

Policy Gradient for LQR with Domain Randomization

Tesshu Fujinami¹, Bruce D. Lee, Nikolai Matni, George J. Pappas

Abstract—Domain randomization (DR) enables sim-to-real transfer by training controllers on a distribution of simulated environments, with the goal of achieving robust performance in the real world. Although DR is widely used in practice and is often solved using simple policy gradient (PG) methods, understanding of its theoretical guarantees remains limited. Toward addressing this gap, we provide the first convergence analysis of PG methods for domain-randomized linear quadratic regulation (LQR). We show that PG converges globally to the minimizer of a finite-sample approximation of the DR objective under suitable bounds on the heterogeneity of the sampled systems. We also quantify the sample-complexity associated with achieving a small performance gap between the sample-average and population-level objectives. Additionally, we propose and analyze a discount-factor annealing algorithm that obviates the need for an initial jointly stabilizing controller, which may be challenging to find. Empirical results support our theoretical findings and highlight promising directions for future work, including risk-sensitive DR formulations and stochastic PG algorithms.

I. INTRODUCTION

Domain randomization (DR) has emerged as a dominant paradigm to enable transfer of policies optimized in simulation to the real world by randomizing simulator parameters during training [1–3]. In doing so, just as with robust control, DR accounts for discrepancies between the model used in simulation to synthesize a policy and the system that it is deployed on. However, unlike conventional robust control approaches, DR minimizes an average control objective over the uncertainty in the system rather than a worst case objective. Since DR does not solely focus on optimizing the worst-case performance, it can result in less conservative controller performance while still ensuring robust stability with high probability. Furthermore, DR can be easily implemented via first order methods. This makes it straightforward to incorporate into a wide variety of reinforcement learning schemes and to benefit from the increasing availability of parallel computation.

Despite the ease with which DR can be implemented using first order methods, ensuring convergence of these methods remains a critical challenge, with practitioners relying upon complex scheduling of various hyperparameters in the optimization procedure [3]. Motivated by this challenge, we rigorously study the convergence of policy gradient methods for DR in the setting of the linear quadratic regulator.

A. Related Work

a) Domain Randomization: Domain randomization, introduced by Tobin et al. [1], is widely used for enabling *sim-to-real transfer*. By randomizing simulator parameters during training, it aims to produce policies robust to simulator variations, thereby enabling transfer to the real-world. The sampling distribution may be a design variable in the synthesis problem [4], or come from a learning procedure [5], e.g. as the posterior distribution of a Bayesian identification procedure. Recently, the approach has been applied in areas like autonomous racing [6] and robotic control [2, 3]. The control community has used similar randomized approaches to achieve high-probability guarantees (e.g. scenario optimization and related methods [7–10]). Recent work has explored generalization of domain randomization in discrete Markov Decision Processes [11, 12] and for continuous control [5]. However, finding optimization procedures which minimize the domain randomization objective remains a challenge, with many empirical studies relying on heuristic approaches like curriculum learning [13]. In this work, we rigorously study the convergence of policy gradient for minimizing the domain randomization objective for linear quadratic control.

b) Policy Gradient Methods: Global convergence of policy gradient methods was first established for linear quadratic control by [14], relying upon a condition known as *gradient dominance* to demonstrate that driving the gradient to zero suffices to ensure convergence to the optimal solution. Subsequently, the results have been extended to a multitude of settings including mixed $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$ [15], Markovian jump systems [16], and output estimation [17]. Hu et al. [18] provide a comprehensive survey on convergence studies of policy optimization methods for continuous control. There are two works closely related to domain randomization: Gravel et al. [19] and Wang et al. [20]. Gravel et al. [19] study a related setting with multiplicative noise on the system, which resembles domain randomization but with variations drawn independently at each time step. Consequently, the resulting optimal controller exhibits robustness primarily in an average sense, rather than explicitly accounting for structured uncertainty as in domain randomization. Wang et al. [20] study a federated approach to minimize the average LQR cost over a collection of systems; however, they prove convergence only up to a gap defined in terms of the heterogeneity between the systems. In contrast, we prove that as long as the systems are sufficiently similar, an approximate gradient domination condition suffices to ensure convergence of policy gradient methods to the globally opti-

¹ All authors are with the Department of Electrical and Systems Engineering, University of Pennsylvania. Emails: {tfesshu, brucele, nmatni, pappasg}@seas.upenn.edu

mal solution. We focus exclusively on model-based analysis; the extension of our results to the model free setting involves routine extension of the analysis for the variance of gradient estimates from prior work [14].

B. Contributions

We study the convergence of policy gradient methods applied to the domain randomized LQR objective and establish the following results:

- **DR Objective Approximation:** We propose optimizing a sample average approximation of the DR objective defined in terms of a finite number of sampled systems. We characterize the excess cost incurred by the solution to the approximate problem on the original objective.
- **Policy Gradient Convergence:** We prove that a first order policy gradient algorithm converges to the globally optimal solution for the sample average approximation of the DR objective. This is the first result showing that policy gradient methods converge to the optimal solution for domain randomized LQR problems, removing the heterogeneity bias that appears in prior work [20].
- **Joint Stabilization:** We propose a first order gradient descent algorithm based on discount factor annealing which provably converges to a controller stabilizing a collection of dynamical systems, extending prior work [21] to the multi-system setting.

The above contributions establish the convergence properties of first order gradient-based algorithms applied to the DR objective for continuous control. Given the prevalence of DR for the practice of learning-enabled robotic control and the engineering challenges involved in achieving convergent optimization procedures for the DR objective, we view this result as an important step towards the analysis and design of reliable reinforcement learning algorithms for sim-to-real transfer. Motivated by this, we include a number of empirical results highlighting limitations and open questions regarding the analysis of this work. These include the generalization of the DR objective to risk metrics other than the expectation and the convergence of stochastic policy gradient algorithms.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider a fully observed linear time-invariant system defined by an unknown parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ with state $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, control input $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u}$, and disturbance $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$. The state of the system evolves as

$$x_{t+1} = A(\theta)x_t + B(\theta)u_t + w_t,$$

where $w_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ is a zero-mean *i.i.d.* disturbance.¹ For a fixed parameter θ , we define the infinite horizon linear quadratic regulation cost function in terms of positive definite matrices $Q \succeq I$ and $R = I$ as

$$J(K, \theta) \triangleq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{E}^K \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} x_t^\top Q x_t + u_t^\top R u_t \mid \theta \right],$$

¹Generalization to noise covariance $I \neq \Sigma_w \succ 0$ may be achieved by scaling $A(\theta) \leftarrow \Sigma_w^{1/2} A(\theta)$ and $B(\theta) \leftarrow \Sigma_w^{1/2} B(\theta)$.

where the superscript K indicates that the expectation is taken under the feedback policy $u_t = Kx_t$.² The goal of DR is to determine a controller K which minimizes the expectation of the LQR objective over a distribution of systems, as in prior work on sampling-based control [10]. Such a distribution can be hand-designed to capture parametric uncertainty, or learned through Bayesian system identification [5]. In particular, we let Θ be a random variable with density p_Θ . The domain randomization problem is then to find $K_{DR}^* \triangleq \operatorname{argmin}_K J_{DR}(K)$, with

$$J_{DR}(K) \triangleq \mathbf{E}_\Theta J(K, \Theta). \quad (1)$$

To solve this problem, we propose applying gradient descent to a finite sample approximation to objective (1). We use M independently sampled systems $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M \sim p_\Theta$ to construct such a finite-sample approximation:

$$J_{SA}(K) \triangleq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M J(K, \theta_i), \quad (2)$$

and apply policy gradient methods to find its minimizer. In particular, we start from a controller K_0 , and iteratively update the controller as

$$K_{n+1} = K_n - \frac{\alpha}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \nabla_K J(K_n, \theta_i), \quad (3)$$

where α is a fixed stepsize and, as shown in Fazel et al. [14], the gradient $\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)$ for system i is given by

$$\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i) \triangleq E_K^i \Sigma_K^i. \quad (4)$$

In the above expression, Σ_K^i is the steady state covariance of system i under controller K , and E_K^i can be written in terms of the Lyapunov equation defining the LQR cost of applying controller K to system i :

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_K^i &\triangleq \operatorname{dlyap}(A(\theta_i) + B(\theta_i)K, \Sigma_w) \\ E_K^i &\triangleq 2(R + B(\theta_i)^\top P_K^i B(\theta_i))K + B(\theta_i)^\top P_K^i A(\theta_i) \\ P_K^i &\triangleq \operatorname{dlyap}(A(\theta_i) + B(\theta_i)K, Q + KRK^\top). \end{aligned}$$

The primary technical challenge in proving convergence of the above scheme to the minimizer of (1) is that the approach to show gradient domination by Fazel et al. [14] does not generalize to the sample average LQR cost for $M \geq 2$. Consequently, we introduce an additional assumption which ensures the support of the distribution p_Θ is suitably small.

