

Distributionally robust chance constrained Markov decision process with Kullback-Leibler divergence

Tian Xia, Jia Liu, Abdel Lisser

Abstract This paper considers the distributionally robust chance constrained Markov decision process with random reward and ambiguous reward distribution. We consider individual and joint chance constraint cases with Kullback-Leibler divergence based ambiguity sets centered at elliptical distributions or elliptical mixture distributions, respectively. We derive tractable reformulations of the distributionally robust individual chance constrained Markov decision process problems and design a new hybrid algorithm based on the sequential convex approximation and line search method for the joint case. We carry out numerical tests with a machine replacement problem.

Keywords Markov decision process · Chance constraint · Distributionally robust optimization · Kullback-Leibler divergence · Elliptical distribution

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000) 90C15 · 90C40 · 90C99

1 Introduction

Markov decision process (MDP) is an effective mathematical model to find an optimal dynamic policy in a long-term uncertain environment, which is the fundamental mathematical tool of reinforcement learning [35]. It has many important applications in healthcare [11], autonomous driving [40], financial markets [3], inventory control [21], game theory [45] and so on.

Tian Xia
School of Mathematics and Statistics, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, 710049, P. R. China
xt990221@stu.xjtu.edu.cn

Jia Liu, Corresponding author
School of Mathematics and Statistics, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, 710049, P. R. China
jialiu@xjtu.edu.cn

Abdel Lisser
Laboratoire des Signaux et des Systemes, CentraleSupélec, Gif-sur-Yvette, 91190, France
abdel.lisser@centralesupelec.fr

The randomness of MDP often comes from two perspectives: reward and transition probabilities. Risk attitude is an important issue when the decision-maker measures the randomness of the reward. Many risk criteria have been considered in risk-aversion MDP, for instance, mean and variance [43], semi-variance [45], Value-at-Risk [25], Conditional Value-at-Risk [31]. Depending on the randomness of transition probabilities, MDP problems can be classified into two groups: rectangular MDP [32,33,41] and nonrectangular MDP [26, 39].

In many real applications of MDP, for instance, autonomous driving or healthcare, the safety requirements play an important role when making a dynamic decision to avoid extreme behaviour out of control [20], which take into account robust constraints in the MDP problem, for instance the constrained MDP (CMDP) [37]. To address the extreme conservation of the robust constraints, chance constraints control the extreme loss in a probability, which has been widely applied in shape optimization, game theory, electricity market and many other fields [7,18,22,24,30]. Delage and Mannor [5] study a reformulation of chance constrained MDP (CCMDP) with random rewards or transition probabilities. Varagapriya et al. [38] apply joint chance constraints into constrained MDP and find reformulations when the rewards follow an elliptical distribution.

In some applications of CCMDP, the distribution of random parameters is not perfectly known, due to the estimation error or imperfect a-priori knowledge. To address this problem, we can employ the distributionally robust optimization (DRO) approach [13], where the decision-maker makes a robust decision with respect to the worst-case distribution in a pre-set ambiguity set. In DRO literature, there are two major types of ambiguity sets: the moments-based and the distance-based. In moments-based DRO [6,42], decision-maker knows some moments information about of random parameters. In distance-based DRO, the decision-maker has a reference distribution and consider a ball centered at it with respect to a probability distance, given that she/he believes that the true distribution of random parameters is close to the reference distribution. Depending on the probability distance we choose, there are ϕ -divergence (including Kullback-Leibler (K-L) divergence as an important case) distance based DRO [14,17] and Wasserstein distance based DRO [4,9,16,44]. Applying the techniques of DRO into CCMDP, we have the distributionally robust chance constrained MDP (DRCCMDP) problem. Nguyen et al. [29] studied individual DRCCMDP with moments-based, ϕ -divergence based and Wasserstein distance based ambiguity sets. However, the study of DRCCMDP is far from completeness. There are still many important problems for research, for instance, the joint chance constraint in DRCCMDP has not been studied, the high-kurtosis, fat-tailedness or multimodality of the reference distribution in distance-based DRCCMDP are not considered.

In this paper, we study the K-L divergence distance based DRCCMDP (KL-DRCCMDP) when the transition probabilities are known and the reward vector is random, which is the same setting as in [29,37,38]. Like [29], we assume that we only know partial information about the distribution of random

reward and apply the distributionally robust optimization approach. Unlike [5], we consider random reward in both the objective function and the constraints in order to model more safe scenes in real life. Compared with [29] where the authors consider only the individual case, we study both individual and joint chance constraint cases in the MDP settings in order to characterize the overall satisfaction of safe constraints with K-L divergence distance based ambiguity set centered at an elliptical reference distribution. We derive reformulations of the related optimization problems in these two cases. For the individual case, the reformulation is convex. However for the joint case, the reformulation is not convex. We design a new hybrid algorithm based on the sequential convex approximation and line search method to solve this nonconvex problem. In the last part of the joint case of KL-DRCCMDP, we study the case where the ambiguity set is centered at an elliptical mixture distribution and derive a new reformulation. Finally we conduct numerical experiments on a machine replacement problem to test our models and algorithms. The major contributions of this paper are listed below.

- As far as we know, this is the first work studying the joint case of DRCCMDP.
- We consider an elliptical reference distribution and an elliptical mixture reference distribution as the center of the ambiguity sets, which can reflect the high-kurtosis, fat-tailedness or multimodality of the a-priori information.
- We propose a new hybrid algorithm based on a sequential convex approximation and line search method to solve the nonconvex reformulation. Numerical results validate the practicability of this algorithm.

In Section 2, we introduce a series of fundamental models of MDP as the background of DRCCMDP. In Section 3, we study three kinds of KL-divergence based DRCCMDP: the individual KL-DRCCMDP with elliptical reference distributions, the joint KL-DRCCMDP with elliptical reference distributions and the joint KL-DRCCMDP with elliptical mixture reference distributions. In Section 4, we carry out numerical experiments on a machine replacement problem. In the last section, we give the conclusion.

2 Background of DRCCMDP

2.1 MDP

We consider an infinite horizon discrete time Markov decision process (MDP) problem, which can be represented as a tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r_0, q, \beta)$, where:

- \mathcal{S} is a finite state space with $|\mathcal{S}|$ states whose generic element is denoted by s .
- \mathcal{A} is a finite action space with $|\mathcal{A}|$ actions and $a \in \mathcal{A}(s)$ denotes the action a at state s .

- $P \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{S}|}$ is the distribution of the transition probability $p(\bar{s}|s, a)$, which denotes the probability of moving from state s to \bar{s} when the action $a \in \mathcal{A}(s)$ is taken.
- $r_0(s, a)_{s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}(s)} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes a running reward, which is the reward at the state s when the action a is taken. $r_0 = (r_0(s, a))_{s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}(s)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}$ is the running reward vector.
- $q = (q(s))_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$ represents the probability of the initial state.
- $\beta \in [0, 1)$ is the discount factor.

In an MDP, the agent aims at maximizing her/his value function with respect to the whole trajectory by choosing an optimal policy. By [34], it is worth noting that there are two ways of formulating the agent's objective. One is the average reward formulation, the other is considering a discounting factor $\beta \in [0, 1)$. As we care more about the long-term reward obtained from the MDP, we pay more attention on optimizing current rewards over future rewards. Therefore, we follow the latter formulation to consider discounting value function in this paper.

