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Abstract
We consider the problem of policy transfer between two Markov Decision Processes (MDPs). We introduce a lemma based on existing theoretical results in reinforcement learning (RL) to measure the relativity between two arbitrary MDPs, that is the difference between any two cumulative expected returns defined on different policies and environment dynamics. Based on this lemma, we propose two new algorithms referred to as Relative Policy Optimization (RPO) and Relative Transition Optimization (RTO), which can offer fast policy transfer and dynamics modeling, respectively. RPO updates the policy using the relative policy gradient to transfer the policy evaluated in one environment to maximize the return in another, while RTO updates the parameterized dynamics model (if there exists) using the relative transition gradient to reduce the gap between the dynamics of the two environments. Then, integrating the two algorithms offers the complete algorithm Relative Policy-Transition Optimization (RPTO), in which the policy interacts with the two environments simultaneously, such that data collections from two environments, policy and transition updates are completed in one closed loop to form a principled learning framework for policy transfer. We demonstrate the effectiveness of RPTO in OpenAI gym’s classic control tasks by creating policy transfer problems via variant dynamics.

1. Introduction

Deep reinforcement learning (RL) has demonstrated its great successes in recent years, including breakthrough of solving a number of challenging problems like Atari \cite{bellemare2013arcade}, GO \cite{silver2016mastering, silver2017mastering}, DOTA2 \cite{346923} and StarCraft II \cite{vuct}, with human-level performance or even beyond. These successes demonstrate that current deep RL methods are capable to explore and exploit sufficiently in huge observation and action spaces, as long as sufficient and effective data samples can be generated for training, such as the cases in games. For example, AlphaGo Zero \cite{silver2017mastering} costs 3 days of training over 4.9 millions self-play games, and OpenAI Five \cite{346923} and AlphaStar \cite{vuct} spend months of training using thousands of GPUs/TPUs over billions of generated matches. However, for environments that prohibit infinite interactions, e.g., robotics, real life traffic control and autopilot, etc., applying
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general RL is difficult because generating data is extremely expensive and slow. Even if parallel data collection is possible, for example, by deploying multiple robots or vehicles running simultaneously, the scale of collected data is still far below that in virtual games. Worse still, exploration in these environments is considerably limited for safety reasons, which further reduces the effectiveness of the generated data. Due to the above challenges, similar significant advances like in solving virtual games have not been witnessed in these applications yet.

Generally, there are three tracks of approaches targeting to alleviate the aforementioned situation to promote the widespread application of RL. They are improving the data efficiency, transfer learning and simulator engineering.

To improve data efficiency, many recent efforts have been paid on investigating offline RL algorithms [17, 5, 10, 24, 22]. Compared to standard on-policy or off-policy RL, offline RL (also known as batch RL) aims to effectively use previously collected experiences stored in a given dataset, like supervised learning, without online interactions with the environment. The stored experiences may not be generated by a fixed or known policy, so offline RL algorithms can leverage any previously collected data and learn a provably better policy than those who generated the experiences in the dataset. Although offline RL can effectively take advantage of finite data samples, solving a complex real-world task still requires huge amount of high quality offline experiences. Another way to increase data efficiency is to adopt model-based RL. Compared to model-free methods, model-based RL [1, 14, 8, 7, 13] learns a dynamics model that mimics the transitions in the true environment, and then the policy can feel free to interact with the learned dynamics instead of the true environment. It has been proved that the true return can be improved by interacting with the learned dynamics model when the model error is bounded [7]. However, learning an accurate dynamics model still requires sufficient transition data by interacting with the true environment.

Transfer learning in RL [20, 25] is practically useful to adapt a policy learned in a source environment to solve another task in the target environment. In the context of this paper, we consider the case where the policy can feel free to explore in the source environment, while the amount of collected data in the target environment should be as small as possible. When the source environment is a simulated one while the target environment takes place in reality, the transfer problem is also known as the simulation to reality (sim2real) problem. The simplest transfer method is to train the policy in the source environment and then use the converged parameters as warm start for a (or part of a) new policy in the target environment, so that the amount of interactions with the target is expected to be largely reduced, as long as the tasks and dynamics in the two environments are closely related.

An important concept in transfer learning is that instead of directly solving the target problem, a source task is considered in advance. Sharing this spirit, the last track of approaches tries to build a proxy simulator that is as close as possible to the target environment, and hence we refer to such methods as simulator engineering. For example, in robotics control problems, there are many mature toolboxes that can offer simulation engineering, including MuJoCo, PyBullet, Gazebo, etc. Model-based RL can also be viewed as a specific form of simulator engineering that the simulator is composed by a pure neural network, which is trained to approach the target environment as with lower model error as possible, while this might require a large amount of dynamics data in the
target environment as mentioned above. Actually, to achieve more efficient and accurate simulator engineering, one recent rising direction is to integrate differentiable programming and physical systems to build a trainable simulator, which follows the physical laws as in reality and also whose key factors, such as the mass, length or friction of some objects, are trainable like the parameters in neural networks. Representative examples include the DiffTaichi [6], Brax [4] and Nimble [23].

Overall, the existing methods focus on either directly improving the data efficiency in the target environment or bridging/reducing the gap between a proxy environment and the target environment, and there lacks a principled way that can incorporate the learning in the two environments through a unified framework. In this paper, we inherit the spirit in transfer learning and consider two environments, where one is free to interact and another is the goal to solve, and the number of interactions in the target environment should be as small as possible. We believe that there exist some explicit connections between the expected returns in the two environments, given two different policies. Actually, previous theoretical approaches have analyzed the difference between two expected returns under different policies [9, 15], or different dynamics [11], separately.

To provide an explicit value difference for the case where both the policy and dynamics vary in two Markov Decision Processes (MDPs), we introduce a lemma to combine the previous results in [9, 11]. Let \( P(s'|s,a) \) and \( P'(s'|s,a) \) denote two dynamics transition functions in any two arbitrary MDPs sharing the same state and action spaces, where \((s,a,s')\) is the tuple of the state, action and next state. Let \( \pi'(a|s) \) and \( \pi(a|s) \) denote two arbitrary policies, and denote \( J(P,\pi) \) as the cumulative expected return given any \( P \) and \( \pi \). Then, the lemma gives an explicit form for the value difference \( J(P',\pi) - J(P,\pi') \), which is referred to as the relativity gap between the two MDPs.

Now, suppose \( P_{source} \) and \( P_{target} \) are the dynamics functions in the source and target MDPs respectively, and \( J(P_{source},\pi_{source}) \) has been maximized by optimizing a parameterized \( \pi_{source} \). Then, with fixed \( P_{source} \), \( P_{target} \) and \( \pi_{source} \), maximizing the relativity gap over \( \pi_{target} \) by constraining \( \pi_{target} \) to be close to \( \pi_{source} \) will also improve the return \( J(P_{target},\pi_{target}) \); on the other hand, for trainable \( P_{source} \), minimizing the relativity gap by optimizing \( P_{source} \) given fixed policies \( \pi_{source} = \pi_{target} \) will reduce the dynamics gap, similar to what is done by conventional model-based RL methods. Based on the above two principles and the relativity lemma, we then propose two new algorithms referred to as Relative Policy Optimization (RPO) and Relative Transition Optimization (RTO), respectively. RPO updates the policy using the relative policy gradient to transfer the policy evaluated in the source environment to maximize the return in the target environment, while RTO updates a dynamics model using the relative transition gradient to reduce the value gap in the two environments. Then, applying RPO and RTO simultaneously offers a complete algorithm named Relative Policy-Transition Optimization (RPTO), which can transfer the policy from the source to the target smoothly. RPO, RTO and RPTO interact with the two environments simultaneously, so that data collections from two environments, policy and/or transition updates are completed in a closed loop to form a principled learning framework. In the experimental section, we show how to practically apply RPO, RTO and RPTO algorithms. We demonstrate the effectiveness of these methods in the classic control problems in OpenAI gym with both discrete and continuous actions, by varying the physical variables like mass, length and gravity of the objects to create policy transfer problems. At the last section, we discuss a few interesting directions which are
At time step where the policy is parameterized by while in many tasks it only relies on one or two of them, or it is even a constant in sparse worthy future investigations.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Reinforcement Learning

A standard RL problem can be described by a tuple \( \langle \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P}, r, \gamma, \pi \rangle \), where \( \mathcal{E} \) indicates the environment that is an MDP with dynamics transition probability \( \mathcal{P} \); at each time step \( t \), \( s_t \in \mathcal{S} \) is the global state in the state space \( \mathcal{S} \), and \( a_t \in \mathcal{A} \) is the action executed by the agent at time step \( t \) from the action space \( \mathcal{A} \); the dynamics transition function \( \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \) is the probability of the state transition \( (s_t, a_t) \rightarrow s_{t+1} \); for the most general case, the reward \( r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \) can be written as a function of \( s_t, a_t \) and \( s_{t+1} \), while in many tasks it only relies on one or two of them, or it is even a constant in sparse rewards problem. For notation simplicity, we usually write \( r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \) as \( r_t \); \( \gamma \in [0, 1] \) is a discount factor and \( \pi(a_t|s_t) \) denotes a stochastic policy. The following equations define some important quantities in reinforcement learning. The objective of RL is to maximize the expected discounted return

\[
J(\mathcal{P}, \pi) = \mathbb{E}_{s_0, a_0, \ldots \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t \right], \text{ where } s_0 \sim \mathcal{P}(s_0), \ a_t \sim \pi(a_t|s_t), \ s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t).
\]

At time step \( t \), the state-action value \( Q^{\mathcal{P}, \pi} \), value function \( V^{\mathcal{P}, \pi} \), and advantage \( A^{\mathcal{P}, \pi} \) are defined as

\[
Q^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s_t, a_t) = \mathbb{E}_{s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}, \ldots \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \left[ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \gamma^l r_{t+l} \right], \quad V^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s_t) = \mathbb{E}_{a_t, s_{t+1}, \ldots \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \left[ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \gamma^l r_{t+l} \right],
\]

and \( A^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s, a) = Q^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s, a) - V^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s) \). In the above standard definitions, we explicitly show their dependence on both the dynamics \( \mathcal{P} \) and policy \( \pi \), since we will analyze these functions defined on variant dynamics and policies. This convention will be kept throughout the paper.

