

# Statistical Efficiency of Distributional Temporal Difference

Yang Peng\*

Liangyu Zhang<sup>†</sup>

Zihua Zhang<sup>‡</sup>

March 12, 2024

## Abstract

Distributional reinforcement learning (DRL), which cares about the full distribution of returns instead of just the mean, has achieved empirical success in various domains. One of the core tasks in the field of DRL is distributional policy evaluation, which involves estimating the return distribution  $\eta^\pi$  for a given policy  $\pi$ . A distributional temporal difference (TD) algorithm has been accordingly proposed, which is an extension of the temporal difference algorithm in the classic RL literature. In the tabular case, Rowland et al. [19] and Rowland et al. [20] proved the asymptotic convergence of two instances of distributional TD, namely categorical temporal difference algorithm (CTD) and quantile temporal difference algorithm (QTD), respectively. In this paper, we go a step further and analyze the finite-sample performance of distributional TD. To facilitate theoretical analysis, we propose non-parametric distributional TD algorithm (NTD). For a  $\gamma$ -discounted infinite-horizon tabular Markov decision process with state space  $\mathcal{S}$  and action space  $\mathcal{A}$ , we show that in the case of NTD we need  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p(1-\gamma)^{2p+2}}}\right)$  iterations to achieve an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal estimator with high probability, when the estimation error is measured by the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance. Under some mild assumptions,  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^4}\right)$  iterations suffices to ensure the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance between the NTD estimator  $\hat{\eta}^\pi$  and  $\eta^\pi$  less than  $\varepsilon$  with high probability. And we revisit CTD, showing that the same non-asymptotic convergence bounds hold for CTD in the case of the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance.

## 1 Introduction

In certain applications of reinforcement learning (RL), such as healthcare [12, 4] and finance[9], only considering the mean of returns is insufficient. It is necessary to incorporate risk and uncertainties

---

\*School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University; email: pengyang@pku.edu.cn.

<sup>†</sup>Academy for Advanced Interdisciplinary Studies, Peking University; email: zhangliangyu@pku.edu.cn.

<sup>‡</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University; email: zhzhang@math.pku.edu.cn.

into consideration. Distributional reinforcement learning (DRL) [15, 1, 2] addresses such issues by modeling the complete distribution of returns.

In the field of DRL, we need to estimate the return distributions  $\eta^\pi$  for a given policy  $\pi$ , which is referred to as distributional policy evaluation. Distributional temporal difference (TD) algorithms are one of the fundamental methodologies for solving the distributional policy evaluation problem. A key aspect of implementing a practical distributional TD algorithm is how to represent the return distribution, an infinite-dimensional object, with a computationally feasible finite-dimensional parametrization. This has led to the development of two special instances of distributional TD: categorical temporal difference algorithm (CTD) [1] and quantile temporal difference algorithm (QTD) [6]. These methods provide computationally tractable parametrizations and updating schemes of the return distributions.

Previous theoretical works have primarily focused on the asymptotic behaviors of distributional TD. In particular, Rowland et al. [19] and Rowland et al. [20] showed the asymptotic convergence of CTD and QTD in the tabular case, respectively. A natural question arises: *can we depict the finite-sample behavior of distributional TD by non-asymptotic results similar to classic TD algorithm [13]?*

## 1.1 Contributions

In this paper, we manage to answer the above question in the synchronous setting [10, 11], for a  $\gamma$ -discounted infinite-horizon tabular Markov decision process (MDP). Firstly, we introduce the non-parametric distributional TD algorithm (NTD), which is not practical but aids in theoretical understanding. We establish that  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p}(1-\gamma)^{2p+2}}\right)^1$  iterations are sufficient to ensure the  $p$ -Wasserstein metric between the NTD estimator  $\hat{\eta}^\pi$  and  $\eta^\pi$  is less than  $\varepsilon$  with high probability. Moreover, under certain mild conditions,  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^4}\right)$  iterations are sufficient to guarantee the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) metric between the NTD estimator  $\hat{\eta}^\pi$  and  $\eta^\pi$  is less than  $\varepsilon$  with high probability. Next, we revisit the more practical CTD, and show that, in terms of the  $p$ -Wasserstein metric, CTD and NTD have the same non-asymptotic convergence bounds.

---

<sup>1</sup>Throughout this paper, the notation  $f(\cdot) = \tilde{O}(g(\cdot))$  ( $f(\cdot) = \tilde{\Omega}(g(\cdot))$ ) means that  $f(\cdot)$  is order-wise no larger (smaller) than  $g(\cdot)$ , ignoring logarithmic factors, as  $|\mathcal{S}|, |\mathcal{A}|, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\delta} \rightarrow \infty$ .

## 1.2 Related Work

Recently, there has been an emergence of work focusing on finite-sample/iteration results in the distributional policy evaluation literature. Böck and Heitzinger [3] proposed speedy CTD (or speedy categorical policy evaluation, SCPE), a variant of CTD motivated by [7], and derived sample complexity bounds in the synchronous setting:  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^4}\right)$  iterations are enough to obtain an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal estimator when the estimation error is measured by 1-Wasserstein metric. Zhang et al. [25] proposed to solve distributional policy evaluation by the model-based approach and derived corresponding sample complexity bounds, namely  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p}(1-\gamma)^{2p+2}}\right)$  in the case of  $p$ -Wasserstein metric, and  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^4}\right)$  in the case of KS metric and total variation metric under different mild conditions. Rowland et al. [21] proposed direct categorical fixed-point computation (DCFP), a model-based version of CTD, in which they constructed the estimator by solving a linear system directly instead of performing an iterative algorithm. They showed that the sample complexity of DCFP is  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^3}\right)$  in the case of 1-Wasserstein metric. This upper bound matches existing lower bounds (up to logarithmic factors) and thus solve an open problem raised in [25]. Roughly speaking, their results imply that learning the full return distribution can be as sample-efficient as learning just its expectation [8]. Wu et al. [24] studied the offline distributional policy evaluation problem, they solved the problem via fitted likelihood estimation (FLE) inspired by the classic offline policy evaluation algorithm fitted Q evaluation (FQE), and provided a generalization bound in the case of  $p$ -Wasserstein metric.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some background of DRL and distributional TD, and propose NTD for further theoretical analysis. In Section 3, we analyze the statistical efficiency of NTD and CTD. And Section 4 presents proof outlines of our theoretical results.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Markov Decision Processes

An infinite-horizon tabular MDP is defined by a 5-tuple  $M = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}_R, P, \gamma \rangle$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  represents a finite state space,  $\mathcal{A}$  a finite action space,  $\mathcal{P}_R$  the distribution of rewards,  $P$  the transition dynamics, *i.e.*,  $\mathcal{P}_R(\cdot|s, a) \in \Delta([0, 1])$ ,  $P(\cdot|s, a) \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$  for any state action pair  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  a discounted factor. Here we use  $\Delta(\cdot)$  to represent the set of all probability distributions over some set. Given a policy  $\pi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$  and an initial state  $s_0 = s \in \mathcal{S}$ , a random trajectory  $\{(s_t, a_t, t_t)_{t=0}^\infty\}$

can be sampled from  $M$ :  $a_t | s_t \sim \pi(\cdot | s_t)$ ,  $r_t | (s_t, a_t) \sim \mathcal{P}_R(\cdot | s_t, a_t)$ ,  $s_{t+1} | (s_t, a_t) \sim P(\cdot | s_t, a_t)$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Given a trajectory, we define the return by

$$G^\pi(s) := \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t. \quad (1)$$

According to Proposition 2.1 in [25],  $G^\pi(s)$  is a random variable in  $\left[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right]$ . We denote  $\eta^\pi(s)$  as the probability distribution of  $G^\pi(s)$ , and  $\eta^\pi := (\eta^\pi(s))_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$ . The expected return  $V^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}G^\pi(s)$  is the value function in traditional RL.

