

Model-Free Learning for the Linear Quadratic Regulator over Rate-Limited Channels

Lintao Ye[†], Aritra Mitra[†], and Vijay Gupta^{*}

September 20, 2024

Abstract

Consider a linear quadratic regulator (LQR) problem being solved in a model-free manner using the policy gradient approach. If the gradient of the quadratic cost is being transmitted across a rate-limited channel, both the convergence and the rate of convergence of the resulting controller may be affected by the bit-rate permitted by the channel. We first pose this problem in a communication-constrained optimization framework and propose a new adaptive quantization algorithm titled Adaptively Quantized Gradient Descent (AQGD). This algorithm guarantees exponentially fast convergence to the globally optimal policy, with *no deterioration of the exponent relative to the unquantized setting*, above a certain finite threshold bit-rate allowed by the communication channel. We then propose a variant of AQGD that provides similar performance guarantees when applied to solve the model-free LQR problem. Our approach reveals the benefits of adaptive quantization in preserving fast linear convergence rates, and, as such, may be of independent interest to the literature on compressed optimization. Our work also marks a first step towards a more general bridge between the fields of model-free control design and networked control systems.

1 Introduction

Reinforcement learning (RL) to solve classical control problems such as the linear quadratic regulator (LQR), the \mathcal{H}_2 or the \mathcal{H}_∞ control problems, is now well-understood. Both the convergence properties of various algorithms and characterization of the convergence rates through a non-asymptotic analysis have been considered. For model-based RL, which requires the construction of an empirical model of the process, we can point to works such as [2, 3, 4, 5]. For model-free approaches that do not involve the construction of such a model, example works include [6, 7, 8]. In this paper, we are interested in a popular model-free algorithm – policy gradient – applied to the linear quadratic regulator (LQR) problem [9]. This algorithm has been studied extensively in the LQR context. The authors in [10] showed that despite the non-convexity of the optimization landscape, model-free policy gradient algorithms can guarantee convergence to the globally optimal policy. Furthermore, given access to exact policy gradients, this convergence is exponentially fast.

^{*}The first two authors contributed equally to this work. L. Ye is with the School of Artificial Intelligence and Automation, Huazhong University of Science and Technology Email: ye1intao93@hust.edu.cn. A. Mitra is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, North Carolina State University Email: amitra2@ncsu.edu. V. Gupta is with The Elmore Family School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Purdue University Email: gupta869@purdue.edu. An initial version of this paper was presented at the L4DC 2024 conference [1].

We consider the performance of policy gradient algorithms being used to solve an LQR problem when a rate-limited channel is present in the loop. The problem of robustness of policy gradient algorithms (or reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms more generally) to communication-induced distortions introduced if the transmission of either the gradient or the policy occurs over realistic communication channels has received only limited attention; see, for instance, the work on event-triggered RL in [11, 12], on rate-limited and noisy channels for stochastic bandit problems in [13, 14, 15], on policy evaluation using compressed temporal difference learning in [16, 17]), and more recently, on the effect of delays in stochastic approximation [18] and policy gradient algorithms for the LQR problem in [19, 20]. On the other hand, the impact of realistic communication channels present in a control loop has been studied extensively under the rubric of networked control systems. The simplest formulation in this area considers a plant being controlled by a remote controller that either receives measurements from a sensor across a communication channel or transmits the control input to an actuator over a channel. The setting that we consider, when the gradient of the cost function is transmitted across a communication channel, corresponds to the channel between the sensor and the controller. In this setting, the abstraction of the communication channel as a rate-limited channel or a ‘bit pipe’ that can transmit a finite number of bits per channel use has been studied for at least two decades now. The so-called data-rate theorem states that if the open loop plant is a linear time-invariant (LTI) system, there is a minimal bit-rate - characterized by the sum of the logarithms of the magnitudes of the open loop unstable eigenvalues of the plant - that must be supported by the channel in order for an encoder-decoder and a controller to exist such that the plant can be stabilized [21, 22]. This result has been extended in various directions, including consideration of stochastic or linear switched plants, combining the channel model with other effects such as a packet drop, consideration of event-triggered communication schemes, and so on. We point the reader to works such as [23, 24, 25, 26] and the references therein.

However, classically, this line of work assumes and exploits the knowledge of the model of the plant being controlled in the encoder-decoder and the controller design. Some limited work [27] has been done to relax this assumption; however, there is little to no theoretical understanding of networked control systems in the absence of such an assumption. As RL-based control becomes more popular and well-understood, it becomes natural to seek to understand how to remove this assumption. From the point of view of networked control, this would require the design of encoders and decoders for the communication channels and that of the controllers when the plant model is either simultaneously being learned (in model-based RL) or is never explicitly constructed. From the point of view of RL-control, this would require the understanding of the impact of communication channel effects on traditional RL algorithms, and the design of measures to counteract this impact. In this paper, we take the first step in this direction. While the modeling choices we make (LTI plant, rate-limited channel, and policy gradient based controller design) may seem specific, they already begin to show some of the intricacies that arise when we seek to bridge these two areas. The ultimate goal of this work is to connect control, communication, and learning by initiating a study of model-free control under communication constraints.

Specifically, in this paper, we consider the setting¹ shown in Figure 1. Consider a remote agent that observes a plant and transmits information to a controller server across a noiseless channel. The channel is abstracted as a bit-pipe, meaning that \bar{B} bits can be transmitted in a noiseless fashion across it per channel use. The agent has two functions. First, it executes the control policy relayed

¹A more careful problem formulation is provided in Section 2, where the notation in the figure is also formally defined.




Figure 1: Communication-constrained policy optimization for model-free LQR. At each iteration t , the decision-maker sends the current policy K_t to an agent over a noiseless channel of infinite capacity. The agent evaluates and encodes the noisy policy gradient $\widehat{\nabla J}(K_t)$ using \bar{B} bits, and transmits the encoded symbol σ_t to the decision-maker over a noiseless rate-limited channel. The decision-maker updates the policy based on the decoded policy gradient g_t .

to it by the server. Notice that the control policy is not communicated across a bit-constrained communication channel to the agent. Such presence of a communication channel only in one of the sensor-controller or controller-actuator paths is standard in networked control systems literature and can model the case where, e.g., the controller has ample transmission power while the sensor is limited by battery constraints. Second, the agent observes the performance of the plant when this control policy is implemented, calculates the observed noisy gradient of the cost function being optimized based on the system trajectory data, and transmits an encoded version of the gradient using \bar{B} bits across the bit-constrained communication channel. The server receives this encoded gradient, decodes it, updates the control policy through a policy gradient type algorithm, and communicates this updated policy to the agent. We assume that the plant being controlled is an *unknown* LTI system and the cost that is sought to be minimized is a quadratic cost. Thus, the collective objective of the agent and the server is to solve an LQR problem based on a model-free RL algorithm.

We comment here that the classical results in networked control systems literature in such a setup seek merely to stabilize the closed-loop system (e.g., [21]), and the optimal control design in the sense of LQR design is an open problem [23]. Further, we emphasize that while the version considered here is only a first step towards realizing a full theory of model-free control/reinforcement learning in multi-agent networked systems, where communication plays a key role [28, 29, 30], it is interesting in its own right parallel to the early developments of networked control systems literature. With such a setup, we seek to design the encoder, decoder, and RL algorithm that can guarantee asymptotic convergence to the globally optimal policy and to understand the loss in performance if that is not possible. In addition, we seek to understand the finite-sample performance of the design in terms of convergence rate, with a particular eye on characterizing any loss in the rate of convergence with a finite value of \bar{B} relative to when the channel has infinite capacity (i.e., when $\bar{B} = \infty$). We summarize our contributions as follows.

- **Novel Quantized Gradient-Descent Scheme with Linear Convergence Rate.** In Section 3, we show that the problem considered is related to the literature on the general problem of quantization in optimization [31, 32, 33] using a single-worker single-server framework (see Fig. 2). Using this connection, we design a new quantized gradient descent algorithm that carefully exploits the smoothness properties of the objective function and utilizes the allowed bits better by encoding the change in the gradient, as opposed to the gradient itself. We first present the Adaptively Quantized Gradient Descent (AQGD) algorithm for optimization of general smooth and strongly-

convex loss functions. For pedagogical ease, we begin with the simpler case when the gradients can be calculated by the agent exactly and show in Theorem 3.3 that for globally smooth and strongly convex objective functions, AQGD guarantees exponentially fast convergence to the optimal solution. Interestingly, and perhaps counter-intuitively, the convergence rate is not hurt above a minimal value for \bar{B} , in the sense that the exponent of convergence is *exactly* the same as that of unquantized gradient descent. Moreover, the minimal value of \bar{B} that we identify matches (up to a universal constant) with that identified in a converse result [32] as being necessary to achieve the same rate as that of unquantized gradient descent. To extend this result for the LQR problem, which is neither strongly-convex nor globally smooth, in Theorem 3.4, we prove that Theorem 3.3 is also valid under the weaker assumption of gradient-domination. This part of the paper was presented in a preliminary form at the L4DC 2024 conference [1].

- **Local Assumptions with Noisy Gradients.** We next consider the case when the gradient is noisy (i.e., the gradient calculation at the agent is based on the observed system trajectories), and the objective function only possesses a local smoothness property. An additional challenge for the LQR problem is that the control policy that is generated must remain within the set of stabilizing policies. Towards this end, in Section 4, we introduce a variant of AQGD (termed as NAQGD) for optimization of general functions that are locally smooth and gradient dominant and the algorithm only uses noisy gradients. We prove in Theorem 4.2 that NAQGD converges exponentially fast to a neighborhood of the optimal policy whose range is characterized by the noise level of the noisy gradient while generating a sequence of stabilizing policies. The NAQGD algorithm achieves the same convergence performance as unquantized gradient descent with noisy gradients (under the locally smooth and gradient-dominant assumptions), as studied in [34]. Our proofs in Sections 3-4 rely on the construction of novel Lyapunov functions that simultaneously account for the optimization error, the error introduced by quantization and the possibly noisy gradients in our algorithm.

- **Application to Model-Free LQR and Sample Complexity Results.** In Section 5, we provide a method to compute a noisy gradient of the LQR objective function for a given policy based solely on trajectories collected from the target system. Based on this method, we show in Theorem 5.3 that NAQGD can be applied to the model-free LQR setting with the same convergence performance as Theorem 4.2. Further, we provide in Corollary 5.4 a finite-sample analysis of NAQGD that characterizes the number of data samples (on the collected trajectories) from the target system required to achieve a certain convergence performance of the algorithm.

Given that we relate our problem to one of optimization over rate limited channels, we would also like to comment on the literature in that area. Despite the rich literature that has emerged on the topic of communication-constrained optimization [35, 36, 37, 31, 33, 38, 39], the only paper we are aware of that manages to preserve fast linear rates (despite quantization) is the recent work by [32]. Our work differs from that of [32] both algorithmically, and also in terms of results: unlike the algorithm proposed in [32], our proposed AQGD algorithm does not require maintaining any auxiliary sequence. Instead, it relies on carefully exploiting smoothness of the loss function to encode innovation signals. In addition to being conceptually simpler, AQGD preserves rates under weaker assumptions of local smoothness and gradient-domination. Moreover, while we also consider scenarios with noisy gradients, it is unclear whether the algorithm in [32] is applicable beyond the setting where exact noiseless gradients are available. As such, our proposed technique might be of independent interest to the literature on compressed optimization. For a summary of the state-of-the-art in this area, we refer the interested reader to [40].

Notation. Let $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Let S_{++}^n denote the set of all positive definite $n \times n$

matrices. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\|x\|$ be its Euclidean norm. For a matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, let $\|P\|$ and $\|P\|_F$ be its spectral norm and Frobenius norm, respectively. Let I_n be the n by n identity matrix. Let $\mathcal{B}_d(0, R)$ denote the d -dimensional Euclidean ball of radius R centered at the origin.

2 Problem Formulation and Preliminaries

Consider a linear time-invariant (LTI) system given by

$$x_{k+1} = Ax_k + Bu_k + w_k, \quad (2.1)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ are system matrices, $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $u_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control input and w_0, w_1, \dots are i.i.d. Gaussian disturbances with zero mean and covariance $\Sigma_w \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$, i.e., $w_k \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_w)$. We assume without loss of generality that $x_0 = 0$. The goal of the LQR problem is to compute the control inputs u_0, u_1, \dots , that solve

$$\min_{u_0, u_1, \dots} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x_k^\top Q x_k + u_k^\top R u_k \right], \quad (2.2)$$

where $Q \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$ and $R \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^m$ are cost matrices, and the expectation is taken with respect to the disturbance process $\{w_k\}_{k \geq 0}$. A classic result in optimal control yields that the optimal solution to the LQR problem in (2.2) is given by the static state-feedback control policy $u_t = Kx_t$ for some controller $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ (see, e.g., [41]). Hence, solving (2.2) is equivalent to solving the following:

$$\min_{K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} J(K) \triangleq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x_k^\top (Q + K^\top R K) x_k \right]. \quad (2.3)$$

Additionally, another well-known result is that the cost function $J(K)$ is finite if and only if K is stabilizing, i.e., the matrix $(A + BK)$ is Schur-stable [41]. It follows that one can solve (2.3) by minimizing $J(K)$ over the set of stabilizing K . For any stabilizing K , we also know from [41] the cost $J(K)$ yields the following closed-form expressions :

$$J(K) = \text{trace}(P_K \Sigma_w) = \text{trace}((Q + K^\top R K) \Sigma_K), \quad (2.4)$$

where $P_K \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$ is the solution to the following Riccati equations:

$$P_K = Q + K^\top R K + (A + BK)^\top P_K (A + BK), \quad \Sigma_K = \Sigma_w + (A + BK) \Sigma_K (A + BK)^\top. \quad (2.5)$$

Based on the above arguments, one can use the so-called policy gradient method to obtain $K^* = \arg \min_K J(K)$ (see, e.g., [42, 43, 6, 44, 45]). The basic scheme is to initialize with an arbitrary stabilizing K_0 and iteratively perform updates of the form: $K_{t+1} = K_t - \alpha \nabla J(K_t)$ for $t = 0, 1, \dots$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is a suitably chosen step size. When the system matrices A, B (and the cost matrices Q, R) are known, the exact gradient $\nabla J(K_t)$ of $J(K_t)$ can be computed and the algorithm described above converges exponentially fast to the optimal policy K^* , even though the cost $J(K)$ is not strictly convex [10, 43]. Further, even when the system model A, B is unknown, for a given stabilizing K , one can compute a noisy version of $\nabla J(K)$, denoted as $\widehat{\nabla J(K)}$, based on observed system trajectories of (2.1) obtained by applying the control policy $u_t = Kx_t$; hence the name *model-free*




Figure 2: Communication-constrained optimization setup with exact gradients at the worker, where g_t represents the decoded gradient at the server.

learning for LQR [10]. The policy gradient update now takes the form $K_{t+1} = K_t - \alpha \widehat{\nabla J(K_t)}$, whose convergence performance is characterized by the distance $\|\nabla J(K_t) - \widehat{\nabla J(K_t)}\|_F$ [10, 34].

