

# Policy Gradient Methods for Risk-Sensitive Distributional Reinforcement Learning with Provable Convergence

Minheng Xiao\* Xian Yu† and Lei Ying‡

## Abstract

Risk-sensitive reinforcement learning (RL) is crucial for maintaining reliable performance in many high-stakes applications. While most RL methods aim to learn a point estimate of the random cumulative cost, distributional RL (DRL) seeks to estimate the entire distribution of it [7]. The distribution provides all necessary information about the cost and leads to a unified framework for handling various risk measures in a risk-sensitive setting. However, developing policy gradient methods for risk-sensitive DRL is inherently more complex as it pertains to finding the gradient of a probability measure. This paper introduces a policy gradient method for risk-sensitive DRL with general coherent risk measures, where we provide an analytical form of the probability measure’s gradient. We further prove the local convergence of the proposed algorithm under mild smoothness assumptions. For practical use, we also design a categorical distributional policy gradient algorithm (CDPG) based on categorical distributional policy evaluation [7] and trajectory-based gradient estimation. Through experiments on a stochastic cliff-walking environment, we illustrate the benefits of considering a risk-sensitive setting in DRL.

## 1 Introduction

In traditional reinforcement learning (RL), the objective often involves minimizing the expected cumulative cost (or maximizing the expected cumulative reward) [46]. This type of problems has been extensively studied using value-based methods [52, 22, 35, 51] and policy gradient methods [53, 47, 26, 41, 30]. However, for intelligent autonomous systems operated in risky and dynamic environments, such as autonomous driving, healthcare and finance, it is equally (or more) important to control the risk under various possible outcomes. To address this, risk-sensitive RL has been developed to ensure more reliable performance using different objectives and constraints [23, 16, 12, 13, 48, 49]. Ref. [3] proposed a class of risk measures that satisfy several natural and desirable properties, called *coherent risk measures*. In Markov decision processes (MDP), the risk can be measured on the total cumulative cost or in a nested way, leading to static or dynamic risk measures. While [34, 2, 10, 9] have recently

---

\*Department of Integrated Systems Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA, Email: xiao.1120@osu.edu;

†Corresponding author; Department of Integrated Systems Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA, Email: yu.3610@osu.edu;

‡Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA, Email: leiying@umich.edu.

shown the global convergence of policy gradient algorithms in a risk-neutral RL framework, the convergence of policy gradient algorithms in risk-averse RL has been underexplored. Ref. [24] showed that Markov coherent risk measures (a class of dynamic risk measures) are not gradient dominated, and thus the stationary points that policy gradient methods find are not guaranteed to be globally optimal in general. Recently, [55] showed the global convergence of risk-averse policy gradient algorithms for a class of dynamic time-consistent risk measures (i.e., expected conditional risk measures). In this paper, we mainly focus on static coherent risk measures and provide local convergence guarantees for risk-averse policy gradient algorithms using a distributional RL (DRL) framework.

Instead of modeling a point estimate of the random cumulative cost, DRL offers a more comprehensive framework by modeling the entire distribution of it [7, 8]. Along this line, [7] proposed a C51 algorithm that models the cost distribution as a categorical distribution with fixed atoms and variable probabilities, and [18] proposed QR-DQN that transposes the parametrization of C51 by considering fixed probabilities and variable atom locations using quantile regression. Besides these value-based methods, various distributional policy gradient methods have also been proposed, such as D4PG [4], DSAC [33], and SDPG [43, 42], etc. However, recent attempts to apply policy gradient methods in risk-sensitive DRL have been primarily based on neural network architectures, which lack rigorous proof of gradient formulas and convergence guarantees. Different from these papers, our work aims to fill the gap by providing analytical gradient forms for general coherent risk measures with convergence guarantees. Specifically, we first utilize distributional policy evaluation to obtain the random cumulative cost’s distribution under any given policy. Then, we compute the gradient of the obtained probability measure, based on which we calculate the policy gradient for a coherent risk measure. The policy parameter is then updated in the gradient descent direction. Next, we review the relevant literature in detail and present our main contributions and major differences with prior work.

**Prior Work.** There has been a stream of research papers on risk-sensitive RL with different objectives and constraints, such as optimizing the worst-case scenario [23, 16, 56, 28], optimizing under safety constraints [12, 13, 1, 45, 14, 19, 29], optimizing a static risk measure [48, 49, 15, 20], or optimizing a dynamic risk measure [39, 11, 44, 27, 54, 55, 56]. Among them, [15] studied a static conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) objective and presented an approximate value-iteration algorithm for CVaR MDPs with convergence rate analysis. Ref. [49] considered a static CVaR objective over a continuous random variable and proposed a sampling-based estimator for the gradient of the CVaR, where the authors proved the convergence of a stochastic gradient descent algorithm to a local CVaR optimum. Ref. [48] provided policy gradients of both static and dynamic coherent risk measures for discrete random variables and adopted a similar sample-based policy gradient method (SPG), where the estimator asymptotically converges to the true gradient when the sample size goes to infinity.

Recently, another vein of research has focused on finding risk-sensitive policies using a distributional perspective (i.e., in DRL). Ref. [36] proposed a method of approximating the return

distribution with particle smoothing and applied it to a risk-sensitive framework with CVaR as the evaluation criterion. Building on recent advances in DRL [7], [17] extended QR-DQN proposed in [18] to implicit quantile networks (IQN) that learn the full quantile function and allow to optimize any distortion risk measures. Ref. [31] showed that replacing expectation with CVaR in action-selection strategy when applying the distributional Bellman optimality operator can result in convergence to neither the optimal dynamic CVaR nor the optimal static CVaR policies. The authors then proposed a new distributional Bellman optimality operator and showed that it expanded the utility of DRL in optimizing CVaR policies. Ref. [25] designed an optimistic version of the distributional Bellman operator that moved probability mass from the lower to the upper tail of the return distribution. The authors demonstrated the efficiency of their algorithm in finding CVaR-optimal policies. Besides these value-based DRL methods, D4PG [4] and SDPG [42] are two actor-critic type policy gradient algorithms based on DRL but are focused on optimizing the mean value of the return. Ref. [43] then extended SDPG to incorporate CVaR in the action network and proposed a risk-aware SDPG algorithm. Ref. [50] assumed the cumulative reward to be Gaussian distributed and focused on optimizing policies for CVaR. They derived the closed-form expression of CVaR-based objective’s gradient and designed an actor-critic framework. Ref. [37] introduced a policy gradient framework that utilized reparameterization of the state distribution for end-to-end optimization of risk-sensitive utility functions in continuous state-action MDPs. Ref. [33] proposed a distributional soft actor-critic algorithm (DSAC) that integrated SAC with DRL and provided a unified framework for learning risk-related metrics such as percentile, mean-variance, and distorted expectation.

**Main Contributions of Our Paper and Comparisons with Prior Work.** The main contributions of this paper are three-fold. First, to the best of our knowledge, this work presents the first distributional policy gradient theorem (Theorem 2) that computes the gradient of the cumulative cost’s probability measure. This gradient is useful for constructing the policy gradient of coherent risk measures. While prior work such as [48, 49] proposed sample-based approaches to estimate this gradient, our paper provides an analytical form based on a DRL perspective. Through numerical experiments conducted in Section 4, our algorithm converges to a safe policy using substantially fewer samples and iterations, compared to the sample-based approach in [48]. Second, we propose a general risk-sensitive distributional policy gradient framework, which can be applied to a broad class of coherent risk measures and combined with any policy evaluation methods. Specifically, we propose a categorical distributional policy gradient algorithm (CDPG) based on categorical policy evaluation and trajectory-based gradient estimation. The CDPG can be seen as a complement of the value-based C51 method [7], which works well on a stochastic cliffwalking environment as we report in Section 4. Third, unlike neural network (NN)-based distributional policy gradient methods such as D4PG [4], SDPG [42, 43], with the aid of analytical gradient forms, we derive assumptions under which the proposed risk-averse distributional policy gradient algorithms converge to a stationary point within a finite number of iterations. We review the most relevant work on risk-sensitive RL/DRL and list the major differences compared to our work in Table 1.

Table 1: Relevant work on risk-sensitive RL/DRL and comparisons with our work.

	Objective	Approach	DRL	Convergence
Our work (CDPG)	Coherent risk measure (Static)	Policy gradient + Analytical gradient forms	✓	✓
[48, 49] (SPG)	Coherent risk measure (Static and dynamic)	Policy gradient + Analytical gradient forms	✗	✓
[12]	Expectation with CVaR-constrained	Policy Gradient + Analytical Gradient Forms	✗	✓
[4] (D4PG)	Expectation	NN-based policy gradient	✓	✗
[43] (SDPG)	Static CVaR	NN-based policy gradient	✓	✗
[33] (DSAC)	Percentile, variance and distorted expectation	NN-based policy gradient	✓	✗
[50] (WCPG)	Static CVaR + Gaussian Reward	NN-based policy gradient + Analytical gradient forms	✓	✗
[7] (C51)	Expectation	Categorical Q-learning	✓	✓
[17] (IQN)	Distortion risk measure	NN-based Q-learning	✓	✗

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $Z_\theta : \Omega \rightarrow [C_{\min}, C_{\max}]$  be a bounded random variable defined on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \eta_\theta)$ , where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$  is a compact set of outcomes,  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra over  $\Omega$  representing the set of events we are interested in. We assume the support of  $Z_\theta$  to be fixed and its probability measure  $\eta_\theta$  to be parameterized by  $\theta$ , i.e.,  $\eta_\theta(A) = \mathbb{P}\{\omega \in \Omega : Z(\omega) \in A\}$  for all  $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ . Denote  $\mathcal{Z}$  as the space of all such random variables,  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  as the space of all probability measures over  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$  as the space of all signed measures over  $\mathbb{R}$ . In this paper, we interpret  $Z_\theta$  as a random cost, and the smaller the realizations of  $Z_\theta$ , the better. For  $Z, Z' \in \mathcal{Z}$ , we denote by  $Z \preceq Z'$  the pointwise partial order meaning  $Z(\omega) \leq Z'(\omega)$  for  $\eta$ -almost  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Different from [48], we consider a nonatomic probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \eta_\theta)$  with continuous random variables  $Z_\theta$ , i.e.,  $d\eta_\theta = f_{Z_\theta}(\omega)d\omega$ , where  $f_{Z_\theta}(\omega) = f_Z(\omega, \theta)$  is the (continuous) probability density function of random variable  $Z_\theta$ . We denote  $F_Z(\omega, \theta)$  as the cumulative density function of  $Z_\theta$ . We will derive the distributional policy gradient results with convergence guarantees under this general setting and propose a categorical distributional policy gradient algorithm (CDPG) in Section 3.3 that uses a class of discrete distributions to approximate any continuous distribution.

