

# Near Minimax-Optimal Distributional Temporal Difference Algorithms and The Freedman Inequality in Hilbert Spaces

Yang Peng\*      Liangyu Zhang†      Zihua Zhang‡

March 15, 2024

## Abstract

Distributional reinforcement learning (DRL) 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  $\pi$ . The 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. [21] and Rowland et al. [22] 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 a non-parametric distributional TD algorithm (NTD). For a  $\gamma$ -discounted infinite-horizon tabular Markov decision process, we show that for NTD we need  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p}(1-\gamma)^{2p+1}}\right)$  iterations to achieve an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal estimator with high probability, when the estimation error is measured by the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance. This sample complexity bound is minimax optimal (up to logarithmic factors) in the case of the 1-Wasserstein distance. To achieve this, we establish a novel Freedman's inequality in Hilbert spaces, which would be of independent interest. In addition, we revisit CTD, showing that the same non-asymptotic convergence bounds hold for CTD in the case of the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance.

---

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

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

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

# 1 Introduction

In certain applications of reinforcement learning (RL), such as healthcare [15, 4] and finance [12], only considering the mean of returns is insufficient. It is necessary to incorporate risk and uncertainties into consideration. Distributional reinforcement learning (DRL) [17, 1, 2] addresses such issues by modeling the complete distribution of returns.

In the field of DRL, we need to estimate the return distribution  $\eta^\pi$  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 function, via 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 algorithms provide computationally tractable parametrization and the updating scheme of the return distribution.

Previous theoretical works have primarily focused on the asymptotic behaviors of distributional TD. In particular, Rowland et al. [21] and Rowland et al. [22] showed the asymptotic convergences 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 the classic TD algorithm [16]?*

## 1.1 Contributions

In this paper, we manage to answer the above question affirmatively in the synchronous setting [13, 14], for a  $\gamma$ -discounted infinite-horizon tabular Markov decision process (MDP). Firstly, we introduce the non-parametric distributional TD algorithm (NTD) in Section 2.5, which is not practical but aids in theoretical understanding. We show that  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p}(1-\gamma)^{2p+1}}\right)^1$  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 (Theorem 3.1). This bound is near minimax optimal if we neglect all logarithmic terms. 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 (see Theorem 3.2). It is worth pointing out that to attain such tight bounds in Theorem 3.1, we establish

---

<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  $|\mathcal{S}|, |\mathcal{A}|, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\delta} \rightarrow \infty$ .

a Freedman’s inequality in Hilbert spaces (Theorem 4.2). And we believe it is of independent interest beyond the current work.

## 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 [10], 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. [29] 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. [23] 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 [29]. Roughly speaking, their results imply that learning the full return distribution can be as sample-efficient as learning just its expectation [11]. Wu et al. [28] 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.

Freedman’s inequality was originally proposed in [9]. Tropp [26] generalized Freedman’s inequality to matrix martingales. And Talebi et al. [25] established Freedman inequalities for martingales in the setting of noncommutative probability spaces.

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. In Section 4, we present Freedman’s inequality in Hilbert spaces. Section 5 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 [29],  $G^\pi(s)$  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 distribution 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  $s \in \mathcal{S}$

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

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

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

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

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

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  $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$  w.r.t. the supreme  $\ell_p$  metric,  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , i.e., for any  $\eta, \eta' \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , 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 5.1 is a Hilbert space.

## 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  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\ell}_p(\eta^{(k)}, \eta^\pi) = 0$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ).

## 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 [13, 14] 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 [24] in classic RL, distributional TD also employs the stochastic approximation (SA) [20] 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

$$\eta_t^\pi = (1 - \alpha_t)\eta_{t-1}^\pi + \alpha_t \mathcal{T}_t^\pi \eta_{t-1}^\pi, \quad (7)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{T}_t^\pi \eta](s) &= \mathbb{E}[(b_{r,\gamma})_\#(\eta(s_{t+1})) | s_t = s, a_t = a_t(s), s_{t+1} = s_t(s)] \\ &= \int_0^1 (b_{r,\gamma})_\#(\eta(s_t(s))) \mathcal{P}_R(dr | s, a_t(s)) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \eta \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

which is an unbiased estimator of  $[\mathcal{T}^\pi \eta](s)$ , where the expectation  $\mathbb{E}$  is regarded as the Bochner integral in the Hilbert space  $(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{\ell_2})$  defined in Section 5.1. 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.

$$\mathcal{P}_K := \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^K p_k \delta_{x_k} : p_0, \dots, p_K \geq 0, \sum_{k=0}^K p_k = 1 \right\}, \quad (9)$$

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

$$\Pi_K(\mu) = \sum_{k=0}^K p_k(\mu) \delta_{x_k}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$p_k(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mu} \left[ \left( 1 - \left| \frac{X - x_k}{\iota_K} \right| \right)_+ \right], \quad (11)$$

$(x)_+ := \max\{x, 0\}$  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 [21])

$$\bar{\ell}_2(\eta^{\pi}, \eta^{\pi, K}) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}(1-\gamma)}. \quad (12)$$

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

$$\eta_t^{\pi} = (1 - \alpha_t) \eta_{t-1}^{\pi} + \alpha_t \Pi_K \mathcal{T}_t^{\pi} \eta_{t-1}^{\pi}, \quad (13)$$

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

$$[\mathcal{T}_t^{\pi} \eta](s) = (b_{r_t(s), \gamma})_{\#}(\eta(s_{t+1})). \quad (14)$$

### 3 Statistical Analysis

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



### 3.1 Non-asymptotic Analysis of NTD

We first provide a non-asymptotic convergence rate of  $\bar{W}_1(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi)$  for NTD, which is near minimax optimal up to logarithmic factors.

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

$$T \geq \frac{C_1 \log^3 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^3} \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}| T}{\delta},$$

for some large universal constant  $C_1 > 0$ , i.e.,  $T = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^3}\right)$ , the step size  $\alpha_t$  given by

$$\frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_2(1-\sqrt{\gamma})t}{\log t}} \leq \alpha_t \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_3(1-\sqrt{\gamma})t}{\log t}}$$

for some small universal constants  $c_2 > c_3 > 0$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the last iterate estimator satisfies  $\bar{W}_1(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi) \leq \varepsilon$ .

Since  $\bar{W}_1(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi) \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  always holds, we can translate the high probability bound to a mean error bound, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E} [\bar{W}_1(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi)] \leq \varepsilon(1-\delta) + \frac{\delta}{1-\gamma} \leq 2\varepsilon, \quad (15)$$

if we take  $\delta \leq \varepsilon(1-\gamma)$ . 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  $\bar{W}_1(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi)$  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  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$ . To control the martingale term, we first use the basic inequality (Lemma D.1)  $W_1(\mu, \nu) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \ell_2(\mu, \nu)$ , which allows us to analyze this error term in the Hilbert space  $(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{\ell_2})$  defined in Section 5.1. Consequently, we can bound it using Freedman's inequality in Hilbert spaces (Theorem 4.2). A more detailed outline of proof can be found in Section 5.2.

Combining Theorem 3.1 with the basic inequalities  $\bar{W}_p(\eta, \eta') \leq \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}} \bar{W}_1^{\frac{1}{p}}(\eta, \eta')$  for any  $\eta, \eta' \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$  (Lemma D.1), we can derive that  $T = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p(1-\gamma)^{2p+1}}}\right)$  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 [29], when  $p > 1$ , the slow rate in terms of  $\varepsilon$  is inevitable without additional regularity conditions.

Although 1-Wasserstein distance cannot bound Cramér distance properly, by making slight

modifications to the proof, we have the following non-asymptotic convergence rate of  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi)$ . See Section 5.3 for the proof.

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

$$T \geq \frac{C_1 \log^3 T}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^{5/2}} \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}| T}{\delta},$$

for some large universal constant  $C_1 > 0$ , i.e.,  $T = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^{5/2}}\right)$ , the step size  $\alpha_t$  given by

$$\frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_2(1-\sqrt{\gamma})t}{\log t}} \leq \alpha_t \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_3(1-\sqrt{\gamma})t}{\log t}}$$

for some small universal constants  $c_2 > c_3 > 0$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the last iterate estimator satisfies  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi) \leq \varepsilon$ .

### 3.2 Non-asymptotic Analysis of CTD

We first state a parallel result to Theorem 3.1.

**Theorem 3.2** (Sample Complexity of CTD for 1-Wasserstein metric). *Consider any given  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose  $K \geq \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^2} + 1$ , the initialization is  $\eta_0^\pi \in \mathcal{P}_K^S$ , the total update steps  $T$  satisfies*

$$T \geq \frac{C_1 \log^3 T}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^3} \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}| T}{\delta},$$

for some large universal constant  $C_1 > 0$ , i.e.,  $T = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^3}\right)$ , the step size  $\alpha_t$  given by

$$\frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_2(1-\sqrt{\gamma})t}{\log t}} \leq \alpha_t \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_3(1-\sqrt{\gamma})t}{\log t}}$$

for some small universal constants  $c_2 > c_3 > 0$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the last iterate estimator satisfies  $\bar{W}_1(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^{\pi, K}) \leq \varepsilon$ .

We can find that the sample complexity bound does not depend on  $K$ . If we further take  $K \geq \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^3}$ , according to the inequality (12), we have  $\bar{W}_1(\eta^{\pi, K}, \eta^\pi) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \bar{\ell}_2(\eta^{\pi, K}, \eta^\pi) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ . To summarize, we need  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^3}\right)$  iterations and  $K \geq \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^3}$  fixed support points to achieve  $\bar{W}_1(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^\pi) \leq \varepsilon$  with high probability.

Note that, the order (modulo logarithmic factors) of sample complexity of CTD is better than the previous results of SCPE [3], and we do not need the additional term introduced in the updating scheme of SCPE.

The proof of this theorem is almost same to that of Theorem 3.1, we outline the proof in Section 5.2. The  $\bar{W}_1$  metric result can be translated into sample complexity bound  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p}(1-\gamma)^{2p+1}}\right)$  in cases of  $\bar{W}_p$  metric. We comment that this theoretical result matches the sample complexity bound in the model-based setting [23].

