
AN APPROACH TO IMPROVE AGENT LEARNING VIA GUARANTEEING GOAL REACHING IN ALL EPISODES

Pavel Osinenko, Grigory Yaremenko, Georgiy Malaniya, Anton Bolychev

May 30, 2024

Contents

- 1 Background and problem statement** **2**
- 1.1 Contribution 3
- 2 Related work** **3**
- 3 Suggested approach** **4**
- 4 Simulation experiments** **6**
- 4.1 Limitations 6
- 5 Conclusion** **8**
- A Formal analysis of the approach** **10**
- B Miscellaneous variants of the approach** **15**
- C Environments** **15**
- C.1 Cartpole 15
- C.2 Inverted pendulum 17
- C.3 Three-wheel robot 18
- C.4 Two-tank system 19
- C.5 Omnibot (kinematic point) 20
- C.6 Lunar lander 21
- D Technical details of experiments** **22**
- D.1 Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) 22
- D.2 Vanilla Policy Gradient (VPG) 25
- D.3 Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (DDPG) 27
- D.4 REINFORCE 29

arXiv:2405.18118v2 [cs.AI] 29 May 2024

D.5 Agent by Algorithm 1 30

D.6 The baseline goal-reaching policies π_0 31

 D.6.1 Omnibot (kinematic point) 31

 D.6.2 Inverted Pendulum 31

 D.6.3 Cartpole 31

 D.6.4 Three-wheel robot 32

 D.6.5 2-tank system 32

 D.6.6 Lunar lander 32

E Miscellaneous results 33

ABSTRACT

Reinforcement learning is commonly concerned with problems of maximizing accumulated rewards in Markov decision processes. Oftentimes, a certain goal state or a subset of the state space attain maximal reward. In such a case, the environment may be considered solved when the goal is reached. Whereas numerous techniques, learning or non-learning based, exist for solving environments, doing so optimally is the biggest challenge. Say, one may choose a reward rate which penalizes the action effort. Reinforcement learning is currently among the most actively developed frameworks for solving environments optimally by virtue of maximizing accumulated reward, in other words, returns. Yet, tuning agents is a notoriously hard task as reported in a series of works. Our aim here is to help the agent learn a near-optimal policy efficiently while ensuring a goal reaching property of some basis policy that merely solves the environment. We suggest an algorithm, which is fairly flexible, and can be used to augment practically any agent as long as it comprises of a critic. A formal proof of a goal reaching property is provided. Simulation experiments on six problems under five agents, including the benchmarked one, provided an empirical evidence that the learning can indeed be boosted while ensuring goal reaching property.

1 Background and problem statement

Consider the following Markov decision process (MDP):

$$(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{A}, p, r), \tag{1}$$

where:

1. \mathbb{S} is the *state space*, assumed as a normed vector space of all states of the given environment;
2. \mathbb{A} is the *action space*, that is a set of all actions available to the agent, it may be discrete or continuous, compact or non-compact;
3. $p : \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the *transition probability density function* of the environment, that is such a function that $p(\bullet \mid s_t, a_t)$ is the probability density of the state s_{t+1} at step $t + 1$ conditioned on the current state s_t and current action a_t ;
4. $r : \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the reward function of the problem, that is a function that takes a state s_t and an action a_t and returns the immediate reward r_t incurred upon the agent if it were to perform action a_t while in state s_t .

Let $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P}[\bullet])$ be a probability space underlying (1), and $\mathbb{E}[\bullet]$ be the respective expected value operator. The problem of reinforcement learning is to find a policy π from some space of admissible policies Π that maximizes

$$V^\pi(s) := \mathbb{E}_{A \sim \pi} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(S_t, A_t) \mid S_0 = s \right], s \in \mathbb{S} \tag{2}$$

for some $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ called a discount factor. The problem may be concerned with a designated initial state s , a distribution thereof, or even the whole state space. A policy may be taken as a probability density function or as an ordinary function (cf. Markov policy). The policy π^* that solves the stated problem is commonly referred to as the optimal policy. An agent will be referred to as a finite routine that generates actions from the observed states.

In some problems, the reward function may have the property that the environment achieve the maximal reward being in a certain state or a set thereof, e. g., the optimal robot routing where the maximal reward is achieved at the target state. For instance, one may assume the reward to be zero at the origin, say, $s = 0$ or some set $\mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{S}$ and zero action, and strictly negative outside. When \mathbb{G} is achieved by the agent, the environment may be considered, e. g., solved. Actually, even if the maximal reward is not achieved exactly, a sufficiently large value thereof may be considered acceptable by the user. So if, e. g., the target is $s = 0$ and $r(0, 0) = 0$, $r < 0$ otherwise, one may wish to consider environment solved when, e. g., $S \in \mathbb{G}$, $\mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{S}$, $0 \in \mathbb{G}$ a. s. (or in mean etc.). It should be remarked that the user needs not to actually specify \mathbb{G} , just the reward function is sufficient to state the problem, whence a set \mathbb{G} occurs naturally. In general, one may drop some state components from the reward thus restricting goal reaching to a subset of state variables. We do not focus on these details here and assume, and, for simplicity, \mathbb{G} to be a compact neighborhood of the origin of the subspace spanned by the state variables of interest. Notice though that the environment may not necessarily be solved optimally, while respecting the problem of maximizing the value V . For instance, a robot may achieve the target pose by some agent that produces suboptimal route and possibly unnecessary action effort. Thus, the problem (1) may be considered as the problem of achieving (and not leaving) \mathbb{G} optimally in the described context. Just achieving \mathbb{G} may be done by various classical techniques such as proportional-derivative-integral regulator (Johnson and Moradi 2005; L. Wang 2020), sliding-mode regulator (Perruquetti and Barbot 2002; Vaidyanathan and Lien 2017), flatness-based regulators (Zhu et al. 2006), energy-based regulators (Spong 1996), funnel regulators (Berger et al. 2021), gain schedulers (Rotondo 2017) etc., but doing so optimally is a non-trivial task for which reinforcement learning is currently the most promising approach. Let $\Pi_0 \subset \Pi$ denote the set of policies which satisfy the property:

$$\pi_0 \in \Pi_0 \implies \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_0} \left[\inf_{s \in \mathbb{G}} \|S_t - s\| \right] = 0. \quad (3)$$

That is Π_0 reaches the goal in mean. Different probabilistic conditions can also be considered (see Corollary 1, Lemma 1). Notice Π_0 is problem-specific. Furthermore, under the properties of the reward function stated above, i. e., being zero on \mathbb{G} under zero action and strictly negative otherwise, and if $\gamma = 1$, the optimal policy π^* is in Π_0 . Hence, a generic $\pi_0 \in \Pi_0$ is suboptimal by default and a reinforcement learning agent, once achieved the performance of such a π_0 in terms of the value V^{π_0} , will actually seek to improve over it. Our quest here is to find a way to boost the learning of the said agent while preserving the goal achieving property of π_0 .

1.1 Contribution

This work presents a method of reinforcement learning, which once achieved a goal-reaching property or, alternatively, provided with a policy $\pi_0 \in \Pi_0$, preserves the said property in all learning episodes thus serving few-episode learning capabilities and sample efficiency due to avoidance of trials which fail probabilistic goal reaching condition and hence fail to improve the value. A rigorous mathematical analysis of the said property preservation is provided. Although not necessarily seen as a direct alternative to such popular baselines as deterministic deep policy gradient (DDPG) and proximal policy optimization (PPO), the demonstration of superiority in learning dynamics is given compared to the said agents, and also to REINFORCE, vanilla policy gradient (VPG) on six environments: cartpole, inverted pendulum, two-tank system, non-holonomic robot, omnidirectional robot (omnibot) and lunar lander. The statement of not being a direct alternative should emphasize the fact the herein presented approach could also be seen as complementary to, e. g., PPO, i. e., it may be integrated into PPO. The details follow in the main text. The code for this work is available at <https://github.com/osinenkop/regelum-calf>.

2 Related work

Common reinforcement learning approaches to the above stated problem include various tabular dynamic programming, episodic Monte-Carlo and online methods (see, e. g., (Sutton and Barto 2018; Bertsekas 2019; Lewis and D. Liu 2013; Vrabie et al. 2012; Bouzy and Chaslot 2006; Lazaric et al. 2007; Vodopivec et al. 2017) for overviews). Applications range from robotics (Kumar et al. 2016; Borno et al. 2013; Tassa et al. 2012; Surmann et al. 2020; Akkaya et al. 2019) to games such as Go, chess, shogi (also known as Japanese chess) (Silver, A. Huang, et al. 2016; Silver, Hubert, et al. 2018), and even complex video games such as StarCraft II (Vinyals et al. 2019).

Some simple policy gradients (Baxter and Bartlett 2001; Sutton, McAllester, et al. 1999; Williams 1992; Kakade 2001; Peters and Schaal 2006), like REINFORCE, are almost direct adaptations of the stochastic approximation theory, whereas advanced methods employ sophisticated step size adjustments, critic learning, batch sampling techniques etc. The contemporary progress in refinement and improvement of reinforcement learning agents is fairly active. Among the most profound basis methods of reinforcement learning are deterministic policy gradient (DDPG) (Silver, Lever, et al. 2014) and proximal policy optimization (PPO) (Schulman, Wolski, et al. 2017). In particular, DDPG is suitable for problems with continuous action spaces commonly found in, e. g., robotics (Lillicrap et al. 2016). Implementation

tweaks, such as value, gradient and reward clipping; reward and layer scaling were studied in trust region policy optimization and PPO (Engstrom et al. 2019).

It was shown that without the said tweaks, PPO was similar to trust region policy optimization in performance. In the experiments of this work, the described tweaks were employed, particularly layer scaling for the actor neural network output. Furthermore, generalized advantage estimation (GAE) in vanilla policy gradient (VPG) and PPO was employed for tackling the common pitfalls of value loss clipping (Schulman, Moritz, et al. 2018; Andrychowicz et al. 2020; N.-C. Huang et al. 2024). Large batches have consistently been reported to produce better agent neural network convergence up until recently (Nikulin, Kurenkov, Tarasov, Akimov, et al. 2023; Akimov et al. 2023; Nikulin, Kurenkov, Tarasov, and Kolesnikov 2023; You et al. 2020; Ginsburg et al. 2018). In all studied baselines of this work, samples from the replay buffers were taken large (larger than 256), as recommended. Besides GAE, there are various tuning recommendations which were also employed following (Furuta et al. 2021; Engstrom et al. 2020; Paine et al. 2020; M. Yang et al. 2020; Henderson et al. 2019). Policy iteration format critic learning, inspired by (Song et al. 2019), was reported to help stabilize policy gradients without the need for excessive entropy tuning. This was employed in the studied baselines as well.

Exploration reinforcement learning presents its own challenges, as highlighted by (C. Wang et al. 2020). They show that squashed actions can lead to poor exploration. In the current work, this was avoided by using a truncated normal distribution for action selection to ensure more natural exploration behaviors. This decision is informed by the discussion in (Fujita and Maeda 2018), which suggested that without such a distribution, one might encounter problematic Q-function estimations.