Assumption II.1 (Heterogeneity bound). Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be such that $p_\Theta(\theta) = 0$ for $\theta \notin \mathcal{S}$, and that for all $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\| [A(\theta_1) \ B(\theta_1)] - [A(\theta_2) \ B(\theta_2)] \| \leq \varepsilon_{\text{HET}},$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{\text{HET}} \leq \frac{1}{5e5\tau_B(\theta) \operatorname{tr} \left(P_{K(\theta)}^\theta \right)^{11/2}}$$

²Generalization to $Q \not\preceq I$ $R \neq I$ can be achieved by rescaling the cost by $1/\lambda_{\min}(Q)$ and the input as $B(\theta) \leftarrow B(\theta)R^{-1/2}$.

for all $\theta \in \mathcal{S}$ and where $\tau_B \triangleq \max\{1, \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}} \|B(\theta)\|\}$. Here $K(\theta)$ is the LQR controller for system θ , and $P_{K(\theta)}^\theta$ its corresponding cost matrix from the Riccati equation.

The bound on ε_{HET} is a technical condition for our analysis. It scales inversely with $\|B(\theta)\|$ and the trace of the Riccati equation. In particular, if the systems are too heterogeneous, our analysis cannot guarantee convergence.

Given the above condition, we demonstrate the convergence of policy gradient methods. The proof consists of three parts. We first show that policy gradient methods converge to the minimizer of the sample average objective $J_{SA}(K)$ starting from an initial controller K_0 which simultaneously stabilizes $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M$ and achieves a sufficiently small cost $J_{SA}(K_0)$. We then introduce a discount factor scheduling scheme to achieve convergence from an arbitrary initial controller. Finally, we characterize the discrepancy between the empirical objective (2) and its population counterpart (1).

III. POLICY GRADIENT CONVERGENCE

We now prove convergence of the gradient update (3) to the minimizer of the sample average LQR objective (2). Denote this minimizer by $K_{SA}^* \triangleq \operatorname{argmin}_K J_{SA}(K)$. To show convergence, we impose an additional assumption that the initial controller simultaneously stabilizes all systems.

Assumption III.1 (Simultaneous Stabilization). *We assume that $K_0 \in \mathcal{K}$ where*

$$\mathcal{K} := \{K : \rho(A(\theta_i) + B(\theta_i)K) < 1, i = 1, \dots, M\}.$$

To achieve sufficient conditions to ensure that (3) converges starting from such a K_0 , we introduce a definition that characterizes the cost of a controller on a particular sample in terms of the sample average cost of that controller.

Definition III.1. (*Scenario Boundedness*) *We call the collection of scenarios $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M$ (B, \mathbf{s}) -bounded if for all K satisfying $J_{SA}(K) \leq B J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)$, it holds that $J(K, \theta_i) \leq \mathbf{s} J_{SA}(K)$.*

Any collection of scenarios is (B, \mathbf{s}) -bounded with $B = \infty$ and $\mathbf{s} = M$ by the fact that the individual cost can never exceed the average scaled by the number of scenarios. However, if the scenarios are sufficiently close, we can determine a (B, \mathbf{s}) -stability condition such that \mathbf{s} does not scale with the number of scenarios. This corresponds to the case where one single controller can perform fairly well in multiple scenarios. One such sufficient condition is provided in Lemma III.5.

Under the above definition, we show that the sample average objective is coercive with a smoothness bound defined in terms of the average cost of the initial iterate K_0 on the systems $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M$. This will in turn be used to ensure convergence of (3) to a fixed point. Note that for any θ_i , the LQR cost $J(K, \theta_i)$ is coercive, twice continuously differentiable, and L_i smooth over any sub-level set $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{s}\zeta}^i \triangleq \{K \in \mathcal{K} : J(K, \theta_i) \leq \mathbf{s}\zeta\}$ for $\zeta < \infty$ [18, Lemma 1] for L_i a polynomial in system parameters. This enables us to establish the following lemma.

Lemma III.1 (Sum of LQR Costs is Coercive). *Suppose that the collection $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M)$ is (B, \mathbf{s}) -bounded. Let $\mathcal{K}_\zeta \triangleq \{K \in \mathcal{K} : J_{SA}(K) \leq \zeta\}$. It holds that $\mathcal{K}_\zeta \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^M \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{s}\zeta}^i$ for any $\zeta \leq B$. Furthermore, it follows that $J_{SA}(K)$ is coercive, twice continuously differentiable, and L -smooth over \mathcal{K}_ζ where $L = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^M L_i}{M}$.*

Proof. By Definition III.1, it holds that for any $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, the cost is bounded as $J(K, \theta_i) \leq \mathbf{s} J_{SA}(K) \leq \mathbf{s}\zeta$ for all $K \in \mathcal{K}_\zeta$. Consequently, $\mathcal{K}_\zeta \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^M \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{s}\zeta}^i$. Now, since $M J_{SA}(K) \geq J(K, \theta^i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, M$, when one of $J(K, \theta^i) \rightarrow \infty$ for any sequence $\{K^l\}_{l=1}^\infty$ if $\|K^l\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$ or K^l converges to an element of $\partial\mathcal{K}$, $J_{SA}(K) \rightarrow \infty$ also holds. Thus $J_{SA}(K)$ is coercive [18, Definition 1]. By the fact that $J(K, \theta_i)$ is twice differentiable and L_i smooth over $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{s}\zeta}^i$, it holds by the mean value theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} & J(K', \theta_i) - J(K, \theta_i) \\ & \leq (K' - K)^\top \nabla_K J(K, \theta_i) + \frac{L_i}{2} \|K' - K\|_F^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for $K, K' \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{s}\zeta}^i$. Then $J_{SA}(K)$ is also twice continuously differentiable, and by summing (5) over $i = 1, \dots, M$, it holds that $J_{SA}(K)$ is L -smooth on \mathcal{K}_ζ with $L = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^M L_i}{M}$. \square

The smoothness constant L_i can be explicitly written in terms of system parameters [14, Theorem 7]. Instantiating these bounds, we find that the smoothness constant L of $J_{SA}(K)$ over the sublevel set of value $J_{SA}(K_0)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} L \leq \text{poly} & \left(\max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} J(K_0, \theta_i), \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \|\nabla J(K_0, \theta_i)\|, \right. \\ & \left. \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \|A(\theta_i)\|, \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \|B(\theta_i)\| \right) \end{aligned}$$

A consequence of the above result is that the gradient descent procedure converges to a fixed point.

Lemma III.2 (Convergence to a Fixed Point). *Suppose that the collection $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M)$ is (B, \mathbf{s}) -bounded. Let $\zeta_0 = J_{SA}(K_0)$ and L be the smoothness constant of $J_{SA}(K)$ on \mathcal{K}_{ζ_0} . Consider the policy gradient method (3). Then, for any $0 < \alpha < \frac{2}{L}$, we have $K_n \in \mathcal{K}_{\zeta_0}$ and $J_{SA}(K_{n+1}) \leq J_{SA}(K_n)$ for all n . Furthermore, we have the convergence of the gradient $\sum_{i=1}^M \nabla_K J_{SA}(K, \theta_i) \rightarrow 0$ with the rate*

$$\min_{0 \leq l \leq k} \|\nabla_K J_{SA}(K)\|_F^2 \leq \frac{\zeta_0}{C(k+1)},$$

with $C = \alpha - \frac{L\alpha^2}{2} > 0$.

This is the direct consequence of Lemma III.1 and Theorem 1 of [18]. Lemma III.2 ensures convergence of the policy gradient procedure to a fixed point; however, it does not imply that this fixed point is the global minimizer of (2). In the case of a single dynamical system, Fazel et al. [14] show that a property known as gradient domination is satisfied by the LQR cost:

$$J(K, \theta) - J(K^*, \theta) \leq \|\Sigma_{K^*}\| \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta)\|_F^2.$$

It is not clear if such a condition holds for the sum of LQR objectives defined by multiple systems. In particular, extending the analysis in Lemma 11 of [14] leads to the following weaker result, which provides only an approximate gradient domination condition.