2.2. The Policy Improvement Theorem

Given two arbitrary policies \( \pi' \) and \( \pi \), the policy improvement theorem \([9, 15]\) is the fact revealed by the following equation

\[
J(\mathcal{P}, \pi') = J(\mathcal{P}, \pi) + \mathbb{E}_{s_0, a_0, \ldots \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi, \pi'} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t A^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s_t, a_t) \right]. \quad (1)
\]

Based on this theorem, some widely adopted RL algorithms such as TRPO \([15]\) and PPO \([16]\) are developed. In TRPO, the following objective is optimized

\[
\text{maximize}_\theta \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d^{\mathcal{P}, \pi_{\theta_{old}}, a \sim \pi_{\theta_{old}}}} \left[ \frac{\pi_\theta(a|s)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(a|s)} A^{\mathcal{P}, \pi_{\theta_{old}}}(s, a) \right], \text{ s.t. } \mathbb{E}[KL(\pi_{\theta_{old}}(·|s)||\pi_\theta(·|s))] \leq \varepsilon,
\]

where the policy is parameterized by \( \theta \) and \( \theta_{old} \) is the parameter since last update. \( d^{\mathcal{P}, \pi} \) is the discounted visitation probability given \( \mathcal{P} \) and \( \pi \), which is a valid probability function defined as \( d^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s) = (1 - \gamma)\mathbb{E}_{s_0, a_0, \ldots \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \left[ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \gamma^l 1(s_l = s) \right] \); \( KL(·|·) \) is the KL-divergence and \( \varepsilon \) is a small constant restricting the policy update step size. To simplify the optimization, PPO removes the constraint in TRPO and maximizes the clipped version

\[
\mathbb{E}_{s \sim d^{\mathcal{P}, \pi_{\theta_{old}}, a \sim \pi_{\theta_{old}}}} \left[ \min (R(\theta)A^{\mathcal{P}, \pi_{\theta_{old}}}(s, a), \text{ clip } (R(\theta), 1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon) A^{\mathcal{P}, \pi_{\theta_{old}}}(s, a)) \right],
\]
where \( R(\theta) = \frac{\pi_{\theta}(a|s)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(a|s)} \) and \( \epsilon \) is a hyperparameter controlling the proportion of clipped data. We review the TRPO and PPO algorithms here to allow readers to conveniently compare and see the connection between them and our proposed algorithms in the following sections.

2.3. The Telescoping Lemma

The telescoping lemma \[11\] reveals the value difference between any two dynamics functions \( \mathcal{P}' \) and \( \mathcal{P} \), given some fixed policy \( \pi \). Using our notations, that is

\[
V^{\mathcal{P}'}_{\pi} - V^{\mathcal{P}}_{\pi} = \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s_0, a_0, \ldots \sim \mathcal{P'}, \pi} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{\mathcal{P}}_{\pi}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{\mathcal{P}}_{\pi}(s_t, a_t) \right] \right].
\] (2)

Eq. (2) was used to design the value difference bound and model-based RL algorithm in \[11\]. In the following section, we will combine the policy improvement theorem in Eq.(1) and the telescoping lemma in Eq. (2) to obtain an explicit form of the value difference under the case for both different policies and dynamics functions.

3. The Relativity Lemma

The following lemma integrates the policy improvement theorem with the telescoping lemma and measures the relative difference between any two expected returns under different policies and dynamics functions.

**Lemma 3.1.** Given two Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) denoted by \( \mathcal{E}' \) and \( \mathcal{E} \), who share the same state and action spaces \( \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} \) and reward function \( r \), their dynamics transition probabilities are defined as \( \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \) and \( \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \) for any transition \((s_t, a_t) \rightarrow s_{t+1}\) in \( \mathcal{E}' \) and \( \mathcal{E} \), respectively. Assume the initial state distributes identically in the two MDPs that \( \mathcal{P}'(s_0) = \mathcal{P}(s_0) \). Let \( J(\mathcal{P}, \pi) \) denote the expected return defined on dynamics \( \mathcal{P} \) and policy \( \pi \). Then, the relativity gap between any two expected returns under different dynamics and policies is defined as

\[
\begin{align*}
J(\mathcal{P}', \pi) - J(\mathcal{P}, \pi) &= J(\mathcal{P}', \pi) - J(\mathcal{P}, \pi) + J(\mathcal{P}, \pi) - J(\mathcal{P}, \pi'), \\
\text{relativity gap} &= \text{dynamics-induced gap} + \text{policy-induced gap},
\end{align*}
\] (3)

such that the dynamics-induced gap can be derived from the telescoping lemma \[11\] in Eq. (2) as

\[
J(\mathcal{P}', \pi) - J(\mathcal{P}, \pi) = \mathbb{E}_{s_0, a_0, \ldots \sim \mathcal{P}', \pi} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{\mathcal{P}}_{\pi}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{\mathcal{P}}_{\pi}(s_t, a_t) \right],
\] (4)

and the policy-induced gap is revealed by the policy improvement theorem \[9\] in Eq. (1), rewritten by switching \( \pi \) and \( \pi' \) as

\[
J(\mathcal{P}, \pi) - J(\mathcal{P}, \pi') = \mathbb{E}_{s_0, a_0, \ldots \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t A^{\mathcal{P}, \pi'}(s_t, a_t).
\] (5)

The proofs of Eqs. (4) and (5) can follow from \[11\] and \[9\], respectively, both using the telescoping expansion as the main technique. In the appendix, we also provide another complete proof by directly expanding the expected returns in Eq. (3). Please refer to Appendix A. Although these gaps in Lemma 3.1 have been referred to as the policy
improvement theorem and telescoping lemma in [11] and [9], we use the terms relativity gap, dynamics-induced gap and policy-induced gap, and refer to the above lemma as the Relativity Lemma in this paper for uniformity.

Before proposing new algorithms based on the Relativity Lemma, we need to emphasize a few points implied in Eqs. (4) and (5):

- In Eq. (4), the expectation is taken over the trajectory $s_0, a_0, \cdots$ sampled from the pair $(\mathcal{P}', \pi)$, while the value and state-action value functions in the expectation, i.e., $V^{P,\pi}(s_{t+1})$ and $Q^{P,\pi}(s_t, a_t)$, are defined on $(\mathcal{P}, \pi)$. This gives a practically useful hint that given a fixed policy $\pi$, the dynamics-induced gap can be calculated by measuring the value functions $V^{P,\pi}(s_{t+1})$ and $Q^{P,\pi}(s_t, a_t)$ in the dynamics $\mathcal{P}$ (imagining this is the source environment, where infinite data can be generated to accurately evaluate the value functions), while collecting (probably a few) data samples in $\mathcal{P}'$ (imagining this is the target environment) to estimate the expectation.

- In Eq. (4), $E_{s_{t+1}\sim\mathcal{P}'|s, a_t}[r(s, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P,\pi}(s_{t+1})] \neq Q^{P,\pi}(s_t, a_t)$, because the transition $(s_t, a_t) \rightarrow s_{t+1}$ takes place in $\mathcal{P}'$ instead of $\mathcal{P}$, and hence Eq. (4) is not zero whereas $\mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \neq \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$ happens for non-zero $r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})$ and $V^{P,\pi}(s_{t+1})$ with high probability, especially for high-dimensional deep neural networks. Of course, when $\mathcal{P}' = \mathcal{P}$, we immediately have $J(\mathcal{P}', \pi) = J(\mathcal{P}, \pi)$ from Eq. (4).

In the following sections, we will introduce two new algorithms inspired by the Relativity Lemma, where one algorithm is for fast policy transfer from the source environment to the target environment, and another algorithm updates the parameterized dynamics in the source environment to be close to the dynamics in the target environment. Then, by combining the two algorithms, we obtain the complete algorithm to fast transfer a policy from the source to the target.

4. Relative Policy Optimization (RPO)

As discussed previously, Eq. (4) in the Relativity Lemma suggests a way of estimating the dynamics-induced value gap by evaluating $Q^{P,\pi}(s_t, a_t)$ and $V^{P,\pi}(s_{t+1})$ in $\mathcal{P}$ while sampling data in $\mathcal{P}'$, given $\pi$. Practically, it is of less interest to estimate the exact dynamics-induced gap. Instead, if we have trained a policy $\pi^*$ in $\mathcal{P}_{source}$ that maximizes $J(\mathcal{P}_{source}, \pi)$, then we are interested in finding another $\hat{\pi}$ such that $\hat{\pi} = \arg\max_{\pi'} [J(\mathcal{P}_{target}, \pi) - J(\mathcal{P}_{source}, \pi^*)]$, which improves $J(\mathcal{P}_{target}, \pi)$. Normally, as long as $\mathcal{P}_{target}$ is not far from $\mathcal{P}_{source}$, finding $\hat{\pi}$ can use $\pi^*$ as a warm start. Motivated by this, we propose the following theorem to get a lower bound of the dynamics-induced value gap.

