

Learning General Parameterized Policies for Infinite Horizon Average Reward Constrained MDPs via Primal-Dual Policy Gradient Algorithm

Qinbo Bai¹, Washim Uddin Mondal², and Vaneet Aggarwal¹

¹Purdue University, USA 47906

²Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur, India 208016

Abstract

This paper explores the realm of infinite horizon average reward Constrained Markov Decision Processes (CMDP). To the best of our knowledge, this work is the first to delve into the regret and constraint violation analysis of average reward CMDPs with a general policy parametrization. To address this challenge, we propose a primal dual based policy gradient algorithm that adeptly manages the constraints while ensuring a low regret guarantee toward achieving a global optimal policy. In particular, we show that our proposed algorithm achieves $\tilde{O}(T^{4/5})$ objective regret and $\tilde{O}(T^{4/5})$ constraint violation bounds.

1 Introduction

The framework of Reinforcement Learning (RL) is concerned with a class of problems where an agent learns to yield the maximum cumulative reward in an unknown environment via repeated interaction. RL finds applications in diverse areas, such as wireless communication, transportation, and epidemic control (Yang et al., 2020; Al-Abbasi et al., 2019; Ling et al., 2023). RL problems are mainly categorized into three setups: episodic, infinite horizon discounted reward, and infinite horizon average reward. Among them, the infinite horizon average reward setup is particularly significant for real-world applications. It aligns with most of the practical scenarios and captures their long-term goals. Some applications in real life require the learning procedure to respect the boundaries of certain constraints. In an epidemic control setup, for example, vaccination policies must take the supply shortage (budget constraint) into account. Such restrictive decision-making routines are described by constrained Markov Decision Processes (CMDP) (Bai et al., 2023b; Agarwal et al., 2022a; Chen et al., 2022). Existing papers on the CMDP utilize either a tabular or a linear MDP structure. This work provides the first algorithm for an infinite horizon average reward CMDP with general parametrization and proves its sub-linear regret and constraint violation bounds.

There are two primary ways to solve a CMDP problem in the infinite horizon average reward setting. The first one, known as the model-based approach, involves constructing estimates of the transition probabilities of the underlying CMDP which are subsequently utilized to derive policies (Chen et al., 2022; Agarwal et al., 2022b,a). The caveat of this approach is the large memory requirement to store the estimated parameters which effectively curtails its applicability to CMDPs with large state spaces. The alternative strategy, known as the model-free approach, either directly estimates the policy function or maintains an estimate of the Q function, which is subsequently used for policy generation (Wei et al., 2022). Model-free algorithms typically demand lower memory and computational resources than their model-based counterparts. Although the CMDP has been solved in a model-free manner in the tabular (Wei et al., 2022) and linear (Ghosh et al., 2023) setups, its exploration with the general parameterization is still open and is the goal of this paper.

General parameterization indexes the policies by finite-dimensional parameters (e.g., via neural networks) to accommodate large state spaces. The learning is manifested by updating these parameters using policy gradient (PG)-type algorithms. Note that, PG algorithms are primarily studied in the discounted reward setup. For example, (Agarwal et al., 2021) characterizes the sample complexities of the PG and the Natural PG (NPG) algorithms with softmax and direct parameterization. Similar results for general parameterization are obtained by (Liu et al., 2020; Mondal and Aggarwal, 2024). The regret analysis of a PG

Algorithm	Regret	Violation	Model-free	Setting
Algorithm 1 in (Chen et al., 2022)	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$	No	Tabular
Algorithm 2 in (Chen et al., 2022)	$\tilde{O}(T^{2/3})$	$\tilde{O}(T^{2/3})$	No	Tabular
UC-CURL and PS-CURL (Agarwal et al., 2022a)	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$	0	No	Tabular
Algorithm 2 in (Ghosh et al., 2023)	$\tilde{O}((dT)^{3/4})$	$\tilde{O}((dT)^{3/4})$	No	Linear MDP
Algorithm 3 in (Ghosh et al., 2023)	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$	$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$	No	Linear MDP
Triple-QA (Wei et al., 2022)	$\tilde{O}(T^{5/6})$	0	Yes	Tabular
This paper	$\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{4}{5}})$	$\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{4}{5}})$	Yes	General Parameterization

Table 1: This table summarizes the different model-based and model-free state-of-the-art algorithms available in the literature for average reward CMDPs. We note that our proposed algorithm is the first to analyze the regret and constraint violation for average reward CMDP with general parameterization. Here the parameter d refers to the dimension of the feature map for linear MDPs.

algorithm with the general parameterization has been recently performed for an infinite horizon average reward MDP without constraints (Bai et al., 2024). Similar regret and constraint violation analysis for the average reward CMDP is still missing in the literature. In this paper, we bridge this gap.

Challenges and Contribution: We propose a PG-based algorithm with general parameterized policies for the average reward CMDP and establish its sublinear regret and constraint violation bounds. In particular, assuming the underlying CMDP to be ergodic, we demonstrate that our PG algorithm achieves an average optimality rate of $\tilde{O}(T^{-\frac{1}{5}})$ and average constraint violation rate of $\tilde{O}(T^{-\frac{1}{5}})$. Invoking this convergence result, we establish that our algorithm achieves regret and constraint violation bounds of $\tilde{O}(T^{\frac{4}{5}})$. Apart from providing the first sublinear regret guarantee for the average reward CMDP with general parameterization, our work also improves the state-of-the-art regret guarantee, $\tilde{O}(T^{5/6})$ in the model-free tabular setup Wei et al. (2022).

Despite the availability of sample complexity analysis of PG algorithms with constraints in the discounted reward setup, obtaining sublinear regret and constraint violation bounds for their average reward counterpart is difficult. Firstly, the discounted case solely needs an estimate of the value function V while we additionally need the estimate of the gain function, J . Secondly, discounted setups typically assume access to a simulator to generate unbiased value estimates. In contrast, our algorithm uses a sample trajectory of length H to estimate the values and gains and does not assume the availability of a simulator. Single trajectory-based estimations are, in general, biased. To counter this, our algorithm samples sub-trajectories of length $N = \mathcal{O}(t_{\text{mix}})$ that are at least N distance apart, where t_{mix} is the mixing time of the underlying CMDP. With such a choice of distance between sub-trajectories, the total rewards across sub-trajectories behave sufficiently independently, thereby reducing the bias. Using above estimators in our primal-dual-based PG algorithm, we prove $\tilde{O}(T^{-\frac{1}{5}})$ convergence rate of the Lagrange function. Unfortunately, the strong duality property, which is central to proving convergence results of CMDPs for tabular and softmax policies, does not hold under the general parameterization. As a result, the convergence result for the dual problem does not automatically translate to that for the primal problem. We overcome this barrier by introducing a novel constraint violation analysis and a series of intermediate results (Lemma 16-18) that help disentangle the regret and constraint violation rates from the Lagrange convergence.

Due to the presence of the Lagrange multiplier, the convergence analysis of a CMDP is much more convoluted than its unconstrained counterpart. The learning rate of the Lagrange update, β , turns out to be pivotal in determining the growth rate of regret and constraint violation. Low values of β push the regret down while simultaneously increasing the constraint violation. Finding the optimal value of β that judiciously balances these two competing goals is one of the cornerstones of our analysis.

2 Related work

The constrained reinforcement learning problem has been extensively studied both for infinite horizon discounted reward and episodic MDPs. For example, discounted reward CMDPs have been recently studied in the tabular setup (Bai et al., 2022), with softmax parameterization (Ding et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2021), and with general policy parameterization (Ding et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2021; Bai et al., 2023b). Moreover, (Efroni et al., 2020; Qiu et al., 2020; Germano et al., 2023) investigated episodic CMDPs in the tabular set-

ting. Recently, the infinite horizon average reward CMDPs have been investigated in model-based setups (Chen et al., 2022; Agarwal et al., 2022b,a), tabular model-free setting (Wei et al., 2022) and linear CMDP setting (Ghosh et al., 2023). For model-based CMDP setup, (Agarwal et al., 2022a) proposed algorithms based on the posterior sampling and the optimism principle that achieve $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret with zero constraint violations. In the tabular model-free setup, the algorithm proposed by (Wei et al., 2022) achieves a regret of $\tilde{O}(T^{5/6})$ with zero constraint violations. Finally, in the linear CMDP setting, (Ghosh et al., 2023) achieves $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret bound with zero constraint violation. Note that the linear CMDP setting assumes that the transition probability has a certain linear structure with a known feature map which is not realistic. Table 1 summarizes all relevant works. Unfortunately, none of these papers study the infinite horizon average reward CMDPs with general parametrization which is the main focus of our article.

In the absence of constraints, both model-based and model-free tabular setups have been widely studied for infinite horizon average reward MDPs. For example, the model-based algorithms proposed by (Agrawal and Jia, 2017; Auer et al., 2008) achieve the optimal regret bound of $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$. Similarly, the model-free algorithm proposed by (Wei et al., 2020) for tabular MDP results in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret. Regret analysis for average reward MDP with general parametrization has been recently studied in (Bai et al., 2024), where a regret bound of $\tilde{O}(T^{3/4})$ is derived.

3 Formulation

This paper analyzes an infinite-horizon average reward constrained Markov Decision Process (CMDP) denoted as $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, r, c, P, \rho)$ where \mathcal{S} is the state space, \mathcal{A} is the action space of size A , $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the reward function, $c : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ is the constraint cost function¹, $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Delta^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ is the state transition function where $\Delta^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ denotes a probability simplex with dimension $|\mathcal{S}|$, and $\rho \in \Delta^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ is the initial distribution of states. A policy $\pi \in \Pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta^A$ maps the current state to an action distribution. The average reward and cost of a policy, π , is,

$$J_{g,\rho}^\pi \triangleq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} g(s_t, a_t) \middle| s_0 \sim \rho, \pi \right] \quad (1)$$

where $g = r, c$ for average reward and cost respectively. The expectation is calculated over the distribution of all sampled trajectories $\{(s_t, a_t)\}_{t=0}^\infty$ where $a_t \sim \pi(s_t)$, $s_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot | s_t, a_t)$, $\forall t \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$. For notational convenience, we shall drop the dependence on ρ whenever there is no confusion. Our goal is to maximize the average reward function while ensuring that the average cost is above a given threshold. Without loss of generality, we can mathematically represent this problem as follows².

$$\max_{\pi \in \Pi} J_r^\pi \quad \text{s.t.} \quad J_c^\pi \geq 0 \quad (2)$$

However, the above problem is difficult to handle when the underlying state space, \mathcal{S} is large. Therefore, we consider a class of parametrized policies, $\{\pi_\theta | \theta \in \Theta\}$ whose elements are indexed by a d -dimensional parameter, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ where $d \ll |\mathcal{S}|A$. Thus, the original problem in Eq (2) can be reformulated as the following parameterized problem.

$$\max_{\theta \in \Theta} J_r^{\pi_\theta} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad J_c^{\pi_\theta} \geq 0 \quad (3)$$

In the rest of this article, we denote $J_g^{\pi_\theta} = J_g(\theta)$, $g \in \{r, c\}$ for notational convenience. Let, $P^{\pi_\theta} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ be a transition function induced by π_θ and defined as, $P^{\pi_\theta}(s, s') = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} P(s' | s, a) \pi_\theta(a | s)$, $\forall s, s'$. If \mathcal{M} is such that for every policy π , the induced function, P^π is irreducible, and aperiodic, then \mathcal{M} is called ergodic.

Assumption 1. The CMDP \mathcal{M} is ergodic.

Ergodicity is a common assumption in the literature (Pesquerel and Maillard, 2022; Gong and Wang, 2020). If \mathcal{M} is ergodic, then $\forall \theta$, there exists a unique stationary distribution, $d^{\pi_\theta} \in \Delta^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ given as follows.

$$d^{\pi_\theta}(s) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \Pr(s_t = s | s_0 \sim \rho, \pi_\theta) \right] \quad (4)$$

¹The range is chosen as $[-1, 1]$ so that the set of feasible solutions to the optimization problem (3) is non-trivial.

²Even if the constraint threshold is non-zero, we can transform the cost function appropriately and make it zero.

