

---

# ONE-SHOT AVERAGING FOR DISTRIBUTED TD( $\lambda$ ) UNDER MARKOV SAMPLING

---

A PREPRINT

**Haoxing Tian, Ioannis Ch. Paschalidis, Alex Olshevsky**  
 Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
 Boston University  
 Boston, MA 02215, USA  
 {tianhx, yannisp, alexols}@bu.edu

March 15, 2024

## ABSTRACT

We consider a distributed setup for reinforcement learning, where each agent has a copy of the same Markov Decision Process but transitions are sampled from the corresponding Markov chain independently by each agent. We show that in this setting, we can achieve a linear speedup for TD( $\lambda$ ), a family of popular methods for policy evaluation, in the sense that  $N$  agents can evaluate a policy  $N$  times faster provided the target accuracy is small enough. Notably, this speedup is achieved by “one shot averaging,” a procedure where the agents run TD( $\lambda$ ) with Markov sampling independently and only average their results after the final step. This significantly reduces the amount of communication required to achieve a linear speedup relative to previous work.

## 1 Introduction

We consider the problem of policy evaluation in reinforcement learning: given a Markov Decision Process (MDP) and a policy, we need to estimate the value of each state (expected discounted sum of all future rewards) under this policy. Policy evaluation is important because it is effectively a subroutine of many other algorithms such as policy iteration and actor-critic. The main challenges for policy evaluation are that we usually do not know the underlying MDP directly and can only interact with it, and that the number of states is typically too large forcing us to maintain a low-dimensional approximation of the true vector of state values.

We focus here on the simplest class of methods overcoming this set of challenges, namely temporal difference methods with linear function approximation. These methods try to maintain a low dimensional parameter which is continuously updated based on observed rewards and transitions to maintain consistency of estimates across states. The proof of convergence for these methods was first given in Tsitsiklis & Van Roy (1996).

In this paper, we focus on the multi-agent version of policy evaluation: we consider  $N$  agents that have a copy of the same MDP and the same policy, but transitions in the MDP by different agents are independent. The question we wish to ask is whether the agents can cooperate to evaluate the underlying policy  $N$  times faster, since now  $N$  transitions are generated per unit time.

Although there is some previous work on distributed temporal difference methods (e.g., Doan et al. (2019); Sun et al. (2020); Wang et al. (2020)), this question has only been considered in the recent papers Khodadadian et al. (2022); Zhang et al. (2024); Liu & Olshevsky (2023). The answer was positive in Khodadadian et al. (2022) in a “federated learning” setting, provided the nodes have  $N$  rounds of communication with a central server before time  $T$ . In Zhang et al. (2024), the answer was also positive (i.e., linear speedup was obtained) under a distributed erasure model where each node communicated with neighbors in a graph a constant fraction of time, leading to  $O(T)$  communications in  $T$  steps. Our previous work Liu & Olshevsky (2023) established that, in fact, only one communication round with a central server is sufficient in the case of i.i.d. observations and TD(0), the most basic method within the temporal difference family. This was accomplished via the “one-shot averaging” methods where the  $N$  agents just ignore each

other for  $T$  steps, and then simply average their results. Further, the final averaging step could be replaced with  $O(\log T)$  rounds of an average consensus method.

The i.i.d. observation assumption is a limiting feature of our previous work in Liu & Olshevsky (2023): it is assumed that at each time, we can generate a random state from the underlying MDP. This is convenient for analysis but rarely satisfied in practice.

In this paper, our contribution is to show that one-shot averaging suffices to give a linear speedup *without* the i.i.d. assumption and for the more general class of temporal difference methods TD( $\lambda$ ) (precise definitions are given later). Our method of proof is new and does not overlap with the arguments given in our previous work.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Markov Decision Process (MDP)

A finite discounted-reward MDP can be described by a tuple  $(S, A, P_{\text{env}}, r, \gamma)$ , where  $S$  is the state-space whose elements are vectors, with  $s_0$  being the starting state;  $A$  is the action space;  $P_{\text{env}} = (P_{\text{env}}(s'|s, a))_{s, s' \in S, a \in A}$  is the transition probability matrix, where  $P_{\text{env}}(s'|s, a)$  is the probability of transitioning from  $s$  to  $s'$  after taking action  $a$ ;  $r : S \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the reward function, where  $r(s, s')$  associates a deterministic reward with each state transition; and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  is the discount factor.

A policy  $\pi$  is a mapping  $\pi : S \times A \rightarrow [0, 1]$  where  $\pi(a|s)$  is the probability that action  $a$  is taken in state  $s$ . Given a policy  $\pi$ , the state transition matrix  $P_\pi = (P_\pi(s'|s))_{s, s' \in S}$  and the state reward function  $r_\pi(s)$  is defined as

$$P_\pi(s'|s) = \sum_{a \in A} P_{\text{env}}(s'|s, a)\pi(a|s), \quad r_\pi(s) = \sum_{s' \in S} P_\pi(s'|s)r(s, s').$$

Since the policy is fixed throughout the paper, we will omit the subscript  $\pi$  and thus write  $P(s'|s)$  and  $r(s)$  instead of  $P_\pi(s'|s)$  and  $r_\pi(s)$ .

