

Optimal Matrix Momentum Stochastic Approximation and Applications to Q-learning

Adithya M. Devraj¹, Ana Bušić², and Sean P. Meyn¹

Abstract

Acceleration is an increasingly common theme in the stochastic optimization literature. The two most common examples are Nesterov’s method, and Polyak’s momentum (heavy ball) technique. In this paper two new algorithms are introduced for root finding problems: 1) PolSA is a root finding algorithm with specially designed matrix momentum, and 2) NeSA can be regarded as a variant of Nesterov’s algorithm, or a simplification of the PolSA algorithm. The PolSA algorithm is new even in the context of optimization (when cast as a root finding problem).

The research surveyed in this paper is motivated by applications to reinforcement learning. It is well known that most variants of TD- and Q-learning may be cast as SA (stochastic approximation) algorithms, and the tools from general SA theory can be used to investigate convergence and bounds on convergence rate. In particular, the asymptotic variance is a common metric of performance for SA algorithms, and is also one among many metrics used in assessing the performance of stochastic optimization algorithms.

There are two well known stochastic approximation techniques that are known to have optimal asymptotic variance: the Ruppert-Polyak averaging technique, and stochastic Newton-Raphson (SNR).

The former algorithm can have extremely bad transient performance, and the latter can be computationally expensive. It is demonstrated here that parameter estimates from the new PolSA algorithm *couple* with those of the ideal (but more complex) SNR algorithm. The new algorithm is thus a third approach to obtain optimal asymptotic covariance.

These strong results require assumptions on the model. A linearized model is considered, and the noise is assumed to be a martingale difference sequence. Numerical results are obtained in a non-linear setting that is the motivation for this work: In PolSA implementations of Q-learning [a nonlinear algorithm] it is observed that coupling occurs with SNR in this non-ideal setting. The performance of NeSA is also very good compared to recent and standard variants of Q-learning.

Funding from the National Science Foundation award EPCN 1609131, and French National Research Agency grant ANR-16-CE05-0008

¹Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611

²Inria and the Computer Science Department of École Normale Supérieure, 75005 Paris, France

1. Introduction

The general goal of this paper is the efficient computation of the root of a vector valued function: obtain the solution $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to the d -dimensional equation:

$$\bar{f}(\theta^*) = 0. \tag{1}$$

It is assumed that the function $\bar{f}: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is expressed as an expectation: $\bar{f}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[f(\theta, \mathcal{X})]$, where $f: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and \mathcal{X} is an \mathbb{R}^m -valued random variable. *The function \bar{f} is not necessarily equal to a gradient, so the setting of this paper goes beyond optimization.*

The stochastic approximation (SA) literature contains a large collection of tools to construct algorithms, and obtain bounds on their convergence rate. In this paper we show how algorithms with optimal rate of convergence can be constructed based on a synthesis of techniques from classical SA theory combined with variants of momentum algorithms pioneered by Polyak (Polyak (1964, 1987)).

The algorithms and analysis in this paper admit application to both stochastic optimization and reinforcement learning. As in much of this literature, it is assumed in this paper that there is a sequence of random functions $\{f_n\}$ satisfying for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\bar{f}(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f_k(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[f_n(\theta)], \tag{2}$$

where the first limit is in the a.s. sense.

Three general classes of algorithms are investigated in this work. Each is defined with respect to a non-negative scalar gain sequence $\{\alpha_n\}$, and two include $d \times d$ matrix sequences $\{G_n\}, \{M_n\}$. For each algorithm, the difference sequence is denoted $\Delta\theta_n := \theta_n - \theta_{n-1}$, $n \geq 0$, with given initial condition $\theta_0 = \theta_{-1}$.

1. Stochastic approximation with matrix gain

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} = \alpha_{n+1} G_{n+1} f_{n+1}(\theta_n) \tag{3}$$

2. Matrix Heavy-Ball Stochastic approximation

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} = M_{n+1} \Delta\theta_n + \alpha_{n+1} G_{n+1} f_{n+1}(\theta_n) \tag{4}$$

3. Nesterov Stochastic approximation (NeSA) For a fixed scalar $\zeta > 0$,

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} = \Delta\theta_n + \zeta[f_{n+1}(\theta_n) - f_{n+1}(\theta_{n-1})] + \zeta\alpha_{n+1}f_{n+1}(\theta_n) \tag{5}$$

If $G_n \equiv I$, then (3) is the classical algorithm of Robbins and Monro (1951). In Stochastic Newton Raphson (SNR) and the more recent *Zap SNR* (Ruppert (1985); Devraj and Meyn (2017a,b)), the matrix sequence $\{G_n\}$ is chosen to be an approximation of $-[\partial\bar{f}(\theta_n)]^{-1}$. Stability of the algorithm has been demonstrated in application to Q-learning (Devraj and Meyn (2017a,b)); a non-trivial result, given that Q-learning is cast as root finding and not an optimization problem.

The matrix heavy ball algorithm (4) coincides with the heavy-ball method when $\{M_n\}$ is a sequence of scalars (Polyak (1964, 1987); Loizou and Richtárik (2017)). Justification for the special form (5) in NeSA is provided in the next section.

As in many previous papers in the context of high-dimensional optimization (Loizou and Richtárik (2017)) and SA (Konda and Tsitsiklis (2004); Kushner and Yin (1997); Borkar (2008)), parameter error analysis is restricted to a linear setting:

$$f_{n+1}(\theta_n) = A_{n+1}\theta_n - b_{n+1} = A(\theta_n - \theta^*) + \Delta_{n+1}$$

in which (A_n, b_n) is a stochastic process with common mean (A, b) , and for $n \geq 1$

$$\Delta_{n+1} := \tilde{A}_{n+1}(\theta_n - \theta^*) + \Delta_{n+1}^* \quad \text{with} \quad \Delta_{n+1}^* := f_{n+1}(\theta^*) = A_{n+1}\theta^* - b_{n+1}$$

and the tilde always denotes deviation: $\tilde{A}_{n+1} := A_{n+1} - A$.

Goals The main goal is to design algorithms with (i) *fast convergence* to zero of the error sequence: $\tilde{\theta}_n := \theta_n - \theta^*$, and (ii) *low computational complexity*.

Rates of convergence are well understood for the SA recursion (3). It is known that the Central Limit Theorem and Law of the Iterated Logarithm hold under general conditions, and the *asymptotic covariance* appearing in these results can be expressed as the limit

$$\Sigma^\theta = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_n^\theta := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\theta}_n \tilde{\theta}_n^T]. \quad (6)$$

The LIL may be most interesting in terms of bounds (Kushner and Yin (1997); Koval and Schwabe (2003)); it may not be as satisfying as a Hoeffding or PAC-style finite- n bound, but there are no such bounds for Markovian models with useful constants (see e.g. Glynn and Ormoneit (2002)); reinforcement learning is typically cast in a Markov setting.

A *necessary* condition for quick convergence is that the CLT or LIL hold with small asymptotic covariance. Again, for the SA recursion (3), optimization of this parameter is well-understood. Denote by Σ^G the asymptotic covariance for (3) with $G_n \equiv G$. When this is finite, it admits a representation in terms of the asymptotic covariance of the noise:

$$\Sigma^\Delta = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \Delta_k^* \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \Delta_k^* \right)^T \right] \quad (7)$$

In particular, the choice $G = G^* := -A^{-1}$ is a special case of SNR, for which asymptotic covariance admits the explicit form

$$\Sigma^* := A^{-1} \Sigma^\Delta A^{-1T} \quad (8)$$

This is optimal: the difference $\Sigma^G - \Sigma^*$ is positive semi-definite for any G (Benveniste et al. (1990); Kushner and Yin (1997); Borkar (2008)).

What about computational complexity? In realistic applications of SNR, the gain sequence will be of the form $G_n = -\hat{A}_n^{-1}$, where $\{\hat{A}_n\}$ are approximations (Monte-Carlo estimates) of the mean A . In a nonlinear model, \hat{A}_n is an approximation of $\partial \bar{f}(\theta_n)$, obtained using the two time-scale algorithm of Devraj and Meyn (2017a,b). The resulting complexity is a barrier to application in high dimension. Steps towards resolving this obstacle are presented in this paper:

- (i) The parameters in the matrix heavy ball SA algorithm can be designed so that the error sequence enjoys all the attractive properties of SNR, but without the need for matrix inversion.

- (ii) NeSA is often simpler than the matrix heavy ball method in applications to RL. A formula for the asymptotic covariance of a variant of NeSA is obtained in this paper. While not equal to Σ^* , the reduced complexity makes it a valuable option.

These conclusions are established in Propositions 2, 3 and 4 for linear recursions, and illustrated in numerical examples for new Q-learning algorithms that are introduced in Section 4. The assumptions of the main results are violated in application to Q-learning since the particular root finding problem is non-linear. Nevertheless, coupling is seen between PolSA and Zap Q-learning in all of the numerical experiments conducted so far.

Nesterov’s acceleration and the heavy-ball method are both second order algorithms, but their relationship has been unclear until now. In this paper we propose a new understanding of the relationship, which is only possible through the introduction of *matrix momentum*. We show that the matrix momentum algorithm PolSA can be interpreted as a linearization of a particular formulation of Nesterov’s method. We further show that the PolSA algorithm approximates (stochastic) Newton Raphson, thus establishing connections between the three algorithms: Nesterov’s acceleration, PolSA, and Newton Raphson. This may not only help explain the success of Nesterov’s acceleration, but may also lead to new algorithms in other application domains such as empirical risk minimization (ERM).¹

Literature survey The present paper is built on a vast literature on optimization (Nesterov (1983); Polyak (1964, 1987); Nesterov (2012)) and stochastic approximation (Konda and Tsitsiklis (2004); Kushner and Yin (1997); Borkar (2008); Ruppert (1985); Polyak (1990); Polyak and Juditsky (1992)). The work of Polyak is central to both thrusts: the introduction of momentum, and techniques to minimize variance in SA algorithms. The reader is referred to (Devraj and Meyn (2017b)) for a survey on SNR and the more recent Zap SNR algorithms, which are also designed to achieve minimum asymptotic variance.

In the stochastic optimization literature, the goal is to minimize an expectation of a function. In connection to (2), each f_n can be viewed as an unbiased estimator of the gradient of the objective. The papers (Moulines and Bach (2011); Bach and Moulines (2013); Gadat et al. (2018); Duchi (2016); Jain et al. (2017)) establish the optimal convergence rate of $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ for various stochastic optimization algorithms.

In ERM (empirical risk minimization) literature, the sample path limit in (2) is replaced by a finite average (Allen-Zhu (2016); Defazio et al. (2014); Jain et al. (2017)): $\bar{f}_n(\theta) = n^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f_k(\theta)$. Denoting $\theta_n^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \bar{f}_n(\theta)$, under general conditions it can be shown that the sequence of ERM optimizers $\{\theta_n^*\}$ is convergent to θ^* , and has optimal asymptotic covariance (a survey and further discussion is presented in Jain et al. (2017)).

The recent paper Jain et al. (2017) is most closely related to the present work, considering the shared goal of optimizing the asymptotic covariance, along with rapidly vanishing transients through algorithm design. The paper restricts to stochastic optimization rather than the general root finding problems considered here, thus ruling out application to many reinforcement learning algorithms such as TD- and Q- learning (Tsitsiklis (1994); Tsitsiklis and Van Roy (1997); Konda and Tsitsiklis (2004)). The metric for performance is slightly different, focusing on the rate of convergence of the *expected loss*, for which they obtain bounds for each iteration n of the algorithm. Along with establishing that the algorithm

1. The key theoretical results in this paper *are not* directly applicable to these problems – an explanation is given in Section 2.3.

achieves optimal asymptotic variance, they also obtain tight bounds on the regret. The algorithm uses an averaging technique similar to the one in (Polyak and Juditsky (1992)), that helps achieve the optimal variance.

The algorithms presented in this work achieve the optimal asymptotic covariance, are not restricted to optimization, and we believe that in many applications they will be simpler to implement. This is especially true for the NeSA algorithm applied to Q-learning.