Ergodicity implies that d^{π_θ} is independent of the initial distribution, ρ , and obeys $P^{\pi_\theta} d^{\pi_\theta} = d^{\pi_\theta}$. Hence, the average reward and cost functions can be expressed as,

$$J_g(\theta) = \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_\theta}, a \sim \pi_\theta(s)}[g(s, a)] = (d^{\pi_\theta})^T g^{\pi_\theta} \quad (5)$$

where $g^{\pi_\theta}(s) \triangleq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} g(s, a) \pi_\theta(a|s)$, $g \in \{r, c\}$. Note that the functions $J_g(\theta)$, $g \in \{r, c\}$ are also independent of the initial distribution, ρ . Furthermore, $\forall \theta$, there exist a function $Q_g^{\pi_\theta} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the following Bellman equation is satisfied $\forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$.

$$Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) = g(s, a) - J_g(\theta) + \mathbf{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} [V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s')] \quad (6)$$

where $g \in \{r, c\}$ and $V_g^{\pi_\theta} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given as,

$$V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_\theta(a|s) Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \quad (7)$$

Observe that if $Q_g^{\pi_\theta}$ satisfies (6), then it is also satisfied by $Q_g^{\pi_\theta} + c$ for any arbitrary, c . To uniquely define the value functions, we assume that $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d^{\pi_\theta}(s) V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s) = 0$. In this case, $V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s)$ turns out to be,

$$V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} [(P^{\pi_\theta})^t(s, s') - d^{\pi_\theta}(s')] g^{\pi_\theta}(s') = \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left\{ g(s_t, a_t) - J_g(\theta) \right\} \middle| s_0 = s \right] \quad (8)$$

where the expectation is computed over all π_θ -induced trajectories. In a similar way, $\forall (s, a)$, one can uniquely define $Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a)$, $g \in \{r, c\}$ as follows.

$$Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) = \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left\{ g(s_t, a_t) - J_g(\theta) \right\} \middle| s_0 = s, a_0 = a \right] \quad (9)$$

Moreover, the advantage function $A_g^{\pi_\theta} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined such that $\forall (s, a)$, $\forall g \in \{r, c\}$,

$$A_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) \triangleq Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) - V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s) \quad (10)$$

Assumption 1 also implies the existence of a finite mixing time. Specifically, for an ergodic MDP, \mathcal{M} , the mixing time is defined as follows.

Definition 1. The mixing time, t_{mix}^θ , of the CMDP \mathcal{M} for a parameterized policy, π_θ , is defined as,

$$t_{\text{mix}}^\theta \triangleq \min \left\{ t \geq 1 \mid \| (P^{\pi_\theta})^t(s, \cdot) - d^{\pi_\theta} \| \leq \frac{1}{4}, \forall s \right\}$$

The overall mixing time is given as $t_{\text{mix}} \triangleq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} t_{\text{mix}}^\theta$. In this paper, t_{mix} is finite due to ergodicity.

Mixing time characterizes how fast a CMDP converges to its stationary state distribution, d^{π_θ} , under a given policy, π_θ . We also define the hitting time as follows.

Definition 2. The hitting time of an ergodic CMDP \mathcal{M} with respect to a policy, π_θ , is defined as,

$$t_{\text{hit}}^\theta \triangleq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{d^{\pi_\theta}(s)}$$

The overall hitting time is defined as $t_{\text{hit}} \triangleq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} t_{\text{hit}}^\theta$. In this paper, t_{hit} is finite due to ergodicity.

Define π^* as the optimal solution to the unparameterized problem (2). For a given CMDP \mathcal{M} , and a time horizon T , the regret and constraint violation of any algorithm \mathbb{A} is defined as follows.

$$\text{Reg}_T(\mathbb{A}, \mathcal{M}) \triangleq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(J_r^{\pi^*} - r(s_t, a_t) \right) \quad (11)$$

$$\text{Vio}_T(\mathbb{A}, \mathcal{M}) \triangleq - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c(s_t, a_t) \quad (12)$$

where the algorithm, \mathbb{A} , executes the actions, $\{a_t\}$, $t \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ based on the trajectory observed up to time, t , and the state, s_{t+1} is decided according to the state transition function, P . For simplicity, we shall denote the regret and constraint violation as Reg_T and Vio_T respectively. Our goal is to design an algorithm \mathbb{A} that achieves low regret and constraint violation bounds.

4 Proposed Algorithm

Algorithm 1 Primal-Dual Parameterized Policy Gradient

- 1: **Input:** Episode length H , learning rates α, β , initial parameters θ_1, λ_1 , initial state $s_0 \sim \rho(\cdot)$,
- 2: $K = T/H$
- 3: **for** $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ **do**
- 4: $\mathcal{T}_k \leftarrow \phi$
- 5: **for** $t \in \{(k-1)H, \dots, kH-1\}$ **do**
- 6: Execute $a_t \sim \pi_{\theta_k}(\cdot|s_t)$
- 7: Observe $r(s_t, a_t), c(s_t, a_t)$ and s_{t+1}
- 8: $\mathcal{T}_k \leftarrow \mathcal{T}_k \cup \{(s_t, a_t)\}$
- 9: **end for**
- 10: **for** $t \in \{(k-1)H, \dots, kH-1\}$ **do**
- 11: Obtain $\hat{A}_{L, \lambda_k}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_t, a_t)$ using Algorithm 2 and \mathcal{T}_k
- 12: **end for**
- 13: Compute ω_k using (17)
- 14: Update parameters as

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{k+1} &= \theta_k + \alpha \omega_k \\ \lambda_{k+1} &= \mathcal{P}_{[0, \frac{2}{\delta}]} \left[\lambda_k - \beta \hat{J}_c(\theta_k) \right]\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

- 15: where $\hat{J}_c(\theta_k) = \frac{1}{H-N} \sum_{t=(k-1)H+N}^{kH-1} c(s_t, a_t)$
 - 16: **end for**
-

We solve (3) via a primal-dual algorithm which is based on the following saddle point optimization.

$$\max_{\theta \in \Theta} \min_{\lambda \geq 0} J_L(\theta, \lambda) \triangleq J_r(\theta) + \lambda J_c(\theta)\tag{14}$$

The function, $J_L(\cdot, \cdot)$, is called the Lagrange function and λ the Lagrange multiplier. Our algorithm updates the pair (θ, λ) following the policy gradient iteration as shown below $\forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ with an initial point (θ_1, λ_1) .

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{k+1} &= \theta_k + \alpha \nabla_{\theta} J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) \\ \lambda_{k+1} &= \mathcal{P}_{[0, \frac{2}{\delta}]} [\lambda_k - \beta J_c(\theta_k)]\end{aligned}\tag{15}$$

where α and β are learning parameters and δ is the Slater parameter introduced in the following assumption. Finally, for any set, Λ , the function $\mathcal{P}_{\Lambda}[\cdot]$ denotes projection onto Λ .

Assumption 2 (Slater condition). There exists a $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\bar{\theta} \in \Theta$ such that $J_c(\bar{\theta}) \geq \delta$.

Notice that in Eq. (15), the dual update is projected onto the set $[0, \frac{2}{\delta}]$ because the optimal dual variable for the parameterized problem is bounded in Lemma 16. The gradient of $J_L(\cdot, \lambda)$ can be computed by invoking a variant of the well-known policy gradient theorem (Sutton et al., 1999).

Lemma 1. *The gradient of $J_L(\cdot, \lambda)$ is computed as,*

$$\nabla_{\theta} J_L(\theta, \lambda) = \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_{\theta}}, a \sim \pi_{\theta}(s)} \left[A_{L, \lambda}^{\pi_{\theta}}(s, a) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(a|s) \right]$$

where $A_{L, \lambda}^{\pi_{\theta}}(s, a) \triangleq A_r^{\pi_{\theta}}(s, a) + \lambda A_c^{\pi_{\theta}}(s, a)$, $\forall (s, a)$ and $\{A_g^{\pi_{\theta}}\}_{g \in \{r, c\}}$ are defined in (10). In typical RL scenarios, learners do not have access to the state transition function, P , and thereby to the functions $d^{\pi_{\theta}}$ and $A_{L, \lambda}^{\pi_{\theta}}$. This makes computing the exact gradient a difficult task. In Algorithm 1, we demonstrate how one can still obtain good estimates of the gradient using sampled trajectories.

Algorithm 1 executes K number of epochs, each of duration $H = 16t_{\text{hit}}t_{\text{mix}}T^{\xi}(\log T)^2$ where $\xi \in (0, 1)$ is a constant whose value is specified later. Evidently, $K = T/H$. Note that, the learner is assumed to know the horizon length, T . This can be relaxed utilizing the well-known doubling trick (Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020). Additionally, it is assumed that the algorithm is aware of the mixing time and the hitting time.

Algorithm 2 Advantage Estimation

1: **Input:** Trajectory $(s_{t_1}, a_{t_1}, \dots, s_{t_2}, a_{t_2})$, state s , action a , Lagrange multiplier λ , and parameter θ

2: **Initialize:** $M \leftarrow 0, \tau \leftarrow t_1$

3: **Define:** $N = 4t_{\text{mix}} \log_2 T$.

4: **while** $\tau \leq t_2 - N$ **do**

5: **if** $s_\tau = s$ **then**

6: $M \leftarrow M + 1$.

7: $\tau_M \leftarrow \tau$

8: $g_M \leftarrow \sum_{t=\tau}^{\tau+N-1} g(s_t, a_t), \forall g \in \{r, c\}$

9: $\tau \leftarrow \tau + 2N$.

10: **else**

11: $\tau \leftarrow \tau + 1$.

12: **end if**

13: **end while**

14: **if** $M > 0$ **then**

15: $\hat{Q}_g(s, a) = \frac{1}{\pi_\theta(a|s)} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M g_i 1(a_{\tau_i} = a) \right],$

16: $\hat{V}_g(s) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M g_i, \forall g \in \{r, c\}$

17: **else**

18: $\hat{V}_g(s) = 0, \hat{Q}_g(s, a) = 0, \forall g \in \{r, c\}$

19: **end if**

20: **return** $(\hat{Q}_r(s, a) - \hat{V}_r(s)) + \lambda(\hat{Q}_c(s, a) - \hat{V}_c(s))$

This assumption is common in the literature (Bai et al., 2024; Wei et al., 2020). The first step in obtaining a gradient estimate is estimating the advantage value for a given pair (s, a) . This can be accomplished via Algorithm 2. At the k th epoch, a π_{θ_k} -induced trajectory, $\mathcal{T}_k = \{(s_t, a_t)\}_{t=(k-1)H}^{kH-1}$ is obtained and subsequently passed to Algorithm 2 that searches for subtrajectories within it that start with a given state s , are of length $N = 4t_{\text{mix}}(\log T)$, and are at least N distance apart from each other. Let us assume that there are M such subtrajectories. Let the total reward and cost of the i th, $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ subtrajectory be $\{r_i, c_i\}$ respectively and τ_i be its starting time. The value function estimates for the k th epoch are specified below.

$$\hat{Q}_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) = \frac{1}{\pi_{\theta_k}(a|s)} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M g_i 1(a_{\tau_i} = a) \right], \quad \hat{V}_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M g_i, \quad \forall g \in \{r, c\} \quad (16)$$

This leads to the following advantage estimator.

$$\hat{A}_{L, \lambda_k}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) = \hat{A}_r^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) + \lambda_k \hat{A}_c^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{A}_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) = \hat{Q}_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) - \hat{V}_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s), \quad g \in \{r, c\}$$

Finally, the gradient estimator can be expressed as follows.

$$\omega_k \triangleq \hat{\nabla}_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) = \frac{1}{H} \sum_{t=t_k}^{t_{k+1}-1} \hat{A}_{L, \lambda_k}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_t, a_t) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a_t | s_t) \quad (17)$$

where $t_k = (k-1)H$ is the starting time of the k th epoch. The parameters are updated following (13). To update the Lagrange multiplier, we need an estimation of $J_c(\theta_k)$, which is obtained as the average cost of the k th epoch. It should be noted that we remove the first N samples from the k th epoch because we require the state distribution emanating from the remaining samples to be close enough to the stationary distribution $d^{\pi_{\theta_k}}$, which is the key to make $\hat{J}_c(\theta_k)$ close to $J_c(\theta_k)$. The following lemma demonstrates that $\hat{A}_{L, \lambda_k}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a)$ is a good estimator of $A_{L, \lambda_k}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a)$.

Lemma 2. *The following inequality holds $\forall k, \forall(s, a)$ and sufficiently large T .*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\left(\hat{A}_{L, \lambda_k}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) - A_{L, \lambda_k}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) \right)^2 \right] \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{t_{\text{hit}} N^3 \log T}{\delta^2 H \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s)} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{t_{\text{mix}}^2 (\log T)^2}{\delta^2 T^\xi \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s)} \right)$$

Lemma 2 shows that the L_2 error of our proposed advantage estimator can be bounded above as $\tilde{O}(T^{-\xi})$. We later utilize the above result to prove the goodness of the gradient estimator. It is to be clarified that our Algorithm 2 is inspired by Algorithm 2 of (Wei et al., 2020). However, while the authors of (Wei et al., 2020) choose $H = \tilde{O}(1)$, we adapt $H = \tilde{O}(T^\xi)$. This subtle change turns out to be important in proving a sublinear regret for general parametrization.

5 Global Convergence Analysis

This section first shows that the sequence $\{\theta_k, \lambda_k\}_{k=1}^K$ produced by Algorithm 1 is such that their associated Lagrange sequence $\{J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converges globally. By expanding the Lagrange function, we then exhibit convergence of each of its components $\{J_g(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k=1}^K$, $g \in \{r, c\}$. This is later used for regret and constraint violation analysis. Before delving into the details, we would like to state a few necessary assumptions.

Assumption 3. The score function (stated below) is G -Lipschitz and B -smooth. Specifically, $\forall \theta, \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\forall (s, a)$, the following inequalities hold.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s)\| &\leq G, \\ \|\nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_1}(a|s) - \nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_2}(a|s)\| &\leq B\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1. The Lipschitz and smoothness properties of the score function are commonly assumed for policy gradient analyses (Agarwal et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2020). These assumptions hold for simple parameterization classes such as Gaussian policies.

