

Almost Sure Convergence Rates and Concentration of Stochastic Approximation and Reinforcement Learning with Markovian Noise

Xiaochi Qian*

*Department of Computer Science
University of Oxford
Wolfson Building, Parks Rd, Oxford, OX1 3QD, UK*

XIAOCHI.JOE.QIAN@GMAIL.COM

Zixuan Xie*

*Department of Computer Science
University of Virginia
85 Engineer's Way, Charlottesville, VA, 22903, United States*

XIE.ZIXUAN@EMAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU

Xinyu Liu*

*Department of Computer Science
University of Virginia
85 Engineer's Way, Charlottesville, VA, 22903, United States*

XINYULIU@VIRGINIA.EDU

Shangtong Zhang

*Department of Computer Science
University of Virginia
85 Engineer's Way, Charlottesville, VA, 22903, United States*

SHANGTONG@VIRGINIA.EDU

Abstract

This paper establishes the first almost sure convergence rate and the first maximal concentration bound with exponential tails for general contractive stochastic approximation algorithms with Markovian noise. As a corollary, we also obtain convergence rates in L^p . Key to our successes is a novel discretization of the mean ODE of stochastic approximation algorithms using intervals with diminishing (instead of constant) length. As applications, we provide the first almost sure convergence rate for Q -learning with Markovian samples without count-based learning rates. We also provide the first concentration bound for off-policy temporal difference learning with Markovian samples.

Keywords: almost sure convergence rate, maximal concentration bound, contractive stochastic approximation, reinforcement learning

1 Introduction

Stochastic approximation refers to a class of algorithms that update some weight vector iteratively and stochastically (Robbins and Monro, 1951; Benveniste et al., 1990; Kushner and Yin, 2003; Borkar, 2009). Notable stochastic approximation algorithms include stochastic gradient descent (SGD, Kiefer and Wolfowitz (1952)), Q -learning (Watkins, 1989; Watkins and Dayan, 1992), and temporal difference learning (TD, Sutton (1988)). Typically, a stochastic approximation algorithm adopts the following form

$$w_{t+1} = w_t + \alpha_t (H(w_t, Y_{t+1}) - w_t). \quad (\text{SA})$$

* indicates equal contribution.

Here $\{w_t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is the stochastic iterates, $\{\alpha_t\}$ is a sequence of learning rates, $\{Y_t\}$ is a sequence of random noise evolving in some space \mathcal{Y} , and $H : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the function that generates the incremental update. The algorithm (SA) can be viewed as a generalization of the running average. Indeed, if $H(w, y)$ is independent of w , the learning rate α_t has the form of $\alpha_t = 1/(t + 1)$, and $\{Y_t\}$ are i.i.d., then w_t can be regarded as the running average for computing $\mathbb{E}[H(Y_t)]$. The law of large numbers (LLN) guarantees the almost sure convergence of a running average to the true expectation. Similarly, numerous works have been able to prove the almost sure convergence of $\{w_t\}$ in (SA) (Benveniste et al., 1990; Kushner and Yin, 2003; Borkar, 2009; Borkar et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2024). It is well known that LLN is accompanied by a few other theorems that characterize the fluctuation of the running average, e.g., the central limit theorem (CLT), the functional central limit theorem (FCLT), Hoeffding’s inequality, and the law of the iterated logarithm (LIL). Similarly, versions of CLT and FCLT have also been well established for the stochastic iterates $\{w_t\}$ in (SA) (Benveniste et al., 1990; Borkar, 2009; Borkar et al., 2021). But the development of a Hoeffding’s inequality (cf. a maximal concentration bound with exponential tails) and a LIL (cf. an almost sure convergence rate) for (SA) is less satisfactory, as summarized by Tables 1 and 2. We defer a detailed discussion of those works to Section 4. But in short, previous works usually fall short in two aspects. The first is that many previous works assume H is linear and then expand their analysis based on products of Hurwitz matrices. But in many important reinforcement learning (RL, Sutton and Barto (2018)) algorithms, the corresponding H is nonlinear. The second is that many previous works assume $\{Y_t\}$ are i.i.d. But in many important RL algorithms, $\{Y_t\}$ is a Markov chain.

Contributions. This work makes two key contributions towards closing the aforementioned gaps. Namely, this work allows $\{Y_t\}$ to be a Markov chain and $H(w, y)$ to be nonlinear, as long as $H(w, y)$ is a noisy estimation of some contractive operator. Under these weak assumptions, this work establishes, for the iterates $\{w_t\}$ generated by (SA), (1) the first almost sure convergence rate (Table 1) and (2) the first maximal concentration bound with exponential tails (Table 2). By “maximal”, we mean that our bound holds for all t . As a corollary, we also obtain L^p convergence rates. Notably, as it can be seen from Tables 1 and 2, this work is the only work that appears simultaneously in both tables. We

	H	Markovian $\{Y_t\}$
Szepesvári (1997)	Q -learning	
Tadic (2002)	Linear TD	✓
Chong et al. (1999)	Linear	✓
Tadic (2004)	Linear	✓
Kouritzin and Sadeghi (2015)	Linear	
Koval and Schwabe (2003)	General	
Vidyasagar (2023)	General	
Karandikar and Vidyasagar (2024)	General	
Theorem 1	General	✓

Table 1: Almost sure convergence rates of stochastic approximation algorithms. Details are in Section 4.

	H	$\{Y_t\}$	α_t	$\forall t$	$\ln(\frac{1}{\delta})$	$\sup \ w_t\ $
Even-Dar et al. (2003)	Q -learning		✓		✓	
Li et al. (2021)	Q -learning				✓	
Li et al. (2024)	Q -learning	✓			✓	
Korda and La (2015)	Linear TD	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dalal et al. (2018a)	Linear TD		✓		✓	✓
Chandak and Borkar (2023)	Linear TD	✓	✓	✓		✓
Prashanth et al. (2021)	Batch TD		✓	✓	✓	
Dalal et al. (2018b)	Linear				✓	✓
Durmus et al. (2021)	Linear		✓	✓	✓	✓
Qu and Wierman (2020)	General	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Thoppe and Borkar (2015)	General		✓		✓	
Chandak et al. (2022)	General	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Mou et al. (2022)	General				✓	✓
Chen et al. (2023)	General		✓	✓	✓	✓
Theorem 2	General	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 2: Concentration of stochastic approximation algorithms. “ $\{Y_t\}$ ” is checked if Markovian noise is allowed. “ α_t ” is checked if there is no need to tune the learning rate during the execution of the algorithm based on runtime statistics. “ $\forall t$ ” stands for “maximal” concentration bound and is checked if the bound holds for all t or it holds for $\forall t \geq t_0$ with t_0 being some deterministic constant, independent of sample path and the probability parameter δ . “ $\ln(\frac{1}{\delta})$ ” is checked if exponential tail is obtained. “ $\sup \|w_t\|$ ” is checked if establishing the concentration bound does not require a priori that the iterates are bounded by some deterministic constant almost surely. Common ways for obtaining such a priori in previous works are (1) to assume it directly or make some other stronger assumptions, (2) to use specific properties of the specific algorithms (e.g., Q -learning), (3) to use a projection operator. Details are in Section 4.

also note that in those tables, we do not include works that only consider SGD as many RL algorithms are not SGD (Sutton and Barto, 2018). The discussion of SGD is deferred to Section 4. As applications (Section 3), we obtain the first almost sure convergence rate for Q -learning with Markovian samples without count-based learning rates and the first concentration bound for off-policy TD with Markovian samples.

Technical Innovation. A common approach to studying the stochastic and discrete iterates in (SA) is to relate them to deterministic and continuous trajectories of the mean ODE $\frac{dw(t)}{dt} = h(w(t)) - w(t)$ with $h(w)$ denoting the expectation of $H(w, y)$. This ODE-based approach has seen celebrated success in establishing the desired almost sure convergence in past decades (Benveniste et al., 1990; Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1996; Kushner and Yin, 2003; Borkar, 2009; Borkar et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2024). In those works, the non-negative real axis is divided into intervals with a fixed length T , corresponding to Euler’s discretization of the ODE with an interval T up to some noise. The key technical innovation in our work is to divide the non-negative real axis into intervals with diminishing length $\{T_m\}$. Namely, we will construct a sequence of anchors $\{t_m\}_{m=0,1,\dots}$ such that the distance between two

anchors, $\bar{\alpha}_m = \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t$, is roughly T_m . Then we examine the iterates $\{w_t\}$ in (SA) in the timescale $\{t_m\}$. In other words, we rewrite (SA) as (Skeleton SA)

$$w_{t_{m+1}} = w_{t_m} + \bar{\alpha}_m(h(w_{t_m}) - w_{t_m}) + z_m, \quad (\text{Skeleton SA})$$

where z_m is the new noise and $\{\bar{\alpha}_m\}$ is the new learning rates. Since this z_m accumulates the noise between t_m and t_{m+1} , it exhibits some useful averaging effects that facilitate the analysis. If we follow previous work Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis (1996) and use a constant T to discretize the ODE, then $\{\bar{\alpha}_m\}$ is almost constant and this (Skeleton SA) has a roughly constant learning rate. It is well known that a constant learning rate stochastic approximation algorithm, in general, does not converge almost surely (Kushner and Yin, 2003). By using a diminishing $\{T_m\}$ to discretize the ODE, the new learning rates $\{\bar{\alpha}_m\}$ also diminish, and we can then expect (Skeleton SA) to converge almost surely and further obtain an almost sure convergence rate and a concentration bound based on supermartingales.

Notations. We use $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ to denote the standard Euclidean inner product. We use $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$ and $\Theta(\cdot)$ to hide deterministic constants for simplifying presentation. In other words, for two non-negative sequence $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$, we say $a_n = \mathcal{O}(b_n)$ if $\exists n_0, C, \forall n \geq n_0, a_n \leq Cb_n$. We say $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$ if $a_n = \mathcal{O}(b_n)$ and $b_n = \mathcal{O}(a_n)$.

2 Main Results

Assumption 2.1 *The Markov chain $\{Y_t\}$ adopts a unique stationary distribution d_Y and mixes geometrically. In other words, let P be the transition kernel of $\{Y_t\}$ and P^n be the n -step transition kernel. Then there exist some constants $\varrho \in [0, 1)$ and $C_{A2.1}$ such that for any y, n*

$$\int_{\mathcal{Y}} |P^n(y, y') - d_Y(y')| dy' \leq C_{A2.1} \varrho^n.$$

This geometrically mixing assumption is standard in analyses concerning Markovian noise, see, e.g., Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis (1996); Srikant and Ying (2019); Borkar et al. (2021). Define $h(w) \doteq \mathbb{E}_{y \sim d_Y}[H(w, y)]$. Then, the expected update $h(w) - w$ can be viewed as the residual of the fixed point problem of $h(w) = w$. This motivates the following contraction assumption.

Assumption 2.2 *There exist some $\kappa \in [0, 1)$ and some norm $\|\cdot\|$ such that for any w, w' ,*

$$\|h(w) - h(w')\| \leq \kappa \|w - w'\|.$$

We then use w_* to denote the unique fixed point of h , thanks to Banach's fixed point theorem. Since the norm $\|\cdot\|$ in Assumption 2.2 is arbitrary, this contraction assumption is easily satisfied in many RL algorithms.

Remark 1 (Pseudo-Contraction) *Similar to Zhang et al. (2023), it is easy to verify that all our proofs will still go through if h is merely a pseudo-contraction, as long as the existence and uniqueness of a fixed point w_* can be established. Example algorithms associated with pseudo-contractions include SARSA with linear function approximation (De Farias and Van Roy, 2000).*

Remark 2 (Linear Stochastic Approximation) For the special case where $h(w) - w$ is linear, i.e., $h(w) - w = Aw + b$, it commonly holds in RL algorithms that the matrix A is Hurwitz (Liu et al., 2024). Then we can rewrite $h(w) - w$ as $\frac{1}{\beta}(\beta Aw + \beta b)$. The outer $\frac{1}{\beta}$ can be absorbed into the learning rate. So it is equivalent to just considering $h(w) - w = \beta Aw + \beta b + w - w$. Proposition 2.4 of Chen et al. (2023) proves that $w \mapsto \beta Aw + \beta b + w$ is a contraction w.r.t. some weighted ℓ_2 norm for some carefully chosen β . This means our results apply to linear stochastic approximation (Lakshminarayanan and Szepesvári, 2018; Srikant and Ying, 2019) in the form of

$$w_{t+1} = w_t + \alpha_t(A(Y_{t+1})w_t + b(Y_{t+1})) \quad (\text{Linear SA})$$

as well, as long as $\mathbb{E}[A(y)]$ is Hurwitz and $\{Y_t\}$ behaves well in the sense of Assumption 2.1.

Assumption 2.3 There exists some finite L_h such that for any w, w', y , it holds that

$$\|H(w, y) - H(w', y)\| \leq L_h \|w - w'\|. \quad (1)$$

Moreover, $\sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \|H(0, y)\| < \infty$.

Assumption LR1 The learning rate has the form

$$\alpha_t = \frac{C_\alpha}{(t+3)^\nu} \quad \text{with } \nu \in \left(\frac{2}{3}, 1\right].$$

Assumption LR2 The learning rate has the form

$$\alpha_t = \frac{C_\alpha}{(t+3) \ln^\nu(t+3)} \quad \text{with } \nu \in (0, 1).$$

The key challenge in designing the (Skeleton SA) is to carefully balance the choice of α_t and T_m such that the new noise z_m has the proper averaging effect. The lower bound $\frac{2}{3}$ and the $\ln^\nu(t+3)$ term are all artifacts from this balance. Assumption LR1 will be used for establishing the almost sure convergence rates. Assumption LR2 will be used for establishing the concentration bounds. For Assumption LR2, a smaller ν is preferred.