2. Momentum methods and applications

2.1. Motivation & Insights

Consider first the deterministic root-finding problem. This will bring insight into the relationship between the three algorithms (3–5) discussed in the introduction. The notation $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is used in place of \tilde{f} in this deterministic setting. The goal remains the same: find the vector $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $f(\theta^*) = 0$.

Deterministic variants of (3–5) commonly considered in the literature are, respectively,

$$\text{Successive approximation:} \quad \Delta\theta_{n+1} = \alpha f(\theta_n) \quad (9)$$

$$\text{Polyak's heavy ball:} \quad \Delta\theta_{n+1} = \mu\Delta\theta_n + \alpha f(\theta_n) \quad (10)$$

$$\text{Nesterov's acceleration:} \quad \Delta\theta_{n+1} = \mu\Delta\theta_n + \zeta[f(\theta_n) - f(\theta_{n-1})] + \alpha f(\theta_n) \quad (11)$$

where α, μ, ζ are positive constants. Nesterov's algorithm was designed for extremal seeking, which is the special case $f = -\nabla J$ for a real-valued function J . The recursion (11) is the natural extension to the root-finding problem considered here.

The questions asked in this paper are posed in a stochastic setting, but analogous questions are:

- (i) Why restrict to a scalar momentum term μ , rather than a matrix M ?
- (ii) Can online algorithms be designed to approximate the optimal momentum matrix?
If so, we require tools to investigate the performance of a given matrix sequence $\{M_n\}$:

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} = M_{n+1}\Delta\theta_n + \alpha f(\theta_n) \quad (12)$$

Potential answers are obtained by establishing relationships between these deterministic recursions. The heuristic relationships presented here are justified for the stochastic models considered later in the paper.

Consider the successive approximation algorithm (9) under the assumption of global convergence: $\theta_n \rightarrow \theta^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Assume moreover that $f \in C^1$ and Lipschitz, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\theta_{n+1} - \Delta\theta_n &\approx \alpha \partial f(\theta_n) \Delta\theta_n \\ &= \alpha^2 \partial f(\theta_n) f(\theta_{n-1}) \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\|\Delta\theta_{n+1} - \Delta\theta_n\| = O(\min\{\alpha^2, \alpha\|\Delta\theta_n\|\})$. This suggests a *heuristic*: swap $\Delta\theta_{n+1}$ and $\Delta\theta_n$ in a given convergent algorithm to obtain a new algorithm that is simpler, but with desirable properties. Applying this heuristic to (12) results in

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} = M_{n+1}\Delta\theta_n + \alpha f(\theta_n) \approx M_{n+1}\Delta\theta_{n+1} + \alpha f(\theta_n)$$

Assuming that an inverse exists, this becomes

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} \approx \alpha[I - M_{n+1}]^{-1}f(\theta_n)$$

We thus arrive at a possible answer to the question of *optimal momentum*: For the matrix sequence $M_{n+1} = I + \alpha\partial f(\theta_n)$, the algorithm (12) can be expressed

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} = [I + \alpha\partial f(\theta_n)]\Delta\theta_n + \alpha f(\theta_n) \quad (13)$$

The foregoing approximations suggest that this is an approximation of Newton-Raphson:

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} \approx -[\partial f(\theta_n)]^{-1}f(\theta_n)$$

Further approximations lead to different interpretations: a Taylor series argument shows that the recursion (13) is approximated by

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} = \Delta\theta_n + \alpha[f(\theta_n) - f(\theta_{n-1})] + \alpha f(\theta_n) \quad (14)$$

This is the special case of Nesterov's algorithm (11) with $\mu = 1$ and $\zeta = \alpha$.

Strong justification for the stochastic analog of (13) is provided through a coupling bound between the respective algorithms: see Proposition 2. It is found that similar transformations lead to new algorithms for reinforcement learning and other applications.

2.2. Optimal matrix momentum and PolSA

Returning to the stochastic setting, the PolSA algorithm considered in this paper is a special case of matrix heavy ball SA (4), and an analog of (13):

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} = [I + \zeta\widehat{A}_{n+1}]\Delta\theta_n + \alpha_{n+1}\zeta f_{n+1}(\theta_n) \quad (15)$$

where $\zeta > 0$, and $\{\widehat{A}_n\}$ are estimates of $A(\theta) := \mathbb{E}[\partial f_n(\theta)]$ (assumed independent of n).

The choice $G_n \equiv \zeta I$ in (4) is imposed to simplify exposition; in Section 4 it is shown that a particular diagonal matrix gives much better performance in applications to Q-learning.

The main technical results are obtained for a linear model, so that

$$f_{n+1}(\theta_n) = A_{n+1}\theta_n - b_{n+1} = A(\theta_n - \theta^*) + \Delta_{n+1} \quad (16)$$

$$\text{with } \Delta_{n+1} := \widetilde{A}_{n+1}(\theta_n - \theta^*) + \Delta_{n+1}^* \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_{n+1}^* := f_{n+1}(\theta^*) = A_{n+1}\theta^* - b_{n+1} \quad (17)$$

In this case we denote $A = A(\theta)$. Estimates are obtained using

$$\widehat{A}_{n+1} = \widehat{A}_n + \frac{1}{n+1}(A_{n+1} - \widehat{A}_n) \quad (18)$$

The SNR algorithm is (3) in which $G_n = \widehat{A}_n^\dagger$ (the Moore–Penrose pseudo inverse).

Additional simplifying assumptions are imposed to ease analysis:

(A1) The stochastic process (A_n, b_n) is wide-sense stationary, with common mean (A, b) .

(A2) $\{\widetilde{A}_n, \widetilde{b}_n\}$ are bounded martingale difference sequences, adapted to the filtration

$$\mathcal{F}_n := \sigma\{A_k, b_k : k \leq n\} \quad (19)$$

(A3) For any eigenvalue λ of A ,

$$\text{Real}(\lambda) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |1 + \zeta\lambda| < 1 \quad (20)$$

It is assumed without loss of generality that $\zeta = 1$.

Under Assumptions **A1** and **A2**, the covariance matrix in (7) can be expressed

$$\Sigma^\Delta = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{n+1}^* (\Delta_{n+1}^*)^T] \quad (21)$$

The noise covariance corresponding to parameter estimate θ_n is denoted

$$\Sigma_{n+1}^\Delta = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{n+1} (\Delta_{n+1})^T] \quad (22)$$

Under the assumption that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n = \theta^*$ in L_2 we obtain $\Sigma_n^\Delta = \Sigma^\Delta + o(1)$.

Even in the linear setting, full stability and coupling arguments are not yet available because the assumptions do not ensure that $\widehat{A}_n^{-1} \rightarrow A^{-1}$ in L_2 . Analysis is restricted to the simplified SNR and PolSA algorithms, defined as follows:

$$\text{SNR: } \Delta\theta_{n+1}^* = -\alpha_{n+1} A^{-1} f_{n+1}(\theta_n^*) \quad (23)$$

$$\text{PolSA: } \Delta\theta_{n+1} = [I + A]\Delta\theta_n + \alpha_{n+1} f_{n+1}(\theta_n) \quad (24)$$

For the linear model, the recursion (23) becomes

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1}^* = -\alpha_{n+1} A^{-1} [A_{n+1} \theta_n^* - b_{n+1}] = -\alpha_{n+1} [\tilde{\theta}_n^* - A^{-1} \Delta_{n+1}] \quad (25)$$

The SNR algorithm is in some sense optimal under general conditions. The proof of Proposition 1 is contained in Section A of the Appendix.

Proposition 1 *Suppose that Assumptions A1–A3 hold. Then, the following hold for the estimates $\{\theta_n^\bullet\}$ obtained from the SNR algorithm and $\{\theta_n^*\}$ obtained from (23):*

(i) *The representations hold:*

$$\tilde{\theta}_n^\bullet = -\widehat{A}_n^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \Delta_k^* \quad \text{whenever the inverse } \widehat{A}_n^{-1} \text{ exists} \quad (26)$$

$$\tilde{\theta}_n^* = -A^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \Delta_k \quad (27)$$

Consequently, each converges to zero with probability one.

(ii) *The scaled covariances $\Sigma_n = n\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\theta}_n^* (\tilde{\theta}_n^*)^T]$ and $\Sigma_n^{22} = n^2\mathbb{E}[\Delta\theta_n^* (\Delta\theta_n^*)^T]$ satisfy*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_n^{22} = \Sigma^* \quad (28)$$

with $\Sigma^* = A^{-1} \Sigma^\Delta A^{-1^T}$; the optimal covariance (8). \square




Figure 1: Coupling between PolSA and SNR occurs quickly for $0.5 \leq \zeta \leq 1.9$.

A drawback with SNR is the matrix inversion. The PolSA algorithm is simpler and enjoys the same attractive properties. This is established through coupling:

Proposition 2 *Suppose assumptions (A1)–(A3) hold. Let $\{\theta_n^*\}$ denote the iterates using SNR (23) and $\{\theta_n\}$ the iterates obtained using (24), with identical initial conditions. Then,*

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} n^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\theta_n - \theta_n^*\|^2] < \infty \quad (29)$$

Consequently, the limits 28 hold for the PolSA algorithm (24):

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\theta}_n^* (\tilde{\theta}_n^*)^T] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^2 \mathbb{E}[\Delta \theta_n^* (\Delta \theta_n^*)^T] = \Sigma^*$$

Other than SNR and the Polyak-Ruppert averaging technique, to the best of our knowledge, PolSA is the only other known algorithm that achieves optimal asymptotic variance.

The proof of Proposition 2, contained in Section B of the supplementary material, is based on a justification of the heuristic used to construct the deterministic recursion (13).

An illustration is provided in Fig. 1 for the linear model $f_n(\theta) = A\theta + \Delta_n$ in which $-A$ is symmetric and positive definite, with $\lambda_{\max}(-A) = 1$, and $\{\Delta_n\}$ is i.i.d. and Gaussian. Shown are the trajectories of $\{\theta_n(1) : n \leq 10^5\}$ (note that $\Sigma^*(1, 1)$ is over one million).

2.3. Applications

Reinforcement learning Section 4 describes application to Q-learning, and includes numerical examples. Section D in the supplementary material contains a full account of TD-learning. In particular, the LSTD algorithm can be regarded as an instance of SNR: (3) with $G_n = -\hat{A}_n^{-1}$ an estimate of $G^* = -A^{-1}$.

Stochastic optimization A common application of stochastic approximation is convex optimization. In this setting, $\tilde{f}(\theta) = \nabla \mathbb{E}[J_n(\theta)]$ for a sequence of smooth functions $\{J_n\}$, and then $f_n = -\nabla J_n$. The theory developed in this paper is applicable, except in degenerate cases. For comparison, consider the quadratic optimization problem in which $f_n(\theta) = A\theta - b + \Delta_n$, with $-A > 0$. The stability condition (20) holds provided $\zeta < 1/\lambda_{\max}(-A)$: a condition familiar in the convex optimization literature.

Stochastic algorithms for deterministic optimization Finally, we explain why the results of this paper *do not* apply in typical deterministic optimization domains.

It is common to use randomized algorithms to solve deterministic optimization problems. Two examples are ERM and the randomized coordinate descent. In these and other examples, the algorithms are designed so that randomness vanishes as θ approaches θ^* . The asymptotic covariance matrix Σ^Δ is zero, and hence the asymptotic covariance (8) also vanishes.

3. Variance analysis of the NeSA algorithm

The NeSA algorithm (5) has a finite asymptotic covariance that can be expressed as the solution to a Lyapunov equation. We again restrict to the linear model, so that the recursion (5) (with $\zeta = 1$) becomes

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} = [I + A_{n+1}]\Delta\theta_n + \alpha_{n+1}[A_{n+1}\theta_n - b_{n+1}] \quad (30)$$

Stability of the recursion requires a strengthening of assumption (20). Define the linear operator $\mathcal{L}: \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ as follows: For any matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$,

$$\mathcal{L}(Q) := \mathbb{E}[(I + A_n)Q(I + A_n)^T] \quad (31)$$

Define the $2d$ -dimensional vector processes $\Phi_n := (\sqrt{n}\tilde{\theta}_n, n\Delta\theta_n)^T$, and

$$\Sigma_n := \mathbb{E}[\Phi_n \Phi_n^T] = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_n^{11} & \Sigma_n^{12} \\ \Sigma_n^{21} & \Sigma_n^{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad (32)$$

The following assumptions are imposed throughout:

(N1) $\{\tilde{A}_n, \tilde{b}_n\}$ are bounded martingale difference sequences. Moreover, for any matrix Q ,

$$\mathbb{E}[(I + A_n)Q(I + A_n)^T \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] = \mathcal{L}(Q)$$

(N2) The bounds in (20) hold, and the spectral radius of \mathcal{L} is strictly bounded by unity.