Objective. We aim to study model-free learning for the LQR problem under communication constraints on the policy gradient updates (see the setup in Fig. 1). At each policy gradient update step t , the worker agent computes a potentially noisy policy gradient $\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)}$ by interacting with the environment and collecting system trajectories under the policy K_t . It then sends an encoded (i.e., quantized) version of $\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)}$ to the decision maker (or server) through a channel that supports noise-free transmission of a finite number of bits \bar{B} per use of the channel. The server updates the policy to K_{t+1} based on the decoded gradient g_t . Our goal is to propose a quantized policy gradient algorithm that specifies the encoding scheme at the worker and the policy update rule at the decision-maker, and characterize the convergence performance of the proposed algorithm to the optimal solution K^* . Moreover, we seek to analyze the convergence rate of the proposed algorithm and relate it to the capacity \bar{B} of the channel. The major challenge here lies in the fact that the channel distorts the policy gradients $\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)}$, which makes it difficult to directly adapt the analysis in the literature on policy gradients for model-free LQR (e.g., [10, 43, 34]) to our setting. Thus, *it is a priori unclear whether the sequence of policies generated using such distorted policy gradients converge to K^* or even remain stabilizing.*

Outline for the Rest of the Paper. To solve the problem described above, we take several steps. In Section 3, we first connect our problem to a general communication-constrained optimization problem setup (depicted by Fig. 2) that has been studied in [31, 33, 32]. For this setting, we propose the AQGD algorithm and show that it manages to preserve convergence rates despite quantization, provided the channel capacity exceeds a certain finite threshold and one has access to exact noiseless gradients. Building on these developments, in Section 4, we introduce a variant of AQGD (termed NAQGD) that can handle perturbation errors on the gradients - as needed to capture the effect of noisy policy gradients. Finally, in Section 5, we show how NAQGD addresses the model-free LQR problem under bit constraints, and provide a finite-sample analysis that relates the number of data samples used for obtaining the noisy gradients to the convergence performance of NAQGD.

3 Adaptively Quantized Gradient Descent (AQGD) for Communication-Constrained Optimization

As we mentioned before, our problem is related to the general communication-constrained optimization framework in Fig. 2 that has been studied in various recent works [31, 33, 32, 38]. By assuming that the worker receives an *exact* gradient $\nabla f(x_t)$ of the objective function in each it-

eration t , we will first develop a method to tackle the gradient distortion (or error) introduced solely by the communication channel. The method developed in this section paves the way for our analysis later in Section 4 that works for the case when the worker receives a noisy gradient $\widehat{\nabla f(x_t)}$, where we need to further consider the gradient error incurred due to noisy gradient evaluations. To proceed, we introduce the following standard definitions.

Definition 3.1. (Smoothness) A continuously differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L -smooth if the gradient map $\nabla f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is L -Lipschitz, i.e.,

$$\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \leq L\|x - y\|, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Definition 3.2. (Strong-Convexity) A differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is μ -strongly convex if, given any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the following inequality holds:

$$f(y) - f(x) \geq \langle y - x, \nabla f(x) \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2}\|y - x\|^2.$$

Consider the setup in Fig. 2 with the objective $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x)$, where $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Under the assumptions that $f(\cdot)$ is globally L -smooth and μ -strongly convex, it is well-known [46, 47] that when the channel from the worker to the server has infinite capacity, i.e., when $\bar{B} = \infty$, the vanilla gradient-descent algorithm $x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha \nabla f(x_t)$ with the constant step-size $\alpha = 1/L$ yields a so-called linear convergence guarantee for all $t \geq 0$ given by

$$f(x_t) - f(x^*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa}\right)^t (f(x_0) - f(x^*)), \quad (3.1)$$

where $x^* = \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x)$ is the unique global minimizer and $\kappa = L/\mu$ is the condition number of $f(\cdot)$. In other words, $f(x_t)$ converges exponentially fast to the optimal solution at the rate $O(\exp(-t/\kappa))$.

When the channel only supports a finite number of bits \bar{B} , employing the update rule $x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha g_t$ (where g_t is a *quantized* version of the gradient $\nabla f(x_t)$) may still guarantee convergence to x^* . However, the convergence rate in Eq. (3.1) may no longer be preserved. Indeed, the typical convergence rate achieved by almost all existing compressed/quantized gradient descent algorithms (see, e.g., [36, 37]) is

$$O\left(\exp\left(-\frac{t}{\kappa\delta}\right)\right),$$

where $\delta \geq 1$ captures the level of compression. A higher δ introduces more distortion, which causes the exponent of convergence to be a factor of δ slower than that of vanilla unquantized gradient descent. An exception is the recent work [32] that employs a differentially quantized approach and preserves the convergence rate of the vanilla unquantized gradient descent. However, the algorithm proposed in [32] requires maintaining an auxiliary sequence (besides $\{x_t\}_{t \geq 0}$) and the convergence result relies on the (global) smoothness and strong convexity of the objective function.

3.1 The AQGD Algorithm

In this section, we will introduce the Adaptively Quantized Gradient Descent (AQGD) algorithm; the detailed steps are included in Algorithm 1. In contrast to the algorithm proposed in [32], the AQGD algorithm is conceptually simpler and does not require maintaining any auxiliary sequence.

Algorithm 1 Adaptively Quantized Gradient Descent (AQGD)

- 1: **Initialization:** $x_0 = 0, g_{-1} = 0$, pick contraction factor γ and pick R_0 such that $\|\nabla f(x_0)\| \leq R_0$.
- 2: **For** $t = 0, 1, \dots$, **do**
- 3: **At Worker:**
- 4: Receive iterate x_t , gradient estimate g_{t-1} , and range R_t from server.
- 5: Compute innovation $i_t = \nabla f(x_t) - g_{t-1}$.
- 6: Encode the innovation $\tilde{i}_t = \mathcal{Q}_{b,R_t}(i_t)$.
- 7: **At Decision-Maker/Server:**
- 8: Decode \tilde{i}_t , and estimate current gradient: $g_t = g_{t-1} + \tilde{i}_t$.
- 9: Update the model as follows:

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \alpha g_t. \quad (3.2)$$

- 10: Update the range of the quantizer map as follows:

$$R_{t+1} = \gamma R_t + \alpha L \|g_t\|. \quad (3.3)$$

- 11: **End For**
-

More importantly, we will show that AQGD preserves the convergence of unquantized gradient descent under weaker assumptions on the objective function (i.e., local smoothness and gradient domination). Additionally, we will show later in Section 4 that AQGD can be further extended to handle noisy gradient calculations at the worker agent.

Let us start by providing some high-level intuition behind the design of AQGD. The core idea is to quantize an innovation sequence corresponding to the gradient sequence $\{\nabla f(x_t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, rather than directly quantizing $\{\nabla f(x_t)\}_{t \geq 0}$. To see why this makes sense, let g_{t-1} in Algorithm 1 represent the estimate of the gradient $\nabla f(x_{t-1})$ at the decision maker (or server) in iteration $t - 1$. Supposing the function $f(\cdot)$ is smooth, the new gradient $\nabla f(x_t)$ at the worker cannot change abruptly from its previous value $\nabla f(x_{t-1})$ (as per Definition 3.1). Based on this observation, if the decision-maker has a reasonably good estimate g_{t-1} of the true gradient $\nabla f(x_{t-1})$ at iteration $t - 1$ (i.e., g_{t-1} is close to $\nabla f(x_{t-1})$), then g_{t-1} should also be close to $\nabla f(x_t)$. Therefore, we define an innovation sequence $i_t = \nabla f(x_t) - g_{t-1}$, which captures the new information contained in the gradient $\nabla f(x_t)$ obtained by the worker at iteration t , relative to the most recent gradient estimate g_{t-1} held by the decision-maker from iteration $t - 1$. The worker encodes (i.e., quantizes) the innovation sequence $\{i_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ based on the intuition that the terms in this sequence will eventually shrink in magnitude. We now discuss in detail the key components of the AQGD algorithm.

• **Quantization Scheme.** Line 6 of Algorithm 1 can be applied in tandem with any reasonably designed quantizer. A particularly simple instance of such a scheme is the scalar quantizer that we describe next. Suppose we want to quantize a vector $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|X\| \leq R$. To achieve this, we can encode each component of X separately using scalar quantizers. Since $\|X\| \leq R$, we have $X_i \in [-R, R], \forall i \in [d]$, where X_i is the i -th component of X . To encode each X_i , the scalar quantizer with b bits partitions the interval $[-R, R]$ into 2^b bins of equal width, and sets the center point \tilde{X}_i of the bin containing X_i to be the quantized version of X_i . This gives $\tilde{X} = [\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_d]^T$ as the quantized version of X . From the above arguments, we know that the scalar quantizer depends on both the range of each component R and the number of bits b . Thus, we will use a quantizer map $\mathcal{Q}_{b,R} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ parameterized by R and b to succinctly describe this scalar quantizer. Specifically,

given $\|X\| \leq R$, we have $\tilde{X} = \mathcal{Q}_{b,R}(X)$. In the sequel, unless otherwise specified, we use the scalar quantizer described above in Algorithm 1. Later in Section 3.3, we will argue that more complicated quantizers can be used to reduce the channel capacity required to achieve a certain level of convergence performance of the AQQD algorithm.

- **Adaptive Ranges of the Quantizer.** Following our arguments above, Algorithm 1 recursively updates (i.e., decreases) the range R_t of the quantizer map $\mathcal{Q}_{b,R_t}(\cdot)$. The intuition behind this step is as follows. Supposing our algorithm operates correctly, i.e., $x_t \rightarrow x^*$, we must have that $\nabla f(x_t) \rightarrow 0$. This, in turn, would imply that the gap between consecutive gradients in the sequence $\{\nabla f(x_t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ should gradually shrink to 0. Recalling that Algorithm 1 encodes the innovations in the sequence $\{\nabla f(x_t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, this means that the innovation sequence $\{i_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ should be contained in balls of progressively smaller radii. The key idea here is to maintain estimates of the radii of such balls, which in turn refine the quantizer range used to encode the innovation (as per line 10 of Algorithm 1). Note that although the quantizer $\mathcal{Q}_{b,R_t}(\cdot)$ uses the same number of bits b to encode each component of i_t across the iterations in Algorithm 1, a progressively finer quantization accuracy is afforded by the fact that the range R_t shrinks with time. We will leverage this property of the quantizer $\mathcal{Q}_{b,R_t}(\cdot)$ in our analysis later. Note also that since we initialize $g_{-1} = 0$, we have $i_0 = \nabla f(x_0)$ and thus an initial upper bound R_0 on $\|\nabla f(x_0)\|$ needs to be known.

- **Correct Decoding at the Server.** To successfully run Algorithm 1, we assume that the server knows the exact encoding strategy at the worker (i.e., knows the parameters b and R_t). Then, given the \bar{B} -bit symbolic encoding of \tilde{i}_t , where $\bar{B} = bd$, the server can decode \tilde{i}_t exactly.

3.2 Convergence Analysis and Results for AQQD

Our first main convergence result pertains to the performance of AQQD under global assumptions of strong convexity and smoothness on the underlying function f .

Theorem 3.3. (Convergence of AQQD) *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L -smooth and μ -strongly convex. Suppose AQQD (Algorithm 1) is run with step-size $\alpha = 1/(6L)$ and contraction factor $\gamma = \sqrt{d}/2^b$. There exists a universal constant $C \geq 1$ such that if the bit-precision b per component satisfies*

$$b \geq C \log \left(\frac{d\kappa}{\kappa - 1} \right), \quad (3.4)$$

then the following is true $\forall t \geq 0$:

$$f(x_t) - f(x^*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{12\kappa} \right)^t (f(x_0) - f(x^*) + \alpha R_0^2), \quad \text{where } \kappa = L/\mu. \quad (3.5)$$

Discussion. Comparing Eq. (3.5) to Eq. (3.1) reveals that AQQD preserves the exact same linear rate of convergence (up to universal constants) as vanilla unquantized gradient descent, provided the channel capacity $\bar{B} = bd$ satisfies the requirement on b in Eq. (3.4). As mentioned earlier, commonly used compression schemes (including sophisticated ones like error-feedback [37]) scale down the exponent of the convergence rate by a factor $\delta \geq 1$ that captures the level of compression. The main takeaway then from Theorem 3.3 is that our simple scheme based on adaptive quantization can avoid such a scale-down, without the need for maintaining an auxiliary sequence as in the algorithm proposed in [32].

The authors in [32] prove a converse result showing that to match the rate of unquantized gradient descent, a necessary condition on the bit-rate is

$$b \geq \log \left(\frac{\kappa + 1}{\kappa - 1} \right). \quad (3.6)$$

We see from Eq. (3.4) that there is an extra $\log(d)$ factor compared to the *minimal* rate in Eq. (3.6). This extra factor is due to the choice of a scalar quantizer in Algorithm 1 as we discussed above. By using a more complicated vector quantizer in AQGD, we will show in Section 3.3 that the extra $\log(d)$ factor in Eq. (3.4) can be shaved off.

As mentioned before, another merit of the AQGD algorithm is that its convergence analysis can be extended gracefully to functions that are locally smooth and gradient-dominant, and its algorithm design can be extended to handle noisy gradients. These developments are then applicable to the model-free LQR setting under communication constraints (see Section 4). As an initial step to build towards the LQR problem of eventual interest to us, we formally show in the next theorem that the convergence result in Theorem 3.3 can be generalized to (potentially non-convex) functions with the gradient-domination property.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L -smooth and satisfies the following gradient-domination property:*

$$\|\nabla f(x)\|^2 \geq 2\mu(f(x) - f(x^*)), \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (3.7)$$

where $x^* \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x)$. Let α, γ , and the bit-precision b be chosen as in Theorem 3.3. Then, AQGD provides exactly the same guarantee as in Eq. (3.5).

Since any strongly convex function is also gradient dominant, it suffices to prove the stronger result in Theorem 3.4, which naturally applies to the result in Theorem 3.3. While the detailed proof of Theorem 3.4 can be found in Appendix A, we provide a sketch of the main ideas below.

Proof Sketch for Theorem 3.4. The key technical novelty of this proof is a carefully designed Lyapunov (potential) function candidate, which we show to contract over time. The choice of the Lyapunov function candidate is given by

$$V_t \triangleq z_t + \alpha R_t^2, \quad \text{where } z_t = f(x_t) - f(x^*). \quad (3.8)$$

Note that when analyzing the convergence of vanilla unquantized gradient descent, it suffices to use z_t (defined in Eq. (3.8)) as the Lyapunov function [47]. However, such a choice is not enough to prove our convergence result due to the following reasons: (i) the dynamics of the iterate x_t are intimately coupled with the errors induced by quantization; and (ii) we also need to ensure that the errors due to quantization decay at a certain rate so that the algorithm achieves the desired overall convergence rate. In our proof, we show that the errors due to quantization are upper bounded by the dynamic range R_t of the quantizer. These motivate the choice of the Lyapunov function candidate in Eq. (3.8), which depends on the *joint evolution* of x_t and R_t .