Note that by combining Assumption 3 with Lemma 2 and using the gradient estimator as given in (17), one can deduce the following result.

Lemma 3. *The following inequality holds $\forall k$ provided that assumptions 1 and 3 are true.*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\|\omega_k - \nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \right] \leq \tilde{O} \left(\frac{AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta^2 T^\xi} \right) \quad (18)$$

Lemma 3 claims that the gradient estimation error can be bounded as $\tilde{O}(T^{-\xi})$. We will use this result later to prove the global convergence of our algorithm.

Assumption 4. Let the transferred compatible function approximation error be defined as follows.

$$L_{d^{\pi^*}, \pi^*}(\omega_{\theta, \lambda}^*, \theta, \lambda) = \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(s)} \left[\left(\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s) \cdot \omega_{\theta, \lambda}^* - A_{L, \lambda}^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) \right)^2 \right] \quad (19)$$

where π^* is the optimal solution of unparameterized problem in (2) and

$$\omega_{\theta, \lambda}^* = \arg \min_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_\theta}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi_\theta(s)} \left[\left(\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s) \cdot \omega - A_{L, \lambda}^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) \right)^2 \right] \quad (20)$$

We assume that $L_{d^{\pi^*}, \pi^*}(\omega_{\theta, \lambda}^*, \theta, \lambda) \leq \epsilon_{\text{bias}}$, $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2}{\delta}]$ and $\theta \in \Theta$ where ϵ_{bias} is a positive constant.

Remark 2. The transferred compatible function approximation error quantifies the expressivity of the parameterized policy class. We can show that $\epsilon_{\text{bias}} = 0$ for softmax parameterization (Agarwal et al., 2021) and linear MDPs (Jin et al., 2020). If the policy class is restricted, i.e., it does not contain all stochastic policies, ϵ_{bias} turns out to be strictly positive. However, if the policy class is parameterized by a rich neural network, then ϵ_{bias} can be assumed to be negligibly small (Wang et al., 2019). Such assumptions are common (Liu et al., 2020; Agarwal et al., 2021).

Remark 3. Note that $\omega_{\theta, \lambda}^*$ defined in (20) can be written as,

$$\omega_{\theta, \lambda}^* = F_\rho(\theta)^\dagger \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d_\rho^{\pi_\theta}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi_\theta(s)} \left[\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s) A_{L, \lambda}^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) \right]$$

where \dagger is the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse and $F_\rho(\theta)$ is the Fisher information matrix defined as,

$$F_\rho(\theta) = \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d_\rho^{\pi_\theta}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|s)} \left[\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s) (\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s))^T \right]$$

Assumption 5. There exists a constant $\mu_F > 0$ such that $F_\rho(\theta) - \mu_F I_d$ is positive semidefinite where I_d is an identity matrix of dimension, d .

Assumption 5 is also common (Liu et al., 2020) in the policy gradient analysis. (Mondal et al., 2023) describes a class of policies that obeys assumptions 3–5 simultaneously. An important result in establishing the global convergence is the Lagrange difference lemma stated below.

Lemma 4. *With a slight abuse of notation, let $J_L(\pi, \lambda) = J_r^\pi + \lambda J_c^\pi$. For any two policies π, π' , the following result holds $\forall \lambda > 0$.*

$$J_L(\pi, \lambda) - J_L(\pi', \lambda) = \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^\pi} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi(s)} [A_{L, \lambda}^{\pi'}(s, a)]$$

We now present a general framework for the convergence analysis of Algorithm 1.

Lemma 5. *If the policy parameters, $\{\theta_k, \lambda_k\}_{k=1}^K$ are updated via (13) and assumptions 3, 4, and 5 hold, then we have the following inequality for any K ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \mathbf{E} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(J_L(\pi^*, \lambda_k) - J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) \right) &\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \frac{G}{K} \sum_k \mathbf{E} \|\omega_k - \omega_k^*\| \\ &+ \frac{B\alpha}{2K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \|\omega_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha K} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \| \pi_{\theta_1}(\cdot|s))] \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\omega_k^* := \omega_{\theta_k, \lambda_k}^*, \omega_{\theta_k, \lambda_k}^*$ is defined in (20), and π^* is the optimal solution to the unparameterized problem (2).

Lemma 5 proves that the optimality error of the Lagrange sequence can be bounded by the average first-order and second-order norms of the intermediate gradients. Note the presence of ϵ_{bias} in the result. If the policy class is severely restricted, the optimality bound loses its importance. Consider the expectation of the second term in (21). Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \|\omega_k - \omega_k^*\| \right)^2 &\leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\|\omega_k - \omega_k^*\|^2 \right] = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\|\omega_k - F_\rho(\theta_k)^\dagger \nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{2}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ \mathbf{E} \left[\|\omega_k - \nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \right] + \mathbf{E} \left[\|\nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - F_\rho(\theta_k)^\dagger \nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \right] \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{2}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\|\omega_k - \nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \right] + \frac{2}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F^2} \right) \mathbf{E} \left[\|\nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where (a) follows from Assumption 5. The expectation of the third term in (21) can be bounded as follows.

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\|\omega_k\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\|\nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\|\omega_k - \nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \right] \quad (23)$$

In both (22) and (23), $\mathbf{E} \|\omega_k - \nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2$ is bounded above by Lemma 3. To bound the term, $\mathbf{E} \|\nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2$, the following lemma is applied.

Lemma 6. *Let $J_g(\cdot)$ be L -smooth, $\forall g \in \{r, c\}$ and $\alpha = \frac{1}{4L(1+\frac{2}{\xi})}$. Then the following inequality holds.*

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{288L}{\delta^2 K} + \frac{3}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k\|^2 + \beta \quad (24)$$

Note the presence of β in (24). Evidently, to ensure convergence, β must be a function of T . Invoking Lemma 3, we get the following relation under the same set of assumptions and the choice of parameters as in Lemma 6.

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \|\nabla_\theta J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \leq \tilde{O} \left(\frac{AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta^2 T^\xi} \right) + \tilde{O} \left(\frac{Lt_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta^2 T^{1-\xi}} \right) + \beta \quad (25)$$

Applying Lemma 3 and (25) in (23), we arrive at,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\|\omega_k\|^2 \right] \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta^2 T^\xi} + \frac{Lt_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta^2 T^{1-\xi}} \right) + \beta \quad (26)$$

Similarly, using (22), we deduce the following.

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \|\omega_k - \omega_k^*\| \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F}\right) \sqrt{\beta} + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F}\right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{AG} t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta T^{\xi/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{Lt_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}}{\delta T^{(1-\xi)/2}} \right) \quad (27)$$

Inequalities (26) and (27) lead to the following global convergence of the Lagrange function.

Lemma 7. *Let $\{\theta_k\}_{k=1}^K$ be as described in Lemma 5. If assumptions 1–5 hold, $\{J_g(\cdot)\}_{g \in \{r, c\}}$ are L -smooth functions, $\alpha = \frac{1}{4L(1+\frac{2}{\delta})}$, $K = \frac{T}{H}$, and $H = 16t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}} T^\xi (\log_2 T)^2$, then the following inequality holds.*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left(J_L(\pi^*, \lambda_k) - J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) \right) &\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F}\right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\sqrt{\beta} + \frac{\sqrt{AG} t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta T^{\xi/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{Lt_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}}{\delta T^{(1-\xi)/2}} \right) \\ &+ \frac{B}{L} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta^2 T^\xi} + \frac{Lt_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta^2 T^{1-\xi}} + \beta \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{Lt_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \| \pi_{\theta_1}(\cdot|s))] }{T^{1-\xi} \delta} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7 establishes that the average difference between $J_L(\pi^*, \lambda_k)$ and $J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)$ is $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sqrt{\beta} + T^{-\xi/2} + T^{-(1-\xi)/2})$. Expanding the function, J_L , and utilizing the update rule of the Lagrange multiplier, we achieve the global convergence for the objective and the constraint in Theorem 1 (stated below). In its proof, Lemma 18 (stated in the appendix) serves as an important tool in disentangling the convergence rates of regret and constraint violation. Interestingly, Lemma 18 is built upon the strong duality property of the unparameterized optimization (2) and has no apparent direct connection with the parameterized setup.

Theorem 1. *Consider the same setup and parameters as in Lemma 7 and set $\beta = T^{-2/5}$ and $\xi = 2/5$. We have,*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left(J_r^{\pi^*} - J_r(\theta_k) \right) &\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \frac{\sqrt{AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}}}{\delta} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F}\right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(T^{-1/5} \right) \\ \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left(-J_c(\theta_k) \right) &\leq \delta \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta T^{1/5}} \right) + \sqrt{AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F}\right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(T^{-1/5} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $J_r^* \triangleq J_r(\theta^*)$ and θ^* is a solution of (3). In the above bounds, we only mention the dominating terms of T .

Theorem 1 establishes $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{-1/5})$ convergence rates for both the objective and the constraint violation.

6 Regret and Violation Analysis

In this section, we utilize the convergence analysis in the previous section to bound the expected regret and constraint violation of Algorithm 1. Note that the regret and constraint violation can be decomposed as,

$$\text{Reg}_T = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(J_r^{\pi^*} - r(s_t, a_t) \right) = H \sum_{k=1}^K \left(J_r^{\pi^*} - J(\theta_k) \right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(J(\theta_k) - r(s_t, a_t) \right)$$

$$\text{Vio}_T = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(-c(s_t, a_t) \right) = H \sum_{k=1}^K \left(-J_c(\theta_k) \right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(J_c(\theta_k) - c(s_t, a_t) \right)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_k \triangleq \{(k-1)H, \dots, kH-1\}$. Observe that the expectation of the first terms in regret and violation can be bounded by Theorem 1. The expectation of the second term in regret and violation can be expanded

as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_k} (J_g(\theta_k) - g(s_t, a_t)) \right] &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbf{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot | s_t, a_t)} [V_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s')] - Q_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_t, a_t) \right] \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_k} V_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_{t+1}) - V_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_t) \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K V_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_{kH}) - V_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_{(k-1)H}) \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} V_g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}(s_{kH}) - V_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_{kH}) \right] + \mathbf{E} \left[V_g^{\pi_{\theta_K}}(s_T) - V_g^{\pi_{\theta_0}}(s_0) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where $g \in \{r, c\}$. Equality (a) uses the Bellman equation and (b) follows from the definition of Q_g . The first term in the last line of Eq. (28) can be upper bounded by Lemma 8 (stated below). On the other hand, the second term can be upper bounded as $\mathcal{O}(t_{\text{mix}})$ using Lemma 9.

Lemma 8. *If assumptions 1 and 3 hold, then for $K = \frac{T}{H}$ where $H = 16t_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}T^{\frac{2}{5}}(\log_2 T)^2$, the following inequalities hold $\forall k, \forall (s, a)$ and sufficiently large T .*

$$\begin{aligned}
(a) \quad &|\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}(a|s) - \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s)| \leq G\|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\| \\
(b) \quad &\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E}|J_g(\theta_{k+1}) - J_g(\theta_k)| \leq \frac{\alpha AG}{\delta t_{\text{hit}}} f(T) \\
(c) \quad &\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E}|V_g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}(s_k) - V_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_k)| \leq t_{\text{mix}} \frac{\alpha AG}{\delta t_{\text{hit}}} f(T)
\end{aligned}$$

where $f(T) \triangleq \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\left[\sqrt{AG}t_{\text{mix}} + \delta \right] T^{\frac{2}{5}} + \sqrt{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}T^{\frac{3}{10}} \right)$, $g \in \{r, c\}$, and $\{s_k\}_{k=1}^K$ is an arbitrary sequence.

Lemma 8 states that the obtained policy parameters are such that the average consecutive difference in the sequence $\{J_g(\theta_k)\}_{k=1}^K$, $g \in \{r, c\}$ decreases with time horizon, T . We would like to emphasize that Lemma 8 works for both reward and constraint functions. Hence, we can prove our regret guarantee and constraint violation as shown below.

Theorem 2. *If assumptions 1–5 hold, $J_g(\cdot)$'s are L -smooth, $\forall g \in \{r, c\}$ and T are sufficiently large, then our proposed Algorithm 1 achieves the following expected regret and constraint violation bounds with learning rates $\alpha = \frac{1}{4L(1+\frac{2}{5})}$ and $\beta = T^{-2/5}$.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} [\text{Reg}_T] &\leq T\sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{4/5}) + \mathcal{O}(t_{\text{mix}}) \\
\mathbf{E} [\text{ViO}_T] &\leq T\delta\sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{4/5}) + \mathcal{O}(t_{\text{mix}})
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

The detailed expressions of these bounds are provided in the Appendix. Here, we keep only those terms that emphasize the order of T . Note that our result outperforms the state-of-the-art model-free tabular result in average-reward CMDP Wei et al. (2022). However, our regret bound is worse than that achievable in average reward unconstrained MDP with general parameterization (Bai et al., 2024). Interestingly, the gap between the convergence results of constrained and unconstrained setups is a common observation across the literature. For example, the state-of-the-art sample complexity in discounted unconstrained MDP is $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ (Mondal and Aggarwal, 2024) and that with constraints is $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^4)$ (Bai et al., 2023b; Ding et al., 2022). Even in the tabular model-free average reward MDP, the state-of-the-art regret bound for unconstrained setup, $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{1/2})$ (Wei et al., 2020), is better than that in the constrained setup, $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{5/6})$ (Wei et al., 2022).

