

Figure 1: **Dual-SPMA loop.** Dual ascent chooses  $y_k$ , which induces a shaped reward for the SPMA policy step; discounted occupancies feed the next dual update.

## Project Milestone — Literature Review: A Dual-SPMA Framework for Convex MDPs

**Shervin Khamooshian Ahmed Magd Pegah Aryadoost Danielle Nguyen**  
Simon Fraser University {ska309, ams80, paa40, tdSn8}@sfu.ca

### Project topic (what we are building)

**Goal.** We study a unified way to solve *Convex MDPs (CMDPs)* by combining a Fenchel-dual saddle formulation with a geometry-aware policy optimizer, *Softmax Policy Mirror Ascent (SPMA)*. CMDPs minimize a convex function of discounted occupancies and are equivalent to the saddle  $\min_{\pi} \max_y \langle y, d_{\pi} \rangle - f^*(y)$ . Fixing  $y$  turns the policy step into standard RL with shaped reward  $r_y(s, a) = -y(s, a)$  (or  $-\phi(s, a)^T y$  under features). We alternate a mirror-ascent step on  $y$  with an SPMA policy step and return discounted occupancy (or feature-expectation) estimates for the next dual update (Fig. 1).

### Paper 1: Reward is Enough for Convex MDPs (NeurIPS 2021)

**Core idea.** Many RL goals can be posed as  $\min_{d \in \mathcal{K}} f(d)$  for convex  $f$  over the occupancy polytope  $\mathcal{K}$ . Using Fenchel conjugacy,  $\min_{d \in \mathcal{K}} f(d) = \min_{d \in \mathcal{K}} \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \lambda \cdot d - f^*(\lambda)$ , so for fixed  $\lambda$  the policy subproblem is vanilla RL with shaped reward  $r_{\lambda} = -\lambda$ .




Figure 2: Convex MDP as a two-player game (adapted from Zahavy et al. [2021], Fig. 1). The cost player provides non-stationary shaped rewards  $r_t = -\lambda^t$  to the agent, observing the resulting occupancy measures  $d_{\pi}^t$ . From the agent's perspective, this reduces to standard RL with time-varying rewards.

Figure 2 illustrates this as a two-player game where the agent sees non-stationary rewards from the cost player. A meta-algorithm (Algorithm 1) alternates a *cost player* (FTL/OMD in  $\lambda$ , a convex ascent step) with a *policy player* (best response or low-regret RL, which reduces to “just RL” under the shaped reward), yielding  $O(1/\sqrt{K})$  optimization error for averaged iterates under standard OCO assumptions. The paper shows best-response is ideal but often intractable in deep RL, so low-regret learners (e.g., UCRL2, MDPO) suffice; the guarantees hold for averaged occupancies  $\bar{d}_\pi^K$  rather than single iterates. It unifies apprenticeship learning, CMDPs and pure exploration (Table 2). [Zahavy et al., 2021]

---

**Algorithm 1:** Meta-algorithm for Convex MDPs [Zahavy et al., 2021]

---

**Input:** Convex-concave payoff  $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{K} \times \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , algorithms  $\text{Alg}_\lambda, \text{Alg}_\pi, K \in \mathbb{N}$

- 1 **for**  $k = 1, \dots, K$  **do**
- 2    $\lambda^k \leftarrow \text{Alg}_\lambda(d_\pi^1, \dots, d_\pi^{k-1}; \mathcal{L});$  // Cost player update
- 3    $d_\pi^k \leftarrow \text{Alg}_\pi(-\lambda^k);$  // Policy: solve RL with  $r = -\lambda^k$

**Output:**  $\bar{d}_\pi^K = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K d_\pi^k, \bar{\lambda}^K = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda^k$

---

**Relevance.** This work justifies the saddle and the shaped-reward reduction we implement and informs our outer-loop design (dual MA + policy best response).

## Paper 2: *Fast Convergence of Softmax Policy Mirror Ascent* (OPT 2024 / arXiv 2025)

**Core idea.** SPMA performs mirror ascent in *logit* space using the log-sum-exp mirror map, in contrast to NPG which uses exponential reweighting in probability space (Sec. 3.2). In tabular MDPs the per-state update (Eq. 3)  $\pi_{t+1}(a|s) = \pi_t(a|s)(1 + \eta A^{\pi_t}(s, a))$  avoids explicit normalization and achieves *linear convergence* for sufficiently small constant step-size: bandit linear convergence (Thm. 1) and tabular MDP linear convergence to the optimal value (Thm. 2), improving over softmax PG (Sec. 3.3). For large problems, SPMA projects onto function classes via convex *softmax classification* subproblems (Eq. 4–5, Algorithm 1) and proves linear convergence to a neighbourhood under FA (Sec. 4); the theory assumes exact or low-noise gradients, and performance depends on advantage-estimation quality (Sec. 4.2). Empirically it competes with PPO/TRPO/MDPO (Sec. 4.1). [Asad et al., 2024]

**Relevance.** We need a strong policy “best response” in Zahavy’s saddle; SPMA provides the geometry and fast rates in tabular settings, plus a practical FA implementation (convex surrogates that fit deep RL) matching our shaped-reward reduction.