**Theorem 4.1.** Define $D_{TV}^{\max}(p, q) = \max_{\epsilon} D_{TV}(p(\cdot|x)\| q(\cdot|x))$ as the total variation divergence between two distributions $p(\cdot|x)$ and $q(\cdot|x)$, where $D_{TV}(p(\cdot|x)\| q(\cdot|x)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_y |p(y|x) - q(y|x)|$. Define $\epsilon = \max_{s,a} |A^{P,\pi}(s, a)|$, where $A^{P,\pi}(s, a) = Q^{P,\pi}(s, a) - V^{P,\pi}(s)$ is the advantage. Let $\delta_1 = D_{TV}^{\max}(\mathcal{P}'(\cdot|s, a), \mathcal{P}(\cdot|s, a))$ for any $\mathcal{P}'$, $\mathcal{P}$, and $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, and let $\delta_2 = D_{TV}^{\max}(\pi^*(\cdot|s), \pi(\cdot|s))$ for any $s \in \mathcal{S}$, and policies...
\(\pi'\) and \(\pi\). Let \(r_{\max} = \max_{s,a,a'} r(s,a,a')\) be the max reward for all \((s,a,a')\). Let \(\Delta^{P',\pi}(\pi) = J(P',\pi) - J(P,\pi)\) be a function of \(P', P\) and \(\pi\). Now, we import a new policy \(\pi'\) and define the following function

\[
L_{\pi'}(\pi) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t E_{s_0,a_0,\ldots,s_t,\pi'} \sum_{a_t, \pi}(a|s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} P'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \left[ r(s_t,a_t,s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P,\pi'}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P,\pi'}(s_t,a_t) \right]
\]

as an approximation of \(\Delta^{P',\pi}(\pi)\) by both sampling \(s_0, a_0, \ldots, s_t\) and evaluating \(V^{P,\pi'}\) and \(Q^{P,\pi'}\) using \(\pi'\). Then, we have the following lower bound

\[
\Delta^{P',\pi}(\pi) \geq L_{\pi'}(\pi) - C_1, \quad \text{where } C_1 = 4\gamma r_{\max}\delta_1 \min\left(\frac{\gamma^2 + 1}{1 - \gamma}, 1 + \frac{\delta_2}{1 - \gamma}\right).
\]

The proof is provided in Appendix C. In Theorem 4.1 we import \(L_{\pi'}(\pi)\) defined on two policies \(\pi\) and \(\pi'\), because in practice we will need an algorithm iterating over the current policy parameter and its old parameter since last update. This technique will be adopted multiple times in the following context. Based on Theorem 4.1 we can further obtain the following lower bound of the entire relativity gap.

**Proposition 4.2.** The entire relativity gap in Eq. (3) has the following lower bound

\[
J(P',\pi) - J(P,\pi') \geq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} E_{s \sim d^{P',\pi'}, a \sim \pi', s' \sim P', \pi'} \pi(a|s) \cdot |r(s,a,a') + \gamma V^{P,\pi'}(s') - V^{P,\pi'}(s)| - C_2,
\]

where \(s'\) is the next state that \((s,a) \to s'\), and

\[
C_2 = \frac{2\gamma \epsilon(\delta_1 + 2\delta_2^2)}{(1 - \gamma)^2} + \frac{4\gamma r_{\max}\delta_1}{(1 - \gamma)^2} \cdot \min\left(\frac{\delta_2}{1 - \gamma}, 1 + \frac{\delta_2}{1 - \gamma}\right)
\]

is a constant relying on the dynamics discrepancy \(\delta_1\) and policy discrepancy \(\delta_2\).

The proof is provided in Appendix D. By taking \(\pi = \pi_\theta\) and \(\pi' = \pi_{\theta_{old}}\) for some policy parameters \(\theta\) and its old version \(\theta_{old}\) since last update, Proposition 4.2 suggests the following empirical objective

\[
\text{maximize}_{\theta} E_{s \sim d^{P,\pi_{\theta_{old}}, a \sim \pi_{\theta_{old}}, s' \sim P, \pi_{\theta_{old}}}} \pi_{\theta_{old}}(a|s) \cdot |r(s,a,s') + \gamma V^{P,\pi_{\theta_{old}}}(s') - V^{P,\pi_{\theta_{old}}}(s)|,
\]

subject to \(E_{s \sim d^{P',\pi_{\theta_{old}}}} [D_{TV}(\pi_{\theta_{old}}(\cdot|s)||\pi_{\theta}(\cdot|s))] \leq \epsilon\),

for some small \(\epsilon\) controlling the policy update step size. The objective in Eq. (6) is very similar to that of TRPO or PPO. However, by noting where the data is sampled from and how \(V\) and \(Q\) values are evaluated, we see that \(E_{s \sim d'}[r(s,a,s') + \gamma V^{P,\pi_{\theta_{old}}}(s') - V^{P,\pi_{\theta_{old}}}(s)] \neq A^{P,\pi_{\theta_{old}}}(s,a)\), i.e., it is not the general advantage function. We call \(r(s,a,s') + \gamma V^{P,\pi_{\theta_{old}}}(s') - V^{P,\pi_{\theta_{old}}}(s)\) by sampling \(s' \sim P'\) the Relative Advantage.

Eq. (6) suggests an empirical algorithm that we can sample \((s, a, s')\) from \(E'\) using \(\pi_{\theta_{old}}\) and compute the values \(V^{P,\pi_{\theta_{old}}}(s')\) and \(V^{P,\pi_{\theta_{old}}}(s)\) using \(\pi_{\theta_{old}}\) in \(E\). Therefore, we refer to the optimization of Eq. (6) as the Relative Policy Optimization (RPO) algorithm. The objective in Eq. (6) contains a constraint on the policy update size, and directly solving

\[1\text{The above terms and assumptions have been widely used in RL in the literature such as 9,15,11,7.}\]
this objective requires searching an appropriate step size, similar to what was adopted in TRPO \cite{schulman2015trust}. To simplify the optimization, we use a clipped version, similar to PPO \cite{schulman2017proximal}.

Now, we still need to look into the tightness of the bound in Proposition \ref{prop:trpo_bound}, which also affects the scale of $\varepsilon$ and the policy update step size. In this section, we have considered fixed and diverse $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}'$, and hence $\delta_1$ is always a positive constant. Then, $C_2$ in Proposition \ref{prop:trpo_bound} will never approach zero by noting that $C_2 > \frac{2\gamma}{(1-\gamma)^2} \delta_1 > 0$ even if $\delta_2$ (\(\varepsilon\) or the step size) is sufficiently small, because the dynamics discrepancy prevents this. With the existence of $\delta_1 > 0$, $J(\mathcal{P}', \pi_\theta)$ is improved over $J(\mathcal{P}, \pi_{\theta_{old}})$ (a constant at the current step) only when we can improve the objective in Eq. \eqref{eq:trpo_loss} by at least $2\gamma(1-\gamma)^2C_2$. Worse still, starting from a well trained policy $\pi_{\theta_{old}}$ in $\mathcal{P}$, as RPO updates $\theta$, $\pi_{\theta_{old}}$ will be gradually far from $\pi_\theta$, and therefore $J(\mathcal{P}, \pi_{\theta_{old}})$ might decrease. If this happens, maximizing the relativity gap $J(\mathcal{P}', \pi_\theta) - J(\mathcal{P}, \pi_{\theta_{old}})$ will not guarantee the increase of $J(\mathcal{P}', \pi_\theta)$. One possible solution is to optimize the RPO loss plus the standard RL loss, e.g., the PPO loss, defined on $\mathcal{P}$ to keep $\pi_{\theta_{old}}$ always performing well in $\mathcal{E}$. As we can imagine, if this works, $\pi_{\theta_{old}}$ will be updated towards a robust policy that performs well in both $\mathcal{E}'$ and $\mathcal{E}$. Indeed, as we will show in our experiments, as long as $\mathcal{P}'$ is not too far away from $\mathcal{P}$, optimizing RPO is able to obtain such a robust policy; however, once $\mathcal{P}'$ differs from $\mathcal{P}$ too much, RPO will fail to transfer the policy to the target environment. This can be remarked as a disadvantage of the RPO algorithm that it requires a relatively small dynamics gap, i.e., $\delta_1$. Overall, to guarantee the success of policy transfer, we need further to eliminate the dynamics discrepancy. This is possible when $\mathcal{P}$ (the dynamics in source environment) is trainable, as considered in physical dynamics modeling \cite{tassa2018deep, sharma2019model, sharma2021learning} and model-based RL methods \cite{haarnoja2018soft}. In next section, we will consider a trainable $\mathcal{P}$.

5. Relative Transition Optimization (RTO)

In this section, given fixed $\pi$ and $\mathcal{P}'$, we consider a trainable $\mathcal{P}$. Suppose $\mathcal{P}_\phi(s'|s,a)$ is parameterized by $\phi$ for any transition $(s,a) \rightarrow s'$. In the following theorem, we will import three dynamics quantities $\mathcal{P}'$, $\mathcal{P}_\phi$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\phi'}$, where $\mathcal{P}'$ can be treated as the dynamics in the target environment, and $\mathcal{P}_\phi$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\phi'}$ are two variant dynamics functions parameterized by $\phi$ and $\phi'$, respectively.