Next, we argue that V_t decays to 0 exponentially fast at the same rate as that of unquantized gradient descent, i.e., at the rate in Eq. (3.5). To achieve this, we will rely on the following two intermediate lemmas.

Lemma 3.5. (No Overflow and Quantization Error) *Suppose f is L -smooth. The following are then true for all $t \geq 0$: (i) $\|i_t\| \leq R_t$; and (ii) $\|e_t\| \leq \gamma R_t$, where $e_t = \nabla f(x_t) - g_t$.*

Part (i) of Lemma 3.5 shows that the innovation i_t belongs to the ball $\mathcal{B}_d(0, R_t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Part (ii) of Lemma 3.5 tells us that the quantization error e_t can be upper bounded by the dynamic range R_t of the quantizer. It follows that if $R_t \rightarrow 0$, then $e_t \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma 3.6. (Recursion for Dynamic Range) *Suppose f is L -smooth. If α is such that $\alpha L \leq 1$, then for all $t \geq 0$, we have:*

$$R_{t+1}^2 \leq 8\gamma^2 R_t^2 + 2\alpha^2 L^2 \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2. \quad (3.9)$$

Lemma 3.6 also reveals that the dynamic range R_t depends on the magnitude of the gradient $\nabla f(x_t)$. Thus, to understand how the behavior of R_t relates to that of x_t , we need the choice of the potential function V_t in Eq. (3.8). Now, using the two lemmas above and under the assumptions of smoothness and gradient domination, we show that

$$V_{t+1} \leq \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{2}\right)}_{T_1} z_t + \underbrace{9\alpha\gamma^2 R_t^2}_{T_2}.$$

In the above display, T_1 represents the optimization error that corresponds to the convergence of $f(x_t)$ to $f(x^*)$, and T_2 represents the quantization error. Hence, to achieve the final rate in Eq. (3.5), we need the quantization error to decay faster than the optimization error. This can be achieved by choosing the bit-rate b as in Eq. (3.4) so that the contraction factor $\gamma = \sqrt{d}/2^b$ is small enough.

3.3 Achieving Minimal Bit-Rates using ϵ -net Coverings

As mentioned earlier, we see from Eq. (3.6) and Eq. (3.4) that the channel capacity above which AQGD preserves the same bounds as unquantized gradient descent contains an extra factor $\log(d)$ compared to the minimal required capacity shown in [32]. In this section, we will show that this extra $\log(d)$ factor can be shaved off by a more complicated quantization scheme (compared to the uniform scalar quantizer discussed in Section 3.1). Specifically, we will show that circular across-the-dimensions quantizers are more efficient than rectangular dimension-by-dimension vector quantizers as the number of dimensions of the target vector increases. Formally, we introduce the following notion of an ϵ -net [48].

Definition 3.7. *Consider a subset $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $\epsilon > 0$. A subset $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ is called an ϵ -net of \mathcal{K} if every point in \mathcal{K} is within a distance of ϵ of some point of \mathcal{N} , i.e., $\forall x \in \mathcal{K}, \exists x_0 \in \mathcal{N} : \|x - x_0\| \leq \epsilon$.*

Based on the ϵ -net defined above, we modify line 6 of Algorithm 1 to construct a γR_t -net of the ball $\mathcal{B}_d(0, R_t)$, where $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is again an input parameter to the algorithm that will be specified shortly. To be more specific, at each iteration t of Algorithm 1, the encoding region $\mathcal{B}_d(0, R_t)$ is covered by a union of balls each of radius γR_t . The center \tilde{i}_t of the ball containing the innovation i_t is determined, and a symbol corresponding to this center is transmitted to the decision-maker. We then have the following result for the AQGD algorithm when the encoding scheme described above is used.

Theorem 3.8. *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L -smooth and satisfies the gradient-domination property in Eq. (3.7). Consider the version of AQGD described above with*

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{3} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa}\right). \quad (3.10)$$

Let the channel bit-rate \bar{B} satisfy:

$$\bar{B} \geq d \log \left(7 \left(\frac{\kappa + 1}{\kappa - 1} \right) \right). \quad (3.11)$$

Then, with $\alpha \leq 1/(6L)$, the rate of convergence of this variant of AQGD is the same as that in Eq. (3.5).

Proof. The convergence proof is exactly the same as that for Theorem 3.4 in Appendix A. Specifically, we first note that if $i_t \in \mathcal{B}_d(0, R_t)$, then by definition of a γR_t -net of $\mathcal{B}_d(0, R_t)$, it holds that $\|i_t - \tilde{i}_t\| \leq \gamma R_t$. In addition, we need the following condition to hold:

$$9\gamma^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{2} \right) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{12\kappa} \right).$$

One can check that the choice of γ in Theorem 3.8 satisfies the above condition.

Next, we need to argue that the bit-rate in Eq. (3.11) suffices to construct a γR_t -net of $\mathcal{B}_d(0, R_t)$ at each iteration. To that end, we will require the concept of covering numbers.

Definition 3.9. (Covering Numbers) Let \mathcal{K} be a subset of \mathbb{R}^d . The smallest cardinality of an ϵ -net of \mathcal{K} is called the covering number of \mathcal{K} and is denoted by $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}, \epsilon)$. Equivalently, $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}, \epsilon)$ is the smallest number of closed balls with centers in \mathcal{K} and radii ϵ whose union covers \mathcal{K} .

We will rely on the following key result that relates the covering number of a set \mathcal{K} to its volume.

Lemma 3.10. (Covering Numbers and Volume) [48, Proposition 4.2.12] Let \mathcal{K} be a subset of \mathbb{R}^d , and $\epsilon > 0$. Then,

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}, \epsilon) \leq \frac{|\mathcal{K} \oplus (\epsilon/2)\mathcal{B}_d(0, 1)|}{|(\epsilon/2)\mathcal{B}_d(0, 1)|}.$$

Here, we used $|\mathcal{K}|$ to represent the volume of a set \mathcal{K} , and $\mathcal{K}_1 \oplus \mathcal{K}_2$ to denote the Minkowski sum of two sets $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Recall that our encoding strategy involves constructing a γR_t -net of the ball $\mathcal{B}_d(0, R_t)$. Invoking Lemma 3.10 with $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{B}_d(0, R_t)$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{B}_d(0, R_t), \gamma R_t) &\leq \frac{|(\mathcal{B}_d(0, R_t) \oplus (\gamma R_t/2)\mathcal{B}_d(0, 1))|}{|(\gamma R_t/2)\mathcal{B}_d(0, 1)|} \\ &= \frac{|(1 + \gamma/2) R_t \mathcal{B}_d(0, 1)|}{|(\gamma R_t/2)\mathcal{B}_d(0, 1)|} \\ &= \frac{[(1 + \gamma/2) R_t]^d}{[(\gamma/2) R_t]^d} \\ &= \left(\frac{2}{\gamma} + 1 \right)^d. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Plugging in the choice of γ from Eq. (3.10) into the above display and simplifying, we obtain:

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{B}_d(0, R_t), \gamma R_t) \leq \left(7 \left(\frac{\kappa + 1}{\kappa - 1} \right) \right)^d.$$

It follows that the maximum number of balls needed to cover the encoding region $\mathcal{B}_d(0, R_t)$ in any iteration t is upper bounded by the right-hand side of the above display; the same bound also

applies to the size of the binary alphabet Σ_t required for encoding the innovation \tilde{i}_t at any t . To realize such an alphabet Σ_t , the maximum number of bits we need is given by

$$\log(|\Sigma_t|) \leq d \log \left(7 \left(\frac{\kappa + 1}{\kappa - 1} \right) \right),$$

where $|\Sigma_t|$ denotes the cardinality of the alphabet Σ_t . This completes the proof. \square

Some remarks about Theorem 3.8 are now in order. First, we note that the channel capacity in Eq. (3.11) matches the minimal rate identified in [32]. Second, given $R > 0$, consider a quantization map $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,R} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ that satisfies the following bound for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$:

$$\|\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,R}(x) - x\| \leq \gamma R, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ such that } \|x\| \leq R.$$

Inspecting the convergence proof in Appendix A, one can show that *any* quantization map $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,R}(\cdot)$ that satisfies the above contraction property can be used in tandem with AQGD. However, there is a natural trade-off between the complexity of implementing a particular quantization map and the best contraction factor one can hope to achieve with it. For instance, while the scalar quantizer is easier to implement compared to the ϵ -net-based covering scheme described in this section, the latter leads to tighter contraction factors, which then translate to minimal bit-rates.² Such a trade-off reveals that the AQGD algorithm proposed in this work allows considerable flexibility in terms of the choice of the quantization map.

4 AQGD under Local Assumptions and with Noisy Gradients

When the system matrices A and B are unknown, directly computing $\nabla J(K)$ for a given $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is not possible and one may instead estimate $\nabla J(K)$ using the resulting trajectories of system (2.1) when the control policy K is applied. Such an estimate of $\nabla J(\cdot)$ can be viewed as a noisy version of $\nabla J(\cdot)$ (as we will argue in detail in Section 5). Thus, in this section, we first adapt our general design and analysis of Algorithm 1 to the setting when evaluating the gradient $\nabla f(\cdot)$ of the function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ incurs noise, and then specialize to the model-free LQR setting in Section 5.

To proceed, let $\widehat{\nabla f(x)}$ denote a noisy gradient of $f(\cdot)$ and we assume the error of $\widehat{\nabla f(x)}$ satisfies

$$\|\widehat{\nabla f(x_t)} - \nabla f(x_t)\| \leq \varepsilon_t, \forall t = 0, 1, \dots, \quad (4.1)$$

where x_t is chosen in Algorithm 1 and $\varepsilon_t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. As we argued above, Eq. (4.1) is a general noisy gradient model. We will show next in Section 5 that when applying Algorithm 1 to the model-free LQR problem, one can find a noisy gradient $\widehat{\nabla J(\cdot)}$ of the objective function $J(\cdot)$ that fits into the model of Eq. (4.1). In particular, the noisy gradient $\widehat{\nabla J(\cdot)}$ given in Section 5 will be shown to satisfy the condition in Eq. (4.1) only *with high probability*. Nevertheless, our analysis developed in this section can be adapted to account for the high probability upper bound on the error of the noisy gradient $\widehat{\nabla J(\cdot)}$ in the LQR setting. Note also that Eq. (4.1) allows a time-varying bound ε_t on the gradient noise, which readily captures the case of a uniform bound (i.e., $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon$ for all $t \geq 0$ and some $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$).

²For a discussion on constructing such coverings, see [49, 50] and the references therein.

To adapt Algorithm 1 to the noisy gradient setting described above, we make the following modifications to the algorithm:

- The computation of the innovation i_t in line 5 of Algorithm 1 is changed into

$$i_t = \widehat{\nabla f(x_t)} - g_{t-1}. \quad (4.2)$$

- The update rule of the range of the quantizer map in line 10 of Algorithm 1 is changed into

$$R_{t+1} = \gamma R_t + \alpha L \|g_t\| + \varepsilon_t + \varepsilon_{t+1}, \quad (4.3)$$

where the initial R_0 is picked such that $\widehat{\nabla f(x_0)} \leq R_0$.

Even though setting R_{t+1} as Eq. (4.3) requires the knowledge of ε_{t+1} and ε_t , we will show in the next section that when applying Algorithm 1 to the model-free LQR setting, one can compute ε_t based on some prior knowledge of system (2.1) (despite that the actual system matrices A, B are unknown). In the sequel, we will refer to the modified Algorithm 1 based on Eqs. (4.2)-(4.3) as Noisy AQGD (NAQGD). The intuitions behind the above modifications are as follows. First, since the true gradient $\nabla f(x_t)$ is not available, the innovation i_t is computed based on the noisy gradient $\widehat{\nabla f(x_t)}$ (rather than $\nabla f(x_t)$), where g_{t-1} is the gradient estimate at the beginning of iteration t in Algorithm 1. Next, since g_t contains an extra error term introduced by the noisy gradient $\widehat{\nabla f(x_t)}$, the range R_t of the quantizer needs to be increased to accommodate this extra error term.

We move on to characterize the convergence of NAQGD described above. Compared to our analysis in Sections 3.2, we need to resolve several extra challenges here. First, the noisy gradient $\widehat{\nabla f(x_t)}$ introduces an extra term in the error of the gradient estimate g_t in NAQGD, while the error of the gradient estimate g_t only depends on the quantization step in AQGD. Second, the LQR objective function $J(\cdot)$ defined in (2.3) does not possess the global smoothness and gradient-domination properties as required by Theorem 3.4 (see, e.g., [10]). Thus, we also need to extend our analysis in Section 3.2 to objective functions with "nice" local properties which are then applicable to the LQR problem. Finally, as we argued in Section 2, when finding $K^* \in \arg \min_K J(K)$ using an iterative algorithm (e.g., Algorithm 1), we need to ensure that all the iterates K_0, K_1, \dots stay in the set of stabilizing controllers. Since K is stabilizing if and only if $J(K)$ is finite [41], we impose a sublevel set of $f(\cdot)$ as a feasible set in the general problem. We introduce the following definition.

Definition 4.1. (Locally Smooth) A function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be locally (L, D) -smooth over $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ if $\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \leq L\|x - y\|$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and all $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|y - x\| \leq D$.

We now present our main result of this section; the detailed proof is included in Appendix B.