(N3) The covariance sequence $\{\Sigma_n\}$ defined in (32) is bounded.

In Section C of the supplementary material we discuss how (N3) can be relaxed.

Proposition 3 *Suppose that (N1) and (N2) hold. Then,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_n = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_\infty^{11} & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_\infty^{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad (33)$$

in which the second limit is the solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$\Sigma_\infty^{22} = \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_\infty^{22}) + \Sigma^\Delta \quad (34)$$

(an explicit solution is given in eqn. (89) of the supplementary material), and

$$\Sigma_\infty^{11} = -\Sigma_\infty^{22} - A^{-1}\Sigma_\infty^{22} - \Sigma_\infty^{22}A^{-1} \quad (35)$$




Figure 2: Histograms for entry 18 of $\{\sqrt{n}\bar{\theta}_n\}$ for three algorithms at iteration 10^6 .

The following result is a corollary to Proposition 3, with an independent proof provided in Section C.1 of the supplementary material.

Proposition 4 *Under (N1)–(N3) the conclusions of Proposition 3 hold for the PolSA recursion (24). In this case the solution to the Lyapunov equation is the optimal covariance:*

$$\Sigma_\infty^{11} = \Sigma^* := A^{-1}\Sigma_\Delta A^{-1T} \quad (36)$$

and $\Sigma_\infty^{22} \geq 0$ is the unique solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$\Sigma_\infty^{22} = (I + A)\Sigma_\infty^{22}(I + A)^T + \Sigma^\Delta \quad (37)$$

The proofs of the following are contained in Section C of the supplementary material.

Lemma 5 *The following approximations hold, with $\psi_n := \sqrt{n}\Sigma_n^{21}$:*

$$\Sigma_{n+1}^{22} = \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_n^{22}) + \Sigma^\Delta + o(1), \quad \psi_n = -\Sigma_n^{11} - A^{-1}\Sigma_\infty^{22} + o(1), \quad n \geq 1. \quad (38)$$

The second iteration is used together with the following result to obtain (35).

Lemma 6 *The following approximation holds:*

$$\Sigma_{n+1}^{11} = \Sigma_n^{11} + \alpha_{n+1} \left(\Sigma_n^{11} + A\Sigma_n^{11} + \Sigma_n^{11}A^T + \psi_n^T(I+A)^T + (I+A)\psi_n + \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_\infty^{22}) + \Sigma^\Delta + o(1) \right) \quad (39)$$

Proof of Proposition 3: The first approximation in (38) combined with (N2) implies that the sequence $\{\Sigma_n^{22}\}$ is convergent, and the limit is the solution to the fixed point equation (34) (details are provided in Section C.2 of the supplementary material).

Substituting the approximation (38) for ψ_n into (39) and simplifying gives

$$\Sigma_{n+1}^{11} = \Sigma_n^{11} + \alpha_{n+1} \left(-\Sigma_n^{11} - \Sigma_\infty^{22} - A^{-1}\Sigma_\infty^{22} - \Sigma_\infty^{22}A^{-1} + o(1) \right)$$

This can be regarded as a Euler approximation to the ODE:

$$\frac{d}{dt}x_t = -x_t - \Sigma_\infty^{22} - A^{-1}\Sigma_\infty^{22} - \Sigma_\infty^{22}A^{-1}$$

Stochastic approximation theory can be applied to establish that the limits of $\{\Sigma_n^{11}\}$ and $\{x_t\}$ coincide with the stationary point Borkar (2008), which is (35). \square

4. Application to Q-learning

Consider a discounted cost MDP model with state space \mathbf{X} , action space \mathbf{U} , cost function $c: \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and discount factor $\beta \in (0, 1)$. It is assumed that the state and action space are finite: denote $\ell = |\mathbf{X}|$, $\ell_u = |\mathbf{U}|$, and P_u the $\ell \times \ell$ controlled transition probability matrix.

The Q-function is the solution to the Bellman equation:

$$Q^*(x, u) = c(x, u) + \beta \mathbb{E}[\min_{u'} Q^*(X_{n+1}, u') \mid X_n = x, U_n = u] \quad (40)$$

The goal of Q-learning is to learn an approximation to Q^* . Given d basis functions $\{\phi_i : 1 \leq i \leq d\}$, with each $\phi_i : \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and a parameter vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the Q-function estimate is denoted $Q^\theta(x, u) = \theta^T \phi(x, u)$, and its minimum, $\underline{Q}^\theta(x) := \min_{u'} Q^\theta(x, u)$.

Watkins' Q-learning algorithm is designed to compute the exact Q-function that solves the Bellman equation (40) (Watkins (1989); Watkins and Dayan (1992)). In this setting, the basis is taken to be the set of indicator functions: $\phi_i(x, u) = \mathbb{I}\{x = x^i, u = u^i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq d$, with $d = |\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{U}|$. The goal is to find $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\bar{f}(\theta^*) = 0$, where, for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\bar{f}(\theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\phi(X_n, U_n) \left(c(X_n, U_n) + \beta \underline{Q}^\theta(X_{n+1}) - Q^\theta(X_n, U_n) \right) \right]$$

where the expectation is with respect to the steady state distribution of the Markov chain.

The basic algorithm of Watkins can be written

$$\Delta \theta_{n+1} = \alpha_{n+1} \widehat{D}_{n+1} [A_{n+1} \theta_n - b_{n+1}] \quad (41)$$

in which the matrix gain is diagonal, with $\widehat{D}_n(i, i)^{-1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{I}\{(X_k, U_k) = (x^i, u^i)\}$, and with $\pi_n(x) := \arg \min_u Q^{\theta_n}(x, u)$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{n+1} &= \phi(X_n, U_n) \{ \beta \phi(X_{n+1}, \pi_n(X_{n+1})) - \phi(X_n, U_n) \}^T \\ b_{n+1} &= c(X_n, U_n) \phi(X_n, U_n) \end{aligned}$$

See (Szepesvári (2010b)) for more details. Among the other algorithms compared are

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SNR:} \quad & \Delta \theta_{n+1} = -\alpha_{n+1} \widehat{A}_{n+1}^{-1} [A_{n+1} \theta_n - b_{n+1}] \\ \text{PolSA:} \quad & \Delta \theta_{n+1} = [I + \widehat{A}_{n+1}] \Delta \theta_n + \alpha_{n+1} [A_{n+1} \theta_n - b_{n+1}] \\ \text{PolSA-D:} \quad & \Delta \theta_{n+1} = [I + \widehat{D}_{n+1} \widehat{A}_{n+1}] \Delta \theta_n + \alpha_{n+1} \widehat{D}_{n+1} [A_{n+1} \theta_n - b_{n+1}] \\ \text{NeSA:} \quad & \Delta \theta_{n+1} = [I + A_{n+1}] \Delta \theta_n + \alpha_{n+1} [A_{n+1} \theta_n - b_{n+1}] \end{aligned}$$

In each of these algorithms, (18) is used to recursively estimate \widehat{A}_n . We have taken $\zeta = 1$ in PolSA. The variant PolSA-D is (4) with $G_{n+1} = \widehat{D}_{n+1}$, and M_{n+1} chosen so that coupling with SNR can be expected.

The SNR algorithm considered coincides with the *Zap Q-learning* algorithm of Devraj and Meyn (2017a,b). A simple 6-state MDP model was considered in this prior work, with the objective of finding the stochastic shortest path. Fig. 2 contains histograms of $\{\sqrt{n} \widehat{\theta}_n\}$ obtained from 1000 parallel simulations of PolSA-D, SNR and NeSA algorithms for this problem. It is observed that the histograms of PolSA-D and SNR nearly coincide after




Figure 3: Bellman error for $n \leq 10^7$ in the shortest path problem with $d = 19$ and $d = 117$. Deterministic exploration leads to much faster convergence in the NeSA algorithm.

$n = 10^6$ iterations (performance for PolSA is similar). The histogram for NeSA shows a much higher variance, but the algorithm requires by-far the least computation per iteration. This is specifically true for Watkins’ Q-learning since A_{n+1} is a sparse matrix, with just 2 non-zero entries.

Experiments were also performed for larger examples. Results from two such experiments are shown in Fig. 3. The MDP model is once again a stochastic shortest path problem. The model construction was based on the creation of a graph with N nodes, in which the probability of an edge between a pair of nodes is i.i.d. with probability p . Additional edges $(i, i + 1)$ are added, for each $i < N$, to ensure the resulting graph is strongly connected.

The transition law is similar to that used in the finite state-action example of Devraj and Meyn (2017a): with probability 0.8 the agent moves in the desired direction, and with remaining probability it ends up in one of the neighboring nodes, chosen uniformly. Two exploration rules were considered: the “online” version wherein at each iteration the agent randomly selects a feasible action (also known as asynchronous Q-learning), and the offline “clock sampling” approach in which state-action pairs (x^i, u^i) are chosen sequentially (also known as synchronous Q-learning). In the latter, at stage n , if (x, u) is the current state-action pair, a random variable X'_{n+1} is chosen according to the distribution $P_u(x, \cdot)$, and the (x, u) entry of the Q-function is updated according to the particular algorithm using the triple (x, u, X'_{n+1}) . A significant change to Watkins’ iteration (41) in the synchronous setting is that \widehat{D}_n is replaced by $d^{-1}I$ (since each state is visited the same number of times after each cycle). This combined with deterministic sampling is observed to result in significant variance reduction. The *synchronous speedy Q-learning* recursion of Azar et al. (2011) appears similar to the NeSA algorithm with clock sampling.

Two graphs were used in the survey experiments, one resulting in an MDP with $d = 19$ state-action pairs and another resulting in a larger MDP with $d = 117$ state-action pairs. The plots in Fig. 3 show Bellman error as a function of iteration n for the two cases (for definitions see Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis (1996); Devraj and Meyn (2017b)). Comparison of the performance of algorithms in a deterministic exploration setting versus the online setting is also shown. The coupling of PolSA and the Zap algorithms are easily observed in

the clock sampling case. In the online case, it is less prominent, but can still be seen when $d = 19$.

5. Conclusions

It is exciting to see how the intuitive transformation from SNR to PolSA and NeSA can be justified theoretically and in simulations. While the covariance of NeSA is not optimal, it is the simplest of the three algorithms and, performs well in applications to Q-learning.

An important next step is to create adaptive techniques to ensure fast coupling or other ways to ensure fast forgetting of the initial condition. It is possible that techniques in [Jain et al. \(2017\)](#) may be adapted. The work can be extended in several ways:

- (i) It will be of great interest to pursue analysis of the proposed algorithms in the special case of nonlinear optimization. It is possible that the structure of the problem such as convexity of the objective and smoothness of the gradients could help us derive bounds on the transients.
- (ii) The authors in [Devraj and Meyn \(2017a\)](#) suggest that their algorithm can be used for Q-learning with function approximation. It would be interesting to see how the PolSA and NeSA algorithms can be extended to this setting. Applications to TD-learning with function approximation is discussed in Section [D](#) of the Appendix.