## 2.2 Distributional Bellman Equation and Operator

Recall the classic policy evaluation task, *i.e.*, evaluating the value functions  $V^\pi$ . It is known that  $V^\pi = (V^\pi(s))_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$  satisfy the Bellman equation, *i.e.*, for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} V^\pi(s) &= [T^\pi(V^\pi)](s) \\ &:= \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot | s), r \sim \mathcal{P}_R(\cdot | s, a)} [r] + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot | s), s' \sim P(\cdot | s, a)} [V^\pi(s')] \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a | s) \int_0^1 r \mathcal{P}_R(dr | s, a) + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}, s' \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(a | s) P(s' | s, a) V^\pi(s') \\ &=: r^\pi(s) + \gamma (P^\pi V^\pi)(s), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

or in a matrix-vector form

$$V^\pi = T^\pi(V^\pi) := r^\pi + \gamma P^\pi V^\pi.$$

The operator  $T^\pi: \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$  is called the Bellman operator, and  $V^\pi$  is a fixed point of  $T^\pi$ .

The task of distributional policy evaluation is finding  $\eta^\pi$  given some fixed policy  $\pi$ .  $\eta^\pi$  satisfies a distributional version of the Bellman equation (2), *i.e.*, for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^\pi(s) &= [\mathcal{T}^\pi(\eta^\pi)](s) \\ &:= \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot | s), r \sim \mathcal{P}_R(\cdot | s, a), s' \sim P(\cdot | s, a)} \left[ (b_{r, \gamma})_{\#} \eta^\pi(s') \right] \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}, s' \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(a | s) P(s' | s, a) \int_0^1 (b_{r, \gamma})_{\#} \eta^\pi(s') \mathcal{P}_R(dr | s, a). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here  $b_{r, \gamma}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an affine function defined by  $b_{r, \gamma}(x) = r + \gamma x$ , and  $f_{\#} \mu$  is the push forward measure of  $\mu$  through any function  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , so that  $f_{\#} \mu(A) = \mu(f^{-1}(A))$ , for any Borel set  $A$ ,

where  $f^{-1}(A) := \{x: f(x) \in A\}$ . The integral  $\int_0^1 (b_{r,\gamma})_{\#} \eta^\pi(s') \mathcal{P}_R(dr | s, a)$  is defined by

$$\left[ \int_0^1 (b_{r,\gamma})_{\#} \eta^\pi(s') \mathcal{P}_R(dr | s, a) \right] (B) = \int_0^1 \left[ (b_{r,\gamma})_{\#} \eta^\pi(s') \right] (B) \mathcal{P}_R(dr | s, a)$$

for any Borel set  $B$  in  $\left[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right]$ . The operator  $\mathcal{T}^\pi: \Delta\left(\left[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \Delta\left(\left[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{\mathcal{S}}$  is known as the distributional Bellman operator, and  $\eta^\pi$  is a fixed point of  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$ .

For simplicity, we will denote  $\Delta\left(\left[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right]\right)$  as  $\mathcal{P}$  from now on.

### 2.3 $\mathcal{T}^\pi$ as Contraction in $\mathcal{P}$

A key property of the Bellman operator  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  is that it is a  $\gamma$ -contraction w.r.t. the supreme norm. However, before we can properly discuss the contraction properties of  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$ , we need to specify a metric  $d$  on  $\mathcal{P}$ . And for any metric  $d$  on  $\mathcal{P}$ , we denote  $\bar{d}$  as the corresponding supreme metric on  $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , i.e.,  $\bar{d}(\eta, \eta') := \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d(\eta(s), \eta'(s))$  for any  $\eta, \eta' \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$ .

Suppose  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are two probability distributions on  $\mathbb{R}$  with finite  $p$ -moments ( $p \in [1, \infty]$ ). The  $p$ -Wasserstein metric between  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  is defined as

$$W_p(\mu, \nu) = \left( \inf_{\kappa \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x - y|^p \gamma(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p}. \quad (4)$$

Each element  $\kappa \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)$  is a coupling of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ , i.e., a joint distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with prescribed marginals  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  on each ‘‘axis’’. In the case of  $p = 1$  we have

$$W_1(\mu, \nu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |F_\mu(x) - F_\nu(x)| dx, \quad (5)$$

where  $F_\mu$  and  $F_\nu$  are the cumulative distribution function of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  respectively. It can be shown that  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  is a  $\gamma$ -contraction w.r.t. the supreme  $p$ -Wasserstein metric  $\bar{W}_p$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** [2, Propositions 4.15] *The distributional Bellman operator is a  $\gamma$ -contraction on  $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$  w.r.t. the supreme  $p$ -Wasserstein metric,  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , i.e., for any  $\eta, \eta' \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , we have*

$$\bar{W}_p(\mathcal{T}^\pi \eta, \mathcal{T}^\pi \eta') \leq \gamma \bar{W}_p(\eta, \eta').$$

The  $\ell_p$  metric ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ) between  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  is defined as

$$\ell_p(\mu, \nu) = \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} |F_\mu(x) - F_\nu(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (6)$$

and  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  is  $\gamma^{\frac{1}{p}}$ -contraction w.r.t. the supreme  $\ell_p$  metric  $\bar{\ell}_p$ .

**Proposition 2.2.** [2, Propositions 4.20] *The distributional Bellman operator is a  $\gamma^{\frac{1}{p}}$ -contraction on  $\mathcal{P}^S$  w.r.t. the supreme  $\ell_p$  metric,  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , i.e., for any  $\eta, \eta' \in \mathcal{P}^S$ , we have*

$$\bar{\ell}_p(\mathcal{T}^\pi \eta, \mathcal{T}^\pi \eta') \leq \gamma^{\frac{1}{p}} \bar{\ell}_p(\eta, \eta').$$

Note that the  $\ell_1$  metric coincides with 1-Wasserstein metric. In the case of  $p = 2$ ,  $\ell_2$  metric is also called Cramér metric. It plays an important role in subsequent analysis because the zero-mass signed measure space equipped with this metric  $(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{\ell_2})$  defined in Section 4.1 possesses an inner product structure.

In the case of  $p = \infty$ ,  $\ell_\infty$  metric is same with KS metric, which is defined as

$$\text{KS}(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mu((-\infty, t]) - \nu((-\infty, t])|. \quad (7)$$

$\mathcal{T}^\pi$  is merely non-expansive w.r.t. the supreme KS metric.