**Theorem 5.1.** With the definitions in Theorem 4.1, introduce the following function

$$L_{\phi'}(\phi) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t E_{s_0,a_0,\ldots,a_{t-1} \sim \mathcal{P}'\prime} [E_{s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}'} (r(s_t,a_t,s_{t+1}) + \gamma V_{\phi'}(s_{t+1})) - E_{s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}_\phi} (r(s_t,a_t,s_{t+1}) + \gamma V_{\phi'}(s_{t+1}))],$$

as an approximation of $\Delta_{\mathcal{P}',\mathcal{P}_\phi}(\pi)$ by evaluating the value $V$ using $\mathcal{P}_{\phi'}$ instead of $\mathcal{P}_\phi$. Then, we have

$$|\Delta_{\mathcal{P}',\mathcal{P}_\phi}(\pi)| \leq |L_{\phi'}(\phi)| + \frac{4\gamma\hat{\delta}_1 r_{\max}}{(1-\gamma)^2} \min \left( \frac{\delta_2 (\gamma^2 + 1)}{1-\gamma}, 1 \right).$$

In order to reduce the dynamics-induced gap by updating $\phi$, we have to minimize $|\Delta_{\mathcal{P}',\mathcal{P}_\phi}(\pi)|$. Based on Theorem 5.1, we can alternatively minimize $|L_{\phi'}(\phi)|$. Empirically, if we consider $\mathcal{P}_\phi$ as a probability function, then by noting that

$$L_{\phi'}(\phi) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t E_{s_0,\ldots,a_{t-1} \sim \mathcal{P}'\prime} \sum_{s_{t+1}} (\mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t,a_t) - \mathcal{P}_\phi(s_{t+1}|s_t,a_t)) (r(s_t,a_t,s_{t+1}) + \gamma V_{\phi'}(s_{t+1})),$$
and taking $\phi' = \phi_{\text{old}}$, we consider a square loss on minimizing $|L_{\phi'}(\phi)|$ as

$$
\text{minimize}_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d, a \sim \pi} \sum_{s'} (P'(s'|s,a) - P(\phi_{\text{old}})(s'|s,a))^2 \left( r(s,a,s') + \gamma V_{\phi_{\text{old}}, \pi}(s') \right)^2.
$$

That is, we sample $(s,a)$ in $\mathcal{E}'$ using $\pi$ and optimize Eq. (7). We refer to the above optimization as Relative Transition Optimization (RTO). It is easy to see that RTO implies the standard model-based RL methods, which directly train $\phi$ using supervised learning, i.e.,

$$
\text{minimize}_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d, a \sim \pi} \sum_{s'} (P'(s'|s,a) - P(\phi)(s'|s,a))^2.
$$

Indeed, the objective of RTO in Eq. (7) can be viewed as a weighted form of supervised learning, with the weight $r(s,a,s') + \gamma V_{\phi_{\text{old}}, \pi}(s')$ showing that transitions with larger values evaluated by $P_{\phi_{\text{old}}}$ and $\pi$ should be optimized more aggressively. This is reasonable from the perspective of fitting values, instead of purely fitting the dynamics. Therefore, RTO provides a theoretical explanation for the standard model-based RL methods by reducing the dynamics-induced value gap, and absorbs standard model-based RL as a special case in RTO.

On the other hand, if the transition function $P_{\phi}$ is treated as a deterministic model, i.e., $s' = \phi(s,a)$, then, replacing the transition probabilities in $L_{\phi'}(\phi)$ with deterministic transitions, RTO optimizes

$$
\text{minimize}_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d, a \sim \pi} \sum_{s'} (P'(s'|s,a) - P(\phi)(s'|s,a))^2.
$$

Similarly, Eq. (8) is advantageous that fitting reward and value functions can distinguish the importance of states, and it is not necessary to learn a perfect dynamics model over all transitions under some cases.

In the experiments, we try both probabilistic and deterministic dynamics models. For the latter case, we adopt deterministic physical dynamics model, similar to recently proposed differentialable simulators [6, 4, 23], which take advantage of the inherent physical processes. Such model is much more efficient than pure neural network based dynamics model, because only a few scalars such as mass, length, gravity, etc., are trainable parameters in the physical systems.

6. Relative Policy-Transition Optimization (RPTO) Algorithm

Combining RPO and RTO, we finally obtain the complete Relative Policy-Transition Optimization (RPTO) algorithm in Algorithm 1. As we observe in Algorithm 1 in the main loop of RPTO, the policy $\pi_\theta$ interacts with the two environments simultaneously and pushes the data into two buffers separately. In step 5, we sample a mini-batch from $D_{\text{source}}$ to update the value function in Eq. (6) from RPO. In step 6, we sample a mini-batch from $D_{\text{target}}$ to update the policy parameter $\theta$ according to Eq. (6) in RPO, and also update the dynamics $\phi$ according to Eqs. (7) or (8) from RTO. Therefore, RPTO combines data collection from two environments, RPO and RTO in a closed loop, and
Algorithm 1: Relative Policy-Transition Optimization (RPTO)

\textbf{Input:} The source and target environments $E_{\text{source}}$ and $E_{\text{target}}$, and their dynamics $P_{\phi_0}$ and $P_{\text{target}}$, where $\phi_0$ can accurately describe the initial source dynamics; a well-trained policy $\pi_{\theta_0}$ in $E_{\phi_0}$.

1. Create two empty replay buffers $D_{\text{source}}$ and $D_{\text{target}}$;
2. Initialize $\theta = \theta_0$ and $\phi = \phi_0$;
3. Using $\pi_\theta$ to interact with $E_{\text{source}}$ and push the generated trajectories into $D_{\text{source}}$;
4. Using $\pi_\theta$ to interact with $E_{\text{target}}$ and push the generated trajectories into $D_{\text{target}}$;
5. Sample a mini-batch $\{(s, a, s')\}_{\text{source}} \sim D_{\text{source}}$, and update $V_{P_{\phi_0}, \pi_\theta}$ by minimizing the TD-error;
6. Sample a mini-batch $\{(s, a, s')\}_{\text{target}} \sim D_{\text{target}}$, and apply RPO to update $\pi_{\theta_t}$; at the same time, update $P_{\phi_0}$ according to RTO;
until Some convergence criteria is satisfied

this offers a principled learning framework for policy transfer. Indeed, steps 5 and 6 can be parallelized, as long as the value function $V_{P_{\phi_0}, \pi_\theta}$ (suppose it is parameterized by $\mu$) does not share parameters with $\pi_\theta$, i.e., $\mu$ and $\theta$ are independent. Also, $\mu$ can be updated more frequently because it only requires data generated from the source environment, and the more accurate the value function in the source environment is, the more accurate the relative policy gradient in step 6 will be estimated. For the dynamics parameter $\phi$, the case turns out to be different, and it is often not a good choice to update $\phi$ as fast as we can. To understand this, we need to explain how RPTO transfers the policy to the target environment in advance.

As we can imagine, as $P_{\phi_0}$ approaches $P_{\text{target}}$ gradually by updating $\phi$, the policy $\pi_\theta$ is able to interact with a sequence of smoothly varying ‘source’ environments. During this training period, the policy sees much more diverse transitions that lie between the initial source environment (with dynamics $P_{\phi_0}$) and the target environment. These diverse transitions are very helpful to encourage the agent to explore a robust policy. On the other hand, since the policy is initialized with a well-trained $\theta_0$ in $P_{\phi_0}$, smoothly varying $P_{\phi_0}$ to reach $P_{\text{target}}$ generates a sequence of environments that naturally provide a curriculum learning scheme, and this is very similar to what is considered in the recently emerged Environment Design methods [3]. Now, we are ready to answer the question in the last paragraph that why $\phi$ should not be updated aggressively: a slowly and smoothly varying $\phi$ provides more chances for the agent to see diverse transitions. Actually, if $P_{\phi_0}$ approaches $P_{\text{target}}$ too fast, RPTO will be similar to directly training PPO in the target environment with a warm start $\theta_0$. In our experiments, we simply keep the learning rate of $\phi$ the same as that in RPO.

7. Experiments

We experiment with all the OpenAI gym’s classic control tasks, including CartPole-v0, Mountain-CarContinuous-v0, Acrobat-v1, and Pendulum-v1, because in these tasks the physical systems are explicitly coded, allowing us to conveniently build physical dynamics model with only a few trainable factors, e.g., pole length, gravity and link mass, as
Table 1: An overview of the studied pairs of environments. All source environments keep the default settings in OpenAI gym.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Env</th>
<th>Target Env</th>
<th>Source Env</th>
<th>Target Env</th>
<th>Source Env</th>
<th>Target Env</th>
<th>Source Env</th>
<th>Target Env</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pole Length</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Gravity</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Link Mass1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Illustrative experiments in CartPole-v0.

indicated in Table 1. Other public environments, e.g., those based on MuJoCo or Bullet, do not support trainable physical factors currently. CartPole-v0 and Acrobot-v1 are of discrete action space and the other two are continuous control problems. For all the tasks, the default settings in OpenAI gym are treated as the source environments, while for each task, we arbitrarily modify some of its physical factors to create the corresponding target environments. Details of the source and target environments are shown in Table 1.

For all tasks, we first pre-train a converged policy with PPO in the source environment, and the pre-trained policy will be used as a warm start when transferring to the target environment. For the policy transfer stage, PPO with the pre-trained policy as initialization, denoted as PPO-warm, will be used as the baseline method. In fact, PPO-warm serves as a strong baseline for the policy transfer task. Accordingly, PPO-zero indicates running PPO from scratch. We also involve a state-of-the-art model-based method MBPO [7] as one of the baseline methods. Other implementation details, such as hyper-parameters and neural network structures, are provided in the appendix. All the experiments in this section are repeated 10 times to plot the mean curve with standard derivation region.

We first use CartPole-v0 as an illustrative environment to show how the proposed algorithms are practically applied. Fig. 1(a) reports the evaluation results of RPO, RTO and RPTO. Fig. 1(a) demonstrates that RPO (without RTO) is sufficient to successfully transfer the policy to the target environment with pole length of 0.6, and RPO transfers the policy faster than PPO-warm. In Fig. 1(b), by varying the pole length to test more target environments, we find that when the pole length difference becomes larger, RPO fails to obtain a stable policy in the target environment. The curves also imply that for the case where RPO succeeds, the learned policy can perform well in both the source and target environments, i.e., RPO finds a robust policy; while for the failed cases, the learned policy deteriorates in both environments accordingly. These results are consistent with our analysis at the end of Section 4. Fig. 1(c) evaluates the performance of RTO. As we can observe, RTO can optimize $\phi$ to converge to the true pole length in the target environment. Finally, Fig. 1(d) reports the RPTO’s performance, where the curves of PPO-zero, PPO-warm and RPO are duplicated from Fig. 1(a) as baselines. As we can observe, RPTO transfers the policy much faster than all the other methods.

