

Optimizing Return Distributions with Distributional Dynamic Programming

Bernardo Ávila Pires
Google DeepMind, London, UK

BAVILAPIRES@GOOGLE.COM

Mark Rowland
Google DeepMind

Diana Borsa
Google DeepMind

Zhaohan Daniel Guo
Google DeepMind

Khimya Khetarpal
Google DeepMind

André Barreto
Google DeepMind

David Abel
Google DeepMind

Rémi Munos
FAIR, Meta; work done at Google DeepMind

Will Dabney
Google DeepMind

Abstract

We introduce distributional dynamic programming (DP) methods for optimizing statistical functionals of the return distribution, with standard reinforcement learning as a special case. Previous distributional DP methods could optimize the same class of expected utilities as classic DP. To go beyond expected utilities, we combine distributional DP with *stock augmentation*, a technique previously introduced for classic DP in the context of risk-sensitive RL, where the MDP state is augmented with a statistic of the rewards obtained so far (since the first time step). We find that a number of recently studied problems can be formulated as stock-augmented return distribution optimization, and we show that we can use distributional DP to solve them. We analyze distributional value and policy iteration, with bounds and a study of what objectives these distributional DP methods can or cannot optimize. We describe a number of applications outlining how to use distributional DP to solve different stock-augmented return distribution optimization problems, for example maximizing conditional value-at-risk, and homeostatic regulation. To highlight the practical potential of stock-augmented return distribution optimization and distributional DP, we combine the core ideas of distributional value iteration with the deep RL agent DQN, and empirically evaluate it for solving instances of the applications discussed.

1 Introduction

Reinforcement learning (RL; Sutton and Barto, 2018; Szepesvári, 2022) is a powerful framework for building intelligent agents, and it has been successfully applied to solve many practical problems (Mnih et al., 2015; Silver et al., 2018; Bellemare et al., 2020; Degraeve et al., 2022; Fawzi et al., 2022). In the standard formulation of the RL problem, the objective is to find a policy (a decision rule for selecting actions) that maximizes the expected (discounted) return in a Markov decision process (MDP; Puterman, 2014). A similar, related problem is what we refer to as *return distribution optimization*, where the objective is to maximize a functional of the return distribution (Marthe et al., 2024), which may not be the expectation. For example, we could maximize an *expected utility* (Von Neumann and Morgenstern, 2007; Bäuerle and Rieder, 2014; Marthe et al., 2024), the expectation of the return “distorted” by some function.

By varying the choice of statistical functional being optimized (be it an expected utility or more general), we can model various RL-like problems as return distribution optimization, including problems in the field of risk-sensitive RL (Chung and Sobel, 1987; Chow and Ghavamzadeh, 2014; Noorani et al., 2022), and problems related to homeostatic regulation (Keramati and Gutkin, 2011) and satisficing (Simon, 1956; Goodrich and Quigley, 2004).

The fact that return distribution optimization captures many problems of interest makes it appealing to develop solution methods for the general problem. At first glance, the apparent benefits of solving the general problem are offset by the fact that, for many instances, optimal stationary Markov policies do not exist (see, for example, Marthe et al., 2024). This can be problematic, because it rules out dynamic programming (DP; value iteration and policy iteration; Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1996; Sutton and Barto, 2018; Szepesvári, 2022) and various other RL methods that yield stationary Markov policies. Defaulting to solution methods that produce history-based policies is an alternative we would like to avoid, under the premise that learning history-based policies can be intractable (Papadimitriou and Tsitsiklis, 1987; Madani et al., 1999).

We show that we can reclaim optimality of stationary Markov policies for many instances of return distribution optimization by augmenting the state of the MDP with a simple statistic we call *stock*. Stock is a backward looking quantity related to the agent’s accumulated past rewards, including an initial stock (the precise definition is given in Section 2). It was introduced by Bäuerle and Ott (2011)¹ for maximizing conditional value-at-risk (Rockafellar et al., 2000). The MDP state and stock together provide enough information for stationary Markov policies (with respect to the state-stock pair) to optimize various statistical functions of the distribution of returns offset by the agent’s initial stock.

Incorporating stock into return distribution optimization gives rise to the specific formulation we consider in this paper, where the environment is assumed to be an MDP with states augmented by stock, and the return is offset by an initial stock. We refer to this formulation as *stock-augmented return distribution optimization*.

The optimality guarantee for stationary stock-Markov policies in return distribution optimization suggests that we may be able to develop DP solution methods for the instances where the guarantee applies. Value/policy iteration cannot cope with return dis-

1. Kreps (Example b, p. 269; 1977) outlined a similar statistic in the undiscounted setting.

tributions, but this limitation can be overcome using distributional RL (Chung and Sobel, 1987; Morimura et al., 2010; Bellemare et al., 2017, 2023). That is, we may resort to *distributional dynamic programming* to tackle return distribution optimization.

In the standard MDP setting, without stock, distributional DP methods already exist for policy evaluation (Chapter 5; Bellemare et al., 2023), for maximizing expected return (as an obvious adaptation), and for expected utilities (Marthe et al., 2024). However, these methods can only solve problems that classic DP can also solve (Marthe et al., 2024), namely, the return distribution optimization problems for which an optimal stationary Markov policy exists (with respect to the MDP states alone). Notably, by incorporating stock into distributional DP, we can optimize statistical functionals of the return distribution that we could not otherwise. Moreover, stock-augmented distributional DP is a single solution method for a variety of return distribution optimization problems (which so far have been studied and solved in isolation), and also a blueprint for practical methods to solve return distribution optimization, in much the same way the principles of classic DP and distributional policy evaluation factor into previously proposed, successful RL methods.

1.1 Paper Summary and Contributions

This paper is an in-depth study of distributional dynamic programming for solving return distribution optimization with stock augmentation, and we make the following contributions:

1. We identify conditions on the statistical functional being optimized under which distributional DP can solve stock-augmented return distribution optimization, and develop a theory of distributional DP for solving this problem, including:
 - principled distributional DP methods (distributional value/policy iteration),
 - performance bounds and asymptotic optimality guarantees (for the cases that distributional DP can solve),
 - necessary and sufficient conditions for the finite-horizon case, plus mild sufficient conditions to the infinite-horizon discounted case.
2. We demonstrate multiple applications of distributional value/policy iteration for stock-augmented return distribution optimization, namely:
 - Optimizing expected utilities (Von Neumann and Morgenstern, 2007; Bäuerle and Rieder, 2014).
 - Maximizing conditional value-at-risk, a form of risk-sensitive RL, both the risk-averse conditional value-at-risk (Bäuerle and Ott, 2011), and a risk-seeking variant that we introduce.
 - Homeostatic regulation (Keramati and Gutkin, 2011), where the agent aims to maintain vector-valued returns near a target.
 - Satisfying constraints, and trading off minimizing constraint violations with maximizing expected return.

3. We show how to reduce stock-augmented return distribution optimization to stock-augmented RL (via reward design), and that, in stock-augmented settings, classic DP cannot solve not all the return distribution optimization problems that distributional DP can.
4. We introduce $D\eta N$, a deep RL agent that combines QR-DQN (Dabney et al., 2018) with the principles of distributional value iteration and stock augmentation to optimize expected utilities. Through experiments, we demonstrate $D\eta N$'s ability to learn effectively under objectives in toy gridworld problems and the game of Pong in Atari (Bellemare et al., 2013).

1.2 Paper Outline

Section 2 introduces notation and basic definitions. In Section 3.1 we formalize the problem of stock-augmented return distribution optimization, and provide some basic example instances. Section 4 introduces distributional value/policy iteration and presents our main theoretical results. In Section 5, we discuss multiple applications of our results and show concrete examples of how to different problems using stock augmentation and distributional DP (Sections 5.1 to 5.5 and 5.8).² In Section 5 we also explore implications of our results in different contexts: Generalized policy evaluation (Barreto et al., 2020; Section 5.6); reward design and the relationship between stock-augmented RL and stock-augmented return distribution optimization (Section 5.7). In Section 6, we introduce $D\eta N$ and show how distributional DP can inform the design of deep RL agents. To highlight the practical implications of our contributions, in Section 7 we present an empirical study of $D\eta N$ in different gridworld instances of applications considered in Section 5. In Section 8 we complement our gridworld results with a demonstration of $D\eta N$ controlling returns in a more complex setting: The Atari game of Pong, where we show that a single trained $D\eta N$ agent can obtain various specific scores in a range, and where we use stock augmentation to specify the scores we want the agent to achieve. Section 9 concludes our work and presents directions for future work, notably practical questions revealed by our empirical study. We provide additional results in Appendix A. Appendix B contains the full analysis of distributional value/policy iteration, and the full analysis of the conditions for our main theorems is provided in Appendix C. Appendices D to G contain proofs for the results in Section 5. Appendix H contains implementation details for $D\eta N$ and our experiments.

2 Preliminaries

We write $\mathbb{N} \doteq \{1, 2, \dots\}$ for the natural numbers excluding zero, and $\mathbb{N}_0 \doteq \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. For a finite $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\Delta(n)$ denotes the $|n|$ -dimensional simplex. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Delta(\mathbb{R}^m)$ denotes the set of probability distribution functions of \mathbb{R}^m -valued random variables.

We study the problems where an agent interacts with a Markov decision process (MDP; Puterman, 2014) with (possibly infinite) state space \mathcal{S} and finite action space \mathcal{A} . Rewards can be stochastic and the discount is $\gamma \in (0, 1]$. We adopt the convention that R_{t+1} is the

2. Some of these problems have been previously studied, and distributional DP is a novel solution approach in some cases (see Section 5).

reward random variable observed jointly with S_{t+1} , that is, R_{t+1}, S_{t+1} result from taking action A_t at state S_t , according to the MDP’s reward and transition kernels.

The reward signal may be a vector-valued pseudo-reward (cumulant) signal (Sutton et al., 2011) in $\mathcal{C} \doteq \mathbb{R}^m$. The vector-valued case allows us to capture interesting applications that are worth the extra generality. However, to avoid unnecessary complication, our presentation is intentionally in terms of \mathcal{C} , so that the reader can easily appreciate the results in the scalar case ($\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R}$) if they wish. We use the terms reward and returns to avoid an excess of *pseudo* prefixes in the text.

Some of our results only apply to finite-horizon MDPs. We say an MDP is *finite-horizon* if there exists a constant n such that S_n is terminal with probability one for any trajectory $S_0, A_0, S_1, A_1, \dots, S_n$ generated in the MDP. We call the smallest such n the *horizon* of the MDP. A state s is terminal if $(S_{t+1}, R_{t+1}) = (s, 0)$ with probability one whenever $S_t = s$ (regardless of A_t). We refer to the case where the MDP is finite-horizon as the *finite-horizon case* (complementary to the *infinite-horizon case*), to the case where $\gamma < 1$ as the *discounted case* (complementary to the *undiscounted case*, where $\gamma = 1$).

We make the following assumption throughout the work, similar to Assumption 2.5 by Bellemare et al. (p. 19; 2023).

Assumption 1 (All rewards have uniformly bounded first moment)

$$\sup_{s,a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}(\|R_{t+1}\|_1 \mid S_t = s, A_t = a) < \infty$$

Similar to Bäuerle and Ott (2011), we consider an augmented MDP state space $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$. If s, a, r', s' is a transition in the original MDP, then for any $c \in \mathcal{C}$ the augmented MDP transitions as $(s, c), a, r', (s', \gamma^{-1}(c + r'))$, that is:

$$c_{t+1} = \frac{c_t + r_{t+1}}{\gamma}. \quad (1)$$

We refer to c_t as the agent’s *stock*.³ If we unroll the recursion in Eq. (1) up to an *initial stock* c_0 (see Remark 2 below), we can interpret the stock, in a forward view, as a scaled sum of the initial stock c_0 and the discounted return from time step zero up to time step t :

$$c_t = \underbrace{\gamma^{-t}}_{\text{time-dependent scaling}} \left(\underbrace{c_0}_{\text{initial stock}} + \underbrace{\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \gamma^i r_{i+1}}_{\text{partial discounted return}} \right).$$

In a backward view, the stock can be seen as a backward reverse-discounted return:

$$c_t = \gamma^{-1}r_t + \gamma^{-2}r_{t-1} + \dots + \gamma^{-t}r_1 + \gamma^{-t}c_0.$$

Importantly, the stock allows us to keep track of the discounted return (plus the initial stock c_0) from time step 0, since, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$c_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma^i r_{i+1} = \gamma^t \left(c_t + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma^i r_{t+i+1} \right),$$

3. In our formulation the stock and the rewards are m -dimensional, whereas Bäuerle and Ott (2011) consider 1-dimensional stock.

When rewards (and stocks) are random, the above holds with probability one and we can write:

$$C_t + G_t = \gamma^{-t} (C_0 + G_0), \quad (2)$$

with $G_t \doteq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma^i R_{t+i+1}$ denoting the respective discounted return from time step t . Equation (2) will be key to optimizing return distributions: We will treat the distribution of $C_t + G_t$ will work as an “anytime proxy” for the distribution of $C_0 + G_0$, and by controlling the former distribution we can also control the latter—provided the objective is such that the γ^{-t} factor does not interfere with the optimization (we will later introduce this as an indifference of the objective to the discount γ).

Remark 2 (The Initial Stock c_0) *The expansion of stock includes an initial stock c_0 that is unspecified. Together with the initial MDP state s_0 , this stock will form the initial augmented state (s_0, c_0) . While the initial s_0 is often “given”, c_0 can be set (even as a function of s_0). This will provide extra flexibility to policies, which may display diverse behaviors in response to changes in c_0 , and it will allow us to reduce different problems to return distribution optimization by plugging in specific choices of c_0 (as a function of s_0). For example, as shown by [Bäuerle and Ott \(2011\)](#), we can choose c_0 in such a way that optimizing conditional value-at-risk reduces to an instance of return distribution optimization with stock augmentation (see [Theorem 16](#) in [Section 5.2](#)).*

Remark 3 (Dynamics Influenced by Stock) *Our results do not rely on the transitions and rewards of the augmented MDP being only a function of s . In a transition $(s, c), a, r', (s', c')$, c' must be updated according to [Eq. \(1\)](#), but s', r' may depend on c . This can be useful, for example, to define termination conditions: The state s' may be terminal when $c' = 0$ or when $|c'|$ is too large.*

Stationary Markov policies with respect to a stock are $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$ functions, and the space of these policies is $\Pi \doteq \Delta(\mathcal{A})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}$. A Markov policy π is a sequence $\pi = \pi_0, \pi_1, \pi_2, \dots$ of stationary policies $\pi_n : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$, and the space of these policies is $\Pi_{\text{M}} \doteq \Pi^{\mathbb{N}}$. For a policy $\pi = \pi_0, \pi_1, \pi_2, \dots$, returns are written as $G^\pi(s, c) \doteq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_{t+1}$ where R_{t+1} are the rewards generated by starting at state $(S_0, C_0) = (s, c)$, then selecting $A_t \sim \pi_t(S_t, C_t)$ for $t \geq 0$. The return $G^\pi(s, c)$ may depend on c (even though rewards do not depend on the stock), because π may chose actions differently depending on c , so visited depend on c . If π is stationary, then $A_t \sim \pi(S_t, C_t)$ for all $t \geq 0$.

The sequence of everything observed preceding action A_t , that is,

$$H_t \doteq (S_0, C_0), A_0, R_1, (S_1, C_1), A_1, \dots, R_t, (S_t, C_t),$$

The history at $t = 0$ is S_0, C_0 . The set of possible histories of finite length is

$$\mathcal{H} \doteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \underbrace{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}_{(s_0, c_0)} \times \underbrace{(\mathcal{A})}_{a_t} \times \underbrace{\mathcal{C}}_{r_{t+1}} \times \underbrace{(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C})}_{(s_{t+1}, c_{t+1})}^n,$$

and a *history-based policy* is a function $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$. That is, a history-based policy makes decisions based on everything observed so far. For π history-based and $t \geq 0$ we have $A_t \sim \pi(H_t)$, and the set of all history-based policies is $\Pi_{\text{H}} \doteq \Delta(\mathcal{A})^{\mathcal{H}}$.

We let $\Delta(\mathbb{R})$ be the set of distributions of \mathbb{R} -valued random variables. With $X \sim \nu$, we write $\text{df}X = \nu$. For two \mathcal{C} -valued random variables X, X' we say $X \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} X'$ if $\text{df}X = \text{df}X'$. For $\nu \in \Delta(\mathbb{R})$, we let QF_ν be the quantile function of ν :

$$\text{QF}_\nu(\tau) \doteq \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{P}(X \leq t) \geq \tau\}. \quad (X \sim \nu)$$

For $c \in \mathcal{C}$, we denote by δ_c the Dirac measure on c , that is, the distribution such that if $\mathbb{P}(G = c) = 1$ when $G \sim \delta_c$. The Dirac on zero is δ_0 (where in the vector-valued case it is understood that 0 refers to the all-zeros vector).

We define $\mathcal{D} \doteq \Delta(\mathcal{C})$ as the set of distributions of \mathcal{C} -valued random variables. The 1-Wasserstein distance for $\nu, \nu' \in \mathcal{D}$ is defined as (Definition 6.1, p. 105; Villani, 2009)

$$\text{w}(\nu, \nu') \doteq \inf\{\mathbb{E}\|X - X'\|_1 : \text{df}(X) = \nu, \text{df}(X') = \nu'\},$$

where X and X' may be jointly distributed. In the scalar case ($\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R}$), we have

$$\text{w}(\nu, \nu') = \|\text{QF}_\nu - \text{QF}_{\nu'}\|_{\ell_1} = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim u_{(0,1)}} |\text{QF}_\nu(\tau) - \text{QF}_{\nu'}(\tau)|,$$

where $u_{(0,1)}$ denotes the uniform distribution in $(0, 1)$. Sometimes we will say the sequence ν_1, ν_2, \dots converges to ν_∞ ; when we say this, we mean convergence in 1-Wasserstein distance: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{w}(\nu_n, \nu_\infty) = 0$. The *supremum 1-Wasserstein distance* is defined for $\eta, \eta' \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}$ as

$$\bar{\text{w}}(\eta, \eta') \doteq \sup_{s \in \mathcal{S}, c \in \mathcal{C}} \text{w}(\eta(s, c), \eta'(s, c)).$$

With a slight abuse of notation, we let $\text{w}(\nu) \doteq \text{w}(\nu, \delta_0)$ and $\bar{\text{w}}(\eta) \doteq \sup_{s \in \mathcal{S}, c \in \mathcal{C}} \bar{\text{w}}(\eta(s, c), \delta_0)$.

Given a policy $\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}$, we define its *return distribution function* $\eta^\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\eta^\pi(s, c) \doteq \text{df}(G^\pi(s, c))$ (for $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$).

We will make ample use of Banach's fixed point theorem (Theorem 1, p. 77, Szepesvári, 2022) and the following spaces:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{D}, \text{w}) &\doteq \{\nu \in \mathcal{D} : \text{w}(\nu) < \infty\}, \\ (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{\text{w}}) &\doteq \{\eta \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}} : \bar{\text{w}}(\eta) < \infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

These spaces are complete as shown in Lemma 23, Appendix A. Assumption 1 combined with $\gamma < 1$ or a finite horizon MDP ensure that the return distributions of all policies are uniformly bounded, that is, $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \bar{\text{w}}(\eta^\pi) < \infty$.

Given a stationary policy $\pi \in \Pi$, we define the *stock-augmented distributional Bellman operator* $T_\pi : (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{\text{w}}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{\text{w}})$ for $\eta \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}$ as follows: $(T_\pi \eta)(s, c)$ is the distribution of $R_{t+1} + \gamma G(S_{t+1}, C_{t+1})$ when $S_t, C_t = (s, c)$, $A_t \sim \pi(S_t, C_t)$, $G(s, c) \sim \eta(s, c)$. We require that if s is terminal then $(T_\pi \eta)(s, c) = \delta_0$ for all $\eta \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{\text{w}})$ and $c \in \mathcal{C}$.

On occasion, we will refer back to classic RL operators for comparison against the distributional case. We will denote the space of possible (state-) value functions by $(\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \doteq \{V \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}} : \sup_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |V(s)| < \infty\}$, and the classic Bellman operator for a stationary policy $\pi \in \Pi$ by $\tilde{T}_\pi : (\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$.

We let $(x)_+ \doteq \max\{x, 0\}$, $(x)_- \doteq \min\{x, 0\}$, and $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ be the indicator function.

3 Stock-Augmented Return Distribution Optimization

3.1 Problem Formulation

We are concerned with building intelligent agents that can do various things. When the agent can be expressed in terms of its behavior (a policy) and the outcome of the agent acting can be modeled as the stock-augmented discounted return generated by that policy, we can frame the problem of building intelligent agents as an optimization problem. A person looking to build an intelligent agent in this framework (we will call them *the designer*) is thus tasked with expressing what they want of agents as an objective to be optimized—where the better the agent, the higher the objective value of its policy.⁴

We propose⁵ to control the distribution of the quantity $c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0)$, which is the return generated by π from the initial augmented state $(s_0, c_0) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$, offset by the initial stock c_0 . We want an objective that quantifies how preferred $c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0)$ for each policy π , so that we can phrase the problem of finding the most preferred policy. We can accomplish this with a statistical functional $K : (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that assigns a real number to each possible distribution of $c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0)$, to phrase the optimization problem as:

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} K \text{df}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0)). \quad (3)$$

As an example, the standard RL problem can be expressed in Eq. (3) by taking K to be the expectation:

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0)) = c_0 + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \mathbb{E}(G^\pi(s_0, c_0)).$$

The optimization, for the moment, is over the (most general) class of history-based policies Π_{H} . In standard RL, this problem formulation (adopted, for example, by [Altman, 1999](#)) differs from the more frequent optimization over stationary Markov policies (adopted, for example, by [Sutton and Barto, 2018](#); [Szepesvári, 2022](#)), but the two formulations are equivalent in MDPs because of the existence of optimal stationary Markov policies ([Puterman, 2014](#)). For stock-augmented return distribution optimization, we have elected to introduce the problem in terms of history-based policies, and to address the existence of optimal stationary Markov policies on the solution side of the results (in connection to DP).

Because the supremum in Eq. (3) is over all history-based policies, it makes sense to talk about optimizing $K \text{df}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))$ simultaneously for all $(s_0, c_0) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$. We can state this problem concisely, using an objective functional applied to the distribution function η^π :

-
4. In practice, the designer is also tasked with modeling the environment as an MDP. In standard RL, this means designing the states, actions and rewards. Stock-augmented MDP additionally require designing the stock and the pseudo-rewards.
 5. In terms of a problem/solution separation, incorporating stock is part of the solution (distributional DP). However, because the scope of our work is DP, it is convenient for our presentation to incorporate stock augmentation and the offset by c_0 as part of the problem (return distribution optimization). The simpler formulation without stock augmentation or the offset is limiting for distributional DP: [Marthe et al. \(2024\)](#) studied return distribution optimization without stock augmentation in the finite-horizon undiscounted setting, and concluded that only exponential utilities could be optimized through distributional DP—the same class that classic DP can optimize. On the other hand, as our analysis will show, the distributional DP with stock can optimize a broader class of objectives than without, and, surprisingly, than classic DP with stock augmentation.

Definition 4 (Stock-Augmented Return Distribution Optimization) Given $K : (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define the stock-augmented objective functional $F_K : (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}$ as

$$(F_K \eta)(s, c) \doteq K \text{df}(c + G(s, c)). \quad (G(s, c) \sim \eta(s, c))$$

The stock-augmented return distribution optimization problem is

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} F_K \eta^\pi. \quad (4)$$

We will often drop the subscript and refer to a stock-augmented objective as F , in which case a corresponding K is implied. We will also drop df and write $K(G) = K \text{df}(G)$.

To recap on Eq. (4): The stock-augmented return distribution optimization problem consists of optimizing, over all policies $\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}$, a preference specified by a statistical functional $K : (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, over the distribution of the policy’s discounted return offset by the stock ($c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0)$). The optimization is considered simultaneously for all (s_0, c_0) , as allowed by history-based policies.

3.2 Example: Expected Utilities

Equation (4) provides a flexible problem formulation for controlling $c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0)$, based on a choice of $K : (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ provided by a designer to capture what they want an agent to achieve. We have already shown that the RL problem can be recovered by taking K to be the the expectation ($K\nu = \mathbb{E}G$, $G \sim \nu$), so what else can we do? We can obtain an interesting family of objective functionals by considering the expected value of transformations of the return specified by a function $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$: $K\nu = \mathbb{E}f(G)$ ($G \sim \nu$). These are the *expected utilities*, which have been widely studied in decision-making theory (Von Neumann and Morgenstern, 2007), and also used for sequential decision-making in RL (Bauerle and Rieder, 2014; Bowling et al., 2023).

Definition 5 A stock-augmented objective functional F_K is an expected utility if there exists $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$K\nu = \mathbb{E}f(G). \quad (G \sim \nu)$$

In this case, we write $F_K = U_f$, which can be written as

$$(U_f \eta)(s, c) \doteq \mathbb{E}f(c + G(s, c)). \quad (G(s, c) \sim \eta(s, c))$$

Table 1 gives examples of return distribution optimization problems resulting from different choices of f in the scalar case⁶ ($\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R}$), with some notable risk-sensitive examples: Maximizing conditional value-at-risk (Bauerle and Ott, 2011; Chow and Ghavamzadeh, 2014; Lim and Malik, 2022) and maximizing the probability of the discounted return being above a threshold. Note that the choice of initial stock c_0 is “up to the user” and can be made as a function of the starting state s_0 .

We will later show that the examples in the first part of the table can be optimized by distributional DP both in the finite-horizon and discounted cases, the ones in the second

6. Expected utilities are not restricted to the scalar case, as implied by Definition 5, since the domain of f is \mathcal{C} . We provide some concrete examples in Section 5 of expected utilities for the vector-valued case.

Problem	$f(x)$	Formulation
Standard RL	x	$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))$ $\equiv \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}G^\pi(s_0, \cdot)$
Minimize the expected absolute distance to a target c_0 (Section 5.1)	$- x $	$\inf_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E} G^\pi(s_0, -c_0) - c_0 $
Optimizing conditional value-at-risk (Section 5.2)	$(x)_-$	$\inf_{\pi \in \Pi_H, c_0} \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \text{QF}_{\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0)}(t) dt$
Maximize the probability of the return above a threshold c_0	$\mathbb{I}(x > 0)$	$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{P}(G^\pi(s_0, -c_0) > c_0)$
Minimize the expected square distance to a target c_0	$-x^2$	$\inf_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}((G^\pi(s_0, -c_0) - c_0)^2)$
Maximize the probability of the return above a threshold plus a margin $c_0 + c$	$\mathbb{I}(x > c)$	$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{P}(G^\pi(s_0, -c_0) > c_0 + c)$

Table 1: Example problems that can be formulated as optimizing an expected utility, with the respective choices of f and the formulation.

part of the table can be optimized in the finite-horizon case, and the example in the third part can only be optimized in the finite-horizon undiscounted case (see Theorems 6 and 8, Section 4.3, and Appendix C.2).