For a discrete time controlled Markov chain $(s_t, a_t)_{t=0}^{\infty}$ defined on the state space \mathcal{S} and action space \mathcal{A} , where s_t and a_t are the state and action at time t respectively. At the initial time $t = 0$, the state is $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, and the action $a_0 \in \mathcal{A}(s_0)$ is taken according to the initial state's probability q . Then the agent gains rewards $r_0(s_0, a_0)$ based on the current state and action. When $t = 1$, the state moves to s_1 with the transition probability $p(s_1|s_0, a_0)$. The dynamics of the MDP repeat at state s_1 and continue in the following infinite time horizon. As a result, we are able to get the value function for the whole process.

We assume that running rewards r and transition probabilities p are stationary, i.e. they only depend on states and actions rather than on time. We define the policy $\pi = (\mu(a|s))_{s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}(s)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}$ where $\mu(a|s)$ denotes the probability that the action a is taken at state s , and $\xi_t = \{s_0, a_0, s_1, a_1, \dots, s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, s_t\}$ the whole historical trajectory at time t . For different time t , sometimes the decisions made by the agent may vary accordingly, thus the chosen policy may vary depending on time. We call this kind of policy the history dependent policy denoted as $\pi_h = (\mu_t(a|s))_{s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}(s)}, t = 1, 2, \dots, \infty$. When the policy is independent of time, we call it a stationary policy. That is, there exists a vector $\bar{\pi}$ such that $\pi_h = (\mu_t(a|s))_{s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}(s)} = \bar{\pi} = (\bar{\mu}(a|s))_{s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}(s)}$ for all t . Let Π_h and Π_s be the sets of all possible history dependent policies and stationary policies respectively. When the reward $r_0(s, a)$ is random, for a fixed $\pi_h \in \Pi_h$, we consider the discounted expected value function

$$V_\beta(q, \pi_h) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \mathbb{E}_{q, \pi_h}(r_0(s_t, a_t)), \quad (1)$$

where $\beta \in [0, 1)$ is the fixed discount factor. The objective of the agent is to maximize the discounted expected value function

$$\max_{\pi_h \in \Pi_h} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \mathbb{E}_{q, \pi_h}(r_0(s_t, a_t)). \quad (2)$$

We denote by $d_\beta(q, \pi_h)$ the β -discounted occupation measure such that

$$d_\beta(q, \pi_h, s, a) = (1 - \beta) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t p_{q, \pi_h}(s_t = s, a_t = a), \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}(s).$$

As the state and action spaces are both finite, by Theorem 3.1 in [2], the occupation measure $d_\beta(q, \pi_h, s, a)$ is a well-defined probability distribution. By taking the occupation measure in (1), the discounted expected value function can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} V_\beta(q, \pi_h) &= \sum_{(s,a) \in \Lambda} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t p_{q, \pi_h}(s_t = s, a_t = a) r_0(s, a) \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - \beta} \sum_{(s,a) \in \Lambda} d_\beta(q, \pi_h, s, a) r_0(s, a), \end{aligned}$$

where we define $\Lambda = \{(s, a) | s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}(s)\}$.

By Theorem 3.2 in [2], we know that the set of occupation measures corresponding to history dependent policies is the same as that concerning stationary policies. Furthermore, from [2, 37] we have:

Lemma 2.1 ([2, 37]) *The set of occupation measures corresponding to history dependent policies is equal to the set*

$$\Delta_{\beta, q} = \left\{ \tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|} \left| \begin{array}{l} \sum_{(s,a) \in \Lambda} \tau(s, a) (\delta(s', s) - \alpha p(s' | s, a)) = (1 - \beta) q(s'), \\ \tau(s, a) \geq 0, \forall s', s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}(s). \end{array} \right. \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where $\delta(s', s)$ is the Kronecker delta, such that the expected discounted value function defined by (2.1) remains invariant to time.

Therefore the MDP problem (2) with history dependent policies can be equivalently written as a stationary MDP problem:

$$\max_{\tau} \frac{1}{1 - \beta} \sum_{(s,a) \in \Lambda} \tau(s, a) r_0(s, a) \quad (4a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \tau \in \Delta_{\beta, q}. \quad (4b)$$

If τ^* is an optimal solution of (4), then the stationary policy f^* is given by $f^*(s, a) = \frac{\tau^*(s, a)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}(s)} \tau^*(s, a)}$ for all $(s, a) \in \Lambda$, whenever the denominator is nonzero.

2.2 Constrained MDP

In a constrained MDP (CMDP), on the basis of the MDP defined above, we consider extra constraints on some additional rewards. Let $r_k(s, a)_{(s,a) \in \Lambda} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the rewards for the k -th constraint under state s and action a , $k = 1, \dots, K$, and K denotes the number of constraints. We denote $r_k =$

$(r_k(s, a))_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$ as the rewards vector for the k -th constraint. Let $\Xi = (\xi_k)_{k=1}^K$ be the set of lower bounds for the constraints. A CMDP is then defined by the tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, R, \Xi, P, q, \beta)$ where $R = (r_k)_{k=0}^K$.

In order to focus on optimizing current rewards rather than future ones, we apply the discount factor in the expected constrained value function, which is defined as

$$\phi_{k,\beta}(q, \pi_h) = \frac{1}{1-\beta} \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{A}} d_\beta(q, \pi_h, s, a) r_k(s, a)$$

for the k -th expected constraint. Combined with Lemma 2.1, we can formulate the objective of a CMDP as the following optimization problem

$$\max_{\tau} \frac{1}{1-\beta} \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{A}} \tau(s, a) r_0(s, a) \quad (5a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{A}} \tau(s, a) r_k(s, a) \geq \xi_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K \quad (5b)$$

$$\tau \in \Delta_{\beta,q}. \quad (5c)$$

2.3 Chance constrained MDP

In many applications, the reward vectors $r_k, k = 0, 1, \dots, K$ are random. It is reasonable to consider the MDP with random reward. In this vein, we can use chance constraints to ensure the constraints in the CMDP hold with a large probability. We denote it as the chance-constrained MDP (CCMDP).

For the k -th random constrained rewards vector $r_k = (r_k(s, a))_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{A}}$, we assume its probability distribution is $F_k, k = 0, 1, \dots, K$. We preset a confidence vector $\epsilon = (\epsilon_k)_{k=1}^K$ for the CCMDP, where $\epsilon_k \in [0, 1]$. Then we can define the individual CCMDP (I-CCMDP) as a tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, R, \Xi, P, \mathcal{D}, q, \beta, \epsilon)$, where $\mathcal{D} = (F_k)_{k=0}^K$, which can be reformulated as the following optimization problem:

$$\text{(I-CCMDP)} \quad \max_{\tau} \frac{1}{1-\beta} \mathbb{E}_{F_0}[\tau^\top \cdot r_0] \quad (6a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{P}_{F_k}(\tau^\top \cdot r_k \geq \xi_k) \geq \epsilon_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K \quad (6b)$$

$$\tau \in \Delta_{\beta,q}. \quad (6c)$$

The joint CCMDP (J-CCMDP) can be defined as a tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, R, \Xi, P, F, q, \beta, \hat{\epsilon})$, where $\hat{\epsilon} \in [0, 1]$. The J-CCMDP can be reformulated as

$$\text{(J-CCMDP)} \quad \max_{\tau} \frac{1}{1-\beta} \mathbb{E}_{F_0}[\tau^\top \cdot r_0] \quad (7a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{P}_F(\tau^\top \cdot r_k \geq \xi_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K) \geq \hat{\epsilon}, \quad (7b)$$

$$\tau \in \Delta_{\beta,q}, \quad (7c)$$

here F denotes the joint probability distribution of r_1, r_2, \dots, r_K when $\hat{\epsilon}$ denotes the overall confidence for K constraints.

