

# CONVEX REGULARIZATION AND CONVERGENCE OF POLICY GRADIENT FLOWS UNDER SAFETY CONSTRAINTS

PEKKA MALO<sup>1</sup>, LAURI VIITASAARI<sup>1</sup>, ANTTI SUOMINEN<sup>1</sup>, EEVA VILKKUMAA<sup>1</sup>,  
AND OLLI TAHVONEN<sup>2</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** This paper studies reinforcement learning (RL) in infinite-horizon dynamic decision processes with almost-sure safety constraints. Such safety-constrained decision processes are central to applications in autonomous systems, finance, and resource management, where policies must satisfy strict, state-dependent constraints. We consider a doubly-regularized RL framework that combines reward and parameter regularization to address these constraints within continuous state-action spaces. Specifically, we formulate the problem as a convex regularized objective with parametrized policies in the mean-field regime. Our approach leverages recent developments in mean-field theory and Wasserstein gradient flows to model policies as elements of an infinite-dimensional statistical manifold, with policy updates evolving via gradient flows on the space of parameter distributions. Our main contributions include establishing solvability conditions for safety-constrained problems, defining smooth and bounded approximations that facilitate gradient flows, and demonstrating exponential convergence towards global solutions under sufficient regularization. We provide general conditions on regularization functions, encompassing standard entropy regularization as a special case. The results also enable a particle method implementation for practical RL applications. The theoretical insights and convergence guarantees presented here offer a robust framework for safe RL in complex, high-dimensional decision-making problems.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Overview of the results and related literature	4
2.1. Modeling policy space as a statistical manifold	6
2.2. Regularization in policy and parameter spaces	7
2.3. Wasserstein gradient flows for regularized objectives	9
2.4. Discussion on our contributions	10
2.5. Related literature	11
3. Solvability of the safety-constrained problem	13
4. The double regularization framework for parametrized policies	14
4.1. Regularized value function	15
4.2. Regularization of policy parametrizations	17
5. Wasserstein differentiable approximation	18
5.1. Definition of Wasserstein differentiability	19
5.2. Smooth and bounded approximation of $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon$	20

---

*Date:* December 2, 2024.

*Key words and phrases.* Wasserstein spaces; gradient flow; reinforcement learning; continuous spaces; safety constraints; regularization.

<sup>1</sup>Aalto University, Department of Information and Service Management, Finland.

<sup>2</sup>University of Helsinki, Department of Forest Sciences, Finland.

5.3. Smooth approximation of $\mathcal{H}$	22
5.4. Smooth and bounded approximation of $\mathcal{J}$	24
6. Convergence of regularized policy gradient	25
6.1. First order optimality condition	25
6.2. Cauchy-Lipschitz conditions and energy identity	26
6.3. Global convergence with $\lambda$ -convex regularization	27
7. Particle methods for Wasserstein gradient flows	28
7.1. Double entropic regularization as noisy gradient descent	29
7.2. $m$ -relative entropy as a Blob method	30
8. Proofs of main results	31
8.1. Proofs related to Section 3	31
8.2. Proofs related to Section 4	32
8.3. Proofs and details related to Section 5.2	36
8.4. Proofs related to Section 5.3	45
8.5. Proofs related to Section 5.4	50
8.6. Proofs related to Sections 6.1–6.2	51
8.7. Proofs related to Section 6.3	56
References	61
Appendix A. Existence of stationary policies	68
Appendix B. Bounded kernel spaces and conditional probabilities	68
Appendix C. Epiconvergence of functions and expectations	70
Appendix D. Selected results on optimal transport	72

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Stochastic dynamic decision processes with safety constraints play a pivotal role in a wide range of applications, including autonomous systems, resource management, and finance. In such problems, the agent’s goal extends beyond merely maximizing cumulative discounted rewards; it also involves ensuring safety by adhering to state-dependent constraints over an infinite time horizon. When decision-making occurs within an environment lacking an analytical model, these problems are often addressed through various adaptations of customized reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms.

The mathematical formulations of safety-constrained RL problems differ significantly across applications and algorithmic frameworks [42, 65, 66, 91, 93]. To intuitively introduce the concept of safe RL, let  $S$  and  $A$  represent the state and action spaces, respectively, which may have infinite cardinality. Without loss of generality, we assume that the set of safe actions can be described by a set-valued mapping  $(t, s) \mapsto D_t(s)$ , where for each state  $s_t \in S$ , the safe action set is given by  $D_t(s_t) \subset A$ . A policy  $\pi$  is deemed safe if the actions it prescribes,  $a_t \sim \pi(\cdot | h_t)$ , conditioned on the history  $h_t = (s_0, a_0, \dots, s_t)$ , including the current state, satisfy  $a_t \in D_t(s_t)$  either almost surely or with high probability. The general safe RL problem with state constraints can thus be expressed as:

$$\underset{\pi \in \Pi}{\text{maximize}} \quad \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(s_t, a_t) \right] \quad \text{subject to} \quad P_\pi (\{(s_t, a_t)_{t=0}^{\infty} : a_t \in D_t(s_t) \forall t\}) \geq 1 - \xi,$$

where  $\Pi$  denotes the space of stochastic policies,  $P_\pi$  is the probability measure induced by policy  $\pi$  on the space of state-action trajectories, and  $\xi$  is the permissible risk of safety violations. Policies with  $\xi \in (0, 1)$  are said to be optimized under chance constraints [72, 75], while in many critical applications, safety must be guaranteed almost surely, necessitating  $\xi = 0$  [85].

In a discrete setting with finite state and action spaces, it may be feasible to specify the set of safe states precisely. However, when state and action spaces are large, the safety map  $D_t$  needs to be approximated [91]. A common approach is to introduce a set of non-negative safety cost functions  $g_k : S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , such that, for any trajectory  $(s_t, a_t)_{t=0}^\infty$ , the probability of the cumulative safety costs exceeding their admissible budgets  $b_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$  should remain below a given safety threshold  $\xi$ :

$$P_\pi \left( \left\{ (s_t, a_t)_{t=0}^\infty : \sum_{t=0}^\infty \beta_k^t g_k(s_t, a_t) - b_k \geq 0 \ \forall k \right\} \right) \leq \xi,$$

where  $\beta_k \in (0, 1)$  denote constraint specific discount factors.

In many applications and algorithms [1, 17, 34, 90], the probability constraint is replaced with a weaker requirement that the expected cumulative safety cost remains below a certain threshold, i.e.  $\mathbb{E}_\pi[\sum_{t=0}^\infty \beta_k^t g_k(s_t, a_t)] \leq b_k$ . This simplification is considered necessary for being able to use Lagrangian methods with a finite number of multipliers.

While standard policy gradient methods [47, 57, 82, 88] can be applied to unconstrained Markov Decision Processes (MDPs), the addition of safety constraints complicates both the formulation and the solution, particularly in continuous state-action spaces. The constraints necessitate specialized methods to ensure that each policy meets safety requirements, ideally with guarantees on convergence and robustness. Recent years have seen a surge in interest in regularization methods for RL algorithms [2, 24, 43, 46, 47, 68], as they offer mechanisms to stabilize training and enhance convergence properties, especially in high-dimensional or continuous settings. The most commonly considered approach is based on entropic regularization of rewards, where  $u(s_t, a_t)$  is replaced with a regularized reward  $u(s_t, a_t) - \epsilon \log(\pi(a_t|s_t))$ . Standard entropy-based regularization of rewards has proven successful in discrete settings, where convergence of policy gradient methods is relatively well-understood [12, 23, 24, 61, 94]. However, for continuous state-action spaces, with more general than linear or log-linear policy representations, conventional approaches often fall short, as they do not scale to continuous decision spaces or parametrized policies with non-linear function approximators [3, 58, 59].

Inspired by the notion of double entropic regularization studied by [58], this paper introduces a generalized convex regularization framework for policy gradient flows in safety-constrained MDPs, combining both reward and parameter regularization. Specifically, we consider the following regularized problem with parametrized policies in the mean-field regime:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)}{\text{maximize}} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\mu} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^\infty \beta^t (u(s_t, a_t) - \epsilon F(\pi_\mu(a_t|s_t))) \right] + \kappa \mathcal{H}(\mu) \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad P_\pi \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^\infty \beta_k^t g_k(s_t, a_t) \leq b_k \right\} = 1 \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $F$  is a reward-regularization function and  $\mathcal{H}$  is a convex functional on the space of parameter distributions  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . By applying recent developments in mean-field theory and

Wasserstein gradient flows [8, 19], we model policies as elements on an infinite-dimensional statistical manifold  $\{\pi_\mu : \mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)\}$  and consider policy updates in terms of gradient flows  $(\mu_t)_{t \geq 0}$  on the space of parameter measures  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . Similar policy space has been previously studied by [3, 58]. This approach leverages convex regularization to not only smooth the reward landscape but also directly influence the distribution of policy parameters, facilitating convergence even under stringent safety constraints. Regularization can act as a “convexifier,” transforming inherently non-convex problems into tractable forms where gradient-based methods can be effectively applied.

Our main contribution is to establish the conditions for local and global convergence of policy gradient methods for safety-constrained decision processes. For this purpose we start by proving solvability of safety constraint augmented problem (without regularization). We then prove that one can approximate the problem by using smooth and bounded approximations for various objects, including regularization functions  $F$  and  $\mathcal{H}$ . This allows to define gradient flows that then can be translated into particle method and corresponding RL algorithm to find the solution. In the process, we study the roles of both regularizations and, in particular, show that under sufficient amount of regularization, the problem becomes convex and one obtains convergence towards a global solution with exponential rate of convergence. It is worth to note that we consider general functions  $F$  and  $\mathcal{H}$ , from which some studied special cases including entropy regularization follows as a special case.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present more detailed discussion on our general setting and results, accompanied with a related literature review. Our technical presentation is postponed into Sections 3–8. In Section 3 we formulate the solvability result for the problem with safety constraints. After that in Section 4, we provide precise details on our double regularization framework. Smooth approximations are then considered in Section 5, and gradient flows and their convergence is detailed in Section 6. The associated particle method is discussed in Section 7, while all the technical proofs are postponed to Section 8. Some essential preliminaries are presented in the appendix.

## 2. OVERVIEW OF THE RESULTS AND RELATED LITERATURE

Let us now formulate our safety-constrained problem (without regularization),

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} & \underset{\pi \in \Pi}{\text{maximize}} \quad \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(s_t, a_t) \mid s_0 \sim p_0 \right] \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta_k^t g_k(s_t, a_t) \leq b_k \quad P_\pi\text{-a.s.}, \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\}, \end{aligned}$$

with more details. Throughout we assume that the state space  $S$  and action space  $A$  are Polish spaces (i.e., separable, completely metrizable topological spaces), with possibly infinite cardinality,  $p : S \times A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S)$  is a weakly continuous transition probability kernel (see Assumption 1), with  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  denoting the set of probability measures on  $S$ ,  $p_0 \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  is an initial state distribution,  $u : S \times A \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  is a bounded, upper semicontinuous utility (reward) function with discount factor  $\beta$ , and  $g_k : S \times A \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  are single-period safety cost functions with corresponding discount factors  $\beta_k$  and budgets  $b_k \geq 0$ . To ensure that the problem is well-posed, we further require the safety cost functions to be lower semicontinuous and satisfy an inf-compactness condition (see Assumption 2). Here, the expected discounted utility is maximized over a policy space  $\Pi$ , where a policy can be interpreted as a sequence

$\pi = (\pi_t)$  of transition probabilities such that  $\pi_t(\cdot|h_t)$  is a conditional probability measure on  $A$  for every history  $h_t = (s_0, a_0, \dots, s_t)$ . By Ionescu-Tulcea theorem, the probability measure  $P_\pi$ , which is induced by  $\pi$  on the product space of histories, is uniquely defined given the initial state distribution  $p_0$  and the transition kernel  $p$ . We use  $\mathbb{E}_\pi[\cdot]$  to denote the expectation taken with respect to the measure  $P_\pi$ . Throughout, we assume that the safety constraint is satisfied almost surely.

We note that (1) can be usually expressed in an unconstrained form

$$(2) \quad \underset{\pi \in \Pi}{\text{maximize}} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(s_t, a_t) - \delta_{\geq 0}(z_t) \mid s_0 \sim p_0 \right],$$

where  $(z_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a sequence of state variables  $z_t = (z_{t,k})_{k=1}^K$  representing the remaining safety budgets for each of the constraints  $k = 1, \dots, K$ . Given the initial budgets  $z_{0,k} = b_k$ , we define

$$(3) \quad z_{t+1,k} = \phi_{z_{t,k}}(s_t, a_t) := (z_{t,k} - g_k(s_t, a_t)) / \beta_k,$$

where  $\phi_{z_{t,k}}$  is known as a safety index for constraint  $k$  parametrized by the remaining budget,  $z_{t,k}$ , before paying the cost for choosing an action  $a_t$  in the current state  $s_t$ . The budget process monitors constraint violations and records the value of the remaining safety budget. The indicator function  $\delta_{\geq 0}(z_t)$  is 0, if  $z_{t,k} \geq 0$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , and  $+\infty$  otherwise. The representation (2) is valid, when the instantaneous safety cost functions  $g_k$  are assumed to be non-negative. Since the budget process is Markov, it can be considered to be a part of the environment state. The key benefit is that we can use additional state variables to represent the constraints instead of a Lagrangian with state-dependent multipliers [85].

Although the formulation (2) appears promising due to its convenient way to handle the state-wise safety constraints, we can see that the sharpness of the indicator function is problematic when constraint violations are encountered during the learning process. By considering a smooth barrier function  $B$ , we obtain the following unconstrained reformulation

$$(4) \quad \underset{\pi \in \Pi}{\text{maximize}} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u_B(s_t, a_t) \mid s_0 \sim p_0 \right],$$

where the single-period utility  $u$  is replaced with the safety-augmented utility function

$$(5) \quad u_B(s_t, a_t) = u(s_t, a_t) - B(\phi_{z_t}(s_t, a_t)).$$

Here,  $\phi_{z_t} = (\phi_{z_{t,k}})_{k=1}^K$  is a vector of constraint-wise safety indices, and  $B \circ \phi_{z_t}$  is a state-action safety barrier function such that for every history  $(s_t, a_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , where  $(s_t, a_t) \in \text{lev}_{>0} \phi_{z_t}$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{z_t}(s_t, a_t) = 0$ , we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} B(\phi_{z_t}(s_t, a_t)) = +\infty$ .

In general, there may not always exist an optimal policy, let alone a Markov policy or a stationary policy. Most approximate dynamic programming and reinforcement learning methods are designed for problems where the agent collects data from the environment in short time steps. In natural resource management problems, the outcomes of policies are observed only after several years, making a fully data-driven approach with trial-and-error learning impractical, especially with safety constraints limiting admissible policies. Hence, before considering numerical solutions for infinite horizon problems, it is sensible to establish the conditions under which the safety constrained problem (1) admits an optimal solution

that can be represented by a stationary Markov policy. To ensure that the model is well-defined, we will make use of the regularity assumptions introduced by [81] to limit the class of admissible problem formulations.

**2.1. Modeling policy space as a statistical manifold.** In the case of finite  $S$  and  $A$ , policies are typically modeled using either direct or tabular softmax parametrization. However, when  $S$  and  $A$  are large or infinite, the tabular representation becomes computationally intractable. For continuous or mixed state-action spaces, we can model the policy space using a class of parametrized policies, where the policies are commonly of form

$$(6) \quad \pi_x(da|s) \propto \exp(\psi(s, a, x)) d\rho(a),$$

where  $\psi : S \times A \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a nonlinear function (e.g., neural network),  $X$  denotes the parameter space, and  $\rho$  is a finite reference measure. For a finite-dimensional  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , the parametrized policy  $\pi_x$  can then be interpreted as a point on a finite-dimensional statistical manifold (or a parameter submanifold),  $\Pi_0 := \{\pi_x : x \in X\} \subset \mathcal{P}(A|S)$ , where  $\mathcal{P}(A|S)$  denotes the space of conditional probability measures. As a convex subspace of the space of bounded signed kernels,  $\mathcal{P}(A|S)$  is a Banach space when endowed with the total variation norm [60]; see Appendix B.

**Example 2.1** (Diagonal Gaussian Policy). *For continuous actions, we can take the diagonal Gaussian policies as an example. A diagonal Gaussian distribution is a special case of multivariate Gaussians where the covariance matrix only has entries on the diagonal, which can be represented as a vector. Let  $m : S \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\dim(A)}$  and  $\sigma : S \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\dim(A)}$  denote the mean actions and their standard deviations. We can then define the function approximator for a Gaussian policy as*

$$\psi(s, a, x) = -\frac{1}{2} \left( (a - m(s, x))^T \Sigma(s, x)^{-1} (a - m(s, x)) \right)$$

where  $\Sigma(s, x) = \sigma(s, x)\sigma(s, x)^T$  is a diagonal matrix. The policy is admissible as long as  $m$  and  $\sigma$  are sufficiently smooth.

To allow for more general policies, with infinite-dimensional parametrization, we will next consider another formulation, where policies are parametrized by measures. We use  $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$  to denote the space of Borel probability measures on  $X$  with a finite  $p$ -moments, which becomes a metric space when endowed with the  $L^p$ -Wasserstein distance. For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ , their  $L^p$ -Wasserstein distance is defined by

$$(7) \quad W_p(\mu, \nu) = \inf \left\{ \left( \int_{X^2} |x - x'|^p d\gamma(x, x') \right)^{1/p} : \gamma \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu) \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over the a set of transfer plans or couplings between  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$ . In this paper, we mainly consider the case of  $p = 2$ . Letting  $\text{pr}^1, \text{pr}^2 : X \times X \rightarrow X$  be the projections of  $X \times X$  onto the first and second copy of  $X$ , respectively, we define the set of couplings as probability measures on  $X \times X$  with marginals  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ ; that is,

$$\Gamma(\mu, \nu) := \{ \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X) \mid \text{pr}_\#^1 \gamma = \mu, \text{pr}_\#^2 \gamma = \nu \}$$

where the push-forwards of  $\gamma$  along projections are defined as  $\text{pr}_\#^1 \gamma(A) := \gamma(A \times X) = \mu(A)$  and  $\text{pr}_\#^2 \gamma(B) := \gamma(X \times B) = \nu(B)$  for any Borel sets  $A, B \subset X$ . The set of optimal transfer plans,  $\Gamma_o(\mu, \nu) \subset \Gamma(\mu, \nu)$  is the convex and narrowly compact set of plans that attain the minimum Wasserstein distance between the given marginals  $\nu$  and  $\mu$ .

Let us now consider the Hilbertian case  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  with  $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ . By modeling the distributions of policy parameters as elements of  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , we can use the recent developments in mean-field theory to extend our results to policies parametrized by measures [3, 58]. In the mean-field approach, the policy space is understood as an infinite-dimensional statistical manifold  $\Pi_2 := \{\pi_\mu : \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)\}$ , where the policies are themselves functionals on the space of parameter measures. For a given  $\mu$ , the parametrized policy is then given by

$$(8) \quad \pi_\mu(da|s) := \pi(\mu)(da|s) \propto \exp\left(\int_X \psi(s, a, x) d\mu(x)\right) d\rho(a),$$

where the approximation function  $\psi : S \times A \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a bounded and jointly measurable function on the product space  $S \times A \times X$  equipped with product measure  $\mathcal{L}^{n_s} \otimes \rho \otimes \mathcal{L}^d$ . Here  $\mathcal{L}^{n_s}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^d$  denote Lebesgue measures on  $S$  and  $X$ , respectively, and  $\rho$  is a fixed reference measure on  $A$ . In this paper, we assume that the approximator  $\psi$  is at least once differentiable with respect to  $x$ , with bounded derivatives for all  $s \in S$ ,  $\rho$ -a.e.  $a \in A$ .

**Remark 2.2** (Deep ensemble models as mean-field approximations). *The mean-field framework can be motivated by establishing a connection to training of deep horizontal ensemble models. Let  $(x_i)_{i=1}^K \in X^K$  be a parameter vector separated into  $K$  components  $x_i \in X$ . When the model  $\psi$  is allowed to be of arbitrary complexity, we can see the mean-field policy  $\pi_\mu$  as an infinite-width limit of policies  $\pi_{\mu_K}$  defined by an ensemble of  $K$  neural networks  $\{\psi(\cdot; x_i)\}_{i=1}^K$ :*

$$(9) \quad \pi_{\mu_K}(da|s) \propto \exp\left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \psi(s, a; x_i)\right) \rho(da),$$

where  $\mu_K = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \delta_{x_i}$  denotes an empirical measure defined by the parameters of the  $K$  ensemble models.

By considering discrete measures  $\mu = \delta_x \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , where  $\delta_x$  denotes the Dirac's measure at  $x$ , we can always recover the policies  $\Pi_0$  as a subset of  $\Pi_2$  by setting  $\pi(\mu) = \pi(\delta_x) = \pi_x$ . When the parameter space  $X$  has a dense countable subset  $D$ , Hahn-Banach theorem implies that the subset of all the convex combinations with rational coefficients of  $\delta$ -measures concentrated in  $D$  is narrowly dense in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , i.e. we have that  $\mathcal{P}_2(X) = \overline{\text{Conv}}(C)$ , where  $\overline{\text{Conv}}(C)$  is the closed convex hull of  $C = \{\delta_x : x \in D\}$ . Then, we can also note that the empirical measures  $\mu_K \rightarrow \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  converge to a limiting measure as  $K \rightarrow \infty$ . where the ensemble policies converge to a mean-field policy on  $\Pi_2$  as  $\mu_K = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \delta_{x_i} \rightarrow \mu$  on  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  when  $K \rightarrow \infty$ .

**2.2. Regularization in policy and parameter spaces.** The most commonly applied form of regularization for MDPs is to include entropy as part of the reward (or cost) function (see, e.g., [24, 43, 47]). However, we can also consider a more direct form of regularization of parameter distributions as demonstrated by [58] in the case of mean-field policies. In this paper, we extend the pioneering work by [58] to safety-constrained problems by considering the following generalized framework for convex regularization of rewards and parameter distributions:

$$(10) \quad \underset{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathcal{J}(\mu) = -\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_\mu) + \kappa \mathcal{H}(\mu), \quad \mathcal{H}(\mu) = \sum_{j=1}^J \kappa_j \mathcal{H}_j(\mu), \quad \kappa_j \geq 0 \quad \forall j,$$

where  $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon$  is the function with regularized rewards, and  $\mathcal{H}$  is a  $\lambda$ -convex regularization functional acting on parameter distributions with strength parameter  $\kappa$ .

**Definition 2.3** (Geodesic convexity in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ ). *A function  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called  $\lambda$ -convex along Wasserstein geodesics if, for any two probability measures  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and any Wasserstein geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  joining  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$ , we have:*

$$\mathcal{F}(\mu_t) \leq (1-t)\mathcal{F}(\mu_0) + t\mathcal{F}(\mu_1) - \frac{\lambda}{2}t(1-t)W_2^2(\mu_0, \mu_1),$$

for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

The double entropic regularization studied by [58] can be recovered by choosing  $F(\pi_\mu) = \log(\pi_\mu)$  and  $\mathcal{H}(\mu) = \text{KL}(\mu|\gamma)$ . The usual entropic regularization framework is obtained by setting  $\mathcal{H}(\mu) = 0$ .

2.2.1. *Regularization of rewards in  $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_\mu)$ .* The first form of regularization in (10) is obtained by adding  $F(\pi)$  in the reward function. The regularized policy value function is then given by

$$(11) \quad \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_\mu) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\mu} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \left( u_B(s_t, a_t) - \epsilon F \left( \frac{d\pi}{d\rho}(a_t|s_t) \right) \right) \mid s_0 \sim p_0 \right],$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\mu}$  is understood as a short hand for writing  $a_t \sim \pi_\mu(\cdot|s_t)$ ,  $s_{t+1} \sim p(\cdot|s_t, a_t)$ ,  $s_0 \sim p_0$ , and  $F \in C^2(0, +\infty)$  is a reward regularization function such that  $z \mapsto zF(z)$  is a convex function. For example, the usual entropy regularization is recovered by choosing  $F(z) = \log(z)$ , and studied among others in [2, 24, 43, 46, 47, 68].

2.2.2. *Regularization of parameter distributions by  $\mathcal{H}$ .* The second form of regularization is obtained using  $\mathcal{H}$ , which is assumed to be a geodesically convex functional on  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , where each component  $\mathcal{H}_j$  is of form

$$(12) \quad \mathcal{H}_j(\mu) = \mathcal{H}_j(\mu|\gamma_j) = \begin{cases} \int_X H_j \left( \frac{d\mu}{d\gamma_j} \right) d\gamma_j & \text{if } \mu \ll \gamma_j \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The parameters  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\kappa_j > 0$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, J$  control the strength of regularization in the action space and parameter space, respectively. The integrands  $z \mapsto H_j(z) \in (0, +\infty)$  are assumed to be proper convex functions and  $\gamma_j$  are given reference measures such that  $\mu \ll \gamma_j \ll \gamma$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, J$ , where  $\gamma$  is a global reference measure for the regularization terms. Commonly, we can choose  $\gamma$  to be the Lebesgue measure  $\mathcal{L}^d$ .

Intuitively, each  $\mathcal{H}_j$  quantifies the divergence between two distributions,  $\mu$  and the prior information represented by reference measure  $\gamma_j$ . The convex integrands  $H_j$  can be understood as cost functions of the likelihood ratio. By selecting  $H_j(z) = s \log(z)$ , we obtain the relative entropy or Kullback-Leibler divergence. As a broader family of regularizers, we can take the family of f-Divergences [4, 31], which covers most of the commonly used entropy functionals.

**Example 2.4** (Generalized entropies as regularizers). *For instance, consider the  $m$ -relative entropy, which stems from Bregman divergence given by*

$$\mathcal{H}^m(\mu | \gamma) = \frac{1}{m(m-1)} \int_X \{ \rho^m - m\rho\sigma^{m-1} + (m-1)\sigma^m \} dx$$



for  $\gamma = \sigma \mathcal{L}^d \in \mathcal{P}_{ac}(X)^1$  and  $\mu = \rho \mathcal{L}^d \in \mathcal{P}_{ac}(X)$  with  $\mu \ll \gamma$ , and  $m \in [(d-1)/d, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ . Though, the functional is not defined for  $m = 1$ , this can be seen as a generalization of Kullback-Leibler divergence, which can be recovered as the limit

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow 1} \mathcal{H}^m(\mu | \gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \{\rho \log \rho - \sigma \log \sigma - (\log \sigma + 1)(\rho - \sigma)\} dx = \text{KL}(\mu | \gamma).$$

**2.3. Wasserstein gradient flows for regularized objectives.** Suppose that the objective functional  $\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is sufficiently smooth. Then, a gradient flow can be defined as a steepest decent for  $\mathcal{J}$  on  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  by writing

$$(13) \quad \partial_t \mu_t = -\text{grad}_W \mathcal{J}(\mu_t) \quad \text{for almost every } t \in I \subset \mathbb{R},$$

for some weak notion of the time derivative  $\partial_t \mu_t$  and functional gradient  $\text{grad}_W \mathcal{J}$ . Despite technical nuances, the underlying idea is still intuitively analogous to gradient descent in the Euclidean case.

**Remark 2.5** (Policy gradient on  $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ ). *By considering the gradient flow of discrete measures,  $(\mu_t)_{t \in I}$ , in the unregularized case, where  $\epsilon = 0$ ,  $\kappa_j = 0$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, J$ , and each measure is defined as a point mass  $\mu_t = \delta_{x_t}$ , we can recover the ODE for the vanilla policy gradient as*

$$(14) \quad \frac{d}{dt} x_t = \nabla_x \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_x).$$

The solution trajectory  $\{x_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  of the ODE induces a path  $\{\pi_{x_t} : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  on the policy manifold  $\Pi_0$  with a corresponding trajectory of objective values  $\{\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_{x_t}) : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ .

To apply (13) in practice, we first need to address two challenges: (1) the safety-augmented results are not bounded; (2) the objective function  $\mathcal{J}$  may be non-smooth and not have a well-defined linear functional derivative. Therefore, instead of solving (10) directly, we construct a sequence of bounded, smooth approximations  $\{\mathcal{J}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  such that for any sequence of solutions  $\mu_n \in \text{argmin}\{\mathcal{J}^n\}$  the cluster points belong to  $\text{argmin}\{\mathcal{J}_0\}$  with  $\mathcal{J}_0(\mu) = \mathcal{V}_0(\pi_\mu)$  denoting the value function with  $\epsilon = 0$ . Under sufficient regularity conditions, we can then define policy gradient flow as a solution to the partial differential equation

$$(15) \quad \partial_t \mu_t = -\text{grad}_W \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_t),$$

where the functional gradient is given by

$$\text{grad}_W \mathcal{J}^n(\mu) = -\nabla_x \cdot (\mu \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu)) \quad \text{with} \quad \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu) = \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{J}^n}{\delta \mu}(\mu).$$

Here,  $\nabla \cdot$  denotes the divergence operator and  $\delta \mathcal{J}^n / \delta \mu$  denotes the linear functional derivative of  $\mathcal{J}^n$ . The functional  $\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu)$ , which is defined as the gradient of the linear functional derivative, is called the Wasserstein gradient of  $\mathcal{J}^n$ . Since we have not yet discussed the topological structure on  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , we can informally think that  $\mathcal{J}^n : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is smooth if there exists a function

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{J}^n}{\delta \mu} : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

such that for all measures  $\mu, \mu' \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , we have that

$$\mathcal{J}^n(\mu') - \mathcal{J}^n(\mu) = \int_0^1 \int_X \frac{\delta \mathcal{J}^n}{\delta \mu}(t\mu' + (1-t)\mu)(x) d[\mu' - \mu](x) dt$$

---

<sup>1</sup>the subscript *ac* stands for absolute continuity.

with the function  $[\delta\mathcal{J}^n/\delta\mu](\mu)(\cdot)$  understood as the Fréchet or Gâteaux derivative of  $\mathcal{J}^n$  at  $\mu$ . For  $\mathcal{J}^n$  to be Wasserstein differentiable at  $\mu$ , the function  $x \mapsto [\delta\mathcal{J}^n/\delta\mu](\mu)(x)$  needs to be differentiable and at most of quadratic growth in  $x$ .

The gradient flow  $(\mu_t)_{t>0}$ , which is obtained as a solution to the partial differential equation (PDE) on the infinite dimensional space  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , can be viewed as generalization of the classical policy gradient defined on the finite dimensional parameter space  $X$ . In practice, the numerical solutions are obtained using particle methods, where a sample of particles  $x_t^i \sim \mu_t$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, K$ , is used to approximate  $\mu_t \approx \hat{\mu}_t = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \delta_{x_t^i}$  for  $t \in I$ . Instead of the single trajectory that is sufficient to characterize the solution for the vanilla policy gradient ODE (14), the curve  $t \mapsto \mu_t$  on  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  is better approximated by a family of solution trajectories in the parameter space

$$\{x_t^i \in X \mid x_t^i \sim \mu_t, t \in I\}_{i=1}^K$$

with corresponding families of curves in the policy space and value space,

$$t \mapsto \pi_{\hat{\mu}_t}, \quad t \mapsto \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_{\hat{\mu}_t})$$

respectively.

**2.4. Discussion on our contributions.** To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper to study the generalized convex regularization framework for both rewards and parameter distributions. The framework extends the pioneering work of [58] from the entropic regularization of parameter measures to cover a general family of convex functionals. We summarize our main contributions as follows:

(i) *Solvability.* As a first step, we establish in Theorem 3.3 the conditions under which the safety-constrained RL problem (1) admits a stationary Markov policy solution. Specifically, we consider the unconstrained reformulation (4), which combines the notion of safety certificates by [65] with the state-augmentation approach discussed by [86]. The result can be considered as a precondition for being able to approximate the general policy space  $\Pi$  using the parametric policy models discussed in Section 2.1.

(ii) *Generalized convex regularization of rewards and parameters.* In Section 4, we provide a detailed description of the double regularization framework formulation, which we shortly introduced in Section 2.2. Specifically, we consider a generalized form of two complementary regularization mechanisms: regularization of rewards; and regularization of parameter distributions. While the role of regularizing the parameter distributions gets highlighted in both derivation of the convergence results as well as in the implementation of particle methods, the role of reward regularization appears to be more intricate. To discuss the role of reward regularization mechanism, we extend the adversarial training interpretation by [52] to the framework considered in this paper. Specifically, using the convex conjugate duality framework by [79], we note in Theorem 4.5 that the policy found by applying general convex reward-regularization has a dual interpretation as an optimal policy under a worst-case adversarial result.

(iii) *Epiconvergence of smooth and bounded approximations.* For being able to use policy gradient flows to solve the problem, we need to consider a sequence of bounded smooth approximations  $(\mathcal{J}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  for the regularized safety constrained problem introduced in Section 2.2. To this end, we present in Section 5 more detailed assumptions needed for obtaining a Wasserstein different approximation for the regularized objective functional. To address the unboundedness of safety-augmented rewards (5), we presents in Theorem 5.20

an epi-convergent strategy for approximating the regularized value function via sequence of Wasserstein differentiable bounded functionals.

(iv) *Convergence of policy gradient under safety constraints.* For the gradient flow of  $\mathcal{J}^n$  to be well defined, we present (in Section 6) a version of non-local Cauchy-Lipschitz conditions [16, 76, 77], which ensure that the continuity equation (15) is well-posed also when the velocity field depends on the measure itself. Specifically, in Theorem 6.4, we show that  $\mathcal{J}^n$  decreases along the gradient flow such that the energy-dissipation equality holds. For given initial data  $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , the gradient flow  $(\mu_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a unique solution for (15), when the Wasserstein gradient  $\nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{J}^n(\mu)$  is a uniformly Lipschitz function with sublinear growth. Moreover, in Proposition 6.2, we show that the stationary points of (15) are characterized by a first order optimality condition  $\nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*) = 0$ , which is analogous to the Euclidean case. Finally, in Theorem 6.8 we show exponential convergence provided that the strength of regularization is strong enough.