The stationary distribution  $\mu$  is a nonnegative vector with coordinates summing to one and satisfying  $\mu^T = \mu^T P$ . The Perron-Frobenius theorem guarantees that such a stationary distribution exists and is unique subject to some conditions on  $P$ , e.g., aperiodicity and irreducibility Gantmacher (1964). The entries of  $\mu$  are denoted by  $\mu(s)$ .

The value function  $V_\pi^*(s)$  is defined as

$$V_\pi^*(s) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{+\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t) \right]$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_\pi$  stands for the expectation when actions are chosen according to policy  $\pi$ . It is useful to assume a bound on rewards.

**Assumption 2.1.** For any  $s, s' \in S \times S$ ,

$$|r(s, s')| \leq r_{\max}.$$

### 2.2 Value Function Approximation

Given a fixed policy, the problem is to efficiently estimate  $V_\pi^*$ . We consider a linear function approximation architecture  $V_{\pi, \theta}(s) = \phi(s)^T \theta$ , where  $\phi(s) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is a feature vector for state  $s$  and  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Without loss of generality, we assume  $\|\phi(s)\| \leq 1$  for all states  $s$ . For simplicity, we define  $V_{\pi, \theta} = (V_{\pi, \theta}(s))_{s \in S}$  to be a column vector,  $\Phi = (\phi(s)^T)_{s \in S}$  to be a  $|S| \times d$  matrix and  $R = (r(s))_{s \in S}$  to be a column vector. We are thus trying to approximate  $V_{\pi, \theta} \approx \Phi \theta$ .

### 2.3 Some special norms

Certain norms will play a special role in our analysis and we define them here. Let  $D = \text{diag}(\mu(s))$  be the diagonal matrix whose elements are given by the entries of the stationary distribution  $\mu$ . Given a function  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , its  $D$ -norm is defined as

$$\|f\|_D^2 = f^T D f = \sum_{s \in S} \mu(s) f(s)^2. \quad (1)$$

The  $D$ -norm is similar to the Euclidean norm except each entry is weighted proportionally to the stationary distribution. We make the following assumption:

**Assumption 2.2** (Input assumption). *It is standard to assume the following statements hold:*

- The vectors  $\{\phi(s), s \in S\}$  are independent.
- The stationary distribution  $\mu(s) > 0, \forall s \in S$ .

We further define  $\Sigma = \Phi^T D \Phi$  and denote  $\omega > 0$  to be its smallest singular value.

Next, we define the so-called ‘‘Dirichlet semi-norm’’ of  $f$ :

$$\|f\|_{\text{Dir}}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s, s' \in S} \mu(s) P(s'|s) (f(s') - f(s))^2. \quad (2)$$

Following Ollivier (2018), the weighted combination of the  $D$ -norm and the Dirichlet semi-norm, denoted as  $\mathcal{N}(f)$ , is defined as the following. Notice that  $\sqrt{\mathcal{N}(f)}$  is a valid norm.

$$\mathcal{N}(f) = (1 - \gamma) \|f\|_D^2 + \gamma \|f\|_{\text{Dir}}^2. \quad (3)$$

We also define the  $k$ -step Dirichlet semi-norm as

$$\|f\|_{\text{Dir}, k}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s, s' \in S} \mu(s) P_k(s'|s) (f(s') - f(s))^2. \quad (4)$$

where  $P_k(\cdot|\cdot)$  stands for the  $k$ -step transition probability. Following Liu & Olshesky (2021), for any fixed  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , the weighted combination of the  $D$ -norm and the  $k$ -step Dirichlet semi-norm, denoted by  $\mathcal{N}^{(\lambda)}(f)$ , is defined as

$$\mathcal{N}^{(\lambda)}(f) = (1 - \kappa) \|f\|_D^2 + (1 - \lambda) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k \gamma^{k+1} \|f\|_{\text{Dir}, k+1}^2. \quad (5)$$

where  $\kappa = \gamma \frac{1-\lambda}{1-\gamma\lambda}$ . An obvious result is that  $\kappa \leq \gamma$ .

## 2.4 Distributed Markov Model and Algorithm

We assume that there are  $N$  agents and each agent shares the same tuple  $(S, A, P_{\text{env}}, r, \gamma)$  as well as the same fixed policy  $\pi$ . However, each agent independently samples its trajectories and updates its own version of a parameter  $\theta_t$ .

We will study an algorithm which mixes TD learning and one-shot averaging: after all agents finish  $T$  steps, they share their information and compute the average parameter as the final result. These agents do not communicate before the final step. The averaging can take place using average consensus (using any average consensus algorithm) or, in a federated manner, using a single communication with a coordinator.

We next spell out the details of our algorithm. Every agent runs TD(0) with Markov sampling as follows. Agent  $i$  generates an initial state  $s_i(0)$  from some initial distribution. It also maintains an iterate  $\theta_i(t)$ , initialized arbitrarily. At time  $t$ , agent  $i$  generates a transition according to  $P$ . It then computes the so-called TD-error

$$\delta_{s, s'}(\theta_i(t)) = r(s, s') + \gamma \phi(s')^T \theta_i(t) - \phi(s)^T \theta_i(t),$$

with  $s = s_i(t)$ ,  $s' = s_i(t+1)$  coming from the transition it just generated; and then updates

$$\theta_i(t+1) = \theta_i(t) + \alpha_t g_{s_i(t), s_i(t+1)}(\theta_i(t)) \quad (6)$$

where the update direction is

$$g_{s, s'}(\theta) = \delta_{s, s'}(\theta) \phi(s).$$

At the end, the agents average their results. The complete algorithm is shown in Algorithm 1.