The significance of N -step returns in enhancing learning with large replay buffers should also be noted (Fedus et al. 2020). Their research suggested that uncorrected N -step returns could be beneficial for replay strategy.

Up-to-date performance on some popular problems relevant to this study should be mentioned. So, e. g., PPO required 500k agent-environment interaction steps as reported, e. g., in (N.-C. Huang et al. 2024; Park et al. 2024). For the inverted pendulum environment, this number was reported to be about 80k (L. Yang et al. 2022). For the cartpole, around 80–100k steps total was needed for PPO to converge as reported in (He et al. 2022; Ishida et al. 2024). The studies in Section 4 indicate good alignment with these numbers with the newly suggested agent greatly outperforming the baselines on five out of six problems.

3 Suggested approach

Recall the problem setup of Section 1. Let, for the sake of motivation, the reward function to be negative-definite, i. e., $r(0,0) = 0, r < 0$ otherwise. In general, it holds, by the virtue of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation, that $\forall t \geq 0 V_{t+1}^* - V_t^* = -r_t^*$, where the optimal value satisfies $V_t^* := \mathbb{E}_{A_t \sim \pi^*(\bullet|s_t), S_{t+1} \sim p(\bullet|s_t, A_t)} [r(s_t, A_t) + V^{\pi^*}(S_{t+1})]$, and $r_t^* := \mathbb{E}_{A_t \sim \pi^*} [r(s_t, A_t)]$. Here, it was assumed that the problem was undiscounted, i. e., $\gamma = 1$ for motivational purposes. Essentially, the HJB dictates that any specified goal $\mathbb{G} \supset 0$ is reached, generally in a probabilistic sense, by the agent following the optimal policy because (1) V^* is finite for any initial state, (2) V_t^* is strictly increasing due to r being negative-definite. If a model, i. e., a critic, is employed, e. g., a w -weighted deep neural network $\hat{V}^w(s)$, then due to imperfections of learning, the goal reaching property may be lost, yet it is desired. It is tempting to ask on retaining the said property. Unfortunately, no such guarantee can be given under learned critic and policy models in practice. The hypothesis of this work is that if the agent is supported by a policy $\pi_0 \in \Pi_0$ (see Section 1), such a guarantee can be provided which in turns improves the learning. As discussed in Section 1, just finding a policy $\pi_0 \in \Pi_0$ is not a difficult task which can be accomplished by various techniques (Johnson and Moradi 2005; Perruquetti and Barbot 2002; Vaidyanathan and Lien 2017; Zhu et al. 2006; Berger et al. 2021). The challenge is to find the optimal policy π^* , which is the aim of the agent. The idea here is to build on top of a nominal agent, which could in turn be based on any reinforcement learning algorithm with a critic, and to prioritize those critic updates which exhibit the property of the kind $\hat{V}^w(s_{t+1}) - \hat{V}^{w^\dagger}(s_t^\dagger) > 0$, where the weight tensor w^\dagger, s_t^\dagger are yet to be determined. Namely, the critic update is done so as to try to satisfy the said property. Should this be the case, the optimized weights are assigned to w^\dagger and the current state is assigned to s_t^\dagger . Subsequently, the action generated by the actor’s policy π is applied to the environment. If the critic update did not satisfy the condition $\hat{V}^w(s_{t+1}) - \hat{V}^{w^\dagger}(s_t^\dagger) > 0$, then the action generated by π_0 is applied. Notice that even if there are to policies π_0, π_0' with a goal reaching property, i. e., $\pi_0, \pi_0' \in \Pi_0$, it is not the case that an arbitrary switching between π_0 and π_0' has the goal reaching property. Hence, combining policies is generally not trivial. We overcome this difficulty in the herein presented approach by “freezing” the critic \hat{V}^{w^\dagger} if it failed to satisfy $\hat{V}^w(s_{t+1}) - \hat{V}^{w^\dagger}(s_t) > 0$. In Section 1.1, we stated that such an approach was not to be necessarily seen as a direct alternative to the existing baselines. This is because, as long as the agent comprises of a critic part, the current approach puts no restrictions on

the choice of the actor and critic loss functions \mathcal{L}_{act} and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{crit}}$, respectively; optimization routines; schedules to update (online or episodic Monte-Carlo); models; replay buffer accumulation and sampling algorithms etc. Now, besides $\hat{V}^w(s_{t+1}) - \hat{V}^{w^\dagger}(s_t) > 0$, the critic should also satisfy the property $-\hat{\kappa}_{\text{up}}(\|s_t\|) \leq \hat{V}^w(s_t) \leq -\hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}(\|s_t\|)$, where $\hat{\kappa}_{\text{up}}, \hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ are two functions which are zero at zero, monotonically increasing and tending to infinity. Their choice is fairly loose, e. g.,

$$\hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}(x) = C_{\text{low}}x^2, \hat{\kappa}_{\text{up}}(x) = C_{\text{up}}x^2, 0 < C_{\text{low}} < C_{\text{up}} \text{ arbitrary}, \quad (4)$$

is acceptable. One may, e. g., square the output of the critic network and add a small regularization while putting any a priori fixed lower and upper bound on the weights, i. e., the weights lie in some compact \mathbb{W} . The reason is that we do not want the critic to be arbitrarily negative large and, respectively, small for non-zero states (equivalently, states outside \mathbb{G}). Finally, the condition $\hat{V}^w(s_{t+1}) - \hat{V}^{w^\dagger}(s_t^\dagger) > 0$ should be cast into a non-strict one with any $\bar{\nu} > 0$ in place of the zero. In Algorithm 1, we present a fairly generic, online form of the suggested approach.

Algorithm 1 Suggested goal reaching agent (state-valued critic).

- 1: **Setup:** MDP, nominal agent details, e. g., networks, actor loss function \mathcal{L}_{act} , critic loss function $\mathcal{L}_{\text{crit}}$, and $\bar{\nu} > 0, \hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}, \hat{\kappa}_{\text{up}}, \pi_0 \in \Pi_0$
- 2: **Initialize:** $s_0, w_0 \in \mathbb{W}$
- 3: $w^\dagger \leftarrow w_0, s^\dagger \leftarrow s_0$
- 4: **for** $t := 1, \dots, \infty$ **do**
- 5: Take action sampled from $\pi_{t-1}(\bullet \mid s_{t-1})$, get state s_t
- 6: Try critic update

$$\begin{aligned} w^* \leftarrow & \arg \min_{w \in \mathbb{W}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{crit}}(w) \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & \hat{V}^w(s_t) - \hat{V}^{w^\dagger}(s^\dagger) \geq \bar{\nu} \\ & -\hat{\kappa}_{\text{up}}(\|s_t\|) \leq \hat{V}^w(s_t) \leq -\hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}(\|s_t\|) \end{aligned}$$

- 7: **if** solution w^* found **then**
- 8: $s^\dagger \leftarrow s_t, w^\dagger \leftarrow w^*$
- 9: Update policy:

$$\pi_t(\bullet \mid s_t) \leftarrow \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathcal{L}_{\text{act}}(\pi)$$

If desired, π_t may be taken to produce a random action with probability $\varepsilon > 0$

- 10: **else**
 - 11: $\pi_t(\bullet \mid s_t) \leftarrow \pi_0(\bullet \mid s_t)$
 - 12: **end if**
 - 13: **end for**
-

The main goal reaching result related to Algorithm 1 is formulated in Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. Consider the problem (2) under the MDP (1). Let $\pi_0 \in \Pi_0$ have the property that, for $\mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{S}$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_0} \left[\inf_{s \in \mathbb{G}} \|S_t - s\| \mid S_0 = s_0 \right] = 0, \quad (5)$$

where the convergence in limit is assumed uniform in s_0 . Let π_t be produced by Algorithm 1 for all $t \geq 0$. Then, the goal reaching property is preserved, i. e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_t} \left[\inf_{s \in \mathbb{G}} \|S_t - s\| \mid S_0 = s_0 \right] = 0. \quad (6)$$

Corollary 1. Let E be an event that implies uniform goal reaching under π_0 , i. e.,

$$A_t \sim \pi_0(\bullet \mid s_t) \implies \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) = 0, \quad (7)$$

where uniform convergence over $\omega \in E$ and $s_0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ is implied for an arbitrary compact set $\mathbb{S}_0 \subset \mathbb{S}$.

Then under π_t the probability of goal reaching is no less than $\mathbb{P}[E]$, i. e.,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) = 0 \mid A_t \sim \pi_t(\bullet \mid s_t) \right] \geq \mathbb{P}[E]. \quad (8)$$

Remark 1. The latter corollary implies that Algorithm 1 preserves the probability of goal reaching if goal reaching is not certain under π_0 .

The full technical details and proof of Theorem 1 are given in Appendix A. Auxiliary goal reaching preservation results are also found in Appendix A, Lemma 1 in particular.

Remark 2. *The policy π_0 may be either derived by techniques such as proportional-derivative-integral regulator (Johnson and Moradi 2005; L. Wang 2020), sliding-mode regulator (Perruquetti and Barbot 2002; Vaidyanathan and Lien 2017), flatness-based regulators (Zhu et al. 2006), energy-based regulators (Spong 1996), funnel regulators (Berger et al. 2021), gain schedulers (Rotondo 2017) etc., or using environment runs over a distribution of start states s_0 while employing statistical confidence bounds by, e. g., Hoeffding’s inequality in terms of the number of runs (Herneck et al. 2018).*

Remark 3. *In Algorithm 1, the critic and actor updates (lines 6, 9) are fairly flexible. They may be varied to the user’s choice without affecting the claim of Theorem 1. In particular, if desired:*

1. *the constraints in line 6 may be shifted to the loss function \mathcal{L}_{crit} as penalties;*
2. *the constraints in line 6 may be omitted altogether and just checked in line 7 instead;*
3. *the critic and policy updates (lines 6, 9) may be arbitrarily event triggered. In the given listing, the updates are done at every step t , but they may also be triggered upon episode ends (cf. Monte-Carlo updates).*

Remark 4. *Notice no direct specification of the goal \mathbb{G} is required in Algorithm 1.*

Remark 5. *The equation (6) can be rephrased in the following way: s_t will eventually get arbitrarily close to \mathbb{G} in mean and stay there permanently. In simpler terms 1 states that Algorithm 1 computes a policy that is guaranteed reach the goal in a suitable statistical sense. This result is valuable, because it indicates that even a poorly trained reinforcement learning agent will still reach the goal with guarantee in all learning episodes. The hypothesis, which was supported by the experiments of this work, is that such a guarantee helps boost learning.*

Remark 6. *In practice, the policy will usually be represented as some θ -weighted model, e. g., softmax or Gaussian, in which case the policy update would actually mean the weight θ_t update. In case of a Markov policy, one directly updates the action a_t .*