References

- Z. Allen-Zhu. Katyusha: The first direct acceleration of stochastic gradient methods. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2016.
- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Rémi Munos, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, and Hilbert Kappen. Speedy Q-learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2011.
- Francis Bach and Eric Moulines. Non-strongly-convex smooth stochastic approximation with convergence rate $o(1/n)$. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, pages 773–781. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.
- A. Benveniste, M. Métivier, and P. Priouret. *Adaptive algorithms and stochastic approximations*, volume 22 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990. ISBN 3-540-52894-6. Translated from the French by Stephen S. Wilson.
- D.P. Bertsekas and J. N. Tsitsiklis. *Neuro-Dynamic Programming*. Atena Scientific, Cambridge, Mass, 1996.
- V. S. Borkar. Average cost dynamic programming equations for controlled Markov chains with partial observations. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 39(3):673–681 (electronic), 2000. ISSN 0363-0129.
- V. S. Borkar. *Stochastic Approximation: A Dynamical Systems Viewpoint*. Hindustan Book Agency and Cambridge University Press (jointly), Delhi, India and Cambridge, UK, 2008.
- Justin A Boyan. Technical update: Least-squares temporal difference learning. *Mach. Learn.*, 49(2-3):233–246, 2002.
- Aaron Defazio, Francis Bach, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. Saga: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1646–1654, 2014.
- Adithya M Devraj and Sean Meyn. Zap Q-learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2235–2244, 2017a.
- Adithya M. Devraj and Sean P. Meyn. Fastest convergence for Q-learning. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2017b.
- J Duchi. Introductory lectures on stochastic optimization. *Stanford Lecture Series*, 2016.
- Sébastien Gadat, Fabien Panloup, and Sofiane Saadane. Stochastic heavy ball. *Electron. J. Statist.*, 12(1):461–529, 2018. doi: 10.1214/18-EJS1395. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-EJS1395>.
- P. W. Glynn and D. Ormoneit. Hoeffding’s inequality for uniformly ergodic Markov chains. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 56:143–146, 2002.
- P. Jain, S. M. Kakade, R. Kidambi, P. Netrapalli, and A. Sidford. Accelerating Stochastic Gradient Descent. *ArXiv e-prints (and to appear, COLT 2018)*, April 2017.

- Thomas Kailath. *Linear systems*, volume 156. Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1980.
- V. R. Konda and J. N. Tsitsiklis. Convergence rate of linear two-time-scale stochastic approximation. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 14(2):796–819, 2004. ISSN 10505164. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4140429>.
- Valery Koval and Rainer Schwabe. A law of the iterated logarithm for stochastic approximation procedures in d-dimensional euclidean space. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 105(2):299 – 313, 2003. ISSN 0304-4149. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4149\(03\)00016-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4149(03)00016-4). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304414903000164>.
- H. J. Kushner and G. G. Yin. *Stochastic approximation algorithms and applications*, volume 35 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997. ISBN 0-387-94916-X.
- N. Loizou and P. Richtárik. Momentum and Stochastic Momentum for Stochastic Gradient, Newton, Proximal Point and Subspace Descent Methods. *ArXiv e-prints*, Dec. 2017.
- Eric Moulines and Francis R. Bach. Non-asymptotic analysis of stochastic approximation algorithms for machine learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24*, pages 451–459. Curran Associates, Inc., 2011.
- Yu. Nesterov. Efficiency of coordinate descent methods on huge-scale optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(2):341–362, 2012. doi: 10.1137/100802001. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/100802001>.
- Yurii Nesterov. A method of solving a convex programming problem with convergence rate $O(1/k^2)$. In *Soviet Mathematics Doklady*, 1983.
- B. T. Polyak and A. B. Juditsky. Acceleration of stochastic approximation by averaging. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 30(4):838–855, 1992. ISSN 0363-0129. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/0330046>.
- Boris Teodorovich Polyak. Some methods of speeding up the convergence of iteration methods. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 4(5):1–17, 1964. ISSN 0041-5553. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0041-5553\(64\)90137-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0041-5553(64)90137-5). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0041555364901375>.
- Boris Teodorovich Polyak. *Introduction to Optimization*. Optimization Software Inc, New York, 1987.
- Boris Teodorovich Polyak. A new method of stochastic approximation type. *Avtomatika i telemekhanika (in Russian)*. translated in *Automat. Remote Control*, 51 (1991), pages 98–107, 1990.
- H. Robbins and S. Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22:400–407, 1951.

- D. Ruppert. A Newton-Raphson version of the multivariate Robbins-Monro procedure. *The Annals of Statistics*, 13(1):236–245, 1985. ISSN 00905364. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2241156>.
- R. S. Sutton. Learning to predict by the methods of temporal differences. *Mach. Learn.*, 3(1):9–44, 1988. ISSN 0885-6125. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1022633531479>.
- C. Szepesvári. *Algorithms for Reinforcement Learning*. Synthesis Lectures on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2010a.
- Csaba Szepesvári. Algorithms for reinforcement learning. *Synthesis lectures on artificial intelligence and machine learning*, 4(1):1–103, 2010b.
- J. N. Tsitsiklis and B. Van Roy. An analysis of temporal-difference learning with function approximation. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 42(5):674–690, 1997.
- J.N. Tsitsiklis. Asynchronous stochastic approximation and Q -learning. *Machine Learning*, 16:185–202, 1994.
- C. J. C. H. Watkins. *Learning from Delayed Rewards*. PhD thesis, King’s College, Cambridge, Cambridge, UK, 1989.
- C. J. C. H. Watkins and P. Dayan. Q -learning. *Machine Learning*, 8(3-4):279–292, 1992.

Appendix

Appendix A. Proof of Proposition 1

Proof of Proposition 1 The proof of the first limit in (28) is obtained through Taylor series arguments surveyed in Devraj and Meyn (2017b). The second limit in (28) follows from the first, and the representation

$$(n+1)\Delta\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}^* = -[\tilde{\theta}_n^* - A^{-1}\Delta_{n+1}]$$

This representation uses (25) and the assumption $\alpha_{n+1} = 1/(n+1)$. Consequently, under the martingale difference property for $\{\Delta_n\}$,

$$\Sigma_{n+1}^{22} = \frac{1}{n}\Sigma_n + A^{-1}\Sigma_{n+1}^\Delta(A^{-1})^T$$

The first term vanishes because $\{\Sigma_n\}$ is convergent. Moreover, because $\Delta_{n+1} = \Delta_{n+1}^* + \tilde{A}_{n+1}\tilde{\theta}_n^*$, it then follows from that $\Sigma_{n+1}^\Delta = \Sigma^\Delta + o(1)$, and hence

$$\Sigma_{n+1}^{22} = A^{-1}\Sigma^\Delta(A^{-1})^T + o(1) = \Sigma^* + o(1).$$

The proof of (26) is obtained as follows: it follows from the definition that

$$\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}^\bullet = \tilde{\theta}_n^\bullet - \alpha_{n+1}\hat{A}_{n+1}^\dagger[A_{n+1}\tilde{\theta}_n^\bullet + \Delta_{n+1}^*]$$

and also

$$(n+1)\hat{A}_{n+1} = n\hat{A}_n + A_{n+1}$$

Consequently, when \hat{A}_{n+1}^{-1} exists, so that $\hat{A}_{n+1}^\dagger = \hat{A}_{n+1}^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (n+1)\hat{A}_{n+1}\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}^\bullet &= [n\hat{A}_n + A_{n+1}]\tilde{\theta}_n^\bullet - [A_{n+1}\tilde{\theta}_n^\bullet + \Delta_{n+1}^*] \\ &= n\hat{A}_n\tilde{\theta}_n^\bullet - \Delta_{n+1}^* \end{aligned}$$

Summing this telescoping series gives (26).

The proof of (27) is similar and simpler, since we immediately obtain from the definition (25),

$$(n+1)A\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}^* = nA\tilde{\theta}_n^* - \Delta_{n+1}$$

Summing each side then gives (27). \square

Appendix B. Coupling

We present here the proof of Proposition 2, based on a transformation of SNR so that it resembles PolSA with a vanishing disturbance sequence. This is essentially a reversal of the manipulations applied to derive (13) from an approximation of (12) at the start of Section 2, but now in a stochastic setting.

Consider the recursion (24). For simplicity we take $\zeta = 1$ (this is without loss of generality by re-defining the matrix A).

It is simplest to first prove Proposition 2 when $\{A_n\}$ is deterministic: $\tilde{A}_n \equiv 0$. The proof of the stochastic case is presented next.

B.1. Deterministic matrix sequence

Lemma 7 *The SNR and PolSA recursions (23)–(24) with deterministic $\{A_n\}$ ($A_n \equiv A$) can be expressed, respectively*

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1}^* = [I + A]\Delta\theta_n^* + \alpha_{n+1}[A\tilde{\theta}_n^* + \Delta_{n+1}] + \mathcal{E}_{n+1} \quad (42)$$

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} = [I + A]\Delta\theta_n + \alpha_{n+1}[A\tilde{\theta}_n + \Delta_{n+1}], \quad (43)$$

where $\Delta_n = b - b_n$ and

$$\mathcal{E}_{n+1} = [I + A](\Delta\theta_{n+1}^* - \Delta\theta_n^*), \quad n \geq 0. \quad (44)$$

Proof Recall the simplified PolSA recursion (24):

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1} = [I + A]\Delta\theta_n + \alpha_{n+1}f_{n+1}(\theta_n)$$

Substituting the linear model (16) into the above recursion, (43) is obtained. Furthermore, in the special setting $A_n \equiv A$, the noise sequence Δ_n in (17) becomes $\Delta_n = \Delta_n^* = b - b_n$.

Next, recall the SNR recursion (23):

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1}^* = -\alpha_{n+1}A^{-1}f_{n+1}(\theta_n^*)$$

Multiplying both sides of the above recursion by A , and substituting for f_{n+1} the linear model (16) gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= A\Delta\theta_{n+1}^* + \alpha_{n+1}[A\tilde{\theta}_n^* + \Delta_{n+1}] \\ &= A\Delta\theta_n^* + \alpha_{n+1}[A\tilde{\theta}_n^* + \Delta_{n+1}] - (\Delta\theta_{n+1}^* - \Delta\theta_n^*) + \mathcal{E}_{n+1} \end{aligned}$$

where once again $\Delta_n = b - b_n$, and \mathcal{E}_{n+1} is defined in (44). Moving $\Delta\theta_{n+1}^*$ to the left-hand side completes the proof of (42). \blacksquare

Denote:

$$\bar{\theta}_n := \theta_n - \theta_n^* \quad \xi_n := n\bar{\theta}_n \quad (45)$$

The proof of Proposition 2 requires that we establish uniform bounds on each of these sequences.

Denoting $\Delta\bar{\theta}_n := \bar{\theta}_n - \bar{\theta}_{n-1}$, the following lemma establishes a recursion for $\{\bar{\theta}_n : n \geq 0\}$ that is similar to the PolSA recursion (43):

Lemma 8 *The error sequence $\{\bar{\theta}_n : n \geq 0\}$ evolves according to the recursion*

$$\Delta\bar{\theta}_{n+1} = [I + A]\Delta\bar{\theta}_n + \alpha_{n+1}A\bar{\theta}_n - \mathcal{E}_{n+1} \quad (46)$$

in which the sequence $\{\mathcal{E}_n : n \geq 1\}$ defined in (44) satisfies the following for a constant $b_{\mathcal{E}} < \infty$:

- (i) $\{n\mathcal{E}_n : n \geq 1\}$ is a bounded sequence: $\|n\mathcal{E}_n\| \leq b_{\mathcal{E}}$ for all $n \geq 1$.

(ii) *Its partial sums are also bounded: Defining*

$$S_n^\mathcal{E} := \sum_{k=1}^n k \mathcal{E}_k, \quad n \geq 1,$$

$$\|S_n^\mathcal{E}\| \leq b_\mathcal{E} \text{ for all } n \geq 1.$$

Proof Representation (46) directly follows by subtracting (42) from (43). We now prove that the error sequence $\{n\mathcal{E}_n : n \geq 1\}$ satisfies the properties in (i) and (ii).