Theorem 1 (Almost Sure Convergence Rates) Let Assumptions 2.1 - 2.3 and LR1 hold. Let $\{w_t\}$ be the iterates generated by (SA). If $\nu < 1$, then for any $\zeta \in (0, \frac{3}{2}\nu - 1)$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\zeta \|w_t - w_*\|^2 = 0 \quad a.s.$$

If $\nu = 1$, then for any $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ and $\nu_1 > 0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \exp\left(\zeta \ln^{1/(1+\nu_1)} t\right) \|w_t - w_*\|^2 = 0 \quad a.s.$$

The proof is in Section 5. To our knowledge, Theorem 1 is the first almost sure convergence rate for general contractive stochastic approximation algorithms with Markovian noise (Table 1).

Theorem 2 (Concentration) *Let Assumptions 2.1 - 2.3 and LR2 hold. Then for any $\nu \in (0, 1)$, there exist some deterministic constants $\bar{C}_\alpha, C_{Th2}, C'_{Th2}$, and integer C_{12} such that the iterates $\{w_t\}$ generated by (SA) satisfy the following concentration property whenever $C_\alpha \geq \bar{C}_\alpha$: for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, it holds, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, that for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\|w_t - w_*\|^2 \leq C_{Th2} \exp\left(\frac{-\ln^{1-\nu}(t+1)}{1-\nu}\right) \left[\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + C'_{Th2} + \frac{\ln^{1-\nu}(t+1)}{1-\nu} \right]^{C_{12}}.$$

The proof is in Section 5. To our knowledge, Theorem 2 is the first maximal concentration bound with exponential tails for general contractive stochastic approximation algorithms with Markovian noise (Table 2). Integrating the exponential tails in Theorem 2 immediately gives L^p convergence rates.

Corollary 1 (L^p Convergence Rates) *Let conditions of Theorem 2 hold. Then the iterates $\{w_t\}$ generated by (SA) satisfy for any $p \geq 2$ and any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|w_t - w_*\|^{2p}\right] \leq (a(t)b(t)^{C_{12}})^p + C_{12}pa(t)^p \exp(b(t))((C_{12}p)!),$$

where $a(t) \doteq C_{Th2} \exp\left(-\frac{\ln^{1-\nu}(t+1)}{1-\nu}\right)$, $b(t) \doteq C'_{Th2} + \frac{\ln^{1-\nu}(t+1)}{1-\nu}$.

The proof is in A.15. Notably, the condition $p \geq 2$ ensures that $a(t)^p$ will dominate $\exp(b(t))$.

3 Reinforcement Learning Applications

We now apply our results to generate new analyses of RL algorithms. In particular, we consider a Markov Decision Process (Bellman, 1957; Puterman, 2014) with a finite state space \mathcal{S} , a finite action space \mathcal{A} , a reward function $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a transition function $p : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, an initial distribution p_0 , and a discount factor $\gamma \in [0, 1)$. At time step 0, an initial state S_0 is sampled from p_0 . At time step t , an agent at the state S_t takes an action $A_t \sim \mu(\cdot|S_t)$, where μ is the behavior policy. A reward $R_{t+1} \doteq r(S_t, A_t)$ is emitted, and the agent proceeds to a successor state $S_{t+1} \sim p(\cdot|S_t, A_t)$.

Q-Learning. The goal of Q-learning is to find the optimal action value function $q_* \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$ satisfying $q_* = \mathcal{T}_*q_*$, where $\mathcal{T}_* : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$ is the Bellman optimality operator defined as $(\mathcal{T}_*q)(s, a) \doteq r(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} p(s'|s, a) \max_{a'} q(s', a')$. It is well-known that \mathcal{T}_* is a γ -contraction w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ (Puterman, 2014). As a result, q_* is well-defined and unique. Q-learning is the most powerful and widely used method to find this q_* . In its simplest and most straightforward form, Q-learning performs the following updates to get the stochastic iterates $\{q_t\}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} q_{t+1}(s, a) &= q_t(s, a) + \alpha_t(R_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{a'} q_t(S_{t+1}, a') - q_t(s, a)) && \text{if } (s, a) = (S_t, A_t) \\ q_{t+1}(s, a) &= q_t(s, a) && \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

This update rule can be written in a compact form as

$$q_{t+1} = q_t + \alpha_t(H(q_t, (S_t, A_t, S_{t+1})) - q_t) \quad (\text{Q-learning})$$

$$[H(q, (s_0, a_0, s_1))](s, a) \doteq q(s, a) + \mathbb{1}_{(s,a)=(s_0,a_0)}(r(s_0, a_0) + \gamma \max_{a_1} q(s_1, a_1) - q(s_0, a_0)),$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is the indicator function. Let d_μ be the stationary state distribution under the behavior policy μ . Define $h(q) \doteq \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu, a \sim \mu(\cdot|s), s' \sim p(\cdot|s,a)}[H(q, (s, a, s'))]$. Proposition 3.1 of [Chen et al. \(2021\)](#) proves that $h(q)$ is a γ' -contraction w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ for some $\gamma' \in [0, 1)$ and has q_* as its unique fixed point, which immediately allows us to invoke [Theorems 1 and 2](#).

Theorem 3 *Let the chain (S_t, A_t, S_{t+1}) induced by the behavior policy μ be irreducible and aperiodic. If Assumption [LR1](#) holds, then the conclusion of [Theorem 1](#) holds with $\{w_t\}$ identified as $\{q_t\}$ generated by ([Q-learning](#)). If Assumption [LR2](#) holds, then the conclusion of [Theorem 2](#) holds with $\{w_t\}$ identified as $\{q_t\}$ generated by ([Q-learning](#)).*

Proof Assumption [2.1](#) is immediately implied by the finiteness of $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S}$ and the irreducibility and aperiodicity of the chain (S_t, A_t, S_{t+1}) . The function H is trivially Lipschitz continuous. Invoking [Theorem 1](#) then completes the proof. \blacksquare

To better understand the contribution of [Theorem 3](#), we briefly discuss three variants of ([Q-learning](#)). The first is **synchronous Q-learning**, where q_t is updated for each (s, a) , not just (S_t, A_t) , at time step t . This requires drawing a sample s' from $p(\cdot|s, a)$ for each (s, a) , and the noise is, therefore, essentially i.i.d. Moreover, in the typical RL setup ([Sutton and Barto, 2018](#)), only one Markovian data stream $(\dots, S_t, A_t, R_{t+1}, S_{t+1}, \dots)$ is available so implementing synchronous Q-learning is impractical. The second variant considers **i.i.d. samples**. In other words, at each time step t , a tuple (S_t, A_t) is drawn independently from some distribution and the S_{t+1} in ([Q-learning](#)) is replaced with $S'_t \sim p(\cdot|S_t, A_t)$. These i.i.d. samples are again not immediately available in the canonical RL setup. The third variant is **count-based learning rates** where the α_t in ([Q-learning](#)) is replaced by $\alpha_{n(t, S_t, A_t)}$. Here, $n(t, s, a)$ counts the number of visits to the state action pair (s, a) until time t . To our knowledge, this count-based learning rate is rarely used by RL practitioners and is mostly an artifact for theoretical analysis. We, therefore, argue that the form of ([Q-learning](#)) we consider in this section is the most straightforward and practical one.

Despite there have been extensive analyses of Q-learning (and its three variants) in various aspects, e.g., almost sure convergence, high probability concentration bound, L^2 convergence rates ([Watkins, 1989](#); [Watkins and Dayan, 1992](#); [Jaakkola et al., 1993](#); [Tsitsiklis, 1994](#); [Kearns and Singh, 1998](#); [Even-Dar et al., 2003](#); [Azar et al., 2011](#); [Beck and Srikant, 2012](#); [Lee and He, 2019](#); [Shah and Xie, 2018](#); [Wainwright, 2019](#); [Qu and Wierman, 2020](#); [Li et al., 2020](#); [Chen et al., 2021, 2023](#); [Li et al., 2024](#)), to our knowledge, **Theorem 3 is the first almost sure convergence rate for Q-learning in the form of ([Q-learning](#))**. It turns out that [Szepesvári \(1997\)](#) is the only almost sure convergence rate of Q-learning prior to this work. It, however, uses count-based learning rates and consider i.i.d. samples¹.

Off-Policy TD. Instead of finding the optimal action value function q_* , another fundamental task in RL is policy evaluation, where the goal is to estimate the value function v_π for some policy π , called the target policy. Here, v_π is the unique fixed point of the Bellman operator $\mathcal{T}_\pi : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ defined as $(\mathcal{T}_\pi v)(s) = \sum_a \pi(a|s)[r(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} p(s'|s, a)v(s)]$. It is well known that \mathcal{T}_π is also a γ -contraction w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ ([Puterman, 2014](#)). When

¹It is discussed in [Szepesvári \(1997\)](#) that their methodology would also work for Markovian samples, but there is no formal statement and no formal proof.

the data is obtained via a behavior policy μ (i.e., $A_t \sim \mu(\cdot|S_t)$), off-policy TD computes estimates $\{v_t\}$ of v_π as

$$v_{t+1} = v_t + \alpha_t (H(v_t, (S_t, A_t, S_{t+1})) - v_t) \quad (\text{off-policy TD})$$

$$[H(v, (s_0, a_0, s_1))](s) \doteq v(s) + \mathbb{1}_{s=s_0} \frac{\pi(a_0|s_0)}{\mu(a_0|s_0)} (r(s_0, a_0) + \gamma v(s_1) - v(s_0)).$$

Similarly, define $h(v) \doteq \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu, a \sim \mu(\cdot|s), s' \sim p(\cdot|s, a)} [H(v, (s, a, s'))]$. It can then be easily proved (omitted here for simplifying presentation) that $h(v)$ is also a γ -contraction w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and adopts v_π as its unique fixed point. We then have

Theorem 4 *Let the chain (S_t, A_t, S_{t+1}) induced by the behavior policy μ be irreducible and aperiodic. Let the behavior policy μ cover the target policy π in the sense that $\mu(a|s) = 0 \implies \pi(a|s) = 0$. If Assumption LR1 holds, then the conclusion of Theorem 1 holds with $\{w_t\}$ identified as $\{v_t\}$ generated by (off-policy TD). If Assumption LR2 holds, then the conclusion of Theorem 2 holds with $\{w_t\}$ identified as $\{v_t\}$ generated by (off-policy TD).*

The proof is the same as that of Theorem 3 and is thus omitted. To our knowledge, **Theorem 4 is the first concentration bound for (off-policy TD) with Markovian samples.** Chen et al. (2023) provide a concentration bound for (off-policy TD) but they assume i.i.d. samples. We also note that (off-policy TD) adopts many variants, including Precup et al. (2000); Munos et al. (2016); Harutyunyan et al. (2016); Asis et al. (2018). The results in this paper apply to those variants as well, but we omit them to simplify the presentation. We refer the reader to Chen et al. (2023) for details of the contraction property of those variants.

Remark 3 *To better understand the contribution of Theorem 4, we highlight a fact that analyzing (off-policy TD) is much harder than (Q-learning). For (Q-learning), it can be easily computed that $\|q_{t+1}\|_\infty \leq (1 - \alpha_t)\|q_t\|_\infty + \alpha_t \gamma \|q_t\|_\infty + \alpha_t \max_{s,a} |r(s, a)|$. Then it can be easily proved that $\sup_t \|q_t\|_\infty$ is upper bounded by some deterministic constant almost surely (Gosavi, 2006). This bound is the basis for many analyses of Q-learning, e.g., Even-Dar et al. (2003); Li et al. (2021, 2024); Qu and Wierman (2020). Such a bound is possible essentially because $\gamma \max_{a_1} q_t(s_1, a_1) \leq \gamma \|q_t\|_\infty$. But for (off-policy TD), we only have $\gamma \frac{\pi(a_0|s_0)}{\mu(a_0|s_0)} v_t(s_1) \leq \gamma \rho_{\max} \|v_t\|_\infty$ where $\rho_{\max} \doteq \max_{s,a} \pi(a|s)/\mu(a|s)$. The multiplier $\gamma \rho_{\max}$ can be larger than 1. Therefore, we cannot get an almost sure bound for (off-policy TD) following Gosavi (2006). Without having such a bound, the concentration analyses of (Q-learning) will not apply to (off-policy TD).*

RL with Linear Function Approximation. In view of Remark 2, Theorems 1 and 2 trivially apply to RL with linear function approximation when the expected update matrices are Hurwitz. Example algorithms include linear TD (Sutton, 1988; Tsitsiklis and Roy, 1996), gradient TD (Sutton et al., 2008, 2009; Maei, 2011; Zhang et al., 2021), and density ratio learning methods (Nachum et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020b,a). We, however, omit them for simplifying the presentation.

We additionally note that prior to this work, Szepesvári (1997); Tadic (2002) are, to our knowledge, the only two works that establish almost sure convergence rates for RL algorithms. By contrast, our Theorem 1 can be applied to a variety of RL algorithms as discussed above.

4 Related Works

Almost Sure Convergence Rates. For almost sure convergence rates, a large body of prior works focus on a special case of (SA), the stochastic gradient descent (SGD), where the update $H(w_t, Y_{t+1}) - w_t$ is the noisy gradient estimation of some objective and $\{Y_t\}$ are i.i.d. (Pelletier, 1998; Godichon-Baggioni, 2019; Sebbouh et al., 2021; Liu and Yuan, 2022; Liang et al., 2023; Liu and Yuan, 2024; Weissmann et al., 2024; Karandikar and Vidyasagar, 2024). Despite that SGD has enjoyed celebrated success (LeCun et al., 2015), in many RL algorithms, the corresponding update is not a noisy gradient estimation of any objective, and $\{Y_t\}$ is not i.i.d. Instead, in RL, $H(w_t, Y_{t+1})$ is usually a noisy estimation of some contractive operator. Moreover, in RL, $\{Y_t\}$ is usually a Markov chain.

