambda, \hat{F}^\lambda,$ 
    and  $\hat{C}^\lambda$  based on empirical average.
14 return  $\pi_\lambda^*, \hat{F}^\lambda, \hat{C}^\lambda, \hat{\mathcal{L}}^\lambda$ 

```

VII. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we aim to validate the performance of the proposed methods through numerical analysis. For ease of analysis, we consider an NCS with $M = 2$ information sources. The two sources are assumed to be equally important, i.e., $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 1$. Each source has three states and is characterized by a symmetric transition matrix, that is, $\mathbf{Q}_{i,j} = p$ for all $i \neq j$ and $1 - 2p$ otherwise. For comparison purposes, the first source is assumed to be slowly evolving with $p = 0.1$, while the second one is rapidly evolving with $p = 0.4$. Also, they have the same CAE matrix given by

$$\delta^1 = \delta^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 10 & 30 \\ 30 & 0 & 10 \\ 10 & 30 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The convergence tolerance of the RVI algorithm and the Bisection search are $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ and $\xi = 10^{-3}$, respectively. The initial search interval of the Bisec-RVI algorithm is $\lambda_{\max} = 100$. The weight factor of the DPP method is $V = 100$. We consider that the SA policy chooses each source with equal probability, i.e., $f_1 = f_2 = F_{\max}/2$.

A. Convergence of the Insec-RVI and Bisec-RVI Methods

Fig. 4 compares the performance of the Bisec-RVI and the Insec-RVI methods in the zero-delay case. It can be observed that F^λ is piecewise constant and \mathcal{L}^λ is piecewise linear and concave. Moreover, $\gamma = 10$ is a breakpoint of F^λ and a corner of \mathcal{L}^λ . In this case, F^λ can be expressed as

$$F^\lambda = \begin{cases} 0.8185, & \lambda \in [0, 3.4) \\ 0.6012, & \lambda \in [3.4, 5.2) \\ 0.5758, & \lambda \in [5.2, 10) \\ 0.3448, & \lambda \in [10, 13.4) \\ 0.1724, & \lambda \in [13.4, 40) \\ 0, & \lambda \in [40, \infty) \end{cases}$$

Interestingly, it can be seen from Fig. 4a that for any $F_{\max} \geq 0.8185$ the solution to the unconstrained problem $\mathcal{P}_{\text{L-MDP}}^0$ is also a solution to the constrained problem $\mathcal{P}_{\text{L-MDP}}^\lambda$. It implies that *continuous transmission is unnecessary and has little marginal performance gain*. Additionally, when $F_{\max} \in [0.8185, 1] \cup \{0.8185, 0.6012, 0.5758, 0.3448, 0.1724, 0\}$, the optimal policy is Markovian deterministic. Otherwise, there is no such λ that satisfies $F^\lambda = F_{\max}$. By Theorem 2, the optimal policy is a combination of two policies in space Π^{MDP} .




Fig. 4. Comparison of different policy search methods when $F_{\max} = 0.4$ and $p_s = 0.4$.

Fig. 4c plots the width of the search interval of the Bisec-RVI and the Insec-RVI methods. The Bisec-RVI method demonstrates a logarithmic decrease in the search interval, converging within 17 iterations in this particular case. However, it requires 13 iterations in the subinterval $[5.2, 13.4]$ to meet the convergence tolerance of $\xi = 10^{-3}$. Also, the number of iterations goes to infinity as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand, the Insec-RVI algorithm requires only 4 iterations and it terminates immediately when reaching this subinterval.

channel condition improves. Also, the transmission delay has a significant impact on the system performance. An important observation is that the gap between the DPP policy and the Insec-RVI policy is approximately 1.07 for the zero-delay case ($d = 0$) and 0 for the one-delay case ($d = 1$). Therefore, the DPP policy is promising in practice as it achieves near-optimal performance with low computational complexity and good scalability. The SA policy, however, shows a big performance disparity compared to the Insec-RVI policy, especially in relatively reliable channel conditions. This is mainly because the SA policy takes probabilistic actions regardless of source states, while our semantic-aware policies exploit the importance of source states and send the right packet at the right time. *This highlights the effectiveness of timing and the importance of information in such systems.*

Fig. 5b depicts the average CAE achieved by different policies for different F_{\max} and d values. Clearly, the average CAE decreases with respect to F_{\max} . It is worth noting that when F_{\max} exceeds a specific value, such as $F_{\max} = 0.8185$ for the zero-delay case, the average CAE remains constant despite further increases in F_{\max} . This phenomenon occurs because, beyond this threshold, the optimal policy is the one used for the unconstrained problem $\mathcal{P}_{L\text{-MDP}}^0$, as discussed in Fig. 4a. For the one-delay case, this threshold is observed to be lowered to 0.3. This implies that the transmission delay diminishes the usefulness of certain status updates, resulting in reduced resource requirements. We will delve into this issue in the following subsection.