Consider a discounted, infinite-horizon MDP, denoted by  $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, C, \gamma)$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a finite space of states,  $\mathcal{A}$  is a finite space of actions,  $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{S})$  is the transition kernel,  $C(s, a)$  is a deterministic immediate cost given state  $s$  and action  $a$ <sup>1</sup>, and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  is the discount factor. We

<sup>1</sup>Our results can be easily extended to random immediate costs.

aim to find a stationary Markov policy  $\pi_\theta : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$  which is parameterized by  $\theta \in \Theta^2$ . For a fixed policy  $\pi_\theta$ , with some abuse of notation, define  $Z_\theta^s$  and  $Z_\theta^{(s,a)}$  as the random variables representing the sum of discounted costs along the trajectory following policy  $\pi_\theta$  starting from state  $s$  and starting from  $(s, a)$ , respectively, i.e.,  $Z_\theta^s = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t C(s_t, a_t)$ ,  $s_t \sim P(\cdot | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1})$ ,  $a_t \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | s_t)$ ,  $s_0 = s$  and  $Z_\theta^{(s,a)} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t C(s_t, a_t)$ ,  $s_t \sim P(\cdot | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1})$ ,  $a_t \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | s_t)$ ,  $s_0 = s$ ,  $a_0 = a$ . Let  $\eta_\theta^s$  and  $\eta_\theta^{(s,a)}$  denote their probability measures, respectively. We make the following assumption throughout the paper, which is commonly seen in the literature, e.g., in [48, 49].

**Assumption 1.** *For  $\eta_\theta$ -almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the gradient  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_Z(\omega, \theta)$  exists and is bounded.*

## 2.1 Policy Gradient Methods

In traditional RL, the objective is to minimize the value function defined as  $V_\theta(s) = \mathbb{E}_\pi[Z_\theta^s] = \mathbb{E}_\pi[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t C(s_t, a_t) | s_0 = s]$ . Similarly, the state-action value function (Q-function) is defined as  $Q_\theta(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_\pi[Z_\theta^{(s,a)}] = \mathbb{E}_\pi[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t C(s_t, a_t) | s_0 = s, a_0 = a]$ . The agent's goal is to find  $\theta^*$  such that  $\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} V_\theta(s)$ . Following first-order methods in nonlinear optimization, policy gradient algorithms consist of updating the policy parameter  $\theta$  in the gradient descent direction, i.e.,  $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \delta \nabla_\theta V_\theta(s)$ , where  $\delta$  is the stepsize (learning rate). The fundamental result underlying policy gradient algorithms is the policy gradient theorem [47], which provides the analytical form of  $\nabla_\theta V_\theta(s)$  as follows:

$$\nabla_\theta V_\theta(s) = \sum_x d_\pi^s(x) \sum_a \nabla_\theta \pi(a|x) \cdot Q_\theta(x, a), \quad (1)$$

where  $d_\pi^s(x) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \Pr(s_t = x | s_0 = s, \pi)$  is the state-visitation distribution.

## 2.2 Coherent Risk Measures

In many situations, an agent would like to manage not only the expected outcome but also the risk associated with extreme cases or the variability of costs. A risk measure  $\rho : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a function that maps a random variable  $Z$  to the real line. A risk measure is called *coherent* if it satisfies several desirable properties, which we present in Definition 2, Appendix A.1. The following theorem shows that a coherent risk measure can be expressed uniquely by a risk envelope.

**Theorem 1** ([40], Theorem 6.7). *A risk measure  $\rho : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is coherent if and only if there exists a convex bounded and closed set  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{B}$ , called risk envelope, such that*

$$\rho(Z_\theta) = \max_{\xi \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{E}_\xi[Z_\theta] \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{B} = \{\xi : \int_\Omega \xi(\omega) f_Z(\omega, \theta) d\omega = 1, \xi \succeq 0\}$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\xi[Z_\theta] = \int_{\omega \in \Omega} \xi(\omega) f_Z(\omega, \theta) Z(\omega) d\omega$  is the expectation of  $Z$  reweighted by  $\xi$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>We note that an optimal policy for a static risk measure is in general history-dependent (neither stationary nor Markov). However, as shown in [5], by augmenting the state space with the accumulated cost, a stationary Markov policy is optimal in the augmented state space for static CVaR objectives.

Ref. [48] gives a general form of risk envelope  $\mathcal{U}$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{U} = \left\{ \xi \succeq 0 : g_e(\xi, f_{Z_\theta}) = 0, \forall e \in \mathcal{E}, h_i(\xi, f_{Z_\theta}) \leq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \int_{\omega \in \Omega} \xi(\omega) f_Z(\omega, \theta) d\omega = 1 \right\}$$

with a set of necessary conditions, which we present in Assumption 2, Appendix C.4. Under this setting, the Lagrangian function of problem (2) can be written as  $\mathcal{L}_\theta(\xi, \lambda^{\mathcal{P}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{E}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{I}}) =$

$$\int_{\Omega} \xi(\omega) f_Z(\omega, \theta) Z(\omega) d\omega - \lambda^{\mathcal{P}} \left( \int_{\Omega} \xi(\omega) f_Z(\omega, \theta) d\omega - 1 \right) - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \lambda^{\mathcal{E}}(e) g_e(\xi, f_{Z_\theta}) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda^{\mathcal{I}}(i) h_i(\xi, f_{Z_\theta}). \quad (3)$$

In this paper, we consider coherent risk measures  $\rho$  that have an explicit form of risk envelope  $\mathcal{U}$  and saddle points of the Lagrangian function (3), such as CVaR, mean-semideviation [48], and we aim to solve the following optimization problem

$$\min_{\theta} \rho(Z_\theta^s) \quad (4)$$

where  $Z_\theta^s$  is the random variable representing the sum of discounted costs along the trajectory following policy  $\pi_\theta$  starting from state  $s$ .

### 2.3 Distributional Reinforcement Learning

Instead of learning the value function, DRL focuses on learning the full distribution of the random variables  $Z_\theta^s$  and  $Z_\theta^{(s,a)}$  directly. To facilitate the analysis, we first define a pushforward operator on the measure space  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$  as follows:

**Definition 1.** *Given a measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$  and a measurable function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the pushforward measure  $f_{\#}\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$  is defined by  $f_{\#}\nu(A) = \nu(f^{-1}(A))$  for all Borel sets  $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ .*

This pushforward operator shifts the support of measure  $\nu$  according to the map  $f$ . Specifically, we focus on the bootstrap function  $b_{c,\gamma} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined as  $b_{c,\gamma}(z) = c + \gamma z$ .

Given a policy  $\pi_\theta$ , the distributional Bellman operator is defined as [38]:

$$(\mathcal{T}^\pi \eta)^{(s,a)} = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_\theta(a'|s') (b_{C(s,a),\gamma})_{\#} \eta^{(s',a')}, \quad \forall \eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \quad (5)$$

Intriguingly, analogous to the Bellman equation in classical RL, a distributional Bellman equation also exists in terms of the probability measure  $\eta_\theta$ . The next lemma is adapted from [38] and we present a proof in Appendix C.1 for completeness.

**Lemma 1** ([38], The Distributional Bellman Equation). *For each state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and action  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , let  $\eta_\theta^s$  and  $\eta_\theta^{(s,a)}$  be the probability measure of random variables  $Z_\theta^s$  and  $Z_\theta^{(s,a)}$ . Then we have*

$$\eta_\theta^{(s,a)} = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_\theta(a'|s') (b_{C(s,a),\gamma})_{\#} \eta_\theta^{(s',a')} = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) (b_{C(s,a),\gamma})_{\#} \eta_\theta^{s'}$$

**Proposition 1** ([7], Lemma 3, Contraction Property of  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$ ). *The distributional Bellman operator  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  defined in Eq. (5) is a  $\gamma$ -contraction mapping in the maximal form of the Wasserstein metric  $\bar{d}_p$  (see Definition 3 in Appendix A.2) for all  $p \geq 1$ . Furthermore, for any initial  $\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$ , we have  $(\mathcal{T}^\pi)^m \eta \rightarrow \eta_\theta$  in  $\bar{d}_p$ , as  $m \rightarrow +\infty$ .*

### 3 Policy Gradient Methods for Risk-Sensitive Distributional Reinforcement Learning

In this section, we present a general risk-sensitive distributional policy gradient framework in Algorithm 1 to solve the optimization problem (4):  $\min_\theta \rho(Z_\theta^s)$  for coherent risk measure  $\rho$ . Algorithm 1 consists of two steps: (i) **Distributional policy evaluation**, where we evaluate the probability measure  $\eta_\theta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$  of  $Z_\theta$  based on Proposition 1 given any policy  $\pi_\theta$  and (ii) **Distributional policy improvement**, where we compute the policy gradient  $\nabla_\theta \rho(Z_\theta^s)$  based on  $\eta_\theta^s$  and update the policy parameter using  $\theta_{t+1} := \theta_t - \delta \cdot \nabla_\theta \rho(Z_\theta^s)$  with  $\delta$  being the stepsize (learning rate). To

---

#### Algorithm 1 Distributional Policy Gradient Algorithm

---

**Require:** Initial Parameter  $\theta_0$ , Stepsize  $\delta$   
**for**  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$  **do**  
    **if**  $\|\nabla_\theta \rho(Z_{\theta_t}^s)\| < \epsilon$  **then**  
        **return**  $\theta_t$   
    **end if**  
    **while not converge do**  
         $\eta \leftarrow \mathcal{T}^{\theta_t} \eta$    # Distributional policy evaluation  
    **end while**  
     $\theta_{t+1} \leftarrow \theta_t - \delta \cdot \nabla_\theta \rho(Z_{\theta_t}^s)$    # Distributional policy improvement  
**end for**  
**return**  $\theta_T$

---

this end, we first present a distributional policy gradient theorem (Theorem 2) that provides the analytical form of  $\nabla_\theta \eta_\theta^s$  in Section 3.1, based on which we compute  $\nabla_\theta \rho(Z_\theta^s)$ . Then we prove the local convergence of the distributional policy gradient algorithm (Algorithm 1) in Section 3.2 under mild assumptions. In Section 3.3, we propose a categorical distributional policy gradient algorithm (CDPG, Algorithm 2) that uses a class of categorical distributions to approximate any distributions [7]. All the proofs are presented in Appendix C.

#### 3.1 Distributional Policy Gradient Theorem

We first use the distributional Bellman equation in Lemma 1 to derive  $\nabla_\theta \eta_\theta^s$  in the following theorem.

**Theorem 2** (Distributional Policy Gradient Theorem). *Let  $\eta_\theta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$  be the limiting distribution of the distributional Bellman operator  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  in Proposition 1. Let  $\tau_\theta$  be a trajectory starting from state  $s_0 = s$  and following policy  $\pi_\theta$  and  $\tau_\theta(s_0, s_t)$  be the  $t$ -step sub-trajectory of  $\tau_\theta$  from  $s_0$  to  $s_t$  for any*

$t \geq 1$ , respectively. Then we have

$$\nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta}^s = \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{\theta}} \left[ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\theta}(a|s) \cdot \eta_{\theta}^{(s,a)} + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}^{\tau_{\theta}(s_0, s_t)} \left( \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\theta}(a|s_t) \cdot \eta_{\theta}^{(s_t, a)} \right) \right] \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{B}^{\tau_{\theta}(s_0, s_t)}$  is the  $t$ -step pushforward operator defined by  $\mathcal{B}^{\tau_{\theta}(s_0, s_t)} = (b_{c_0, \gamma})_{\#} \dots (b_{c_{t-1}, \gamma})_{\#} = (b_{c_{t-1} + \gamma c_{t-2} + \dots + \gamma^{t-1} c_0, \gamma^t})_{\#}$  with  $\tau_{\theta}(s_0, s_t) = (s_0 = s, a_0, c_0, \dots, s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, c_{t-1}, s_t)$ .