Lemma III.3 (Approximate Gradient Domination). *For any K that simultaneously stabilizes $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M$, it holds that*

$$J_{SA}(K) - J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*) \leq \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \nabla_K J(K, \theta_i) (\Sigma_K^i)^{-1} \Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i \right\|_F^2.$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{E} = \sum_{i=1}^M (\Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i \otimes I) \text{vec} E_K^i$ and $\tilde{G} = \sum_{i=1}^M \Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i \otimes (B(\theta_i)^T P_K^i B(\theta_i) + R)$. By Lemma 12 of [14] and the identity $\text{tr}(A^T B C D^T) = \text{vec}(A)^T (D \otimes B) \text{vec}(C)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} J_{SA}(K) - J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*) &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M J(K, \theta_i) - J(K_{SA}^*, \theta_i) \\ &= -\frac{1}{M} \text{vec}(K - K_{SA}^*)^T (\tilde{G} \text{vec}(K - K_{SA}^*) - 2\tilde{E}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M} \tilde{E} \tilde{G}^{-1} \tilde{E} \leq \frac{1}{M^2} \|\tilde{E}\|^2 = \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M E_K^i \Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i \right\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality results from completing the square and the second inequality follows from the fact that $\tilde{G} \succeq MI$. The last equality holds by the identity $\text{vec}(XYZ) = (Z^T \otimes X) \text{vec}(Y)$. Conclude by applying (4). \square

Critically, we observe that convergence of the gradient $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)$ to zero does not immediately suffice to ensure that the sum of gradients weighted by $(\Sigma_K^i)^{-1} \Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i$ appearing in the approximate gradient domination condition converges to zero. However, we may write the upper bound in the condition as a gradient term, plus a remainder as

$$\begin{aligned} J_{SA}(K) - J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*) \\ \leq 2 \left(\|\nabla_K J_{SA}(K)\|_F^2 + \|R(K, K_{SA}^*)\|_F^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where

$$R(K, K_{SA}^*) \triangleq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M E_K^i (\Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i - \Sigma_K^i).$$

The remainder term above becomes small as $K \rightarrow K_{SA}^*$. In particular, the remainder term is bounded by a small constant multiplied by the cost gap, we achieve gradient domination.

Lemma III.4. *Let $\mu \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\zeta_0 = J_{SA}(K_0)$. Suppose that*

$$\|R(K, K_{SA}^*)\|_F^2 \leq \mu (J_{SA}(K) - J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)) \quad (7)$$

for all $K \in S \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{\zeta_0}$. Then for all $K \in S$,

$$J_{SA}(K) - J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*) \leq \frac{2}{1 - 2\mu} \|\nabla_K J_{SA}(K)\|_F^2.$$

Proof. The result follows by substitution of (7) into (6). \square

The above result in combination with Lemma III.2 establishes convergence of algorithm (3) to the solution of objective (2) from an initial iterate satisfying Assumption III.1 as long as the collection $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M$ is (B, \mathbf{s}) -bounded, and the iterates of the gradient updates (3) converge to a set S for which the condition (7) is satisfied. The convergence rate is determined by the stepsize α , the initial cost ζ_0 , and the smoothness constant L of the sample average control cost.

The heterogeneity bound of Assumption II.1 ensures that (B, \mathbf{s}) -boundedness is satisfied.

Lemma III.5. *Under Assumption II.1, it holds that any collection of samples $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M$ drawn from p_Θ is (B, \mathbf{s}) -bounded with $B = 8$ and $\mathbf{s} = 2$.*

If additionally the cost of the initial iterate is not too much higher than the optimal cost, then condition (7) holds.

Lemma III.6. *Suppose Assumption II.1 holds and that*

$$\zeta_0 = J_{SA}(K_0) \leq 8J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*).$$

Then condition (7) is satisfied with $\mu = \frac{1}{4}$ and

$$S = \left\{ K \in \mathcal{K}_{\zeta_0} : \|\nabla_K J_{SA}(K)\|_F \leq \frac{1}{256\tau_B J_{SA}(K)^{5/2}} \right\}.$$

Before proving this fact, we state an intermediate result, the proof of which is deferred to the appendix.

Lemma III.7. *Suppose that Assumption II.1 holds and that $J_{SA}(K_0) \leq 8 \inf_K J_{SA}(K)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|R(K, K_{SA}^*)\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{4} \|K - K_{SA}^*\|_F \\ \|R(K_{SA}^*, K)\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{4} \|K - K_{SA}^*\|_F \end{aligned}$$

for all $K \in S$ with S defined by Lemma III.6.

We now prove Lemma III.6.

Proof. By Lemma III.7, it holds that $\|R(K, K_{SA}^*)\|_F \leq \frac{1}{4} \|K - K_{SA}^*\|_F$ and $\|R(K_{SA}^*, K)\|_F \leq \frac{1}{4} \|K - K_{SA}^*\|_F$. To bound the result by $J_{SA}(K) - J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)$, note that by [14, Lemma 12],

$$\begin{aligned} J_{SA}(K) - J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*) \\ &\geq \frac{2}{M} \text{tr} \left((K - K_{SA}^*)^T \left(\sum_{i=1}^M E_{K_{SA}^*}^i \Sigma_K^i \right) \right) + \|K - K_{SA}^*\|_F^2 \\ &\geq \|K - K_{SA}^*\|_F^2 - 2 \|K - K_{SA}^*\|_F \|R(K_{SA}^*, K)\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $J_{SA}(K) - J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|K - K_{SA}^*\|_F^2$, which can in turn be substituted to show $\|R(K, K_{SA}^*)\|_F \leq \frac{1}{4} \|K - K_{SA}^*\|_F \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{J_{SA}(K) - J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)}$. Squaring completes the proof. \square

Ultimately, synthesizing these results provides the following convergence bound.

Theorem III.1 (Policy Gradient for Sample Average LQR). *Suppose Assumption II.1 holds. Let K_{SA}^* be an optimal policy for the sample average objective (2), and let K_0 be a controller which simultaneously stabilizes $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M$*

achieving average cost $J_{SA}(K_0) \leq 8J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)$. Let L be the smoothness constant of $J_{SA}(K)$ over K_{ζ_0} . Consider running algorithm (3) with stepsize $\alpha = 1/L$. Then after

$$N \geq 2L\zeta_0 \max\{1/\varepsilon, 64\tau_B\zeta_0\}$$

iterations, let $\tilde{K} = \operatorname{argmin}_{K \in \{K_0, \dots, K_N\}} \|\nabla_K J_{SA}(K)\|_F$. Then it holds that $J_{SA}(\tilde{K}) - J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*) \leq \varepsilon$.

The above result demonstrates that under a sufficiently small randomization distribution, the approximate gradient domination condition suffices to ensure convergence to the global optimal solution for the sample average LQR objective. The heterogeneity requirements of Assumption II.1 are stronger than desired, as they exclude particular cases in which it is possible to achieve a controller that simultaneously stabilizes multiple systems, but for which the systems are not close in the sense of Assumption II.1. We leave relaxing this condition or determining if it is fundamental to future work. The condition $J_{SA}(K_0) \leq 8J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)$ means K_0 is not too far in cost from the optimal – this can be guaranteed by the discounting scheme in the sequel.

IV. STABILIZATION

The previous section analyzed the convergence of the policy gradient method on a collection of sampled instances starting from an initial stabilizing controller. Here, we remove the requirement that we have access to an initial controller which simultaneously stabilizes all systems and incurs a small cost. We do so by incorporating a discounting factor annealing scheme. In particular, consider scaling the matrices $A(\theta_i)$ and $B(\theta_i)$ by a factor $\sqrt{\gamma}$. For any controller K , if $\gamma < \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \rho(A(\theta_i) + B(\theta_i)K)^{-2}$, then K stabilizes $\sqrt{\gamma}A(\theta_i)$ and $\sqrt{\gamma}B(\theta_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, M$.³ Therefore, if we start from a small discount factor, run several iterations of (3), and then increase the discount factor, we will be able to ensure convergence to a controller that simultaneously stabilizes all systems. Algorithm 1 extends a similar scheme proposed in Perdomo et al. [21] for the single system setting to the multi-system setting we consider. We let $J_{SA}(\cdot | \gamma)$ denote the sample average cost (2) evaluated on the discounted systems $(\sqrt{\gamma}A(\theta_i), \sqrt{\gamma}B(\theta_i))$.

Subproblems (8) and (10) can be solved via bisection, while subproblem (9) can be solved with algorithm (3) starting from $K_0 \leftarrow K$ by choosing an appropriate stepsize, and running sufficiently many iterations, as in Theorem III.1. Extending the analysis of [21, Theorem 1] to the setting of multiple systems leads to the following result.

Theorem IV.1 (Stabilization by Discount Annealing). *Suppose that Assumption II.1 holds. Let γ_0 be the largest γ satisfying (8). Then Algorithm 1 is guaranteed to cease after at most $1024J_{SA}(K^*)^4 \log(1/\gamma_0)$ iterations. At the start of any iteration, it holds that $J_{SA}(K|\gamma) \leq 8 \inf_{\tilde{K}} J_{SA}(\tilde{K}|\gamma)$. The final controller K' jointly stabilizes all M systems, and satisfies $J_{SA}(K') - J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*) \leq \varepsilon$.*

³Scaling A and B by $\sqrt{\gamma} < \rho(A+BK)^{-1}$ is equivalent to introducing a discount factor in the LQR cost which ensures the cost is finite even for a controller which does not stabilize A, B .