**Proposition 2.3.** [25, Propositions 2.5] *The distributional Bellman operator is non-expansive on  $\mathcal{P}^S$  w.r.t. the supreme KS metric, i.e., for any  $\eta, \eta' \in \mathcal{P}^S$ , we have*

$$\bar{\text{KS}}(\mathcal{T}^\pi \eta, \mathcal{T}^\pi \eta') \leq \bar{\text{KS}}(\eta, \eta').$$

However,  $\text{KS}(\mu, \nu)$  can be bounded with  $W_1(\mu, \nu)$  if either of  $\mu, \nu$  has a bounded Lebesgue density.

**Proposition 2.4.** [18, Proposition 1.2] *Assume that  $\mu \in \Delta(\mathbb{R})$  has finite moment and  $\mu$  has a Lebesgue density  $p_\mu$  that is bounded by  $C$ . Then for any  $\nu \in \Delta(\mathbb{R})$  with finite moment,  $\text{KS}(\mu, \nu) \leq \sqrt{2CW_1(\mu, \nu)}$ .*

## 2.4 Distributional Dynamic Programming

If the MDP  $M = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}_R, P, \gamma \rangle$  is known, since  $V^\pi$  is the fixed point of the contraction  $T^\pi$ ,  $V^\pi$  can be evaluated via the famous dynamic programming algorithm (DP). To be concrete, for any initialization  $V^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , if we define the iteration sequence  $V^{(k+1)} = T^\pi(V^{(k)})$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|V^{(k)} - V^\pi\|_\infty = 0$  by the contraction mapping theorem (Proposition 4.7 in [2]).

Similarly, distributional dynamic programming algorithm (DP) defines the iteration sequence as  $\eta^{(k+1)} = \mathcal{T}^\pi \eta^{(k)}$  for any initialization  $\eta^{(0)}$ . And in the same way, we have  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{W}_p(\eta^{(k)}, \eta^\pi) = 0$  ( $p \in [1, \infty]$ ) and  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\ell}_p(\eta^{(k)}, \eta^\pi) = 0$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ).

If we consider the supreme KS metric instead, distributional DP may not converge in general, but as in [25], under the following assumption, the convergence still holds.

**Assumption 1.** *Assume that for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_R(dr | s, a)$  has a Lebesgue density  $p_{s,a}^R$  upper-bounded by a constant  $C$ .*

It is easily verified that  $C \geq 1 - \gamma$ . For convenience, we assume  $C \geq 1$  subsequently.

**Proposition 2.5.** [25, Proposition 2.5] *If Assumption 1 holds, we have*

$$\bar{\text{KS}}(\eta^{(k)}, \eta^\pi) \leq (\sqrt{\gamma})^k \sqrt{C \bar{W}_1(\eta^{(0)}, \eta^\pi)}$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\text{KS}}(\eta^{(k)}, \eta^\pi) = 0.$$

The strategy of proving Proposition 2.5 is straightforward, we first show that when Assumption 1 is true, the distribution of return  $\eta^\pi(s)$  must have a density bounded by  $C$ . Then by Proposition 2.4, the KS metric can be controlled by the 1-Wasserstein metric.

## 2.5 Distributional Temporal Difference Algorithms

In most application scenarios, the transition dynamic  $P$  is unknown and we can only get samples of  $P$  in a streaming manner. In this paper, a generative model [10, 11] is assumed to be accessible, which generates independent samples for all states in each iteration, *i.e.*, in the  $t$ -th iteration, we collect sample  $a_t(s) \sim \pi(\cdot | s)$ ,  $s_t(s) \sim P(\cdot | s, a_t(s))$ ,  $r_t(s) \sim \mathcal{P}_R(\cdot | s, a_t(s))$  for each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Similar to TD [22] in classic RL, distributional TD also employs the stochastic approximation (SA) [17] technique to address the aforementioned problem and can be viewed as an approximate version of distributional DP.

**Non-parametric Distributional TD** We first introduce non-parametric distributional TD algorithm (NTD), which is helpful in the theoretical understanding of distributional TD. In the setting of NTD, we assume the reward distribution  $\mathcal{P}_R$  is known (hence  $r_t(s)$  is not used in NTD) and the return distributions can be precisely updated without any parametrization. For any initialization  $\eta_0^\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , the updating scheme is given by

$$\eta_t^\pi = (1 - \alpha_t)\eta_{t-1}^\pi + \alpha_t \mathcal{T}_t^\pi \eta_{t-1}^\pi, \quad (8)$$

for any  $t \geq 1$ , where  $\alpha_t$  is the step size. The empirical Bellman operator at  $t$ -th iteration  $\mathcal{T}_t^\pi$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{T}_t^\pi \eta](s) &= \mathbb{E}[(b_{r_t, \gamma})_\#(\eta(s_{t+1})) | s_t = s, a_t = a_t(s), s_{t+1} = s_t(s)] \\ &= \int_0^1 (b_{r, \gamma})_\#(\eta(s_t(s))) \mathcal{P}_R(dr | s, a_t(s)) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \eta \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

which is an unbiased estimator of  $[\mathcal{T}^\pi \eta](s)$ , where the expectation  $\mathbb{E}$  is regarded as the Bochner integral in the normed linear space  $(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{KS}})$  defined in Section 4.1. It is evident that NTD is a SA modification of distributional DP. Consequently, we can analyze NTD using the techniques from the SA literature.

**Categorical Distributional TD** Now, we revisit the more practical CTD. In this case, the immediate reward is obtained through sampling and we do not require the assumption that  $\mathcal{P}_R$  is known. Moreover, the updates in CTD is computationally efficient, due to the following categorical parametrization of probability distributions.

$$\mathcal{P}_K := \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^K p_k \delta_{x_k} : p_0, \dots, p_K \geq 0, \sum_{k=0}^K p_k = 1 \right\}, \quad (10)$$

where  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 \leq x_0 < \dots < x_K \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  are fixed points of the support. For simplicity, we assume  $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^K$  are equally-spaced, *i.e.*,  $x_k = \frac{k}{K(1-\gamma)}$ . We denote the gap between two points as  $\iota_K = \frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)}$ . When updating the return distributions, we need to evaluate the  $\ell_2$ -projection of  $\mathcal{P}_K$ ,  $\Pi_K: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_K$ ,  $\Pi_K(\mu) := \operatorname{argmin}_{\hat{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_K} \ell_2(\mu, \hat{\mu})$ . It can be shown (Proposition 5.14 in [2]) that the projection is unique and given by

$$\Pi_K(\mu) = \sum_{k=0}^K p_k(\mu) \delta_{x_k}, \quad (11)$$



where

$$p_k(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu} \left[ \left( 1 - \left| \frac{X - x_k}{\iota_K} \right| \right)_+ \right], \quad (12)$$