7 Conclusion

We propose a policy gradient (PG) algorithm for constrained reinforcement learning problems in the infinite horizon average reward setup. Unlike recent works on the same framework, we do not assume the

underlying constrained Markov Decision Process (CMDP) to be tabular or linear. Instead, we adopt the framework of general parameterization. We establish that our proposed algorithm achieves $\tilde{O}(T^{4/5})$ regret and constraint violation bounds where T is the time horizon. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to establish sublinear regret and constraint violation bounds in the average reward CMDP setup.

We note that with general parameterization, achieving zero constraint violation is challenging. The typical approach involves addressing a stricter problem that achieves zero constraint violation and then examining the consequences of solving this stricter problem on the objective. However, it requires strong duality to bound the gap of optimal gain function between the original problem and the stricter problem. In the context of general parameterization, an additional assumption was employed in (Bai et al., 2023b, Assumption 6) to demonstrate this result in a discounted setup. The task of proving such a result without relying on additional assumptions remains an open problem.

References

- Alekh Agarwal, Sham M Kakade, Jason D Lee, and Gaurav Mahajan. Optimality and approximation with policy gradient methods in markov decision processes. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 64–66. PMLR, 2020.
- Alekh Agarwal, Sham M Kakade, Jason D Lee, and Gaurav Mahajan. On the theory of policy gradient methods: Optimality, approximation, and distribution shift. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(1):4431–4506, 2021.
- Mridul Agarwal, Qinbo Bai, and Vaneet Aggarwal. Concave utility reinforcement learning with zero-constraint violations. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022a.
- Mridul Agarwal, Qinbo Bai, and Vaneet Aggarwal. Regret guarantees for model-based reinforcement learning with long-term average constraints. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 22–31. PMLR, 2022b.
- Shipra Agrawal and Randy Jia. Optimistic posterior sampling for reinforcement learning: worst-case regret bounds. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- Abubakr O Al-Abbasi, Arnob Ghosh, and Vaneet Aggarwal. Deeppool: Distributed model-free algorithm for ride-sharing using deep reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 20(12):4714–4727, 2019.
- Peter Auer, Thomas Jaksch, and Ronald Ortner. Near-optimal regret bounds for reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 21, 2008.
- Qinbo Bai, Amrit Singh Bedi, Mridul Agarwal, Alec Koppel, and Vaneet Aggarwal. Achieving zero constraint violation for constrained reinforcement learning via primal-dual approach. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 3682–3689, 2022.
- Qinbo Bai, Vaneet Aggarwal, and Ather Gattami. Provably sample-efficient model-free algorithm for mdps with peak constraints. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(60):1–25, 2023a.
- Qinbo Bai, Amrit Singh Bedi, and Vaneet Aggarwal. Achieving zero constraint violation for constrained reinforcement learning via conservative natural policy gradient primal-dual algorithm. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 6737–6744, 2023b.
- Qinbo Bai, Washim Uddin Mondal, and Vaneet Aggarwal. Regret analysis of policy gradient algorithm for infinite horizon average reward markov decision processes. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2024.
- Liyu Chen, Rahul Jain, and Haipeng Luo. Learning infinite-horizon average-reward markov decision process with constraints. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3246–3270. PMLR, 2022.
- Dongsheng Ding, Kaiqing Zhang, Tamer Basar, and Mihailo Jovanovic. Natural policy gradient primal-dual method for constrained markov decision processes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33: 8378–8390, 2020.

- Dongsheng Ding, Kaiqing Zhang, Jiali Duan, Tamer Başar, and Mihailo R Jovanović. Convergence and sample complexity of natural policy gradient primal-dual methods for constrained mdps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.02346*, 2022.
- Ron Dorfman and Kfir Yehuda Levy. Adapting to mixing time in stochastic optimization with markovian data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5429–5446. PMLR, 2022.
- Yonathan Efroni, Shie Mannor, and Matteo Pirotta. Exploration-exploitation in constrained mdps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.02189*, 2020.
- Jacopo Germano, Francesco Emanuele Stradi, Gianmarco Genalti, Matteo Castiglioni, Alberto Marchesi, and Nicola Gatti. A best-of-both-worlds algorithm for constrained mdps with long-term constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14326*, 2023.
- Arnob Ghosh, Xingyu Zhou, and Ness Shroff. Achieving sub-linear regret in infinite horizon average reward constrained mdp with linear function approximation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Hao Gong and Mengdi Wang. A duality approach for regret minimization in average-award ergodic markov decision processes. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 862–883. PMLR, 2020.
- Chi Jin, Zhuoran Yang, Zhaoran Wang, and Michael I Jordan. Provably efficient reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. In Jacob Abernethy and Shivani Agarwal, editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Third Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2137–2143. PMLR, 09–12 Jul 2020.
- Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Lu Ling, Washim Uddin Mondal, and Satish V. Ukkusuri. Cooperating graph neural networks with deep reinforcement learning for vaccine prioritization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05163*, 2023.
- Yanli Liu, Kaiqing Zhang, Tamer Basar, and Wotao Yin. An improved analysis of (variance-reduced) policy gradient and natural policy gradient methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:7624–7636, 2020.
- Washim Uddin Mondal and Vaneet Aggarwal. Improved sample complexity analysis of natural policy gradient algorithm with general parameterization for infinite horizon discounted reward markov decision processes. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 2024.
- Washim Uddin Mondal, Vaneet Aggarwal, and Satish V Ukkusuri. Mean-field control based approximation of multi-agent reinforcement learning in presence of a non-decomposable shared global state. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- Fabien Pesquerel and Odalric-Ambrym Maillard. Imed-rl: Regret optimal learning of ergodic markov decision processes. In *NeurIPS 2022-Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- Shuang Qiu, Xiaohan Wei, Zhuoran Yang, Jieping Ye, and Zhaoran Wang. Upper confidence primal-dual reinforcement learning for cmdp with adversarial loss. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15277–15287, 2020.
- Richard S Sutton, David McAllester, Satinder Singh, and Yishay Mansour. Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 12, 1999.
- Lingxiao Wang, Qi Cai, Zhuoran Yang, and Zhaoran Wang. Neural policy gradient methods: Global optimality and rates of convergence. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Chen-Yu Wei, Mehdi Jafarnia Jahromi, Haipeng Luo, Hiteshi Sharma, and Rahul Jain. Model-free reinforcement learning in infinite-horizon average-reward markov decision processes. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 10170–10180. PMLR, 2020.
- Honghao Wei, Xin Liu, and Lei Ying. A provably-efficient model-free algorithm for infinite-horizon average-reward constrained markov decision processes. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 3868–3876, 2022.

- Tengyu Xu, Yingbin Liang, and Guanghui Lan. Crpo: A new approach for safe reinforcement learning with convergence guarantee. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11480–11491. PMLR, 2021.
- Helin Yang, Zehui Xiong, Jun Zhao, Dusit Niyato, Liang Xiao, and Qingqing Wu. Deep reinforcement learning-based intelligent reflecting surface for secure wireless communications. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 20(1):375–388, 2020.
- Junyu Zhang, Chengzhuo Ni, Csaba Szepesvari, and Mengdi Wang. On the convergence and sample efficiency of variance-reduced policy gradient method. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 2228–2240, 2021.

A Proofs for Lemmas in 4

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Since the first step of the proof works in the same way for functions J_r and J_c , we use the generic notations J_g, V_g, Q_g where $g = r, c$ and derive the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_\theta V_g^{\pi_\theta} (s) &= \nabla_\theta \left(\sum_a \pi_\theta(a|s) Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) \right) \\
&= \sum_a \left(\nabla_\theta \pi_\theta(a|s) \right) Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) + \sum_a \pi_\theta(a|s) \nabla_\theta Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_a \pi_\theta(a|s) \left(\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s) \right) Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) + \sum_a \pi_\theta(a|s) \nabla_\theta \left(g(s, a) - J_g(\theta) + \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s') \right) \\
&= \sum_a \pi_\theta(a|s) \left(\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s) \right) Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) + \sum_a \pi_\theta(a|s) \left(\sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) \nabla_\theta V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s') \right) - \nabla_\theta J_g(\theta)
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where the step (a) is a consequence of $\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta = \frac{\nabla \pi_\theta}{\pi_\theta}$ and the Bellman equation. Multiplying both sides by $d^{\pi_\theta}(s)$, taking a sum over $s \in \mathcal{S}$, and rearranging the terms, we obtain the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_\theta J_g(\theta) &= \sum_s d^{\pi_\theta}(s) \nabla_\theta J(\theta) \\
&= \sum_s d^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_a \pi_\theta(a|s) \left(\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s) \right) Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) + \sum_s d^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_a \pi_\theta(a|s) \left(\sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) \nabla_\theta V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s') \right) \\
&\quad - \sum_s d^{\pi_\theta}(s) \nabla_\theta V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s) \\
&= \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_\theta}, a \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|s)} \left[Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s) \right] + \sum_s d^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_{s'} P(s'|s) \nabla_\theta V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s') - \sum_s d^{\pi_\theta}(s) \nabla_\theta V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_\theta}, a \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|s)} \left[Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s) \right] + \sum_{s'} d^{\pi_\theta}(s') \nabla_\theta V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s') - \sum_s d^{\pi_\theta}(s) \nabla_\theta V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s) \\
&= \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_\theta}, a \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|s)} \left[Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where (a) uses the fact that d^{π_θ} is a stationary distribution. Note that,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_\theta}, a \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|s)} \left[V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s) \nabla \log \pi_\theta(a|s) \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_\theta}} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s) \nabla_\theta \pi_\theta(a|s) \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_\theta}} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s) \nabla_\theta \pi_\theta(a|s) \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_\theta}} \left[V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s) \nabla_\theta \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_\theta(a|s) \right) \right] = \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_\theta}} \left[V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s) \nabla_\theta (1) \right] = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

We can, therefore, replace the function $Q_g^{\pi_\theta}$ in the policy gradient with the advantage function $A_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) = Q_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) - V_g^{\pi_\theta}(s)$, $\forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$. Thus,

$$\nabla_\theta J_g(\theta) = \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_\theta}, a \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|s)} \left[A_g^{\pi_\theta}(s, a) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a|s) \right] \tag{33}$$

The proof is completed using the definitions of $J_{L,\lambda}$ and $A_{L,\lambda}$.

A.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of (Wei et al., 2020, Lemma 6). Consider the k th epoch and assume that π_{θ_k} is denoted as π for notational convenience. Let, M be the number of disjoint sub-trajectories of length N that start with the state s and are at least N distance apart (found by Algorithm 2). Let, $g_{k,i}$ be the sum of rewards or constraint ($g = r, c$ accordingly) observed in the i th sub-trajectory and τ_i denote its starting time. The advantage function estimate is,

$$\hat{A}_g^\pi(s, a) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\pi(a|s)} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M g_{k,i} 1(a_{\tau_i} = a) \right] - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M g_{k,i} & \text{if } M > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } M = 0 \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

Note the following,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[g_{k,i} \middle| s_{\tau_i} = s, a_{\tau_i} = a \right] &= g(s, a) + \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{t=\tau_i+1}^{\tau_i+N} g(s_t, a_t) \middle| s_{\tau_i} = s, a_{\tau_i} = a \right] \\ &= g(s, a) + \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{t=\tau_i+1}^{\tau_i+N} g(s_t, a_t) \middle| s_{\tau_i+1} = s' \right] \\ &= g(s, a) + \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) \left[\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (P^\pi)^j(s', \cdot) \right]^T g^\pi \\ &= g(s, a) + \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) \left[\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (P^\pi)^j(s', \cdot) - d^\pi \right]^T g^\pi + N(d^\pi)^T g^\pi \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} g(s, a) + \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (P^\pi)^j(s', \cdot) - d^\pi \right]^T g^\pi + \underbrace{N J_g^\pi - \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) \left[\sum_{j=N}^{\infty} (P^\pi)^j(s', \cdot) - d^\pi \right]^T g^\pi}_{\triangleq E_T^\pi(s, a)} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} g(s, a) + \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) V_g^\pi(s') + N J_g^\pi - E_T^\pi(s, a) \stackrel{(c)}{=} Q_g^\pi(s, a) + (N+1) J_g^\pi - E_T^\pi(s, a) \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where (a) follows from the definition of J_g^π as given in (5), (b) is an application of the definition of V_g^π given in (8), and (c) follows from the Bellman equation. Define the following quantity.

$$\delta^\pi(s, T) \triangleq \sum_{t=N}^{\infty} \|(P^\pi)^t(s, \cdot) - d^\pi\|_1 \quad \text{where } N = 4t_{\text{mix}}(\log_2 T) \quad (36)$$