In addition to physical dynamics model, we also consider the standard neural network
(NN) based models. For NN dynamics models, we try both deterministic model and probability model. For the latter, we use an ensemble of dynamics models of size 7, following [7]. NN dynamics models are pre-trained in the source environment as well. Detailed configuration is provided in the appendix. Now, we report the performance curves in all tasks in Fig. 3 (where the target pole length in CartPole-v0 is increased to 0.8 to create a harder transfer task). In Fig. 3, methods implemented with the physical dynamics, deterministic NN, and probabilistic NN are denoted with suffix -phy, -det, and -prob, respectively. The horizon axis indicates the number of training samples in target environment, and we ignore the samples generated from the source environment since it is of less interest under our setting. In all the tasks, the RPTO methods demonstrate superiority over the other baselines in terms of both fast policy transfer and even better asymptotic convergence, because RPTO sees much more diverse dynamics that promotes exploration, as explained at the end of Section 6. The NN based dynamics models generally need more target training samples to converge because they contain more parameters than the physical dynamics model, while RPTO-det and RPTO-prob can gradually reach the performance of RPTO-phy after training over sufficient samples. This demonstrates the advances of the physical dynamics model. For all cases, RPO fails to transfer well in the target environment as expected and we omit its curve from the plots.

8. Future Work

Our work is related to model-based RL, environment design and sim2real problems. There are some future directions worth investigating. For example, as we have discussed at the end of Section 6, controlling the update step size or frequency of RTO can provide better curriculum learning or environment design (although in this paper we simply fix the learning coefficient of RTO as the same as RPO). Connecting this with meta-RL and current environment design algorithms is a promising future direction. Moreover, the theory and algorithms in this paper are orthogonal to other techniques commonly used in sim2real tasks, such as domain adaptation, domain randomization, augmented observation, etc., and all of these methods can be integrated together in sim2real applications. It is of great interests to apply all these techniques to solve complex real-world problems like robotics in future research.
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Appendix

A. Proof of The Relativity Lemma 3.1

Proof. Define the expected cumulative return as

$$J(\mathcal{P}, \pi) = \mathbb{E}_{s_0, a_0, \ldots \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \right],$$

where

$$s_0 \sim \rho(\mathcal{P}_0), \ a_t \sim \pi(a_t|s_t), \ s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t).$$

The expected cumulative return can be expanded as

$$J(\mathcal{P}, \pi) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{s_t, a_t, s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})$$

$$= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim \rho(\mathcal{P}), a_t \sim \pi(a_t|s_t), s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)} r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})$$

$$= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \sum_{s_t} p^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s_t) \sum_{a_t} \pi(a_t|s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}),$$

where $p^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s_t)$ indicates the marginal probability that $s_t$ is visited under $\mathcal{P}$ and $\pi$. With a fixed policy $\pi$, we investigate the value difference between two MDPs as

$$J(\mathcal{P}', \pi) - J(\mathcal{P}, \pi)$$

$$= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \left[ \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim p^{\mathcal{P}', \pi}(s_t), a_t \sim \pi(a_t|s_t), s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)} r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim \rho(\mathcal{P}), a_t \sim \pi(a_t|s_t), s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)} r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \right]$$

$$= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \left[ \sum_{s_t} p^{\mathcal{P}', \pi}(s_t) \sum_{a_t} \pi(a_t|s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} \left( \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) - \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \right) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \sum_{s_t} \left( p^{\mathcal{P}', \pi}(s_t) - p^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s_t) \right) \sum_{a_t} \pi(a_t|s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \right]. \quad (9)$$

The first term in Eq. (9) derives as

$$\sum_{s_t} p^{\mathcal{P}', \pi}(s_t) \sum_{a_t} \pi(a_t|s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} \left( \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) - \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \right) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})$$

$$= \sum_{s_t} \frac{p^{\mathcal{P}', \pi}(s_t)}{p^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s_t)} p^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s_t) \sum_{a_t} \pi(a_t|s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} \left( \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) - \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \right) \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim p^{\mathcal{P}', \pi}(s_t), a_t \sim \pi(a_t|s_t), s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)} \frac{p^{\mathcal{P}', \pi}(s_t)}{p^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s_t)} \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim p^{\mathcal{P}', \pi}(s_t), a_t \sim \pi(a_t|s_t), s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)} \frac{p^{\mathcal{P}', \pi}(s_t)}{p^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s_t)} \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}),$$

where we briefly write $s_t, a_t, s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi$ to represent $s_t \sim p^{\mathcal{P}, \pi}(s_t), a_t \sim \pi(a_t|s_t), s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$, when it is clear from the context around. In the second term of Eq. (9), the
difference of the marginal probabilities \( p^{D, \pi}(s_t) - p^{D, \pi}(s_t) \) can be expanded similarly as

\[
p^{D, \pi}(s_t) - p^{D, \pi}(s_t) = \mathbb{E}_{s_{t-1} \sim p^{D, \pi}(s_{t-1}), a_{t-1} \sim \pi(a_{t-1} | s_{t-1})} \mathcal{P}'(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) - \mathcal{P}(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1})
\]

\[
= \sum_{s_{t-1}} p^{D, \pi}(s_{t-1}) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi(a_{t-1} | s_{t-1}) \left( \mathcal{P}'(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) - \mathcal{P}(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) \right) + \sum_{s_{t-1}} \left( p^{D, \pi}(s_{t-1}) - p^{D, \pi}(s_{t-1}) \right) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi(a_{t-1} | s_{t-1}) \mathcal{P}(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1})
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_{s_{t-1} \sim p^{D, \pi}(s_{t-1}), a_{t-1} \sim \pi(a_{t-1} | s_{t-1})} \left( \frac{p^{D, \pi}(s_{t-1})}{p^{D, \pi}(s_{t-1})} \mathcal{P}'(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) - \mathcal{P}(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) \right) + \sum_{s_{t-1}} \left( p^{D, \pi}(s_{t-1}) - p^{D, \pi}(s_{t-1}) \right) \mathbb{E}_{a_{t-1} \sim \pi(a_{t-1} | s_{t-1})} \mathcal{P}(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}). \tag{10}
\]

Plugging Eq. (10) back into the corresponding term of Eq. (9), we have

\[
= \sum_{s_t} \frac{p^{P, \pi}(s_t)}{p^{P, \pi}(s_t)} \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_{a_{t} \sim \pi(a_{t} | s_{t}), s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t)} \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \sum_{s_{t-1}} \left( p^{D, \pi}(s_{t-1}) - p^{D, \pi}(s_{t-1}) \right) \mathbb{E}_{a_{t-1} \sim \pi(a_{t-1} | s_{t}), s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t)} \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}). \tag{11}
\]

Note that the second term in Eq. (11) has an identical form as that in Eq. (9) by expanding prior states and actions. Therefore, by recursively expanding Eq. (11) backward, we finally have

\[
J(\mathcal{P}', \pi) - J(\mathcal{P}, \pi) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \left[ \mathbb{E}_{s_t, a_t, s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \frac{p^{P, \pi}(s_t)}{p^{P, \pi}(s_t)} \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \mathbb{E}_{s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, s_t, a_t, s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \frac{p^{P, \pi}(s_{t-1})}{p^{P, \pi}(s_{t-1})} \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) - \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \right] \\
\]

\[
= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \sum_{i=0}^{t} \gamma^i \frac{p^{P, \pi}(s_t)}{p^{P, \pi}(s_t)} \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) - \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \mathbb{E}_{s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, s_t, a_t, s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \frac{p^{P, \pi}(s_{t-1})}{p^{P, \pi}(s_{t-1})} \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) - \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) + \mathbb{E}_{s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, s_t, a_t, s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \frac{p^{P, \pi}(s_{t-1})}{p^{P, \pi}(s_{t-1})} \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) - \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \right] \\
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \sum_{i=0}^{t} \gamma^i r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \sum_{i=0}^{t} \frac{p^{P, \pi}(s_t)}{p^{P, \pi}(s_t)} \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) - \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \mathbb{E}_{s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, s_t, a_t, s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi} \frac{p^{P, \pi}(s_{t-1})}{p^{P, \pi}(s_{t-1})} \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) - \mathcal{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \right] \tag{12}
\]

where \( \tau \) indicates the trajectory \( s_0, a_0, \ldots \).
Let \( x_t = \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \) and \( y_i = \frac{p^{P', \pi}(s_i)}{p^{P, \pi}(s_i)} \left( \frac{p'(s_{i+1}|s_i, a_i) - p(s_{i+1}|s_i, a_i)}{p(s_{i+1}|s_i, a_i)} \right) \), we have

\[
\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{t} y_i = x_0 y_0 + x_1 (y_0 + y_1) + x_2 (y_0 + y_1 + y_2) + \cdots \\
= y_0 (x_0 + x_1 + x_2 + \cdots) + y_1 (x_1 + x_2 + \cdots) + \cdots = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} y_i x_t
\]

and \( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} x_t = \gamma^t \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^{t-i} r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) = \gamma^t R_t \), where \( R_t = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{t-i} r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \) is the empirical cumulative future reward. Continuing from Eq. [12],

\[
J(P', \pi) - J(P, \pi) = \mathbb{E}_{t \sim P, \pi} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \left( \frac{p^{P', \pi}(s_t) p'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) - p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)}{p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{t \sim P, \pi} R_t \left( \frac{p^{P', \pi}(s_t) p'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) - p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)}{p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{t \sim P, \pi} R_t \left( p^{P', \pi}(s_t) p'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) - p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{t \sim P, \pi} R_t \left( p^{P', \pi}(s_t) p'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) - p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{t \sim P, \pi} R_t \left( p^{P', \pi}(s_t) p'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) - p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{t \sim P, \pi} R_t \left( p^{P', \pi}(s_t) p'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) - p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \right)
\]