Recalling that $\alpha_{n+1} = 1/(n+1)$ in the SNR recursion (23) we have:

$$\Delta\theta_{n+1}^* = -(n+1)^{-1}(\theta_n^* + A^{-1}\Delta_{n+1}). \quad (47)$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} (n+1)(\Delta\theta_{n+1}^* - \Delta\theta_n^*) &= (n+1)\Delta\theta_{n+1}^* - n\Delta\theta_n^* - \Delta\theta_n^* \\ &= -(\theta_n^* + A^{-1}\Delta_{n+1}) + (\theta_{n-1}^* + A^{-1}\Delta_n) - \Delta\theta_n^* \\ &= -2\Delta\theta_n^* - A^{-1}(\Delta_{n+1} - \Delta_n) \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where the second equality follows from (47), and the last equality is obtained by combining the common terms. Under the assumption of the Proposition 2, the sequences $\{\theta_n^* : n \geq 0\}$ and $\{\Delta_n : n \geq 0\}$ are bounded. Therefore, the right hand side of (48) is also bounded, and multiplying both sides of the equation by $[I + A]$, part (i) of the lemma follows. It is also easy to see that the right hand side of (48) is a telescoping sequence. Therefore, for each $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n k(\Delta\theta_k^* - \Delta\theta_{k-1}^*) &= \sum_{k=1}^n (-2\Delta\theta_{k-1}^* - A^{-1}(\Delta_k - \Delta_{k-1})) \\ &= -2\theta_{n-1}^* + 2\theta_0^* - A^{-1}(\Delta_n - \Delta_0) \end{aligned}$$

Once again, the right hand side of the above equation is uniformly bounded in n under the assumptions of Proposition 2. \blacksquare

Lemma 9 *The normalized error sequence $\{\xi_n : n \geq 0\}$ defined in (45) satisfies the following recursion:*

$$\Delta\xi_{n+1} = [I + A](\Delta\xi_n + 2[\bar{\theta}_n - \bar{\theta}_{n-1}]) - (n+1)\mathcal{E}_{n+1} \quad (49)$$

where $\Delta\xi_n := \xi_n - \xi_{n-1}$. \square

Proof By definition of ξ_n in (45), we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\xi_{n+1} &= \xi_{n+1} - \xi_n \\ &= (n+1)\bar{\theta}_{n+1} - n\bar{\theta}_n \\ &= (n+1)(\theta_{n+1} - \theta_{n+1}^*) - n(\theta_n - \theta_n^*) \\ &= (n+1)\Delta\theta_{n+1} - (n+1)\Delta\theta_{n+1}^* + \theta_n - \theta_n^* \\ &= (n+1)\Delta\bar{\theta}_{n+1} + \bar{\theta}_n \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Substituting for $\Delta\bar{\theta}_{n+1}$ using (46) in the above equation, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\xi_{n+1} &= (n+1)[I+A]\Delta\bar{\theta}_n + A\bar{\theta}_n + \bar{\theta}_n - (n+1)\mathcal{E}_{n+1} \\
&= [I+A]\left(n\bar{\theta}_n - (n-1)\bar{\theta}_{n-1} + \bar{\theta}_n - 2\bar{\theta}_{n-1} + \bar{\theta}_n\right) - (n+1)\mathcal{E}_{n+1} \\
&= [I+A]\left(\Delta\xi_n + 2\Delta\bar{\theta}_n\right) - (n+1)\mathcal{E}_{n+1}
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

■

We are now ready to prove Proposition 2 for the deterministic case.

Proof of Proposition 2 – deterministic case: On summing each side of the identity (49) in Lemma 9 we obtain, for any $n > m \geq 2$,

$$\xi_{n+1} - \xi_m = [I+A]\left(\xi_n - \xi_{m-1} + 2[\bar{\theta}_n - \bar{\theta}_{m-1}]\right) - \sum_{k=m}^n (k+1)\mathcal{E}_{k+1}$$

Using the definition $\bar{\theta}_n = \xi_n/n$ then gives

$$\xi_{n+1} = [I+A]\left((1+2n^{-1})\xi_n\right) + \xi_m - (1+2(m-1)^{-1})[I+A]\xi_{m-1} - \sum_{k=m}^n (k+1)\mathcal{E}_{k+1}$$

Letting $m = 2$ in the above recursion,

$$\xi_{n+1} = [I+A]\left((1+2n^{-1})\xi_n\right) + b_{n+1}^\xi \tag{52}$$

where the final term b_{n+1}^ξ is bounded in n (part (ii) of Lemma 8):

$$b_{n+1}^\xi = \xi_2 - 3[I+A]\xi_1 - \sum_{k=2}^n (k+1)\mathcal{E}_{k+1}$$

Since by assumption, all eigenvalues of $[I+A]$ satisfy $\lambda(I+A) < 1$, the recursion (52) can be viewed as a stable linear system with bounded input $\{b_n^\xi\}$. Therefore, for each $Q > 0$, there exists a matrix $M > 0$ satisfying the discrete time Lyapunov equation Kailath (1980):

$$[I+A]^T M [I+A] = M - Q \tag{53}$$

Choosing $Q = I$, and noting that $I \geq \varepsilon M$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ that is small enough, we have:

$$[I+A]^T M [I+A] \leq \delta^2 M \tag{54}$$

where $\delta^2 = 1 - \varepsilon < 1$. Denote $\|\cdot\|_M$ to be the weighted norm with respect to the matrix M that satisfies (54): For all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|\xi\|_M := (\xi^T M \xi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{55}$$

Applying the triangle inequality to (52) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\|\xi_{n+1}\|_M &\leq (1 + 2n^{-1}) \cdot \|[I + A]\xi_n\|_M + \|b_{n+1}^\xi\|_M \\ &\leq \delta(1 + 2n^{-1}) \cdot \|\xi_n\|_M + \|b_{n+1}^\xi\|_M\end{aligned}\quad (56)$$

Choosing N_0 large enough, such that $(1 + 2n^{-1})\delta < \sqrt{\delta}$ for all $n \geq N_0$, we have

$$\|\xi_{n+1}\|_M \leq \sqrt{\delta} \cdot \|\xi_n\|_M + \|b_{n+1}^\xi\|_M, \quad n \geq N_0 \quad (57)$$

Consequently, for each $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\xi_{N_0+k}\|_M &\leq \delta^{\frac{k}{2}} \cdot \|\xi_{N_0}\|_M + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \delta^{i/2} \|b_{N_0+k-i+1}^\xi\|_M \\ &\leq \delta^{\frac{k}{2}} \cdot \|\xi_{N_0}\|_M + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta^{i/2} \right) \sup_{k \geq 0} \|b_{n_0+k}^\xi\|_M < \infty\end{aligned}\quad (58)$$

□

B.2. Proof of Proposition 2 for the general linear algorithm

The major difference in the case of random $\{A_n\}$ is that the identity (46) holds with a modified error sequence:

$$\Delta\bar{\theta}_{n+1} = [I + A]\Delta\bar{\theta}_n + \alpha_{n+1}A\bar{\theta}_n - \mathcal{E}_{n+1} + \alpha_{n+1}\tilde{A}_{n+1}\bar{\theta}_n, \quad (59)$$

where the last term appears because we are replacing the last but one term $\alpha_{n+1}A\bar{\theta}_n$ in (46) with $\alpha_{n+1}A_{n+1}\bar{\theta}_n$. The error sequence $\{\mathcal{E}_n\}$ is identical to the deterministic case, and therefore satisfies the properties in Lemma 8. Lemma 9 however must be modified due to the additional term (the proof follows exactly the same lines):

Lemma 10 *For the general linear algorithm, the normalized error sequence $\{\xi_n : n \geq 0\}$ defined in (45) satisfies the following recursion:*

$$\Delta\xi_{n+1} = [I + A]\left(\Delta\xi_n + 2[\bar{\theta}_n - \bar{\theta}_{n-1}]\right) - (n+1)\mathcal{E}_{n+1} + \tilde{A}_{n+1}\bar{\theta}_n \quad (60)$$

where $\Delta\xi_n := \xi_n - \xi_{n-1}$. □

The proof then proceeds as in the previous deterministic setting, except that we have to deal with the additional martingale difference sequence $\{\tilde{A}_{n+1}\bar{\theta}_n\}$.

Proof of Proposition 2 – general linear algorithm On summing each side of the identity (60) in Lemma 10 we obtain, for any $n > m \geq 2$,

$$\xi_{n+1} - \xi_m = [I + A]\left(\xi_n - \xi_{m-1} + 2[\bar{\theta}_n - \bar{\theta}_{m-1}]\right) - \sum_{k=m}^n (k+1)\mathcal{E}_{k+1} + \sum_{k=m}^n \tilde{A}_{k+1}\bar{\theta}_k$$

Using the definition $\bar{\theta}_n = \xi_n/n$ then gives

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{n+1} &= [I + A] \left((1 + 2n^{-1})\xi_n \right) + \xi_m - (1 + 2(m-1)^{-1})[I + A]\xi_{m-1} \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=m}^n (k+1)\mathcal{E}_{k+1} + \sum_{k=m}^n \frac{1}{k}\tilde{A}_{k+1}\xi_k\end{aligned}$$

The above recursion can be rewritten as,

$$\xi_{n+1} = [I + A] \left((1 + 2n^{-1})\xi_n \right) + b_{m,n+1}^\xi + U_{m,n}^{\tilde{A}} \quad (61)$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}b_{m,n+1}^\xi &:= \xi_m - (1 + 2(m-1)^{-1})[I + A]\xi_{m-1} - \sum_{k=m}^n (k+1)\mathcal{E}_{k+1} \\ U_{m,n}^{\tilde{A}} &:= \sum_{k=m}^n \frac{1}{k}\tilde{A}_{k+1}\xi_k\end{aligned}$$

The proof is now similar to the case $A_n \equiv A$, except that we now a weighted L_2 norm to obtain L_2 bounds. Let M denote a solution to (54) with $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and define for any d -dimensional random vector Z ,

$$\|Z\|_M^* = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|Z_M\|^2]} = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[Z^T M Z]}.$$

Applying the triangle inequality to (61) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\|\xi_{n+1}\|_M &\leq (1 + 2n^{-1}) \cdot \|[I + A]\xi_n\|_M + \|b_{m,n+1}^\xi\|_M + \|U_{m,n}^{\tilde{A}}\|_M \\ &\leq \delta(1 + 2n^{-1}) \cdot \|\xi_n\|_M + \|b_{m,n+1}^\xi\|_M + \|U_{m,n}^{\tilde{A}}\|_M\end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Part (ii) of Lemma 8 implies the following L_2 bound: for some $\bar{\sigma}_\xi < \infty$,

$$\|b_{m,n+1}^\xi\|_M \leq \bar{\sigma}_\xi, \quad n > m \geq 2. \quad (63)$$

Furthermore, for all $m \geq 2$ and $n > m$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\|U_{m,n}^{\tilde{A}}\|_M^{*2} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{k=m}^n \frac{1}{k}\tilde{A}_{k+1}\xi_k \right\|_M^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k=m}^n \frac{1}{k}\tilde{A}_{k+1}\xi_k \right)^T M \left(\sum_{k=m}^n \frac{1}{k}\tilde{A}_{k+1}\xi_k \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=m}^n \frac{1}{k^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\xi_k^T \tilde{A}_{k+1}^T M \tilde{A}_{k+1} \xi_k \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{k=m}^n \frac{1}{k^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\xi_k^T \tilde{A}_{k+1}^T M \tilde{A}_{k+1} \xi_k \right] \\ &\leq \bar{\sigma}_A^2 \sum_{k=m}^n \frac{1}{k^2} \|\xi_k\|_M^{*2}\end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where $\bar{\sigma}_A^2$ exists under the boundedness assumption on $\{A_n\}$.