Theorem 4.2. (Convergence of NAQGD under Local Properties) Consider $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : f(x) \leq v\}$, where $v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Suppose $f(\cdot)$ is locally (L, D) -smooth over \mathcal{X} , $\|\nabla f(x)\| \leq G$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $f(\cdot)$ satisfies the following local gradient-domination property:

$$\|\nabla f(x)\|^2 \geq 2\mu(f(x) - f(x^*)), \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (4.4)$$

where $x^* \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)$. Suppose NAQGD is initialized with $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $f(x_0) \leq v/4$, and run with step-size $\alpha \leq \min\{D/(7G), 1/(6L)\}$. Moreover, suppose the gradient noise ε_t in Eq. (4.1) satisfies that for any $t \geq 0$, $\varepsilon_t \leq G$ and $\bar{\varepsilon}_t^2 \leq v\mu/60$, where

$$\bar{\varepsilon}_t^2 \triangleq \max_{s \in \{0, \dots, t\}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{3}\right)^{t-s} (8\varepsilon_{s-1}^2 + 6\varepsilon_s^2) \right\}, \quad (4.5)$$

with $\varepsilon_s \triangleq 0$ if $s < 0$. Let the contraction factor γ be the same as in Theorem 3.4. Then, for all $t \geq 0$, $f(x_t) \leq v/2$ and the following is true:

$$f(x_t) - f(x^*) \leq \max \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{3}\right)^t (f(x_0) - f(x^*)), \frac{15\bar{\varepsilon}_t^2}{\mu} \right\}. \quad (4.6)$$

Discussion. While the results in [32] and Section 3.2 hold for objective functions that enjoy global smoothness and strong convexity (or gradient domination) properties, the result in Theorem 4.2 holds more generally for functions that exhibit such properties only locally on the feasible set $\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : f(x) \leq v\}$.³ More importantly, Theorem 4.2 holds for scenarios with noisy gradients that satisfy the bound in Eq. (4.1). The standard gradient-descent method (without any quantization) has also been studied under the noisy gradient scenario in, e.g., [34], where $f(x_{t+1}) = f(x_t) - \alpha \widehat{\nabla f(x_t)}$. Interestingly, despite the quantization step, our algorithm (i.e., NAQGD) achieves the same convergence performance - as given by Eq. (4.6) (up to universal constants) - as that in [34]. Elaborating more on Eq. (4.6), the overall convergence result is characterized by a term with linear convergence and a term that depends on the gradient noise ε_t . Thus, an overall linear convergence result is achievable provided that the gradient noise ε_t decays exponentially with t . Alternatively, Eq. (4.6) shows that $f(x_t)$ converges exponentially fast to a neighborhood of $f(x^*)$ whose range is characterized by $\bar{\varepsilon}_t$. Finally, it is worth pointing out the following immediate corollary of Theorem 4.2 when the algorithm takes exact gradients.

Corollary 4.3. Suppose ε_t in Eq. (4.1) satisfies $\varepsilon_t = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ and consider the same settings as those in Theorem 4.2. Then, for all $t \geq 0$, $f(x_t) \leq v/2$ and the following is true:

$$f(x_t) - f(x^*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{3}\right)^t (f(x_0) - f(x^*)).$$

Corollary 4.3 can be viewed as a generalization of Theorem 3.3 when AQGD is applied to objective functions with only local smoothness and gradient-domination properties, and our proposed approach still achieves linear convergence rates.

Proof Sketch of Theorem 4.2. Similarly to Theorem 3.4, the proof relies on a carefully designed potential function V_t . In particular, since noisy gradients $\widehat{f(x_t)}$ are used in NAQGD, the choice of V_t also depends on the noise level ε_t of $\widehat{f(x_t)}$. In addition, to tackle the extra challenges introduced by the local properties of the objective function $f(\cdot)$, when upper bounding the innovation i_t and the gradient error $e_t = g_t - \nabla f(x_t)$, we need a more careful induction argument to prove the desired convergence result.

5 Application to the Model-Free LQR

We are now in place to apply the modified Algorithm 1 described above (i.e., NAQGD) to the model-free LQR case, i.e., when the agent (depicted in Fig. 1) does not have access to the system model A, B and thus *cannot* evaluate the true gradient $\nabla J(K)$ at any controller $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. For notational simplicity in the sequel, let us introduce the following:

$$\beta_0 I \preceq R \preceq \beta_1 I, \beta_0 I \preceq Q \preceq \beta_1 I, \Sigma_w \succeq \sigma_w^2 I, \|B\| \leq \psi, J(K^*) \leq \frac{J}{4}, \quad (5.1)$$

³Note that assuming $\varepsilon_t = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, the NAQGD algorithm reduces to AQGD introduced in Section 3.

where $\beta_0, \beta_1, \sigma_w, J \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $\psi \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$, and $J(K^*)$ is the optimal cost to problem (2.3). Moreover, we assume without loss of generality that $\beta_1 \leq 1$ (since one may always scale the cost matrices Q, R by a positive real number). In addition, we construct the following sublevel set of the LQR objective function $J(\cdot)$:

$$\mathcal{K} = \{K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} : J(K) \leq J\}, \quad (5.2)$$

and impose \mathcal{K} as the feasible set of $J(\cdot)$. We will use the following lemma in our analysis.

Lemma 5.1. *The objective $J(\cdot)$ in problem (2.3) and \mathcal{K} defined in Eq. (5.2) satisfy:*

- (a) [10, Lemma 1]&[51, Lemma 40] *For any $K \in \mathcal{K}$, the gradient of $J(K)$ satisfies $\nabla J(K) = 2((R + B^\top P_K B)K + B^\top P_K A)\Sigma_K$, where P_K, Σ_K are given in (2.5) and $\|P_K\| \leq 2\beta_1\zeta^4/(1-\eta)$.*
- (b) [51, Lemma 41] *For any $K \in \mathcal{K}$, it holds that $\|(A + BK)^k\| \leq \zeta\eta^k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\|K\| \leq \zeta$, where $\zeta \triangleq \sqrt{J/(\beta_0\sigma_w^2)}$ satisfies $\zeta \geq 1$ and $\eta \triangleq 1 - 1/(2\zeta^2)$.*
- (c) [10, Lemma 25] *For any $K \in \mathcal{K}$, it holds that $\|\nabla J(K)\|_F \leq G = \frac{2J}{\beta_0\sigma_w^2} \sqrt{(\sigma_w^2 + \psi^2)J}$.*
- (d) [34, Lemma 5] *Let $D = 1/(\psi\zeta^3)$. Then, $J(\cdot)$ is (D, L) -locally smooth with $L = 112\sqrt{n}J\psi^2\zeta^8/\beta_0$, i.e., $\|\nabla J(K') - \nabla J(K)\|_F \leq L\|K' - K\|_F$, for all $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and all $K' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $\|K' - K\|_F \leq D$; $J(\cdot)$ is (D, \bar{G}) -locally Lipschitz with $\bar{G} = 4\psi J\zeta^7/\beta_0$, i.e., $|J(K') - J(K)| \leq \bar{G}\|K' - K\|_F$ for all $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and all $K' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $\|K' - K\|_F \leq D$.*
- (e) [10, Lemma 11] *$J(\cdot)$ satisfies the gradient-domination property with $\mu = 2J/\zeta^4$, i.e., $\|\nabla J(K)\|_F^2 \geq 2\mu(J(K) - J(K^*))$ for all $K \in \mathcal{K}$, where $K^* = \arg \min_{K \in \mathcal{K}} J(K)$.*

Note that Lemma 5.1(c)-(e) show that the LQR objective function $J(\cdot)$ satisfies the local properties required by Theorem 4.2 over the set \mathcal{K} . Note also that the additional local Lipschitz property of $J(\cdot)$ will play a role when analyzing the noisy gradient of $J(\cdot)$ as we elaborate next.

Lemma 5.1(a) provides a closed-form expression of $\nabla J(K)$ which however depends on the system matrices A and B . For unknown A and B , we introduce in Algorithm 2 a noisy gradient oracle of $J(K_t)$ based solely on the observed system trajectories of system (2.1) when the control policy K_t is applied; similar noisy gradient oracles for model-free LQR have been considered in, e.g., [34, 10, 52]. Specifically, for any iteration $t = 0, 1, \dots$, of NAQGD, the worker agent obtains $\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)}$ from Algorithm 2 by playing $u_{t,k}^i = (K_t + U_t^i)x_{t,k}^i$ and observing $x_{t,k}^i$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, N_t - 1$ from ℓ_t trajectories of system (2.1) with length N_t , where $x_{t,k+1}^i = Ax_{t,k}^i + Bu_{t,k}^i + w_{t,k}^i$ and U_t^i is a random perturbation.⁴ The following remark discusses some important aspects regarding the implementation and analysis of NAQGD when applied to solve model-free LQR.

Remark 5.2. As we will show in our proof, Algorithm 2 relies on the random perturbation by U_t^i to ensure the bound on the noisy gradient $\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)}$ required by Eq. (4.1) and Theorem 4.2. Such random perturbations are typical in gradient-based methods without access to the true gradients [53, 54]. Note that both K and $\nabla J(K)$ are matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, while Algorithm 1 is designed for vectors $x, \nabla f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Nonetheless, one can first vectorize K and $\nabla J(K)$ to obtain vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and then apply Algorithm 1 to achieve the desired convergence performance. Finally, using the results in [48, Section 3.3.3], one can show that the random matrices $U_t^i \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ obtained as line 3 of Algorithm 2 (or the vectorized U_t^i in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$) are equal in distribution to a random vector sampled uniformly from the nm -dimensional unit sphere (i.e., $\{u : \|u\| = 1\}$).

⁴Note that we use t, i and k to index an iteration of NAQGD, a trajectory of system (2.1) and a time step in the trajectory used in Algorithm 2, respectively. We assume that $w_{t,k}^i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_w) \forall i \in [\ell_t], \forall k \in \{0, \dots, N_t - 1\}$ and $\forall t \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$.

Algorithm 2 Compute $\widehat{\nabla J}(K_t)$ for iteration t

- Input:** controller K_t , number of trajectories ℓ_t , trajectory length N_t , parameter r .
- 1: **for** $i = 1, \dots, \ell_t$ **do**
 - 2: **Initialization:** $x_{t,0}^i = 0$.
 - 3: Sample \widetilde{U}_t^i with i.i.d. entries from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and normalize $U_t^i = \widetilde{U}_t^i / \|\widetilde{U}_t^i\|_F$.
 - 4: Play $u_{t,k}^i = (K_t + rU_t^i)x_{t,k}^i$ and observe $x_{t,k}^i$ for all $k = 0, \dots, N_t - 1$.
 - 5: Compute $\widehat{J}_i = \frac{mn}{rN_t} \sum_{k=0}^{N_t-1} (x_{t,k}^{i\top} Q x_{t,k}^i + u_{t,k}^{i\top} R u_{t,k}^i) U_t^i$.
 - 6: **end for**
- Output:** $\widehat{\nabla J}(K_t) = \frac{1}{\ell_t} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_t} \widehat{J}_i$.
-

We now state our result for NAQGD when applied to solve model-free LQR; the detailed proof of Theorem 5.3 is included in Appendix B.

Theorem 5.3. Consider the same setting as Theorem 4.2 with the parameters D, G, L, μ of the LQR objective $J(\cdot)$ given by Lemma 5.1 and \mathcal{K} given by Eq. (5.2). Suppose NAQGD is applied to solve $\min_{K \in \mathcal{K}} J(K)$ with $\widehat{\nabla J}(K_t)$ given by Algorithm 2 for $t = 0, \dots, T - 1$, and initialized with $J(K_0) \leq J/4$. Let the step-size α and the contraction factor γ be the same as Theorem 4.2. For any $0 < \delta < 1$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_t = Lr + \frac{mnJ}{r\sqrt{\ell_t}} \sqrt{8 \log \frac{45T}{\delta} + \frac{10mn\beta_1\zeta^4 \text{tr}(\Sigma_w)}{3TN_t r(1-\eta)} \log \frac{27TN_t}{\delta}} \\ + \frac{10mn\beta_1\zeta^2 \text{tr}(\Sigma_w)}{r(1-\eta)^2} \log \frac{3N_t\ell_t T}{\delta} \left(\frac{1+\zeta^2}{\sqrt{\ell_t}} \sqrt{2 \log \frac{45T}{\delta} + \frac{\zeta^4}{N_t(1-\eta)}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where r is chosen to satisfy $r \leq \min\{J/(2\bar{G}), D\}$. Moreover, suppose N_t and ℓ_t are chosen such that $\varepsilon_t \leq G$ and $15\bar{\varepsilon}_t^2/\mu \leq J/4$ for all $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$, where $\bar{\varepsilon}_t$ is defined as Eq. (4.5) using ε_t given above. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, $J(K_t) \leq J/2$ and

$$J(K_t) - J(K^*) \leq \max \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{3}\right)^t (J(K_0) - J(K^*)), \frac{15\bar{\varepsilon}_{t-1}^2}{\mu} \right\}, \forall t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}, \quad (5.4)$$

where $K^* \in \arg \min_{K \in \mathcal{K}} J(K)$.

Discussion. Compared to the generic result provided in Theorem 4.2, the extra step here is to specify the choice of ε_t such that $\|\widehat{\nabla J}(K_t) - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F \leq \varepsilon_t$ for the noisy gradient $\widehat{\nabla J}(K_t)$ returned by Algorithm 2. Since $\widehat{\nabla J}(K_t)$ is stochastic due to the stochastic disturbance w_k in system (2.1), we show that the upper bound $\|\widehat{\nabla J}(K_t) - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F \leq \varepsilon_t$ holds with high probability under the choice of ε_t in Eq. (5.3) and consequently, the overall convergence result provided in Theorem 5.3 holds with high probability. Additionally, we see from the results in Lemma 5.1 that ε_t in Eq. (5.3) can be determined using the parameters of the LQR problem, including $\beta_0, \beta_1, \sigma_w, \psi, J$ in Eq. (5.1). Meanwhile, note that Eq. (5.3) can be equivalently written as $\varepsilon_t = \widetilde{O}(r + 1/(\sqrt{\ell_t}r) + 1/(N_t r))$, where $\widetilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides polynomial factors in problem parameters of LQR and logarithmic factors in T, N_t, ℓ_t . Thus, to satisfy the requirement on ε_t in Theorem 5.3, the lengths N_t and ℓ_t need to be greater than some polynomials in the problem parameters of LQR. Furthermore, setting the input

parameter t for Algorithm 2 to satisfy $r = \mathcal{O}(1/(\ell_t)^{1/4})$ and setting the trajectory length to be sufficiently long such that $N_t \geq \sqrt{\ell_t}$, one can show that $\varepsilon_t = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/(\ell_t)^{1/4})$.

Similar to our arguments before, the overall convergence of NAQGD (when applied to model-free LQR) is given by a term with linear convergence and a term that depends quadratically on the gradient noise ε_t . Alternatively, the convergence given by Eq. (5.4) in Theorem 5.3 can be interpreted as follows. Suppose we want to achieve a τ -convergence result, i.e., $J(K_t) - J(K^*) \leq \tau$ for some $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Letting N_t and ℓ_t to be the same for all $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$, we have $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon$ for some ε and for all t , and $\bar{\varepsilon}_t = 14\varepsilon_t$ for all t by Eq. (4.5), which implies via Eq. (5.4) that

$$J(K_t) - J(K^*) \leq \max \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{3}\right)^t (J(K_0) - J(K^*)), \frac{210\varepsilon^2}{\mu} \right\}.$$

Moreover, we know from our arguments above that $\varepsilon = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/(\ell_t)^{1/4})$, i.e., $\varepsilon^2 = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\sqrt{\ell_t})$. One can now deduce that to achieve the desired τ -convergence result, the number of iterations for NAQGD should satisfy $T = \mathcal{O}(\log(1/\tau))$ and the number of trajectories used in Algorithm 2 should satisfy $\ell_t = \mathcal{O}((1/\tau)^2(\log(1/\tau))^2)$ for all $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$. The above arguments yield the following sample complexity result which is a typical performance measure of learning algorithms for LQR (with unknown system model) [2, 6].