Now, we complete the proof.

\[\square\]

**B. Some Useful Lemmas**

**Lemma B.1.** Let \( p^{P, \pi}(s) \) indicate the marginal visitation probability for state \( s \) under dynamics \( P \) and policy \( \pi \). Let \( \delta_1 \) and \( \delta \) be the total variation divergence of the dynamics and policies, respectively, as defined in Theorem [4.1]. With the assumption used in Lemma [3.1] that \( P'(s_0) = P(s_0) \), we have

\[
\sum_s |p^{P', \pi}(s) - p^{P, \pi}(s)| \leq 2t \delta_1, \tag{14}
\]

\[
\sum_s |p^{P', \pi}(s) - p^{P, \pi}(s)| \leq 2t \delta_2. \tag{15}
\]
Proof. From Eq. (10), we know that
\[ p^{P'}(s_t) - p^P(s_t) \]
\[ = \sum_{s_{t-1}} p^{P'}(s_{t-1}) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi(a_{t-1}|s_{t-1}) (P'(s_t|s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) - P(s_t|s_{t-1}, a_{t-1})) + \]
\[ \sum_{s_{t-1}} \left( p^{P'}(s_{t-1}) - p^P(s_{t-1}) \right) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi(a_{t-1}|s_{t-1}) P(s_t|s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}). \]

Recursively expanding the above equation will get
\[ p^{P'}(s_t) - p^P(s_t) \]
\[ = \sum_{s_{t-1}} p^{P'}(s_{t-1}) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi(a_{t-1}|s_{t-1}) (P'(s_t|s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) - P(s_t|s_{t-1}, a_{t-1})) + \]
\[ \sum_{s_{t-1}} \sum_{s_{t-2}} \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi(a_{t-2}|s_{t-2}) (P'(s_t|s_{t-2}, a_{t-2}) - P(s_t|s_{t-2}, a_{t-2})) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi(a_{t-1}|s_{t-1}) P(s_t|s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) \]
\[ + \sum_{s_{t-1}} \sum_{s_{t-2}} \left( p^{P'}(s_{t-2}) - p^P(s_{t-2}) \right) \sum_{a_{t-2}} \pi(a_{t-2}|s_{t-2}) P(s_t|s_{t-2}, a_{t-2}) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi(a_{t-1}|s_{t-1}) P(s_t|s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) \]
\[ = \ldots \]

By noting that \( p^{P'}(s_0) = P'(s_0) = P(s_0) = p^P(s_0) \), the last expanded term containing \( p^{P'}(s_0) - p^P(s_0) \) equals zero, and
\[ \sum_{s_i} |P'(s_i|s_{i-1}, a_{i-1}) - P(s_i|s_{i-1}, a_{i-1})| \leq 2\delta_1, \text{for any } i. \]

Then, it is easy to obtain
\[ \sum_{s_t} |p^{P'}(s_t) - p^P(s_t)| \leq 2t\delta_1. \]
Similarly, we have
\[ p^{P,\pi'}(s_t) - p^{P,\pi}(s_t) \]
\[ = \sum_{s_{t-1}} p^{P,\pi'}(s_{t-1}) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi'(a_{t-1}|s_{t-1}) P(s_t|s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) - \sum_{s_{t-1}} p^{P,\pi}(s_{t-1}) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi(a_{t-1}|s_{t-1}) P(s_t|s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) \]
\[ = \sum_{s_{t-1}} p^{P,\pi'}(s_{t-1}) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi'(a_{t-1}|s_{t-1}) P(s_t|s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) - \sum_{s_{t-1}} p^{P,\pi}(s_{t-1}) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi'(a_{t-1}|s_{t-1}) P(s_t|s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) + \]
\[ \sum_{s_{t-1}} \sum_{a_{t-1}} \left( p^{P,\pi'}(s_{t-2}) - p^{P,\pi}(s_{t-2}) \right) \sum_{a_{t-2}} \pi'(a_{t-2}|s_{t-2}) P(s_{t-1}|s_{t-2}, a_{t-2}) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi'(a_{t-1}|s_{t-1}) \sum_{a_{t-1}} \pi(a_{t-1}|s_{t-1}) P(s_{t-1}|s_{t-2}, a_{t-2}) \]
\[ = \ldots \]

By noting that \( p^{P,\pi'}(s_0) = P(s_0) = p^{P,\pi}(s_0) \), the last expanded term containing \( (p^{P,\pi'}(s_0) - p^{P,\pi}(s_0)) \) equals zero, and
\[ \sum_{a_i} |\pi'(a_i|s_i) - \pi(a_i|s_i)| \leq 2\delta_1, \text{for any } i. \]

Then, it is easy to obtain
\[ \sum_{s_t} |p^{P,\pi'}(s_t) - p^{P,\pi}(s_t)| \leq 2t\delta_2. \]

\[ \square \]

**Lemma B.2.** With the definitions in Theorem 4.1 and Lemma B.1, we have the following bounds on the value differences at a single state \( s_t \).

\[ |V^{P,\pi'}(s_t) - V^{P,\pi}(s_t)| \leq \min \left( 2r_{max}\delta_1 \frac{t\gamma(1-\gamma)}{(1-\gamma)^2}, \frac{2r_{max}}{1-\gamma} \right), \quad (16) \]

\[ |V^{P,\pi'}(s_t) - V^{P,\pi}(s_t)| \leq \min \left( 2r_{max}\delta_2 \frac{t\gamma(1-\gamma)}{(1-\gamma)^2}, \frac{2r_{max}}{1-\gamma} \right). \quad (17) \]

**Proof.** First, it is easy to see that for any \( P, \pi \) and state \( s_t \) we always have
\[ |V^{P,\pi}(s_t)| = \mathbb{E}_{a_t, s_{t+1}, \ldots} P^{s,\pi} \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \gamma^{i-t} r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) \leq \frac{r_{max}}{1-\gamma}. \]
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Therefore, applying Lemma B.1, we have

\[ |V^{P',\pi}(s_t) - V^{P,\pi}(s_t)| \leq \frac{2r_{\text{max}}}{1 - \gamma}. \]

Next, we derive another bound for the value differences. We have

\[
\begin{align*}
V^{P',\pi}(s_t) - V^{P,\pi}(s_t) & = \mathbb{E}_{a_t, s_{t+1}, \ldots \sim P, \pi} \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \gamma^{i-t} r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) - \mathbb{E}_{a_t, s_{t+1}, \ldots \sim P, \pi} \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \gamma^{i-t} r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) \\
& = \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{s_i, a_i, s_{i+1} \sim P', \pi} r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) - \mathbb{E}_{s_i, a_i, s_{i+1} \sim P, \pi} r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) \\
& = \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \sum_{s_i} \mathbb{E}_{a_i} \pi(a_i | s_i) \left( P'(s_{i+1} | s_i, a_i) - P(s_{i+1} | s_i, a_i) \right) r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) \\
& = \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \sum_{s_i} \pi(a_i | s_i) \left( P'(s_{i+1} | s_i, a_i) - P(s_{i+1} | s_i, a_i) \right) r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}).
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, applying Lemma B.1, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
|V^{P',\pi}(s_t) - V^{P,\pi}(s_t)| & \leq 2r_{\text{max}} \delta_1 + 2r_{\text{max}} \sum_{i=t+1}^{\infty} \gamma^{i-t} \sum_{s_i} \left| P'(s_{i+1} | s_i, a_i) - P(s_{i+1} | s_i, a_i) \right| r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) \\
& \leq 2r_{\text{max}} \delta_1 + 2r_{\text{max}} \sum_{i=t+1}^{\infty} i \gamma^{i-t} + 2r_{\text{max}} \delta_1 \sum_{i=t+1}^{\infty} \gamma^{i-t} \\
& = 2r_{\text{max}} \delta_1 \frac{t \gamma (1 - \gamma) + 1}{(1 - \gamma)^2}.
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
V^{P,\pi'}(s_t) - V^{P,\pi}(s_t) & = \mathbb{E}_{a_t, s_{t+1}, \ldots \sim P, \pi} \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \gamma^{i-t} r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) - \mathbb{E}_{a_t, s_{t+1}, \ldots \sim P, \pi} \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \gamma^{i-t} r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) \\
& = \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{s_i, a_i, s_{i+1} \sim P', \pi} r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) - \mathbb{E}_{s_i, a_i, s_{i+1} \sim P, \pi} r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) \\
& = \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \sum_{s_i} \mathbb{E}_{a_i} \pi'(a_i | s_i) \sum_{s_{i+1}} P(s_{i+1} | s_i, a_i) r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) \\
& = \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \sum_{s_i} \pi'(a_i | s_i) \sum_{s_{i+1}} P(s_{i+1} | s_i, a_i) r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) + \\
& \quad \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \sum_{s_i} \mathbb{E}_{s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}} \pi'(a_i | s_i) - \pi(a_i | s_i) \sum_{s_{i+1}} P(s_{i+1} | s_i, a_i) r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}) + \\
& \quad \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \sum_{s_i} \pi'(a_i | s_i) - \pi(a_i | s_i) \sum_{s_{i+1}} P(s_{i+1} | s_i, a_i) r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1}).
\end{align*}
\]
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Therefore,
\[
|V^{P,\pi'}(s_t) - V^{P,\pi}(s_t)| \leq r_{\text{max}} \sum_{a_t} |\pi'(a_t|s_t) - \pi(a_t|s_t)| + \\
r_{\text{max}} \sum_{i=t+1}^{\infty} \gamma^{i-t} \sum_{s_i} p^{P,\pi}(s_i) \sum_{a_i} |\pi'(a_i|s_i) - \pi(a_i|s_i)| + \\
r_{\text{max}} \sum_{i=t+1}^{\infty} \gamma^{i-t} \sum_{s_i} |p^{P,\pi}(s_i) - p^{P,\pi}(s_i)|
\]
\[
\leq 2r_{\text{max}} \delta_2 + 2r_{\text{max}} \delta_2 \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} \gamma^{i-t} + 2r_{\text{max}} \delta_2 \sum_{i=t+1}^{\infty} \gamma^{i-t}
\]
\[
= 2r_{\text{max}} \delta_2 \frac{t \gamma(1 - \gamma) + 1}{(1 - \gamma)^2}.
\]

\[\square\]