2.4 Distributionally robust chance constrained MDP

Based on the CCMDP defined above, if the information of distributions of rewards r_k are not perfectly known, we can apply the distributionally robust optimization approach to handle the uncertainty of \tilde{F} or F_k , $k = 0, \dots, K$. Then we consider a distributionally robust chance constrained MDP (DRCCMDP).

The individual DRCCMDP (I-DRCCMDP) can be defined as the tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, R, \Xi, P, \mathcal{D}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, q, \beta, \epsilon)$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = (\mathcal{F}_k)_{k=0}^K$ when \mathcal{F}_k denotes the ambiguity set for the random distribution F_k . Therefore the I-DRCCMDP can be reformulated as the following optimization problem:

$$(\text{I-DRCCMDP}) \max_{\tau} \inf_{F_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0} \frac{1}{1-\beta} \mathbb{E}_{F_0}[\tau^\top \cdot r_0] \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \inf_{F_k \in \mathcal{F}_k} \mathbb{P}_{F_k}(\tau^\top \cdot r_k \geq \xi_k) \geq \epsilon_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (8b)$$

$$\tau \in \Delta_{\beta, q}. \quad (8c)$$

The joint DRCCMDP (J-DRCCMDP) can be defined as the tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, R, \Xi, P, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{F}, q, \beta, \hat{\epsilon})$, where $\hat{\epsilon} \in [0, 1]$, \mathcal{F}_0 denotes the ambiguity set for the unknown distribution F_0 and \mathcal{F} denotes the ambiguity set for the unknown joint distribution F of r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k . The J-DRCCMDP can be reformulated as

$$(\text{J-DRCCMDP}) \max_{\tau} \inf_{F_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0} \frac{1}{1-\beta} \mathbb{E}_{F_0}[\tau^\top \cdot r_0] \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_F(\tau^\top \cdot r_k \geq \xi_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K) \geq \hat{\epsilon}, \quad (9b)$$

$$\tau \in \Delta_{\beta, q}. \quad (9c)$$

3 K-L divergence based DRCCMDP

In this Section, we study DRCCMDP with the K-L divergence distance [19] based ambiguity set (K-L DRCCMDP). In Section 3.1, we study the individually K-L DRCCMDP (K-L I-DRCCMDP) with an elliptical reference distribution. In Section 3.2, we study the jointly K-L DRCCMDP (K-L J-DRCCMDP) with an elliptical reference distribution. In Section 3.3, we study the K-L J-DRCCMDP with an elliptical mixture reference distribution.

Definition 3.1 Let D_{KL} denotes the Kullback-Leibler divergence distance

$$D_{\text{KL}}(F_k || \tilde{F}_k) = \int_{\Omega_k} \phi \left(\frac{f_{F_k}(r_k)}{f_{\tilde{F}_k}(r_k)} \right) f_{\tilde{F}_k}(r_k) dr_k,$$

where \tilde{F}_k is the reference distribution of r_k , $f_{F_k}(r_k)$ and $f_{\tilde{F}_k}(r_k)$ are the density functions of the true distribution and the reference distribution of r_k on support Ω_k respectively. $\phi(t)$ is defined as follows

$$\phi(t) = \begin{cases} t \log t - t + 1, & t \geq 0, \\ \infty, & t < 0. \end{cases}$$

3.1 K-L I-DRCCMDP with elliptical reference distribution

In this Section, we study the I-DRCCMDP whose ambiguity sets are based on the K-L divergence distance.

Assumption 1 *The ambiguity sets are*

$$\mathcal{F}_k = \left\{ F_k \mid D_{\text{KL}}(F_k \parallel \tilde{F}_k) \leq \delta_k \right\}, k = 0, 1, \dots, K,$$

where \tilde{F}_k is the reference distribution of reward vector r_k , the radius δ_k controls the size of the ambiguity sets.

We assume that the reference distribution belongs to the elliptical distribution family.

Definition 3.2 ([8]) A d -dimensional vector X follows an elliptical distribution $E_d(\mu, \Sigma, \psi)$ if its characteristic function has the form $\mathbb{E}(e^{ib^\top X}) = e^{ib^\top \mu} \psi(b^\top \Sigma b)$, where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the location parameter, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the dispersion matrix, ψ is the characteristic generator.

The elliptical distribution has the following property.

Lemma 3.1 ([28]) *Let $X \sim E_d(\mu, \Sigma, \psi)$. For any $B \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$BX + b \sim E_d(B\mu + b, B\Sigma B^\top, \psi).$$

As a special case, if $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then

$$a^\top X \sim E_1(a^\top \mu, a^\top \Sigma a, \psi).$$

A random vector X follows a multivariate log-elliptical distribution with parameters μ and Σ if $\log X$ follows an elliptical distribution:

$$\log X \sim E_d(\mu, \Sigma, \psi),$$

which can be denoted as $X \sim LE_d(\mu, \Sigma, \psi)$. The following lemma defines the expectation of log-elliptical distributions.

Lemma 3.2 ([12]) *Let $X \sim LE_d(\mu, \Sigma, \psi)$ with components X_1, X_2, \dots, X_K . If the mean of X_k exists, then*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_k) = e^{\mu_k} \psi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sigma_k^2\right),$$

where μ_k and σ_k^2 are the mean and variance of X_k respectively.

Gaussian, Laplace and Generalized stable laws distributions are all elliptical distributions with different characteristic generator $\psi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as shown in Table 1.

Before considering the reformulation of K-L I-DRCCMDP centered at elliptical distributions, we cite two important lemmas from literature.

Table 1 The characteristic generator of three different elliptical distributions

Distribution	Gaussian	Laplace	Generalized stable laws
Characteristic generator $\psi(t)$	e^{-t}	$\frac{1}{1+t}$	$e^{-\omega_1 t^{\frac{\omega_2}{2}}}$, $\omega_1, \omega_2 > 0$

Lemma 3.3 ([14]) *Given Assumption 1, the objective function in (8a) is equivalent to*

$$\inf_{\alpha \in [0, +\infty)} \alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{F}_0} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top r_0}{\alpha}\right) \right] + \alpha \delta_0.$$

Lemma 3.4 ([17]) *Given Assumption 1, the constraint (8b) is equivalent to*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{F}_k}(\tau^\top r_k \geq \xi_k) \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_k = \inf_{x \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{e^{-\delta_k x^{\epsilon_k} - 1}}{x-1} \right\}$.

Based on these two Lemmas, we get the following reformulation of (8).

Theorem 3.1 *We study the ambiguity set in Assumption 1. We assume the reference distribution $\tilde{F}_k \sim E_{|A|}(\mu_k, \Sigma_k, \psi_k)$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$, Σ_0 is a positive definite matrix, ψ_0 is continuous and $\inf_{t \leq 0} \psi_0(t) \geq e^{-\delta_0}$. Then (I-DRCCMDP) problem (8) is equivalent to*

$$\min_{\tau, \alpha} -\tau^\top \mu_0 + \alpha \log \left[\psi_0\left(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{2\alpha^2}\right) \right] + \alpha \delta_0, \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \tau^\top \mu_k + \Phi_k^{-1}(1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_k) \sqrt{\tau^\top \Sigma_k \tau} \geq \xi_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (10b)$$

$$\alpha \geq 0, \quad (10c)$$

$$\tau \in \Delta_{\beta, q}, \quad (10d)$$

where Φ_k is the CDF of the variable $Z_k \sim E_1(0, 1, \psi_k)$, $\tilde{\epsilon}_k = \inf_{x \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{e^{-\delta_k x^{\epsilon_k} - 1}}{x-1} \right\}$.