Beyond the special SGD case, the almost sure convergence rate of (SA) is previously studied in Chong et al. (1999); Tadic (2004); Kouritzin and Sadeghi (2015). Those works, however, all assume that H is linear. Nonlinear H is previously investigated in Koval and Schwabe (2003); Vidyasagar (2023); Karandikar and Vidyasagar (2024). However, Koval and Schwabe (2003) require the strong assumption that $\{Y_t\}$ are i.i.d. Gaussian noise. Vidyasagar (2023) does not require $\{Y_t\}$ being Gaussian, but it still needs to be i.i.d. Karandikar and Vidyasagar (2024) do allow non-i.i.d. noise, but the noise needs to diminish sufficiently fast. To be more specific, the noise term in (SA) can be regarded as $H(w_t, Y_{t+1}) - h(w_t)$. If $\{Y_t\}$ is i.i.d., then the noise is simply a martingale difference sequence, and the conditional expectation is 0. Consequently, the results in Vidyasagar (2023) apply. Karandikar and Vidyasagar (2024) lift this zero conditional expectation assumption and assume $\|\mathbb{E}[H(w_t, Y_{t+1}) - h(w_t) | w_0, Y_0, \dots, Y_t]\| \leq C_t(\|w_t\| + 1)$. But this $\{C_t\}$ needs to diminish sufficiently fast such that $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \alpha_t C_t < \infty$ (see Theorem 5 of Vidyasagar (2023)). Unfortunately, when $\{Y_t\}$ is a Markov chain, the best we can get is that C_t is a constant. So the results in Karandikar and Vidyasagar (2024) do not apply for Markovian $\{Y_t\}$.

High Probability Concentration Bounds. For high probability concentration bounds, SGD is also a main focus of prior works, including Rakhlin et al. (2011); Duchi et al. (2012); Hazan and Kale (2014); Harvey et al. (2019); Zhu et al. (2022); Telgarsky (2022). We refer the reader to Chen et al. (2023) for a more detailed review of those works since SGD is not the main focus of this work.

For general stochastic approximation and reinforcement learning, Even-Dar et al. (2003) is perhaps the earliest work that establishes a concentration bound with exponential tails. In particular, Even-Dar et al. (2003) study synchronous Q -learning, so their noise is essentially i.i.d. (martingale difference sequence). Furthermore, their concentration bound holds for only one iterate, and they require using specific properties of Q -learning to establish the boundedness of iterates and noise first (Remark 3). Qu and Wierman (2020) study general stochastic approximation and use Q -learning as an application. In their general results, it is assumed that the iterates are bounded. In their Q -learning application, this assumption is fulfilled via using specific properties of Q -learning (Remark 3). Li et al. (2021) also study synchronous Q -learning. So their noise is also i.i.d. Furthermore, they also require specific properties of Q -learning to establish the boundedness first (Remark 3). Li et al. (2024) extend the analysis of Q -learning in Li et al. (2021) from synchronous setup to asynchronous setup and thus allow Markovian noise. However, their concentration bound only holds for the last iterate, and their constant learning rate depends on the prefixed number of iterates.

Prashanth et al. (2021) study a batch version of TD with linear function approximation, using a projection operator to ensure the boundedness of iterates. Furthermore, their algorithm runs on a given dataset, so their noise is essentially i.i.d. Thoppe and Borkar (2015) establish concentration bound for general stochastic approximation algorithms under i.i.d. noise. But their bound holds only when $t \geq t_0$ with t_0 depending on some unknown random event (the iterates run into the domain of attraction of w_*). This work is improved by Chandak et al. (2022) to allow both i.i.d. and Markovian noise and to remove the dependence on the unknown event. However, it relies on a priori that the Lipschitz constant of $w \mapsto H(w, y)$ (i.e., L_h in Assumption 2.3) is strictly smaller than 1. Although requiring $h(w)$ to be contractive is standard, requiring $H(w, y)$ to be contractive for each y is restrictive. The follow-up work Chandak and Borkar (2023) lifts this contraction requirement of $H(w, y)$ in the context of linear TD. However, to make the tail of their results exponential, they have to rely on Korda and La (2015) to bound a term. Dalal et al. (2018a) study linear TD with i.i.d. noise. Their bound holds only for $t \geq t_0$ with t_0 in the order of $\ln(1/\delta)$. Dalal et al. (2018b) extend Dalal et al. (2018a) and study general two timescale linear stochastic approximation under i.i.d. noise. Similarly, their t_0 also depends on δ . Durmus et al. (2021) study linear stochastic approximation with i.i.d. noise using a constant learning rate. Mou et al. (2022) apply variance reduction techniques to general stochastic approximation algorithms with i.i.d. noise (i.e., instead of using $H(w_t, Y_{t+1})$, they use an empirical average of $H(w_t, Y_{t+1})$). Their bound holds only for the last iterate and requires a constant learning rate. Chen et al. (2023) is the closest work to this paper. In fact, we will apply the techniques therein on (Skeleton SA) to obtain concentration bounds for Markovian $\{Y_t\}$. By contrast, Chen et al. (2023) work on the original iterates (SA) directly and need to assume $\{Y_t\}$ are i.i.d.

L^p Convergence Rates. L^2 convergence rates for stochastic approximation with Markovian noise is a very large research area and is not the main topic of this work. So we skip a detailed survey and only mention a few works such as Bhandari et al. (2018); Zou et al. (2019); Srikant and Ying (2019); Chen et al. (2021); Zhang et al. (2022). Since L^p convergence can be derived via integrating exponential tails once a high probability concentration is obtained for each t , here we only survey works that obtain L^p convergence rates in other more direct methods. For L^p convergence rates of SGD, we refer the reader to Godichon-Baggioni (2016, 2019). The literature on general L^p convergence for general nonlinear stochastic approximation with Markovian noise is rather thin. To our knowledge, Lauand and Meyn (2024) is the only work that falls into this category. However, Lauand and Meyn (2024) only establish asymptotic convergence in L^p , and there is no convergence rate.

Stochastic Approximation. In this work, the Markovian noise $\{Y_t\}$ is assumed to mix geometrically (Assumption 2.1), akin to Borkar et al. (2021). In Liu et al. (2024), this geometrically mixing assumption is lifted and Liu et al. (2024) only need LLN to hold for $\{Y_t\}$ to establish the almost sure convergence. To establish an almost sure convergence rate and concentration bound under these weakened assumptions on $\{Y_t\}$ is left for future work. Furthermore, Borkar et al. (2021); Liu et al. (2024) also allow the Lipschitz constant L_h in Assumption 2.3 to depend on y for their almost sure convergence. To establish an almost sure convergence rate and a concentration bound under this weakened assumption on the Lipschitz continuity is also left for future work.

Our ([Skeleton SA](#)) technique is inspired by the proof of Proposition 4.8 of [Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis \(1996\)](#), where the almost sure convergence of ([Linear SA](#)) is studied. That proof uses a **constant** T to discretize the ODE and assume $b(y)$ in ([Linear SA](#)) is always 0. By contrast, we use a diminishing $\{T_m\}$ to discretize the ODE and study general contractive stochastic approximation algorithms, establishing both almost sure convergence rate (and thus almost sure convergence) and maximal concentration bound with exponential tails. The diminishing nature of $\{T_m\}$ is vital to our success. To see this, we note that their proof is conducted under the assumption that $b(y) = 0$ and at the beginning of their proof, it is claimed that assuming $b(y) = 0$ is only for simplifying presentations and the proof for a general $b(y)$ is similar (the proof with a general $b(y)$ is not provided). We argue that this is not the case. In particular, their almost sure convergence in Proposition 4.8 is essentially obtained by a supermartingale convergence theorem (Proposition 4.2 of [Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis \(1996\)](#) or Lemma 14). When $b(y) = 0$ holds, their proof is able to identify the $\{B_t\}$ in Lemma 14 as 0. So $\sum B_t = 0 < \infty$ almost surely (Condition (ii) of Lemma 14). But with a constant T and a general $b(y)$, the $\{B_t\}$ in Lemma 14 will be identified as some small positive constant in the order of T^2 . Although this constant can be arbitrarily small, it is always positive, indicating $\sum B_t = \infty$, so the supermartingale convergence theorem will not apply. By using a diminishing $\{T_m\}$, we are able to identify $\{B_t\}$ in Lemma 14 as T_m^2 and have $\sum B_t < \infty$.

5 Proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2

Both proofs start with the same skeleton iterates technique and deviate after we obtain certain recursive bounds.

5.1 Skeleton Iterates

We first formally define the anchors for constructing the ([Skeleton SA](#)). We define

$$T_m = \frac{C_\alpha \ln^{\nu_1}(m+3)}{(m+3)^{\nu_2}}. \quad (2)$$

We set ν_1 and ν_2 depending on the ν in α_t . In particular, we set

$$\begin{cases} 0 < \nu_1 < 1, \nu_2 = 1 & \text{for Assumption LR1 with } \nu = 1 \\ \nu_1 = 0, \frac{1}{2} < \nu_2 < \frac{\nu}{2-\nu} & \text{for Assumption LR1 with } \nu \in (2/3, 1) . \\ \nu_1 = 0, \nu_2 = 1 & \text{for Assumption LR2} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

For all three setups, $\{T_m\}$ is always monotonically decreasing. We then define a sequence $\{t_m\}$ as $t_0 = 0$,

$$t_{m+1} \doteq \min \left\{ k \mid \sum_{t=t_m}^{k-1} \alpha_t \geq T_m \right\}, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots \quad (4)$$

Under this definition, we have $t_{m+1} \geq t_m + 1$ so $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} t_m = \infty$. More importantly,

$$\bar{\alpha}_m \doteq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t \geq T_m. \quad (5)$$

We have now divided the real axis into intervals of length $\{\bar{\alpha}_m\}$, using $\{t_m\}$ as anchors. We now investigate the iterates $\{w_t\}$ interval by interval. To simplify the presentation, from now on, we define shorthand

$$G(w, y) \doteq H(w, y) - w, \quad g(w) \doteq h(w) - w.$$

Clearly $w \mapsto G(w, y)$ is $L_h + 1$ Lipschitz. Telescoping (SA) yields

$$\begin{aligned} w_{t_{m+1}} &= w_{t_m} + \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t G(w_t, Y_{t+1}) \\ &= w_{t_m} + \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t (g(w_{t_m}) + G(w_t, Y_{t+1}) - g(w_{t_m})) \\ &= w_{t_m} + \bar{\alpha}_m g(w_{t_m}) + \underbrace{\sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t (G(w_t, Y_{t+1}) - g(w_{t_m}))}_{z_m}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, $\{w_{t_m}\}$ can be regarded as iterates generated by a new stochastic approximation algorithm (Skeleton SA) running in the timescale $\{t_m\}$ while the original algorithm (SA) runs in the timescale $\{t\}$. The following properties of the intervals will be used repeatedly.

Lemma 1 *There exists some C_1 and m_0 such that for all $m \geq m_0$ and $t \geq t_m$, we have $\alpha_t \leq C_1 T_m^2$.*

The proof is in Section A.2. Notably, Lemma 1 is the key result to balance α_t and T_m .

Lemma 2 *There exists some m_0 such that for all $m \geq m_0$, $\bar{\alpha}_m \leq T_m + C_1 T_m^2 \leq 2T_m$.*

The proof is in Section A.3. Lemma 2 and (5) confirm that $\bar{\alpha}_m = \Theta(T_m)$. Notably, many lemmas below will need “ $m \geq m_0$ ”. For simplifying notations, we assume the current m_0 is large enough such that all previous lemmas hold. For example, the m_0 in Lemma 2 is assumed to be large enough such that Lemma 1 also holds. But m_0 always remains deterministic, independent of sample path and probability parameter δ .

5.2 Moreau Envelop Based Laypunov Function

We now construct a Laypunov function to study the behavior of $\{w_{t_m}\}$. The most straightforward candidate would be $\|w - w_*\|^2$. Unfortunately, the function $\|w - w_*\|^2$ is not necessarily smooth, rendering the analysis challenging. Following Chen et al. (2020, 2021); Zhang et al. (2022), we then construct the Moreau envelop of $\|\cdot\|^2$ as the Laypunov function. We say a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L -smooth w.r.t. some norm $\|\cdot\|_s$ if

$$f(w') \leq f(w) + \langle \nabla f(w), w - w' \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|w' - w\|_s^2. \quad (6)$$

Fix $\|\cdot\|_s$ to be an arbitrary norm such that $\frac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|_s^2$ is L -smooth, e.g., ℓ_p norm with $p \geq 2$. The Moreau envelop for $\frac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|_s^2$ w.r.t. $\frac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|_s^2$ is defined as

$$M(w) \doteq \inf_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_s^2 + \frac{1}{2\xi} \|w - u\|_s^2 \right\},$$

where $\xi > 0$ is a constant to be tuned. Due to the equivalence between norms, there exist positive constants l_{cs} and u_{cs} such that $l_{cs} \|w\|_s \leq \|w\| \leq u_{cs} \|w\|_s$. The properties of $M(w)$ are summarized below.

Lemma 3 (Proposition A.1 and Section A.2 of [Chen et al. \(2021\)](#))

- (i). $M(w)$ is $\frac{L}{\xi}$ -smooth w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_s$.
- (ii). There exists a norm $\|\cdot\|_m$ such that $M(w) = \frac{1}{2}\|w\|_m^2$.
- (iii). Define $l_{cm} = \sqrt{(1 + \xi l_{cs}^2)}$, $u_{cm} = \sqrt{(1 + \xi u_{cs}^2)}$, then $l_{cm}\|w\|_m \leq \|w\| \leq u_{cm}\|w\|_m$.
- (iv). $\langle \nabla M(w), w' \rangle \leq \|w\|_m \|w'\|_m$, $\langle \nabla M(w), w \rangle \geq \|w\|_m^2$.