Using (63) and (64) in (62) gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi_{n+1}\|_M^* &\leq \delta(1 + 2n^{-1}) \cdot \|\xi_n\|_M^* + \bar{\sigma}_\xi + \bar{\sigma}_A \left(\sum_{k=m}^n \frac{1}{k^2} \|\xi_k\|_M^{*2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \delta(1 + 2n^{-1}) \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{M,n} + \bar{\sigma}_\xi + \bar{\sigma}_A \left(\sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{M,n} \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where for each n ,

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{M,n} := \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \|\xi_k\|_M < \infty$$

Choose $N_0 \geq 2$ such that

$$\rho = (1 + 2N_0^{-1})\delta + \bar{\sigma}_A \left(\sum_{k=N_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < 1,$$

and fix $m = N_0$. We then conclude from (65) that for each $n \geq N_0$,

$$\|\xi_{n+1}\| \leq \rho \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{M,n} + \bar{\sigma}_\xi$$

Next apply the definition $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{M,n+1} = \max\{\|\xi_{n+1}\|, \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{M,n}\}$, to obtain

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{M,n+1} \leq \max\{\rho \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{M,n} + \bar{\sigma}_\xi, \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{M,n}\}, \quad n \geq m = N_0 \quad (66)$$

It then follows by induction that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{M,n} \leq \max\{\bar{\sigma}_\xi/(1 - \rho), \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{M,m}\}, \quad n \geq N_0,$$

which implies (29). \square

Appendix C. Variance analysis of the NeSA algorithm

Throughout this section it is assumed that the assumptions of Section 3 hold (repeated here for convenience of the reader):

(N1) $\{\tilde{A}_n, \tilde{b}_n\}$ are bounded martingale difference sequences. Moreover, for any matrix Q ,

$$\mathbb{E}[(I + A_n)Q(I + A_n)^T \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] = \mathcal{L}(Q)$$

where \mathcal{F} is the natural filtration:

$$\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma\{A_k, b_k : k \leq n\}.$$

(N2) The bounds in (20) hold, and the linear operator \mathcal{L} has spectral radius strictly bounded by unity.

(N3) The covariance sequence $\{\Sigma_n\}$ defined in (32) is bounded.

Even under the stability assumption, the convergence proof appears complex. We first provide a proof for the simpler PolSA algorithm (24) for which (N3) holds by applying Proposition 1.

C.1. Variance analysis of PolSA

The recursion (24) is expressed in state space form as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\theta}_{n+1} \\ \Delta\theta_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & (I+A) \\ 0 & (I+A) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\theta}_n \\ \Delta\theta_n \end{bmatrix} + \alpha_{n+1} \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ A & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\theta}_n \\ \Delta\theta_n \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{n+1} \\ \Delta_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (67)$$

Recall that the $2d$ -dimensional vector process $\{\Phi_n\}$ is defined as:

$$\Phi_n := \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n}\tilde{\theta}_n \\ n\Delta\theta_n \end{pmatrix} \quad (68)$$

and the covariance matrix sequence $\{\Sigma_n\}$ is defined to be:

$$\Sigma_n := \mathbf{E}[\Phi_n \Phi_n^T] = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_n^{11} & \Sigma_n^{12} \\ \Sigma_n^{21} & \Sigma_n^{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n\mathbf{E}[\tilde{\theta}_n \tilde{\theta}_n^T] & n^{3/2}\mathbf{E}[\tilde{\theta}_n \Delta\theta_n^T] \\ n^{3/2}\mathbf{E}[\Delta\theta_n \tilde{\theta}_n^T] & n^2\Sigma_n^{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad (69)$$

Also define the noise sequence $\{\Delta_n^\phi\}$:

$$\Delta_n^\phi := \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_n \\ \sqrt{n}\Delta_n \end{pmatrix} \quad (70)$$

We begin by establishing Assumption (N3) for PolSA. The following is a direct corollary to Proposition 1 and Proposition 2:

Proposition 11 *Suppose that the assumptions of Proposition 2 hold. Then, each $\{\Sigma_n^{11}\}$, $\{\Sigma_n^{12}\}$, $\{\Sigma_n^{21}\}$ and $\{\Sigma_n^{22}\}$ are bounded sequences for the PolSA algorithm:*

$$\sup_n \text{trace}(\Sigma_n^{ij}) < \infty, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq 2$$

Proof Proposition 2 implies that $\{n^2\mathbf{E}[\|\tilde{\theta}_n^* - \tilde{\theta}_n\|^2]\}$ is bounded in n , where $\tilde{\theta}_n^*$ is the error sequence of the SNR algorithm, and $\tilde{\theta}_n$ is the error sequence of the PolSA algorithm. We then have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{trace}(\Sigma_n^{11}) &= n\|\tilde{\theta}_n\|^2 \\ &= n\|\tilde{\theta}_n - \tilde{\theta}_n^* + \tilde{\theta}_n^*\|^2 \\ &\leq 2n\|\tilde{\theta}_n - \tilde{\theta}_n^*\|^2 + 2n\|\tilde{\theta}_n^*\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Since each of the two terms on the right hand side is bounded (by Proposition 2 and Proposition 1), we have boundedness of $\text{Trace}(\Sigma_n^{11})$ for all $n \geq 0$.

Next consider $\{\Sigma_n^{22}\}$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{trace}(\Sigma_n^{22}) &= n^2\|\Delta\theta_n\|^2 \\ &\leq 2n^2\|\Delta\theta_n - \Delta\theta_n^*\|^2 + 2n^2\|\Delta\theta_n^*\|^2 \\ &\leq 4n^2\|\tilde{\theta}_n - \tilde{\theta}_n^*\|^2 + 4n^2\|\tilde{\theta}_{n-1} - \tilde{\theta}_{n-1}^*\|^2 + 2n^2\|\Delta\theta_n^*\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Once again, each of the three terms on the right hand side of the above inequality are bounded, uniformly in n , by Proposition 2 and Proposition 1. The boundedness of (Σ_n^{12}) and (Σ_n^{21}) follow from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. \blacksquare

We now proceed to establish the limit for $\{\Sigma_n^{11}\}$. Using the Taylor series approximation:

$$\sqrt{n+1} = \sqrt{n} + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2n} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right), \quad (71)$$

it follows from (67) that the process $\{\Phi_n\}$ evolves as

$$\Phi_{n+1} = M\Phi_n + \alpha_{n+1}(B\Phi_n + (\sqrt{n+1})\Delta_{n+1}^\Phi + \varepsilon_n^\Phi), \quad (72)$$

where the $2d \times 2d$ matrices M and B , and the $2d \times 1$ column vector ε_n^Φ are defined to be:

$$M := \begin{bmatrix} I & \frac{(I+A)}{\sqrt{n}} \\ \frac{A}{\sqrt{n}} & I+A \end{bmatrix}, \quad B := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}I+A & 0 \\ 0 & I+A \end{bmatrix}, \quad \varepsilon_n^\Phi := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \begin{bmatrix} O(\|\tilde{\theta}_n\| + \|\theta_n\|) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (73)$$

where the term ε_n^Φ is due to the last term in (71).

The main step in the proof of Proposition 4 is to obtain sharp results for the off-diagonal blocks of the covariance matrix: $\{\Sigma_n^{12}\}$ and $\{\Sigma_n^{21}\}$. The proof of the following lemma is contained in Section C.2.

Lemma 12 *Under the conditions of Proposition 4, for each $n \geq 1$, the following approximations hold for Σ_n and the scaled covariance $\psi_n := \sqrt{n}\Sigma_n^{21}$:*

$$\Sigma_{n+1}^{22} = (I+A)\Sigma_n^{22}(I+A)^T + \Sigma^\Delta + O(\alpha_{n+1}), \quad (74)$$

$$\psi_n = -\Sigma_n^{11} - A^{-1}\Sigma_\infty^{22} + o(1), \quad (75)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{n+1}^{11} = & \Sigma_n^{11} + \alpha_{n+1} \left(\Sigma_n^{11} + A\Sigma_n^{11} + \Sigma_n^{11}A^T + \psi_n^T(I+A)^T + (I+A)\psi_n \right. \\ & \left. + (I+A)\Sigma_\infty^{22}(I+A)^T + \Sigma^\Delta + o(1) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Proof of Proposition 4 From Assumption (A3), which requires that the eigenvalues of matrix $(I+A)$ lie within the open unit disc, it follows that (74) can be approximated by a geometrically stable discrete-time Lyapunov recursion, with a time-invariant, bounded input Σ^Δ Kailath (1980). The limit (37) directly follows:

$$\Sigma_\infty^{22} = (I+A)\Sigma_\infty^{22}(I+A)^T + \Sigma^\Delta$$

Substituting the approximation (75) for ψ_n into the right hand side of the recursion in (76) gives (after simplification),

$$\Sigma_{n+1}^{11} = \Sigma_n^{11} + \alpha_{n+1} \left(-\Sigma_n^{11} + A^{-1}\Sigma^\Delta(A^{-1})^T + o(1) \right) \quad (77)$$

This can be regarded as a Euler approximation to the ODE (Borkar (2000)):

$$\frac{d}{dt}x_t = -x_t + A^{-1}\Sigma^\Delta(A^{-1})^T$$

The limits of $\{\Sigma_n^{11}\}$ and $\{x_t\}$ coincide with the stationary point $x^* = A^{-1}\Sigma^\Delta(A^{-1})^T$. \square

C.2. Recursion approximations for PolSA

The proof of Lemmas 5, 6 and 12 are provided here. These results are established using the result of Proposition 11: the covariance sequence $\{\Sigma_n\}$ is bounded for the PolSA algorithm.

Recall the definitions of Σ_n^Δ and Σ^Δ in (21) and (22). We begin with the following consequence of the definitions:

Lemma 13 *Under Assumption (N1), the covariance Σ_n^Δ satisfies:*

$$\Sigma_n^\Delta = \Sigma^\Delta + O(n^{-1/2} \sqrt{\text{trace}(\Sigma_n^{11})}) \quad (78)$$

□

From Proposition 11, we have:

$$\Sigma_n^\Delta = \Sigma^\Delta + O(n^{-1/2}) \quad (79)$$

Bounds for PolSA From equations (72) and (32), ignoring terms that are of the order $O(1/n^{3/2})$, the $2d \times 2d$ matrix sequence $\{\Sigma_n\}$ satisfies:

$$\Sigma_{n+1} = M\Sigma_n M^T + \alpha_{n+1}(B\Sigma_n M^T + M\Sigma_n B^T + \Sigma_{n+1}^{\Delta\Phi}), \quad (80)$$

where M and B are defined in (73), and $\Sigma_n^{\Delta\Phi} = E[\Delta_n^\Phi(\Delta_n^\Phi)^T]$ is also a $2d \times 2d$ matrix:

$$\Sigma_n^{\Delta\Phi} := \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_n^\Delta & \sqrt{n}\Sigma_n^\Delta \\ \sqrt{n}\Sigma_n^\Delta & n\Sigma_n^\Delta \end{bmatrix} \quad (81)$$

with Σ_n^Δ defined in (22). Based on (32), it is simpler to view (80) as four parallel interdependent matrix recursions:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{n+1}^{11} &= \Sigma_n^{11} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\Sigma_n^{12}(I+A)^T + (I+A)\Sigma_n^{21} \right) \\ &\quad + \alpha_{n+1} \left(\left(\frac{1}{2}I + A \right) \Sigma_n^{11} + \Sigma_n^{11} \left(\frac{1}{2}I + A \right)^T + (I+A)\Sigma_n^{22}(I+A)^T + \Sigma^\Delta + \varepsilon_n^{11} \right) \\ \Sigma_{n+1}^{12} &= \Sigma_n^{12}(I+A)^T \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n}(I+A)\Sigma_n^{21}A^T \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\Sigma_n^{11}A^T + (I+A)\Sigma_n^{22}(I+A)^T + \Sigma^\Delta \right) \\ &\quad + \alpha_{n+1} \left(\frac{\left(\frac{1}{2}I + A \right) \Sigma_n^{11}A^T}{\sqrt{n}} + \left(\frac{3}{2}I + A \right) \Sigma_n^{12}(I+A)^T + \frac{(I+A)\Sigma_n^{22}(I+A)^T}{\sqrt{n}} + \varepsilon_n^{12} \right) \\ \Sigma_{n+1}^{22} &= (I+A)\Sigma_n^{22}(I+A)^T + \Sigma^\Delta + \frac{1}{n}A\Sigma_n^{11}A^T + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(A\Sigma_n^{12}(I+A)^T + (I+A)\Sigma_n^{21}A^T \right) \\ &\quad + \alpha_{n+1} \left(\frac{A\Sigma_n^{12}(I+A)^T}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{(I+A)\Sigma_n^{21}A^T}{\sqrt{n}} + 2(I+A)\Sigma_n^{22}(I+A)^T + \varepsilon_n^{22} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

in which the error terms satisfy the following:

$$\varepsilon_n^{11} = O(n^{-1/2}\sqrt{\text{trace } \Sigma_n^{11}}), \quad \varepsilon_n^{12} = O(n^{-1/2}\text{trace } \Sigma_n^{11}), \quad \varepsilon_n^{22} = O(\text{trace } \Sigma_n^{11}) \quad (83)$$