C. Proof of Theorem 4.1

Proof. Denote the dynamics-induced value gap as a function
\[
\Delta^{P',P}(\pi) = J(P', \pi) - J(P, \pi)
\]
\[
= \mathbb{E}_{r \sim p', \pi} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P,\pi}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P,\pi}(s_t, a_t) \right].
\]

Let
\[
L_{\pi'}(\pi) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{a_0, a_0, \ldots, s_t \sim p', \pi'} \sum_{a_t} \pi(a_t|s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} p'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)
\]
\[
\left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P,\pi'}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right]
\]
be the approximation of $\Delta^{P',P}(\pi)$ by sampling $(s_0, a_1, \ldots, s_t)$ and evaluating values using $\pi'$.

Then, we have
\[
\Delta^{P',P}(\pi) - L_{\pi'}(\pi)
\]
\[
= \mathbb{E}_{r \sim p', \pi} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P,\pi}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P,\pi}(s_t, a_t) \right] - \\
\mathbb{E}_{r \sim p', \pi} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P,\pi'}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right] + \\
\mathbb{E}_{r \sim p', \pi} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P,\pi'}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right] - \\
\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{a_0, a_0, \ldots, s_t \sim p', \pi'} \sum_{a_t} \pi(a_t|s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} p'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)
\]
\[
\left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P,\pi'}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right].
\]
Let
\[
D_1 = \mathbb{E}_{r \sim P^p} \sum_{t=0}^\infty \gamma^t \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P, \pi}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P, \pi}(s_t, a_t) \right] - \\
\mathbb{E}_{r \sim P^p} \sum_{t=0}^\infty \gamma^t \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P, \pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right],
\]
and
\[
D_2 = \mathbb{E}_{r \sim P^p} \sum_{t=0}^\infty \gamma^t \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P, \pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right] - \\
\sum_{t=0}^\infty \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{s_0, a_0, \ldots, s_t \sim P^p} \sum_{a_t} \pi(a_t | s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} \mathbb{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \\
\left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P, \pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right].
\]

For \( D_1 \), we have
\[
D_1 = \mathbb{E}_{r \sim P^p} \sum_{t=0}^\infty \gamma^t \left[ \gamma \left( V^{P, \pi}(s_{t+1}) - V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) \right) \right] - \\
\left( \mathbb{E}_{r \sim P} \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P, \pi}(s_{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}_{s_{t+1} \sim P} \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) \right] \right] \right)
\]
\[
= \sum_{t=0}^\infty \gamma^{t+1} \mathbb{E}_{s_0, \ldots, a_t \sim P^p} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{s_{t+1} \sim P^p} \left( V^{P, \pi}(s_{t+1}) - V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) \right) \right]
\]
\[
= \sum_{t=0}^\infty \gamma^{t+1} \mathbb{E}_{s_0, \ldots, a_t \sim P^p} \left[ \sum_{s_{t+1}} \left( \mathbb{P}'(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) - \mathbb{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \right) \left( V^{P, \pi}(s_{t+1}) - V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) \right) \right].
\]

Therefore, we have
\[
|D_1| = \sum_{t=0}^\infty \gamma^{t+1} \mathbb{E}_{s_0, \ldots, a_t \sim P^p, \pi} \left[ \left| \sum_{s_{t+1}} \mathbb{P}'(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) - \mathbb{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \right| \left| V^{P, \pi}(s_{t+1}) - V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) \right| \right]
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{t=0}^\infty \gamma^{t+1} \mathbb{E}_{s_0, \ldots, a_t \sim P^p, \pi} \left[ \left| \sum_{s_{t+1}} \mathbb{P}'(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) - \mathbb{P}(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \right| \cdot \min \left( 2r_{max} \delta_2 \frac{t \gamma (1 - \gamma) + 1}{(1 - \gamma)^2}, \frac{2r_{max}}{1 - \gamma} \right) \right]
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{t=0}^\infty \gamma^{t+1} \cdot \min \left( 4r_{max} \delta_1 \delta_2 \frac{t \gamma (1 - \gamma) + 1}{(1 - \gamma)^2}, 4r_{max} \delta_1 \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \right)
\]
\[
= \frac{4r_{max} \delta_1}{(1 - \gamma)^2} \min \left( \frac{\delta_2 (\gamma^2 + 1)}{1 - \gamma}, 1 \right),
\]
where the first inequality in Eq. (18) is obtained by applying Lemma B.2. For \( D_2 \), we
have
\[
D_2 = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{a_t \sim \pi^{t+1}} \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P, \pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right] - \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{a_t \sim \pi^{t+1}} \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P, \pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right]
\]
\[
= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{s_t} (p^{P', \pi}(s_t) - p^{P', \pi'}(s_t)) \sum_{a_t} \pi(a_t|s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) \right] - \sum_{s_{t+1}} \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) Q^{P, \pi'}(s_t, a_t)
\]
\[
= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{s_t} (p^{P', \pi}(s_t) - p^{P', \pi'}(s_t)) \sum_{a_t} \pi(a_t|s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) \right] - \sum_{s_{t+1}} \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) Q^{P, \pi'}(s_t, a_t)
\]
\[
= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{s_t} (p^{P', \pi}(s_t) - p^{P', \pi'}(s_t)) \sum_{a_t} \pi(a_t|s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1}) \right] - \sum_{s_{t+1}} \mathcal{P}'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) Q^{P, \pi'}(s_t, a_t)
\]
\[
By noting that
\[
|r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P, \pi'}(s_{t+1})| = |r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{a_{t+1}, s_{t+2}, \ldots \sim \mathcal{P}, \pi'} \sum_{i=t+1}^{\infty} \gamma^{i-t-1} r(s_i, a_i, s_{i+1})| \leq \frac{r_{\text{max}}}{1 - \gamma},
\]
and applying Lemma B.1, we have
\[
|D_2| \leq \frac{4r_{\text{max}} \delta_1 \delta_2}{1 - \gamma} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} t \gamma^t = \frac{4r_{\text{max}} \delta_1 \delta_2}{(1 - \gamma)^3}. \tag{19}
\]
Combining Eqs. (18) and (19), we finally get the lower bound
\[
\Delta^{P', \mathcal{P}}(\pi) \geq \Delta^{P}(\pi) - \frac{4r_{\text{max}} \delta_1}{(1 - \gamma)^2} \min \left( \frac{\delta_2 (\gamma^2 + 1)}{1 - \gamma}, 1 \right) - \frac{4r_{\text{max}} \delta_1 \delta_2}{(1 - \gamma)^3}
\]
\[
= \Delta^{P}(\pi) - \frac{4r_{\text{max}} \delta_1}{(1 - \gamma)^2} \min \left( \frac{\delta_2 (\gamma^2 + 2)}{1 - \gamma}, 1 + \frac{\delta_2}{1 - \gamma} \right). \tag{20}
\]
Now, we complete the proof.
D. Proof of Proposition 4.2

Proof. The policy improvement theorems in TRPO [15] suggest

\[ J(P, \pi) - J(P, \pi') \geq \mathbb{E}_{t \sim \pi} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t A^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right] - \frac{4\gamma \delta_2^2}{(1 - \gamma)^2}, \tag{21} \]

where \( \epsilon = \max_{s,a} |A^{P,\pi}(s, a)| \) is the maximum advantage given any \((s, a)\), defined in [15]. Continuing from Eq. \([21]\), we have

\[ J(P, \pi) - J(P, \pi') \geq \mathbb{E}_{t \sim \pi} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t A^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right] - \frac{4\gamma \delta_2^2}{(1 - \gamma)^2} \]

We then analyze the above advantage discrepancy term. We have

\[ \mathbb{E}_{t \sim \pi} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t A^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t \sim \pi'} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t A^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right] \]

\[ = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t p^{P,\pi'}(s_t) \sum_{a_t} \pi'(a_t|s_t) A^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) - \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \sum_{s_t} p^{P,\pi'}(s_t) \sum_{a_t} \pi'(a_t|s_t) A^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \]

\[ = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \sum_{s_t} (p^{P,\pi'}(s_t) - p^{P,\pi'}(s_t)) \sum_{a_t} \pi'(a_t|s_t) A^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t). \]

Applying Lemma B.1, we can obtain

\[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{t \sim \pi} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t A^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t \sim \pi'} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t A^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right] \right| \leq \frac{2\gamma \epsilon \delta_1}{(1 - \gamma)^2}. \tag{23} \]

Combining Eq. \([23]\) and Eq. \([22]\), we have

\[ J(P, \pi) - J(P, \pi') \geq \mathbb{E}_{t \sim \pi} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t A^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right] - \frac{2\gamma\epsilon(\delta_1 + 2\delta_2^2)}{(1 - \gamma)^2}. \tag{24} \]