Algorithm 1 Discount Annealing

- 1: **Input:** collection of systems, $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M$, optimization tolerance ε
- 2: $K \leftarrow 0$
- 3: Find the largest $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ satisfying

$$J_{SA}(K|\gamma) \leq 8d_X. \quad (8)$$

- 4: **while** $\gamma < 1$ **do**
- 5: Set $K \leftarrow K'$, where K' is such that

$$J_{SA}(K' | \gamma) - \inf_{\tilde{K}} J_{SA}(\tilde{K} | \gamma) \leq d_X. \quad (9)$$

- 6: Find a discount factor $\gamma' \in [\gamma, 1]$ such that

$$2.5J_{SA}(K | \gamma) \leq J_{SA}(K | \gamma') \leq 4J_{SA}(K | \gamma) \quad (10)$$

- 7: $\gamma \leftarrow \gamma'$
- 8: Run (3) starting from K to find K' such that

$$J_{SA}(K') - \inf_{\tilde{K}} J_{SA}(\tilde{K}) \leq \varepsilon.$$

- 9: **Return** K'
-

Notably, the bound on the discounted cost of a controller K at the start of every iteration suffices to satisfy the requisite condition on the cost of the K_0 in Theorem III.1.

Proof. We first show that at the start of every iteration $J_{SA}(K|\gamma) \leq 8 \inf_{\tilde{K}} J_{SA}(\tilde{K}|\gamma)$. This holds for the first iteration by the fact that γ_0 satisfies the bound (8), and $d_X \leq \inf_{\tilde{K}} J_{SA}(\tilde{K}|\gamma)$. It holds for subsequent iterations by the fact that update (9) achieves a controller within a factor of 2 of the optimal cost, and the choice of γ in (10) inflates the cost by at most a factor of 4. This implies that $J_{SA}(K|\gamma) \leq 8 \inf_{\tilde{K}} J_{SA}(\tilde{K}|\gamma)$ by the fact that the cost is nondecreasing with γ .

To bound the number of iterations, let $P_{K,\gamma}^i$ denote the Riccati equation solution corresponding to the discounted system $(\sqrt{\gamma}A(\theta_i), \sqrt{\gamma}B(\theta_i))$. By Perdomo et al. [21, Theorem 1], if $\tilde{\gamma} \leq \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} (1/(8 \|P_{K,\gamma}^i\|^4) + 1)^2 \gamma$, then $\operatorname{tr}(P_{K,\gamma}^i) \leq 2 \operatorname{tr}(P_{K,\tilde{\gamma}}^i)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. Therefore $J_{SA}(K|\tilde{\gamma}) \leq 2J_{SA}(K|\gamma)$. Thus the value γ' from (10) satisfies

$$\frac{\gamma'}{\gamma} \geq \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \left(\frac{1}{8 \|P_{K,\gamma}^i\|^4} + 1 \right)^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{2^{11} J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)^4} + 1 \right)^2.$$

This follows from the bound $\|P_{K,\gamma}^i\| \leq \operatorname{tr}(P_{K,\gamma}^i) \leq 2J_{SA}(K|\gamma) \leq 4J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*|\gamma)$. Here, the second inequality follows from Lemma III.5 paired with the fact that $J_{SA}(K|\gamma) \leq 8 \inf_{\tilde{K}} J_{SA}(\tilde{K}|\gamma)$. The last inequality follows from the fact that K satisfies the error bound of (9), and $d_X \leq J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*|\gamma)$. Then using the inequality $\log(1+x) \leq x$, it holds that $\gamma = 1$ after the given number of iterations.

The bound on the sample average cost of the final iterate follows immediately from the last step of the algorithm. \square




Fig. 1. Convergence of policy gradient with domain randomization. A controller initialized at $K = 0$ converges to the optimal controller via progressive discounting and gradient descent (left), resulting in the convergence of the excess sample average cost (center). With more samples, the minimizer for the sample average cost and the domain randomization objective start to match (right).

V. SAMPLING

The previous sections provided guarantees ensuring that a gradient-based algorithm converges to the minimizer of objective (2). In this section, we bound the suboptimality incurred by optimizing the sample average cost (2) rather than the desired domain randomization objective (1). In particular, let \tilde{K} be the iterate of running the aforementioned gradient procedure. It holds that

$$J_{DR}(\tilde{K}) - J_{DR}(K_{DR}^*) = J_{DR}(\tilde{K}) - J_{SA}(\tilde{K}) + J_{SA}(\tilde{K}) - J_{SA}(K_{DR}^*) + J_{SA}(K_{DR}^*) - J_{DR}(K_{DR}^*).$$

The results of the previous section ensure that the term

$$J_{SA}(\tilde{K}) - J_{SA}(K_{DR}^*) \leq J_{SA}(\tilde{K}) - J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Then to characterize the gap $J_{DR}(\tilde{K}) - J_{DR}(K_{DR}^*)$, it suffices to achieve upper bounds on $|J_{DR}(\tilde{K}) - J_{SA}(\tilde{K})|$ and $|J_{DR}(K_{DR}^*) - J_{SA}(K_{DR}^*)|$. Note that if $J(K, \theta) \leq \mathcal{J}$, then by Hoeffding's inequality [22], it holds that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$|J_{DR}(K) - J_{SA}(K)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\mathcal{J}^2}{M} \log \frac{2}{\delta}}.$$

To establish the bound \mathcal{J} , consider $\tilde{\theta}, \theta \in \mathcal{S}$. We show in Lemma IX.9 that under Assumption II.1, $J(K_{DR}^*, \tilde{\theta}) \leq 6J(K(\theta), \theta)$ and $J(\tilde{K}, \tilde{\theta}) \leq 48J(K(\theta), \theta)$. This leads to the following characterization of the excess cost.

Theorem V.1 (Population Excess Cost Bound). *Suppose Assumption II.1 holds. Consider sampling M systems from Θ . Let \tilde{K} be the iterate achieved by running Algorithm 1. Consider an arbitrary $\theta \in \mathcal{S}$. With probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$J_{DR}(\tilde{K}) - J_{DR}(K_{DR}^*) \leq \varepsilon + 200 \sqrt{\frac{J(K(\theta), \theta)}{M} \log \frac{2}{\delta}}.$$

VI. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

We conduct numerical experiments on the discretized and linearized inverted pendulum defined by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & dt \\ \frac{g}{\ell} dt & 1 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{dt}{m\ell^2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

We suppose that the parameters $dt = 0.01$ and $g = 10$ are known. The unknown parameters m and ℓ are modeled with a

uniform distribution over the interval $[0.75, 1.25]$. For policy update in Algorithm 1, we run 20 iterations of (3) with a stepsize $\alpha = 1 \times 10^{-3}$ instead of explicitly evaluating the inequality (9). Refer to the code for more details.⁴

a) *Verification of Proposed Approach:* Figure 1 demonstrates the application of Algorithm 1 to a collection of $M = 10, 20, 500$ samples from the distribution of systems (11). We run the algorithm over 100 random seeds. We plot the median and shade 25% to 75% quantile for the distance of the iterate from the optimal controller, the excess sample average control cost, and a Monte Carlo approximation of the domain randomized objective (1) formed with 10^5 samples. We see that the discounted annealing algorithm succeeds in synthesizing a controller that simultaneously stabilizes all systems, and that the policy update (3) converges to the minimizer of sample average cost. This is predicted by the analysis of Theorem III.1 and Theorem IV.1. The rightmost figure demonstrates the impact of optimizing the sample average objective defined in terms of M samples. As suggested in Theorem V.1, sampling more systems results in a controller achieving lower domain randomization objective.

b) *Alternative Risk Metrics:* We can consider risk metrics other than the expectation for defining the objective (1). For example, we could replace the expectation the entropic risk measure of temperature t :

$$J_{ER}^t(K) \triangleq \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbf{E}_{\Theta}[\exp(tJ(K, \Theta))]. \quad (12)$$

The gradient-based optimization of a Monte Carlo approximation proposed in the previous sections can still be applied in this setting by replacing the average gradient of (3) with the gradient of (12):

$$K \leftarrow K - \alpha \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{\exp(tJ(K, \theta_i))}{\sum_{m=1}^M \exp(tJ(K, \theta_m))} \nabla_K J(K, \theta_i).$$

We lack theoretical convergence guarantees for this approach; however, Figure 2 validates it numerically. We see that the proposed algorithm still converges with this alternative risk metric and achieves the optimal controller for the risk-sensitive objective. This result opens the future direction of risk-sensitive domain randomized control.