$(x)_+ := \max\{x, 0\}$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . It is known that  $\Pi_K$  is non-expansive w.r.t. Cramér metric (Lemma 5.23 in [2]), *i.e.*,  $\ell_2(\Pi_K(\mu), \Pi_K(\nu)) \leq \ell_2(\mu, \nu)$  for any  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$ . For any  $\eta \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$ ,  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , we slightly abuse the notation and define  $[\Pi_K \eta](s) := \Pi_K(\eta(s))$ .  $\Pi_K$  is still non-expansive w.r.t.  $\bar{\ell}_2$ , hence  $\mathcal{T}^{\pi, K} := \Pi_K \mathcal{T}^\pi$  is a  $\sqrt{\gamma}$ -contraction w.r.t.  $\bar{\ell}_2$ , we denote its unique fixed point as  $\eta^{\pi, K} \in \mathcal{P}_K^{\mathcal{S}}$ . And the approximation error induced by categorical parametrization is given by (Proposition 3 in [19])

$$\bar{\ell}_2(\eta^\pi, \eta^{\pi, K}) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}(1-\gamma)}. \quad (13)$$

Now, we are ready to give the updating scheme of CTD, given any initialization  $\eta_0^\pi \in \mathcal{P}_K^{\mathcal{S}}$ ,

$$\eta_t^\pi = (1 - \alpha_t)\eta_{t-1}^\pi + \alpha_t \Pi_K \mathcal{T}_t^\pi \eta_{t-1}^\pi, \quad (14)$$

for any  $t \geq 1$ . Here we no longer assume a known reward distribution  $\mathcal{P}_R$ , now the immediate reward is accessed via sampling. The empirical Bellman operator at  $t$ -th iteration  $\mathcal{T}_t^\pi$  has a different form from that of NTD. Concretely, we have

$$[\mathcal{T}_t^\pi \eta](s) = (b_{r_t(s), \gamma})_\#(\eta(s_{t+1})). \quad (15)$$

### 3 Statistical Analysis

In this section, we state our main results. For NTD, we give the non-asymptotic convergence rates of  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi)$ ,  $\bar{W}_p(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi)$  and  $\bar{\text{KS}}(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi)$  (under Assumption 1). For CTD, we provide the non-asymptotic convergence rate of  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^{\pi, K})$  and  $\bar{W}_p(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^{\pi, K})$ .

#### 3.1 Non-asymptotic Analysis of NTD

First, we present a non-asymptotic convergence rate of  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi)$  for NTD.

**Theorem 3.1** (Sample Complexity of NTD in Cramér metric). *Consider any given  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose the initialization is  $\eta_0^\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , the total update steps  $T$  satisfies*

$$T \geq \frac{L \log^2 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^3} \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta},$$

for some  $L > 0$ , i.e.,  $T = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^3}\right)$ , the step size  $\alpha_t$  given by

$$\alpha_t = \frac{4 \log t}{t(1-\sqrt{\gamma})} \wedge 1 = \min \left\{ \frac{4 \log t}{t(1-\sqrt{\gamma})}, 1 \right\},$$

in which case  $L = 402$ ; or a constant

$$\alpha = \frac{\log T}{2T(1-\sqrt{\gamma})},$$

in which case  $L = 3$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the last iterate estimator satisfies  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi) \leq \varepsilon$ .

Since  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}}$  always holds, we can translate the high probability bound to a mean error bound, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E} [\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi)] \leq \varepsilon(1-\delta) + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \leq 2\varepsilon, \quad (16)$$

if we take  $\delta \leq \varepsilon\sqrt{1-\gamma}$ . In subsequent discussion, we will not state the mean error bound conclusions for the sake of brevity.

The key idea of our proof is to first expand the error term  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi)$  over the time steps. Then it can be decomposed into an initial error term and a martingale term. The initial error term becomes smaller as the iterations progress due to the contraction properties of  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$ . And the martingale term can be addressed using martingale concentration inequalities in the inner product space  $(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{\ell_2})$  defined in Section 4.1. A more detailed outline of proof can be found in Section 4.2.

Combining Theorem 3.1 with the basic inequalities  $\bar{W}_1(\eta, \eta') \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \bar{\ell}_2(\eta, \eta')$  and  $\bar{W}_p(\eta, \eta') \leq \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}} \bar{W}_1^{\frac{1}{p}}(\eta, \eta')$  for any  $\eta, \eta' \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$  (Lemma B.1), we can derive that  $T = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p}(1-\gamma)^{2p+2}}\right)$  iterations are sufficient to ensure  $\bar{W}_p(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi) \leq \varepsilon$ . As pointed out in the example after Corollary 3.1 in [25], when  $p > 1$ , the slow rate in terms of  $\varepsilon$  is inevitable without additional regularity conditions.

Under Assumption 1, we also have the following bounds in case of KS metric.

**Theorem 3.2** (Sample Complexity of NTD in KS metric). *Suppose Assumption 1 holds true. Consider any given  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose the initialization is  $\eta_0^\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , the total update steps  $T$  satisfies*

$$T \geq \frac{113^2 C^2 \log^2 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^4} \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta},$$

and the step size is a constant

$$\alpha = \frac{2 \log T}{T(1-\gamma)},$$

Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the last iterate estimator satisfies  $\bar{\text{KS}}(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi) \leq \varepsilon$ .

The upper bound of the supreme KS metric between  $\eta_T^\pi$  and  $\eta^\pi$  is of the same order as that of the result in Theorem 3.2 in [25].

The key differences in the proof of this theorem compared to the proof of Theorem 3.3 are as follows. On the one hand, the initial error term needs to be controlled using Proposition 2.4 since  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  is no longer a contraction mapping. On the other hand, the martingale term no longer lives in an inner product space, and we need to use the more complex chaining method (Chapter 8 in [23] for example) to analyze its concentration behavior. We present a more detailed outline of proof in Section 4.3.

### 3.2 Non-asymptotic Analysis of CTD

The main result for CTD is the non-asymptotic convergence rate of  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^{\pi, K})$  and  $\bar{W}_p(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^{\pi, K})$ .

**Theorem 3.3** (Sample Complexity of CTD in Cramér metric). *Consider any given  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose the initialization is  $\eta_0^\pi \in \mathcal{P}_K^S$ , the total update steps  $T$  satisfies*

$$T \geq \frac{L \log^2 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1 - \gamma)^3} \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta},$$

for some  $L > 0$ , i.e.,  $T = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 (1 - \gamma)^3}\right)$ , the step size  $\alpha_t$  given by

$$\alpha_t = \frac{4 \log t}{t(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})} \wedge 1,$$

in which case  $L = 402$ ; or a constant

$$\alpha = \frac{\log T}{2T(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})},$$

in which case  $L = 3$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the last iterate estimator satisfies  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^{\pi, K}) \leq \varepsilon$ .

We can find that the sample complexity does not depend on  $K$ . If we further take  $K = \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2 (1 - \gamma)^2}$ , then  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta^{\pi, K}, \eta^\pi) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  according to the inequality (13). In this circumstance, we need  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 (1 - \gamma)^3}\right)$  iterations to achieve  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi) \leq \varepsilon$  with high probability.

Note that, the order (modulo logarithmic factors) of sample complexity of CTD is same as the previous results of SCPE [3], but we do not need the additional term introduced in the updating

scheme of SCPE.