Finally, in Section 7, we discuss the implications the choice of a regularization form has on the particle approximation of the corresponding gradient flow. By considering the usual KL divergence regularization and  $m$ -relative entropy as examples, we note that, while KL divergence leads to a linear diffusion of McKean-Vlasov type that has a natural implementation as a noisy particle gradient, the use of  $m$ -relative entropy leads to a non-linear diffusion, which is better approached using other methods such as the blob particle techniques [22].

**2.5. Related literature.** Given the extensive body of research on reinforcement learning, we have focused our discussion on the literature most pertinent to the results presented in this paper.

**2.5.1. Safety constraints in RL.** The mathematical formulations for safety-constrained RL problems vary significantly across different applications [42, 65, 66, 91, 93]. In Constrained Markov Decision Processes (CMDPs), the goal is to maximize an expected reward while satisfying one or more constraints on the expected cumulative cost [5]. These methods generally enforce safety constraints "on average" (e.g., using Lagrange multipliers) to perform policy updates that balance reward maximization and constraint satisfaction in expectation. As a result, CMDPs lack almost-sure guarantees and may permit occasional policy deviations exceeding the safety limits. Similarly, also risk-sensitive and chance constrained RL provide probabilistic safety guarantees that may hold with high confidence rather than almost surely [28, 92].

The initial problem formulation in this paper is closely related to that in [85], where constraints are required to hold on a state-wise basis almost surely, a stricter condition than the conventional expected value constraint formulation in CMDPs. Such state-wise constraints pose significant challenges for standard Lagrangian-based methods, as they imply an infinite number of constraints in a continuous state space [64, 65]. In this work, we leverage control barrier functions (CBFs) [9, 25, 99] and safety indices [64, 65] as natural tools to ensure safety under these state-wise constraints. This approach is also motivated by its compatibility with state-augmentation techniques [85]. CBFs and energy-function-based safety certificates [65, 98, 99] provide a sufficient condition for maintaining forward invariance of the safe set, using Lyapunov-like arguments to define a robust barrier around the safe region.

While there appears to be extensive literature on the empirical performance of policy gradient methods under safety constraints, the mathematical analysis of their convergence

has remained mostly on the level of heuristic arguments. Moreover, the existence of Markov policy solutions is assumed without providing formal proofs.

*2.5.2. Convergence of MDPs with reward regularization.* Entropy regularization of reward (or cost) functions in Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) [2, 24, 43, 46, 47, 68] has garnered substantial interest due to its empirical success and favorable theoretical properties. In the discrete setting, both the value functions and policies of entropy-regularized MDPs demonstrate linear convergence rates under natural policy gradient methods [23, 24, 94]. Additionally, studies on policy mirror descent [61, 95] indicate that linear convergence can be achieved by employing arbitrary convex or strongly convex regularization functions to shape rewards. However, these results in the discrete setting do not directly extend to continuous state and action spaces, where techniques independent of the action space’s cardinality are required.

In the context of continuous state and action spaces [67], most convergence results focus on linear-quadratic (or nearly linear-quadratic) regulator problems, where both the problem structure and the Polyak-Łojasiewicz (PL) condition [78]—also known as the gradient dominance condition—can be leveraged to establish linear convergence of policy gradient algorithms [37, 44, 48, 50]. Recently, [12] extended these results, inspired by LQR problems, to a broader class of infinite-horizon MDPs with finite-dimensional parameterized policies (such as linear policies and policies derived by minimizing linearly parameterized state-action value functions). Further contributions in this direction are presented in [10, 13, 36, 96]. Generally, the findings in these studies rely on a uniform PL condition that must hold for the objective function across admissible parameters. However, as noted by [69], verifying such a PL condition can be challenging, even in discrete settings.

While most studies focus on Euclidean state and action spaces, [59] provides evidence for the global convergence of Fisher-Rao policy gradient flow in solving entropy-regularized MDPs over Polish state and action spaces. However, similar to [97], their main results are derived without parameterized policies and may not directly apply to our setting. Nonetheless, by recognizing the connection between Fisher-Rao gradient flows and continuous-time mirror descent, the findings of [59] offer valuable insights into the role of entropic reward regularization in analyzing the convergence of policy gradient methods within continuous action spaces. Their results align with the dual interpretation of reward-regularized policies as optimal policies trained under worst-case adversarial conditions [52], a perspective we have also confirmed to hold in our safety-constrained framework under general convex regularization.

*2.5.3. MDPs with mean-field softmax policies.* To date, only [3] and [58] have examined parametrized policy gradient methods within the mean-field regime, where the policy space is modeled as an infinite-dimensional statistical manifold parametrized by probability measures. Notably, [3] appear to be the first to derive the Wasserstein gradient flow for the parameter measure in a mean-field setting with softmax policies. However, as [58] point out, although [3] demonstrate that a softmax policy is optimal upon convergence of the gradient flow, they do not establish clear conditions under which this convergence is guaranteed.

The double regularization framework presented in this paper draws inspiration from the pioneering work of [58], who investigated global convergence of policy gradient methods for infinite-horizon entropy-regularized MDPs with neural softmax policies. To our knowledge, [58] is the only study, apart from our own, to consider direct regularization of parameter distributions. By employing the theory of nonlinear Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equations

[14, 15], they establish exponential convergence under a strongly regularized regime using Kullback-Leibler divergence. In the current work, we extend these insights by showing that uniqueness of solutions and exponential convergence rates can be achieved with a broader class of strongly convex regularization functionals.

In related work, [97] offer insights into the convergence of actor-critic algorithms via mean-field theory. Their approach, however, does not explicitly parameterize policies. Instead, they parameterize the critic using a two-layer neural network and represent the policy (actor) implicitly through the critic and proximal policy updates. Furthermore, they assume differentiability of the regularization term along the flow, though without providing formal justification.

*2.5.4. Particle gradient descent for overparametrized neural networks.* Our work on the convergence of policy gradient methods in the mean-field regime connects closely with recent research on stochastic gradient descent (SGD) in over-parameterized supervised learning models [27, 63, 70, 71, 83, 84]. These studies treat deep neural networks as interacting particle systems, offering new insights into how factors like network depth, width, and layer structure shape the optimization landscape and influence SGD dynamics. In the large particle (parameter) limit, the dynamics of stochastic gradient descent can be approximated by Mean-Field Langevin dynamics [26, 89], which can be viewed as a Wasserstein gradient flow for an energy functional tied to the supervised learning objective.

In this paper, we extend the mean-field perspective to analyze policy gradient methods for safety-constrained Markov Decision Processes (MDPs). Specifically, our approach draws on the double entropic regularization framework used by [58], which leads to a McKean-Vlasov-type partial differential equation (PDE). However, by choosing different convex regularizers, we can define alternative gradient flows characterized by various forms of non-linear diffusion. In this way, selecting a regularizer effectively corresponds to choosing a different policy gradient method, each with distinct dynamics and convergence properties.

Further, our approach aligns with the blob method by [22] for approximating PDEs with nonlinear diffusions. In this context, the discrete particle approximation serves to model non-local interactions in the policy updates, allowing us to approximate complex dynamics with tractable, particle-based representations.

### 3. SOLVABILITY OF THE SAFETY-CONSTRAINED PROBLEM

To ensure that the formulations of the safety-constrained model (1) and (4) are well-defined, we will make use of the following regularity assumptions, which limit the complexity of the state-action space as well as the form of reward functions:

**Assumption 1** (Continuity). *We assume that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (W1) *The safety cost functions  $g_k : S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $k = 1 \dots, K$ , are non-negative, lower semicontinuous functions.*
- (W2) *The utility function  $u : S \times A \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  is upper semicontinuous and bounded from above. We denote  $\|u\|_{\infty,+} = \sup_{(s,a) \in S \times A} u(s, a)$ .*
- (W3) *The transition law  $p : S \times A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S)$  is weakly continuous; that is,  $\int_S \varphi(s') dp(s'|s, a)$  is a continuous function on  $S \times A$  for each bounded continuous function  $\varphi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .*

**Assumption 2.** (*Compactness*) For each  $s \in S$  and safety cost  $g_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , define function  $g_k(s, \cdot) : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We assume that the lower level-sets

$$\{a \in A : g_k(s, a) \leq z\}$$

are compact for all  $(s, z) \in S \times \mathbb{R}_+$ .

Note that since  $g_k \geq 0$ , this assumption means that the pre-image (in variable  $a$ ) of compact sets  $[0, z]$  are compact (for every fixed  $s$ ). Note also that if the action space  $A$  is compact, then this assumption is automatically satisfied due to lower semicontinuity of  $g$ . Indeed, by lower semicontinuity, the pre-image of a compact  $[0, z] \subset \mathbb{R}$  is closed, and hence the claim follows since a closed subset of a compact set is automatically compact.

**Assumption 3** (General convergence condition). For all  $s \in S$ ,  $\pi \in \Pi$ , at least one of the numbers  $V_\pi^+(s) := \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^\infty u_t^+ | s \right]$  and  $V_\pi^-(s) := \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^\infty u_t^- | s \right]$  is finite. For any  $u_t := \beta^t u(s_t, a_t)$ , we write  $u_t^+ = \max\{u_t, 0\}$  and  $u_t^- = \min\{u_t, 0\}$  so that  $u_t = u_t^+ + u_t^-$ .

**Definition 3.1** (Feasible safety certificate). Let  $(\phi_{z_t})_{t \geq 0}$  denote a sequence of safety-index vectors  $\phi_{z_t} = (\phi_{z_t, k})_{k=1}^K$ , where the parameters  $(z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , that represent remaining safety budgets, follow (3). We say that  $(\phi_{z_t})_{t \geq 0}$  is a feasible safety certificate, if for any state transition  $s_{t+1} \sim p(\cdot | s_t, a_t)$  that is realized by starting from a safe state-action pair  $(s_t, a_t) \in \text{lev}_{\geq 0} \phi_{z_t}$ , there exists an action  $a_{t+1} \in A$  such that  $(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) \in \text{lev}_{\geq 0} \phi_{z_{t+1}}$ .

**Definition 3.2** (State-action safety barrier). For a given safety certificate  $(\phi_{z_t})_{t \geq 0}$ , we can define a corresponding sequence of barrier functions as  $(B \circ \phi_{z_t})_{t \geq 0}$ , where  $B : \mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is a continuously differentiable non-increasing function. For a vector of currently remaining safety budgets,  $z_t$ , the function  $B \circ \phi_{z_t} : (s, a) \mapsto B(\phi_{z_t}(s, a))$  is said to be a state-action safety barrier, if for every history  $(s_t, a_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , where  $(s_t, a_t) \in \text{lev}_{> 0} \phi_{z_t} = \{(s, a) : \phi_{z_t, k}(s, a) > 0 \forall k\}$  such that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{z_t}(s_t, a_t) = 0$ , we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} B(\phi_{z_t}(s_t, a_t)) = +\infty$ .

**Theorem 3.3** (Existence of stationary Markov policies under safety constraints). Suppose that the safety-constrained problem (1) satisfies the Assumptions 1, 2 and 3. Let

$$(16) \quad u_B(s_t, a_t) = u(s_t, a_t) - B(\phi_{z_t}(s_t, a_t))$$

denote the safety-augmented utility function, where  $B \circ \phi_{z_t}$  is a state-action safety barrier. Then the solution for the optimization problem

$$(17) \quad \underset{\pi \in \Pi}{\text{maximize}} \quad V_\pi(s) := \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^\infty \beta^t u_B(s_t, a_t) \mid s_0 = s \right]$$

can be represented as a stationary, deterministic, Markov policy  $f^* : S \rightarrow A$  such that  $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} V_\pi(s) = V_{f^*}(s)$  for every  $s \in S$ . That is, there exists a function  $f^*$  such that the optimal action is given by  $a = f^*(s)$ .

For proof, see Section 8.1.

#### 4. THE DOUBLE REGULARIZATION FRAMEWORK FOR PARAMETRIZED POLICIES

We now proceed to provide a comprehensive analysis of the convex regularization techniques applied to both reward functions and parameter distributions, briefly introduced in

Section 2.2:

$$\min_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{J}(\mu) = -\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_\mu) + \kappa \mathcal{H}(\mu), \quad \mathcal{H}(\mu) = \sum_{j=1}^J \kappa_j \mathcal{H}_j(\mu | \gamma_j), \quad \kappa_j \geq 0 \quad \forall j,$$

where the first term corresponds to reward regularization through  $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon$  (see Section 4.1), and the second term introduces a geodesically convex functional  $\mathcal{H}$ , which directly regularizes the parameter distributions (refer to Section 4.2). Theoretical analysis can be simplified by assuming, without loss of generality, that all reference measures  $\gamma_j$  are absolutely continuous with respect to a single global reference measure  $\gamma$ , which allows us to reduce our discussion to the case  $J = 1$ .

**4.1. Regularized value function.** For the safety constrained problem (17), we define the regularized policy value function as

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_\mu) &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\mu} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \left\{ u_B(s_t, a_t) - \epsilon F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a_t | s_t) \right) \right\} \middle| s_0 \sim p_0 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S \int_A \left( u_B(s, a) - \epsilon F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a | s) \right) \right) \pi_\mu(da | s) d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu}(ds), \end{aligned}$$

where  $u_B(s, a) - \epsilon F(d\pi_\mu/d\rho(a | s))$  is called the regularized reward from executing action  $a$  in state  $s$  when following policy  $\pi_\mu$ ,  $F \in C^2(0, +\infty)$  is a regularization function,  $\epsilon > 0$  is a regularization strength parameter, and  $d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu}(ds)$  denotes the discounted state visitation distribution of a policy. For the given  $\pi_\mu$  and initial state distribution  $p_0$ , we have written here

$$d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu}(ds') = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim p_0} [d_s^{\pi_\mu}(ds' | s)], \quad d_s^{\pi_\mu}(ds' | s) = (1 - \beta) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t P_{\pi_\mu}^t(ds' | s),$$

where  $P_{\pi_\mu}^t$  is interpreted as a product of state transition kernels, and

$$P_{\pi_\mu}(ds' | s) = \int_A p(ds' | s, a) \pi_\mu(da | s)$$

denotes the state transition kernel of the Markov chain.

**Assumption 4.** Suppose  $F \in C^2(0, +\infty)$  satisfies  $\lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty} F(z) = +\infty$ . Suppose further that  $U(z) = zF(z)$  is convex and  $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} U(z) = 0$ .

**Remark 4.1.** Since  $U(z) = zF(z)$  is convex and  $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} zF(z) = 0$ , we have for all  $z \in (0, +\infty)$  that

$$zF(z) = \int_0^z U'(t) dt \leq zU'(z) = z^2 F'(z) + zF(z),$$

which implies that  $F$  is non-decreasing, i.e.  $F'(z) \geq 0$ . Note also that now we also have  $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} U(z) = \infty$ , and it follows that  $U$  is bounded from below.

**Remark 4.2.** The Assumption 4 is commonly applied in the literature on partial differential equations to define internal energy functionals [8, 22]. For example, considering  $F(z) = \log(z)$  gives the usual entropy regularization, which is often used in RL problems [47, 52].

**Assumption 5.** Assume that, for all  $s \in S$  and  $\rho$ -a.e.  $a \in A$ , there exist constants  $C_{\psi, \rho}^k > 0$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2$ , such that

$$(19) \quad \sup_{s \in S} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{a \in A} \left| \frac{d^k F(\pi_\mu(a|s))}{dz^k} \right| \leq C_{\psi, \rho}^k \quad \forall \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X),$$

where  $\pi_\mu(a, s) = \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a, s)$  and the constants may depend on  $\psi$  appearing in (6) and the reference measure  $\rho$ .

**Remark 4.3.** Note that Assumption 5 is automatically valid if  $F$  and its derivatives are globally bounded. However, we remark that Assumption 5 is typically valid in other cases as well, since we are restricting into the support of  $\pi_\mu(a, s)$ . Indeed, the density  $\pi_\mu$  is given by

$$\pi_\mu(a, s) = Z_\mu^{-1}(s) \exp(\psi(s, a, x)) d\mu(x)$$

with  $Z_\mu(s)$  denoting the normalisation constant given by

$$Z_\mu(s) = \int_A \exp(\psi(s, a, x)) \rho(a) da.$$

Hence if  $\psi$  is bounded, we obtain

$$(20) \quad e^{-2\|\psi\|_\infty} / \rho(A) \leq \pi_\mu(a, s) \leq e^{2\|\psi\|_\infty} / \rho(A).$$

Thus it would be sufficient for  $F$  to be bounded, e.g., on compact subsets  $[a, b] \subset (0, \infty)$  (where the choice of the actual  $[a, b]$  depends on  $\psi$  and  $\rho$  through (20)). Treating the derivatives in a similar way, we obtain (19) where the upper bounds depend on  $\psi$  and its derivatives, cf. Assumption 8 below. In particular, we note that the entropy regularization corresponding to  $F(z) = \log z$  and studied in [58] satisfies Assumption 5 provided that  $\psi$  satisfies Assumption 8.

By using  $\nu_\mu(ds, da) = (1-\beta)^{-1} d_{p_0}^\pi(ds) \pi_\mu(da|s)$  to denote the state-action visitation measure induced by a policy  $\pi_\mu$ , we obtain a complementary interpretation of (18) given by treating the utility function as a variable in the value function. To highlight this, we write  $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_\mu)$  as a function of the given utility function and  $\nu_\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S \times A)$ ,

$$(21) \quad \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(u, \nu_\mu) := \mathcal{V}(u, \nu_\mu) - \epsilon \mathcal{F}(\nu_\mu), \quad \mathcal{F}(\nu_\mu) = \int_{S \times A} F\left(\frac{d\pi}{d\rho}(a|s)\right) d\nu_\mu(s, a),$$

where  $\mathcal{V}$  denotes the bilinear function given by

$$\mathcal{V}(u, \nu_\mu) = \int_{S \times A} u(s, a) d\nu_\mu(s, a).$$

When  $\mathcal{F}$  is a convex functional, the value function  $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon$  is also a convex functional on  $\mathcal{P}(S, A)$ . By lifting the RL problem to the space of state-action visitation measures, we can apply the conjugate duality framework of [79] to extend the robustness characterization of regularized learning introduced by [52] to our setting, where the value function is regularized by a convex, lower semicontinuous penalty function  $\mathcal{F}$  acting on the state-action visitation measures (Lemma 4.4). The dual representation of the regularized RL problem provides a way to interpret the use of regularized value functions in RL problems as a mechanism for enforcing a robustness guarantee on the optimal policy. For simplicity, we discuss the reward robustness interpretation under the additional assumption that the action space  $A$  is a separable Hilbert space. This assumption is only used in Lemma 4.4 and Theorem 4.5.



**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose  $F$  satisfies Assumption 4 and  $A$  is a separable Hilbert space, where  $\rho$  is a fixed reference measure on  $A$ . Then, the regularizer acting on state-action visitation measures,  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{P}(S \times A) \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ ,*

$$\mathcal{F}(\nu) = \int_{S \times A} F \left( \frac{d\nu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) d\nu(s, a),$$

*is a convex and lower semicontinuous function.*

Let  $u_B(s, a) = \bar{u}(s, a) - B(\phi_z(s, a))$  denote the safety augmented utility function, where  $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{U}$  is assumed to be a bounded utility function, and  $\mathcal{U} = L^\infty(S \times A)$  is the space of bounded measurable functions on  $S \times A$ . Throughout, we denote  $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(S \times A)}$  by simply  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  whenever confusion cannot arise. Suppose that there exists a safe policy  $\pi$  that solves (17) in Theorem 3.3, i.e.  $\pi \in \operatorname{argmax} V_\pi$ . Under a strong assumption of no policy approximation error, there exists  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  such that  $\pi = \pi_\mu \in \Pi_2$  can be represented as a parametrized policy. Since  $\pi$  solves the safety constrained problem, it is then sufficient to provide the reward robustness interpretation under the simplifying assumption of bounded rewards.

**Theorem 4.5** (Reward robustness). *Suppose that the assumptions of Lemma 4.4 are satisfied. Let  $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{U} = L^\infty(S \times A)$  be a bounded measurable utility function, and let  $\bar{\nu} \in \operatorname{argmax} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\bar{u}, \cdot)$  denote the state-action measure induced by an optimal policy that solves the safety constrained problem in Theorem 3.3. If the space of parametric policies is large enough to attain zero approximation error, we have that*

$$(22) \quad \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\bar{u}, \bar{\nu}) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_\mu) = \inf_{u' \in \mathcal{U}} \{ \mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*(\bar{u} + u') - \mathcal{V}(u', \bar{\nu}) \},$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*(\bar{u} + u')$  represents the optimal value attainable under the perturbed utility  $\bar{u} + u'$  given by

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*(\bar{u} + u') = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(S \times A)} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\bar{u} + u', \nu) = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(S \times A)} \{ \mathcal{V}(\bar{u} + u', \nu) - \epsilon \mathcal{F}(\nu) \},$$

which coincides with the convex conjugate  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^* = (\epsilon \mathcal{F})^*$ .

For proofs of these results, see Section 8.2.

The dual formulation (22) suggests that the solution to the regularized RL problem needs to be robust against rewards chosen by an adversary. The behavior of the adversary is determined by the shape of the original utility function. While the adversary seeks to optimize a worst-case utility function, it is penalized for behaving according to a utility function that is too far from the original utility. In practice, we can then interpret that the policies learned using regularized value functions should be stable in the presence small perturbances to the rewards.

**4.2. Regularization of policy parametrizations.** While regularization of the value function can be viewed as a robustification strategy, we may still benefit from regularizing also the distribution of policy parameters directly. Intuitively,  $\mathcal{H}$  quantifies the divergence between two distributions  $\mu$  and  $\gamma$  as an average cost of the likelihood ratio for a convex cost function  $H$ . By selecting  $H(s) = s \log(s)$ , we obtain the relative entropy or Kullback-Leibler divergence. Other well known examples include the Hellinger distance,  $\chi^2$ -divergence, and the  $\alpha$ -divergences that are convex transformations of the Rényi divergences.

To ensure that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a convex and lower semicontinuous functional on  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , we assume that Assumptions 6 and 7 hold. Then, the proof of lower semicontinuity and convexity of  $\mathcal{H}(\cdot|\gamma)$  stated in Lemma 4.6 is readily obtained by combining [8, Lemma 9.4.3 and Theorem 9.4.12].

**Assumption 6** (Convexity and growth condition). *Let  $H : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  be a proper, convex and lower semicontinuous function with superlinear growth at infinity such that*

$$(23) \quad \text{the map } z \mapsto H(e^{-z})e^z \text{ is convex and non-increasing in } (0, +\infty).$$

*Furthermore, we assume that  $H \in C^2(0, +\infty)$  has a second derivative  $H''$  that is at most of linear growth.*

**Assumption 7** (Normalized potential). *We say that a reference measure  $\gamma$  is defined by a normalized potential, if there exists a convex and a differentiable function  $U : X \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  such that  $\gamma = e^{-U} \cdot \mathcal{L}^d$  is a Borel probability measure, and  $\nabla U$  is Lipschitz-continuous and at most of linear growth in  $x$ .*

**Lemma 4.6.** *Suppose  $H : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  satisfies Assumption 6. If  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  is a probability measure defined by a normalized potential such that Assumption 7 holds, then  $\mathcal{H}$  given by*

$$\mathcal{H}(\mu) := \mathcal{H}(\mu|\gamma) = \begin{cases} \int_X H\left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}\right) d\gamma & \text{if } \mu \ll \gamma \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

*is lower semicontinuous and convex in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ .*

## 5. WASSERSTEIN DIFFERENTIABLE APPROXIMATION

To define the gradient flow in the Wasserstein metric for the safety constrained RL problem, we can translate the original maximization problem into a corresponding minimization problem, where the solution can be approximated using a sequence of smooth and bounded functionals. Let  $\operatorname{argmin}\{\mathcal{J}\}$  denote the set of (exact) minimizers of  $\mathcal{J}$ , and let  $\varepsilon$ - $\operatorname{argmin}\mathcal{J}^n$  denote the set of  $\varepsilon$ -optimal (approximate) minimizers of  $\mathcal{J}^n$ :

$$(24) \quad \operatorname{argmin}\{\mathcal{J}\} := \left\{ \mu^* \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) \mid \mathcal{J}(\pi_{\mu^*}) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{J}(\pi_{\mu}) \right\};$$

$$(25) \quad \varepsilon\text{-}\operatorname{argmin}\{\mathcal{J}^n\} := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) \mid \mathcal{J}^n(\pi_{\mu}) \leq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{J}^n(\mu) + \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Specifically, we need to construct a sequence of bounded, smooth approximations  $\{\mathcal{J}^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left[ \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{J}^n(\mu) \right] = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{J}(\mu),$$

and, for any choice of  $\varepsilon^n \searrow 0$  and regularization parameters  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\kappa > 0$ , the cluster points for a sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $\mu_n \in \varepsilon^n\text{-}\operatorname{argmin}\{\mathcal{J}^n\}$ , belong to  $\operatorname{argmin}\{\mathcal{J}\}$ .

We will now present epiconvergent approximations  $\mathcal{V}^n$  and  $\mathcal{H}^n$  for both value function (see Section 5.2) and the regularizer (see Section 5.3), respectively, where each approximator is a smooth and bounded functional. Then, having the components defined, we can show in Section 5.4 that the smooth approximation  $\mathcal{J}^n = \mathcal{V}^n + \kappa\mathcal{H}^n$  satisfies the above requirements.

**5.1. Definition of Wasserstein differentiability.** In the sequel, we consider a functional  $\phi : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ . For convenience, we will first recall the following connection between the linear functional derivative and the existence of a Wasserstein gradient.

**Definition 5.1** (Linear functional derivative). *A functional  $\phi$  on  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  is said to have a linear functional derivative if there exists a function*

$$\frac{\delta\phi}{\delta\mu} : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \times X \ni (\mu, x) \mapsto \frac{\delta\phi}{\delta\mu}(\mu)(x) \in \mathbb{R},$$

*which is continuous for the product topology, such that, for any bounded subset  $M \subset \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , the function  $X \ni x \mapsto [\delta\phi/\delta\mu](\mu)(x)$  is at most of quadratic growth in  $x$  uniformly in  $\mu$ ,  $\mu \in M$ , and such that for all  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , it holds:*

$$\phi(\mu') - \phi(\mu) = \int_0^1 \int_X \frac{\delta\phi}{\delta\mu}(t\mu' + (1-t)\mu)(x) d[\mu' - \mu](x) dt$$

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $\phi : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  have a linear functional derivative such that for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  the function  $X \ni x \mapsto [\delta\phi/\delta\mu](\mu)(x)$  is differentiable and the derivative*

$$\mathcal{P}_2(X) \times X \ni (\mu, x) \mapsto \nabla_x \left[ \frac{\delta\phi}{\delta\mu} \right] (\mu)(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

*is jointly continuous in  $(\mu, x)$  and is at most of linear growth in  $x$ , uniformly in  $\mu \in M$  for any bounded subset  $M \subset \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ . Then the following statements hold:*

(i) *For any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , there exists  $\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \varepsilon(r) = 0$ , and*

$$\phi(\mu') - \phi(\mu) = \int_X \frac{\delta\phi}{\delta\mu}(\mu)(x) d[\mu' - \mu](x) + o(W_2^2(\mu, \mu')) \quad \forall \mu' \in \mathcal{P}_2(X),$$

*where  $|o(W_2^2(\mu, \mu'))| \leq \varepsilon(W_2^2(\mu, \mu'))$ .*

(ii) *The function  $\phi$  has a Wasserstein gradient  $\nabla_\mu \phi(\mu)(\cdot) \in T_\mu \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  such that*

$$\nabla_\mu \phi(\mu)(\cdot) = \nabla_x \frac{\delta\phi}{\delta\mu}(\mu)(\cdot), \quad \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X).$$

*where the elements of tangent space  $T_\mu \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  are identified with gradients of the test functions*

$$T_\mu \mathcal{P}_2(X) = \overline{\{\nabla\varphi : \varphi \in C_c^\infty(X)\}}^{L^2(\mu, X)} \quad \forall \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X).$$

The proof of the proposition is obtained directly by combining [19, Proposition 5.44 and Proposition 5.48].

We say that  $\phi$  is Wasserstein differentiable (Definition 5.5), if both sub- and super-differentials (Definition 5.3) coincide and contain only one element known as the Wasserstein gradient. We denote the proper domain of  $\phi$  by

$$\text{dom}(\phi) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) \mid \phi(\mu) < \infty\}.$$

**Definition 5.3** (Wasserstein sub- and super-differential). *Let  $\mu \in \text{dom}(\phi)$ . A function  $\xi \in L^2(X, \mathbb{R}^d; \mu)$  belongs to the subdifferential  $\partial^- \phi(\mu)$  of  $\phi$  at  $\mu$  if*

$$\phi(\mu') - \phi(\mu) \geq \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma_o(\mu, \mu')} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle \xi(x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) + o(W_2(\mu, \mu'))$$

*for all  $\mu' \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Similarly,  $\xi \in L^2(X, \mathbb{R}^d; \mu)$  belongs to the superdifferential  $\partial^+ \phi(\mu)$  of  $\phi$  at  $\mu$  if  $-\xi \in \partial^-(-\phi)(\mu)$ .*

**Remark 5.4.** Here, we have denoted  $f(x) = o(g(x))$  for non-negative  $f$  and positive  $g$  if  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = 0$ ; in particular,  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{o(x)}{x} = 0$ .

**Definition 5.5** (Wasserstein gradient). A functional  $\phi : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is said to be Wasserstein-differentiable at some  $\mu \in \text{dom}(\phi)$  if there exists a unique element  $\nabla_\mu \phi(\mu) \in \partial^+ \phi(\mu) \cap \partial^- \phi(\mu)$  called the Wasserstein gradient of  $\phi$  at  $\mu$ , which satisfies

$$\phi(\mu') - \phi(\mu) = \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_\mu \phi(\mu)(x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) + o(W_2(\mu, \mu'))$$

for any  $\mu' \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  and any  $\gamma \in \Gamma_o(\mu, \mu')$ .

**Remark 5.6.** The definition of the Wasserstein gradient coincides with Lion's  $L$ -derivative and the notion of  $L$ -differentiability [19]. A function  $\phi$  on  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  is said to be  $L$ -differentiable at  $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  if there exists a random variable  $Y_0$  with  $\text{Law}(Y_0) = \mu_0$  such that the lifted function  $\tilde{\phi}$  is Fréchet differentiable at  $Y_0$ . Here, the lifting  $\tilde{\phi}$  is defined on a Hilbert space  $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}; X)$  over some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  by setting  $\tilde{\phi}(Y) = \phi(\text{Law}(Y))$ , for  $Y \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}; X)$ ,  $\Omega$  being a Polish space,  $\mathcal{F}$  its Borel  $\sigma$ -field and  $\mathbb{P}$  an atomless probability measure (since  $\Omega$  is Polish,  $\mathbb{P}$  is atomless if and only if every singleton has a zero measure).

**5.2. Smooth and bounded approximation of  $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon$ .** In the presence of safety constraints, the regularized value function  $\mu \mapsto \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_\mu)$  is unbounded when the policy  $\pi_\mu$  does not meet the safety requirements. Though the use of state-action barrier functions brings smoothness to the formulation, we would benefit from being able to approximate the original formulation by considering a sequence of problems, where the rewards are bounded.

Let  $(m_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  be sequences such that  $m_n \nearrow +\infty$  and  $\epsilon_n \searrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ . Let  $(u_{B \wedge m_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of truncated rewards, where  $u_{B \wedge m_n}$  denotes the  $m_n$ -truncation of  $u_B$  defined by

$$u_{B \wedge m_n}(s, a) = \begin{cases} -m_n & \text{if } u_B(s, a) \in (-\infty, -m_n), \\ u_B(s, a) & \text{if } u_B(s, a) \in [-m_n, +\infty). \end{cases}$$

Note that now  $u_{B \wedge m_n}$  is bounded since  $u$  is bounded from above and  $B(z) \geq 0$ . Then, a corresponding sequence of value functions  $(\mathcal{V}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is given by

$$(26) \quad \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu) := \frac{1}{1 - \beta} \int_S \int_A u_{B \wedge m_n}(s, a) - \epsilon_n \cdot F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) \pi_\mu(da|s) d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu}(ds).$$

The following result shows that the optimal values of the approximating problems converge to the optimal value of the original problem under safety constraints. Let  $\text{argmax } \mathcal{V}_0$  denote the set maximizers for  $\mu \mapsto \mathcal{V}_0(\pi_\mu)$ , and let  $\epsilon$ -argmax  $\mathcal{V}^n$  be the set of  $\epsilon$ -optimal maximizers for  $\mu \mapsto \mathcal{V}^n$ :

$$(27) \quad \text{argmax } \mathcal{V}_0 := \{\mu^* \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) \mid \mathcal{V}_0(\pi_{\mu^*}) \geq \mathcal{V}_0(\pi_\mu) \ \forall \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)\};$$

$$(28) \quad \epsilon\text{-argmax } \mathcal{V}^n := \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) \mid \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu) \geq \sup \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu) - \epsilon\}$$

**Proposition 5.7** (Convergence of approximations). If  $(u_{B \wedge m_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of truncated rewards, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left[ \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu) \right] = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{V}_0(\pi_\mu),$$

where  $\mathcal{V}_0(\pi_\mu) = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim p_0}[V_{\pi_\mu}^B(s)]$  is the value function of the safety constrained problem without regularization and truncation. Moreover, for  $\varepsilon^n \searrow 0$  and  $\mu_n \in \varepsilon^n$ -argmax  $\mathcal{V}^n$ , the sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded such that all its cluster points belong to argmax  $\mathcal{V}_0$ .

For proof, see Section 8.3.1.

The boundedness of rewards in the approximating problems provides us a way to calculate linear functional derivatives and the Wasserstein gradient for each of the approximate value functions.