Proof By Lemma 3.3 and 3.4, problem (8) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\tau} \inf_{\alpha \in [0, +\infty)} \alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{F_0} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top r_0}{\alpha}\right) \right] + \alpha \delta_0, \quad (11a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{F}_k}(\tau^\top r_k \geq \xi_k) \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (11b)$$

$$\tau \in \Delta_{\beta, q}, \quad (11c)$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_k$ is defined in Lemma 3.4.

As r_0 follows an elliptical distribution $E_{|A|}(\mu_0, \Sigma_0, \psi_0)$, we have by Lemma 3.1 that $-\frac{\tau^\top r_0}{\alpha}$ still follows an elliptical distribution with mean value $-\frac{\tau^\top \mu_0}{\alpha}$, variance $\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{\alpha^2}$ and characteristic generator ψ_0 . By Lemma 3.2, $\exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top r_0}{\alpha}\right)$

follows a log-elliptical distribution with mean value $e^{-\frac{\tau^\top \mu_0}{\alpha}} \psi_0(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{2\alpha^2})$. Therefore (11a) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\tau} \inf_{\alpha \in [0, +\infty)} -\tau^\top \mu_0 + \alpha \log [\psi_0(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{2\alpha^2})] + \alpha \delta_0. \quad (12)$$

By the assumption that Σ_0 is positive definite, we have $-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{2\alpha^2} \leq 0$. Then as $\inf_{t \leq 0} \psi_0(t) \geq e^{-\delta_0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\alpha \in [0, +\infty)} -\tau^\top \mu_0 + \alpha \log [\psi_0(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{2\alpha^2})] + \alpha \delta_0 \\ & \geq \inf_{\alpha \in [0, +\infty)} -\tau^\top \mu_0 + \alpha \left[\log \left(\inf_{t \leq 0} \psi_0(t) \right) + \delta_0 \right] \\ & \geq \inf_{\alpha \in [0, +\infty)} -\tau^\top \mu_0 + \alpha [\log (e^{-\delta_0}) + \delta_0] = -\tau^\top \mu_0. \end{aligned}$$

Since ψ_0 is continuous w.r.t. α when $\alpha \geq 0$, the inner function of (12) is continuous w.r.t. α . Also we have $\inf_{\alpha \in [0, +\infty)} -\tau^\top \mu_0 + \alpha \log [\psi_0(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{2\alpha^2})] + \alpha \delta_0 = \inf_{\alpha \in [0, +\infty)} -\tau^\top \mu_0 + \alpha \log [\psi_0(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{2\alpha^2})] + \alpha \delta_0$. Therefore by Weierstrass Theorem, there exists $\alpha^* \in [0, +\infty]$ such that when $\alpha = \alpha^*$, the inner infimum term of (12) reaches its optimal value. Therefore, (12) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\tau, \alpha} -\tau^\top \mu_0 + \alpha \log [\psi_0(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{2\alpha^2})] + \alpha \delta_0, \quad (13a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \alpha \geq 0. \quad (13b)$$

Moreover, (11b) is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{F}_k} (\frac{\tau^\top r_k - \tau^\top \mu_k}{\sqrt{\tau^\top \Sigma_k \tau}} \geq \frac{\xi_k - \tau^\top \mu_k}{\sqrt{\tau^\top \Sigma_k \tau}}) \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K$.

Let $Z_k = \frac{\tau^\top r_k - \tau^\top \mu_k}{\sqrt{\tau^\top \Sigma_k \tau}}$. By Lemma 3.1, we know that $Z_k \sim E_1(0, 1, \psi_k)$. We denote $\Phi_k(z) = \mathbb{P}(Z_k \leq z)$ as the CDF of Z_k . Then (11b) is equivalent to $\frac{\xi_k - \tau^\top \mu_k}{\sqrt{\tau^\top \Sigma_k \tau}} \leq \Phi_k^{-1}(1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_k)$, which can be written as

$$\tau^\top \mu_k + \Phi_k^{-1}(1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_k) \sqrt{\tau^\top \Sigma_k \tau} \geq \xi_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K.$$

□

3.2 K-L J-DRCCMDP with elliptical reference distribution

In this section, we assume that the ambiguity sets in different rows are jointly independent.

Assumption 2 *The joint K-L ambiguity set with jointly independent rows is*

$$\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{F}_K = \{F = F_1 \times \dots \times F_K | F_k \in \mathcal{F}_k, k = 1, \dots, K\},$$

where F is the joint distribution of r_1, r_2, \dots, r_K with jointly independent marginals F_1, \dots, F_K , and \mathcal{F}_k is a K-L ambiguity set with reference marginal distribution \tilde{F}_k and radius $\delta_k, k = 1, \dots, K$.

Theorem 3.2 Consider \mathcal{F}_0 defined in Assumption 1 and $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{F}_K$ defined in Assumption 2. Assume the reference marginal distribution $\tilde{F}_k \sim E_{|A|}(\mu_k, \Sigma_k, \psi_k)$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$, Σ_0 is positive definite, ψ_0 is continuous and $\inf_{t \leq 0} \psi_0(t) \geq e^{-\delta_0}$. Then the (J-DRCCMDP) problem (9) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\tau, \alpha, y} -\tau^\top \mu_0 + \alpha \log [\psi_0(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{2\alpha^2})] + \alpha \delta_0, \quad (14a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \tau^\top \mu_k + \Phi_k^{-1}(1 - \tilde{y}_k) \sqrt{\tau^\top \Sigma_k \tau} \geq \xi_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (14b)$$

$$0 \leq y_k \leq 1, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (14c)$$

$$\prod_{k=1}^K y_k \geq \hat{\epsilon}, \quad (14d)$$

$$\alpha \geq 0, \quad (14e)$$

$$\tau \in \Delta_{\beta, q}, \quad (14f)$$

where $\tilde{y}_k = \inf_{x \in (0,1)} \{ \frac{e^{-\delta_k x^{y_k} - 1}}{x-1} \}$.