Using Lemma 10, we get $\delta^\pi(s, T) \leq \frac{1}{T^3}$ which implies, $|E_T^\pi(s, a)| \leq \frac{1}{T^3}$. Observe that,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\pi(a|s)} g_{k,i} 1(a_{\tau_i} = a) - g_{k,i} \right) \middle| s_{\tau_i} = s \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left[g_{k,i} \middle| s_{\tau_i} = s, a_{\tau_i} = a \right] - \sum_{a'} \pi(a'|s) \mathbf{E} \left[g_{k,i} \middle| s_{\tau_i} = s, a_{\tau_i} = a' \right] \\ &= Q_g^\pi(s, a) + (N+1) J_g^\pi - E_T^\pi(s, a) - \sum_{a'} \pi(a'|s) [Q^\pi(s, a) + (N+1) J_g^\pi - E_T^\pi(s, a)] \\ &= Q_g^\pi(s, a) - V_g^\pi(s) - \left[E_T(s, a) - \sum_{a'} \pi(a'|s) E_T^\pi(s, a') \right] \\ &= A_g^\pi(s, a) - \Delta_T^\pi(s, a) \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where $\Delta_T^\pi(s, a) \triangleq E_T(s, a) - \sum_{a'} \pi(a'|s) E_T^\pi(s, a')$. Using the bound on $E_T^\pi(s, a)$, we derive, $|\Delta_T^\pi(s, a)| \leq \frac{2}{T^3}$, which implies,

$$\left| \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\pi(a|s)} g_{k,i} 1(a_{\tau_i} = a) - g_{k,i} \right) \middle| s_{\tau_i} = s \right] - A_g^\pi(s, a) \right| \leq |\Delta_T^\pi(s, a)| \leq \frac{2}{T^3} \quad (38)$$

Note that (38) cannot be directly used to bound the bias of $\hat{A}_g^\pi(s, a)$. This is because the random variable M is correlated with the variables $\{g_{k,i}\}_{i=1}^M$. To decorrelate them, imagine a CMDP where the state distribution resets to the stationary distribution, d^π after exactly N time steps since the completion of a sub-trajectory. In other words, if a sub-trajectory starts at τ_i , and ends at $\tau_i + N$, then the system ‘rests’ for additional N steps before rejuvenating with the state distribution, d^π at $\tau_i + 2N$. Clearly, the wait time between the reset after the $(i-1)$ th sub-trajectory and the start of the i th sub-trajectory is, $w_i = \tau_i - (\tau_{i-1} + 2N)$, $i > 1$. Let w_1 be the difference between the start time of the k th epoch and the start time of the first sub-trajectory. Note that,

- (a) w_1 only depends on the initial state, $s_{(k-1)H}$ and the induced transition function, P^π ,
- (b) w_i , where $i > 1$, depends on the stationary distribution, d^π , and the induced transition function, P^π ,
- (c) M only depends on $\{w_1, w_2, \dots\}$ as other segments of the epoch have fixed length, $2N$.

Clearly, in this imaginary CMDP, the sequence, $\{w_1, w_2, \dots\}$, and hence, M is independent of $\{g_{k,1}, g_{k,2}, \dots\}$. Let, \mathbf{E}' denote the expectation operation and \Pr' denote the probability of events in this imaginary system. Define the following.

$$\Delta_i \triangleq \frac{g_{k,i} \mathbf{1}(a_{\tau_i} = a)}{\pi(a|s)} - g_{k,i} - A_g^\pi(s, a) + \Delta_T^\pi(s, a) \quad (39)$$

where $\Delta_T^\pi(s, a)$ is given in (37). Note that we have suppressed the dependence on T, s, a , and π while defining Δ_i to remove clutter. Using (37), one can write $\mathbf{E}'[\Delta_i(s, a) | \{w_i\}] = 0$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}' \left[\left(\hat{A}_g^\pi(s, a) - A_g^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}' \left[\left(\hat{A}_g^\pi(s, a) - A_g^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \middle| M > 0 \right] \times \Pr'(M > 0) + \left(A_g^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \times \Pr'(M = 0) \\ &= \mathbf{E}' \left[\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \Delta_i - \Delta_T^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \middle| M > 0 \right] \times \Pr'(M > 0) + \left(A_g^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \times \Pr'(M = 0) \\ &\leq 2\mathbf{E}'_{\{w_i\}} \left[\mathbf{E}' \left[\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \Delta_i \right)^2 \middle| \{w_i\} \right] \middle| w_1 \leq H - N \right] \times \Pr'(w_1 \leq H - N) \\ &\quad + 2 \left(\Delta_T^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 + \left(A_g^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \times \Pr'(M = 0) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2\mathbf{E}'_{\{w_i\}} \left[\frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{E}'[\Delta_i^2 | \{w_i\}] \middle| w_1 \leq H - N \right] \times \Pr'(w_1 \leq H - N) + \frac{8}{T^6} + \left(A_g^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \times \Pr'(M = 0) \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where (a) uses the bound $|\Delta_T^\pi(s, a)| \leq \frac{2}{T^3}$ derived in (38), and the fact that $\{\Delta_i\}$ are zero mean independent random variables conditioned on $\{w_i\}$. Note that $|g_{k,i}| \leq N$ almost surely, $|A_g^\pi(s, a)| \leq \mathcal{O}(t_{\text{mix}})$ via Lemma 9, and $|\Delta_T^\pi(s, a)| \leq \frac{2}{T^3}$ as shown in (38). Combining, we get, $\mathbf{E}'[|\Delta_i|^2 | \{w_i\}] \leq \mathcal{O}(N^2/\pi(a|s))$ (see the definition of Δ_i in (39)). Invoking this bound into (40), we get the following result.

$$\mathbf{E}' \left[\left(\hat{A}_g^\pi(s, a) - A_g^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \right] \leq 2\mathbf{E}' \left[\frac{1}{M} \middle| w_1 \leq H - N \right] \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{N^2}{\pi(a|s)} \right) + \frac{8}{T^6} + \mathcal{O}(t_{\text{mix}}^2) \times \Pr'(w_1 > H - N) \quad (41)$$

Note that, one can use Lemma 11 to bound the following violation probability.

$$\Pr'(w_1 > H - N) \leq \left(1 - \frac{3d^\pi(s)}{4} \right)^{4t_{\text{hit}} T^\xi (\log T) - 1} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{3d^\pi(s)}{4} \right)^{\frac{4}{d^\pi(s)} (\log T)} \leq \frac{1}{T^3} \quad (42)$$

where (a) is a consequence of the fact that $4t_{\text{hit}} T^\xi (\log_2 T) - 1 \geq \frac{4}{d^\pi(s)} \log_2 T$ for sufficiently large T . Finally, note that, if $M < M_0$, where M_0 is defined as,

$$M_0 \triangleq \frac{H - N}{2N + \frac{4N \log T}{d^\pi(s)}} \quad (43)$$

then there exists at least one w_i that exceeds $4N \log_2 T/d^\pi(s)$ which can happen with the following maximum probability according to Lemma 11.

$$\Pr'(M < M_0) \leq \left(1 - \frac{3d^\pi(s)}{4}\right)^{\frac{4 \log T}{d^\pi(s)}} \leq \frac{1}{T^3} \quad (44)$$

The above probability bound can be used to obtain the following result,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}' \left[\frac{1}{M} \middle| M > 0 \right] &= \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \Pr'(M = m)}{\Pr'(M > 0)} \leq \frac{1 \times \Pr'(M \leq M_0) + \frac{1}{M_0} \Pr'(M > M_0)}{\Pr'(M > 0)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T^3} + \frac{2N + \frac{4N \log T}{d^\pi(s)}}{H - N} \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{N \log T}{H d^\pi(s)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Injecting (42) and (45) into (41), we finally obtain the following.

$$\mathbf{E}' \left[\left(\hat{A}_g^\pi(s, a) - A_g^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \right] \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{N^3 \log T}{H d^\pi(s) \pi(a|s)} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{N^3 t_{\text{hit}} \log T}{H \pi(a|s)} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{t_{\text{mix}}^2 (\log T)^2}{T^\xi \pi(a|s)} \right) \quad (46)$$

Eq. (46) shows that our desired inequality is satisfied in the imaginary system. We now need a mechanism to translate this result to our actual CMDP. Notice that, we can write $(\hat{A}_g^\pi(s, a) - A_g^\pi(s, a))^2 = f(X)$ where $X = (M, \tau_1, \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \tau_M, \mathcal{T}_M)$, and $\mathcal{T}_i = (a_{\tau_i}, s_{\tau_i+1}, a_{\tau_i+1}, \dots, s_{\tau_i+N}, a_{\tau_i+N})$. We have,

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}[f(X)]}{\mathbf{E}'[f(X)]} = \frac{\sum_X f(X) \Pr(X)}{\sum_X f(X) \Pr'(X)} \leq \max_X \frac{\Pr(X)}{\Pr'(X)} \quad (47)$$

The last inequality uses the non-negativity of $f(\cdot)$. Observe that, for a fixed sequence, X , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(X) &= \Pr(\tau_1) \times \Pr(\mathcal{T}_1|\tau_1) \times \Pr(\tau_2|\tau_1, \mathcal{T}_1) \times \Pr(\mathcal{T}_2|\tau_2) \times \dots \\ &\quad \times \Pr(\tau_M|\tau_{M-1}, \mathcal{T}_{M-1}) \times \Pr(\mathcal{T}_M|\tau_M) \times \Pr(s_t \neq s, \forall t \in [\tau_M + 2N, kH - N] | \tau_M, \mathcal{T}_M), \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr'(X) &= \Pr(\tau_1) \times \Pr(\mathcal{T}_1|\tau_1) \times \Pr'(\tau_2|\tau_1, \mathcal{T}_1) \times \Pr'(\mathcal{T}_2|\tau_2) \times \dots \\ &\quad \times \Pr'(\tau_M|\tau_{M-1}, \mathcal{T}_{M-1}) \times \Pr'(\mathcal{T}_M|\tau_M) \times \Pr'(s_t \neq s, \forall t \in [\tau_M + 2N, kH - N] | \tau_M, \mathcal{T}_M), \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The difference between $\Pr(X)$ and $\Pr'(X)$ arises because $\Pr(\tau_{i+1}|\tau_i, \mathcal{T}_i) \neq \Pr'(\tau_{i+1}|\tau_i, \mathcal{T}_i), \forall i \in \{1, \dots, M-1\}$. Note that the ratio of these two terms can be bounded as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Pr(\tau_{i+1}|\tau_i, \mathcal{T}_i)}{\Pr'(\tau_{i+1}|\tau_i, \mathcal{T}_i)} &= \frac{\sum_{s' \neq s} \Pr(s_{\tau_i+2N} = s' | \tau_i, \mathcal{T}_i) \times \Pr(s_t \neq s, \forall t \in [\tau_i + 2N, \tau_{i+1} - 1], s_{\tau_{i+1}} = s | s_{\tau_i+2N} = s')}{\sum_{s' \neq s} \Pr'(s_{\tau_i+2N} = s' | \tau_i, \mathcal{T}_i) \times \Pr(s_t \neq s, \forall t \in [\tau_i + 2N, \tau_{i+1} - 1], s_{\tau_{i+1}} = s | s_{\tau_i+2N} = s')} \\ &\leq \max_{s'} \frac{\Pr(s_{\tau_i+2N} = s' | \tau_i, \mathcal{T}_i)}{\Pr'(s_{\tau_i+2N} = s' | \tau_i, \mathcal{T}_i)} \\ &= \max_{s'} 1 + \frac{\Pr(s_{\tau_i+2N} = s' | \tau_i, \mathcal{T}_i) - d^\pi(s')}{d^\pi(s')} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \max_{s'} 1 + \frac{1}{T^3 d^\pi(s')} \leq 1 + \frac{t_{\text{hit}}}{T^3} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{T^2} \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where (a) is a consequence of Lemma 10. We have,

$$\frac{\Pr(X)}{\Pr'(X)} \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{T^2}\right)^M \leq e^{\frac{M}{T^2}} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} e^{\frac{1}{T}} \leq \mathcal{O} \left(1 + \frac{1}{T}\right) \quad (51)$$

where (a) uses the fact that $M \leq T$. Combining (47) and (51), we get,

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\left(\hat{A}_g^\pi(s, a) - A_g^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \right] \leq \mathcal{O} \left(1 + \frac{1}{T} \right) \mathbf{E}' \left[\left(\hat{A}_g^\pi(s, a) - A_g^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \right] \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{t_{\text{mix}}^2 (\log T)^2}{T^\xi \pi(a|s)} \right) \quad (52)$$

where (a) follows from (46). Using the definition of $A_{L,\lambda}$, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\hat{A}_{L,\lambda}^\pi(s, a) - A_{L,\lambda}^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \right] &= \mathbf{E} \left[\left((\hat{A}_r^\pi(s, a) - A_r^\pi(s, a)) + \lambda(\hat{A}_c^\pi(s, a) - A_c^\pi(s, a)) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbf{E} \left[\left(\hat{A}_r^\pi(s, a) - A_r^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \right] + 2\lambda^2 \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\hat{A}_c^\pi(s, a) - A_c^\pi(s, a) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{t_{\text{mix}}^2 (\log T)^2}{\delta^2 T^\xi \pi(a|s)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

This completes the proof. \square

B Proofs for the Section of Global Convergence Analysis

B.1 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. Recall from Eq. (17) that,

$$\omega_k = \frac{1}{H} \sum_{t=t_k}^{t_{k+1}-1} \hat{A}_{L,\lambda}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_t, a_t) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a_t | s_t), \quad (54)$$