We will further use  $\bar{g}$  to denote the expectation of  $g_{s, s'}$  assuming  $s$  are sampled from the stationary distribution  $\mu$  and  $s'$  is generated by taking a step from  $P$ :

$$\bar{g}(\theta) := \mathbb{E}_{\text{I}} [g_{s, s'}(\theta)] := \sum_s \mu(s) \sum_{s'} P_{\pi}(s'|s) g_{s, s'}(\theta).$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{\text{I}}$  means  $s \sim \mu, s' \sim P(\cdot|s)$ .

**Algorithm 1** TD(0) with local state**Require:** Iterations  $T$ , learning rate  $\alpha_t$ .Initialize  $\theta_i(0)$  for every agent  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ .**for**  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T-1\}$  **do**  **for**  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  **do**    Compute  $\delta_{s_i(t), s_i(t+1)}(\theta_i(t))$  and  $g_{s_i(t), s_i(t+1)}(\theta_i(t))$ .  
    Execute

$$\theta_i(t+1) = \theta_i(t) + \alpha_t g_{s_i(t), s_i(t+1)}(\theta_i(t)).$$

**end for****end for**

Return the average

$$\bar{\theta}(T) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i(T).$$

In order to perform our analysis, we need to define the stationary point. We adopt the classic way of defining such point as shown in Tsitsiklis & Van Roy (1996). We call  $\theta^*$  the stationary point if  $\bar{g}(\theta^*) = 0$ . In matrix notation,

$$\Phi^T D (R + (\gamma P - I) \Phi \theta^*) = 0.$$

Naturally, each agent can easily compute  $\theta^*$  by running TD(0) for infinite times and simply ignore all the other agents. However, this ignores the possibility that agents can benefit from communicating with each other.

We next introduce Distributed TD( $\lambda$ ) Tsitsiklis & Van Roy (1996). For any fixed  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , TD( $\lambda$ ) executes the update

$$\theta_i(t+1) = \theta_i(t) + \alpha_t x_{s_i(t), s_i(t+1)}(\theta_i(t), z_{0:t}).$$

Here,  $z_{0:t}$  is called eligibility trace.  $z_{0:t}$  and  $x_{s_i(t), s_i(t+1)}(\theta_i(t), z_{0:t})$  is given by

$$z_{0:t} = \sum_{k=0}^t (\gamma \lambda)^k \phi(s_i(t-k)), \quad x_{s_i(t), s_i(t+1)}(\theta_i(t), z_{0:t}) = \delta_{s_i(t), s_i(t+1)}(\theta_i(t)) z_{0:t}$$

The complete algorithm is shown in Algorithm 2.

**Algorithm 2** TD( $\lambda$ ) with local state**Require:** Iterations  $T$ , learning rate  $\alpha_t$ .Initialize for every agent by  $\theta_i(0), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ .**for**  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T-1\}$  **do**  **for**  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  **do**    Compute  $\delta_{s_i(t), s_i(t+1)}(\theta_i(t))$  and  $x_{s_i(t), s_i(t+1)}(\theta_i(t), z_{0:t})$ .  
    Execute

$$\theta_i(t+1) = \theta_i(t) + \alpha_t x_t(\theta_i(t), z_{0:t}).$$

**end for****end for**

Return the average

$$\bar{\theta}(T) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i(T).$$

For convenience of the analysis, we define the eligibility trace going back to minus infinity:

$$z_{-\infty:t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} z_{0:t} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\gamma \lambda)^k \phi(s_i(t-k)).$$

We also introduce the operator  $T_{\pi}^{(\lambda)}$  which is defined as

$$\left( T_{\pi}^{(\lambda)} V \right) (s) = (1 - \lambda) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^k \gamma^t r(s_i(t), s_i(t+1)) + \gamma^{k+1} V(s_i(k+1)) \mid s_i(0) = s \right].$$

In matrix notation:

$$T_\pi^{(\lambda)}V = (1 - \lambda) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k \left( \sum_{t=0}^k \gamma^t P^t R + \gamma^{k+1} P^{k+1} V \right). \quad (7)$$

We denote  $\bar{x}(\theta_i(t)) = \mathbb{E}_I [x_{s,s'}(\theta_i(t), z_{-\infty:t})]$ . This expectation assumes that  $s_i(k) \sim \mu, \forall k$ , and that the history of the process then extends to  $-\infty$  according to a distribution consistent with each forward step being taken by  $P$ ; for more details, see Tsitsiklis & Van Roy (1996). We also note that Lemma 8 in Tsitsiklis & Van Roy (1996) implies

$$\bar{x}(\theta_t) = \Phi^T D \left( T_\pi^{(\lambda)}(\Phi\theta) - \Phi\theta \right). \quad (8)$$

Finally, the optimal solution is defined to satisfy  $\bar{x}(\theta^*) = 0$ .