Proof As \mathcal{F}_0 is defined in Assumption 1 and (9a) is the same to (8a), with the same assumption of Σ_0 and ψ_0 , we have (9a) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\tau, \alpha} -\tau^\top \mu_0 + \alpha \log [\psi_0(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{2\alpha^2})] + \alpha \delta_0, \quad (15a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \alpha \geq 0. \quad (15b)$$

As F_k are pairwise independent, constraint (9b) is equivalent to

$$\prod_{k=1}^K \inf_{F_k \in \mathcal{F}_k} \mathbb{P}_{F_k}(\tau^\top \cdot r_k \geq \xi_k) \geq \hat{\epsilon}. \quad (16)$$

By Lemma 3.4 and introducing auxiliary variables $y_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$, (16) is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{F}_k}(\tau^\top \cdot r_k \geq \xi_k) \geq \tilde{y}_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (17)$$

$$\prod_{k=1}^K y_k \geq \hat{\epsilon}, 0 \leq y_k \leq 1, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (18)$$

where $\tilde{y}_k = \inf_{x \in (0,1)} \{ \frac{e^{-\delta_k x^{y_k} - 1}}{x-1} \}$. As the reference distribution \tilde{F}_k is an elliptical distribution, following the similar reformulation procedure for (11b) in Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\tau^\top \mu_k + \Phi_k^{-1}(1 - \tilde{y}_k) \sqrt{\tau^\top \Sigma_k \tau} \geq \xi_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (19)$$

where Φ_k is the CDF of the variable $Z_k \sim E_1(0, 1, \psi_k)$. Combining (15),(18) and (19) finishes the proof. \square

Proposition 3.1 Consider \mathcal{F}_0 defined in Assumption 1 and $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{F}_K$ defined in Assumption 2. If \tilde{F}_k is a Gaussian distribution $N(\mu_k, \Sigma_k)$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$, and Σ_0 is positive definite, then (9) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\tau, y} -\tau^\top \mu_0 + \sqrt{2\delta_0 \tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}, \quad (20a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \tau^\top \mu_k + \Phi_k^{-1}(1 - \tilde{y}_k) \sqrt{\tau^\top \Sigma_k \tau} \geq \xi_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (20b)$$

$$0 \leq y_k \leq 1, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (20c)$$

$$\prod_{k=1}^K y_k \geq \hat{\epsilon}, \quad (20d)$$

$$\tau \in \Delta_{\beta, q}, \quad (20e)$$

where $\tilde{y}_k = \inf_{x \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{e^{-\delta_k x^{y_k}} - 1}{x - 1} \right\}$ and Φ_k is the CDF of the standard Gaussian distribution $N(0, 1)$.

Proof If \tilde{F}_0 is a Gaussian distribution, by Table 1, $\psi_0(t) = e^{-t}$ and satisfies $\inf_{t \leq 0} e^{-t} = 1 \geq e^{-\delta_0}$ for any radius δ_0 . Therefore we can use the conclusion of Theorem 3.2. The objective function in (14a) can be written as $-\tau^\top \mu_0 + \frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{2\alpha} + \alpha \delta_0$, which reaches its minimum value at $\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}{2\delta_0}}$ where Σ_0 is positive definite and $\tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau > 0$. Taking the optimal value of α , we have that the optimal value of (14a) is $-\tau^\top \mu_0 + \sqrt{2\delta_0 \tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}$. Therefore (9) is equivalent to (20). \square

Next we study the solution method of the optimization problem (20). As y_k and τ are both decision variables, (20b) is a nonconvex constraint and (20) is not convex. Moreover, \tilde{y}_k here is a highly nonlinear function of y_k . Thus, we propose a sequential convex approximation method to solve the nonconvex problem (20). We decompose problem (20) into the following two subproblems where two subsets of variables are fixed alternatively. Firstly, we compute $\tilde{y}_k^n = \inf_{x \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{e^{-\delta_k x^{y_k^n}} - 1}{x - 1} \right\}$, and update τ by solving

$$\min_{\tau} -\tau^\top \mu_0 + \sqrt{2\delta_0 \tau^\top \Sigma_0 \tau}, \quad (21a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \tau^\top \mu_k + \Phi_k^{-1}(1 - \tilde{y}_k^n) \sqrt{\tau^\top \Sigma_k \tau} \geq \xi_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (21b)$$

$$\tau \in \Delta_{\beta, q}. \quad (21c)$$

Then we fix $\tau = \tau^n$ and update y by solving

$$\min_y \sum_{k=1}^K \Gamma_k y_k \quad (22a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \frac{1}{2} \leq \tilde{y}_k \leq 1 - \Phi\left(\frac{\xi_k - \tau^n \mu_k}{\sqrt{\tau^n \Sigma_k \tau^n}}\right), k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (22b)$$

$$0 \leq y_k \leq 1, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (22c)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \log y_k \geq \log \hat{\epsilon}, \quad (22d)$$

where Γ_k is a given searching direction and $\tilde{y}_k = \inf_{x \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{e^{-\delta_k x y_k} - 1}{x-1} \right\}$. We denote $\tilde{y}_k = \chi_k(y_k) := \inf_{x \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{e^{-\delta_k x y_k} - 1}{x-1} \right\}$. By the proof of Proposition 4 in [17], the infimum of $\chi_k(y_k)$ is attained in the interval $(0, 1)$. For any $0 \leq y_k \leq 1$, $\chi_k(y_k) > 0$. By the Envelope Theorem [36], $\chi_k(y_k)$ is strictly monotonically decreasing w.r.t. y_k . Thus we can reformulate (22b) as:

$$\chi_k^{-1} \left(1 - \Phi \left(\frac{\xi_k - \tau^{n \top} \mu_k}{\sqrt{\tau^n \Sigma_k \tau^{n \top}}} \right) \right) \leq y_k \leq \chi_k^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right), \quad (23)$$

where $\chi^{-1}(\cdot)$ denotes the inverse function of $\chi(\cdot)$. And from the strict monotonicity of function χ , both sides of (23) are unique at the interval $(0, 1)$. We then design an algorithm based on the sequential convex approximation method, and line search method for χ^{-1} , see Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: A hybrid algorithm to solve problem (20)

Data: $\mu_k, \Sigma_k, \delta_k, \xi_k, \Delta_{\beta,q}, n_{max}, \hat{\epsilon}, \tilde{\epsilon}, \gamma, k = 0, 1, \dots, K$.

Result: τ^n, V^n .

- 1 Set $n = 0$;
 - 2 Choose an initial point $y^0 = [y_1^0, \dots, y_K^0]$ feasible for (22c) and (22d);
 - 3 **while** $n \leq n_{max}$ and $\|y^{n-1} - y^n\| \geq \tilde{\epsilon}$ **do**
 - 4 Compute $\tilde{y}_k^n = \inf_{x \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{e^{-\delta_k x y_k^n} - 1}{x-1} \right\}$. Solve problem (21) with \tilde{y}_k^n . Let τ^n, V^n be an optimal solution and the optimal value of (21) respectively. Let θ^n be the optimal dual multiplier vector to constraints (21b) ;
 - 5 Use the line search method to find $y_k^{Up,n} = \chi_k^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})$ and $y_k^{Low,n} = \chi_k^{-1}(1 - \Phi(\frac{\xi_k \tau^{n \top} \mu_k}{\sqrt{\tau^n \Sigma_k \tau^{n \top}}}))$, $k = 1, \dots, K$;
 - 6 Solve problem (22) where we replace (22b) by $y_k^{Low,n} \leq y_k \leq y_k^{Up,n}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, and set

$$\Gamma_k = \theta_k^n \cdot (\Phi^{-1})'(1 - \tilde{y}_k^n) \sqrt{\tau^{n \top} \Sigma_k \tau^n};$$
 let \tilde{y} be an optimal solution of problem (22);
 - 7 $y^{n+1} \leftarrow y^n + \gamma(\tilde{y} - y^n)$, $n \leftarrow n + 1$. Here, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is the step length.
 - 8 **end**
-

Note that in practical numerical experiments, the function $(\Phi^{-1})'$ does not have a closed-form. We apply the following approximation

$$\Phi^{-1}(x) \approx t - \frac{2.515517 + 0.802853 \times t + 0.010328 \times t^2}{1 + 1.432788 \times t + 0.189269 \times t^2 + 0.001308 \times t^3}, t = \sqrt{-2 \log x},$$

which holds an error bound of 4.5×10^{-14} in ([1], Page 933) to approximate Φ^{-1} here.