⁴Code available at [this GitHub repository](#)




Fig. 2. Convergence of policy gradient with the entropic risk measure using $t = 1.0$




Fig. 3. Stochastic Gradient Descent (Algorithm 2) applied to the linearized inverted pendulum of (11).

c) *Stochastic Gradient Descent*: Prior experiments verified that the approach analyzed in sections Section III-V is valid for the numerical example of stabilizing a pendulum linearized about the upright position. In Figure 3, we demonstrate a stochastic gradient descent approach which samples a new system at every iteration and takes a gradient step with that system, detailed in Algorithm 2.⁵ This also converges, although we lack theoretical convergence guarantees. The figure plots the mean and standard deviation over 5 random seeds. The cost $J_{DR}(K)$ is approximated via Monte Carlo, as in the previous experiments. The initial stepsize is chosen as $\alpha = 2 \times 10^{-4}$ and the discount coefficient is $\gamma_0 = 0.99$. We see that the controller converges to achieve approximately the same cost on the domain randomization objective as the batch algorithm with $M = 500$ samples from Figure 1.

Algorithm 2 Stochastic Gradient Descent

- 1: **Input:** distribution p_Θ , iterations N , stepsize α , discount coefficient γ_0
 - 2: $K \leftarrow 0$,
 - 3: **for** $n = 1, \dots, N$ **do**
 - 4: Sample $\theta \sim p_\Theta$
 - 5: $\gamma \leftarrow \min\{\gamma_0 \rho(A(\theta) + B(\theta)K)^{-2}, 1\}$
 - 6: $K \leftarrow K - \alpha \nabla_K J(K, \theta)$
 - 7: **Return:** K
-

d) *Rotary Inverted Pendulum Experiments*: We also verify the Algorithm 1 on a Quanser Qube Servo 2 rotary inverted pendulum [23] to study how it can help to overcome the sim-to-real gap. We consider the scenario where we

⁵The update is performed with the gradient of the discounted cost for the sampled system. The discounting ensures stabilization by the current iterate.

have coarse estimates of several physical parameters, and compare the controller synthesized with DR against the LQR controller which takes these coarse estimates as ground truth. The DR controller achieves a higher success rate by holding a pendulum upright and around the center.⁶ Details are deferred to the appendix.

VII. DISCUSSION

There are several exciting possibilities for theoretical and empirical extensions of the results presented in this paper.

- **Relaxed heterogeneity assumptions:** Our theory required strong requirements on the distance between systems. These requirements can almost certainly be made weaker; however, it is unclear the extent to which they are fundamental. Our numerical experiments failed to discover any instances where policy gradient did not converge due to a large distance between systems, unless it was impossible to simultaneously stabilize these systems.
- **Extensions of the convergence analysis:** Our numerical experiments tested a variation of the algorithm (stochastic gradient descent) and an alternative risk metric (entropic risk) for domain randomization for which we do not have theoretical convergence guarantees, and saw empirical success. It would be interesting to provide convergence proofs for these approaches. In particular, stochastic gradient descent closer resembles the way that domain randomization is implemented in practice. Meanwhile, the entropic risk (or alternative metrics) may better represent the goal of domain randomization to provide robustness to uncertainty. Indeed, entropic risk interpolates between DR as $t \rightarrow 0$, and robust control as $t \rightarrow \infty$.
- **Practical implications:** The study conducted in this paper provides a better understanding of the application of gradient-based approaches for reinforcement learning with domain randomization. It may be possible to use this perspective to design alternative hyperparameter schedules for domain randomization as applied in practice [3].

VIII. CONCLUSION

Our work proves the convergence of policy gradient methods applied to linear quadratic control with domain randomization. The analysis relies upon a generalization of the gradient domination condition from prior work. This generalization results in guarantees that are sensitive to

⁶The experiment video can be found at [this YouTube link](#).

the initialization; however, a curriculum learning approach with an appropriate schedule can bypass this sensitivity. We believe that this line of analysis has potential to demystify and improve heuristic approaches for taming the optimization landscape of DR from the robot learning literature [3].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Leonardo Toso for instructive conversations. TF is supported by JASSO Exchange Support program and UTokyo-TOYOTA Study Abroad Scholarship. TF and GP are supported in part by NSF Award SLES 2331880 and NSF TRIPODS EnCORE 2217033. BL and NM are supported by NSF Award SLES-2331880, NSF CAREER award ECCS-2045834 and AFOSR Award FA9550-24-1-0102.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Tobin, R. Fong, A. Ray, J. Schneider, W. Zaremba, and P. Abbeel, "Domain randomization for transferring deep neural networks from simulation to the real world," in *2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2017, pp. 23–30.
- [2] X. B. Peng, M. Andrychowicz, W. Zaremba, and P. Abbeel, "Sim-to-real transfer of robotic control with dynamics randomization," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2018, pp. 3803–3810.
- [3] I. Akkaya, M. Andrychowicz, M. Chociej, M. Litwin, B. McGrew, A. Petron, A. Paino, M. Plappert, G. Powell, R. Ribas *et al.*, "Solving rubik's cube with a robot hand," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.07113*, 2019.
- [4] B. Mehta, M. Diaz, F. Golemo, C. J. Pal, and L. Paull, "Active domain randomization," in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 1162–1176.
- [5] T. Fujinami, B. D. Lee, N. Matni, and G. J. Pappas, "Domain randomization is sample efficient for linear quadratic control," 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.12310>
- [6] A. Loquercio, E. Kaufmann, R. Ranftl, A. Dosovitskiy, V. Koltun, and D. Scaramuzza, "Deep drone racing: From simulation to reality with domain randomization," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2019.
- [7] G. C. Calafiore and M. C. Campi, "The scenario approach to robust control design," *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 742–753, 2006.
- [8] R. F. Stengel and L. R. Ray, "Technical notes and correspondence: Stochastic robustness of linear time-invariant control systems," *NASA. Langley Research Center, Joint University Program for Air Transportation Research, 1990-1991*, 1991.
- [9] L. R. Ray and R. F. Stengel, "A monte carlo approach to the analysis of control system robustness," *Automatica*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 229–236, 1993.
- [10] M. Vidyasagar, "Randomized algorithms for robust controller synthesis using statistical learning theory," *Automatica*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 1515–1528, 2001.
- [11] X. Chen, J. Hu, C. Jin, L. Li, and L. Wang, "Understanding domain randomization for sim-to-real transfer," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.03239*, 2021.
- [12] Y. Zhong, A. A. Deshmukh, and C. Scott, "Pac reinforcement learning without real-world feedback," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.10449>
- [13] F. Muratore, F. Ramos, G. Turk, W. Yu, M. Gienger, and J. Peters, "Robot learning from randomized simulations: A review," *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, vol. 9, p. 799893, 2022.
- [14] M. Fazel, R. Ge, S. Kakade, and M. Mesbahi, "Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 1467–1476.
- [15] K. Zhang, B. Hu, and T. Basar, "Policy optimization for \mathcal{H}_2 linear control with \mathcal{H}_∞ robustness guarantee: Implicit regularization and global convergence," in *Learning for Dynamics and Control*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 179–190.
- [16] S. Rathod, M. Bhadu, and A. De, "Global convergence using policy gradient methods for model-free markovian jump linear quadratic control," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.15228*, 2021.
- [17] J. Umenberger, M. Simchowitz, J. C. Perdomo, K. Zhang, and R. Tedrake, "Globally convergent policy search over dynamic filters for output estimation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.11659*, 2022.
- [18] B. Hu, K. Zhang, N. Li, M. Mesbahi, M. Fazel, and T. Başar, "Toward a theoretical foundation of policy optimization for learning control policies," *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 123–158, 2023.
- [19] B. Gravell, P. M. Esfahani, and T. Summers, "Learning robust control for lqr systems with multiplicative noise via policy gradient," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13547*, 2019.
- [20] H. Wang, L. F. Toso, A. Mitra, and J. Anderson, "Model-free learning with heterogeneous dynamical systems: A federated lqr approach," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11743*, 2023.
- [21] J. Perdomo, J. Umenberger, and M. Simchowitz, "Stabilizing dynamical systems via policy gradient methods," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 34, pp. 29 274–29 286, 2021.
- [22] R. Vershynin, "High-dimensional probability," 2009.
- [23] K. Polzounov, R. Sundar, and L. Redden, "Blue River Controls: A toolkit for Reinforcement Learning Control Systems on Hardware," Accepted at the Workshop on Deep Reinforcement Learning at the 33rd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2019), Vancouver, Canada., 2019.
- [24] M. Simchowitz and D. Foster, "Naive exploration is optimal for online lqr," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 8937–8948.

IX. APPENDIX

A. Notation

We use the fact that $J(K, \theta) \geq 1$ by the lower bound on Q and the fact that $\Sigma_w = I$. Note that $\|X + Y\|^2 \leq 2\|X\|^2 + 2\|Y\|^2$. Let $\nu(K) := 1 + \|K\|$ and $\zeta(K) := 1 + \|K\|^2$. Let $\tau_B = \max\{\|B(\theta_1)\|, \dots, \|B(\theta_M)\|, 1\}$. Assume that if $J_{SA}(K) \leq \mathcal{B}$, then $J^i(K) \leq \mathfrak{s}J_{SA}(K)$.