**Assumption 8** (Differentiability and boundedness of  $\psi$ ). *Assume that for all  $s \in S$ ,  $\rho$ -a.e.  $a \in A$ , the approximator  $\psi_{s,a}(\cdot) := \psi(s, a, \cdot)$  is  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  times differentiable with bounded derivatives, which allows us to interpret  $\psi_{s,a}$  as an element of a Sobolev space,*

$$\psi_{s,a} \in W^{k,\infty}(X) = \{f \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{L}^d) : D^\alpha f \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{L}^d) \forall |\alpha| \leq k\},$$

where  $\alpha$  is a multi-index and  $\|\psi_{s,a}\|_{W^{k,\infty}(X)} := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \text{ess sup}_{x \in X} |D^\alpha \psi_{s,a}|$ . To ensure boundedness of  $\psi$ , we further assume that for all  $s \in S$  and  $\rho$ -a.e.  $a \in A$ , we have

$$\|\psi\|_{\Psi_X^{k,\infty}} := \sup_{s \in S} \text{ess sup}_{a \in A} \|\psi_{s,a}\|_{W^{k,\infty}(X)} < +\infty,$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{\Psi_X^{k,\infty}}$  is the norm on the product space  $S \times A \times X$ . We then denote the set of admissible approximations by  $\Psi_X^{k,\infty} := \left\{ \psi \in L^\infty(S \times A \times X) : \|\psi\|_{\Psi_X^{k,\infty}} < +\infty \right\}$ .

The following Lemma 5.8 can be obtained by using the same arguments as [58].

**Lemma 5.8** (Differentiability of  $\pi_\mu$ ). *For any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  and state  $s \in S$ , let  $Z_\mu(s)$  denote the normalization constant for a soft-max policy*

$$(29) \quad \pi_\mu(da|s) = \frac{1}{Z_\mu(s)} \exp\left(\int_X \psi(s, a, x) d\mu(x)\right) d\rho(a).$$

*If the approximator  $\psi$  satisfies Assumption 8 for some  $k \geq 1$ , then the policy (29) has a linear functional derivative*

$$(30) \quad \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) = \left[ \psi(s, a, x) - \int_A \psi(s, a', x) d\pi_\mu(a'|s) \right] \pi_\mu(da|s),$$

*which satisfies the Wasserstein differentiability condition in Proposition 5.2.*

**Remark 5.9.** *To show the connection between the gradient of the functional derivative (30) and the classical policy gradient formula, let us consider a policy  $\pi_x(a|s) \propto e^{\psi(s,a,x)}$  with  $\psi(s, a, x) = \varphi(s, a)^T x$ , which is constructed using only one particle  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  (i.e.,  $\mu_K = \delta_x$  with  $K = 1$ ). Noting that  $\nabla_x \log \pi_x(a|s) = \varphi(s, a) - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(s, a') \mid a' \sim \pi_x(\cdot|s)]$ , we obtain  $\nabla_x \pi_x(a|s) = [\varphi(s, a) - \int_A \varphi(s, a') \pi_x(da'|s)] \pi_x(a|s)$  showing the similarity of  $\nabla_x \pi_x$  to  $\nabla_x[\delta \pi_\mu / \delta \mu]$ , which is the gradient of the functional derivative (30).*

**Proposition 5.10** (Differentiability of  $\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)$ ). *Suppose  $\psi$  satisfies Assumption 8 for some  $k \geq 1$ . Then for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , the truncated value function  $\mathcal{V}^n$  has a linear functional*

derivative,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x) &= \frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S \left[ \int_A \left( Q_{\pi_\mu}^n(s, a) - \epsilon_n F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) \right) \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \epsilon_n \int_A \frac{\delta F(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \pi_\mu} \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) \right] d^{\pi_\mu}(ds), \end{aligned}$$

where  $Q_{\pi_\mu}^n$  is the state-action value function for a policy parametrized by  $\mu$ :

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\pi_\mu}^n(s, a) &= u_{B \wedge m_n}(s, a) + \beta \int_S \mathcal{V}_{\pi_\mu}^n(s') dp(s'|s, a) \\ \mathcal{V}_{\pi_\mu}^n(s) &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\mu} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \left\{ u_{B \wedge m_n}(s_t, a_t) - \epsilon_n F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a_t|s_t) \right) \right\} \middle| s_0 = s \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the functional derivative satisfies the Wasserstein differentiability conditions in Proposition 5.2.

For proof, see Section 8.3.2.

**Example 5.11.** In the case of entropic regularization,  $F(s) = \log(s)$ , the linear functional derivative can be simplified to

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x) = \frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S \int_A \left( Q_{\pi_\mu}^n(s, a) - \epsilon_n \log \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) \right) \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d^{\pi_\mu}(ds).$$

For details, see Section 8.3.4.

**5.3. Smooth approximation of  $\mathcal{H}$ .** Although  $\mathcal{H}$  is only lower semicontinuous, we can achieve a differentiable functional by convolving it with a mollifier. Our use of mollifiers to regularize the entropy functional is essentially similar to the approach discussed by [22].

For any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and measurable function  $\phi$ , the convolution of  $\phi$  and  $\mu$  is given by

$$\phi * \mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x-y) d\mu(y)$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , whenever the integral converges. With a chosen mollifier  $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfying  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \eta(x) dx = 1$ , we define a family  $(\eta_\zeta)$  by  $\eta_\zeta(x) = \zeta^{-d} \eta(x/\zeta)$  and define the approximation  $\mu_\zeta$  by

$$\mu_\zeta(x) = \eta_\zeta * \mu(x).$$

It is well-known that the resulting function is smooth, and  $\mu_\zeta(x) dx$  can be considered as an absolute continuous approximation of  $d\mu(x)$ .

**Remark 5.12.** A prototypical mollifier is the Gaussian density with zero mean and covariance matrix  $\zeta I_d$ . The Gaussian convolutions are often referred to as the heat semigroup due to their close connection to the heat equations. While the use of Gaussian mollifiers is convenient, most of the results discussed in this paper are valid for any choice of mollifier  $\eta$  that can be written as  $\eta = \zeta * \zeta$ , where  $\zeta \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d; [0, \infty))$  is even,  $\|\zeta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} = 1$  and  $\zeta(x) \leq C_\zeta |x|^{-q}$ ,  $|\nabla \zeta(x)| \leq C'_\zeta |x|^{-q'}$  for some  $C_\zeta, C'_\zeta > 0$  and  $q > d+1$ ,  $q' > d$ , cf. [22].

**Definition 5.13** (Smoothed divergence). Let  $(\eta_\zeta) \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be a family of mollifiers in the parameter variable  $x$ , for example  $\eta_\zeta(x) = (2\pi\zeta)^{-d/2} \exp(-|x|^2/2\zeta)$  corresponding to Gaussian

mollifiers, and suppose that  $H \in C^2(0, +\infty)$  satisfies Assumption 6. Given a prior probability measure  $\gamma$  satisfying Assumption 7, we define the smoothed divergence functional as

$$(31) \quad \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu) := \mathcal{H}(\eta_\varsigma * \mu | \gamma) = \int_X H(\eta_\varsigma * \mu) d\gamma, \quad \mu \ll \gamma, \text{ for all } \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), \varsigma > 0,$$

where  $\mathcal{H}(\eta_\varsigma * \mu | \gamma)$  denotes the generalized relative entropy of the mollified measure  $\eta_\varsigma * \mu$  with respect to  $\gamma$ .

Throughout, we require the following technical assumption.

**Assumption 9.** Denote  $\nu_\varsigma = \eta_\varsigma * \nu = \eta_\varsigma * \frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}$ . We assume that

$$\left\| \frac{\nabla \nu_\varsigma \cdot \nu_\varsigma}{\nu} \right\|_\infty < \infty$$

uniformly for small enough  $\varsigma$ .

**Remark 5.14.** Note that the Assumption 9 is rather mild and is satisfied for many densities  $\nu$ . Indeed, while  $\nu_\varsigma(x)$  might decay slower than  $\nu(x)$ , the derivative  $\nabla \nu_\varsigma$  is typically sufficient to compensate the difference. For example, if  $\eta_\varsigma$  is a Gaussian mollifier, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\varsigma(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varsigma^{-d} \eta((x-y)/\varsigma) \nu(y) dy \\ &= \int_{|x-y| > \frac{|x|}{c_0}} \varsigma^{-d} \eta((x-y)/\varsigma) \nu(y) dy \\ &\quad + \int_{|x-y| < \frac{|x|}{c_0}} \varsigma^{-d} \eta((x-y)/\varsigma) \nu(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first term decays as  $\exp(-c_1|x|^2)$  for some  $c_1$  depending on the choice of  $c_0$  if, e.g.  $\nu$  is bounded. Similarly, if e.g.  $\nu$  is eventually decreasing, the second term decays as  $\nu(c_2|x|)$  for  $c_2$  depending on  $c_0$ . Since  $\nabla \eta$  decays similarly as  $\eta$  (by possibly altering  $\varsigma$  slightly), we see that the derivative of  $\nabla \nu^\varsigma$  has similar behaviour. It can be now shown that by choosing  $c_0$  suitably, Assumption 9 is automatically valid with Gaussian mollifiers provided that  $\eta(x)$  decays as Gaussian, as exponential, or as power function  $|x|^{-\alpha}$ . One can show with simpler arguments that the same conclusion is valid if the mollifier  $\eta$  has compact support.

Under Assumptions 6 and 7 both  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  can be understood as convex functionals in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ .

**Lemma 5.15.** Suppose  $H : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  satisfies Assumption 6. If  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  is a probability measure defined by a normalized potential such that Assumption 7 holds, then  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  is lower semicontinuous and convex in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ .

For proof, see Section 8.4.1.

**Proposition 5.16** ( $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  epi-converges to  $\mathcal{H}$ ). Let  $(\mu_\varsigma)_\varsigma \subset \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  such that  $\mu_\varsigma \rightarrow \mu$  narrowly as  $\varsigma \rightarrow 0$ . Then

- (i)  $\liminf_{\varsigma \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_\varsigma) \geq \mathcal{H}(\mu | \gamma)$ ; and
- (ii)  $\limsup_{\varsigma \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu) \leq \mathcal{H}(\mu | \gamma)$ .

Moreover, for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , the (inf-)level sets of  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$ :

$$\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) \mid \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu) \leq \alpha\}$$

are compact with respect to the weak-\* topology on  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ .

For proof, see Section 8.4.2.

In addition to convexity and lower semicontinuity properties, Assumptions 4 and 7, are sufficiently strong to ensure differentiability of the mollified divergence functionals. Even though  $\mathcal{H}$  may not have a linear functional derivative, its mollified counterpart  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  becomes sufficiently well-behaved to allow us to apply the differential calculus on  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ .

**Proposition 5.17** (Differentiability of  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$ ). *Suppose  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  is a smoothed divergence with  $\varsigma > 0$ , and let  $L_H : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  denote the function  $L_H(u) = uH'(u) - H(u)$ . For any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ ,  $\mu = \varrho \cdot \mathcal{L}^d$ , the smoothed divergence  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  with reference measure  $\gamma = e^{-U} \mathcal{L}^d$  has a linear functional derivative,  $\delta\mathcal{H}_\varsigma/\delta\mu$ , which is differentiable in  $x$ . Then, the Wasserstein gradient is given by*

$$(32) \quad \nabla_x \frac{\delta\mathcal{H}_\varsigma}{\delta\mu}(\mu, x) = \frac{\nabla_x L_H(\varrho_\varsigma(x)/e^{-U(x)})}{\varrho(x)/e^{-U(x)}} \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where  $\varrho_\varsigma$  is the density of  $\eta_\varsigma * \mu$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

For proof, see Section 8.4.3.

**Remark 5.18.** *We note that if  $\varrho$  is sufficiently smooth in the first place, mollification is not required for the above result to hold true. Formally this means that we can plug in  $\varsigma = 0$  whenever  $\nabla_x L_H(\varrho(x)/e^{-U(x)})$  exists.*

**Example 5.19.** *For  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  and  $\varsigma > 0$ , let  $\mu_\varsigma = \eta_\varsigma * \mu = \varrho_\varsigma \cdot \mathcal{L}^d$  and  $\gamma = e^{-U} \mathcal{L}^d$ . Then, if we choose  $H(s) = s \log(s)$ , we recover the derivative for the smoothed Kullback-Leibler divergence,*

$$\mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu) = \int_X \frac{d\mu_\varsigma}{d\gamma} \log\left(\frac{d\mu_\varsigma}{d\gamma}\right) d\gamma,$$

as

$$\nabla_x \frac{\delta\mathcal{H}_\varsigma}{\delta\mu}(\mu, x) = \left( \frac{\nabla_x \varrho_\varsigma(x)}{\varrho_\varsigma(x)} + \nabla_x U(x) \right) \frac{\varrho_\varsigma(x)}{\varrho(x)}.$$

If  $\rho$  is smooth, we can set  $\varsigma = 0$ , and the gradient is given by

$$\nabla_x \frac{\delta\mathcal{H}_\varsigma}{\delta\mu}(\mu, x) = \frac{\nabla_x \varrho(x)}{\varrho(x)} + \nabla_x U(x).$$

**5.4. Smooth and bounded approximation of  $\mathcal{J}$ .** We can now define the approximation for the objective functional as

$$(33) \quad \mathcal{J}^n(\mu) = -\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu) + \kappa_n \cdot \mathcal{H}_{\varsigma_n}(\mu).$$

In line with the minimization formulation of the problem, we also define  $\mathcal{J}_0 : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathcal{J}_0(\mu) = -\mathcal{V}_0(\pi_\mu) = -\frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S \int_A u_B(s, a) d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu}(ds) \pi_\mu(da|s),$$

as the negative of the value function for the safety constrained problem without regularization and truncation; i.e., we obtain  $\mathcal{J}_0$  by setting  $\epsilon_n = 0$  and  $m_n = +\infty$  in (33). To motivate this approach, we show that the sequence of approximations converges and each  $\mathcal{J}^n$  is sufficiently smooth to be a Wasserstein differentiable function such that we can present a necessary optimality condition in a way that is analogous to the Euclidean case.



**Theorem 5.20** (Wasserstein differentiable approximation). *For any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , the approximation  $\mathcal{J}^n$  has a linear functional derivative*

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{J}^n}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x) = -\frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x) + \kappa_n \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}_{\zeta_n}}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x),$$

which is differentiable in  $x$ , and the Wasserstein gradient

$$\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu)(x) = -\nabla_x \left[ \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu} \right](\mu, x) + \kappa_n \nabla_x \left[ \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}_{\zeta_n}}{\delta \mu} \right](\mu, x)$$

is jointly continuous in  $(\mu, x)$  and is at most of linear growth in  $x$ , uniformly in  $\mu \in M$  for any bounded subset  $M \subset \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ .

If  $(\mathcal{J}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of approximations (33), then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left[ \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{J}^n(\mu) \right] = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{J}_0(\mu),$$

where  $\mathcal{J}_0$  is the value function of the safety constrained problem without regularization and truncation. Moreover, for any choice of  $\varepsilon^n \searrow 0$  and  $\mu_n \in \varepsilon^n$ -argmin  $\mathcal{J}^n$ , the sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded such that all its cluster points belong to argmin  $\mathcal{J}_0$ .

For proof, see Section 8.5.

## 6. CONVERGENCE OF REGULARIZED POLICY GRADIENT

Now that we have defined smooth approximations  $\mathcal{J}^n : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ , let

$$\mathbf{v}_t(x) = \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{J}^n}{\delta \mu_t}(\mu_t, x),$$

be a Borel vector field defined using the Wasserstein gradient of  $\mathcal{J}^n$ . When  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  is endowed with a Riemannian differentiable structure, the gradient flow  $(\mu_t)_{t \in I}$  is a curve in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  that solves the following continuity equation:

$$(34) \quad \partial_t \mu_t + L_\mu^* \mu_t = 0, \quad L_\mu^* \mu_t = -\nabla_x \cdot (\mathbf{v}_t \mu_t) \quad \text{in } I \times X,$$

where  $\nabla_x \cdot$  denotes the divergence operator, and  $L_\mu^*$  is an operator on  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  defined by a Borel vector field  $\mathbf{v} : (t, x) \mapsto \mathbf{v}_t(x) \in X$ .

**6.1. First order optimality condition.** Given that  $(\mathcal{P}_2(X), W_2)$  is a metric space, we can define the notions of local and global minimizers in the usual way. Then, we can state the necessary optimality condition in a way that is analogous to the Euclidean case.

**Definition 6.1** (Local and global minimizers). *We say that a probability measure  $\mu^* \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  is a local minimizer of a function  $\phi : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ , if there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\phi(\mu) \geq \phi(\mu^*)$  for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\mu^*)$ , where*

$$\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\mu^*) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) : W_2(\mu, \mu^*) < \epsilon\}$$

is a  $d_W$ -ball of radius  $\epsilon > 0$  at  $\mu^*$ . If this holds for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , then  $\mu^*$  is a global minimizer.

In the light of the recent work [62], we recover our Proposition 6.2 as a special case of a broader result [62, Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2] that can be extended to other optimization problems that are sufficiently regular to admit the use of Wasserstein gradients.

**Proposition 6.2** (First-order optimality condition for  $\mathcal{J}^n$ ). *If  $\mu^* \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{J}^n)$  is a local minimizer of the approximation  $\mathcal{J}^n$ , then the Wasserstein gradient  $\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*) \in T_{\mu^*} \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  vanishes at the point  $\mu^*$ :*

$$\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*)(x) = 0 \quad \mu^*\text{-a.e. } x \in X.$$

For completeness, we have included the proof in Section 8.6.1 that can be seen as a simplified version of the proof presented in [62]. If  $\mu^*$  satisfies the necessary optimality condition in Proposition 6.2, we have  $L_\mu^* \mu^* = 0$ , and hence  $\mu^*$  is a stationary point for the partial differential equation (34).

**6.2. Cauchy-Lipschitz conditions and energy identity.** When the gradient flow is defined using the Wasserstein gradient of  $\mathcal{J}^n$  and it can be characterized using a so-called energy-dissipation equality, which shows that  $\mathcal{J}^n$  decreases along the gradient flow. For given initial data  $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , it can be shown that the gradient flow  $(\mu_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a unique solution for the continuity equation, when  $\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu)$  is a uniformly Lipschitz function with sublinear growth.

However, before stating the regularity conditions that are needed to ensure the existence and uniqueness of solutions, we revisit the definition of the continuity equation (34) to highlight that the velocity field defined by Wasserstein gradient is a non-local term; that is, the velocity field  $\mathbf{v}$  depends on the measure itself. For every  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , we say that a Borel family of vector fields  $(t, x) \mapsto \mathbf{v}(\mu)(t, x)$  is a non-local velocity field with regularity

$$\mathbf{v} : \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) \mapsto \mathbf{v}(\mu)(\cdot, \cdot) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, C^1(X; X))$$

Here, it is important to observe that  $\mathbf{v}$  is understood as an operator taking as input the whole measure  $\mu$  and giving as an output a global vector field  $\mathbf{v}(\mu)$  on the whole space  $X$ .

We will now state the regularity conditions under the assumption that the initial data  $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  is compactly supported. Let  $\mathcal{P}_c(X)$  denote the subset of measures which have compact support. The support of a Borel probability measure is defined as the closed set  $\text{supp}(\mu) = \{x \in X \text{ s.t. } \mu(\mathcal{N}) > 0 \text{ for any neighbourhood } \mathcal{N} \text{ of } x\}$ . Following [16, 76, 77], we consider the following conditions to ensure that the continuity equation (34) is well-posed when the velocity field depends on the measure itself.

**Definition 6.3** (Non-local Cauchy-Lipschitz conditions). *Consider a non-local velocity field  $\mathbf{v}(\mu) := \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu)$  defined by the Wasserstein gradient of  $\mathcal{J}^n$ . We say that  $\mathbf{v}$  satisfies Cauchy-Lipschitz conditions, if the following conditions hold:*

(i) *For all  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$ ,  $x, y \in X$ , there exist constants  $L, M > 0$  not depending on  $\mu$  such that*

$$(35) \quad |\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu, x) - \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu, y)| \leq L|x - y| \quad \text{and}$$

$$(36) \quad |\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu, x)| \leq M(1 + |x|).$$

(ii) *For all  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$ , there exists a constant  $K > 0$  such that*

$$(37) \quad \|\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu) - \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\nu)\|_{C^0(X; X)} \leq KW_1(\mu, \nu).$$

**Theorem 6.4** (Characterization of gradient flow via energy identity). *For any  $\bar{\mu}_0 \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{J}^n)$ , there exists an absolutely continuous curve  $(\mu_t)_{t \geq 0}$  in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  such that the pair  $(\mu_t, \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_t))_{t \geq 0}$  solves the Cauchy problem*

$$(38) \quad \partial_t \mu_t + L_\mu^* \mu_t = 0, \quad \mu_0 = \bar{\mu}_0,$$

where  $L_\mu^* \mu_t = -\nabla_x \cdot (\mathbf{v}_t \mu_t)$  is defined by  $\mathbf{v}_t = \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_t) \in T_\mu \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ . Then,  $(\mu_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a gradient flow for  $\mathcal{J}^n$  satisfying the energy-dissipation equality:

$$(39) \quad \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_b) - \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_a) = - \int_a^b \|\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_t)\|_{L^2(\mu_t; X, X)}^2 dt \quad \forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}, a < b.$$

When  $\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n$  satisfies the Cauchy-Lipschitz conditions and  $\bar{\mu}_0 \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$ , the Cauchy problem (38) admits a unique solution  $(\mu_t)_t \subset \mathcal{P}_c(X)$  that is locally Lipschitz with respect to the  $W_1$ -metric. Besides, if  $\bar{\mu}_0$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{L}^d$ , then  $\mu_t$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{L}^d$  as well for all times  $t \geq 0$ .

Furthermore for every  $T > 0$  and every  $\bar{\mu}_0, \bar{\nu}_0 \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$ , there exists  $R_T > 0$  depending on  $\text{supp}(\bar{\mu}_0)$  and  $C_T > 0$  such that

$$\text{supp}(\mu_t) \subset \overline{B(0, R_T)} \quad \text{and} \quad W_1(\mu_t, \nu_t) \leq e^{C_T t} W_1(\bar{\mu}_0, \bar{\nu}_0),$$

for all times  $t \in [0, T]$  and any solutions  $(\mu_t)_t, (\nu_t)_t$ .

For proof, see Section 8.6.2.

**Remark 6.5.** Note that in natural settings, we have the first order condition  $\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*) = 0$  given in Proposition 6.2 and the gradient flow decreases to a local minimizer satisfying  $\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*) = 0$ .

**Lemma 6.6** (Approximation by regular curves). Let  $\bar{\mu}_0 \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$  and let  $(\eta_\zeta) \subset C^\infty$  be a family of strictly positive mollifiers in the  $x$  variable. Denote the mollified measures and the corresponding velocity field by  $\mu^\zeta := \eta_\zeta * \mu$  and  $\mathbf{v}^\zeta := \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^\zeta)$ , respectively. Suppose that

- (i) the approximator satisfies  $\psi \in \Psi_X^{k, \infty}$  for some  $k \geq 2$ ;
- (ii)  $F$  satisfies Assumptions 4 and 5;
- (iii)  $H \in C^3(0, +\infty)$  and  $U \in C^1(X)$  satisfy Assumptions 6 and 7.

Then  $\mathbf{v}^\zeta$  satisfies Cauchy-Lipschitz conditions and  $(\mu_t^\zeta)_{t \geq 0}$  solves the Cauchy problem

$$\partial_t \mu_t^\zeta + L_\mu^* \mu_t^\zeta = 0, \quad \mu_0^\zeta = \eta_\zeta * \bar{\mu}_0$$

where  $L_\mu^* \mu_t^\zeta = -\nabla_x \cdot (\mathbf{v}_t^\zeta \mu_t^\zeta)$ .

For proof, see Section 8.6.3.

**6.3. Global convergence with  $\lambda$ -convex regularization.** The results discussed in the previous section are only about local optimality of solutions. Though the regularizers are convex functionals, the approximated objective function  $\mathcal{J}^n$  is not necessarily convex with respect to the parameter measure  $\mu$ . However, as implied by the recent findings of [58] in the case of a double entropic regularization, it is possible to choose the regularization strength parameters such that the objective functional behaves in a similar way as a functional that is convex along geodesics in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ . In Theorem 6.8, we show that the asymptotic convergence properties of strongly regularized gradient flows can be generalized in the case of Wasserstein differentiable functions.

**Definition 6.7.** A continuously Wasserstein differentiable function  $\phi : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be  $\lambda$ -convex (semi-convex) with  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , if for every  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , we have:

$$\phi(\mu') - \phi(\mu) - \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_\mu \phi(\mu)(x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} W_2^2(\mu', \mu),$$

for any  $\gamma \in \Gamma_o(\mu, \mu')$ .

**Theorem 6.8** (Convergence to global optimizer). *Let  $\mathcal{H}_\zeta$  be a  $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}_\zeta}$ -convex functional with  $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}_\zeta} > 0$ . Suppose that  $\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n$  satisfies the non-local Cauchy-Lipschitz conditions and there exist  $C_V > 0$  and  $K_V > 0$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_\mu \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, y) - \nabla_\mu \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, x)| &\leq C_V |y - x| \\ |\nabla_\mu \mathcal{V}^n(\nu, y) - \nabla_\mu \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, x)| &\leq K_V W_1(\mu, \nu) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$  and  $x, y \in X$ . If the regularization strength parameter  $\kappa_n > 0$  is sufficiently large such that  $\lambda_J := \kappa_n \lambda_{\mathcal{H}_\zeta} - C_V - K_V \geq 0$ , then  $\mathcal{J}^n$  is  $\lambda_J$ -convex along geodesics.

If  $\lambda_J > 0$  and  $(\mu_t)_t$  is a gradient flow for  $\mathcal{J}^n$  with  $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$ , then  $\mathcal{J}^n$  admits a unique minimum  $\mu^*$  and

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(\mu_t, \mu^*) &\leq W_2(\mu_{t_0}, \mu^*) e^{-\lambda_J(t-t_0)}, \\ \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_t) - \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*) &\leq (\mathcal{J}^n(\mu_{t_0}) - \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*)) e^{-2\lambda_J(t-t_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

For proof, see Section 8.7.1.

**Lemma 6.9** (Convergence of regular approximations). *Let  $\bar{\mu}_0 \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$  and let  $(\eta_\zeta) \subset C^\infty$  be a family of strictly positive mollifiers in the  $x$  variable. Denote the mollified measures and the corresponding velocity field by  $\mu^\zeta := \eta_\zeta * \mu = \nu^\zeta \cdot \gamma$  and  $\mathbf{v}^\zeta := \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^\zeta)$ , respectively. Suppose that*

- (i) the conditions in Lemma 6.6 are satisfied;
- (i) there exists  $m_\zeta > 0$  such that  $L'_H((n\nu^\zeta(x))) \geq m_\zeta$  for any  $\nu^\zeta = d\mu^\zeta/d\gamma$ ,  $\mu^\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$  and  $x \in \text{supp}(\mu^\zeta)$ ; and
- (ii) there exists  $\lambda_U > 0$  such that  $\langle \nabla U(y) - \nabla U(x), y - x \rangle \geq \lambda_U |y - x|^2$  for all  $x, y \in \text{supp}(\mu^\zeta)$ .

Then the smoothed divergence  $\mathcal{H}_\zeta$  is  $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}_\zeta}$ -convex with  $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}_\zeta} > 0$ , where the constant depends on the choice of  $H$ ,  $U$ , and the mollifier  $\eta_\zeta$ . By Theorem 6.4,  $\mathbf{v}^\zeta$  satisfies Cauchy-Lipschitz conditions and  $(\mu_t^\zeta)_{t \geq 0}$  solves the Cauchy problem with initial data  $\mu_0^\zeta = \eta_\zeta * \bar{\mu}_0$ . Moreover, since  $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}_\zeta} > 0$ , Theorem 6.8 gives an exponential convergence rate, when the regularization parameter  $\kappa_n > 0$  is sufficiently large.

For proof, see Section 8.7.2.

**Remark 6.10.** *The additional condition on  $H$ , i.e.,  $L'_H(\nu_\zeta(x)) \geq m_\zeta$ , is closely related to the “dimension free” condition for geodesic convexity of internal energy functionals [8, Proposition 9.3.9 and Remark 9.3.10]. That is, if  $H$  satisfies the condition  $zL'_H(z) - L_H(z) \geq 0$  for all  $z \in (0, +\infty)$ , then the map  $z \mapsto z^d H(z^{-d})$  is convex and non-increasing in  $(0, +\infty)$ , which is a sufficient condition for (generalized) geodesic convexity of a functional  $\int_X H(\rho(x)) d\mathcal{L}^d$  if  $\mu = \rho \cdot \mathcal{L}^d \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ .*

## 7. PARTICLE METHODS FOR WASSERSTEIN GRADIENT FLOWS

The parametrized policy gradient methods are generally solved using particle methods, where we discretize  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  using  $K$  particles parametrized by their positions and weights,  $\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K w_i \delta_{x_i}$ . This leads to the finite-dimensional problem:

$$(40) \quad \underset{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^K, \mathbf{x} \in X^K}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathcal{J}_K^n(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) := \mathcal{J}^n \left( \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K w_i \delta_{x_i} \right),$$

which can be approached using a combination of Monte Carlo methods and general gradient descent algorithms. The choice of a suitable algorithm, however, depends on the type of the regularization functions used to define  $\mathcal{J}^n$ . From practical perspective, it is then essential to be aware of the close connection between the chosen regularizer and how it is manifested in the structure of the particle methods.

As an example on how the choice of regularizer can have important implications for the numerical algorithms, we can consider the well-known variants of  $m$ -relative entropy, i.e., Kullback-Leibler divergence ( $m = 1$ ) and the power entropy ( $m \geq 2$ ):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_\varsigma^{(1)}(\mu) &= \int_X \frac{\varrho_\varsigma(x)}{\sigma(x)} \log \left( \frac{\varrho_\varsigma(x)}{\sigma(x)} \right) d\gamma(x), \\ \mathcal{H}_\varsigma^{(m)}(\mu) &= \frac{1}{m(m-1)} \int_X \{ \varrho_\varsigma(x)^m - m\varrho_\varsigma(x)\sigma(x)^{m-1} + (m-1)\sigma(x)^m \} dx,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\varrho_\varsigma$  denotes the mollified density of  $\mu$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure, and  $\gamma = \sigma \mathcal{L}^d$ , is a reference measure with density  $\sigma = e^{-U}$  defined by a normalized potential  $U$  such that Assumption 7 is satisfied.

**7.1. Double entropic regularization as noisy gradient descent.** Let us start by considering the most commonly applied regularization with  $F(s) = \log(s)$  and  $H(s) = s \log(s)$ , which corresponds to the double entropic regularization setting [58]. In the case of double entropic setting, it is possible to obtain a well-defined gradient without mollification of the measures. Hence, we can set  $\varsigma = 0$ , and the regularized objective and the corresponding Wasserstein gradient are then given by

$$\mathcal{J}^n(\mu) = -\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu) + \kappa_n \mathcal{H}_0^{(1)}(\mu),$$

and

$$\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu, x) = -\nabla_\mu \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)(\mu, x) + \kappa_n \left( \frac{\nabla_x \varrho(x)}{\varrho(x)} + \nabla_x U(x) \right),$$

respectively. The gradient flow is then defined as a solution to the following continuity equation with linear diffusion

$$(41) \quad \partial_t \mu_t = \nabla_x \cdot \left( \left( -\nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\mu_t) + \kappa_n \nabla_x U \right) \mu_t \right) + \kappa_n \Delta_x \mu_t,$$

where  $\Delta_x$  denotes the Laplace operator. Since the approximate objective  $\mathcal{J}^n$  is smooth and bounded, our framework satisfies the assumptions of [58, Theorem 2.10] and [19, Theorem 4.21]. Hence, the above PDE can be represented using a forward stochastic differential equation (SDE) of McKean-Vlasov type, which are often referred to as nonlinear SDEs where the coefficients can depend on the marginal distributions of the solutions. McKean-Vlasov SDEs describe the asymptotic behavior of mean-field interacting particle systems as the number of particles tends to infinity [18, 54, 55].

**Theorem 7.1** (SDE of McKean-Vlasov Type). *Let  $(\Omega, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}, \mathbb{P})$  be a filtered probability space. Let  $W = (W_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  is an  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted Wiener process. Then, if  $X_0 \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P}; \mathbb{R}^d)$  is a  $\mathcal{F}_0$ -measurable random variable independent of  $W$ , there exists a unique continuous  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted solution  $X_t : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  of the McKean-Vlasov SDE:*

$$(42) \quad dX_t = \left( \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\mu_t, X_t) - \kappa_n \nabla_x U(X_t) \right) dt + \sqrt{2\kappa_n} dW_t, \quad X|_{t=0} = X_0,$$

where  $\mu_t = \text{Law}(X_t)$  is the distribution of  $X_t$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .

The dynamics in (42) can be viewed as continuous time noisy gradient ascent [35, 56] to maximize  $\mathcal{V}^n$  (or minimize  $\mathcal{J}^n$ ). Particle approximation to the mean-field equation leads to the following discretization with time step  $\Delta t$ :

$$X_{t+1,i} = X_{t,i} + \alpha \left( \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\hat{\mu}_t, X_{t,i}) - \kappa_n \nabla_x U(X_{t,i}) \right) \Delta t \\ + \sqrt{2\kappa_n \Delta t} Z_{t+1,i},$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, K$  is an index of a particle,  $\alpha > 0$  is a learning rate,  $\hat{\mu}_t = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \delta_{X_{t,i}}$  is a  $K$ -particle approximation of measure  $\mu_t$ , and  $(Z_{t,i})_{i=1}^K$  is a sequence of random variables  $Z_{t,i} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ . The approximation error between  $\hat{\mu}_t$  and  $\mu_t$  depends on the number of particles and the learning rate, such that the complexity is of order  $O(1/K) + O(\alpha)$  uniformly in time [32, 56].

**7.2.  $m$ -relative entropy as a Blob method.** Let us next consider  $m$ -relative entropy with  $m \geq 2$  as a regularizer:

$$\mathcal{J}^n(\mu) = -\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu) + \kappa_n \mathcal{H}_\zeta^{(m)}(\mu),$$

While the gradient flow with KL divergence regularization ( $m = 1$ ) corresponds to a linear diffusion that has a natural representation as a stochastic particle method [51, 54, 55], the choice of  $m$ -relative entropy with  $m > 1$  as a regularizer leads to a non-linear diffusion (see, e.g. [53, Proposition 8.3] for the Wasserstein gradient of  $\mathcal{H}_\zeta^{(m)}(\mu)$ ):

$$(43) \quad \partial_t \mu_t = \nabla_x \cdot \left[ \left( -\nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\mu_t) + \kappa_n \nabla_x \left( \frac{(\eta_\zeta * \mu_t)^{m-1} - \sigma^{m-1}}{1-m} \right) \right) \mu_t \right].$$

So far, there has been very scarce discussion on extensions of the stochastic particle methods to cover the non-linear case. Instead, we can approach the problem using deterministic particle methods [20, 21, 54].