As in the NTD setting, we have the following non-asymptotic convergence rate of  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^{\pi,K})$  as a corollary of Theorem 3.2. See Section 5.3 for the proof.

**Corollary 3.2** (Sample Complexity of CTD for Cramér metric). *Consider any given  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose  $K \geq \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^2} + 1$ , the initialization is  $\eta_0^\pi \in \mathcal{P}_K^S$ , the total update steps  $T$  satisfies*

$$T \geq \frac{C_1 \log^3 T}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^{5/2}} \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|T}{\delta},$$

for some large universal constant  $C_1 > 0$ , i.e.,  $T = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^{5/2}}\right)$ , the step size  $\alpha_t$  given by

$$\frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_2(1-\sqrt{\gamma})t}{\log t}} \leq \alpha_t \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_3(1-\sqrt{\gamma})t}{\log t}}$$

for some small universal constants  $c_2 > c_3 > 0$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the last iterate estimator satisfies  $\bar{\ell}_2(\eta_T^\pi, \eta^{\pi,K}) \leq \varepsilon$ .

## 4 The Key Lemma: Freedman's Inequality in Hilbert Spaces

Freedman's inequality [9] can be viewed as a Bernstein inequality for martingales, which is crucial for analyzing stochastic approximation algorithms. Compared to the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality which only utilizes the boundedness of martingale differences, Freedman's inequality incorporates second-order information, namely the quadratic variation (cumulative conditional variance) of martingales. This may leads to a sharper concentration result. It has various generalizations, such as matrix Freedman's inequality [26]. However, to the best of our knowledge, a Freedman's inequality in Hilbert spaces has not been established yet. Just as Freedman's inequality is essential for the theory of TD (Theorem 1 in [16]), it is indispensable for deriving the minimax non-asymptotic convergence bound for distributional TD.

In this section, we will present a Freedman's inequalities in Hilbert spaces. Firstly, we will state a Hilbert space version of the original Freedman's inequality (Theorem 1.6 in [9]). After that, we state a generalization of a more powerful version (Theorem 6 in [16]) to Hilbert spaces. We will provide self-contained proofs in Appendix A, primarily inspired by Theorem 3.2 in [18]. The necessary knowledge of martingale theory for the proofs can be found in any standard textbook, such as [8].

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a Hilbert space,  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be an  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued martingale difference sequence adapted to the filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ ,  $Y_i := \sum_{j=1}^i X_j$  be the corresponding martingale,  $W_i := \sum_{j=1}^i \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \|X_j\|^2$  be the corresponding quadratic variation process. Here  $\mathbb{E}_i[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_i]$  is the conditional expectation.

**Theorem 4.1** (Freedman's inequality in Hilbert spaces). *Suppose  $\max_{i \in [n]} |X_i| \leq b$  for some constant  $b > 0$ . Then, for any  $\varepsilon, \sigma > 0$ , the following inequality holds*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists k \in [n], \text{ s.t. } \|Y_k\| \geq \varepsilon \text{ and } W_k \leq \sigma^2) \leq 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{\varepsilon^2/2}{\sigma^2 + b\varepsilon/3}\right\}. \quad (16)$$

Now, we are ready to state the generalization of Theorem 6 in [16] to Hilbert spaces, which is used in our non-asymptotic analysis.

**Theorem 4.2** (Freedman's inequality in Hilbert spaces with bounded quadratic variation). *Suppose  $\max_{i \in [n]} |X_i| \leq b$  and  $W_n \leq \sigma^2$  for some constant  $b, \sigma > 0$ . Then, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , and any positive integer  $H \geq 1$ , the following inequality holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta$*

$$\|Y_n\| \leq \sqrt{8 \max\left\{W_n, \frac{\sigma^2}{2H}\right\} \log \frac{2H}{\delta}} + \frac{4}{3} b \log \frac{2H}{\delta}. \quad (17)$$

## 5 Proof Outlines

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

## 5.1 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

$$\mathcal{M} := \left\{ \mu: \mu \text{ is a signed measure with } |\mu|(\mathbb{R}) < \infty, \mu(\mathbb{R}) = 0, \text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq [0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}] \right\}, \quad (18)$$

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:

$$F_\mu(x) := \mu[0, x]. \quad (19)$$

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  $\mathcal{M}$ ,

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

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

$$\|\mu\|_{\ell_2} = \sqrt{\langle \mu, \mu \rangle_{\ell_2}} = \sqrt{\int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} (F_\mu(x))^2 dx}. \quad (21)$$

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

The  $W_1$  norm on  $\mathcal{M}$  is defined as

$$\|\mu\|_{W_1} := \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} |F_\mu(x)| dx, \quad (22)$$

we have  $\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|_{W_1} = W_1(\nu_1, \nu_2)$  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 Banach space, and we use the supreme norm:  $\|\eta\|_{\bar{\ell}_2} := \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \|\eta(s)\|_{\ell_2}$ , and  $\|\eta\|_{\bar{W}_1} := \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \|\eta(s)\|_{W_1}$  for any  $\eta \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$ . We denote  $\mathcal{I}$  as the identity operator in  $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$ .

When the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  is applied to  $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X})$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  is any Banach space, and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X})$  is the space

of all bounded linear operators in  $\mathcal{X}$ , we refer  $\|A\|$  to the operator norm of  $A$ , which is defined as  $\|A\| := \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{X}, \|\eta\|=1} \|A\eta\|$ . With this notation,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}) = \{A \text{ is a linear operator mapping from } \mathcal{X} \text{ to } \mathcal{X} : \|A\| < \infty\}$ .

**Proposition 5.1.**  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  and  $\Pi_K$  are linear operators in  $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$ . Furthermore,  $\|\mathcal{T}^\pi\|_{\bar{\ell}_2} \leq \sqrt{\gamma}$ ,  $\|\mathcal{T}^\pi\|_{\bar{W}_1} \leq \gamma$ ,  $\|\Pi_K\|_{\bar{\ell}_2} = 1$ , and  $\|\Pi_K\|_{\bar{W}_1} \leq 1$ .

The proof of the last inequality can be found in the proof of Lemma B.3, while the remaining results are trivial. We omit the proofs for brevity.

Moreover, we have the following matrix (of operators) representations of  $\mathcal{T}^\pi$  and  $\Pi_K$ .  $\mathcal{T}^\pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}}$ : for any  $\eta \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{T}^\pi(\eta)](s) &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}, s' \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(a | s) P(s' | s, a) \int_0^1 (b_{r,\gamma})_{\#} \eta(s') \mathcal{P}_R(dr | s, a) \\ &= \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{T}^\pi(s, s') \eta(s'), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where  $\mathcal{T}^\pi(s, s') \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ , for any  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\mathcal{T}^\pi(s, s') \nu = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a | s) P(s' | s, a) \int_0^1 (b_{r,\gamma})_{\#} \nu \mathcal{P}_R(dr | s, a). \quad (24)$$

It can be verified that  $\|\mathcal{T}(s, s')\|_{\ell_2} \leq \sqrt{\gamma} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a | s) P(s' | s, a) =: \sqrt{\gamma} P^\pi(s' | s)$ . And  $\Pi_K = \text{diag}(\Pi_K|_{\mathcal{M}})_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}}$ . With the representations,  $\Pi_K \mathcal{T}^\pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}}$  can be interpreted as matrix multiplication, where the scalar multiplication is replaced by the composition of operators. It can be verified that  $(\Pi_K \mathcal{T}^\pi)(s, s') = \Pi_K \mathcal{T}^\pi(s, s')$ , and  $\|(\Pi_K \mathcal{T}^\pi)(s, s')\| \leq \sqrt{\gamma} P^\pi(s' | s)$ .

**Remark:** Although the spaces  $(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{\ell_2})$  and  $(\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{W_1})$  are not complete, we can use their completion space without loss of generality, since the completeness property does not affect the non-asymptotic analysis. For simplicity, we still use  $\mathcal{M}$  to denote the completion space. And according to BLT theorem, any bounded linear operator can be extended to the completion space, preserving its operator norm.

## 5.2 Analysis of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2

For simplicity, we abbreviate both  $\|\cdot\|_{\bar{\ell}_2}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\ell_2}$  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 D.2,  $\eta_t \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{S}}$  for NTD and  $\eta_t \in \mathcal{P}_K^{\mathcal{S}}$  for CTD. Our goal is to bound the  $\bar{W}_1$  norm of the error term  $\|\Delta_T\|_{\bar{W}_1}$ . This

can be achieved by bounding  $\|\Delta_T\|$ , as  $\|\Delta_T\|_{\bar{W}_1} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \|\Delta_T\|$ .

According to the updating rule, we have the error decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_t &= \eta_t - \eta \\
&= (1 - \alpha_t)\eta_{t-1} + \alpha_t \mathcal{T}_t \eta_{t-1} - \eta \\
&= (1 - \alpha_t)\Delta_{t-1} + \alpha_t (\mathcal{T}_t \eta_{t-1} - \mathcal{T}\eta) \\
&= (1 - \alpha_t)\Delta_{t-1} + \alpha_t (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1} + \alpha_t \mathcal{T} (\eta_{t-1} - \eta) \\
&= [(1 - \alpha_t)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_t \mathcal{T}] \Delta_{t-1} + \alpha_t (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

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

$$\Delta_T = \underbrace{\prod_{t=1}^T [(1 - \alpha_t)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_t \mathcal{T}] \Delta_0}_{(I)} + \underbrace{\sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t \prod_{i=t+1}^T [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i \mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1}}_{(II)}. \tag{26}$$

Term (I) is an initial error term that becomes negligible when  $T$  is large since  $\mathcal{T}$  is a contraction. Term (II) can be bounded via Freedman's inequality in Hilbert space (Theorem 4.2). By combining the two upper bound, we can establish a recurrence relation. Solving this relation will lead to the conclusion.