The proof of this theorem is identical to that of Theorem 3.1, and can also be translated into sample complexity bound  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p(1-\gamma)^{2p+2}}}\right)$  in cases of  $\bar{W}_p$  metric. We comment that this theoretical result is strictly worse than the sample complexity bound  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p(1-\gamma)^{2p+1}}}\right)$  derived in the model-based setting [21]. The reason is that the Azuma-Hoeffding concentration inequality for martingales in inner product spaces only utilizes the boundedness of the martingale difference sequence, without further exploiting the fine properties of the variance. We leave this as future work to refine our analysis.

## 4 Proof Outlines

In this section, we will outline the proofs of our main theoretical results (Theorem 3.1, Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3). Before diving into the details of the proofs, we first define some notations.

### 4.1 Zero-mass Signed Measure Space

To analyze the distance between the estimator and the ground-truth  $\eta^\pi$ , we define the zero-mass signed measure space to work with

$$\mathcal{M} := \left\{ \mu: \mu \text{ is a signed measure with } |\mu|(\mathbb{R}) < \infty, \mu(\mathbb{R}) = 0, \text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq \left[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right] \right\}, \quad (17)$$

where  $|\mu|$  is the total variation measure of  $\mu$ , and  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  is the support of  $\mu$ . See [5] for more details about signed measures.

For any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ , we define its cumulative function as follow:

$$F_\mu(x) := \mu[0, x]. \quad (18)$$

We can check that  $F_\mu$  is linear w.r.t.  $\mu$ , *i.e.*,  $F_{\alpha\mu+\beta\nu} = \alpha F_\mu + \beta F_\nu$  for any  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ .

To analyze Cramér metric, we define the following Cramér inner product on  $\mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\langle \mu, \nu \rangle_{\ell_2} := \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} F_\mu(x) F_\nu(x) dx. \quad (19)$$

It is easy to verify that  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\ell_2}$  is indeed an inner product on  $\mathcal{M}$ . The corresponding norm, called

Cramér norm, is given by

$$\|\mu\|_{\ell_2} = \sqrt{\langle \mu, \mu \rangle_{\ell_2}} = \sqrt{\int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} (F_\mu(x))^2 dx}. \quad (20)$$

We have  $\nu_1 - \nu_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|_{\ell_2} = \ell_2(\nu_1, \nu_2)$  for any  $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ .

We also define the following KS norm on  $\mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\|\mu\|_{\text{KS}} := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mu((-\infty, t])| \quad (21)$$

we have  $\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|_{\text{KS}} = \text{KS}(\nu_1, \nu_2)$  for any  $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ .

We can extend the distributional Bellman operator  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  and the Cramér projection operator  $\Pi_K$  naturally to  $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$  without modifying its original definition. Here, the product space  $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$  is also a normed linear space, and we use the supreme norm:  $\|\eta\|_{\bar{\ell}_2} := \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \|\eta(s)\|_{\ell_2}$  and  $\|\eta\|_{\bar{\text{KS}}_2} := \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \|\eta(s)\|_{\text{KS}}$  for any  $\eta \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$ . We denote  $\mathcal{I}$  as the identical operator in  $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$ .

When the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  is applied to a bounded linear operator  $A$ , we refer  $\|A\|$  to the operator norm of  $A$ , which is defined as  $\|A\| := \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}, \|\eta\|=1} \|A\eta\|$ .

**Proposition 4.1.**  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  and  $\Pi_K$  are linear operators in  $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , furthermore,  $\|\mathcal{T}^\pi\|_{\bar{\ell}_2} \leq \sqrt{\gamma}$ ,  $\|\Pi_K\|_{\bar{\ell}_2} = 1$ , and  $\|\mathcal{T}^\pi\|_{\bar{\text{KS}}_2} = 1$ .

The proof is straightforward, and we omit the details.

## 4.2 Analysis of Theorem 3.1 and 3.3

For simplicity, we abbreviate  $\|\cdot\|_{\bar{\ell}_2}$  as  $\|\cdot\|$  in this part. For all  $t \in [T] := \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$ , we denote  $\mathcal{T}_t := \mathcal{T}_t^\pi$ ,  $\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{T}^\pi$ ,  $\eta := \eta^\pi$  for NTD;  $\mathcal{T}_t := \Pi_K \mathcal{T}_t^\pi$ ,  $\mathcal{T} := \Pi_K \mathcal{T}^\pi$ ,  $\eta := \eta^{\pi, K}$  for CTD; and  $\eta_t := \eta_t^\pi$ ,  $\Delta_t := \eta_t - \eta \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$  for both NTD and CTD. According to Lemma B.2,  $\eta_t \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$  for NTD and  $\eta_t \in \mathcal{P}_K^{\mathcal{S}}$  for CTD. Our target is to bound the norm of the error term  $\|\Delta_T\|$ .

According to the updating rule, we have the error decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_t &= \eta_t - \eta \\ &= (1 - \alpha_t)\eta_{t-1} + \alpha_t \mathcal{T}_t \eta_{t-1} - \eta \\ &= (1 - \alpha_t)\Delta_{t-1} + \alpha_t (\mathcal{T}_t \eta_{t-1} - \mathcal{T} \eta) \\ &= (1 - \alpha_t)\Delta_{t-1} + \alpha_t (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1} + \alpha_t \mathcal{T} (\eta_{t-1} - \eta) \\ &= [(1 - \alpha_t)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_t \mathcal{T}] \Delta_{t-1} + \alpha_t (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Apply it recursively, we can further decompose the error into two terms

$$\Delta_T = \prod_{t=1}^T [(1 - \alpha_t)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_t\mathcal{T}] \Delta_0 + \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t \prod_{i=t+1}^T [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1}. \quad (23)$$

The first term is an initial error term that becomes negligible when  $T$  is large since  $\mathcal{T}$  is a contraction, and the second term can be bounded via Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (Theorem B.1) in inner product spaces since it is a martingale.

We introduce the following important quantities involving step sizes and  $\gamma$

$$\beta_t := \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^T (1 - \alpha_i(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})), & \text{if } t = 0, \\ \alpha_t \prod_{i=t+1}^T (1 - \alpha_i(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})), & \text{if } 0 < t < T, \\ \alpha_T, & \text{if } t = T. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Now, the first term can be bounded as follow

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \prod_{t=1}^T [(1 - \alpha_t)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_t\mathcal{T}] \Delta_0 \right\| \\ & \leq \prod_{t=1}^T \|(1 - \alpha_t)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_t\mathcal{T}\| \|\Delta_0\| \\ & \leq \prod_{t=1}^T (1 - \alpha_t(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})) \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}} \\ & = \frac{\beta_0}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where  $\|\Delta_0\| \leq \sqrt{\int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} dx} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}}$ .

As for the second term, we have the following upper bound with high probability by utilizing Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (Theorem B.1).

