

# Uncertainty quantification for Markov chains with application to temporal difference learning

Weichen Wu\*      Yuting Wei†      Alessandro Rinaldo‡

February 20, 2025

## Abstract

Markov chains are fundamental to statistical machine learning, underpinning key methodologies such as Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling and temporal difference (TD) learning in reinforcement learning (RL). Given their widespread use, it is crucial to establish rigorous probabilistic guarantees on their convergence, uncertainty, and stability. In this work, we develop novel, high-dimensional concentration inequalities and Berry-Esseen bounds for vector- and matrix-valued functions of Markov chains, addressing key limitations in existing theoretical tools for handling dependent data. We leverage these results to analyze the TD learning algorithm, a widely used method for policy evaluation in RL. Our analysis yields a sharp high-probability consistency guarantee that matches the asymptotic variance up to logarithmic factors. Furthermore, we establish a  $O(T^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log T)$  distributional convergence rate for the Gaussian approximation of the TD estimator, measured in convex distance. These findings provide new insights into statistical inference for RL algorithms, bridging the gaps between classical stochastic approximation theory and modern reinforcement learning applications.

## Contents

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>   | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>High-dimensional concentration and Berry-Esseen bounds on Markov chains</b>    | <b>4</b>  |
| 2.1      | Matrix Hoeffding’s inequality on Markov chains . . . . .                          | 4         |
| 2.2      | Berry-Esseen bounds on vector-valued martingales . . . . .                        | 5         |
| 2.3      | Uncertainty quantification for martingales generated from Markov chains . . . . . | 6         |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Application to TD learning with linear function approximation</b>              | <b>8</b>  |
| 3.1      | TD learning with linear function approximation . . . . .                          | 8         |
| 3.2      | Convergence and Berry-Essen bounds for TD estimator . . . . .                     | 9         |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Discussion and future directions</b>   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>A</b> | <b>Preliminary facts</b>  | <b>14</b> |
| A.1      | Markov chain basics . . . . .   | 14        |
| A.2      | Algebraic facts . . . . .   | 16        |
| A.3      | Other basic facts . . . . .   | 20        |

\*The Voleon Group, Berkeley, CA 94704 USA.

†Department of Statistics and Data Science, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.

‡Department of Statistics and Data Sciences, University of Texas, Austin TX 78705, USA.

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>B Proof of theoretical results regarding general Markov chains</b>           | <b>21</b> |
| B.1 Proof of Theorem 1  | 21        |
| B.2 Proof of Corollary 1  | 25        |
| B.3 Proof of Theorem 2  | 25        |
| B.4 Proof of Corollary 2  | 29        |
| B.5 Proof of Corollary 3  | 31        |
| B.6 Proof of Corollary 4  | 31        |
| <b>C Proof of results regarding TD learning</b>                                 | <b>35</b> |
| C.1 $L^2$ convergence of the TD estimation error                                | 36        |
| C.2 High-probability convergence guarantee for the original TD estimation error | 41        |
| C.3 Proof of Theorem 3  | 47        |
| C.4 Proof of Theorem 4  | 52        |
| C.5 Proof of Relation (21)  | 58        |
| <b>D Proof of supportive lemmas and propositions</b>                            | <b>58</b> |
| D.1 Proof of Proposition 4  | 58        |
| D.2 Proof of Lemma 10   | 59        |
| D.3 Proof of Proposition 5  | 61        |
| D.4 Proof of Equation (68)  | 63        |
| D.5 Proof of Lemma 11   | 64        |

## 1 Introduction

Markov chains are important tools in statistical machine learning for modeling dependent data. They provide a theoretical framework for analyzing sequential algorithms, are fundamental to MCMC sampling, Hidden Markov Models, and Reinforcement Learning (RL), and are widely used in a multitude of high-stakes applications, including NLP, finance, biology, and AI systems.