Fig. 5. Performance comparisons of different policies.

B. Performance Comparisons of Different Policies

Fig. 5a shows the average CAE achieved by different policies for different success transmission probability p_s and different delay d . Clearly, the average CAE decreases as the

C. Behavioral Analysis

Fig. 6a and Fig. 6b illustrate the transmission frequency of each source when using the Insec-RVI and DPP policies in the zero-delay scenario, respectively. Despite a small performance gap, they exhibit distinct behaviors. Evidently, the Insec-RVI policy schedules more frequently the slowly evolving source, whereas the DPP policy consistently prioritizes the rapidly evolving source. This could be attributed to the fact that the DPP policy selects the source with higher (one-step) expected costs, disregarding the long-term system performance. Since the slowly evolving source is more likely to remain synced, the DPP policy places more emphasis on the rapidly evolving source. Additionally, both the DPP and Insec-RVI policies




Fig. 6. Transmission frequency vs. p_s when $F_{\max} = 0.4$.

increase the importance of the rapidly evolving source in relatively reliable channel conditions.

Fig. 6c demonstrates the transmission frequency of each source in the one-delay scenario. A notable difference compared to the zero-delay case is that both the Insec-RVI and the DPP policies tend to neglect the rapidly evolving source. This distinction is owing to the ineffectiveness of delayed updates of the rapidly evolving source, as the source is more likely to transition to a different state at the time of actuation. Furthermore, we observe that the overall transmission frequency is lower than F_{\max} . It implies that *we can attain optimal performance by strategically utilizing fewer transmissions and exploiting the timing of the important information*. This shows the superiority of semantic-aware policies in such systems.

Now we look into how the Insec-RVI policy caters to state-dependent requirements. Let T^1 and T^2 denote the transmission frequencies of the slowly evolving and rapidly evolving sources obtained by the Insec-RVI policy, respectively. Here, $T_{i,j}^1$ ($T_{i,j}^2$) denotes the transmission frequency when the slowly (rapidly) evolving source is in state i and the reconstructed state is j . When $d = 0$, $p_s = 0.4$, and $F_{\max} = 0.8$, the values of T^1 and T^2 are as follows

$$T^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.045 & 0.058 \\ 0.058 & 0 & 0.045 \\ 0.045 & 0.058 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, T^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.066 & 0.098 \\ 0.098 & 0 & 0.066 \\ 0.066 & 0.098 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In this specific case, we can observe a two-level significance. Firstly, the rapidly evolving source is more important than the slowly evolving source (as also demonstrated in Fig. 6a and Fig. 6c). Secondly, some states are scheduled more frequently, indicating they are more critical than others. On the other hand, the transmission frequencies under the distortion-optimal policy are

$$T^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.058 & 0.058 \\ 0.058 & 0 & 0.058 \\ 0.058 & 0.058 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, T^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.076 & 0.076 \\ 0.076 & 0 & 0.076 \\ 0.076 & 0.076 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Obviously, the distortion-optimal policy treats each source's states equally and is incapable of satisfying state-dependent and context-aware requirements in such systems.

D. Convergence of the Average-Cost Q-learning

Fig. 7 shows the average CAE over time when the average-cost Q-learning algorithm is employed. It can be seen that a smaller learning rate results in a slower convergence rate but offers more stable and optimal performance. Conversely, a larger learning rate may cause more variations. The Q-learning algorithm with $\alpha = 10^{-3}$ converges to the minimum value in 400 iterations. Therefore, it can estimate the optimal policy without prior knowledge of the system dynamics with an appropriately chosen learning rate.

Table II compares the offline computation time of different policies. We can observe that the computation time grows exponentially with the number of sources. The learning algorithm requires a large number of iterations to attain the minimum, which limits its learning capability. Fortunately, this is made offline.