**Lemma 4.1.** *For any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t \prod_{i=t+1}^T [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1} \right\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1 - \gamma} \sum_{t=1}^T \beta_t^2 \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}}.$$

Combine the two results, we arrive at, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\|\Delta_T\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \left( \beta_0 + \sqrt{2 \sum_{t=1}^T \beta_t^2 \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} \right). \quad (26)$$

Here, for simplicity, we consider a constant step size, *i.e.*,  $\alpha_t \equiv \alpha$ . The proof of Lemma 4.1 and the case with decaying step size can be found in Appendix A. In this case of constant step size, it is easy to derive upper bounds for  $\beta_0$  and  $\sum_{t=1}^T \beta_t^2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0 &= (1 - \alpha(1 - \sqrt{\gamma}))^T \\ &= (1 - \alpha(1 - \sqrt{\gamma}))^{\frac{1}{\alpha(1-\sqrt{\gamma})} T \alpha(1-\sqrt{\gamma})} \\ &\leq \exp\{-T\alpha(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})\}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

and

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \beta_t^2 = \alpha^2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (1 - \alpha(1 - \sqrt{\gamma}))^{2t} \leq T\alpha^2, \quad (28)$$

hence we can get the desired conclusion

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_T\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \left( \exp\{-T\alpha(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})\} + \alpha \sqrt{2T \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \left( \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \log T\right\} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{\log T}{2(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})} \sqrt{2 \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \left( 1 + \frac{\sqrt{2} \log T}{1 - \gamma} \sqrt{\log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} \right) \\ &\leq \varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where we have used the assumptions  $\alpha = \frac{\log T}{2T(1-\sqrt{\gamma})}$  and  $T \geq \frac{3 \log^2 T}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^3} \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}$ .

### 4.3 Analysis of Theorem 3.2

For simplicity, we abbreviate  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{KS}}$  as  $\|\cdot\|$  in this part. As before, we denote  $\mathcal{T}_t := \mathcal{T}_t^\pi$ ,  $\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{T}^\pi$ ,  $\eta_t := \eta_t^\pi$ ,  $\eta := \eta^\pi$ , and  $\Delta_t := \eta_t - \eta \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$  the error term, for all  $t \in [T]$ . Our target is to bound  $\|\Delta_T\|$ .

Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1 and 3.3, we can still decompose the error into these two

terms.

$$\Delta_T = \prod_{t=1}^T [(1 - \alpha_t)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_t\mathcal{T}] \Delta_0 + \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t \prod_{i=t+1}^T [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1}, \quad (30)$$

where the first term needs to be controlled using Proposition 2.4 since  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  is no longer a contraction mapping. And we need to use the more complex chaining method (Chapter 8 in [23] for example) to deal with the second term since it no longer lives in an inner product space.

Again, we define  $\beta_0 = \prod_{t=1}^T ((1 - \alpha_t) + \alpha_t\gamma)$ , which is slightly different from the one defined earlier. By utilizing Proposition 2.4, we can bound the first term straightforwardly.

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \prod_{t=1}^T [(1 - \alpha_t)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_t\mathcal{T}] \Delta_0 \right\| \\ & \leq \sqrt{2C \left\| \prod_{t=1}^T ((1 - \alpha_t)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_t\mathcal{T}) \Delta_0 \right\|_{\bar{W}_1}} \\ & \leq \sqrt{2C \prod_{t=1}^T \|((1 - \alpha_t)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_t\mathcal{T})\|_{\bar{W}_1} \|\Delta_0\|_{\bar{W}_1}} \\ & \leq \sqrt{2C \prod_{t=1}^T ((1 - \alpha_t) + \alpha_t\gamma) \frac{1}{1 - \gamma}} \\ & = \frac{\sqrt{2C\beta_0}}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}} \\ & \leq \frac{\sqrt{C}}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}} \exp\{-T\alpha(1 - \gamma)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where we have used  $\|\Delta_0\|_{\bar{W}_1} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma}$  and  $\beta_0 \leq \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}T\alpha(1 - \gamma)\}$ , we only consider constant step size here. As for the second term, we have the following upper bound with high probability by utilizing Dudley's integral inequality (Theorem B.2).

**Lemma 4.2.** *For any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t \prod_{i=t+1}^T [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1} \right\| \leq \frac{56C}{1 - \gamma} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t^2 \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}}.$$

See Appendix A for the proof of Lemma 4.2.

Combining the two results with the assumptions  $\alpha = \frac{2 \log T}{T(1 - \gamma)}$  and  $T \geq \frac{113^2 C^2 \log^2 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1 - \gamma)^4} \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}$ , we



have with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta_T\| &\leq \frac{\sqrt{C}}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}T\alpha(1-\gamma)\right\} + \frac{56C\alpha\sqrt{T}}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{C}}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \frac{1}{T} + \frac{112C \log T}{\sqrt{T}(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{C}}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{112\sqrt{C} \log T}{(1-\gamma)^{3/2}} \sqrt{\log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{113C \log T}{\sqrt{T}(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} \\
&\leq \varepsilon,
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

which is desired.

## 5 Conclusions

In this paper, we analyze the statistical performance of the distributional temporal difference (TD) algorithm from a non-asymptotic perspective. Specifically, we consider two instances of distributional TD, namely the non-parametric distributional TD (NTD) and the categorial distributional TD (CTD). For NTD, we show that  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p}(1-\gamma)^{2p+2}}\right)$  TD updates are sufficient to achieve a  $p$ -Wasserstein  $\varepsilon$ -optimal estimator and  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^4}\right)$  TD updates are sufficient to achieve a KS  $\varepsilon$ -optimal estimator. For CTD, we show that  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p}(1-\gamma)^{2p+2}}\right)$  TD updates can ensure  $p$ -Wasserstein  $\varepsilon$ -optimality.

## References

- [1] M. G. Bellemare, W. Dabney, and R. Munos. A distributional perspective on reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 449–458. PMLR, 2017.
- [2] M. G. Bellemare, W. Dabney, and M. Rowland. *Distributional Reinforcement Learning*. MIT Press, 2023. <http://www.distributional-rl.org>.
- [3] M. Böck and C. Heitzinger. Speedy categorical distributional reinforcement learning and complexity analysis. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 4(2):675–693, 2022. doi: 10.1137/20M1364436. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1364436>.

- [4] M. Böck, J. Malle, D. Pasterk, H. Kukina, R. Hasani, and C. Heitzinger. Superhuman performance on sepsis mimic-iii data by distributional reinforcement learning. *PLoS One*, 17(11): e0275358, 2022.
- [5] V. I. Bogachev. *Measure theory*, volume 1. Springer, 2007.
- [6] W. Dabney, M. Rowland, M. Bellemare, and R. Munos. Distributional reinforcement learning with quantile regression. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- [7] M. Ghavamzadeh, H. Kappen, M. Azar, and R. Munos. Speedy q-learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- [8] M. Gheshlaghi Azar, R. Munos, and H. J. Kappen. Minimax pac bounds on the sample complexity of reinforcement learning with a generative model. *Machine learning*, 91:325–349, 2013.
- [9] E. Ghysels, P. Santa-Clara, and R. Valkanov. There is a risk-return trade-off after all. *Journal of financial economics*, 76(3):509–548, 2005.
- [10] S. M. Kakade. *On the Sample Complexity of Reinforcement Learning*. PhD thesis, University College London, 2003.
- [11] M. Kearns, Y. Mansour, and A. Y. Ng. A sparse sampling algorithm for near-optimal planning in large markov decision processes. *Machine learning*, 49:193–208, 2002.
- [12] P. W. Lavori and R. Dawson. Dynamic treatment regimes: practical design considerations. *Clinical trials*, 1(1):9–20, 2004.
- [13] G. Li, C. Cai, Y. Chen, Y. Wei, and Y. Chi. Is q-learning minimax optimal? a tight sample complexity analysis. *Operations Research*, 72(1):222–236, 2024.
- [14] S. Luo. On azuma-type inequalities for banach space-valued martingales. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 35(2):772–800, Jun 2022. ISSN 1572-9230. doi: 10.1007/s10959-021-01086-5. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10959-021-01086-5>.
- [15] T. Morimura, M. Sugiyama, H. Kashima, H. Hachiya, and T. Tanaka. Nonparametric return distribution approximation for reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-10)*, pages 799–806, 2010.