We first establish the conclusion for step sizes that depend on  $T$ . Specifically, we consider

$$T \geq \frac{C_4 \log^3 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1 - \gamma)^3} \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}| T}{\delta}, \tag{27}$$

$$\frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_5 (1 - \sqrt{\gamma}) T}{\log^2 T}} \leq \alpha_t \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_6 (1 - \sqrt{\gamma}) t}{\log^2 T}}, \tag{28}$$

where  $c_5 > c_6 > 0$  are small constants satisfying  $c_5 c_6 \leq \frac{1}{8}$ , and  $C_4$  is a large constant depending only on  $c_5$  and  $c_6$ . As shown in Appendix B.1, once we have established the conclusion in this setting, we can recover the original conclusion stated in the theorem.

Now, we introduce the following useful quantities involving step sizes and  $\gamma$

$$\beta_k^{(t)} := \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^t (1 - \alpha_i (1 - \sqrt{\gamma})), & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \alpha_k \prod_{i=k+1}^t (1 - \alpha_i (1 - \sqrt{\gamma})), & \text{if } 0 < k < t, \\ \alpha_T, & \text{if } k = t. \end{cases} \tag{29}$$

The following lemma provides useful bounds for  $\beta_k^{(t)}$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Suppose  $c_5 c_6 \leq \frac{1}{8}$ . Then for all  $t \geq \frac{T}{c_6 \log T}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_k^{(t)} &\leq \frac{1}{T^2}, \text{ for } 0 \leq k \leq \frac{t}{2}, \\ \beta_k^{(t)} &\leq \frac{2 \log^3 T}{(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})T}, \text{ for } \frac{t}{2} < k \leq t.\end{aligned}$$

The proof can be found in Appendix B.2. From now on, we only consider  $t \geq \frac{T}{c_6 \log T}$ .

The upper bound of term (I) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \prod_{k=1}^t [(1 - \alpha_k)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_k \mathcal{T}] \Delta_0 \right\| &\leq \prod_{k=1}^t \|(1 - \alpha_k)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_k \mathcal{T}\| \|\Delta_0\| \\ &\leq \prod_{k=1}^t ((1 - \alpha_k) + \alpha_k \sqrt{\gamma}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}} \\ &= \frac{\beta_0^{(t)}}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma} T^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{30}$$

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

As for term (II), we have the following upper bound with high probability by utilizing Freedman's inequality (Theorem 4.2).

**Lemma 5.2.** *For any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have for all  $t \geq \frac{T}{c_6 \log T}$ , in the case of NTD,*

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^t \alpha_k \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i \mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_k - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{k-1} \right\| \leq 34 \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left(\log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}\right)}{(1 - \gamma)^2 T} \left(1 + \max_{k: t/2 < k \leq t} \|\Delta_{k-1}\|_{\bar{W}_1}\right)},$$

the conclusion still holds for CTD if we take  $K \geq \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^2} + 1$ .

The proof can be found in Appendix B.3. Combining the two results, we find the following recurrence relation in terms of  $\bar{W}_1$  norm holds given the choice of  $T$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t \geq \frac{T}{c_6 \log T}$

$$\|\Delta_t\|_{\bar{W}_1} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}} \|\Delta_t\| \leq 35 \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left(\log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}\right)}{(1 - \gamma)^3 T} \left(1 + \max_{k: t/2 < k \leq t} \|\Delta_{k-1}\|_{\bar{W}_1}\right)}.\tag{31}$$



In Theorem B.1, we solve the relation and obtain the error bound of last iterate estimator.

$$\|\Delta_T\|_{\bar{W}_1} \leq C_7 \left( \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left(\log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^3 T}} + \frac{(\log^3 T) \left(\log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^3 T} \right), \quad (32)$$

which is less than  $\varepsilon$  if we take  $C_4 \geq \max\{1, 2C_7\}$  and  $T \geq \frac{C_4 \log^3 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^3} \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}$ . Here,  $C_7$  is a large universal constant depending on  $c_6$ .

### 5.3 Analysis of Corollaries 3.1 and 3.2

The difference in the proof compared to the previous section arises in Lemma 5.2 when we control term (II). Now we further bound the result in Lemma B.2 by the Cramér norm of the error term,

$$\sigma(\eta_t) - \sigma(\eta) \leq 4 \|\Delta_t\|_{\bar{W}_1} \mathbf{1} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \|\Delta_t\| \mathbf{1}. \quad (33)$$

In the same way, we can derive the following recurrence relation: with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t \geq \frac{T}{c_6 \log T}$

$$\|\Delta_t\| \leq 35 \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left(\log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^{5/2} T}} \left( 1 + \max_{k: t/2 < k \leq t} \|\Delta_{k-1}\| \right). \quad (34)$$

By repeating the reasoning of Theorem B.1, we can obtain the desired conclusion.

$$\|\Delta_T\| \leq C_7 \left( \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left(\log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^{5/2} T}} + \frac{(\log^3 T) \left(\log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^{5/2} T} \right), \quad (35)$$

which is less than  $\varepsilon$  if we take  $C_4 \geq \max\{1, 2C_7\}$  and  $T \geq \frac{C_4 \log^3 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^{5/2}} \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}$ . Here,  $C_7$  is a large universal constant depending on  $c_6$ .

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper we have studied the statistical performance of the distributional temporal difference (TD) algorithm from a non-asymptotic perspective. Specifically, we have considered two instances of distributional TD, namely, the non-parametric distributional TD (NTD) and the categorical distributional TD (CTD). For both NTD and CTD, we have shown that  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2p}(1-\gamma)^{2p+1}}\right)$  TD

iterations are sufficient to achieve a  $p$ -Wasserstein  $\varepsilon$ -optimal estimator, which is minimax optimal (up to logarithmic factors). We have established a novel Freedman’s inequality in Hilbert spaces to prove these theoretical results, which has independent theoretical value beyond the current work.

## 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] V. H. de la Pena. A general class of exponential inequalities for martingales and ratios. *The Annals of Probability*, 27(1):537–564, 1999.
- [8] R. Durrett. *Probability: theory and examples*, volume 49. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [9] D. A. Freedman. On tail probabilities for martingales. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 100–118, 1975.
- [10] M. Ghavamzadeh, H. Kappen, M. Azar, and R. Munos. Speedy q-learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.

- [11] 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.
- [12] 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.
- [13] S. M. Kakade. *On the Sample Complexity of Reinforcement Learning*. PhD thesis, University College London, 2003.
- [14] 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.
- [15] P. W. Lavori and R. Dawson. Dynamic treatment regimes: practical design considerations. *Clinical trials*, 1(1):9–20, 2004.
- [16] 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.
- [17] 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.
- [18] I. Pinelis. Optimum bounds for the distributions of martingales in banach spaces. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 1679–1706, 1994.
- [19] G. Pisier. *Martingales in Banach Spaces*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2016. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781316480588.
- [20] H. Robbins and S. Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 400–407, 1951.
- [21] 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.
- [22] 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.

- [23] 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.
- [24] R. S. Sutton. Learning to predict by the methods of temporal differences. *Machine learning*, 3:9–44, 1988.
- [25] A. Talebi, G. Sadeghi, and M. Moslehian. Freedman inequality in noncommutative probability spaces. *Complex Analysis and Operator Theory*, 16(2):22, 2022.
- [26] J. Tropp. Freedman’s inequality for matrix martingales. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 16(none):262 – 270, 2011. doi: 10.1214/ECP.v16-1624. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/ECP.v16-1624>.
- [27] C. Villani et al. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer, 2009.
- [28] 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>.
- [29] 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 Proof of Freedman's Inequality

### A.1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

*Proof.* For any  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $j \in [n]$ , let  $\phi(t) = \phi_{j,\lambda}(t) := \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \cosh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1} + tX_j\|) = \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \cosh(\lambda u(t))$ , where  $u(t) := \|Y_{j-1} + tX_j\|$ . We aim to use the Newton-Leibniz formula to establish the relationship between  $\phi(1) = \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \cosh(\lambda \|Y_j\|)$  and  $\phi(0) = \cosh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|)$ . This will allow us to construct a positive supermartingale  $(B_i)_{i=0}^n$ .

Firstly, we calculate the derivative of  $\phi$ .

$$u'(t) = \frac{\langle u(t), X_j \rangle}{u(t)}, \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(t) &= \lambda \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [\sinh(\lambda u(t)) u'(t)] \\ &= \lambda \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[ \sinh(\lambda u(t)) \frac{\langle u(t), X_j \rangle}{u(t)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(0) &= \lambda \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[ \sinh(\lambda u(0)) \frac{\langle u(0), X_j \rangle}{u(0)} \right] \\ &= \lambda \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[ \sinh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|) \frac{\langle \|Y_{j-1}\|, X_j \rangle}{\|Y_{j-1}\|} \right] \\ &= \lambda \sinh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|) \frac{\langle \|Y_{j-1}\|, \mathbb{E}_{j-1}[X_j] \rangle}{\|Y_{j-1}\|} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

By utilizing Newton-Leibniz formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(1) &= \phi(0) + \int_0^1 \phi'(s) ds \\ &= \phi(0) + \int_0^1 \int_0^s \phi''(t) dt ds \\ &= \phi(0) + \int_0^1 (1-t) \phi''(t) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Now, we calculate the second order derivate of  $\phi$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi''(t) &= \lambda \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left\{ \frac{d}{dt} [\sinh(\lambda u(t)) u'(t)] \right\} \\
&= \lambda^2 \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[ (u'(t))^2 \cosh(\lambda u(t)) + u''(t) \sinh(\lambda u(t)) \right] \\
&\leq \lambda^2 \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[ \left( (u'(t))^2 + u''(t)u(t) \right) \cosh(\lambda u(t)) \right] \\
&= \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[ (u^2)''(t) \cosh(\lambda u(t)) \right] \\
&= \lambda^2 \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[ \|X_j\|^2 \cosh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1} + tX_j\|) \right] \\
&\leq \lambda^2 \cosh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|) \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[ \|X_j\|^2 \exp(\lambda t \|X_j\|) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where in the third line, we used  $h(x) = x \cosh(x) - \sinh(x) \geq 0$  for any  $x \geq 0$ , the inequality holds because  $h(0) = 0$  and  $h'(x) = x \sinh(x) \geq 0$  for any  $x \geq 0$ . In the fourth line, we used  $(u^2)''(t) = 2 \left( (u'(t))^2 + u''(t)u(t) \right)$ . In the fifth line, we used

$$(u^2)''(t) = \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \|Y_{j-1} + tX_j\|^2 = \frac{d}{dt} (2 \langle Y_{j-1} + tX_j, X_j \rangle) = 2 \|X_j\|^2.$$