Given their widespread use, it is crucial to provide rigorous probabilistic guarantees on the convergence, stability, and error bounds of Markovian sequences. Uncertainty quantification is essential for assessing the reliability, robustness, and generalizability of machine learning models built on Markov chains. For example, in MCMC sampling, precise uncertainty quantification ensures reliable convergence diagnostics and variance estimation, preventing misleading inferences in Bayesian models. In RL, uncertainty estimation for value functions helps balance exploration and exploitation, leading to more stable decision-making. Similarly, understanding uncertainty in reverse stochastic processes improves sample quality and diversity in diffusion-based generative models.

In this paper, we are concerned with uncertainty quantification for the temporal difference (TD) learning algorithm, a widely used method for value function estimation in RL [Sutton and Barto, 2018], assuming Markovian data. TD learning is an instance of stochastic approximation [Robbins and Monro, 1951], designed to solve fixed-point equations via randomized approximations of residuals. In recent years, largely motivated by the diffusion and success of RL applications, there have been significant advancements in statistical inference techniques for Markov chain-based algorithms in RL; see, e.g., Bhandari et al. [2021], Mou et al. [2020], Fan et al. [2021], Li et al. [2021], Samsonov et al. [2023, 2024], Srikant [2024]. These results can be broadly classified into two categories: (i) non-asymptotic bounds on the discrepancy between the algorithm’s output and the target quantity, and (ii) non-asymptotic distributional guarantees, such as Berry-Esseen bounds, which measure how fast the sequence of estimators converges to the limiting distribution. However, when it comes to providing tight, non-asymptotic characterizations of general functions of Markov chains — an essential task in analyzing and calibrating machine learning procedures — existing theoretical tools have limited scope and applicability, at least compared to the tools available for handling independent data. Our goal in this paper is to derive novel concentration bounds and Berry-Esseen bounds for vector- and matrix-valued functions of Markov chains and to exemplify their uses for tackling the crucial problem of value function estimation in RL.

**Summary of the contributions.** We make two types of theoretical contributions. First, we derive new high-dimensional finite sample approximations to Markov data and martingale processes in discrete time that are of broad applicability.

- In Theorem 1 and Corollary 1, we derive powerful matrix Hoeffding inequalities for discrete-time Markov chains that generalize existing results in the literature [see, e.g. Garg et al., 2018, Qiu et al., 2020] by allowing for infinite state space, time-dependent functions, and arbitrary tolerance levels. Remarkably, when applied to univariate Markov chains, our bound nearly matches the optimal bound of Fan et al. [2021].
- In Theorem 2 and Corollary 2, we obtain novel high-dimensional Berry-Esseen bounds in Wasserstein distance for normalized sums of discrete time vector-valued martingales with deterministic variance exhibiting dependence on the sample size  $n$  of order  $O(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log n)$ . We establish this bound by refining and extending a proof strategy recently put forward by Srikant [2024].
- Leveraging the aforementioned results, we study martingales generated from Markov chains, a dependency structure that arises naturally in reinforcement learning algorithms but may be of independent interest. Corollary 3 and Corollary 4 establish matrix Bernstein type inequality and high-dimensional Berry-Esseen bound for these sequences respectively.

Secondly, we establish rates of consistency and distributional approximations to the output of the TD learning algorithm (with Polyak-Ruppert averaging and polynomial step-size), arguably the most popular methodology for policy evaluation using linear approximations in reinforcement learning, with Markovian sequences of length  $T$ . Specifically,

- Theorem 3 gives a high-probability bound on the Euclidean norm of the estimation error of the TD learning algorithm featuring a sample dependence of order  $T^{-1/2}$ , up to log factors, and an optimal dependence on the asymptotic variance;
- Theorem 4 provides a high-dimensional Berry-Esseen bound for the TD estimator in the convex distance with a sample dependence of order  $O(T^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log T)$ .

Both results are highly novel and do not have direct counterparts in the RL literature, which has, for the most part, focused on independent samples; see Section 3 for a discussion of relevant work.