In general, the problem with particle methods has been that particles do not remain particles for PDEs with a diffusion, because the initial data (an empirical measure represented by sums of Dirac masses) gets smoothed instantaneously. However, as shown by [22], a suitable regularization of the energy functional (convolution with mollifiers) can help to ensure that particles remain as particles while retaining the Wasserstein gradient flow structure. The choice of regularization approach in this paper was largely motivated by its compatibility with the Blob method proposed by [22], which can be seen as an extension of vortex Blob methods and linearly transformed particle methods [30, 45, 49].

Under the assumptions of Theorem 6.4 and Theorem 6.8, the gradient flow (43) is well-defined. The regularization also ensures that the deterministic particle method by [22] is applicable; i.e., a solution of the gradient flow with initial datum given by a finite sum of Dirac masses remains a sum of Dirac masses. Then, the trajectories of the particles are given by a system of ordinary differential equations:

$$\dot{X}_{t,i} = \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\hat{\mu}_t, X_{t,i}) - \kappa_n \nabla_x \left( \frac{(\eta_\zeta * \hat{\mu}_t(X_{t,i}))^{m-1} - \sigma(X_{t,i})^{m-1}}{1-m} \right), \quad t \in [0, T] \\ X_{0,i} = X_i^0, \quad i = 1, \dots, K,$$

where  $\hat{\mu}_t := \sum_{i=1}^K w_i \delta_{X_{t,i}}$ , with  $\sum_{i=1}^K w_i = 1$ , is a  $K$ -particle approximation of measure  $\mu_t$ . The particle solution can be expressed as a Blob solution by considering the convolution with the mollifier

$$\mu_t^\zeta(X_{t,i}) := (\eta_\zeta * \mu_t)(X_{t,i}) \approx \sum_{j=1}^K \eta_\zeta(X_{t,i} - X_{t,j}) w_j.$$

Here, we have assumed the use of Gaussian mollifier, which allows us to interpret the Blob approximation as a sum of  $K$  Gaussian distributions. For insights on how the effects of  $m$ -relative entropy, we can consider the particle approximation for the gradient of the mollified density:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x \mu_t^\zeta(X_{t,i})^{m-1} &= (m-1) \mu_t^\zeta(X_{t,i})^{m-2} \nabla_x \mu_t^\zeta(X_{t,i}) \\ &\approx (1-m) \left( \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{(X_{t,i} - X_{t,j})}{\zeta^2} \eta_\zeta(X_{t,i} - X_{t,j}) w_j \right) \left( \sum_{j=1}^K \eta_\zeta(X_{t,i} - X_{t,j}) w_j \right)^{m-2}, \end{aligned}$$

which suggests that the gradient of the mollified density has a resemblance to particle interaction terms. Specifically, it captures mainly short-range interactions, while it tends to ignore longer distance effects due to exponential decay of the Gaussian mollifier. As such, we can see that the way how  $m$ -relative entropy influences the particle trajectories is quite different from the KL divergence. The decision on what types of regularizers to prefer is therefore likely to be a highly context dependent choice. When considering asymptotic convergence, the specific choice of a regularizer does not seem so important, but in practice there are a number of considerations to take into account ranging from the dimension of the parameter space and the type of function approximation used.

## 8. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

### 8.1. Proofs related to Section 3.

*Proof of Theorem 3.3.* Our aim is to use the general result of [81] (see Theorem A.1 in Appendix A). For this, we enlarge the state space and then verify that the (enlarged) problem satisfies the assumptions of Theorem A.1. Without loss of generality and for the sake of notational simplicity, we consider the case of a single constraint,  $g$ , and initial budget  $b \geq 0$ . Let now

$$\phi_z : (s, a) \mapsto (z - g(s, a)) / \beta_g \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

be the corresponding safety index function parametrized by  $z \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . For any sequence of state-action pairs  $(s_t, a_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , we then have a corresponding sequence of safety index values  $(z_t)_{t \geq 0}$  given by  $z_{t+1} = \phi_{z_t}(s_t, a_t)$ ,  $z_0 = b$ . Since  $(z_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a Markov process, we can store these variables as part of the state space  $S$ . Denote the augmented space by  $\bar{S} = S \times \mathbb{R}_+$ , where the elements are defined as pairs  $\bar{s} = (s, z)$ . It follows that now we can characterize the state-wise constraint in terms of the level sets of  $\phi_{z,s} : a \mapsto \phi_z(s, \cdot)$ , i.e.,

$$(44) \quad D(\bar{s}) = \text{lev}_{\geq 0} \phi_{z,s} = \{a \in A \mid \phi_z(s, a) \geq 0\},$$

where  $D : \bar{S} \rightrightarrows A$  is a measurable, set-valued mapping, and the problem can be re-written as

$$\text{maximize}_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(s_t, a_t) - B(\phi_{z_t}(s_t, a_t)) \mid s_0 = s \right].$$

It now remains to verify that the assumptions of Theorem A.1 are satisfied. For this we first note that

$$D(\bar{s}) = \{a \in A : g(s, a) \leq z\}$$

is compact by Assumption 2. Consider next item (i). We have to prove that the set

$$G_M = \{(s, z) \in \bar{S} : D(\bar{s}) \cap M \neq \emptyset\}$$

is closed whenever  $M$  is closed. However, this follows from the lower semicontinuity of  $g$ . Indeed, fix  $a \in M$ . Since  $D(\bar{s}) \cap M \neq \emptyset$  for all  $\bar{s} \in G_M$ , we have  $g(s, a) - z \neq 0$  for all  $(s, z) \in G_M$ . Let now  $(s_n, z_n) \in G_M$  be a converging sequence. Then in particular  $g(s_n, a) - z_n \leq 0$ , and since  $g$  is lower semicontinuous, it follows that

$$g(s, a) - z \leq \liminf_{(s_n, z_n) \rightarrow (s, z)} g(s_n, a) - z_n \leq 0$$

and thus  $(s, z) \in G_M$  proving that  $G_M$  is closed. Next for item (ii), it simply suffices to note that it corresponds to our assumption (W3). Similarly for item (iii), our reward function is now given by

$$u(s, a) - B((z - g(s, a))/\beta).$$

Here  $u$  is upper semicontinuous by (W2), and  $-B((z - g(s, a))/\beta)$  is upper semicontinuous as a composition of non-decreasing upper semicontinuous function  $-B$  (by Definition 3.2) together with a function  $z - g(s, a)$  that is upper semicontinuous by (W1). It remains to verify (iv). For this, we show that

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t [u_B(s_t, a_t)]_+ | s_0 = s \right] < \infty$$

for all  $s \in S$  and  $\pi \in \Pi$ . However, this follows directly from the fact that

$$(u_B)_+ = (u - B)_+ \leq u_+ \leq C$$

since  $B((z - g(s, a))/\beta) \geq 0$  for all  $(a, s, z)$  by Definition 3.2 and  $u$  is bounded from above by (W2). This gives (iv) as well concluding the proof.  $\square$

## 8.2. Proofs related to Section 4.

8.2.1. *Proof of Lemma 4.4.* First, to show that  $\mathcal{F}$  is convex, let  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(S \times A)$  be a state-action visitation measure, let  $\text{pr}_1 : S \times A \rightarrow A$  be a projection on the first component, and let  $\nu_S = (\text{pr}_1)_\# \nu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  be the image measure defined by the projection map. By applying the disintegration theorem [8, Theorem 5.3.1], we can then canonically identify each fiber  $s \mapsto (\text{pr}_1)^{-1}(s)$  with  $A$  and obtain a  $\nu_S$ -a.e. uniquely determined Borel family of probability measures  $\{\pi_s\}_{s \in S} \subset \mathcal{P}(A)$  such that  $\nu = \int_S \pi_s d\nu_S(s)$ .

By writing  $\pi(a|s) := \pi_s(a) \in \mathcal{K}(S, A)$  to denote the density corresponding to  $a \in A$  given  $s \in S$ , we interpret the conditional probabilities as elements of a bounded kernel space  $\mathcal{K}(S, A)$ ; see Appendix B. Let  $L^\infty(S \times A)$  be the space of bounded measurable functions. Denoting the set of densities on  $S \times A$  by

$$D := \{\nu \in L^\infty(S \times A) \mid \nu(s, a) = \pi(a|s)\nu_S(s), \nu_S \in \mathcal{P}(S), \pi \in \mathcal{K}(S, A)\},$$



we can interpret  $\mathcal{F}$  as a functional on bounded measurable functions:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}(\nu) &= \int_{S \times A} F(\pi(a|s)) d\nu(s, a) \\ &= \int_S \left( \int_A F(\pi(a|s)) \pi(a|s) d\rho(a) \right) d\nu_S(s) \\ &= \int_S \left( \int_A F\left(\frac{\nu(s, a)}{\int_A \nu(s, a) da}\right) \frac{\nu(s, a)}{\int_A \nu(s, a) da} d\rho(a) \right) \nu_S(s) ds.\end{aligned}$$

For a given  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\nu^1(s, a) = \pi^1(a|s)\nu_S^1(s)$ ,  $\nu^2(s, a) = \pi^2(a|s)\nu_S^2(s) \in D$ , we can define

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^\lambda(a|s) &:= \frac{\nu^\lambda(s, a)}{\int_A \nu^\lambda(s, a) da} = \frac{\lambda\nu^1(s, a) + (1-\lambda)\nu^2(s, a)}{\nu_S^\lambda(s)} \\ &= \frac{\lambda\nu_S^1(s)}{\nu_S^\lambda(s)} \pi^1(a|s) + \frac{(1-\lambda)\nu_S^2(s)}{\nu_S^\lambda(s)} \pi^2(a|s) \\ &= \alpha(s, \lambda) \pi^1(a|s) + (1-\alpha(s, \lambda)) \pi^2(a|s),\end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha(s, \lambda) := \lambda\nu_S^1(s)/\nu_S^\lambda(s) \in [0, 1]$ . Since the function  $U : x \mapsto xF(x)$  is convex by Assumption 4, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}(\nu^\lambda) &\leq \int_S \left( \int_A [\alpha(s, \lambda)U(\pi^1(a|s)) + (1-\alpha(s, \lambda))U(\pi^2(a|s))] d\rho(a) \right) \nu_S^\lambda(s) ds \\ &= \lambda \int_S \left( \int_A U(\pi^1(a|s)) d\rho(a) \right) d\nu_S^1(s) + (1-\lambda) \int_S \left( \int_A U(\pi^2(a|s)) d\rho(a) \right) d\nu_S^2(s) \\ &= \lambda\mathcal{F}(\nu^1) + (1-\lambda)\mathcal{F}(\nu^2).\end{aligned}$$

To finalize the proof of convexity, we check that the set  $D$  is convex. Using the above notations, for any  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\nu^1, \nu^2 \in D$ , there exist  $\nu_S^1, \nu_S^2 \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  and  $\pi^1, \pi^2 \in \mathcal{K}(S, A)$  such that

$$\nu^\lambda = \lambda\nu^1(s, a) + (1-\lambda)\nu^2(s, a) = \bar{\nu}_S(s) \left( \lambda\pi^1(a|s) \frac{\nu_S^1(s)}{\bar{\nu}_S(s)} + (1-\lambda)\pi^2(a|s) \frac{\nu_S^2(s)}{\bar{\nu}_S(s)} \right),$$

where we can choose  $\bar{\nu}_S(s) = \frac{1}{2}(\nu_S^1(s) + \nu_S^2(s)) \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  so that both  $\nu_S^1$  and  $\nu_S^2$  are absolutely continuous with respect to  $\bar{\nu}_S$ . Then we find the sum inside the brackets bounded and it is well defined as an element of  $\mathcal{K}(S, A)$ , which means that  $\nu^\lambda$  is in  $D$ .

To show that  $\mathcal{F}$  is lower semicontinuous, we write  $\mathcal{F}(\nu) = \int_S G_\rho(s, \nu) d\nu_S(s)$ , where the integrand function  $G$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned}G_\rho(s, \nu) &:= \int_A F\left(\frac{\nu(s, a)}{\int_A \nu(s, a) da}\right) \frac{\nu(s, a)}{\int_A \nu(s, a) da} d\rho(a) \\ &= \int_A U(\pi_\nu(a|s)) d\rho(a).\end{aligned}$$

By recalling Assumption 4, we note that  $U(x) = xF(x)$  is a proper, continuous, convex function with superlinear growth (since  $F(z) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $z \rightarrow \infty$ ), and by construction  $\pi_\nu \in \mathcal{K}(S, A)$  is understood as a density that is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\rho$ ; i.e.  $\pi_\nu(\cdot|s) \ll \rho$  for all  $s \in S$ . Then by [8, Lemma 9.4.3], we have that

$$G_\rho(s, \nu) \leq \liminf_{h \rightarrow \infty} G(s, \nu^h),$$

when  $(\nu^h)$  weakly\* converges to  $\nu$ , which implies that  $G_\rho(s, \nu)$  is lower semicontinuous, convex function of  $\nu$  for every  $s \in S$ . For the lower semicontinuity of  $\mathcal{F}$ , take  $\nu^h$  such that  $\|\nu_h - \nu\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ . By Fatou's lemma we then get

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{h \rightarrow \infty} \int_S G_\rho(s, \nu^h) \nu_S^h(s) ds &\geq \int_S \liminf_{h \rightarrow \infty} G_\rho(s, \nu^h) \nu_S^h(s) ds \\ &\geq \int_S G_\rho(s, \nu) \nu_S(s) ds \end{aligned}$$

showing that  $\mathcal{F}$  is lower semicontinuous. This completes the whole proof.  $\square$

8.2.2. *Proof of Theorem 4.5.* Let  $\bar{\mathcal{U}} \subset \mathcal{U}$  denote the set of utility functions, which is a subset of  $\mathcal{U} = L^\infty(S \times A)$ , which is the space of bounded measurable functions equipped with  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -norm. Let  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{M}(S \times A)$  denote the space of all complex measures, which is a Banach space when endowed with the total variation norm. Let  $\mathcal{Y}_\pi \subset \mathcal{Y}$  be the set of state action visitation measures induced by the parametrized policies (8),

$$\mathcal{Y}_\pi = \{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(S \times A) \mid \exists \pi_\mu \in \Pi_2, \nu(ds, da) = \pi_\mu(da|s) d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu}(ds), p_0 \in \mathcal{P}(S)\},$$

where  $\Pi_2$  denotes the policy space with  $\pi_\mu$  parametrized by measures  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , and  $d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu}$  is the state visitation measure induced by  $\pi_\mu$  and the initial state distribution  $p_0$ . As shown by [60] (see Example 2.3), the topological dual of  $\mathcal{U}$  can be identified with  $\mathcal{Y}$  such that  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$  is a norming dual pair with a continuous bilinear form given by

$$\langle u, \nu \rangle = \int_{S \times A} u(s, a) d\nu(s, a).$$

Since  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$  is a norming dual pair, the norm unit ball,  $U_1^\circ = \{\nu \in \mathcal{Y} : \|\nu\| \leq 1\}$ , of the continuous dual is weak-\* compact by Banach-Alaoglu theorem. Specifically, we then note that the set of probability measures  $\mathcal{P}(S \times A) \subset \{\nu \in \mathcal{Y} : \|\nu\| = 1\} \subset U_1^\circ$  is weak-\* compact as a closed subset of  $U_1^\circ$ .

Let  $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{U}$  denote a given utility function such that

$$\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_\mu) = \langle \bar{u}, \nu_\mu \rangle - \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\nu_\mu),$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\cdot) := \epsilon \mathcal{F}(\cdot) + \delta_{\mathcal{P}(S \times A)}(\cdot)$ ,  $\nu_\mu \in \mathcal{Y}_\pi$  is the state-action visitation induced by  $\pi_\mu$ , and  $\delta_{\mathcal{P}(S \times A)}$  is the indicator function for the set of probability measures  $\mathcal{P}(S \times A)$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}(S \times A)$  is weak-\* compact and convex, the indicator function  $\delta_{\mathcal{P}(S \times A)}$  is a proper, lower semicontinuous, convex function. We can now interpret the policy optimization task as a concave maximization problem over the general set of measures on state-action space:

$$(45) \quad \text{maximize } \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\bar{u}, \nu) := \langle \bar{u}, \nu \rangle - \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\nu) \quad \text{over } \nu \in \mathcal{P}(S \times A).$$

By considering the state-action visitation measures as a subset of  $\mathcal{Y}$ , we obtain an upper bound for the optimal value function given by the convex conjugate of  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$ ,

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*(u) = \sup\{\langle u, \nu \rangle - \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\nu) \mid \nu \in \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

That is, for the given utility  $u$ , we have that  $\sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{Y}_\pi} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(u, \nu) \leq \mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*(u)$ . However, under the strong assumption of no policy approximation error, we can write

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*(\bar{u}) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_\mu) = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(S \times A)} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\bar{u}, \nu).$$

Let us now construct an alternative interpretation for the regularized policy optimization problem by using the duality framework studied by [74, 79]. Let  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$  be a dual pair and

$(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$  be a copy of the original dual pair, i.e.  $\mathcal{X} = L^\infty(S \times A)$  and  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{M}(S \times A)$ . To embed our concave maximization problem (which can be naturally interpreted as the dual formulation) in the duality framework, we need to construct a suitable minimization problem to obtain a corresponding primal formulation.

To this end, we will now introduce function  $F : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  as

$$F(x, u) = \mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*(u + x),$$

and define the primal problem as

$$(46) \quad \text{minimize } F(x, u) - \langle x, v' \rangle \quad \text{over } x \in \mathcal{X},$$

and the corresponding dual problem as

$$(47) \quad \text{maximize } \langle u, \nu \rangle - F^*(v', \nu) \quad \text{over } \nu \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

We have included an additional linear perturbation in the primal objective for the symmetry of formulations. The primal value function is then given by

$$\varphi_{v'}(u) := \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{F(x, u) - \langle x, v' \rangle\},$$

and the corresponding dual value function is defined as

$$\gamma_u(v') := \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{Y}} \{F^*(v', \nu) - \langle u, \nu \rangle\}.$$

By the definition, we can write the conjugate  $F^*$  as

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} F^*(v', \nu) &= \sup_{x, u} \{\langle x, v' \rangle + \langle u, \nu \rangle - \mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*(u + x) \mid x \in \mathcal{X}, u \in \mathcal{U}\} \\ &= \sup_{x, u'} \{\langle x, v' \rangle + \langle u' - x, \nu \rangle - \mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*(u') \mid x \in \mathcal{X}, u' = u + x \in \mathcal{U}\} \\ &= \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{\langle x, v' \rangle - \langle x, \nu \rangle + \sup_{u' \in \mathcal{U}} \{\langle u', \nu \rangle - \mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*(u')\}\} \\ &= \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{\langle x, v' - \nu \rangle + \mathcal{F}_\epsilon^{**}(\nu)\} \\ &= \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\nu) + \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{\langle x, v' - \nu \rangle\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since, by Lemma 4.4,  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon$  is a lower semicontinuous, convex function, which is closed in the sense that  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\nu) > -\infty$  for all  $\nu$ , we have by the biconjugate theorem [79, Theorem 5] that  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\nu) = \mathcal{F}_\epsilon^{**}(\nu)$ . When  $v' = \nu$  and  $u = \bar{u}$ , we recover the policy optimization problem (45) showing that it is embedded within the dual formulation (47).

We note that the Lagrangian associated with  $F$  is the convex-concave function on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}$  given by

$$L(x, \nu) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \{F(x, u) - \langle u, \nu \rangle\}.$$

Now we can state the Lagrangian saddle-point problem as finding the saddle-point for

$$(49) \quad L_{v', u}(x, \nu) = L(x, y) - \langle x, v' \rangle + \langle u, \nu \rangle.$$

That is, we find the dual problem being equivalent to the maximization half of this Lagrangian minimax problem

$$\inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} L_{v', u}(x, \nu) = \langle u, \nu \rangle - F^*(v', \nu).$$

Since  $F$  is closed in  $u$  by construction, the biconjugate theorem gives

$$F(x, u) - \langle x, v' \rangle = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{Y}} L_{v', u}(x, \nu),$$

which shows that we recover the primal problem as the minimization half of the minimax problem.

The absence of duality gap follows from [74, Theorem 60 and Theorem 61]. The closedness of the objective  $F$  follows from the biconjugate theorem, since  $F$  is defined as a composition of  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*$  (closed, convex) and a linear function, which means that also  $F$  must be closed and convex, i.e., we have that  $F^{**} = F$ . Since  $\varphi_{v'}^*(\nu) = F^*(v', \nu)$  and  $F$  is closed, the biconjugate theorem implies that  $\varphi_{v'}(u) = \varphi_{v'}^{**}(u) = \sup_\nu \{\langle u, \nu \rangle - F^*(v', \nu)\}$ , and hence  $\varphi_{v'}$  must be also closed. Then, by [74, item (2) of Theorem 60], the absence of duality gap is equivalent to  $\varphi_{v'}$  being closed at  $u$ . Since  $F$  is closed, we then have by items (3) and (4) in the same theorem that also  $\gamma_u$  is closed at  $v'$ , and  $L_{v',u}$  has a saddle-value, i.e.

$$(50) \quad \inf_x \sup_\nu L_{v',u}(x, \nu) = \sup_\nu \inf_x L_{v',u}(x, \nu).$$

Let us now consider the problem parametrized by  $u = \bar{u}$  and  $v' = \bar{\nu}$ , and assume that  $\bar{\nu}$  solves the regularized policy optimization problem for the given utility  $\bar{u}$ , i.e.  $\bar{\nu} \in \operatorname{argmax}\{\langle \bar{u}, \nu' \rangle - \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\nu') : \nu' \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ . Under the strong assumption of no policy approximation error, there exists  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  and  $\pi_\mu \in \Pi_2$  such that  $\bar{\nu} \in \mathcal{Y}_\pi$ . Given that  $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\pi_\mu) \in (-\infty, \infty)$ , we have by equality also  $-\gamma_{\bar{u}}(\bar{\nu}) = \varphi_{\bar{\nu}}(\bar{u}) \in (-\infty, \infty)$  and, by [74, Theorem 61], we note that  $\bar{\nu} \in \partial\varphi_{\bar{\nu}}(\bar{u})$  solves the dual. Then the minimax problem (50) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} -\gamma_{\bar{u}}(\bar{\nu}) &= \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\bar{u}, \bar{\nu}) = \sup_\nu \{\langle \bar{u}, \nu \rangle - F^*(\bar{\nu}, \nu)\} \\ &= \inf_x \{F(x, \bar{u}) - \langle x, \bar{\nu} \rangle\} \\ &= \inf_x \{\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*(\bar{u} + x) - \langle x, \bar{\nu} \rangle\} = \varphi_{\bar{\nu}}(\bar{u}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\bar{u} + x)$  represents the optimal value attainable under the perturbed utility  $\bar{u} + x$

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^*(\bar{u} + x) = \sup_\nu \{\langle \bar{u} + x, \nu \rangle - \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\nu)\}.$$

Since the perturbation is chosen by minimization, we can interpret the primal problem as an adversarial policy optimization problem. In the absence of duality gap, solving the regularized policy optimization (dual) problem (45) has an alternative interpretation as an adversarial (primal) optimization problem (46), which completes the proof.  $\square$

**8.3. Proofs and details related to Section 5.2.** We first present the proofs of Propositions 5.7 and Proposition 5.10. For brevity, we omit the proof of Lemma 5.8, which can be obtained using the same arguments as in [58]. After that in Section 8.3.3 we present some additional lemmas used in the proofs. The details on Example 5.11 are presented in Section 8.3.4.

**8.3.1. Proof of Proposition 5.7.** For convenience, we formulate the problem from minimization perspective and consider the sequence of approximations  $(-\mathcal{V}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where

$$-\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu) := \frac{1}{1 - \beta} \int_S \int_A -u_{B \wedge m_n}(s, a) + \epsilon_n \cdot F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu}(ds) \pi_\mu(da|s).$$

To simplify the notations, let  $\Xi := S \times A$ . If  $(\mu_n)_n$  is a sequence of parameter measures, we denote the corresponding sequence of parametrized policies by  $(\pi_{\mu_n})_n \subset \mathcal{K}(S, A)$ . Similarly, we denote the sequence of parametrized state-action measures by  $(\nu_n)_n$ , where  $\nu_n := d_{p_0}^{\pi_{\mu_n}}(ds) \pi_{\mu_n}(da|s)$  is a measure on  $\Xi$  parametrized by  $\mu_n$ .

Let  $(f_n)_n$  denote the sequence of integrands  $f_n : \Xi \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ ,

$$(51) \quad f_n(\xi, y) = \frac{1}{1 - \beta} (-u_{B \wedge m_n}(\xi) + \epsilon_n \cdot F(y)).$$

Then, we can write  $-\mathcal{V}^n : \mathcal{K}(S, A) \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  as an expectation function

$$(52) \quad -\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_{\mu_n}) = E_{\nu_n}[f_n](\pi_{\mu_n}) := \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n}[f_n(\xi, \pi_{\mu_n}(\xi))], \quad \pi_{\mu_n} \in \mathcal{K}(S, A).$$

By Lemma 8.3, we know that  $-\mathcal{V}^n$  is a lower semicontinuous functional with inf-compact level sets. Note also that  $-\mathcal{V}^n > -\infty$ . Indeed, this follows since  $u_{B \wedge m_n}$  is bounded and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_S \int_A F\left(\frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s)\right) d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu}(ds) \pi_\mu(da|s) \\ &= \int_S \int_A F\left(\frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s)\right) \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) d\rho(a) d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu}(ds) \\ &= \int_S \int_A U\left(\frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s)\right) d\rho(a) d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu}(ds) \\ &> -C > -\infty \end{aligned}$$

since  $U(z) > -C$  is bounded from below. Thus  $\bar{\alpha}_n = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} [-\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)]$  is finite, and hence the set

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \{-\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)\} = \bigcap_{\alpha \in (\bar{\alpha}_n, \infty)} \operatorname{lev}_{\leq \alpha} -\mathcal{V}^n = \operatorname{lev}_{\leq \bar{\alpha}_n} -\mathcal{V}^n$$

is compact and non-empty due to inf-compactness property of  $-\mathcal{V}^n$ . Moreover, the set of  $\varepsilon^n$ -approximate minimizers,

$$\varepsilon^n\text{-argmin}\{-\mathcal{V}^n\} = \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) \mid -\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu) \leq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} [-\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)] + \varepsilon^n \right\},$$

is compact as a level set with  $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}_n + \varepsilon^n$ . Moreover, the set of approximate minimizers is always non-empty when  $\varepsilon^n > 0$ . Here, the sets are non-empty also when  $\varepsilon^n = 0$  due to inf-compactness of  $-\mathcal{V}^n$ . By similar argument as above, the set of minimizers  $\operatorname{argmin}\{-\mathcal{V}_0\}$  is compact and non-empty as an intersection of compact level sets. Hence, for any choice of  $\varepsilon^n \searrow 0$ , there exists a sequence of parametric measures  $(\mu_n)_n$  such that  $\mu_n \in \varepsilon^n\text{-argmin}\{-\mathcal{V}^n\}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Finally, we still need to show that the sequence  $(-\mathcal{V}^n)_n$  is equi-coercive in the sense of Definition C.3. By Lemma 8.1 and Lemma 8.2, we have that  $\text{e-lim}_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -\mathcal{V}^n = -\mathcal{V}_0$ . Then, by [11, Theorem 3.1], there exists a sequence  $(\alpha_n)_n$  of reals convergent to  $\alpha$  such that the level sets converge in the sense of Painlevé-Kuratowski:  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{lev}_{\leq \alpha_n} -\mathcal{V}^n = \operatorname{lev}_{\leq \alpha} -\mathcal{V}_0$ . Then, the convergence of level sets together with inf-compactness of  $-\mathcal{V}_0$  and  $-\mathcal{V}^n$  implies that the sequence  $(-\mathcal{V}^n)$  is equi-coercive. As noted above, the set of (exact) minimizers  $\operatorname{argmin}\{-\mathcal{V}_0\}$  is non-empty due to inf-compactness of  $-\mathcal{V}_0$ . Now, the remainder follows from Theorem C.4, which states that the sequence  $(\mu_n)_n$  with  $\mu_n \in \varepsilon^n\text{-argmin}\{-\mathcal{V}^n\}$  is weakly-\* relatively compact and each cluster point  $\bar{\mu}$  minimizes  $-\mathcal{V}_0$ . That is, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} [-\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)] = -\mathcal{V}_0(\pi_{\bar{\mu}}) = \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} [-\mathcal{V}_0(\pi_\mu)].$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

8.3.2. *Proof of Proposition 5.10.* Our proof works in a similar manner than in [58] except that the treatment of the regularization function  $F$  needs to be paid attention due to the general form of  $F$  and the appearance of the term involving derivative  $F'$ .

Let  $\mu, \mu' \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  and consider the curve  $\mu_t = (1-t)\mu + t\mu'$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Consider finding the following limit

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_{\mu_t}) - \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{t} = \int_X \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x) d[\mu' - \mu](x).$$

For convenience, we introduce the notation

$$\frac{\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_{\mu_t}) - \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{t} = \int_S \delta_t \mathcal{V}^n(s) dp_0(s), \text{ with } \delta_t \mathcal{V}^n(s) := \frac{\mathcal{V}^n(\mu_t, s) - \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, s)}{t},$$

where the regularized state-value function  $\mathcal{V}^n(\mu, s)$  can be expressed in two equivalent ways,

$$(53) \quad \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, s) := \frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S \int_A u_{B \wedge m_n}(s', a') - \epsilon_n F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a'|s') \right) d_s^{\pi_\mu}(ds'|s) \pi_\mu(da'|s')$$

$$(54) \quad = \int_A \left( u_{B \wedge m_n}(s, a) + \beta \int_S \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, s') p(ds'|s, a) - \epsilon_n F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) \right) d\pi_\mu(a|s)$$

such that  $\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu) = \int_S \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, s) dp_0(s)$  with  $p_0$  denoting the initial state distribution, and  $d_s^{\pi_\mu}$  is the state-transition kernel when following policy  $\pi_\mu$ .

Let  $s \in S$  be arbitrary. Due to linearity, we can decompose the calculation of the first-variation ratio as  $\delta_t \mathcal{V}^n(s) = \delta_t \mathcal{V}_1(s) + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_2(s) + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_3(s)$ , where

$$(55) \quad \delta_t \mathcal{V}_1(s) = \int_A u_{B \wedge m_n}(s, a) \frac{1}{t} \left( \frac{d\pi_{\mu_t}}{d\rho}(a|s) - \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) d\rho(a)$$

$$(56) \quad \delta_t \mathcal{V}_2(s) = \beta \int_A \int_S \mathcal{V}^n(\mu_t, s') p(ds'|s, a) d\pi_{\mu_t}(a|s) - \beta \int_A \int_S \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, s') p(ds'|s, a) d\pi_\mu(a|s)$$

$$(57) \quad \delta_t \mathcal{V}_3(s) = -\epsilon_n \int_A F \left( \frac{d\pi_{\mu_t}}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) d\pi_{\mu_t}(a) + \epsilon_n \int_A F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) d\pi_\mu(a|s)$$

For the the second component  $\delta_t \mathcal{V}_2(s)$ , by adding and subtracting a term allows to rewrite  $\delta_t \mathcal{V}_2(s) = \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{2,1}(s) + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{2,2}(s)$ , where

$$(58) \quad \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{2,1}(s) = \beta \int_A \left( \int_S \mathcal{V}^n(\mu_t, s') dp(s'|s, a) \right) \frac{1}{t} \left( \frac{d\pi_{\mu_t}}{d\rho}(a|s) - \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) d\rho(a)$$

$$(59) \quad \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{2,2}(s) = \beta \int_A \int_S \frac{\mathcal{V}^n(\mu_t, s') - \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, s')}{t} p(ds'|s, a) d\pi_\mu(a|s) = \beta \int_S \delta_t \mathcal{V}^n(s') dP_{\pi_\mu}(s'|s).$$

Similarly, we can rewrite the third component  $\delta_t \mathcal{V}_3(s)$  as  $\delta_t \mathcal{V}_3(s) = \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,1}(s) + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,2}(s)$ , where

$$(60) \quad \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,1}(s) = -\epsilon_n \int_A F \left( \frac{d\pi_{\mu_t}}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) \frac{1}{t} \left( \frac{d\pi_{\mu_t}}{d\rho}(a|s) - \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) d\rho(a)$$

$$(61) \quad \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,2}(s) = -\epsilon_n \int_A \frac{1}{t} \left( F \left( \frac{d\pi_{\mu_t}}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) - F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) \right) d\pi_\mu(a|s).$$

By collecting the terms, we obtain the following decomposition

$$(62) \quad \delta_t \mathcal{V}^n(s) = \delta_t \mathcal{V}_1(s) + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{2,1}(s) + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{2,2}(s) + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,1}(s) + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,2}(s)$$

$$(63) \quad = \delta_t \mathcal{V}_1(s) + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{2,1}(s) + \beta \int_S \delta_t \mathcal{V}^n(s') dP_{\pi_\mu}(s'|s) + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,1}(s) + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,2}(s)$$

$$(64) \quad = \frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S (\delta_t \mathcal{V}_1(s') + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{2,1}(s') + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,1}(s') + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,2}(s')) d_s^{\pi_\mu}(ds'|s),$$

where  $P_{\pi_\mu}$  is the state-transition kernel when following policy  $\pi_\mu$ ,

$$d_s^{\pi_\mu}(ds'|s) = (1-\beta) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \beta^k P_{\pi_\mu}^k(ds'|s),$$

and the last line follows from unrolling (63). For details, see the proof of the policy gradient theorem [87] where a similar strategy was used.