We will also establish later that distributional DP can, in fact, optimize any expected utility in the finite-horizon undiscounted case (see Lemma 12). Going beyond expected utilities, we will see later that is an open question whether it is possible for distributional DP to optimize any non-expected utility in the infinite-horizon discounted case, but we provide examples that can be optimized in the finite-horizon case (see Section 5.8).

4 Distributional Dynamic Programming

Dynamic programming (Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1996; Bertsekas, 2019) is at the heart of RL theory and many RL algorithms,⁷. For this reason, we have chosen to establish the basic theory of solving stock-augmented return distribution optimization by studying how we can solve these problems using DP. We refer to the solution methods we introduce as *distributional dynamic programming*. As in the case of distributional DP for policy evaluation (Chapter 5; Bellemare et al., 2023), return distribution functions (in $(\mathcal{D}^{S \times C}, \bar{w})$) are the main object of distributional value/policy iteration, whereas, in contrast, classic DP (see, for example, Szepesvári, 2022), namely value iteration and policy iteration, work directly with value functions.

7. As pointed out by Szepesvári (2022) many RL algorithms can be thought of dynamic of programming methods, modified to cope with scale and complexity of practical problems.

4.1 Distributional Value Iteration

Classic value iteration computes the iterates V_1, V_2, \dots satisfying, for $n \geq 0$,

$$V_{n+1} = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \tilde{T}_\pi V_n, \quad (5)$$

and the procedure enjoys the following optimality guarantees. In finite-horizon MDPs, V_n is optimal if n is at least the horizon of the MDP and in the discounted case (Section 2.4; Szepesvári, 2022):

$$V^* - V_n \leq \gamma^n \|V^* - V_0\|_\infty \quad (6)$$

pointwise for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, where $V^* \doteq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} V^\pi$ and V^π denotes the value function of a policy π .

Note how the bounds are distinct for the finite-horizon case and the discounted case. This distinction recurs in results for both classic and distributional value/policy iteration, and it will merit further discussion in the case of distributional DP.

In classic value iteration, the iterates correspond to the values of the objective functional being optimized, and the iteration in Eq. (5) makes a one-step decision that maximizes that objective functional. We typically use the value iterates to obtain policies via a greedy selection, and leverage a near-optimality guarantee for these greedy policies. We say $\tilde{\pi}_n$ is greedy policy with respect to V_n if it satisfies the following:

$$T_{\tilde{\pi}_n} V_n = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \tilde{T}_\pi V_n.$$

Classic value iteration results give us the following optimality guarantees for the greedy policies: In finite-horizon MDPs, $\tilde{\pi}_n$ is optimal when n is at least the horizon of the MDP, and in the discounted case (Section 2.4, Szepesvári, 2022; Singh and Yee, 1994):

$$V^* - V^{\tilde{\pi}_n} \leq \frac{2\gamma^n}{1-\gamma} \|V^* - V_0\|_\infty. \quad (7)$$

Distributional value iteration, while similar to value iteration, maintains distributional iterates $\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$, which means the iterates no longer correspond to values of the objective functional. The distributional analogue of Equation (5) makes a one-step decision that maximizes the objective functional F_K , and this iteration of locally optimal one-step decisions gives guarantees similar to the classic case. Theorem 6 formalizes this claim:⁸

Theorem 6 (Distributional Value Iteration) *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , then for every $\eta_0 \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$, if the iterates η_1, η_2, \dots satisfy (for $n \geq 0$)*

$$F_K \eta_{n+1} = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F_K T_\pi \eta_n, \quad (\text{Distributional Value Iterates})$$

and the policies $\bar{\pi}_0, \dots, \bar{\pi}_n$ satisfy (for $n \geq 0$),

$$F_K T_{\bar{\pi}_n} \eta_n = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F_K T_\pi \eta_n, \quad (\text{Greedy Policies})$$

8. To simplify the presentation, we have chosen to present the distributional DP results upfront, and discuss the conditions on the objective functional F_K in Section 4.3.

then the following holds.

If the MDP is finite-horizon, then for all n greater or equal to the horizon of the MDP,

$$F_K \eta_n = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi, \quad (8)$$

and

$$F_K \eta^{\bar{\pi}^n} = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi. \quad (9)$$

If $\gamma < 1$ and K is L -Lipschitz, then for all $n \geq 0$

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi - F_K \eta_n \leq L\gamma^n \cdot \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_M} \bar{w}(\eta_0, \eta^\pi), \quad (10)$$

and

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi - F_K \eta^{\bar{\pi}^n} \leq L\gamma^n \cdot \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \bar{w}(T_\pi \eta_0, \eta_0) + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_M} \bar{w}(\eta_0, \eta^\pi) \right). \quad (11)$$

It is worth noting that the guarantees in Theorem 6 only apply to values of the objective functional $F_K \eta_n$. The iterates may not converge. This is similar to how classic value iterates converge but not classic policy iterates, as there may be multiple policies “tied” at the optimum. In distributional value/policy iteration, iterates may not converge for a similar reason: F_K may allow ties between different return distribution functions at the optimum.⁹

The guarantees for finite-horizon MDPs are essentially the same for distributional and classic value iteration: Namely, optimality after iterating at least as many times as the MDP horizon. In the discounted case, the bounds for distributional value iteration (Eqs. (10) and (11)) are similar to the classic value iteration bounds (Eqs. (6) and (7)) with three notable differences: First, the bounding terms are 1-Wasserstein distances, rather than ∞ -norms. This is inherent to the fact that our iterates are distributional. Second, the Lipschitz constant of K is present. This constant is 1 when F is the standard RL objective. Third, the classic value/policy iteration bounds are given in terms of V^* , but the distributional value/policy iteration bounds are not. It is still an open question whether an optimal return distribution η^* exists in the infinite-horizon discounted case, so we could not use this quantity in the bounds. Because $\|V^* - V_0\|_\infty \leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \|V^\pi - V_0\|_\infty$, we can say Eq. (10) is slightly looser than its classic counterpart, though if we assume η^* exists we can tighten the bounding term in Eq. (10) to $L\gamma^n \cdot \bar{w}(\eta_0, \eta^*)$. The greedy policy bounds for distributional and classic DP have similar differences, and if we assume the existence of η^* we can also “recover” the classic bounds (modulo the Lipschitz constant and the 1-Wasserstein distances).

When an optimal return distribution η^* does exist, we can show an optimality guarantee for policies that are greedy with respect to η^* , similar to the classic case:

Theorem 7 (Greedy Optimality) *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , if there exists a policy (possibly non-stationary) that attains*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F_K \eta^\pi,$$

9. This has also been observed in distributional DP for policy optimisation with usual expectation statistical functional (Example 7.11, p. 210, [Bellemare et al., 2023](#)).

and if the MDP is finite-horizon or $\gamma < 1$ and F_K is Lipschitz, then

$$F_K \eta^* = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F_K T_\pi \eta^*,$$

and any policy that realizes the supremum on the right-hand side above (namely, a greedy policy with respect to η^*) is an optimal policy π^* satisfying

$$F_K \eta^{\pi^*} = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi.$$

4.2 Distributional Policy Iteration

Classic policy iteration computes the iterates π_1, π_2, \dots satisfying, for $n \geq 0$,

$$\tilde{T}_{\pi_{n+1}} V^{\pi_n} = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \tilde{T}_\pi V^{\pi_n},$$

that is, each iterate π_{n+1} is greedy with respect to the value of the previous iterate π_n . In finite-horizon MDPs, V^{π_n} is optimal if n is at least the horizon of the MDP and in the discounted case (Proposition 2.8, p. 45; Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1996):

$$V^* - V^{\pi_n} \leq \gamma^n \|V^* - V^{\pi_0}\|_\infty.$$

Distributional policy iteration is similar to its classic counterpart, the main difference being that the objective functional F_K determines the greedy policy selection. Distributional policy iteration enjoys a similar guarantees to its classic counterpart, as formalized by Theorem 8:

Theorem 8 (Distributional Policy Iteration) *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , for every non-stationary policy π_0 if the iterates π_1, π_2, \dots satisfy (for $n \geq 0$)*

$$F_K T_{\pi_{n+1}} \eta^{\pi_n} = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F_K T_\pi \eta^{\pi_n} \quad (\text{Distributional Policy Iterates})$$

then the following holds.

If the MDP is finite-horizon, then for all n greater or equal to the horizon of the MDP,

$$F_K \eta^{\pi_n} = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi. \quad (12)$$

If $\gamma < 1$ and K is L -Lipschitz, then for all $n \geq 0$

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi - F_K \eta^{\pi_n} \leq L \gamma^n \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_M} \bar{\mathbb{w}}(\eta^{\pi_0}, \eta^\pi), \quad (13)$$

The differences between the bounds for classic and distributional policy iteration are similar to the ones discussed for value iteration. This is because we obtain the policy iteration bounds for the discounted case from the value iteration bounds, using the fact that $V^{\pi_n} \geq V_n$ for classic DP, and $F_K \eta^{\pi_n} \geq F_K \eta_n$ for distributional DP (see the proof of Theorem 8 in Appendix B.6).

4.3 Conditions Overview

Theorems 6 and 8 only apply to objective functionals that satisfy certain properties: Indifference to γ and indifference to mixtures in the finite-horizon case, plus Lipschitz continuity in the infinite-horizon discounted case. In this section we give an overview of these conditions and test them: How restrictive are these conditions? Can they be weakened? The proofs for the results in this section can be found in Appendix C. Recall that we are abusing notation and writing $K(G) = Kdf(G)$.

Definition 9 (Indifference to Mixtures (of Initial Augmented States)) We say $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures (of initial augmented states) if for every $\eta, \eta' \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ such that

$$K\eta(s, c) \geq K\eta'(s, c),$$

for all $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$, then for all random variables (S, C) taking values in $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$ we also have

$$K(G(S, C)) \geq K(G'(S, C)). \quad (G(s, c) \sim \eta(s, c), G'(s, c) \sim \eta'(s, c))$$

Definition 10 (Indifference to γ) We say $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to γ if, for every $\nu, \nu' \in (\mathcal{D}, w)$

$$K\nu \geq K\nu' \Rightarrow K(\gamma G) \geq K(\gamma G'). \quad (G \sim \nu, G' \sim \nu')$$

Definition 11 (Lipschitz Continuity) We say $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L -Lipschitz (or Lipschitz, for simplicity) if there exists $L \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\sup_{\substack{\nu, \nu': \\ w(\nu) < \infty \\ w(\nu') < \infty \\ w(\nu, \nu') > 0}} \frac{|K\nu - K\nu'|}{w(\nu, \nu')} \leq L.$$

L is the Lipschitz constant of K .

We believe that in general these conditions are fairly easy to verify for difference choices of the objective functional. As an example, Lemma 12 does part of the verification for expected utilities (we say $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to γ if for all $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$ we have $f(c) \geq f(c') \Rightarrow f(\gamma c) \geq f(\gamma c')$).

Lemma 12 (Conditions for Expected Utilities) Let U_f be an expected utility, which is an objective functional F_K with $K\nu = \mathbb{E}f(G)$ ($G \sim \nu$). Then the following holds:

1. K is indifferent to mixtures.
2. K is indifferent to γ iff f is indifferent to γ .
3. K is Lipschitz iff f is Lipschitz.

If we refer back to Table 1, we see that the choices of f in the first part of the table satisfy all three conditions, so distributional DP can optimize the corresponding U_f both in the finite-horizon and discounted cases. The choices of f in the second part of the table are not Lipschitz continuous, so we know that DP can optimize the corresponding U_f in the finite-horizon setting. The choice of f in the third part of the table is neither Lipschitz continuous nor indifferent to $\gamma < 1$, so distributional DP can only optimize the corresponding U_f in the finite-horizon *undiscounted* setting.

A consequence of Lemma 12, since indifference to $\gamma = 1$ is trivially true, is that distributional DP can optimize any expected utility in the finite-horizon undiscounted case. The discounted cases (finite-horizon or not) demand indifference to γ , which we argue is not too restrictive. The class of f indifferent to γ includes: Norms, positively-homogeneous functions, polynomially-homogeneous functions, monotone functions, and functions that are symmetric about zero and monotone in $[0, \infty)$. As a reference, in the discounted cases classic DP cannot optimize objective functionals that are not of the form U_f with f polynomially-homogeneous (see Theorem 20).

We have investigated the three conditions (Definitions 9 to 11) to determine how restrictive they are. We have found that indifference to mixtures and indifference to γ are necessary and sufficient, so they are minimal. In the absence of either, even a basic greedy optimality guarantee (Theorem 7) fails:

Proposition 13 *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is not indifferent to mixtures or not indifferent to γ , then there exists an MDP, an $\eta^* \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ and a $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$ such that $\bar{\pi}$ is greedy with respect to η^* and*

$$F_K \eta^* = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi,$$

however, for some $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$

$$F_K \eta^{\bar{\pi}}(s, c) < \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi(s, c).$$

We have found that the relationship between Lipschitz continuity and the infinite-horizon discounted case is less clear, and it is still an open question whether this property is necessary. However, we can show that indifference to mixtures and indifference to γ are not sufficient for the infinite-horizon discounted case, so there is a real distinction between the finite-horizon and infinite-horizon discounted cases, in line with our results for distributional DP (Theorems 6 and 8).

In Appendix C.2, we show an instance where distributional value/policy iteration fail for the expected utility U_f with $f(x) = \mathbb{I}(x > 0)$, even though the starting iterate is optimal. The intuition for this is simple and we outline it here, and the key is to exploit the fact that f is not continuous. Consider an MDP with $\mathcal{S} = \{s_0, s_1\}$, $\mathcal{A} = \{a_0, a_1\}$, $r(\cdot, a_i) = i$ and $\gamma < 1$. The initial state is s_0 and s_1 is terminal, and taking a_i in s_0 transitions to s_i . A stationary policy $\pi \in \Pi$ satisfying $\pi(a_1 | s_0, \cdot)$ is optimal, so let us denote it by π^* and its return distribution function by η^* . Thanks to η^* , we have

$$U_f T_\pi \eta^* = U_f \eta^*,$$

for all $\pi \in \Pi$, including a policy that always selects a_0 , and, in fact, by induction, any non-stationary policy that selects a_0 finitely many times is also optimal, even though selecting

a_0 *always* is suboptimal. In the case of distributional value iteration with $\eta_0 = \eta^*$, if we take $\bar{\pi}_n$ to be the policy that always selects a_0 we will have $U_f \eta_n = U_f \eta^*$ for all n , however, $U_f \eta^{\bar{\pi}_n} < U_f \eta^*$ also for all n , which means distributional value iteration has failed. Distributional policy iteration fails too, except that when starting from π^* every other iterate may be suboptimal depending on how ties are broken.

The assumption on Lipschitz continuity of f for the infinite-horizon discounted case prevents failures like the example above (which we attributed to the fact that f is not continuous). In Appendix C.2 we also show that the lack of Lipschitz continuity affects our ability to evaluate policies, in the sense that if we take $f(x) = x^2$ (which is continuous but not Lipschitz) we can construct an MDP and a policy $\pi \in \Pi$ such that $T_\pi^n \eta$ converges to η^π as $n \rightarrow \infty$, but $U_f T_\pi^n \eta$ does not converge uniformly to $U_f \eta^\pi$ (though it converges pointwise).

It is unclear whether the lack of uniform convergence for non-Lipschitz f can be translated to a failure of distributional value/policy iteration, however we have a failure case example of a discontinuous f , so it suggests that some property related to continuity of f (and K more generally) is necessary.

4.4 Analysis Overview

The valuable insight in this work is that we can use distributional DP to optimize different objective functionals F_K of the (stock-augmented) return distribution (and a broader class than without). Once we identify the right conditions and the core components for distributional value/policy iteration to work, the remaining work is relatively straightforward: We retrace the steps of classic DP and ensure technical correctness. Most of the challenge is, in fact, ensuring technical correctness once we use a generic objective functional (for example, making correct statements about convergence). For example, we cannot rely on the existence of an optimal return distribution η^* or on the convergence of distributional value iterates.

In this section, we give an outline of our analysis with the most interesting points and a focus on how we can obtain asymptotic optimality guarantees. This will allow us to understand how the different conditions factor into our proofs, and how they work in essence. We defer the technical proofs to Appendix B, including details about performance bounds.

A fundamental component for DP is monotonicity. In classic RL (see Lemma 2.1, p. 21, Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1996), it states that if we have $V \geq V'$, then following a policy π for one step and having a value of V afterward is always better than following the same policy but obtaining a value of V' afterward, regardless of the policy π . That is, we have

$$V \geq V' \Rightarrow \tilde{T}_\pi V \geq \tilde{T}_\pi V'$$

for all $\pi \in \Pi$. In distributional DP, it translates to the following:

Lemma 14 (Monotonicity) *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , then, for every $\pi \in \Pi$, the distributional Bellman operator T_π is monotone (or order-preserving) with respect to the preference induced by F_K on $(\mathcal{D}^{S \times C}, \bar{w})$. That is, for every stationary policy $\pi \in \Pi$ and $\eta, \eta' \in (\mathcal{D}^{S \times C}, \bar{w})$, we have*

$$F_K \eta \geq F_K \eta' \Rightarrow F_K T_\pi \eta \geq F_K T_\pi \eta'.$$

Monotonicity is a powerful result that underpins value iteration, policy iteration and also *policy improvement*.¹⁰ Classic policy improvement (see Proposition 2.4, p. 30, Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1996) states that if a policy π' is greedy with respect to V^π , then π' is better than π ($V^{\pi'} \geq V^\pi$). We have a similar result for distributional DP, given as Lemma 15. This result is of particular interest here because its proof gives a good sense of how to provide asymptotic guarantees for distributional DP, and how the different conditions factor in, in particular how departing from the standard RL case in classic DP demands special attention to convergence guarantees.

Lemma 15 (Distributional Policy Improvement) *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , and if the MDP is finite-horizon or $\gamma < 1$ and K is Lipschitz, then for any non-stationary policy π and any stationary policy $\pi' \in \Pi$ if*

$$F_K T_{\pi'} \eta^\pi \geq F_K T_\pi \eta^\pi,$$

then

$$F_K \eta^{\pi'} \geq F_K \eta^\pi.$$

Proof We write $F = F_K$ for simplicity. We know from distributional RL that $\eta^\pi = T_\pi \eta^\pi$. In the finite-horizon case, if n is the horizon of the MDP we have $\eta^\pi = T_\pi^n \eta^\pi$, and since the horizon is n we have

$$T_\pi \eta^\pi = T_\pi^{n+1} \eta^\pi = T_\pi^n \eta^\pi = \eta^\pi.$$

In the infinite-horizon discounted case, T_π is a contraction (see Lemma 26 and Proposition 4.15, p. 88, Bellemare et al., 2023) so by Banach's fixed point theorem we have $\eta^\pi = T_\pi \eta^\pi$.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} F T_{\pi'} \eta^\pi &\geq F T_\pi \eta^\pi && \text{(choice of } \pi') \\ &= F \eta^\pi. && (\eta^\pi = T_\pi \eta^\pi) \end{aligned}$$

Indifference to mixtures and indifference to γ give us monotonicity (Lemma 14), which means that

$$F T_{\pi'} \eta^\pi \geq F T_\pi \eta^\pi \Rightarrow F T_{\pi'} T_{\pi'} \eta^\pi \geq F T_{\pi'} T_\pi \eta^\pi,$$

so it follows that

$$F T_{\pi'}^2 \eta^\pi \geq F T_\pi \eta^\pi = F \eta^\pi.$$

By induction, if we assume that $F T_{\pi'}^n \eta^\pi \geq F \eta^\pi$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} F T_{\pi'}^{n+1} \eta^\pi &= F T_{\pi'} T_{\pi'}^n \eta^\pi \\ &\geq F T_{\pi'} \eta^\pi && \text{(monotonicity, induction assumption)} \\ &\geq F T_\pi \eta^\pi && \text{(choice of } \pi') \\ &= F \eta^\pi. && (\eta^\pi = T_\pi \eta^\pi) \end{aligned}$$

Which means that, for all $n \geq 0$:

$$F T_{\pi'}^n \eta^\pi \geq F \eta^\pi. \tag{14}$$

10. To underscore the importance of monotonicity, we note that the result in Proposition 13 holds essentially because Monotonicity is equivalent to K being indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , and it is the absence of monotonicity that causes greedy optimality (Theorem 7) to fail.

In the finite-horizon case, we can take n to be the horizon of the MDP and the result follows, since $T_{\pi'}^n \eta^{\pi} = \eta^{\pi'}$.

In the infinite-horizon discounted case, the induction argument is not enough to show that $F\eta^{\pi'} \geq F\eta^{\pi}$, since we need Eq. (14) to hold in the limit. In this case, we have $\gamma < 1$ and $T_{\pi'}^n \eta^{\pi}$ converges to $\eta^{\pi'}$, since T_{π} is a contraction. K is Lipschitz implies F_K Lipschitz by Proposition 31. Because F is Lipschitz, the convergence of $T_{\pi'}^n \eta^{\pi}$ to $\eta^{\pi'}$ implies the convergence of $FT_{\pi'}^n \eta^{\pi}$ to $F\eta^{\pi'}$ (see Proposition 32), so Eq. (14) holds in the limit of $n \rightarrow \infty$, which gives the result:

$$F\eta^{\pi'} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} FT_{\pi'}^n \eta^{\pi} \geq F\eta^{\pi}. \quad \blacksquare$$

As we can see in the proof of Lemma 15, indifference to mixtures and indifference to γ are connected to monotonicity, whereas Lipschitz continuity is used to ensure that the values of the objective functional $FT_{\pi'}^n \eta^{\pi}$ converge to the value of $F\eta^{\pi'}$. In terms of asymptotic convergence, the main additional technical challenge in the proofs of Theorems 6 and 8 comes from the fact that iterates do not necessarily converge. However, it is still possible to show that the value of the objective functional converges uniformly for all starting augmented states. Then the induction argument for chaining improvements (Eq. (14)) as well as the use of monotonicity and Lipschitz continuity are essentially the same as in the proof of Lemma 15.

5 Applications

5.1 Generating Desired Returns

In many cases, we want to instruct agents to perform tasks in highly controllable environments, but not necessarily the tasks with a “do something as much as possible” nature that are a clear fit for RL. For example, we may want to specify the task of collecting a given number of objects in a room, or obtaining a score equal to two in the game of Pong in the Atari Benchmark (Bellemare et al., 2013). The standard RL framework can be unwieldy for this type of task, but it can be easily modeled as a stock-augmented problem.

If we were to solve an RL problem without stock augmentation to collect a given number of apples, we would likely have to use a non-Markov reward that tracks how many apples have been collected, and give a reward of 1 to the agent when the third apple is collected, and zero otherwise. Moreover, we would have one reward function for each number of apples to be collected, which might require training one agent per reward function (which seems wasteful).

With stock augmentation, on the other hand, this type of task can be tackled effectively. We can frame it as a stock-augmented return distribution optimization problem with an expected utility U_f and $f(x) = -|x|$, where the stock is the number of apples collected so far by the agent. Moreover, we can get a *single stock-augmented agent* to perform various instances of the same task—for example, collect one apple, or collect three apples—simply by changing the agent’s initial stock: Without discounting and with a reward of 1 for each apple, a stock of -3 will cause an optimal stock-augmented agent to collect 3 apples, a stock of -2 will cause the agent to collect 2 apples, and so forth.

5.2 Maximizing the Conditional Value-at-Risk of Returns

The problem of maximizing *conditional value-at-risk* (CVaR; Rockafellar et al., 2000), also known as *average value-at-risk* or *expected shortfall*, has received attention both in the context of risk-sensitive reinforcement learning (Bäuerle and Ott, 2011; Chow and Ghavamzadeh, 2014; Chow et al., 2015; Bäuerle and Glauner, 2021; Greenberg et al., 2022) and in non-sequential decision-making (Rockafellar et al., 2000).

The τ -CVaR of returns with distribution $\nu \in (\Delta(\mathbb{R}), w)$ is defined as

$$\text{CVaR}(\nu, \tau) \doteq \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \text{QF}_\nu(t) dt.$$

We can see the τ -CVaR as an “expected return in the worst-case”, since it corresponds to the expected return of $X \sim \nu$ in the lower-tail of the return distribution (where the tail has mass τ).

For any starting augmented state (s_0, c_0) , a history-based policy $\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}$ generates returns distributed according to $\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0)$, and we want to find a policy and a c_0 to maximize the τ -CVaR of these returns:

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{CVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau).$$

It is easy to see that this problem does not admit an optimal stationary Markov policy on states alone, however Bäuerle and Ott (2011) showed that we can solve it as follows (see Appendix D for the proof):

Theorem 16 (Adapted from Bäuerle and Ott, 2011) *For every $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$,*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{CVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) = -c_0^* + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \mathbb{E}(c_0^* + G^\pi(s_0, c_0^*))_-,$$

where c_0^* is the solution of

$$\max_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_- \right). \quad (15)$$

The key difference between our work and that of Bäuerle and Ott (2011) is how we obtain π^* . While we propose to use distributional DP with $F_K = U_f$ and $f(x) = (x)_-$, Bäuerle and Ott (2011) used a modified classic value iteration, but required the iterates to satisfy specific conditions (see M, p. 45, Bäuerle and Ott, 2011).

Other works have also proposed methods for optimizing the τ -CVaR, as well as other risk measures. Chow et al. (2015) introduced a method to locally optimize a τ' -CVaR for different values of τ' based on the temporal decomposition introduced by Pflug and Pichler (2016). This is distinctly different from the approach of Bäuerle and Ott (2011) and ours, where the action selection locally optimizes an expected utility U_f (see also the discussion of Theorem 21 in Section 5.8).

Lim and Malik (2022) introduced a practical distributional Q-learning method for optimizing $F_K = U_f$ and $f(x) = (x)_-$. They track the stock throughout each episode and use it during action selection, however they do not consider stock-augmented return distribution

estimators (the estimators have domain $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$). There is a clear correspondence between distributional DP and their Algorithm 2, which updates return distributions (without stock augmentation) using actions selected to optimize U_f with $f(x) = (x)_-$ (because the objective being optimized is an expected utility, it is sufficient to use deterministic greedy policies). Their method corresponds to a hybrid decision rule like $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} T_\pi \eta$, but where η is constrained not to be stock-augmented, that is, for all $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$, $\eta(s, c) = \eta(s, \cdot)$.

Bäuerle and Glauner (2021) introduced a classic value iteration method to optimize a class of risk functionals called *spectral risk measures*, where the τ -CVaR is included, and used the analysis tools originally introduced by Moghimi and Ku (2025) built on the work of Bäuerle and Glauner (2021) and introduced distributional value iteration with stock augmentation and U_f with f concave, though their theoretical analysis does not provide optimality or approximate optimality guarantees for the spectral risk measure.