Once we obtain  $\eta_{\theta}$  from the distributional policy evaluation step,  $\nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta}^s$  can be derived by applying the multi-step pushforward operators  $\mathcal{B}^{\tau_{\theta}(s_0, s_t)}$  on  $\eta_{\theta}^{(s_t, a)}$  following Theorem 2. Based on  $\nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta}^s$ , we calculate the gradient of the probability density function  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(x, \theta)$ , as shown in the next corollary.

**Corollary 1.** *If  $\nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta}^s$  is well-defined, then  $\nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta}^s \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$  is a signed measure with a total mass of 0, i.e.,  $\nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta}^s(\Omega) = 0$ . Furthermore, if  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} F_{Z^s}(x, \theta)$  and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(x, \theta)$  are continuous, then we have  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(x, \theta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta}^s((-\infty, x])$ .*

Theorem 2 and Corollary 1 are useful for computing  $\nabla_{\theta} \rho(Z_{\theta}^s)$  as we show in the next theorem.

**Theorem 3** (Gradient Formula for Static Coherent Risk Measure). *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, for any saddle point  $(\xi_{\theta}^*, \lambda_{\theta}^{*, \mathcal{P}}, \lambda_{\theta}^{*, \mathcal{E}}, \lambda_{\theta}^{*, \mathcal{I}})$  of the Lagrangian function (3), we have*

$$\nabla_{\theta} \rho(Z_{\theta}^s) = \int_{\Omega} \xi_{\theta}^*(\omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) (Z^s(\omega) - \lambda_{\theta}^{*, \mathcal{P}}) d\omega - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \lambda_{\theta}^{*, \mathcal{E}}(e) \nabla_{\theta} g_e(\xi_{\theta}^*; f_{Z_{\theta}^s}) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_{\theta}^{*, \mathcal{I}}(i) \nabla_{\theta} h_i(\xi_{\theta}^*; f_{Z_{\theta}^s}). \quad (7)$$

Note that Theorem 3 also holds for discrete random variables as shown in Theorem 4.2 in [48], where they use  $\nabla_{\theta} p_i^{\theta}$  (gradient of the point mass) instead of  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta)$ . We extend their proof to the continuous random variable case, which is presented in Appendix C.4. The following gives an example of computing the gradient of a static coherent risk measure using Theorems 2-3. We also present two other examples in Appendix A.1.

**Example 1** (CVaR). *Given a risk level  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , the CVaR of a random variable  $Z$  is defined as the  $\alpha$ -tail expectation, i.e.,  $\rho_{CVaR}(Z; \alpha) = \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \{t + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}[(Z - t)_+]\}$ . The risk envelope for CVaR is known to be  $\mathcal{U} = \{\xi : \xi(\omega) \in [0, \alpha^{-1}], \int_{\Omega} \xi(\omega) f_Z(\omega) d\omega = 1\}$  [40]. Furthermore, [40] showed that the saddle points of Lagrangian function (3) for CVaR satisfy  $\xi_{\theta}^*(\omega) = \alpha^{-1}$  when  $Z_{\theta}^s(\omega) > \lambda_{\theta}^{*, \mathcal{P}}$  and  $\xi_{\theta}^*(\omega) = 0$  when  $Z_{\theta}^s(\omega) < \lambda_{\theta}^{*, \mathcal{P}}$ , where  $\lambda_{\theta}^{*, \mathcal{P}} = q_{\alpha}$  is the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of  $Z_{\theta}^s$ . As a result, following Eq. (7), the gradient of CVaR can be written as*

$$\nabla_{\theta} \rho_{CVaR}(Z_{\theta}^s; \alpha) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) (Z^s(\omega) - q_{\alpha}) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{Z^s(\omega) > q_{\alpha}\}} d\omega \quad (8)$$

Using Algorithm 1, we first evaluate  $Z_{\theta}^s$  under any given policy  $\pi_{\theta}$ . Based on Theorem 2 and Corollary 1, we compute  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta)$  and plug it into Eq. (8) to get a closed form of  $\nabla_{\theta} \rho_{CVaR}(Z_{\theta}^s; \alpha)$ .

**Remark 1** (Comparison with Classical Policy Gradient Theorem). *Compared to the classical policy gradient theorem (Eq. (1)) with both sides being real numbers, our Theorem 2 extends it to a measure*



version, i.e., both sides of Eq. (6) are signed measures, which provide a richer set of information on the gradient. Once we get  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(x, \theta)$  from Corollary 1, it can be plugged into Eq. (7) to get the objective's gradient if we have an explicit form of the risk envelope and Lagrangian saddle points.

**Remark 2** (Comparison with Sample-based Policy Gradient Algorithms). In [48, 49], the authors proposed a sample-average estimator of  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(x, \theta)$  by assuming i.i.d. samples of  $Z_\theta^s$ . On the contrary, we obtain a closed form of  $Z_\theta^s$  and  $\eta_\theta^s$  by Proposition 1 and provide an analytical form of  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(x, \theta)$  based on Theorem 2 and Corollary 1. While we still need to use trajectories to estimate the expectation in Eq. (6), as demonstrated in Section 4, our method converges to a safe policy using much fewer samples and iterations, compared to the sample-based method in [48].

### 3.2 Convergence Guarantees of Distributional Policy Gradient Algorithms

Since Model (4) is a non-convex optimization problem, we aim to search for a *locally* optimal  $\theta$ . In the next theorem, we show that Algorithm 1 converges to a stationary point at rate  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}})$ , provided that the distributional policy evaluation step is exact. We list a set of necessary conditions in Assumption 3, together with the proof of Theorem 4 in Appendix C.5.

**Theorem 4** (Local Convergence Guarantee). *Under Assumptions 1-3, the objective function (4) is  $\beta$ -smooth. Furthermore, with exact distributional policy evaluation, if  $\{\theta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  is the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 with stepsize  $\delta = \frac{1}{\beta}$ , then we have  $\min_{t=0, \dots, T-1} \|\nabla_{\theta} \rho(Z_{\theta_t}^s)\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2\beta(\rho(Z_{\theta_0}^s) - \rho(Z_{\theta^*}^s))}}{\sqrt{T}}$ .*

**Remark 3.** *Note that the iteration complexity provided in Theorem 4 only works when we have exact distributional policy evaluation. However, if the policy evaluation step is subject to some error term, we may still be able to derive an iteration bound for Algorithm 1 based on the error bound of inexact policy evaluation, which we leave as future work.*

### 3.3 Categorical Distributional Policy Gradient Algorithm (CDPG)

From a computational viewpoint, representing a continuous probability distribution requires an infinite number of parameters, which is intractable. In this section, we propose an approximate algorithm based on a categorical representation of distributions [7, 38], named *CDPG*. Specifically, we approximate any probability distribution using the parametric family  $\mathcal{P}_N = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^\theta \delta_{z_i} \mid p_1^\theta, \dots, p_N^\theta \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^\theta = 1 \right\}$  with a set of equally-spaced supports  $C_{\min} = z_1 < \dots < z_N = C_{\max}$  over the interval  $[C_{\min}, C_{\max}]$ . Note that  $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^N$  are predefined and fixed and  $\{p_i^\theta\}_{i=1}^N$  are parametrized by the policy parameter  $\theta$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}_N$  is not closed under the distributional Bellman operator  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{T}^\pi \eta$  may not belong to  $\mathcal{P}_N$  for  $\eta \in \mathcal{P}_N$ , we introduce a projection operator  $\Pi_C : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_N$  defined as follows

$$\Pi_C(\delta_y) = \begin{cases} \delta_{z_1} & \text{if } y \leq z_1 \\ \frac{z_{i+1}-y}{z_{i+1}-z_i} \delta_{z_i} + \frac{y-z_i}{z_{i+1}-z_i} \delta_{z_{i+1}} & \text{if } z_i < y \leq z_{i+1} \\ \delta_{z_N} & \text{if } y > z_N \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

This projection operator can be extended to a mixture of Diracs, i.e.,  $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\sum_{i=1}^K p_i \delta_{y_i}) = \sum_{i=1}^K p_i \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\delta_{y_i})$ , as well as to the more general measure space  $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_N$ , where  $\mathcal{M}_N = \{\sum_{i=1}^N p_i^\theta \delta_{z_i}\}$  is the  $N$ -categorical measure space without the simplex requirements. The projected distributional Bellman operator  $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{T}^\pi$  is then defined as

$$(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{T}^\pi\eta)^{(s,a)} = \Pi_{\mathcal{C}} \left( \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) \sum_{a'} \pi(a'|s') (b_{\mathcal{C}(s,a),\gamma})_{\#} \eta^{(s',a')} \right), \quad \forall \eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \quad (10)$$

The categorical distributional policy evaluation step updates the probability measure  $\eta$  by applying the projected distributional Bellman operator iteratively:  $\eta \leftarrow \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{T}^\pi\eta$ , which will eventually converge to a limiting distribution (i.e., the fixed point of  $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{T}^\pi$ ) because of the following propositions.

**Proposition 2** ([38], Proposition 2). *The projected distributional Bellman operator  $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{T}^\pi$  defined in Eq. (10) is a contraction mapping in  $\bar{l}_2$ , where  $\bar{l}_2$  is the supremum-Cramér distance (see Definition 4 in Appendix A.3). Furthermore, there exists a unique distribution  $\eta_{\theta,N} \in \mathcal{P}_N^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$  such that for any initial distribution  $\eta_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$ , we have  $(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{T}^\pi)^m \eta_0 \rightarrow \eta_{\theta,N}$  in  $\bar{l}_2$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .*

**Proposition 3** (The Projected Distributional Bellman Equation). *For each state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and action  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , let  $\eta_{\theta,N}$  be the limiting distribution in Proposition 2, then we have*

$$\eta_{\theta,N}^{(s,a)} = \Pi_{\mathcal{C}} \left( \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_\theta(a'|s') (b_{\mathcal{C}(s,a),\gamma})_{\#} \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s',a')} \right) = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{\mathcal{C}(s,a),\gamma})_{\#} \eta_{\theta,N}^{s'}$$

We present the detailed steps of the categorical distributional policy evaluation in Algorithm 3, Appendix E. Having evaluated the probability measure  $\eta_{\theta,N}$  for any fixed policy  $\pi_\theta$ , the following theorem shows how to compute the gradient of  $\eta_{\theta,N}$  in a categorical setting:

**Theorem 5** (Projected Distributional Policy Gradient). *Let  $\eta_{\theta,N} \in \mathcal{P}_N^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$  be the limiting distribution of the projected distributional Bellman operator  $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{T}^\pi$  in Proposition 2. The gradient of such a  $N$ -categorical distribution can be computed by*

$$\nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta,N}^s = \mathbb{E}_{\tau_\theta} \left[ \sum_a \nabla_{\theta} \pi_\theta(a|s) \cdot \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s,a)} + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\tau_\theta(s_0, s_t)} \left( \sum_a \nabla_{\theta} \pi_\theta(a|s_t) \cdot \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s_t, a)} \right) \right] \quad (11)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\tau_\theta(s_0, s_t)}$  is the  $t$ -step projected pushforward operator defined by  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\tau_\theta(s_0, s_t)} = \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{c_0, \gamma})_{\#} \dots \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{c_{t-1}, \gamma})_{\#}$  with  $\tau_\theta(s_0, s_t) = (s_0 = s, a_0, c_0, \dots, s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, c_{t-1}, s_t)$ .