## 2.5 Markov Sampling and Mixing

The typical way of sampling  $s_i(t)$  is generating a trajectory  $s_i(1), \dots, s_i(T)$ . Every state in this trajectory is sampled by taking a transition  $s_i(t) \sim P(\cdot | s_i(t-1))$  (and recall our policy is always fixed). This way of sampling is called Markov sampling, and we denote  $\mathbb{E}_M = \mathbb{E}_{s_i(t) \sim P(\cdot | s_i(t-1))}$ . Analyzing algorithms under Markov sampling can be challenging since one cannot ignore the dependency on previous samples. The following ‘‘uniform mixing’’ assumption is standard Bhandari et al. (2018). We also note that this assumption always holds for irreducible and aperiodic Markov chains Levin & Peres (2017).

**Assumption 2.3.** *There are constants  $m$  and  $\rho$  such that*

$$\|P(s(t) \in \cdot | s(0)) - \mu\|_1 \leq m\rho^t, \quad \forall t.$$

A key definition from the uniform mixing assumption is called the mixing time. We define the mixing time  $\tau_{\min}(\epsilon)$ :

$$\tau_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon) = \min\{t \mid m\rho^t \leq \epsilon\}.$$

In this paper, we always set  $\epsilon = \alpha_t$  which is the step-size at time  $t$ , typically  $\alpha_t = \beta/(c+t)$ , and simplify  $\tau_{\text{mix}}(\alpha_t)$  as  $\tau_{\text{mix}}$ . An obvious result is that

$$m\rho^t \leq \alpha_t, \quad \forall t \geq \tau_{\text{mix}}.$$

## 2.6 Convergence times for centralized TD(0) and TD( $\lambda$ )

We are now able to state previous results for the centralized case which we will use as a basis for comparison for our distributed results.

**Lemma 2.1** (Bhandari et al. (2018)). *In TD(0) with the Markov chain observation model, suppose Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3 hold. For a decaying stepsize sequence  $\alpha_t = 2/(\omega(t+1)(1-\gamma))$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\theta_i(T) - \theta^*\|^2] \leq \nu_{\text{central}},$$

where

$$\nu_{\text{central}} = \frac{r_{\max}^2 (1 + \frac{2}{\omega_1})^2 (36 + 96\tau_{\text{mix}})}{\omega^2 T (1 - \gamma)^2} (1 + \log T).$$

We next discuss convergence times for TD( $\lambda$ ). It is usually assumed that the algorithm extends back to negative infinity, and that every  $s_i(t)$  has distribution  $\mu$  (but the samples are, of course, correlated since each successive state is obtained by taking a step in the Markov chain  $P$  from the previous one). Similarly as before, we define  $\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}(\epsilon)$  as

$$\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}(\epsilon) = \max\{\tau_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon), \tau'_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon)\},$$

where

$$\tau_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon) = \min\{t \mid m\rho^t \leq \epsilon\}, \quad \tau'_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon) = \min\{t \mid (\gamma\lambda)^t \leq \epsilon\}.$$

As before, we choose  $\epsilon = \alpha_t$  and simplify  $\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}(\alpha_t)$  as  $\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}$ . The same result applies to  $\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}$ :

$$\max\{m\rho^t, (\gamma\lambda)^t\} \leq \alpha_t, \quad \forall t \geq \tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}(\alpha_t). \quad (9)$$

With these notations in place, we can now state the following result from the previous literature.

**Lemma 2.2** (Bhandari et al. (2018)). *Suppose TD( $\lambda$ ) is applied under the Markov sampling. Suppose Assumptions 2.2, 2.3 hold. For a decaying stepsize sequence  $\alpha_t = 2/(\omega(t+1)(1-\kappa))$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\theta_i(T) - \theta^*\|^2] \leq \nu_{\text{central}}^{(\lambda)},$$

where

$$\nu_{\text{central}}^{(\lambda)} = \frac{r_{\max}^2 \left( \frac{1}{1-\gamma\lambda} + \frac{2}{\omega_1^{(\lambda)}(1-\gamma\lambda)^2} \right)^2 (52 + 208\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)})}{T(1-\kappa)^2\omega^2} (1 + \log T).$$

### 3 Main Result

We now state our main result which claims a linear speed-up for both distributed TD(0) and distributed TD( $\lambda$ ). Recall that we use  $\theta_i(t)$  to denote the parameters of agent  $i$  at time  $t$ ,  $\bar{\theta}(t) = (\sum_i \theta_i(t))/N$  to denote the averaged parameters among all  $N$  agents, and  $\bar{\theta}_i(t) = \mathbb{E}[\theta_i(t)]$  to denote the expectation of  $\theta_i(t)$ . We now have the following two theorems for TD(0) and TD( $\lambda$ ) respectively.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3 hold and  $T \geq \tau_{\text{mix}}$ . With  $\nu_{\text{central}}$  defined in Lemma 2.1. TD(0) with stepsize  $\alpha_t = 2/(\omega(t+1)(1-\gamma))$  satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\bar{\theta}(T) - \theta^*\|^2] \leq \frac{1}{N} \nu_{\text{central}} + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right).$$

**Theorem 3.2.** *Suppose Assumptions 2.2, 2.3 hold and  $T \geq 2\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}$ . With  $\nu_{\text{central}}^{(\lambda)}$  defined in Lemma 2.2, TD( $\lambda$ ) with stepsize  $\alpha_t = 2/(\omega(t+1)(1-\kappa))$  satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\bar{\theta}(T) - \theta^*\|^2] \leq \frac{1}{N} \nu_{\text{central}}^{(\lambda)} + \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right).$$

In brief, the distributed version with  $N$  nodes is  $N$  times faster than the comparable centralized version for large enough  $T$  (note that  $\nu_{\text{central}}$  and  $\nu_{\text{central}}^{(\lambda)}$  are  $\tilde{O}(1/T)$  whereas the term that does not get divided by  $N$  is  $\tilde{O}(1/T^2)$  in both theorems). This significantly improves previous results from Liu & Olshevsky (2023), which only showed this for TD(0).