Corollary 5.4. *It requires $\mathcal{O}((1/\tau)^2(\log(1/\tau))^3)$ number of trajectories of system (2.1) for the NAQGD algorithm to achieve a τ -convergence result when applied to the communication-constrained model-free LQR.*

The above sample complexity result also matches with the result in [43] (up to logarithmic factors in $1/\tau$), where a version of LQR with discounted cost was studied in [43] for the model-free setting without any quantization, and the convergence result in [43] only holds with a constant probability of $3/4$.

Proof Sketch of Theorem 5.3. The main step in the proof of Theorem 5.3 is to upper bound $\|\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)} - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F$, where $\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)}$ is a random matrix due to the random disturbance in system (2.1). Since the noisy gradient $\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)}$ is not an unbiased estimate of $\nabla J(K_t)$, $\|\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)} - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F$ may not be upper bounded by directly applying standard concentration inequalities. Thus, we prove the result by introducing an unbiased estimate of $\nabla J(K_t)$, denoted as $\nabla J'(K_t)$, and decomposing $\|\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)} - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F \leq \|\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)} - \nabla J'(K_t)\|_F + \|\nabla J'(K_t) - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F$. We then provide upper bounds on the two resulting terms using concentration inequalities for martingales.

6 Numerical Results

To validate our theoretical results, we apply AQGD and NAQGD to solve instances of the LQR problem in (2.3) constructed below. Specifically, we generate a Schur-stable $A \in \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 5}$ matrix in a random manner and a $B \in \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 3}$ matrix is also generated randomly. The cost matrices are set to be $Q = 5I_{5 \times 5}$ and $R = 5I_{3 \times 3}$. The noise covariance is set to be $\Sigma_w = I_5$. We first apply AQGD (Algorithm 1) to solve the above LQR instances when the exact gradient $\nabla J(K)$ is available for a given stabilizing $K^{3 \times 5}$. Note that $K_0 = 0$ is an initial stabilizing controller since A is stable. The parameters in AQGD are set according to Corollary 4.3, where the parameters of the LQR problem are given by Lemma 5.1. In particular, we set the step size $\alpha = 10^{-3}$ and set $R_0 = G$ (since $\|J(K_0)\|_F \leq G$ by Lemma 5.1(c)). The performance of AQGD is presented in Fig. 3(a), which shows the exponential convergence of $J(K_t)$ to the optimal solution $J(K^*)$, aligning with the result in Corollary 4.3 and

also our findings in Sections 3-4. The fluctuation of the curve in Fig. 3 is due to the fact that when proving the convergence of AQGD, we only show that $V_t = J(K_t) - J(K^*) + \alpha R_t$ decays exponentially, i.e., $J(K_t) - J(K^*)$ can potentially increase in some iterations of AQGD.

Next, we apply NAQGD (described in Section 4) to the LQR instances constructed above using the noisy gradient $\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)}$ returned by Algorithm 2, where the parameters in NAQGD and Algorithm 2 are set according to Theorem 5.3. In particular, we set $\alpha = 0.2 \times 10^{-3}$, $r = 0.1$, $\ell_t = \ell \geq 30(1/\tau)^2(\log(1/\tau))^3$ (with $\tau = 0.1$) and $N_t \geq \ell_t$ for all $t \in \{0, \dots, 40\}$, which implies that $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon$ for all $t \in \{0, \dots, 40\}$ as per Eq. (5.3). We further set $R_0 = \varepsilon + G$ such that $\|\widehat{J(K_0)}\|_F \leq R_0$ (see our arguments in the proof of Theorem 5.3). While Fig. 3(a) shows that AQGD converges to $J(K^*)$, Fig. 3(b) shows that NAQGD converges (exponentially) to only a neighborhood around $J(K^*)$, which aligns with the result in Theorem 5.3. In addition, since the noisy gradients are used in NAQGD, we choose a more conservative step size α compared to that chosen in AQGD, which leads to a slower convergence rate in Fig. 3(b).




Figure 3: The suboptimality gap $J(K_t) - J(K^*)$ versus the iteration t in the AQGD and NAQGD algorithms. In Fig. 3(b), the results are averaged over 10 experiments and the shaded regions represent quantiles.

7 Conclusions and Future Directions

We studied policy gradient algorithms for the model-free LQR problem subject to communication constraints. Specifically, we considered a rate-limited channel and introduced a novel adaptively quantized gradient-descent algorithm titled AQGD. We showed that under assumptions of smoothness and gradient-domination, AQGD guarantees exponentially fast convergence to the globally optimal solution. More importantly, above a finite bit-rate, the exponent of convergence of AQGD remains unaffected by quantization. We further introduced a variant of AQGD that works under noisy gradients and local assumptions, and applied it to solve the model-free LQR problem, providing convergence and finite-sample guarantees along the way. Overall, our work can be seen as an initial attempt towards merging model-free control with the area of networked control systems. There are several open questions left open by our work. We discuss some of them below.

- **Adaptive Quantization for other optimization and RL problems.** One key message conveyed

by our work is the power of adaptive quantization. Using very simple guiding principles, we could craft algorithms that build on this powerful idea and incur no loss in performance above certain minimal requirements on the channel. This naturally begs the question: Can the ideas developed in this paper be applied more broadly to other classes of optimization and RL problems subject to bit-constraints? Our conjecture is that for stochastic approximation problems where the underlying operator exhibits some version of Lipschitzness (e.g., like the gradients in smooth optimization), similar ideas should likely go through.

- **Alternate Channel Models.** The bit-constrained channel model we studied in this work is arguably one of the simplest channel models. One natural direction is to explore other well-known models in the networked controls literature: packet-dropping models, noisy models, and channels that introduce latencies. In general, the interplay between different types of communication channels and the finite-time performance of RL algorithms is not well understood.
- **Communication-Efficient Multi-Agent RL.** The rationale for looking at communication constraints in this paper was broadly motivated by the areas of federated/multi-agent RL and RL-based control over networks. In particular, while some recent works have considered multi-agent versions of the LQR problem [30, 29], the aspect of how communication affects performance is not adequately explored in such works.

References

- [1] Aritra Mitra, Lintao Ye, and Vijay Gupta. Towards model-free lqr control over rate-limited channels. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, pages 1253–1265. PMLR, 2024. 1, 4
- [2] Anastasios Tsiamis, Ingvar Ziemann, Nikolai Matni, and George J Pappas. Statistical learning theory for control: A finite sample perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.05423*, 2022. 1, 18
- [3] Lintao Ye, Hao Zhu, and Vijay Gupta. On the sample complexity of decentralized linear quadratic regulator with partially nested information structure. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(8):4841–4856, 2023. 1
- [4] Horia Mania, Stephen Tu, and Benjamin Recht. Certainty equivalence is efficient for linear quadratic control. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019. 1
- [5] Max Simchowitz and Dylan Foster. Naive exploration is optimal for online lqr. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8937–8948. PMLR, 2020. 1
- [6] Bin Hu, Kaiqing Zhang, Na Li, Mehran Mesbahi, Maryam Fazel, and Tamer Başar. Toward a theoretical foundation of policy optimization for learning control policies. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 6:123–158, 2023. 1, 5, 18
- [7] Kaiqing Zhang, Bin Hu, and Tamer Basar. Policy optimization for h_2 linear control with h_∞ robustness guarantee: Implicit regularization and global convergence. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 59(6):4081–4109, 2021. 1
- [8] Feiran Zhao, Keyou You, and Tamer Başar. Global convergence of policy gradient primal-dual methods for risk-constrained lqrs. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2023. 1

- [9] Brian DO Anderson and John B Moore. *Optimal control: linear quadratic methods*. Courier Corporation, 2007. [1](#)
- [10] Maryam Fazel, Rong Ge, Sham Kakade, and Mehran Mesbahi. Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator. In *Proc. International conference on machine learning*, pages 1467–1476, 2018. [1](#), [5](#), [6](#), [14](#), [16](#)
- [11] Tianyi Chen, Kaiqing Zhang, Georgios B Giannakis, and Tamer Başar. Communication-efficient policy gradient methods for distributed reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 9(2):917–929, 2021. [2](#)
- [12] Konstantinos Gatsis. Federated reinforcement learning at the edge: Exploring the learning-communication tradeoff. In *2022 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 1890–1895. IEEE, 2022. [2](#)
- [13] Osama A Hanna, Lin Yang, and Christina Fragouli. Solving multi-arm bandit using a few bits of communication. In *Proc. International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 11215–11236, 2022. [2](#)
- [14] Francesco Pase, Deniz Gündüz, and Michele Zorzi. Remote contextual bandits. In *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 1665–1670, 2022. [2](#)
- [15] Aritra Mitra, Hamed Hassani, and George J Pappas. Linear stochastic bandits over a bit-constrained channel. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, pages 1387–1399. PMLR, 2023. [2](#)
- [16] Aritra Mitra, George J Pappas, and Hamed Hassani. Temporal difference learning with compressed updates: Error-feedback meets reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00944*, 2023. [2](#)
- [17] Nicolò Dal Fabbro, Aritra Mitra, and George J Pappas. Federated td learning over finite-rate erasure channels: Linear speedup under markovian sampling. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2023. [2](#)
- [18] Arman Adibi, Nicolò Dal Fabbro, Luca Schenato, Sanjeev Kulkarni, H Vincent Poor, George J Pappas, Hamed Hassani, and Aritra Mitra. Stochastic approximation with delayed updates: Finite-time rates under markovian sampling. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2746–2754. PMLR, 2024. [2](#)
- [19] Xingyu Sha, Feiran Zhao, and Keyou You. Asynchronous parallel policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.03233*, 2024. [2](#)
- [20] Leonardo F Toso, Han Wang, and James Anderson. Asynchronous heterogeneous linear quadratic regulator design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09061*, 2024. [2](#)
- [21] Sekhar Tatikonda and Sanjoy Mitter. Control under communication constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(7):1056–1068, 2004. [2](#), [3](#)
- [22] Girish N Nair and Robin J Evans. Stabilizability of stochastic linear systems with finite feedback data rates. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 43(2):413–436, 2004. [2](#)

- [23] Girish N Nair, Fabio Fagnani, Sandro Zampieri, and Robin J Evans. Feedback control under data rate constraints: An overview. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 95(1):108–137, 2007. 2, 3
- [24] Paolo Minero, Massimo Franceschetti, Subhrakanti Dey, and Girish N Nair. Data rate theorem for stabilization over time-varying feedback channels. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(2):243–255, 2009. 2
- [25] Pavankumar Tallapragada and Jorge Cortés. Event-triggered stabilization of linear systems under bounded bit rates. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(6):1575–1589, 2015. 2
- [26] Nuno C Martins. Finite gain lp stabilization requires analog control. *Systems & control letters*, 55(11):949–954, 2006. 2
- [27] Kunihisa Okano and Hideaki Ishii. Minimum data rate for stabilization of linear systems with parametric uncertainties. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1405.5932*, 2014. 2
- [28] Yiheng Lin, Guannan Qu, Longbo Huang, and Adam Wierman. Multi-agent reinforcement learning in stochastic networked systems. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:7825–7837, 2021. 3
- [29] Sungho Shin, Yiheng Lin, Guannan Qu, Adam Wierman, and Mihai Anitescu. Near-optimal distributed linear-quadratic regulator for networked systems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 61(3):1113–1135, 2023. 3, 20
- [30] Han Wang, Leonardo F Toso, Aritra Mitra, and James Anderson. Model-free learning with heterogeneous dynamical systems: A federated lqr approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11743*, 2023. 3, 20
- [31] Venkata Gandikota, Daniel Kane, Raj Kumar Maity, and Arya Mazumdar. vqsgd: Vector quantized stochastic gradient descent. In *Proc. International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2197–2205, 2021. 3, 4, 6
- [32] Chung-Yi Lin, Victoria Kostina, and Babak Hassibi. Differentially quantized gradient methods. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2022. 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15
- [33] Prathamesh Mayekar and Himanshu Tyagi. Ratq: A universal fixed-length quantizer for stochastic optimization. In *Proc. International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1399–1409, 2020. 3, 4, 6
- [34] Asaf B Cassel and Tomer Koren. Online policy gradient for model free learning of linear quadratic regulators with \sqrt{T} regret. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1304–1313, 2021. 4, 6, 15, 16, 37
- [35] Jeremy Bernstein, Yu-Xiang Wang, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, and Animashree Anandkumar. signsgd: Compressed optimisation for non-convex problems. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 560–569, 2018. 4
- [36] Sebastian U Stich and Sai Praneeth Karimireddy. The error-feedback framework: Better rates for sgd with delayed gradients and compressed communication. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05350*, 2019. 4, 7

- [37] Sebastian U Stich, Jean-Baptiste Cordonnier, and Martin Jaggi. Sparsified sgd with memory. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4447–4458, 2018. 4, 7, 9
- [38] Rajarshi Saha, Mert Pilanci, and Andrea J Goldsmith. Efficient randomized subspace embeddings for distributed optimization under a communication budget. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, 2022. 4, 6
- [39] Peter Richtárik, Igor Sokolov, and Ilyas Fatkhullin. Ef21: A new, simpler, theoretically better, and practically faster error feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:4384–4396, 2021. 4
- [40] Kaja Gruntkowska, Alexander Tyurin, and Peter Richtárik. Ef21-p and friends: Improved theoretical communication complexity for distributed optimization with bidirectional compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.15218*, 2022. 4
- [41] Dimitri P Bertsekas. Dynamic programming and optimal control 4th edition, volume ii. *Athena Scientific*, 2015. 5, 14, 35
- [42] Karl Mårtensson and Anders Rantzer. Gradient methods for iterative distributed control synthesis. In *Proc. IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 549–554, 2009. 5
- [43] Dhruv Malik, Ashwin Pananjady, Kush Bhatia, Koulik Khamaru, Peter L Bartlett, and Martin J Wainwright. Derivative-free methods for policy optimization: Guarantees for linear quadratic systems. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(21):1–51, 2020. 5, 6, 18
- [44] Jingjing Bu, Afshin Mesbahi, and Mehran Mesbahi. On topological properties of the set of stabilizing feedback gains. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(2):730–744, 2020. 5
- [45] Ilyas Fatkhullin and Boris Polyak. Optimizing static linear feedback: Gradient method. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 59(5):3887–3911, 2021. 5
- [46] Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003. 7
- [47] Sébastien Bubeck et al. Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 8(3-4):231–357, 2015. 7, 10, 36
- [48] Roman Vershynin. High-dimensional probability. *University of California, Irvine*, 2020. 11, 12, 16
- [49] Ilya Dumer, Mark S Pinsker, and Vyacheslav V Prelov. On coverings of ellipsoids in euclidean spaces. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 50(10):2348–2356, 2004. 13
- [50] Jean-Louis Verger-Gaugry. Covering a ball with smaller equal balls in \mathbb{R}^n . *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 33(1):143–155, 2005. 13
- [51] Asaf Cassel, Alon Cohen, and Tomer Koren. Logarithmic regret for learning linear quadratic regulators efficiently. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1328–1337, 2020. 16, 37

- [52] Yingying Li, Yujie Tang, Runyu Zhang, and Na Li. Distributed reinforcement learning for decentralized linear quadratic control: A derivative-free policy optimization approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(12):6429–6444, 2022. 16
- [53] Abraham D Flaxman, Adam Tauman Kalai, and H Brendan McMahan. Online convex optimization in the bandit setting: gradient descent without a gradient. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 385–394, 2005. 16, 33
- [54] Yurii Nesterov and Vladimir Spokoiny. Random gradient-free minimization of convex functions. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 17(2):527–566, 2017. 16
- [55] Sheng-De Wang, Te-Son Kuo, and Chen-Fa Hsu. Trace bounds on the solution of the algebraic matrix riccati and lyapunov equation. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 31(7):654–656, 1986. 35
- [56] Thomas P Hayes. A large-deviation inequality for vector-valued martingales. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 2005. 37

A Proof of Theorem 3.4

In this section, we will provide a proof for Theorem 3.4, which relies on a few intermediate lemmas. The first one below provides a bound on the performance of the scalar quantizer introduced in Section 3.1.