**Remark 4.** *In the categorical setting,  $\eta_{\theta,N}^s = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^\theta \delta_{z_i} \in \mathcal{P}_N$  and thus  $\nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta,N}^s = \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{\theta} p_i^\theta \delta_{z_i} \in \mathcal{M}_N$ . To obtain  $\nabla_{\theta} p_i^\theta$ , we first compute the right-hand side of Eq. (11) by applying the projected pushforward operator  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\tau_\theta(s_0, s_t)}$  on  $\eta_{\theta,N}$  and denote the resulting  $N$ -categorical measure as  $\sum_{i=1}^N q_i^\theta \delta_{z_i} \in \mathcal{M}_N$ . Then we match the point mass by setting  $\nabla_{\theta} p_i^\theta = q_i^\theta$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . These gradients  $\{\nabla_{\theta} p_i^\theta\}_{i=1}^N$  can be further plugged into Eq. (7) replacing  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta)$  to compute the gradient  $\nabla_{\theta} \rho(Z_\theta^s)$ . The detailed steps of this CDPG are presented in Algorithm 2.*

It is then natural to ask how this limiting distribution  $\eta_{\theta,N}$  differs from the true probability measure  $\eta_\theta$  if we do not use categorical representation. The next proposition measures the error bound between  $\eta_{\theta,N}$  and  $\eta_\theta$ , which is adapted from [38].

**Proposition 4** ([38], Proposition 3). *Let  $\eta_{\theta,N}$  and  $\eta_\theta$  be the limiting distribution of  $\Pi_C \mathcal{T}^\pi$  (in Proposition 2) and  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  (in Proposition 1), respectively. If  $\eta_\theta^{(s,a)}$  is supported on  $[z_1, z_N] = [C_{\min}, C_{\max}]$  for all  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , then we have  $\bar{l}_2^2(\eta_{\theta,N}, \eta_\theta) \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} (z_{i+1} - z_i)$ . Furthermore, when  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\eta_{\theta,N} \rightarrow \eta_\theta$  in  $\bar{l}_2$ .*

Proposition 4 implies that as the fineness of the grid  $z_1, \dots, z_N$  increases, we gradually recover the true cost distribution and obtain an exact distributional policy evaluation, which can again guarantee the convergence of CDPG (Algorithm 2) to locally optimal policies by Theorem 4.

## 4 Numerical Experiment

In this section, we test our CDPG (Algorithm 2) on a stochastic Cliffwalk environment under risk-averse/risk-neutral settings and compare CDPG with SPG (non-DRL and sample-based policy gradient) proposed in [48]. The experiments are conducted on a Macbook Air using Apple M2 chip.

**Experiment Setup.** Consider a stochastic  $3 \times 3$  Cliffwalk environment [46] in Figure 1(a), where an agent starts from the bottom left and aims to reach the bottom right. Each step incurs a cost of 10, while falling off the cliff results in a cost of 30 and forces a restart. Assume the state above the cliff is slippery, with a probability  $p = 0.2$  of falling off the cliff when entered. The discount factor is set to  $\gamma = 0.95$ . The shortest path is the red path in Figure 1(a), which takes a cost of 40 if not entering the cliff and incurs a higher cost otherwise; a safer path is the blue path, which induces a deterministic cost of 60. We present the detailed steps for computing the discounted average and CVaR costs in Appendix D. We adopt a softmax parameterization for the policy, i.e.,  $\pi_\theta(a|s) = \frac{\exp(\theta_{a,s})}{\sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}(s)} \exp(\theta_{a',s})}$ , and focus on the CVaR objective, where a smaller  $\alpha$  represents a more risk-averse attitude.




Figure 1: Comparison between risk-averse and risk-neutral policies. Figure (a) describes environment settings, Figure (b) displays cost distribution, and Figures (c) and (d) show the average test cost and number of fails with respect to the number of iterations.

**Result Comparison between Risk-Averse and Risk-Neutral Settings.** We first compare the performance under risk-averse ( $\alpha = 0.1$ ) and risk-neutral ( $\alpha = 1$ ) settings. Since each problem is a non-convex optimization model, we start from the *same* set of initial policy parameters  $\theta$  with the *same* learning rate  $\delta = 0.3$  and evaluate the test cost on the best initial  $\theta$  for each model. We perform the task over 10 independent simulation runs and report the cost distribution, average episodic test costs, and numbers of fails (falling off the cliff) for each setting in Figures 1(b),(c),(d), respectively, where in these figures, colored curves represent the mean and colored shades represent the standard deviation over the 10 independent runs. As shown in Figure 1(b), the cost distribution for the risk-neutral policy exhibits a long right tail (with maximum cost being over 100), showing a high risk and variance. From Figures 1(c) and (d), the risk-averse model converges to the safe path with a steady cost of 60 and 0 fail within 20 iterations, while the risk-neutral model converges to the shortest path with a lower cost mean but higher variance as well as a higher number of fails. These results illustrate the importance of considering a risk-averse setting to reduce variance and improve safety.




Figure 2: Comparison between CDPG and SPG [48] algorithms. Figure (a) shows the divergence to safe path with different sample sizes after 100 iterations. Figure (b) shows the divergence to safe path w.r.t. iterations. Figures (c) and (d) show the average test cost and number of fails w.r.t. iterations.

**Result Comparison between CDPG (Algorithm 2) and SPG.** We fix  $\alpha = 0.1$  and compare our CDPG (Algorithm 2) with SPG proposed in [48] while using the same initial  $\theta$  and learning rate. All gradients are normalized to ensure the same length (the only difference lies in the direction). In Figure 2(a), we vary the sample size from 100 to 5000 and report the divergence to the safe path after 100 training iterations. From the figure, our CDPG converges to a close-to-optimal policy even with a small sample size, whereas the SPG requires a significantly larger sample size for similar performance. Then we fix the sample size at 100 and report the divergence to safe path, average test cost, and number of fails with respect to the iteration number in Figures 2(b), (c), (d), respectively. From these figures, using the same sample size, our CDPG also converges to a safe policy faster than SPG and results in fewer failures during learning.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we developed a new policy gradient method for risk-sensitive MDPs using a distributional perspective, which can be applied to a broad class of coherent risk measures. Specifically, we first used distributional policy evaluation to estimate the full distribution of the cumulative cost function. With the aid of an analytical form of the probability measure’s gradient, we computed the policy gradients and proposed a distributional policy gradient algorithm with local convergence guarantees. For practical use, we also used a categorical distribution to approximate any continuous distribution and proposed a categorical distributional policy gradient algorithm (CDPG). Our numerical experiments on a stochastic Cliffwalk environment illustrated the importance of considering risk aversion and the effectiveness of our approach compared to a non-DRL sample-based counterpart.

**Limitations and Future Work.** There are several limitations in the current work, which lead to possible future directions. First, the current framework only applies to coherent risk measures with explicit forms of risk envelope and Lagrangian saddle points. One possible direction is to consider more general risk measures that do not satisfy these nice properties. Second, we used a categorical representation of distributions, while several other parametric families (e.g., quantile, Gaussian representations) are also worth investigating.

## References

- [1] Joshua Achiam, David Held, Aviv Tamar, and Pieter Abbeel. Constrained policy optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 22–31. PMLR, 2017.
- [2] Alekh Agarwal, Sham M Kakade, Jason D Lee, and Gaurav Mahajan. On the theory of policy gradient methods: Optimality, approximation, and distribution shift. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(98):1–76, 2021.
- [3] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, and David Heath. Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance*, 9(3):203–228, 1999.
- [4] Gabriel Barth-Maron, Matthew W Hoffman, David Budden, Will Dabney, Dan Horgan, Dhruva Tb, Alistair Muldal, Nicolas Heess, and Timothy Lillicrap. Distributed distributional deterministic policy gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.08617*, 2018.
- [5] Nicole Bäuerle and Jonathan Ott. Markov decision processes with average-Value-at-Risk criteria. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 74:361–379, 2011.
- [6] Amir Beck. *First-order methods in optimization*. SIAM, 2017.
- [7] Marc G Bellemare, Will Dabney, and Rémi Munos. A distributional perspective on reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 449–458. PMLR, 2017.

- [8] Marc G Bellemare, Will Dabney, and Mark Rowland. *Distributional reinforcement learning*. MIT Press, 2023.
- [9] Jalaj Bhandari and Daniel Russo. Global optimality guarantees for policy gradient methods. *Operations Research*, 2024.
- [10] Shicong Cen, Yuejie Chi, S Du, and Lin Xiao. Faster last-iterate convergence of policy optimization in zero-sum markov games. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- [11] Yin-Lam Chow and Marco Pavone. Stochastic optimal control with dynamic, time-consistent risk constraints. In *2013 American Control Conference*, pages 390–395. IEEE, 2013.
- [12] Yinlam Chow and Mohammad Ghavamzadeh. Algorithms for CVaR optimization in MDPs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 27, 2014.
- [13] Yinlam Chow, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, Lucas Janson, and Marco Pavone. Risk-constrained reinforcement learning with percentile risk criteria. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(167):1–51, 2018.
- [14] Yinlam Chow, Ofir Nachum, Edgar Duenez-Guzman, and Mohammad Ghavamzadeh. A lyapunov-based approach to safe reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [15] Yinlam Chow, Aviv Tamar, Shie Mannor, and Marco Pavone. Risk-sensitive and robust decision-making: a CVaR optimization approach. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.
- [16] Stefano P Coraluppi and Steven I Marcus. Mixed risk-neutral/minimax control of discrete-time, finite-state Markov decision processes. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 45(3):528–532, 2000.
- [17] Will Dabney, Georg Ostrovski, David Silver, and Rémi Munos. Implicit quantile networks for distributional reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1096–1105. PMLR, 2018.
- [18] Will Dabney, Mark Rowland, Marc Bellemare, and Rémi Munos. Distributional reinforcement learning with quantile regression. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- [19] Dongsheng Ding, Kaiqing Zhang, Tamer Basar, and Mihailo Jovanovic. Natural policy gradient primal-dual method for constrained Markov decision processes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:8378–8390, 2020.