4 Simulation experiments

Experiments were conducted on six problems with six environments – cartpole, inverted pendulum, two-tank system, non-holonomic robot, omnidirectional robot (omnibot) and lunar lander – under five agents: REINFORCE, VPG, DDPG, PPO, and a benchmarked agent following Algorithm 1. The details of each problem can be found in Appendix C. The technical details of the agents may be found in Appendix D. A policy π_0 for each environment was designed by energy-based and proportional-derivative-integral regulators. We aimed to pretrain every benchmarking agent (REINFORCE, VPG, DDPG, PPO) to achieve at least the value of π_0 in each experiment. The learning curves of the agents, which succeeded in this task, are shown in Figure 1. The accumulated rewards are shown relative to the one achieved by using π_0 . Hence, the plots essentially show how much better than π_0 the agents performed. The respective numerical values are given in Table 1. More detailed evaluation data are provided in Appendix E. We observed learning convergence for lunar lander by PPO and VPG in about 500k agent-environment interaction steps – similar results were reported, e. g., in (N.-C. Huang et al. 2024; Park et al. 2024). For the inverted pendulum environment, it was reported that PPO required approximately 85k timesteps to achieve convergence (L. Yang et al. 2022). Our results showed that PPO converged in about 90–100k steps, which is consistent with the said existing benchmark. For the cartpole, around 80–100k steps total was needed for PPO to converge as reported in (He et al. 2022; Ishida et al. 2024). In our studies, such performance was achieved on separate runs, but about 300–400k was required in median. Nevertheless, the agent by Algorithm 1 required not more than 10k steps in median which is superior anyway, justifying the claim of the work. Overall, we observed superior performance of the agent by Algorithm 1 in all problems, except for the lunar lander. Nevertheless, in terms of the total learning iterations, the agent by Algorithm 1 was still superior as it required no pretraining. Notice Figure 1 shows all learning iterations of the agent by Algorithm 1.

4.1 Limitations

The reference to a policy π_0 is, strictly speaking, a limitation of Algorithm 1. However, there are reasons to recommend Algorithm 1. First, finding π_0 is commonly not difficult and can be done in a systemic way following one of the established techniques of, e. g., proportional-derivative-integral regulation, sliding-mode regulation, flatness-based regulation, energy-based regulation, funnel regulation, gain scheduling etc. The biggest challenge is to optimally solve the environment, which is the target problem of reinforcement learning. Second, it is generally not possible to guarantee goal reaching by an arbitrary agent in all learning episodes. It is asserted here that some insight is needed within the agent and a minimalistic one is the reference to π_0 . Notice that even just a combination of two goal reaching policies,

Table 1: Medians of accumulated rewards upon convergence for various algorithms relative to the baseline policy π_0 , with π_0 's performance subtracted from each algorithm's performance.

	Inverted pendulum	2-tank system	3-wheeled robot	Cartpole	Lunar lander	Omnibot
REINFORCE	40.3	51.0	97.4	-514.8	-5.6	1010.5
DDPG	28.8	33.5	-780.3	-2036.7	-131.0	1239.9
VPG	-219.1	35.9	194.2	-809.9	43.2	1213.7
PPO	51.2	-79.6	-69.7	102.9	34.8	597.7
Agent by Algorithm 1	56.0	55.0	196.2	111.9	6.4	1271.1




Figure 1: Smoothed learning curves, i. e., accumulated reward vs. iterations. The plots represent median performance relative to the baseline policy π_0 , with the accumulated reward of π_0 subtracted for clarity. The iterations axis is human-normalized (see Appendix E for unnormalized plots). Plots are truncated starting when policy gradient algorithms (PPO, DDPG, VPG, REINFORCE) reach π_0 performance, while full learning plots are shown for agent by Algorithm 1.

say, π_0, π'_0 , is not in general goal reaching as well. Algorithm 1 comprises of a non-trivial integration of π_0 into the agent by carefully saving the last successful critic update. Third, our experiments on six problems showed that even pre-trained agents, which achieved the value of the respective π_0 , were mostly beaten by Algorithm 1. It is thus claimed that at least for the problems, where a policy π_0 is accessible, agent design as per Algorithm 1 may be seen beneficial.

5 Conclusion

This work presented an approach to improve agent learning via ensuring a goal reaching property for the stated return maximization problem. While simply reaching a designated goal (or a goal that arises naturally from the stated reward rate) is not difficult and can be done via numerous techniques, including proportional-derivative-integral regulator, sliding-mode regulator, flatness-based regulators, energy-based regulators, funnel regulators, gain schedulers etc., doing so optimally is the main challenge addressed by reinforcement learning. The purpose of this work was to study how goal reaching guarantee could help the agent learning. A fairly flexible algorithm for this sake was presented and benchmarked on six problems providing an empirical evidence for better learning under the said guarantee. The algorithm should not necessarily be seen as a direct alternative to, say, proximal policy optimization, and can be built on top of a nominal agent. Formal analysis of the algorithm was provided.

References

1. Huang, N.-C. et al. (2024). “PPO-Clip Attains Global Optimality: Towards Deeper Understandings of Clipping”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Vol. 38. 11, pp. 12600–12607.
2. Ishida, S. et al. (2024). “LangProp: A code optimization framework using Large Language Models applied to driving”. In: *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Large Language Model (LLM) Agents*.
3. Park, J. et al. (2024). “Unveiling the Significance of Toddler-Inspired Reward Transition in Goal-Oriented Reinforcement Learning”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Vol. 38. 1, pp. 592–600.
4. Akimov, D. et al. (2023). *Let Offline RL Flow: Training Conservative Agents in the Latent Space of Normalizing Flows*. arXiv: 2211.11096 [cs.LG].
5. Nikulin, A., V. Kurenkov, D. Tarasov, D. Akimov, et al. (2023). *Q-Ensemble for Offline RL: Don’t Scale the Ensemble, Scale the Batch Size*. arXiv: 2211.11092 [cs.LG].
6. Nikulin, A., V. Kurenkov, D. Tarasov, and S. Kolesnikov (2023). *Anti-Exploration by Random Network Distillation*. arXiv: 2301.13616 [cs.LG].
7. He, Q. et al. (2022). “Representation gap in deep reinforcement learning”. In: *Decision Awareness in Reinforcement Learning Workshop at ICML 2022*.
8. Yang, L. et al. (2022). “Policy optimization with stochastic mirror descent”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Vol. 36. 8, pp. 8823–8831.
9. Berger, T. et al. (2021). “Funnel control of nonlinear systems”. In: *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems* 33, pp. 151–194.
10. Furuta, H. et al. (2021). *Co-Adaptation of Algorithmic and Implementational Innovations in Inference-based Deep Reinforcement Learning*. arXiv: 2103.17258 [cs.LG].
11. Andrychowicz, M. et al. (2020). “What matters for on-policy deep actor-critic methods? a large-scale study”. In: *International conference on learning representations*.
12. Engstrom, L. et al. (2020). “Implementation Matters in Deep RL: A Case Study on PPO and TRPO”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
13. Fedus, W. et al. (2020). “Revisiting fundamentals of experience replay”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, pp. 3061–3071.
14. Paine, T. L. et al. (2020). *Hyperparameter Selection for Offline Reinforcement Learning*. arXiv: 2007.09055 [cs.LG].
15. Surmann, H. et al. (2020). *Deep Reinforcement learning for real autonomous mobile robot navigation in indoor environments*. arXiv: 2005.13857 [cs.RO].
16. Wang, C. et al. (2020). “Striving for simplicity and performance in off-policy DRL: Output normalization and non-uniform sampling”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, pp. 10070–10080.

17. Wang, L. (2020). *PID control system design and automatic tuning using MATLAB/Simulink*. John Wiley & Sons.
18. Yang, M. et al. (2020). *Offline Policy Selection under Uncertainty*. arXiv: 2012.06919 [cs.LG].
19. You, Y. et al. (2020). “Large Batch Optimization for Deep Learning: Training BERT in 76 minutes”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
20. Akkaya, I. et al. (2019). “Solving rubik’s cube with a robot hand”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.07113*.
21. Bertsekas, D. P. (2019). *Reinforcement learning and optimal control*. Athena Scientific Belmont, MA.
22. Engstrom, L. et al. (2019). “Implementation matters in deep rl: A case study on ppo and trpo”. In: *International conference on learning representations*.
23. Henderson, P. et al. (2019). *Deep Reinforcement Learning that Matters*. arXiv: 1709.06560 [cs.LG].
24. Song, H. F. et al. (2019). “V-mpo: On-policy maximum a posteriori policy optimization for discrete and continuous control”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12238*.
25. Vinyals, O. et al. (2019). “Grandmaster level in StarCraft II using multi-agent reinforcement learning”. In: *Nature* 575.7782, pp. 350–354.
26. Fujita, Y. and S.-i. Maeda (2018). “Clipped action policy gradient”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, pp. 1597–1606.
27. Ginsburg, B. et al. (2018). *Large Batch Training of Convolutional Networks with Layer-wise Adaptive Rate Scaling*.
28. Hertneck, M. et al. (2018). “Learning an approximate model predictive controller with guarantees”. In: *IEEE Control Systems Letters* 2.3, pp. 543–548.
29. Schulman, J., P. Moritz, et al. (2018). *High-Dimensional Continuous Control Using Generalized Advantage Estimation*. arXiv: 1506.02438 [cs.LG].
30. Silver, D., T. Hubert, et al. (2018). “A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and Go through self-play”. In: *Science* 362.6419, pp. 1140–1144.
31. Sutton, R. S. and A. G. Barto (2018). *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. Cambridge, MA, USA: A Bradford Book.
32. Rotondo, D. (2017). *Advances in gain-scheduling and fault tolerant control techniques*. Springer.
33. Schulman, J., F. Wolski, et al. (2017). “Proximal Policy Optimization Algorithms.” In: *CoRR* abs/1707.06347.
34. Vaidyanathan, S. and C.-H. Lien (2017). *Applications of sliding mode control in science and engineering*. Vol. 709. Springer.
35. Vodopivec, T. et al. (2017). “On monte carlo tree search and reinforcement learning”. In: *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 60, pp. 881–936.
36. Kumar, V. et al. (2016). “Optimal control with learned local models: Application to dexterous manipulation”. In: *2016 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 378–383.
37. Lillicrap, T. P. et al. (2016). “Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning.” In: *ICLR*. Ed. by Y. Bengio and Y. LeCun.
38. Silver, D., A. Huang, et al. (2016). “Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search”. In: *Nature* 529.7587, pp. 484–489.
39. Silver, D., G. Lever, et al. (22–24 Jun 2014). “Deterministic Policy Gradient Algorithms”. In: *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*. Ed. by E. P. Xing and T. Jebara. Vol. 32. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research 1. Beijing, China: PMLR, pp. 387–395.
40. Borno, M. et al. (Aug. 2013). “Trajectory Optimization for Full-Body Movements with Complex Contacts”. In: *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* 19, pp. 1405–14.
41. Lewis, F. L. and D. Liu (2013). *Reinforcement learning and approximate dynamic programming for feedback control*. Vol. 17. John Wiley & Sons.
42. Tassa, Y. et al. (2012). “Synthesis and stabilization of complex behaviors through online trajectory optimization”. In: *2012 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 4906–4913.
43. Vrabie, D. et al. (2012). *Optimal Adaptive Control and Differential Games by Reinforcement Learning Principles*. Institution of Engineering and Technology.