One limitation of the classic value iteration approaches based on the work of Bäuerle and Ott (2011) is that the specific conditions on iterates may not be easy to ensure in approximate settings. With distributional DP, on the other hand, it is possible to establish approximate guarantees for τ -CVaR optimization, for both distributional value/policy iteration, with minimal conditions on the starting iterates (value iterates must have uniformly bounded first moment). This is what the following result shows, if we combine distributional DP with a grid search procedure to approximately solve the optimization in Eq. (15):

Theorem 17 *For every $\tau \in (0, 1)$, $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a stationary policy $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$ (obtainable through distributional DP) and a \bar{c}_0^* (obtainable through grid search) such that*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{CVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) - \text{CVaR}(\eta^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, \bar{c}_0^*), \tau) \leq 4\varepsilon.$$

In particular, $\bar{\pi}$ satisfies (for $f(x) = (x)_-$)

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} U_f \eta^\pi - U_f \eta^{\bar{\pi}} \leq \varepsilon,$$

and

$$\bar{c}_0^* = \arg \max_{c_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_- \right), \quad (16)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{C}} \doteq \{c_{\min} + i\varepsilon : i \in \mathbb{N}_0, c_{\min} + i\varepsilon \leq c_{\max}\}$ and c_{\min} and c_{\max} are chosen so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_- \right) \\ &= \max_{c_{\min} \leq c_0 \leq c_{\max}} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_- \right). \end{aligned}$$

The key insight in Theorem 17 is that the objective functional being maximized over c_0 in in Eq. (15) is 1-Lipschitz, so we can approximate it through a grid search with an approximately optimal return distribution (Eq. (16)). A remaining limitation of the approach is how to choose c_{\min}, c_{\max} in practice. We know from Theorems 16 and 17 that we can choose c_{\min} small enough and c_{\max} large enough to satisfy the requirement, but how large/small they need to be is left to a case-by-case basis.

5.3 Maximizing the Optimistic Conditional Value-at-Risk of Returns

The τ -CVaR is the expectation of the return over the lower tail of the distribution (with tail mass τ), and maximizing it is a risk-averse approach. With $\tau = 0$, the τ -CVaR is the risk-neutral expected return, and as τ decreases the amount of risk-aversion increases.

We can also consider the problem of maximizing the right-tail of the return distribution, which we call the *optimistic* τ -CVaR, defined for returns with distribution $\nu \in (\Delta(\mathbb{R}), w)$ as

$$\text{OCVaR}(\nu, \tau) \doteq \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{1-\tau}^1 \text{QF}_\nu(t) dt.$$

This application is interesting to analyze because it is similar to the optimism used by [Fawzi et al. \(2022\)](#) in AlphaTensor. More generally, risk-seeking behavior can be useful for “scientific discovery” problems like discovering matrix multiplication algorithms, where it is more helpful to attain exceptional outcomes some of the time, even at the expense of performance in most cases, than to perform well on average. This is because in this type of problem the RL agent is being used to generate solutions to a search-like problem where exceptional solutions are very valuable, but low-quality solutions are harmless, as they can simply be discarded.

We can show that analogues of Theorems 16 and 17 hold for optimizing the optimistic τ -CVaR.

Theorem 18 *For every $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$,*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{OCVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) = -c_0^* + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \mathbb{E}(c_0^* + G^\pi(s_0, c_0^*))_+,$$

where c_0^* is the solution of

$$\min_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \right).$$

The proof of Theorem 18 is more subtle than the proof of its risk-averse counterpart. In Theorem 16, we can exploit the equivalence

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{CVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \right).$$

The similar step in the case of the optimistic τ -CVaR gives

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{CVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \inf_{c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \right).$$

Thanks to distributional DP, we can optimize U_f with $f(x) = (x)_+$ uniformly for all (s_0, c_0) , and we use this to swap the supremum and the infimum above, which gives Theorem 18.

The approximate version of Theorem 19 then follows analogously to Theorem 17.

Theorem 19 *For every $\tau \in (0, 1)$, $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a stationary policy $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$ (obtainable through distributional DP) and a \bar{c}_0^* (obtainable through grid search) such that*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{OCVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) - \text{OCVaR}(\eta^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, \bar{c}_0^*), \tau) \leq 4\varepsilon.$$

In particular, $\bar{\pi}$ satisfies (for $f(x) = (x)_+$)

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} U_f \eta^\pi - U_f \eta^{\bar{\pi}} \leq \varepsilon,$$

and

$$\bar{c}_0^* = \arg \min_{c_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_+ \right),$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{C}} \doteq \{c_{\min} + i\varepsilon : i \in \mathbb{N}_0, c_{\min} + i\varepsilon \leq c_{\max}\}$ and c_{\min} and c_{\max} are chosen so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_+ \right) \\ &= \min_{c_{\min} \leq c_0 \leq c_{\max}} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_+ \right). \end{aligned}$$

5.4 Homeostatic Regulation

Homeostatic regulation is a computational model for the behavior of natural agents (Keramati and Gutkin, 2011) whereby they aim to reduce *drive* (Hull, 1943), the mismatch between their current internal state and a stable state. Drive reduction aims to explain empirical observations about the behavior of natural agents (Hull, 1943)—a simplistic instance being the hypothesis that an animal feeds to reduce its hunger.

We can formalize the homeostatic regulation problem considered by Keramati and Gutkin (2011) as:

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} -\mathbb{E} \|c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0)\|_p^q,$$

where $p, q \geq 1$, $-c_0$ is the “ideal” setpoint for the agent’s internal state, and the agent’s stock C_t represents its drive, that is, the deviation from the desired state to be reduced.

“Minimizing drive in norm” above corresponds to the expected utility U_f with $f(x) = -\|x\|_p^q$. This choice of f is indifferent to γ (since $f(\gamma x) = \gamma^{\frac{q}{p}} f(x)$), but Lipschitz only when $q = 1$, so by Lemma 12 and Theorems 6 and 8 distributional DP can solve this variant of homeostatic regulation in the finite-horizon case (regardless of q) and in the infinite-horizon discounted case if $q = 1$ and if we consider the variant where the agent’s drive increases over time due to the reverse-discounting, as $C_{t+1} = \gamma^{-1}(C_t + R_{t+1})$.

The formulation where f is a norm presumes that there is an ideal setpoint (namely, $-c_0$), and that the agent wants to keep its stock as close to that as possible, that is, the agent wants its drive (positive or negative) to be as close to zero as possible. This is different from minimizing positive drive—intuitively, a sated agent would not actively drive itself back to the threshold of being hungry.

To accommodate for minimizing only positive drive, we can consider a homeostatic regulation problem with an expected utility, but a different choice of f :

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \cdot (x_i)_-,$$

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in \mathbb{R}$ are fixed weights. Once again, this choice of f is indifferent to γ (since $f(\gamma x) = \gamma f(x)$) and Lipschitz (since $f(x) \leq \max_i |\alpha_i| \cdot \|x\|_1$), so by Lemma 12 and Theorems 6 and 8 distributional DP can also solve this variant of homeostatic regulation both in the finite-horizon case and in the infinite-horizon discounted case.

These two reductions are examples of how we can use the framework of stock-augmented return distribution optimization to provide simple solution methods for a problem that has been otherwise complicated to solve with RL. Previously, solving homeostatic regulation with RL methods required the design of an appropriate reward signal (as done by [Keramati and Gutkin, 2011](#)). Considering that [Keramati and Gutkin \(2011\)](#) aimed to reconcile the differences between the drive reduction and the RL-based computational model proposed by [Schultz et al. \(1997\)](#), perhaps the framework of stock-augmented return distribution optimization will help bring the two models close together.

The reward signal designed by [Keramati and Gutkin \(2011\)](#) to reduce homeostatic regulation to RL corresponds precisely to the reward signal that we have identified as the way to reduce stock-augmented return distribution optimization to stock-augmented RL (see Theorem 20).

5.5 Constraint Satisfaction

In this application, we want an agent to generate returns that satisfy various constraints, with probability one if they are feasible. Our proposal is to model constraint satisfaction as minimizing constraint violations in expectation, which is a variation of minimizing only positive drive discussed in Section 5.4 and generating exact returns from Section 5.1. Constraint satisfaction is related to satisficing problems ([Simon, 1956](#); [Goodrich and Quigley, 2004](#)), though satisficing proposes to use constraint satisfaction as a means to find acceptable suboptimal policies when finding optimal policies is infeasible.

If we want a policy with return above a threshold g , we can implement the constraint satisfaction as a stock-augmented return distribution optimization problem with U_f , $f(x) = (x)_-$ and set $c_0 = -g$. This choice of f is indifferent to γ , so distributional DP can optimize U_f . Maximizing the expected utility will correspond to minimizing the expected violation:

$$\mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_- = -\mathbb{E}(g - G^\pi(s_0, -g))_+.$$

For any π , we have $G^\pi(s_0, -g) \geq g$ with probability one iff $\mathbb{E}(g - G^\pi(s_0, -g))_+ = 0$. So if the constraint can be satisfied, optimizing U_f will suffice. If we want a policy with return below a threshold g , we optimize U_f with $f(x) = -(x)_+$ and set $c_0 = g$, and for any π , we have $G^\pi(s_0, -g) \leq g$ with probability one iff $\mathbb{E}(G^\pi(s_0, -g) - g)_+$ is zero. For an equality constraint, we can use $f(x) = -|x|$ as in Section 5.1.

Distributional DP can also optimize any weighted combination of the constraints above, with a different stock and reward vector coordinate per constraint, since the weighted

combination will be γ indifferent. For example, to generate a return in the interval $[g_1, g_2]$, assume the return is replicated, so that $G_1 = G_2$, set $c_0 = (-g_1, -g_2)$ and optimize U_f with

$$f(x) = (x_1)_- - (x_2)_+.$$

Then for any π , we have $G^\pi(s_0, (-g_1, -g_2)) \in [g_1, g_2]$ with probability one iff

$$\mathbb{E}(G^\pi(s_0, (-g_1, -g_2))_1 - g_1)_- - \mathbb{E}(G^\pi(s_0, (-g_1, -g_2))_2 - g_2)_+ = 0.$$

Finally, we can also trade off minimizing constraint violations and minimizing or maximizing expected return. An example of this kind of problem is when we want an agent achieve a certain goal “as fast as possible” (Section 3.2, Sutton and Barto, 2018). Traditionally, this kind of goal is normally implemented in episodic settings by terminating the episode when the goal is achieved, with a constant negative reward at each step, or in discounted settings with a reward of 1 when the goal is achieved, and zero otherwise. This is manageable when the goal is achieved instantaneously,¹¹ but otherwise specifying a reward can be tricky. Return distribution optimization with vector-valued rewards allows for an alternative formulation of this problem with U_f and

$$f(x) = -x_1 + \sum_{i=2}^m \alpha_i \cdot (x_i)_-,$$

where the first coordinate of the reward vector is always -1 (representing the time penalty), and the remaining $\alpha_i \cdot (x_i)_-$ regularize the agent’s behavior to achieve the multiple goals. It is easy to see that this choice of f is indifferent to γ and Lipschitz, so by Lemma 12 and Theorems 6 and 8 distributional DP can solve this problem both in the finite-horizon case and in the infinite-horizon discounted case. We will explore this application in an empirical setting in Section 7.4.

5.6 Generalized Policy Evaluation

One interesting aspect of stock-augmented return distribution optimization is that policy evaluation is not bound to any particular objective functional: If we know the return distribution for a policy π , we can evaluate it under various different choices of F_K , which means the setting is amenable to Generalized Policy Evaluation (GPE; Barreto et al., 2020). In the standard RL setting, GPE is “the computation of the value function of a policy π on a set of tasks” (Barreto et al., 2020). Its natural adaptation to our setting can be stated as the evaluation of a policy under multiple objective functionals F_{K_1}, \dots, F_{K_n} , each corresponding to a different task.

We can also adapt Generalized Policy Improvement (GPI; Barreto et al., 2020) in a similar way: Given policies π_1, \dots, π_n and an objective functional F_K , the following is an improved policy using GPI:

$$\bar{\pi}(s, c) \doteq \arg \max_{\pi \in \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n\}} (F_K \eta^\pi)(s, c).$$

11. Admittedly neither a sparse reward nor a constant reward of -1 may be easy for deep RL agents to optimize in practical settings.

The individual policies π_1, \dots, π_n may have been obtained by optimizing different objective functionals F_{K_1}, \dots, F_{K_n} , and they can be combined into a policy $\bar{\pi}$ for a new objective functional F_K which is at least as good for F_K as any of the individual policies π_1, \dots, π_n (by distributional policy improvement, Lemma 15).

5.7 Reward Design

In deploying RL algorithms on real-world sequential decision-making problems, it is often required to explicitly design a reward signal to codify the intended outcomes. As the reward hypothesis states (Section 3.2, Sutton and Barto, 2018): “All of what we mean by goals and purposes can be well thought of as the maximization of the expected value of the cumulative sum of a received scalar signal (called reward).” This hypothesis has been explored and disproved for some interpretations of what constitutes a “goal” (Pitis, 2019; Abel et al., 2021; Shakerinava and Ravanbakhsh, 2022; Bowling et al., 2023). However, even when the hypothesis holds, the reward signal is not necessarily the simplest tool for expressing goals and purposes.

Designing rewards is notoriously difficult. For instance, Knox et al. (2023) present a systematic examination of the perils of designing effective rewards for autonomous driving. They found that, among publicly available reward functions for autonomous driving, “the most risk-averse reward function [...] would approve driving by a policy that crashes 2000 times as often as our estimate of drunk 16–17 year old US drivers” (p. 7). Earlier work by Hadfield-Menell et al. (2017) reveals the difficulty of hand-designing rewards, with common failures including unintentional positive reward cycles.

We contend that, in some cases, the framework of stock-augmented return distribution optimization eliminates the need for reward design. To support this claim, we extend a reward-design result by Bowling et al. (2023) to the stock-augmented setting, showing how to design a reward signal once the objective functional has been chosen, and that the statistical functional must be an expected utility for reward design to be possible at all.

Theorem 20 *A stock-augmented return distribution optimization problem with objective functional F_K can be reduced to an equivalent stock-augmented reinforcement learning problem (expected return maximization) iff F_K is an expected utility ($F_K = U_f$ for some $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$) and there exists an $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ such that, for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$,*

$$f(\gamma c) = \alpha f(c) + (1 - \alpha)f(0).$$

When the reduction is possible, the equivalent stock-augmented reinforcement learning problem has discount α and reward proportional to

$$\tilde{R}_{t+1} \doteq \alpha f(C_{t+1}) - f(C_t) + (1 - \alpha)f(0) = f(C_t + R_{t+1}) - f(C_t).$$

The reward construction used in Theorem 16 may seem obvious in hindsight, but we believe that it can be much less evident if the corresponding U_f has not been identified, and that this may account for some of the challenges in designing rewards straight from imprecise “goals and purposes”. However, once U_f has been identified, the construction essentially automates away one step in the design of RL agents. For example, the construction used in Theorem 20 can be seen to be the same as the one used by Keramati and Gutkin (2011) to

reduce homeostatic regulation to an RL problem, and Theorem 20 provides this reduction immediately.

Not all utilities U_f allow a reduction to RL, even if f is indifferent to γ and Lipschitz (in which case distributional DP can optimize U_f). For example, when $f(x) = e^{-|x|} - 1$ and $\gamma < 1$, there is no α such that $f(\gamma c) = \alpha f(c) + (1 - \alpha)f(0)$ for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$.

5.8 Beyond Expected Utilities

In all the applications we have presented so far, the objective functionals being optimized by distributional DP were expected utilities. While expected utilities cover many common use cases of stock-augmented return distribution optimization, it is worth considering which non-expected utilities distributional DP can optimize. Without stock augmentation, distributional DP cannot optimize non-expected utilities, even in the finite-horizon undiscounted case (Marthe et al., 2024), which is the most permissive as far as conditions for optimizing F_K go. We also saw in Theorem 20 that classic DP cannot optimize non-expected utilities (even with stock augmentation), but that it can optimize any expected utility in the finite-horizon undiscounted case (Section 4.3). What about distributional DP with stock augmentation?

The answers differ depending on whether we consider the infinite-horizon discounted case, or the finite-horizon case. In the infinite-horizon discounted case, the following theorem states that only Lipschitz expected utilities satisfy all three properties (indifference to mixtures, indifference to γ , and Lipschitz continuity) required our distributional DP guarantees.

Theorem 21 *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and Lipschitz, then F_K is an expected utility, that is, there exists an $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$K\nu = \mathbb{E}f(G), \quad (G \sim \nu)$$

and f is Lipschitz.

Theorem 21 does not necessarily rule out distributional DP optimizing non-expected utilities in the infinite-horizon discounted case (because it is still an open question whether Lipschitz continuity is necessary), but it does rule out Lipschitz functionals that are not expected utilities, including, for example, the τ -CVaR:

$$K\nu = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{1-\tau}^1 \text{QF}_\nu dt. \quad (17)$$

K is Lipschitz, but F_K is not an expected utility.¹² This may seem to contradict the claims in Section 5.2, but it does not. Theorem 34 shows that distributional DP can optimize the τ -CVaR by transforming the problem into the optimization of an expected utility, and specifying how to select c_0 . The objective that distributional DP cannot optimize is F_K with K set to be exactly the τ -CVaR functional (as in Eq. (17)). To emphasize the difference between the two cases, compare which K is used in the greedy policies of Theorems 6 and 8.

12. K violates the von-Neumann-Morgenstern (Von Neumann and Morgenstern, 2007) axiom of independence. See Axiom 3 in Appendix F with ν uniform in $\{-1, 1\}$, ν' uniform in $\{0\}$, $\bar{\nu}$ uniform in $\{-1\}$ and $\tau, p = \frac{1}{2}$.

As another example of non-expected utilities with Lipschitz K , consider minimizing the 1-Wasserstein distance to a reference distribution $\bar{\nu}$ in the scalar case ($\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R}$), that is, $K\nu = -w(\nu, \bar{\nu})$. K is Lipschitz (by the triangle inequality), however F_K is not an expected utility unless $\bar{\nu}$ is a Dirac. By Theorem 21, distributional DP cannot optimize this objective functional if $\bar{\nu}$ is not a Dirac. We can verify that the K is not indifferent to mixtures, for example, when $\bar{\nu}$ is the distribution of a Bernoulli- $\frac{1}{2}$ random variable (in this case, $K\delta_0 = K\delta_1$, so indifference to mixtures requires that $K(\frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_0)$ equal $K(\frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_1)$, which is not the case). When $\bar{\nu} = \delta_c$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, it is easy to see that $K\nu = -\mathbb{E}|G - c|$ ($G \sim \nu$), and we have already established that K is indifferent to $\gamma < 1$ iff $c = 0$.

Turning to the finite-horizon case, can we claim that distributional DP cannot optimize non-expected utilities? A positive answer here would imply that distributional and classic DP are essentially equivalent in the finite-horizon *undiscounted* case, with stock augmentation as well as without. However, as the next result shows, it is possible for distributional DP to optimize non-expected utilities in the finite-horizon case. The choice of functional in Proposition 22 can be phrased as “any negative return is (equally) unacceptable,” and is known not to be an expected utility (Juan Carreño, 2020; Bowling et al., 2023).

Proposition 22 *The statistical functional $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying, for $\nu \in (\mathcal{D}, w)$,*

$$K\nu = \mathbb{I}(\nu([0, \infty)) = 1)$$

is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , however F_K is not an expected utility.

Bowling et al. (2023) used the statistical functional K in Proposition 22 as a counter-example objective that RL (classic DP) cannot optimize. However, because that choice of K is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , the corresponding objective functional F_K can be optimized by distributional DP.

6 D η N

To highlight the practical potential of distributional DP for solving return distribution optimization problems, we adapted QR-DQN (DQN with quantile regression; Dabney et al., 2018) to optimize expected utilities U_f —a method that we call *Deep η Networks*, or *D η N* (pronounced *din*)—and evaluated it in empirical settings (see Sections 7 and 8). In this section we give an overview of D η N and how it incorporates the principles of distributional DP.

D η N uses a neural-network estimator for the stock-augmented return distribution. The architecture diagrams for DQN (Mnih et al., 2015), QR-DQN (Dabney et al., 2018)) and D η N are given in Fig. 1. D η N uses a similar network as QR-DQN, the only difference being the stock embedding, which is computed by inputting the stock to a linear layer¹³ and then adding the output of this linear layer to output to the of the agent’s vision network.¹⁴ The output ξ_θ of the network is a return distribution parameterized as quantiles (see Appendix H.1 for implementation details).

13. While this simple design decision proved sufficient for our experiments, we believe that improved scalar embedding should be considered in the future (for example, Springenberg et al., 2024).

14. In practice, the MDP state s is converted to an image observation before being input to the vision network, and the conversion is domain-dependent.




Figure 1: Architecture diagrams for DQN (left), QR-DQN (center) and $D\eta$ N (right). In red, the elements introduced specifically for $D\eta$ N.

To explain the remaining differences between QR-DQN and $D\eta$ N, it is useful to understand how QR-DQN is adapted from classic DP, and then see how distributional DP is adapted into $D\eta$ N. This adaptation is necessary because DP is designed for a *planning setting* (where the transition and reward dynamics of the MDP are known), however planning methods are rarely tractable or feasible in practice, where state spaces can be very large and the dynamics can only be observed through interaction with the environment. Practical settings are more closely modeled as prediction and control settings (Sutton and Barto, 2018) with a function approximator learned through deep learning, that is, the typical setting for deep reinforcement learning.

Recall that \tilde{T}_π denotes the classic Bellman operator for a stationary policy π . Given a (state-) value function $V \in (\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$, the corresponding *action-value function* is defined by

$$Q(s, a) = (\tilde{T}_{\pi_a} V)(s),$$

where π_a denotes the policy that selects action a with probability one at all states. It is convenient to denote this transformation with an operator, so we define

$$(\tilde{A}V)(s, a) \doteq (\tilde{T}_{\pi_a} V)(s),$$

which is commonly known as the classic *Bellman lookahead operator* (p. 30, Szepesvári, 2022). We also let $\tilde{M} : (\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ be the *max operator on action-value functions* defined by

$$(\tilde{M}Q)(s) \doteq \max_a Q(s, a) = \sup_{p \in \Delta(\mathcal{A})} \mathbb{E}Q(s, A). \quad (A \sim p)$$

In reference to classic value iteration, each iterate V_n gives rise to a corresponding $Q_n \doteq \tilde{A}V_n$. Since $\tilde{M}Q_n = V_{n+1}$, we can equivalently carry out value iteration on action-value functions, via the relation

$$Q_{n+1} = \tilde{A}\tilde{M}Q_n. \quad (18)$$

Q-learning (Watkins, 1989; Sutton and Barto, 2018) aims to approximate through multiple asynchronous stochastic updates per transition. Given a *transition* $(s_t, a_t, r_{t+1}, s_{t+1})$, the Q-learning update is:

$$Q_\theta(s_t, a_t) \leftarrow (1 - \alpha)Q_\theta(s_t, a_t) + \alpha \cdot \left(r_{t+1} + \gamma(\tilde{M}Q_\theta)(s_{t+1}) \right), \quad (19)$$

where Q_θ is the action-value function estimator being learned and α is a learning rate. Note how the term in parentheses resembles the right-hand side of Eq. (18). Roughly speaking, it serves as an estimate of $\tilde{A}\tilde{M}Q_\theta$ on the given transition.¹⁵ In control settings, we must also specify how to select the agent’s actions. Typically, an ε -greedy policy (p. 28; Sutton and Barto, 2018) is used, with the greedy action a_t satisfying

$$Q_\theta(s_t, a_t) = (\tilde{M}Q_\theta)(s_t) = \max_a Q_\theta(s_t, a) = \sup_{p \in \Delta(\mathcal{A})} \mathbb{E}Q_\theta(s_t, A). \quad (A \sim p)$$

DQN (Mnih et al., 2015) implements the Q-learning update with a deep neural network estimator for Q_θ , and in addition, an estimator $Q_{\bar{\theta}}$ with *target parameters* $\bar{\theta}$ on the right-hand side of Eq. (19). The target parameters slowly track θ , and the DQN value update only modifies θ . The updates to θ are performed through regression, similar to fitted Q-iteration (Ernst et al., 2005) with a Huber loss, and with the *prediction targets*

$$r_{t+1} + \gamma(\tilde{M}Q_{\bar{\theta}})(s_{t+1}),$$

which, as before, are meant to serve as an estimate of $\tilde{A}\tilde{M}Q_{\bar{\theta}}$ on the given transition.

The implementation of D η N can be thought of applying the adaptations above to distributional DP, assuming the objective functional is an expected utility. This is a stock-augmented setting, so note the use of the augmented state $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{C}$, in contrast to the use of the plain states $s \in \mathcal{S}$ for classic DP, Q-learning, DQN and QR-DQN. The *stock-augmented distributional Bellman lookahead* operator is defined by

$$(A\eta)(s, c, a) \doteq (T_{\pi_a}\eta)(s, c),$$

where, as before, π_a selects a with probability one at all $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$. The space of possible action-conditional return distribution functions is:

$$\left\{ \xi \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{A}} : \sup_{s \in \mathcal{S}, c \in \mathcal{C}, a \in \mathcal{A}} w(\xi(s, c, a)) < \infty \right\}$$

and a *max operator* M_f on action-conditional return distribution function is defined to satisfy

$$U_f(M_f\xi)(s, c) = \sup_{p \in \Delta(\mathcal{A})} \mathbb{E}f(c + G(s, c, A)). \quad (A \sim p, G(s, c, a) \sim \xi(s, c, a))$$

15. The precise relationship between the two quantities can be understood from the analysis of Q-learning (Dayan and Watkins, 1992).

M_f may not be unique because U_f may allow for “ties” (multiple policies may realize the supremum on the right-hand side), but we can implement it via a simple maximization over actions. This is because the right-hand side above is linear in π , which implies that

$$U_f(M_f\xi)(s, c) = \max_a \mathbb{E}f(c + G(s, c, a)). \quad (G(s, c, a) \sim \xi(s, c, a))$$

Similar to the classic case with action-value functions, we can carry out distributional value iteration on action-conditional iterates:

$$\xi_{n+1} = AM_f\xi_n = A\eta_{n+1},$$

with η_{n+1} denoting the distributional value iteration iterates introduced previously (see Theorem 6).

D η N adapts distributional value iteration similarly to how QR-DQN adapts classic value iteration. QR-DQN replaces DQN’s action-value function estimator with a return distribution estimator $\xi_\theta : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ (see the middle diagram in Fig. 1), and employs quantile regression to fit this estimator, rather than ordinary scalar regression with a Huber loss. The distributional prediction target for QR-DQN and D η N can be written as

$$\text{df}(r_{t+1} + \gamma(M_f\xi_\theta)(s_{t+1}, c_{t+1})), \quad (20)$$

which, in analogy to DQN, is meant to serve as an estimate of $AM_f\xi_\theta$ on the observed data. In QR-DQN, U_f is the standard RL objective (f is the identity function), which means that

$$\mathbb{E}(M_f\xi_\theta)(s_{t+1}, c_{t+1}) = \max_a \mathbb{E}(G(s_{t+1}, c_{t+1}, a)). \quad (G(s, c, a) \sim \xi_\theta(s, c, a))$$

This is an equation over action-values, and it naturally resembles the action choice used in the Q-learning update and DQN’s prediction targets.