And in the last line, we used

$$\cosh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1} + tX_j\|) \leq \cosh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|) \exp(\lambda t \|X_j\|),$$

this holds since

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp(\lambda \|Y_{j-1} + tX_j\|) &\leq \exp\{\lambda (\|Y_{j-1}\| + t \|X_j\|)\} = \exp(\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|) \exp(\lambda t \|X_j\|), \\
\exp(-\lambda \|Y_{j-1} + tX_j\|) &\leq \exp\{-\lambda (\|Y_{j-1}\| - t \|X_j\|)\} = \exp(-\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|) \exp(\lambda t \|X_j\|).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can derive the following inequality for all  $j \in [n]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{j-1} [\cosh(\lambda \|Y_j\|)] &= \phi(1) = \phi(0) + \int_0^1 (1-t) \phi''(t) dt \\
&\leq \cosh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|) + \lambda^2 \cosh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|) \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[ \|X_j\|^2 \int_0^1 (1-t) \exp(\lambda t \|X_j\|) dt \right] \\
&= \cosh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|) + \lambda^2 \cosh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|) \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[ \|X_j\|^2 \frac{\exp(\lambda \|X_j\|) - \lambda \|X_j\| - 1}{\lambda^2 \|X_j\|^2} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [\exp(\lambda \|X_j\|) - \lambda \|X_j\|] \cosh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [1 + f(\lambda \|X_j\|)] \cosh(\lambda \|Y_{j-1}\|),
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where  $f(x) := e^x - x - 1 \geq 0$ .

Let  $B_0 := 1$ ,  $B_i := \frac{\cosh(\lambda \|Y_i\|)}{\prod_{j=1}^i \mathbb{E}_{j-1}[1+f(\lambda \|X_j\|)]}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[B_i] &= \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^i \mathbb{E}_{j-1}[1+f(\lambda \|X_j\|)]} \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\cosh(\lambda \|Y_i\|)] \\ &\leq \frac{\cosh(\lambda \|Y_{i-1}\|)}{\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{E}_{j-1}[1+f(\lambda \|X_j\|)]} \\ &= B_{i-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

*i.e.*,  $(B_i)_{i=0}^n$  is positive supermartingale. By optional stopping theorem (Theorem 4.8.4 in [8]), for any stopping time  $\tau$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[B_\tau] \leq \mathbb{E}[B_0] = 1$ .

Let  $\tau := \inf\{k \in [n] : \|Y_k\| \geq \varepsilon\}$  be a stopping time, and  $\inf \emptyset := \infty$ . Define an event

$$A := \{\exists k \in [n], \text{s.t. } \|Y_k\| \geq \varepsilon \text{ and } W_k \leq \sigma^2\}, \tag{43}$$

then on  $A$ , we have  $\tau < \infty$ ,  $\|Y_\tau\| \geq \varepsilon$  and  $W_\tau \leq \sigma^2$ , noting that  $W_k$  is non-decreasing with  $k$ . Our goal is to provide an upper bound for  $\mathbb{P}(A)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A) &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sqrt{B_\tau} \frac{1}{\sqrt{B_\tau}} \mathbf{1}(A)\right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[B_\tau] \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{B_\tau} \mathbf{1}(A)\right]} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\prod_{j=1}^\tau (1 + \mathbb{E}_{j-1}[f(\lambda \|X_j\|)])}{\cosh(\lambda \|Y_\tau\|)} \mathbf{1}(A)\right]} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\exp\left\{\sum_{j=1}^\tau \mathbb{E}_{j-1}[f(\lambda \|X_j\|)]\right\}}{\cosh(\lambda \varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}(A)\right]} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{-\lambda \varepsilon + \sum_{j=1}^\tau \mathbb{E}_{j-1}[f(\lambda \|X_j\|)]\right\} \mathbf{1}(A)\right]}, \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where in the second line, we used Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. In the third line, we used  $\mathbb{E}[B_\tau] \leq 1$ . In the fourth line, we used the basic inequality  $1 + x \leq e^x$ ,  $\|Y_\tau\| \geq \varepsilon$  on  $A$ , and  $\cosh(x)$  is increasing when  $x \geq 0$ . In the last line, we used  $\cosh(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}e^x$ .

Let's deal with  $\sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [f(\lambda \|X_j\|)]$  on  $A$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [f(\lambda \|X_j\|)] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [\exp(\lambda \|X_j\|) - \lambda \|X_j\| - 1] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k+2)!} (\lambda \|X_j\|)^{k+2} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[ \|X_j\|^2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda b}{3}\right)^k \right] \\
&= \frac{\lambda^2}{2(1-\lambda b/3)} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [\|X_j\|^2] \\
&= \frac{\lambda^2}{2(1-\lambda b/3)} W_{\tau} \\
&\leq \frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2(1-\lambda b/3)},
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

which holds for any  $\lambda \in (0, \frac{3}{b})$ . In the third line, we used Taylor expansion  $e^x = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^k}{k!}$ . In the fourth line, we used  $(k+2)! \geq 2(3^k)$  and  $\|X_j\| \leq b$ . In the fifth line, we used Taylor expansion  $\frac{1}{1-x} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} x^k$  for  $x \in (-1, 1)$ . And in the last line, we use  $W_{\tau} \leq \sigma^2$  on  $A$ .

Substitute it into the previous inequality, we have for any  $\lambda \in (0, \frac{3}{b})$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(A) &\leq \sqrt{2\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ -\lambda\varepsilon + \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [f(\lambda \|X_j\|)] \right\} \mathbf{1}(A) \right]} \\
&\leq \sqrt{2\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ -\lambda\varepsilon + \frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2(1-\lambda b/3)} \right\} \mathbf{1}(A) \right]} \\
&= \sqrt{2 \exp \left\{ -\lambda\varepsilon + \frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2(1-\lambda b/3)} \right\}} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(A)},
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

hence

$$\mathbb{P}(A) \leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\lambda\varepsilon + \frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2(1-\lambda b/3)} \right\}, \tag{47}$$



we choose  $\lambda^* = \frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma^2 + \varepsilon b/3} \in (0, \frac{3}{b})$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(A) &\leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\lambda^* \varepsilon + \frac{(\lambda^*)^2 \sigma^2}{2(1 - \lambda^* b/3)} \right\} \\
&= 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\sigma^2 + \varepsilon b/3} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2 \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon b/3}{\sigma^2 + \varepsilon b/3}\right)} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\sigma^2 + \varepsilon b/3)^2} \right\} \\
&= 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{\varepsilon^2/2}{\sigma^2 + \varepsilon b/3} \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

which is the desired conclusion.  $\square$

We note that this proof cannot be straightforwardly extended to the case where the  $(\|X_i\|)_{i=1}^n$  are unbounded, such as when the conditions are changed to the Bernstein condition (Theorem 1.2A in [7]). To obtain such a result, one possible approach is to generalize the decoupling theory in [7] to Hilbert spaces. Fortunately, in this paper, we only need to consider the case where  $(\|X_i\|)_{i=1}^n$  are bounded.

## A.2 Proof of Theorem 4.2

*Proof.* According to Theorem 4.1, for any  $\varepsilon, \tilde{\sigma} > 0$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Y_n\| \geq \varepsilon \text{ and } W_n \leq \tilde{\sigma}^2) \leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{\varepsilon^2/2}{\tilde{\sigma}^2 + b\varepsilon/3} \right\}. \tag{49}$$

We can check that, when  $\varepsilon = \sqrt{4\tilde{\sigma}^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}} + \frac{4}{3}b \log \frac{2}{\delta}$ , we have the upper bound on RHS is less than  $\delta$ , hence

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \|Y_n\| \geq \sqrt{4\tilde{\sigma}^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}} + \frac{4}{3}b \log \frac{2}{\delta} \text{ and } W_n \leq \tilde{\sigma}^2 \right) \leq \delta. \tag{50}$$

Define the events

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_H &:= \left\{ \|Y_n\| \geq \sqrt{8 \max \left\{ W_n, \frac{\sigma^2}{2H} \right\} \log \frac{2H}{\delta}} + \frac{4}{3}b \log \frac{2H}{\delta} \right\}, \\
\mathcal{B}_{0,H} &:= \left\{ \|Y_n\| \geq \sqrt{8 \frac{\sigma^2}{2H} \log \frac{2H}{\delta}} + \frac{4}{3}b \log \frac{2H}{\delta} \text{ and } W_n \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{H-1}} \right\} \\
\mathcal{B}_{k,H} &:= \left\{ \|Y_n\| \geq \sqrt{8 \frac{\sigma^2}{2^k} \log \frac{2H}{\delta}} + \frac{4}{3}b \log \frac{2H}{\delta} \text{ and } \frac{\sigma^2}{2^k} \leq W_n \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{k-1}} \right\}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq H-1.
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Since  $W_n \leq \sigma^2$ , we can verify that  $\mathcal{H}_H \subseteq \bigcup_{0 \leq k < H} \mathcal{B}_{k,H}$ . By the inequality (50) with  $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{k-1}}$  and  $\delta$  set to be  $\frac{\delta}{H}$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_{k,H}) \leq \frac{\delta}{H}$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, H-1$ . By the union bound, we arrive at the conclusion

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_H) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_{k,H}) \leq \delta. \quad (52)$$

□

## B Omitted Proofs in Section 5.2

### B.1 Remove the Dependence on T for Step Sizes

We have shown that the conclusion holds for

$$T \geq \frac{C_4 \log^3 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^3} \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}| T}{\delta}, \quad (53)$$

$$\frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_5 (1-\sqrt{\gamma}) T}{\log^2 T}} \leq \alpha_t \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_6 (1-\sqrt{\gamma}) t}{\log^2 T}}, \quad (54)$$

where  $c_5 c_6 \leq \frac{1}{8}$ ,  $c_5 > c_6 > 0$  and  $C_4 > 0$ .