Lemma A.1. (Scalar Quantizer Bound) *Given a vector $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|X\| \leq R$, let $\tilde{X} = \mathcal{Q}_{b,R}(X)$. The following is then true:*

$$\|\tilde{X} - X\| \leq \gamma R,$$

where $\gamma = \frac{\sqrt{d}}{2^b}$.

Proof. The proof is straightforward, and we only provide it here for completeness. Let X_i and \tilde{X}_i be the i -th components of X and \tilde{X} , respectively. Since $\|X\| \leq R$, clearly $|X_i| \leq R, \forall i \in [d]$. From the description of the scalar quantizer in Section 3, if b bits are used to encode X_i , then it is easy to see that $|X_i - \tilde{X}_i| \leq 2^{-b}R$. We thus have:

$$\|\tilde{X} - X\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [d]} \|X_i - \tilde{X}_i\|^2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{d}}{2^b} R = \gamma R,$$

which is the desired claim. \square

Next, we prove Lemma 3.5 from Section 3.2 in the main body, which we restate below.

Lemma A.2. (No Overflow and Quantization Error) *Suppose f is L -smooth. The following are then true for all $t \geq 0$: (i) $\|i_t\| \leq R_t$; and (ii) $\|e_t\| \leq \gamma R_t$, where $e_t = \nabla f(x_t) - g_t$.*

Proof. Proof of part (i): We will prove this result via induction. For the base case of induction, we observe that at $t = 0$, $i_0 = \nabla f(x_0) - g_{-1} = \nabla f(x_0)$, since $g_{-1} = 0$. Now since R_0 is chosen such that $\|\nabla f(x_0)\| \leq R_0$, we conclude that $\|i_0\| \leq R_0$.

Now suppose $\|i_t\| \leq R_t$ holds for $t = 0, 1, \dots, k$, where k is some positive integer. Our goal is to show that $\|i_{k+1}\| \leq R_{k+1}$. To that end, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|i_{k+1}\| &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - g_k\| \\ &= \|\nabla f(x_{k+1}) - \nabla f(x_k) + \nabla f(x_k) - g_k\| \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} L\|x_{k+1} - x_k\| + \|\nabla f(x_k) - g_k\| \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \alpha L\|g_k\| + \|\nabla f(x_k) - g_k\|. \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

In the above steps, (a) follows from the definition of the innovation i_{k+1} (line 5 of AQGD); (b) follows from L -smoothness; and (c) is a consequence of the update rule of AQGD in Eq. (3.2). Now from line 8 of AQGD, we have

$$g_k = g_{k-1} + \tilde{i}_k = \nabla f(x_k) + \tilde{i}_k - i_k,$$

where in the last step, we used $i_k = \nabla f(x_k) - g_{k-1}$. We thus conclude that

$$\|e_k\| = \|\nabla f(x_k) - g_k\| = \|i_k - \tilde{i}_k\|. \tag{A.2}$$

From the induction hypothesis, we have $\|i_k\| \leq R_k$. Since $\tilde{i}_k = Q_{b,R_k}(i_k)$, Lemma A.1 then tells us that

$$\|i_k - \tilde{i}_k\| \leq \gamma R_k.$$

Combining the above display with Eq. (A.1) and Eq. (A.2) yields:

$$\|i_{k+1}\| \leq \gamma R_k + \alpha L \|g_k\| = R_{k+1},$$

where in the last step, we used the update rule for the range in Eq. (3.3). This concludes the induction step.

Proof of part (ii): In the above analysis, we have already shown that

$$\|e_t\| = \|\nabla f(x_t) - g_t\| = \|i_t - \tilde{i}_t\|.$$

Since from part (i), $\|i_t\| \leq R_t, \forall t \geq 0$, we have $\|i_t - \tilde{i}_t\| \leq \gamma R_t$ based on Lemma A.1. We conclude that $\|e_t\| \leq \gamma R_t, \forall t \geq 0$. This completes the proof. \square

Finally, we prove Lemma 3.6 from Section 3.2 in the main body.

Lemma A.3. (Recursion for Dynamic Range) Suppose f is L -smooth. If α is such that $\alpha L \leq 1$, then for all $t \geq 0$, we have:

$$R_{t+1}^2 \leq 8\gamma^2 R_t^2 + 2\alpha^2 L^2 \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Proof. From the update rule for the range in Eq. (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{t+1} &= \gamma R_t + \alpha L \|g_t\| \\ &\leq \gamma R_t + \alpha L (\|g_t - \nabla f(x_t)\| + \|\nabla f(x_t)\|) \\ &= \gamma R_t + \alpha L \|e_t\| + \alpha L \|\nabla f(x_t)\| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} (1 + \alpha L) \gamma R_t + \alpha L \|\nabla f(x_t)\| \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2\gamma R_t + \alpha L \|\nabla f(x_t)\|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where for (a), we used Lemma A.2, and for (b), we used the fact that $\alpha L \leq 1$. Squaring both sides of the final inequality above, and using the elementary fact that $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2, \forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, leads to the claim of the lemma. \square

With the above lemmas, We are in place to prove Theorem 3.4.

Proof. (Proof of Theorem 3.4): Consider the following potential function:

$$V_t \triangleq z_t + \alpha R_t^2, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where $z_t = f(x_t) - f(x^*)$. Our goal is to establish that the above potential function decays to 0 exponentially fast at a desired rate. To that end, we first recall that L -smoothness implies the following:

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|y - x\|^2, \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Using the above display, observe

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x_{t+1}) &\leq f(x_t) + \langle \nabla f(x_t), x_{t+1} - x_t \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|x_{t+1} - x_t\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} f(x_t) - \alpha \langle \nabla f(x_t), g_t \rangle + \frac{\alpha^2 L}{2} \|g_t\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} f(x_t) - \alpha \langle \nabla f(x_t), \nabla f(x_t) - e_t \rangle + \frac{\alpha^2 L}{2} \|\nabla f(x_t) - e_t\|^2 \\
&\leq f(x_t) - \alpha(1 - \alpha L) \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \alpha \langle \nabla f(x_t), e_t \rangle + \alpha^2 L \|e_t\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} f(x_t) - \alpha \left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha L \right) \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \alpha \left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha L \right) \|e_t\|^2 \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} f(x_t) - \alpha \left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha L \right) \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \alpha \gamma^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha L \right) R_t^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

In the above steps, for (a), we used Eq. (3.2); for (b), we used $e_t = \nabla f(x_t) - g_t$; and for (c), we used the elementary fact that for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds that

$$\langle a, b \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2} \|a\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|b\|^2.$$

Finally, (d) follows from part (ii) of Lemma A.2. Using the final display in Eq. (A.6) in tandem with Lemma A.3, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{t+1} &= z_{t+1} + \alpha R_{t+1}^2 \\
&\leq z_t - \alpha \left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha L \right) \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \alpha \gamma^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha L \right) R_t^2 + \alpha R_{t+1}^2 \\
&\leq z_t - \frac{\alpha}{2} (1 - 2\alpha L - 4\alpha^2 L^2) \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \alpha \left(8 + \frac{1}{2} + \alpha L \right) \gamma^2 R_t^2 \\
&\leq z_t - \frac{\alpha}{2} (1 - 3\alpha L) \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + 9\alpha \gamma^2 R_t^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

where in the last step, we used $\alpha L \leq 1/2$. Now suppose $\alpha L \leq 1/6$. Then the above display in tandem with the gradient domination property (see Eq. (3.7)) yields:

$$V_{t+1} \leq \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{2}\right)}_{T_1} z_t + \underbrace{9\alpha\gamma^2 R_t^2}_{T_2}. \tag{A.8}$$

Let us now make a couple of simple observations. Suppose we set $\alpha = \frac{1}{6L}$. Then, in the absence of the term T_2 above, it is easy to see that one can achieve a rate of the form $O(\exp(-t/\kappa))$, where $\kappa = L/\mu$. To continue to preserve this rate in the presence of the term T_2 - which arises due to quantization errors - we need T_2 to decay faster than T_1 . As such, we would like to have

$$9\gamma^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{2}\right) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{12\kappa}\right). \quad (\text{Rate Preservation Condition})$$

Recalling that $\gamma = \sqrt{d}/2^b$, a bit of simple algebra shows that

$$b \geq C \log \left(\frac{d\kappa}{\kappa - 1} \right),$$

suffices to ensure the rate preservation condition above. Thus, suppose the bit-precision b satisfies the condition in the above display. We then immediately obtain from Eq. (A.8) that

$$V_{t+1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{12\kappa}\right) (z_t + \alpha R_t^2) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{12\kappa}\right) V_t,$$

where in the last step, we used the definition of the potential function V_t from Eq. (3.8). Iterating the above inequality yields:

$$V_t \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{12\kappa}\right)^t (f(x_0) - f(x^*) + \alpha R_0^2).$$

The result follows by noting that $f(x_t) - f(x^*) = z_t \leq V_t$. \square

B Proofs Omitted in Section 4

B.1 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 3.4, we prove Theorem 4.2 via an induction on $t \geq 0$. However, since the innovation i_t and the range R_t of the quantizer map have been modified according to Eqs. (4.2) and (4.3), our analysis in this proof will be different from that for Theorem 3.4. We first prove via the induction that $\|i_t\| \leq R_t$, $\|e_t\| \leq \gamma R_t + \varepsilon_t$ and $f(x_t) \leq v/2$, $\forall t \geq 0$, where $e_t = \nabla f(x_t) - g_t$.

To prove the base case, we first recall that $f(x_0) \leq v/4$ as assumed. Moreover, since R_0 is picked to satisfy $\|\widehat{\nabla f(x_0)}\| \leq R_0$, we have $\|i_0\| = \|\widehat{\nabla f(x_0)}\| \leq R_0$. In fact, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\nabla f(x_0)}\| &= \|\widehat{\nabla f(x_0)} - \nabla f(x_0) + \nabla f(x_0)\| \\ &\leq \|\widehat{\nabla f(x_0)} - \nabla f(x_0)\| + \|\nabla f(x_0)\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon_0 + G, \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumptions in Eq. (4.1) and $\|\nabla f(x_0)\| \leq G$ (since $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$). Thus, we can choose $R_0 = \varepsilon_0 + G$. By the definition of Algorithm 1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_0\| &= \|\nabla f(x_0) - g_0\| \\ &= \|\nabla f(x_0) - g_{-1} - \tilde{i}_0\| \\ &= \|\nabla f(x_0) - \widehat{\nabla f(x_0)} + i_0 - \tilde{i}_0\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(x_0) - \widehat{\nabla f(x_0)}\| + \|i_0 - \tilde{i}_0\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon_0 + \gamma R_0, \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumption in Eq. (4.1) and Lemma A.1 via the fact that $\|i_0\| \leq R_0$.

To prove the induction step, suppose the following induction hypotheses hold for $k = 0, 1, \dots, t$: (i) $\|i_k\| \leq R_k$; and (ii) $f(x_k) \leq v/2$. Using the same arguments as Eq. (B.2) and the induction hypothesis $\|i_t\| \leq R_t$, one can show that $\|e_t\| \leq \varepsilon_t + \gamma R_t$. We now aim to show that $\|x_{t+1} - x_t\| \leq D$ so that the local properties of $f(\cdot)$ can be applied. We begin by relating x_{t+1} to x_t as

$$\|x_{t+1} - x_t\| = \|x_t - \alpha g_t - x_t\| = \alpha \|g_t\| \leq \alpha \|e_t\| + \alpha \|\nabla f(x_t)\|. \tag{B.3}$$