The action selection in D η N is ε -greedy (similar to DQN and QR-DQN). Similar to how the greedy action for Q-learning and DQN realizes \widetilde{M} , D η N’s greedy action at (s_t, c_t) realizes M_f , that is:

$$U_f(M_f\xi_\theta)(s_t, c_t) = \mathbb{E}f(c_t + G(s_t, c_t, a_t)) = \max_a \mathbb{E}f(c_t + G(s_t, c_t, a)). \quad (21)$$

with $G(s, c, a) \sim \xi_\theta(s, c, a)$.

In summary, D η N is similar to QR-DQN in many ways, with two notable differences: The neural network supports stock augmentation (Fig. 1), and the stock and the utility factor into the action selection, both for the quantile regression targets (Eq. (20)) and for the agent’s interaction with the environment (Eq. (21)). Differently from QR-DQN, the action selection for D η N is influenced by the stock, and is selected so as to locally maximize the expected utility U_f . The fact that the objective functional is an expected utility, and thus linear in π , means that it is possible to select a locally optimal action at each step (whereas for general F_K only distributions over actions may be locally optimal).

7 Gridworld Experiments

In this section we present experiments to illustrate how D η N solves different toy instances of stock-augmented return distribution optimization, corresponding to some of the applications

s_{init}			$-2B$
		$3B$ T	
1			T

Figure 2: Example gridworld (with cells indexed as matrix entries). The starting cell s_{init} is the upper-left corner cell (1, 1). The bottom-left corner (red, (4, 1)) has a deterministic reward of 1. The upper-right corner (yellow, (1, 4)) has a stochastic reward $-2B$, where $B \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\frac{1}{2})$ (sampled independently each time step). The bottom-right corner (gray, (4, 4)) is terminal. The cell (3, 3) (gray) is terminal and has a stochastic reward of $3B$.

discussed in Section 5. These experiments are also interesting because they reveal practical challenges of training stock-augmented return distribution optimization agents.

The environments are 4×4 gridworlds (Sutton and Barto, 2018). The agent’s actions are up, down, left, right, and no-op. If the agent takes a no-op action or attempts to go outside the grid, it stays in the same cell. The starting cell is always the top-left corner of the grid, which we denote by $s_0 = s_{\text{init}}$, and the starting stock c_0 is set per experiment. For a transition $(s, c), a, r', (s', c')$, if s is terminal, then $c' = c$, $s' = s$ and $r' = 0$. Otherwise, $c' = \gamma^{-1}(c + r')$ (as in Eq. (1)). Some cells are terminating; if the agent enters a terminating cell, then s' is terminal (and absorbing). Some cells are rewarding: If s is non-terminal and s' is rewarding, then the agent receives r' associated with s' . The reward may be deterministic, or it may be $r' \cdot B$ where $B \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\frac{1}{2})$ (independently for each transition). A cell may be both rewarding and terminal, in which case the agent receives the reward for the cell upon entering it, but not afterwards. Figure 2 gives an example gridworld with the notation we use. At an augmented state (s, c) , besides the stock c , the input to $D\eta\text{N}$ ’s vision network (see Fig. 1) is a one-channel 4×4 frame with 1 in the cell corresponding to s and zero otherwise.

During training, it was essential to randomize the starting c_0 , by sampling values uniformly from a range of values (implementation details are given in Appendix H.2). This was meant to introduce diversity in the training data and ensure that the agent could solve problems for a variety of c_0 .

7.1 Generating Desired Returns

Our two first experiments illustrate how $D\eta\text{N}$ with $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R}$ and $f(x) = -|x|$ can generate desired outcomes in a deterministic environment (see the application discussed in Section 5.1). In this setting the trained $D\eta\text{N}$ agent displays a range of different behaviors depending on c_0 .




Figure 3: Gridworld for the first experiment for generating returns.

Desired discounted return	Discounted return	Error
$-c_0$	$\mathbb{E}G(s_0, c_0)$	$\mathbb{E} c_0 + G(s_0, c_0) $
7.00	6.95 (6.95, 6.95)	0.05 (0.05, 0.05)
5.00	4.98 (4.98, 4.98)	0.02 (0.02, 0.02)
3.00	3.00 (3.00, 3.00)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)
1.00	1.01 (1.01, 1.01)	0.01 (0.01, 0.01)
-2.00	-1.85 (-1.99, -1.59)	0.15 (0.01, 0.41)
-4.00	-3.96 (-3.96, -3.96)	0.04 (0.04, 0.04)
-6.00	-5.92 (-5.92, -5.92)	0.08 (0.08, 0.08)
-8.00	-7.87 (-7.87, -7.87)	0.13 (0.13, 0.13)

 Table 2: Evaluation results for $D\eta N$ optimizing U_f with $f(x) = -|x|$ in the gridworld from Fig. 3, and $\gamma = 0.997$. Entries are averages with bootstrap confidence intervals in the format “average (low, high)” where low and high are the interval bounds.

We first consider generating specific returns in the gridworld given in Fig. 3. Because this gridworld is deterministic, we can set c_0 to different values to generate different desired discounted returns, and the agent must do so by combining the rewards of 2 on the top-right corner and the rewards of -1 on the bottom-left corner.

Because in practice DQN-like agents tend not to cope well with $\gamma = 1$, we set $\gamma = 0.997$ and assessed whether the agent can approximately generate the values of c_0 provided. Table 2 shows the agent’s average return for different choices of c_0 , with confidence interval bounds in parentheses. In each independent run, we trained the agent and then measured its average discounted return (over 200 episodes) for each of the values of c_0 considered. We then computed 95%-confidence intervals based on the 30 independent averages using bias-corrected and accelerated bootstrap (James et al., 2013; Virtanen et al., 2020). Each row of Table 2 shows the “desired” return ($-c_0$), the average discounted return obtained by the agent ($\mathbb{E}G(s_0, c_0)$) and the “error” $\mathbb{E}|c_0 + G(s_0, c_0)|$, the negative of the objective. We can see that, as intended, the trained $D\eta N$ agent can approximately produce the desired discounted returns.




Figure 4: Gridworld for the second experiment.

The mismatch between $-c_0$ and average discounted returns is likely due to the function approximation and discounting, which makes the exact c_0 challenging to realize for arbitrary c_0 . However, the agent should generate returns equal to $-c_0$ when it corresponds to a realizable discounted return. To test this hypothesis, we carried out a follow-up evaluation where, for each trained agent, each choice of c_0 , and each evaluation episode generated with discounted return $G(s_0, c_0)$, we ran that agent starting from (s_0, c'_0) with $c'_0 = -G(s_0, c_0)$, and measured the discounted return $G(s_0, c'_0)$ obtained. The observed values for $|c'_0 + G(s_0, c'_0)|$ were less than $3.02 \cdot 10^{-2}$ uniformly for *all runs* (across all seeds, c_0 and episodes). Thus $D\eta N$ can closely reproduce realizable discounted returns, and that the mismatches in Table 2 are likely related to γ and function approximation.

This first experiment is an illustration of the ability of methods like $D\eta N$ to control deterministic environments and generate desired outcomes, which is a desirable capability for artificial agents. Besides combining different rewards, another means to control the returns is to use the discounting. Intuitively, in this case, instead of immediately collecting a unit of reward as soon as it is possible, the agent may choose to “wait” for a few time steps until the discounted reward (from the starting state) achieves the desired value. To illustrate this point, in our second experiment we removed the negative reward from the gridworld in the first experiment, and set $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$. The gridworld diagram is given in Fig. 4.

The results are in Table 3, and the agent successfully generates the desired discounted returns. From an observer’s point of view, the perceived behavior of the agent is that it “correctly times” the rewarding transitions; in reality, the agent uses the stock to decide whether or not to collect a reward at a particular augmented state.

7.2 Maximizing the τ -CVaR

We can use $D\eta N$ to optimize τ -CVaR of the return, the risk-averse RL setup outlined in Section 5.2. The 1-CVaR is risk-neutral (stock-augmented RL), and as τ goes to zero optimizing the τ -CVaR requires more risk aversion. In this setting, $D\eta N$ displays behaviors with different risk profiles in response to changing τ .

The objective functional is U_f with $f(x) = (x)_-$, but we do not specify c_0 directly. Instead, given a desired τ , we compute c_0^* according to Theorem 16 and start the agent in the augmented state (s_0, c_0^*) . The gridworld for this experiment is given in Fig. 5. It has a “safe” terminating cell in the bottom-left corner, and a “high-risk” terminating cell in

Desired discounted return $-c_0$	Discounted return $\mathbb{E}G(s_0, c_0)$	Error $\mathbb{E} c_0 + G(s_0, c_0) $
1.00	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)
0.50	0.50 (0.50, 0.50)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)
0.25	0.25 (0.25, 0.25)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)
0.12	0.12 (0.12, 0.12)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)
0.06	0.06 (0.06, 0.06)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)

Table 3: Evaluation results for $D\eta N$ with $f(x) = -|x|$ in the gridworld from Fig. 4 and $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$. Entries are averages with bootstrap confidence intervals in the format “average (low, high)” where low and high are the interval bounds.

s_{init}		$-2B$	$\frac{3}{T}$
			$-2B$
$\frac{1}{T}$			

Figure 5: Gridworld for the first risk-averse RL experiment.

the upper-right corner. This cell has high risk because it is surrounded by cells that give -2 reward with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ (and zero otherwise). With $\gamma = 0.997$ the high-risk cell is better in expectation, so an optimal risk-neutral agent ($\tau = 1$) would go there. However, an optimal risk-averse agent (with respect to the τ -CVaR and for small enough τ) will avoid the high-risk cell and go to the safe counterpart in the bottom-left corner.

$D\eta N$'s performance is consistent with these behaviors, as we see in Fig. 6, which shows the histograms of the returns obtained by $D\eta N$ over several runs. As before, we trained the $D\eta N$ agent in 30 independent training runs. After training the agent in each of the runs, we ran the agent with different values of τ for 200 episodes. It is worth emphasizing that we run the *same* trained agent with different values of τ , as discussed in Section 5.1. We binned the observed returns and computed their frequencies for each independent run, and we report the average frequencies per bin with 95% bootstrap confidence intervals. For smaller τ , the agent goes to the safe terminating cell. As τ increases, the frequency of returns corresponding to the high-risk cell also increases.

$D\eta N$ generated zero returns in some instances, which are suboptimal behaviors regardless of τ . The selection of c_0^* uses grid search and approximate return estimates from $\xi_{\bar{\theta}}$, and estimation errors may cause $\mathbb{E}(c_0^* + \xi_{\bar{\theta}}(s_0, c_0^*, a))_-$ to be zero for all actions, even for the down action. When this is the case, $D\eta N$ selects actions uniformly at random (because all actions are greedy). The stock, which starts often at a negative value, inflates due to




Figure 6: Discounted return histogram for different values of τ , obtained by a trained $D\eta N$ agent. Error bars correspond to bootstrap confidence intervals.

s_{init}	1	1	1 T
$\frac{3}{2}B$	$\frac{3}{2}B$	1 T	
$\frac{3}{2}B$	1 T		
$\frac{3}{2}B$ T			

Figure 7: Gridworld for the risk-seeking RL experiment. The only allowed actions are down and right.

the γ^{-1} factor and becomes more negative. Eventually it is so large in magnitude that the future discounted return can never exceed the stock, and the result is degenerate behavior.

7.3 Maximizing the Optimistic τ -CVaR

Similar to how we can use $D\eta N$ to produce risk-averse behavior, we can also use it to produce risk-seeking behavior, by following the outline in Section 5.3. In this case we also observe $D\eta N$ display behaviors with different risk profiles: When the agent is risk-seeking, it tries to maximize its best-case expected performance, and as it becomes more risk neutral its performance resembles that of an RL agent maximizing value.

The objective functional is U_f with $f(x) = (x)_+$ and as before we do not specify c_0 directly. Instead, given τ , we compute c_0^* according to Theorem 18, and run the agent from (s_0, c_0^*) . The optimistic 1-CVaR is risk-neutral, and as τ goes to zero the optimistic τ -CVaR demands more risk-seeking behavior. The gridworld for this experiment is given in Fig. 7. The only allowed actions are down and right, and $\gamma = 0.997$. In this environment, the higher the risk, the higher the best-case return, but the lower the expected return. A risk-neutral agent will go right twice and then either right or down, terminating with a discounted return of $1 + \gamma + \gamma^2$. These are the low-risk paths. In any given cell and whatever




Figure 8: Discounted return histogram for different values of τ , obtained by a trained $D\eta N$ agent. Error bars correspond to bootstrap confidence intervals.

the stock, moving to a cell with Bernoulli rewards increases the risk relative to choosing a cell with deterministic reward. Going down three times is the path with highest risk, with expected discounted return $\frac{3}{4}(1 + \gamma + \gamma^2)$, but twice that amount with probability $\frac{1}{8}$ (the best case).

$D\eta N$'s performance is consistent with the risk profile given by τ , as we see in Fig. 8, which shows the histograms of the returns obtained by $D\eta N$ over several runs. We trained the $D\eta N$ agent and computed histograms in the same way as in Fig. 6.

For $\tau \leq 0.1$ we see that the agent is maximally risk-seeking, as the support of the distribution includes the maximum possible return (approximately 4.5) with probability around $\frac{1}{8}$. As τ increases, the agent becomes less risk-seeking, and eventually ($\tau = 0.25$) the agent stops going for the riskiest path and visits cells with deterministic rewards more often. At $\tau \approx 1$ the agent is nearly risk-neutral, with a mean discounted return of 2.6 ± 0.485 . The optimal risk-neutral expected discounted return is approximately 2.99, and we believe the mismatch is due to approximation errors on the choice of the starting c_0^* .

To highlight the agent's ability to adapt to different stochastic outcomes, notice how the frequency of zero returns is quite low, even for the highly risk-seeking behavior ($\tau = 0.01$). This may seem counter-intuitive if we consider that the highest-risk path has the same probability of a best discounted return (4.48 with probability $\frac{1}{8}$) as of a worst discounted return (zero). Yet $D\eta N$ with $\tau = 0.01$ observes a discounted return of 4.48 with probability around $\frac{1}{8}$, and worst-case returns with probability around 0.03 ± 0.02 . This happens because $D\eta N$ adapts its behaviors to the observed returns, through stock augmentation. If we look back at Fig. 7, we can see that there is always a path such that, if the agent observes a zero reward at one of the non-terminal cells with Bernoulli rewards, it can go right and avoid a return of zero. For example, for a low enough τ , the agent's starting stock will be $c_0^* \leq -4$. If the agent goes down on its first action and observes a reward of zero, it is no longer able to generate a discounted return above 4. Because $f(x) = (x)_+$, all actions will have expected utility zero (modulo estimation errors), and because $D\eta N$ breaks ties by uniform sampling, the agent will follow a uniformly random policy. This would mean that the probability of observing a zero discounted return is $\mathbb{P}(R_1 = 0, A_1 = \text{down}, R_2 = 0, A_2 = \text{down}, R_3 = 0)$. Since there are only two actions, this probability is $(\frac{1}{2})^5 = 0.03125$, which is consistent with our data.

s_{init}	-2	-2	-2 T
		-2	-2
			T
1			

Figure 9: Gridworld for the experiment with trading off minimizing constraint violation and maximizing expected return.

7.4 Trading Off Minimizing Constraint Violation and Maximizing Expected Return

In this section, we consider the application outlined at the end of Section 5.5: To obtain a certain amount of reward in as few steps as possible. This application requires $D\eta\text{N}$ to optimize an objective functional with vector-valued rewards.

In this setting, we have $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R}^2$. The first coordinate of the reward is always -1 , and corresponds to the “time-to-termination” penalty to be minimized. The values observed in the second coordinate of the reward vector are given in Fig. 9. The objective functional is U_f with $f(x) = -x_1 + \alpha \cdot (x_2)_-$. We set $\alpha = 50$ to encourage prioritizing the term on the second coordinate of the reward vector, so the semantics of the objective functional is to get to termination as fast as possible, keeping $G(s, c)_2 \geq -(c_0)_2$, but allowing for small violations to be traded off for faster termination. For this experiment, we estimate the marginal distributions (per coordinate) of the vector-valued returns. This simplifies the prediction in $D\eta\text{N}$, and is sufficient for the expected utility being optimized,¹⁶

An optimal policy with respect to U_f will display different behaviors depending on the choice of $(c_0)_2$. If $-(c_0)_2 \leq -2(\gamma^2 + \gamma^1 + \gamma^0) \approx -5.98$, the policy will go straight from s_{init} to terminate at the top-right corner. This is the shortest possible path to termination, but it is “costly” in terms of the cell rewards. With $-2(\gamma^2 + \gamma^1 + \gamma^0) < -(c_0)_2 \leq 0$, the policy goes to the “lower” terminating cell $((3, 4))$ in 5 steps and with $G(s_0, c_0)_2 = 0$. For $-(c_0)_2 > 0$, the policy must stay at the cell in the lower-left corner for multiple steps before going to the “lower” terminating cell $((3, 4))$. The number of steps it stays will depend on α and $-(c_0)_2$: As $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ the policy will stay longer to make $G(s_0, c_0)_2$ closer to $-(c_0)_2$ (either larger or slightly smaller). For example, it would take the optimal policy at most 8 steps to reach termination with $-(c_0)_2 = 1$, 9 steps with $-(c_0)_2 = 2$ and 10 steps with $-(c_0)_2 = 3$.

The results for $D\eta\text{N}$ are in Table 4. $D\eta\text{N}$ did not produce optimal behaviors, but aligned with them. In the first three settings (upper rows of the table), visiting the bottom-left

16. When $f(x)$ does not decouple as $\sum_i f_i(x_i)$ for some choice of f_i (for example, of $f(x) = \|x\|_2$) then the distribution of the quantile vectors is needed. For those cases, one may consider building on results for multivariate distributional RL (Zhang et al., 2021; Wiltzer et al., 2024).

Lower-bound $-(c_0)_2$	Discounted Return $\mathbb{E}G(s_0, c_0)_2$	Penalty term $\mathbb{E}((c_0)_2 + G(s_0, c_0)_2)_-$	Episode duration
3.00	3.62 (3.39, 3.88)	-0.05 (-0.18, -0.01)	10.83 (10.23, 11.70)
2.00	2.47 (2.14, 2.77)	-0.14 (-0.41, -0.04)	11.00 (10.00, 12.20)
1.00	1.41 (1.08, 1.77)	-0.20 (-0.37, -0.10)	11.57 (10.20, 12.97)
0.00	0.20 (0.07, 0.55)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	5.87 (5.37, 7.20)
-1.00	0.06 (0.00, 0.39)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	5.37 (5.00, 6.83)
-2.00	0.03 (0.00, 0.16)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	5.37 (5.00, 6.83)
-6.00	-0.40 (-1.20, 0.00)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	4.93 (4.67, 5.00)
-7.00	-4.79 (-5.58, -3.79)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	3.40 (3.13, 3.73)

Table 4: Performance of $D\eta N$ trading off minimizing constraint violation and maximizing expected return. The weight of the second term is $\alpha = 50$. Entries are averages with bootstrap confidence intervals in the format “average (low, high)” where low and high are the interval bounds.

corner was required by U_f . The agent did that (albeit overstaying) and then went to the lower terminating cell. In the second three settings (middle rows of the table), visiting the bottom-left corner was not required by U_f ; the agent went to the lower terminating cell. In the last two settings (bottom rows of the table), U_f allowed the agent to suffer the -2 rewards on the path to the upper terminating cell, in exchange for a shorter time to termination. An optimal agent would go in a straight line to the right and terminate in three steps, but $D\eta N$ behaved suboptimally most of the time. For $c_0 = 7$ (last row), we see that the agent often took the path to the upper terminating cell, however, for $c_0 = 6$ (second to last line) the agent rarely did so, often going for the lower terminating cell.

Why did $D\eta N$ overshoot the second coordinate of the discounted return on the first three settings, and why did it rarely go for the upper terminating cell when $c_0 = 6$? We hypothesize that the cause was inaccuracy in the return distribution estimates. A small underestimation of $\mathbb{E}((c_t)_2 + G(s_t, c_t)_2)_-$ will be amplified by $\alpha = 50$ and may cause the agent to become “conservative” in optimizing for this term of the objective, relative to term on the first coordinate of the discounted return. To test this hypothesis, we ran a second version of our experiment with $\alpha = 500$. The choice of $\alpha \in \{50, 500\}$ should have little impact on an optimal agent’s behavior with the values of c_0 we considered, however, larger α should make an agent with imperfect return estimates seem more conservative. The results are in Table 5. Consistent with our hypothesis, we observe that $D\eta N$ with $\alpha = 500$ appears more conservative, with longer episodes than with $\alpha = 50$, especially for $c_0 = 0$ and $c_0 = 7$. For $c_0 = 0$, the agent did not take the zero-reward path to the lower terminating cell, but first visited the rewarding cell in the bottom-left corner, and for $c_0 = 7$ the agent did not go to the upper terminating cell.

Lower-bound $-(c_0)_2$	Discounted Return $\mathbb{E}G(s_0, c_0)_2$	Penalty term $\mathbb{E}((c_0)_2 + G(s_0, c_0)_2)_-$	Episode duration
3.00	5.83 (5.09, 7.06)	-0.00 (-0.00, 0.00)	12.97 (12.17, 13.83)
2.00	4.75 (3.89, 5.92)	-0.04 (-0.20, 0.00)	12.47 (11.43, 13.53)
1.00	3.38 (2.73, 4.40)	-0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)	11.83 (10.73, 13.03)
0.00	1.73 (1.24, 2.44)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	12.07 (10.77, 13.30)
-1.00	0.36 (0.13, 0.84)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	6.80 (5.80, 8.47)
-2.00	0.19 (-0.07, 0.63)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	6.77 (5.67, 8.47)
-6.00	-0.27 (-1.14, -0.01)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	6.50 (5.43, 8.30)
-7.00	-0.74 (-1.74, -0.07)	0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	5.97 (5.03, 7.67)

Table 5: Performance of $D\eta N$ on the task where the goal is to terminate as fast as possible, but with the second coordinate of the discounted return $G(s_0, c_0)_2$ above the lower bound $-(c_0)_2$. Optimizing U_f also requires minimizing the first coordinate of the vector-valued discounted return, which affects the episode duration. The weight of the second term is $\alpha = 500$. Entries are averages with bootstrap confidence intervals in the format “average (low, high)” where low and high are the interval bounds.

8 Atari Experiment

Atari 2600 (Bellemare et al., 2013) is a popular RL benchmark where several deep RL agents have been evaluated, including DQN (Mnih et al., 2015) and QR-DQN (Dabney et al., 2018). It provides us with a more challenging setting for deep RL agents than gridworld instances, since agents must overcome multiple learning challenges—to name a few: perception, exploration and control over longer timescales.

Atari 2600 is very much an RL benchmark, with games framed as RL problems in which the goal is to maximize the score. However, we can use the game of Pong to create an interesting setting for generating returns—an Atari analogue of the gridworld experiments in Section 7.1. In Pong, the agent plays against an opponent controlled by the environment. The goal of the game is for each player to get the ball to cross the edge of the opponent’s side of the screen. Each time this happens, the player gets a point. Each player controls a paddle that can be used for hitting back the ball, preventing the opponent from scoring a point and sending the ball toward the opponent in a straight trajectory.

In a typical RL setting, we train agents to maximize the score (the difference between the player’s and the opponent’s scores), but in this section we are interested in using $D\eta N$ to achieve different scores, which entails both scoring against the opponent, and being scored upon. We trained $D\eta N$ and evaluated the trained agent with different values of c_0 , corresponding to different desired discounted returns, $\gamma = 0.997$, and reduced episode duration from thirty minutes to twenty-five seconds (implementation details are given in Appendix H.3). This dramatic reduction is related to the interaction between γ and the objective functional. The goal is to control the distribution of the discounted return from the start of the episode, and reward at time step $t + 1$ offsets this discounted return by

Desired discounted return $-c_0$	Discounted return $\mathbb{E}G(s_0, c_0)$	Error $\mathbb{E} c_0 + G(s_0, c_0) $
4.00	2.26 (2.22, 2.28)	1.74 (1.72, 1.78)
2.00	1.90 (1.88, 1.92)	0.15 (0.13, 0.18)
1.00	0.88 (0.82, 0.95)	0.23 (0.21, 0.27)
0.00	-0.23 (-0.33, -0.15)	0.29 (0.22, 0.37)
-1.00	-1.03 (-1.09, -0.95)	0.19 (0.16, 0.21)
-2.00	-2.06 (-2.11, -1.96)	0.18 (0.16, 0.22)
-4.00	-3.97 (-4.01, -3.94)	0.14 (0.11, 0.16)

Table 6: Evaluation results generating discounted returns with $D\eta N$ in Pong and $\gamma = 0.997$. Entries are averages with bootstrap confidence intervals in the format “average (low, high)” where low and high are the interval bounds.

$\gamma^t R_{t+1}$. The rewards in Pong are ± 1 and the agent acts at 15Hz, so after 25s an observed reward only offsets the discounted return by approximately ± 0.32 . As the episode advances, the effect of the agent’s actions on the value of the objective decreases, and at a minute this effect has reduced to ± 0.07 . The agent’s behavior after that is unlikely to make any meaningful difference to the return and collected data may be less useful for training. For these experiments, we have sidestepped the issue by reducing the episode duration, but the interaction between the timescale and γ for stock-augmented return distribution optimization is an important practical consideration that deserves a systematic study in future work.

Table 6 shows the performance of $D\eta N$. Similar to the setting in Table 2, we trained the agent and, for evaluation, conditioned its policy on different values of c_0 corresponding to the negative of the desired discounted return. We measured the agent’s average discounted return ($\mathbb{E}G(s_0, c_0)$) and the “error” $\mathbb{E}|c_0 + G(s_0, c_0)|$. The confidence intervals correspond to 95%-confidence bootstrap intervals over 12 independent repetitions of training and evaluation (differently from the 30 independent runs in the gridworld setting). $D\eta N$ approximately and reliably generated the desired discounted returns for various choices of c_0 , with the exception of discounted returns to approximate $-c_0 = 4$ (first row). We believe that the agent’s training regime explains both the successes and the failure for $-c_0 = 4$.

We used $D\eta N$ ’s policy for data collection during training, which required us to select c_0 during training. At the beginning of each episode, we sampled a value for c_0 uniformly at random from $[-9, 9)$. This was the strategy used in the gridworld experiments (albeit with a different interval) and it was meant to increase data diversity. Because the episodes in Atari were much longer than in the gridworld experiment (375 versus 16 steps), this strategy likely yielded little diversity in the stocks observed later in the episode. Diversity is important because we need to train the stock-augmented agent to optimize the objective for a variety of augmented states. Similar to how certain RL problems may pose exploration challenges in the state space \mathcal{S} , stock-augmented problems may suffer from exploration challenges in the augmented-state space $(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C})$.