Then for some  $c_2 > c_3 > 0$  to be determined, now we assume

$$\frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_2 (1-\sqrt{\gamma}) t}{\log^2 t}} \leq \alpha_t \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_3 (1-\sqrt{\gamma}) t}{\log^2 t}}. \quad (55)$$

Next, we will show that if we consider the result of the  $\frac{T}{2}$ -th iteration with this step size scheme as the initialization of a new iteration process, then the step sizes in the subsequent  $\frac{T}{2}$  iterations lie in the previously established range. If this is done, the conclusion still holds if we choose  $T \geq \frac{2C_4 \log^3 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^3} \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}| T}{\delta}$ , since the initialization  $\eta_{T/2}^\pi \in \mathcal{P}^S$  (or  $\mathcal{P}_K^S$  in the case of CTD) is independent of the samples obtained for  $\frac{T}{2} < t \leq T$ .

For any  $\frac{T}{2} < t \leq T$ , we denote  $\tau := t - \frac{T}{2}$ , we can see that there exist  $c_2 > c_3 > 0$ , such that the last inequality in both of the following lines hold simultaneously, which is desired.

$$\tilde{\alpha}_\tau := \alpha_t \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_3 (1-\sqrt{\gamma}) (\tau + T/2)}{\log^2 (\tau + T/2)}} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_3 (1-\sqrt{\gamma}) \tau}{\log^2 T}} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_6 (1-\sqrt{\gamma}) \tau}{\log^2 (T/2)}}, \quad (56)$$

and

$$\bar{\alpha}_\tau = \alpha_t \geq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_2(1-\sqrt{\gamma})(\tau+T/2)}{\log^2(\tau+T/2)}} \geq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2c_2(1-\sqrt{\gamma})T/2}{\log^2(T/2)}} \geq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{c_5(1-\sqrt{\gamma})T/2}{\log^2(T/2)}}. \quad (57)$$

## B.2 Range of Step Size

*Proof of Lemma 5.1.*

$$(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})\alpha_t \geq \frac{1 - \sqrt{\gamma}}{1 + \frac{c_5(1-\sqrt{\gamma})T}{\log^2 T}} \geq \frac{1 - \sqrt{\gamma}}{\frac{2c_5(1-\sqrt{\gamma})T}{\log^2 T}} = \frac{\log^2 T}{2c_5 T}. \quad (58)$$

For any  $0 \leq k \leq \frac{t}{2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_k^{(t)} &\leq [1 - \alpha_{t/2}(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})]^{t/2} \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\log^2 T}{2c_5 T}\right)^{t/2} \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\log^2 T}{2c_5 T}\right)^{\frac{T}{2c_6 \log T}} \\ &= \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{\log^2 T}{2c_5 T}\right)^{\frac{2c_5 T}{\log^2 T}} \right\}^{\frac{\log T}{4c_5 c_6}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where in the last inequality, we used  $c_5 c_6 \leq \frac{1}{8}$ .

And for any  $\frac{t}{2} < k \leq t$ ,

$$\beta_k^{(t)} \leq \alpha_k \leq \frac{1}{\frac{c_6(1-\sqrt{\gamma})k}{\log^2 T}} \leq \frac{2 \log^3 T}{(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})T}. \quad (60)$$

□

## B.3 Concentration of the Martingale Term

*Proof of Lemma 5.2.* We will show that the inequality holds for each  $t \geq \frac{T}{c_6 \log T}$  and then apply the union bound. For any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , we denote

$$\zeta_k(s) := \zeta_k^{(t)}(s) = \alpha_k \left\{ \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i \mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{t-1} \right\}(s), \quad (61)$$

where we omit the superscript  $(t)$  for brevity, then LHS in the lemma equals  $\|\sum_{k=1}^t \zeta_k\|$  for each  $t$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_k := \sigma(\eta_0, \dots, \eta_k)$ , then  $\{\zeta_k(s)\}_{k=1}^t$  is a  $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}_{k=1}^t$ -martingale difference sequence:

$$\mathbb{E}_{k-1}[\zeta_k(s)] = \alpha_k \left\{ \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] \mathbb{E}_{k-1}[(\mathcal{T}_k - \mathcal{T})\eta_{k-1}] \right\}(s) = 0. \quad (62)$$

the first equality holds because a Bochner integral can be exchanged with a bounded linear operator (see [19] for more details about Bochner integral), and the second equality holds due to the definition of the empirical Bellman operator.

We hope to use Freedman's inequality (Theorem 4.2) to bound this martingale.

The norm of the martingale difference  $\|\zeta_k(s)\|$  can be bounded as follow

$$\begin{aligned} \|\zeta_k(s)\| &\leq \|\zeta_k\| \\ &\leq \alpha_k \left\| \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] \right\| \|(\mathcal{T}_k - \mathcal{T})\eta_{k-1}\| \\ &\leq \alpha_k \prod_{i=k+1}^t ((1 - \alpha_i) + \alpha_i\sqrt{\gamma}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}} \\ &= \frac{\beta_k^{(t)}}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}}. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Hence,  $\max_{k \in [t]} \|\zeta_k(s)\| \leq \frac{\max_{k \in [t]} \beta_k^{(t)}}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma}} \max \left\{ \frac{1}{T^2}, \frac{2 \log^3 T}{(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})T} \right\} \leq \frac{4 \log^3 T}{(1 - \gamma)^{3/2} T} =: b$ .

Now, let's calculate the quadratic variation.

We first introduce some notations. For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we denote  $\text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\boldsymbol{\xi}(s)\|^2 \right] \right)_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$ ,  $\text{Var}_k(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := \left( \mathbb{E}_k \left[ \|\boldsymbol{\xi}(s)\|^2 \right] \right)_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$  for any random element  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$  in  $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$ . With these notations, we need to bound  $\text{Var}_{k-1}(\zeta_k)$ .

For any  $\xi \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , we define its one-step update Cramér variation as  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\xi) := \text{Var} \left( (\widehat{\mathcal{T}} - \mathcal{T})\xi \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , where  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  is a random operator and has the same distribution as  $\mathcal{T}_1$ .

For any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , we say  $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}$  if  $\mathbf{x}(s) \leq \mathbf{y}(s)$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . In this part,  $\|\mathbf{x}\| := \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\infty} = \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |\mathbf{x}(s)|$ ,  $\sqrt{\mathbf{x}} := \left( \sqrt{\mathbf{x}(s)} \right)_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$ . And for any  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{U}\| := \|\mathbf{U}\|_{\infty} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}, \|\mathbf{x}\|=1} \|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}\| = \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} |\mathbf{U}(s, s')|$ .

We denote  $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}}$  as the identity matrix,  $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$  as the all-ones vector, and  $\mathbf{P} := P^{\pi} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}}$ , *i.e.*,  $\mathbf{P}(s, s') := P^{\pi}(s'|s) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s)P(s'|s, a)$ . Also, we let  $\mathbf{P}_t = (\delta_{s_t(s)=s'})_{s, s' \in \mathcal{S}}$  be the empirical version of  $\mathbf{P}$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{T}_t$ , for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

For any matrix of operators  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}}$ , we denote  $\mathbf{U}(s) = (\mathbf{U}(s, s'))_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})^{\mathcal{S}}$  as

the  $s$ -row of  $\mathcal{U}$ . And for any  $\xi \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , we define the vector inner product operation  $\mathcal{U}(s)\xi := \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{U}(s, s')\xi(s') \in \mathcal{M}$ .

We need to establish the following result first, which holds for both cases of NTD and CTD.

**Lemma B.1.** *For any  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(\alpha_i)_{i \in [n]} \in [0, 1]^n$ , let  $\mathcal{U}_n = \prod_{i=1}^n [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}]$ ,  $\mathbf{U}_n = \prod_{i=1}^n [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathbf{I} + \alpha_i\sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P}]$ ,  $u_n = \prod_{i=1}^n [(1 - \alpha_i) + \alpha_i\sqrt{\gamma}]$  then for any  $s, s' \in \mathcal{S}$ , we have*

$$\|\mathcal{U}_n(s, s')\nu\|^2 \leq u_n \mathbf{U}_n(s, s') \|\nu\|^2.$$

Utilizing this lemma, we get derive the following useful inequality. For any non-random  $\xi \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{S}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \mathcal{U}_n(s)(\widehat{\mathcal{T}} - \mathcal{T})\xi \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{U}_n(s, s') \left[ (\widehat{\mathcal{T}} - \mathcal{T})\xi \right] (s') \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{U}_n(s, s') \left[ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}(s')\xi - \mathcal{T}(s')\xi \right] \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \mathcal{U}_n(s, s') \left[ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}(s')\xi - \mathcal{T}(s')\xi \right] \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq u_n \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{U}_n(s, s') \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{T}}(s')\xi - \mathcal{T}(s')\xi \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= u_n \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{U}_n(s, s') \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\xi)(s') \\ &= u_n \mathbf{U}_n(s) \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\xi), \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

where we used different rows of  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  are independent, and  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}(s')\xi$  is an unbiased estimator of  $\mathcal{T}(s')\xi \in \mathcal{M}$ . Hence,  $\text{Var} \left( \mathcal{U}_n(\widehat{\mathcal{T}} - \mathcal{T})\xi \right) \leq u_n \mathbf{U}_n \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\xi)$ .