We note that the proofs given in this paper have no overlaps with the proof from Liu & Olshevsky (2023), which could not be extended to either TD( $\lambda$ ) or Markov sampling (and here both extensions are done simultaneously). Instead, our analysis here is based on the following simple observation, at each step of which we just use independence plus elementary algebra:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\bar{\theta}(T) - \theta^*\|^2] &\leq \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\|\theta_i(T) - \theta^*\|^2] + \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \mathbb{E} [(\theta_i(T) - \theta^*)^T (\theta_j(T) - \theta^*)] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\|\theta_i(T) - \theta^*\|^2] + \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} (\bar{\theta}_i(T) - \theta^*)^T (\bar{\theta}_j(T) - \theta^*). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here, the last equality uses the fact that  $\theta_i(T)$  are independent of each other since there is no communication during learning. This immediately implies a linear speed-up if only we could prove that the first term dominates. This is quite plausible, since the second term involves the convergence speed of the *expected* updates. In other words, all that is really needed is to prove that the expected update converges faster than the unexpected update.

### 4 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Before we go into the proof, we first introduce some notations. We rewrite  $\bar{g}(\theta)$  in matrix notation as

$$\bar{g}(\theta) = \Phi^T D(I - \gamma P) \Phi (\theta^* - \theta) := \Sigma_I (\theta^* - \theta). \quad (11)$$

This matrix has some nice properties, which is pointed out in Liu & Olshevsky (2021); Tian et al. (2022). Indeed, we have the following lemma whose proof we postpone:

**Lemma 4.1.** *The matrix  $\Sigma_I$  is a positive definite matrix that satisfies*

$$x^T \Sigma_I x = \mathcal{N}(\Phi x).$$

Furthermore, letting  $\omega_I$  be the smallest eigenvalue of  $\Sigma_I$ , we have  $\omega_I \geq (1-\gamma)\omega$ .

Similarly, we define

$$\bar{g}'(\theta_i(t)) = \mathbb{E}_M [g_{s,s'}(\theta_i(t))]$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_M$  means  $s \sim P_t(\cdot | s_i(0))$  and  $s' \sim P(\cdot | s)$ . We call  $\bar{g}'(\theta_i(t)) - \bar{g}(\theta_i(t))$  Markov noise and write it as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{g}'(\theta_i(t)) - \bar{g}(\theta_i(t)) &= \sum_{s_i(t), s'_i(t)} (P_t(s_i(t) | s_i(0)) - \mu(s_i(t))) \phi(s_i(t)) \\ &\quad \cdot (r(t) - (\phi(s_i(t)) - \gamma P(s'_i(t) | s_i(t)) \phi(s'_i(t))) \theta_i(t)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $P_t(s' | s)$  stands for the  $t$  step transition probability. To further address both the Markov noise and the recursion relations we will derive, we need the following lemmas, whose proofs we also postpone.

**Lemma 4.2.** In TD(0),  $\theta^*$  satisfies

$$\|\theta^*\| \leq r_{\max}/\omega_I.$$

**Lemma 4.3.** For a sequence of numbers  $\{x_t\}$  and two constants  $a, b$  such that  $a > 1$ , we have the following recursive inequality:

$$x_{t+1} \leq (1 - a \cdot \alpha_t) x_t + \alpha_t^2 b^2, \forall t \geq \tau.$$

with  $\alpha_t = \frac{1}{c+t}$ . Then we have the following result:

$$x_t \leq \frac{\nu}{c+T}, \text{ where } \nu = \max \left\{ \frac{b^2}{a-1}, (c+\tau)x_\tau \right\}.$$

Given all preliminaries, we can begin our proof.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* We first take expectation on both sides of TD(0) update,

$$\bar{\theta}_i(t+1) - \theta^* = \bar{\theta}_i(t) - \theta^* + \alpha_t \mathbb{E}[\bar{g}(\theta_i(t))] + \alpha_t \mathbb{E}[\bar{g}'(\theta_i(t)) - \bar{g}(\theta_i(t))].$$