Fortunately, we can reintroduce diversity across stocks after generating data, as we now explain. Stock editing is based on the following observation: When the state dynamics are independent of the stock, from a single transition $(S_t, C_t), A_t, R_{t+1}, (S_{t+1}, C_{t+1})$, it is possible to generate counterfactual transitions with the correct distribution for the whole spectrum of stocks $c \in \mathcal{C}$, that is, the following transitions:

$$\{(S_t, c), A_t, R_{t+1}, (S_{t+1}, \gamma^{-1}(c + R_{t+1})) : c \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

We refer to this change on C_t and C_{t+1} as *stock editing*. D η N updates parameters using a minibatch of trajectories with subsequent transitions. In this setting, before performing each update, we edited the stocks in the minibatch as follows: We sampled a value of C'_0 uniformly at random from $[-9, 9)$ for the first step of each trajectory, and edited the whole trajectory to create new transitions $(S_{t+k}, C'_k), A_{t+k}, R_{t+k+1}, (S_{t+k+1}, C'_{k+1})$ with, for $k \geq 0$,

$$C'_{k+1} = \gamma^{-k} \left(C'_0 + \sum_{i=0}^k \gamma^i R_{t+i+1} \right).$$

Stock editing was essential for our results, and we were unable to reproduce the outcomes in Table 6 without it.

We believe that the failure for $-c_0 = 4$ happened because there was not enough data for learning to generate discounted returns of approximately 4. As $-c_0$ increases, the behaviors generated for the diverse stocks through stock editing are likely not as useful for solving the problem at c_0 . In other words, we conjecture that the data was diverse but imbalanced, and we pose this issue of data balance as a question for future work.

9 Conclusion

While standard RL has been successfully employed to solve various practical problems, its formulation as maximizing expected return limits its use in the design of intelligent agents. The problem of return distribution optimization aims to address this limitation by posing the optimization of a statistical functional return distribution. While this is a more general problem, the additional flexibility cannot be exploited by dynamic programming, as distributional DP can only solve the instances that classic DP can solve (Marthe et al., 2024). We showed that this limitation can be addressed by augmenting the state of the MDP with *stock* (Eq. (1)), a statistic originally introduced by Bäuerle and Ott (2011) for optimizing the τ -CVaR with classic DP, a method with was later extended by Bäuerle and Rieder (2014) to minimize expected utilities U_f with continuous and strictly increasing f . It is through the combination of distributional RL, stock augmentation and optimizing statistical functionals of the return distribution that distributional DP can tackle a broader class of return distribution optimization problems than what is possible when any of the components are missing.

We introduced distributional value iteration and distributional policy iteration as principled distributional DP methods for stock-augmented return distribution optimization, that is, optimizing various objective functionals F_K of the return distribution. These methods enjoy performance bounds that resemble the classic DP bounds, and they can be applied

to various RL-like problems that have been the subject of interest in previous work, including instances of risk-sensitive RL (Chow and Ghavamzadeh, 2014; Noorani et al., 2022), homeostatic regulation (Keramati and Gutkin, 2011) and constraint satisfaction.

Distributional DP offers a clear path for developing practical return distribution optimization methods based on existing deep RL agents, as exemplified by our empirical results. We adapted QR-DQN (Dabney et al., 2018) to incorporate the principles of distributional DP into a novel agent called $D\eta N$ (Deep η -Networks, pronounced *din*), and illustrated that it works as intended in different simple scenarios for return distribution optimization in gridworld and Atari.

We believe there are a number of interesting directions for future work in stock-augmented return distribution optimization. Besides open theoretical questions, there are various practical challenges to be studied systematically on the path to developing strong practical methods for return distribution optimization. Because return distribution optimization formalizes a wide range of problems, these solution methods can have broad applicability in practice.

9.1 Open Theoretical Questions

Does an optimal return distribution exist when K is indifferent to γ , indifferent to mixtures and Lipschitz? If this is the case, the proofs of Theorems 6 and 8 can be simplified and the bounds can be tightened to depend on the optimal return distribution, similar to how the classic DP error bounds depend on the optimal value function.

What is needed for DP to optimize an objective functional in the infinite-horizon discounted case? We believe some form of continuity may be necessary (see Appendix C.2, where we show a failure case with U_f and $f(x) = \mathbb{I}(x > 0)$).

Can we develop distributional DP methods to solve constrained problems? We have come close to constrained problems in Section 5.5, and it would be interesting to develop a theory of stock-augmented constrained return distribution optimization, somewhat like constrained MDPs (Altman, 1999) are related to RL.

9.2 Addressing $D\eta N$'s Limitations

$D\eta N$ is a proof-of-concept stock-augmented agent that we used for illustrating how the principles underlying distributional value/policy iteration can be incorporated into a deep reinforcement learning agent. Below, we list some limitations of the method that we believe should be addressed on the path to developing full-fledged stock-augmented agents for optimizing return distributions in challenging environments.

How to embed the stock? We have employed a simple embedding strategy for the stock in $D\eta N$'s network, which relies on inputting the stock to an MLP and adding out result to the output of the agent's vision network (see Fig. 1). This was sufficient for our experiments, however improved scalar embedding should be considered in the future (for example, Springenberg et al., 2024), as it may improve the agent's data efficiency and performance, especially in more challenging environments.

How to go beyond expected utilities? The fact that $D\eta N$ can only optimize expected utilities is also a limitation worth addressing. $D\eta N$ relies on the existence of greedy actions, which holds for expected utilities, but not for other objective functionals. That is,

other stock-augmented return distribution optimization problems may only admit optimal stochastic policies. Perhaps an approach based on policy gradient (Sutton and Barto, 2018; Espeholt et al., 2018) or policy optimization (Schulman et al., 2017; Abdolmaleki et al., 2018) may be therefore more suited for going beyond expected utilities.

How to estimate distributions of vector-valued returns? D η N maintains estimates of the marginal distributions (per coordinate) of the vector-valued returns (see Appendix H.1). This was enough for our experiments, but our simplification highlights an important consideration: We want practical methods that can estimate the distributions of vector-valued returns. This capability is needed, for example, to tackle the formulation of homeostatic regulation proposed by Keramati and Gutkin (2011). Zhang et al. (2021); Wiltzer et al. (2024) have studied learning distributional estimates with vector-valued returns, so their results can inform the design of distributional estimators for vector-valued returns.

9.3 Practical Challenges

Our experimental results revealed a number of interesting challenges in stock-augmented return distribution optimization that we believe should be addressed in order to develop effective agents for practical settings.

In our experiments we mitigated these issues with simple ideas, and we were helped by the simplicity of the experimental settings, but stronger solutions may be required in more challenging environments. We typically need to apply interventions to the stock during training, in order to generate diverse data (Sections 7 and 8). The interaction of objective functional, c_0 and approximate return distribution estimates may result in degenerate behavior (Sections 7.2 and 7.3) and this can be worsened when c_0 is selected through a procedure like grid-search to optimize an approximate objective (as in the case of τ -CVaR, both risk-averse and risk-seeking). Depending on the objective functional, near-optimal decision making may require substantially accurate return estimates (Section 7.4). Over long timescales, the discount factor may limit the agent’s ability to influence the returns (Section 8). In more complex environments, we need to ensure the training data is not only diverse across the stock spectrum, but also balanced, lest the learned policies underperform for certain choices of c_0 .

Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

We thank Csaba Szepesvári for reviewing our draft of this work. We also thank Kalesha Bullard, Noémi Éltető, András György, Lucia Cipolina Kun, Dale Schuurmans, and Yunhao Tang for helpful discussions. Our experimental infrastructure was built using Python 3, Flax (Heek et al., 2024), Haiku (Hennigan et al., 2020), JAX (Bradbury et al., 2018), and NumPy (Harris et al., 2020). We have used Matplotlib (Hunter, 2007), NumPy (Harris et al., 2020), pandas (Wes McKinney, 2010; pandas development team, 2020) and SciPy (Virtanen et al., 2020) for analyzing and plotting our experimental data.

Appendix A. Additional Theoretical Results

A.1 Complete Spaces

Lemma 23 *The spaces (\mathcal{D}, w) and $(\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ are complete.*

Proof We know that (\mathcal{D}, w) is complete (Theorem 6.18, p. 116; Villani, 2009), so it remains to show that $(\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ is complete. Let η_1, η_2, \dots be a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$. For each (s, c) , the sequence $\eta_1(s, c), \eta_2(s, c), \dots$ is Cauchy in (\mathcal{D}, w) and by completeness it has a limit $\eta_\infty(s, c)$.

We claim that η_∞ is the limit of η_1, η_2, \dots in $(\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we can take n such that $\sup_{n' \geq n} \bar{w}(\eta_{n'}, \eta_n) < \varepsilon$, which means

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &> \sup_{n' \geq n} \bar{w}(\eta_{n'}, \eta_n) \\ &= \sup_{n' \geq n} \sup_{s, c} w(\eta_{n'}(s, c), \eta_n(s, c)) \\ &\geq \sup_{n' \geq n} \sup_{s, c} w(\eta_{n'}(s, c), \eta_\infty(s, c)) \\ &= \sup_{n' \geq n} \bar{w}(\eta_{n'}, \eta_\infty), \end{aligned}$$

and since this holds for all $\varepsilon > 0$ we have that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{w}(\eta_n, \eta_\infty) = 0.$$

Combining the above with the fact that \bar{w} is a norm gives

$$0 \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{w}(\eta_n, \eta_\infty) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{w}(\eta_n, \eta_\infty) = 0,$$

so, indeed, η_∞ is the limit of η_1, η_2, \dots

It remains to show that $\eta_\infty \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$, that is, that $\bar{w}(\eta_\infty) < \infty$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and n such that

$$\bar{w}(\eta_n, \eta_\infty) < \varepsilon.$$

We have $\bar{w}(\eta_n) < \infty$ since $\eta_n \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$, and, by the triangle inequality,

$$\bar{w}(\eta_n, \eta_\infty) \geq \bar{w}(\eta_\infty) - \bar{w}(\eta_n),$$

so

$$\bar{w}(\eta_\infty) \leq \bar{w}(\eta_n) + \varepsilon < \infty. \quad \blacksquare$$

Appendix B. Analysis of Distributional Dynamic Programming

B.1 History-based policies

We start by reducing the stock-augmented return distribution optimization problem to an optimization over *Markov policies*.

Proposition 24 *If Assumption 1 holds and $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , and the MDP is finite-horizon or $\gamma < 1$ and K is Lipschitz, then*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_M} F_K \eta^\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F_K \eta^\pi.$$

Proof We write $F = F_K$. This result is similar to the RL case, and the proof relies on showing that for every history-based policy π we can find a $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$, and such that

$$F \eta^\pi \leq F \eta^{\bar{\pi}},$$

uniformly (the inequality holds pointwise for all $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$). First note that

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F \eta^\pi \leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_M} F \eta^\pi \leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F \eta^\pi,$$

so it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F \eta^\pi \leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F \eta^\pi.$$

Under the given conditions, policy improvement (Lemma 15) applies, meaning that given a history-based policy π , we can pick a stationary Markov policy $\bar{\pi}$ such that $F \eta^{\bar{\pi}} \geq F \eta^\pi$.

This is sufficient for the result. To see this, by means of contradiction, if

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F \eta^\pi > \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F \eta^\pi,$$

then there exists a history-based policy $\pi \in \Pi_H$ such that

$$F \eta^\pi > \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F \eta^\pi,$$

but then there also exists a policy $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$ such that

$$F \eta^{\bar{\pi}} \geq F \eta^\pi > \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F \eta^\pi,$$

which is a contradiction. Thus

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F \eta^\pi \leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F \eta^\pi. \quad \blacksquare$$

Proposition 24 implies that under the conditions on F , every history-based policy $\pi \in \Pi_H$ we can find a Markov policy $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi_M$ that is no worse than π simultaneously for all (s, c) . In this sense, the quantity

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_M} F \eta^\pi$$

is well-defined, even though it is a supremum of a vector-valued quantity.

B.2 Distributional Policy Evaluation

For our analysis, we also employ existing distributional RL theory for policy evaluation:

Theorem 25 (from Proposition 4.15, p. 88, Bellemare et al., 2023) *For every stationary policy $\pi \in \Pi$, the distributional Bellman operator T_π is a non-expansion in the supremum 1-Wasserstein distance. If $\gamma < 1$, then T_π is a γ -contraction in the supremum 1-Wasserstein distance.*

Proof The proof is as presented by Bellemare et al. (2023), with the caveat that to obtain the result for $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R}^m$ with $m > 1$ we apply Proposition 4.15 to each coordinate of the vector-valued rewards individually. \blacksquare

The following lemma uses Theorem 25 to give us a policy evaluation result for the infinite-horizon case.

Lemma 26 (Distributional Policy Evaluation) *If $\gamma < 1$ or the MDP is finite-horizon, for any $\eta, \eta' \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ and $\pi \in \Pi_M$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{w}(T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta, T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta') = 0.$$

Proof *Discounted Case.* In this case, $\gamma < 1$ and T_π is a γ -contraction by Theorem 25. Letting $\eta_n \doteq T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta$ for $n \geq 1$, we can use a similar argument as Szepesvári (proof of Theorem 1, p. 77, 2022) to show that the sequence η_1, η_2, \dots is Cauchy. For all $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$

$$\bar{w}(\eta_{n+k}, \eta_n) \leq \frac{\gamma^n}{1 - \gamma} \bar{w}(\eta_1, \eta).$$

and

$$\bar{w}(\eta_1, \eta) = \bar{w}(T_{\pi_1} \eta, \eta) \leq \bar{w}(T_{\pi_1} \eta) + \bar{w}(\eta) < \infty.$$

so η_1, η_2, \dots converges.

Given $\eta' \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ let $\eta'_n \doteq T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta'$ for $n \geq 1$. Then η'_1, η'_2, \dots converges by the argument above. For every $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\bar{w}(\eta_n, \eta'_n) \leq \gamma^n \bar{w}(\eta, \eta'),$$

and

$$\bar{w}(\eta, \eta') \leq \bar{w}(\eta) + \bar{w}(\eta') < \infty.$$

so

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{w}(\eta_n, \eta'_n) = 0,$$

which implies the result.

Finite-horizon Case. In finite-horizon MDPs, if n is greater or equal to the horizon, then

$$T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta = T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta',$$

for all $\eta, \eta' \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$, so

$$\bar{w}(T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta) = \bar{w}(T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta'),$$

and we must show is that $T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$. When the MDP is finite-horizon, T_π is a non-expansion (by Theorem 25), which implies that $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \bar{w}(T_\pi \eta) < \infty$ and, for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\bar{w}(T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta) \leq \bar{w}(\eta) < \infty. \quad \blacksquare$$

We refer to Lemma 26 as the distributional policy evaluation result because it implies that for a stationary policy $\pi \in \Pi$ the sequence discounted return functions given by $\eta_n \doteq T_\pi^n \eta$ converges in 1-Wasserstein distance to η^π , the distribution of discounted returns obtained by π . Moreover, the sequence of returns $G_n \sim \eta_n$ (which are distributed independently from each other) converges almost surely to a $G^\pi \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_{t+1}$ (Skorokhod's Theorem, p. 114; Shorack, 2017)

B.3 Local Policy Improvement

Informally, DP builds a globally optimal policy by “chaining” locally optimal decisions at each time step. A “distributional max operator” gives a return distribution where the first decision is locally optimal:

Definition 27 (Distributional Max Operator) *Given $F : (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}$, an operator $T_* : (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ is a distributional max operator if it satisfies, for all $\eta \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$,*

$$FT_*\eta = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} FT_\pi \eta.$$

The mechanism for locally optimal decision-making is the greedy policy, which is a policy that realizes a distributional max operator:

Definition 28 (Greedy Policy) *Given $F : (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}$, a policy $\pi \in \Pi$ is greedy with respect to $\eta \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ if*

$$FT_\pi \eta = FT_*\eta.$$

Given F_K , it is possible that K is such that for some $\nu \in (\mathcal{D}, w)$ we have $K\nu$ degenerate and “infinite” (for example, the expected utility U_f with $f(x) = x^{-1}$). In this case, we interpret K as encoding a preference where if $\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots \in (\mathcal{D}, w)$ converges to ν_∞ and $K\nu_n < \infty$ for all n , but $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} K\nu_n = \infty$, then there is no $\nu \in (\mathcal{D}, w)$ that is strictly preferred over ν_∞ . In this sense, we write $K\nu_\infty \geq \sup_{\nu \in (\mathcal{D}, w)} K\nu$. Similarly, for F_K and $\bar{\pi}$ greedy with respect to η , we write

$$F_K T_* \eta = F_K T_{\bar{\pi}} \eta \geq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F_K T_\pi \eta$$

even if the right-hand side is infinite for some $\eta \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ and $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$.

B.4 Monotonicity

The following intermediate result will be useful for proving monotonicity, and it highlights a phenomenon in stock-augmented problems, where the rewards are absorbed into the augmented state:

Lemma 29 (Reward absorption) *For every stationary policy $\pi \in \Pi$, $\eta \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ and $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$ If $(S_t, C_t) = (s, c)$, $A_t \sim \pi(S_t, C_t)$, $G_{\text{lookahead}}(s, c) \sim (T_\pi \eta)(s, c)$ and $G(s, c) \sim \eta(s, c)$, then*

$$C_t + G_{\text{lookahead}}(S_t, C_t) = \gamma (C_{t+1} + G(S_{t+1}, C_{t+1})).$$

Proof We have that

$$\begin{aligned} C_t + G_{\text{lookahead}}(S_t, C_t) &\stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} C_t + R_{t+1} + \gamma G(S_{t+1}, C_{t+1}) && \text{(definition of } T_\pi) \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \gamma C_{t+1} + \gamma G(S_{t+1}, C_{t+1}) && \text{(Eq. (1))} \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \gamma (C_{t+1} + G(S_{t+1}, C_{t+1})). && \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 14 (Monotonicity) *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , then, for every $\pi \in \Pi$, the distributional Bellman operator T_π is monotone (or order-preserving) with respect to the preference induced by F_K on $(\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$. That is, for every stationary policy $\pi \in \Pi$ and $\eta, \eta' \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$, we have*

$$F_K \eta \geq F_K \eta' \Rightarrow F_K T_\pi \eta \geq F_K T_\pi \eta'.$$

Proof Fix a stationary policy $\pi \in \Pi$ and $\eta, \eta' \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ satisfying $F_K \eta \geq F_K \eta'$. Fix also $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$, and let $(S_t, C_t) = (s, c)$, $A_t \sim \pi(S_t, C_t)$, $G(s, c) \sim \eta(s, c)$, $G'(s, c) \sim \eta'(s, c)$, $G_{\text{lookahead}}(s, c) \sim (T_\pi \eta)(s, c)$ and $G'_{\text{lookahead}}(s, c) \sim (T_\pi \eta')(s, c)$

By assumption, for all (s, c)

$$K(c + G(s, c)) \geq K(c + G'(s, c)).$$

Combining the above with indifference to mixtures, we get

$$K(C_{t+1} + G(S_{t+1}, C_{t+1})) \geq K(C_{t+1} + G'(S_{t+1}, C_{t+1})),$$

and, thanks to indifference to γ ,

$$K(\gamma (C_{t+1} + G(S_{t+1}, C_{t+1}))) \geq K(\gamma (C_{t+1} + G'(S_{t+1}, C_{t+1}))).$$

From Lemma 29 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} C_t + G_{\text{lookahead}}(S_t, C_t) &= \gamma (C_{t+1} + G(S_{t+1}, C_{t+1})), \\ C_t + G'_{\text{lookahead}}(S_t, C_t) &= \gamma (C_{t+1} + G'(S_{t+1}, C_{t+1})), \end{aligned}$$

so it follows that

$$K(C_t + G_{\text{lookahead}}(S_t, C_t)) \geq K(C_t + G'_{\text{lookahead}}(S_t, C_t)). \quad \blacksquare$$

B.5 Convergence

Definition 30 (Lipschitz Continuity for Objective Functionals) We say $F : (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}$ is L -Lipschitz (or Lipschitz, for simplicity) if there exists $L \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\sup_{\substack{\eta, \eta': \\ \bar{w}(\eta) < \infty \\ \bar{w}(\eta') < \infty \\ \bar{w}(\eta, \eta') > 0}} \frac{\|F\eta - F\eta'\|_\infty}{\bar{w}(\eta, \eta')} \leq L.$$

L is the Lipschitz constant of F .

Proposition 31 Given $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, F_K is L -Lipschitz iff K is L -Lipschitz.

Proof Note that for every $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\nu, \nu' \in (\mathcal{D}, w)$, with $G \sim \nu$ and $G' \sim \nu'$, we have $w(\text{df}(c + G), \text{df}(c + G')) = w(\nu, \nu')$. If F_K is L -Lipschitz, then

$$\begin{aligned} L &\geq \sup_{\substack{\eta, \eta': \\ \bar{w}(\eta) < \infty \\ \bar{w}(\eta') < \infty \\ \bar{w}(\eta, \eta') > 0}} \frac{\|F\eta - F\eta'\|_\infty}{\bar{w}(\eta, \eta')} \\ &\geq \sup_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \sup_{\substack{\nu, \nu': \\ w(\nu) < \infty \\ w(\nu') < \infty \\ w(\nu, \nu') > 0}} \frac{|K(c + G) - K(c + G')|}{w(\text{df}(c + G), \text{df}(c + G'))} && (G \sim \nu, G' \sim \nu') \\ &= \sup_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \sup_{\substack{\nu, \nu': \\ w(\nu) < \infty \\ w(\nu') < \infty \\ w(\nu, \nu') > 0}} \frac{|K(c + G) - K(c + G')|}{w(\nu, \nu')} \\ &= \sup_{\substack{\nu, \nu': \\ w(\nu) < \infty \\ w(\nu') < \infty \\ w(\nu, \nu') > 0}} \frac{|K\nu - K\nu'|}{w(\nu, \nu')}, && (\text{b} = 0) \end{aligned}$$

so K is L -Lipschitz.

If K is L -Lipschitz, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sup_{\substack{\eta, \eta': \\ \bar{w}(\eta) < \infty \\ \bar{w}(\eta') < \infty \\ \bar{w}(\eta, \eta') > 0}} \frac{\|F\eta - F\eta'\|_\infty}{\bar{w}(\eta, \eta')} \\
 & \sup_{\substack{\eta, \eta': \\ \bar{w}(\eta) < \infty \\ \bar{w}(\eta') < \infty \\ \bar{w}(\eta, \eta') > 0}} \sup_{(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}} \frac{|K(c + G(s, c)) - K(c + G'(s, c))|}{\bar{w}(\eta, \eta')} \quad (G(s, c) \sim \eta(s, c), G'(s, c) \sim \eta'(s, c)) \\
 & \leq L \cdot \sup_{\substack{\eta, \eta': \\ \bar{w}(\eta) < \infty \\ \bar{w}(\eta') < \infty \\ \bar{w}(\eta, \eta') > 0}} \sup_{(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}} \frac{w(\eta(s, c), \eta'(s, c))}{\bar{w}(\eta, \eta')} \\
 & = L
 \end{aligned}$$

so F_K is L -Lipschitz. ■

Proposition 32 *If $F : (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}$ is Lipschitz and the sequence $\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}}, \bar{w})$ converges in \bar{w} to some η_∞ , then $F\eta_1, F\eta_2, \dots \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}}$ converges in supremum norm to $F\eta_\infty$.*

Proof If $\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}}, \bar{w})$ converges in \bar{w} to some η_∞ and L is the Lipschitz constant of F , then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|F\eta_n - F\eta_\infty\|_\infty \leq L \cdot \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{w}(\eta_n, \eta_\infty) = 0,$$

which gives the result. ■

The convergence highlighted in Proposition 32 is somewhat surprising: If we consider $K\nu = \mathbb{E}(G)$ ($G \sim \nu$), we have

$$\|F_K \delta_0\|_\infty = \sup_{c \in \mathcal{C}} |K \text{df}(c + 0)| = \sup_{c \in \mathcal{C}} |c| = \infty,$$

so these objective functionals may have unbounded supremum norm. However, the difference of the objective functionals for $\eta, \eta' \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}}, \bar{w})$ (namely, $F\eta - F\eta'$) does have bounded supremum norm when F is Lipschitz, and we can show convergence of $F\eta_n$ to $F\eta_\infty$.

Lemma 33 *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , and the MDP is finite-horizon or $\gamma < 1$ and K is Lipschitz, then for all $\eta \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\mathbb{H}}} F_K \eta^\pi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} F_K T_{\pi_n} \cdots T_{\pi_1} \eta. \quad (22)$$

If $\gamma < 1$ and K is L -Lipschitz, then for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} F_K \eta^\pi \leq \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} F_K T_{\pi_n} \cdots T_{\pi_1} \eta + L\gamma^n \cdot \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} \bar{w}(\eta, \eta^{\pi'}). \quad (23)$$

Proof Proposition 24 establishes that K indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ implies

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} F_K \eta^\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} F_K \eta^\pi,$$

so for the rest of the proof we consider the supremum over Markov policies. We write $F = F_K$ for the rest of the proof.

If the MDP is finite horizon, then for all $\eta \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} F \eta^\pi = \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} F T_{\pi_n} \cdots T_{\pi_1} \eta,$$

where n is the horizon of the MDP.

Otherwise, assume that $\gamma < 1$ and assume that K is L -Lipschitz. Then F is also L -Lipschitz, by Proposition 31. By the triangle inequality, the fact that $\eta \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ and Assumption 1 we have

$$\sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} \bar{w}(\eta, \eta^{\pi'}) \leq \bar{w}(\eta) + \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} \bar{w}(\eta^{\pi'}) < \infty,$$

so Eq. (23) implies Eq. (22) in limit $n \rightarrow \infty$.