Now, we are ready to bound  $\text{Var}_{k-1}(\zeta_t)$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_{k-1}(\zeta_k) &= \alpha_k^2 \text{Var}_{k-1} \left( \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathcal{I} + \alpha_i\mathcal{T}] (\mathcal{T}_t - \mathcal{T}) \eta_{k-1} \right) \\ &\leq \alpha_k^2 \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) + \alpha_i\sqrt{\gamma}] \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathbf{I} + \alpha_i\sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P}] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_{k-1}) \\ &= \alpha_k \beta_k^{(t)} \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i)\mathbf{I} + \alpha_i\sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P}] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_{k-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Hence, the quadratic variation  $\mathbf{W}_t := \sum_{k=1}^t \text{Var}_{k-1}(\zeta_k)$  can be bounded as follow

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{W}_t &= \sum_{k=1}^t \text{Var}_{t-1}(\zeta_k) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^t \alpha_k \beta_k^{(t)} \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) \mathbf{I} + \alpha_i \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_{k-1}) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{t/2} \alpha_k \beta_k^{(t)} \left\| \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) \mathbf{I} + \alpha_i \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}] \right\| \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_{k-1})\| \mathbf{1} + \sum_{k=t/2+1}^t \alpha_k \beta_k^{(t)} \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) \mathbf{I} + \alpha_i \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_{k-1}) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{t/2} \left( \beta_k^{(t)} \right)^2 \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \mathbf{1} + \left( \max_{k: t/2 < k \leq t} \beta_k^{(t)} \right) \sum_{k=t/2+1}^t \alpha_k \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) \mathbf{I} + \alpha_i \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_{k-1}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2(1 - \gamma) T^3} \mathbf{1} + \frac{2 \log^3 T}{(1 - \sqrt{\gamma}) T} \left\{ \sum_{k=t/2+1}^t \alpha_k \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) \mathbf{I} + \alpha_i \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}] \right\} \max_{k: t/2 < k \leq t} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_{k-1}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2(1 - \gamma) T^3} \mathbf{1} + \frac{4 \log^3 T}{(1 - \gamma) T} (\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P})^{-1} \max_{k: t/2 < k \leq t} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_{k-1}),
\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

where in the forth line, we used

$$\alpha_k \left\| \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) \mathbf{I} + \alpha_i \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}] \right\| \leq \alpha_k \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) + \alpha_i \sqrt{\gamma}] = \beta_k^{(t)},$$

and

$$\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_{k-1})\| \leq \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} dx = \frac{1}{1 - \gamma}.$$

In the last line, note that  $\max_{k: t/2 \leq k < t} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_{k-1}) \geq \mathbf{0}$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=t/2+1}^t \alpha_k \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) \mathbf{I} + \alpha_i \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}] \\
&= (\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P})^{-1} \sum_{k=t/2+1}^t \alpha_k (\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}) \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) \mathbf{I} + \alpha_i \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}] \\
&= (\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P})^{-1} \sum_{k=t/2+1}^t \left\{ \prod_{i=k+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) \mathbf{I} + \alpha_i \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}] - \prod_{i=k}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) \mathbf{I} + \alpha_i \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}] \right\} \\
&= (\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P})^{-1} - (\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P})^{-1} \prod_{i=t/2+1}^t [(1 - \alpha_i) \mathbf{I} + \alpha_i \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}] \\
&\leq (\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P})^{-1},
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

where the inequality holds entry-wise since we can verify that all entries of  $(\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})^k$  and  $(1 - \alpha_i)\mathbf{I} + \alpha_i\sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P}$  are non-negative.

According to (66), we have the following deterministic upper bound for  $\|\mathbf{W}_t\| = \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{W}_t(s)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{W}_t\| &\leq \frac{1}{2(1-\gamma)T^3} + \frac{4\log^3 T}{(1-\gamma)T} \left\| (\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})^{-1} \right\|_{\max_{k: t/2 < k \leq t}} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_{k-1})\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2(1-\gamma)T^3} + \frac{8\log^3 T}{(1-\gamma)^3 T} \\ &\leq \frac{9\log^3 T}{(1-\gamma)^3 T} \\ &=: \sigma^2. \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Let  $H = \lceil 2\log_2 \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \rceil$ , we have

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{2^H} \leq \frac{9\log^3 T}{(1-\gamma)T}. \tag{69}$$

By applying Freedman's inequality (Theorem 4.2) and utilizing the union bound over  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , we obtain with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $t \in [T]$  and  $s \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( \left\| \sum_{k=1}^t \zeta_k(s) \right\| \right)_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{8 \left( \mathbf{W}_t + \frac{\sigma^2}{2^K} \mathbf{1} \right) \log \frac{8|\mathcal{S}|T \log \frac{1}{1-\gamma}}{\delta} + \frac{4}{3} b \log \frac{8|\mathcal{S}|T \log \frac{1}{1-\gamma}}{\delta} \mathbf{1}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{16 \left( \mathbf{W}_t + \frac{9\log^3 T}{(1-\gamma)T} \mathbf{1} \right) \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|T}{\delta} + 3b \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|T}{\delta} \mathbf{1}} \\ &\leq 8 \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)T} \left[ (\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})^{-1} \max_{k: t/2 < k \leq t} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_{k-1}) + 3 \cdot \mathbf{1} \right] + \frac{12(\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)^{3/2} T} \mathbf{1}}, \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

where we used  $\log \frac{8|\mathcal{S}|T \log \frac{1}{1-\gamma}}{\delta} \leq 2 \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|T}{\delta}$  in the second line, which holds due to the choice of  $T$ . The following lemmas are required for deriving the upper bound, which hold for both cases of NTD and CTD.

**Lemma B.2.** For any  $t \in [T]$ ,

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta_t) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta) \leq 4 \|\Delta_t\|_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}_1} \mathbf{1}.$$

**Lemma B.3.**

$$(\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta) \leq \frac{4}{1-\gamma}\mathbf{1}.$$

Combining the upper bound with the two lemmas, we get the desired conclusion

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \left\| \sum_{k=1}^t \zeta_k(s) \right\| \right)_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \\ & \leq 8 \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)T} \left[ 4 \max_{k: t/2 < k \leq t} \|\Delta_{k-1}\|_{\bar{W}_1} (\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})^{-1}\mathbf{1} + \frac{8}{1-\gamma}\mathbf{1} \right]} + \frac{12 (\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)^{3/2}T} \mathbf{1} \\ & \leq 22 \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)^2 T} \left( 1 + \max_{k: t/2 < k \leq t} \|\Delta_{k-1}\|_{\bar{W}_1} \right) \mathbf{1}} + \frac{12 (\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)^{3/2}T} \mathbf{1} \\ & \leq 34 \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)^2 T} \left( 1 + \max_{k: t/2 < k \leq t} \|\Delta_{k-1}\|_{\bar{W}_1} \right) \mathbf{1}}, \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

where in the last line, we used that, excluding the constant term, the first term is larger than the second term, given the choice of  $T \geq \frac{C_4 \log^3 T}{\varepsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^3} \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}$ .

□

## B.4 Solve the Recurrence Relation

**Theorem B.1.** *Suppose for all  $t \geq \frac{T}{\log T}$ ,*

$$\|\Delta_t\|_{\bar{W}_1} \leq 35 \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)^3 T} \left( 1 + \max_{k: t/2 < k \leq t} \|\Delta_{k-1}\|_{\bar{W}_1} \right)}.$$

*Then there exists some large universal constant  $C_7 > 0$ , such that*

$$\|\Delta_T\|_{\bar{W}_1} \leq C_7 \left( \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)^3 T}} + \frac{(\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)^3 T} \right).$$

*Proof.* For any  $k \geq 0$ , we denote

$$u_k := \max \left\{ \|\Delta_t\|_{\bar{W}_1} \mid 2^k \frac{T}{c_6 \log T} \leq t \leq T \right\}, \tag{72}$$

for  $0 \leq k \leq \log_2(c_6 \log T)$ . We can see that  $\|\Delta_T\|_{\bar{W}_1} \leq u_k$  for any valid  $k$ . Hence, it suffices to



show the upper bound holds for  $u_k$  for any valid  $k$ . It can be verified that  $u_0 \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ , and for  $k \geq 0$

$$u_{k+1} \leq 35 \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)^3 T}} (1 + u_k). \quad (73)$$

We first show that once  $u_k \leq 1$ , the subsequent values of  $u_{k+l}$  will also remain upper bounded by

1. Namely, if  $u_k \leq 1$  for some  $k \geq 1$ , then

$$u_{k+1} \leq 35 \sqrt{\frac{2 (\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)^3 T}} \leq 1, \quad (74)$$

if  $T \geq \frac{2450 \log^3 T \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}}{(1-\gamma)^3}$ .

Let  $\tau := \inf \{k : u_k \leq 1\}$ , then for any  $k > \tau$ , we have

$$u_k \leq 35 \sqrt{\frac{2 (\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)^3 T}} =: a. \quad (75)$$

For  $k \leq \tau$ , we have  $u_k \geq 1$  and thereby

$$u_{k+1} \leq 35 \sqrt{\frac{2 (\log^3 T) \left( \log \frac{|S|T}{\delta} \right)}{(1-\gamma)^3 T}} u_k = a \sqrt{u_k}, \quad (76)$$

*i.e.*,

$$\log u_{k+1} - 2 \log a \leq \frac{1}{2} (\log u_k - 2 \log a). \quad (77)$$

Apply it recursively, we have

$$\log u_{k+1} \leq 2 \log a + \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{k+1} (\log u_0 - 2 \log a), \quad (78)$$

*i.e.*,

$$u_{k+1} \leq a^2 \left( \frac{u_0}{a^2} \right)^{1/2^k} = a^{2(1-1/2^k)} u_0^{1/2^k} \leq a^{2(1-1/2^k)} \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^{1/2^k}}. \quad (79)$$

To sum up, for any  $k \geq 0$ ,  $u_{k+1}$  is always less than the sum of the upper bounds in cases of  $k > \tau$  and  $k \leq \tau$ ,

$$u_{k+1} \leq a + a^{2(1-1/2^k)} \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^{1/2^k}} \quad (80)$$