From Eq. (4.3), we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{t+1} &= \gamma R_t + \alpha L \|g_t\| + \varepsilon_t + \varepsilon_{t+1} \\
&\leq \gamma R_t + \alpha L \|e_t\| + \alpha L \|\nabla f(x_t)\| + \varepsilon_t + \varepsilon_{t+1} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \gamma(1 + \alpha L)R_t + \alpha L \|\nabla f(x_t)\| + (1 + \alpha L)\varepsilon_t + \varepsilon_{t+1} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2\gamma R_t + \alpha LG + 2\varepsilon_t + \varepsilon_{t+1},
\end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

where (a) follows from the fact $\|e_t\| \leq \varepsilon_t + \gamma R_t$ as we argued above, and (b) is due to the choice of α that satisfies $\alpha L \leq 1$ and the gradient upper bound $\|\nabla f(x_t)\| \leq G$ by the induction hypothesis $f(x_t) \leq v/2$, i.e., $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$. Setting γ (i.e., b) in the same way as Theorem 3.4 (see our arguments in the proof of Theorem 3.4) yields

$$9\gamma^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{2}\right) \leq 1,$$

where the second inequality follows from the choice of α ; we conclude that $0 < \gamma^2 \leq 1/9$ (i.e., $0 < \gamma \leq 1/3$). Unrolling the recursion in Eq. (B.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
R_t &\leq (2\gamma)^t R_0 + \sum_{k=1}^t (2\gamma)^{k-1} (\alpha LG + 2\varepsilon_{t-k} + \varepsilon_{t+1-k}) \\
&\leq G + \varepsilon_0 + \frac{\alpha LG + 3\bar{\varepsilon}}{1 - 2\gamma} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 4G + 10\bar{\varepsilon} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 14G
\end{aligned} \tag{B.5}$$

where (a) follows from $0 < \gamma \leq 1/3$ as we argued above and $\bar{\varepsilon} \triangleq \max_{t \geq 0} \varepsilon_t$, and (b) follows from the assumption that $\varepsilon_t \leq G$ for all $t \geq 0$. Substituting the last relation in Eq. (B.5) into $\|e_t\| \leq \varepsilon_t + \gamma R_t$ yields $\|e_t\| \leq G + 14\gamma G \leq 6G$, where we again invoke the assumption $\varepsilon_t \leq G$ and the fact $0 < \gamma \leq 1/3$. Returning to Eq. (B.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{t+1} - x_t\| &\leq \alpha \|e_t\| + \alpha \|\nabla f(x_t)\| \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 6\alpha G + \alpha G \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} D,
\end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

where (a) follows from the induction hypothesis $f(x_t) \leq v/2$ which implies that $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\|\nabla f(x_t)\| \leq G$, and (b) follows from the choice of α that satisfies $\alpha \leq D/(7G)$. It follows from Eq. (B.6) that the local (L, D) -smoothness property can be applied to x_{t+1} and x_t . We can now

upper bound $\|i_{t+1}\|$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|i_{t+1}\| &= \|\widehat{\nabla f(x_{t+1})} - g_t\| \\
&\leq \|\widehat{\nabla f(x_{t+1})} - \nabla f(x_{t+1})\| + \|\nabla f(x_{t+1}) - \nabla f(x_t)\| + \|\nabla f(x_t) - g_t\| \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \varepsilon_{t+1} + \|e_t\| + \|\nabla f(x_{t+1}) - \nabla f(x_t)\| \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \varepsilon_{t+1} + \varepsilon_t + \gamma R_t + L\|x_{t+1} - x_t\| \\
&\leq \varepsilon_{t+1} + \varepsilon_t + \gamma R_t + L\|x_t - \alpha g_t - x_t\| \\
&\leq \varepsilon_{t+1} + \varepsilon_t + \gamma R_t + \alpha L\|g_t\| \\
&\leq \gamma R_t + \alpha L\|g_t\| + \varepsilon_{t+1} + \varepsilon_t \\
&= R_{t+1},
\end{aligned} \tag{B.7}$$

where (a) follows from the assumption in Eq. (4.1), and (b) follows from the fact $\|e_t\| \leq \varepsilon_t + \gamma R_t$ as we argued above, and the (L, D) -smoothness of $f(\cdot)$. Thus, we have shown $\|i_{t+1}\| \leq R_{t+1}$ for the induction step.

To finish the induction step, it remains to show that $f(x_{t+1}) \leq v/2$. To this end, following the arguments to those for Eq. (A.6) and leveraging the (L, D) -smoothness of $f(\cdot)$ via Lemma C.1, one can relate $f(x_{t+1})$ to $f(x_t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x_{t+1}) &\leq f(x_t) - \alpha \left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha L \right) \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \alpha \left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha L \right) \|e_t\|^2 \\
&\leq f(x_t) - \frac{\alpha}{3} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \alpha(1 + 2\alpha L)(\gamma^2 R_t^2 + \varepsilon_t^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{B.8}$$

where the second inequality follows from $\|e_t\| \leq \gamma R_t + \varepsilon_t$ and the choice of α that satisfies $\alpha L \leq 1/6$. Let us denote $z_t = f(x_t) - f(x^*)$ and consider the following potential function:

$$V_t = z_t + z_{t-1} + \alpha R_t^2 \tag{B.9}$$

To relate V_{t+1} to V_t , we first show that

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{t+1} &= z_{t+1} + z_t + \alpha R_t^2 \\
&\leq z_t - \frac{\alpha}{3} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \alpha(1 + 2\alpha L)(\gamma^2 R_t^2 + \varepsilon_t^2) \\
&\quad + z_{t-1} - \frac{\alpha}{3} \|\nabla f(x_{t-1})\|^2 + \alpha(1 + 2\alpha L)(\gamma^2 R_{t-1}^2 + \varepsilon_{t-1}^2) + \alpha R_t^2 \\
&\leq z_t - \frac{\alpha}{3} \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 + \alpha(\gamma^2 + 2\gamma^2 \alpha L + 1)R_t^2 \\
&\quad + z_{t-1} - \frac{\alpha}{3} \|\nabla f(x_{t-1})\|^2 + \alpha(\gamma^2 + 2\gamma^2 \alpha L)R_{t-1}^2 + \alpha(1 + 2\alpha L)(\varepsilon_t^2 + \varepsilon_{t-1}^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{B.10}$$

where the first inequality follows from Eq. (B.8). Note that by squaring both sides of the second last inequality in Eq. (B.4) and using the fact $(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2) \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2, \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $\forall a_i \in \mathbb{R}$, we get

$$R_t^2 \leq 4\gamma^2(1 + \alpha L)^2 R_{t-1}^2 + 4\alpha^2 L^2 \|\nabla f(x_{t-1})\|^2 + 4(1 + \alpha L)^2 \varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + 4\varepsilon_t^2. \tag{B.11}$$

Substituting Eq. (B.11) into the last inequality of Eq. (B.10), using the local gradient-domination property for $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$, one can show via some algebra that

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{t+1} &\leq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha\mu}{3}\right) z_t + \left(1 - 2\left(\frac{1}{3} - 4(\gamma^2 + 2\gamma^2\alpha L + 1)\alpha^2 L^2\right)\alpha\mu\right) z_{t-1} \\
&\quad + \alpha\gamma^2 \left(4(\gamma^2 + 2\gamma^2\alpha L + 1)(1 + \alpha L)^2 + 1 + 2\alpha L\right) R_{t-1}^2 \\
&\quad + \alpha \left(4(\gamma^2 + 2\gamma^2\alpha L + 1)(1 + \alpha L)^2 + 1 + 2\alpha L\right) \varepsilon_{t-1}^2 \\
&\quad + \alpha \left(4(\gamma^2 + 2\gamma^2\alpha L + 1) + 1 + 2\alpha L\right) \varepsilon_t^2 \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha\mu}{3}\right) z_t + \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha\mu}{5}\right) z_{t-1} + 8\alpha\gamma^2 R_{t-1}^2 + 8\alpha\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + 6\alpha\varepsilon_t^2 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha\mu}{5}\right) (z_t + z_{t-1} + \alpha R_{t-1}^2) + 8\alpha\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + 6\alpha\varepsilon_t^2 \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha\mu}{5}\right) V_t + 8\alpha\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + 6\alpha\varepsilon_t^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{B.12}$$

where (a) uses the choice of α such that $\alpha L \leq 1/6$ and the fact $\gamma^2 \leq 1/9$, (b) follows from $8\gamma^2 \leq (1 - 2\alpha\mu/5)$ again due to the facts $\alpha L \leq 1/6$ and $\gamma^2 \leq 1/9$, and (c) follows from the definition of V_t . To proceed, we split our analysis into two cases. First, supposing $8\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + 6\varepsilon_t^2 \leq V_t\mu/15$, we have

$$V_{t+1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha\mu}{5}\right) V_t + \frac{V_t\mu}{15} = \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{3}\right) V_t. \tag{B.13}$$

Second, supposing $8\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + 6\varepsilon_t^2 > V_t\mu/15$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{t+1} &\leq \left(\left(1 - \frac{2\alpha\mu}{5}\right) \frac{15}{\mu} + \alpha\right) (8\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + 6\varepsilon_t^2) \\
&\leq \frac{15}{\mu} (8\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + 6\varepsilon_t^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.14}$$

It follows from the above two cases that

$$V_{t+1} \leq \max \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{3}\right) V_t, \frac{15}{\mu} (8\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + 6\varepsilon_t^2) \right\}. \tag{B.15}$$

Unrolling the above relation, one can show that

$$V_{t+1} \leq \max \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{3}\right)^{t+1} V_0, \frac{15\bar{\varepsilon}_t^2}{\mu} \right\}, \tag{B.16}$$

where $\bar{\varepsilon}_t$ is given by Eq. (4.5). Also recalling the definition of V_t and noting that $V_0 = z_0 + z_{-1} + \alpha R_{-1}^2$ with $z_{-1} \triangleq 0$ and $R_{-1} \triangleq 0$, we further obtain

$$f(x_{t+1}) - f(x^*) \leq \max \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\mu}{3}\right)^{t+1} (f(x_0) - f(x^*)), \frac{15\bar{\varepsilon}_t^2}{\mu} \right\}. \tag{B.17}$$

Invoking the assumptions that $f(x_0) \leq v/4$ (and thus $f(x^*) \leq v/4$) and $15\bar{\varepsilon}_t^2/\mu \leq v/4$, we get $f(x_{t+1}) \leq v/2$, completing the induction step. Note that we have also proved the desired convergence result. \square

B.2 Proof of Theorem 5.3

We begin by introducing some notations and definitions that will be used in this proof. Define an auxiliary function

$$J^r(K) = \mathbb{E}[J(K + rU)], \forall K \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (\text{B.18})$$

where U is uniformly distributed over the set $\{U : \|U\|_F = 1\}$. In addition, introduce the following probabilistic event for all $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ and all $i \in [\ell_t]$:

$$\mathcal{E}_t^i = \left\{ \|w_{t,k}^i\| \leq \sqrt{5 \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_w) \log \frac{3N_t \ell_t T}{\delta}}, \forall k \in \{0, \dots, N_t - 1\} \right\}. \quad (\text{B.19})$$

Lemma B.1. *The event \mathcal{E}_t^i defined in Eq. (B.19) holds with probability $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_t^i) \geq 1 - \delta/(3\ell_t T)$.*

Proof. By Lemma C.4, for any $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ and any $k \in \{0, \dots, N_t - 1\}$, it holds with probability at least $1 - \delta/(3N_t \ell_t T)$ that $\|w_{t,k}^i\| \leq \sqrt{5 \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_w) \log \frac{3N_t \ell_t T}{\delta}}$. Taking a union bound over all $k \in \{0, \dots, N_t - 1\}$ completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Claim B.2. *Consider any $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$. Then, (i) $J(K_{t'}) \leq J/2$ for all $t' \leq t$ hold with probability at least $1 - t\delta/T$; and (ii) $\|\widehat{\nabla J(K_{t'})} - \nabla J(K_{t'})\|_F \leq \varepsilon_{t'}$ for all $t' \leq t$ hold with probability at least $1 - (t+1)\delta/T$, where $\varepsilon_{t'}$ is given in Eq. (5.3).*

Proof. The base step in the induction holds since we assumed that $J(K_0) \leq J/4$. Next, consider a given $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ and suppose $J(K_t) \leq J/2$ for all $t' \leq t$ hold with probability at least $1 - t\delta/T$. We will show that $J(K_{t+1}) \leq J/2$ holds with probability at least $1 - (t+1)\delta/T$. Leveraging $J^r(\cdot)$ defined in Eq. (B.18), we first decompose the error of $\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)}$ as

$$\|\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)} - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F \leq \|\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)} - \nabla J^r(K_t)\|_F + \|\nabla J^r(K_t) - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F, \quad (\text{B.20})$$

and we will upper bound the two terms on the right-hand side of the above relation separately in the sequel. To upper bound $\|\nabla J^r(K_t) - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F$, we show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla J^r(K_t) - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F &= \|\nabla \mathbb{E}_U[J(K_t + rU)] - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F \\ &\leq \|\mathbb{E}_U[\nabla J(K_t + rU) - \nabla J(K_t)]\|_F \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_U [\|\nabla J(K_t + rU) - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} Lr, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.21})$$

where (a) follows from Jensen's inequality and the convexity of $\|\cdot\|$. To obtain (b), we first used the fact $K_t \in \mathcal{K}$ from the induction hypothesis, and then invoked the local (L, D) -smoothness of $J(\cdot)$ given by Lemma 5.1(d) based on the choice of r that satisfies $r\|U\|_F \leq D$, where recall that $\|U\|_F = 1$. We next upper bound $\|\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)} - \nabla J^r(K_t)\|_F$. Denoting $c_{t,k}^i = x_{t,k}^{i\top} Q x_{t,k}^i + u_{t,k}^{i\top} R u_{t,k}^i$, we see from Algorithm 2 that $\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)} = \frac{mn}{r\ell_t N_t} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_t} \sum_{k=0}^{N_t-1} c_{t,k}^i U_t^i$. We may further decompose $\|\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)} -$

$\nabla J^r(K_t)\|_F$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)} - \nabla J^r(K_t)\|_F &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{\ell_t N_t} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_t} \sum_{k=0}^{N_t-1} \frac{mn}{r} (c_{t,k}^i - J(K_t + rU_t^i)) U_t^i \right\|_F \\
&\quad + \left\| \frac{1}{\ell_t N_t} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_t} \sum_{k=1}^{N_t-1} \left(\frac{mn}{r} J(K_t + rU_t^i) U_t^i - \nabla J^r(K_t) \right) \right\|_F \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\ell_t} \underbrace{\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_t} \sum_{k=0}^{N_t-1} \frac{mn}{N_t r} (c_{t,k}^i - J(K_t + rU_t^i)) U_t^i \right\|_F}_{E_t^1} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\ell_t} \underbrace{\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_t} \left(\frac{mn}{r} J(K_t + rU_t^i) U_t^i - \nabla J^r(K_t) \right) \right\|_F}_{E_t^2}. \tag{B.22}
\end{aligned}$$

To upper bound E_t^2 in (B.22), we first note that $K_t \in \mathcal{K}$ (since $J(K_t) \leq J/2$ by the induction hypothesis) and obtain that for any $i \in [\ell_t]$,

$$J(K_t + rU_t^i) - J(K_t) \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \overline{G} \|rU_t^i\|_F \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{J}{2},$$

where (a) follows from the (D, \overline{G}) -local Lipschitz of $J(\cdot)$ in Lemma 5.1(d) via the choice of r that satisfies $r\|U_t^i\|_F = r \leq D$, and (b) follows from the choice of r that satisfies $r \leq J/(2\overline{G})$. Hence, we have $J(K_t + rU_t^i) \leq J$ and $(K_t + rU_t^i) \in \mathcal{K}$. Now, recalling from Remark 5.2 that U_t^i is equal in distribution to a random matrix selected uniformly from the set $\{U : \|U\|_F = 1\}$, one can obtain from [53, Lemma 2.1] that

$$\nabla J^r(K_t) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{mn}{r} J(K_t + rU_t^i) U_t^i \mid K_t \right], \forall i \in [\ell_t].$$

Denoting $X_t^i = \frac{mn}{r} J(K_t + rU_t^i) U_t^i - \nabla J^r(K_t)$, we obtain from our arguments above that

$$\|X_t^i\|_F \leq \left\| \frac{mn}{r} J(K_t + rU_t^i) U_t^i \right\|_F + \|\nabla J^r(K_t)\|_F \leq \frac{2mnJ}{r},$$

and $\mathbb{E}[X_t^i \mid K_t] = 0$ for all $i \in [\ell_t]$. Thus, we can apply Lemma C.5 and obtain that with probability at least $1 - \delta/(3T)$,

$$E_t^2 = \frac{1}{\ell_t} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_t} X_t^i \right\| \leq \frac{2mnJ}{\ell_t r} \sqrt{2\ell_t \log \frac{45T}{\delta}}. \tag{B.23}$$