Once again, applying Proposition 11, we have:

$$\varepsilon_n^{11} = O(n^{-1/2}), \quad \varepsilon_n^{12} = O(n^{-1/2}), \quad \varepsilon_n^{22} = O(1) \quad (84)$$

Proof of Lemma 12 The first approximation (74) follows from the recursion for Σ_n^{22} in (82), and the fact that $\varepsilon_n^{22} = O(1)$ using (84). The stability condition (20) implies that this sequence is convergent, and the limit solves the Lyapunov equation

$$\Sigma_\infty^{22} = (I + A)\Sigma_\infty^{22}(I + A)^T + \Sigma^\Delta$$

We next prove that (75) holds. Multiplying both sides of the recursion for Σ_n^{21} in (82) by $\sqrt{n+1}$, and using the Taylor series approximation (71), we obtain:

$$\psi_{n+1} = A\Sigma_n^{11} + (I + A)\psi_n + (I + A)\Sigma_n^{22}(I + A)^T + \Sigma^\Delta + O(\alpha_{n+1}(1 + \|\psi_n\|)) \quad (85)$$

where we have used Proposition 11 which establishes the boundedness of $\{\Sigma_n\}$. Notice that the last term in (85) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} O(\alpha_{n+1}(1 + \|\psi_n\|)) &= O(\alpha_{n+1}(1 + \sqrt{n}\|\Sigma_n^{21}\|)) \\ &= O(n^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

where we have once again applied Proposition 11, and used $\alpha_{n+1} = 1/(n+1)$.

Substituting the approximation for Σ_n^{22} in (74) into the recursion (85) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{n+1} &= (I + A)\psi_n + (I + A)\Sigma_\infty^{22}(I + A)^T + \Sigma^\Delta + O(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= A\Sigma_n^{11} + (I + A)\psi_n + \Sigma_\infty^{22} + O(n^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

Using the principle of super-position for linear systems, we can represent the sequence $\{\psi_n\}$ as the sum of two terms, with one equal to the “ $O(n^{-1/2})$ ” error sequence, and the other evolving as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{n+1}^\circ &= (I + A)\psi_n^\circ + u(n) \\ u(n) &= A\Sigma_n^{11} + \Sigma_\infty^{22} \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

or equivalently,

$$\psi_{n+k}^\circ = (I + A)^k \psi_n^\circ + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (I + A)^j u(n + k - 1 - j)$$

The next step is to replace $u(n + k - 1 - j)$ with $u(n + k)$, and bound the error $\{\varepsilon(n, k)\}$:

$$\psi_{n+k}^\circ = (I + A)^k \psi_n^\circ + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (I + A)^j u(n + k) + \varepsilon(n, k), \quad (87)$$

where:

$$\varepsilon(n, k) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (I + A)^j (u(n + k - 1 - j) - u(n + k))$$

From the recursion for Σ_n^{11} in (82), it follows that for some constant $c_0 < \infty$:

$$\|\Sigma_{n+j}^{11} - \Sigma_n^{11}\| \leq c_0 \ln \left(\frac{n+j+1}{n} \right)$$

Using the bound $\log(1+x) \leq x$, it follows that for $c < \infty$, the input sequence $\{u(n)\}$ satisfies:

$$\|u(n+j) - u(n)\| \leq c \left(\frac{j+1}{n} \right), \quad j \geq 0, \quad n \geq 1 \quad (88)$$

Using this in the expression for $\varepsilon(n, k)$, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varepsilon(n, k)\| &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|(I + A)^j u(n + k - 1 - j) - u(n + k)\| \\ &\leq c \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left\| (I + A)^j \left(\frac{j+2}{n+k-1-j} \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{c}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|(I + A)^j\| (j+2) \\ &\leq \frac{c}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|(I + A)^j\| (j+2) \end{aligned}$$

This together with the eigenvalue bound for $(I + A)$ in (20) gives

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_k \|\varepsilon(n, k)\| = 0.$$

Using this in (87), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{n+k}^\circ &= (I + A)^k \psi_n^\circ + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (I + A)^j u(n + k) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (I + A)^j u(n + k) + o(1) + O(\rho^k), \end{aligned}$$

where $0 < \rho < 1$. Applying (88) once more gives

$$\psi_n = \psi_n^\circ + o(1) = -A^{-1}u(n) + o(1)$$

Substituting the definition of $u(n)$ from (86) gives the desired result:

$$\psi_n = -\Sigma_n^{11} - A^{-1}\Sigma_\infty^{22} + o(1)$$

The final approximation for the $\{\Sigma_n^{11}\}$ recursion in (76) follows by substituting $\psi_n = \sqrt{n}\Sigma_n^{21}$ and $\psi_n^T = \sqrt{n}\Sigma_n^{21}$ in the recursion for Σ_n^{11} in (82) and then using (74) and (75). \square

C.3. Bounds for NeSA

Assumption (N2) ensures that the following representation is well defined:

$$[I - \mathcal{L}]^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}^k$$

The matrix $H = [I - \mathcal{L}]^{-1}(Q)$ solves the Lyapunov equation $H = \mathcal{L}(H) + Q$ for any matrix Q . The solution to (34) is thus

$$\Sigma_{\infty}^{22} = [I - \mathcal{L}]^{-1}(\Sigma^{\Delta}). \quad (89)$$

Based on (30) and (16), the pair of sequences $\{\tilde{\theta}_n\}$ and $\{\Delta\theta_n\}$ for the NeSA algorithm satisfy the following recursion:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\theta}_{n+1} \\ \Delta\theta_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & (I + A_{n+1}) \\ 0 & (I + A_{n+1}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\theta}_n \\ \Delta\theta_n \end{bmatrix} + \alpha_{n+1} \left[\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ A & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\theta}_n \\ \Delta\theta_n \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{n+1} \\ \Delta_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} \right] \quad (90)$$

Recall the definitions of $\{\Phi_n\}$ and $\{\Delta_n^{\phi}\}$:

$$\Phi_n \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_n^1 \\ \Phi_n^2 \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{n}\tilde{\theta}_n \\ n\Delta\theta_n \end{bmatrix} \quad \Delta_n^{\phi} := \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_n \\ \sqrt{n}\Delta_n \end{bmatrix} \quad (91)$$

Multiplying the first d rows on both sides of (90) by $\sqrt{n+1}$, and the last d rows by $(n+1)$, and using the Taylor series approximation for $\sqrt{n+1}$ in (71), we obtain a state space recursion for the normalized error sequence:

$$\Phi_{n+1} = \widehat{M}_{n+1}\Phi_n + \alpha_{n+1}(\widehat{B}_{n+1}\Phi_n + (\sqrt{n+1})\Delta_{n+1}^{\phi} + \varepsilon_n^{\Phi}), \quad (92)$$

where the $2d \times 2d$ matrices \widehat{M}_{n+1} and \widehat{B}_{n+1} are defined as:

$$\widehat{M}_{n+1} := \begin{bmatrix} I & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(I + A_{n+1}) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}A & I + A_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} \quad \widehat{B}_{n+1} := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}I + A & 0 \\ 0 & I + A_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (93)$$

and

$$\varepsilon_n^{\Phi} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \begin{bmatrix} O(\|\tilde{\theta}_n\| + \|\theta_n\|) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (94)$$

To begin the covariance analysis, consider first the outer-products without expectation:

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_n := \Phi_n \Phi_n^T \quad \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{\Delta} := \Delta_n \Delta_n^T \quad (95)$$

along with two more $2d \times 2d$ matrix sequences:

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{\Delta\Phi} := \Delta_n^{\phi} (\Delta_n^{\phi})^T = \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{\Delta} & \sqrt{n}\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{\Delta} \\ \sqrt{n}\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{\Delta} & n\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{\Delta} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad W_{n+1}^T := (\sqrt{n+1})\Phi_n (\Delta_{n+1}^{\phi})^T$$

Then, based on (92), ignoring terms of the order $O(1/n^{3/2})$, the $2d \times 2d$ matrix sequence $\{\widehat{\Sigma}_n\}$ satisfies the following recursion:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Sigma}_{n+1} = & \widehat{M}_{n+1} \widehat{\Sigma}_n \widehat{M}_{n+1}^T + \alpha_{n+1} \left(\widehat{B}_{n+1} \widehat{\Sigma}_n \widehat{M}_{n+1}^T + \widehat{M}_{n+1} \widehat{\Sigma}_n \widehat{B}_{n+1}^T \right. \\ & \left. + \widehat{\Sigma}_{n+1}^{\Delta\Phi} + \widehat{M}_{n+1} \widehat{W}_{n+1}^T + \widehat{W}_{n+1} \widehat{M}_{n+1}^T \right). \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

Taking expectations results in these interdependent matrix recursions:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{n+1}^{11} = & \Sigma_n^{11} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\Sigma_n^{12} (I + A)^T + (I + A) \Sigma_n^{21} \right) \\ & + \alpha_{n+1} \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} I + A \right) \Sigma_n^{11} + \Sigma_n^{11} \left(\frac{1}{2} I + A \right)^T + \ell_n^{22} + \Sigma^\Delta + \Sigma_n^W + \Sigma_n^{W^T} + o(1) \right) \\ \Sigma_{n+1}^{12} = & \Sigma_n^{12} (I + A)^T + \frac{1}{n} (I + A) \Sigma_n^{21} A^T + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\Sigma_n^{11} A^T + \ell_n^{22} + \Sigma^\Delta + \Sigma_n^W + \Sigma_n^{W^T} \right) \\ & + \alpha_{n+1} \left(\frac{\left(\frac{1}{2} I + A \right) \Sigma_n^{11} A^T}{\sqrt{n}} + \left(\frac{3}{2} I + A \right) \Sigma_n^{12} (I + A)^T + \frac{\ell_n^{22}}{\sqrt{n}} + o(1) \right) \\ \Sigma_{n+1}^{21} = & \left(\Sigma_{n+1}^{12} \right)^T \\ \Sigma_{n+1}^{22} = & \ell_n^{22} + \left(\Sigma^\Delta + \Sigma_n^W + \Sigma_n^{W^T} \right) + \frac{A \Sigma_n^{12} (I + A)^T}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{(I + A) \Sigma_n^{21} A^T}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{A \Sigma_n^{11} A^T}{n} \\ & + \alpha_{n+1} \left(\frac{A \Sigma_n^{12} (I + A)^T}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{(I + A) \Sigma_n^{21} A^T}{\sqrt{n}} + 2\ell_n^{22} + O(1) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

where $\Sigma_n^W := \mathbb{E}[(I + A_{n+1}) \Phi_n^1 \Delta_{n+1}^T]$, and $\ell_n^{22} = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{22})]$ with \mathcal{L} is defined in (31).

Linearity implies that expectation and operation can be interchanged:

$$\ell_n^{22} = \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{22}]) = \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_n^{22})$$

Two more linear operators are required in the following: For any $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(Q) := \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}_{n+1}) Q \tilde{A}_{n+1}^T]. \quad (98)$$

The second operator maps vectors to matrices: for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{M}(v) = \mathbb{E}[(I + A_{n+1}) v (\tilde{A}_{n+1} \theta^* - \tilde{b}_{n+1})^T] \quad (99)$$

The following result will be used to show that $\{\Sigma_n^W\}$ converges to 0:

Lemma 14 *Under (N1)–(N3) we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Phi_n] = 0$.*

Proof Denote $\bar{\Phi}_n = \mathbb{E}[\Phi_n]$, and similarly, $\bar{\Phi}_n^1 = \mathbb{E}[\Phi_n^1]$, $\bar{\Phi}_n^2 = \mathbb{E}[\Phi_n^2]$. Based on (92), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Phi}_{n+1}^2 &= \left(1 + \frac{1}{n+1}\right)(I + A)\bar{\Phi}_n^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}A\bar{\Phi}_n^1 \\
&\cong \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (I + A)^k \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-k}} A\bar{\Phi}_{n-k}^1 \\
&\cong \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (I + A)^k \right) A\bar{\Phi}_n^1 \\
&= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} A^{-1} A\bar{\Phi}_n^1 \\
&= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \bar{\Phi}_n^1
\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

In (100), each of the approximations can be shown rigorously, using techniques that are very similar to the ones that were used in Section C.2: The error in each approximation can be bounded as a constant times $\|\Phi_n\|/n$.