Note that,  $a^{2(1-1/2^k)} \leq \max\{a, \sqrt{a}\}$ , and if we take  $k \geq c_8 \log \log \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  for any constant  $c_8$ , we have  $\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^{1/2^k}} = O(1)$ . We can take the constant  $c_8$  small enough such that  $c_8 \log \log \frac{1}{1-\gamma} < \log_2(c_6 \log T)$  (this can be done and  $c_8$  is universal since  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma} = o(T)$ ), and thereby we can find a valid  $k^* \geq c_8 \log \log \frac{1}{1-\gamma} + 1$ . Then

$$\|\Delta_T\|_{\bar{W}_1} \leq u_{k^*} \leq C_7 \left( \sqrt{\frac{(\log^3 T) \left(\log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^3 T}} + \frac{(\log^3 T) \left(\log \frac{|S|T}{\delta}\right)}{(1-\gamma)^3 T} \right), \quad (81)$$

which is the desired conclusion, and  $C_7$  is some large universal constant related to  $c_8$ .  $\square$

## B.5 Proofs of Auxiliary Lemmas

*Proof of Lemma B.1.* We proof this result by induction. For  $n = 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{I}$ ,  $\mathbf{U}_0 = \mathbf{I}$ ,  $u_0 = 1$ , thereby the inequality holds trivially. Suppose the inequality holds true for  $n - 1$ . To prove that the inequality holds for  $n$ , it is sufficient to show that, for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\|[(1 - \alpha_n)\delta_{s,s'} + \alpha_n \mathcal{T}(s, s')] \mu\|^2 \leq [(1 - \alpha_n) + \alpha_n \sqrt{\gamma}] [(1 - \alpha_n)\delta_{s,s'} + \alpha_n \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}(s, s')] \|\mu\|^2,$$

where  $\delta_{s,s'} = 1$  if  $s = s'$ , and 0 otherwise.

LHS can be bounded as follow

$$\begin{aligned} & \|[(1 - \alpha_n)\delta_{s,s'} + \alpha_n \mathcal{T}(s, s')] \mu\|^2 \\ &= (1 - \alpha_n)^2 \delta_{s,s'} \|\mu\|^2 + 2(1 - \alpha_n)\alpha_n \delta_{s,s'} \langle \mu, \mathcal{T}(s, s')\mu \rangle + \alpha_n^2 \|\mathcal{T}(s, s')\mu\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 - \alpha_n)^2 \delta_{s,s'} \|\mu\|^2 + 2(1 - \alpha_n)\alpha_n \delta_{s,s'} \|\mu\| \|\mathcal{T}(s, s')\mu\| + \alpha_n^2 \|\mathcal{T}(s, s')\mu\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

where we used Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. We need to give an upper bound for  $\|\mathcal{T}(s, s')\mu\|^2$ .

Note that  $(\Pi_K \mathcal{T}^\pi)(s, s') = \Pi_K(\mathcal{T}^\pi(s, s'))$  and  $\|\Pi_K\| = 1$ , we only need to consider the case of

NTD, by the definition of  $\mathcal{T}(s, s')$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{T}(s, s')\mu\|^2 &= \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left[ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) P(s'|s, a) \int_0^1 F_\mu \left( \frac{x-r}{\gamma} \right) \mathcal{P}_R(dr|s, a) \right]^2 dx \\
&= \mathbf{P}(s, s')^2 \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left[ \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\pi(a|s) P(s'|s, a)}{\mathbf{P}(s, s')} \int_0^1 F_\mu \left( \frac{x-r}{\gamma} \right) \mathcal{P}_R(dr|s, a) \right]^2 dx \\
&= \mathbf{P}(s, s')^2 \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|s), r \sim \mathcal{P}_R(\cdot|s, a)} \left[ F_\mu \left( \frac{x-r}{\gamma} \right) \middle| s' \right] \right\}^2 dx \\
&\leq \mathbf{P}(s, s')^2 \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|s), r \sim \mathcal{P}_R(\cdot|s, a)} \left\{ \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left[ F_\mu \left( \frac{x-r}{\gamma} \right) \right]^2 dx \middle| s' \right\} \\
&= \gamma \mathbf{P}(s, s')^2 \|\mu\|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

where we used Jensen's inequality and Fubini's theorem. Substitute it back to the upper bound,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|[(1 - \alpha_n)\delta_{s,s'} + \alpha_n \mathcal{T}(s, s')] \mu\|^2 \\
&\leq (1 - \alpha_n)^2 \delta_{s,s'} \|\mu\|^2 + 2(1 - \alpha_n)\alpha_n \delta_{s,s'} \|\mu\| \|\mathcal{T}(s, s')\mu\| + \alpha_n^2 \|\mathcal{T}(s, s')\mu\|^2 \\
&\leq [(1 - \alpha_n)^2 \delta_{s,s'} + 2(1 - \alpha_n)\alpha_n \delta_{s,s'} \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}(s, s') + \alpha_n^2 \gamma \mathbf{P}(s, s')^2] \|\mu\|^2 \\
&= [(1 - \alpha_n)^2 \delta_{s,s'} + \alpha_n \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}(s, s')]^2 \|\mu\|^2 \\
&\leq [(1 - \alpha_n) + \alpha_n \sqrt{\gamma}] [(1 - \alpha_n)\delta_{s,s'} + \alpha_n \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbf{P}(s, s')] \|\mu\|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

which is desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma B.2.* For any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma(\eta_t)(s) - \sigma(\eta)(s) \\
&= \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ F_{(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta_t)(s)}^2(x) \right] - F_{(\mathcal{T}\eta_t)(s)}^2(x) - \mathbb{E} \left[ F_{(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta)(s)}^2(x) \right] + F_{(\mathcal{T}\eta)(s)}^2(x) \right\} dx \\
&= \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ F_{(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta_t)(s)}^2(x) - F_{(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta)(s)}^2(x) \right] + F_{(\mathcal{T}\eta)(s)}^2(x) - F_{(\mathcal{T}\eta_t)(s)}^2(x) \right\} dx \\
&= \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( F_{(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta_t)(s)}(x) - F_{(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta)(s)}(x) \right) \left( F_{(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta_t)(s)}(x) + F_{(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta)(s)}(x) \right) \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left( F_{(\mathcal{T}\eta)(s)}(x) - F_{(\mathcal{T}\eta_t)(s)}(x) \right) \left( F_{(\mathcal{T}\eta)(s)}(x) + F_{(\mathcal{T}\eta_t)(s)}(x) \right) \right\} dx \\
&\leq 2 \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| F_{(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta_t)(s)}(x) - F_{(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta)(s)}(x) \right| \right] + \left| F_{(\mathcal{T}\eta)(s)}(x) - F_{(\mathcal{T}\eta_t)(s)}(x) \right| \right\} dx \\
&= 2 \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{T}}(\eta_t - \eta)(s) \right\|_{W_1} \right] + \|\mathcal{T}(\eta_t - \eta)(s)\|_{W_1} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

In the case of NTD,  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  are  $\gamma$ -contraction w.r.t. the supreme 1-Wasserstein metric, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(\eta_t)(s) - \sigma(\eta)(s) &\leq 2 \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{T}}(\eta_t - \eta)(s) \right\|_{W_1} \right] + \|\mathcal{T}(\eta_t - \eta)(s)\|_{W_1} \right) \\ &\leq 4\gamma \|\eta_t - \eta\|_{\bar{W}_1} \\ &\leq 4 \|\Delta_t\|_{\bar{W}_1}.\end{aligned}\tag{86}$$

In the case of CTD, if we can show  $\Pi_K$  is non-expansive w.r.t. 1-Wasserstein metric, the conclusion still holds. For any  $x, y \in \left[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right]$  such that  $x < y$ , we denote  $x \in [x_k, x_{k+1})$  and  $y \in [x_l, x_{l+1})$ , then  $k \leq l$ , by the definition of  $\Pi_K$ , we have

$$\Pi_K(\delta_x) = \frac{x_{k+1} - y}{\iota_K} \delta_{x_k} + \frac{y - x_k}{\iota_K} \delta_{x_{k+1}},\tag{87}$$

$$\Pi_K(\delta_y) = \frac{x_{l+1} - y}{\iota_K} \delta_{x_l} + \frac{y - x_l}{\iota_K} \delta_{x_{l+1}}.\tag{88}$$

If  $k = l$ , we can check that  $W_1(\Pi_K \delta_x, \Pi_K \delta_y) = \iota_K \frac{y-x}{\iota_K} = y-x$ . If  $k < l$ , we have  $W_1(\Pi_K \delta_x, \Pi_K \delta_y) \leq W_1(\Pi_K \delta_x, x_{k+1}) + W_1(x_{k+1}, x_l) + W_1(x_l, \Pi_K \delta_y) = (x_{k+1} - x) + (x_l - x_{k+1}) + (y - x_{x_l}) = y - x$ . Hence, for any  $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}$  and for any transport plan  $\kappa \in \Gamma(\nu_1, \nu_2)$ , the previous results tell us the cost of the transport plan  $\Pi_K \kappa \in \Gamma(\Pi_K \nu_1, \Pi_K \nu_2)$  induced by  $\Pi_K$  is no greater than the cost of  $\kappa$ . Consequently,  $W_1(\Pi_K \nu_1, \Pi_K \nu_2) \leq W_1(\nu_1, \nu_2)$ , *i.e.*,  $\Pi_K$  is non-expansive w.r.t. 1-Wasserstein metric, which is desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma B.3.* Firstly, we show that for any  $\mathbf{v} \geq \mathbf{0}$ , we have  $\|(\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})^{-1}\mathbf{v}\| \leq 2\|(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\mathbf{v}\|$

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})^{-1}\mathbf{v}\| &= \|(\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})^{-1}(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\mathbf{v}\| \\ &= \|(\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})^{-1}[(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})\mathbf{I} + \sqrt{\gamma}(\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})](\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\mathbf{v}\| \\ &= \|[ (1 - \sqrt{\gamma})(\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})^{-1} + \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{I} ](\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\mathbf{v}\| \\ &\leq (1 - \sqrt{\gamma})\|(\mathbf{I} - \sqrt{\gamma}\mathbf{P})^{-1}(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\mathbf{v}\| + \sqrt{\gamma}\|(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\mathbf{v}\| \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{\gamma}}{1 - \sqrt{\gamma}} + \sqrt{\gamma}\right)\|(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\mathbf{v}\| \\ &\leq 2\|(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\mathbf{v}\|.\end{aligned}\tag{89}$$