44. Lazaric, A. et al. (2007). “Reinforcement learning in continuous action spaces through sequential monte carlo methods”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 20, pp. 833–840.
45. Bouzy, B. and G. Chaslot (2006). “Monte-Carlo Go reinforcement learning experiments”. In: *2006 IEEE symposium on computational intelligence and games*, pp. 187–194.
46. Peters, J. and S. Schaal (2006). “Policy gradient methods for robotics”. In: *2006 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 2219–2225.
47. Zhu, G. et al. (2006). “Flatness-based control of electrostatically actuated MEMS with application to adaptive optics: a simulation study”. In: *Journal of Microelectromechanical Systems* 15.5, pp. 1165–1174.
48. Johnson, M. A. and M. H. Moradi (2005). *PID control*. Springer.
49. Jiang, Z.-P. and Y. Wang (Jan. 2002). “A converse Lyapunov theorem for discrete-time systems with disturbances”. In: *Systems & Control Letters* 45.1, pp. 49–58.
50. Perruquetti, W. and J.-P. Barbot (2002). *Sliding Mode Control in Engineering*. CRC Press.
51. Baxter, J. and P. L. Bartlett (2001). “Infinite-horizon policy-gradient estimation”. In: *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 15, pp. 319–350.
52. Kakade, S. M. (2001). “A natural policy gradient”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 14.
53. Sutton, R. S., D. A. McAllester, et al. (1999). “Policy Gradient Methods for Reinforcement Learning with Function Approximation”. In: *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
54. Sontag, E. D. (May 1998). “Comments on integral variants of ISS”. In: *Systems and Control Letters* 34.1-2, pp. 93–100.
55. Lin, Y. et al. (1996). “A smooth converse Lyapunov theorem for robust stability”. In: *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 34.1, pp. 124–160.
56. Spong, M. W. (1996). “Energy based control of a class of underactuated mechanical systems”. In: *IFAC Proceedings Volumes* 29.1, pp. 2828–2832.
57. Williams, R. J. (1992). “Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning”. In: *Machine Learning* 8, pp. 229–256.

Technical appendix

A Formal analysis of the approach

We will use Python-like array notation, e. g., $[0 : T] = \{0, \dots, T - 1\}$ or $s_{0:T} = \{s_0, \dots, s_{T-1}\}$. In particular, indexing as $0 : \infty$ will refer to an infinite sequence starting at index zero. The subscript ≥ 0 in number set notation will indicate that only non-negative numbers are meant. Let $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}_\infty : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ denote the spaces of continuous, monotonically increasing, zero-at-zero functions, and, additionally, unbounded in case of \mathcal{K}_∞ . We will also use the common notation of capital vs. small letters to distinguish between random variables and the values they attend when it is clear from context. The notation “ $\bullet \sim \bullet$ ” means the first argument is sampled from the distribution being the second argument. To declare a variable, we will use the $:=$ sign and for a dynamic assignment, e. g., to an action in an algorithm, we will use the left arrow.

Let us recall Algorithm 1.

Our aim here is to prove Theorem 1. Let us recall it also.

Theorem. Consider the problem (2) under the MDP (1). Let $\pi_0 \in \Pi_0$ have the property that, for a compact $\mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{S}$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_0} \left[\inf_{s \in \mathbb{G}} \|S_t - s\| \mid S_0 = s_0 \right] = 0, \quad (9)$$

where compact convergence is assumed with respect to s_0 . Let π_t be produced by Algorithm 1 for all $t \geq 0$. Then, the goal reaching property is preserved, i. e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_t} \left[\inf_{s \in \mathbb{G}} \|S_t - s\| \mid S_0 = s_0 \right] = 0. \quad (10)$$

Let the goal \mathbb{G} be a compact neighborhood of the origin and the distance to it be denoted $d_{\mathbb{G}}(s) := \inf_{s' \in \mathbb{G}} \|s - s'\|$. If some of the state variables were dropped from consideration, one might restrict the state space to the one spanned by the

Algorithm 1 Suggested goal reaching agent (state-valued critic).

- 1: **Setup:** MDP, nominal agent details, e. g., networks, actor loss function \mathcal{L}_{act} , critic loss function $\mathcal{L}_{\text{crit}}$, and $\bar{v} > 0$, $\hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}, \hat{\kappa}_{\text{up}}, \pi_0 \in \Pi_0$
 - 2: **Initialize:** $s_0, w_0 \in \mathbb{W}$
 - 3: $w^\dagger \leftarrow w_0, s^\dagger \leftarrow s_0$
 - 4: **for** $t := 1, \dots, \infty$ **do**
 - 5: Take action sampled from $\pi_{t-1}(\bullet \mid s_{t-1})$, get state s_t
 - 6: Try critic update

$$w^* \leftarrow \arg \min_{w \in \mathbb{W}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{crit}}(w)$$

$$\text{s. t. } \hat{V}^w(s_t) - \hat{V}^{w^\dagger}(s^\dagger) \leq -\bar{v}$$

$$-\hat{\kappa}_{\text{up}}(\|s_t\|) \leq \hat{V}^w(s_t) \leq -\hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}(\|s_t\|)$$
 - 7: **if** solution w^* found **then**
 - 8: $s^\dagger \leftarrow s_t, w^\dagger \leftarrow w^*$
 - 9: Update policy:

$$\pi_t(\bullet \mid s_t) \leftarrow \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathcal{L}_{\text{act}}(\pi)$$

If desired, π_t may be taken to produce a random action with probability $\varepsilon > 0$
 - 10: **else**
 - 11: $\pi_t(\bullet \mid s_t) \leftarrow \pi_0(\bullet \mid s_t)$
 - 12: **end if**
 - 13: **end for**
-

state variables of interest. The results derived herein are independent from it, so we simply assume \mathbb{G} to be a compact neighborhood of the origin. Let $\text{diam}_{\mathbb{G}}$ denote the number $\sup_{s, s' \in \mathbb{G}} \|s - s'\|$. The following technical definition will be needed.

Definition 1. A continuous function $\beta : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is said to belong to space \mathcal{KL} if

- $\beta(v, \tau)$ is a \mathcal{K} function with respect to v for each fixed τ .
- $\beta(v, \tau)$ is a strictly decreasing function with respect to τ for each fixed v .
- For each fixed s it holds that $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \beta(v, \tau) = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 1. Examine the constraints in 6. Let us introduce $\hat{\Lambda}^w := -\hat{V}^w$. Then, a successful critic update would yield

$$\hat{\Lambda}^w(s_t) - \hat{\Lambda}^{w^\dagger}(s^\dagger) \leq -\bar{v},$$

$$\hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}(\|s_t\|) \leq \hat{\Lambda}^w(s_t) \leq \hat{\kappa}_{\text{up}}(\|s_t\|).$$
(11)

Notice that this is a sure statement if the respective event happened.

Let us now introduce some notation. First,

$$s_t^\dagger := \begin{cases} s_t, & t \in \hat{\mathbb{T}}, \\ s_{t-1}^\dagger, & t \in \mathbb{T}^{\pi_0}, \end{cases} \quad w_t^\dagger := \begin{cases} w_t, & t \in \hat{\mathbb{T}}, \\ w_{t-1}^\dagger, & t \in \mathbb{T}^{\pi_0}, \end{cases}$$

Similarly, we introduce:

$$\hat{\mathbb{T}} := \{t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} : \text{the critic finds a solution } w^*\},$$

$$\mathbb{T}^{\pi_0} := \{t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} : \pi_0 \text{ is activated}\},$$
(12)

which represent the sets of time indices where the critic successfully finds a solution w^* and, respectively, where the policy π_0 is activated.

Now, let us define:

$$\hat{\Lambda}_t^\dagger := \hat{\Lambda}^{w_t^\dagger}(s_t^\dagger).$$
(13)

and, similarly, $\hat{\Lambda}_t^\dagger$ for the ease of reference. Finally, define the last successful critic time step in a similar fashion:

$$t^\dagger := \begin{cases} t, & \text{the critic finds a solution } w^*, \\ t^\dagger - 1, & \pi_0 \text{ is activated.} \end{cases}$$
(14)

Observe that, surely (since successful critic updates are done *ex-post*, i. e., upon evaluating the state that was already observed),

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \left\| S_t^\dagger \right\| \leq \hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}^{-1}(\hat{\Lambda}_t^\dagger) \leq \hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}^{-1}(\hat{\Lambda}_0^\dagger). \quad (15)$$

Now, the condition $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_0} [d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) \mid S_0 = s_0] = 0, \forall s_0 \in \mathbb{S}$ implies that there exists a \mathcal{KL} function β_E with the following property:

$$\forall s_0 \in \mathbb{S}, t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi_0} [d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) \mid S_0 = s_0] \leq \beta_E(d_{\mathbb{G}}(s_0), t) \quad (16)$$

since $\{\mathbb{E}_{\pi_0} [d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t)]\}_{t=0:\infty}$ is a non-random sequence that is converging compactly over s_0 (cf. (Lin et al. 1996), Remark 2.4, Proposition 2.5; (Jiang and Y. Wang 2002), Proposition 2.2). Equation (16) describes the behavior of the mean distance to the goal if only π_0 were employed.

By (Sontag 1998, Lemma 8), there exist two \mathcal{K}_∞ functions κ_E, ξ_E s. t.

$$\forall v > 0, t > 0 \quad \beta_E(v, t) \leq \kappa_E(v)\xi_E(e^{-t}). \quad (17)$$

Since $0 \in \mathbb{G}$, it holds that

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{S} \quad \kappa_E(d_{\mathbb{G}}(s)) \leq \kappa_E(\|s\|). \quad (18)$$

Hence

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{S}, t > 0 \quad \beta_E(s, t) \leq \kappa_E(\|s\|)\xi_E(e^{-t}). \quad (19)$$

Notice

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{S} \quad d_{\mathbb{G}}(s) \leq \|s\| \leq d_{\mathbb{G}}(s) + \text{diam}_{\mathbb{G}}. \quad (20)$$

Hence,

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \mathbb{E} [\|S_t\|] \leq \mathbb{E} [d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t)] + \text{diam}_{\mathbb{G}}. \quad (21)$$

Since, under Algorithm 1 either $\pi_t = \pi_0$ or the critic fires, (16) amounts to (assuming some fixed starting state s_0):

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi_t} [d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t)] \leq \beta_E(d_{\mathbb{G}}(s_t^\dagger), t - t^\dagger). \quad (22)$$

Let us describe intuitively what happens behind (22). Let $\mathbb{T}' \subseteq \mathbb{T}^{\pi_0}$ be a set of time steps where π_0 was called consecutively. It was, say, preceded by a last successful critic update at state s_t^\dagger . Then, this s_t^\dagger is the new “starting” state for the convergence modulus, i. e., β_E . On the other hand, the “timer” in β_E has to be “reset” hence the argument $t - t^\dagger$. The mean distance to the goal then evolves under π_0 for $|\mathbb{T}'|$ time steps being bounded by decaying β_E until the critic fires again.