- [20] Yingjie Fei, Zhuoran Yang, Yudong Chen, Zhaoran Wang, and Qiaomin Xie. Risk-sensitive reinforcement learning: Near-optimal risk-sample tradeoff in regret. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:22384–22395, 2020.
- [21] Gerald B Folland. *Real analysis: modern techniques and their applications*, volume 40. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [22] Hado Hasselt. Double Q-learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 23, 2010.
- [23] Matthias Heger. Consideration of risk in reinforcement learning. In *Machine Learning Proceedings 1994*, pages 105–111. Elsevier, 1994.
- [24] Audrey Huang, Liu Leqi, Zachary C Lipton, and Kamyar Azizzadenesheli. On the convergence and optimality of policy gradient for Markov coherent risk. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.02827*, 2021.
- [25] Ramtin Keramati, Christoph Dann, Alex Tamkin, and Emma Brunskill. Being optimistic to be conservative: Quickly learning a CVaR policy. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 4436–4443, 2020.
- [26] Vijay Konda and John Tsitsiklis. Actor-critic algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 12, 1999.
- [27] Umit Köse and Andrzej Ruszczyński. Risk-averse learning by temporal difference methods with Markov risk measures. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(38):1–34, 2021.
- [28] Navdeep Kumar, Esther Derman, Matthieu Geist, Kfir Y Levy, and Shie Mannor. Policy gradient for rectangular robust Markov decision processes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [29] Prashanth La and Mohammad Ghavamzadeh. Actor-critic algorithms for risk-sensitive MDPs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 26, 2013.
- [30] Timothy P Lillicrap, Jonathan J Hunt, Alexander Pritzel, Nicolas Heess, Tom Erez, Yuval Tassa, David Silver, and Daan Wierstra. Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971*, 2015.
- [31] Shiau Hong Lim and Ilyas Malik. Distributional reinforcement learning for risk-sensitive policies. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30977–30989, 2022.
- [32] David G Luenberger. *Optimization by Vector Space Methods*. John Wiley & Sons, 1997.
- [33] Xiaoteng Ma, Li Xia, Zhengyuan Zhou, Jun Yang, and Qianchuan Zhao. Dsac: Distributional soft actor critic for risk-sensitive reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14547*, 2020.

- [34] Jincheng Mei, Chenjun Xiao, Csaba Szepesvari, and Dale Schuurmans. On the global convergence rates of softmax policy gradient methods. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6820–6829. PMLR, 2020.
- [35] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, et al. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- [36] Tetsuro Morimura, Masashi Sugiyama, Hisashi Kashima, Hirotaka Hachiya, and Toshiyuki Tanaka. Nonparametric return distribution approximation for reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-10)*, pages 799–806, 2010.
- [37] Noah Patton, Jihwan Jeong, Mike Gimelfarb, and Scott Sanner. A distributional framework for risk-sensitive end-to-end planning in continuous MDPs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 9894–9901, 2022.
- [38] Mark Rowland, Marc Bellemare, Will Dabney, Rémi Munos, and Yee Whye Teh. An analysis of categorical distributional reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 29–37. PMLR, 2018.
- [39] Andrzej Ruszczyński. Risk-averse dynamic programming for Markov decision processes. *Mathematical Programming*, 125:235–261, 2010.
- [40] Alexander Shapiro, Darinka Dentcheva, and Andrzej Ruszczyński. *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory*. SIAM, 2009.
- [41] David Silver, Guy Lever, Nicolas Heess, Thomas Degris, Daan Wierstra, and Martin Riedmiller. Deterministic policy gradient algorithms. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 387–395. PMLR, 2014.
- [42] Rahul Singh, Keuntaek Lee, and Yongxin Chen. Sample-based distributional policy gradient. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, pages 676–688. PMLR, 2022.
- [43] Rahul Singh, Qinsheng Zhang, and Yongxin Chen. Improving robustness via risk averse distributional reinforcement learning. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 958–968. PMLR, 2020.
- [44] Sumeet Singh, Yinlam Chow, Anirudha Majumdar, and Marco Pavone. A framework for time-consistent, risk-sensitive model predictive control: Theory and algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 64(7):2905–2912, 2018.
- [45] Adam Stooke, Joshua Achiam, and Pieter Abbeel. Responsive safety in reinforcement learning by pid lagrangian methods. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9133–9143. PMLR, 2020.



- [46] Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [47] 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.
- [48] Aviv Tamar, Yinlam Chow, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, and Shie Mannor. Policy gradient for coherent risk measures. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.
- [49] Aviv Tamar, Yonatan Glassner, and Shie Mannor. Optimizing the CVaR via sampling. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 29, 2015.
- [50] Yichuan Charlie Tang, Jian Zhang, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Worst cases policy gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03618*, 2019.
- [51] Hado Van Hasselt, Arthur Guez, and David Silver. Deep reinforcement learning with double Q-learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 30, 2016.
- [52] Christopher JCH Watkins and Peter Dayan. Q-learning. *Machine Learning*, 8:279–292, 1992.
- [53] Ronald J Williams. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine Learning*, 8:229–256, 1992.
- [54] Xian Yu and Siqian Shen. Risk-averse reinforcement learning via dynamic time-consistent risk measures. In *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 2307–2312. IEEE, 2022.
- [55] Xian Yu and Lei Ying. On the global convergence of risk-averse policy gradient methods with expected conditional risk measures. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 40425–40451. PMLR, 2023.
- [56] Runyu Zhang, Yang Hu, and Na Li. Regularized robust MDPs and risk-sensitive MDPs: Equivalence, policy gradient, and sample complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11626*, 2023.

# Appendix

The appendix is organized as follows.

- Appendix A: Omitted Definitions.
- Appendix B: Useful Properties of the Operators.
- Appendix C: Omitted Proofs.
- Appendix D: Numerical Experiment Details.
- Appendix E: Categorical Distributional Policy Gradient Algorithm.

## A Omitted Definitions

In this appendix, we provide detailed information on omitted definitions used in this paper. In Sections A.1-A.3, we provide definitions of coherent risk measures, Wasserstein and Cramer Distance, respectively. In Sections A.4, we explain the divergence used in our numerical experiment (Section 4).

### A.1 Coherent Risk Measures

**Definition 2.** *A risk measure is called coherent if it satisfies the following properties for all  $X, Y \in \mathcal{Z}$  [3]:*

- **Convexity:**  $\forall \lambda \in [0, 1], \rho(\lambda X + (1 - \lambda)Y) \leq \lambda\rho(X) + (1 - \lambda)\rho(Y)$ ;
- **Monotonicity:** *if  $X \preceq Y$ , then  $\rho(X) \leq \rho(Y)$ ;*
- **Translation invariance:**  $\forall a \in \mathbb{R}, \rho(X + a) = \rho(X) + a$ ;
- **Positive homogeneity:** *if  $\lambda \geq 0$ , then  $\rho(\lambda X) = \lambda\rho(X)$ .*

**Example 2** ([48], Expectation). *The gradient of the expectation of random variable  $Z_\theta$  under policy  $\pi$  with the probability measure  $\eta_\theta$  is given by*

$$\nabla_\theta \mathbb{E}[Z_\theta] = \mathbb{E}[\nabla_\theta \log f_Z(\omega, \theta) Z]$$

Next, we introduce two coherent risk measures with explicit gradient formulas.

**Example 3** ([48], Mean-Semideviation). *The mean-semideviation of the cost random variable  $Z_\theta$  with probability measure  $\eta_\theta$  at risk level  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  is defined by*

$$\rho_{MSD}(Z_\theta; \alpha) = \mathbb{E}[Z_\theta] + \alpha \left( \mathbb{E}[(Z_\theta - \mathbb{E}[Z_\theta])_+]^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

*Then the gradient  $\nabla_\theta \rho_{MSD}(Z_\theta; \alpha)$  is given by*

$$\nabla_\theta \rho_{MSD}(Z_\theta; \alpha) = \nabla_\theta \mathbb{E}[Z_\theta] + \frac{\alpha \mathbb{E}[(Z - \mathbb{E}[Z])_+ (\nabla_\theta \log f_Z(\omega, \theta) (Z - \mathbb{E}[Z]) - \nabla_\theta \mathbb{E}[Z])]}{\text{SD}(Z)}$$

## A.2 Wasserstein Metric

**Definition 3.** The  $p$ -Wasserstein distance  $d_p$  is defined as

$$d_p(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \left( \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda(\nu_1, \nu_2)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x - y|^p \lambda(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p}$$

for all  $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ , where  $\Lambda(\nu_1, \nu_2)$  is the set of probability distributions on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with marginals  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_2$ . The supremum- $p$ -Wasserstein metric  $\bar{d}_p$  is defined on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$  by

$$\bar{d}_p(\eta, \nu) = \sup_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} d_p\left(\eta^{(s,a)}, \nu^{(s,a)}\right),$$

for all  $\eta, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$ .

## A.3 Cramér Distance

**Definition 4.** The Cramér distance  $l_2$  between two distributions  $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ , with cumulative distribution functions  $F_{\nu_1}$  and  $F_{\nu_2}$  respectively, is defined by:

$$l_2(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} (F_{\nu_1}(x) - F_{\nu_2}(x))^2 dx \right)^{1/2}.$$

Furthermore, the supremum-Cramér metric  $\bar{l}_2$  is defined between two distribution functions  $\eta, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$  by

$$\bar{l}_2(\eta, \mu) = \sup_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} l_2(\eta(s,a), \mu(s,a)).$$

## A.4 Divergence in Numerical Experiments (Section 4)

Given a target state trajectory  $s = (s_0, \dots, s_T)$ , the divergence between two policies  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{D}(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left| \pi_1(a|s_t) - \pi_2(a|s_t) \right|^2}$$

For instance,  $\pi^*$  is a specific target policy (e.g., safe path in Figure 1(a)), then  $\mathcal{D}(\pi^*, \pi)$  measures the distance from policy  $\pi$  to the target policy  $\pi^*$ .

## B Useful Properties of the Operators

In this appendix, we present some useful properties of the pushforward and projection operators. We first provide the following properties of the pushforward operator  $(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}$ :

**Proposition 5.** The pushforward operator  $(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}$  has the following properties:

- $\nabla_{\theta}(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}\eta_{\theta}^s = (b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}\nabla_{\theta}\eta_{\theta}^s$  for all  $\eta_{\theta}^s \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ ;
- $(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}(\sum_s p_s \eta^s) = \sum_s p_s (b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}\eta^s$  for all  $\eta^s \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $p_s \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Given any set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ , by Definition 1, we have

$$(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}\nabla_{\theta}\eta_{\theta}^s(A) = \nabla_{\theta}\eta_{\theta}^s[(b_{c,\gamma})^{-1}(A)].$$

Similarly, we have

$$\nabla_{\theta}(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}\eta_{\theta}^s(A) = \nabla_{\theta}(\eta_{\theta}^s[(b_{c,\gamma})^{-1}(A)]).$$

Hence, we have  $\nabla_{\theta}(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}\eta_{\theta}^s = (b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}\nabla_{\theta}\eta_{\theta}^s$ . Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}(\sum_s p_s \eta^s)(A) &= \left( \sum_s p_s \eta^s \right) [(b_{c,\gamma})^{-1}(A)] \\ &= \sum_s p_s \eta^s [(b_{c,\gamma})^{-1}(A)] = \sum_s p_s (b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}\eta^s(A) \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

We then provide the following properties of the projection operator  $\Pi_C$ :

**Proposition 6.** *The projected operator  $\Pi_C$  has the following properties:*

- $\nabla_{\theta}\Pi_C\eta_{\theta}^s = \Pi_C\nabla_{\theta}\eta_{\theta}^s$  for all  $\eta_{\theta}^s \in \mathcal{P}_N$ ;
- $\Pi_C(\sum_s p_s \eta^s) = \sum_s p_s \Pi_C\eta^s$  for all  $\eta^s \in \mathcal{P}_N$ .