Finally, combining Theorem 4.1 and Eq. \([24]\), we have

\[ J(P', \pi) - J(P, \pi') \]

\[ = J(P, \pi) - J(P, \pi) + J(P, \pi) - J(P, \pi') \]

\[ \geq L_{\pi}(\pi) + \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d^P,\pi'} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t A^{P,\pi'}(s_t, a_t) \right] - \frac{2\gamma\epsilon(\delta_1 + 2\delta_2^2)}{(1 - \gamma)^2} - 4\gamma \delta_{\max} \min \left( \frac{\delta_2 (\gamma^2 + 2)}{1 - \gamma}, 1 + \frac{\delta_2}{1 - \gamma} \right) \]

\[ \geq 1 - \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d^P,\pi', a \sim \pi, s \sim \pi'} \pi(a|s) [r(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{P,\pi'}(s') - Q^{P,\pi'}(s, a) + A^{P,\pi'}(s, a)] - C \]

\[ = 1 - \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d^P,\pi', a \sim \pi, s \sim \pi'} \pi(a|s) [r(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{P,\pi'}(s') - V^{\pi'}(s)] - C \tag{25} \]
where \( C = \frac{2\gamma_2(\gamma_1^2+2\delta_1^2)}{(1-\gamma)^2} + \frac{4\gamma_2 \gamma_2(\gamma_1^2+2\delta_1^2)}{(1-\gamma)^2} \cdot \min \left( \frac{(\gamma_2^2+2)}{1-\gamma}, 1 + \frac{\delta_2}{1-\gamma} \right) \). Now, we complete the proof. 

\[ \square \]

E. Proof of Theorem 5.1

Proof. Continuing from the relativity lemma, i.e., Eq. [13], we have

\[ J(P', \pi) - J(P, \pi) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P',\pi}(s_{t+1}) - Q^{P,\pi}(s_t, a_t) \right] \]

\[ = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{s_{t}, a_{t} \sim P', \pi} \left[ r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P',\pi}(s_{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}_{s_{t+1} \sim P(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)} r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) - \gamma V^{P,\pi}(s_{t+1}) \right] \]

\[ = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \left[ \sum_{s_{t+1}} P'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P',\pi}(s_{t+1}) \right] \]

\[ - \sum_{s_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P,\pi}(s_{t+1}) \]

Now, considering a parameterized source dynamics function \( P_\phi \) and replacing \( P \) with \( P_\phi \), we have

\[ \Delta^{P',P_\phi}(\pi) = J(P', \pi) - J(P_\phi, \pi) \]

\[ = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{s_{t}, a_{t} \sim P', \pi} \left[ \sum_{s_{t+1}} P'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P_\phi,\pi}(s_{t+1}) \right] \]

\[ - \sum_{s_{t+1}} P_\phi(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P_\phi,\pi}(s_{t+1}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (26)

Let

\[ L_\phi(\phi') = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \mathbb{E}_{s_{t}, a_{t} \sim P', \pi} \left[ \sum_{s_{t+1}} P'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P_\phi,\pi}(s_{t+1}) \right] \]

\[ - \sum_{s_{t+1}} P_\phi(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) + \gamma V^{P_\phi,\pi}(s_{t+1}) \]

be an approximate function of \( \Delta^{P',P_\phi}(\pi) \) by replacing \( V^{P_\phi,\pi} \) in Eq. [26] with \( V^{P_\phi,\pi} \), i.e., importing another dynamics parameter \( \phi' \) to evaluate the value. Then,

\[ \Delta^{P',P_\phi}(\pi) - L_\phi(\phi') = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^{t+1} \mathbb{E}_{s_{t}, a_{t} \sim P', \pi} \left[ \sum_{s_{t+1}} \left( P'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) - P_\phi(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \right) \left( V^{P_\phi,\pi}(s_{t+1}) - V^{P_\phi',\pi}(s_{t+1}) \right) \right]. \]
Applying Lemma B.2, we obtain the bound
\[
|\Delta P_\pi - L_\phi| \leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^{t+1} E_{s_t, a_t \sim P_{\pi'}} \left[ \sum_{s_{t+1}} |P'(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) - P_\phi(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)| \right] \frac{2r_{max}}{1 - \gamma} \min \left( \delta_t \left( t\gamma + \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \right), 1 \right)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{4\gamma \delta_1 r_{max}}{(1 - \gamma)^2} \min \left( \frac{\delta_1 (\gamma^2 + 1)}{1 - \gamma}, 1 \right).
\]

Alternatively, we can also use the discrepancy between the dynamics parameters \( \phi \) and \( \phi' \) to bound the above equation instead of using Lemma B.2. When taking small step sizes in updating \( \phi \) to \( \phi' \), we can obtain sufficiently tight bound, because the above bound only depends on \( \delta_1 \), i.e., the differences between \( \phi \) and \( \phi' \) here.

\[\square\]

F. The RPO and RTO Algorithms

Due to space limitation, we are not able to put the RPO and RTO algorithms in the main text. These two algorithms can be tailored from the RPTO algorithm in Algorithm 1 and we put them here.

Algorithm 2: Relative Policy Optimization (RPO)

**Input:** the source and target environments \( E_{\text{source}} \) and \( E_{\text{target}} \), and their dynamics \( P_{\text{source}} \) and \( P_{\text{target}} \); a well-trained policy \( \pi_{\theta_0} \) in \( E_{\text{source}} \).

1. Create two empty replay buffers \( D_{\text{source}} \) and \( D_{\text{target}} \);
2. Initialize \( \theta = \theta_0 \);
3. Using \( \pi_{\theta} \) to interact with \( E_{\text{source}} \) and push the generated trajectories into \( D_{\text{source}} \);
4. Using \( \pi_{\theta} \) to interact with \( E_{\text{target}} \) and push the generated trajectories into \( D_{\text{target}} \);
5. Sample a mini-batch \( \{(s, a, s')\}_{\text{source}} \sim D_{\text{source}} \), and update \( V_{\phi', \pi_{\theta}} \) by minimizing the TD-error;
6. Sample a mini-batch \( \{(s, a, s')\}_{\text{target}} \sim D_{\text{target}} \), and apply the relative policy gradient in RPO to update \( \pi_{\theta} \);
7. Until some convergence criteria is satisfied.

G. Other Experimental Details

For all the environments used in our experiments, the policy neural network and value neural network are of the same structure. The state is fed into three fully connected layers with ReLU activation function, and then the output embedding is fed into a policy head and a value head, respectively. That is, the policy network and value network share the bottom embeddings. For tasks with discrete action space, the policy head is a softmax layer to output multinomial distribution; for continuous control problems, the policy head is a diagonal Gaussian distribution that outputs a mean and a std. The value head consists of two fully connected layers and finally outputs a scalar value. All the layers are of the same size of 64 in our experiments. For the physical dynamics model, each
Algorithm 3: Relative Transition Optimization (RTO)

**Input:** the source and target environments $\mathcal{E}_{\text{source}}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\text{target}}$, and their dynamics $P_{\phi}$ and $P_{\text{target}}$, where the source dynamics $P_{\phi}$ is parameterized by $\phi$; an arbitrary policy $\pi_{\theta}$;

1. Create two empty replay buffers $D_{\text{source}}$ and $D_{\text{target}}$;
2. Initialize $\phi = \phi_0$;
3. repeat
   3.   Using $\pi_{\theta}$ to interact with $\mathcal{E}_{\phi}$ and push the generated trajectories into $D_{\text{source}}$;
   4.   Using $\pi_{\theta}$ to interact with $\mathcal{E}_{\text{target}}$ and push the generated trajectories into $D_{\text{target}}$;
   5.   Sample a mini-batch $\{(s, a, s')\}_{\text{source}} \sim D_{\text{source}}$, and update $V_{P_{\phi}, \pi_{\theta}}$ by minimizing the TD-error;
   6.   Sample a mini-batch $\{(s, a, s')\}_{\text{target}} \sim D_{\text{target}}$, and update $P_{\phi}$ according to RTO or SL;
4. until Some convergence criteria is satisfied

environment has its own physical systems coded in OpenAI gym. In CartPole-v0, only the pole length is treated as the trainable parameter, i.e., $\phi$ in CartPole-v0 only contains one free parameter. Similarly, in MountainCarContinuous-v0, only gravity is trainable; in Acrobot-v1, two physical factors link mass1 and link mass2 are trainable; in Pendulum-v0, the trainable parameter in $\phi$ is also the gravity.

For all algorithms, we choose their learning rate from $[1e-3, 5e-4, 1e-4, 1e-5]$ with the best final performance. For RPTO, its loss consists of the RPO loss and the RTO loss, and we simply fix both the loss coefficients as 1.0 in all experiments. For RPO, as mentioned in the main text, we clip the objective in Eq. (6) in a similar way as PPO did, and the clip range is set to 0.2, which is suggested by PPO.

For the NN dynamics model, the network structure consists of 3 fully connected layers with 32 units for embedding. The last layer of the probabilistic network predicts the mean and variance of each dimension of the state, while the last layer of the deterministic network directly predicts the state. All tasks share the same NN model structure. All experiments were ran with one NVIDIA TESLA M40 GPU and tens of CPU cores.

Figure 3: Overall performance of RTO in four policy transfer tasks. The target pole length in CartPole-v0 is increased to 0.8.
H. Performance of RTO in RPTO-phy

Due to space limitation, we put the curves of RTO in RPTO-phy here. In all tasks, RTO could converge to the true dynamics factors smoothly, similar to the illustrative experiments in Fig. [1]. For NN dynamics models used in RPTO-det and RPTO-prob, they do not directly fit the dynamics factors.