**Limit for  $\delta_t \mathcal{V}_1$ :** Using the arguments of the proof of Lemma 5.8 together with the dominated convergence theorem, we can write the limit for the first component as

$$(65) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \delta_t \mathcal{V}_1(s) = \int_A u_{B \wedge m_n}(s, a) \int_X \frac{\delta \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s)}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d[\mu' - \mu](x) d\rho(a)$$

$$(66) \quad = \int_A u_{B \wedge m_n}(s, a) \int_X \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d[\mu' - \mu](x),$$

since here  $\|u_{B \wedge m_n}\|_\infty < \infty$ .

**Limit for  $\delta_t \mathcal{V}_{2,1}$ :** Similarly, for the next term,  $\delta_t \mathcal{V}_{2,1}(s)$ , we obtain the limit

$$(67) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{2,1}(s) = \beta \int_A \int_S \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, s') dp(s'|s, a) \int_X \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d[\mu' - \mu](x),$$

which follows from dominated convergence theorem and boundedness of utility (see Lemma 8.4), when we note that

$$(68) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\pi_{\mu_t} - \pi_\mu\|_{\mathcal{K}(S, A)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{s \in S} \int_A \left| \frac{d\pi_{\mu_t}}{d\rho}(a|s) - \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right| d\rho(a) = 0, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(69) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{V}^n(\mu_t, s) = \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, s).$$

Here  $\mathcal{K}(S, A)$  is a bounded kernel space and  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{K}(S, A)}$  denotes the total variation norm; see Appendix B. To show the convergence of the regularized state value function consider the formulation

$$(70) \quad \mathcal{V}^n(\mu_t, s) = \frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S \int_A u_{B \wedge m_n}(s', a') - \epsilon_n F \left( \frac{d\pi_{\mu_t}}{d\rho}(a'|s') \right) \pi_{\mu_t}(da'|s') d_s^{\pi_{\mu_t}}(ds'|s).$$

For any  $s \in S$ , we have that

$$|\mathcal{V}^n(\mu_t, s) - \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, s)| \leq \frac{\|u_{B \wedge m_n}\|_\infty + \epsilon_n C_{\psi, \rho}^0}{1-\beta} \|K_t - K\|_{\mathcal{K}(S, S \times A)},$$

where  $K_t(s, \cdot) := d_s^{\pi_{\mu_t}}(ds'|s) \pi_{\mu_t}(da'|s')$  and  $K(s, \cdot) := d_s^{\pi_\mu}(ds'|s) \pi_\mu(da'|s')$  are understood as stochastic kernels (see Appendix B),  $K_t, K \in \mathcal{P}(S \times A|S) \subset \mathcal{K}(S, S \times A)$ , and the utility is bounded by

$$\left\| u_{B \wedge m_n} - \epsilon_n F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho} \right) \right\|_\infty \leq \|u_{B \wedge m_n}\|_\infty + \epsilon_n C_{\psi, \rho}^0 < +\infty,$$

where  $C_{\psi,\rho}^0 > 0$  is the constant defined by Assumption 5. Noting that  $d_s^{\pi_{\mu_t}}, d_s^{\pi_\mu} \in \mathcal{K}(S, S)$  and  $\pi_{\mu_t}, \pi_\mu \in \mathcal{K}(S, A)$ , it can be shown by using the definition of the state-transition kernel  $d_s^{\pi_\mu}(ds'|s) = (1 - \beta) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \beta^k P_{\pi_\mu}^k(ds'|s)$  and  $P_{\pi_\mu}(ds'|s) = \int_A p(ds'|s, a) \pi_\mu(a|s)$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \|d_s^{\pi_{\mu_t}} - d_s^{\pi_\mu}\|_{\mathcal{K}(S,S)} &\leq (1 - \beta) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \beta^k \|p\|_{\mathcal{K}(S \times A, S)} \|\pi_{\mu_t} - \pi_\mu\|_{\mathcal{K}(S,A)} \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} \|\pi_{\mu_t} - \pi_\mu\|_{\mathcal{K}(S,A)}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we have  $\|d_s^{\pi_{\mu_t}} - d_s^{\pi_\mu}\|_{\mathcal{K}(S,S)} \rightarrow 0$  when  $\|\pi_{\mu_t} - \pi_\mu\|_{\mathcal{K}(S,A)} \rightarrow 0$ , which shows that also  $\|K_t - K\|_{\mathcal{K}(S, S \times A)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ .

**Limit for  $\delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,1}$ :** Similar to the case  $\delta_t \mathcal{V}_1(s)$ , we can use (68) and boundedness of regularization part to obtain

$$(71) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,1}(s) = -\epsilon_n \int_A F\left(\frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s)\right) \int_X \frac{\delta\pi_\mu}{\delta\mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d[\mu' - \mu](x).$$

**Limit for  $\delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,2}$ :** The existence of the limit depends directly on the smoothness of  $F$ , i.e.

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{F(\pi_{\mu_t}(da|s)) - F(\pi_\mu(da|s))}{t} = \int_X \frac{\delta F(\pi_\mu)}{\delta\pi_\mu} \frac{\delta\pi_\mu}{\delta\mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d[\mu' - \mu](x).$$

The RHS follows from the chain rule for functional derivatives. Since  $F$  is differentiable, we have  $\delta F(\pi_\mu)/\delta\pi_\mu = F'(\pi_\mu)$ , where  $\pi_\mu$  is interpreted as a density with respect to the reference measure  $\rho$ . Then we have that

$$(72) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,2}(s) = -\epsilon_n \int_A \int_X \frac{\delta F(\pi_\mu)}{\delta\pi_\mu} \frac{\delta\pi_\mu}{\delta\mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d[\mu' - \mu](x)$$

Combining the above limits, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_{\mu_t}) - \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{t} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_S \delta_t \mathcal{V}^n(s) dp_0(s) \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - \beta} \int_S \int_S (\delta_t \mathcal{V}_1(s') + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{2,1}(s') + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,1}(s') + \delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,2}(s')) d_s^{\pi_\mu}(ds'|s) p_0(s) \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - \beta} \int_S \left[ \int_A \left( Q^n(\mu, s, a) - \epsilon_n F\left(\frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s)\right) \right) \int_X \frac{\delta\pi_\mu}{\delta\mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d[\mu' - \mu](x) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \epsilon_n \int_A \int_X \frac{\delta F(\pi_\mu)}{\delta\pi_\mu} \frac{\delta\pi_\mu}{\delta\mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d[\mu' - \mu](x) \right] d_s^{\pi_\mu}(ds), \end{aligned}$$

where  $Q^n$  is the regularized state-action value function for policy parametrized by  $\mu$ :

$$(73) \quad Q^n(\mu, s, a) = u_{B \wedge m_n}(s, a) + \beta \int_S \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, s') dp(s'|s, a)$$



Therefore, we have

$$(74) \quad \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x) = \frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S \left[ \int_A \left( Q^n(\mu, s, a) - \epsilon_n F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) \right) \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) \right. \\ \left. - \epsilon_n \int_A \frac{\delta F(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \pi_\mu} \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) \right] d^{\pi_\mu}(ds).$$

**Boundedness and continuity of  $\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)/\delta \mu$ :** By Assumption 5, we get

$$|Q^n(\mu, s, a)| \leq \|u_{B \wedge m_n}\|_\infty + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \|u_{B \wedge m_n} - \epsilon_n F(\pi_\mu)\|_\infty \\ \leq \frac{1}{1-\beta} \|u_{B \wedge m_n}\|_\infty + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \epsilon_n C_{\psi, \rho}^0 < +\infty.$$

Similarly, Assumption 5 and since  $\psi$  is assumed to be bounded, we have

$$\frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(a|s) = \left( \psi(s, a, x) - \int_A \psi(s, a', x) d\pi_\mu(a'|s) \right) \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s)$$

which leads to

$$\left\| \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x) \right\|_{\mathcal{K}(S, A)} \leq 2 \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{0, \infty}}.$$

Hence

$$\left| \frac{\delta F(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \pi_\mu} \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(a|s) \right| = \left| F'(\pi_\mu(a|s)) \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(a|s) \right| \leq C_{\psi, \rho}^1 \left\| \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu} \right\|_{\mathcal{K}(S, A)} \leq 2C_{\psi, \rho}^1 \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{0, \infty}},$$

which imply that each of the terms in (74) is bounded.

To show that (74) is continuous with respect to the product topology, we recall that by Proposition 5.8, the functional derivative  $\delta \pi_\mu/\delta \mu$  is jointly continuous in  $(\mu, x)$ . By Lemma 8.4, we also know that  $\pi_\mu$  and  $d^{\pi_\mu}$  are continuous in  $\mu$ . Since also  $Q^n$  is continuous in  $\mu$ , the continuity of (74) follows from the dominated convergence theorem, which completes the part of the proof showing that  $\mathcal{V}^n$  has a linear functional derivative.

**Regularity of  $x \mapsto [\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)/\delta \mu](\mu, x)$ :** By Lemma 5.8,  $\delta \pi_\mu/\delta \mu$  is differentiable in  $x$  and we have

$$\nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) = \left( \nabla_x \psi(s, a, x) - \int_A \nabla_x \psi(s, a', x) d\pi_\mu(a'|s) \right) \pi_\mu(da|s).$$

This gives immediately the bound

$$(75) \quad \left\| \nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x) \right\|_{\mathcal{K}(S, A)} \leq 2 \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{1, \infty}}.$$

Since  $\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)/\delta \mu$  is uniformly bounded, we can use dominated convergence theorem to obtain

$$\nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x) = \frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S \int_A \bar{Q}^n(\mu, s, a) \nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d^{\pi_\mu}(ds)$$

where  $\bar{Q}^n(\mu, s, a) = Q^n(\mu, s, a) - \epsilon_n F(\pi_\mu(a|s)) - \epsilon_n F'(\pi_\mu(a|s))$  such that

$$(76) \quad |\bar{Q}^n(\mu, s, a)| \leq \frac{1}{1-\beta} \|u_{B \wedge m_n}\|_\infty + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \epsilon_n C_{\psi, \rho}^0 + \epsilon_n C_{\psi, \rho}^1$$

Then, for any  $(\mu, x)$ , the derivative has the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S \int_A |\bar{Q}^n(\mu, s, a)| \left| \nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x) \right| (da|s) d^{\pi_\mu}(ds) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{(1-\beta)^2} (\|u_{B \wedge m_n}\|_\infty + \epsilon_n (C_{\psi, \rho}^0 + C_{\psi, \rho}^1)) \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{1, \infty}}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with the dominated convergence theorem implies that the derivative is jointly continuous in  $(\mu, x)$ .  $\square$

### 8.3.3. Used additional lemmas.

**Lemma 8.1.** *Let  $(f_n)_n$  be a sequence of integrands defined by (51). Then, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the function  $f_n$  is a normal integrand and the sequence epiconverges such that  $e\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} f_n = -u_B/(1-\beta)$ .*

*Proof.* We begin by showing that  $f_n$  is a normal integrand. By Assumption 1, the negative reward  $-u_{B \wedge m_n}$  is lower semicontinuous, since  $u_B$  is upper semicontinuous. Then  $f_n$  is jointly lower semicontinuous with respect to the product topology  $\Xi \times \mathbb{R}$ , because also  $F$  is lower semicontinuous by Assumption 4. This means that the epigraphical mapping

$$S_{f_n}(\xi) = \text{epi } f_n(\xi, \cdot) = \{(y, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} : f_n(\xi, y) \leq \alpha\}$$

has closed graph. Because joint lower semicontinuity implies that  $S_{f_n}$  is also measurable (see [80, 14.31]), then  $f_n$  is a normal integrand.

Next, we show that the sequence of integrands epi-converges. Since the sequence  $(-u_{B \wedge m_n})_n$  is increasing and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -u_{B \wedge m_n}(\xi) = -u_B(\xi) \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi,$$

we have that  $e\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} -u_{B \wedge m_n} = -u_B$  (see [80, Proposition 7.4]). Also the sequence  $(\epsilon_n F)_n$  is decreasing and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \epsilon_n F(y) = 0$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ , which by similar argument implies that  $e\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \epsilon_n F = 0$ . Since both sequences converge pointwise, then by [80, Theorem 7.46],  $f_n$  as a sum of two epiconverging functions is also epiconvergent; i.e.,  $e\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} f_n = -1/(1-\beta)u_B$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.2.** *Let  $(\mu_n)_n \subset \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  be a sequence of parameter measures converging narrowly to  $\mu$  and let  $(f_n)_n$  be a sequence of integrands defined by (51). Then, the sequence of state-action measures  $(\nu_n)_n$  converges narrowly to  $\nu$ , and the sequence of expectation functions defined by (52) epiconverges,  $e\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E_{\nu_n}[f_n] = E_\nu[f]$ , where  $f = 1/(1-\beta)u_B$ .*

*Proof.* If  $(\mu_n)_n$  converges narrowly to  $\mu$ , then the convergence of corresponding state-action visitation measures  $(\nu_n)_n \subset \mathcal{P}(\Xi)$  to  $\nu = d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu} \pi_\mu$  follows from Lemma 8.4. Since both  $\mu \mapsto \pi_\mu$  and  $\mu \mapsto d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu}$  are Lipschitz continuous with respect to the parameter measure and  $\Xi$  is bounded as a compact subset of a Euclidean space, then also  $\mu \mapsto d_{p_0}^{\pi_\mu} \pi_\mu$  is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the parameter measure.

To show that the expectation functions  $-\mathcal{V}^n = E_{\nu_n}[f_n]$  epiconverge, we start from the liminf-condition for epiconvergence by checking that the conditions of the parametric Fatou's lemma in Theorem C.6 are satisfied. Since  $(f_n)_n$  is a sequence of normal integrands that epiconverge, we have already shown that the conditions (i) and (iii) in Theorem C.6 hold (see Remark C.7). To show that also condition (ii) is satisfied, we note that

$$f_n(\xi, \pi_{\mu_n}) \geq -u_{B \wedge m_n}(\xi) \geq -u(\xi) \geq -\|u\|_{\infty, +} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, (\xi, \pi_{\mu_n}) \in \Xi \times \mathcal{K}(S, A),$$

since  $u$  is assumed to be bounded from above by Assumption 1. Since  $(\mu_n)_n \subset \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  converges narrowly to  $\mu$ , then also  $(\pi_{\mu_n}) \subset \mathcal{K}(S, A)$  converges to  $\pi_\mu$ . Then, for any  $(K_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} K_i = +\infty$ , there exists  $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $K_i \geq \|u\|_{\infty,+}$  for all  $i \geq i_0$ , which implies that

$$\int_{\Xi} f_n(\xi, \pi_{\mu_n}) \mathbf{I} \{ \xi : f_n(\xi, \pi_{\mu_n}) \leq -K_i \} d\nu_n(\xi) = 0,$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  when  $i \geq i_0$  and  $\nu_n$  converges narrowly to  $\nu$  as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ . Hence the condition (ii) in Theorem C.6 holds, and we have

$$\liminf_{(n, \pi') \rightarrow (+\infty, \pi_\mu)} E_{\nu_n}[f_n](\pi') \geq -\frac{1}{1-\beta} \mathbb{E}_\nu[u_B],$$

which shows the first half of the epi-convergence.

To show that the lower epi-limit agrees with the upper epi-limit, fix an arbitrary  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and let  $(\mu_n)_n$  be a sequence converging narrowly to  $\mu$  such that

$$\liminf_{(n, \pi') \rightarrow (+\infty, \pi_\mu)} E_{\nu_n}[f_n](\pi') = \liminf_{(n, \pi_{\mu_n}) \rightarrow (+\infty, \pi_\mu)} E_{\nu_n}[f_n](\pi_{\mu_n}) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E_{\nu_n}[f_n](\pi_{\mu_n}).$$

If  $E_\nu[f](\pi_\mu) = +\infty$ , then Theorem C.6 implies  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E_{\nu_n}[f_n](\pi_{\mu_n}) = E_\nu[f](\pi_\mu)$ . Let  $E_\nu[f](\pi_\mu) < +\infty$ . In the light of the above liminf-condition, it is sufficient to establish the inequality

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E_{\nu_n}[f_n](\pi_{\mu_n}) \leq E_\nu[f](\pi_\mu).$$

Since  $(f_n)_n$  epi-converges, we have

$$\limsup_{(n, \xi') \rightarrow (+\infty, \xi)} f_n(\xi', \pi_{\mu_n}) \leq f(\xi, \pi_\mu) = -\frac{1}{1-\beta} u_B(\xi) < +\infty \quad \text{for } \nu\text{-a.e. } \xi \in \Xi.$$

Then we can write

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E_{\nu_n}[f_n](\pi_{\mu_n}) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n}[f(\xi, \pi_\mu(\xi))] = \mathbb{E}_\nu[f(\xi, \pi_\mu(\xi))] = -\frac{1}{1-\beta} \mathbb{E}_\nu[u_B],$$

since  $f_n(\cdot, \pi_{\mu_n}) < +\infty$  for almost every  $\xi \in \Xi$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $(\nu_n)$  converges narrowly to  $\nu$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.3.** *For all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the (inf-)level sets  $\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} -\mathcal{V}^n$  and  $\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} -\mathcal{V}_0$  are compact with respect to the weak-\* topology on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and the expectation functions  $-\mathcal{V}^n$  and  $-\mathcal{V}_0$  are lower semicontinuous.*

*Proof.* Let  $\Xi = S \times A$ . To show that the lower level sets  $\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} -\mathcal{V}^n$  are compact with respect to the weak-\* topology on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , let  $(\mu_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} -\mathcal{V}^n$  be any sequence of parameter measures. Then, for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$0 \leq \epsilon_n \int_{\Xi} F(\pi_{\mu_i}) d\nu_{\mu_i} \leq \alpha + \int_{\Xi} u_{B \wedge m_n} d\nu_{\mu_i} \leq \alpha + \|u\|_{\infty,+},$$

where  $\pi_\mu \in \mathcal{K}(S, A)$  is the density with respect to  $\rho$ . The last inequality follows from noting that  $u_B \leq u$  and the assumption that  $u$  is bounded. By Assumption 4, we note that  $U : z \mapsto zF(z)$  is a proper, continuous, convex function with superlinear growth, and

$$\int_{\Xi} F(\pi_{\mu_i}) d\nu_{\mu_i} = \int_S \left[ \int_A U(\pi_{\mu_i}(a|s)) d\rho(a) \right] d_{p_0}^{\pi_{\mu_i}}(s) ds.$$

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $s \in S$  be arbitrary. Let

$$\bar{u}_s = \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \int_A U(\pi_{\mu_i}(a|s)) d\rho(a).$$

Since  $\lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty} U(z)/z = +\infty$ , we can choose  $z_0$  large enough that  $U(z)/z \geq \bar{u}_s/\varepsilon$  for all  $z \geq z_0$ . Then, we have that  $0 \leq \pi_{\mu_i}(a|s) \leq \varepsilon U(\pi_{\mu_i}(a|s))/\bar{u}_s$  on the set  $\{\pi_{\mu_i}(\cdot|s) \geq z_0\} \subset A$ , which implies

$$\int_{\{\pi_{\mu_i}(\cdot|s) \geq z_0\}} \pi_{\mu_i}(a|s) d\rho(a) \leq \varepsilon \int_{\{\pi_{\mu_i}(\cdot|s) \geq z_0\}} \frac{U(\pi_{\mu_i}(a|s))}{\bar{u}_s} d\rho(a) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Hence, the set of densities  $P_s := \{\pi_{\mu_i}(\cdot|s), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is uniformly integrable in  $L^1(\rho; A)$  for all  $s \in S$ . By Dunford-Pettis theorem [7, Theorem 1.38],  $P_s$  is relatively compact with respect to the weak topology  $\sigma(L^1, L^\infty)$ . so by Eberlein-Smulian theorem [29, Theorem 13.1],  $P_s$  is relatively weakly sequentially compact. Hence, there exists  $\pi_\mu(\cdot|s)$  and a subsequence  $(\pi_{\mu_{i_k}}(\cdot|s))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  that converges with respect to the weak topology  $\sigma(L^1, L^\infty)$  for all  $s \in S$ . Given that the choice of  $s \in S$  was arbitrary, the sequence of densities converges also in total variation norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{K}(S,A)}$  (see Appendix B), when the densities are interpreted as elements of the bounded kernel space  $\mathcal{K}(S, A)$ :

$$\|\pi_{\mu_{i_k}} - \pi_\mu\|_{\mathcal{K}(S,A)} = \sup_{s \in S} \sup_{f \in L^\infty(A)} \left\{ \int_A f(a) (\pi_{\mu_{i_k}} - \pi_\mu)(da|s) : \|f\|_\infty \leq 1 \right\} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty.$$

To show that also  $(\mu_{i_k})$  converge to some  $\mu$ , let  $f \in L^\infty(A)$  and  $s \in S$  be arbitrary. Since  $\pi_\mu$  admits a linear functional derivative with respect to the parameter measure, we can repeat steps in the proof of Lemma 8.4 to obtain

$$\int_A f(a) (\pi_{\mu_{i_k}} - \pi_\mu)(da|s) = \int_X \varphi(x, s) (\mu_{i_k} - \mu_i)(dx).$$

Here, the integrand  $\varphi$  is a Lipschitz continuous function with respect to  $x$ :

$$\varphi(x, s) = \int_A f(a) \int_0^1 \left( \psi(s, a, x) - \int_A \psi(s, a', x) d\pi_{\mu_t}(a'|s) \right) d\pi_{\mu_t}(a|s) dt$$

where  $\mu_t = t\mu_{i_k} + (1-t)\mu$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Hence, convergence of  $(\pi_{\mu_{i_k}})$  implies that also the underlying sequence of parameter measure  $(\mu_{i_k})$  converges, which shows that  $\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} -\mathcal{V}^n$  are relatively weakly compact.

To show that  $-\mathcal{V}^n$  is lower semicontinuous for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $(\mu_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of parameter measures converging narrowly to  $\mu$ . Then, for arbitrary  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have by general Fatou's lemma that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} [-\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_{\mu_k})] \geq \int_{\Xi} \liminf_{(k, \xi') \rightarrow (+\infty, \xi)} f_n(\xi', \pi_{\mu_k}) d\nu_\mu(\xi) = -\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)$$

since  $f_n(\xi, \mu_k) \geq -\|u\|_{\infty, +}$  is lower semicontinuous and bounded from below for all  $\xi \in \Xi$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then,  $-\mathcal{V}^n$  is lower semicontinuous and the level sets,  $\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} -\mathcal{V}^n$ , are closed.

To finalize the proof, it remains to check that the statements hold also in the case of  $-\mathcal{V}_0$ . For any  $\mu \in \text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} -\mathcal{V}_0$ , we have

$$\int_{\Xi} -u_B(\xi) d\nu_{\pi_\mu}(\xi) \leq \alpha,$$

where  $-u_B$  is lower semicontinuous with compact level sets due to Berge's theorem [38, Lemma 2.1]. Then, by the tightness criterion that follows from Prokhorov's Theorem [8, Theorem 5.1.3],  $\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} -\mathcal{V}_0$  is relatively compact and closed due to lower semicontinuity.  $\square$

The following Lemma can be obtained by using the same arguments as in [58].

**Lemma 8.4.** *For any parameter measures  $\mu, \mu' \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , the parametric policy  $\pi_\mu \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A})$  and the occupancy measure  $d^{\pi_\mu} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S})$  are Lipschitz continuous with respect to the parameter measure. That is, there exist  $C_d > 0$  and  $C_\pi > 0$  such that*

$$\|d^{\pi_{\mu'}} - d^{\pi_\mu}\|_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S})} \leq C_d W_1(\mu', \mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\pi_{\mu'} - \pi_\mu\|_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A})} \leq C_\pi W_1(\mu', \mu),$$

where  $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A})$  and  $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S})$  denote bounded signed kernel spaces (see Appendix B).

8.3.4. *Example: entropy-regularization.* If  $F(x) = \ln(x)$ , then the term  $\delta_t \mathcal{V}_{3,2}$  vanishes, since  $F'(x) = 1/x$  and the derivative of the policy is

$$\frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) = \pi_\mu(da|s)\psi(s, a, x) - \pi_\mu(da|s) \left( \int_A \psi(s, a', x) d\pi_\mu(a'|s) \right),$$

which together with the chain rule gives that

$$\frac{\delta F(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \pi_\mu} \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu)(x) = \psi(s, a, x) - \int_A \psi(s, a', x) d\pi_\mu(a'|s).$$

Substituting into the RHS of (72) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_A \int_X \frac{\delta F(\pi_\mu)}{\delta \pi_\mu} \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d[\mu' - \mu](x) \\ &= \int_A \int_X \left( \psi(s, a, x) - \int_A \psi(s, a', x) d\pi_\mu(a'|s) \right) (da|s) d[\mu' - \mu](x) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then the first variation of  $\mathcal{V}^n$  simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{V}^n(\mu_t) - \mathcal{V}^n(\mu)}{t} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - \beta} \int_S \left[ \int_A \left( Q^n(\mu, s, a) - \epsilon_n F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) \right) \int_X \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d[\mu' - \mu](x) \right] d^{\pi_\mu}(ds), \end{aligned}$$

and the functional derivative becomes

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n}{\delta \mu}(\mu)(x) = \frac{1}{1 - \beta} \int_S \int_A \left( Q^n(\mu, s, a) - \epsilon_n F \left( \frac{d\pi_\mu}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) \right) \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu}(\mu, x)(da|s) d^{\pi_\mu}(ds).$$

## 8.4. Proofs related to Section 5.3.

8.4.1. *Proof of Lemma 5.15.* Under Assumptions 6 and 7, the proof of lower semicontinuity and convexity of  $\mathcal{H}(\cdot|\gamma)$  is readily obtained by combining [8, Lemma 9.4.3 and Theorem 9.4.12]. Then the convexity of  $\mathcal{H}_\zeta$  is inherited from  $\mathcal{H}(\cdot|\gamma)$ .

To show that  $\mathcal{H}_\zeta$  is also lower semicontinuous, we can use similar arguments as [22] who showed the lower semicontinuity of mollified internal energy functionals. We begin by noting

that for any sequence  $(\mu_n)_n \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $(\mu_n)$  converges narrowly to  $\mu$ , and any sequence  $x_n \rightarrow x$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\eta_\varsigma * \mu_n(x_n) - \eta_\varsigma * \mu(x)| \\
&= \left| \int \eta_\varsigma(x_n - y) d\mu_n(y) - \int \eta_\varsigma(x - y) d\mu(x) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \int (\eta_\varsigma(x_n - y) - \eta_\varsigma(x - y)) d\mu_n(y) \right| + \left| \int \eta_\varsigma(x - y) d\mu_n(y) - \int \eta_\varsigma(x - y) d\mu(x) \right| \\
(77) \quad &\leq |x_n - x| \|\nabla \eta_\varsigma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \left| \int \eta_\varsigma(x - y) d\mu_n(y) - \int \eta_\varsigma(x - y) d\mu(x) \right| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0
\end{aligned}$$

since  $y \mapsto \eta_\varsigma(x - y)$  is continuous and bounded.

Let  $h_n(x) := H(\eta_\varsigma * \mu_n(x)) e^{-V(x)}$  be a sequence of integrands such that  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_n) = \int h_n(x) dx$ . Then, by using the above inequality together with a version of Fatou's lemma presentend in [39], see Theorem C.6 in Appendix C, we have that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_n) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty, x' \rightarrow x} h_n(x') dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x) dx = \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu),$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

8.4.2. *Proof of Proposition 5.16.* The proof of epi-convergence and inf-compactness of smoothed divergence follows from Lemma 8.5 and Lemma 8.6, respectively.

**Lemma 8.5** ( $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  epi-converges to  $\mathcal{H}$ ). *Let  $(\mu_\varsigma)_\varsigma \subset \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $\mu_\varsigma \rightarrow \mu$  narrowly as  $\varsigma \rightarrow 0$ . Then (i)  $\liminf_{\varsigma \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_\varsigma) \geq \mathcal{H}(\mu|\gamma)$ ; and (ii)  $\limsup_{\varsigma \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu) \leq \mathcal{H}(\mu|\gamma)$ .*

*Proof.* Let us prove part (i). Given that the sequence of measures  $(\mu_\varsigma)$  converges in the weak-\* topology of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , then the mollified sequence converges to the same limit; i.e.,  $\eta_\varsigma * \mu_\varsigma \rightarrow \mu$  narrowly as  $\varsigma \rightarrow 0$  (see [22, Lemma 2.3]). By Lemma 5.15, the generalized divergence  $\mathcal{H}(\cdot|\gamma)$  is lower semicontinuous, which implies that (i) holds:

$$\liminf_{\varsigma \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_\varsigma) = \liminf_{\varsigma \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}(\eta_\varsigma * \mu_\varsigma|\gamma) \geq \mathcal{H}(\mu|\gamma).$$

To show (ii), we may suppose, without loss of generality, that  $\liminf_{\varsigma \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_\varsigma)$  is finite. Then, there exists a positive sequence  $(\varsigma_n)_n$  such that  $\varsigma_n \rightarrow 0$  and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{H}_{\varsigma_n}(\mu_{\varsigma_n}) = \liminf_{\varsigma \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_\varsigma) = \liminf_{\varsigma \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}(\eta_\varsigma * \mu_\varsigma|\gamma) = \mathcal{H}(\mu|\gamma).$$

where the last equality follows from lower semicontinuity of  $\mathcal{H}(\cdot|\gamma)$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.6** (Compactness of level sets). *For all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , the (inf-)level sets of  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$ :*

$$\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu) \leq \alpha\}$$

*are compact with respect to the weak-\* topology on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .*

*Proof.* To show that the level sets are relatively compact, it is sufficient to show that any sequence is uniformly integrable. Noting that  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  is non-negative for any  $\varsigma > 0$ , we can choose  $\alpha \geq 0$ , and let  $(\mu_n)_n \subset \text{lev}_\alpha \mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  be any sequence. Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given and define

$$M = \sup_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(\eta_\varsigma * \mu_n(x)) d\gamma(x) \leq \alpha < +\infty.$$

By Assumption 6 the integrand  $H$  is a convex, increasing function with superlinear growth such that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} H(t)/t = +\infty$ . Let  $Z = M/\epsilon$  and choose  $s$  large enough that  $H(t)/t \geq Z$  for all  $t \geq s$ . Then we have

$$0 \leq \eta_\varsigma * \mu_n \leq \frac{H(\eta_\varsigma * \mu_n)}{Z}$$

on the set  $\{\eta_\varsigma * \mu_n \geq s\}$ , which implies that for every density in the sequence we obtain

$$\int_{\{\eta_\varsigma * \mu_n \geq s\}} \eta_\varsigma * \mu_n d\gamma \leq \frac{1}{Z} \int_{\{\eta_\varsigma * \mu_n \geq s\}} H(\eta_\varsigma * \mu_n) d\gamma \leq \frac{1}{Z} M = \epsilon.$$

Hence, the sequence of mollified densities  $(\eta_\varsigma * \mu_n)_n \subset L^1(\gamma)$  is uniformly integrable. Then, by Dunford-Pettis theorem (see e.g. [33, Theorem 25]), there exists a subsequence  $(\eta_\varsigma * \mu_{n_i})$  that converges in  $L^1(\gamma)$  in the sense of the weak topology  $\sigma(L^1, L^\infty)$ . By identifying the probability measures with densities, the result implies that the level set  $\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  is relatively compact with respect to the weak-\* topology on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Since  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  is lower semicontinuous,  $\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  is also closed, which completes the proof.  $\square$

8.4.3. *Proof of Proposition 5.17.* We begin by recalling three definitions.

**Definition 8.7** (Strong upper gradient). *Let  $\phi : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be proper. A map  $g : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  is said to be a strong upper gradient for  $u$  if, for every absolutely continuous curve  $\gamma : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , the function  $g \circ \gamma$  is measurable and*

$$(78) \quad |\phi(\gamma(t)) - \phi(\gamma(s))| \leq \int_s^t g(\gamma(r)) |\gamma'(r)| dr \quad \forall s, t \in (a, b) \text{ with } s \leq t.$$

**Definition 8.8** (Metric slope). *Let  $\phi : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be a proper function. The metric slope, or local slope,  $|\partial\phi| : \text{dom } \phi \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  of  $\phi$  is defined by*

$$|\partial\phi|(\mu) = \limsup_{d_W(\mu, \mu') \rightarrow 0} \frac{(\phi(\mu) - \phi(\mu'))_+}{d_W(\mu, \mu')}, \quad \forall \mu \in \text{dom}(u)$$

which is a weak upper gradient for  $\phi$ .

*Proof of Proposition 5.17.* For any  $\mu, \mu' \in D(\mathcal{H}_\varsigma)$  and  $\varsigma > 0$ , let  $\Psi : X \rightarrow X$  denote the optimal transport map for the Wasserstein distance pushing  $\mu$  to  $\mu'$ . For  $t \in [0, 1]$ , we set

$$(79) \quad \mu_t = (\mathbf{i} + t(\Psi - \mathbf{i}))_{\#} \mu \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_t(x) = x + t(\Psi(x) - x),$$

where  $\Psi_t$  is the optimal transport map between  $\mu$  and  $\mu_t$ . Due to the absolute continuity of the measures w.r.t  $\mathcal{L}^d$ , the optimal transport map is unique and the curve of measures  $(\mu_t)_t$  is absolutely continuous.

By [8, Proposition 6.2.12 and Remark 6.2.11], for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ , the optimal transport map  $\Psi_t$  is  $\mu_t$ -essentially injective (i.e., its restriction to a set with full  $\mu_t$ -measure is injective) and strictly monotonic such that  $\nabla \Psi_t > 0$   $\mu$ -a.e.

After these preparations, we can apply the change of variables formula [8, Lemma 5.5.3] to write the density of the push-forward of measures  $\mu_t = (\Psi_t)_{\#} \mu$  with  $\mu = \nu \cdot \gamma = \rho \cdot \mathcal{L}^d$  as

$$(80) \quad \mu_t = \nu_t \cdot \gamma = \rho_t \mathcal{L}^d \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_t(y) = \frac{\rho}{\det(\nabla \Psi_t)} \circ \Psi_t^{-1}(y) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } y \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where  $\det \nabla \Psi_t(x) > 0$   $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

Let  $\eta_\varsigma * \mu_t = \nu_t^\varsigma \cdot \gamma = \rho_t^\varsigma \mathcal{L}^d$ , and let  $\tilde{H}(u, v) := vH(u/v)$ ,  $u \in [0, +\infty)$ ,  $v \in (0, +\infty)$ . Then, by the definition of  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_t) - \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(\nu_t^\varsigma) d\gamma - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(\nu^\varsigma) d\gamma \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[ H\left(\frac{\rho^\varsigma}{e^{-U} \det \nabla \Psi_t}\right) e^{-U} \det \nabla \Psi_t - H\left(\frac{\rho^\varsigma}{e^{-U}}\right) e^{-U} \right] dx \\
(81) \quad &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[ \tilde{H}(\rho^\varsigma(x) e^{U(x)}, \det \nabla \Psi_t(x)) - H(\rho^\varsigma(x) e^{U(x)}) \right] e^{-U(x)} dx
\end{aligned}$$

for any  $t \in (0, 1]$ .