**Notation.** Throughout the paper, we use boldface small letters to denote vectors and boldface capital letters to denote matrices. For any vector  $\mathbf{x}$ , we let  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2$  be its  $L_2$  norm; for any matrix  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{M})$  denotes its trace,  $\det(\mathbf{M})$  its determinant,  $\|\mathbf{M}\|$  its spectral norm (i.e., the largest singular value), and  $\|\mathbf{M}\|_F$  its Frobenius norm, i.e.,  $\|\mathbf{M}\|_F = \sqrt{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{M})}$ . For any  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{S}^{d \times d}$ , set of all  $d \times d$  real symmetric matrices, we use  $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{M}) = \lambda_1(\mathbf{M}) \geq \lambda_2(\mathbf{M}) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d(\mathbf{M}) = \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{M})$  to indicate its eigenvalues. For sequences  $\{f_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{g_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  of numbers, we write  $f_t \lesssim g_t$ , or  $f_t = O(g_t)$ , to signify that there exists a quantity  $C > 0$  independent of  $t$  such that  $f_t \leq Cg_t$  for all  $t$ . We will use the notation  $\tilde{C}$  to express a quantity independent of  $T$ , the number of iterations/sample size, but possibly dependent on other problem-related parameters.

For two measures  $\mu, \nu$  on the same measurable space  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ , if  $\nu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mu$ , we use  $\frac{d\nu}{d\mu}$  to denote its Radon-Nykodin derivative with respect to  $\mu$ . For any measurable function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and any number  $p > 1$ , we set  $\|f\|_{\mu, p}^p := \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |f(\mathbf{x})|^p d\mu(\mathbf{x})$ . This definition can also be extended to the case of  $p = \infty$ , by defining  $\|f\|_{\mu, \infty} = \text{ess sup } |f|$ , the essential supremum of  $|f|$  with respect to  $\mu$ . To simplify the notation, when  $p = 2$ , we write  $\|f\|_{\mu} := \|f\|_{\mu, 2}$ .

We will consider the following measure of distance between two probability distributions  $P, Q$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ : the *Total Variance distance*  $d_{\text{TV}}(P, Q) := \sup_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_d} |P(\mathcal{A}) - Q(\mathcal{A})|$ , where  $\mathcal{B}_d$  represents the class of all Borel sets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ; the *convex distance*  $d_C(P, Q) := \sup_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}_d} |P(\mathcal{A}) - Q(\mathcal{A})|$ , where  $\mathcal{C}_d$  represents the class of all convex subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ; the *Wasserstein distance*  $d_W(P, Q) := \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}_1} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim P}[h(\mathbf{x})] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim Q}[h(\mathbf{x})]|$ , where  $\text{Lip}_1$  represents the class of all 1-Lipchitz functions from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ ; and the *Smooth Wasserstein distance*  $d_2(P, Q) := \sup_{h \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim P}[h(\mathbf{x})] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim Q}[h(\mathbf{x})]|$ , where  $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  represents the class of all twice-differentiable functions from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . It can be easily verified by definition that  $d_{\text{TV}} \leq d_C$  and  $d_2 \leq d_W$ .

## 2 High-dimensional concentration and Berry-Esseen bounds on Markov chains

In this section, we present our main results for uncertainty quantification of Markov chains. Section 2.1 focuses on generalized and improved concentration inequalities for matrix-valued functions, while Section 2.2 focuses on multi-variate Berry-Esseen bounds on martingales. Section 2.3 applies these results to the case where the martingale is generated from a Markov chain.

Throughout the paper, we consider a Markov chain  $\{s_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  with state space  $\mathcal{S}$ , transition kernel  $P$  and a *unique stationary distribution*, denoted as  $\mu$ . It can be guaranteed that any positive recurrent, irreducible and aperiodic Markov chain admits this property. Furthermore, let  $\lambda$  denote the *spectral expansion* of the Markov chain, and assume throughout the *spectral gap condition*  $1 - \lambda > 0$ . We refer the reader to Appendix A.1 for background on Markov chains. Notably, the theoretical results in this paper does *not* require the Markov chain to be reversible.