Now, from (15), (19), (21) and (22) we deduce, for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_t} [\|S_t\|] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\pi_t} [d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t)] + \text{diam}_{\mathbb{G}} && \text{by (21)} \\ &\leq \beta_E(d_{\mathbb{G}}(s_t^\dagger), t - t^\dagger) + \text{diam}_{\mathbb{G}} && \text{by (22)} \\ &\leq \kappa_E(\hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}^{-1}(\hat{\Lambda}_0^\dagger))\xi_E(0) + \text{diam}_{\mathbb{G}} && \text{by (15), (19)}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

This indicates that the environment’s state is stable in mean. Now, we need to show mean goal reaching.

Let us analyze the possible scenarios under Algorithm 1. We start with the two limiting cases. First, let us assume that only π_0 fired. Fix an arbitrary $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{G}} > 0$. Let $\beta^* := \kappa_E(\hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}^{-1}(\hat{\Lambda}_0^\dagger))\xi_E(e^{-t})$. Define

$$T^{\pi_0} := \max \left\{ 1, -\log \left(\xi_E^{-1} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{G}}}{\hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}^{-1}(\hat{\Lambda}_0^\dagger)} \right) \right) \right\}. \quad (24)$$

This is a bound on the time for $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_t} [d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t)]$ to reach the level $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{G}} > 0$. This bound is a worst-case bound in terms of the starting state s_t^\dagger for π_0 to start firing.

If, in contrast, only the critic fired, \mathbb{G} , the goal itself, would be achieved in no more than

$$\hat{T} := \frac{\hat{\Lambda}_0^\dagger - \hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}} \left(\inf_{s \notin \mathbb{G}} \|s\| \right)}{\bar{\nu}} \quad (25)$$

steps.

Let us define $T^* := \max\{\hat{T}, T^{\pi_0}\}$.

Now, we examine a hybrid scenario. The worst one is when for every successful critic update, there are $T^{\pi_0} - 1$ activations of π_0 until $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_t}[d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t)] \leq \varepsilon_{\mathbb{G}}$ is nearly reached, but not quite, followed by another critic success, and so on. Thus, the overall time taken to achieve the condition $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_t}[d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t)] \leq \varepsilon_{\mathbb{G}}$ under Algorithm 1 is:

$$T^*(T^* - 1). \quad (26)$$

Since $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{G}} > 0$ was arbitrary, we conclude asymptotic convergence of S_t to \mathbb{G} in mean. ■

Remark 7. It holds that $\hat{\Lambda}^\dagger$ is non-increasing and

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \hat{\Lambda}_{t+T^*}^\dagger - \hat{\Lambda}_t^\dagger < 0.$$

Remark 8. The claim of Theorem 1 can be rephrased in the following way: s_t will eventually get arbitrarily close to \mathbb{G} in mean and stay there permanently. In other words, Theorem 1 states that Algorithm 1 computes a policy that is guaranteed to reach the goal in the respective statistical sense. This result is valuable, because it indicates that even a poorly trained reinforcement learning agent will still solve the environment.

Corollary. Let E be an event that implies uniform goal reaching under π_0 , i. e.,

$$A_t \sim \pi_0(\bullet | s_t) \implies \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) = 0, \quad (27)$$

where uniform convergence over $\omega \in E$ and $s_0 \in \mathbb{S}_0$ is implied for an arbitrary compact set $\mathbb{S}_0 \subset \mathbb{S}$.

Then under π_t the probability of goal reaching is no less than $\mathbb{P}[E]$, i. e.,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) = 0 \mid A_t \sim \pi_t(\bullet | s_t)\right] \geq \mathbb{P}[E]. \quad (28)$$

Proof. Let $\omega \in E$. Then by uniform convergence, for an arbitrary compact set $\mathbb{S}_0 \subset \mathbb{S}$ there is a \mathcal{KL} -function β s. t.

$$\forall t \geq 0 \quad d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) \leq \beta\left(\sup_{s \in \mathbb{S}_0} \|s\|, t\right). \quad (29)$$

The latter is true because one can choose a uniform bound like this for an arbitrary compact set of the kind $\mathbb{S}^C = \{s \in \mathbb{S} \mid d_{\mathbb{G}}(s) \leq C\}$. Evidently $\mathbb{S}_0 \subset \mathbb{S}^{\sup\|s\|}$. The proof of goal reaching for E under $A_t \sim \pi_t(\bullet | s_t)$ using the bound (29) is essentially analogous to the proof of Theorem 1. Hence, the probability of goal reaching is at least that of E . ■

Remark 9. The latter corollary implies that Algorithm 1 preserves the probability of goal reaching if goal reaching is not certain under π_0 .

Corollary 2. Corollary 1 holds if we consider almost sure goal reaching of the kind

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) = 0 \mid A_t \sim \pi_t(\bullet | s_t)\right] = 1, \quad (30)$$

where convergence in limit is uniform in $S_0 = s_0$.

For the next auxiliary but useful result, we need some definitions.

Let us denote a function β that depends on some $N_\beta \in \mathbb{N}$ parameters besides its main arguments, say, $v, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$ as $\beta[\rho^{0:N_\beta-1}](v, \tau)$.

Definition 2. Let β be of space \mathcal{KL} and $N_\beta \in \mathbb{N}$. A subspace $\mathcal{KL}[\beta, N_\beta]$ of \mathcal{KL} functions is called tractable if it is finitely parametrizable w. r. t. β , i. e., for any β' from $\mathcal{KL}[\beta, N_\beta]$ there exist N_β real numbers $\rho^{0:N_\beta-1}$ s. t.

$$\beta' \equiv \beta[\rho^{0:N_\beta-1}]$$

Example 1. Exponential functions $Cve^{-\lambda t}$, $C > 0$ with parameters $C > 0, \lambda > 0$ form a tractable \mathcal{KL} subspace.

We call a π_0 tractable ε -sure goal-reaching if there exists a tractable \mathcal{KL} subspace $\mathcal{KL}[\beta, N_\beta]$ s. t.

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists \beta' \in \mathcal{KL}[\beta, N_\beta] \quad d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) \leq \beta'(s_0, t) \mid A_t \sim \pi_0(\bullet | s_t)] \geq 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (31)$$

Example 2. For a controlled Markov chain

$$S_{t+1} = AS_t + B_t, \quad (32)$$

where B_t is uniformly distributed on $[-\bar{b}, \bar{b}]^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\bar{b} < \text{diam}_{\mathbb{G}}$, a condition

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) = 0 \mid A_t \sim \pi_0(\bullet | s_t)\right] \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad (33)$$

implies π_0 is tractable ε -sure goal-reaching with the respective exponential tractable \mathcal{KL} subspace as per Example 1.

Remark 10. *The reason to take tractable \mathcal{KL} subspaces in goal reaching policies is justified by the fact that general \mathcal{KL} functions may be rather bizarre despite the common intuition of them being akin to, say, exponentials or something similarly behaved. In fact, a \mathcal{KL} may entail extremely slow convergence which cannot be described by any polynomial, elementary or even computable functions. It may formally entail, e. g., a construction based on the busy beaver function. We would like to avoid such exotic cases here.*

The next goal reaching property preservation is stated in Lemma 1.

Lemma 1. *Let π_0 be tractable ε -sure goal-reaching, i. e., there exists a tractable \mathcal{KL} subspace $\mathcal{KL}[\beta, N_\beta]$ s. t.*

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists \beta' \in \mathcal{KL}[\beta, N_\beta] \ d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) \leq \beta'(s_0, t) \mid A_t \sim \pi_0(\bullet \mid s_t)] \geq 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (34)$$

Then under π_t the probability of goal reaching satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) = 0 \mid A_t \sim \pi_t(\bullet \mid s_t)\right] \geq 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (35)$$

Proof. recall $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P}[\bullet])$, the probability space underlying (1) and denote the state trajectory induced by the policy π_0 emanating from s_0 as $Z_{0:\infty}^{\pi_0}(s_0)$ with single elements thereof denoted $Z_t^{\pi_0}(s_0)$. Let us explicitly specify the sample variable in the trajectory $Z_{0:\infty}^{\pi_0}(s_0)$ emanating from s_0 as follows: $Z_{0:\infty}^{\pi_0}(s_0)[\omega], \omega \in \Omega$. Define, the subset Ω^* of elements $\omega \in \Omega$ to satisfy:

$$\Omega^* := \{\exists \beta' \in \mathcal{KL}[\beta, N_\beta] \ d_{\mathbb{G}}(Z_t^{\pi_0}(s_0)[\omega]) \leq \beta'(s_0, t)\}. \quad (36)$$

By the condition of the lemma, $\mathbb{P}[\Omega^*] \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ for any $s_0 \in \mathbb{S}$. Since the limit involved is uniform on compact sets of \mathbb{S} , by (Jiang and Y. Wang 2002, Proposition 2.2), for every $\omega \in \Omega^*$, there exists a \mathcal{KL} function β^ω s. t.

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, s_0 \in \mathbb{S} \ d_{\mathbb{G}}(Z_t^{\pi_0}(s_0)[\omega]) \leq \beta^\omega(d_{\mathbb{G}}(s_0), t). \quad (37)$$

Since π_0 is tractable ε -sure goal-reaching, there is a tractable $\mathcal{KL}[\beta, N_\beta]$ subspace s. t. every β^ω in (37) is finitely parametrizable via some reals $\rho^{0:N_\beta-1}$. Even though we ruled out bizarre \mathcal{KL} functions, still the betas β^ω may be arbitrary “slow” whence we have to somehow make them uniform over ω . To this end, let $\rho_{j=0:\infty}^{0:N_\beta-1}$ be a dense sequence in \mathbb{R}^{N_β} . Choose a sequence $\beta_{k=0:\infty}$ of $\mathcal{KL}[\beta, N_\beta]$ of functions assigning to each k an index j_k for parameter vectors ρ that satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k, v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \forall t \geq 0 \\ \beta_{k+1} &:= \beta[\rho_{j_{k+1}}^{0:N_\beta-1}] > \beta_k := \beta[\rho_{j_k}^{0:N_\beta-1}]. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Using (38), define $\{\Omega_k\}_{k=0:\infty}$ to be a sequence of subsets of Ω with the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \ \Omega_k &\subseteq \Omega_{k+1}, \\ \bigcap_{k=0:\infty} \Omega_k &= \Omega^*, \\ \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \ \exists \beta_k \text{ s. t. } \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, s_0 \in \mathbb{S}, \omega \in \Omega_k \\ &d_{\mathbb{G}}(Z_t^{\pi_0}(s_0)[\omega]) \leq \beta_k(d_{\mathbb{G}}(s_0), t). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Notice that such a construction is possible since for every $\omega \in \Omega^*$ there exists a k s. t. ω is also in Ω_k . Furthermore, the intersection is countable and hence an event, i. e., $\bigcap_{k=0:\infty} \Omega_k \in \Sigma$ with non-zero measure $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[\Omega_k] = \mathbb{P}[\Omega^*]$. Notice also how β_k was chosen uniform over ω . Intuitively, Ω_k are the sets of outcomes for which there is a uniform convergence modulus.