B. Helper Lemmas

Lemma IX.1 (Cost Bound, Lemma 13 of [14], Lemma 6 of [5]). *Let K be arbitrary gain that stabilizes the system. Then following inequalities hold*

- 1) $\|K\|^2 \leq \|P_K^i\| \leq \frac{J(K, \theta_i)}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_w)} = J(K, \theta_i)$,
- 2) $\|\Sigma_K^i\| \leq \frac{J(K, \theta_i)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} \leq J(K, \theta_i)$,
- 3) $\|E_K^i\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_w)^2} \text{tr}(\Sigma_K^i (E_K^i)^\top E_K^i \Sigma_K^i) = \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\|_F^2$,
- 4) $1 \leq \nu(K) \leq 2\sqrt{J(K, \theta_i)}$, $1 \leq \zeta(K) \leq 2J(K, \theta_i)$.

Lemma IX.2 (Closed Loop System Perturbation). *Let $A_{\text{cl}}^i := A(\theta_i) + B(\theta_i)K$ for $i = 1, 2$ with some stabilizing controller K . Define the heterogeneity parameter $\epsilon_{\text{het}} := \max\{\|A(\theta_1) - A(\theta_2)\|, \|B(\theta_1) - B(\theta_2)\|\}$. Then $\|A_{\text{cl}}^1 - A_{\text{cl}}^2\| \leq \nu(K)\epsilon_{\text{het}}$.*

Proof. From the definition of A_{cl}^i , we have

$$\|A_{\text{cl}}^1 - A_{\text{cl}}^2\| = \|(A(\theta_1) - A(\theta_2)) - (B(\theta_1) - B(\theta_2))K\| \leq \|A(\theta_1) - A(\theta_2)\| + \|B(\theta_1) - B(\theta_2)\| \|K\|.$$

□

Lemma IX.3 (State Correlation Matrix Perturbation). *Let K be a stabilizing controller. Then for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, it holds that $\|\Sigma_K^i - \Sigma_K^j\| \leq 2J(K, \theta_i)J(K, \theta_j)^{3/2}(\nu(K)\epsilon_{\text{het}} + \zeta(K)\epsilon_{\text{het}}^2)$.*

Proof. From the Lyapunov perturbation argument in Lemma 3 in [5] and Lemma IX.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Sigma_K^i - \Sigma_K^j\| &\leq \frac{\|\Sigma_K^i\| \|\Sigma_K^j\|}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_w)} \left(2\|A_{\text{cl}}^j\| \|A_{\text{cl}}^i - A_{\text{cl}}^j\| + \|A_{\text{cl}}^i - A_{\text{cl}}^j\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq 2\|\Sigma_K^i\| \|\Sigma_K^j\| \left(\|P_K^j\|^{1/2} \epsilon_{\text{het}}(1 + \|K\|) + \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2(1 + \|K\|^2) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\|A_{\text{cl}}^j\| \leq \|P_K^j\|^{1/2}$ in the second inequality. Apply Lemma IX.1 to conclude. □

Lemma IX.4 (Lyapunov Perturbation). *Then it holds that $\|P_K^i - P_K^j\| \leq 2J(K, \theta_i)J(K, \theta_j)^{3/2}(\nu(K)\epsilon_{\text{het}} + \zeta(K)\epsilon_{\text{het}}^2)$.*

Proof. From Lemma 3 in [5], it follows for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ that

$$\|P_K^i - P_K^j\| \leq \frac{2\|P_K^i\| \|P_K^j\|}{\sigma_{\min}(Q + K^T R K)} \left(\|A_{\text{cl}}^j\| \epsilon_{\text{het}}(1 + \|K\|) + \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2(1 + \|K\|^2) \right),$$

and apply Lemma IX.1 and $\|A_{\text{cl}}^j\| \leq \|P_K^j\|^{1/2}$. □

Lemma IX.5 (E_K perturbation). *Let K be a stabilizing controller. Then it holds for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ that*

$$\|E_K^i - E_K^j\| \leq \left(J(K, \theta_i) + \tau_B J(K, \theta_j) + 2\tau_B J(K, \theta_i)J(K, \theta_j)^{3/2} \right) \nu(K)\epsilon_{\text{het}} + 2\tau_B J(K, \theta_i)J(K, \theta_j)^{3/2} \zeta(K)\epsilon_{\text{het}}^2.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_K^i - E_K^j\| &= \left\| (R + B(\theta_i)^\top P_K^i B(\theta_i))K - B(\theta_i)^\top P_K^i A(\theta_i) - (R + B(\theta_j)^\top P_K^j B(\theta_j))K + B(\theta_j)^\top P_K^j A(\theta_j) \right\| \\ &= \left\| -B(\theta_i)^\top P_K^i A_{\text{cl}}^i + B(\theta_j)^\top P_K^j A_{\text{cl}}^j \right\| \\ &= \left\| (B(\theta_j)^\top P_K^j - B(\theta_i)^\top P_K^i) A_{\text{cl}}^i + B(\theta_j)^\top P_K^j (A_{\text{cl}}^i - A_{\text{cl}}^j) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| B(\theta_j)^\top P_K^j - B(\theta_i)^\top P_K^i \right\| + \left\| B(\theta_j)^\top P_K^j \right\| \|A_{\text{cl}}^i - A_{\text{cl}}^j\|, \end{aligned}$$

where we add and subtract $B(\theta_j)^\top P_K^j A_{\text{cl}}^i$ in the third equality. As for the first term, we have

$$\left\| B(\theta_j)^\top P_K^j - B(\theta_i)^\top P_K^i \right\| = \left\| (B(\theta_j) - B(\theta_i))^\top P_K^i + B(\theta_j)^\top (P_K^j - P_K^i) \right\| \leq \epsilon_{\text{het}} \|P_K^i\| + \|B(\theta_j)\| \|P_K^i - P_K^j\|.$$

Thus with Lemma IX.1 and Lemma IX.4,

$$\left\| B(\theta_j)^\top P_K^j - B(\theta_i)^\top P_K^i \right\| \leq J(K, \theta_i) \epsilon_{\text{het}} + 2\tau_B J(K, \theta_i) J(K, \theta_j)^{3/2} \left(\epsilon_{\text{het}} (1 + \|K\|) + \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2 (1 + \|K\|^2) \right).$$

For the remaining term $\left\| (B^j)^\top P_K^j \right\| \left\| A_{\text{cl}}^i - A_{\text{cl}}^j \right\| \leq \tau_B J(K, \theta_j) \epsilon_{\text{het}} (1 + \|K\|)$, from Lemma IX.1 and Lemma IX.2. Since $\nu(K) > 1$, we get the result. \square

Lemma IX.6 (Gradient Perturbation). *Suppose that $J(K, \theta_i) \leq \mathbf{s} J_{SA}(K)$ for $i = 1, \dots, M$. Let $\nabla J(K, \theta_i)$ be the gradient of the cost function of i th system with the controller K . It holds for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ that*

$$\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^M \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i) - \nabla_K J(K, \theta_j)\|_F \leq (M_i^1 + M_i^3 \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\|) \nu(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}} + (M_i^2 + M_i^3 \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\|) \zeta(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2.$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_i^1 &= M J_{SA}(K) J(K, \theta_i) + M \tau_B \mathbf{s} J_{SA}(K)^2 + 2M \tau_B \mathbf{s}^{3/2} J_{SA}(K)^{5/2} J(K, \theta_i), \\ M_i^2 &= 2M \tau_B \mathbf{s}^{3/2} J_{SA}(K)^{5/2} J(K, \theta_i), \\ M_i^3 &= 2M \mathbf{s}^{1/2} J_{SA}(K)^{3/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i) = E_K^i \Sigma_K^i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i) - \nabla_K J(K, \theta_j)\|_F &= \left\| E_K^i \Sigma_K^i - E_K^j \Sigma_K^j \right\|_F \leq \left\| E_K^i \Sigma_K^i \left((\Sigma_K^i)^{-1} (\Sigma_K^i - \Sigma_K^j) \right) \right\|_F + \left\| (E_K^i - E_K^j) \Sigma_K^j \right\|_F \\ &\leq \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\|_F \left\| (\Sigma_K^i)^{-1} (\Sigma_K^i - \Sigma_K^j) \right\| + \left\| E_K^i - E_K^j \right\| \left\| \Sigma_K^j \right\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemma IX.1, Lemma IX.5 and (14), we get

$$S_{ij} = \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i) - \nabla_K J(K, \theta_j)\|_F \leq (M_{ij}^1 + M_{ij}^3 \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\|) \nu(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}} + (M_{ij}^2 + M_{ij}^3 \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\|) \zeta(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2,$$

where $M_{ij}^1 = (J(K, \theta_i) + \tau_B J(K, \theta_j) + 2\tau_B J(K, \theta_i) J(K, \theta_j)^{3/2}) J(K, \theta_j)$, $M_{ij}^2 = 2\tau_B J(K, \theta_i) J(K, \theta_j)^{5/2}$, $M_{ij}^3 = 2J(K, \theta_j)^{3/2}$. Then by summing over $j \in \{1, \dots, M\} \setminus \{i\}$ and applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality concludes the proof. \square