### 2.1 Matrix Hoeffding's inequality on Markov chains

In this section, we present a new matrix Hoeffding's inequality for sums of matrix-valued functions on Markov chains. Matrix Hoeffding's inequality, offering finite sample bounds for the spectral norm of sums of bounded random matrices, is a powerful and widely used result in statistics, machine learning and computer science. Initially developed for the sum of independent random matrices [see, e.g., Tropp, 2011, Oliveira, 2010], it has been recently generalized [Garg et al., 2018, Qiu et al., 2020] to the case where the matrices are generated from a Markov chain. Our first theorem provides an extension and improvement of these results. See Appendix B.1 for the proof.

**Theorem 1.** *[Matrix Hoeffding's inequality for Markov Chains] Consider a Markov chain  $\{s_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  with a unique stationary distribution  $\mu$  and a spectral gap  $1 - \lambda > 0$ . Let  $\{\mathbf{F}_i\}_{i \in [n]}$  be a sequence of matrix-valued functions from the state space  $\mathcal{S}$  to  $\mathbb{S}^{d \times d}$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu}[\mathbf{F}_i(s)] = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\|\mathbf{F}_i(s)\| \leq M_i$  almost surely for every  $i \in [n]$ . Then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , it can be guaranteed that when  $s_1 \sim \mu$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right\| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq 2d^{2-\frac{\pi}{4}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1-\lambda}{20} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^2 \frac{n^2 \varepsilon^2}{\sum_{j=1}^n M_j^2}\right\}. \quad (1)$$

It is noteworthy that the right-hand-side of the above expression depends on the dimension  $d$  through  $d^{2-\frac{\pi}{4}}$ , a worse dependence than for independent matrices [see, e.g., Tropp, 2011, Theorem 5.2]. The exponent  $2 - \frac{\pi}{4}$  stems from an application of a multi-matrix Golden-Thompson inequality due to Garg et al. [2018]. We refer readers to inequality (47) in Appendix B.1. Indeed, the proof of this theorem follows the framework developed by Garg et al. [2018] and Qiu et al. [2020] but makes improvements on multiple fronts. Firstly, our proof is presented in the language of measure theory, thus allowing for infinite state spaces; secondly, we implement novel recursive algebraic analysis to obtain a tighter Hoeffding's inequality for *arbitrary tolerance level*  $\varepsilon$ , instead of  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , and *time-dependent* functions  $\{\mathbf{F}_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ , instead of a *time-invariant* function  $\mathbf{F}$  throughout the steps  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

It is also important to point out that Theorem 1 implies that, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\left\|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{1}{1-\lambda} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n M_j^2}{n} \log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (2)$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , where, here and throughout the paper,  $\lesssim$  indicates weak inequality up to universal constants. In the scalar case, i.e. when  $d = 1$ , our result agrees, albeit with a worse dependence on the constant and on  $\lambda$ , with Theorem 1 in Fan et al. [2021], which provides a sharp Hoeffding's inequality for averages of scalar functions on Markov chains. This is an indication that our bound is not loose.

In order to generalize Theorem 1 to non-stationary Markov chains, we impose the following assumption on the distribution of the initial state, denoted as  $\nu$ .

**Assumption 1.** *The probability measure  $\nu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the stationary distribution  $\mu$ ; furthermore, assume that there exists  $p \in (1, \infty]$ , such that the Radon-Nykodin derivative of  $\nu$  with respect to  $\mu$  satisfies  $\left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} < \infty$ .*

We also let  $q \in [1, \infty)$  denote the conjugate of  $p$ , i.e.  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$  when  $p < \infty$  and  $q = 1$  if  $p = \infty$ . For simplicity, we say  $\nu$  satisfies Assumption 1 with parameters  $(p, q)$  if these conditions hold true. The following corollary generalizes Theorem 1 to the case where  $s_1$ , the first state of the Markov chain, is not generated from the stationary distribution  $\mu$  but rather from a distribution  $\nu$  satisfying Assumption 1.