5.3 Noise Decomposition and Bounds

In view of Lemma 3, realizing f, w', w in (6) as $f = M$, $w' = w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*$, and $w = w_{t_m} - w_*$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2 \\ & \leq \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, \bar{\alpha}_m g(w_{t_m}) + z_m \right\rangle + \frac{L}{\xi} \|\bar{\alpha}_m g(w_{t_m}) + z_m\|_s^2. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_t \doteq \sigma(w_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_t)$ be the filtration until time t and use $\mathbb{E}_m[\cdot] \doteq \mathbb{E}[\cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_m}]$ to denote the conditional expectation given \mathcal{F}_{t_m} . We then perform decomposition

$$z_m = \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t (G(w_t, Y_{t+1}) - g(w_{t_m})) = z_{1,m} + z_{2,m} + z_{3,m}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} z_{1,m} & \doteq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t (G(w_t, Y_{t+1}) - G(w_{t_m}, Y_{t+1})), \\ z_{2,m} & \doteq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t (G(w_{t_m}, Y_{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}_m[G(w_{t_m}, Y_{t+1})]), \\ z_{3,m} & \doteq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t (\mathbb{E}_m[G(w_{t_m}, Y_{t+1})] - g(w_{t_m})). \end{aligned}$$

Notably, $\mathbb{E}_m[z_{2,m}] = 0$. We then rearrange (7) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2 \\ & \leq \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + \bar{\alpha}_m \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, g(w_{t_m}) \right\rangle + \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, z_{2,m} \right\rangle \\ & \quad + \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, z_{1,m} + z_{3,m} \right\rangle + \frac{L}{\xi} \|\bar{\alpha}_m g(w_{t_m}) + z_{1,m} + z_{2,m} + z_{3,m}\|_s^2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We now bound the terms of the RHS one by one.

Lemma 4 $\left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, g(w_{t_m}) \right\rangle \leq -2\left(1 - \frac{u_{cm}}{l_{cm}}\kappa\right)\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2$.

The proof is in Section A.4. By Lemma 3, it is easy to see $\lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \frac{u_{cm}}{l_{cm}} = 1$. From now on, we fix a sufficiently small ξ such that

$$\kappa' \doteq 1 - \frac{u_{cm}}{l_{cm}}\kappa \in (0, 1).$$

This also allows us to identify the \bar{C}_α required in Theorem 2 as $\bar{C}_\alpha = 1/\kappa'$.

Lemma 5 *There exists some deterministic C_5 and m_0 such that for all $m \geq m_0$,*

$$\|z_{1,m}\|_m \leq T_m^2 C_5 (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + 1).$$

The proof is in Section A.5.

Lemma 6 *There exists some deterministic C_6 and m_0 such that for all $m \geq m_0$,*

$$\|z_{2,m}\|_m \leq T_m C_6 (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + 1).$$

The proof is in Section A.6.

Lemma 7 *There exists some deterministic C_7 and m_0 such that for all $m \geq m_0$,*

$$\|z_{3,m}\|_m \leq T_m^2 C_7 (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + 1).$$

The proof is in Section A.7. Assembling the above bounds yields

Lemma 8 *There exists some deterministic C_8 and m_0 such that for all $m \geq m_0$,*

$$\|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2 \leq (1 - T_m \kappa') \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, z_{2,m} \right\rangle + C_8 T_m^2.$$

The proof is in Section A.8.

Notably, our error decomposition of z_m is significantly different from previous works with Markovian noise like Bhandari et al. (2018); Zou et al. (2019); Chen et al. (2021); Zhang et al. (2022). In those works, they work on the original timescale $\{t\}$ in (SA) and $G(w_t, Y_{t+1})$ is usually decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} G(w_t, Y_{t+1}) - g(w_t) &= G(w_{t-\tau_t}, Y_{t+1}) - g(w_{t-\tau_t}) \\ &\quad + G(w_t, Y_{t+1}) - G(w_{t-\tau_t}, Y_{t+1}) \\ &\quad + g(w_{t-\tau_t}) - g(w_t), \end{aligned}$$

where τ_t is a function of t depending on the mixing rate ϱ in Assumption 2.1 and the learning rate α_t . The last two terms in the RHS can be easily bounded via Lipschitz continuity. To bound the first term in the RHS, they then have to take $\mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{t-\tau_t}]$ on their counterparts of (8). This will relate $\mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w_*\|_m^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-\tau_t}]$ to $\mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w_*\|_m^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-\tau_t}]$. But this is not a recursion since the conditional expectations are conditioned on the same $\mathcal{F}_{t-\tau_t}$. And w_t is not adapted to $\mathcal{F}_{t-\tau_t}$. So they have to take another expectation over $\mathcal{F}_{t-\tau_t}$ and thus get recursions between $\mathbb{E}[\|w_{t+1} - w_*\|_m^2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|w_t - w_*\|_m^2]$. This recursion is enough to obtain an L^2 convergence rate but does not help obtain an almost sure convergence rate. By contrast, our Lemma 8 will be used to connect $\mathbb{E}[\|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t_m}]$ with $\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2$ for Theorem 1 and to connect $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2) | \mathcal{F}_{t_m}]$ with $\exp(\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2)$ for Theorem 2, both of which resemble a supermartingale.

5.4 Almost Sure Convergence Rates (Proof of Theorem 1)

We recall that we proceed under Assumption [LR1](#) and $\mathbb{E}_m[z_{2,m}] = 0$. Taking conditional expectation on both sides of [Lemma 8](#) then yields

$$\mathbb{E}_m \left[\|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2 \right] \leq (1 - T_m \kappa') \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + C_8 T_m^2.$$

This ensures that $\{\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2\}$ is “almost” a supermartingale w.r.t. $\{\mathcal{F}_{t_m}\}$. As a result, a canonical result in [Robbins and Siegmund \(1971\)](#) regarding the convergence of “almost” supermartingale confirms that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 = 0$ almost surely. A finer version of this canonical result in [Liu and Yuan \(2024\)](#); [Karandikar and Vidyasagar \(2024\)](#) (included as [Lemma 14](#) for completeness) further yields an almost sure convergence rate.

Lemma 9 *For any $\nu \in (2/3, 1]$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 2\nu_2 - 1)$, it holds that*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} m^\epsilon \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 = 0 \quad a.s.$$

The proof is in [Section A.9](#). We recall that ν_2 is defined in [\(2\)](#). For $\nu = 1$, we have $\nu_2 = 1$. For $\nu \in (2/3, 1)$, we have $\nu_2 \rightarrow 1$ when $\nu \rightarrow 1$. So under Assumption [LR1](#), ϵ can be arbitrarily close to 1. Then the almost sure convergence rate in [Lemma 9](#) can be arbitrarily close to $\sqrt{m} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m \rightarrow 0$, which is the optimal rate given by the LIL up to a $\sqrt{\log \log m}$ term. We, therefore, argue that our analysis of ([Skeleton SA](#)) here is reasonably tight.

Mapping the almost sure convergence rate from m back to t ([Section A.10](#)) then completes the proof of [Theorem 1](#).

5.5 Concentration (Proof of Theorem 2)

In this section, we proceed under Assumption [LR2](#). We will follow [Chen et al. \(2023\)](#) to establish the concentration bound, which is an inductive (bootstrapping / recursive) argument. We first lay out the inductive basis.

Lemma 10 *There exist some deterministic integers C_{10} and C'_{10} such that for any $m \geq 0$,*

$$\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 \leq C'_{10} m^{C_{10}} \quad a.s.$$

The proof is in [Section A.11](#). [Lemma 10](#) uses the discrete Gronwall inequality ([Lemma 13](#)) to give the worst-case almost sure bound. We now present the inductive step.

Lemma 11 *There exists some deterministic constant m_0 such that the following implication relation holds. If for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists some non-decreasing sequence $\{B_m(\delta)\}_{m=m_0}^\infty$ such that*

$$\Pr \left(\forall m \geq m_0, \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 \leq B_m(\delta) \right) \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (9)$$

then for any $\delta' \in (0, 1 - \delta)$, there exists a new sequence $\{B_m(\delta, \delta')\}_{m=m_0}^\infty$ such that

$$\Pr \left(\forall m \geq m_0, \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 \leq B_m(\delta, \delta') \right) \geq 1 - \delta - \delta',$$

where $B_m(\delta, \delta') = C_{11} T_m B_m(\delta) (1 + \ln(1/\delta') + \ln(m + 3))$ with C_{11} being some constant depending on m_0 and independent of m, δ, δ' .

The proof is in Section A.12. In other words, by using Lemma 11 once, we can improve the bound by T_m . Since the almost sure bound given in Lemma 10 is of the order $m^{C_{10}}$, after applying Lemma 11 for $C_{10} + 1$ times, we will get the desired bound. We cannot keep applying Lemma 11 thereafter because then the bound B_m will not be non-decreasing.

Lemma 12 *There exists some constant $C_{12} = C_{10} + 1$ and C'_{12} such that for any $\delta > 0$, it holds, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, that for all $m \geq 0$,*

$$\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 \leq C'_{12} \frac{1}{m+3} \left[\ln\left(\frac{C_{12}}{\delta}\right) + 1 + \ln(m+3) \right]^{C_{12}}.$$

The proof is in Section A.13. We do note that the proofs of Lemmas 11 and 12 are analogous to Chen et al. (2023) and we include them here mostly for completeness. The techniques therein are not our contribution. Instead, applying those techniques to the (Skeleton SA) and obtaining stronger results than Chen et al. (2023) is our contribution.

Remark 4 *It is necessary to have $T_m = \Theta(1/m)$ here. The polynomial $m^{C_{10}}$ in Lemma 10 results from a term $\exp(C_{10} \sum_{i=0}^m T_i) \leq m^{C_{10}}$. If, e.g., $T_m = \Theta(1/m^\nu)$ is used for some $\nu < 1$, then the term would be of the order $\exp(m^{1-\nu})$. But each inductive step is only able to shrink it by $1/m^\nu$. Then, this inductive approach can never reach a diminishing rate. This restriction on T_m further restricts our choice of α_t .*

Mapping the concentration bound from m back to t (Section A.14) then completes the proof of Theorem 2.

6 Conclusion

This work establishes the first almost sure convergence rate and the first maximal concentration bound with exponential tails for general contractive stochastic approximation algorithms with Markovian noise, generating state-of-the-art analysis for Q -learning and off-policy TD. We envision that the skeleton iterates technique introduced in this work could serve as a new tool for analyzing stochastic approximation algorithms with Markovian noise. A possible future work is to refine the choice of $\{T_m\}$ to further improve the convergence rates.

Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

This work is supported in part by the US National Science Foundation under grants III-2128019 and SLES-2331904.

Appendix A. Proofs in Section 5

A.1 Auxiliary Lemmas

Lemma 13 (Discrete Gronwall Inequality) *(Lemma 8 in Section 11.2 of Borkar (2009)) For non-negative real sequences $\{x_n, n \geq 0\}$ and $\{a_n, n \geq 0\}$ and scalars $C > x_0$, $L \geq 0$, it holds*

$$x_{n+1} \leq C + L \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x_i \quad \forall n \implies x_{n+1} \leq C \exp(L \sum_{i=0}^n a_i) \quad \forall n.$$

Lemma 14 (Theorem 2 of Karandikar and Vidyasagar (2024)) *Let $\{A_t\}$, $\{B_t\}$, $\{Z_t\}$, and $\{\alpha_t\}$ be sequences of non-negative random variables adapted to a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$. For some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, assume it holds that:*

- (i) for all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbb{E}[Z_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \leq (1 + A_t)Z_t + B_t - \alpha_t Z_t$,
- (ii) $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} A_t < \infty$, $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} B_t < \infty$, $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \alpha_t = \infty$ a.s.,
- (iii) there exists a $T \geq 1$ such that $\alpha_t \geq \frac{\epsilon}{t}$ a.s. for all $t \geq T$,
- (iv) $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} (t+1)^\epsilon B_t < \infty$, $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} (\alpha_t - \frac{\epsilon}{t}) = \infty$ a.s.

Then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\epsilon Z_t = 0$ a.s.

Lemma 15 *There exists some constant C_{15} such that for any w, y ,*

$$\|G(w, y)\| \leq C_{15}(\|w\| + 1), \quad \|G(w, y)\|_m \leq C_{15}(\|w\|_m + 1).$$

Proof Setting $w' = 0$ in (1) yields $\|H(w, y) - H(0, y)\| \leq L_h \|w\|$. So we have

$$\|G(w, y)\| \leq (L_h + 1)\|w\| + \|H(0, y)\| \leq (L_h + 1)\|w\| + \sup_y \|H(0, y)\|.$$

Assumption 2.3 and norm equivalence then complete the proof. ■

Lemma 16 *There exists some constant C_{16} such that for any m and any $t \in [t_m, t_{m+1}]$,*

$$\|w_t - w_*\| \leq C_{16}(\bar{\alpha}_m + \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|), \quad (10)$$

$$\|w_t - w_{t_m}\| \leq \bar{\alpha}_m C_{16}(\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + 1). \quad (11)$$

Furthermore, for any $t \geq 0$, it holds that

$$\|w_t - w_*\| \leq (\|w_0 - w_*\| + C_{16} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \alpha_\tau) \exp\left(C_{16} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \alpha_\tau\right). \quad (12)$$

Proof Proof of (10). From (SA) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{t+1} - w_*\| &\leq \|w_t - w_*\| + \alpha_t \|G(w_t, Y_{t+1})\| \\ &\leq \|w_t - w_*\| + \alpha_t C_{15}(\|w_t - w_*\| + \|w_*\| + 1). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

For any $t \in [t_m, t_{m+1}]$, we have, by telescoping, that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_t - w_*\| &\leq \|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \sum_{\tau=t_m}^{t-1} \alpha_\tau C_{15}(\|w_*\| + 1) + \sum_{\tau=t_m}^{t-1} \alpha_\tau C_{15} \|w_\tau - w_*\| \\ &\leq (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \bar{\alpha}_m C_{15}(\|w_*\| + 1)) + \sum_{\tau=t_m}^{t-1} \alpha_\tau C_{15} \|w_\tau - w_*\| \\ &\leq (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \bar{\alpha}_m C_{15}(\|w_*\| + 1)) \exp\left(\sum_{\tau=t_m}^{t-1} \alpha_\tau C_{15}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is from the discrete Gronwall inequality. It then holds that

$$\|w_t - w_*\| \leq (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \bar{\alpha}_m C_{15}(\|w_*\| + 1)) \exp(\bar{\alpha}_m C_{15}).$$

Since $\{T_m\}$ is monotonically decreasing to 0 and $T_m \leq \bar{\alpha}_m \leq 2T_m$ (Lemma 2), we have $\bar{\alpha}_m \leq 2T_1$ for all $m \geq 1$. Therefore, we can take $C_{16} = C_{15}(\|w_*\| + 1) \exp(2T_1 C_{15})$ to complete the proof.