Fix an arbitrary $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ s. t. $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_k] \geq 1 - \varepsilon + \eta_k$ for some corresponding real η_k . The function β_k by (Sontag 1998, Lemma 8) can be bounded as follows:

$$\forall v > 0, t > 0 \ \beta_k(v, t) \leq \kappa_k(v) \xi_k(e^{-t}), \quad (40)$$

where $\kappa_k, \xi_k \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ which depend on k !

The condition $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_k] \leq \mathbb{P}[\Omega_{k+1}]$ implies the sequence $\{\eta_k\}_{k=0:\infty}$ is a monotone increasing sequence which is also bounded above. Hence, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k$ exists. Since π_0 is tractable ε -sure goal-reaching, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k = 0$.

We thus argue that with probability not less than $1 - \varepsilon + \eta_k$, the policy π_0 is goal reaching. Now, it follows, essentially similarly to the proof of Theorem 1, upon replacing the statements about the mean with statements that hold with probability not less than $1 - \varepsilon + \eta_k$, that \mathbb{G} is reached by applying π_t in no more than $T^*(k)(T^*(k) - 1)$ steps, where

$T^*(k)$ now explicitly depends on k ! This is due to the fact that the decomposition bound of β_k by (Sontag 1998, Lemma 8) depends on k . We thus deduce

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{G}}(S_t) = 0 \mid A_t \sim \pi_t(\bullet \mid s_t) \right] \geq 1 - \varepsilon + \eta_k, \varepsilon > 0,$$

with $\eta_k < 0$ being arbitrarily small hence the claim of the theorem. ■

Remark 11. *The difference of the claim in Lemma 1 to that of Theorem 1 is that no uniform bound on the reaching time of \mathbb{G} is deduced for convergence with probability not less than $1 - \varepsilon$. It is, however, if one relaxes the probability requirement to $1 - \varepsilon - \eta_k$ with an $\eta_k > 0$ arbitrarily small.*

Remark 12. *To verify the condition like in Theorem 1, Corollary 1, Lemma 1 in practice, one may use statistical confidence bounds by, e. g., Hoeffding’s Inequality in terms of the environment episodes (Hertneck et al. 2018).*

Remark 13. *It follows that Algorithm 1 qualitatively retains the goal reaching property of π_0 , although the exact reaching times may be different.*

B Miscellaneous variants of the approach

Algorithm 2 Suggested goal reaching agent (state-action-valued critic by model $\hat{Q}^w(s, a)$).

1: **Setup:** MDP, nominal agent details, e. g., networks, actor loss function \mathcal{L}_{act} , critic loss function $\mathcal{L}_{\text{crit}}$, and $\bar{\nu} >$

$0, \hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}, \hat{\kappa}_{\text{up}}, \pi_0 \in \Pi_0$

2: **Initialize:** $s_0, w_0 \in \mathbb{W}, a_0 \sim \pi_0(\bullet \mid s_0)$

3: $w^\dagger \leftarrow w_0, s^\dagger \leftarrow s_0$

4: **for** $t := 1, \dots, \infty$ **do**

5: Take action a_{t-1}

6: Update policy:

$$\pi_t(\bullet \mid s_t) \leftarrow \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathcal{L}_{\text{act}}(\pi)$$

If desired, π_t may be taken to produce a random action with probability $\varepsilon > 0$

7: Get new action a_t sampled from $\pi_t(\bullet \mid s_t)$

8: Try critic update

$$w^* \leftarrow \arg \min_{w \in \mathbb{W}} \mathcal{L}^{\text{crit}}(w)$$

$$\text{s. t. } \hat{Q}^w(s_t, a_t) - \hat{Q}^{w^\dagger}(s^\dagger, a^\dagger) \leq -\bar{\nu},$$

$$\hat{\kappa}_{\text{low}}(\|s_t\|) \leq \hat{Q}^w(s_t, a_t) \leq \hat{\kappa}_{\text{up}}(\|s_t\|)$$

9: **if** solution w^* found **then**

10: $s^\dagger \leftarrow s_t, a^\dagger \leftarrow a_t, w^\dagger \leftarrow w^*$

11: **else**

12: $\pi_t(\bullet \mid s_t) \leftarrow \pi_0(\bullet \mid s_t)$

13: **end if**

14: **end for**

Remark 14. *Theorem 1 with its corollaries apply for goal reaching preservation by Algorithm 2 as well. The proofs are exactly the same upon setting $\hat{\Lambda}_t^\dagger := -\hat{Q}^{w^\dagger}(s_t^\dagger, a_t^\dagger)$, where a_t^\dagger is set analogously to the setting of s_t^\dagger (see Appendix A).*

C Environments

C.1 Cartpole

A pole is attached by an unactuated joint to a cart, which moves along a frictionless track. The goal is to balance the pole by applying a positive or a negative force F to the left side of the cart. The duration of one episode is set to 15 seconds, while the sampling rate of measurements is set to 100 Hz.

$$\begin{aligned}
 s_t &= \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta_t \\ x_t \\ \omega_t \\ v_t \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{array}{l} \vartheta - \text{pendulum angle,} \\ x - \text{cart horizontal coordinate,} \\ \omega - \text{pendulum angular velocity,} \\ v - \text{cart horizontal velocity,} \end{array} \quad a_t = (F_t), \quad F - \text{horizontal force,} \\
 r(s, a) &= -20(1 - \cos \vartheta) - 2\omega^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

The dynamics are described by the following differential equations (omitting the subscript t for simplicity):

$$\text{d} \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta \\ x \\ \omega \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega \\ v \\ \frac{g \sin \vartheta (m_c + m_p) - \cos \vartheta (F + m_p l \omega^2 \sin \vartheta)}{\frac{4l}{3}(m_c + m_p) - l m_p \cos^2 \vartheta} \\ \frac{F + m_p l \omega^2 \sin \vartheta - \frac{3}{8} m_p g \sin(2\vartheta)}{m_c + m_p - \frac{3}{4} m_p \cos^2 \vartheta} \end{pmatrix} \text{d}t \tag{42}$$

where

- m_c is the mass of the cart
- m_p is the mass of the pole
- l is the length of the pole
- g is the acceleration of gravity

We define the goal set \mathbb{G} as follows

$$\mathbb{G} = \{|\vartheta| \leq 0.1\} \tag{43}$$

In the case of the cartpole, the observations differ from the state variables. We exclude x by setting $x \equiv 0$. Thus, for the

state $s = \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta \\ x \\ \omega \\ v \end{pmatrix}$, we set the observation as follows:

$$o = \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta \\ 0 \\ \omega \\ v \end{pmatrix}.$$

Our main goal is to stabilize the angle ϑ ; x is not of concern.




Figure 2: A diagram of the cartpole environment.

C.2 Inverted pendulum

The system consists of a pendulum attached at one end to a fixed point, and the other end being free. The pendulum is initially pointed downwards and the goal is to apply torque τ to the joint to swing the pendulum into an upright position, with its center of gravity right above the fixed point. The duration of one episode is set to 10 seconds, while the sampling rate of measurements is set to 100 Hz.

$$s_t = \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta_t \\ \omega_t \end{pmatrix}, \quad \vartheta - \text{angle}, \quad \omega - \text{angular velocity}, \quad a_t = (\tau_t), \quad \tau - \text{torque}, \quad (44)$$

$$r(s, a) = -10\vartheta^2 - 3\omega^2.$$

The dynamics are described by the following differential equations (omitting the subscript t for simplicity):

$$d \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta \\ \omega \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega \\ \frac{g}{l} \sin(\vartheta) + \frac{\tau}{ml^2} \end{pmatrix} dt \quad (45)$$

where

- m is the mass of the pendulum
- l is the length of the pendulum
- g is the acceleration of gravity

We define the goal set \mathbb{G} as follows

$$\mathbb{G} = \{|\vartheta| \leq 0.25, |\omega| \leq 0.25\} \quad (46)$$




Figure 3: A diagram of the inverted pendulum environment.

C.3 Three-wheel robot

A pair of actuated wheels and a ball-wheel are attached to a platform that moves on a flat surface. The wheels roll without slipping. The pair of actions for the respective actuators is decomposed into forward velocity v that is aligned with the direction in which the robot is facing and angular velocity ω applied to the center of mass of the robot and directed perpendicular to the platform. The goal is to park the robot at the origin and facing the negative x axis. The duration of one episode is set to 5 seconds, while the sampling rate of measurements is set to 100 Hz.

$$s_t = \begin{pmatrix} x_t \\ y_t \\ \vartheta_t \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{array}{l} x - \text{coordinate along } x\text{-axis,} \\ y - \text{coordinate along } y\text{-axis,} \\ \vartheta - \text{angle,} \end{array} \quad a_t = \begin{pmatrix} v_t \\ \omega_t \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{array}{l} v - \text{forward velocity,} \\ \omega - \text{angular velocity,} \end{array} \quad (47)$$

$$r(s, a) = -x^2 - 10y^2 - \vartheta^2.$$

The dynamics are described by the following differential equations (omitting the subscript t for simplicity):

$$d \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ \vartheta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x \cos \vartheta \\ y \sin \vartheta \\ \omega \end{pmatrix} dt \quad (48)$$

We define the goal set \mathbb{G} as follows

$$\mathbb{G} = \{|x| \leq 1, |y| \leq 1, |\vartheta| \leq 0.7\} \quad (49)$$




Figure 4: A diagram of the three-wheel robot environment.