By (11) and Lemma 4.1,

$$\|\bar{\theta}_i(t+1) - \theta^*\| \leq (1 - \alpha_t \omega_I) \|\bar{\theta}_i(t) - \theta^*\| + \alpha_t \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{g}'(\theta_i(t)) - \bar{g}(\theta_i(t))\|].$$

where we use the fact that  $\bar{g}(\theta_i(t)) = \Sigma_I(\theta^* - \theta_i(t))$ . To address the second term on the right-hand side, by Assumption 2.3, for all  $t \geq \tau_{\text{mix}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{g}'(\theta_i(t)) - \bar{g}(\theta_i(t))\|] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ (r_{\max} + 2\|\theta_i(t) - \theta^*\| + 2\|\theta^*\|) \cdot \sum_{s_i(t) \in S} |P_t(s_i(t)|s_i(0)) - \mu(s_i(t))| \right] \\ & \leq \alpha_t \left( r_{\max} + 2u + \frac{2r_{\max}}{\omega_I} \right). \end{aligned}$$

where  $u$  is defined as  $u = \max_{i,t} \mathbb{E}\|\theta_i(t) - \theta^*\|$ . Notice that Lemma 2.2 guarantees  $u$  is finite. This immediately indicates that for all  $\forall t \geq \tau_{\text{mix}}$ ,

$$\|\bar{\theta}_i(t+1) - \theta^*\| \leq (1 - \alpha_t \omega_I) \|\bar{\theta}_i(t) - \theta^*\| + \alpha_t^2 \left( r_{\max} + 2u + \frac{2r_{\max}}{\omega_I} \right).$$

We set  $x_t = \|\bar{\theta}_i(t) - \theta^*\|$ ,  $a = 2\omega_I/(\omega(1-\gamma))$ ,  $b^2 = r_{\max} + 2u + 2r_{\max}/\omega_I$ ,  $c = 1$  and  $\tau = \tau_{\text{mix}}$ . By Lemma 4.3,

$$\|\bar{\theta}_i(t) - \theta^*\| \leq \frac{\nu_i}{1+t},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_i &= \max\{\alpha, \beta_i\}, \\ \alpha &= \frac{r_{\max} + 2u + \frac{2r_{\max}}{\omega_I}}{\frac{2\omega_I}{\omega(1-\gamma)} - 1}, \\ \beta_i &= (1 + \tau_{\text{mix}}) \|\bar{\theta}_i(\tau_{\text{mix}}) - \theta^*\|. \end{aligned}$$

The result directly follows after plugging the above fact as well as Lemma 2.1 into (10). □

#### 4.1 Proof of Lemma 4.1

*Proof.*  $\Sigma_I$  is shown to be a positive definite matrix in Liu & Olshevsky (2021); Tian et al. (2022). The fact  $\omega_I \geq (1-\gamma)\omega$  is because

$$x^T \Sigma_I x = \mathcal{N}(\Phi x) \geq (1-\gamma)\omega \|x\|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad \square$$

## 4.2 Proof of Lemma 4.2

*Proof.* Recall that  $\theta^*$  is defined to satisfy  $\bar{g}(\theta^*) = 0$ , which is the same as

$$\Phi^T D (R + (\gamma P - I)\Phi\theta^*) = 0.$$

By the Gershgorin circle theorem,  $D(\gamma P - I)$  is invertible, and thus so is  $\Phi^T D(\gamma P - I)\Phi$ . Therefore,

$$\theta^* = [\Phi^T D(I - \gamma P)\Phi]^{-1} \Phi^T DR.$$

By definition of  $\omega$ , the norm of the inverse in the above equation is  $\omega_1^{-1}$ . Furthermore, since  $\|\Phi^T \sqrt{D}\|^2 \leq 1$  which is because all features vectors have norm at most one by assumption, and  $\|\sqrt{D}R\|^2 \leq r_{\max}^2$ , we obtain  $\|\theta^*\| \leq r_{\max}/\omega_1$ .  $\square$

## 4.3 Proof of Lemma 4.3

*Proof.* We prove it by induction. First, it is easy to see  $x_\tau \leq \frac{\nu}{\lambda + \tau}$ . Now suppose  $x_t \leq \frac{\nu}{\lambda + t}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &\leq (1 - a \cdot \alpha_t) x_t + \alpha_t^2 b^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{a}{\lambda + t}\right) \frac{\nu}{\lambda + t} + \frac{b^2}{(\lambda + t)^2} \\ &= \frac{\lambda + t - 1}{(\lambda + t)^2} \nu + \frac{(1 - a)\nu + b^2}{(\lambda + t)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda + t + 1} \nu, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses the facts that  $x^2 \geq (x - 1)(x + 1)$ ,  $\forall x$  and  $(1 - a)\nu + b^2 \leq 0$  (This is because of the definition of  $\nu$  as defined in Lemma 4.3).  $\square$

## 5 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Our proof here follows the same strategy as for TD(0).

**Lemma 5.1.** *Define*

$$\Sigma_I^{(\lambda)} = \Phi^T D \Phi - (1 - \lambda) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k \gamma^{k+1} \Phi^T D P^{k+1} \Phi.$$

Then  $\Sigma_I^{(\lambda)}$  is a positive definite matrix which satisfies

$$x^T \Sigma_I^{(\lambda)} x = \mathcal{N}^{(\lambda)}(\Phi x).$$

Furthermore, let  $\omega_1^{(\lambda)}$  be the smallest eigenvalue of  $\Sigma_I^{(\lambda)}$ . Then  $\omega_1^{(\lambda)} \geq (1 - \kappa)\omega$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** *In TD( $\lambda$ ),  $\theta^*$  satisfies*

$$\|\theta^*\| \leq \frac{r_{\max}}{\omega_1^{(\lambda)}(1 - \gamma)}.$$

We postpone the proofs of these two lemmas and first provide a proof of our main result.