It remains to prove Eq. (23). Let

$$g_{s,c}(n) \doteq \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} (F T_{\pi_n} \cdots T_{\pi_1} \eta)(s, c) - \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} (F \eta^\pi)(s, c)$$

and

$$h(n) \doteq \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} \|F T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta - F T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta^{\pi'}\|_\infty.$$

We will show that, for all $n \geq 0$ and $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$|g_{s,c}(n)| \leq h(n) \leq L\gamma^n \cdot \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} \bar{w}(\eta, \eta^{\pi'}).$$

For all $n \geq 0$ and $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{s,c}(n) &= \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} (F \eta^{\pi'})(s, c) - \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} (F T_{\pi_n} \cdots T_{\pi_1} \eta)(s, c) \\ &= \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} \inf_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \left((F \eta^{\pi'})(s, c) - (F T_{\pi_n} \cdots T_{\pi_1} \eta)(s, c) \right) \\ &= \sup_{\pi'_1, \dots, \pi'_n \in \Pi} \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} \inf_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \left((F T_{\pi'_1} \cdots T_{\pi'_n} \eta^{\pi'})(s, c) - (F T_{\pi_n} \cdots T_{\pi_1} \eta)(s, c) \right) \\ &\hspace{15em} (\pi' \text{ is non-stationary}) \\ &\leq \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} \left((F T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta^{\pi'})(s, c) - (F T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta)(s, c) \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} \left| (F T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta^{\pi'})(s, c) - (F T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta)(s, c) \right| \\ &= \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_{\text{M}}} \|F T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta^{\pi'} - F T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta\|_\infty \\ &= h(n). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 -g_{s,c}(n) &= \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} (FT_{\pi_n} \cdots T_{\pi_1} \eta)(s, c) - \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_M} (F\eta^{\pi'})(s, c) \\
 &= \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \inf_{\pi' \in \Pi_M} \left((FT_{\pi_n} \cdots T_{\pi_1} \eta)(s, c) - (F\eta^{\pi'})(s, c) \right) \\
 &= \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \inf_{\pi'_1, \dots, \pi'_n \in \Pi} \inf_{\pi' \in \Pi_M} \left((FT_{\pi_n} \cdots T_{\pi_1} \eta)(s, c) - (FT_{\pi'_1} \cdots T_{\pi'_n} \eta^{\pi'})(s, c) \right) \\
 &\hspace{20em} (\pi' \text{ is non-stationary}) \\
 &\leq \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_M} \left((FT_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta)(s, c) - (FT_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta^{\pi'})(s, c) \right) \\
 &\leq \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_M} \left| (FT_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta)(s, c) - FT_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta^{\pi'}(s, c) \right| \\
 &\leq \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_M} \|FT_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta - FT_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta^{\pi'}\|_\infty \\
 &= h(n)
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$-h(n) \leq g_{s,c}(n) \leq h(n),$$

which means

$$|g_{s,c}(n)| \leq h(n).$$

Finally, for all $n \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 h(n) &= \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_M} \|FT_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta - FT_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta^{\pi'}\|_\infty \\
 &\leq L \cdot \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_M} \bar{w}(T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta, T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta^{\pi'}) \quad (F \text{ is } L\text{-Lipschitz}) \\
 &\leq L\gamma^n \cdot \sup_{\pi' \in \Pi_M} \bar{w}(\eta, \eta^{\pi'}). \quad (\gamma\text{-contraction}) \quad \blacksquare
 \end{aligned}$$

B.6 Distributional Dynamic Programming

Theorem 6 (Distributional Value Iteration) *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , then for every $\eta_0 \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$, if the iterates η_1, η_2, \dots satisfy (for $n \geq 0$)*

$$F_K \eta_{n+1} = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F_K T_\pi \eta_n, \quad (\text{Distributional Value Iterates})$$

and the policies $\bar{\pi}_0, \dots, \bar{\pi}_n$ satisfy (for $n \geq 0$),

$$F_K T_{\bar{\pi}_n} \eta_n = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F_K T_\pi \eta_n, \quad (\text{Greedy Policies})$$

then the following holds.

If the MDP is finite-horizon, then for all n greater or equal to the horizon of the MDP,

$$F_K \eta_n = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi, \quad (8)$$

and

$$F_K \eta^{\bar{\pi}^n} = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi. \quad (9)$$

If $\gamma < 1$ and K is L -Lipschitz, then for all $n \geq 0$

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi - F_K \eta_n \leq L\gamma^n \cdot \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_M} \bar{w}(\eta_0, \eta^\pi), \quad (10)$$

and

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi - F_K \eta^{\bar{\pi}^n} \leq L\gamma^n \cdot \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \bar{w}(T_\pi \eta_0, \eta_0) + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_M} \bar{w}(\eta_0, \eta^\pi) \right). \quad (11)$$

Proof We use $F = F_K$ and note that if K L -Lipschitz then F is also L -Lipschitz (by Proposition 31. Fix $\eta_0 \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ and let $\eta_n \doteq T_*^n \eta_0$ for $n \geq 1$.

The sequence $\bar{\pi}_0, \bar{\pi}_1, \bar{\pi}_2, \dots$ satisfies $F\eta_{n+1} = FT_{\bar{\pi}_n} \eta_n = FT_* \eta_n$ for all $n \geq 0$. The definition of a distributional max operator (Definition 27) gives us

$$FT_* \eta = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} FT_\pi \eta,$$

and, by monotonicity (Lemma 14) and induction, we have for every $n \geq 1$

$$FT_*^{n+1} \eta_0 = FT_{\bar{\pi}_n} \cdots T_{\bar{\pi}_0} \eta_0 = \sup_{\pi_0, \dots, \pi_n \in \Pi} FT_{\pi_n} \cdots T_{\pi_0} \eta_0. \quad (24)$$

Then Eqs. (8) and (10) follow from Lemma 33.

Equation (9) follows from Eq. (8) combined with distributional policy improvement (Lemma 15).

It remains to prove Eq. (11). We start by bounding the following quantity, for $n, k \geq 0$:

$$\|FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k \eta_{n+1} - FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k \eta_n\|_\infty.$$

For all $n, k \geq 0$ and $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k \eta_{n+1})(s, c) - (FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k \eta_n)(s, c) \\ &= (FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k T_*^n \eta_1)(s, c) - (FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k T_*^n \eta_0)(s, c) \\ &= \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n} (FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta_1)(s, c) - \sup_{\pi'_1, \dots, \pi'_n} (FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k T_{\pi'_1} \cdots T_{\pi'_n} \eta_0)(s, c) \\ &\leq \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n} \left((FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta_1)(s, c) - (FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta_0)(s, c) \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n} \left\| FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta_1 - FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta_0 \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq L \cdot \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n} \bar{w}(T_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta_1, T_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_n} \eta_0) \quad (F \text{ } L\text{-Lipschitz}) \\ &\leq L\gamma^{n+k} \bar{w}(\eta_1, \eta_0) \quad (\gamma\text{-contraction}) \end{aligned}$$

and by a symmetric argument it also holds that for all $n, k \geq 0$ and $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$

$$(FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k \eta_{n+1})(s, c) - (FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k \eta_n)(s, c) \geq -L\gamma^{n+k}\bar{w}(\eta_1, \eta_0).$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \|FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k \eta_{n+1} - FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k \eta_n\|_\infty &\leq L\gamma^{n+k}\bar{w}(\eta_1, \eta_0) \\ &\leq L\gamma^{n+k} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \bar{w}(T_\pi \eta_0, \eta_0) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Recall that $\bar{\pi}_n$ realizes $T_*\eta_n$, so $T_{\bar{\pi}_n}\eta_n = \eta_{n+1}$. Then, for all $n \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\eta^{\bar{\pi}_n} - F\eta_n\|_\infty &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^{k+1}\eta_n - FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k\eta_n\|_\infty \quad (\text{telescoping and triangle inequality}) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k\eta_{n+1} - FT_{\bar{\pi}_n}^k\eta_n\|_\infty \quad (T_{\bar{\pi}_n}\eta_n = \eta_{n+1}) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} L\gamma^{n+k} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \bar{w}(T_\pi \eta_0, \eta_0) \quad (\text{Eq. (25)}) \\ &= \frac{L\gamma^n}{1-\gamma} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \bar{w}(T_\pi \eta_0, \eta_0). \end{aligned}$$

We have already established (in Eq. (10)) that

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F\eta^\pi - F\eta_n \leq L\gamma^n \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_M} \bar{w}(\eta_0, \eta^\pi),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F\eta^\pi - F\eta^{\bar{\pi}_n} &= \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F\eta^\pi - F\eta_n + F\eta_n - F\eta^{\bar{\pi}_n} \\ &\leq L\gamma^n \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_M} \bar{w}(\eta, \eta^\pi) + \frac{L\gamma^n}{1-\gamma} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \bar{w}(T_\pi \eta_0, \eta_0), \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

A surprising technical detail about Theorem 6 is that distributional value iteration “works” (and $F\eta_n$ converges) under the given conditions, even though:

- T_* may not be a γ -contraction when $\gamma < 1$,
- T_* may not have a fixed point (for example, if there are ties between policies that realize T_*),
- η_n may not converge (depending how ties are broken when selecting policies to realize T_*).
- it is unclear whether an optimal return distribution exists, that is, η^* such that $F\eta^* = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F\eta^\pi$.

We can use the basic ideas from Theorem 6 to that distributional policy iteration also works under the same conditions as distributional value iteration.

Theorem 8 (Distributional Policy Iteration) *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , for every non-stationary policy π_0 if the iterates π_1, π_2, \dots satisfy (for $n \geq 0$)*

$$F_K T_{\pi_{n+1}} \eta^{\pi_n} = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F_K T_{\pi} \eta^{\pi_n} \quad (\text{Distributional Policy Iterates})$$

then the following holds.

If the MDP is finite-horizon, then for all n greater or equal to the horizon of the MDP,

$$F_K \eta^{\pi_n} = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^{\pi}. \quad (12)$$

If $\gamma < 1$ and K is L -Lipschitz, then for all $n \geq 0$

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^{\pi} - F_K \eta^{\pi_n} \leq L \gamma^n \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_M} \bar{w}(\eta^{\pi_0}, \eta^{\pi}), \quad (13)$$

Proof We use $F = F_K$. For any $n \geq 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} F \eta^{\pi_{n+1}} &= F T_{\pi_{n+1}} \eta^{\pi_{n+1}} && (\text{distributional Bellman equation}) \\ &\geq F T_{\pi_{n+1}} \eta^{\pi_n} && (\text{Lemmas 14 and 15}) \\ &= F T_{\pi_{n+1}} \eta^{\pi_n} && (\text{definition of } \pi_{n+1} \text{ and Definition 27}) \\ &\geq F T_{\pi_{n+1}} \eta^{\pi_0} && (\text{induction}) \\ &= \sup_{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n+1} \in \Pi} F T_{\pi_1} \cdots T_{\pi_{n+1}} \eta^{\pi_0}. && (\text{Definition 27}) \end{aligned}$$

Then both Eqs. (12) and (13) follow by combining the above with Lemma 33. \blacksquare

Theorem 7 (Greedy Optimality) *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , if there exists a policy (possibly non-stationary) that attains*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F_K \eta^{\pi},$$

and if the MDP is finite-horizon or $\gamma < 1$ and F_K is Lipschitz, then

$$F_K \eta^* = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} F_K T_{\pi} \eta^*,$$

and any policy that realizes the supremum on the right-hand side above (namely, a greedy policy with respect to η^*) is an optimal policy π^* satisfying

$$F_K \eta^{\pi^*} = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^{\pi}.$$

Proof We write $F = F_K$. Under the assumption that the supremum is attained, we can let $\eta^* \in (\mathcal{D}^{S \times C}, \bar{w})$ be the return distribution of a policy that attains the supremum. Then

$$F\eta^* = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F\eta^\pi.$$

For every policy $\pi \in \Pi_H$, we have

$$F\eta^* \geq F\eta^\pi,$$

so by monotonicity (Lemma 14), we also have, for all $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$,

$$FT_{\bar{\pi}}\eta^* \geq FT_{\bar{\pi}}\eta^\pi,$$

so, for all $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$,

$$FT_{\bar{\pi}}\eta^* \geq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} FT_{\bar{\pi}}\eta^\pi.$$

and thus

$$FT_*\eta^* = \sup_{\bar{\pi} \in \Pi} FT_{\bar{\pi}}\eta^* \geq \sup_{\bar{\pi} \in \Pi} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} FT_{\bar{\pi}}\eta^\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F\eta^\pi.$$

Now, let π^* be greedy with respect to η^* . Then

$$FT_{\pi^*}\eta^* = FT_*\eta^* = F\eta^* = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F\eta^\pi.$$

Moreover, we have, for all $n \geq 0$,

$$FT_{\pi^*}^n\eta^* = F\eta^*,$$

but we know by Lemma 26 that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{\pi^*}^n\eta^* = \eta^{\pi^*},$$

so

$$F\eta^{\pi^*} = F\eta^* = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F\eta^\pi. \quad \blacksquare$$

Appendix C. Analysis of the Conditions for Distributional Dynamic Programming

C.1 Proofs

Lemma 12 (Conditions for Expected Utilities) *Let U_f be an expected utility, which is an objective functional F_K with $K\nu = \mathbb{E}f(G)$ ($G \sim \nu$). Then the following holds:*

1. K is indifferent to mixtures.
2. K is indifferent to γ iff f is indifferent to γ .
3. K is Lipschitz iff f is Lipschitz.

Proof Items 1 and 2 follow essentially from the tower rule. Letting $G(s, c) \sim \eta(s, c)$ and $G'(s, c) \sim \eta'(s, c)$, we have $K(G(S, C)) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(K(G(S, C))|S, C))$. If $K\eta \geq K\eta'$, then

$$\begin{aligned} K(G(S, C)) &= \mathbb{E}f(G(S, C)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(f(G(S, C))|S, C)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(K(G(S, C))|S, C)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(K'(G(S, C))|S, C)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(f(G'(S, C))|S, C)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}f(G'(S, C)) \\ &= K(G'(S, C)), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for showing that if f is indifferent to γ then U_f is also indifferent to γ . If f is not indifferent to γ for some x, x' , then U_f cannot be indifferent to γ for $\delta_x, \delta_{x'}$.

For Item 3, we proceed as follows: If K is L -Lipschitz, then

$$L = \sup_{\substack{\nu, \nu': \\ w(\nu) < \infty \\ w(\nu') < \infty \\ w(\nu, \nu') > 0}} \frac{|K\nu - K\nu'|}{w(\nu, \nu')} \geq \sup_{x \neq x'} \frac{|f(x) - f(x')|}{w(\delta_x, \delta_{x'})} = \sup_{x \neq x'} \frac{|f(x) - f(x')|}{\|x - x'\|_1},$$

which means f is L -Lipschitz. If f is L -Lipschitz, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\substack{\nu, \nu': \\ w(\nu) < \infty \\ w(\nu') < \infty \\ w(\nu, \nu') > 0}} \frac{|K\nu - K\nu'|}{w(\nu, \nu')} &= \sup_{\substack{\nu, \nu': \\ w(\nu) < \infty \\ w(\nu') < \infty \\ w(\nu, \nu') > 0}} \frac{|\mathbb{E}f(G) - \mathbb{E}f(G')|}{w(\nu, \nu')} && (G \sim \nu, G' \sim \nu') \\ &= \sup_{\substack{\nu, \nu': \\ w(\nu) < \infty \\ w(\nu') < \infty \\ w(\nu, \nu') > 0}} \frac{1}{w(\nu, \nu')} \inf \{ |\mathbb{E}f(X) - \mathbb{E}f(X')| : \text{df}(X) = \nu, \text{df}(X') = \nu' \} \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{\nu, \nu': \\ w(\nu) < \infty \\ w(\nu') < \infty \\ w(\nu, \nu') > 0}} \frac{1}{w(\nu, \nu')} \inf \{ \mathbb{E}|f(X) - f(X')| : \text{df}(X) = \nu, \text{df}(X') = \nu' \} \\ &\leq L \cdot \sup_{\substack{\nu, \nu': \\ w(\nu) < \infty \\ w(\nu') < \infty \\ w(\nu, \nu') > 0}} \frac{1}{w(\nu, \nu')} \inf \{ \|X - X'\|_1 : \text{df}(X) = \nu, \text{df}(X') = \nu' \} \\ &= L, \end{aligned}$$

which means K is L -Lipschitz. ■

To get a better understanding of the limits of distributional DP, it is useful to inspect the necessary conditions for it to work. In the absence of indifference to mixtures or indifference

to γ we can construct MDPs where greedy optimality (Theorem 7) fails due to a lack of monotonicity:

Proposition 13 *If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is not indifferent to mixtures or not indifferent to γ , then there exists an MDP, an $\eta^* \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{w})$ and a $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$ such that $\bar{\pi}$ is greedy with respect to η^* and*

$$F_K \eta^* = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi,$$

however, for some $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$

$$F_K \eta^{\bar{\pi}}(s, c) < \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} F_K \eta^\pi(s, c).$$

Proof Case 1: *F_K is not indifferent to mixtures.* For $\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots \in \mathcal{D}$ with $\sup_n w(\nu_n) < \infty$ and $\lambda \in \Delta(\mathbb{N})$, we write $\nu_\lambda = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_i \nu_i$ to denote the λ -mixture of the distributions $(\nu_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$.

Consider ν_1, ν_2, \dots and ν'_1, ν'_2, \dots and a mixture distribution $\lambda \in \Delta(\mathbb{N})$ for which $K\nu_n \geq K\nu'_n$ for all $n \geq 1$, but $K\nu_\lambda < K\nu'_\lambda$, and consider an MDP with $\mathcal{S} = \{\text{init}, \text{term}\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{a, a'\}$ as follows: State term is terminal, and each state $n \in \mathbb{N}$ transitions to term with either action, but with reward distributed according to ν_n for a and ν'_n for a' . The initial state is init, which transitions with either a or a' to state N where $N \sim \lambda$, with zero rewards. This MDP has horizon 2.

There is an optimal non-stationary policy, corresponding to $\pi_1^* \pi_2^*$, where, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\pi_1^*(n, 0) \doteq a$ and $\pi_2^*(n, 0) \doteq a'$. Let η^* be the return distribution function for this policy. The policy $\bar{\pi}$ that selects a always is greedy with respect to η^* , however

$$K\eta^{\bar{\pi}}(\text{init}, 0) = K\nu_\lambda < K\nu'_\lambda = K\eta^*(\text{init}, 0),$$

which proves the result.

Case 2: *F_K is not indifferent to γ .* Consider ν, ν' for which $K\nu \geq K\nu'$ but $K(\gamma G) < K(\gamma G')$, with $G \sim \nu, G' \sim \nu'$.

and consider an MDP with $\mathcal{S} = \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{a, a'\}$ as follows: State 0 is initial, state 2 terminal, state 0 transitions to state 1 with either action and zero rewards, state 1 transitions to state 2 with either action, but with reward distributed according to ν for a and ν' for a' . This MDP has horizon 2.

There is an optimal non-stationary policy, corresponding to $\pi_1^* \pi_2^*$, where $\pi_1^*(1, 0) \doteq a$ and $\pi_2^*(1, 0) \doteq a'$. Let η^* be the return distribution function for this policy. The policy $\bar{\pi}$ that selects a always is greedy with respect to η^* , however

$$K\eta^{\bar{\pi}}(0, 0) = K(\gamma G) < K(\gamma G') = K\eta^*(0, 0),$$

which proves the result. ■

C.2 Exploring Lipschitz Continuity

We can use the examples in the second part of Table 1 to motivate why we may need Lipschitz continuity in the infinite-horizon setting. Neither $f(x) = \mathbb{I}(x > 0)$ nor $f(x) = -x^2$

are Lipschitz. $f(x) = \mathbb{I}(x > 0)$ is also not continuous, and it is informative to first consider how the lack of continuity can break distributional value/policy iteration.

Consider, by means of a counter-example, a single-state MDP with two actions $\{a_0, a_1\}$, $\gamma < 1$, and $r(a_i) = i$. The objective functional is U_f with $f(x) = \mathbb{I}(x > 0)$. Let π_i be the policy that always selects a_i . The return of π_i is deterministic and equal to $(1 - \gamma)^{-1}i$. The policy π_1 and its return distribution η^{π_1} are optimal. The following is a valid greedy policy with respect to η^{π_1} :

$$\bar{\pi}(c) = \begin{cases} a_0 & c + (1 - \gamma)^{-1}\gamma > 0 \\ a_1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

When starting from the stock $c = 0$, taking $\bar{\pi}$ for k steps followed by π_1 yields a return of $(1 - \gamma)^{-1}\gamma^k > 0$ (since the first k actions are a_0). We know that the sequence $T_{\bar{\pi}}^1\eta^{\pi_1}, T_{\bar{\pi}}^2\eta^{\pi_1}, \dots$ converges in supremum 1-Wasserstein distance to $T_{\bar{\pi}}^\infty\eta^{\pi_1} = \eta^{\bar{\pi}}$ (see Lemma 26). We also have that, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(U_f T_{\bar{\pi}}^k \eta^{\pi_1})(0) = 1$ and $(U_f \eta^{\pi_1})(0) = 1$, so $(U_f T_{\bar{\pi}}^k \eta^{\pi_1})(0) \geq (U_f \eta^{\pi_1})(0)$. However, the inequality fails in the limit: $(U_f T_{\bar{\pi}}^\infty \eta^{\pi_1})(0) = (U_f \eta^{\bar{\pi}})(0) = 0$, whereas $(U_f \eta^{\pi_1})(0) = 1$. For this reason, if π_0 is the chosen greedy policy with respect to η_1^π , then policy improvement (Lemma 15) fails, greedy optimality (Theorem 7) fails, distributional value iteration starting from $\eta^* = \eta^{\pi_1}$ fails, and distributional policy iteration starting from $\pi^* = \pi_1$ fails.

It is less clear how to design a counter-example when f is continuous but not Lipschitz, however we can show a case where basic ‘‘evaluation’’ fails. Considering $f(x) = -x^2$, which is continuous but not Lipschitz, and the trivial MDP where $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R}$ and all rewards are zero. Consider the function $\eta_0 \doteq (s, c) \mapsto \delta_1$. This is not a value function in the MDP (no policy satisfies $\eta^\pi = \eta_0$), but we may want to use it for bootstrapping in distributional value iteration. In this particular MDP, T_* with $\gamma < 1$ is a contraction, since $\bar{w}(T_*\eta, T_*\eta') \leq \gamma\bar{w}(\eta, \eta')$, and the sequence η_1, η_2, \dots where $\eta_{n+1} = T_*\eta_n$ for $n \geq 0$ is Cauchy with respect to \bar{w} , since $\bar{w}(\eta_n, \eta_{n+k}) = \gamma^n(1 - \gamma^k)$ for all $n, k \geq 0$. Therefore η_n converges to $\eta_\infty = (s, c) \mapsto \delta_0$. However, letting $G_n(s, c) \sim \eta_n(s, c)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_f\eta_n - U_f\eta_{n+k}\|_\infty &= \sup_{s \in \mathcal{S}, c \in \mathcal{C}} |\mathbb{E}f(c + G_n(s, c)) - \mathbb{E}f(c + G_{n+k}(s, c))| \\ &= \sup_{c \in \mathcal{C}} |(c + \gamma^n)^2 - (c + \gamma^{n+k})^2| \\ &= \sup_{c \in \mathcal{C}} |(2c + \gamma^n + \gamma^{n+k})(\gamma^n - \gamma^{n+k})| \\ &= \sup_{c \in \mathcal{C}} |(2c + \gamma^n + \gamma^{n+k})| \cdot \gamma^n \cdot (1 - \gamma^k) \\ &= \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which means the sequence $U_f\eta_n$ does not converge uniformly to $U_f\eta_\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We have not been able to translate this failure of convergence to a failure of distributional value/policy iteration, so, as we stated earlier, it is unclear exactly what kind of convergence-related property of F_K is necessary for distributional DP to work in the infinite-horizon discounted case.

Appendix D. Proofs for Section 5.2

To prove Theorem 16, we follow the strategy used by [Bäuerle and Ott \(2011\)](#), where we reduce τ -CVaR optimization to solving the stock-augmented return distribution optimization problem with the expected utility U_f and $f(x) = (x)_-$, but where the starting stock c_0 must be chosen in a specific way as a function of s_0 . We use notation from Appendix B.1 to make it clear when a supremum is over the set of history-based policies, Π_H , but we use the convention that if the supremum is unqualified it is over the set of Markov policies $\pi \in \Pi_M$.

We start with a reduction of the τ -CVaR to an optimization problem, as shown in previous work, and some intermediate results.

Theorem 34 ([Rockafellar et al., 2000](#)) *For all $\nu \in (\Delta(\mathbb{R}), w)$ and $\tau \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\text{CVaR}(\nu, \tau) = \max_c \left(c + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(G - c)_- \right), \quad (G \sim \nu)$$

and the maximum is attained at $\text{QF}_\nu(\tau)$.

Proposition 35 *For all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the function $c \mapsto -c + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s, c))_-$ is 1-Lipschitz.*

Proof Fix $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and let

$$g(c) \doteq -c + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s, c))_-.$$

For $\varepsilon \geq 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s, c))_- &\leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + \varepsilon + G^\pi(s, c))_- && ((x + \varepsilon)_- \geq (x)_-) \\ &= \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + \varepsilon + G^\pi(s, c + \varepsilon))_-, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by noticing that the value in the stock augmentation does not change the supremum over history-based policies.