*Proof.* Assume  $\eta_{\theta}^s = \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^{\theta} \delta_{y_i}$ . Since  $\Pi_C(\sum_{i=1}^N P_i^{\theta} \delta_{y_i}) = \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^{\theta} \Pi_C(\delta_{y_i})$ , we have

$$\Pi_C\nabla_{\theta}\eta_{\theta}^s = \Pi_C\left\{ \nabla_{\theta}\left( \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^{\theta} \delta_{y_i} \right) \right\} = \Pi_C\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{\theta} P_i^{\theta} \delta_{y_i} \right\} = \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{\theta} P_i^{\theta} \Pi_C(\delta_{y_i})$$

and

$$\nabla_{\theta}\Pi_C\eta_{\theta}^s = \nabla_{\theta}\Pi_C\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^{\theta} \delta_{y_i} \right\} = \nabla_{\theta}\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^{\theta} \Pi_C(\delta_{y_i}) \right\} = \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{\theta} P_i^{\theta} \Pi_C(\delta_{y_i})$$

Similarly, let  $\eta^s = \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^s \delta_{y_i}$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_C(\sum_s p_s \eta^s) &= \Pi_C\left( \sum_s p_s \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^s \delta_{y_i} \right) = \sum_s p_s \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^s \Pi_C(\delta_{y_i}) \\ &= \sum_s p_s \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^s \Pi_C(\delta_{y_i}) = \sum_s p_s \Pi_C\eta^s \end{aligned}$$

□

Combining Propositions 5 and 6, we get the following properties of projected pushforward operator  $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}$ :

**Proposition 7.** *The projected pushforward operator  $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}$  has the following properties:*

- $\nabla_{\theta}\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}\eta_{\theta}^s = \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}\nabla_{\theta}\eta_{\theta}^s$  for all  $\eta_{\theta}^s \in \mathcal{P}_N$ ;
- $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}(\sum_s p_s \eta^s) = \sum_s p_s \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{c,\gamma})_{\#}\eta^s$  for all  $\eta^s \in \mathcal{P}_N$ .

## C Omitted Proofs

In this appendix, we present all the omitted proofs.

### C.1 Proof of Lemma 1

*Proof of Lemma 1.* Given a deterministic cost function  $C(s, a)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\theta}^{(s,a)} &\stackrel{(i)}{=} (\mathcal{T}^{\pi}\eta_{\theta})^{(s,a)} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta}(a'|s') (b_{C(s,a),\gamma})_{\#}\eta_{\theta}^{(s',a')} \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{=} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) (b_{C(s,a),\gamma})_{\#}\eta_{\theta}^{s'} \end{aligned}$$

where (i) is the distributional Bellman equation from [38], (ii) is based on Eq. (5) and (iii) uses  $\eta_{\theta}^s = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta}(a|s) \eta_{\theta}^{(s,a)}$  and Proposition 5.  $\square$

### C.2 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Denote  $g(s) = \sum_a \nabla_{\theta}\pi(a|s) \cdot \eta_{\theta}^{(s,a)}$  for notation simplicity and set  $s_0 = s$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta}\eta_{\theta}^{s_0} &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \nabla_{\theta} \left[ \sum_{a_0} \pi(a_0|s_0) \cdot \eta_{\theta}^{(s_0,a_0)} \right] = \sum_{a_0} \left[ \nabla_{\theta}\pi(a_0|s_0) \cdot \eta_{\theta}^{(s_0,a_0)} + \pi(a_0|s_0) \cdot \nabla_{\theta}\eta_{\theta}^{(s_0,a_0)} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \sum_{a_0} \left[ \nabla_{\theta}\pi(a_0|s_0) \cdot \eta_{\theta}^{(s_0,a_0)} + \pi(a_0|s_0) \cdot \nabla_{\theta} \left( \sum_{s_1} P(s_1|s_0, a_0) (b_{C(s_0,a_0),\gamma})_{\#}\eta_{\theta}^{s_1} \right) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{=} g(s_0) + \sum_{a_0} \pi(a_0|s_0) \sum_{s_1} P(s_1|s_0, a_0) (b_{C(s_0,a_0),\gamma})_{\#}\nabla_{\theta}\eta_{\theta}^{s_1} \\ &\stackrel{(iv)}{=} g(s_0) + \sum_{a_0} \pi(a_0|s_0) \sum_{s_1} P(s_1|s_0, a_0) (b_{C(s_0,a_0),\gamma})_{\#}g(s_1) \\ &\quad + \sum_{a_0} \pi(a_0|s_0) \sum_{s_1} P(s_1|s_0, a_0) \sum_{a_1} \pi(a_1|s_1) \sum_{s_2} P(s_2|s_1, a_1) \left[ (b_{C(s_0,a_0),\gamma})_{\#}(b_{C(s_1,a_1),\gamma})_{\#} \right] g(s_2) \\ &\quad + \dots \end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(v)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_\theta} \left[ \sum_a \nabla_\theta \pi(a|s_0) \cdot \eta_\theta^{(s_0, a)} + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}^{\tau_\theta(s_0, s_t)} \left( \sum_a \nabla_\theta \pi(a|s_t) \cdot \eta_\theta^{(s_t, a)} \right) \right],$$

where (i) follows because  $\eta_\theta^{s_0}$  is a mixture of probabilities, (ii) utilizes the distributional Bellman equation (Lemma 1), (iii) holds because of Proposition 5, and (iv) results from an iterative expansion of  $\nabla_\theta \eta_\theta^s$  with Proposition 5 and (v) holds because each trajectory  $\tau_\theta = (s_0, a_0, c_0, s_1, a_1, c_1, \dots)$  has a probability of  $\pi(a_0|s_0)P(s_1|s_0, a_0)\pi(a_1|s_1)P(s_2|s_1, a_1) \dots$ . Furthermore, for any two pushforward operators and any measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (b_{c_0, \gamma})_\# (b_{c_1, \gamma})_\# \nu(A) &= (b_{c_0, \gamma})_\# \nu(b_{c_1, \gamma}^{-1}(A)) = \nu(b_{c_0, \gamma}^{-1}(b_{c_1, \gamma}^{-1}(A))) \\ &= \nu((b_{c_1, \gamma} b_{c_0, \gamma})^{-1}(A)) = (b_{c_1, \gamma} b_{c_0, \gamma})_\# \nu(A) = (b_{c_1 + \gamma c_0, \gamma^2})_\# \nu(A), \quad \forall A \subset \mathbb{R} \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $(b_{c_0, \gamma})_\# (b_{c_1, \gamma})_\# = (b_{c_1 + \gamma c_0, \gamma^2})_\#$ , and the multi-step pushforward operator can be combined as  $\mathcal{B}^{\tau_\theta(s_0, s_t)} = (b_{c_0, \gamma})_\# \dots (b_{c_{t-1}, \gamma})_\# = (b_{c_{t-1} + \gamma c_{t-2} + \dots + \gamma^{t-1} c_0, \gamma^t})_\#$ .  $\square$

### C.3 Proof of Corollary 1

*Proof of Corollary 1.* We first show that  $\nabla_\theta \eta_\theta^s = \lim_{\theta_1 \rightarrow \theta_2} \frac{\eta_{\theta_1}^s - \eta_{\theta_2}^s}{\theta_1 - \theta_2}$  is a signed measure, if it exists. First of all,

$$\nabla_\theta \eta_\theta^s(\emptyset) = \lim_{\theta_1 \rightarrow \theta_2} \frac{\eta_{\theta_1}^s - \eta_{\theta_2}^s}{\theta_1 - \theta_2}(\emptyset) = \lim_{\theta_1 \rightarrow \theta_2} \frac{\eta_{\theta_1}^s(\emptyset) - \eta_{\theta_2}^s(\emptyset)}{\theta_1 - \theta_2} = 0$$

Next, we show that it is  $\sigma$ -additive:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\theta \eta_\theta^s(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) &= \lim_{\theta_1 \rightarrow \theta_2} \frac{\eta_{\theta_1}^s - \eta_{\theta_2}^s}{\theta_1 - \theta_2}(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) = \lim_{\theta_1 \rightarrow \theta_2} \frac{\eta_{\theta_1}^s(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) - \eta_{\theta_2}^s(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n)}{\theta_1 - \theta_2} \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \lim_{\theta_1 \rightarrow \theta_2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\eta_{\theta_1}^s(A_n) - \eta_{\theta_2}^s(A_n)}{\theta_1 - \theta_2} \stackrel{(ii)}{=} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lim_{\theta_1 \rightarrow \theta_2} \frac{\eta_{\theta_1}^s(A_n) - \eta_{\theta_2}^s(A_n)}{\theta_1 - \theta_2} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \nabla_\theta \eta_\theta^s(A_n) \end{aligned}$$

where (i) is due to the  $\sigma$ -additivity of  $\eta_{\theta_1}^s$  and  $\eta_{\theta_2}^s$  and (ii) is because  $\frac{\eta_{\theta_1}^s(A_n) - \eta_{\theta_2}^s(A_n)}{\theta_1 - \theta_2}$  is bounded. As a result,  $\nabla_\theta \eta_\theta^s$  is a measure (because it satisfies two measure properties) and a signed measure (it can take values from the real line instead of  $[0, 1]$ ). Furthermore, since  $\eta_\theta^s(\Omega) = 1$ , we have  $\nabla_\theta \eta_\theta^s(\Omega) = 0$ , i.e.,  $\nabla_\theta \eta_\theta^s$  has a total mass of 0.