Proof of (11). Similarly, for any $t \in [t_m, t_{m+1}]$, it holds that

$$\|w_{t+1} - w_{t_m}\| \leq \|w_t - w_{t_m}\| + \alpha_t C_{15}(\|w_t - w_{t_m}\| + \|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \|w_*\| + 1).$$

Telescoping yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_t - w_{t_m}\| &\leq \sum_{\tau=t_m}^{t-1} \alpha_\tau C_{15}(\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \|w_*\| + 1) + \sum_{\tau=t_m}^{t-1} \alpha_\tau C_{15} \|w_\tau - w_{t_m}\| \\ &\leq \bar{\alpha}_m C_{15}(\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \|w_*\| + 1) + \sum_{\tau=t_m}^{t-1} \alpha_\tau C_{15} \|w_\tau - w_{t_m}\| \\ &\leq \bar{\alpha}_m C_{15}(\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \|w_*\| + 1) \exp(\bar{\alpha}_m C_{15}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is again from the discrete Gronwall inequality. Take the chosen C_{16} from above completes the proof.

Proof of (12). For any $t \geq 0$, Telescoping (13) from $t = 0$ yields

$$\|w_t - w_*\| \leq \|w_0 - w_*\| + \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \alpha_\tau C_{15}(\|w_\tau - w_*\| + \|w_*\| + 1).$$

Similarly, the discrete Gronwall inequality yields that for any t ,

$$\|w_t - w_*\| \leq (\|w_0 - w_*\| + \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \alpha_\tau C_{15}(\|w_*\| + 1)) \exp\left(C_{15} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \alpha_\tau\right),$$

which completes the proof. ■

A.2 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof Case 1: $\nu < 1$ in Assumption LR1. In this case, we have $T_m = \Theta(m^{-\nu_2})$. From (5), we have for any m ,

$$\sum_{t=0}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t \geq \sum_{i=0}^m T_i.$$

Using integral approximation, we get $\sum_{i=0}^m T_i = \Theta((m+1)^{1-\nu_2})$ and $\sum_{t=0}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t = \Theta(t_{m+1}^{1-\nu})$. This means $m^{1-\nu_2} = \mathcal{O}(t_m^{1-\nu})$, i.e., $t_m^{-(1-\nu)} = \mathcal{O}(m^{-(1-\nu_2)})$. For any $t \geq t_m$, we have

$$\alpha_t \leq \alpha_{t_m} = \mathcal{O}(t_m^{-\nu}) = \mathcal{O}\left(m^{-\frac{1-\nu_2}{1-\nu}\nu}\right).$$

We recall that $T_m^2 = \Theta(m^{-2\nu_2})$. So for $\alpha_{t_m} \leq T_m^2$ to hold for sufficiently large m , it is sufficient to have $\frac{\nu(1-\nu_2)}{1-\nu} > 2\nu_2$, which is equivalent to $\nu_2 < \frac{\nu}{2-\nu}$ in (3).

Case 2: $\nu = 1$ in Assumption LR1. In this case, we have $T_m = \Theta\left(\frac{\ln^{\nu_1} m}{m}\right)$. A similar integral approximation yields $\sum_{i=0}^m T_i = \Theta(\ln^{\nu_1+1}(m+1))$ and $\sum_{t=0}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t = \Theta(\ln t_{m+1})$. Then we have $\ln^{\nu_1+1}(m) \leq C_{1,1} \ln t_m$ for some constant $C_{1,1}$ and sufficiently large m . It follows that

$$\alpha_{t_m} = \mathcal{O}(t_m^{-1}) = \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\exp((\ln^{\nu_1+1} m)/C_{1,1})\right)^{-1}\right) = \mathcal{O}(m^{-(\ln^{\nu_1} m)/C_{1,1}}).$$

For $\alpha_{t_m} \leq T_m^2$ to hold for sufficiently large m , it is sufficient to have

$$\frac{1}{m^{(\ln^{\nu_1} m)/C_{1,1}}} \leq \frac{\ln^{2\nu_1} m}{m^2}.$$

This is true because $(\ln^{\nu_1} m)/C_{1,1} > 2$ holds for sufficiently large m .

Case 3: Assumption LR2. In this case, we have $T_m = \Theta(\frac{1}{m})$. Using integral approximation, we get $\sum_{i=0}^m T_i = \Theta(\ln(m+1))$ and $\sum_{t=0}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t = \Theta(\ln^{1-\nu} t_{m+1})$. Then we have $\ln m \leq C_{1,2} \ln^{1-\nu} t_m$ for some constant $C_{1,2}$ and sufficiently large m . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{t_m} &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{t_m \ln^{\nu} t_m}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\exp\left(\left(\frac{\ln m}{C_{1,2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\nu}}\right)\left(\frac{\ln m}{C_{1,2}}\right)^{\frac{\nu}{1-\nu}}\right)^{-1}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\left(m^{(\ln^{\nu/(1-\nu)} m) C_{1,2}^{-1/(1-\nu)}} \left(\frac{\ln m}{C_{1,2}}\right)^{\frac{\nu}{1-\nu}}\right)^{-1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\ln^{\nu/(1-\nu)} m) C_{1,2}^{-1/(1-\nu)} > 2$ holds for sufficiently large m , we conclude that $\alpha_{t_m} \leq T_m^2$ holds for sufficiently large m , which completes the proof. \blacksquare

A.3 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof By (4), we must have $t_{m+1} \geq t_m + 1$. Let m be sufficiently large such that $C_1 T_m < 1$. If $t_{m+1} = t_m + 1$, we have $\bar{\alpha}_m = \alpha_{t_m} \leq C_1 T_m^2 < 2T_m$. If $t_{m+1} \geq t_m + 2$, we have by the min operator in (4) that $\bar{\alpha}_m - \alpha_{t_{m+1}-2} < T_m$. This means that $\bar{\alpha}_m \leq T_m + \alpha_{t_{m+1}-2} \leq T_m + \alpha_{t_m} \leq T_m + C_1 T_m^2 \leq 2T_m$. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

A.4 Proof of Lemma 4

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, g(w_{t_m}) \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, h(w_{t_m}) - w_* \right\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, w_* - w_{t_m} \right\rangle \\ &\leq \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m \|h(w_{t_m}) - w_*\|_m + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, w_* - w_{t_m} \right\rangle \quad (\text{Lemma 3}) \\ &= \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m \|h(w_{t_m}) - w_*\|_m - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, w_{t_m} - w_* \right\rangle \\ &\leq \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m \|h(w_{t_m}) - w_*\|_m - \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 \quad (\text{Lemma 3}) \\ &\leq \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m \frac{u_{cm}}{l_{cm}} \kappa \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m - \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 \quad (\text{Lemma 3}) \\ &= -\left(1 - \frac{u_{cm}}{l_{cm}} \kappa\right) \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2. \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \blacksquare

A.5 Proof of Lemma 5

Proof

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|z_{1,m}\| &\leq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t (L_h + 1) \|w_t - w_{t_m}\| \\
 &\leq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t (L_h + 1) \bar{\alpha}_m C_{16} (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + 1) && \text{(Lemma 16)} \\
 &= \bar{\alpha}_m^2 (L_h + 1) C_{16} (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + 1) \\
 &\leq 4T_m^2 (L_h + 1) C_{16} (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + 1). && \text{(Lemma 2)}
 \end{aligned}$$

The equivalence between norms then completes the proof. ■

A.6 Proof of Lemma 6

Proof

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|z_{2,m}\| &\leq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t \|G(w_{t_m}, Y_{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}_m[G(w_{t_m}, Y_{t+1})]\| \\
 &\leq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t \|G(w_{t_m}, Y_{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}_m[G(w_{t_m}, Y_{t+1})]\| \\
 &\leq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t 2 \sup_y \|G(w_{t_m}, y)\| \\
 &\leq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t 2C_{15} (\|w_{t_m}\| + 1) && \text{(Lemma 15)} \\
 &\leq \bar{\alpha}_m 2C_{15} (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \|w_*\| + 1) \\
 &\leq 2T_m 2C_{15} (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \|w_*\| + 1) && \text{(Lemma 2)}
 \end{aligned}$$

The equivalence between norms then completes the proof. ■

A.7 Proof of Lemma 7

Proof

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|z_{3,m}\| &\leq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t \|\mathbb{E}_m[G(w_{t_m}, Y_{t+1}) - g(w_{t_m})]\| \\
 &\leq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t \left\| \int_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (P^{t+1-t_m}(Y_{t_m}, y) - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)) G(w_{t_m}, y) dy \right\| \\
 &\leq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t \int_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |(P^{t+1-t_m}(Y_{t_m}, y) - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y))| \|G(w_{t_m}, y)\| dy \\
 &\leq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t \sup_y \|G(w_{t_m}, y)\| \int_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |(P^{t+1-t_m}(Y_{t_m}, y) - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y))| dy \\
 &\leq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t C_{15} (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \|w_*\| + 1) C_{A2.1} \varrho^{t-t_m} \\
 &\leq \sum_{t=t_m}^{t_{m+1}-1} C_1 T_m^2 C_{15} (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \|w_*\| + 1) C_{A2.1} \varrho^{t+1-t_m} \\
 &\leq \frac{T_m^2 C_1 C_{15} (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\| + \|w_*\| + 1) C_{A2.1} \varrho}{1-\varrho}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The equivalence between norms then completes the proof. ■

A.8 Proof of Lemma 8

Proof We first bound the last two terms in (8). For the first of the two, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, z_{1,m} + z_{3,m} \right\rangle \\
 & \leq 2 \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m \|z_{1,m} + z_{3,m}\|_m && \text{(Lemma 3)} \\
 & \leq 2 \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m (\|z_{1,m}\|_m + \|z_{3,m}\|_m) \\
 & \leq 2 \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m T_m^2 (C_5 + C_7) (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + 1) \\
 & \leq 2 T_m^2 (C_5 + C_7) (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m) \\
 & \leq 2 T_m^2 (C_5 + C_7) (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + 1)) \\
 & \leq 3 T_m^2 (C_5 + C_7) (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + 1).
 \end{aligned}$$

For the second of the two, we notice from Lemma 15 that

$$\|g(w_{t_m})\|_m \leq C_{15} (\|w_{t_m}\|_m + 1).$$

With the fact that $\bar{\alpha}_m \leq 2T_m$, it then follows easily that

$$\|\bar{\alpha}_m g(w_{t_m})\|_m \leq 2C_{15} T_m (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + \|w_*\|_m + 1)$$

The equivalence between norms then confirms that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|\bar{\alpha}_m g(w_{t_m}) + z_{1,m} + z_{2,m} + z_{3,m}\|_s^2 \\
 & \leq 4 (\|\bar{\alpha}_m g(w_{t_m})\|_s^2 + \|z_{1,m}\|_s^2 + \|z_{2,m}\|_s^2 + \|z_{3,m}\|_s^2) \\
 & \leq 4 (u_{cm}/l_{cs})^2 (\|\bar{\alpha}_m g(w_{t_m})\|_m^2 + \|z_{1,m}\|_m^2 + \|z_{2,m}\|_m^2 + \|z_{3,m}\|_m^2) \\
 & \leq 4 (u_{cm}/l_{cs})^2 [4T_m^2 C_{15}^2 (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + \|w_*\|_m + 1)^2 \\
 & \quad + T_m^2 (1 + T_m^2) (C_5^2 + C_6^2 + C_7^2) (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + 1)] \\
 & \leq C_{8,1} T_m^2 (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + 1),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{8,1} \doteq 4 (u_{cm}/l_{cs})^2 \max\{8C_{15}^2 (\|w_*\|_m + 1)^2, (1 + T_0^2) (C_5^2 + C_6^2 + C_7^2)\}$. Take $C_8 \doteq \max\{3(C_5 + C_7), C_{8,1}\}$, we are now ready to refine (8) as

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2 \\
 & \leq (1 - 2\bar{\alpha}_m \kappa') \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, z_{2,m} \right\rangle + C_8 T_m^2 (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + 1) \\
 & \leq (1 - 2T_m \kappa') \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, z_{2,m} \right\rangle + C_8 T_m^2 (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + 1).
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $m_0 \doteq \min\{m : T_m \leq \min\{\kappa'/C_8, 1\}\}$. Then for all $m \geq m_0$, we have

$$\|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2 \leq (1 - T_m \kappa') \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, z_{2,m} \right\rangle + C_8 T_m^2,$$

which completes the proof. ■

A.9 Proof of Lemma 9

Proof We recall that $\mathbb{E}_m[z_{2,m}] = 0$. Then, taking conditional expectations on both sides of Lemma 8 yields that for $m \geq m_0$,

$$\mathbb{E}_m \left[\|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2 \right] \leq (1 - T_m \kappa') \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 + C_8 T_m^2.$$

We now proceed via applying Lemma 14. In particular, we identify

$$Z_m \leftrightarrow \|w_{t_{m+m_0}} - w_*\|_m^2, A_m \leftrightarrow 0, B_m \leftrightarrow C_8 T_{m+m_0}^2, \alpha_m \leftrightarrow T_{m+m_0} \kappa'.$$

Then Condition (i) holds. The definition of T_m in (2) trivially confirms that Condition (ii) holds. Let the ϵ in Lemma 14 be any number in $(0, 2\nu_2 - 1)$.