By the convexity condition (23) in Assumption 6, we have that the map

$$z \mapsto z^d H(\rho^\varsigma(x) e^{U(x)} / z^d)$$

is convex and non-increasing in  $(0, +\infty)$ . Given that  $\nabla \Psi$  is a diagonalizable map with non-negative eigenvalues, the map  $t \mapsto \det((1-t)I + t\nabla \Psi)^{1/d}$  is concave in  $[0, 1]$ . Then, the function

$$t \mapsto \tilde{H}(\rho^\varsigma(x) e^{U(x)}, \det \nabla \Psi_t(x)) \quad \forall t \in (0, 1]$$

is a convex function, since it is defined as a composition of a convex non-increasing function and a concave map. By defining function  $L_H : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  as

$$(82) \quad L_H(u) = uH'(u) - H(u),$$

we find the following connection between  $L_H$  and the derivative of the function  $\tilde{H}$ :

$$\tilde{H}(u, v) \leq H(u) \text{ for } v \geq 1, \quad \frac{H(u) - \tilde{H}(u, v)}{v-1} \uparrow L_H(u) \text{ as } v \downarrow 1,$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial v} \tilde{H}(u, v) = -\frac{u}{v} H'(u/v) + H(u/v) = -L_H(u/v).$$

As a result, the function

$$(83) \quad t \mapsto \frac{1}{t} \left[ \tilde{H}(\rho^\varsigma(x) e^{U(x)}, \det \nabla \Psi_t(x)) - H(\rho^\varsigma(x) e^{U(x)}) \right] \quad \forall t \in (0, 1]$$

is non-decreasing with respect to  $t$ , and bounded above by an integrable function; for any  $t \in (0, 1]$ , we have  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_t) \leq H(\|\eta_\varsigma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}) < +\infty$ . Using the monotone convergence theorem, we obtain the following limit

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} (\mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_t) - \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu)) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{H}(\rho^\varsigma(x), e^{-U(x)} \det \nabla \Psi_t(x)) \Big|_{t=0} dx \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L_H(\rho^\varsigma / e^{-U}) (e^{-U} \operatorname{tr}(\nabla(\Psi - \mathbf{i})) - e^{-U} \langle \nabla U, \Psi - \mathbf{i} \rangle) dx \\
(84) \quad &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L_H(\nu^\varsigma) \operatorname{tr}(\nabla(e^{-U}(\Psi - \mathbf{i}))) dx
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the derivative of  $t \mapsto \tilde{H}(\rho^\varsigma, e^{-U} \det \nabla \Psi_t)$  is given by chain rule, where we have used the expansion of the Jacobian determinant,

$$(85) \quad \det \nabla \Psi_t = 1 + t \cdot \operatorname{tr}(\nabla(\Psi - \mathbf{i})) + o(t),$$

and the fact that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial v} \tilde{H}(u, v) = -L_H(u/v)$ .



Since this holds for every vector field  $\Psi$ , which is approximately differentiable  $\mu$ -a.e and  $\nabla\Psi$  is diagonalizable with non-negative eigenvalues, we can rewrite the result as

$$(86) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} (\mathcal{H}_\zeta((\Psi_t)_\# \mu) - \mathcal{H}_\zeta(\mu)) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L_H(\nu^\zeta) \operatorname{tr} (\nabla(e^{-U} \xi)) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla L_H(\nu^\zeta), \xi \rangle d\gamma$$

where the transport map  $\Psi = \mathbf{i} + \xi$  is defined by a smooth gradient vector field  $\xi = \nabla\varphi$  with  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Note that this choice is motivated by the definition of the tangent space,  $T_\mu \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , as the  $L^2(\mu, \mathbb{R}^d)$ -closure of the gradients of  $C_c^\infty$  functions. Then, the approximate differential coincides with the classical differential  $\nabla\xi$ , and the last equality follows from rewriting the trace of the Jacobian as divergence and using the formula of integration by parts.

Since  $L_H(\nu^\zeta)$  is differentiable due to the smoothness of the mollified measures and the potential  $U$  is bounded on any compact subset  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have

$$(87) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla L_H(\nu^\zeta), \xi \rangle d\gamma \right| \leq |\partial\mathcal{H}_\zeta|(\mu) \|\xi\|_{L^2(\mu, \mathbb{R}^d)} < |\partial\mathcal{H}_\zeta|(\mu) \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |\xi(x)|,$$

where  $|\partial\mathcal{H}_\zeta|$  is the local (or metric) slope, which gives a strong upper gradient for  $\mathcal{H}_\zeta$  (see 8.7 and 8.8). Now, by duality argument, there exists  $\mathbf{w}^\zeta \in L^2(\mu, \mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\|\mathbf{w}^\zeta\|_{L^2(\mu, \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq |\partial\mathcal{H}_\zeta|(\mu)$  such that

$$(88) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla L_H(\nu^\zeta), \xi \rangle d\gamma = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \mathbf{w}^\zeta, \xi \rangle d\mu, \quad \forall \xi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d),$$

which shows that  $\nabla L_H(\nu^\zeta) = \nu \mathbf{w}^\zeta$  and  $\mathbf{w}^\zeta \in \partial\mathcal{H}_\zeta(\mu)$ . In fact,  $\mathbf{w}^\zeta = \nabla L_H(\nu^\zeta)/\nu$  is a strong subdifferential with  $\|\mathbf{w}^\zeta\|_{L^2(\mu, \mathbb{R}^d)} = |\partial\mathcal{H}_\zeta|(\mu)$ , since  $\mu$  is absolutely continuous w.r.t  $\mathcal{L}^d$  (and hence a regular measure), and  $\mathcal{H}_\zeta$  is convex. Then, the gradient of the linear functional derivative is defined by

$$(89) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_x \frac{\delta\mathcal{H}_\zeta}{\delta\mu}(\mu, x) \cdot \xi(x) d\mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\nabla L_H(\nu^\zeta(x))}{\nu(x)} \cdot \xi(x) d\mu(x).$$

Hence, by construction, the linear functional derivative,  $[\partial\mathcal{H}_\zeta/\partial\mu](\mu)(x)$ , is differentiable with respect to  $x$ .

To show that  $(\mu, x) \mapsto \nabla \frac{\delta\mathcal{H}_\zeta}{\delta\mu}(\mu)(x)$  is jointly continuous with respect to the product topology, let  $(\mu_n, x_n) \subset \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^d$  be a sequence converging pointwise to  $(\mu, x)$ . As given by equation (77), we first note that

$$|\eta_\zeta * \mu_n(x_n) - \eta_\zeta * \mu(x)| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

Let  $(\nu_n^\zeta)$  be a corresponding sequence of mollified densities so that  $\eta_\zeta * \mu_n = \nu_n^\zeta \cdot \gamma$ . For any  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we denote the  $i$ th component of  $\nabla L_H$  by

$$h_i(\nu_n^\zeta(x)) := \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} L_H(\nu_n^\zeta(x)) = \frac{\partial \nu_n^\zeta}{\partial x_i}(x) \cdot \nu_n^\zeta(x) H''(\nu_n^\zeta(x))$$

Since  $\nu_n^\zeta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $H \in C^2(0, +\infty)$ , we have that  $h_i$  is continuous and  $h_i(\nu_n^\zeta(x_n)) \rightarrow h_i(\nu^\zeta(x))$  pointwise as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ . Then, the continuity of  $\nabla L_H(\nu^\zeta)$  in the product topology follows from the continuity of each component mapping.

To complete the proof, we need to show that  $(\mu, x) \mapsto \nabla \frac{\delta\mathcal{H}_\zeta}{\delta\mu}(\mu)(x)$  has at most linear growth in  $x$ , uniformly in  $\mu$  within bounded subsets. For the mollified density  $\eta_\zeta * \mu = \nu^\zeta \cdot \gamma$ ,

we have

$$|\nu^\varsigma(x)| \leq \|\eta_\varsigma\|_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \nu^\varsigma(x) \right| \leq \|\nabla \eta_\varsigma\|_\infty.$$

By the growth properties of  $H''$  and convexity, there exist  $C_0, C_1 > 0$  such that

$$0 \leq H''(\nu^\varsigma(x)) \leq C_0 + C_1 \nu^\varsigma(x) \leq C_0 + C_1 \|\eta_\varsigma\|_\infty.$$

Then, for any  $(\mu, x)$ , we have

$$(90) \quad \left| \frac{\nabla L_H(\nu^\varsigma(x))}{\nu(x)} \right| = \left| \frac{\nabla \nu^\varsigma(x) \cdot \nu^\varsigma(x) H''(\nu^\varsigma(x))}{\nu(x)} \right|$$

$$(91) \quad \leq \left\| \frac{\nabla \nu^\varsigma \cdot \nu^\varsigma}{\nu} \right\|_\infty (C_0 + C_1 \|\eta_\varsigma\|_\infty),$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

## 8.5. Proofs related to Section 5.4.

8.5.1. *Proof of Theorem 5.20.* The first part, differentiability of  $\mathcal{J}^n$ , is obtained as a direct application of Proposition 5.10 and Proposition 5.17, which show the existence of linear functional derivatives that meet the condition in Proposition 5.2, which then implies that the approximation  $\mathcal{J}^n$  is Wasserstein differentiable.

To show the second part, epiconvergence of  $(\mathcal{J}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , let  $(m_n, \epsilon_n, \kappa_n, \varsigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of hyper-parameter vectors, where  $m_n \nearrow \infty$  and  $(\epsilon_n, \kappa_n, \varsigma_n) \searrow 0$  component-wise, and  $\mathcal{J}^n(\mu) = -\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu) + \kappa_n \cdot \mathcal{H}_{\varsigma_n}(\mu)$ . By Lemma 8.5 the smoothed divergence  $\mathcal{H}_{\varsigma_n}$  epi-converges to  $\mathcal{H}$  as  $\varsigma_n \rightarrow 0$ . Similarly, by Lemma 8.2 and Lemma 8.1, the bounded approximations  $-\mathcal{V}^n$  epi-converge to  $\mathcal{J}_0 = -\mathcal{V}_0$ . Then, by [80, Theorem 7.46], we note that  $\mathcal{J}^n$  epi-converges, since the components of the sum converge also pointwise.

For all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\kappa_n > 0$ , if  $\mu \in \text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} \mathcal{J}^n = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid -\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu) + \kappa_n \cdot \mathcal{H}_{\varsigma_n}(\mu) \leq \alpha\}$ , we have

$$0 \leq \mathcal{H}_{\varsigma_n}(\mu) \leq \frac{\alpha + C_n}{\kappa_n},$$

where  $C_n := \max(\|u\|_\infty, m_n) + \epsilon_n C_{\psi, \rho}$  denotes the bound for  $\mathcal{V}^n(\pi_\mu)$ . Then, we have

$$\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} \mathcal{J}^n \subset \text{lev}_{\leq \tilde{\alpha}} \mathcal{H}_{\varsigma_n} \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{\alpha} = \frac{\alpha + C_n}{\kappa_n},$$

which together with Lemma 8.6 implies that the set  $\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} \mathcal{J}^n$  is compact as a closed subset of a compact set  $\text{lev}_{\leq \tilde{\alpha}} \mathcal{H}_{\varsigma_n}$ . Since this holds for any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , we say that  $\mathcal{J}^n$  is inf-compact. Then, by using similar arguments as in the proof of Proposition 5.7, we note that also the set of approximately optimal minimizers,  $\varepsilon^n$ -argmin $\{\mathcal{J}^n\}$ , is compact and non-empty for any  $\varepsilon^n \geq 0$ . The existence of exact minimizers (i.e. when  $\varepsilon^n = 0$ ) follows from inf-compactness of  $\mathcal{J}^n$ . Hence, for any choice of  $\varepsilon^n \searrow 0$ , we find a sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\mu_n \in \varepsilon^n$ -argmin $\{\mathcal{J}^n\}$ .

Since  $\text{e-lim}_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{J}^n = \mathcal{J}_0$ , [11, Theorem 3.1] gives that there exists a sequence  $(\alpha_n)_n$  of reals convergent to  $\alpha$  such that the level sets converge in the sense of Painlevé-Kuratowski:  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{lev}_{\leq \alpha_n} \mathcal{J}^n = \text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} -\mathcal{V}_0$ , where the sets  $\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} -\mathcal{V}_0$  for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  are all compact by Lemma 8.3 (i.e.,  $\mathcal{J}_0$  is inf-compact). Then, the convergence of level sets together with the compactness property implies that the sequence  $(\mathcal{J}^n)$  is equi-coercive. Moreover, the inf-compactness of  $\mathcal{J}_0$  provides a criterion for the existence of an optimal solution, i.e., argmin $\{\mathcal{J}_0\} \neq \emptyset$ . The remainder follows directly from [41, Theorem 2.11] (see Appendix C.4),

which states that the sequence  $(\mu_n)_n$  with  $\mu_n \in \operatorname{argmin}\{\mathcal{J}^n\}$  is weakly-\* relatively compact and each cluster point  $\bar{\mu}$  minimizes  $\mathcal{J}_0$ :

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} [\mathcal{J}^n(\pi_\mu)] = \mathcal{J}_0(\mu) = \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)} \mathcal{J}_0(\mu),$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 8.6. Proofs related to Sections 6.1–6.2.

8.6.1. *Proof of Proposition 6.2.* Let  $\mu^* \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  be a local minimizer. Then, there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that, for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\mu^*) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) : W_2(\mu^*, \mu) < \epsilon\}$ , we have  $\mathcal{J}^n(\mu) - \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*) \geq 0$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\mu^*) \subset \mathcal{P}_2^{ac}(X)$ , because, for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\mu^*)$ , the objective value  $\mathcal{J}^n(\mu)$  is finite only when the divergence term  $\mathcal{H}_{\zeta_n}(\mu)$  is also finite, which in turn requires that  $\mu \ll \mathcal{L}^d$ .

Then, by [8, Proposition 6.2.12, Theorem 6.2.10], for any measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\mu^*)$ , there exists a unique optimal transport map  $\mathbf{t}_{\mu^*}^\mu = \nabla\phi$   $\mu^*$ -a.e for some convex function  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that, for  $t \in [0, 1]$ , the curve

$$(92) \quad \mu_t = (\mathbf{i} + t(\nabla\phi - \mathbf{i}))_{\#}\mu^*$$

defines a constant speed geodesic between the measures;  $W_2(\mu_t, \mu_s) = |t - s|W_2(\mu^*, \mu)$  for  $s, t \in [0, 1]$ . Here,  $\mathbf{i} : X \rightarrow X$ ,  $\mathbf{i}(x) = x$  denotes the identity mapping. Now, referring to [8, Theorem 8.5.1], we can define the tangent space at  $\mu^*$  as

$$T_{\mu^*}\mathcal{P}_2(X) = \overline{\{t(\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{i}) : \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}_{\mu^*}^\mu \text{ for some } \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X), t > 0\}}^{L^2(\mu^*; \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)},$$

which is, though not obvious from the definition, a linear space. The reason is that, in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , Lipschitz functions are dense in  $L^2(\mu^*; \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ , and for Lipschitz function  $\mathbf{t}$  the negative of a tangent element

$$-t(\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{i}) = s(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{i}), \quad s > t\|\mathbf{t}\|_{\text{Lip}}, \quad \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{i} + \frac{t}{s}(\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{t})$$

lies in the tangent space, since  $s$  can be seen to belong to the subgradient of a convex function by definition of  $s$ . This also shows that  $T_{\mu^*}\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  can be seen to be the  $L^2(\mu^*; \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ -closure of all gradients of  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  functions.

Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\mu^*)$  be arbitrary. Then, there exists  $t_\mu \in (0, \epsilon)$  and a differentiable convex function  $\phi_\mu$  such that  $\mu_h = (\mathbf{i} + h(\nabla\phi_\mu - \mathbf{i}))_{\#}\mu^*$  and  $W_2(\mu^*, \mu_h) = |h|W_2(\mu^*, \mu) = |h|\|\nabla\phi_\mu\|_{L^2(\mu^*; \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)} < \epsilon$  for all  $h \in (-t_\mu, t_\mu)$ , which shows that  $(\mu_h)_h \subset \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\mu^*)$ . Since  $\mathcal{J}^n$  is Wasserstein differentiable and  $\mu^*$  is a local minimizer, we have the following pair of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{J}^n(\mu_h) - \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*)}{h} &= \int_X \langle \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*)(x), \nabla\phi_\mu(x) - x \rangle d\mu^*(x) + \frac{o(h)}{h} \geq 0 \quad \forall h \in (0, t_\mu) \\ \frac{\mathcal{J}^n(\mu_h) - \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*)}{h} &= \int_X \langle \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*)(x), \nabla\phi_\mu(x) - x \rangle d\mu^*(x) + \frac{o(h)}{h} \leq 0 \quad \forall h \in (-t_\mu, 0). \end{aligned}$$

By letting  $h \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain

$$\int_X \langle \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*)(x), \nabla\phi_\mu(x) - x \rangle d\mu^*(x) = 0 \quad \mu^*\text{-a.e.}$$

Since the choice of  $\mu$  was arbitrary, this holds for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\mu^*)$  and  $(\nabla\phi_\mu - \mathbf{i}) \in T_{\mu^*}\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ . Then, by [8, Lemma 8.4.2 and Proposition 8.4.3],  $\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*) \in L^2(\mu^*; \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  is a divergence-free vector field, and hence  $\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu^*) \in T_{\mu^*}\mathcal{P}_2(X) \cap T_{\mu^*}^\perp \mathcal{P}_2(X) = \{0\}$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

8.6.2. *Proof of Theorem 6.4.* By our assumptions, the function  $\mathcal{J}^n$  is inf-compact, i.e. the sets  $\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} \mathcal{J}^n$  for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  are all compact. Then, the value  $\inf \mathcal{J}^n$  is finite and the set  $\text{argmin} \mathcal{J}^n$  is nonempty and compact. Moreover, by Theorem 5.20 we have that  $\mathcal{J}^n$  is Wasserstein differentiable.

Given initial data  $\bar{\mu}_0 \in D(\mathcal{J}^n)$ , let  $\mu^* \in \text{argmin} \mathcal{J}^n$  be a local minimizer such that  $\bar{\mu}_0 \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\mu^*) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) : W_2(\mu^*, \mu) < \epsilon\}$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . Let  $(\mu_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a curve in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$  satisfying the continuity equation

$$\partial_t \mu_t + L_\mu^* \mu_t = 0, \quad \mu_0 = \bar{\mu}_0,$$

where  $L_\mu^* \mu_t = -\nabla_x \cdot (\mathbf{v}_t \mu_t)$  is defined by  $\mathbf{v}_t = \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_t) \in T_{\mu_t} \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ . The continuity equation implies

$$\int_X f(x) d\mu_{t+h}(x) - \int_X f(x) d\mu_t(x) = - \int_t^{t+h} \int_X \langle \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_s, x), \nabla f(x) \rangle d\mu_s(x) ds$$

for any  $f \in C_c^\infty(X)$  and  $t, h \in (0, \infty)$ , or equivalently

$$\int_X f(x) \frac{1}{h} (\mu_{t+h} - \mu_t)(dx) = - \frac{1}{h} \int_t^{t+h} \int_X \langle \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_s, x), \nabla f(x) \rangle d\mu_s(x) ds.$$

Choose  $f(\cdot) = [\delta \mathcal{J}^n / \delta \mu](\mu_t^\tau)(\cdot)$  with  $\mu_t^\tau = \mu_t + \tau(\mu_{t+h} - \mu_t)$ . Since  $\nabla f(\cdot) = \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_t^\tau)(\cdot)$  is in the analytical tangent space at  $\mu_t^\tau$ , we can approximate  $f$  with compactly supported smooth functions from which passing to the limit justifies our choice of  $f$  (see [6, Lemma 6.1]). Hence, we obtain

$$\int_X \frac{\delta \mathcal{J}^n}{\delta \mu}(\mu_t^\tau)(x) \frac{1}{h} (\mu_{t+h} - \mu_t)(dx) = - \frac{1}{h} \int_t^{t+h} \int_X \left\langle \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_s, x), \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{J}^n}{\delta \mu}(\mu_s^\tau, x) \right\rangle d\mu_s(x) ds.$$

By dominated convergence and Lebesgue differentiation theorem, this gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_t) = - \int_X |\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_s, x)|^2 d\mu_t(x) = - \|\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_t)\|_{L^2(\mu_t, TX)}^2.$$

By integrating we obtain the energy identity

$$\mathcal{J}^n(\mu_{t+h}) - \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_t) = - \int_t^{t+h} \|\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_s)\|_{L^2(\mu_s, TX)}^2 ds,$$

which shows that  $\mathcal{J}^n$  decreases along  $(\mu_t)_t$ . Then, noting that Wasserstein gradient is always also a strong upper gradient (see Definition 1.3.2 and Remark 1.3.3 in [8]), the characterization of the gradient flow via energy-dissipation equality shows that the absolutely continuous curve  $(\mu_t)_t$  is a metric gradient flow for  $\mathcal{J}^n$  started at  $\bar{\mu}_0$ . Finally, under the Cauchy-Lipschitz conditions, the uniqueness follows from Theorem D.2.  $\square$

8.6.3. *Proof of Lemma 6.6. Part 1: Growth condition* (36): Let us begin by noting that  $\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{J}^n$  satisfies the growth condition (36), since the gradient is uniformly bounded. As shown in Appendix 8.3.2, we can write the Wasserstein gradient  $\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{V}^n$  as

$$\nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_{\mu_\zeta})}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, x) = \frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S \int_A \bar{Q}^n(\mu_\zeta, s, a) \nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_{\mu_\zeta}}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, x)(da|s) d^{\pi_{\mu_\zeta}}(ds)$$

where  $\bar{Q}^n(\mu_\zeta, s, a) = Q^n(\mu_\zeta, s, a) - \epsilon_n F'(\pi_{\mu_\zeta}(a|s)) - \epsilon_n F'(\pi_{\mu_\zeta}(a|s))$ . Recall that we have

$$\left| \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_{\mu_\zeta})}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, x) \right| \leq \frac{2}{(1-\beta)^2} (C_n + \epsilon_n (C_{\psi, \rho}^0 + C_{\psi, \rho}^1)) \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{1, \infty}} =: M_V$$

and (cf. Section 8.4.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}_\zeta}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, x) \right| &= \left| \frac{\nabla_x L_H(\nu_\zeta(x))}{\nu_\zeta(x)} \right| \leq \left\| \frac{\nabla \nu_\zeta \cdot \nu_\zeta}{\nu_\zeta} \right\|_\infty (C_0 + C_1 \|\eta_\zeta\|_\infty) \\ &\leq \|\nabla_x \eta_\zeta\|_\infty (C_0 + C_1 \|\eta_\zeta\|_\infty) =: M_H. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have, for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$  and  $x \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ , that

$$|\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{J}^n(\mu_\zeta, x)| \leq |\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{V}^n(\mu_\zeta, x)| + \kappa_n |\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{H}_\zeta^n(\mu_\zeta, x)| = M_V + \kappa_n M_H.$$

**Part 2:  $\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{J}^n$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $x$ :** Similarly as in handling the first derivative, we get

$$D_x^2 \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, x) = \left( D_x^2 \psi(s, a, x) - \int_A D_x^2 \psi(s, a', x) d\pi_{\mu_\zeta}(a'|s) \right) \pi_{\mu_\zeta}(da|s)$$

leading to

$$\left| D_x^2 \frac{\delta \pi_{\mu_\zeta}}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, x) \right| \leq 2 \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{2, \infty}}.$$

Thus

$$\left| \nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, x) - \nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_\mu}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, y) \right| \leq 2 \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{2, \infty}} |x - y|$$

and as a result, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{V}^n(\mu_\zeta, x) - \nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{V}^n(\mu_\zeta, y)| &= \left| \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_{\mu_\zeta})}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, x) - \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_{\mu_\zeta})}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, y) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S \int_A |\bar{Q}^n(\mu_\zeta, s, a)| \left| \nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_{\mu_\zeta}}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, x)(da|s) - \nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_{\mu_\zeta}}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, y)(da|s) \right| d^{\pi_{\mu_\zeta}}(ds) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{(1-\beta)^2} (C_n + \epsilon_n (C_{\psi, \rho}^0 + C_{\psi, \rho}^1)) \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{2, \infty}} |x - y|. \end{aligned}$$

This proves Lipschitz continuity in  $x$  of  $\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{V}^n(\mu_\zeta, x)$ .

Let us next consider the regularization term

$$\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{H}_\zeta(\mu_\zeta, x) = \frac{\nabla \nu_\zeta(x) \cdot L'_H(\nu_\zeta(x))}{\nu_\zeta(x)} = \nabla \nu_\zeta(x) H^{(2)}(\nu_\zeta(x)).$$

For any  $\mu_\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$  and  $x, y \in \text{supp}(\mu_\zeta)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{H}_\zeta(\mu_\zeta, x) - \nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{H}_\zeta(\mu_\zeta, y)| &= |\nabla \nu_\zeta(x) H^{(2)}(\nu_\zeta(x)) - \nabla \nu_\zeta(y) H^{(2)}(\nu_\zeta(y))| \\ &\leq \left| (\nabla \nu_\zeta(x) - \nabla \nu_\zeta(y)) H^{(2)}(\nu_\zeta(x)) \right| + \left| \nabla \nu_\zeta(y) (H^{(2)}(\nu_\zeta(x)) - H^{(2)}(\nu_\zeta(y))) \right| =: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Consider first the term  $I_2$ . Since  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  is compact, Lipschitz continuous function  $\nu_\zeta(x)$  is also supported on a compact set and hence since  $H \in C^3(0, +\infty)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \left| \nabla \nu_\zeta(y) \left( H^{(2)}(\nu_\zeta(x)) - H^{(2)}(\nu_\zeta(y)) \right) \right| \leq \|\nabla \nu_\zeta\|_\infty C_H C_{\zeta,1} |x - y| \\ &\leq C_H C_{\zeta,1}^2 |x - y| \end{aligned}$$

with  $C_H$  denoting the (local) Lipschitz coefficient of  $H^{(2)}$  and  $C_{\zeta,1} := \|\nabla_x \eta_\zeta\|_\infty$ .

Consider next the term  $I_1$ . We start by noting that due to Assumption 6 there exist  $C_0, C_1 > 0$  such that

$$(93) \quad 0 \leq H^{(2)}(\nu_\zeta(x)) \leq C_0 + C_1 \nu_\zeta(x) \leq C_0 + C_1 \|\eta_\zeta\|_\infty < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad |\nu_\zeta(x)| \leq \|\eta_\zeta\|_\infty < \infty.$$

Noting that  $\nu_\zeta \in C^\infty(X_\mu)$ , with  $X_\mu = \text{supp}(\mu)$ , we have  $\|D_x^2 \nu_\zeta\|_\infty \leq \|D_x^2 \eta_\zeta\|_\infty$ , and hence

$$(94) \quad |\nabla_x \nu_\zeta(x) - \nabla_x \nu_\zeta(y)| \leq C_{\zeta,2} |x - y| \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\zeta,2} = \|D_x^2 \eta_\zeta\|_\infty$$

for any  $x, y \in X_\mu$ . Then,

$$I_1 \leq |H^{(2)}(\nu_\zeta(x))| \cdot |\nabla \nu_\zeta(x) - \nabla \nu_\zeta(y)| \leq (C_0 + C_1 \|\eta_\zeta\|_\infty) \cdot C_{\zeta,2} |x - y|.$$

Now bounds for  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  gives us

$$|\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{H}_\zeta(\mu_\zeta, x) - \nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{H}_\zeta(\mu_\zeta, y)| \leq \left( C_0 C_{\zeta,2} + C_1 \|\eta_\zeta\|_\infty C_{\zeta,2} + C_H C_{\zeta,1}^2 \right) |x - y|$$

which shows the Lipschitz continuity of  $\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{H}_\zeta$  in  $x$ .

Finally, we conclude that  $\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{J}^n$  is Lipschitz as a sum of two Lipschitz continuous functions, given that both  $\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{V}^n$  and  $\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{H}_\zeta$  are Lipschitz.

**Part 3:  $\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{J}^n$  is Lipschitz continuous with respect to  $W_1$ -metric:** Let  $\mu_\zeta, \mu'_\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$  and  $x \in X$  be arbitrary. Let us first show that the condition holds for  $\nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{V}^n$  by considering the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{V}^n(\mu'_\zeta, x) - \nabla_{\mu_\zeta} \mathcal{V}^n(\mu_\zeta, x) &= \frac{1}{1 - \beta} (D_1 + D_2 + D_3) \quad \text{with} \\ D_1 &:= \int_S \int_A \bar{Q}^n(\mu'_\zeta, s, a) \nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_{\mu_\zeta}}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu'_\zeta, x)(da|s) [d^{\pi_{\mu'_\zeta}} - d^{\pi_{\mu_\zeta}}](ds), \\ D_2 &:= \int_S \int_A [\bar{Q}^n(\mu'_\zeta, s, a) - \bar{Q}^n(\mu_\zeta, s, a)] \nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_{\mu_\zeta}}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu'_\zeta, x)(da|s) d^{\pi_{\mu_\zeta}}(ds), \\ D_3 &:= \int_S \int_A \bar{Q}^n(\mu_\zeta, s, a) \left[ \nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_{\mu_\zeta}}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu'_\zeta, x)(da|s) - \nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_{\mu_\zeta}}{\delta \mu_\zeta}(\mu_\zeta, x)(da|s) \right] d^{\pi_{\mu_\zeta}}(ds), \end{aligned}$$

where we denote  $\bar{Q}^n(\mu_\zeta, s, a) = Q^n(\mu_\zeta, s, a) - \epsilon_n F(\pi_{\mu_\zeta}(a|s)) - \epsilon_n F^{(1)}(\pi_{\mu_\zeta}(a|s))$ .

**3.A. Bound for  $D_1$ .** Lemma 8.4 together with (75) and (76) gives

$$(95) \quad |D_1| \leq \frac{2\beta}{(1 - \beta)^2} (C_n + \epsilon_n (C_{\psi, \rho}^0 + C_{\psi, \rho}^1)) \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{1, \infty}} W_1(\mu'_\zeta, \mu_\zeta).$$

**3.B. Bound for  $D_2$ .** To establish the bound, we proceed in two steps: (i) we will show the Lipschitz continuity of  $\bar{Q}^n$ ; and (ii) we provide a bound for  $\nabla_x [\delta \pi_{\mu_\zeta} / \delta \mu_\zeta]$ .