**Corollary 1.** *Assume the conditions of Theorem 1 and that  $s_1 \sim \nu$ , where  $\nu$  is a probability measure on the state space  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfying Assumption 1 with parameters  $(p, q)$ . Then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i) \right\| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq 2d^{2-\frac{\pi}{4}} \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1-\lambda}{20q} \left( \frac{\pi}{4} \right)^2 \frac{n^2 \varepsilon^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n M_k^2} \right\}.$$

This corollary follows directly from Theorem 1 and Holder's inequality. See Appendix B.2 for details. As an application, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , we have that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i) \right\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{q}{1-\lambda} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n M_j^2}{n} \log \left( \frac{d}{\delta} \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} \right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (3)$$

Comparing the above bound with the analogous one for stationary Markovian sequences (see 2), we observe that for a non-stationary Markov chain, the upper bound is larger by a factor of  $\sqrt{q}$  and an additional factor in the logarithm term that reflects the difference between the starting distribution  $\nu$  and the stationary distribution  $\mu$ . Of course, when  $\nu = \mu$ , then  $\frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \equiv 1$  and we can take  $p = \infty$  and  $q = 1$ , so that  $\left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} = 1$ , and the bound (3) coincides with (2).

## 2.2 Berry-Esseen bounds on vector-valued martingales

In our next result, we derive novel high-dimensional Berry-Esseen bounds for vector-valued martingales in terms of the Wasserstein distance. See Appendix B.3 for the proof.

**Theorem 2.** *[Berry-Esseen bound on vector-valued martingales] Let  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k=1}^n$  be a martingale difference process in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with respect to the filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}_{k=0}^n$ . For every  $k \in [n]$ , define*

$$\mathbf{V}_k := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}], \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}_k := \sum_{j=k}^n \mathbf{V}_j.$$

Furthermore, define

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mid \mathcal{F}_0],$$

and assume that

$$\mathbf{P}_1 = n\mathbf{\Sigma}_n \quad \text{almost surely.} \quad (4)$$

Then for any  $d$ -dimensional symmetric positive semi-definite matrix  $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ , it can be guaranteed that

$$\begin{aligned} d_W \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{x}_k, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_n) \right) &\lesssim \frac{(2 + \log(d\|(n\mathbf{\Sigma}_n + \mathbf{\Sigma})\|))^+}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| (\mathbf{P}_k + \mathbf{\Sigma})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k \right\|_2^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} [\text{Tr}(\log(n\mathbf{\Sigma}_n + \mathbf{\Sigma})) - \log(\mathbf{\Sigma})] + \sqrt{\frac{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma})}{n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Let us compare this result with analogous ones in the literature. When  $d = 1$ , Theorem 2 agrees with Theorem 2.1 of Röllin [2018], aside from logarithmic factors, by letting

$$\Sigma_n = s_n^2/n, \quad P_k = \rho_k^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma = a^2.$$

In this sense, Theorem 2 may be regarded as a multivariate generalization of the univariate bound of Theorem 2.1 of Röllin [2018]. Next, Theorem 2 bears similarities with Theorem 1 of Anastasiou et al. [2019], also concerned with Gaussian approximations of multivariate martingale sequences. Our result offers a different but arguably more general guarantee because it establishes convergence in the weaker Wasserstein distance instead of the  $d_2$  distance. We believe that these are meaningful improvements, since the Wasserstein distance can be directly related to the convex distance [Nourdin et al., 2021], which, in turn, is more amenable to statistical inference.

Our strategy to prove Theorem 2 above is heavily inspired by the recent, very interesting pre-print by Srikant [2024], which deploys Stein’s method and Lindeberg swapping. We refine the approach of Srikant [2024] in the following ways: firstly, we addressed a gap in their proof if assumption (4) does not hold; secondly, we obtained a tighter bound on the smoothness of the solution to the multivariate Stein’s equation, which may be of independent interest; see Proposition 5 in Appendix B.3 and compare it to Proposition 2.2 and 2.3 in Gallouët et al. [2018b]. The following corollary offers a useful simplification of our upper bound under a slightly stronger condition; see Appendix B.4 for the proof.