When $\nu < 1$, for Condition (iii), we have $T_m = \frac{C_\alpha}{(m+3)^{\nu_2}}$ with $\nu_2 < 1$. So when m is sufficiently large, it holds that $T_{m+m_0} \kappa' \geq \frac{\epsilon}{m}$. Condition (iii) holds. For Condition (iv), we have from $\epsilon < 2\nu_2 - 1$ that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (m+1)^\epsilon B_m = C_\alpha^2 C_8 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(m+1)^\epsilon}{(m+m_0+3)^{2\nu_2}} < \infty,$$

and from $\nu_2 < 1$ that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (\alpha_m - \frac{\epsilon}{m}) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{C_\alpha \kappa'}{(m+m_0+3)^{\nu_2}} - \frac{\epsilon}{m} \right) = \infty.$$

So Condition (iv) holds.

When $\nu = 1$, we have $\nu_2 = 1$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. For Condition (iii), we have $T_m = \frac{C_\alpha \ln^{\nu_1}(m+3)}{m+3}$, implying that Condition (iii) holds. For Condition (iv), we have from $\epsilon < 1$ that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (m+1)^\epsilon B_m = C_\alpha^2 C_8 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(m+1)^\epsilon \ln^{2\nu_1}(m+m_0+3)}{(m+m_0+3)^2} < \infty,$$

and

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (\alpha_m - \frac{\epsilon}{m}) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{C_\alpha \ln^{\nu_1}(m+m_0+3) \kappa'}{m+m_0+3} - \frac{\epsilon}{m} \right) = \infty.$$

So Condition (iv) holds. Having verified all conditions of Lemma 14 for all setup in Assumption LR1, invoking Lemma 14 and using $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(m+m_0)^\epsilon}{m^\epsilon} = 1$ then completes the proof. \blacksquare

A.10 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof Having established the convergence rate of (Skeleton SA) in Lemma 9, we now complete the proof by mapping the convergence rate back to (SA). We recall that we proceed under Assumption LR1 and recall the m_0 in Lemma 2. Then for all $m \geq m_0$, it holds that

$$\sum_{i=m_0}^m T_i \leq \sum_{i=m_0}^m \bar{\alpha}_i = \sum_{t=t_{m_0}}^{t_{m+1}-1} \alpha_t \leq \sum_{i=m_0}^m T_i + C_1 T_i^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i=m_0}^m T_i. \quad (14)$$

From Lemma 16, it is easy to see for any $t \in [t_m, t_{m+1}]$,

$$\|w_t - w_*\|^2 \leq 2C_{16}(\bar{\alpha}_m^2 + \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|^2) \leq 8C_{16}(T_m^2 + \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|^2). \quad (15)$$

For any $\epsilon \in (2\nu_2 - 1)$, we have

$$m^\epsilon \sup_{t \in [t_m, t_{m+1}]} \|w_t - w_*\|^2 \leq 8C_{16}(m^\epsilon T_m^2 + m^\epsilon \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|^2).$$

The definition of T_m in (2) and Lemma 9 then confirms that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} m^\epsilon \sup_{t \in [t_m, t_{m+1}]} \|w_t - w_*\|^2 = 0.$$

For $\nu < 1$, using (14) and integral approximation (cf. Section A.2), it is easy to get $m^{1-\nu_2} = \Theta(t_m^{1-\nu})$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (m-1)^\epsilon \sup_{t \in [t_{m-1}, t_m]} \|w_t - w_*\|^2 = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} m^\epsilon \sup_{t \in [t_{m-1}, t_m]} \|w_t - w_*\|^2 \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} t_m^{\frac{1-\nu}{1-\nu_2}\epsilon} \sup_{t \in [t_{m-1}, t_m]} \|w_t - w_*\|^2 \\ &\geq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [t_{m-1}, t_m]} t^{\frac{1-\nu}{1-\nu_2}\epsilon} \|w_t - w_*\|^2 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{\frac{1-\nu}{1-\nu_2}\epsilon} \|w_t - w_*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We now optimize the choice of $\nu_2 \in (1/2, \nu/(2-\nu))$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 2\nu_2 - 1)$. Notice that $\sup_{\nu_2 \in (1/2, \nu/(2-\nu)), \epsilon \in (0, 2\nu_2 - 1)} \frac{1-\nu}{1-\nu_2}\epsilon = \frac{3}{2}\nu - 1$. We then conclude that for any $\zeta < \frac{3}{2}\nu - 1$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\zeta \|w_t - w_*\|^2 = 0.$$

For $\nu = 1$, using (14) and integral approximation (cf. Section A.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} C_\alpha \ln^{1+\nu_1}(m+3) + C_1 C_\alpha^2 \sum_{i=m_0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln^{2\nu_1}(i+3)}{(i+3)^2} &\geq C_\alpha (\ln(t_{m+1}+2) - \ln(t_{m_0}+3)), \\ \ln(m+3) &\geq \left(\ln(t_{m+1}+2) - \ln(t_{m_0}+3) - C_1 C_\alpha \sum_{i=m_0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln^{2\nu_1}(i+3)}{(i+3)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\nu_1}}. \end{aligned}$$

To simplify this, we should clarify an inequality first.

Lemma 17 *For any $\nu \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b > 0$, we have $a^\nu + b^\nu \geq (a+b)^\nu$.*

Proof First, notice that to conclude, we only need to prove $f(x) = 1 + x^\nu - (1+x)^\nu > 0, \forall x > 0$. We have $f'(x) = \nu x^{\nu-1} - \nu(1+x)^{\nu-1}$. It then follows from $\nu - 1 < 0$ that $f'(x) > 0, \forall x \geq 0$. Thus, we obtain $f(x) > f(0) = 0, \forall x > 0$. \blacksquare

We now identify $b = \ln(t_{m_0}+3) + C_1 C_\alpha \sum_{i=m_0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln^{2\nu_1}(i+3)}{(i+3)^2}$ and $a = \ln(t_{m+1}+2) - b$. When m is sufficiently large, a is positive. So we get

$$\ln(m+3) \geq (\ln(t_{m+1}+2))^{\frac{1}{1+\nu_1}} - \left(\ln(t_{m_0}+3) + C_1 C_\alpha \sum_{i=m_0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln^{2\nu_1}(i+3)}{(i+3)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\nu_1}}.$$

Define $C_{Th1} \doteq \exp\left(-\zeta \left(\ln(t_{m_0}+3) + C_1 C_\alpha \sum_{i=m_0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln^{2\nu_1}(i+3)}{(i+3)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\nu_1}}\right)$, then we have

$$0 = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (m+2)^\zeta \sup_{t \in [t_{m-1}, t_m]} \|w_t - w_*\|^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\geq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} C_{Th1} \exp\left(\zeta \ln^{1/(1+\nu_1)} t_m\right) \sup_{t \in [t_{m-1}, t_m]} \|w_t - w_*\|^2 \\
 &\geq C_{Th1} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \exp\left(\zeta \ln^{1/(1+\nu_1)} t\right) \|w_t - w_*\|^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. ■

A.11 Proof of Lemma 10

Proof For $m \geq m_0$, where m_0 is a sufficiently large constant, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m &\leq \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + \bar{\alpha}_m \|g(w_{t_m})\|_m + \|z_m\|_m \\
 &\leq \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + \bar{\alpha}_m C_{15} (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + \|w_*\|_m + 1) \\
 &\quad + (T_m^2 C_5 + T_m C_6 + T_m^2 C_7) (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + 1) \\
 &\leq (1 + 2T_m C_{15} + T_m^2 C_5 + T_m C_6 + T_m^2 C_7) \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m \\
 &\quad + (2T_m C_{15} + T_m^2 C_5 + T_m C_6 + T_m^2 C_7) (\|w_*\|_m + 1)
 \end{aligned}$$

Denote $C_{10,1} \doteq 2C_{15} + T_0 C_5 + C_6 + T_0 C_7$, $C_{10,2} \doteq (2T_0 C_{15} + T_0^2 C_5 + T_0 C_6 + T_0^2 C_7) (\|w_*\|_m + 1)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m &\leq \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + C_{10,1} T_m \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + C_{10,2} \\
 &\leq \|w_{t_{m_0}} - w_*\|_m + \sum_{i=m_0}^m C_{10,1} T_i \|w_{t_i} - w_*\|_m + \sum_{i=m_0}^m C_{10,2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

From (12), we have for any $t \leq t_{m_0}$ (including t_m with $m \leq m_0$),

$$\|w_t - w_*\| \leq C_{10,3} \doteq (\|w_0 - w_*\| + C_{16} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t_{m_0}-1} \alpha_\tau) \exp\left(C_{16} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t_{m_0}-1} \alpha_\tau\right).$$

Applying the discrete Gronwall inequality then yields that for all $m \geq m_0$,

$$\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m \leq \left(\frac{u_{cm}}{t_{cm}} C_{10,3} + (m - m_0 + 1) C_{10,2}\right) \exp\left(\sum_{i=m_0}^{m-1} C_{10,1} T_i\right).$$

Noticing $T_m = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{m})$ and $\sum_{i=0}^m T_i = \mathcal{O}(\ln m)$ then completes the proof. ■

A.12 Proof of Lemma 11

Proof For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, consider the non-decreasing sequence $\{B_m(\delta)\}$ defined in (9). For each $m \geq m_0$, define an event $E_m(\delta) = \left\{ \|w_{t_k} - w_*\|_m^2 \leq B_k(\delta), \forall k = m_0, m_0 + 1, \dots, m \right\}$. Notably, $\{E_m(\delta)\}_{m \geq m_0}$ is by definition a sequence of decreasing events, i.e., $E_{m+1}(\delta) \subset E_m(\delta)$. In addition, according to (9), we have $\Pr(E_m(\delta)) \geq 1 - \delta$ for any $m \geq m_0$. Let $\lambda_m = \theta T_m^{-1} B_m(\delta)^{-1}$ where θ is a tunable constant yet to be chosen.

We now proceed to show that $\left\{ \exp\left(\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \right\}$ is ‘‘almost’’ a supermartingale. First, by first multiplying $\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_{m+1}(\delta)}$ and then taking exponential on both sides of Lemma 8,

$$\exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_{m+1}(\delta)} \|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_{m+1}(\delta)} (1 - T_m \kappa') \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \\
 &\quad \times \exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_{m+1}(\delta)} \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, z_{2,m} \right\rangle\right) \times \exp(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_{m+1}(\delta)} C_8 T_m^2) \\
 &\leq \exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} (1 - T_m \kappa') \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \\
 &\quad \times \exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, z_{2,m} \right\rangle\right) \times \exp(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} C_8 T_m^2),
 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that $\{E_m(\delta)\}$ is a decreasing sequence of events. Taking expectation conditioned on \mathcal{F}_m on both sides of the previous inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_{m+1}(\delta)} \|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_m\right] \\
 &\leq \exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} (1 - T_m \kappa') \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \times \exp(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} C_8 T_m^2) \\
 &\quad \times \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, z_{2,m} \right\rangle\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_m\right]. \tag{16}
 \end{aligned}$$

To bound the last term, we will use Hoeffding's lemma. We recall $\mathbb{E}_m[z_{2,m}] = 0$. Additionally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\left| \lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, z_{2,m} \right\rangle \right| \\
 &\leq 2\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m \|z_{2,m}\|_m \tag{Lemma 3} \\
 &\leq 2\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m T_m C_6 (\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m + 1) \tag{Lemma 6} \\
 &\leq 2\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m T_m C_6 (B_m(\delta)^{1/2} + 1). \tag{Definition of } E_m(\delta)
 \end{aligned}$$

Now we can apply Hoeffding's lemma to the last term in (16), which gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \left\langle \nabla \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2, z_{2,m} \right\rangle\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_m\right] \\
 &\leq \exp\left(16\lambda_{m+1}^2 \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 T_m^2 C_6^2 (B_m(\delta)^{1/2} + 1)^2 / 8\right) \\
 &\leq \exp\left(4\lambda_{m+1}^2 \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 T_m^2 C_6^2 (B_m(\delta) + 1)\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Applying this back to (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_{m+1}(\delta)} \|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_m\right] \\
 &\leq \exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 (1 - T_m \kappa' + 4\lambda_{m+1} T_m^2 C_6^2 (1 + B_m(\delta)))\right) \\
 &\quad \times \exp(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} C_8 T_m^2).
 \end{aligned}$$

To simplify notation, define

$$\begin{aligned}
 D_{1,m} &\doteq \frac{\lambda_{m+1}}{\lambda_m} (1 - T_m \kappa' + 4\lambda_{m+1} T_m^2 C_6^2 (1 + B_m(\delta))), \\
 D_{2,m} &\doteq \lambda_{m+1} C_8 T_m^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, the previous inequality reads

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_{m+1}(\delta)} \|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_m\right] \tag{17}$$

$$\leq \exp\left(D_{1,m}\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \exp(D_{2,m} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)}).$$