From the definition of probability measure  $\eta_\theta^s$ , we have  $\eta_\theta^s((-\infty, x]) = \mathbb{P}\{\omega \in \Omega : Z_\theta^s(\omega) \in (-\infty, x]\} = F_{Z^s}(x, \theta)$ . Taking derivative with respect to  $\theta$  on both sides, we have

$$\nabla_\theta \eta_\theta^s((-\infty, x]) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} F_{Z^s}(x, \theta) \tag{12}$$

Now taking the derivative with respect to  $x$  again, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta}^s((-\infty, x]) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} F_{Z^s}(x, \theta)$$

Since  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} F_{Z^s}(x, \theta)$  and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(x, \theta)$  are continuous, we can switch the order of partial derivatives and get

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta}^s((-\infty, x]) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} F_{Z^s}(x, \theta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} F_{Z^s}(x, \theta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(x, \theta).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

#### C.4 Proof of Theorem 3

**Assumption 2** (The General Form of Risk Envelopes). *For any given policy parameter  $\theta \in \Theta$ , the risk envelope  $\mathcal{U}$  of a coherent risk measure can be written as*

$$\mathcal{U} = \left\{ \xi \succeq 0 : g_e(\xi, f_{Z_{\theta}}) = 0, \forall e \in \mathcal{E}, h_i(\xi, f_{Z_{\theta}}) \leq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \int_{\omega \in \Omega} \xi(\omega) f_Z(\omega, \theta) d\omega = 1 \right\}$$

where each constraint  $g_e(\xi, f_{Z_{\theta}})$  is an affine function in  $\xi$ , each constraint  $h_i(\xi, f_{Z_{\theta}})$  is a convex function in  $\xi$ , and there exists a strictly feasible point  $\bar{\xi}$ .  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{I}$  here denote the sets of equality and inequality constraints, respectively. Furthermore, for any given  $\xi \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $h_i(\xi, f_{Z_{\theta}})$  and  $g_e(\xi, f_{Z_{\theta}})$  are twice differentiable in  $f_{Z_{\theta}}$ , and there exists a  $M > 0$  such that for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we have

$$\max \left\{ \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left| \frac{\partial h_i(\xi, f_{Z_{\theta}})}{\partial f_Z(\omega, \theta)} \right|, \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \left| \frac{\partial g_e(\xi, f_{Z_{\theta}})}{\partial f_Z(\omega, \theta)} \right| \right\} \leq M.$$

**Theorem 6** (Differentiation in Measure Theory [21]). *Let  $\Theta$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $\Omega$  be a measure space. Suppose  $f : \Theta \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies the following conditions:*

- (i)  $f(\theta, \omega)$  is a Lebesgue-integrable function of  $\omega$  for each  $\theta \in \Theta$ .
- (ii) For almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the derivative  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f(\theta, \omega)$  exists for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ .
- (iii) There is an integrable function  $\Gamma : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $|\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f(\theta, \omega)| \leq \Gamma(\omega)$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ .

Then for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $\frac{d}{d\theta} \int_{\Omega} f(\theta, \omega) d\omega = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f(\theta, \omega) d\omega$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.* For continuous random variable  $Z_{\theta}$ , the Lagrangian function of problem (2) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\theta}(\xi, \lambda^{\mathcal{P}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{E}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{I}}) &= \int_{\Omega} \xi(\omega) f_Z(\omega, \theta) Z(\omega) d\omega - \lambda^{\mathcal{P}} \left( \int_{\Omega} \xi(\omega) f_Z(\omega, \theta) d\omega - 1 \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \lambda^{\mathcal{E}}(e) g_e(\xi, f_{Z_{\theta}}) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda^{\mathcal{I}}(i) h_i(\xi, f_{Z_{\theta}}), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

which is concave in  $\xi$  and convex in  $(\lambda^{\mathcal{P}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{E}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{I}})$ . By Assumption 2 and Theorem 1 in Section 8.6, Page 224 in [32], strong duality holds, i.e.,  $\rho(Z_\theta) = \max_{\xi \geq 0} \min_{\lambda^{\mathcal{P}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{E}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{I}} \geq 0} \mathcal{L}_\theta(\xi, \lambda^{\mathcal{P}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{E}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{I}}) = \min_{\lambda^{\mathcal{P}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{E}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{I}} \geq 0} \max_{\xi \geq 0} \mathcal{L}_\theta(\xi, \lambda^{\mathcal{P}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{E}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{I}})$ . By Assumption 1, for almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the gradient of the probability density function  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_Z(\omega, \theta)$  exists and is bounded by a constant for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Since  $\Omega$  is a compact set with finite Lebesgue measure,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_Z(\omega, \theta)$  is also bounded by an integrable function. Then by Theorem 6, it is guaranteed that  $\nabla_\theta \int_\Omega f_Z(\omega, \theta) d\omega = \int_\Omega \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_Z(\omega, \theta) d\omega$ . Hence, by taking derivative with respect to  $\theta$  on the both sides of Eq. (13) at any saddle point  $(\xi_\theta^*, \lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{P}}, \lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{E}}, \lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{I}})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_\theta(\xi, \lambda^{\mathcal{P}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{E}}, \lambda^{\mathcal{I}}) \Big|_{(\xi_\theta^*, \lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{P}}, \lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{E}}, \lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{I}})} &= \int_\Omega \xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_Z(\omega, \theta) (Z(\omega) - \lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{P}}) d\omega \\ &\quad - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{E}}(e) \nabla_\theta g_e(\xi_\theta^*, f_{Z_\theta}) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{I}}(i) \nabla_\theta h_i(\xi_\theta^*, f_{Z_\theta}) \end{aligned}$$

The rest follows the same procedure in the proof of Theorem 4.2 in [48].  $\square$

## C.5 Proof of Theorem 4

**Assumption 3.** *Given any static coherent risk measure that satisfies Assumption 2, assume for almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the second-order partial derivative of  $f_Z(\omega, \theta)$  exists and is bounded, i.e.,  $\|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} f_Z(\omega, \theta)\|_\infty \leq C_2$ . Additionally, assume the first-order derivatives of Lagrangian multipliers exist and are bounded for almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$  and the first- and second-order derivatives of the constraint functions exist and are bounded, i.e.,:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi_\theta^*(\omega)\|_\infty &\leq C_3, \quad \|\nabla_\theta \xi_\theta^*(\omega)\|_\infty \leq C_4, \quad \text{for almost all } \omega \in \Omega, \\ \|\lambda_\theta^{*i}\|_\infty &\leq C_5, \quad \|\nabla_\theta \lambda_\theta^{*i}\|_\infty \leq C_6, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{P}, \\ \|\nabla_\theta g_e(\xi; f_Z)\|_\infty &\leq C_7, \quad \|\nabla_\theta^2 g_e(\xi; f_Z)\|_\infty \leq C_8, \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}, \\ \|\nabla_\theta h_i(\xi; f_Z)\|_\infty &\leq C_7, \quad \|\nabla_\theta^2 h_i(\xi; f_Z)\|_\infty \leq C_8, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 5.** *Assumption 3 is commonly seen in the literature to provide smoothness guarantees, see, e.g., in [24, 47]. We show that it can be satisfied for a broad class of coherent risk measures, such as Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR). As have been seen in Example 1, for CVaR,  $\xi_\theta^*(\omega) = \alpha^{-1}$  when  $Z_\theta(\omega) > \lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{P}}$  and  $\xi_\theta^*(\omega) = 0$  when  $Z_\theta(\omega) < \lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{P}}$ , and  $\lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{P}} = q_\alpha$ . The risk envelope of CVaR does not involve  $g_e$  and  $f_i$ . It is obvious that  $\xi_\theta^*$  is bounded. If  $\{\omega \in \Omega : Z_\theta(\omega) = \lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{P}}\}$  has a measure of 0, then  $\xi_\theta^*$  is differentiable and the gradient is bounded for almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Since we already assume that  $Z_\theta$  is a continuous random variable, then  $\lambda_\theta^{*\mathcal{P}} = q_\alpha$  is also bounded and differentiable with bounded gradient by [49].*

**Theorem 7** ([6], Theorem 10.15). *Suppose that  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty)$  is proper and closed,  $\text{dom}(f)$  is convex and  $f$  is  $\beta$ -smooth over  $\text{int}(\text{dom}(f))$ . Let  $\{x_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  be the sequence generated by the gradient descent algorithm with stepsize  $\eta = 1/\beta$  such that  $x_{t+1} = x_t - \eta \nabla f(x_t)$ , then we have*

- The sequence  $\{f(x_t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  is non-increasing;



- $\nabla f(x_t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ;
- $\min_{t=0,1,\dots,T-1} \|\nabla f(x_t)\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2\beta(f(x_0)-f(x^*))}}{\sqrt{T}}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4.* By Theorem 3, for any saddle point  $(\xi_\theta^*, \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}, \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{E}}, \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{I}})$  of the Lagrangian function (3), the gradient of the coherent risk measure  $\rho$  is

$$\nabla_\theta \rho(Z_\theta^s) = \int_\Omega \xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) (Z^s(\omega) - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}) d\omega - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{E}}(e) \nabla_\theta g_e(\xi_\theta^*; f_{Z_\theta^s}) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{I}}(i) \nabla_\theta h_i(\xi_\theta^*; f_{Z_\theta^s}).$$

Hence, we have

$$\nabla_\theta \int_\Omega \xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) (Z^s(\omega) - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}) d\omega \stackrel{(i)}{=} \int_\Omega \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[ \xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) (Z^s(\omega) - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}) \right] d\omega$$

where (i) is due to Theorem 6 and Assumption 3. Specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[ \xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) (Z^s(\omega) - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}) \right] \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) (Z^s(\omega) - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}})}_{(a)} + \underbrace{\xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) (Z^s(\omega) - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}})}_{(b)} - \underbrace{\xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}}_{(c)} \end{aligned}$$

For (a), we have for almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) (Z^s(\omega) - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}) \right\|_\infty \leq C_1 C_4 |C_{\max} - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}|$$

where  $\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) \right\|_\infty \leq C_1$  is due to Assumption 1. For (b), we have for almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$\left\| \xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) (Z^s(\omega) - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}) \right\|_\infty \leq C_2 C_3 |C_{\max} - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}|$$

and for (c), we have for almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$\left\| \xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}} \right\|_\infty \leq C_1 C_3 C_6$$

Since  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[ \xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) (Z^s(\omega) - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}) \right]$  is bounded by a constant for almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\Omega$  is a compact set with finite Lebesgue measure ( $m(\Omega) < +\infty$ ), we can switch the derivative and integral in (i) and furthermore,  $\nabla_\theta \int_\Omega \xi_\theta^*(\omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_{Z^s}(\omega, \theta) (Z^s(\omega) - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}) d\omega$  is bounded by  $(C_1 C_4 |C_{\max} - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}| + C_2 C_3 |C_{\max} - \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{P}}| + C_1 C_3 C_6) m(\Omega)$ . For constraint functions, we have

$$\left\| \nabla_\theta \left( \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{E}}(e) \nabla_\theta g_e(\xi_\theta^*; f_{Z_\theta^s}) \right) \right\|_\infty = \left\| \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \left( \nabla_\theta \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{E}}(e) \nabla_\theta g_e(\xi_\theta^*; f_{Z_\theta^s}) + \lambda_\theta^{*,\mathcal{E}}(e) \nabla_\theta^2 g_e(\xi_\theta^*; f_{Z_\theta^s}) \right) \right\|_\infty$$

$$\leq |\mathcal{E}| \cdot \|\nabla_{\theta} \lambda_{\theta}^{*,\mathcal{E}}(e)\|_{\infty} \|\nabla_{\theta} g_e(\xi_{\theta}^*; f_{Z_{\theta}^s})\|_{\infty} + |\mathcal{E}| \cdot \|\lambda_{\theta}^{*,\mathcal{E}}(e)\|_{\infty} \|\nabla_{\theta}^2 g_e(\xi_{\theta}^*; f_{Z_{\theta}^s})\|_{\infty} \leq (C_6 C_7 + C_5 C_8) |\mathcal{E}|$$

and similarly,

$$\left\| \nabla_{\theta} \left( \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_{\theta}^{*,\mathcal{I}}(i) \nabla_{\theta} h_i(\xi_{\theta}^*; f_{Z_{\theta}^s}) \right) \right\|_{\infty} \leq (C_6 C_7 + C_5 C_8) |\mathcal{I}|$$