We can apply the same reasoning to see that

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c - \varepsilon + G^\pi(s, c - \varepsilon))_- \leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c - \varepsilon + \varepsilon + G^\pi(s, c - \varepsilon + \varepsilon))_- = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s, c))_-.$$

Thus for every $\varepsilon \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} g(c - \varepsilon) &= -(c - \varepsilon) + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c - \varepsilon + G^\pi(s, c - \varepsilon))_- \\ &\leq -c + \varepsilon + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s, c))_- \\ &= g(c) + \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 g(c + \varepsilon) &= -(c + \varepsilon) + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + \varepsilon + G^\pi(s, c + \varepsilon))_- \\
 &\geq -c - \varepsilon + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s, c))_- \\
 &= g(c) - \varepsilon,
 \end{aligned}$$

That is:

$$g(c - \varepsilon) - \varepsilon \leq g(c) \leq g(c + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon \quad (26)$$

Thus, for $c, c' \in \mathbb{R}$, letting $c_{\max} = \max\{c, c'\}$ and $c_{\min} = \min\{c, c'\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 -(c_{\max} - c_{\min}) &\leq g(c_{\max}) - g(c_{\max} - (c_{\max} - c_{\min})) \quad (\text{Eq. (26) with } \varepsilon = c_{\max} - c_{\min}) \\
 &= g(c_{\max}) - g(c_{\min}) \\
 &= g(c_{\max}) - g(c_{\min} + (c_{\max} - c_{\min})) \\
 &\leq c_{\max} - c_{\min}, \quad (\text{Eq. (26) with } \varepsilon = c_{\max} - c_{\min})
 \end{aligned}$$

so

$$|g(c) - g(c')| = |g(c_{\max}) - g(c_{\min})| \leq |c_{\max} - c_{\min}| = |c - c'|,$$

which means g is 1-Lipschitz. ■

Theorem 16 (Adapted from Bäuerle and Ott, 2011) For every $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{CVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) = -c_0^* + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0^* + G^\pi(s_0, c_0^*))_-,$$

where c_0^* is the solution of

$$\max_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_- \right). \quad (15)$$

Proof By Theorem 34, for all $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \text{CVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0), \tau) &= \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \max_{c_0} \left(c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(G^\pi(s_0) - c_0)_- \right) \\
 &= \sup_{c_0} \left(c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(G^\pi(s_0) - c_0)_- \right) \\
 &= \sup_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0))_- \right) \\
 &= \sup_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_- \right) \quad (\text{Proposition 24})
 \end{aligned}$$

It only remains to show that for all $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ there exists c_0^* that realizes the supremum over c_0 . Note that by Assumption 1, we have

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(G^\pi(s_0, c)) < \infty. \quad (27)$$

For all $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{c_0 \rightarrow -\infty} -c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_- \\ & \leq \lim_{c_0 \rightarrow -\infty} -c_0 \\ & = -\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{Eq. (27)})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{c_0 \rightarrow -\infty} -c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_- \\ & = \lim_{c_0 \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{1-\tau}{\tau} c_0 + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(G^\pi(s_0, c_0)) - \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \\ & \leq \lim_{c_0 \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{1-\tau}{\tau} c_0 + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(G^\pi(s_0, c)) \\ & = -\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{Eq. (27)})$$

Therefore there exist $c_{\min}, c_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_- \right) \\ & = \sup_{c_{\min} \leq c_0 \leq c_{\max}} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_- \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, Proposition 35 implies $c \mapsto -c + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s_0, c))_-$ is continuous. Therefore the supremum over c_0 is attained at a maximizer $c_0^* \in \mathbb{R}$. \blacksquare

Theorem 17 *For every $\tau \in (0, 1)$, $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a stationary policy $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$ (obtainable through distributional DP) and a \bar{c}_0^* (obtainable through grid search) such that*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{CVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) - \text{CVaR}(\eta^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, \bar{c}_0^*), \tau) \leq 4\varepsilon.$$

In particular, $\bar{\pi}$ satisfies (for $f(x) = (x)_-$)

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} U_f \eta^\pi - U_f \eta^{\bar{\pi}} \leq \varepsilon,$$

and

$$\bar{c}_0^* = \arg \max_{c_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_- \right), \quad (16)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{C}} \doteq \{c_{\min} + i\varepsilon : i \in \mathbb{N}_0, c_{\min} + i\varepsilon \leq c_{\max}\}$ and c_{\min} and c_{\max} are chosen so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_- \right) \\ &= \max_{c_{\min} \leq c_0 \leq c_{\max}} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_- \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof Let us fix τ , $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $f(x) = (x)_-$, and define

$$g(c_0) \doteq -c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\pi}(s_0, c_0))_-.$$

Bäuerle and Ott (2011) (Theorem 16) established that

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{CVaR}(\eta^{\pi}(s_0, c_0), \tau) = \sup_{c_0} g(c_0).$$

By using distributional DP (Theorems 6 and 8), we can find a near-optimal policy for optimizing U_f , that is a $\bar{\pi}$ satisfying

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} U_f \eta^{\pi} - U_f \eta^{\bar{\pi}} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Let

$$\bar{g}(c_0) \doteq -c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_-.$$

Then, for all $c_0 \in \mathcal{C}$

$$|g(c_0) - \bar{g}(c_0)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, by Proposition 35, g is 1-Lipschitz, so for all $c_0, c'_0 \in \mathcal{C}$

$$|g(c_0) - g(c'_0)| \leq |c_0 - c'_0|,$$

so for all $c_0, c'_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ we have

$$|\bar{g}(c_0) - \bar{g}(c'_0)| \leq |\bar{g}(c_0) - g(c'_0)| + |g(c_0) - g(c'_0)| + |g(c'_0) - \bar{g}(c'_0)| \leq |c_0 - c'_0| + 2\varepsilon.$$

This means that we can choose $c_{\min} \leq c_{\max}$ such that

$$\max_{c_0} \bar{g}(c_0) = \max_{c_{\min} \leq c_0 \leq c_{\max}} \bar{g}(c_0).$$

Define the grid $\bar{\mathcal{C}} \doteq \{c_{\min} + i\varepsilon : i \in \mathbb{N}_0, c_{\min} + i\varepsilon \leq c_{\max}\}$, Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{CVaR}(\eta^{\pi}(s_0, c_0), \tau) &= \sup_{c_0} g(c_0) && \text{(Theorem 16)} \\ &\leq \max_{c_0} \bar{g}(c_0) + \varepsilon \\ &= \max_{c_{\min} \leq c_0 \leq c_{\max}} \bar{g}(c_0) + \varepsilon \\ &\leq \sup_{c_{\min} \leq c_0 \leq c_{\max}} g(c_0) + 2\varepsilon \\ &\leq \max_{c_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}} g(c_0) + 3\varepsilon \\ &\leq \max_{c_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{g}(c_0) + 4\varepsilon \\ &\leq \text{CVaR}(\eta^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, \bar{c}_0^*), \tau) + 4\varepsilon && \text{(Theorem 34)} \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Appendix E. Proofs for Section 5.3

Lemma 36 For all $\nu \in (\Delta(\mathbb{R}), w)$ and $\tau \in (0, 1)$,

$$\text{OCVaR}(\nu, \tau) = \min_c \left(c + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(G - c)_+ \right), \quad (G \sim \nu)$$

and the minimum is attained at $\text{QF}_\nu(\tau)$.

Proof The proof of this result is derived from the proof of Theorem 34 by [Rockafellar et al. \(2000\)](#).

Fix $\nu \in (\Delta(\mathbb{R}), w)$ and $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and let $G \sim \nu$ and

$$g(c) \doteq c + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(G - c)_+.$$

$x \mapsto (x)_+$ is convex, so for $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{E}(G - \alpha c - (1 - \alpha)c')_+ \leq \alpha \mathbb{E}(G - c)_+ + (1 - \alpha) \mathbb{E}(G - c')_+,$$

which means $g(\alpha c + (1 - \alpha)c') \leq \alpha g(c) + (1 - \alpha)g(c')$, that is, g is convex. Moreover,

$$\frac{d}{dc} g = 1 - \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{P}(G \geq c),$$

which means $\text{QF}_\nu(1 - \tau)$ is a minimizer of g . Finally, with $c^* = \text{QF}_\nu(1 - \tau)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_c g(c) &= g(c^*) \\ &= c^* + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(G - c^*)_+ \\ &= c^* + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E} \max\{G - c^*, 0\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\tau} c^* - \frac{1 - \tau}{\tau} c^* + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E} \max\{G - c^*, 0\} \\ &= -\frac{1 - \tau}{\tau} c^* + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E} \max\{G, c^*\} \\ &= -\frac{1 - \tau}{\tau} c^* + \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^1 \max\{\text{QF}_\nu(t), c^*\} dt \\ &= -\frac{1 - \tau}{\tau} c^* + \frac{1 - \tau}{\tau} c^* + \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{1 - \tau}^1 \text{QF}_\nu(t) dt \\ &= \text{OCVaR}(\nu, \tau). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 37 For all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the function $c \mapsto -c + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s, c))_+$ is 1-Lipschitz.

Proof This proof is essentially the proof of Proposition 35 with $(x)_+$ instead of $(x)_-$. Fix $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and let

$$g(c) \doteq -c + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s, c))_+.$$

For $\varepsilon \geq 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s, c))_+ &\leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + \varepsilon + G^\pi(s, c))_+ && ((x + \varepsilon)_+ \geq (x)_+) \\ &= \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + \varepsilon + G^\pi(s, c + \varepsilon))_+, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by noticing that the value in the stock augmentation does not change the supremum over history-based policies.

We can apply the same reasoning to see that

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c - \varepsilon + G^\pi(s, c - \varepsilon))_+ \leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c - \varepsilon + \varepsilon + G^\pi(s, c - \varepsilon + \varepsilon))_+ = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s, c))_+.$$

Thus for every $\varepsilon \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} g(c - \varepsilon) &= -(c - \varepsilon) + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c - \varepsilon + G^\pi(s, c - \varepsilon))_+ \\ &\leq -c + \varepsilon + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s, c))_+ \\ &= g(c) + \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} g(c + \varepsilon) &= -(c + \varepsilon) + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + \varepsilon + G^\pi(s, c + \varepsilon))_+ \\ &\geq -c - \varepsilon + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s, c))_- \\ &= g(c) - \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

That is:

$$g(c - \varepsilon) - \varepsilon \leq g(c) \leq g(c + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon \tag{28}$$

Thus, for $c, c' \in \mathbb{R}$, letting $c_{\max} = \max\{c, c'\}$ and $c_{\min} = \min\{c, c'\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -(c_{\max} - c_{\min}) &\leq g(c_{\max}) - g(c_{\max} - (c_{\max} - c_{\min})) && \text{(Eq. (28) with } \varepsilon = c_{\max} - c_{\min}\text{)} \\ &= g(c_{\max}) - g(c_{\min}) \\ &= g(c_{\max}) - g(c_{\min} + (c_{\max} - c_{\min})) \\ &\leq c_{\max} - c_{\min}, && \text{(Eq. (28) with } \varepsilon = c_{\max} - c_{\min}\text{)} \end{aligned}$$

so

$$|g(c) - g(c')| = |g(c_{\max}) - g(c_{\min})| \leq |c_{\max} - c_{\min}| = |c - c'|,$$

which means g is 1-Lipschitz. ■

Theorem 18 For every $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{OCVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) = -c_0^* + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \mathbb{E}(c_0^* + G^\pi(s_0, c_0^*))_+,$$

where c_0^* is the solution of

$$\min_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \right).$$

Proof Fix $\tau, s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, and $f(x) = (x)_+$. By Lemma 36, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{OCVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) \\ &= \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \min_c \left(-c + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \right) \\ &= \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \min_c \left(-c + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s_0, c))_+ \right). \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we use the fact that the choice of c_0 is irrelevant since the supremum is over history-based policies.

For every $\varepsilon > 0$, by using distributional DP (Theorems 6 and 8), we can find a near-optimal policy for optimizing U_f , that is a $\bar{\pi}$ satisfying

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} U_f \eta^\pi - U_f \eta^{\bar{\pi}} < \varepsilon.$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{OCVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) \\ &= \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \min_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \right) \\ &\geq \min_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_+ \right) \\ &> \inf_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \right) - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{OCVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) \\ &= \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \min_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \right) \\ &< \min_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\pi'}(s_0, c_0))_+ \right) + \varepsilon \\ &\leq \inf_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{\text{H}}} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \right) + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Since the above holds for all $\varepsilon > 0$, it means that

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{OCVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) = \inf_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \right).$$

It only remains to show that for all $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ there exists c_0^* that realizes the infimum over c_0 . Note that by Assumption 1, we have

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(G^\pi(s_0, c)) < \infty. \quad (29)$$

For all $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{c_0 \rightarrow -\infty} -c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \\ & \leq \lim_{c_0 \rightarrow -\infty} -c_0 \\ & = \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{Eq. (29)})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{c_0 \rightarrow \infty} -c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \\ & = \lim_{c_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1-\tau}{\tau} c_0 + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(G^\pi(s_0, c_0)) - \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_- \\ & \geq \lim_{c_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1-\tau}{\tau} c_0 + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(G^\pi(s_0, c)) \\ & = \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{Eq. (29)})$$

Therefore there exist $c_{\min}, c_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \right) \\ & = \inf_{c_{\min} \leq c_0 \leq c_{\max}} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^\pi(s_0, c_0))_+ \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, Proposition 37 implies $c \mapsto -c + \frac{1}{\tau} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} \mathbb{E}(c + G^\pi(s_0, c))_+$ is continuous. Therefore the infimum over c_0 is attained at a minimizer $c_0^* \in \mathbb{R}$. \blacksquare

Theorem 19 *For every $\tau \in (0, 1)$, $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a stationary policy $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$ (obtainable through distributional DP) and a \bar{c}_0^* (obtainable through grid search) such that*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H, c_0 \in \mathcal{C}} \text{OCVaR}(\eta^\pi(s_0, c_0), \tau) - \text{OCVaR}(\eta^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, \bar{c}_0^*), \tau) \leq 4\varepsilon.$$

In particular, $\bar{\pi}$ satisfies (for $f(x) = (x)_+$)

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_H} U_f \eta^\pi - U_f \eta^{\bar{\pi}} \leq \varepsilon,$$

and

$$\bar{c}_0^* = \arg \min_{c_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_+ \right),$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{C}} \doteq \{c_{\min} + i\varepsilon : i \in \mathbb{N}_0, c_{\min} + i\varepsilon \leq c_{\max}\}$ and c_{\min} and c_{\max} are chosen so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{c_0} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_+ \right) \\ &= \min_{c_{\min} \leq c_0 \leq c_{\max}} \left(-c_0 + \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}(c_0 + G^{\bar{\pi}}(s_0, c_0))_+ \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof The proof of this result is essentially the same as Theorem 17, except that we use Lemma 36, Proposition 37, and Theorem 18 instead of Theorems 16 and 34 and Proposition 35. \blacksquare

Appendix F. Proofs for Section 5.7

We build on the results by Bowling et al. (2023) to prove Theorem 20, which means that our results rely on connecting stock-augmented return distribution optimization to theory about optimizing expected utilities, namely the von-Neumann-Morgenstern theorem. We start with the four axioms that underpin utilities in von-Neumann-Morgenstern theorem, as well as the theorem itself, which can be found in Bowling et al. (2023).

Axiom 1 (Completeness, adapted from Bowling et al., 2023) For all $\nu, \nu' \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{w})$, $\nu \succeq \nu'$ or $\nu' \succeq \nu$ (or both, if $\nu \simeq \nu'$).

Axiom 2 (Transitivity, adapted from Bowling et al., 2023) For all $\nu, \nu', \nu'' \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{w})$, if $\nu \succeq \nu'$ and $\nu' \succeq \nu''$, then $\nu \succeq \nu''$.

Axiom 3 (Independence, adapted from Bowling et al., 2023) For all $\nu, \nu', \bar{\nu} \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{w})$, $\nu \succeq \nu'$ iff for all $p \in (0, 1)$ $p\nu + (1-p)\bar{\nu} \succeq p\nu' + (1-p)\bar{\nu}$.

Axiom 4 (Continuity, adapted from Bowling et al., 2023) For all $\nu, \nu', \bar{\nu} \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{w})$, if $\nu \succeq \bar{\nu} \succeq \nu'$ then there exists $p \in [0, 1]$ such that $p\nu + (1-p)\nu' \simeq \bar{\nu}$.

Theorem 38 (von Neumann-Morgenstern Utility Theorem) A binary preference relation \succeq on $(\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{w})$ satisfies Axioms 1 to 4 if and only if there exists a utility function $u : (\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

1. for all $\nu, \nu' \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{w})$, $\nu \succeq \nu' \iff u(\nu) \geq u(\nu')$,
2. for all $\nu \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{w})$, $u(\nu) = \mathbb{E}u(G)$ ($G \sim \nu$),
3. u is unique up to positive affine transformations.

Bowling et al. (2023) introduced a fifth axiom, called Temporal Discount Indifference, to connect utility optimization to reinforcement learning. Their temporal discount indifference axiom allows the discount to be transition-dependent, but we are interested in making statements about the RL problem with fixed discount, so we introduce an adaptation, which we refer to as Fixed Discount Indifference.

Axiom 5 (Fixed Discount Indifference) *There exists $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ such that for all $\nu, \nu' \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w})$, with $G \sim \nu$ and $G' \sim \nu'$,*

$$\frac{1}{1+\alpha} \text{df}(\gamma \cdot G) + \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha} \nu' \simeq \frac{1}{1+\alpha} \text{df}(\gamma \cdot G') + \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha} \nu.$$

Our first result is a useful intermediate result.

Proposition 39 *Let \succeq be a relation over $(\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w})$, and let $u : (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a utility function satisfying Theorem 38 Items 1 to 3 and $u(\delta_0) = 0$. Axiom 5 holds iff for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$*

$$\alpha \cdot u(\delta_c) = u(\delta_{\gamma c}). \quad (30)$$

Proof Since u is linear, for $c \in \mathcal{C}$ we write $u(c) = u(\delta_c)$.

Axiom 5 states that there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ such that for all $\nu, \nu' \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w})$, with $G \sim \nu$ and $G' \sim \nu'$,

$$\frac{1}{1+\alpha} \text{df}(\gamma \cdot G) + \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha} \nu' \simeq \frac{1}{1+\alpha} \text{df}(\gamma \cdot G') + \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha} \nu.$$

Since u is equivalent to the preference, the above is equivalent to

$$u\left(\frac{1}{1+\alpha} \text{df}(\gamma \cdot G)\right) + u\left(\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha} \nu'\right) = u\left(\frac{1}{1+\alpha} \text{df}(\gamma \cdot G')\right) + u\left(\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha} \nu\right),$$

and since u is linear, the above is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{1+\alpha} \mathbb{E}u(\gamma \cdot G) + \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha} u(\nu') = \frac{1}{1+\alpha} \mathbb{E}u(\gamma \cdot G') + \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha} u(\nu).$$

Thus, by rearranging the above, Axiom 5 holds iff there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ such that for all $\nu, \nu' \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w})$,

$$\mathbb{E}u(\gamma \cdot G) - \alpha \cdot u(\nu) = \mathbb{E}u(\gamma \cdot G') - \alpha \cdot u(\nu'). \quad (31)$$

Axiom 5 implies Eq. (30) Using Eq. (31) with $\nu = \delta_c$ and $\nu' = \delta_0$ gives

$$u(\gamma c) - \alpha \cdot u(c) = u(0) - \alpha \cdot u(0) = 0,$$

which gives the result.

Equation (30) implies Axiom 5 We have that for all $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$

$$u(\gamma c) - \alpha \cdot u(c) = 0 = u(\gamma c') - \alpha \cdot u(c'),$$

and since this holds “pointwise”, it also holds in expectation (with random C, C'), so Eq. (31) follows. \blacksquare

The next result is an analogue of Theorem 4.1 by Bowling et al. (2023) for the stock-augmented RL problem. Theorem 20, the result presented in the main text, is then a straightforward combination of Proposition 39 and Theorem 40.

Theorem 40 *A binary preference relation on $(\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{w})$ satisfies Axioms 1 to 5 iff there exists a stock-augmented utility $\tilde{u} : (\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{w}) \times (\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a stock-augmented reward function $\tilde{r} : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ such that:*

1. *for all $c, r' \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\nu \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{w})$, $\tilde{u}(\delta_c, \text{df}(r' + \gamma G)) = \tilde{r}(c, r') + \alpha \cdot \tilde{u}(\delta_{\gamma^{-1}(c+r')}, \nu)$ ($G \sim \nu$),*
2. *for all $\nu, \nu' \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{w})$, $\nu \succeq \nu'$ iff $\tilde{u}(0, \nu) \geq \tilde{u}(0, \nu')$,*
3. *for all $\nu, \nu' \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{w})$, $\tilde{u}(\nu, \nu') = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(\tilde{u}(\delta_G, \delta_{G'}) | G, G'))$ ($G \sim \nu, G' \sim \nu'$),*

Proof This proof retraces the steps of the proof of Theorem 4.1 by [Bowling et al., 2023](#).

Axioms 1 to 5 imply Items 1 to 3.

From the von Neumann-Morgenstern theorem (Theorem 38), we know that Axioms 1 to 4 imply the existence of a utility function $u : (\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is equivalent to the preference (Theorem 38 Item 1), linear (Theorem 38 Item 2) and unique up to positive affine transformations (Theorem 38 Item 3).

Since u is linear, for $c \in \mathcal{C}$ we write $u(c) = u(\delta_c)$, and since u is unique up to positive affine transformations, we assume without loss of generality that $u(0) = 0$. We define

$$\tilde{u}(\nu, \nu') \doteq u(\text{df}(G + G')) - u(\nu), \quad (32)$$

with $G \sim \nu$ and $G' \sim \nu'$

Equation (32) and linearity of u imply Item 3. Since \tilde{u} is linear, we will write, for $c \in \mathcal{C}$, $\tilde{u}(c, \nu) = \tilde{u}(\delta_c, \nu)$ and $\tilde{u}(\nu, c) = \tilde{u}(\nu, \delta_c)$.

Item 2 follows from the fact that $\tilde{u}(0, \nu) = u(\nu)$ combined with the equivalence between u and the preference.

It remains for us to prove Item 1. For this, we define the reward function:

$$\tilde{r}(c, r') \doteq \alpha \cdot u(\gamma^{-1}(c + r')) - u(c). \quad (33)$$

Fix $\nu \in \mathcal{D}$ and define $G \sim \nu$. From Proposition 39, we get that for all $c, r' \in \mathcal{C}$

$$\alpha \cdot u(\gamma^{-1}(c + r')) = u(c + r),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \cdot \tilde{u}(\gamma^{-1}(c + r'), \nu) &= \alpha \mathbb{E}u(\gamma^{-1}(c + r') + G) - \alpha \cdot u(\gamma^{-1}(c + r')) && \text{(linearity, Eq. (32))} \\ &= \mathbb{E}u(c + r' + \gamma G) - \alpha \cdot u(\gamma^{-1}(c + r')) && \text{(linearity and Eq. (30))} \\ &= \mathbb{E}u(c + r' + \gamma G) - u(c) + u(c) - \alpha \cdot u(\gamma^{-1}(c + r')) \\ &= \tilde{u}(c, \text{df}(r' + \gamma G)) + u(c) - \alpha \cdot u(\gamma^{-1}(c + r')) \\ & && \text{(linearity and Eq. (32))} \\ &= \tilde{u}(c, \text{df}(r' + \gamma G)) - \tilde{r}(c, r'), && \text{(linearity and Eq. (33))} \end{aligned}$$

and rearranging gives Item 1.

Axioms 1 to 5 follow from Items 1 to 3. Define the utility $u : (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $\nu \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w})$ as

$$u(\nu) = \tilde{u}(0, \nu)$$

with $u(\delta_0) = 0$. Then Items 2 and 3 together with Theorem 38 imply Axioms 1 to 4.

It remains only to show Axiom 5. We have that for all $c, r' \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\nu \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{r}(c, r') &= \tilde{u}(c, \text{df}(r' + \gamma G)) - \alpha \cdot \tilde{u}(\gamma^{-1}(c + r'), \nu) \\ &= u(\text{df}(c + r' + \gamma G)) - u(c) - \alpha \cdot u(\text{df}(\gamma^{-1}(c + r' + \gamma \nu))) + \alpha \cdot u(\gamma^{-1}(c + r')) \\ &= u(\text{df}(c + r' + \gamma G)) - \alpha \cdot u(\text{df}(\gamma^{-1}(c + r' + \gamma \nu))) - (u(c) - \alpha \cdot u(\gamma^{-1}(c + r'))). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the above and setting $c = r' = 0$, we get that for all $\nu \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w})$,

$$\tilde{r}(0, 0) = u(\text{df}(\gamma G)) - \alpha \cdot u(\nu).$$

Thus, for all $\nu, \nu' \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{w})$, with $G \sim \nu$ and $G' \sim \nu'$, we have

$$u(\text{df}(\gamma G)) - \alpha \cdot u(\nu) = u(\text{df}(\gamma G')) - \alpha \cdot u(\nu'),$$

which, by Proposition 39, implies Axiom 5. ■

Theorem 20 *A stock-augmented return distribution optimization problem with objective functional F_K can be reduced to an equivalent stock-augmented reinforcement learning problem (expected return maximization) iff F_K is an expected utility ($F_K = U_f$ for some $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$) and there exists an $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ such that, for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$,*

$$f(\gamma c) = \alpha f(c) + (1 - \alpha)f(0).$$

When the reduction is possible, the equivalent stock-augmented reinforcement learning problem has discount α and reward proportional to

$$\tilde{R}_{t+1} \doteq \alpha f(C_{t+1}) - f(C_t) + (1 - \alpha)f(0) = f(C_t + R_{t+1}) - f(C_t).$$

Proof This result is obtained from Theorem 40 with the stock-augmented utility $\tilde{u}(\nu', \nu) \doteq \mathbb{E}f(G + G') - f(0)$ ($G \sim \nu$, $G' \sim \nu'$). The condition on α comes from Proposition 39 with $u(c) = \tilde{u}(\delta_0, \delta_c) = f(c) - f(0)$. This satisfies the assumption in Proposition 39 that $u(\delta_c) = 0$, and the result gives

$$\alpha u(c) = u(\gamma c),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\alpha(f(c) - f(0)) = f(\gamma c) - f(0),$$

and rearranging gives

$$f(\gamma c) = \alpha f(c) + (1 - \alpha)f(0).$$

The definition of \tilde{R} comes from Eq. (33) in the proof of Theorem 40, which uses

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{R}_{t+1} &\doteq \tilde{r}(C_t, R_{t+1}) \\ &= \alpha \cdot u(\gamma^{-1}(C_t + R_{t+1})) - u(C_t) \\ &= \alpha(f(C_{t+1}) - f(0)) - (f(C_t) - f(0)) \\ &= \alpha f(C_{t+1}) - f(C_t) + (1 - \alpha)f(0).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we note that, by assumption,

$$f(\gamma C_{t+1}) = \alpha f(C_{t+1}) + (1 - \alpha)f(0)$$

with probability one, so

$$(1 - \alpha)f(0) = f(\gamma C_{t+1}) - \alpha f(C_{t+1}) = f(C_t + R_{t+1}) - \alpha f(C_{t+1}),$$

and this gives

$$\tilde{R}_{t+1} = \alpha f(C_{t+1}) - f(C_t) + (1 - \alpha)f(0) = f(C_t + R_{t+1}) - f(C_t). \quad \blacksquare$$

Appendix G. Proofs for Section 5.8

Our characterization builds on and extends the results by [Marthe et al. \(2024\)](#), which characterized objective functionals that distributional DP can optimize in the finite-horizon undiscounted setting, *without* stock augmentation. Our proof strategy is to connect indifference to mixtures, indifference to γ and Lipschitz continuity to the von Neumann-Morgenstern axioms (from Appendix F), so that we can apply the powerful von Neumann-Morgenstern theorem (or show that it cannot apply, in the case of the non-utility objective functional that distributional DP can optimize).

The following results connect Lipschitz continuity and indifference to mixtures to the von Neumann-Morgenstern independence axiom (Axiom 3).

Proposition 41 (If K Lipschitz then Axiom 3's \Leftarrow is satisfied.) *If K is Lipschitz then the following holds: For every $\nu, \nu', \bar{\nu} \in (\mathcal{D}, w)$ if for $p \in (0, 1)$ we have*

$$K((1 - p)\nu + p\bar{\nu}) \geq K((1 - p)\nu' + p\bar{\nu}),$$

then

$$K\nu \geq K\nu'.$$

Proof Fix $\nu, \nu', \bar{\nu} \in (\mathcal{D}, w)$ and assume that for all $p \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$K((1 - p)\nu + p\bar{\nu}) \geq K((1 - p)\nu' + p\bar{\nu}).$$

Define the sequences of distributions

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_n &\doteq \frac{1}{n}\bar{\nu} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)\nu \\ \nu'_n &\doteq \frac{1}{n}\bar{\nu} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)\nu'.\end{aligned}$$

We have that ν_n converges to ν in w as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (and ν'_n to ν') Because K is Lipschitz, and by assumption $K\nu_n - K\nu'_n \geq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we get

$$K\nu - K\nu' = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K\nu_n - K\nu'_n \geq 0. \quad \blacksquare$$

Proposition 42 (If K is indifferent to mixtures, then Axiom 3's \Rightarrow is satisfied.)
 If K is indifferent to mixtures, then the following holds: For every $\nu, \nu', \bar{\nu} \in (\mathcal{D}, w)$ if

$$K\nu \geq K\nu',$$

then for all $p \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$K((1-p)\nu + p\bar{\nu}) \geq K((1-p)\nu' + p\bar{\nu}).$$

Proof Definition 9 with $\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu'_1, \nu'_2$ such that $K\nu_1 \geq K\nu'_1$ and $\nu'_2 = \nu_2$, gives us that for all $p \in (0, 1)$ (with $\lambda = (1-p, p)$) we have

$$K\nu \geq K\nu' \Rightarrow K((1-p)\nu + p\bar{\nu}) \geq K((1-p)\nu' + p\bar{\nu}). \quad \blacksquare$$

Next, we apply the von Neumann-Morgenstern theorem to characterize objective functionals that distributional DP can optimize in the infinite-horizon discounted case.