Fig. 7. Performance of the average-cost Q-learning for $\lambda = 2$, $F_{\max} = 0.4$, $p_s = 0.4$. The optimal Lagrangian cost obtained by the RVI method is $\mathcal{L}^\lambda = 15.9449$.

TABLE II
COMPUTATION TIME (IN SECONDS) OF DIFFERENT POLICIES

Algorithm	No. of sources		
	1	2	3
Bisec-RVI	0.01	0.22	28.67
Insec-RVI	0.01	0.08	8.65
Q-learning	0.02	16.52	5005.77

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we studied the semantic-aware remote estimation of multiple Markov sources over a lossy and rate-constrained channel. Based on the availability of system dynamics and the computational complexity, we designed and analyzed three scheduling algorithms, i.e., the optimal Insec-RVI scheduling algorithm, the low-complexity DPP scheduling algorithm, and the learning-based scheduling algorithm. We theoretically investigated the optimality and complexity of the proposed algorithms and validated their performance using simulations. An important takeaway message is that we can significantly reduce the number of uninformative transmissions by exploiting the timing of important information.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Chakravorty and A. Mahajan, "Fundamental limits of remote estimation of autoregressive markov processes under communication constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 1109–1124, 2017.
- [2] N. Pappas and M. Kountouris, "Goal-oriented communication for real-time tracking in autonomous systems," in *IEEE International Conference on Autonomous Systems (ICAS)*, 2021, pp. 1–5.
- [3] L. Zhang, H. Gao, and O. Kaynak, "Network-induced constraints in networked control systems—a survey," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 403–416, 2013.
- [4] J. Gielis, A. Shankar, and A. Prorok, "A critical review of communications in multi-robot systems," *Current robotics reports*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 213–225, 2022.
- [5] M. Kountouris and N. Pappas, "Semantics-empowered communication for networked intelligent systems," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 96–102, 2021.
- [6] J. Wu, Q.-S. Jia, K. H. Johansson, and L. Shi, "Event-based sensor data scheduling: Trade-off between communication rate and estimation quality," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 1041–1046, 2013.
- [7] A. S. Leong, A. Ramaswamy, D. E. Quevedo, H. Karl, and L. Shi, "Deep reinforcement learning for wireless sensor scheduling in cyber-physical systems," *Automatica*, vol. 113, p. 108759, 2020.
- [8] M. Pezzutto, L. Schenato, and S. Dey, "Transmission power allocation for remote estimation with multi-packet reception capabilities," *Automatica*, vol. 140, p. 110257, 2022.
- [9] G. Cocco, A. Munari, and G. Liva, "Remote monitoring of two-state markov sources via random access channels: an information freshness vs. state estimation entropy perspective," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 4, pp. 651–666, 2023.
- [10] P. Popovski *et al.*, "A perspective on time toward wireless 6g," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 110, no. 8, 2022.
- [11] N. Pappas, M. A. Abd-Elmagid, B. Zhou, W. Saad, and H. S. Dhillon, *Age of Information: Foundations and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- [12] V. Tripathi *et al.*, "Wiswarm: Age-of-information-based wireless networking for collaborative teams of uavs," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2023 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, 2023, pp. 1–10.
- [13] P. Kutsevol, O. Ayan, N. Pappas, and W. Kellerer, "Experimental study of transport layer protocols for wireless networked control systems," in *IEEE International Conference on Sensing, Communication, and Networking (SECON)*, 2023, pp. 438–446.
- [14] S. Jayanth, N. Pappas, and R. V. Bhat, "Distortion minimization with age of information and cost constraints," in *IEEE International Symposium on Modeling and Optimization in Mobile, Ad Hoc, and Wireless Networks (WiOpt)*, 2023, pp. 1–8.
- [15] O. Ayan, M. Vilgelm, M. Klügel, S. Hirche, and W. Kellerer, "Age-of-information vs. value-of-information scheduling for cellular networked control systems," in *Proceedings of the 10th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems*, 2019, p. 109–117.
- [16] O. Ayan, M. Vilgelm, and W. Kellerer, "Optimal scheduling for discounted age penalty minimization in multi-loop networked control," in *IEEE Consumer Communications & Networking Conference (CCNC)*, 2020, pp. 1–7.
- [17] Y. Sun, Y. Polyanskiy, and E. Uysal, "Sampling of the wiener process for remote estimation over a channel with random delay," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 1118–1135, 2019.