*Proof of Theorem 3.2.* The TD( $\lambda$ ) update implies

$$\bar{\theta}_i(t+1) - \theta^* = \bar{\theta}_i(t) - \theta^* + \alpha_t \mathbb{E}[\bar{x}(\theta_i(t))] + \alpha_t (\mathbb{E}[\bar{x}'(\theta_i(t)) - \bar{x}(\theta_i(t))]).$$

where we denote  $\bar{x}'(\theta_i(t)) = \mathbb{E}_M[x_{s,s'}(\theta_i(t), z_{0:t})]$ . This expectation assumes that  $s_i(0) \sim \mu$  while the subsequent states are sampled according to the transition probability of the policy, i.e.,  $s_i(k) \sim P(\cdot | s_i(k-1))$ . We call the quantity  $\bar{x}'(\theta_i(t)) - \bar{x}(\theta_i(t))$  Markov noise. For simplicity, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}(\theta) &= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} (\gamma\lambda)^k \sum_{s_i(t-k)} \mu(s_i(t-k)) \phi(s_i(t-k)) l_{t-k}(\theta) \\ \bar{x}'(\theta) &= \sum_{k=0}^t (\gamma\lambda)^k \sum_{s_i(t-k)} P_{t-k}(s_i(t-k) | s_i(0)) \phi(s_i(t-k)) l_{t-k}(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$l_{t-k}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim P_k(\cdot | s_i(t-k)), s' \sim P(\cdot | s)} [\delta_{s, s'}(\theta)].$$

Let  $l_0 = |l_{t-k}(\theta)| / (1 - \gamma\lambda)$ . A simple bound for  $l_0$  is

$$l_0 \leq \frac{r_{\max} + 2\|\theta_i(t) - \theta^*\| + 2\|\theta^*\|}{1 - \gamma\lambda}.$$

With these notations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}(\theta) - \bar{x}'(\theta) &= \sum_{k=0}^t (\gamma\lambda)^k \sum_{s_i(t-k)} [\mu - P_{t-k}(\cdot | s_i(0))]_{s_i(t-k)} \phi(s_i(t-k)) l_{t-k}(\theta) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=t+1}^{+\infty} (\gamma\lambda)^k \sum_{s_i(t-k)} \mu(s_i(t-k)) \phi(s_i(t-k)) l_{t-k}(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

We denote the first term as  $I_{0:t}$  and divide it into two terms,  $I_{0:\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}}$  and  $I_{\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}+1:t}$ . By Assumption 2.3,

$$\|P_{t-k}(\cdot | s_i(0)) - \mu\|_1 \leq \alpha_t, \quad \forall t \leq \tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)},$$

where we use the fact  $t \geq 2\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|I_{0:\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}}\| \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ |l_{t-k}(\theta)| \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}} (\gamma\lambda)^k \cdot \|P_{t-k}(\cdot | s_i(0)) - \mu\|_1 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} [l_0] \alpha_t. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of  $\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}$ ,  $(\gamma\lambda)^t \leq \alpha_t$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|I_{\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}+1:t}\| \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ |l_{t-k}(\theta)| \sum_{k=\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}+1}^t (\gamma\lambda)^k \|P_{t-k}(\cdot | s_i(0)) - \mu\|_1 \right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E} [l_0] \alpha_t. \end{aligned}$$

The second term (under expectation) also has upper-bound  $\mathbb{E} [l_0] \alpha_t$  since  $(\gamma\lambda)^t \leq \alpha_t$  and the remaining terms are bounded by  $\mathbb{E} [l_0]$ . So far, we have

$$\|\bar{\theta}_i(t+1) - \theta^*\| = (1 - \alpha_t \omega_1^{(\lambda)}) \|\bar{\theta}_i(t) - \theta^*\| + \alpha_t^2 \frac{4}{1 - \gamma\lambda} \cdot \left( r_{\max} + 2u^{(\lambda)} + \frac{2r_{\max}}{\omega_1^{(\lambda)}(1 - \gamma)} \right),$$

where we use Lemma 5.2 and denote  $u^{(\lambda)} = \max_{i,t} \mathbb{E} \|\theta_i(t) - \theta^*\|$ . Notice that Lemma 2.2 guarantees that  $u^{(\lambda)}$  is finite.

Now, we set  $x_t = \|\bar{\theta}_i(t) - \theta^*\|$ ,  $a = 2\omega_1^{(\lambda)} / (\omega(1 - \kappa))$ ,  $b^2 = 4 \left( r_{\max} + 2u^{(\lambda)} + 2r_{\max} / (\omega_1^{(\lambda)}(1 - \gamma)) \right) / (1 - \gamma\lambda)$ ,  $c = 1$  and  $\tau = 2\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}$ . By Lemma 4.3,

$$\|\bar{\theta}_i(t) - \theta^*\| \leq \frac{\nu_i^{(\lambda)}}{1 + t},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_i^{(\lambda)} &= \max \{ \alpha, \beta_i \}, \\ \alpha^{(\lambda)} &= \frac{4r_{\max} + 8u^{(\lambda)} + \frac{8r_{\max}}{\omega_1^{(\lambda)}(1 - \gamma)}}{\left( \frac{2\omega_1^{(\lambda)}}{\omega(1 - \kappa)} - 1 \right) (1 - \gamma\lambda)}, \\ \beta_i^{(\lambda)} &= (2\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)} + 1) \|\bar{\theta}_i(2\tau_{\text{mix}}^{(\lambda)}) - \theta^*\|. \end{aligned}$$