**Corollary 2.** *Under the settings of Theorem 2, further assume there exists a uniform constant  $M > 0$ , such that for any matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and any  $k \in [n]$ , it satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \leq M \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right]. \quad (6)$$

Then,

$$d_W \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{x}_k, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_n) \right) \lesssim [M(2 + \log(dn\|\Sigma_n\|))]^+ + 1 \Big] \frac{d \log n}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\text{Tr}(\Sigma_n)}{n}}.$$

Corollary 2 should be compared with Corollary 2.3 in Röllin [2018] when  $d = 1$ , and Corollary 3 in Anastasiou et al. [2019], valid in multivariate settings but for the stronger  $d_2$  distance. In establishing our bound, we have lifted the requirement on the conditional third momentum of  $\mathbf{x}_k$  and addressed a potential gap in the proof of Corollary 3 of Anastasiou et al. [2019].

## 2.3 Uncertainty quantification for martingales generated from Markov chains

In this section, we leverage the results presented above to investigate a specific structure of sample dependency arising when a matrix- or vector-valued function sequence is *both a martingale difference and generated from a Markov chain*. The study of dependent data of this type is motivated by our analysis of TD learning, but it can also be of independent interest as it applies to MCMC algorithms. Specifically, we consider functions  $\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  that satisfy the following assumption.

**Assumption 2.** *For every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s)} \mathbf{F}(s, s') = \mathbf{0}$ .*

Notice that when a sequence of functions  $\{\mathbf{F}_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  with the same dimensions all satisfy Assumption 2, it can be guaranteed that  $\{\mathbf{F}_i(s_{i-1}, s_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  is a martingale, and hence better statistical properties can be derived.

The next result presents a Bernstein-style convergence guarantee on matrix-valued functions satisfying Assumption 2.

**Corollary 3.** *[Matrix Bernstein’s inequality on martingales generated from Markov chains] Consider a Markov chain  $\{s_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  with a unique stationary distribution  $\mu$  and a spectral gap  $1 - \lambda > 0$ . Let  $\{\mathbf{F}_i\}_{i \in [n]}$  be a sequence of functions mapping from  $\mathcal{S}^2$  to  $\mathbb{S}^{d \times d}$ , satisfying Assumption 2 and such that  $\|\mathbf{F}_i(s, s')\| \leq M$  for every  $i \in [n]$  and  $s, s' \in \mathcal{S}$ . Further define*

$$\Sigma_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu, s' \sim P(\cdot|s)} [\mathbf{F}_i(s, s') \mathbf{F}_i^\top(s, s')]. \quad (7)$$

Let  $\nu$  denote a probability distribution on  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfying Assumption 1 with parameters  $(p, q)$ . Then for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , it can be guaranteed that, when  $s_0 \sim \nu$ ,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_{i-1}, s_i) \right\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|}{n} \log \frac{d}{\delta}} + \frac{\sqrt{q}M}{(1-\lambda)^{\frac{1}{4}} n^{\frac{3}{4}}} \log^{\frac{3}{4}} \left( \frac{d}{\delta} \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} \right) + \frac{M}{n} \log \frac{d}{\delta}, \quad (8)$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

To establish Corollary 3, whose proof is in Appendix B.5, we first deploy matrix Freedman's inequality, which gives an upper bound that is dependent on the *conditional* covariance matrix

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{F}_i \mathbf{F}_i^\top \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1}].$$

However, the above quantity is not measurable with respect to the trivial  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{F}_0$ . Thus, we control the difference between  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$  using Corollary 1, which leads to the first two terms in the upper bound (8). Notice that the second and third terms on the right hand side of (8) both converge faster than  $n^{-1/2}$ , so Theorem 3 shows that when measured by spectral norm, the sample mean of the sequence  $\{\mathbf{F}_i\}$  converges to  $\mathbf{0}$  by a rate determined by  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$  with high probability. This bound plays a key role in our analysis of TD learning in Section 3 and can be potentially used to understand the concentration of other machine learning algorithms.

The following result, which is a corollary to Theorem 2, presents a multi-dimensional Berry-Esseen bound on vector-valued functions satisfying Assumption 2. See Appendix B.6 for the proof.