Similarly, the recursion for $\bar{\Phi}_n^1$ satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Phi}_{n+1}^1 &= \bar{\Phi}_n^1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(I + A)\bar{\Phi}_n^2 + \frac{1}{n+1}(\frac{1}{2}I + A)\bar{\Phi}_n^1 \\
&\cong \bar{\Phi}_n^1 - \frac{1}{n}(I + A)\bar{\Phi}_n^1 + \frac{1}{n+1}(\frac{1}{2}I + A)\bar{\Phi}_n^1 \\
&\cong \bar{\Phi}_n^1 - \frac{1}{2(n+1)}\bar{\Phi}_n^1
\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

The above recursion can be viewed as a stochastic approximation algorithm (with 0 noise). This implies: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Phi_n^1] = 0$. Using this in (100), we also have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Phi_n] = 0$. ■

Lemma 15 Under (N1)–(N3) we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_n^W = 0$.

Proof Using the definition of Δ_n in (17) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_n^W &= \mathbb{E}[(I + A_{n+1})\Phi_n^1 \tilde{\theta}_n^T \tilde{A}_{n+1}^T] + \mathbb{E}[(I + A_{n+1})\Phi_n^1 (\tilde{A}_{n+1}\theta^* - \tilde{b}_{n+1})^T] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}_{n+1})\Phi_n^1 \tilde{\theta}_n^T \tilde{A}_{n+1}^T] + \mathbb{E}[(I + A_{n+1})\Phi_n^1 (\tilde{A}_{n+1}\theta^* - \tilde{b}_{n+1})^T] \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}_{n+1})\hat{\Sigma}_n^{21} \tilde{A}_{n+1}^T | \mathcal{F}_n] \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[(I + A_{n+1})\Phi_n^1 (\tilde{A}_{n+1}\theta^* - \tilde{b}_{n+1})^T | \mathcal{F}_n] \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\hat{\Sigma}_n^{21})] + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}(\Phi_n^1)]
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from the fact that $\mathbb{E}[\Phi_n^1 \tilde{\theta}_n^T \tilde{A}_{n+1}^T] = 0$, second equality follows from the definition of $\hat{\Sigma}_n^{21}$, and the last equality follows from (N1) and definitions (98) and (99).

Linearity of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ and \mathcal{M} then implies

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_n^W &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{21}]) + \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{E}[\Phi_n^1]) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\Sigma_n^{21}) + \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{E}[\Phi_n^1]) \\ &= \frac{1}{n}\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\psi_n) + \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{E}[\Phi_n^1])\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality used the definition $\psi_n = \sqrt{n}\Sigma_n^{21}$.

The first term vanishes under (N3) since $\psi_n/n = O(n^{-1/2})$.

It remains to show that the second term converges to 0. Based on (92) it is straightforward to establish the following limit under (N1)–(N2):

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Phi_n] = 0$$

Using the definition (99), and taking expectations completes the proof that $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}(\Phi_n^1)] = o(1)$. \blacksquare

Proof of Lemma 5 We first prove the first recursion in (38). Based on the assumption that each Σ^{11} , Σ^{22} and $\psi_n = \sqrt{n}\Sigma_n^{21}$ in (97) are bounded, the recursion for Σ_n^{22} can be written as

$$\Sigma_{n+1}^{22} = \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_n^{22}) + \Sigma^\Delta + \Sigma_n^W + \Sigma_n^{W^T} + O(\alpha_{n+1}),$$

where the $O(\alpha_{n+1})$ term includes all terms in the recursion that are multiplied with α_{n+1} . Lemma 15 then implies the first recursion in (38),

$$\Sigma_{n+1}^{22} = \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_n^{22}) + \Sigma^\Delta + O(1/\sqrt{n})$$

This is regarded as a Lyapunov recursion with time varying forcing term $\Sigma^\Delta + O(1/\sqrt{n})$. Under (N2) convergence follows, giving (34).

We next prove that the second recursion in (38) holds. Multiplying both sides of the recursion for Σ_n^{21} in (97) by $\sqrt{n+1}$, and using the Taylor series approximation (71), we obtain:

$$\psi_{n+1} = (I + A)\psi_n + A\Sigma_n^{11} + \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_n^{22}) + \Sigma^\Delta + \Sigma_n^W + \Sigma_n^{W^T} + O(\alpha_{n+1}),$$

where once again, the $O(\alpha_{n+1})$ terms are due to the boundedness assumption on Σ^{11} , Σ^{22} and ψ_n . From Lemma 15, we have $\Sigma_n^W \rightarrow 0$, and furthermore, using $\Sigma_n^{22} = \Sigma_\infty^{22} + o(1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{n+1} &= (I + A)\psi_n + A\Sigma_n^{11} + \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_\infty^{22}) + \Sigma^\Delta + o(1) \\ &= (I + A)\psi_n + A\Sigma_n^{11} + \Sigma_\infty^{22} + o(1)\end{aligned}$$

Once we have the above form, the rest of the proof follows steps exactly same as the proof of Lemma 12: By viewing the recursion as state evolution of a discrete-time stable linear system with bounded input sequence $\{A\Sigma_n^{11} + \Sigma_\infty^{22}\}$ and vanishing additive noise, we can show that $\{\psi_n\}$ satisfies the second recursion in (38). \square

Proof of Lemma 6 The Lemma follows directly by substituting $\psi_n = \sqrt{n}\Sigma_n^{21}$ and $\psi_n^T = \sqrt{n}\Sigma_n^{21}$ in the recursion for Σ_n^{11} in (97) and then using (38). \square

Appendix D. NeSA and PolSA TD-learning algorithms

In this section of the Appendix, we briefly give details on how to apply the algorithms introduced in this paper to solve value-function estimation problems in Reinforcement Learning. For simplicity, we consider the TD(λ)-learning algorithm with $\lambda = 0$. Extension to $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ is straightforward.

Consider a Markov chain \mathbf{X} evolving on $\mathsf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$. Let $\{P^n\}$ denote its transition semi-group: For each $n \geq 0$, $x \in \mathsf{X}$, and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X})$ (where $\mathcal{B}(\cdot)$ denotes the Borel set),

$$P^n(x, A) := \mathbb{P}_x\{X_n \in A\} := \Pr\{X_n \in A \mid X_0 = x\}.$$

The standard operator-theoretic notation is used for conditional expectation: for any measurable function $f: \mathsf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$P^n f(x) = \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_n)] := \mathbb{E}[f(X_n) \mid X_0 = x].$$

In a finite state space setting, P^n is the n -step transition probability matrix of the Markov chain, and the conditional expectation appears as matrix-vector multiplication:

$$P^n f(x) = \sum_{x' \in \mathsf{X}} P^n(x, x') f(x'), \quad x \in \mathsf{X}.$$

Let $c: \mathsf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ denote a cost function, and $\beta \in (0, 1)$ a discount factor. The discounted-cost value function is defined as

$$h(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n P^n c(x), \quad x \in \mathsf{X}$$

It is known that the value function is the unique solution to the Bellman equation

$$c(x) + \beta P h(x) = h(x) \tag{102}$$

Consider the case of a d -dimensional linear parameterization: A function $\psi: \mathsf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is chosen, which is viewed as a collection of d basis functions. Given a parameter vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the corresponding approximation to the value function is defined as:

$$h^\theta(x) = \sum_i \theta_i \psi_i(x) = \theta^T \psi(x)$$

The goal of TD-learning is to approximate the solution to (102) by $h^\theta(x)$ [Sutton \(1988\)](#); [Tsitsiklis and Van Roy \(1997\)](#). In particular, the TD(0) algorithm intends to solve the Galerkin relaxation of the problem [Szepesvári \(2010a\)](#); [Devraj and Meyn \(2017b\)](#): Find θ^* such that

$$0 = \mathbb{E}[(-h^{\theta^*}(X_n) + c(X_n) + \beta h^{\theta^*}(X_{n+1}))\psi_i(X_n)], \quad 1 \leq i \leq d, \tag{103}$$

where the expectation is with respect to the steady state distribution of the Markov chain. This model is of the form considered in [Proposition 1](#), with Markov chain defined by $\mathcal{X}_n = (X_n, X_{n-1})$, and $\bar{f}(\theta) = A\theta - b$, with $A := \mathbb{E}[A_n]$, $b := \mathbb{E}[b_n]$ (expectations in steady-state), and

$$A_n := \psi(X_{n-1})(\beta\psi(X_n) - \psi(X_{n-1}))^T, \quad b_n := -\psi(X_n)c(X_n) \tag{104}$$

The TD(0) algorithm is stochastic approximation in the form (3), with $G_n \equiv I$.

TD(0) algorithm: For initialization $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the sequence of estimates are defined recursively:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{n+1} &= \theta_n + \alpha_{n+1}\psi(X_n)d_{n+1} \\ d_{n+1} &= c(X_n) + [\beta\psi(X_{n+1}) - \psi(X_n)]^T\theta_n\end{aligned}\tag{105}$$

The sequence $\{d_n\}$ also appears in the algorithms described next. The parameter recursion can be expressed in the more suggestive form

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + \alpha_{n+1}[A_{n+1}\theta_n - b_n]$$

The LSTD algorithm of [Boyan \(2002\)](#) is a stochastic approximation algorithm of the form (3), with G_n equal to a Monte-Carlo estimate of $-A^{-1}$ [Devraj and Meyn \(2017b\)](#).

LSTD(0) algorithm: For initialization $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the sequence of estimates are defined recursively:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{n+1} &= \theta_n - \alpha_{n+1}\widehat{A}_{n+1}^{-1}\psi(X_n)d_{n+1} \\ d_{n+1} &= c(X_n) + [\beta\psi(X_{n+1}) - \psi(X_n)]^T\theta_n \\ \widehat{A}_{n+1} &= \widehat{A}_n + \gamma_{n+1}[A_{n+1} - \widehat{A}_n]\end{aligned}\tag{106}$$

The non-negative gain sequence $\{\gamma_n\}$ is an ingredient in the ‘‘Zap’’ algorithms of [Devraj and Meyn \(2017b,a\)](#), where it is assumed to satisfy standard assumptions, but is relatively large:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma_n = \infty, \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma_n^2 < \infty, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_n}{\alpha_n} = \infty$$

There is a single gain sequence in the LSTD(0) algorithm, $\alpha_n \equiv \gamma_n$, and in this case the matrix recursion is equivalent to the simple average:

$$\widehat{A}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n A_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(X_{i-1})[\beta\psi(X_i) - \psi(X_{i-1})]^T$$

The PolSA and NeSA algorithms for TD(0)-learning are given as follows. In each case, the initialization $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and gain ζ satisfying (20), are pre-specified.

PolSA TD(0) algorithm:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{n+1} &= \theta_n + (I + \zeta\widehat{A}_{n+1})\Delta\theta_n + \alpha_{n+1}\zeta\psi(X_n)d_{n+1} \\ d_{n+1} &= c(X_n) + [\beta\psi(X_{n+1}) - \psi(X_n)]^T\theta_n\end{aligned}\tag{107}$$

NeSA TD(0) algorithm:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{n+1} &= \theta_n + (I + \zeta A_{n+1})\Delta\theta_n + \alpha_{n+1}\zeta\psi(X_n)d_{n+1} \\ d_{n+1} &= c(X_n) + [\beta\psi(X_{n+1}) - \psi(X_n)]^T\theta_n\end{aligned}\tag{108}$$

The matrix momentum term, highlighted in red, is the only difference between the two algorithms.