Next, we bound the terms $D_{1,m}$ and $D_{2,m}$. Since $\lambda_m = \theta T_m^{-1} B_m(\delta)^{-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{1,m} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} &= \frac{\lambda_{m+1}}{\lambda_m} (1 - T_m \kappa' + 4\lambda_{m+1} T_m^2 C_6^2 (1 + B_m(\delta))) \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \\ &= \frac{T_m B_m(\delta)}{T_{m+1} B_{m+1}(\delta)} \left(1 - T_m \kappa' + \frac{4\theta T_m^2 C_6^2 (1 + B_m(\delta))}{T_{m+1} B_{m+1}(\delta)}\right) \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \\ &\leq \frac{T_m}{T_{m+1}} \left(1 - T_m \kappa' + \frac{4\theta T_m^2 C_6^2}{T_{m+1}} \frac{1 + B_m(\delta)}{B_m(\delta)}\right) \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \\ &\leq \frac{T_m}{T_{m+1}} \left(1 - T_m \kappa' + \frac{4\theta T_m^2 C_6^2}{T_{m+1}} \frac{1 + \|w_0 - w_*\|^2}{\|w_0 - w_*\|^2}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{T_m}{T_{m+1}} \left(1 - T_m \kappa' + 8\theta T_m C_6^2 \frac{1 + \|w_0 - w_*\|^2}{\|w_0 - w_*\|^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We recall $C_\alpha > \bar{C}_\alpha = 1/\kappa'$. Select any $\kappa'' \in (1/C_\alpha, \kappa')$ and define $\theta \doteq \frac{\|w_0 - w_*\|^2}{1 + \|w_0 - w_*\|^2} \min\{1, \frac{\kappa' - \kappa''}{8C_6^2}\}$. Then we have

$$D_{1,m} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \leq \frac{T_m}{T_{m+1}} (1 - T_m \kappa'') = \frac{m+4}{m+3} \left(1 - \frac{C_\alpha \kappa''}{m+3}\right).$$

Since $C_\alpha \kappa'' > 1$, it is easy to compute that $D_{1,m} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} < 1$ holds for all m . Now, consider $D_{2,m}$. We have by definition of λ_m that

$$D_{2,m} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} = \frac{\theta C_8 T_m^2}{T_{m+1} B_{m+1}(\delta)} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \leq \frac{\theta C_8 T_m^2}{T_{m+1} \|w_0 - w_*\|^2} \leq 2C_8 T_m.$$

Using the upper bounds we obtained for the terms $D_{1,m}$ and $D_{2,m}$ in (17), we have for any $m \geq m_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_{m+1}(\delta)} \|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_m \right] \\ &\leq \exp\left(D_{1,m} \lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \exp(D_{2,m} \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)}) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \exp(2C_8 T_m). \end{aligned}$$

For $m \geq m_0$, define $Z_m \doteq \exp\left(\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 - 2C_8 \sum_{i=m_0}^{m-1} T_i\right)$. We next show that $\{Z_m\}$ is a supermartingale with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_m\}$. Indeed, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_{m+1} | \mathcal{F}_m] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp\left(\lambda_{m+1} \mathbb{1}_{E_{m+1}(\delta)} \|w_{t_{m+1}} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_m \right] \exp(-2C_8 \sum_{i=m_0}^m T_i) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2\right) \exp(2C_8 T_m) \exp(-2C_8 \sum_{i=m_0}^m T_i) \\ &= Z_m. \end{aligned}$$

For any $\delta' \in (0, 1 - \delta)$, we now construct $B(\delta, \delta')$. By Ville's maximal inequality, we get for any ϵ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr\left(\sup_{m \geq m_0} \exp\left(\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 - 2C_8 \sum_{i=m_0}^{m-1} T_i\right) \geq \exp(\epsilon)\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp\left(\lambda_{m_0} \mathbb{1}_{E_{m_0}(\delta)} \|w_{t_{m_0}} - w_*\|_m^2 - \epsilon\right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\theta T_{m_0}^{-1} B_{m_0}(\delta)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{E_{m_0}(\delta)} \|w_{t_{m_0}} - w_*\|_m^2 - \epsilon \right) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp(\theta T_{m_0}^{-1} - \epsilon) \right] = \exp(\theta T_{m_0}^{-1} - \epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Select ϵ such that $\exp(\theta T_{m_0}^{-1} - \epsilon) = \delta'$, then it holds, with probability at least $1 - \delta'$, that for all $m \geq m_0$,

$$\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 - 2C_8 \sum_{i=m_0}^{m-1} T_i \leq \theta T_{m_0}^{-1} - \ln \delta',$$

implying

$$\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 \leq \theta T_{m_0}^{-1} + \ln(1/\delta') + 2C_8 C_\alpha \ln(m+3).$$

Next, we complete Lemma 11 by removing $\mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)}$ in the LHS of the above inequality. For simplicity of notation, we denote the RHS of the above inequality as $\epsilon(m, m_0, \delta')$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr(\lambda_m \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|^2 \leq \epsilon(m, m_0, \delta'), \forall m \geq m_0) \\ &= \Pr\left(\bigcap_{m=m_0}^{\infty} \{\lambda_m \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|^2 \leq \epsilon(m, m_0, \delta')\}\right) \\ &\geq \Pr\left(\bigcap_{m=m_0}^{\infty} \{\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|^2 \leq \epsilon(m, m_0, \delta')\} \cap E_m(\delta)\right). \end{aligned}$$

To proceed, note that for any two events, A and B , we have

$$\Pr(A \cap B) = 1 - \Pr(A^c \cup B^c) \geq 1 - \Pr(A^c) - \Pr(B^c) = \Pr(A) + \Pr(B) - 1.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr(\lambda_m \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|^2 \leq \epsilon(m, m_0, \delta'), \forall m \geq m_0) \\ &\geq \Pr\left(\bigcap_{m=m_0}^{\infty} \{\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|^2 \leq \epsilon(m, m_0, \delta')\} \cap E_m(\delta)\right) \\ &\geq \Pr\left(\bigcap_{m=m_0}^{\infty} \{\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|^2 \leq \epsilon(m, m_0, \delta')\}\right) + \Pr\left(\bigcap_{m=0}^{\infty} E_m(\delta)\right) - 1 \\ &= \Pr(\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{E_m(\delta)} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|^2 \leq \epsilon(m, m_0, \delta'), \forall m \geq m_0) + \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(E_m(\delta)) - 1 \\ &\geq (1 - \delta') + (1 - \delta) - 1 \\ &= 1 - \delta - \delta'. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definitions of $\epsilon(m, m_0, \delta')$ and λ_m , we arrive at the following result. For any $\delta' \in (0, 1 - \delta)$, it holds, with probability at least $1 - \delta - \delta'$, that for any $m \geq m_0$

$$\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 \leq \frac{T_m B_m(\delta)}{\theta} (\theta T_{m_0}^{-1} + \ln(1/\delta') + 2C_8 C_\alpha \ln(m+3)).$$

Defining C_{11} accordingly then completes the proof. ■

A.13 Proof of Lemma 12

Proof For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we define $B_m(\delta) = C'_{10} m^{C_{10}}$. From Lemma 10, we conclude that

$$\Pr(\|x_m - x^*\|^2 \leq B_m(\delta), \forall m \geq m_0) = 1 \geq 1 - \delta.$$

This lays out the antecedent term in the implication relationship specified in Lemma 11. We define $C_{12} \doteq C_{10} + 1$. Let $\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_{C_{12}} > 0$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^{C_{12}} \delta_i \leq 1$. Repeatedly applying Lemma 11 for C_{12} times, we have that it holds, with probability at least $1 - \sum_{i=1}^{C_{12}} \delta_i$, that for any $m \geq m_0$,

$$\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 \leq T_m^{C_{12}} B_m(\delta) \prod_{i=1}^{C_{12}} C_{11} [\ln(1/\delta_i) + 1 + \ln(m+3)].$$

By choosing $\delta_i = \delta/C_{12}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, C_{12}\}$, the previous inequality reads

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 &\leq C_{11}^{C_{12}} T_m^{C_{12}} B_m(\delta) [\ln(C_{12}/\delta) + 1 + \ln(m+3)]^{C_{12}} \\ &= C_{11}^{C_{12}} C_\alpha^{C_{12}} C'_{10} (m+3)^{-1} [\ln(C_{12}/\delta) + 1 + \ln(m+3)]^{C_{12}}. \end{aligned}$$

Notably, the above inequality holds only for $m \geq m_0$. For $m < m_0$, Lemma 10 gives a trivial almost sure bound that $\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m \leq C'_{10} m_0^{C_{10}}$. To get a bound for all m , we select a constant $C_{12,1}$ such that

$$C_{12,1} \min_{m=0, \dots, m_0} C_{11}^{C_{12}} C_\alpha^{C_{12}} C'_{10} (m+3)^{-1} [\ln C_{12} + 1 + \ln(m+3)]^{C_{12}} > 1.$$

Since $\ln(C_{12}/\delta) \geq \ln C_{12}$, we have

$$C_{12,1} \min_{m=0, \dots, m_0} C_{11}^{C_{12}} C_\alpha^{C_{12}} C'_{10} (m+3)^{-1} [\ln(C_{12}/\delta) + 1 + \ln(m+3)]^{C_{12}} > 1.$$

It then holds that for any $m \geq 0$,

$$\|w_{t_m} - w_*\|_m^2 \leq C'_{10} m_0^{C_{10}} C_{12,1} C_{11}^{C_{12}} C_\alpha^{C_{12}} C'_{10} (m+3)^{-1} [\ln(C_{12}/\delta) + 1 + \ln(m+3)]^{C_{12}}. \quad (18)$$

Defining C'_α accordingly then completes the proof. \blacksquare

A.14 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof We recall that we proceed under Assumption LR2 and have

$$\alpha_t = \frac{C_\alpha}{(t+3) \ln^\nu(t+3)}, \quad T_m = \frac{C_\alpha}{m+3}.$$

The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 1 in Section A.10. Applying the bound in Lemma 12 to (15), we have for any $t \in [t_m, t_{m+1}]$

$$\|w_t - w_*\|^2 \leq 8C_{16} (T_m^2 + C'_{12} \frac{1}{m+3} [\ln(C_{12}/\delta) + 1 + \ln(m+3)]^{C_{12}}).$$

Using the first inequality in (14) and integral approximation (cf. Section A.2), we get

$$C_\alpha \frac{\ln^{1-\nu}(t_{m+1}+3) - \ln^{1-\nu}(t_m+2)}{1-\nu} \geq C_\alpha (\ln(m+3) - \ln(m_0+3))$$

That is $m+3 \leq (m_0+3) \exp\left(\frac{\ln^{1-\nu}(t_{m+1}+1)}{1-\nu}\right)$. Using the second inequality in (14) and integral approximation, we get

$$C_\alpha \frac{\ln^{1-\nu}(t_{m+1}+2) - \ln^{1-\nu}(t_m+3)}{1-\nu} \leq C_\alpha (\ln(m+2) - \ln(m_0+2)) + \sum_{i=m_0}^m C_1 \frac{C_\alpha}{(i+3)^2}.$$

This means that there exists some constant $C_{Th2,1}$ such that $m+2 \geq C_{Th2,1} \exp\left(\frac{\ln^{1-\nu} t_{m+1}}{1-\nu}\right)$. Then for all $m \geq m_0$ and any $t \in [t_m, t_{m+1})$, we have, for some proper constants,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|w_t - w_*\|^2 \\
 & \leq 8C_{16} \left(\frac{C_\alpha^2}{(m+3)^2} + C_{12,1} \frac{1}{m+3} [\ln(C_{12}/\delta) + 1 + \ln(m+3)]^{C_{12}} \right) \\
 & \leq C_{Th2,2} \frac{1}{m+3} \left[\ln(1/\delta) + C_{Th2,3} + \ln(m+3) \right]^{C_{12}} \\
 & \leq C_{Th2,2} \left(C_{Th2,1} \exp\left(\frac{\ln^{1-\nu} t_{m+1}}{1-\nu}\right) \right)^{-1} \left[\ln(1/\delta) + C_{Th2,3} + \ln\left((m_0+3) \exp\left(\frac{\ln^{1-\nu}(t_{m+1})}{1-\nu}\right)\right) \right]^{C_{12}} \\
 & \leq C_{Th2,4} \exp\left(\frac{-\ln^{1-\nu}(t+1)}{1-\nu}\right) \left[\ln(1/\delta) + C_{Th2,5} + \frac{\ln^{1-\nu}}{1-\nu}(t+1) \right]^{C_{12}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For all $t \leq t_{m_0}$, we can use a trivial almost sure bound from (12). Combining the two bounds (cf. (18)) then completes the proof. \blacksquare

A.15 Proof of Corollary 1

Proof For any real random variable X and $p \geq 1$, we have the identity $\mathbb{E}[|X|^p] = \int_0^\infty p\epsilon^{p-1} \Pr(|X| \geq \epsilon) d\epsilon$. For any fixed t , define $\eta \doteq \ln(1/\delta) \in (0, \infty)$. Then Theorem 2 reads

$$\Pr\left(\forall t \geq 0, \|w_t - w_*\|_m^2 \leq a(t)(\eta + b(t))^{C_{12}}\right) \geq 1 - \exp(-\eta).$$

This means for any t and any $\epsilon \geq a(t)b(t)^{C_{12}}$, we have

$$\Pr\left(\|w_t - w_*\|_m^2 \geq \epsilon\right) \leq \exp\left(-(\epsilon/a(t))^{1/C_{12}} + b(t)\right).$$

To bound $\mathbb{E}\left[\|w_t - w_*\|_m^{2p}\right]$, we split the integral into two parts.