**3.B(i) Lipschitz continuity of  $\bar{Q}^n$ .** To show the Lipschitz continuity of  $\bar{Q}^n$  with respect to  $\mu_\zeta$ , we need to check that each of the components,  $Q^n$ ,  $F(\pi_{\mu_\zeta})$ , and  $F^{(1)}(\pi_{\mu_\zeta})$  are Lipschitz

continuous in  $\mu_\varsigma$ . Let  $\mu_t^\xi = \mu_\varsigma + t(\mu'_\varsigma - \mu_\varsigma)$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$  and let  $\mathcal{V}^n(\mu_t^\xi, s)$  be the state value function as in equation (70):

$$\mathcal{V}^n(\mu_t^\xi, s) = \frac{1}{1-\beta} \int_S \int_A u_{B \wedge m_n}(s', a') - \epsilon_n F \left( \frac{d\pi_{\mu_t^\xi}}{d\rho}(a'|s') \right) \pi_{\mu_t^\xi}(da'|s') d_s^{\pi_{\mu_t^\xi}}(ds'|s).$$

Then, starting with  $Q^n$ , we have by Lemma 5.10, (73), (76), and the fundamental theorem of calculus that

$$\begin{aligned} Q^n(\mu'_\varsigma, s, a) - Q^n(\mu_\varsigma, s, a) &= \beta \int_S (\mathcal{V}^n(\mu'_\varsigma, s') - \mathcal{V}^n(\mu_\varsigma, s')) p(ds'|s, a) \\ &= \beta \int_S \int_0^1 \int_X \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_{\mu_\varsigma})}{\delta \mu_\varsigma}(\mu_t^\xi, x) (\mu'_\varsigma - \mu_\varsigma)(dx) p(ds'|s, a) dt \\ &\leq \beta \sup_{\mu_\varsigma \in \mathcal{P}_1(X)} \sup_{x \in X} \left| \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{V}^n(\pi_{\mu_\varsigma})}{\delta \mu_\varsigma}(\mu_\varsigma, x) \right| W_1(\mu'_\varsigma, \mu_\varsigma) \|p\|_{\mathcal{K}(S \times A, S)} \\ &\leq \underbrace{\frac{2\beta}{(1-\beta)^2} (C_n + \epsilon_n (C_{\psi, \rho}^0 + C_{\psi, \rho}^1)) \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{1, \infty}}}_{=: K_Q} W_1(\mu'_\varsigma, \mu_\varsigma) = K_Q W_1(\mu'_\varsigma, \mu_\varsigma) \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider  $F \in C^2(0, +\infty)$  such that the derivatives  $F^{(1)}(\pi_{\mu_\varsigma})$  and  $F^{(2)}(\pi_{\mu_\varsigma})$  are uniformly bounded. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |F(\pi_{\mu'_\varsigma}(a|s)) - F(\pi_{\mu_\varsigma}(a|s))| &= \left| \int_0^1 \int_X \frac{\delta F(\pi_{\mu_\varsigma})}{\delta \pi_{\mu_\varsigma}} \frac{\delta \pi_{\mu_\varsigma}}{\delta \mu_\varsigma}(\mu_t^\xi, x)(a|s) (\mu'_\varsigma - \mu_\varsigma)(dx) dt \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \int_X \left| \frac{d}{dz} F(\pi_{\mu_t^\xi}(a|s)) \right| \left| \left( \psi(s, a, x) - \int_A \psi(s, a', x) \pi_{\mu_t^\xi}(da'|s) \right) \right| \pi_{\mu_t^\xi}(a|s) (\mu'_\varsigma - \mu_\varsigma)(dx) dt \\ &\leq \underbrace{2C_{\psi, \rho}^1 \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{0, \infty}} C_{\pi, F}}_{=: K_F} W_1(\mu'_\varsigma, \mu_\varsigma) = K_F W_1(\mu'_\varsigma, \mu_\varsigma), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_{\psi, \rho}^1$  is bound for the derivative  $|F^{(1)}(\pi_{\mu_\varsigma})|$  and  $C_{\pi, F} = \exp(2\|\psi\|_{\Psi^{0, \infty}} + |\log \rho(A)|)$  denotes the bound for the density  $\pi_{\mu_t^\xi}$ , which is obtained by noting that, for any  $\mu_\varsigma$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left( \frac{d\pi_{\mu_\varsigma}}{d\rho}(a|s) \right) &\leq \left| \int_X \psi(s, a, x) d\mu_\varsigma(x) - \log \left( \int_A \exp \left( \int_X \psi(s, a', x) d\mu_\varsigma(x) \right) d\rho(a) \right) \right| \\ &\leq 2\|\psi\|_{\Psi^{0, \infty}} + |\log \rho(A)|. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for  $F^{(1)}(\pi_{\mu_\varsigma})$ , we obtain

$$|F^{(1)}(\pi_{\mu'_\varsigma}(a|s)) - F^{(1)}(\pi_{\mu_\varsigma}(a|s))| \leq \underbrace{2C_{\psi, \rho}^{(2)} \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{1, \infty}} C_{\pi, F}}_{=: K'_F} W_1(\mu'_\varsigma, \mu_\varsigma) = K'_F W_1(\mu'_\varsigma, \mu_\varsigma),$$

where  $C_{\psi, \rho}^{(2)} > 0$  is the bound for the second derivative  $|F^{(2)}(\pi_{\mu_\varsigma})|$  given by Assumption 5. Hence, we find

$$(96) \quad |\bar{Q}^n(\mu'_\varsigma, s, a) - \bar{Q}^n(\mu_\varsigma, s, a)| \leq (K_Q + \epsilon_n (K_F + K'_F)) W_1(\mu'_\varsigma, \mu_\varsigma).$$

**3.B(ii) Bound for  $\nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_{\mu_\varsigma}}{\delta \mu_\varsigma}(\mu_\varsigma, x)$ .** Similarly as before, we have

$$\nabla_x \frac{\delta \pi_{\mu_\varsigma}}{\delta \mu_\varsigma}(\mu_\varsigma, x)(a|s) = \left( \nabla_x \psi(s, a, x) - \int_A \nabla_x \psi(s, a', x) d\pi_{\mu_\varsigma}(a'|s) \right) \frac{d\pi_{\mu_\varsigma}}{d\rho}(a|s)$$

that can be upper bounded with  $2\|\psi\|_{\Psi^{1,\infty}}$  that in turn, together with (96), leads to

$$(97) \quad |D_2| \leq (K_Q + \epsilon_n (K_F + K'_F)) 2\|\psi\|_{\Psi^{1,\infty}} W_1(\mu'_\varsigma, \mu_\varsigma).$$

**3.C. Bound for  $D_3$ .** We decompose  $D_3$  further as  $D_3 = D_{3,1} + D_{3,2}$ , where

$$D_{3,1} := \int_S \int_A \bar{Q}^n(\mu_\varsigma, s, a) \int_A \nabla_x \psi(s, a', x) [\pi_{\mu'_\varsigma} - \pi_{\mu_\varsigma}] (da'|s) \pi_{\mu'_\varsigma}(da|s) d^{\pi_{\mu_\varsigma}}(ds)$$

$$D_{3,2} := \int_S \int_A \bar{Q}^n(\mu_\varsigma, s, a) \left( \nabla_x \psi(s, a, x) - \int_A \nabla_x \psi(s, a', x) \pi_{\mu'_\varsigma}(da'|s) \right) [\pi_{\mu'_\varsigma} - \pi_{\mu_\varsigma}](da|s) d^{\pi_{\mu_\varsigma}}(ds).$$

Here, thanks to Lemma 8.4,

$$\int_A f(a) (\pi_{\mu'_\varsigma} - \pi_{\mu_\varsigma})(da|s) \leq \|\pi_{\mu'_\varsigma} - \pi_{\mu_\varsigma}\|_{\mathcal{K}(S,A)} \leq 2\|\psi\|_{\Psi^{1,\infty}} \|f\|_\infty W_1(\mu'_\varsigma, \mu_\varsigma),$$

which together with the bound (76) for  $\bar{Q}^n$  gives

$$(98) \quad |D_3| = |D_{3,1} + D_{3,2}| \leq \frac{4}{1-\beta} (C_n + \epsilon_n (C_{\psi,\rho}^0 + C_{\psi,\rho}^1)) \|\psi\|_{\Psi^{1,\infty}}^2 W_1(\mu'_\varsigma, \mu_\varsigma).$$

This shows that then  $D_3$  is also Lipschitz, and hence  $\nabla_{\mu_\varsigma} \mathcal{V}^n$  is Lipschitz with respect to  $W_1$ -metric.

**3.D.  $\nabla_{\mu_\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  is Lipschitz with respect to  $W_1$ -metric.** For any  $\mu_\varsigma, \mu'_\varsigma \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$  and  $\mu_t^\varsigma = \mu_\varsigma + t(\mu'_\varsigma - \mu_\varsigma)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{\mu_\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu'_\varsigma) - \nabla_{\mu_\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_\varsigma)| &= \left| \int_0^1 \int_X \frac{\delta \nabla_{\mu_\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma}{\delta \mu_\varsigma}(\mu_t^\varsigma, x) (\mu'_\varsigma - \mu_\varsigma)(dx) dt \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{\delta \nabla_{\mu_\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma}{\delta \mu_\varsigma}(\mu_t^\varsigma, x) \right| W_1(\mu'_\varsigma, \mu_\varsigma), \end{aligned}$$

if  $\nabla_{\mu_\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma$  has also a uniformly bounded linear functional derivative. As such, it suffices to show existence and boundedness of the following limit:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\nabla_{\mu_\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_t^\varsigma) - \nabla_{\mu_\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_\varsigma)}{t} = \int_X \frac{\delta \nabla_{\mu_\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma}{\delta \mu_\varsigma}(\mu_t^\varsigma, x) (\mu'_\varsigma - \mu_\varsigma)(dx).$$

Denoting  $\nu_t^\varsigma = d\mu_t^\varsigma/d\gamma$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \nabla_{\mu_\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_t^\varsigma, x) &= \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} [\nabla_x \nu_t^\varsigma(x) H^{(2)}(\nu_t^\varsigma(x))] \\ &= \nabla_x (\nu'_\varsigma(x) - \nu_\varsigma(x)) H^{(2)}(\nu_t^\varsigma(x)) + \nabla_x \nu^\varsigma(x) \cdot (\nu'_\varsigma - \nu_\varsigma) H^{(3)}(\nu_\varsigma(x)) \end{aligned}$$

Since all of the components on the RHS of the above equation are sufficiently many times continuously differentiable,  $\nu_\varsigma \in C^\infty(X_{\mu_\varsigma})$ ,  $H \in C^3(0, +\infty)$ , they are also bounded given that the support  $X_{\mu_\varsigma} = \text{supp}(\mu_\varsigma)$  is compact. Hence, we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{x \in X_{\mu_\varsigma}} \left| \frac{\delta \nabla_{\mu_\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma}{\delta \mu_\varsigma}(\mu_t^\varsigma, x) \right| < \infty,$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

## 8.7. Proofs related to Section 6.3.



8.7.1. *Proof of Theorem 6.8.* Since  $\mathcal{J}^n$  is Wasserstein differentiable at  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$ , by [73, Theorem 1.2.] it is sufficient show that there exists  $\lambda_J > 0$  such that

$$\int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{J}^n(\nu, y) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{J}^n(\mu, x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) \geq \lambda_J W_2(\mu, \nu)^2,$$

where  $\gamma \in \Gamma_0(\mu, \nu)$  is an optimal transport plan.

Let  $x, y \in X$  and  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$  be arbitrary. Then, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{J}^n(\nu, y) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{J}^n(\mu, x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) \\ &= - \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\nu, y) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) \quad (=:-I_1) \\ & \quad + \kappa_n \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{H}_{\varsigma}(\nu, y) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{H}_{\varsigma}(\mu, x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) \quad (=:I_2) \end{aligned}$$

where  $I_1$  is further decomposed into  $I_{1,1} + I_{1,2}$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,1} &= \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\nu, x) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) \\ I_{1,2} &= \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\nu, y) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\nu, x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n$  is assumed to be Lipschitz continuous with respect to measures, there exists  $K_V > 0$  such that  $|\nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\nu, x) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, x)| \leq K_V W_1(\mu, \nu)$ . Then, by using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{1,1}|^2 &= \left| \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\nu, x) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) \right|^2 \\ &\leq \int_{X^2} |\nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\nu, x) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\mu, x)|^2 d\gamma(x, y) \cdot \int_{X^2} |y - x|^2 d\gamma(x, y) \\ &\leq K_V^2 W_1(\mu, \nu)^2 \cdot W_2(\mu, \nu)^2 = K_V^2 \left( \int_{X^2} |y - x| d\gamma(x, y) \right)^2 W_2(\mu, \nu)^2 \\ (99) \quad &\leq K_V^2 \int_{X^2} |y - x|^2 d\gamma(x, y) W_2(\mu, \nu)^2 = K_V^2 W_2(\mu, \nu)^4, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we have applied Jensen's inequality. Thus we have obtained

$$|I_{1,1}| \leq K_V W_2(\mu, \nu)^2.$$

To find a bound for  $I_{1,2}$ , we can use the assumption that  $\nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n$  is also Lipschitz continuous with respect to parameters: there exists  $C_V > 0$  such that  $|\nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\nu, y) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\nu, x)| \leq C_V |y - x|$ . Then Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{1,2}| &\leq \int_{X^2} |\langle \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\nu, y) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^n(\nu, x), y - x \rangle| d\gamma(x, y) \\ &\leq \int_{X^2} C_V |y - x|^2 d\gamma(x, y) \leq C_V W_2(\mu, \nu)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathcal{H}_{\varsigma}$  is convex with  $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}_{\varsigma}}$ , we have

$$I_2 = \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{H}_{\varsigma}(\nu, y) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{H}_{\varsigma}(\mu, x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) \geq \lambda_{\mathcal{H}_{\varsigma}} W_2(\mu, \nu)^2.$$

Now, collecting the above results, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{J}^n(\nu, y) - \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{J}^n(\mu, x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) &= \kappa_n I_2 - I_{1,1} - I_{1,2} \\ &\geq \kappa_n \lambda_{\mathcal{H}_{\zeta}} W_2(\mu, \nu)^2 - K_V W_2(\mu, \nu)^2 - C_V W_2(\mu, \nu)^2 \\ &= (\kappa_n \lambda_{\mathcal{H}_{\zeta}} - K_V - C_V) W_2(\mu, \nu)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that  $\mathcal{J}^n$  is convex if the regularization parameter  $\kappa_n > 0$  is large enough to ensure that  $\lambda_J := \kappa_n \lambda_{\mathcal{H}_{\zeta}} - K_V - C_V \geq 0$ . For a Wasserstein differentiable function, the notion of  $\lambda$ -convexity along geodesics is equivalent to convexity along generalized geodesics; see [73, Theorem 1.1]. Then, the claims regarding asymptotic behavior of gradient flows are then obtained from Theorem D.3. This completes the whole proof.  $\square$

8.7.2. *Proof of Lemma 6.9.* Let  $\mu_0 = \nu_0 \cdot \gamma = \varrho_0 \cdot \mathcal{L}^d$  and  $\mu_1 = \nu_1 \cdot \gamma = \varrho_1 \cdot \mathcal{L}^d$ . We denote the corresponding mollified densities by  $\varrho_0^{\zeta}, \varrho_1^{\zeta}$  and  $\nu_0^{\zeta}, \nu_1^{\zeta}$ . To find the semi-convexity coefficient for  $\mathcal{H}_{\zeta}$ , by [73, Theorem 1.2] it is sufficient to show that there exists  $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}_{\zeta}} > 0$  such that the following inequality holds:

$$(100) \quad \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_{\mu_{\zeta}} \mathcal{H}_{\zeta}(\mu_1^{\zeta}, y) - \nabla_{\mu_{\zeta}} \mathcal{H}_{\zeta}(\mu_0^{\zeta}, x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) \geq \lambda_{\mathcal{H}_{\zeta}} W_2(\mu_0^{\zeta}, \mu_1^{\zeta})^2,$$

where  $\gamma \in \Gamma_0(\mu_0^{\zeta}, \mu_1^{\zeta})$  denotes the optimal transport plan. Let  $x, y \in X$  be arbitrary. Denoting the derivative of  $L_H$  by  $L'_H(u) = uH''(u)$ , we can decompose  $\nabla_{\mu_{\zeta}} \mathcal{H}_{\zeta}(\mu^{\zeta}, x)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mu_{\zeta}} \mathcal{H}_{\zeta}(\mu^{\zeta}, x) &= \frac{\nabla_x L_H(\nu^{\zeta}(x))}{\nu^{\zeta}(x)} = \frac{\nabla_x(\nu^{\zeta}(x)) \cdot L'_H(\nu^{\zeta}(x))}{\nu^{\zeta}(x)} \\ &= \frac{[(\nabla_x \log \varrho^{\zeta}(x) + \nabla_x U(x)) \varrho^{\zeta}(x) e^{U(x)}] L'_H(\varrho^{\zeta}(x) e^{U(x)})}{\varrho^{\zeta}(x) e^{U(x)}} \\ &= (\nabla_x \log \varrho^{\zeta}(x) + \nabla_x U(x)) L'_H(\varrho^{\zeta}(x) e^{U(x)}) \\ &= f(\varrho^{\zeta}, x) + g(\varrho^{\zeta}, x), \end{aligned}$$

where  $f$  and  $g$  are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} f(\varrho^{\zeta}, x) &= \nabla_x \log \varrho^{\zeta}(x) \cdot L'_H(\varrho^{\zeta}(x) e^{U(x)}), \quad \text{and} \\ g(\varrho^{\zeta}, x) &= \nabla_x U(x) \cdot L'_H(\varrho^{\zeta}(x) e^{U(x)}), \end{aligned}$$

respectively. By adding and removing terms, the left-hand-side of (100) can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_{\mu_{\zeta}} \mathcal{H}_{\zeta}(\mu_1^{\zeta}, y) - \nabla_{\mu_{\zeta}} \mathcal{H}_{\zeta}(\mu_0^{\zeta}, x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) \\ &= \int_{X^2} \underbrace{\langle f(\varrho_1^{\zeta}, y) - f(\varrho_0^{\zeta}, x), y - x \rangle}_{=: F_1 + F_2} d\gamma(x, y) + \int_{X^2} \underbrace{\langle g(\varrho_1^{\zeta}, y) - g(\varrho_0^{\zeta}, x), y - x \rangle}_{=: G_1 + G_2} d\gamma(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

where further decompositions for the integrands are given by

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &:= \langle f(\varrho_1^{\zeta}, y) - f(\varrho_1^{\zeta}, x), y - x \rangle \\ F_2 &:= \langle f(\varrho_1^{\zeta}, x) - f(\varrho_0^{\zeta}, x), y - x \rangle \\ G_1 &:= \langle (\nabla U(y) - \nabla U(x)) L'_H(\nu_1^{\zeta}(y)), y - x \rangle \\ G_2 &:= \langle \nabla U(x) (L'_H(\nu_1^{\zeta}(y)) - L'_H(\nu_0^{\zeta}(x))), y - x \rangle \end{aligned}$$

**Lower bound for  $G_1$ :** By using the assumption that  $L'_H(\nu^\varsigma(x)) \geq m_\varsigma > 0$  and

$$\langle \nabla U(y) - \nabla U(x), y - x \rangle \geq \lambda_U |y - x|^2,$$

we now have a lower bound for  $G_1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &= \langle (\nabla U(y) - \nabla U(x)) L'_H(\nu_1^\varsigma(y)), y - x \rangle \\ &\geq \lambda_U |y - x|^2 L'_H(\nu_1^\varsigma(y)) \geq m_\varsigma \lambda_U |y - x|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the bound, we get

$$(101) \quad \int_{X^2} G_1 d\gamma \geq m_\varsigma \lambda_U \int_{X^2} |y - x|^2 d\gamma(x, y) = m_\varsigma \lambda_U W_2(\mu_0^\varsigma, \mu_1^\varsigma)^2.$$

**Upper bound for  $G_2$ :** Define

$$(102) \quad \bar{L}_H(\nu^\varsigma, x) := L'_H(\nu^\varsigma(x)) = \nu^\varsigma(x) H^{(2)}(\nu^\varsigma(x)),$$

By adding and removing terms, we can further decompose

$$\begin{aligned} G_2 &= \langle \nabla U(x) (\bar{L}_H(\nu_1^\varsigma, y) - \bar{L}_H(\nu_0^\varsigma, x)), y - x \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla U(x) (\bar{L}_H(\nu_1^\varsigma, y) - \bar{L}_H(\nu_0^\varsigma, y)), y - x \rangle \quad (= G_{2,1}) \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla U(x) (\bar{L}_H(\nu_0^\varsigma, y) - \bar{L}_H(\nu_0^\varsigma, x)), y - x \rangle \quad (= G_{2,2}) \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Lemma 6.6, since now we have  $\|H^{(2)} \circ \nu^\varsigma\|_\infty \leq C_0 + C_1 \|\eta_\varsigma\|_\infty$ , it follows that it is Lipschitz continuous on  $\text{supp}(\nu_0^\varsigma)$ , since  $H \in C^3(0, +\infty)$  and  $\nu_0^\varsigma \in C^\infty(X)$ . Hence,

$$(103) \quad |\bar{L}_H(\nu_0^\varsigma, y) - \bar{L}_H(\nu_0^\varsigma, x)| \leq \underbrace{((C_0 + C_1 \|\eta_\varsigma\|_\infty) C_{\varsigma,1} + \|\eta_\varsigma\|_\infty C_H C_{\varsigma,1})}_{=: C_{L,\varsigma}} |y - x|$$

and it follows that

$$|G_{2,2}| \leq \|\nabla U\|_\infty C_{L,\varsigma} |y - x|^2.$$

This gives

$$(104) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{X^2} G_{2,2} d\gamma &\leq \|\nabla U\|_\infty C_{L,\varsigma} \int_{X^2} |y - x|^2 d\gamma(x, y) \\ &= \|\nabla U\|_\infty C_{L,\varsigma} W_2(\mu_0^\varsigma, \mu_1^\varsigma)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Next, for the term  $G_{2,1}$ , we can establish a bound by showing that  $\bar{C}_L < \infty$  in

$$(105) \quad |\bar{L}_H(\nu_1^\varsigma, y) - \bar{L}_H(\nu_0^\varsigma, y)| \leq \underbrace{\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{x \in \text{supp}(\nu_t^\varsigma \cdot \gamma)} \left| \frac{\delta \bar{L}_H}{\delta \nu^\varsigma}(\nu_t^\varsigma, x) \right|}_{=: \bar{C}_L} W_1(\mu_0^\varsigma, \mu_1^\varsigma),$$

where the function  $\delta \bar{L}_H / \delta \nu^\varsigma$  is defined by

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0, t \in [0,1]} \frac{\bar{L}_H(\nu_0^\varsigma + t(\nu_1^\varsigma - \nu_0^\varsigma)) - \bar{L}_H(\nu_0^\varsigma)}{t} = \int_X \frac{\delta \bar{L}_H}{\delta \nu^\varsigma}(\nu_t^\varsigma, x) d[\mu_1^\varsigma - \mu_0^\varsigma](x),$$

where  $\bar{L}_H$  is understood as a functional on measures (densities). Interpreting the left-hand-side as a time-derivative, we obtain

$$(106) \quad \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \bar{L}_H(\nu_t^\varsigma, x) = (\nu_1^\varsigma(x) - \nu_0^\varsigma(x)) H^{(2)}(\nu_0^\varsigma(x)) + (\nu_1^\varsigma(x) - \nu_0^\varsigma(x)) H^{(3)}(\nu_0^\varsigma(x)) \nu_0^\varsigma(x).$$

Since the terms are bounded, we get  $\bar{C}_L \in (0, \infty)$ . By applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality then gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{X^2} G_{2,1} d\gamma \right|^2 &= \left| \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla U(x)(\bar{L}_H(\nu_1, y) - \bar{L}_H(\nu_0, y)), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) \right|^2 \\
&\leq \|\nabla U\|_\infty^2 \int_{X^2} |\bar{L}_H(\nu_1, y) - \bar{L}_H(\nu_0, y)|^2 d\gamma(x, y) \cdot \int_{X^2} |y - x|^2 d\gamma(x, y) \\
&\leq \|\nabla U\|_\infty^2 \cdot \bar{C}_L^2 W_1(\mu_0^\zeta, \mu_1^\zeta)^2 \cdot W_2(\mu_0^\zeta, \mu_1^\zeta)^2 \\
&= \|\nabla U\|_\infty^2 \cdot \bar{C}_L^2 \left( \int_{X^2} |y - x| d\gamma(x, y) \right)^2 \cdot W_2(\mu_0^\zeta, \mu_1^\zeta)^2 \\
&\leq \|\nabla U\|_\infty^2 \cdot \bar{C}_L^2 \int_{X^2} |y - x|^2 d\gamma(x, y) W_2(\mu_1^\zeta, \mu_2^\zeta)^2 = \|\nabla U\|_\infty^2 \cdot \bar{C}_L^2 W_2(\mu_1^\zeta, \mu_2^\zeta)^4.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have obtained

$$(107) \quad \int_{X^2} G_{2,1} d\gamma \leq \bar{C}_L \|\nabla U\|_\infty W_2(\mu_1^\zeta, \mu_2^\zeta)^2$$

and combining the bounds for  $G_{2,1}$  and  $G_{2,2}$  gives

$$(108) \quad \int_{X^2} G_2 d\gamma \leq \|\nabla U\|_\infty (\bar{C}_L + C_{L,\zeta}) W_2(\mu_0^\zeta, \mu_1^\zeta)^2.$$

**Upper bound for  $F_1$ :** Let us first rewrite  $f$  as

$$f(\varrho^\zeta, x) = \nabla_x \log \varrho^\zeta(x) \cdot L'_H(\varrho^\zeta(x) e^{U(x)}) = \nabla_x \varrho^\zeta(x) \cdot e^{U(x)} H^{(2)}(\nu^\zeta(x)).$$

Since  $U \in C^1(X)$ ,  $H \in C^3(0, +\infty)$ , and  $\rho^\zeta, \nu^\zeta \in C^\infty(X)$ , the function  $f(\varrho^\zeta, \cdot)$  is understood as a product of three Lipschitz continuous functions with bounded derivatives on the compact set  $\text{supp}(\rho^\zeta)$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla_x \varrho^\zeta(y) - \nabla_x \varrho^\zeta(x)| &\leq C_{\zeta,2} |x - y|, \quad C_{\zeta,2} = \|D_x^2 \eta_\zeta\|_\infty \\
|e^{U(y)} - e^{U(x)}| &\leq C_{e^U} |x - y|, \quad C_{e^U} := \|\nabla_x U\|_\infty \|e^U\|_\infty \\
|H^{(2)}(\nu^\zeta(y)) - H^{(2)}(\nu^\zeta(x))| &\leq C_H C_{\zeta,1} |y - x|.
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that the constants depend only on  $H$ ,  $\eta_\zeta$  and  $U$ , the function  $f(\varrho^\zeta, \cdot)$  has a Lipschitz constant  $C_f > 0$  that does not depend on the measures. Then, we get

$$(109) \quad \int_{X^2} F_1 d\gamma = \int_{X^2} \langle f(\varrho_1^\zeta, y) - f(\varrho_1^\zeta, x), y - x \rangle d\gamma(x, y) \leq C_f W_2(\mu_0^\zeta, \mu_1^\zeta)^2.$$

**Upper bound for  $F_2$ :** We can establish the bound using similar steps as in the case of term  $G_{2,1}$ . That is, we need to show that there exists  $\bar{C}_f < \infty$  such that

$$|f(\rho_1^\zeta, x) - f(\rho_0^\zeta, x)| \leq \underbrace{\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{x \in \text{supp}(\rho_t^\zeta)} \left| \frac{\delta f}{\delta \varrho^\zeta}(\varrho_t^\zeta, x) \right|}_{=: \bar{C}_f} W_1(\mu_0^\zeta, \mu_1^\zeta),$$

where the flat derivative  $\delta f / \delta \varrho^\zeta$  is given by

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0, t \in [0,1]} \frac{f(\varrho_t^\zeta) - f(\varrho_0^\zeta)}{t} = \int_X \frac{\delta f}{\delta \varrho^\zeta}(\varrho_t^\zeta, x) d[\mu_1^\zeta - \mu_0^\zeta](x).$$

Here,  $f(\varrho^\varsigma) = \nabla_x \varrho^\varsigma \cdot e^U H^{(2)}(\nu^\varsigma)$  is understood as a functional on measures (densities). Hence,

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} f(\rho_t^\varsigma) = \nabla_x(\varrho_1^\varsigma - \varrho_0^\varsigma) \cdot e^U H^{(2)}(\nu_0^\varsigma) + \nabla_x \varrho_0^\varsigma \cdot (\nu_1^\varsigma - \nu_0^\varsigma) e^U H^{(3)}(\nu_0^\varsigma),$$

where terms on the RHS of the above equation are bounded in  $x$  on  $\text{supp}(\mu_0^\varsigma)$ . Then, we have  $\bar{C}_f \in (0, +\infty)$ , which together with Cauchy-Schwartz inequality gives

$$(110) \quad \int_{X^2} F_2 \, d\gamma \leq \bar{C}_f W_2(\mu_0^\varsigma, \mu_1^\varsigma)^2.$$

**Finding the semi-convexity coefficient in (100):** Collecting the bounds (101), (108), (109) and (110), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X^2} \langle \nabla_{\mu^\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_1^\varsigma, y) - \nabla_{\mu^\varsigma} \mathcal{H}_\varsigma(\mu_0^\varsigma, x), y - x \rangle \, d\gamma(x, y) &= \int_{X^2} F_1 + F_2 + G_1 + G_2 \, d\gamma \\ &\geq m_\varsigma \lambda_U W_2(\mu_0^\varsigma, \mu_1^\varsigma)^2 - \|\nabla U\|_\infty (\bar{C}_L + C_{L,\varsigma}) W_2(\mu_0^\varsigma, \mu_1^\varsigma)^2 \\ &\quad - C_f W_2(\mu_0^\varsigma, \mu_1^\varsigma)^2 - \bar{C}_f W_2(\mu_0^\varsigma, \mu_1^\varsigma)^2 \\ &= \left( m_\varsigma \lambda_U - \|\nabla U\|_\infty \bar{C}_L - \|\nabla U\|_\infty C_{L,\varsigma} - C_f - \bar{C}_f \right) W_2(\mu_0^\varsigma, \mu_1^\varsigma)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we find

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{H}} = m_\varsigma \lambda_U - \|\nabla U\|_\infty \bar{C}_L - \|\nabla U\|_\infty C_{L,\varsigma} - C_f - \bar{C}_f$$

as a semi-convexity coefficient for  $\mathcal{H}_\varsigma$ . Then,  $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$  if the coefficients  $m_\varsigma$  and  $\lambda_U$  are large enough. As the rest of the claim follows from Theorems 6.4 and 6.8, this completes the proof.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Joshua Achiam, David Held, Aviv Tamar, and Pieter Abbeel. Constrained policy optimization. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2017.
- [2] Alekh Agarwal, Sham M Kakade, Jason D Lee, and Gaurav Mahajan. Optimality and approximation with policy gradient methods in Markov decision processes. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 64–66. PMLR, 2020.
- [3] Andrea Agazzi and Jianfeng Lu. Global optimality of softmax policy gradient with single hidden layer neural networks in the mean-field regime. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [4] S. M. Ali and S. D. Silvey. A general class of coefficients of divergence of one distribution from another. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 28(1): 131–142, 1966.
- [5] Eitan Altman. *Constrained Markov decision processes*. Routledge, 1999.
- [6] Luigi Ambrosio and Wilfrid Gangbo. Hamiltonian ODEs in the Wasserstein space of probability measures. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Journal Issued by the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences*, 61(1):18–53, 2008.
- [7] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Fusco, and Diego Pallara. *Functions of Bounded Variation and Free Discontinuity Problems*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs, 2000. ISBN 9780198502456. doi: 10.1093/oso/9780198502456.001.0001.

- [8] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient Flows in Metric Spaces and in the Space of Probability Measures*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser, 2. ed edition, 2008. ISBN 978-3-7643-8722-8 978-3-7643-8721-1. OCLC: 254181287.
- [9] Aaron D. Ames, Samuel Coogan, Magnus Egerstedt, Giulio Notomista, Koushil Sreenath, and Paulo Tabuada. Control barrier functions: Theory and applications. In *Proceedings of the 18th European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 3420–3431, Bochum, Germany, Jun 2019.
- [10] Amrit Singh Bedi, Souradip Chakraborty, Anjaly Parayil, Brian M Sadler, Pratap Tokekar, and Alec Koppel. On the hidden biases of policy mirror ascent in continuous action spaces. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162, pages 1716–1731, 17–23 Jul 2022.
- [11] Gerald Beer, RT Rockafellar, and Roger J-B Wets. A characterization of epi-convergence in terms of convergence of level sets. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 116(3):753–761, 1992.
- [12] JalaJ Bhandari and Daniel Russo. Global optimality guarantees for policy gradient methods. *Operations Research*, 2024.
- [13] Sujay Bhatt, Alec Koppel, and Vikram Krishnamurthy. Policy gradient using weak derivatives for reinforcement learning. In *2019 53rd Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems (CISS)*, pages 5531–5537. IEEE, 2019.
- [14] Vladimir I Bogachev, Michael Röckner, and Stanislav V Shaposhnikov. Distances between transition probabilities of diffusions and applications to nonlinear Fokker–Planck–Kolmogorov equations. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 271(5):1262–1300, 2016.
- [15] Vladimir I Bogachev, Michael Röckner, and Stanislav V Shaposhnikov. Convergence in variation of solutions of nonlinear Fokker–Planck–Kolmogorov equations to stationary measures. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 276(12):3681–3713, 2019.
- [16] Benoît Bonnet and Francesco Rossi. The Pontryagin maximum principle in the Wasserstein space. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 58(1):11, 2019.
- [17] Archana Bura, Aria HasanzadeZonuzy, Dileep Kalathil, Srinivas Shakkottai, and Jean-Francois Chamberland. DOPE: Doubly optimistic and pessimistic exploration for safe reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 36th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- [18] René Carmona and François Delarue. Forward–backward stochastic differential equations and controlled McKean–Vlasov dynamics. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 2647–2700, 2015.
- [19] René Carmona and François Delarue. *Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications I*. Springer, 2018.
- [20] José A. Carrillo, Marco Di Francesco, Alessio Figalli, Thomas Laurent, and Dejan Slepčev. Global-in-time weak measure solutions and finite-time aggregation for non-local interaction equations. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 156(2):229–271, 2011.
- [21] José A. Carrillo, Young-Pil Choi, and Maxime Hauray. The derivation of swarming models: mean-field limit and Wasserstein distances. In *Collective Dynamics from Bacteria to Crowds: An Excursion Through Modeling, Analysis and Simulation*, volume 553 of *CISM Courses and Lectures*, pages 1–46. Springer, Vienna, 2014.
- [22] José A. Carrillo, Katy Craig, and Francesco S. Patacchini. A blob method for diffusion. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 58–53(2):53, 2019.

- [23] Semih Cayci, Niao He, and Rayadurgam Srikant. Convergence of entropy-regularized natural policy gradient with linear function approximation. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 34(3):2729–2755, 2024.
- [24] Shicong Cen, Chen Cheng, Yuxin Chen, Yuting Wei, and Yuejie Chi. Fast global convergence of natural policy gradient methods with entropy regularization. *Operations Research*, 70(4):2563–2578, 2022.
- [25] Richard Cheng, Gábor Orosz, Richard M Murray, and Joel W Burdick. End-to-end safe reinforcement learning through barrier functions for safety-critical continuous control tasks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 3387–3395, 2019.
- [26] Lénaïc Chizat. Mean-field langevin dynamics : Exponential convergence and annealing. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022. ISSN 2835-8856.
- [27] LENAÏC CHIZAT and FRANCIS BACH. On the global convergence of gradient descent for over-parameterized models using optimal transport. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [28] Yinlam Chow, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, Lucas Janson, and Marco Pavone. Risk-constrained reinforcement learning with percentile risk criteria. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):6070–6120, 2017.
- [29] John B. Conway. *A Course in Functional Analysis*, volume 96 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2nd edition, 1990. ISBN 978-1-4612-4286-4.
- [30] Katie Craig and Andrea L. Bertozzi. A blob method for the aggregation equation. *Mathematics of Computation*, 85(300):1681–1717, 2016.
- [31] Imre Csiszar. Information-type measures of difference of probability distributions and indirect observation. *Studia Scientiarum Mathematicarum Hungarica*, 2:229–318, 1967.
- [32] François Delarue and Alvin Tse. Uniform in time weak propagation of chaos on the torus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.14973*, 2021.
- [33] Claude Dellacherie and Paul A. Meyer. *Probabilities and Potential*. Elsevier North-Holland, 1978.
- [34] Dongsheng Ding, Xiaohan Wei, Zhuoran Yang, Zhaoran Wang, and Mihailo Jovanovic. Provably efficient safe exploration via primal-dual policy optimization. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 2021.
- [35] Gintare Karolina Dziugaite and Daniel M Roy. Data-dependent PAC-Bayes priors via differential privacy. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [36] Ilyas Fatkhullin, Anas Barakat, Anastasia Kireeva, and Niao He. Stochastic policy gradient methods: Improved sample complexity for Fisher-non-degenerate policies. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202, pages 9827–9869, 23–29 Jul 2023.
- [37] Maryam Fazel, Rong Ge, Sham Kakade, and Mehran Mesbahi. Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1467–1476, 10–15 Jul 2018.
- [38] Eugene A. Feinberg, Pavlo O. Kasyanov, and Nina V. Zadoianchuk. Berge’s theorem for noncompact image sets. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 397(1): 255–259, 2013. ISSN 0022-247X.