Define the following quantity,

$$\bar{\omega}_k = \frac{1}{H} \sum_{t=t_k}^{t_{k+1}-1} A_{L,\lambda}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_t, a_t) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a_t | s_t) \quad (55)$$

where $t_k = (k-1)H$ is the starting time of the k th epoch. Note that the true gradient is given by,

$$\nabla_\theta J_{L,\lambda}(\theta_k) = \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi_{\theta_k}}, a \sim \pi_{\theta_k}(\cdot|s)} \left[A_{L,\lambda}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s) \right] \quad (56)$$

Moreover, using Assumption 3, Lemma 9, and the fact that $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2}{\delta}]$, we get $|A_{L,\lambda}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s)| \leq \mathcal{O}(\frac{t_{\text{mix}} G}{\delta})$, $\forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ which implies $|\nabla_\theta J_{L,\lambda}(\theta_k)| \leq \mathcal{O}(\frac{t_{\text{mix}} G}{\delta})$. Applying Lemma 14, we, thus, arrive at,

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\|\bar{\omega}_k - \nabla_\theta J_{L,\lambda}(\theta_k)\|^2 \right] \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\delta^2} G^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2 \log T \right) \times \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{t_{\text{mix}} \log T}{H} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{G^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta^2 t_{\text{hit}} T^\xi} \right) \quad (57)$$

Finally, the difference, $\mathbf{E} \|\omega_k - \bar{\omega}_k\|^2$ can be bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E} \|\omega_k - \bar{\omega}_k\|^2 \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{H} \sum_{t=t_k}^{t_{k+1}-1} \hat{A}_{L,\lambda}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_t, a_t) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a_t | s_t) - \frac{1}{H} \sum_{t=t_k}^{t_{k+1}-1} A_{L,\lambda}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_t, a_t) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a_t | s_t) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{G^2}{H} \sum_{t=t_k}^{t_{k+1}-1} \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\hat{A}_{L,\lambda}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_t, a_t) - A_{L,\lambda}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_t, a_t) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{G^2}{H} \sum_{t=t_k}^{t_{k+1}-1} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_a \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s_t) \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\hat{A}_{L,\lambda}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_t, a) - A_{L,\lambda}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_t, a) \right)^2 \middle| s_t \right] \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2 (\log T)^2}{\delta^2 T^\xi} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where (a) follows from Assumption 3 and Jensen's inequality whereas (b) follows from Lemma 2. Combining, (57) and (58), we conclude the result. \square

B.2 Proof of Lemma 4

Proof. Using the Lemma 12, it is obvious to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_g^\pi - J_g^{\pi'} &= \sum_s \sum_a d^\pi(s) (\pi(a|s) - \pi'(a|s)) Q_g^{\pi'}(s, a) \\
&= \sum_s \sum_a d^\pi(s) \pi(a|s) Q_g^{\pi'}(s, a) - \sum_s d^\pi(s) V_g^{\pi'}(s) \\
&= \sum_s \sum_a d^\pi(s) \pi(a|s) Q_g^{\pi'}(s, a) - \sum_s \sum_a d^\pi(s) \pi(a|s) V_g^{\pi'}(s) \\
&= \sum_s \sum_a d^\pi(s) \pi(a|s) [Q_g^{\pi'}(s, a) - V_g^{\pi'}(s)] \\
&= \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^\pi} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|s)} [A_g^{\pi'}(s, a)]
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

We conclude the lemma using the definition of $J_{L,\lambda}$ and $A_{L,\lambda}$. \square

B.3 Proof of Lemma 5

Proof. We start with the definition of KL divergence.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \| \pi_{\theta_k}(\cdot|s)) - KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \| \pi_{\theta_{k+1}}(\cdot|s))] \\
&= \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s)} \left[\log \frac{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}(a|s)}{\pi_{\theta_k}(a|s)} \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s)} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s) \cdot (\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k)] - \frac{B}{2} \|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\|^2 \\
&= \alpha \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s)} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s) \cdot \omega_k] - \frac{B\alpha^2}{2} \|\omega_k\|^2 \\
&= \alpha \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s)} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s) \cdot \omega_k^*] + \alpha \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s)} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s) \cdot (\omega_k - \omega_k^*)] - \frac{B\alpha^2}{2} \|\omega_k\|^2 \\
&= \alpha [J_L(\pi^*, \lambda_k) - J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)] + \alpha \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s)} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s) \cdot \omega_k^*] - \alpha [J_L(\pi^*, \lambda_k) - J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)] \\
&\quad + \alpha \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s)} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s) \cdot (\omega_k - \omega_k^*)] - \frac{B\alpha^2}{2} \|\omega_k\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \alpha [J_L(\pi^*, \lambda_k) - J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)] + \alpha \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s)} \left[\nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s) \cdot \omega_k^* - A_{L,\lambda_k}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) \right] \\
&\quad + \alpha \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s)} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s) \cdot (\omega_k - \omega_k^*)] - \frac{B\alpha^2}{2} \|\omega_k\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \alpha [J_L(\pi^*, \lambda_k) - J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)] - \alpha \sqrt{\mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s)} \left[\left(\nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s) \cdot \omega_k^* - A_{L,\lambda_k}^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) \right)^2 \right]} \\
&\quad - \alpha \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} \mathbf{E}_{a \sim \pi^*(\cdot|s)} \|\nabla_\theta \log \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s)\|_2 \|(\omega_k - \omega_k^*)\| - \frac{B\alpha^2}{2} \|\omega_k\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\geq} \alpha [J_L(\pi^*, \lambda_k) - J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)] - \alpha \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} - \alpha G \|(\omega_k - \omega_k^*)\| - \frac{B\alpha^2}{2} \|\omega_k\|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where the step (a) holds by Assumption 3 and step (b) holds by Lemma 4. Step (c) uses the convexity of the function $f(x) = x^2$. Finally, step (d) comes from the Assumption 4. Rearranging items, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_L(\pi^*, \lambda_k) - J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) &\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + G \|(\omega_k - \omega_k^*)\| + \frac{B\alpha}{2} \|\omega_k\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \| \pi_{\theta_k}(\cdot|s)) - KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \| \pi_{\theta_{k+1}}(\cdot|s))]
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Summing from $k = 1$ to K , using the non-negativity of KL divergence and dividing the resulting expression by K , we get the desired result. \square

B.4 Proof of Lemma 6

Proof. By the L -smooth property of the objective function and constraint function, we know that $J_L(\cdot, \lambda)$ is a $L(1 + \lambda)$ -smooth function. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
J_L(\theta_{k+1}, \lambda_k) &\geq J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) + \langle \nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k), \theta_{k+1} - \theta_k \rangle - \frac{L(1 + \lambda_k)}{2} \|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) + \alpha \nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)^T \omega_k - \frac{L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2}{2} \|\omega_k\|^2 \\
&= J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) + \alpha \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 - \alpha \langle \nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k, \nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2}{2} \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k - \nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) + \alpha \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k\|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \\
&\quad - L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2 \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k\|^2 - L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2 \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \\
&= J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 - \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k\|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where step (a) follows from the fact that $\theta_{t+1} = \theta_k + \alpha\omega_k$ and inequality (b) holds due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Now, adding $J_L(\theta_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1})$ on both sides, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_L(\theta_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) &\geq J_L(\theta_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) - J_L(\theta_{k+1}, \lambda_k) + J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} (\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k) J_c(\theta_{k+1}) + J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} -\beta + J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k\|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

where (a) holds by the definition of $J_L(\theta, \lambda)$ and step (b) is true because $|J_c(\theta)| \leq 1, \forall \theta$ and $|\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k| \leq \beta |\hat{J}_c(\theta_k)| \leq \beta$ where the last inequality uses the fact that $|\hat{J}_c(\theta_k)| \leq 1$. Summing over $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^K \left[J_L(\theta_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) - J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) \right] &\geq -\beta K + \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k\|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

which leads to the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
J_L(\theta_{K+1}, \lambda_{K+1}) - J_L(\theta_1, \lambda_1) &\geq -\beta K + \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + L(1 + \lambda_k)\alpha^2\right) \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k\|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Rearranging the terms and using $0 \leq \lambda_k \leq \frac{2}{\delta}$ due to the dual update, we arrive at the following.

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{J_L(\theta_{K+1}, \lambda_{K+1}) - J_L(\theta_1, \lambda_1) + \beta K + \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + L(1 + \frac{2}{\delta})\alpha^2\right) \sum_{k=1}^K \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k\|^2}{\frac{\alpha}{2} - L(1 + \frac{2}{\delta})\alpha^2} \tag{66}$$

Choosing $\alpha = \frac{1}{4L(1+\frac{2}{\delta})}$ and dividing both sides by K , we conclude the result.

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{16L(1+\frac{2}{\delta})}{K} [J_L(\theta_{K+1}, \lambda_{K+1}) - J_L(\theta_1, \lambda_1)] + \frac{3}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k\|^2 + \beta \quad (67)$$

Recall that $|J_L(\theta, \lambda)| \leq 1 + \lambda \leq 1 + \frac{2}{\delta} \leq \frac{3}{\delta}, \forall \theta \in \Theta, \forall \lambda \geq 0$. Thus,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k)\|^2 \leq \frac{288L}{\delta^2 K} + \frac{3}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\nabla J_L(\theta_k, \lambda_k) - \omega_k\|^2 + \beta \quad (68)$$

This completes the proof. \square

B.5 Proof of Theorem 1

B.5.1 Rate of Convergence of the Objective

Recall the definition of $J_L(\theta, \lambda) = J_r(\theta) + \lambda J_c(\theta)$. Using Lemma 7, we arrive at the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left(J_r^{\pi^*} - J_r(\theta_k) \right) &\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\sqrt{\beta} + \frac{\sqrt{AG}t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta T^{\xi/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}}{\delta T^{(1-\xi)/2}} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{B}{L} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta^2 T^\xi} + \frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta^2 T^{1-\xi}} + \beta \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \|\pi_{\theta_1}(\cdot|s))]]}{T^{1-\xi}\delta} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\lambda_k \left(J_c^{\pi^*} - J_c(\theta_k) \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Thus, we need to find a bound for the last term in the above equation.

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq (\lambda_{K+1})^2 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \left((\lambda_{k+1})^2 - (\lambda_k)^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\mathcal{P}_{[0, \frac{2}{\delta}]} [\lambda_k - \beta \hat{J}_c(\theta_k)]^2 - (\lambda_k)^2 \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \left([\lambda_k - \beta \hat{J}_c(\theta_k)]^2 - (\lambda_k)^2 \right) \\ &= -2\beta \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k \hat{J}_c(\theta_k) + \beta^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{J}_c(\theta_k)^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2\beta \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k (J_c^{\pi^*} - \hat{J}_c(\theta_k)) + \beta^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{J}_c(\theta_k)^2 \\ &\leq 2\beta \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k (J_c^{\pi^*} - \hat{J}_c(\theta_k)) + 2\beta^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{J}_c(\theta_k)^2 \\ &= 2\beta \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k (J_c^{\pi^*} - J_c(\theta_k)) + 2\beta \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k (J_c(\theta_k) - \hat{J}_c(\theta_k)) + 2\beta^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{J}_c(\theta_k)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Inequality (a) holds because θ^* is a feasible solution to the constrained optimization problem. Rearranging items and taking the expectation, we have

$$-\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\lambda_k (J_c^{\pi^*} - J_c(\theta_k)) \right] \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\lambda_k (J_c(\theta_k) - \hat{J}_c(\theta_k)) \right] + \frac{\beta}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} [\hat{J}_c(\theta_k)]^2 \quad (71)$$

Notice that different from the discounted reward case, $\hat{J}_c(\theta_k)$ is no longer an unbiased estimator. However, by Lemma 13 and the fact that $|c(s, a)| \leq 1, \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, we have the following result

$$-\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\lambda_k (J_c^{\pi^*} - J_c(\theta_k)) \right] \leq \frac{2}{\delta T^2} + \beta \quad (72)$$

Combining with Eq. (69), we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left(J_r^{\pi^*} - J_r(\theta_k) \right) &\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\sqrt{\beta} + \frac{\sqrt{AG}t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta T^{\xi/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}}{\delta T^{(1-\xi)/2}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{T^2} + \beta \right) \\ &+ \frac{B}{L} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{AG^2t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta^2 T^\xi} + \frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta^2 T^{1-\xi}} + \beta \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \|\pi_{\theta_1}(\cdot|s))] }{T^{1-\xi}\delta} \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\sqrt{\beta} + \frac{\sqrt{AG}t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta T^{\xi/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}}{\delta T^{(1-\xi)/2}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

The last inequality presents only the dominant terms of β and T .