C.4 Two-tank system

The two-tank system consists of two tanks which are connected by an open valve. Liquid inflow i to the first tank is governed by a pump and there is an interconnection between the tanks. In addition, there is a permanent leak from tank 2. The goal is to keep both tanks exactly 40% full. The duration of one episode is set to 80 seconds, while the sampling rate of measurements is set to 10 Hz.

$$s_t = \begin{pmatrix} h_{1,t} \\ h_{2,t} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{array}{l} h_1 - \text{first tank fullness,} \\ h_2 - \text{second tank fullness,} \end{array} \quad a_t = (i_t), \quad i - \text{liquid inflow,} \quad (50)$$

$$r(s, a) = -10(h_1 - 0.4)^2 - 10(h_2 - 0.4)^2.$$

The dynamics are described by the following differential equations (omitting the subscript t for simplicity):

$$d \begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\tau_1}(i - Q_1 h_1) \\ \frac{1}{\tau_2}(Q_1 h_1 - Q_2 h_2 + Q_2 h_2^2) \end{pmatrix} dt \quad (51)$$

where

- Q_1 is the outbound flow in the first tank
- Q_2 is the inbound flow in the second tank
- τ_1 is the base area of the first tank
- τ_2 is the base area of the second tank

We define the goal set \mathbb{G} as follows

$$\mathbb{G} = \{|h_1 - 0.4| \leq 0.05, |h_2 - 0.4| \leq 0.05\} \quad (52)$$




Figure 5: A diagram of the two-tank environment.

C.5 Omnibot (kinematic point)

A massless point moves on a plane with velocity $\begin{pmatrix} v_x \\ v_y \end{pmatrix}$. The goal is to drive the point to the origin. The duration of one episode is set to 10 seconds, while the sampling rate of measurements is set to 100 Hz.

$$s_t = \begin{pmatrix} x_t \\ y_t \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{array}{l} x - \text{coordinate along x-axis,} \\ y - \text{coordinate along y-axis,} \end{array} \quad a_t = \begin{pmatrix} v_{x,t} \\ v_{y,t} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{array}{l} v_x - \text{velocity along x-axis,} \\ v_y - \text{velocity along y-axis,} \end{array} \quad (53)$$

$$r(s, a) = -10x^2 - 10y^2.$$

The dynamics are described by the following differential equations (omitting the subscript t for simplicity):

$$d \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} v_x \\ v_y \end{pmatrix} dt \quad (54)$$

We define the goal set \mathbb{G} as follows:

$$\mathbb{G} = \{|x| \leq 0.5, |y| \leq 0.5\}. \quad (55)$$




Figure 6: A diagram of the omnibot environment.

C.6 Lunar lander

A jet-powered spacecraft is approaching the surface of the moon. It can activate its two engines and thus accelerate itself in the direction opposite to which the activated engine is facing. The goal is to land at the desired location at the appropriate speed and angle. The duration of one episode is set to 20 seconds, while the sampling rate of measurements is set to 100 Hz.

$$s_t = \begin{pmatrix} x_t \\ y_t \\ \vartheta_t \\ v_{x,t} \\ v_{y,t} \\ \omega_t \end{pmatrix}, \begin{matrix} x - \text{horizontal coordinate,} \\ y - \text{vertical coordinate,} \\ \vartheta - \text{angle,} \\ v_x - \text{horizontal velocity,} \\ v_y - \text{vertical velocity,} \\ \omega - \text{angular velocity,} \end{matrix} \quad a_t = \begin{pmatrix} F_{\text{side},t} \\ F_{\text{vert},t} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{matrix} F_{\text{side}} - \text{lateral thrust,} \\ F_{\text{vert}} - \text{upward thrust,} \end{matrix} \quad (56)$$

$$r(s, a) = -x^2 - 0.1(y - 1)^2 - 10\vartheta^2 - 0.1v_x^2 - 0.1v_y^2 - 0.1\omega^2.$$

The dynamics are described by the following differential equations (omitting the subscript t for simplicity):

$$d \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ \vartheta \\ v_x \\ v_y \\ \omega \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} v_x \\ v_y \\ \omega \\ \frac{1}{m} (F_{\text{side}} \cos \vartheta - F_{\text{vert}} \sin \vartheta) \\ \frac{1}{m} (F_{\text{side}} \sin \vartheta + F_{\text{vert}} \cos \vartheta) - g \\ \frac{F_{\text{side}}}{J} \end{pmatrix} dt, \quad (57)$$

where

- m is the mass of the spaceship
- J is the moment of inertia of the spaceship with respect to its axis of rotation
- g is the acceleration of gravity

We define the goal set \mathbb{G} as follows:

$$\mathbb{G} = \{|y - 1| \leq 0.05, |\vartheta| \leq 0.05\}. \quad (58)$$




Figure 7: A diagram of the lunar lander environment.

D Technical details of experiments

D.1 Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO)

Algorithm 3 PPO

1: Input:

- θ_1 is the initial policy weights
- The policy $\pi^\theta(\bullet | S)$ is represented by a truncated normal distribution $\text{Truncated}[\mathcal{N}(\mu^\theta(S), \sigma^2 I)]$, where σ is a hyperparameter, μ^θ is a neural network with weights θ , and I is the identity matrix.
- $\hat{V}^w(S)$ is the model of the value function, represented by a neural network with weights w
- M is the number of episodes
- \mathcal{I} is the number of iterations
- T is the number of steps per episode
- γ is the discount factor
- α_{act} is the policy learning rate for Adam optimizer
- α_{crit} is the critic learning rate for Adam optimizer
- $N_{\text{epochs}}^{\text{crit}}$ is the number of epochs for the critic
- $N_{\text{epochs}}^{\text{act}}$ is the number of epochs for the policy
- λ is the GAE parameter

2: **for** learning iteration $i := 1 \dots \mathcal{I}$ **do**

3: **for** episode $j := 1 \dots M$ **do**

4: obtain initial state S_0^j

5: **for** step $t := 0 \dots T - 1$ **do**

6: sample action $A_t^j \sim \pi^\theta(\bullet | S_t^j)$

7: transition to next state $t + 1$ from transition function $S_{t+1}^j \sim p(\bullet | S_t^j, A_t^j)$

8: **end for**

9: **end for**

10: Optimize critic \hat{V}^w with Adam optimizer:

11: **for** $1 \dots N_{\text{epochs}}^{\text{crit}}$ **do**

12: Perform a gradient descent step:

$$w^{\text{new}} \leftarrow w^{\text{old}} - \alpha_{\text{crit}} \nabla_w \mathcal{L}_{\text{crit}}(w) \Big|_{w=w^{\text{old}}},$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{crit}}(w)$ is a temporal difference loss:

$$\sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{t=0}^{T-1-N_{\text{TD}}} \left(\hat{V}^w(S_t^j) - \sum_{t'=t}^{t+N_{\text{TD}}-1} \gamma^{t'-t} r(S_{t'}^j, A_{t'}^j) - \gamma^{N_{\text{TD}}} \hat{V}^w(S_{t+N_{\text{TD}}}^j) \right)^2. \quad (59)$$

13: **end for**

14: Estimate GAE-Advantages:

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\pi^{\theta_i}}(S_t^j, A_t^j) := \sum_{t'=t}^{T-1} (\gamma\lambda)^{t'} \left(r(S_{t'}^j, A_{t'}^j) + \gamma \hat{V}^w(S_{t'+1}^j) - \hat{V}^w(S_t^j) \right)$$

15: Optimize policy π^θ with Adam optimizer:

16: **for** $1 \dots N_{\text{epochs}}^{\text{act}}$ **do**

17: Perform a gradient ascent step:

$$\theta^{\text{new}} \leftarrow \theta^{\text{old}} + \alpha_{\text{act}} \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\text{act}}(\theta) \Big|_{\theta=\theta^{\text{old}}},$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{act}}(\theta)$ is defined as follows:

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t \min \left(\hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\pi^{\theta_i}}(S_t^j, A_t^j) \frac{\pi^\theta(A_t^j | S_t^j)}{\pi^{\theta_i}(A_t^j | S_t^j)}, \hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\pi^{\theta_i}}(S_t^j, A_t^j) \text{clip}_{1-\varepsilon}^{1+\varepsilon} \left(\frac{\pi^\theta(A_t^j | S_t^j)}{\pi^{\theta_i}(A_t^j | S_t^j)} \right) \right). \quad (60)$$

18: **end for**

19: Denote θ^{i+1} as the latest value of θ^{new} in the **for** loop above.

20: **end for**

Table 2: Hyperparameters for PPO algorithm

	Inverted pendulum	2-tank system	3-wheeled robot	Cartpole	Lunar lander	Omnibot
Time final	10	80	5	15	10	10
Sampling rate in Hz	100	10	100	100	100	100
Steps per episode (T)	1000	800	500	1500	1000	1000
Number of episodes	2	2	10	5	10	2
Discount factor	0.9964	0.9895	0.9964	0.9989	0.9964	0.9964
Critic TD order (N_{TD})	1	70	1	1	1	1
Critic hidden sizes	[100,100,100,100]	[100,50,10]	[15,15]	[100,50]	[15,15]	[100,50,10]
Critic learning rate (α_{crit})	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.01	0.01	0.0005
Critic epochs (N_{crit_epochs})	50	50	50	50	30	30
Policy hidden sizes	[4]	[4]	[4]	[15,15]	[32,32]	[15,15]
Policy learning rate (α_{act})	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.0005	0.003	0.0005
Policy epochs (N_{act_epochs})	50	50	50	50	50	50

D.2 Vanilla Policy Gradient (VPG)

Algorithm 4 VPG

1: **Input:**

- θ_1 is the initial policy weights
- The policy $\pi^\theta(\bullet | S)$ is represented by a truncated normal distribution $\text{Truncated}[\mathcal{N}(\mu^\theta(S), \sigma^2 I)]$, where σ is a hyperparameter, μ^θ is a neural network with weights θ , and I is the identity matrix.
- $\hat{V}^w(S)$ is the model of the value function, represented by a neural network with weights w
- M is the number of episodes
- \mathcal{I} is the number of iterations
- T is the number of steps per episode
- γ is the discount factor
- α_{act} is the policy learning rate for Adam optimizer
- α_{crit} is the critic learning rate for Adam optimizer
- $N_{\text{epochs}}^{\text{crit}}$ is the number of epochs for the critic
- λ is the GAE parameter

2: **for** learning iteration $i := 1 \dots \mathcal{I}$ **do**

3: **for** episode $j := 1 \dots M$ **do**

4: obtain initial state S_0^j

5: **for** step $t := 0 \dots T - 1$ **do**

6: sample action $A_t^j \sim \pi^\theta(\bullet | S_t^j)$

7: transition to next state $t + 1$ from transition function $S_{t+1}^j \sim p(\bullet | S_t^j, A_t^j)$

8: **end for**

9: **end for**

10: Optimize critic \hat{V}^w with Adam optimizer:

11: **for** $1 \dots N_{\text{epochs}}^{\text{crit}}$ **do**

12: Perform a gradient descent step:

$$w^{\text{new}} \leftarrow w^{\text{old}} - \alpha_{\text{crit}} \nabla_w \mathcal{L}_{\text{crit}}(w) \Big|_{w=w^{\text{old}}},$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{crit}}(w)$ is a temporal difference loss:

$$\sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{t=0}^{T-1-N_{\text{TD}}} \left(\hat{V}^w(S_t^j) - \sum_{t'=t}^{t+N_{\text{TD}}-1} \gamma^{t'-t} r(S_{t'}^j, A_{t'}^j) - \gamma^{N_{\text{TD}}} \hat{V}^w(S_{t+N_{\text{TD}}}^j) \right)^2. \quad (61)$$