- [39] Eugene A. Feinberg, Pavlo O. Kasyanov, and Nina V. Zadoianchuk. Fatou’s lemma for weakly converging probabilities. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 58(4):683–689, 2014.
- [40] Eugene A. Feinberg, Pavlo O. Kasyanov, and Johannes O. Royset. Epi-Convergence of Expectation Functions under Varying Measures and Integrands, 2022.
- [41] Matteo Focardi.  $\gamma$ -convergence: a tool to investigate physical phenomena across scales. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 35(14):1613–1658, 2012.
- [42] Samy Wu Fung and Levon Nurbekyan. Mean-field control barrier functions: A framework for real-time swarm control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18945*, 2024.
- [43] Matthieu Geist, Bruno Scherrer, and Olivier Pietquin. A theory of regularized Markov decision processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2160–2169. PMLR, 2019.
- [44] Michael Giegrich, Christoph Reisinger, and Yufei Zhang. Convergence of policy gradient methods for finite-horizon stochastic linear-quadratic control problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.00617*, 2022.
- [45] Jonathan Goodman, Thomas Y. Hou, and John Lowengrub. Convergence of the point vortex method for the 2-d Euler equations. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 43(3):415–430, 1990.
- [46] Tuomas Haarnoja, Haoran Tang, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Reinforcement learning with deep energy-based policies. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1352–1361. PMLR, 2017.
- [47] Tuomas Haarnoja, Aurick Zhou, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Soft Actor-Critic: Off-Policy Maximum Entropy Deep Reinforcement Learning with a Stochastic Actor. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.01290*, 2018.
- [48] Yinbin Han, Meisam Razaviyayn, and Renyuan Xu. Policy gradient finds global optimum of nearly linear-quadratic control systems. In *OPT 2022: Optimization for Machine Learning (NeurIPS 2022 Workshop)*, 2022.
- [49] Maxime Hauray. Wasserstein distances for vortices approximation of Euler-type equations. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 19(8):1357–1384, 2009.
- [50] Bin Hu, Kaiqing Zhang, Na Li, Mehran Mesbahi, Maryam Fazel, and Tamer Başar. Toward a theoretical foundation of policy optimization for learning control policies. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 6:123–158, 2023.
- [51] Hao Huang and Jian-Guo Liu. Error estimate of a random particle blob method for the Keller–Segel equation. *Mathematics of Computation*, 86(308):2719–2744, 2014.
- [52] Hisham Husain, Kamil Ciosek, and Ryota Tomioka. Regularized policies are reward robust. In *Proceedings of The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 130, pages 64–72, 13–15 Apr 2021.
- [53] Shin ichi Ohta and Asuka Takatsu. Displacement convexity of generalized relative entropies. *Advances in Mathematics*, 228(3):1742–1787, 2011. ISSN 0001-8708.
- [54] Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin. A review of the mean field limits for Vlasov equations. *Kinetic and Related Models*, 7(4):661–711, 2014.
- [55] Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin and Zhenfu Wang. Mean field limit for stochastic particle systems. In *Active Particles. Advances in Theory, Models, and Applications*, volume 1 of *Modeling and Simulation in Science, Engineering and Technology*, pages 379–402. Birkhäuser, Cham, 2017.



- [56] Jean-François Jabir, David Šiška, and Lukasz Szpruch. Mean-field neural ODEs via relaxed optimal control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.05475*, 2019.
- [57] Sham M Kakade. A natural policy gradient. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 14, 2001.
- [58] Bekzhan Kerimkulov, James-Michael Leahy, David Siska, and Lukasz Szpruch. Convergence of Policy Gradient for Entropy Regularized MDPs with Neural Network Approximation in the Mean-Field Regime. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162, pages 12222–12252, 17–23 Jul 2022.
- [59] Bekzhan Kerimkulov, James-Michael Leahy, David Siska, Lukasz Szpruch, and Yufei Zhang. A Fisher-Rao gradient flow for entropy-regularised Markov decision processes in Polish spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02951*, 2023.
- [60] Markus Kunze. A Pettis-type integral and applications to transition semigroups. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 61(2):437–459, 2011.
- [61] Guanghui Lan. Policy mirror descent for reinforcement learning: Linear convergence, new sampling complexity, and generalized problem classes. *Mathematical programming*, 198(1):1059–1106, 2023.
- [62] Nicolas Lanzetti, Antonio Terpin, and Florian Dörfler. Variational analysis in the Wasserstein space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10676*, 2024.
- [63] Yiping Lu, Chao Ma, Yaoyu Lu, Jianfeng Lu, and Lexing Ying. A mean field analysis of deep resnet and beyond: Towards provable optimization via overparameterization from depth. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research (PMLR), 2020.
- [64] Haitong Ma, Yang Guan, Shengbo Eben Li, Xiangteng Zhang, Sifa Zheng, and Jianyu Chen. Feasible actor-critic: Constrained reinforcement learning for ensuring statewise safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.10682*, 2021.
- [65] Haitong Ma, Changliu Liu, Shengbo Eben Li, Sifa Zheng, and Jianyu Chen. Joint Synthesis of Safety Certificate and Safe Control Policy using Constrained Reinforcement Learning, 2021.
- [66] Haitong Ma, Changliu Liu, Shengbo Eben Li, Sifa Zheng, Wenchao Sun, and Jianyu Chen. Learn zero-constraint-violation safe policy in model-free constrained reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2024.
- [67] Sukriti Manna, Troy D Loeffler, Rohit Batra, Suvo Banik, Henry Chan, Bilvin Varughese, Kiran Sasikumar, Michael Sternberg, Tom Peterka, Mathew J Cherukara, et al. Learning in continuous action space for developing high dimensional potential energy models. *Nature communications*, 13(1):368, 2022.
- [68] 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.
- [69] Jincheng Mei, Yue Gao, Bo Dai, Csaba Szepesvari, and Dale Schuurmans. Leveraging non-uniformity in first-order non-convex optimization. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7555–7564, 18–24 Jul 2021.
- [70] Song Mei, Andrea Montanari, and Phan-Minh Nguyen. A mean field view of the landscape of two-layer neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115:E7665–E7671, 2018.

- [71] Song Mei, Theodor Misiakiewicz, and Andrea Montanari. Mean-field theory of two-layers neural networks: dimension-free bounds and kernel limit. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research (PMLR), 2019.
- [72] Masahiro Ono, Marco Pavone, Yoshiaki Kuwata, and J Balaram. Chance-constrained dynamic programming with application to risk-aware robotic space exploration. *Autonomous Robots*, 39(4):555–571, 2015.
- [73] Guy Parker. Some convexity criteria for differentiable functions on the 2-Wasserstein space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09120*, 2023.
- [74] Teemu Pennanen and Ari-Pekka Perkiö. Dual solutions in convex stochastic optimization. *Mathematics of operations Research*, November 2023. ISSN 0364-765X.
- [75] Samuel Pfrommer, Tanmay Gautam, Alec Zhou, and Somayeh Sojoudi. Safe reinforcement learning with chance-constrained model predictive control. In *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference (L4DC)*, 2022.
- [76] Benedetto Piccoli and Francesco Rossi. Transport equation with nonlocal velocity in Wasserstein spaces: convergence of numerical schemes. *Acta applicandae mathematicae*, 124:73–105, 2013.
- [77] Benedetto Piccoli, Francesco Rossi, and Emmanuel Trélat. Control to flocking of the kinetic cucker–smale model. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 47(6):4685–4719, 2015.
- [78] Boris T. Polyak. Gradient methods for the minimisation of functionals. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 3(4):864–878, 1963.
- [79] R. Tyrrell Rockafellar. *Conjugate Duality and Optimization*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1974.
- [80] R Tyrrell Rockafellar and Roger J-B Wets. *Variational analysis*, volume 317. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [81] Manfred Schäl. Stationary Policies in Dynamic Programming Models under Compactness Assumptions. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 8(3):366–372, 1983.
- [82] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [83] Justin Sirignano and Konstantinos Spiliopoulos. Mean field analysis of neural networks: A central limit theorem. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 130:1820–1852, 2020.
- [84] Justin Sirignano and Konstantinos Spiliopoulos. Mean field analysis of neural networks: A law of large numbers. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 80:725–, 2020.
- [85] Aivar Sootla, Alexander I Cowen-Rivers, Taher Jafferjee, Ziyang Wang, David Mguni, Jun Wang, and Haitham Bou-Ammar. Sauté RL: Almost Surely Safe Reinforcement Learning Using State Augmentation. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 20423–20443, 2022.
- [86] Aivar Sootla, Alexander I. Cowen-Rivers, Jun Wang, and Haitham Bou-Ammar. Effects of safety state augmentation on safe exploration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.02675*, 2022.
- [87] Richard S Sutton, David McAllester, Satinder Singh, and Yishay Mansour. Policy Gradient Methods for Reinforcement Learning with Function Approximation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 12, 1999.
- [88] 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.

- [89] Taiji Suzuki, Denny Wu, and Atsushi Nitanda. Mean-field langevin dynamics: Time-space discretization, stochastic gradient, and variance reduction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [90] Chen Tessler, Daniel J Mankowitz, and Shie Mannor. Reward constrained policy optimization. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019.
- [91] Akifumi Wachi, Xun Shen, and Yanan Sui. A survey of constraint formulations in safe reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02025*, 2024.
- [92] Qing Yang, Tiago D. Simão, Simon H. Tindemans, and Matthijs T. Spaan. WCSAC: Worst-case soft actor critic for safety-constrained reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 31st AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 10639–10646, 2021.
- [93] Dongjie Yu, Haitong Ma, Shengbo Li, and Jianyu Chen. Reachability constrained reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 25636–25655. PMLR, 2022.
- [94] Rui Yuan, Simon S Du, Robert M Gower, Alessandro Lazaric, and Lin Xiao. Linear convergence of natural policy gradient methods with log-linear policies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01400*, 2022.
- [95] Wenhao Zhan, Shicong Cen, Baihe Huang, Yuxin Chen, Jason D Lee, and Yuejie Chi. Policy mirror descent for regularized reinforcement learning: A generalized framework with linear convergence. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 33(2):1061–1091, 2023.
- [96] M. S. Zhang, M. A. Erdogdu, and A. Garg. Convergence and optimality of policy gradient methods in weakly smooth settings. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 9066–9073, 2022.
- [97] Yufeng Zhang, Siyu Chen, Zhuoran Yang, Michael Jordan, and Zhaoran Wang. Wasserstein flow meets replicator dynamics: A mean-field analysis of representation learning in actor-critic. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:15993–16006, 2021.
- [98] Yuxiang Zhang, Xiaoling Liang, Dongyu Li, Shuzhi Sam Ge, Bingzhao Gao, Hong Chen, and Tong Heng Lee. Barrier lyapunov function-based safe reinforcement learning for autonomous vehicles with optimized backstepping. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 35(2):2066–2080, 2022.
- [99] Wenhao Zhao, Tong He, and Changliu Liu. Model-free safe control for zero-violation reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 784–793, 2022.

## APPENDIX A. EXISTENCE OF STATIONARY POLICIES

In this section, we present the result by [81], which plays a central role in showing the existence of stationary policies under compactness conditions. Let us consider a dynamic decision process  $(S, A, D, q, r)$ , where the components of the tuple are defined as follows:

- (i)  $S$  stands for the state space and is assumed to be a standard Borel space, i.e.,  $S$  is a nonempty Borel subset of some Polish space and is endowed with the  $\sigma$ -algebra of Borel subsets of  $S$ .
- (ii)  $A$  is the action space and is assumed to be a standard Borel space.
- (iii)  $D : S \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(A)$  specifies the set of all admissible actions  $D(s)$  if the system is in state  $s$ , and  $\mathfrak{C}(A)$  denotes the set of all non-empty compact subsets on  $A$ . We assume that  $\text{gph } D = \{(s, a) \in S \times A \mid a \in D(s)\}$  is a measurable subset of  $S \times A$ .
- (iv) The so-called transition law  $p$  is a transition probability  $p : \text{gph } D \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S)$ . There,  $p(\cdot | s, a)$  is the distribution of the state next visited by the system if the system is in the state  $s$  and the action  $a$  is taken.
- (v) The reward function  $r : \text{gph } D \times S \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  is a measurable function.

Let  $\Pi$  denote the set of all randomized policies and let  $\mathbf{F}$  be the set of all decision functions, i.e.,  $f \in \mathbf{F}$  iff  $f$  is a measurable function  $f : S \rightarrow A$  such that  $f(s) \in D(s)$  for  $s \in S$ . Consider the problem

$$\underset{\pi \in \Pi}{\text{maximize}} V_\pi(s) := \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} r_t \mid s_0 = s \right],$$

where  $r_t := r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})$ .

**Theorem A.1.** *Suppose that the following regularity conditions are satisfied:*

- (i)  $D(s) \in \mathfrak{C}(A)$ ,  $s \in S$ ,  $D : S \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(A)$  is upper semicontinuous;
- (ii)  $p : \text{gph } D \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S)$  is continuous with respect to the topology of weak convergence on  $\mathcal{P}(S)$ ;
- (iii)  $r : \text{gph } D \times S \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  is upper semicontinuous;
- (iv) for all  $s \in S, \pi \in \Pi$ , at least one of the numbers  $V_+(\pi)(s)$  and  $V_-(\pi)(s)$  is finite, where  $V_\pm(\pi)(s) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} r_t^\pm \mid s_0 = s \right]$  with  $r^+ = \max(r, 0)$  and  $r^- = \min(r, 0)$ ;

Then, there exists a deterministic stationary optimal policy  $f \in \mathbf{F}$  such that  $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} V_\pi(s) = \sup_{f \in \mathbf{F}} V_f(s)$  for each  $s \in S$ .

The formulation presented here is an abbreviated version of the main result in [81].

## APPENDIX B. BOUNDED KERNEL SPACES AND CONDITIONAL PROBABILITIES

If  $(E, \Sigma)$  is a measurable space, then  $L^\infty(E)$  denotes the space of all bounded, measurable functions  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , endowed with the supremum norm. By  $\mathcal{M}(E)$  we denote the space of all complex measures on  $(E, \Sigma)$ . The total variation of a measure  $\mu$  is defined by

$$|\mu|(A) = \sup_{\mathcal{Z}} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{Z}} |\mu(B)|$$

where the supremum is taken over all partitions  $\mathcal{Z}$  of  $A$  into finitely many, disjoint, measurable sets. Endowed with the total variation norm  $\|\mu\|_{\mathcal{M}(E)} := |\mu|(E)$ , the space  $\mathcal{M}(E)$  is a Banach space.

**Definition B.1** (Bounded kernel). *Let  $(E_1, \Sigma_1)$  and  $(E_2, \Sigma_2)$  be measurable spaces. A bounded kernel from  $E_1$  to  $E_2$  is a mapping  $k : E_1 \times \Sigma_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that*

- (i)  $k(x, \cdot)$  is a measure on  $(E_2, \Sigma_2)$  for all  $x \in E_1$ ;
- (ii)  $k(\cdot, A)$  is measurable for all  $A \in \Sigma_2$ ;
- (iii)  $\sup_{x \in E_1} |k|(x, E_2) < \infty$ , where  $|k|(x, \cdot)$  is the total variation of  $k(x, \cdot)$ .

If  $(E_1, \Sigma) = (E_2, \Sigma) = (E, \Sigma)$ , then  $k$  is said to be a kernel on  $(E, \Sigma)$ .

We use  $\mathcal{K}(E_1, E_2)$  to denote the set of bounded signed kernels from  $E_1$  to  $E_2$ , which is a Banach space, when endowed with norm  $\|k\|_{\mathcal{K}(E_1, E_2)} = \sup_{x \in E_1} |k|(x, E_2)$ . If  $k(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{M}(E_2)$  is absolutely continuous with respect to a non-negative measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(E_2)_+$  for all  $x \in E_1$ , i.e. there is a family of functions  $\{f_x\}_{x \in E_1}$ , such that  $f_x \in L^1(E_2; \nu)$  and  $k(x, \cdot) = f_x \nu$ . Then the total variation norm is given by  $\|k\|_{\mathcal{K}(E_1, E_2)} = \sup_{x \in E_1} \|f_x\|_{L^1(E_2; \nu)}$ .

The space of signed kernels is a vector space as a linear subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{E_1 \times \Sigma_2}$ . Every kernel is associated with two natural integral operators; one that operates on the left with measures, and another that operates on the right with functions.

**Definition B.2** (Kernel operators). *Let  $k$  be a bounded kernel from  $(E_1, \Sigma_1)$  to  $(E_2, \Sigma_2)$ . Then  $k$  is associated with two bounded linear operators  $T_k \in B(\mathcal{M}(E_1), \mathcal{M}(E_2))$  and  $S_k \in B(L^\infty(E_2), L^\infty(E_1))$ , where*

- (i)  $T_k : \mathcal{M}(E_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(E_2)$  is defined by  $(T_k \mu)(A) := \int_{E_1} k(x, A) \mu(dx)$ ,  $A \in \Sigma_2$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(E_1)$ ;
- (ii)  $S_k : L^\infty(E_2) \rightarrow L^\infty(E_1)$  is defined by  $(S_k f)(x) := \int_{E_2} f(y) k(x, dy)$ ,  $x \in E_1$ ,  $f \in L^\infty(E_2)$ .

When considering  $(L^\infty(E_1), \mathcal{M}(E_1))$  and  $(L^\infty(E_2), \mathcal{M}(E_2))$  as dual pairs, the operator  $T_k$  can be understood as the adjoint of  $S_k$ . When  $E_1 = E_2 = E$ , the space  $\mathcal{K}(E, E)$  becomes a Banach algebra, where the product is defined via composition of corresponding linear operators.

**Definition B.3** (Conditional probability measures). *Let  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  be measurable spaces. The set of conditional probability measures  $\mathcal{P}(E_2|E_1)$  is defined as the convex subspace of  $\mathcal{K}(E_1, E_2)$  such that  $P(\cdot|x) := k(x, \cdot)$  is a probability measure on  $E_2$  for all  $x \in E_1$ , when  $k \in \mathcal{K}(E_1, E_2)$  and  $\|k\| = 1$ . The kernel  $P \in \mathcal{P}(E_2|E_1)$  is said to be a stochastic kernel or a Markov kernel, and it is called strongly Feller if  $S_k f \in L^\infty(E_1)$  is continuous on  $E_1$  for all  $f \in L^\infty(E_2)$ .*

**Remark B.4** (Weak compactness of unit balls). *Assume that  $E$  is a standard Borel space. Let  $\mathcal{U} = L^\infty(E)$  be the space of bounded measurable functions endowed with  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -norm, and let  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{M}(E)$  denote the space of all complex measures endowed with the total variation norm  $\|\nu\| := |\nu|(E)$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Then,  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$  is a norming dual pair with respect to the duality  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ , given by (for details, see [60, Example 2.3])*

$$\langle f, \nu \rangle := \int_E f d\nu.$$

Then, by Banach-Alaoglu theorem, the polar of the unit ball  $U_1 = \{f \in \mathcal{U} : \|f\|_\infty \leq 1\}$ ,

$$U_1^\circ = \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{Y} : \sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} |\langle f, \nu \rangle| \leq 1 \right\},$$

is a weak-\* compact subset of  $(\mathcal{Y}, \sigma(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{U}))$ . Since  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$  is a norming dual pair, the polar set agrees with the unit ball of  $\mathcal{Y}$  as a normed space, i.e.  $U_1^\circ = \{\nu \in \mathcal{Y} : \|\nu\| \leq 1\}$ . Specifically, we then have that the set of probability measures  $\mathcal{P}(A \times S) = \{\nu \in \mathcal{Y} : \|\nu\| = 1\} \subset U_1^\circ$  is weak-\* compact as a closed subset of  $U_1^\circ$ . However, we note that it is not compact with respect to the norm topology.

The compactness of polar sets can be generalized using Alaoglu theorem, which says that the polar set,

$$U^\circ = \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{Y} : \sup_{f \in U} |\langle f, \nu \rangle| \leq 1 \right\},$$

is weak-\* compact if  $U$  is a neighborhood of origin in  $\mathcal{U}$ .

Conversely, if we consider  $\mathcal{Y}$  as a Banach space with total variation norm, the polar of  $Y_1 = \{\nu \in \mathcal{Y} : \|\nu\| \leq 1\}$ , given by

$$Y_1^\circ = \left\{ f \in \mathcal{U} : \sup_{\|\nu\| \leq 1} |\langle f, \nu \rangle| \leq 1 \right\}$$

is weakly compact subset of  $(\mathcal{U}, \sigma(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ .

### APPENDIX C. EPICONVERGENCE OF FUNCTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

**Definition C.1** (epi-convergence). Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space, and let  $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of functions  $f_n : X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ . The lower epi-limit of a sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  of functions is the lower semicontinuous function defined by

$$\text{e-lim inf } f_n(x) = \inf_{x_n \rightarrow x} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x_n)$$

and the upper epi-limit is the lower semicontinuous function defined by

$$\text{e-lim sup } f_n(x) = \inf_{x_n \rightarrow x} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x_n).$$

If  $\text{e-lim inf } f_n = \text{e-lim sup } f_n$ , then the common limit, denoted  $\text{e-lim } f_n$ , is called the epi-limit of  $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  and the sequence is said to epi-converge to it.

Equivalently,  $f_n : X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  epi-converge to  $f : X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  if and only if

- (i) for every  $x_n \rightarrow x$ ,  $\liminf f_n(x_n) \geq f(x)$ , and
- (ii) for some  $x_n \rightarrow x$ ,  $\limsup f_n(x_n) \leq f(x)$ .

As the name suggests, epi-convergence can be characterized in terms of set convergence in the sense of Painlevé-Kuratowski.

**Definition C.2** (d-equi-coercivity). A sequence of functions  $f_n : X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  is d-equi-coercive on  $X$ , if for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a sequentially compact set  $K_\alpha$  such that  $\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} f_n := \{x : f_n(x) \leq \alpha\} \subseteq K_\alpha$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Definition C.3** (d-equi-mildly coercivity). The  $f_n$ 's are d-equi-mildly coercive on  $X$  if for some non-empty sequentially compact set  $K \subseteq X$

$$\inf_{x \in X} f_n(x) = \inf_{x \in K} f_n(x) \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

**Theorem C.4** (Convergence of global minimizers). *Suppose that  $f_n : X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  are  $d$ -equi-mildly coercive. If  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  epi-converges to  $f$ , then every sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of asymptotic minimizers,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left( f_n(x_n) - \inf_{x \in X} f_n(x) \right) = 0,$$

*is relatively compact and each cluster point  $\bar{x}$  minimizes  $f$  and*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left( \inf_{x \in X} f_n(x) \right) = f(\bar{x}) = \min_{x \in X} f(x).$$

For details, see [41, Theorem 2.11].

We also recall few useful results from [40] on the epi-convergence of expectations. Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and  $(\Xi, \mathcal{F})$  be a measurable space. A function  $f : \Xi \times X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is an integrand if  $f(\cdot, x)$  is  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}))$ -measurable for each  $x \in X$ . An integrand  $f$  together with a probability  $P$  on  $(\Xi, \mathcal{F})$  define an expectation function  $E^P[f] : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  given by

$$E^P[f](x) := \mathbb{E}^P[f(\xi, x)], \quad x \in X.$$

If  $\Xi$  is a metric space, we always consider  $\mathcal{F}$  to be its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(\Xi)$ .

**Definition C.5** (Normal integrand). *A function  $f : \Xi \times X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  will be called a normal integrand if its epigraphical mapping  $S_f : \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$(111) \quad S_f(\xi) := \text{epi } f(\xi, \cdot) = \{(x, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \mid f(\xi, x) \leq \alpha\},$$

*is closed-valued and measurable.*

**Theorem C.6** (parametric Fatou's lemma). *Let  $X$  and  $\Xi$  be metric spaces. For probability measures  $\{P, P^\nu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}\}$  on  $(\Xi, \mathcal{B}(\Xi))$  and functions  $\{f, f^\nu : \Xi \times X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}\}$ , suppose that  $P^\nu$  converges weakly to  $P$  and the following hold for each  $x \in X$  :*

(i)  $\{f(\cdot, x), f^\nu(\cdot, x), \nu \in \mathbb{N}\}$  are measurable;

(ii) one has

$$\liminf_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{(\nu, y) \rightarrow (+\infty, x)} \mathbb{E}^{P^\nu} [f^\nu(\xi, y) \mathbf{I}\{\xi : f^\nu(\xi, y) \leq -K\}] = 0;$$

(iii) for  $P$ -a.e.  $\xi \in \Xi$

$$\liminf_{(\nu, y, \zeta) \rightarrow (+\infty, x, \xi)} f^\nu(\zeta, y) \geq f(\xi, x)$$

Then for each  $x \in X$

$$\liminf_{(\nu, y) \rightarrow (+\infty, x)} E^{P^\nu} [f^\nu] (y) \geq E^P[f](x).$$

For proof of this generalized version of Fatou's lemma, see [40].

**Remark C.7.** *As noted by [40], the Assumption (iii) in Theorem C.6 can be replaced with lower semiconvergence of  $\{f^\nu(\cdot, x), \nu \in \mathbb{N}\}$  to  $f(\cdot, x)$  in probability  $P$ , that is, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , one has*

$$P(\{\xi \in \Xi : f^\nu(\xi, x) \leq f(\xi, x) - \varepsilon\}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \nu \rightarrow +\infty.$$

*A sufficient condition for lower semiconvergence is*

$$\liminf_{\nu \rightarrow +\infty} f^\nu(\xi, x) \geq f(\xi, x) \quad \text{for } P\text{-a.e. } \xi \in \Xi.$$

**Theorem C.8** (epi-convergence under weakly convergent probabilities). *Let  $X$  and  $\Xi$  be metric spaces. For probability measures  $\{P, P^\nu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}\}$  on  $(\Xi, \mathcal{B}(\Xi))$  and functions  $\{f, f^\nu : \Xi \times X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}\}$ , suppose that  $P^\nu$  converges weakly to  $P$ , assumptions (i)-(iii) of Theorem C.6 hold, and for each  $x \in X$  either  $E^P[f](x) = +\infty$  or there exists a sequence  $\{x^\nu\}_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}} \subset X$  converging to  $x$  with the following properties:*

(i) one has

$$\limsup_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \limsup_{\nu \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}^{P^\nu} [f^\nu(\xi, x^\nu) \mathbf{I}\{\xi : f^\nu(\xi, x^\nu) \geq K\}] = 0;$$

(ii) for  $P$ -a.e.  $\xi \in \Xi$ ,

$$\limsup_{(\nu, \zeta) \rightarrow (+\infty, \xi)} f^\nu(\zeta, x^\nu) \leq f(\xi, x).$$

Then

$$\text{e-lim}_{\nu \rightarrow +\infty} E^{P^\nu} [f^\nu] = E^P[f].$$

For details, see [40, Theorem 3.7].

#### APPENDIX D. SELECTED RESULTS ON OPTIMAL TRANSPORT

**Definition D.1** (Measures with compact support). *The support of a Borel probability measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  is defined as the closed set  $\text{supp}(\mu) = \{x \in X \text{ s.t. } \mu(\mathcal{N}) > 0 \text{ for any neighbourhood } \mathcal{N} \text{ of } x\}$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{P}_c(X)$  the subset of  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  of measures which supports are compact.*

Following [16, 76, 77], we introduce the continuity equations with non-local velocities in  $(\mathcal{P}_c(X), W_1)$ . To highlight that  $\mathbf{v}$  depends on the solution  $\mu$ , we write  $(t, x) \mapsto \mathbf{v}[\mu](t, x)$  to denote a Borel family of vector fields for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , satisfying the condition

$$\int_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\mathbf{v}[\mu](t, x)| d\mu_t(x) dt < +\infty,$$

where  $I$  is an interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ . Then, the continuity equation is given by

$$\int_I \int_X (\partial_t \varphi(t, x) + \langle \nabla_x \varphi(t, x), \mathbf{v}[\mu_t](t, x) \rangle) d\mu_t(x) dt = 0$$

for all  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(I \times X)$ , or alternatively as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_X \varphi(x) d\mu_t(x) = \int_X \langle \nabla \varphi(x), \mathbf{v}[\mu_t](t, x) \rangle d\mu_t(x)$$

for all  $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(X)$  and  $\mathcal{L}^1$ -almost every  $t \in I$ .

**Theorem D.2** (Existence and uniqueness of solutions). *Consider a non-local velocity field*

$$\mathbf{v} : \mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X) \mapsto \mathbf{v}[\mu](\cdot, \cdot) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, C^1(X) \cap L^\infty(X)),$$

*which satisfies the following Cauchy-Lipschitz assumptions:*

(i) *There exist functions  $L(\cdot)$  and  $M(\cdot)$  in  $L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  such that*

$$|\mathbf{v}[\mu](t, x) - \mathbf{v}[\mu](t, y)| \leq L(t)|x - y| \text{ and } |\mathbf{v}[\mu](t, x)| \leq M(t)(1 + |x|)$$

*for every  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $x, y \in X$ .*

(ii) *There exists a function  $K(\cdot)$  in  $L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  such that*

$$\left\| \mathbf{v}[\mu] - \mathbf{v}[\nu] \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; C^0(X))} \leq K(t)W_1(\mu, \nu)$$



for every  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Then for every initial datum  $\mu^0 \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$ , the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mu_t + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v}[\mu_t](t, \cdot) \mu_t) = 0 \\ \mu_0 = \mu^0 \end{cases}$$

admits a unique solution  $(\mu_t)_t$  in  $\text{Lip}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{P}_c(X))$  locally Lipschitz with respect to the  $W_1$ -metric. Besides, if  $\mu^0$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{L}^d$ , then  $\mu_t$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{L}^d$  as well for all times  $t \geq 0$ . Furthermore for every  $T > 0$  and every  $\mu^0, \nu^0 \in \mathcal{P}_c(X)$ , there exists  $R_T > 0$  depending on  $\text{supp}(\mu^0)$  and  $C_T > 0$  such that

$$\text{supp}(\mu_t) \subset \overline{B(0, R_T)} \text{ and } W_1(\mu_t, \nu_t) \leq e^{C_T t} W_1(\mu^0, \nu^0),$$

for all times  $t \in [0, T]$  and any solutions  $(\mu_t)_t, (\nu_t)_t$ .

Moreover, the solution  $\mu$  of the Cauchy problem can be made explicit as follows. Let  $\Phi(t)$  be the flow of diffeomorphisms of  $X$  generated by the time-dependent vector field  $\mathbf{v}[\mu]$ , defined as the unique solution of the Cauchy problem  $\dot{\Phi}(t) = \mathbf{v}[\mu_t] \circ \Phi(t), \Phi(0) = \text{Id}_X$ , or in other words,

$$(112) \quad \partial_t \Phi(t, x) = \mathbf{v}[\mu_t](t, \Phi(t, x)), \quad \Phi(0, x) = x.$$

Then, we have

$$\mu_t = \Phi(t) \# \mu(0),$$

that is,  $\mu_t$  is the pushforward of  $\mu^0$  under  $\Phi(t)$ .

For details, see [77, Theorem 2].

In this section we are considering the case of a proper, l.s.c. and coercive functional  $\phi : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ , which is  $\lambda$ -convex along generalized geodesics and  $X$  is a separable Hilbert space. By [8, Lemma 2.4.8], for  $\lambda$ -convex functionals the coercivity assumption can be formulated as

$$\exists r_* > 0 : \quad \inf \left\{ \phi(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X), \quad \int_X |x|^2 d\mu(x) \leq r_* \right\} > -\infty.$$

**Theorem D.3.** *Let  $\phi : \mathcal{P}_2(X) \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be a proper, l.s.c.  $\lambda$ -geodesically convex functional that satisfies the coercivity assumption. If  $\mu_t^i : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_2(X), i = 1, 2$ , are gradient flows satisfying  $\mu_t^i \rightarrow \mu^i$  as  $t \downarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , then*

$$W_2(\mu_t^1, \mu_t^2) \leq e^{-\lambda t} W_2(\mu^1, \mu^2) \quad \forall t > 0.$$

*In particular, for any  $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  there is at most one gradient flow  $\mu_t$  satisfying the initial Cauchy condition  $\mu_t \rightarrow \mu_0$  as  $t \downarrow 0$  and it is also characterized by the system of "Evolution Variational Inequalities"*

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} W_2^2(\mu_t, \sigma) + \frac{\lambda}{2} W_2^2(\mu_t, \sigma) \leq \phi(\sigma) - \phi(\mu_t) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{L}^1\text{-a.e. } t > 0, \forall \sigma \in \text{dom}(\phi).$$

*Moreover, if  $\phi$  is  $\lambda$ -convex along generalized geodesics and  $\lambda > 0$ , then  $\phi$  admits a unique minimum point  $\bar{\mu}$  and*

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(\mu(t), \bar{\mu}) &\leq W_2(\mu(t_0), \bar{\mu}) e^{-\lambda(t-t_0)}, \\ \phi(\mu(t)) - \phi(\bar{\mu}) &\leq (\phi(\mu(t_0)) - \phi(\bar{\mu})) e^{-2\lambda(t-t_0)} \\ |\partial\phi|(\mu(t)) &\leq |\partial\phi|(\mu(t_0)) e^{-\lambda(t-t_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\lambda = 0$  and  $\bar{\mu}$  is a minimum point of  $\phi$  then we have

$$|\partial\phi|(\mu(t)) \leq \frac{W_2(\mu_0, \bar{\mu})}{t}, \quad \phi(\mu(t)) - \phi(\bar{\mu}) \leq \frac{W_2^2(\mu_0, \bar{\mu})}{2t},$$

and the map  $t \mapsto W_2(\mu(t), \bar{\mu})$  is not increasing.

For details, see [8, Theorem 11.1.4 and Theorem 11.2.1].