- [16] G. Pisier. *Martingales in Banach Spaces*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2016. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781316480588.
- [17] H. Robbins and S. Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 400–407, 1951.
- [18] N. Ross. Fundamentals of stein’s method. *Probability Surveys*, 8:210–293, 2011.
- [19] M. Rowland, M. Bellemare, W. Dabney, R. Munos, and Y. W. Teh. An analysis of categorical distributional reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 29–37. PMLR, 2018.
- [20] M. Rowland, R. Munos, M. G. Azar, Y. Tang, G. Ostrovski, A. Harutyunyan, K. Tuyls, M. G. Bellemare, and W. Dabney. An analysis of quantile temporal-difference learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.04462*, 2023.
- [21] M. Rowland, L. K. Wenliang, R. Munos, C. Lyle, Y. Tang, and W. Dabney. Near-minimax-optimal distributional reinforcement learning with a generative model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07598*, 2024.
- [22] R. S. Sutton. Learning to predict by the methods of temporal differences. *Machine learning*, 3:9–44, 1988.
- [23] R. Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2018. doi: 10.1017/9781108231596.
- [24] R. Wu, M. Uehara, and W. Sun. Distributional offline policy evaluation with predictive error guarantees. In A. Krause, E. Brunskill, K. Cho, B. Engelhardt, S. Sabato, and J. Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 37685–37712. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/wu23s.html>.
- [25] L. Zhang, Y. Peng, J. Liang, W. Yang, and Z. Zhang. Estimation and inference in distributional reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17262*, 2023.

## A Omitted Proofs in Section 4

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* For any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , we denote

$$\zeta_t(s) = \alpha_t \left\{ \prod_{i=t+1}^T [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1} \right\} (s), \quad (33)$$

then LHS equals  $\sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_t$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(\eta_0, \dots, \eta_t)$ ,  $\{\zeta_t(s)\}_{t=1}^T$  is a  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ -martingale difference sequence:

$$\mathbb{E}[\zeta_t(s)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \alpha_t \left\{ \prod_{i=t+1}^T [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] \Pi_K \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{T}_t^\pi - \mathcal{T}^\pi) \eta_{t-1} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \right\} (s) = 0, \quad (34)$$

the first equality holds because a Bochner integral can be exchanged with a bounded linear operator (see [16] for more details about Bochner integral), and the second equality holds based on the definition of the empirical Bellman operator.

$\|\zeta_t(s)\|$  can be bounded as follow

$$\begin{aligned} \|\zeta_t(s)\| &\leq \|\zeta_t\| \\ &\leq \alpha_t \left\| \prod_{i=t+1}^T [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] \right\| \|(\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1}\| \\ &\leq \alpha_t \prod_{i=t+1}^T (1 - \alpha_i (1 - \sqrt{\gamma})) \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}} \\ &= \frac{\beta_t}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

By applying the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (Theorem B.1) and utilizing the union bound over  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , we obtain the conclusion, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t \prod_{i=t+1}^T [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1} \right\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{1 - \gamma} \sum_{t=1}^T \beta_t^2 \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}}, \quad (36)$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 3.1 and 3.3.* We proceed to prove the omitted part regarding the decaying step size in Section 4.2. First, we prove that the conclusion holds for  $\alpha_t \in [\alpha^{(T)}, \tilde{\alpha}_t^{(T)}]$  when  $T \geq \frac{201 \log^2 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1 - \gamma)^3} \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}$ , where  $\alpha^{(T)} := \frac{2 \log T}{T(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})} \in (0, 1)$  and  $\tilde{\alpha}_t^{(T)} := \frac{5 \log T}{t(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})} \wedge 1$ , we can check that

$\tilde{\alpha}_{\frac{T}{2}}^{(T)} \in (0, 1)$ . Then, we will remove the dependence on  $T$  for step size. For  $0 \leq t \leq \frac{T}{2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_t &\leq \left(1 - \alpha^{(T)}(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})\right)^{\frac{T}{2}} \\
&= \left(1 - \alpha^{(T)}(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha^{(T)}(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})} \frac{T}{2} \alpha^{(T)}(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})} \\
&\leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{T}{2} \alpha^{(T)}(1 - \sqrt{\gamma}) \right\} \\
&= \exp \{-\log T\} \\
&= \frac{1}{T}.
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

For  $\frac{T}{2} < t \leq T$ ,

$$\beta_t \leq \tilde{\alpha}_{\frac{T}{2}}^{(T)} = \frac{10 \log T}{T(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})}. \tag{38}$$

It is obvious that  $\frac{1}{T} \leq \frac{10 \log T}{T(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})}$ , therefore

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \beta_t^2 \leq \frac{100 \log^2 T}{T(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})^2}. \tag{39}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta_T\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}} \left( \beta_0 + \sqrt{2 \sum_{t=1}^T \beta_t^2 \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{10\sqrt{2} \log T}{1 - \gamma} \sqrt{\log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

which is less than  $\varepsilon$  given the assumption  $T \geq \frac{201 \log^2 T}{\varepsilon^2(1 - \gamma)^3} \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}$ .

Now, we can remove the dependence on  $T$  for step size, and assume  $\alpha_t = \frac{4 \log t}{t(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})} \wedge 1$ , for any  $t > 0$ . For any  $\frac{T}{2} < t \leq T$ , let  $\tau := t - \frac{T}{2}$ , then

$$\alpha_t = \frac{4 \log \left(\tau + \frac{T}{2}\right)}{\left(\tau + \frac{T}{2}\right)(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})} \leq \frac{4 \log T}{\tau(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})} \wedge 1 \leq \frac{5 \log \frac{T}{2}}{\tau(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})} \wedge 1 = \tilde{\alpha}_{\tau}^{(\frac{T}{2})}, \tag{41}$$

and

$$\alpha_t = \frac{4 \log \left(\tau + \frac{T}{2}\right)}{\left(\tau + \frac{T}{2}\right)(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})} \geq \frac{2 \log \frac{T}{2}}{\frac{T}{2}(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})} = \alpha^{(\frac{T}{2})}, \tag{42}$$

hence  $\bar{\alpha}_{\tau} := \alpha_{\tau + \frac{T}{2}} \in \left[ \alpha^{(\frac{T}{2})}, \tilde{\alpha}_{\tau}^{(\frac{T}{2})} \right]$ . Considering  $\eta_{T/2}^{\pi} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$  (or  $\mathcal{P}_K^{\mathcal{S}}$  in the case of CTD) as the initialization, which is independent of the samples taken at  $\frac{T}{2} < t \leq T$ , according to the result we

just proved, the conclusion still holds as long as we choose  $T \geq \frac{402 \log^2 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^3} \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.2.* We manage to prove the result via the chaining method.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t \prod_{i=t+1}^T [(1-\alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1} \right\| \\
&= \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{x \in [0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} \left| \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t \prod_{i=t+1}^T [(1-\alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1} \right\} (s) \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]} \right| \\
&= \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{x \in [0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} \left| \sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_t(s) \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]} \right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