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|w_t - w_*\|_m^{2p}\right] = \int_0^\infty p\epsilon^{p-1} \Pr\left(\|w_t - w_*\|_m^2 \geq \epsilon\right) d\epsilon \leq I_1 + I_2,$$

where $I_1 = \int_0^{a(t)b(t)^{C_{12}}} p\epsilon^{p-1} d\epsilon$, and $I_2 = \int_{a(t)b(t)^{C_{12}}}^\infty p\epsilon^{p-1} \Pr\left(\|w_t - w_*\|_m^2 \geq \epsilon\right) d\epsilon$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 I_1 & \leq \int_0^{a(t)b(t)^{C_{12}}} p\epsilon^{p-1} d\epsilon = (a(t)b(t)^{C_{12}})^p, \\
 I_2 & \leq \int_{a(t)b(t)^{C_{12}}}^\infty p\epsilon^{p-1} \exp\left(-(\epsilon/a(t))^{1/C_{12}} + b(t)\right) d\epsilon \\
 & = C_{12} p a(t)^p e^{b(t)} \int_{b(t)}^\infty u^{C_{12}p-1} e^{-u} du \quad \left(\text{change of variable } u = (\epsilon/a(t))^{1/C_{12}}\right) \\
 & \leq C_{12} p a(t)^p e^{b(t)} \Gamma(C_{12}p)
 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we use the definition of the gamma function Γ . Then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|w_t - w_*\|_m^{2p}\right] \leq (a(t)b(t)^{C_{12}})^p + C_{12} p a(t)^p \exp(b(t)) \Gamma(C_{12}p),$$

which completes the proof. \blacksquare

References

- Kristopher De Asis, J. Fernando Hernandez-Garcia, G. Zacharias Holland, and Richard S. Sutton. Multi-step reinforcement learning: A unifying algorithm. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 2018.
- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Remi Munos, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, and Hilbert Kappen. Speedy q-learning. In Advances in neural information processing systems, 2011.
- Carolyn L Beck and Rayadurgam Srikant. Error bounds for constant step-size q-learning. Systems & control letters, 2012.
- Richard Bellman. A markovian decision process. Journal of mathematics and mechanics, 1957.
- Albert Benveniste, Michel Métivier, and Pierre Priouret. Adaptive Algorithms and Stochastic Approximations. Springer, 1990.
- Dimitri P Bertsekas and John N Tsitsiklis. Neuro-Dynamic Programming. Athena Scientific Belmont, MA, 1996.
- Jalaj Bhandari, Daniel Russo, and Raghav Singal. A finite time analysis of temporal difference learning with linear function approximation. In Proceedings of the Conference on Learning Theory, 2018.
- Vivek Borkar, Shuhang Chen, Adithya Devraj, Ioannis Kontoyiannis, and Sean Meyn. The ode method for asymptotic statistics in stochastic approximation and reinforcement learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14427, 2021.
- Vivek S Borkar. Stochastic approximation: a dynamical systems viewpoint. Springer, 2009.
- Siddharth Chandak and Vivek S Borkar. A concentration bound for td (0) with function approximation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10424, 2023.
- Siddharth Chandak, Vivek S Borkar, and Parth Dodhia. Concentration of contractive stochastic approximation and reinforcement learning. Stochastic Systems, 2022.
- Zaiwei Chen, Siva Theja Maguluri, Sanjay Shakkottai, and Karthikeyan Shanmugam. Finite-sample analysis of contractive stochastic approximation using smooth convex envelopes. arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.00874, 2020.
- Zaiwei Chen, Siva Theja Maguluri, Sanjay Shakkottai, and Karthikeyan Shanmugam. A lyapunov theory for finite-sample guarantees of asynchronous q-learning and td-learning variants. arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.01567, 2021.
- Zaiwei Chen, Siva Theja Maguluri, and Martin Zubeldia. Concentration of contractive stochastic approximation: Additive and multiplicative noise. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15740, 2023.

- Edwin KP Chong, I-Jeng Wang, and Sanjeev R Kulkarni. Noise conditions for prespecified convergence rates of stochastic approximation algorithms. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 1999.
- Gal Dalal, Balázs Szörényi, Gugan Thoppe, and Shie Mannor. Finite sample analyses for $td(0)$ with function approximation. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 2018a.
- Gal Dalal, Gugan Thoppe, Balázs Szörényi, and Shie Mannor. Finite sample analysis of two-timescale stochastic approximation with applications to reinforcement learning. In Conference On Learning Theory, 2018b.
- Daniela Pucci De Farias and Benjamin Van Roy. On the existence of fixed points for approximate value iteration and temporal-difference learning. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 2000.
- John C Duchi, Alekh Agarwal, Mikael Johansson, and Michael I Jordan. Ergodic mirror descent. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 2012.
- Alain Durmus, Eric Moulines, Alexey Naumov, Sergey Samsonov, Kevin Scaman, and Hoi-To Wai. Tight high probability bounds for linear stochastic approximation with fixed stepsize. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2021.
- Eyal Even-Dar, Yishay Mansour, and Peter Bartlett. Learning rates for q-learning. Journal of machine learning Research, 2003.
- Antoine Godichon-Baggioni. Estimating the geometric median in hilbert spaces with stochastic gradient algorithms: L_p and almost sure rates of convergence. Journal of Multivariate Analysis, 2016.
- Antoine Godichon-Baggioni. L_p and almost sure rates of convergence of averaged stochastic gradient algorithms: locally strongly convex objective. ESAIM: Probability and Statistics, 2019.
- Abhijit Gosavi. Boundedness of iterates in q-learning. Systems & control letters, 2006.
- Anna Harutyunyan, Marc G Bellemare, Tom Stepleton, and Rémi Munos. $Q(\lambda)$ with off-policy corrections. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory, 2016.
- Nicholas JA Harvey, Christopher Liaw, and Sikander Randhawa. Simple and optimal high-probability bounds for strongly-convex stochastic gradient descent. arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.00843, 2019.
- Elad Hazan and Satyen Kale. Beyond the regret minimization barrier: optimal algorithms for stochastic strongly-convex optimization. The Journal of Machine Learning Research, 2014.
- Tommi Jaakkola, Michael Jordan, and Satinder Singh. Convergence of stochastic iterative dynamic programming algorithms. Advances in neural information processing systems, 1993.

- Rajeeva Laxman Karandikar and Mathukumalli Vidyasagar. Convergence rates for stochastic approximation: Biased noise with unbounded variance, and applications. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 2024.
- Michael Kearns and Satinder Singh. Finite-sample convergence rates for q-learning and indirect algorithms. Advances in neural information processing systems, 1998.
- J. Kiefer and J. Wolfowitz. Stochastic estimation of the maximum of a regression function. Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 1952.
- Nathaniel Korda and Prashanth La. On $\text{td}(0)$ with function approximation: Concentration bounds and a centered variant with exponential convergence. In International conference on machine learning, 2015.
- Michael A Kouritzin and Samira Sadeghi. Convergence rates and decoupling in linear stochastic approximation algorithms. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 2015.
- 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, 2003.
- Harold Kushner and G George Yin. Stochastic approximation and recursive algorithms and applications. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- Chandrashekar Lakshminarayanan and Csaba Szepesvári. Linear stochastic approximation: How far does constant step-size and iterate averaging go? In Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, 2018.
- Caio Kalil Lauand and Sean Meyn. Revisiting step-size assumptions in stochastic approximation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17834, 2024.
- Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. Deep learning. Nature, 2015.
- Donghwan Lee and Niao He. A unified switching system perspective and ode analysis of q-learning algorithms. arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02270, 2019.
- Gen Li, Yuting Wei, Yuejie Chi, Yuantao Gu, and Yuxin Chen. Sample complexity of asynchronous q-learning: Sharper analysis and variance reduction. Advances in neural information processing systems, 2020.
- Gen Li, Changxiao Cai, Yuxin Chen, Yuantao Gu, Yuting Wei, and Yuejie Chi. Tightening the dependence on horizon in the sample complexity of q-learning. In International Conference on Machine Learning, 2021.
- Gen Li, Changxiao Cai, Yuxin Chen, Yuting Wei, and Yuejie Chi. Is q-learning minimax optimal? a tight sample complexity analysis. Operations Research, 2024.
- Yuqing Liang, Dongpo Xu, Naimin Zhang, and Danilo P Mandic. Almost sure convergence of stochastic composite objective mirror descent for non-convex non-smooth optimization. Optimization Letters, 2023.

- Jun Liu and Ye Yuan. On almost sure convergence rates of stochastic gradient methods. In Conference on Learning Theory, 2022.
- Jun Liu and Ye Yuan. Almost sure convergence rates analysis and saddle avoidance of stochastic gradient methods. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 2024.
- Shuze Liu, Shuhang Chen, and Shangdong Zhang. The ODE method for stochastic approximation and reinforcement learning with markovian noise, 2024.
- Hamid Reza Maei. Gradient temporal-difference learning algorithms. PhD thesis, University of Alberta, 2011.
- Wenlong Mou, Koulik Khamaru, Martin J Wainwright, Peter L Bartlett, and Michael I Jordan. Optimal variance-reduced stochastic approximation in banach spaces. arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08518, 2022.
- Rémi Munos, Tom Stepleton, Anna Harutyunyan, and Marc Bellemare. Safe and efficient off-policy reinforcement learning. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2016.
- Ofir Nachum, Yinlam Chow, Bo Dai, and Lihong Li. Dualdice: Behavior-agnostic estimation of discounted stationary distribution corrections. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2019.
- Mariane Pelletier. On the almost sure asymptotic behaviour of stochastic algorithms. Stochastic processes and their applications, 1998.
- LA Prashanth, Nathaniel Korda, and Remi Munos. Concentration bounds for temporal difference learning with linear function approximation: the case of batch data and uniform sampling. Machine Learning, 2021.
- Doina Precup, Richard S. Sutton, and Satinder P. Singh. Eligibility traces for off-policy policy evaluation. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning, 2000.
- Martin L Puterman. Markov decision processes: discrete stochastic dynamic programming. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- Guannan Qu and Adam Wierman. Finite-time analysis of asynchronous stochastic approximation and q -learning. In Conference on Learning Theory, 2020.
- Alexander Rakhlin, Ohad Shamir, and Karthik Sridharan. Making gradient descent optimal for strongly convex stochastic optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1109.5647, 2011.
- Herbert Robbins and Sutton Monro. A stochastic approximation method. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 1951.
- Herbert Robbins and David Siegmund. A convergence theorem for non negative almost supermartingales and some applications. In Optimizing methods in statistics. 1971.

- Othmane Sebbouh, Robert M Gower, and Aaron Defazio. [rob-bins1951stochastic,benveniste1990mp,kushner2003stochastic,borkar2009stochasticalmost sure convergence rates for stochastic gradient descent and stochastic heavy ball](#). In Conference on Learning Theory, 2021.
- Devavrat Shah and Qiaomin Xie. Q-learning with nearest neighbors. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2018.
- Rayadurgam Srikant and Lei Ying. Finite-time error bounds for linear stochastic approximation and td learning. In Proceedings of the Conference on Learning Theory, 2019.
- Richard S. Sutton. Learning to predict by the methods of temporal differences. Machine Learning, 1988.
- Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction (2nd Edition). MIT press, 2018.
- Richard S. Sutton, Csaba Szepesvári, and Hamid Reza Maei. A convergent $o(n)$ temporal-difference algorithm for off-policy learning with linear function approximation. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2008.
- Richard S. Sutton, Hamid Reza Maei, Doina Precup, Shalabh Bhatnagar, David Silver, Csaba Szepesvári, and Eric Wiewiora. Fast gradient-descent methods for temporal-difference learning with linear function approximation. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning, 2009.
- Csaba Szepesvári. The asymptotic convergence-rate of q-learning. Advances in neural information processing systems, 1997.
- Vladislav B. Tadic. On the almost sure rate of convergence of temporal-difference learning algorithms. IFAC Proceedings Volumes, 2002.
- Vladislav B Tadic. On the almost sure rate of convergence of linear stochastic approximation algorithms. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 2004.
- Matus Telgarsky. Stochastic linear optimization never overfits with quadratically-bounded losses on general data. In Conference on Learning Theory, 2022.
- Gugan Thoppe and Vivek S Borkar. A concentration bound for stochastic approximation via alekseev’s formula. arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.08657, 2015.
- John N Tsitsiklis. Asynchronous stochastic approximation and q-learning. Machine learning, 1994.
- John N. Tsitsiklis and Benjamin Van Roy. Analysis of temporal-difference learning with function approximation. In IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 1996.
- M Vidyasagar. Convergence of stochastic approximation via martingale and converse lyapunov methods. Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems, 2023.

- Martin J Wainwright. Stochastic approximation with cone-contractive operators: Sharp L_∞ -bounds for q -learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.06265, 2019.
- Christopher JCH Watkins and Peter Dayan. Q-learning. Machine Learning, 1992.
- Christopher John Cornish Hellaby Watkins. Learning from delayed rewards. PhD thesis, King’s College, Cambridge, 1989.
- Simon Weissmann, Sara Klein, Waïss Azizian, and Leif Döring. Almost sure convergence rates of stochastic gradient methods under gradient domination, 2024.
- Shangdong Zhang, Bo Liu, and Shimon Whiteson. GradientDICE: Rethinking generalized offline estimation of stationary values. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning, 2020a.
- Shangdong Zhang, Bo Liu, Hengshuai Yao, and Shimon Whiteson. Provably convergent two-timescale off-policy actor-critic with function approximation. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning, 2020b.
- Shangdong Zhang, Yi Wan, Richard S. Sutton, and Shimon Whiteson. Average-reward off-policy policy evaluation with function approximation. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning, 2021.
- Shangdong Zhang, Remi Tachet des Combes, and Romain Laroche. Global optimality and finite sample analysis of softmax off-policy actor critic under state distribution mismatch. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 2022.
- Shangdong Zhang, Remi Tachet Des Combes, and Romain Laroche. On the convergence of sarsa with linear function approximation. In International Conference on Machine Learning, 2023.
- Wanrong Zhu, Zhipeng Lou, and Wei Biao Wu. Beyond sub-gaussian noises: Sharp concentration analysis for stochastic gradient descent. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 2022.
- Shaofeng Zou, Tengyu Xu, and Yingbin Liang. Finite-sample analysis for SARSA with linear function approximation. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2019.