Lemma IX.7 (Controller Gap). *Let K_i, K_i^* be arbitrary and optimal controllers for the system with the cost $J(K, \theta_i)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. Then it holds that $\|K_i - K_i^*\|_F \leq \sqrt{J(K_i^*, \theta_i)} \|\nabla J(K_i, \theta_i)\|_F$.*

Proof. From Lemma 12 in [14],

$$J(K, \theta_i) - J(K_i^*, \theta_i) = \text{vec}(K_i - K_i^*)^\top \left(\Sigma_{K_i}^i \otimes (R + B(\theta_i)^\top P_{K_i^*}^i B(\theta_i)) \right) \text{vec}(K_i - K_i^*),$$

where the term linear in $K - K_i^*$ disappears since $E_{K_i^*}^i = (R + B(\theta_i)^\top P_{K_i^*}^i B(\theta_i)) K_i^* - B(\theta_i)^\top P_{K_i^*}^i A(\theta_i) = 0$. Since $\Sigma_{K_i}^i \otimes (R + B(\theta_i)^\top P_{K_i^*}^i B(\theta_i)) \succeq I$, It holds that $\|K_i - K_i^*\|_F^2 \leq J(K_i, \theta_i) - J(K_i^*, \theta_i)$. Now consider the gradient domination condition for $J(K, \theta_i)$. From Lemma 11 in [14], $J(K_i, \theta_i) - J(K_i^*, \theta_i) \leq \left\| \Sigma_{K_i^*}^i \right\| \|\nabla J(K_i, \theta_i)\|_F^2$. By applying Lemma IX.1 we get the result. \square

Lemma IX.8 (Cost bound with heterogeneity). *Suppose Assumption II.1 holds. Consider any $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S}$, and let $K(\theta), K(\tilde{\theta})$ be the corresponding LQR controller. The following inequalities are satisfied:*

- 1) $J(K(\theta), \tilde{\theta}) \leq 2J(K(\tilde{\theta}), \tilde{\theta})$.
- 2) $J(K(\theta), \tilde{\theta}) \leq 3J(K(\theta), \theta)$.

Proof. By the fact that $\epsilon_{\text{het}} \leq \frac{1}{54 \|P_{K(\theta)}^\theta\|^{1/5}}$, the first fact follows from Simchowitiz and Foster [24], Theorem 5 part two. Similarly, the second fact follows from the first fact in addition to Simchowitiz and Foster [24], Theorem 5 part four. \square

C. Proof of Lemma III.5

Consider any K such that $J_{SA}(K) \leq 8J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)$. For some $\tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S}$, it holds that $J(K, \tilde{\theta}) \leq J_{SA}(K) \leq 8J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)$.

By Lemma IX.8, $J(K(\theta), \tilde{\theta}) \leq 3J(K(\theta), \theta)$ for $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S}$. Therefore any controller K satisfying $J_{SA}(K) \leq 8J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)$ also satisfies $J(K, \tilde{\theta}) \leq 24J_{SA}(K(\theta), \theta)$.

Furthermore, from Lemma IX.4, it holds for any $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ and some $\tilde{\theta}$ that

$$\text{tr}(P_K^{\theta_j} - P_K^{\tilde{\theta}}) \leq 2 \text{tr}(P_K^{\theta_j}) \left\| P_K^{\tilde{\theta}} \right\| \left(\left\| P_K^{\tilde{\theta}} \right\|^{1/2} (1 + \|K\|) \epsilon_{\text{het}} + (1 + \|K\|^2) \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2 \right) \leq 8 \text{tr}(P_K^{\theta_j}) \left\| P_K^{\tilde{\theta}} \right\|^2 \epsilon_{\text{het}}.$$

From Lemma IX.8, it follows that $\epsilon_{\text{het}} \leq \frac{1}{16 \cdot 24^2 \cdot \text{tr}(P_{K(\theta)}^{\theta})^5} \leq \frac{1}{16 \cdot 24^2 \text{tr}(P_{K(\theta)}^{\theta})^2}$. Then by substituting the above bound on $J_{SA}(K(\theta), \theta)$, ϵ_{het} satisfies $\epsilon_{\text{het}} \leq \frac{1}{16 \|P_K^{\tilde{\theta}}\|^2}$, resulting in $J(K, \theta_j) \leq 2J(K, \tilde{\theta}) \leq 2J_{SA}(K)$.

D. Uniform bounds

Lemma IX.9. *Let $\theta \in \mathcal{S}$. Under Assumption II.1, it holds that for any $\tilde{\theta} \in \mathcal{S}$*

- $J(K_{DR}^*, \tilde{\theta}) \leq 6J(K(\theta), \theta)$.
- $J(\tilde{K}, \theta) \leq 48J(K(\theta), \theta)$.

Proof. For the first fact, note that there exists some θ' such that $J(K_{DR}^*, \theta') \leq J_{DR}(K_{DR}^*) \leq J_{DR}(K(\theta)) \leq 3J(K(\theta), \theta)$ by Lemma IX.8. Then by the same Lyapunov perturbation argument as in the proof of Lemma III.5, it follows that $J(K_{DR}^*, \tilde{\theta}) \leq 6J(K(\theta), \theta)$. For the second fact, we follow the same argument, but with the bound $J_{SA}(\tilde{K}) \leq 8J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)$. \square

E. Proof of Lemma III.7

Proof. It holds by Lemma III.5 that the collection $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M$ is (B, \mathbf{s}) -bounded with $B = 8$ and $\mathbf{s} = 2$. By the assumption that $J_{SA}(K) \leq 8J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)$, it holds that $J(K, \theta_i) \leq \mathbf{s}J_{SA}(K)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$.

The remainder term is bounded as follows:

$$\|R(K, K_{SA}^*)\|_F = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M E_K^i \Sigma_K^i \left((\Sigma_K^i)^{-1} (\Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i - \Sigma_K^i) \right) \leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\|_F \left\| (\Sigma_K^i)^{-1} (\Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i - \Sigma_K^i) \right\|, \quad (13)$$

Since it holds from the proof in Lemma 3 in [5] that

$$\Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i - \Sigma_K^i \preceq \Sigma_K^i \left\| \Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i \right\| \left(2\|A(\theta_i) - B(\theta_i)K\| \|B(\theta_i)\| \|K - K_{SA}^*\| + \|B(\theta_i)\|^2 \|K - K_{SA}^*\|^2 \right),$$

we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (\Sigma_K^i)^{-1} (\Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i - \Sigma_K^i) \right\| &= \sqrt{\left\| (\Sigma_K^i)^{-1} (\Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i - \Sigma_K^i)^2 (\Sigma_K^i)^{-1} \right\|^2} \\ &\leq \left\| \Sigma_{K_{SA}^*}^i \right\| \left(2\|A(\theta_i) - B(\theta_i)K\| \|B(\theta_i)\| \|K - K_{SA}^*\| + \|B(\theta_i)\|^2 \|K - K_{SA}^*\|^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. To simplify this reduction and substitute it into (14), we must show that $\|K - K_{SA}^*\|$ becomes small. To this end, note that if K_i^* is the optimal policy for system i , then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|K - K_{SA}^*\| &= \left\| K - K_{SA}^* + \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{1}{M} (K_i^* - K_i^*) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M (\|K - K_i^*\| + \|K_{SA}^* - K_i^*\|) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \sqrt{J(K_i^*, \theta_i)} (\|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\|_F + \|\nabla_K J(K_{SA}^*, \theta_i)\|_F) \quad (\text{Lemma IX.7}) \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{s}J_{SA}(K)}}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M (\|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\|_F + \|\nabla_K J(K_{SA}^*, \theta_i)\|_F). \quad (\sqrt{J(K_i^*, \theta_i)} \leq \sqrt{J(K, \theta_i)} \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{s}J_{SA}(K)}) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