To upper bound E_1 in (B.22), we first consider

$$\tilde{E}_t^1 = \frac{1}{\ell_t} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_t} \sum_{k=0}^{N_t-1} \frac{mn}{N_t r} (\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_t^i\} c_{t,k}^i - J(K_t + rU_t^i)) U_t^i \right\|_F.$$

Note that $\tilde{E}_t^1 = E_t^1$ holds with probability $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_t)$, where $\mathcal{E}_t \triangleq \bigcap_{i \in [\ell_t]} \mathcal{E}_t^i$. Using Lemma B.1, we have via a union bound that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_t) \geq 1 - \delta/(3T)$. Thus, an upper bound on \tilde{E}_t^1 will give an upper bound

on E_t^1 that holds with probability at least $1 - \delta/(3T)$. To this end, we upper bound \tilde{E}_t^1 and again decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_t^1 &\leq \frac{1}{\ell_t} \left\| \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_t} \sum_{k=0}^{N_t-1} \frac{mn}{N_t r} (\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_t\} c_{t,k}^i - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_t\} c_{t,k}^i | K_t, U_t^i]) U_t^i}_{Y_t^i} \right\|_F \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\ell_t} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_t} \left| \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{N_t-1} \frac{mn}{N_t r} (\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_t\} c_{t,k}^i | K_t, U_t^i] - J(K_t + rU_t^i))}_{Z_t^i} \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.24})$$

where we used the fact that $\|U_t^i\|_F = 1$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[Y_t^i | K_t, U_t^i] = 0$ for all $i \in [\ell_t]$. Moreover, we have that under the event \mathcal{E}_t ,

$$\begin{aligned} c_{t,k}^i &= x_{t,k}^{i\top} (Q + (K_t + rU_t^i)^\top R (K_t + rU_t^i)) x_{t,k}^i \\ &\leq \|Q + (K_t + rU_t^i)^\top R (K_t + rU_t^i)\| \|x_{t,k}^i\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} (1 + \zeta^2) \beta_1 \|x_{t,k}^i\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{(1 + \zeta^2) \beta_1 \zeta^2}{(1 - \eta)^2} \max_{0 \leq k \leq N_t-1} \|w_{t,k}^i\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{5(1 + \zeta^2) \beta_1 \zeta^2}{(1 - \eta)^2} \text{tr}(\Sigma_w) \log \frac{3N_t \ell_t T}{\delta}, \forall i \in [\ell_t] \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact $(K_t + rU_t^i) \in \mathcal{K}$ and Lemma 5.1(b), and (b) follows from Lemma C.2, and (c) follows from Eq. (B.19). Thus, we get from the definition of Y_t^i that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y_t^i\|_F &\leq \frac{2mn}{N_t r} \sum_{k=0}^{N_t-1} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_t\} c_{t,k}^i \|U_t^i\|_F \\ &\leq \frac{10mn(1 + \zeta^2) \beta_1 \zeta^2}{r(1 - \eta)^2} \text{tr}(\Sigma_w) \log \frac{3N_t \ell_t T}{\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.25})$$

We can now apply Lemma C.5 and obtain with probability at least $1 - \delta/(3T)$,

$$\frac{1}{\ell_t} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_t} Y_t^i \right\|_F \leq \frac{10mn(1 + \zeta^2) \beta_1 \zeta^2}{\ell_t (1 - \eta)^2} \text{tr}(\Sigma_w) \log \frac{3N_t \ell_t T}{\delta} \sqrt{2\ell_t \log \frac{45T}{\delta}}. \quad (\text{B.26})$$

To upper bound Z_t^i , we first observe that $\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_t\} c_{t,k}^i$ is equal (with probability one) to the cost corresponding to the system $x_{t,s+1}^i = (A + B(K_t + rU_t^i))x_{t,s}^i + \tilde{w}_{t,s}^i$ for $s = 0, 1, \dots$, where $\tilde{w}_{t,s}^i = \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_t\} w_{t,s}^i$. We then write

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_t^i| &= \frac{mn}{N_t r} \sum_{k=0}^{N_t-1} \left| \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_t\} c_{t,k}^i | K_t, U_t^i] - \tilde{J}(K_t + rU_t^i) + \tilde{J}(K_t + rU_t^i) - J(K_t + rU_t^i) \right| \\ &\leq \underbrace{\frac{mn}{N_t r} \sum_{k=0}^{N_t-1} \left| \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_t\} c_{t,k}^i | K_t, U_t^i] - \tilde{J}(K_t + rU_t^i) \right|}_{Z_{t,1}^i} + \underbrace{\frac{mn}{N_t r} \sum_{k=0}^{N_t-1} \left| \tilde{J}(K_t + rU_t^i) - J(K_t + rU_t^i) \right|}_{Z_{t,2}^i}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.27})$$

where $\tilde{J}(\cdot)$ is the cost defined as (2.3) when the disturbance $w_{t,k}^i$ is replaced by $\tilde{w}_{t,k}^i$ described above. Similarly to Eq. (2.4), we have $\tilde{J}(K) = \text{tr}(P_K \tilde{\Sigma}_w)$ for any $K \in \mathcal{K}$, where P_K is the solution to the Riccati equation in Eq. (2.5) and $\tilde{\Sigma}_w = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{w}_k \tilde{w}_k^\top]$ is the covariance of the disturbance $\tilde{w}_k = \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}_t\} w_k$ [41]. Using Lemma C.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{t,1}^1 &\leq \frac{mn}{N_t r} \frac{2\beta_1 \zeta^6}{(1-\eta)^3} \max_{0 \leq k \leq N_t - 1} \|\tilde{w}_{t,k}^i\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{10mn\beta_1 \zeta^6}{N_t r (1-\eta)^3} \text{tr}(\Sigma_w) \log \frac{3N_t \ell_t T}{\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

where we recalled the definition of \mathcal{E}_t^i in Eq. (B.19). Moreover, denoting $P_{K_t + rU_t^i}$ as the solution to the Riccati equation in Eq. (2.5) associated with $K_t + rU_t^i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{t,2}^i &= \frac{mn}{r} \left| \tilde{J}(K_t + rU_t^i) - J(K_t + rU_t^i) \right| \\ &= \frac{mn}{r} \left| \text{tr} \left(P_{K_t + rU_t^i} (\tilde{\Sigma}_w - \Sigma_w) \right) \right| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{mn}{r} \text{tr} \left(P_{K_t + rU_t^i} (\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}\{(\mathcal{E}_t^i)^c\} w_{t,k}^i w_{t,k}^{i\top}]) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{mn}{r} \|P_{K_t + rU_t^i}\| \text{tr} \left(\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}\{(\mathcal{E}_t^i)^c\} w_{t,k}^i w_{t,k}^{i\top}] \right) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{2mn\beta_1 \zeta^4}{r(1-\eta)} \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}\{(\mathcal{E}_t^i)^c\} \|w_{t,k}^i\|^2] \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \frac{10mn\beta_1 \zeta^4}{3TN_t r (1-\eta)} \text{tr}(\Sigma_w) \log \frac{27TN_t}{\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $\Sigma_w - \tilde{\Sigma}_w = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{(\mathcal{E}_t^i)^c\} w_{t,k}^i w_{t,k}^{i\top}] \geq 0$, (b) follows from standard trace inequality [55], (c) follows from Lemma C.2 via the fact that $(K_t + rU_t^i) \in \mathcal{K}$ as we argued above, and (d) follows from Lemma C.4 via the fact $\mathbb{P}((\mathcal{E}_t^i)^c) \leq \delta/(3N_t T)$ by Lemma B.1. Hence, we have shown an upper bound on $|Z_t^i|$ as per (B.27).

Now, recalling that (B.26) holds with probability at least $1 - \delta/(3T)$, we can use (B.26) and (B.27) in (B.24) to obtain an upper bound on \tilde{E}_t^1 that holds with probability at least $1 - \delta/(3T)$. Since $\tilde{E}_t^1 = E_t^1$ holds with probability $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_t) \geq 1 - \delta/(3T)$ as we argued above, a union bound implies an upper bound on \tilde{E}_t^1 as per (B.24) that holds with probability at least $1 - 2\delta/(3T)$. Additionally, recalling that we have shown that the upper bound on E_t^2 in (B.23) holds with probability at least $1 - \delta/(3T)$, we can further apply a union bound to combine the upper bound on \tilde{E}_t^1 in (B.24) and the upper bound on E_t^2 in (B.23), which gives the upper bound $\|\widehat{\nabla J}(K_t) - \nabla J^r(K_t)\|_F \leq \varepsilon_t$ as per (B.22) that holds with probability at least $1 - \delta/T$, where ε_t is given by Eq. (5.3). Finally, since all the arguments above for the induction step rely on the induction hypothesis $J(K_t) \leq J/2$ that holds with probability at least $1 - t\delta/T$, another union bound shows that the upper bound $\|\widehat{\nabla J}(K_t) - \nabla J^r(K_t)\|_F \leq \varepsilon_t$ holds with probability at least $1 - (t+1)\delta/T$. By our choices of N_t and ℓ_t given in Theorem 5.3, we have that $15\bar{\varepsilon}_t^2/\mu \leq J/4$, where μ is given in Lemma 5.1(e) and $\bar{\varepsilon}_t$ is defined as Eq. (4.5) using ε_t in Eq. (5.3). Hence, one can now use similar arguments to those in the proof of Theorem 4.2 leading up to (B.17) to show that $J(K_{t+1}) \leq J/2$ holds with probability at least $1 - (t+1)\delta/T$, completing the induction step of the proof of part (i) in Claim B.2. Note that part (ii) of Claim B.2 was readily proved by our above arguments. \square

Proof. (**Proof of Theorem 4.2**) We see from Claim B.2 that the following hold with probability at least $1 - \delta$: $J(K_t) \leq v/2$ for all $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, and $\|\widehat{\nabla J(K_t)} - \nabla J(K_t)\|_F \leq \varepsilon_t$ for all $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$. Based on the choices of N_t, ℓ_t such that $15\bar{\varepsilon}_t^2/\mu \leq J/4$ as we argued above, the results in Theorem 5.3 follow directly from the arguments in the proof of Theorem 4.2 \square

C Auxiliary Lemmas

Lemma C.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be locally (L, D) -smooth over $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|y - x\| \leq D$,*

$$f(y) \leq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|y - x\|^2. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Proof. The proof follows from adapting the standard result in e.g. [47, Lemma 3.4]. Fix any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|y - x\| \leq D$. We may write $f(y) - f(x)$ as an integral and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & f(y) - f(x) - \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle \\ &= \int_0^1 \langle \nabla f(x + t(y - x)), y - x \rangle dt - \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \int_0^1 \|\nabla f(x + t(y - x)) - \nabla f(x)\| \|y - x\| dt \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \int_0^1 Lt \|y - x\|^2 dt \\ &= \frac{L}{2} \|y - x\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and (b) follows from Definition 4.1 via the fact that $\|x + t(y - x) - x\| \leq D$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. \square

Lemma C.2. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with \mathcal{K} defined in Eq. (5.2). Then, for any $k \geq 1$, the state of system (2.1) given by $x_{s+1} = Ax_s + Bu_s + w_s$ for $s = 0, \dots, k-1$ with $u_s = Kx_s$ and $x_0 = 0$ satisfies that*

$$\|x_k\| \leq \frac{\zeta}{1 - \eta} \max_{0 \leq s \leq k-1} \|w_s\|, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where ζ and η are given in Lemma 5.1. Moreover, the solution to the Riccati equation (2.5), i.e., $P_K \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$, satisfies that

$$\|P_K\| \leq \frac{2\beta_1\zeta^4}{1 - \eta}.$$

Proof. First, one can obtain from (2.1) that

$$x_k = (A + BK_t)^k x_0 + \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} (A + BK_t)^{k-(s+1)} w_s. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Recalling from Lemma 5.1(b) that $\|(A + BK_t)^k\| \leq \zeta \eta^k$, we further obtain

$$\|x_k\| \leq \zeta \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \eta^k \|w_s\| \leq \frac{\zeta}{1 - \eta} \max_{0 \leq s \leq k-1} \|w_s\|. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

The upper bound on $\|P_K\|$ is proved in the proof of [51, Lemma 40]. \square

Lemma C.3. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with \mathcal{K} defined in Eq. (5.2). Consider the state of system (2.1) given by $x_{s+1} = (A + BK)x_s + w_s$ for $s = 0, \dots, k-1$ with $x_0 = 0$. Then, for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\left| \sum_{s=1}^k \mathbb{E} [x_s^\top (Q + K^\top RK)x_s] - kJ(K) \right| \leq \frac{2\beta_1\zeta^6}{(1-\eta)^3} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{0 \leq s \leq k} \|w_s\|^2 \right],$$

where $J(\cdot)$ is the cost of K given in (2.3), β_1 is given in (5.1) and η, ζ are given in Lemma 5.1.

Proof. Following the arguments in the proof of [51, Lemma 40], we have

$$\left| \sum_{s=1}^k \mathbb{E} [x_s^\top (Q + K^\top RK)x_s] - kJ(K) \right| = \mathbb{E} [x_{k+1}^\top P_K x_{k+1}] \leq \|P_K\| \mathbb{E} [x_{k+1}^\top x_{k+1}],$$

where $P_K \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$ is the positive definite to the Riccati equation given by Eq. (2.5). Now, using the result of Lemma C.2, we finish the proof of Lemma C.3. \square

Lemma C.4. Let $w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_w)$ with $\Sigma_w \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$. (a) For any $0 < \delta < 1/e$, the following holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$\|w\| \leq \sqrt{5 \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_w) \log \frac{1}{\delta}}.$$

(b) Let $0 < \delta' < 1$ and let \mathcal{E} be a probabilistic event that holds with probability $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \delta'$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\} \|w\|^2] \leq 5 \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_w) \delta' \log \frac{9}{\delta'}.$$

Proof. Part (a) is [34, Lemma 14]. Using similar arguments to those in the proof of [51, Lemma 35], one can prove part (b). \square

Lemma C.5. (Vector Azuma Inequality) Given a real Euclidean space E , let $\|X_k\|_{k \geq 1}$ be a martingale difference sequence adapted to a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}_{k \geq 0}$, i.e., $X_k \in E$ is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable and $\mathbb{E}[X_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$. Suppose $\|X_k\| \leq b$ for all $k \geq 0$. Then, for any $s \geq 1$ and any $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}e^{-2}$,

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^s X_k \right\| \leq b \sqrt{2s \log \frac{15}{\delta}}.$$

Proof. This lemma is a direct consequence of [56, Theorem 1.8]. \square