## Paper 3: *Natural Policy Gradient Primal–Dual for CMDPs* (NeurIPS 2020)

**Core idea.** A policy-based primal–dual method for the Lagrangian CMDP formulation  $V_r^\pi(\rho) + \lambda(V_g^\pi(\rho) - b)$ : *natural policy gradient* (NPG) ascent for the policy and projected subgradient updates for the multiplier (Eq. 7–8, Sec. 3–4), showing a multiplicative update for softmax policies and projection for  $\lambda$ . Despite nonconcavity/nonconvexity under softmax parameterization, it proves *dimension-free*  $O(1/\sqrt{T})$  bounds on averaged optimality gap and constraint violation (Thm. 1, Eq. 9a–9b) under Slater’s condition; with FA, rates hold up to an approximation neighbourhood (Sec. 5, Thm. 3); sample-based variants have finite-sample guarantees (Thm. 4). [Ding et al., 2020]

**Relevance.** NPG–PD is our principled CMDP baseline for both guarantees and practice: we compare Dual–SPMA (Fenchel saddle + SPMA policy player) against NPG–PD (Lagrangian saddle + NPG) in terms of geometry (logit-space vs. probability-space), convergence rates, constraint violation, and sample-efficiency.

## How the three fit together (and into our project)

Zahavy et al. provide the *formulation and outer-loop template* (Fenchel saddle; shaped-reward RL). SPMA supplies a *fast policy player* for that RL step (mirror ascent in logits; linear rates; FA via convex

Work	Objective / Saddle	Policy Player	Guarantees / Notes
Zahavy et al. (2021) [Zahavy et al., 2021]	$\min_d f(d)$ ; Fenchel dual $\min_d \max_\lambda \lambda \cdot d - f^*(\lambda)$	Best response / low-regret RL under $r_\lambda = -\lambda$	$O(1/\sqrt{K})$ via OCO; unifies AL, CMDPs, exploration
Asad et al. (2025) [Asad et al., 2024]	RL inner step (fixed $y$ )	SPMA: $\pi_{t+1} = \pi_t(1 + \eta A)$ ; FA via convex projection	Linear (tabular); neighbourhood (FA); strong empirical results
Ding et al. (2020) [Ding et al., 2020]	Lagrangian CMDP $\max_\pi \min_{\lambda \geq 0} V_r^\pi + \lambda(V_g^\pi - b)$	NPG for $\pi$ , projected subgradient for $\lambda$	Dimension-free gap & violation (avg.)

Table 1: Three perspectives that our project unifies or compares against.

classification). NPG–PD offers a *policy-based CMDP baseline* with sublinear but dimension-free guarantees.

**Our implementation.** Building on Zahavy’s formulation, we alternate a dual step  $y_{k+1} \leftarrow \text{MA}(y_k, \hat{d}_{\pi_k} - \nabla f^*(y_k))$  with a policy step that runs SPMA on the shaped reward  $r_{y_k} = -y_k$ , returning discounted occupancies  $\hat{d}_{\pi_k}$  (or feature expectations) for the next dual update. We will benchmark this Dual–SPMA against NPG–PD, focusing on convergence speed, constraint satisfaction, and sample efficiency.

Table 2: Instantiations of the convex MDP framework (adapted from Zahavy et al. [2021], Table 1). Different choices of objective  $f$  and player algorithms recover well-known RL problems.

Application	Objective $f(d_\pi)$	Cost Player	Policy Player
Standard RL	$-\lambda \cdot d_\pi$ (linear)	FTL	RL
Apprenticeship Learning	$\ d_\pi - d_E\ _2^2$	FTL	Best Response
Pure Exploration	$d_\pi \cdot \log(d_\pi)$ (entropy)	FTL	Best Response
AL with $\ell_\infty$	$\ d_\pi - d_E\ _\infty$	OMD	Best Response
Constrained MDPs	$\lambda_1 \cdot d_\pi$ s.t. $\lambda_2 \cdot d_\pi \leq c$	OMD	RL
GAIL / State Matching	$\text{KL}(d_\pi \  d_E)$	FTL	RL

## What we will implement and measure (brief)

**Method.** Dual–SPMA:  $y_{k+1} \leftarrow \text{MA}(y_k, \hat{d}_{\pi_k} - \nabla f^*(y_k))$ ; policy step: run SPMA for  $K_{\text{in}}$  epochs on  $r_{y_k}$ ; return  $\hat{d}_{\pi_k}$  (or  $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\phi]$ ).

**Metrics.** (i) Saddle value  $L(\pi, y)$  (when  $f^*$  known); (ii) constraint value/violation; (iii) policy return under  $r_y$ ; (iv) convergence of  $\|\hat{d}_\pi\|_1$  (tabular) or  $\|\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\phi]\|$  (FA); (v) wall-clock/sample efficiency. Baselines include NPG–PD.

## References

- R. Asad, R. B. Harikandeh, I. H. Laradji, N. L. Roux, and S. Vaswani. Fast convergence of softmax policy mirror ascent for bandits & tabular MDPs. 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=f50jNMXIik>.
- D. Ding, K. Zhang, T. Başar, and M. R. Jovanović. Natural policy gradient primal-dual method for constrained markov decision processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- T. Zahavy, B. O’Donoghue, G. Desjardins, and S. Singh. Reward is enough for convex mdps. volume 34, pages 25746–25759, 2021.




Figure 3: **Overview of the Dual-SPMA framework.** We synthesize ideas from three recent works: (1) the Fenchel duality approach for convex MDPs [Zahavy et al., 2021], (2) primal-dual methods for constraint handling [Ding et al., 2020], and (3) mirror ascent for fast convergence [Asad et al., 2024]. The key insight is that fixing the dual variable  $y$  reduces the policy step to standard RL with shaped reward  $r_y = -y$ , enabling us to use SPMA as the policy player while Ding et al. inform our dual/multiplier updates.