We will show that under the provided heterogeneity conditions, the above quantity becomes small as $\|\nabla_K J_{SA}(K)\| \rightarrow 0$. In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\|_F &= \left\| \nabla_K J(K, \theta_i) + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^M (\nabla_K J(K, \theta_j) - \nabla_K J(K, \theta_j)) \right\|_F \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \nabla_K J(K, \theta_i) + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^M (\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i) - \nabla_K J(K, \theta_j)) \right\|_F \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{M} \left(M \|\nabla_K J_{SA}(K)\|_F + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^M \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i) - \nabla_K J(K, \theta_j)\|_F \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{M} (M \epsilon_{\text{grad}} + (M_i^1 + M_i^3 \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\|) \nu(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}} + (M_i^2 + M_i^3 \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\|) \zeta(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Note where $\epsilon_{\text{grad}} \triangleq \|\nabla_K J_{SA}(K)\|_F$. and the second term is characterized by a quadratic function of the heterogeneity with the coefficients defined in Lemma IX.6. By grouping the term, we get

$$\|\nabla J(K, \theta_i)\|_F \leq \frac{M \epsilon_{\text{grad}} + M_i^1 \nu(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}} + M_i^2 \zeta(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2}{M - M_i^3 (\nu(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}} + \zeta(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2)} \leq \frac{2}{M} (M \epsilon_{\text{grad}} + M_i^1 \nu(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}} + M_i^2 \zeta(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2) \triangleq \Lambda^i(K, \epsilon_{\text{grad}}, \epsilon_{\text{het}}),$$

where $\Lambda^i(K, \epsilon_{\text{grad}}, \epsilon_{\text{het}})$ is the upper bound on the gradient. The second inequality in the above bound follows from the fact that for $\epsilon_{\text{het}} \leq (8s^{3/2} J_{SA}(K)^{3/2})^{-1}$ (demonstrated in (17)),

$$M_i^3 (\nu(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}} + \zeta(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2) = 2Ms J_{SA}(K) (\nu(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}} + \zeta(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2) < \frac{M}{2}. \quad (16)$$

Define $\Lambda(K, \epsilon_{\text{grad}}, \epsilon_{\text{het}}) \triangleq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \Lambda^i(K, \epsilon_{\text{grad}}, \epsilon_{\text{het}})$. It holds by definition of M_i^1 and M_i^2 along with Lemma IX.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda(K, \epsilon_{\text{grad}}, \epsilon_{\text{het}}) &= \epsilon_{\text{grad}} + \left((1 + s\tau_B) J_{SA}(K)^2 + 2\tau_B s^{3/2} J_{SA}(K)^{7/2} \right) \nu(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}} + 2\tau_B s^{3/2} J_{SA}(K)^{7/2} \zeta(K) \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2 \\
&\leq \epsilon_{\text{grad}} + 8s^{3/2} J_{SA}(K)^4 \epsilon_{\text{het}} + 4\tau_B s^{3/2} J_{SA}(K)^{9/2} \epsilon_{\text{het}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Return now to the remainder term. From (13), (14), and Lemma IX.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{R}(K, K_{SA}^*)\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \|\nabla_K J(K, \theta_i)\| J(K, \theta_i)^{3/2} \left(2\tau_B \|K - K_{SA}^*\| + \tau_B^2 \|K - K_{SA}^*\|^2 \right) \\
&\leq s^{3/2} J_{SA}(K)^{3/2} \Lambda(K, \epsilon_{\text{grad}}, \epsilon_{\text{het}}) \left(2\tau_B \|K - K_{SA}^*\| + \tau_B^2 \|K - K_{SA}^*\|^2 \right) \quad (\text{gradient bound \& } J(K, \theta_i) \leq s J_{SA}(K)) \\
&\leq 2\tau_B s^{3/2} J_{SA}(K)^{3/2} \Lambda(K, \epsilon_{\text{grad}}, \epsilon_{\text{het}}) \left(1 + \tau_B \sqrt{s J_{SA}(K)} \Lambda(K, \epsilon_{\text{grad}}, \epsilon_{\text{het}}) \right) \|K - K_{SA}^*\|. \quad ((15) \& \text{ gradient bound})
\end{aligned}$$

For $K \in S$ and $\epsilon_{\text{het}} \leq (5 \cdot 2^8 \tau_B J_{SA}(K)^{11/2})^{-1}$, we reach the desired conclusion. It is shown below that Assumption II.1 along with the assumption $J_{SA}(K_0) \leq 8 \inf_K J_{SA}(K)$ suffice to satisfy this condition on ϵ_{het} .

$$\left(5 \cdot 2^8 \tau_B J_{SA}(K)^{11/2} \right)^{-1} \geq \left(5 \cdot 2^{11} \tau_B J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*)^{11/2} \right)^{-1} \geq \left(5e5\tau_B J(K_i^*, \theta_i)^{11/2} \right)^{-1}, \quad (17)$$

where the final inequality follows by Lemma IX.8.

Since $J_{SA}(K_{SA}^*) \leq J_{SA}(K)$ and $\Lambda(K_{SA}^*, \epsilon_{\text{grad}}, \epsilon_{\text{het}}) \leq \Lambda(K, \epsilon_{\text{grad}}, \epsilon_{\text{het}})$ hold, the argument follows in similar way and we get

$$\|\mathbb{R}(K_{SA}^*, K)\|_F \leq \frac{1}{4} \|K - K_{SA}^*\|,$$

under the same heterogeneity condition. □

F. Sim-to-real Experiments Details

We conduct experiments on a nonlinear, underactuated rotational inverted pendulum defined by

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u), \quad x = [\theta \ \alpha \ \dot{\theta} \ \dot{\alpha}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^4, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^1,$$

where θ is the angle of arm from the forward position, α is the angle of pendulum from upright, $\dot{\theta}$ and $\dot{\alpha}$ are angular velocities of respective angles, and the control input u is a motor voltage. We linearize this system around the zero state $x_0 = [0; 0; 0; 0]$ and zero control input $u_0 = 0$ with $A_c = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}|_{(x_0, u_0)}$ and $B_c = \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}|_{(x_0, u_0)}$ and discretize the system with $dt = 0.01$, resulting in the following discrete time linear system

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t, \quad A \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 1}.$$

We design a linear state feedback policy $u = Kx$ with $K \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 4}$ to regulate this system to the origin. The LQR cost matrices used to determine this controller are set as $Q = I_4$ and $R = 5I_2$.

We consider the case where the mass m and the length l of the pendulum are uncertain. The ground truth values are $m = 0.024$ and $l = 0.129$, and we consider coarse estimates $\hat{m} = 0.05$ and $\hat{l} = 0.2$. For DR, we set the distribution for both parameters as a uniform distribution: $m \sim [0.02, 0.08]$ and $l \sim [0.1, 0.3]$. For policy update in Algorithm 1, we schedule the




Fig. 5. 10 trials of CE stabilization. The pendulum almost achieves the upright posture (left) while fails to remain within ± 90 degrees (right).




Fig. 6. 10 trials of DR stabilization. The pendulum almost achieves the upright posture (left) and remains within ± 90 degrees simultaneously (right).

step size and number of gradient descent iterations based on γ . While this is not strictly necessary (choosing a very small stepsize and running sufficiently many iterations suffices), scheduling these parameters results in convergence with far fewer total iterations. In particular the stepsize and number of iterations of gradient descent are chosen as follows:

- For $\gamma < 0.85$, $\alpha = 1e - 3$ and $n_{\text{steps}} = 160$
- For $\gamma \in (0.85, 1.0)$, $\alpha = 1e - 5$ and $n_{\text{steps}} = 480$
- For $\gamma = 1.0$, $\alpha = 2e - 5$ and $n_{\text{steps}} = 400$

Refer to the `dr_stabilization_cube.py` for more details. From Figure 4, we see that the algorithm succeeds in finding a stabilizing controller and converging to the minimizer.

We compare DR with certainty equivalence (CE), which synthesizes a policy by using the coarse parameter estimates as though they were the ground truth. The CE policy is calculated by solving discrete algebraic Riccati equation. The resulting controllers are as follows:

$$K_{CE} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.37 & 27.45 & -0.51 & 2.44 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$K_{DR} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.41 & 31.62 & -0.66 & 2.97 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since the system is linearized around the upright position, the linear policies determined via CE and DR are used only when the pendulum is near upright, i.e. when the magnitude of α is less than 20 degrees, and an energy-based controller is used for swing up behavior. Refer to `control.py` for details of the energy-based controller.

In the experiment, we run the 10 trials from the same downward initial position, and measure the success rate. We define the success and failure as follows:

- **Success:** the pendulum holds the upright posture and remains within ± 90 degrees from the center for 10 seconds
- **Upright:** the pendulum holds upright posture but fails to remain around center
- **Failure:** The pendulum fails to hold in the upright position

The results are shown in Figure 5 and Figure 6. The CE policy achieves 9 **upright** and 1 **failure** while the DR policy achieves 9 **success** and 1 **upright**. The reason the CE policy fails to hold the pendulum around the center can be explained by the sim-to-real gap. In particular, the optimal policy synthesized at the estimated parameter does not necessarily lead




Fig. 4. Gradient Descent (Algorithm 1) applied to the linearized rotational inverted pendulum.

to stability when the parameter estimates are far from the ground truth. On the other hand, the DR policy succeeded in holding both upright and around center. This shows that it provides robustness to poor parameter estimates, thereby enabling sim-to-real transfer.