In the case of NTD, by Corollary C.1, we have

$$\|(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\sigma(\eta)\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma},\tag{90}$$

In the case of CTD, by Corollary 5.12 in [23], we have

$$\|(\mathbf{I} - \gamma \mathbf{P})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta)\| \leq \frac{2}{1 - \gamma}, \quad (91)$$

given  $K \geq \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2(1-\gamma)^2} + 1$ . □

## C Stochastic Distributional Bellman Equation and Operator

In this section, we use the same notations as in Appendix B and only consider the NTD setting. Inspired by stochastic categorical CDF Bellman operator introduced in [23], we introduce stochastic distributional Bellman operator  $\mathcal{T}: \Delta(\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{P})$  to derive an upper bound for  $\|(\mathbf{I} - \gamma \mathbf{P})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta)\|$  in the case of NTD. For any  $\phi \in \Delta(\mathcal{P})$ , we denote  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_\phi$  be the random element in  $\mathcal{P}$  with law  $\phi$ .

$$\mathcal{T}\phi := \text{Law}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_\phi\right), \quad (92)$$

where  $(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_\phi)(\omega) := (\widehat{\mathcal{T}})(\omega)(\boldsymbol{\eta}_\phi)(\omega) \in \mathcal{P}$  for any  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\Omega$  is the corresponding probability space, and  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  is independent of  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_\phi$ . In this part,  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  uses samples of immediate reward  $\{r(s)\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$  instead of the full information of  $\mathcal{P}_R$  to update. And  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  does not consist of  $\Pi_K$  since we only consider the NTD setting.

We consider the 1-Wasserstein metric  $W_1$  on  $\Delta(\mathcal{P})$ , the space of all probability measures on the space  $(\mathcal{P}, \bar{\ell}_2)$ . Since  $(\mathcal{P}, \bar{\ell}_2)$  is Polish (complete and separable), the space  $(\Delta(\mathcal{P}), W_1)$  is also Polish (Theorem 6.18 in [27]).

**Proposition C.1.** *The stochastic distributional Bellman operator  $\mathcal{T}$  is a  $\sqrt{\gamma}$ -contraction on  $\Delta(\mathcal{P})$ , i.e., for any  $\phi, \phi' \in \Delta(\mathcal{P})$ , we have*

$$W_1(\mathcal{T}\phi, \mathcal{T}\phi') \leq \sqrt{\gamma} W_1(\phi, \phi').$$

*Proof.* Let  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}^* \in \Gamma(\phi, \phi')$  be the optimal coupling between  $\phi$  and  $\phi'$ . The existence of  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}^*$  is guaranteed by Theorem 4.1 in [27]. And let the random element  $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \boldsymbol{\xi}_2)$  in  $\mathcal{P}^2$  has the law  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}^*$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_1$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_2$  are both random elements in  $\mathcal{P}$ . We denote  $\mathcal{T}\boldsymbol{\kappa}^* := \text{Law}\left[\left(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{\xi}_2\right)\right] \in$

$\Gamma(\mathcal{T}\phi, \mathcal{T}\phi')$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
W_1(\mathcal{T}\phi, \mathcal{T}\phi') &= \inf_{\kappa \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}\phi, \mathcal{T}\phi')} \int_{\mathcal{P}^2} \bar{\ell}_2(\xi, \xi') \kappa(d\xi, d\xi') \\
&\leq \int_{\mathcal{P}^2} \bar{\ell}_2(\xi, \xi') \mathcal{T}\kappa^*(d\xi, d\xi') \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \bar{\ell}_2(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\xi_1, \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\xi_2) \right] \\
&\leq \sqrt{\gamma} \mathbb{E} [\bar{\ell}_2(\xi_1, \xi_2)] \\
&= \sqrt{\gamma} \int_{\mathcal{P}^2} \bar{\ell}_2(\xi, \xi') \kappa^*(d\xi, d\xi') \\
&= \sqrt{\gamma} \inf_{\kappa \in \Gamma(\phi, \phi')} \int_{\mathcal{P}^2} \bar{\ell}_2(\xi, \xi') \kappa(d\xi, d\xi') \\
&= \sqrt{\gamma} W_1(\phi, \phi').
\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

□

By the proposition and contraction mapping theorem, there exists a unique fixed point of  $\mathcal{T}$ , we denote  $\psi \in \Delta(\mathcal{P})$  as the fixed point. Hence, the stochastic distributional Bellman equation reads

$$\psi = \mathcal{T}\psi. \tag{94}$$

We denote  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi$  as the random element in  $\mathcal{P}$  with law  $\psi$ , then  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi$  have the same law. As shown in the following proposition,  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi$  can be regarded as a noisy version of  $\eta$ .

**Proposition C.2.**

$$\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi] = \eta,$$

where the expectation is regarded as the Bochner integral in the space of all finite measures on  $\mathcal{P}$ , which is a normed linear space equipped with Cramér metric as its norm.

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi] &= \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi \mid \boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi] \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi] \\
&= \mathcal{T}\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi],
\end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

where we used  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  is independent of  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi$ . Since  $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi]$  is the fixed point of  $\mathcal{T}$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi] = \eta$ . □

Based on the concepts of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\psi$ , we can obtain the following second order distributional Bellman equation, which is similar to the classic second-order Bellman equation (Lemma 7 in [11]).

Recall the one-step Cramér variation  $\sigma(\eta) = \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{full}} \eta \right) (s) - \eta(s) \right\|^2 \right] \right)_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$  used in the NTD setting, where  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{full}}$  use the full distribution  $\mathcal{P}_R$  to update. We denote  $\sigma := \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \eta \right) (s) - \eta(s) \right\|^2 \right] \right)_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , and  $\Sigma := \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi(s) - \eta(s) \right\|^2 \right] \right)_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$ .

We first show that  $\sigma(\eta) \leq \sigma$ . In fact, this is a direct consequence of the Rao-Blackwell theorem.

**Proposition C.3.**

$$\sigma(\eta) \leq \sigma.$$

*Proof.* We construct  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{full}}$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ , such that they use same action and next state samples to update, then  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{full}} \eta = \mathbb{E} \left[ \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \eta \mid \{(a(s), s'(s))\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \right]$ . For any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\eta)(s) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{full}} \eta \right) (s) - \eta(s) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \eta \right) (s) - \eta(s) \mid a(s), s'(s) \right] \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \eta \right) (s) - \eta(s) \right\|^2 \mid a(s), s'(s) \right] \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \eta \right) (s) - \eta(s) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \sigma(s). \end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

where we used Jensen's inequality for conditional expectation. □

**Proposition C.4** (Second order distributional Bellman equation).

$$\Sigma = \sigma + \gamma \mathbf{P} \Sigma.$$

*Proof.* For any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(s) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi(s) - \eta(s) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi \right) (s) - \eta(s) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi \right) (s) - \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \eta \right) (s) + \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \eta \right) (s) - \eta(s) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \eta \right) (s) - \eta(s) \right\|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi \right) (s) - \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \eta \right) (s) \right\|^2 \right], \end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

where the last equality holds since the cross term is zero as below

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\langle \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta \right) (s) - \eta(s), \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi \right) (s) - \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta \right) (s) \right\rangle \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\langle \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta \right) (s) - \eta(s), \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi \right) (s) - \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta \right) (s) \right\rangle \middle| \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \right] \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\langle \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta \right) (s) - \eta(s), \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi \right) (s) \middle| \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \right] - \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta \right) (s) \right\rangle \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\langle \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta \right) (s) - \eta(s), \mathbf{0} \right\rangle \right] \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

The first term in (97) is  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(s)$ , we need to deal with the second term.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi \right) (s) - \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta \right) (s) \right\|^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi \right) (s) - \left( \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\eta \right) (s) \right\|^2 \middle| \boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi \right] \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{a(s) \sim \pi(\cdot|s), s'(s) \sim P(\cdot|s, a(s)), r(s) \sim \mathcal{P}_R(\cdot|s, a(s))} \left[ \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \left( F_{(\boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi)(s'(s))} \left( \frac{x-r}{\gamma} \right) - F_{\eta(s'(s))} \left( \frac{x-r}{\gamma} \right) \right)^2 dx \middle| \boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi \right] \right\} \\
&= \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi(s') - \eta(s') \right\|^2 \right] \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) P(s'|s, a) \\
&= \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{P}(s, s') \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(s').
\end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

Put these together, and we can arrive at the conclusion.  $\square$

Now, we can derive a tighter upper bound for  $\|(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta)\|$ .

**Corollary C.1.**

$$\|(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta)\| \leq \|(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}\| = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\| \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}.$$

*Proof.* Note that all entries of  $(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\gamma\mathbf{P})^k$  are positive, thereby  $(\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\eta) \leq (\mathbf{I} - \gamma\mathbf{P})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(s) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \boldsymbol{\eta}_\psi(s) - \eta(s) \right\|^2 \right] \leq \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} dx = \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

## D Other Technical Lemmas

**Lemma D.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,

$$\begin{aligned}
W_1(\mu, \nu) &= \int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} |F_\mu(x) - F_\nu(x)| dx \\
&\leq \sqrt{\int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} 1^2 dx} \sqrt{\int_0^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} |F_\mu(x) - F_\nu(x)|^2 dx} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} \ell_2(\mu, \nu).
\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}
W_p(\mu, \nu) &= \left( \inf_{\kappa \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \int_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]^2} |x - y|^p \kappa(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}} \left( \inf_{\kappa \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \int_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]^2} |x - y| \kappa(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p} \\
&= \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}} W_1^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mu, \nu).
\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

□

**Lemma D.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

$$\eta_t^\pi = (1 - \alpha_t) \eta_{t-1}^\pi + \alpha_t \mathcal{T}_t^\pi \eta_{t-1}^\pi. \tag{102}$$

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. □