The result directly follows after plugging the above fact as well as Lemma 2.2 into (10).  $\square$

### 5.1 Proof of Lemma 5.1

*Proof.* As pointed out in Theorem 2 in Liu & Olshevsky (2021), we also have  $\mathcal{N}^{(\lambda)}(V_\theta - V^*) = -(\theta - \theta^*)\bar{x}(\theta)$ . Now, using (7), (8) and the definition of  $\theta^*$  that  $\bar{x}(\theta^*) = 0$  (and recall we assume  $V_{\pi, \theta}$  is linear to  $\theta$ ), we arrive at

$$\mathcal{N}^{(\lambda)}(\Phi(\theta - \theta^*)) = (\theta - \theta^*)^T \Sigma_I^{(\lambda)} (\theta - \theta^*).$$

Because the above fact holds for all possible  $\theta$ , we can summarize  $x^T \Sigma_I^{(\lambda)} x = \mathcal{N}^{(\lambda)}(\Phi x)$ . Then,

$$x^T \Sigma_I^{(\lambda)} x = \mathcal{N}^{(\lambda)}(\Phi x) \geq (1 - \kappa)\omega \|x\|^2.$$

Since it holds for every  $x$ , we conclude that  $\omega_I^{(\lambda)} \geq (1 - \kappa)\omega$ .  $\square$

### 5.2 Proof of Lemma 5.2

*Proof.* Recall that the definition of  $\theta^*$  is that  $\bar{x}(\theta^*) = 0$ , which is  $\Phi^T D (T_\pi^{(\lambda)}(\Phi\theta^*) - \Phi\theta^*) = 0$ . Also recall that

$$T_\pi^{(\lambda)} V = (1 - \lambda) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k \left( \sum_{t=0}^k \gamma^t P^t R + \gamma^{k+1} P^{k+1} V \right).$$

Solving for  $\theta^*$ , we arrive at

$$\theta^* = \left( \Sigma_I^{(\lambda)} \right)^{-1} \Phi^T D (1 - \lambda) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k \sum_{t=0}^k \gamma^t P^t R.$$

By the definition of  $\omega_I^{(\lambda)}$ , the norm of the inverse in the above equation is  $\omega_I^{(\lambda)-1}$ . Furthermore, since  $\|\Phi^T \sqrt{D}\|^2 \leq 1$  which is because all features vectors have norm at most one by assumption, and  $\|\sqrt{D}(1 - \lambda) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k \sum_{t=0}^k \gamma^t P^t R\|^2 \leq r_{\max}^2 / (1 - \gamma)^2$ , we obtain  $\|\theta^*\| \leq \frac{r_{\max}}{\omega_I^{(\lambda)}(1 - \gamma)}$ .  $\square$

## 6 Conclusions

We have shown that one-shot averaging suffices to give a linear speedup for distributed TD( $\lambda$ ) under Markov sampling. This is an improvement over previous works, which had alternatively either  $O(T)$  communication rounds per  $T$  steps or  $O(N)$  averaging rounds per  $T$  steps to achieve the same. An open question is whether a similar result can be proven for tabular Q-learning.

## References

- Jalaj Bhandari, Daniel Russo, and Raghav Singal. A finite time analysis of temporal difference learning with linear function approximation. In *Conference on learning theory*, pp. 1691–1692. PMLR, 2018.
- Thinh Doan, Siva Maguluri, and Justin Romberg. Finite-time analysis of distributed TD(0) with linear function approximation on multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1626–1635. PMLR, 2019.
- FR Gantmacher. The theory of matrices. *New York*, 1964.
- Sajad Khodadadian, Pranay Sharma, Gauri Joshi, and Siva Theja Maguluri. Federated reinforcement learning: Linear speedup under Markovian sampling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 10997–11057. PMLR, 2022.
- David A Levin and Yuval Peres. *Markov chains and mixing times*, volume 107. American Mathematical Soc., 2017.
- Rui Liu and Alex Olshevsky. Temporal difference learning as gradient splitting. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 6905–6913. PMLR, 2021.
- Rui Liu and Alex Olshevsky. Distributed TD(0) with almost no communication. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2023.

- Yann Ollivier. Approximate temporal difference learning is a gradient descent for reversible policies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.00869*, 2018.
- Jun Sun, Gang Wang, Georgios B Giannakis, Qinmin Yang, and Zaiyue Yang. Finite-time analysis of decentralized temporal-difference learning with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 4485–4495. PMLR, 2020.
- Haoxing Tian, Ioannis C. Paschalidis, and Alex Olshevsky. On the performance of temporal difference learning with neural networks. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- John Tsitsiklis and Benjamin Van Roy. Analysis of temporal-difference learning with function approximation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 9, 1996.
- Gang Wang, Songtao Lu, Georgios Giannakis, Gerald Tesauro, and Jian Sun. Decentralized TD tracking with linear function approximation and its finite-time analysis. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:13762–13772, 2020.
- Chenyu Zhang, Han Wang, Aritra Mitra, and James Anderson. Finite-time analysis of on-policy heterogeneous federated reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15273*, 2024.