- [18] Y. Chen and A. Ephremides, "Minimizing age of incorrect information for unreliable channel with power constraint," in *IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [19] A. Maatouk, M. Assaad, and A. Ephremides, "The age of incorrect information: An enabler of semantics-empowered communication," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 2621–2635, 2023.
- [20] G. Stamatakis, N. Pappas, and A. Traganitis, "Control of status updates for energy harvesting devices that monitor processes with alarms," in *IEEE Globecom Workshops*, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [21] X. Zheng, S. Zhou, and Z. Niu, "Urgency of information for context-aware timely status updates in remote control systems," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 19, no. 11, pp. 7237–7250, 2020.
- [22] J. Heinovski, J. Torres Gómez, and F. Dressler, "A spatial model for using the age of information in cooperative driving applications," in *Proceedings of the 25th International ACM Conference on Modeling Analysis and Simulation of Wireless and Mobile Systems (MSWiM)*, 2022, p. 85–94.
- [23] A. Nikkhah, A. Ephremides, and N. Pappas, "Age of actuation in a wireless power transfer system," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHOPS)*, 2023, pp. 1–6.
- [24] M. Salimnejad, M. Kountouris, and N. Pappas, "Real-time reconstruction of markov sources and remote actuation over wireless channels," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, pp. 1–1, 2024.
- [25] —, "State-aware real-time tracking and remote reconstruction of a markov source," *Journal of Communications and Networks*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 657–669, 2023.
- [26] E. Fountoulakis, N. Pappas, and M. Kountouris, "Goal-oriented policies for cost of actuation error minimization in wireless autonomous systems," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 27, no. 9, pp. 2323–2327, 2023.
- [27] A. Zakeri, M. Moltafet, and M. Codreanu, "Semantic-aware sampling and transmission in real-time tracking systems: A pomdp approach," *techrxiv*.
- [28] E. Altman, *Constrained Markov decision processes*. CRC Press, 1999.
- [29] M. Althoff, O. Stursberg, and M. Buss, "Model-based probabilistic collision detection in autonomous driving," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 299–310, 2009.
- [30] N. K. Ure, M. U. Yavas, A. Alizadeh, and C. Kurtulus, "Enhancing situational awareness and performance of adaptive cruise control through model predictive control and deep reinforcement learning," in *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 2019, pp. 626–631.
- [31] D. Shi, R. J. Elliott, and T. Chen, "On finite-state stochastic modeling and secure estimation of cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 65–80, 2017.
- [32] Y. Sun, E. Uysal-Biyikoglu, R. D. Yates, C. E. Koksall, and N. B. Shroff, "Update or wait: How to keep your data fresh," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 7492–7508, 2017.
- [33] M. L. Puterman, *Markov decision processes: discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 1994.
- [34] L. I. Sennott, *Stochastic dynamic programming and the control of queueing systems*. John Wiley & Sons, 1998.
- [35] R. G. Gallager, *Discrete stochastic processes*. Taylor & Francis, 1997.
- [36] D. P. Bertsekas, *Dynamic Programming and Optimal Control, Volume II, 3rd edition*. Athena Scientific, 2007.
- [37] F. J. Beutler and K. W. Ross, "Optimal policies for controlled markov chains with a constraint," *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, vol. 112, no. 1, pp. 236–252, 1985.
- [38] L. I. Sennott, "Constrained average cost markov decision chains," *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 69–83, 1993.
- [39] C. Tessler, D. J. Mankowitz, and S. Mannor, "Reward constrained policy optimization," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019.
- [40] D. V. Djonin and V. Krishnamurthy, "Q-learning algorithms for constrained markov decision processes with randomized monotone policies: Application to mimo transmission control," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 55, no. 5, pp. 2170–2181, 2007.
- [41] D.-j. Ma, A. M. Makowski, and A. Shwartz, "Estimation and optimal control for constrained markov chains," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 1986, pp. 994–999.

- [42] M. Ono, M. Pavone, Y. Kuwata, and J. Balaram, "Chance-constrained dynamic programming with application to risk-aware robotic space exploration," *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 39, pp. 555–571, 2015.
- [43] M. J. Neely, *Stochastic network optimization with application to communication and queueing systems*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2010.
- [44] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto, *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. MIT Press, 2018.
- [45] J. Abounadi, D. Bertsekas, and V. S. Borkar, "Learning algorithms for markov decision processes with average cost," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 681–698, 2001.