Overall, we have

$$\|\nabla_{\theta}^2 \rho(Z_{\theta}^s)\| \leq ((C_1 C_4 + C_2 C_3) |C_{\max} - \lambda_{\theta}^{*,\mathcal{P}}| + C_1 C_3 C_6) m(\Omega) + (|\mathcal{E}| + |\mathcal{I}|) (C_6 C_7 + C_5 C_8) = \beta$$

and hence,  $\rho(Z_{\theta}^s)$  is a  $\beta$ -smooth function. The remaining proof follows from the standard gradient descent theorem (Theorem 7).  $\square$

## C.6 Proof of Proposition 3

*Proof of Proposition 3.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s,a)} &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \Pi_{\mathcal{C}} \left( \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta}(a'|s') (b_{\mathcal{C}(s,a),\gamma})_{\#} \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s',a')} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \Pi_{\mathcal{C}} \left( \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta}(a'|s') (b_{\mathcal{C}(s,a),\gamma})_{\#} \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s',a')} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{=} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \Pi_{\mathcal{C}} \left( (b_{\mathcal{C}(s,a),\gamma})_{\#} \eta_{\theta,N}^{s'} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where (i) is because  $\eta_{\theta,N}$  is the fixed point of  $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{T}^{\pi}$  [38]; (ii) holds due to Proposition 6; and (iii) follows from Proposition 5 and  $\sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta}(a'|s') \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s',a')} = \eta_{\theta,N}^{s'}$ .  $\square$

## C.7 Proof of Theorem 5

*Proof of Theorem 5.* Denote  $\tilde{g}(s) = \sum_a \nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\theta}(a|s) \cdot \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s,a)}$  for notation simplicity and set  $s_0 = s$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta,N}^{s_0} &= \nabla_{\theta} \left[ \sum_{a_0} \pi_{\theta}(a_0|s_0) \cdot \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s_0,a_0)} \right] = \sum_{a_0} \left[ \nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\theta}(a_0|s_0) \cdot \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s_0,a_0)} + \pi_{\theta}(a_0|s_0) \cdot \nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s_0,a_0)} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \sum_{a_0} \left[ \nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\theta}(a_0|s_0) \cdot \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s_0,a_0)} + \pi_{\theta}(a_0|s_0) \cdot \nabla_{\theta} \left( \sum_{s_1} P(s_1|s_0, a_0) \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{\mathcal{C}(s_0,a_0),\gamma})_{\#} \eta_{\theta,N}^{s_1} \right) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \tilde{g}(s_0) + \sum_{a_0} \pi_{\theta}(a_0|s_0) \sum_{s_1} P(s_1|s_0, a_0) \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{\mathcal{C}(s_0,a_0),\gamma})_{\#} \nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta,N}^{s_1} \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{=} \tilde{g}(s_0) + \sum_{a_0} \pi_{\theta}(a_0|s_0) \sum_{s_1} P(s_1|s_0, a_0) \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{\mathcal{C}(s_0,a_0),\gamma})_{\#} \tilde{g}(s_1) \\ &\quad + \sum_{a_0} \pi_{\theta}(a_0|s_0) \sum_{s_1} P(s_1|s_0, a_0) \sum_{a_1} \pi_{\theta}(a_1|s_1) \sum_{s_2} P(s_2|s_1, a_1) \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{\mathcal{C}(s_0,a_0),\gamma})_{\#} \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b_{\mathcal{C}(s_1,a_1),\gamma})_{\#} \tilde{g}(s_2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \dots\dots \\
& \stackrel{(iv)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_\theta} \left[ \sum_a \nabla_\theta \pi_\theta(a|s_0) \cdot \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s_0,a)} + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\tau_\theta(s_0,s_t)} \left( \sum_a \nabla_\theta \pi_\theta(a|s_t) \cdot \eta_{\theta,N}^{(s_t,a)} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

where (i) is due to the projected distributional Bellman equation (Proposition 3); (ii) is due to Proposition 7; (iii) results from an iterative expansion of  $\nabla_\theta \eta_{\theta,N}^{s_1}$  with Proposition 7 and (iv) holds because each trajectory  $\tau_\theta = (s_0, a_0, c_0, s_1, a_1, c_1, \dots)$  has a probability of  $\pi(a_0|s_0)P(s_1|s_0, a_0)\pi(a_1|s_1)P(s_2|s_1, a_1) \dots$ .  $\square$

## D Numerical Experiment Details

In this appendix, we compute the expectation and CVaR cost of the shortest and safe paths. In our environment, the discounted factor  $\gamma = 0.95$ , the probability of dropping off the cliff is  $p = 0.2$ , the cost of dropping off the cliff is  $x = 30$ , and the cost of each step is  $c = 10$ . The expected cost of the shortest path from the starting state 6 can be computed by solving the following Bellman equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_6 &= c + \gamma v_3 \\
v_3 &= p(x + \gamma v_6) + (1 - p)(c + \gamma v_4) \\
v_4 &= c + \gamma v_5 \\
v_5 &= c + \gamma v_8 \\
v_8 &= 0
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the expected cost of the shortest path is  $v_6 = 45.61$ , and the expected cost of the safe path is  $60(\gamma^0 + \gamma^1 + \dots + \gamma^5) = 52.98$ . As for the CVaR, for the shortest path, the CVaR is greater than 74.14 and for the safe path, the CVaR is exactly 52.98. Thus, our risk-averse policy should choose the safe path (with a lower CVaR) and the risk-neutral policy should choose the shortest path (with a lower expectation), which agrees with our numerical results in Section 4.




Figure 3: Cost distribution of the shortest (red) and safe (blue) path.

## E Categorical Distributional Policy Gradient Algorithm

In this appendix, we present the details of the categorical distributional policy evaluation in Algorithm 3 and the categorical distributional policy gradient algorithm (CDPG) in Algorithm 2.

---

### Algorithm 2 Categorical Distributional Policy Gradient (CDPG)

---

**Require:** initial policy parameter  $\theta_0$ , learning rate  $\delta$ , number of training iterations  $T$ , discount factor  $\gamma$ , cost bound  $C_{\min}, C_{\max}$ , number of atoms  $N$ , number of trajectories  $M$

**for**  $t = 0, \dots, T - 1$  **do**

    ### Categorical distributional policy evaluation and collect trajectories

    For  $\theta_t$ , get  $\eta_{\theta_t, N}$  and  $\{\tau_m\}_{m=1}^M$  following Algorithm 3

    ### Policy gradient estimation

$g \leftarrow 0$  # initialize the gradient

**for**  $m = 1, \dots, M$  **do**

$g_m \leftarrow 0$  # initial the gradient from one trajectory

**for**  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K = \#_s(\tau_m)$  **do** #  $\#_s(\tau_m)$  is the number of state visited in trajectory  $\tau_m$

            Compute  $g(s_k) = \sum_a \nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\theta_t}(a|s_k) \cdot \eta_{\theta_t, N}^{(s_k, a)}$

$g_m \leftarrow g_m + \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\tau_{\theta_t}(s_0, s_k)}(g(s_k))$  #  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\tau_{\theta_t}}$  is the projected pushforward operator in Theorem 5

**end for**

$g \leftarrow g + g_m/M$

$\nabla_{\theta} \eta_{\theta_t} \leftarrow g$

**end for**

    Compute  $\nabla_{\theta} \rho(Z_{\theta_t})$  following Eq. (7) and Remark 4.

**if**  $\|\nabla_{\theta} \rho(Z_{\theta_t})\| < \epsilon$  **then**

**return**  $\theta_t$

**else**

        ### Policy improvement

$\theta_{t+1} \leftarrow \theta_t - \delta \nabla_{\theta} \rho(Z_{\theta_t})$

**end if**

**end for**

**return**  $\theta_T$

---

---

**Algorithm 3** Categorical Distributional Policy Evaluation

---

**Require:** Policy parameter  $\theta$ , discount factor  $\gamma$ , cost bound  $C_{\min}, C_{\max}$ , number of atoms  $N$ , number of trajectories  $M$

$$\Delta z \leftarrow (C_{\max} - C_{\min}) / (N - 1)$$

$$z_j \leftarrow C_{\min} + j * \Delta z, \quad j = 0, \dots, N - 1 \quad \# \text{ atom locations}$$

$$\text{Initialize } \eta_{\theta, N}^{(s, a)} = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} m_j^{(s, a)} \delta_{z_j}, \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \quad \# \text{ categorical distribution on } N \text{ atoms}$$

**for**  $m = 1, \dots, M$  **do**

Start an episode, observe the initial state  $s$

$$\tau_m \leftarrow [] \quad \# \text{ record the trajectory}$$

**while** *episode not terminated* **do**

Execute an action  $a \sim \pi(\cdot | s)$ , observe  $c, s'$

$$\tau \leftarrow \tau + [s, a, c, s']$$

Sample an action  $a' \sim \pi(\cdot | s')$

$$\text{Initialize } m_j^{(s, a)} \leftarrow 0 \quad \forall j = 0, \dots, N - 1 \quad \# \text{ probability vector for } N \text{ atoms}$$

### pushforward and projection

**for**  $j = 0, \dots, N - 1$  **do**

$$\mathcal{T}^\pi z_j \leftarrow c + \gamma z_j$$

**if**  $\mathcal{T}^\pi z_j < C_{\min}$  **then**

$$m_0^{(s, a)} \leftarrow m_0^{(s, a)} + \eta_{\theta, j}^{(s', a')}$$

**else if**  $\mathcal{T}^\pi z_j > C_{\max}$  **then**

$$m_{N-1}^{(s, a)} \leftarrow m_{N-1}^{(s, a)} + \eta_{\theta, j}^{(s', a')}$$

**else**

$$b_j \leftarrow (\mathcal{T}^\pi z_j - C_{\min}) / \Delta z$$

$$l \leftarrow \lfloor b_j \rfloor, u \leftarrow \lceil b_j \rceil$$

$$m_l^{(s, a)} \leftarrow m_l^{(s, a)} + \eta_{\theta, j}^{(s', a')} (u - b_j)$$

$$m_u^{(s, a)} \leftarrow m_u^{(s, a)} + \eta_{\theta, j}^{(s', a')} (b_j - l)$$

**end if**

**end for**

$$\eta_{\theta, N}^{(s, a)} \leftarrow \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} m_j^{(s, a)} \delta_{z_j}, \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \quad \# \text{ update distribution}$$

$$s \leftarrow s' \quad \# \text{ update current state}$$

**end while**

**end for**

**return**  $\eta_{\theta, N}, \{\tau_m\}_{m=1}^M$   $\#$  return the distribution and a set of trajectories

---