13: **end for**

14: Estimate GAE-Advantages:

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\pi^{\theta_i}}(S_t^j, A_t^j) := \sum_{t'=t}^{T-1} (\gamma \lambda)^{t'} \left(r(S_{t'}^j, A_{t'}^j) + \gamma \hat{V}^w(S_{t'+1}^j) - \hat{V}^w(S_t^j) \right)$$

15: Perform a gradient ascent step:

$$\theta_{i+1} \leftarrow \theta_i + \alpha_{\text{act}} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t \hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\pi^{\theta}}(S_t^j, A_t^j) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi^{\theta}(A_t^j | S_t^j) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_i}. \quad (62)$$

16: **end for**

Table 3: Hyperparameters for VPG algorithm

	Inverted pendulum	2-tank system	3-wheeled robot	Cartpole	Lunar lander	Omnibot
Time final	10	80	5	15	10	10
Sampling rate in Hz	100	10	100	100	100	100
Steps per episode (T)	1000	800	500	1500	1000	1000
Number of episodes	2	2	10	5	10	2
Discount factor	0.9964	0.9895	0.9964	0.9989	0.9964	0.9964
Critic TD order (N_{TD})	1	70	1	1	1	1
Critic hidden sizes	[100,100,100,100]	[100,50,10]	[15,15]	[100,50]	[15,15]	[100,50,10]
Critic learning rate (α_{crit})	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.01	0.01	0.0005
Critic epochs (N_{crit_epochs})	50	50	50	50	50	50
Policy hidden sizes	[4]	[4]	[4]	[15,15]	[32,32]	[15,15]
Policy learning rate (α_{act})	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.0005	0.003	0.0005
Policy epochs (N_{act_epochs})	50	50	50	50	50	50

D.3 Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (DDPG)

Algorithm 5 DDPG

- 1: **Input:**
 - θ_1 is the initial policy weights
 - The policy $\pi^\theta(S)$ is represented by a neural network with weights θ
 - M is the number of episodes
 - \mathcal{I} is the number of iterations
 - T is the number of steps per episode
 - γ is the discount factor
 - α_{act} is the policy learning rate for Adam optimizer
- 2: **for** learning iteration $i := 1 \dots \mathcal{I}$ **do**
- 3: **for** episode $j := 1 \dots M$ **do**
- 4: obtain initial state S_0^j
- 5: **for** step $t := 0 \dots T - 1$ **do**
- 6: sample action $A_t^j = \pi^\theta(S_t^j)$
- 7: (optional) add exploration noise $A_t^j := A_t^j + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\text{expl}}^2)$
- 8: transition to next state $t + 1$ from transition function $S_{t+1}^j \sim p(\bullet | S_t^j, A_t^j)$
- 9: **end for**
- 10: **end for**
- 11: Perform a gradient ascent step with Adam optimizer:

$$\theta_{i+1} \leftarrow \theta_i + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t \nabla_{\theta} \pi^\theta(S_t^j) \nabla_a \hat{Q}^w(S_t, a) \Big|_{a=A_t^j},$$

- 12: **end for**
-

Table 4: Hyperparameters for DDPG algorithm

	Inverted pendulum	2-tank system	3-wheeled robot	Cartpole	Lunar lander	Omnibot
Time final	10	80	5	15	10	10
Sampling rate in Hz	100	10	100	100	100	100
Steps per episode (T)	1000	800	500	1500	1000	1000
Number of episodes	2	2	0.9895	1	1	2
Discount factor	0.9964	[100, 100, 100, 100]	[100, 50, 10]	0.9964	0.9989	0.9964
Critic TD order (N_{TD})	1	70	0.001	1	[100, 50]	1
Critic hidden sizes	[4]	50	[4]	[15, 15]	0.01	[15, 15]
Critic learning rate (α_{crit})	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.1	0.0005	0.0005
Critic epochs (N_{epochs}^{crit})	50	50	50	30	[32, 32]	30
Policy hidden sizes	[4]	[4]	[4]	[4]	0.003	[15, 15]
Policy learning rate (α_{act})	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.0005	0.0005
Policy epochs (N_{epochs}^{act})	50	50	50	50	50	50

D.4 REINFORCE

Algorithm 6 REINFORCE

1: **Input:**

- θ_1 is the initial policy weights
- $B_t^1 := 0$ is the initial baseline for the 1st iteration
- The policy $\pi^\theta(\bullet | S)$ is represented by a truncated normal distribution $\text{Truncated}[\mathcal{N}(\mu_\theta(S), \sigma^2 I)]$, where σ is a hyperparameter, μ^θ is a neural network, and I is the identity matrix.
- M is the number of episodes
- \mathcal{I} is the number of iterations
- T is the number of steps per episode
- γ is the discount factor
- α_{act} is the policy learning rate for Adam optimizer

2: **for** learning iteration $i := 1 \dots \mathcal{I}$ **do**

3: **for** episode $j := 1 \dots M$ **do**

4: obtain initial state S_0^j

5: **for** step $t := 0 \dots T - 1$ **do**

6: sample action $A_t^j \sim \pi^\theta(\bullet | S_t^j)$

7: transition to next state $t + 1$ from transition function $S_{t+1}^j \sim p(\bullet | S_t^j, A_t^j)$

8: **end for**

9: **end for**

10: Perform a gradient ascent step with Adam optimizer:

$$\theta_{i+1} \leftarrow \theta_i + \alpha_{\text{act}} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{t'=t}^{T-1} \left(\gamma^{t'} r(S_{t'}^j, A_{t'}^j) - B_t^i \right) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi^\theta(A_t^j | S_t^j) |_{\theta=\theta_i},$$

11: Update baselines for the next iteration: $B_t^{i+1} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{t'=t}^T \gamma^{t'} r(S_{t'}^j, A_{t'}^j)$

12: **end for**

Table 5: Hyperparameters for REINFORCE algorithm

	Inverted pendulum	2-tank system	3-wheeled robot	Cartpole	Lunar lander	Omnibot
Time final	10	80	5	15	10	10
Sampling rate in Hz	100	10	100	100	100	100
Steps per episode (T)	1000	800	500	1500	1000	1000
Number of episodes	4	4	4	3	0.9989	4
Discount factor	1.0	1.0	1.0	[15, 15]	[32, 32]	1.0
Policy hidden sizes	[4]	[4, 4]	[4, 4]	0.01	0.05	[4]
Policy learning rate (α_{act})	0.1	0.1	0.1	1	1	0.1
Policy epochs ($N_{\text{act epochs}}$)	1	1	1	1	1	1

D.5 Agent by Algorithm 1

The algorithm is detailed in the main article (see algorithm 1). For the agent we employed temporal difference loss for the critic at step t , calculated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{crit}}(w) = \sum_{t'=t-T_{\mathcal{R}}}^{t-N_{\text{TD}}} \left(\hat{V}^w(S_t) - \sum_{t'=t}^{t+N_{\text{TD}}-1} \gamma^{t'-t} r(S_{t'}, A_{t'}) - \gamma^{N_{\text{TD}}} \hat{V}^w(S_{t'+N_{\text{TD}}}) \right)^2,$$

and for policy loss that at the step t is calculated as follows

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{act}}(a) = r(S_t, a) + \gamma \hat{V}^w(S_{t+1}),$$

where $T_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the batch size and is a hyperparameter. and we used casADI as the engine for constrained optimization.

Table 6: Hyperparameters for agent by Algorithm 1

	Inverted pendulum	2-tank system	3-wheeled robot	Cartpole	Lunar lander	Omnibot
Time final	10	80	5	15	10	10
Sampling rate in Hz	100	10	100	100	100	100
Steps per episode (T)	1000	800	500	1500	1000	1000
Discount factor	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Critic TD order (N_{TD})	1	1	1	2	3	3
Critic batch size (T_R)	1	1	1	2	3	3

D.6 The baseline goal-reaching policies π_0

D.6.1 Omnibot (kinematic point)

$$a = \begin{pmatrix} -0.5x \\ -0.5y \end{pmatrix} \quad (63)$$

D.6.2 Inverted Pendulum

$$a = -20\vartheta - 2\omega \quad (64)$$

D.6.3 Cartpole

$$a = (1 - \lambda)a_{\text{upswing}} + \lambda a_{\text{upright}} \quad (65)$$

where

- $a_{\text{upright}} = 70\vartheta + 20\omega$
- $a_{\text{upswing}} = \begin{cases} 3 \text{sign}(\omega), & \text{if } \cos \vartheta < 0 \\ 3 \text{sign}(\sin \vartheta), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
- $\lambda = \frac{1 - \tanh(\frac{\vartheta - 0.35}{10})}{2}$

D.6.4 Three-wheel robot

$$a = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -3 \operatorname{sign}(\vartheta - \operatorname{atan2}(y, x)) \sqrt{|\vartheta - \operatorname{atan2}(y, x)|} \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } (|x| \geq 0.001 \vee |y| \geq 0.001) \wedge (|\vartheta - \operatorname{atan2}(y, x)| \geq 0.001) \\ \begin{pmatrix} -3 \sqrt[4]{x^2 + y^2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } (|x| \geq 0.001 \vee |y| \geq 0.001) \wedge (|\vartheta - \operatorname{atan2}(y, x)| < 0.001) \\ \begin{pmatrix} -0 \\ -3 \operatorname{sign} \vartheta \sqrt{|\vartheta|} \end{pmatrix}, & \text{if } (|x| < 0.001 \vee |y| < 0.001) \wedge (|\vartheta| \geq 0.001) \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (66)$$

D.6.5 2-tank system

$$a = -3(h_1 - 0.4) - 4\dot{h}_1 - 3(h_2 - 0.4) - 4\dot{h}_2 \quad (67)$$

where \dot{h}_1 and \dot{h}_2 are derived from the right-hand side of the system that defines the 2-tank system dynamics:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{h}_1 &= \frac{1}{\tau_1}(i - Q_1 h_1) \\ \dot{h}_2 &= \frac{1}{\tau_2}(Q_1 h_1 - Q_2 h_2 + Q_2 h_2^2). \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

D.6.6 Lunar lander

$$a = \begin{pmatrix} -80\vartheta - 20\omega - \cos^2 \vartheta (-10x - 40v_x) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (69)$$

E Miscellaneous results






Figure 8: Smoothed accumulated rewards vs. iterations.


Selected episodic state-action trajectory for **our agent** on two-tank sytem




Selected episodic state-action trajectory for **our agent** on three-wheeled robot






Selected episodic state-action trajectory for **our agent** on cartpole







Selected episodic state-action trajectory for **our agent** on inverted pendulum








































Selected episodic state-action trajectory for VPG on inverted pendulum



Selected episodic state-action trajectory for VPG on omnibot (kinematic point)



Selected episodic state-action trajectory for VPG on lunar lander