Remark 3.1 Algorithm 1 can be seen as a particular case of the alternate convex search or block-relaxation methods [10]. From Theorem 2 in [23], we know that Algorithm 1 converges to a stationary point in a finite number of iterations and the returned value V^n is an upper bound of problem (20). When these sub-problems are all convex, the objective function is continuous, the feasible set is closed, the alternate convex search algorithm converges monotonically to a partial optimal point (Theorem 4.7 [10]). Furthermore, Algorithm 1 is exactly a hybrid one which combines the line search method to handle the non-linearity of function $\tilde{y}_k = \chi_k(y_k)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$.

3.3 K-L J-DRCCMDP with elliptical mixture distribution

In this Section, we assume the reference distribution in the marginal K-L ambiguity set is an elliptical mixture distribution and study the reformulation of the K-L J-DRCCMDP problem (9). As for the variable vector r_k , the PDF

f_k of r_k is defined by $f_k(r_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{J_k} \omega_j^k f_j^k(r_k)$, where $f_j^k(r_k)$ is the density function which follows $E_{|\Lambda|}(\mu_j^k, \Sigma_j^k, \psi_j^k)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{J_k} \omega_j^k = 1$.

Theorem 3.3 Consider \mathcal{F}_0 defined in Assumption 1 and \mathcal{F} defined in Assumption 2. Suppose the reference distribution $\tilde{F}_k = \sum_{j=1}^{J_k} \omega_j^k \tilde{F}_j^k$ is an elliptical mixture distribution with density $\tilde{f}_k(r_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{J_k} \omega_j^k \tilde{f}_j^k(r_k)$, where $\tilde{F}_j^k(r_k)$ and $\tilde{f}_j^k(r_k)$ are the distribution function and density function of $E_{|\Lambda|}(\mu_j^k, \Sigma_j^k, \psi_j^k)$, $j = 1, \dots, J_k$, respectively, and $\sum_{j=1}^{J_k} \omega_j^k = 1$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$. We further assume that Σ_j^0 is positive definite, $\mu_j^0 \leq 0$, ψ_j^0 is continuous and $\inf_{t \leq 0} \left\{ \min_{1 \leq j \leq J_0} \psi_j^0(t) \right\} \geq e^{-\delta_0}$, $j = 1, \dots, J_0$. Then (K-L J-DRCCMDP) problem (9) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\tau, \alpha, x, y, l, \hat{y}} \alpha \log \left[\sum_{j=1}^{J_0} \omega_j^0 \exp \left(-\frac{\tau^\top \mu_j^0}{\alpha} \right) \psi_j^0 \left(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_j^0 \tau}{2\alpha^2} \right) \right] + \alpha \delta_0, \quad (24a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \tau^\top \mu_j^k + (\Phi_j^k)^{-1} (1 - l_j^k) \sqrt{\tau^\top \Sigma_j^k \tau} \geq \xi_k, j = 1, 2, \dots, J_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (24b)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{J_k} \omega_j^k l_j^k \geq \hat{y}_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (24c)$$

$$\hat{y}_k \geq \frac{e^{-\delta_k} x_k^{y_k} - 1}{x_k - 1}, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (24d)$$

$$0 < x_k < 1, 0 \leq y_k \leq 1, 0 \leq \hat{y}_k \leq 1, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (24e)$$

$$0 \leq l_j^k \leq 1, j = 1, 2, \dots, J_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (24f)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^K y_k \geq \hat{\epsilon}, \alpha \geq 0, \quad (24g)$$

$$\tau \in \Delta_{\beta, q}, \quad (24h)$$

where Φ_j^k is the cdf of the variable $Z_j^k \sim E_1(0, 1, \psi_j^k)$.

Proof By Lemma 3.3, the objective function in (9a) is equivalent to

$$\inf_{\alpha \in [0, +\infty)} \alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{F}_0} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top r_0}{\alpha}\right) \right] + \alpha \delta_0. \quad (25)$$

As \tilde{F}_0 is an elliptical mixture distribution, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{F}_0} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top r_0}{\alpha}\right) \right] = \int_{\Omega_0} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top r_0}{\alpha}\right) d\tilde{F}_0(r_0) \quad (26a)$$

$$= \int_{\Omega_0} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top r_0}{\alpha}\right) d\left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_0} \omega_j^0 \tilde{F}_j^0(r_0)\right) \quad (26b)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{J_0} \omega_j^0 \int_{\Omega_0} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top r_0}{\alpha}\right) \tilde{f}_j^0(r_0) dr_0 \quad (26c)$$

$$= \sum_j \omega_j^0 \exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top \mu_j^0}{\alpha}\right) \psi_j^0\left(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_j^0 \tau}{2\alpha^2}\right), \quad (26d)$$

where the last equation follows from Lemma 3.2. Then by the assumption in Theorem 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{F}_0} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top r_0}{\alpha}\right) \right] + \alpha \delta_0 &= \alpha \left[\sum_j \omega_j^0 \exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top \mu_j^0}{\alpha}\right) \psi_j^0\left(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_j^0 \tau}{2\alpha^2}\right) + \delta_0 \right] \\ &\geq \alpha \left[\sum_j \omega_j^0 \left\{ \min_{1 \leq j \leq J_0} \psi_j^0\left(-\frac{\tau^\top \Sigma_j^0 \tau}{2\alpha^2}\right) \right\} + \delta_0 \right] \\ &\geq \alpha \left[\sum_j \omega_j^0 \inf_{t \leq 0} \left\{ \min_{1 \leq j \leq J_0} \psi_j^0(t) \right\} + \delta_0 \right] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first inequality is by the assumption $\mu_j^0 \leq 0$ and thus $\exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top \mu_j^0}{\alpha}\right) \geq 1$. The second inequality holds by the positive definiteness of Σ_j^0 , and the fact that

$\min_{1 \leq j \leq J_0} \psi_j^0(t) \geq e^{-\delta_0} \geq 0, \forall t \leq 0$. The last equality is by $\inf_{t \leq 0} \left\{ \min_{1 \leq j \leq J_0} \psi_j^0(t) \right\} \geq e^{-\delta_0}$. As ψ_j^0 is continuous, by Weierstrass Theorem we have

$$\inf_{\alpha \in [0, +\infty)} \alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{F}_0} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top r_0}{\alpha}\right) \right] + \alpha \delta_0 = \min_{\alpha \in [0, +\infty)} \alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{F}_0} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{\tau^\top r_0}{\alpha}\right) \right] + \alpha \delta_0.$$

Taking (26) to (25), we get the reformulation in (24a).