B.5.2 Rate of Constraint Violation

For any $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2}{\delta}]$, given the dual update in algorithm 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda|^2 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \left| \lambda_k - \beta J_c(\theta_k) - \lambda \right|^2 \\ &= |\lambda_k - \lambda|^2 - 2\beta J_c(\theta_k)(\lambda_k - \lambda) + \beta^2 J_c(\theta_k)^2 \\ &\leq |\lambda_k - \lambda|^2 - 2\beta J_c(\theta_k)(\lambda_k - \lambda) + \beta^2 \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

where (a) is because of the non-expansiveness of projection \mathcal{P}_Λ . Averaging the above inequality over $k = 1, \dots, K$ yields

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{K} |\lambda_{K+1} - \lambda|^2 \leq \frac{1}{K} |\lambda_1 - \lambda|^2 - \frac{2\beta}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K J_c(\theta_k)(\lambda_k - \lambda) + \beta^2 \quad (75)$$

Taking expectations at both sides,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[J_c(\theta_k)(\lambda_k - \lambda) \right] \leq \frac{1}{2\beta K} |\lambda_1 - \lambda|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \quad (76)$$

Notice that $\lambda_k J_c(\theta_k) \geq 0, \forall k$. Adding the above inequality to (69) at both sides, we, therefore, have,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left(J_r^{\pi^*} - J_r(\theta_k) \right) + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\lambda \left(-J_c(\theta_k) \right) \right] &\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \frac{1}{2\beta K} |\lambda_1 - \lambda|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \\ &+ G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\sqrt{\beta} + \frac{\sqrt{AG}t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta T^{\xi/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}}{\delta T^{(1-\xi)/2}} \right) + \frac{B}{L} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{AG^2t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta^2 T^\xi} + \frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta^2 T^{1-\xi}} + \beta \right) \\ &+ \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \|\pi_{\theta_1}(\cdot|s))] }{T^{1-\xi}\delta} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Setting $\lambda = \frac{2}{\delta}$ if $\sum_{k=1}^K -J_c(\theta_k) \geq 0$ and $\lambda = 0$ otherwise, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[J_r^{\pi^*} - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K J_r(\theta_k) \right] + \frac{2}{\delta} \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K -J_c(\theta_k) \right]_+ &\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \frac{2}{\delta^2 \beta K} + \frac{\beta}{2} \\ &+ G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\sqrt{\beta} + \frac{\sqrt{AG}t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta T^{\xi/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}}{\delta T^{(1-\xi)/2}} \right) + \frac{B}{L} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{AG^2t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta^2 T^\xi} + \frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta^2 T^{1-\xi}} + \beta \right) \\ &+ \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \|\pi_{\theta_1}(\cdot|s))] }{T^{1-\xi}\delta} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

We define a new policy $\bar{\pi}$ which uniformly chooses the policy π_{θ_k} for $k \in [K]$. By the occupancy measure method, $J_g(\theta_k)$ is linear in terms of an occupancy measure induced by policy π_{θ_k} . Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K J_g(\theta_k) = J_g^{\bar{\pi}} \quad (79)$$

Injecting the above relation to (78), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[J_r^{\pi^*} - J_r^{\bar{\pi}} \right] + \frac{2}{\delta} \mathbf{E} \left[-J_c^{\bar{\pi}} \right]_+ &\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \frac{2}{\delta^2 \beta K} + \frac{\beta}{2} + G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\sqrt{\beta} + \frac{\sqrt{AG}t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta T^{\xi/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}}{\delta T^{(1-\xi)/2}} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{B}{L} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta^2 T^\xi} + \frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta^2 T^{1-\xi}} + \beta \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \|\pi_{\theta_1}(\cdot|s))]}{T^{1-\xi} \delta} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

By Lemma 18, we arrive at,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[-J_c^{\bar{\pi}} \right]_+ &\leq \delta \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \frac{2}{\delta \beta K} + \frac{\delta \beta}{2} + G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\delta \sqrt{\beta} + \frac{\sqrt{AG}t_{\text{mix}}}{T^{\xi/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}}{T^{(1-\xi)/2}} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{B}{L} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta T^\xi} + \frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta T^{1-\xi}} + \delta \beta \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \|\pi_{\theta_1}(\cdot|s))]}{T^{1-\xi}} \right) \\ &\leq \delta \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{2t_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta \beta T^{1-\xi}} \right) + G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\delta \sqrt{\beta} + \frac{\sqrt{AG}t_{\text{mix}}}{T^{\xi/2}} + \frac{\sqrt{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}}{T^{(1-\xi)/2}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

The last inequality presents only the dominant terms of β and T .

B.5.3 Optimal Choice of β and ξ

If we choose $\beta = T^{-\eta}$ for some $\eta \in (0, 1)$, then following (73) and (81), we can write,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left(J_r^{\pi^*} - J_r(\theta_k) \right) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(T^{-\eta/2} + T^{-\xi/2} + T^{-(1-\xi)/2} \right), \quad (82)$$

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K -J_c(\theta_k) \right]_+ \leq \delta \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(T^{-(1-\xi-\eta)} + T^{-\eta/2} + T^{-\xi/2} + T^{-(1-\xi)/2} \right) \quad (83)$$

Clearly, the optimal values of η and ξ can be obtained by solving the following optimization.

$$\max_{(\eta, \xi) \in (0, 1)^2} \min \left\{ 1 - \xi - \eta, \frac{\eta}{2}, \frac{\xi}{2}, \frac{1 - \xi}{2} \right\} \quad (84)$$

One can easily verify that $(\xi, \eta) = (2/5, 2/5)$ is the solution of the above optimization. Therefore, the convergence rate of the objective function can be written as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left(J_r^{\pi^*} - J_r(\theta_k) \right) &\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{1}{T^{1/5}} + \frac{\sqrt{AG}t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta T^{1/5}} + \frac{\sqrt{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}}{\delta T^{3/10}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{T^2} + \frac{1}{T^{2/5}} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{B}{L} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{\delta^2 + AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta^2 T^{2/5}} + \frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta^2 T^{3/5}} \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{Lt_{\text{mix}}t_{\text{hit}} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \|\pi_{\theta_1}(\cdot|s))]}{T^{3/5} \delta} \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \frac{\sqrt{AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}}}{\delta} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(T^{-1/5} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

The last expression only considers the dominant terms of T . Similarly, the constraint violation rate can

be computed as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K -J_c(\theta_k) \right]_+ &\leq \delta \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta T^{1/5}} + \frac{\delta}{T^{2/5}} \right) + G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{\delta + \sqrt{AG} t_{\text{mix}}}{T^{1/5}} + \frac{\sqrt{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}}{T^{3/10}} \right) \\
&+ \frac{B}{L} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{\delta^2 + AG^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta T^{2/5}} + \frac{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta T^{3/5}} \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [KL(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \| \pi_{\theta_1}(\cdot|s))]}{T^{3/5}} \right) \\
&\leq \delta \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta T^{1/5}} \right) + \sqrt{AG} t_{\text{mix}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(T^{-1/5} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

where the last expression contains only the dominant terms of T . This concludes the theorem.

C Proofs for the Regret and Violation Analysis

C.1 Proof of Lemma 8

Proof. Using Taylor's expansion, we can write the following $\forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \forall k$.

$$\begin{aligned}
|\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}(a|s) - \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s)| &= |(\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k)^T \nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\bar{\theta}}(a|s)| \\
&= \pi_{\bar{\theta}_k}(a|s) |(\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k)^T \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\bar{\theta}_k}(a|s)| \\
&\leq \pi_{\bar{\theta}_k}(a|s) \|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\| \|\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\bar{\theta}_k}(a|s)\| \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} G \|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\|
\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

where $\bar{\theta}_k$ is some convex combination³ of θ_k and θ_{k+1} and (a) results from Assumption 3. This concludes the first statement. Applying (87) and Lemma 12, we obtain the following for $g \in \{r, c\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} |J_g(\theta_{k+1}) - J_g(\theta_k)| &= \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left| \sum_{s,a} d^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}(s) (\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}(a|s) - \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s)) Q_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{s,a} d^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}(s) |\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}(a|s) - \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s)| |Q_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a)| \right] \\
&\leq G \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{s,a} d^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}(s) \|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\| |Q_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, a)| \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} G \alpha \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_a \underbrace{\sum_s d^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}(s) \|\omega_k\|}_{=1} \cdot 6t_{\text{mix}} \right] = 6AG\alpha t_{\text{mix}} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \|\omega_k\| \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 6AG\alpha t_{\text{mix}} \sqrt{K} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \|\omega_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{\alpha AG}{\delta t_{\text{hit}}} \left[(\sqrt{AG} t_{\text{mix}} + \delta) T^{\frac{2}{5}} + \sqrt{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}} T^{\frac{3}{10}} \right] \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

Inequality (a) uses Lemma 9 and the update rule $\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k + \alpha \omega_k$. Step (b) holds by the Cauchy inequality and Jensen inequality whereas (c) can be derived using (26) and substituting $K = T/H$. This establishes the second statement. Next, recall from (5) that for any policy π_{θ} , $g^{\pi_{\theta}}(s) \triangleq \sum_a \pi_{\theta}(a|s) g(s, a)$. Note that, for any policy parameter θ , and any state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the following holds.

$$V_g^{\pi_{\theta}}(s) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \langle (P^{\pi_{\theta}})^t(s, \cdot) - d^{\pi_{\theta}}, g^{\pi_{\theta}} \rangle = \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \langle (P^{\pi_{\theta}})^t(s, \cdot), g^{\pi_{\theta}} \rangle - NJ(\theta) + \sum_{t=N}^{\infty} \langle (P^{\pi_{\theta}})^t(s, \cdot) - d^{\pi_{\theta}}, g^{\pi_{\theta}} \rangle. \tag{89}$$

³Note that, in general, $\bar{\theta}_k$ is dependent on (s, a) .

Define the following quantity.

$$\delta^{\pi_\theta}(s, T) \triangleq \sum_{t=N}^{\infty} \|(P^{\pi_\theta})^t(s, \cdot) - d^{\pi_\theta}\|_1 \quad \text{where } N = 4t_{\text{mix}}(\log_2 T) \quad (90)$$

Lemma 10 states that for sufficiently large T , we have $\delta^{\pi_\theta}(s, T) \leq \frac{1}{T^3}$ for any policy π_θ and state s . Combining this result with the fact that the g^{π_θ} function is absolutely bounded in $[0, 1]$, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} |V_g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}(s_k) - V_g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_k)| \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left| \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \langle (P^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}})^t(s_k, \cdot) - (P^{\pi_{\theta_k}})^t(s_k, \cdot), g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}} \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \left| \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \langle (P^{\pi_{\theta_k}})^t(s_k, \cdot), g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}} - g^{\pi_{\theta_k}} \rangle \right| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + N \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} |J_g(\theta_{k+1}) - J_g(\theta_k)| + \frac{2K}{T^3} \right. \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{E} \|(P^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}})^t - (P^{\pi_{\theta_k}})^t\|_\infty \|g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}\|_\infty + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{E} \|g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}} - g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}\|_\infty \\ & \quad \left. + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{\alpha AG t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta t_{\text{hit}}} \left[(\sqrt{AG} t_{\text{mix}} + \delta) T^{\frac{2}{5}} + \sqrt{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}} T^{\frac{3}{10}} \right] \right) \right. \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

where (a) follows from (88) and substituting $N = 4t_{\text{mix}}(\log_2 T)$. For the first term, note that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|((P^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}})^t - (P^{\pi_{\theta_k}})^t)g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}\|_\infty \\ & \leq \|P^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}((P^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}})^{t-1} - (P^{\pi_{\theta_k}})^{t-1})g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}\|_\infty + \|(P^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}} - P^{\pi_{\theta_k}})(P^{\pi_{\theta_k}})^{t-1}g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}\|_\infty \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \|((P^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}})^{t-1} - (P^{\pi_{\theta_k}})^{t-1})g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}\|_\infty + \max_s \|P^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}(s, \cdot) - P^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, \cdot)\|_1 \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

Inequality (a) holds since every row of $P^{\pi_{\theta_k}}$ sums to 1 and $\|(P^{\pi_{\theta_k}})^{t-1}g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}\|_\infty \leq 1$. Moreover, invoking (87), and the parameter update rule $\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k + \alpha\omega_k$, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_s \|P^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}(s, \cdot) - P^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, \cdot)\|_1 &= \max_s \left| \sum_{s'} \sum_a (\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}(a|s) - \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s)) P(s'|s, a) \right| \\ &\leq G \|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\| \max_s \left| \sum_{s'} \sum_a P(s'|s, a) \right| \leq \alpha AG \|\omega_k\| \end{aligned}$$

Plugging the above result into (92) and using a recursive argument, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \|((P^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}})^t - (P^{\pi_{\theta_k}})^t)g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}\|_\infty &\leq \sum_{t'=1}^t \max_s \|P^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}(s, \cdot) - P^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s, \cdot)\|_1 \\ &\leq \sum_{t'=1}^t \alpha AG \|\omega_k\| \leq \alpha t AG \|\omega_k\| \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{E} \|((P^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}})^t - (P^{\pi_{\theta_k}})^t)g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}\|_\infty &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \alpha t AG \|\omega_k\| \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\alpha AG N^2) \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \|\omega_k\| \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\alpha AG N^2 \sqrt{K}) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \|\omega_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{\alpha AG t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta t_{\text{hit}}} \left[(\sqrt{AG} t_{\text{mix}} + \delta) T^{\frac{2}{5}} + \sqrt{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}} T^{\frac{3}{10}} \right] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

where (a) follows from (26). Moreover, notice that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{E} \|g^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}} - g^{\pi_{\theta_k}}\|_{\infty} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{E} \left[\max_s \left| \sum_a (\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}(a|s) - \pi_{\theta_k}(a|s)) g(s, a) \right| \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \alpha A G N \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \|\omega_k\| \\
&\leq \alpha A G N \sqrt{K} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E} \|\omega_k\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{\alpha A G}{\delta t_{\text{hit}}} \left[(\sqrt{A G t_{\text{mix}}} + \delta) T^{\frac{2}{5}} + \sqrt{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}} T^{\frac{3}{10}} \right] \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

where (a) follows from (87) and the parameter update rule $\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k + \alpha \omega_k$ while (b) is a consequence of (26). Combining (91), (93), and (94), we establish the third statement. \square