For any  $0 \leq y < x \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ ,  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_t(s) (\mathbb{1}_{[0,x]} - \mathbb{1}_{[0,y]}) = \sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_t(s) \mathbb{1}_{(y,x]}, \tag{44}$$

is a martingale, and satisfies

$$|\zeta_t(s) \mathbb{1}_{(y,x]}| = \alpha_t \left| \left\{ \prod_{i=t+1}^T [(1-\alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1} \right\} (s) \mathbb{1}_{(y,x]} \right| \leq \alpha_t C(x-y), \tag{45}$$

since the absolute value of the density function of  $(\mathcal{T}\eta)(s)$  is less than  $C$  for any valid distributional Bellman operator  $\mathcal{T}$ .

By Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (Theorem B.1), with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\left| \sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_t(s) \mathbb{1}_{(y,x]} \right| \leq C(x-y) \sqrt{2B \log \frac{2}{\delta}}, \tag{46}$$

where  $B := \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t^2$ , in fact, we have the following stronger result (only in constant sense): for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ \lambda \sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_t(s) \mathbb{1}_{(y,x]} \right\} \right] \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{C^2 B (x-y)^2 \lambda^2}{2} \right\}. \tag{47}$$

Let  $\mathcal{X} = [0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]$ ,  $\text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ , and  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}, \epsilon) = \frac{1}{\epsilon(1-\gamma)}$ . Note that  $\sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_t(s) \mathbb{1}_{[0,1]} = 0$ , we can utilize the Dudley's integral inequality (Theorem B.2) with  $K = C\sqrt{B}$  and union bound over  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

we have with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{x \in [0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} \left| \sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_t(s) \mathbf{1}_{[0,x]} \right| \\
& \leq 16C\sqrt{B} \left[ \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}, \epsilon)} d\epsilon + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \left( \sqrt{\log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} + 1 \right) \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \right] \\
& \leq 16C\sqrt{B} \left[ \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)\epsilon}} d\epsilon + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \left( \sqrt{\log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} + 1 \right) \right] \\
& = \frac{8C\sqrt{B}}{1-\gamma} \left[ \sqrt{2 \log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}} + \sqrt{2} + 4 \right] \\
& \leq \frac{56C\sqrt{B}}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{\log \frac{2|\mathcal{S}|}{\delta}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

□

## B Technical Lemmas

**Theorem B.1** (Azuma-Hoeffding inequality in inner product spaces, Theorem 3.1 in [14]). *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an inner product space and  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be an  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued martingale difference sequence such that there exists a non-negative predictable sequence  $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$  satisfying  $\|X_i\| \leq b_i$  a.s. for all  $i \in [n]$ , and  $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^2 \leq B$  a.s. for some  $B > 0$ . Then, for any  $\delta > 0$ , the following inequality holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\sup_{j \leq n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^j X_i \right\| \leq \sqrt{2B \log \frac{2}{\delta}}.$$

**Theorem B.2** (Dudley's integral inequality). *Let  $(X_t)_{t \in T}$  be a zero-mean stochastic process on a metric space  $(T, d)$  with sub-gaussian increments, i.e. there exists  $K > 0$  such that for all  $s, t \in T$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{\lambda(X_s - X_t)} \right] \leq e^{\frac{K^2 d(s,t)^2 \lambda^2}{2}}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in T} X_t \leq 16K \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(T, d, \epsilon)} d\epsilon,$$

and for every  $\delta > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$

$$\sup_{s, t \in T} |X_s - X_t| \leq 16K \left[ \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(T, d, \epsilon)} d\epsilon + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \left( \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} + 1 \right) \text{diam}(T) \right].$$

Furthermore, if there exists  $t_0 \in T$  such that  $X_{t_0} = 0$ , we have with probability at least  $1 - \delta$

$$\sup_{t \in T} |X_t| \leq 16K \left[ \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(T, d, \epsilon)} d\epsilon + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \left( \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} + 1 \right) \text{diam}(T) \right].$$

*Proof.* See Theorem 8.1.3 and 8.1.6 in [23], the constant can be determined by checking the proof in detail.  $\square$

**Lemma B.1** (Basic inequalities for metrics on the space of probability measures). *For any  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$ , we have  $W_1(\mu, \nu) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \ell_2(\mu, \nu)$  and  $W_p(\mu, \nu) \leq \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}} W_1^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mu, \nu)$ .*

*Proof.* By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(\mu, \nu) &= \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} |F_\mu(x) - F_\nu(x)| dx \\ &\leq \sqrt{\int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} 1^2 dx} \sqrt{\int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} |F_\mu(x) - F_\nu(x)|^2 dx} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \ell_2(\mu, \nu). \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} W_p(\mu, \nu) &= \left( \inf_{\kappa \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \int_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]^2} |x - y|^p \gamma(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}} \left( \inf_{\kappa \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \int_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]^2} |x - y| \gamma(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p} \\ &= \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}} W_1^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mu, \nu). \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

$\square$

**Lemma B.2** (Range of  $\eta_t^\pi$ ). *Suppose that  $\alpha_t \in [0, 1]$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Assume that  $\eta_0^\pi \in \mathcal{P}^S$ , then we have, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\eta_t^\pi \in \mathcal{P}^S$  in the case of NTD. Similarly, assume that  $\eta_0^\pi \in \mathcal{P}_K^S$ , then we have, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\eta_t^\pi \in \mathcal{P}_K^S$  in the case of CTD.*

*Proof.* We will only prove the case of NTD, and the proof for CTD is similar by utilizing the property of the projection operator  $\Pi_K: \mathcal{P}^S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_K^S$ . We prove the result by induction. It is trivial that  $\eta_t^\pi \in \mathcal{P}^S$  for  $t = 0$ . Suppose that  $\eta_{t-1}^\pi \in \mathcal{P}^S$ , recall the updating scheme of NTD

$$\eta_t^\pi = (1 - \alpha_t) \eta_{t-1}^\pi + \alpha_t \mathcal{T}_t^\pi \eta_{t-1}^\pi. \tag{51}$$



It is evident that  $\mathcal{P}^S$  is a convex set, considering that  $\mathcal{P}^S$  is a subset of the product signed measure space, which is a linear space. Therefore, we only need to show that  $\mathcal{T}_t^\pi \eta_{t-1}^\pi \in \mathcal{P}^S$ , which trivially holds since  $\mathcal{T}_t^\pi$  is a random operator mapping from  $\mathcal{P}^S$  to  $\mathcal{P}^S$ , and  $\eta_{t-1}^\pi \in \mathcal{P}^S$ . By applying the induction argument, we can arrive at the conclusion.  $\square$