Same as the proof of Theorem 3.2, we can first reformulate (9b) by introducing auxiliary variables $y_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ as (17) and (18). By Proposition 2 in [15], we have that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{F}_k}(\tau^\top \cdot r_k \geq \xi_k) \geq \tilde{y}_k \iff \sum_{j=1}^{J_k} \omega_j^k \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{F}_j^k}(\tau^\top r_k \geq \xi_k) \geq \tilde{y}_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K,$$

where $\tilde{y}_k = \inf_{x \in (0,1)} \left\{ \frac{e^{-\delta_k x^{y_k}} - 1}{x-1} \right\}$. With Theorem 3.2, through adding auxiliary variables $l_j^k, \hat{y}_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $x_k \in (0, 1)$, we can reformulate (17) as

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{F}_j^k}(\tau^\top r_k \geq \xi_k) \geq l_j^k, j = 1, 2, \dots, J_k, k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (27)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{J_k} \omega_j^k l_j^k \geq \hat{y}_k, \hat{y}_k \geq \frac{e^{-\delta_k x_k^{y_k}} - 1}{x_k - 1}, k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (28)$$

$$0 < x_k < 1, \sum_{k=1}^K y_k \geq \hat{\epsilon}, 0 \leq y_k \leq 1, 0 \leq l_j^k \leq 1, j = 1, 2, \dots, J_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K. \quad (29)$$

As \tilde{F}_j^k is an elliptical distribution, (27) is equivalent to

$$\tau^\top \mu_j^k + (\Phi_j^k)^{-1}(1 - l_j^k) \sqrt{\tau^\top \Sigma_j^k \tau} \geq \xi_k, j = 1, 2, \dots, J_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (30)$$

where Φ_j^k is the cdf of $E_1(0, 1, \psi_j^k)$. Collecting the reformulations (25), (26), (28), (29) and (30), we finish the proof. \square

Remark 3.2 Any mixture distribution is a weighted sum of a finite set of probability measures, and can be seen as a semiparametric approach to model the randomness [27]. As a broader class of distributions, mixture distributions has now been used in many areas such as finance, economics and engineering. In particular, the elliptical mixture distribution is an important type for research. Theorem 3.3 gives an exact tractable reformulation for K-L J-DRCCMDP problems when the reference distribution belongs to the class of elliptical mixture distribution under a mild assumption.

4 Numerical experiments

4.1 Machine replacement problem

We carry out the numerical tests on a machine replacement problem [5, 11, 32, 37, 41]. In the machine replacement problem, we consider the opportunity cost in the objective function along with two kinds of opportunity cost in the

constraint. The opportunity cost denoted by r_0 comes from the potential production losses when the machine is under repair. The maintenance cost comes from two parts: one part is due to the operation consumption for machines, such as the required electricity fees and fuel costs when the machine is working denoted by r_1 ; the other part comes from the production of low quality products denoted by r_2 . We set the states as the using age of the machine. At each state, there are two possible actions: a_1 , repair and a_2 , do not repair. The considered costs are incurred at every state. The transition probabilities are known for the whole MDP, and are the same as in [37].

In all numerical experiments, we take the discount factor $\beta = 0.9$ and assume that the initial distribution q is a uniform distribution. We assume that there are 10 states. The mean values of the three costs are shown in Table 2. For example, at state 1, if the “repair” action is taken, the mean values of r_0, r_1, r_2 are $-10, -15, 0$, respectively; if the action “do not repair” is used, the mean values of three costs are $0, -10, -40$ respectively. The last two states are risky states such that the mean values of costs are much lower. The covariance matrices of the three costs are all assumed to be diagonal and positive definite. Concretely, for both actions, the covariance matrix of r_0 is $\Sigma_0 = \text{diag}([0.3, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3, 3, 5, 2, 8, 9])$, the covariance matrix of r_1 is $\Sigma_1 = \text{diag}([0.5, 5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 5, 0.5, 5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 8, 9, 8, 9])$ and the the covariance matrix of r_2 is $\Sigma_2 = \text{diag}([0.04, 0.04, 0.04, 0.04, 0.04, 0.04, 0.04, 0.04, 0.04, 0.04, 0.04, 0.04, 0.04, 0.04, 4, 9, 8, 8.5, 10])$.

In our numerical experiments, we set $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = -40$ and $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 0.8$ for I-DRCCMDP in (8). We set $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = -40$ and $\hat{\epsilon} = 0.8$ for J-DRCCMDP in (9).

Table 2 The mean values of three kinds of costs

States	Opportunity cost		Operation consumption cost		Low quality cost	
	$r_0(s, a_1)$	$r_0(s, a_2)$	$r_1(s, a_1)$	$r_1(s, a_2)$	$r_2(s, a_1)$	$r_2(s, a_2)$
1	-10	0	-15	-10	0	-40
2	-10	0	-15	-30	0	-40
3	-10	0	-15	-40	0	-50
4	-10	0	-15	-50	0	-50
5	-10	0	-15	-70	-15	-50
6	-10	0	-15	-80	-15	-55
7	-10	0	-15	-80	-15	-55
8	-10	0	-15	-80	-15	-55
9	-40	-85	-50	-200	-30	-80
10	-40	-95	-50	-200	-30	-100

4.2 Numerical results on K-L divergence based DRCCMDP

We consider the case where the reference distribution of the K-L divergence based ambiguity set is a Gaussian distribution with mean values and covariance




Fig. 1 The probability of the “repair” action at each state

matrix defined in Section 4.1. Following the same proof process in Proposition 3.1, when the reference distribution is a Gaussian distribution, we can further reformulate the I-DRCCMDP problem from (10) as

$$\min_{\tau} -\tau^{\top} \mu_0 + \sqrt{2\delta_0 \tau^{\top} \Sigma_0 \tau}, \quad (31a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \tau^{\top} \mu_k + \Phi_k^{-1}(1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_k) \sqrt{\tau^{\top} \Sigma_k \tau} \geq \xi_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (31b)$$

$$\tau \in \Delta_{\beta, q}, \quad (31c)$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_k = \inf_{x \in (0,1)} \{ \frac{e^{-\delta_k x^{\epsilon_k}} - 1}{x-1} \}$. We consider six different cases when $\delta_0 = \delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0.5, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2, 0.1, 0.01$, respectively. We solve the convex optimization problem (31) using GUROBI in MATLAB, on a computer with AMD Ryzen 7 5800H CPU and 16.0 GB RAM. We show the probability of the “repair” action at each state under K-L I-DRCCMDP in Figure (a). As there are in total two actions to choose at each state, the probability of the “do not repair” action can be computed by subtracting the probability of the “repair” action with 1. From Figure (a), we can see the asymptotic convergence of the probability at each state when $\delta_0, \delta_1, \delta_2$ decrease from 0.5 to 0.01. Under all six radii, the probability of “repair” at last three states are all equal to 1, which is consistent to the fact that the machine gets aging as the state goes by.

Next we focus on the K-L J-DRCCMDP problem which is solved by Algorithm 1. We set the initial points $y_1^0 = 0.95, y_2^0 = 0.91$ and $n_{max} = 50, \tilde{\epsilon} = 10^{-4}, \gamma = 0.9$, the approximation accuracy of the line search method is 10^{-3} . The other settings and parameters are the same as K-L I-DRCCMDP. We consider six cases with different radii, $\delta_0 = \delta_1 = \delta_2 = 10^{-4}, 5 \times 10^{-5}, 10^{-5}, 5 \times 10^{-6}, 10^{-6}, 0$. We use the MOSEK solver to solve the sub problem (21) and (22). We list the probability of “repair” at each state in Figure (b), from which we can observe the convergence of the probability at each state when the radius decreases to 0.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we study the distributionally robust chance constrained Markov decision process problems. We consider Kullback-Leibler distance based ambiguity sets centered at elliptical distributions or elliptical mixture distributions. We find the deterministic formulation of the K-L I-DRCCMDP problem and design a hybrid algorithm to solve the K-L J-DRCCMDP problem. However, we only consider the randomness of the reward vector with deterministic transition probability. It is a promising topic to consider the randomness of the transition probability in this kind of problems. Moreover, we can study the reformulations and efficient algorithms under more ambiguity sets.