C.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Recall the decomposition of the regret in section 6 and take the expectation.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[\text{Reg}_T] &= \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(J_r^{\pi^*} - r(s_t, a_t) \right) = H \sum_{k=1}^K \left(J_r^{\pi^*} - J_r(\theta_k) \right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_k} \left(J_r(\theta_k) - r(s_t, a_t) \right) \\
&= H \sum_{k=1}^K \left(J_r^{\pi^*} - J_r(\theta_k) \right) + \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} V_r^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}(s_{kH}) - V_r^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_{kH}) \right] + \mathbf{E} \left[V_r^{\pi_{\theta_K}}(s_T) - V_r^{\pi_{\theta_0}}(s_0) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

Using the result in (85), Lemma 8 and Lemma 9, we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[\text{Reg}_T] &\leq T \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(T^{\frac{4}{5}} + \frac{\sqrt{A G t_{\text{mix}}}}{\delta} T^{\frac{4}{5}} + \frac{\sqrt{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}}{\delta} T^{\frac{7}{10}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{T} + T^{\frac{3}{5}} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{B}{L} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{\delta^2 + A G^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta^2} T^{\frac{3}{5}} + \frac{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta^2} T^{\frac{2}{5}} \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [K L(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \| \pi_{\theta_1}(\cdot|s))] }{\delta} T^{\frac{2}{5}} \right) \\
&\quad + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{\alpha A G t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta t_{\text{hit}}} \left[(\sqrt{A G t_{\text{mix}}} + \delta) T^{\frac{2}{5}} + \sqrt{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}} T^{\frac{3}{10}} \right] \right) + \mathcal{O}(t_{\text{mix}})
\end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

Similarly, for the constraint violation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[\text{Vio}_T] &= \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (-c(s_t, a_t)) = H \sum_{k=1}^K -J_c(\theta_k) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}_k} (J_c(\theta_k) - c(s_t, a_t)) \\
&= -H \sum_{k=1}^K J_c(\theta_k) + \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} V_c^{\pi_{\theta_{k+1}}}(s_{kH}) - V_c^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s_{kH}) \right] + \mathbf{E} \left[V_c^{\pi_{\theta_K}}(s_T) - V_c^{\pi_{\theta_0}}(s_0) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

Using the result in (86), Lemma 8 and Lemma 9, we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[\text{Vio}_T] &\leq T \delta \sqrt{\epsilon_{\text{bias}}} + G \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu_F} \right) \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\left[\delta + \sqrt{A G t_{\text{mix}}} \right] T^{\frac{4}{5}} + \sqrt{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}} T^{\frac{7}{10}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta} T^{\frac{4}{5}} + \delta T^{\frac{3}{5}} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{B}{L} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{\delta^2 + A G^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2}{\delta} T^{\frac{3}{5}} + \frac{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}}{\delta} T^{\frac{2}{5}} \right) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}} \mathbf{E}_{s \sim d^{\pi^*}} [K L(\pi^*(\cdot|s) \| \pi_{\theta_1}(\cdot|s))] T^{\frac{2}{5}} \right) \\
&\quad + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{\alpha A G t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta t_{\text{hit}}} \left[(\sqrt{A G t_{\text{mix}}} + \delta) T^{\frac{2}{5}} + \sqrt{L t_{\text{mix}} t_{\text{hit}}} T^{\frac{3}{10}} \right] \right) + \mathcal{O}(t_{\text{mix}})
\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

This concludes the theorem. \square

D Some Auxiliary Lemmas for the Proofs

Lemma 9. (Wei et al., 2020, Lemma 14) For any ergodic MDP with mixing time t_{mix} , the following holds $\forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, any policy π and $\forall g \in \{r, c\}$.

$$(a) |V_g^\pi(s)| \leq 5t_{\text{mix}}, \quad (b) |Q_g^\pi(s, a)| \leq 6t_{\text{mix}}$$

Lemma 10. (Wei et al., 2020, Corollary 13.2) Let $\delta^\pi(\cdot, T)$ be defined as written below for an arbitrary policy π .

$$\delta^\pi(s, T) \triangleq \sum_{t=N}^{\infty} \|(P^\pi)^t(s, \cdot) - d^\pi\|_1, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \text{ where } N = 4t_{\text{mix}}(\log_2 T) \quad (99)$$

If $t_{\text{mix}} < T/4$, we have the following inequality $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}$: $\delta^\pi(s, T) \leq \frac{1}{T^3}$.

Lemma 11. (Wei et al., 2020, Lemma 16) Let $\mathcal{I} = \{t_1 + 1, t_1 + 2, \dots, t_2\}$ be a certain period of an epoch k of Algorithm 2 with length N . Then for any s , the probability that the algorithm never visits s in \mathcal{I} is upper bounded by

$$\left(1 - \frac{3d^{\pi_{\theta_k}}(s)}{4}\right)^{\lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{I}|}{N} \rfloor} \quad (100)$$

Lemma 12. (Wei et al., 2020, Lemma 15) The difference of the values of the function J_g , $g \in \{r, c\}$ at policies π and π' , is

$$J_g^\pi - J_g^{\pi'} = \sum_s \sum_a d^\pi(s) (\pi(a|s) - \pi'(a|s)) Q_g^{\pi'}(s, a) \quad (101)$$

Lemma 13. (Wei et al., 2020, Lemma 7) The estimation of $\hat{J}_c(\theta_k)$ for any iteration $k \in K$ is a good estimation for $J_c(\theta_k)$, which means

$$|\hat{J}_c(\theta_k) - J_c(\theta_k)| \leq \frac{1}{T^2} \quad (102)$$

Lemma 14. (Dorfman and Levy, 2022, Lemma A.6) Let $\theta \in \Theta$ be a policy parameter. Fix a trajectory $z = \{(s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ generated by following the policy π_θ starting from some initial state $s_0 \sim \rho$. Let, $\nabla L(\theta)$ be the gradient that we wish to estimate over z , and $l(\theta, \cdot)$ is a function such that $\mathbf{E}_{z \sim d^{\pi_\theta, \pi_\theta}} l(\theta, z) = \nabla L(\theta)$. Assume that $\|l(\theta, z)\|, \|\nabla L(\theta)\| \leq G_L, \forall \theta \in \Theta, \forall z \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}$. Define $l^Q = \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{i=1}^Q l(\theta, z_i)$. If $P = 2t_{\text{mix}} \log T$, then the following holds as long as $Q \leq T$,

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\|l^Q - \nabla L(\theta)\|^2 \right] \leq \mathcal{O} \left(G_L^2 \log(PQ) \frac{P}{Q} \right) \quad (103)$$

Lemma 15 (Strong duality). (Ding et al., 2022, Lemma 3) For convenience, we rewrite the problem (2).

$$\max_{\pi \in \Pi} J_r^\pi \quad \text{s.t.} \quad J_c^\pi \geq 0 \quad (104)$$

Define π^* as the optimal solution to the above problem. Define the associated dual function as

$$J_D^\lambda \triangleq \max_{\pi \in \Pi} J_r^\pi + \lambda J_c^\pi \quad (105)$$

and denote $\lambda^* = \arg \min_{\lambda \geq 0} J_D^\lambda$. We have the following strong duality property for the unparameterized problem.

$$J_r^{\pi^*} = J_D^{\lambda^*} \quad (106)$$

Although the strong duality holds for the unparameterized problem, the same is not true for parameterized class $\{\pi_\theta | \theta \in \Theta\}$. However, we can still derive a bound for λ for the parameterized problem (3). Redefine the associated dual function for the parameterized problem as

$$J_{D, \Theta}^\lambda \triangleq \max_{\theta \in \Theta} J_r(\theta) + \lambda J_c(\theta) \quad (107)$$

and denote $\lambda_\theta^* = \arg \min_{\lambda \geq 0} J_{D, \Theta}^\lambda$

Lemma 16 (Boundness of λ). *Under Assumption 2, the optimal dual variable for the parameterized problem is bounded as*

$$0 \leq \lambda_\theta^* \leq \frac{J_r^{\pi^*} - J_r(\bar{\theta})}{\delta} \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \quad (108)$$

Proof. The proof follows the approach in (Ding et al., 2022, Lemma 3), but is revised to the general parameterization setup. Let $\Lambda_a \triangleq \{\lambda \geq 0 \mid J_{D,\Theta}^\lambda \leq a\}$ be a sublevel set of the dual function for $a \in \mathbb{R}$. If Λ_a is non-empty, then for any $\lambda \in \Lambda_a$,

$$a \geq J_{D,\Theta}^\lambda \geq J_r(\bar{\theta}) + \lambda J_c(\bar{\theta}) \geq J_r(\bar{\theta}) + \lambda\delta \quad (109)$$

where $\bar{\theta}$ is a Slater point in Assumption 2. Thus, $\lambda \leq (a - J_r(\bar{\theta}))/\delta$. If we take $a = J_{D,\Theta}^{\lambda_\theta^*} \leq J_{D,\Theta}^{\lambda^*} \leq J_D^{\lambda^*} = J_r^{\pi^*}$, then we have $\lambda_\theta^* \in \Lambda_a$, which proves the Lemma. The last inequality holds since $J_r^\pi \in [0, 1]$ for any π . \square

To avoid the problem of lack of strong duality in parameterized setup, we define $v(\tau) \triangleq \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \{J_r^\pi \mid J_c^\pi \geq \tau\}$. Utilizing the analysis for the unparameterized problem in Eq. (104), we establish the following property of the function, $v(\tau)$.

Lemma 17. *Assume that the Assumption 2 holds, we have for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$v(0) - \tau\lambda^* \geq v(\tau) \quad (110)$$

Proof. By the definition of $v(\tau)$, we have $v(0) = J_r^{\pi^*}$. With a slight abuse of notation, denote $J_L(\pi, \lambda) = J_r^\pi + \lambda J_c^\pi$. By the strong duality stated in Lemma 15, we have the following for any $\pi \in \Pi$.

$$J_L(\pi, \lambda^*) \leq \max_{\pi \in \Pi} J_L(\pi, \lambda^*) \stackrel{Def}{=} J_D^{\lambda^*} \stackrel{(106)}{=} J_r^{\pi^*} = v(0) \quad (111)$$

Thus, for any $\pi \in \{\pi \in \Pi \mid J_c^\pi \geq \tau\}$,

$$v(0) - \tau\lambda^* \geq J_L(\pi, \lambda^*) - \tau\lambda^* = J_r^\pi + \lambda^*(J_c^\pi - \tau) \geq J_r^\pi \quad (112)$$

Maximizing the right-hand side of this inequality over $\{\pi \in \Pi \mid J_c^\pi \geq \tau\}$ yields

$$v(0) - \tau\lambda^* \geq v(\tau) \quad (113)$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

We note that a similar result was shown in (Bai et al., 2023a, Lemma 15). However, the setup of the stated paper is different from that of ours. Specifically, Bai et al. (2023a) considers a tabular setup with peak constraints. Note that Lemma 17 has no direct connection with the parameterized setup since its proof uses strong duality and the function, $v(\cdot)$, is defined via a constrained optimization over the entire policy set, Π , rather than the parameterized policy set. Interestingly, however, the relationship between $v(\tau)$ and $v(0)$ leads to the lemma stated below which turns out to be pivotal in establishing regret and constraint violation bounds in the parameterized setup.

Lemma 18. *Let Assumption 2 hold. For any constant $C \geq 2\lambda^*$, if there exists a $\pi \in \Pi$ and $\zeta > 0$ such that $J_r^{\pi^*} - J_r^\pi + C[-J_c(\theta)]_+ \leq \zeta$, then*

$$[-J_c^\pi]_+ \leq 2\zeta/C \quad (114)$$

where $[x]_+ = \max(x, 0)$.

Proof. Let $\tau = -[-J_c^\pi]_+$, we have

$$J_r^\pi \leq J_r^{\pi^*} = v(0) \leq v(\tau) \quad (115)$$

where the last step holds due to $\tau < 0$. Combining Eq. (113) and (115), we have

$$J_r^\pi - J_r^{\pi^*} \leq v(\tau) - v(0) \leq -\tau\lambda^* \quad (116)$$

By the condition in Lemma, we have

$$(C - \lambda^*)|\tau| = \tau\lambda^* + C|\tau| \leq J_r^{\pi^*} - J_r^\pi + C|\tau| \leq \zeta \quad (117)$$

Finally, we have

$$|\tau| \leq \frac{\zeta}{C - \lambda^*} \leq \frac{2\zeta}{C} \quad (118)$$

which completes the proof. \square