Theorem 21 If $K : (\mathcal{D}, w) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is indifferent to mixtures and Lipschitz, then F_K is an expected utility, that is, there exists an $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$K\nu = \mathbb{E}f(G), \quad (G \sim \nu)$$

and f is Lipschitz.

Proof Consider the relation \succeq over (\mathcal{D}, w) defined by

$$\nu \succeq \nu' \iff K\nu \geq K\nu'.$$

It is easy to see that \succeq satisfies completeness and transitivity (Axioms 1 and 2 in Appendix F). K Lipschitz implies that \succeq also satisfies continuity (Axiom 4). K Lipschitz and K indifferent to mixtures implies that K satisfies Axiom 3 (Propositions 41 and 42).

Then by the von Neumann-Morgenstern theorem (Theorem 38) there exists a utility function $u : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying Items 1 to 3. By Item 1, we have that for all $\nu, \nu' \in (\mathcal{D}, w)$, with $G \sim \nu$ and $G' \sim \nu'$,

$$\nu \succeq \nu' \iff u(G) \geq u(G'),$$

and thus

$$K\nu \geq K\nu' \iff u(G) \geq u(G').$$

Moreover, by Item 3 of Theorem 38, we know u is unique up to positive affine transformations, so there exist $a > 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $\nu \in (\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{w})$:

$$K\nu = a \cdot u(\nu) + c.$$

Without loss of generality we can consider u in the rest of this proof such that $a = 1$ and $c = 0$. Since u is linear, we know there exists and $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $\nu \in (\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{w})$:

$$u(\nu) = \mathbb{E}f(\nu).$$

The statement that f is Lipschitz follows from Lemma 12. ■

Proposition 22 *The statistical functional $K : (\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying, for $\nu \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{w})$,*

$$K\nu = \mathbb{I}(\nu([0, \infty)) = 1)$$

is indifferent to mixtures and indifferent to γ , however F_K is not an expected utility.

Proof K is indifferent to mixtures. Consider $\eta, \eta' \in (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}}, \bar{\mathfrak{w}})$ such that, for all $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$,

$$K\eta(s, c) \geq K\eta'(s, c), \tag{34}$$

and let (S, C) be a random variable values in $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$, $\nu \doteq \text{df}(G(S, C))$ and $\nu' \doteq \text{df}(G'(S, C))$.

Equation (34) implies that $\{\nu'(S, C)([0, \infty)) = 1\} \subset \{\nu(S, C)([0, \infty)) = 1\}$, which in turn implies that

$$\mathbb{I}(\nu'(S, C)([0, \infty)) = 1) \leq \mathbb{I}(\nu(S, C)([0, \infty)) = 1),$$

which proves the result.

K is indifferent to γ . Given $\nu, \nu' \in (\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{w})$ and letting $G \sim \nu$ and $G' \sim \nu'$, note that $\nu([0, \infty)) = 1 \iff \text{df}(\gamma G)([0, \infty)) = 1$ (and similarly for ν' and G'), so $K(\gamma G) = K\nu$ and $K(\gamma G') = K\nu'$, which means $K\nu \geq K\nu'$ implies $K(\gamma G) \geq K(\gamma G')$.

F_K is not an expected utility. It suffices to show that K it violates at least one of the von Neumann-Morgenstern axioms, otherwise Theorem 38 applies and F_K is an expected utility. K invariably satisfies completeness and transitivity (Axioms 1 and 2), however it violates independence and continuity (Axioms 3 and 4) [Juan Carreño \(2020, p. 15\)](#). ■

Appendix H. Implementation details

H.1 D η N

The architecture diagram for D η N's stock-augmented return distribution estimator is given in Fig. 1. The training and network parameters were set per domain (see Appendices H.2 and H.3).

The target parameters $\bar{\theta}$ were updated via exponential moving average updates, as done by [Schwarzer et al. \(2023\)](#), and differently from the periodic updates used by [Mnih et al.](#)

(2015). Our intent was to have smoother quantile regression targets, rather than sudden changes introduced by the periodic update. The target network is updated as an exponential moving average with step size α :

$$\bar{\theta} \leftarrow (1 - \alpha)\bar{\theta} + \alpha\theta.$$

$D\eta\text{N}$ uses the target network parameters $\bar{\theta}$ for both training and evaluation (similar to [Abdolmaleki et al., 2018](#)). Our intent was to slower-changing behavior and quantile regression targets.

As in DQN ([Mnih et al., 2015](#)) and QR-DQN ([Dabney et al., 2018](#)), the the action selection used by $D\eta\text{N}$ during data collection is ε -greedy. For greedy policy selection during both data generation (Eq. (21)) and learning (Eq. (20)), given a return distribution function $\xi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, $D\eta\text{N}$ selects the greedy policy $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$ satisfying

$$U_f(M_f\xi)(s, c) = \mathbb{E}f(c + G(s, c, A)) \quad (A \sim \bar{\pi}(s, c), G(s, c, a) \sim \xi(s, c, a))$$

and, for all $(s, c) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\bar{\pi}(a|s, c) > 0 \Rightarrow \bar{\pi}(a|s, c) = \max_{a'} \bar{\pi}(a'|s, c).$$

We chose this because ties may happen often in return distribution optimization. This is not the case standard deep RL with DQN, and we rarely need to resort to tie-breaking, because action-value estimates are often noisy. However, the choice of U_f may introduce ties in practice. For example, when maximizing the risk-averse τ -CVaR, we have $f(x) = (x)_-$, which can introduce ties among maximizing actions.

With vector-valued returns, $D\eta\text{N}$ maintains estimates of the quantiles each individual return coordinate, rather than an estimate of the joint distribution of the vector-valued return. This means we cannot optimize all expected utilities over vector-valued returns, but only the ones with the form:

$$f(x) = \sum_i f_i(x_i).$$

We believe this is acceptable for a proof-of-concept algorithm, and that future work will address this limitation based on results for multivariate distributional RL ([Zhang et al., 2021](#); [Wiltzer et al., 2024](#)).

For the quantile regression loss, the greedy policy $\bar{\pi}$ breaks ties via uniform random action selection, but to avoid having to sample multiple actions from $\bar{\pi}$ we use the policy directly. For a transition $(s, c), a, r', (s', c')$, the loss estimate is:

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \bar{\pi}(a'|s, c) \ell(r' + \gamma \ell(\xi_{\bar{\theta}}(s', a', c')_j - \xi_{\theta}(s, a, c)_i, \tau_i),$$

where ℓ is the quantile regression loss ([Dabney et al., 2018](#))

$$\ell_c(x, \tau) \doteq |\mathbb{I}(x > 0) - \tau| \cdot |x|,$$

and the quantiles are the bin centers of an n -bin discretization of $[0, 1]$, that is, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have $\tau_i \doteq \frac{2i-1}{2n}$.

As in DQN ([Mnih et al., 2015](#)) and QR-DQN ([Dabney et al., 2018](#)), the we explicitly use δ_0 as the return distribution of the terminal state.

Parameter	Value
Batch size	64
Trajectory length	16
Training duration (environment steps)	$\approx 2M$
Training duration (learner updates)	$2K$
Optimizer	Adam
Learning rate	10^{-4}
Target network exponential moving average step size α	10^{-2}
Discount (γ)	0.997
ε -greedy parameter	0.1
Interval for sampling c_0	$[-10, 10]$

Table 7: Training parameters for $D\eta N$ in the gridworld experiments.

H.2 Gridworld

In these experiments we trained $D\eta N$ on an Nvidia V100 GPU. For simplicity, $D\eta N$ did not use a replay in these experiments. Instead, it alternated generating a minibatch of transitions by having the agent interact with the environment, and then updating the network with the generated minibatch (the “learner update”). The transitions were generated in episodic fashion, with the agent starting at s_{init} and acting in the environment until the end of the episode. The episode ended when the agent reached a terminating cell, or when it was interrupted on the 16-th step. Upon interruption, s' was not treated as terminal. Each minibatch consisted of 64 trajectories of length 16, and each transition had the form $(s_k, c_k), a_k, r'_k, (s'_k, c'_k)$. If a termination or interruption happened at the k -th step in a trajectory, the next transition would start from the initial state, in which case $s'_k \neq s_{k+1}$ ($s'_k = s_{k+1}$ held otherwise).

Tables 7 and 8 contain additional implementation details. For training, we have used the Adam optimizer (Kingma, 2014) with defaults from the Optax library (DeepMind et al., 2020) unless otherwise stated.

During evaluation, $D\eta N$ followed greedy policies ($\varepsilon = 0$ for the ε -greedy exploration). For the τ -CVaR experiments (Sections 7.2 and 7.3), we selected c_0^* based on Theorems 17 and 19, with a grid search of 256 equally spaced points on the interval $[-10, 10]$ (with points on the interval limits).

The vision network in the gridworld experiments is a ConvNet (LeCun et al., 2015) following the implementation used by Mnih et al. (2015). Convolutional layers used ReLU activations (Nair and Hinton, 2010), as did the MLP hidden layer. The “Linear” components in Fig. 1 did not use an activation function on the outputs (with the exception of the the explicit ReLU activation shown in the diagrams). The outputs of the ConvNet were flattened before being input to the “Linear” component.

H.3 Atari

In these experiments we trained $D\eta N$ in a distributed actor-learner setup (Horgan et al., 2018) using TPUv3 actors and learners. The data was generated in episodic fashion (with

Component	Parameter	Value
Vision (ConvNet)		
	Output channels (per layer)	(32, 64, 64)
	Kernel sizes (per layer)	((8, 8), (4, 4), (3, 3))
	Strides (all layers)	(1, 1)
	Padding	SAME
Linear		
	Output size	512
MLP		
	Number of quantiles (per action)	128
	Hidden layer size	512

Table 8: Neural network parameters for $D\eta$ N’s return distribution estimator ξ_θ in the grid-world experiments. See Fig. 1 for reference.

multiple asynchronous actors). The episode duration was set to 25s, at 15Hz and 4 frames per environment step due to action repeats (Mnih et al., 2015). The Atari benchmark typically has sticky actions (Machado et al., 2018), but we disabled them for these experiments, to have deterministic returns. $D\eta$ N, similar to DQN (Mnih et al., 2015) and QR-DQN (Dabney et al., 2018), observes 84×84 grayscale Atari frames with frame stacking of 4.

$D\eta$ N was trained with a 3 : 7 mixture of online and replay data in each learner update. Each minibatch consisted of 144 sampled trajectories (sequences of subsequent transitions) of length 19 (the minibatch was distributed across multiple learners, and updates were combined before being applied). The data generated in the actors was added simultaneously to a queue (for the online data stream) and to the replay (for the replay data stream). The replay was not prioritized, and we edited the stocks in each minibatch as explained in Section 8.

Tables 9 and 10 contain additional implementation details. For training, we have used the Adam optimizer (Kingma, 2014) with defaults from the Optax library (DeepMind et al., 2020) unless otherwise stated, as well as gradient norm clipping and weight decay.

During training, similar to DQN, we annealed the ε -greedy parameter linearly from 1.0 at the start to 0.1 at the end of training. During evaluation, $D\eta$ N followed 10^{-2} -greedy policies.

The convolutional network in the Atari experiments is a ResNet (He et al., 2016) following the implementation used by Espeholt et al. (2018). Convolutional layers and residual blocks used ReLU activations (Nair and Hinton, 2010), as did the MLP hidden layer. The “Linear” components in Fig. 1 did not use an activation function on the outputs (note that the explicit ReLU activation in the diagrams is used). The outputs of the ResNet were flattened before being input to the “Linear” component.

Parameter	Value
Batch size (global, across 6 learners)	144
Trajectory length	19
Training duration (environment steps)	75M
Training duration (learner updates)	$\approx 3.44K$
Optimizer	Adam
Learning rate	10^{-4}
Weight decay	10^{-2}
Gradient norm clipping	10
Target network exponential moving average step size α	10^{-2}
Discount (γ)	0.997
Interval for sampling c_0	$[-9, 9)$

 Table 9: Training parameters for $D\eta N$ in the Atari experiments.

Component	Parameter	Value
Vision (ResNet)		
	Output channels (per for Conv2D and residual layers per section)	(64, 128, 128)
	Kernel sizes (all Conv2D and residual layers)	(3, 3)
	Strides (all Conv2D and residual layers)	(1, 1)
	Padding	SAME
	Pool sizes (all sections)	(3, 3)
	Pool strides (all sections)	(3, 3)
	Residual blocks (per section)	(2, 2, 2)
Linear		
	Output size	512
Quantile MLP		
	Number of quantiles (per action)	100
	Hidden layer size	512

 Table 10: Neural network parameters for $D\eta N$'s return distribution estimator ξ_θ in the Atari experiments. See Fig. 1 for reference.

References

- A. Abdolmaleki, J. T. Springenberg, Y. Tassa, R. Munos, N. Heess, and M. Riedmiller. Maximum a Posteriori Policy Optimisation. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- D. Abel, W. Dabney, A. Harutyunyan, M. K. Ho, M. L. Littman, D. Precup, and S. Singh. On the Expressivity of Markov Reward. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing*

- Systems*, volume 34, 2021.
- E. Altman. *Constrained Markov Decision Processes*. Routledge, 1999.
- A. Barreto, S. Hou, D. Borsa, D. Silver, and D. Precup. Fast Reinforcement Learning with Generalized Policy Updates. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(48):30079–30087, 2020.
- N. Bäuerle and A. Glauner. Minimizing Spectral Risk Measures Applied to Markov Decision Processes. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 94(1):35–69, 2021.
- N. Bäuerle and J. Ott. Markov Decision Processes with Average-Value-at-Risk Criteria. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 74:361–379, 2011.
- N. Bäuerle and U. Rieder. More Risk-Sensitive Markov Decision Processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 39(1):105–120, 2014.
- M. G. Bellemare, Y. Naddaf, J. Veness, and M. Bowling. The Arcade Learning Environment: An Evaluation Platform for General Agents. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 47:253–279, 2013.
- M. G. Bellemare, W. Dabney, and R. Munos. A Distributional Perspective on Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 449–458. PMLR, 2017.
- M. G. Bellemare, S. Candido, P. S. Castro, J. Gong, M. C. Machado, S. Moitra, S. S. Ponda, and Z. Wang. Autonomous Navigation of Stratospheric Balloons Using Reinforcement Learning. *Nature*, 588(7836):77–82, 2020.
- M. G. Bellemare, W. Dabney, and M. Rowland. *Distributional Reinforcement Learning*. MIT Press, 2023.
- D. Bertsekas. *Reinforcement Learning and Optimal Control*, volume 1. Athena Scientific, 2019.
- D. Bertsekas and J. N. Tsitsiklis. *Neuro-Dynamic Programming*. Athena Scientific, 1996.
- M. Bowling, J. D. Martin, D. Abel, and W. Dabney. Settling the Reward Hypothesis. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3003–3020. PMLR, 2023.
- J. Bradbury, R. Frostig, P. Hawkins, M. J. Johnson, C. Leary, D. Maclaurin, G. Necula, A. Paszke, J. VanderPlas, S. Wanderman-Milne, and Q. Zhang. JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs, 2018. URL <http://github.com/jax-ml/jax>.
- Y. Chow and M. Ghavamzadeh. Algorithms for CVaR Optimization in MDPs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27, 2014.
- Y. Chow, A. Tamar, S. Mannor, and M. Pavone. Risk-Sensitive and Robust Decision-Making: a CVaR Optimization Approach. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28, 2015.

- K.-J. Chung and M. J. Sobel. Discounted MDP’s: Distribution Functions and Exponential Utility Maximization. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 25(1):49–62, 1987.
- W. Dabney, M. Rowland, M. Bellemare, and R. Munos. Distributional Reinforcement Learning with Quantile Regression. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- P. Dayan and C. Watkins. Q-Learning. *Machine Learning*, 8(3):279–292, 1992.
- DeepMind, I. Babuschkin, K. Baumli, A. Bell, S. Bhupatiraju, J. Bruce, P. Buchlovsky, D. Budden, T. Cai, A. Clark, I. Danihelka, A. Dedieu, C. Fantacci, J. Godwin, C. Jones, R. Hemsley, T. Hennigan, M. Hessel, S. Hou, S. Kapturowski, T. Keck, I. Kemaev, M. King, M. Kunesch, L. Martens, H. Merzic, V. Mikulik, T. Norman, G. Papamakarios, J. Quan, R. Ring, F. Ruiz, A. Sanchez, L. Sartran, R. Schneider, E. Sezener, S. Spencer, S. Srinivasan, M. Stanojević, W. Stokowiec, L. Wang, G. Zhou, and F. Viola. The DeepMind JAX Ecosystem, 2020. URL <http://github.com/google-deepmind>.
- J. Degraeve, F. Felici, J. Buchli, M. Neunert, B. Tracey, F. Carpanese, T. Ewalds, R. Hafner, A. Abdolmaleki, D. de Las Casas, et al. Magnetic Control of Tokamak Plasmas Through Deep Reinforcement Learning. *Nature*, 602(7897):414–419, 2022.
- D. Ernst, P. Geurts, and L. Wehenkel. Tree-Based Batch Mode Reinforcement Learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 6, 2005.
- L. Espeholt, H. Soyer, R. Munos, K. Simonyan, V. Mnih, T. Ward, Y. Doron, V. Firoiu, T. Harley, I. Dunning, et al. Impala: Scalable Distributed Deep-RL with Importance Weighted Actor-Learner Architectures. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1407–1416. PMLR, 2018.
- A. Fawzi, M. Balog, A. Huang, T. Hubert, B. Romera-Paredes, M. Barekatin, A. Novikov, F. J. R Ruiz, J. Schrittwieser, G. Swirszcz, et al. Discovering Faster Matrix Multiplication Algorithms with Reinforcement Learning. *Nature*, 610(7930):47–53, 2022.
- M. A. Goodrich and M. Quigley. Satisficing Q-Learning: Efficient Learning in Problems with Dichotomous Attributes. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications*, 2004.
- I. Greenberg, Y. Chow, M. Ghavamzadeh, and S. Mannor. Efficient Risk-Averse Reinforcement Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, 2022.
- D. Hadfield-Menell, S. Milli, P. Abbeel, S. Russell, and A. Dragan. Inverse Reward Design. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, 2017.
- C. R. Harris, K. J. Millman, S. J. van der Walt, R. Gommers, P. Virtanen, D. Cournapeau, E. Wieser, J. Taylor, S. Berg, N. J. Smith, R. Kern, M. Picus, S. Hoyer, M. H. van Kerkwijk, M. Brett, A. Haldane, J. F. del Río, M. Wiebe, P. Peterson, P. Gérard-Marchant, K. Sheppard, T. Reddy, W. Weckesser, H. Abbasi, C. Gohlke, and T. E. Oliphant. Array Programming with NumPy. *Nature*, 585(7825):357–362, Sept. 2020. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2.

- K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- J. Heek, A. Levskaya, A. Oliver, M. Ritter, B. Rondepierre, A. Steiner, and M. van Zee. Flax: A Neural Network Library and Ecosystem for JAX, 2024. URL <http://github.com/google/flax>.
- T. Hennigan, T. Cai, T. Norman, L. Martens, and I. Babuschkin. Haiku: Sonnet for JAX, 2020. URL <http://github.com/deepmind/dm-haiku>.
- D. Horgan, J. Quan, D. Budden, G. Barth-Maron, M. Hessel, H. Van Hasselt, and D. Silver. Distributed Prioritized Experience Replay. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- C. L. Hull. *Principles of Behavior: An Introduction to Behavior Theory*. Appleton-Century, 1943.
- J. D. Hunter. Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment. *Computing in Science & Engineering*, 9(3):90–95, 2007. doi: 10.1109/MCSE.2007.55.
- G. James, D. Witten, T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, et al. *An Introduction to Statistical Learning*, volume 112. Springer, 2013.
- D. Juan Carreño. The Von Neumann-Morgenstern Theory and Rational Choice. *Treballs Finals de Grau (TFG) – Matemàtiques, Universitat de Barcelona*, 2020.
- M. Keramati and B. Gutkin. A Reinforcement Learning Theory for Homeostatic Regulation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 24, 2011.
- D. P. Kingma. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014.
- W. B. Knox, A. Allievi, H. Banzhaf, F. Schmitt, and P. Stone. Reward (Mis) Design for Autonomous Driving. *Artificial Intelligence*, 316:103829, 2023.
- D. M. Kreps. Decision Problems with Expected Utility Criteria, ii: Stationarity. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2(3):266–274, 1977. ISSN 0364765X, 15265471.
- Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton. Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553):436–444, 2015.
- S. H. Lim and I. Malik. Distributional Reinforcement Learning for Risk-Sensitive Policies. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 30977–30989, 2022.
- M. C. Machado, M. G. Bellemare, E. Talvitie, J. Veness, M. Hausknecht, and M. Bowling. Revisiting the arcade learning environment: Evaluation protocols and open problems for general agents. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 61:523–562, 2018.

- O. Madani, S. Hanks, and A. Condon. On the Undecidability of Probabilistic Planning and Infinite-Horizon Partially Observable Markov Decision Problems. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence and the Eleventh Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, volume 10, 1999.
- A. Marthe, A. Garivier, and C. Vernade. Beyond Average Return in Markov Decision Processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, 2024.
- V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, A. A. Rusu, J. Veness, M. G. Bellemare, A. Graves, M. Riedmiller, A. K. Fidjeland, G. Ostrovski, et al. Human-Level Control through Deep Reinforcement Learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- M. Moghimi and H. Ku. Beyond CVaR: Leveraging Static Spectral Risk Measures for Enhanced Decision-Making in Distributional Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.02087*, 2025.
- T. Morimura, M. Sugiyama, H. Kashima, H. Hachiya, and T. Tanaka. Nonparametric Return Distribution Approximation for Reinforcement Learning. In J. Fürnkranz and T. Joachims, editors, *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 799–806, Haifa, Israel, June 2010. Omnipress.
- V. Nair and G. E. Hinton. Rectified Linear Units Improve Restricted Boltzmann Machines. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 807–814, 2010.
- E. Noorani, C. Mavridis, and J. Baras. Risk-Sensitive Reinforcement Learning with Exponential Criteria. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09010*, 2022.
- T. pandas development team. pandas-dev/pandas: Pandas, Feb. 2020.
- C. H. Papadimitriou and J. N. Tsitsiklis. The Complexity of Markov Decision Processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 12(3):441–450, 1987.
- G. C. Pflug and A. Pichler. Time-Consistent Decisions and Temporal Decomposition of Coherent Risk Functionals. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 41(2):682–699, 2016.
- S. Pitis. Rethinking the Discount Factor in Reinforcement Learning: A Decision Theoretic Approach. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019.
- M. L. Puterman. *Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- R. T. Rockafellar, S. Uryasev, et al. Optimization of Conditional Value-at-Risk. *Journal of Risk*, 2:21–42, 2000.
- J. Schulman, F. Wolski, P. Dhariwal, A. Radford, and O. Klimov. Proximal Policy Optimization Algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- W. Schultz, P. Dayan, and P. R. Montague. A Neural Substrate of Prediction and Reward. *Science*, 275(5306):1593–1599, 1997.

- M. Schwarzer, J. S. O. Ceron, A. Courville, M. G. Bellemare, R. Agarwal, and P. S. Castro. Bigger, Better, Faster: Human-Level Atari with Human-Level Efficiency. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 30365–30380. PMLR, 2023.
- M. Shakerinava and S. Ravanbakhsh. Utility Theory for Sequential Decision Making. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 19616–19625, 2022.
- G. R. Shorack. *Probability for Statisticians*. Springer, 2017.
- D. Silver, T. Hubert, J. Schrittwieser, I. Antonoglou, M. Lai, A. Guez, M. Lanctot, L. Sifre, D. Kumaran, T. Graepel, et al. A General Reinforcement Learning Algorithm that Masters Chess, Shogi, and Go Through Self-Play. *Science*, 362(6419):1140–1144, 2018.
- H. A. Simon. Rational Choice and the Structure of the Environment. *Psychological Review*, 63(2):129, 1956.
- S. P. Singh and R. C. Yee. An Upper Bound on the Loss from Approximate Optimal-Value Functions. *Machine Learning*, 16:227–233, 1994.
- J. T. Springenberg, A. Abdolmaleki, J. Zhang, O. Groth, M. Bloesch, T. Lampe, P. Brakel, S. Bechtle, S. Kapturowski, R. Hafner, et al. Offline Actor-Critic Reinforcement Learning Scales to Large Models. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 46323–46350. PMLR, 2024.
- R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- R. S. Sutton, J. Modayil, M. Delp, T. Degris, P. M. Pilarski, A. White, and D. Precup. Horde: A Scalable Real-Time Architecture for Learning Knowledge from Unsupervised Sensorimotor Interaction. In *The 10th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems—Volume 2*, pages 761–768, 2011.
- C. Szepesvári. *Algorithms for Reinforcement Learning*. Springer nature, 2022.
- C. Villani. *Optimal Transport: Old and New*, volume 338. Springer, 2009.
- P. Virtanen, R. Gommers, T. E. Oliphant, M. Haberland, T. Reddy, D. Cournapeau, E. Burovski, P. Peterson, W. Weckesser, J. Bright, S. J. van der Walt, M. Brett, J. Wilson, K. J. Millman, N. Mayorov, A. R. J. Nelson, E. Jones, R. Kern, E. Larson, C. J. Carey, Í. Polat, Y. Feng, E. W. Moore, J. VanderPlas, D. Laxalde, J. Perktold, R. Cimrman, I. Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, C. R. Harris, A. M. Archibald, A. H. Ribeiro, F. Pedregosa, P. van Mulbregt, and SciPy 1.0 Contributors. SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python. *Nature Methods*, 17:261–272, 2020. doi:10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2.
- J. Von Neumann and O. Morgenstern. Theory of Games and Economic Behavior: 60th Anniversary Commemorative Edition. In *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton University Press, 2007.

- C. J. C. H. Watkins. *Learning from Delayed Rewards*. King's College, Cambridge United Kingdom, 1989.
- Wes McKinney. Data Structures for Statistical Computing in Python. In Stéfan van der Walt and Jarrod Millman, editors, *Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference*, pages 56–61, 2010. doi: 10.25080/Majora-92bf1922-00a.
- H. Wiltzer, J. Farebrother, A. Gretton, and M. Rowland. Foundations of Multivariate Distributional Reinforcement Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, 2024.
- P. Zhang, X. Chen, L. Zhao, W. Xiong, T. Qin, and T.-Y. Liu. Distributional Reinforcement Learning for Multi-Dimensional Reward Functions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, 2021.