Declarations

- **Funding:** This research was supported by National Key R&D Program of China under No. 2022YFA1004000 and National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Number 11991023 and 11901449.
- **Competing interests:** The authors declare they have no financial interests.
- **Data Availability:** All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article

References

1. Milton Abramowitz and Irene A Stegun. *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*, volume 55. US Government printing office, 1964.
2. Eitan Altman. *Constrained Markov Decision Processes: Stochastic Modeling*. Routledge, 1999.
3. Souradeep Chakraborty. Capturing financial markets to apply deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.04373*, 2019.
4. Zhi Chen, Daniel Kuhn, and Wolfram Wiesemann. Data-driven chance constrained programs over wasserstein balls. *Operations Research*, 2022.
5. Erick Delage and Shie Mannor. Percentile optimization for markov decision processes with parameter uncertainty. *Operations Research*, 58(1):203–213, 2010.
6. Erick Delage and Yinyu Ye. Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems. *Operations Research*, 58(3):595–612, 2010.
7. Yury Dvorkin. A chance-constrained stochastic electricity market. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 35(4):2993–3003, 2019.
8. Kai Wang Fang. *Symmetric multivariate and related distributions*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2018.
9. Rui Gao and Anton Kleywegt. Distributionally robust stochastic optimization with wasserstein distance. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2022.
10. Jochen Gorski, Frank Pfeuffer, and Kathrin Klamroth. Biconvex sets and optimization with biconvex functions: a survey and extensions. *Mathematical methods of operations research*, 66(3):373–407, 2007.
11. Vineet Goyal and Julien Grand-Clement. Robust markov decision processes: Beyond rectangularity. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2022.

12. Mahmoud Hamada and Emiliano A Valdez. Capm and option pricing with elliptically contoured distributions. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 75(2):387–409, 2008.
13. Grani A Hanasusanto, Vladimir Roitch, Daniel Kuhn, and Wolfram Wiesemann. A distributionally robust perspective on uncertainty quantification and chance constrained programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 151(1):35–62, 2015.
14. Zhaolin Hu and L Jeff Hong. Kullback-leibler divergence constrained distributionally robust optimization. *Available at Optimization Online*, pages 1695–1724, 2013.
15. Zhaolin Hu, Wenjie Sun, and Shushang Zhu. Chance constrained programs with gaussian mixture models. *IIEE Transactions*, 54(12):1117–1130, 2022.
16. Ran Ji and Miguel A Lejeune. Data-driven distributionally robust chance-constrained optimization with wasserstein metric. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 79(4):779–811, 2021.
17. Ruiwei Jiang and Yongpei Guan. Data-driven chance constrained stochastic program. *Mathematical Programming*, 158(1):291–327, 2016.
18. Shiyi Jiang, Jianqiang Cheng, Kai Pan, Feng Qiu, and Boshi Yang. Data-driven chance-constrained planning for distributed generation: A partial sampling approach. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 2022.
19. James M Joyce. Kullback-leibler divergence. In *International Encyclopedia of Statistical Science*, pages 720–722. Springer, 2011.
20. B Ravi Kiran, Ibrahim Sobh, Victor Talpaert, Patrick Mannion, Ahmad A Al Sallab, Senthil Yogamani, and Patrick Pérez. Deep reinforcement learning for autonomous driving: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2021.
21. Diego Klabjan, David Simchi-Levi, and Miao Song. Robust stochastic lot-sizing by means of histograms. *Production and Operations Management*, 22(3):691–710, 2013.
22. Simge Küçükyavuz and Ruiwei Jiang. Chance-constrained optimization under limited distributional information: a review of reformulations based on sampling and distributional robustness. *EURO Journal on Computational Optimization*, page 100030, 2022.
23. Jia Liu, Abdel Lisser, and Zhiping Chen. Stochastic geometric optimization with joint probabilistic constraints. *Operations Research Letters*, 44(5):687–691, 2016.
24. Jia Liu, Abdel Lisser, and Zhiping Chen. Distributionally robust chance constrained geometric optimization. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47(4):2950–2988, 2022.
25. Shuai Ma and Jia Yuan Yu. State-augmentation transformations for risk-sensitive reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 4512–4519, 2019.
26. Shie Mannor, Ofir Mebel, and Huan Xu. Robust mdps with k-rectangular uncertainty. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 41(4):1484–1509, 2016.
27. Geoffrey J McLachlan and Kaye E Basford. *Mixture models: Inference and applications to clustering*, volume 38. M. Dekker New York, 1988.
28. Alexander J McNeil, Rüdiger Frey, and Paul Embrechts. *Quantitative risk management: concepts, techniques and tools-revised edition*. Princeton university press, 2015.
29. Hoang Nam Nguyen, Abdel Lisser, and Vikas Vikram Singh. Distributionally robust chance-constrained markov decision processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08126*, 2022.
30. Shen Peng, Abdel Lisser, Vikas Vikram Singh, Nalin Gupta, and Eshan Balachandrar. Games with distributionally robust joint chance constraints. *Optimization Letters*, 15(6):1931–1953, 2021.
31. LA Prashanth. Policy gradients for cvar-constrained mdps. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 155–169. Springer, 2014.
32. Sivaramkrishnan Ramani and Archis Ghate. Robust markov decision processes with data-driven, distance-based ambiguity sets. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 32(2):989–1017, 2022.
33. Jay K Satia and Roy E Lave Jr. Markovian decision processes with uncertain transition probabilities. *Operations Research*, 21(3):728–740, 1973.
34. Richard S Sutton, David McAllester, Satinder Singh, and Yishay Mansour. Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 12, 1999.
35. Richard S Sutton, Doina Precup, and Satinder Singh. Between mdps and semi-mdps: A framework for temporal abstraction in reinforcement learning. *Artificial intelligence*, 112(1-2):181–211, 1999.

36. Gonçalo Terça and David Wozabal. Envelope theorems for multistage linear stochastic optimization. *Operations Research*, 69(5):1608–1629, 2021.
37. V Varagapriya, Vikas Vikram Singh, and Abdel Lisser. Constrained markov decision processes with uncertain costs. *Operations Research Letters*, 50(2):218–223, 2022.
38. V Varagapriya, Vikas Vikram Singh, and Abdel Lisser. Joint chance-constrained markov decision processes. *Annals of Operations Research*, pages 1–23, 2022.
39. Jie Wang, Rui Gao, and Hongyuan Zha. Reliable off-policy evaluation for reinforcement learning. *Operations Research*, 2022.
40. Junqing Wei, John M Dolan, Jarrod M Snider, and Bakhtiar Litkouhi. A point-based mdp for robust single-lane autonomous driving behavior under uncertainties. In *2011 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 2586–2592. IEEE, 2011.
41. Wolfram Wiesemann, Daniel Kuhn, and Berç Rustem. Robust markov decision processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 38(1):153–183, 2013.
42. Wolfram Wiesemann, Daniel Kuhn, and Melvyn Sim. Distributionally robust convex optimization. *Operations Research*, 62(6):1358–1376, 2014.
43. Li Xia. Risk-sensitive markov decision processes with combined metrics of mean and variance. *Production and Operations Management*, 29(12):2808–2827, 2020.
44. Weijun Xie. On distributionally robust chance constrained programs with wasserstein distance. *Mathematical Programming*, 186(1):115–155, 2021.
45. Zhihui Yu, Xianping Guo, and Li Xia. Zero-sum semi-markov games with state-action-dependent discount factors. *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*, 32(4):545–571, 2022.