**Corollary 4.** [High-dimensional Berry-Esseen bound on martingales generated from Markov chains] Consider a Markov chain  $\{s_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  with a unique stationary distribution  $\mu$  and a spectral gap  $1 - \lambda > 0$ . Let  $\{\mathbf{f}_i\}_{i \in [n]}$  be a sequence of functions from  $\mathcal{S}^2$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying Assumption 2 and such that  $\|\mathbf{f}_i(s, s')\|_2 \leq M_i \leq M$  for all  $s, s' \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $i \in [n]$ . Further define

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu, s' \sim P(\cdot|s)} [\mathbf{f}_i(s, s') \mathbf{f}_i^\top(s, s')], \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{M} = \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n M_i^4}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Assume that  $\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n) \geq c$  for a constant  $c > 0$ . For simplicity, we also assume that  $M \geq 1$  and that  $d\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| \geq 1$ .<sup>1</sup> Let  $\nu$  denote a probability distribution on  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfying Assumption 1 with parameters  $(p, q)$ . Then, when  $s_0 \sim \nu$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{\mathcal{C}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{f}_i(s_{i-1}, s_i), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n) \right) \\ & \lesssim \left\{ \bar{M} \left( \frac{q}{1-\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( d \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} \right) \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{\bar{M}} \log^{\frac{1}{2}}(d\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|) \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{4}} \right\} \sqrt{dn}^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log n. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

For readability, in the above expression we have omitted a lower-order term depending on the lower bound  $c$  on  $\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)$ ; see equation (75) in Appendix B.6. To the best of our knowledge, Corollary 4 presents the first high-dimensional Berry-Esseen bound on Markov chain-induced martingales in the convex distance. This distance is amenable for constructing confidence regions/sets, which would not be possible using the Wasserstein distance. There are a number of notable differences between the conditions of Corollary 4 and Corollary 2: Firstly, Corollary 4 does *not* use the restrictive condition (4), which demands a deterministic conditional variance, but instead only requires the martingale to be generated from a Markov chain with good mixing property, which means  $\mathbf{P}_1$  is *close to*  $n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$  with high probability. Secondly, Theorem 4 requires that the norm of  $\mathbf{f}_i$ 's be *uniformly bounded*, which is strictly stronger than (6), as required by Corollary 2.

<sup>1</sup>These assumptions are made for ease of presentation, and are not essential.

In order to demonstrate how the Berry-Esseen bound in Corollary 4 depends on problem-related quantities, consider the scenario in which  $\mathbf{f}_1 = \mathbf{f}_2 = \dots = \mathbf{f}_n = \mathbf{f}$ , and  $M_1 = M_2 = \dots = M_n = M$ . Then, in this case,

$$\Sigma_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{s_0 \sim \mu} \left[ \mathbf{f}_i(s_{i-1}, s_i) \mathbf{f}_i^\top(s_{i-1}, s_i) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu, s' \sim P(\cdot | s)} [\mathbf{f}(s, s') \mathbf{f}^\top(s, s')] =: \Sigma,$$

and  $\overline{M} = M$ . Therefore, (9) implies that

$$d_C \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{f}(s_{i-1}, s_i), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma) \right) \lesssim \left( \frac{q}{1-\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( d \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} \right) M \|\Sigma\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{dn}^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log n.$$

We remark that the dependence on  $d$  appears both explicitly in the  $\sqrt{d}$  term, and implicitly in the  $\|\Sigma\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $M$  terms.

The proof of Corollary 4 is inspired by the arguments developed by Röllin [2018] to relax Assumption (4) in the uni-dimensional case, recently extended to the multivariate setting in Cattaneo et al. [2022, Lemma B.8] and Belloni and Oliveira [2018, Theorem 2.1]. Specifically, we construct an auxiliary martingale satisfying (4), and apply Corollary 2 to derive a Berry-Esseen bound. At the same time, we bound the difference between the target martingale and this auxiliary martingale by Corollary 1. Finally, we combine these bounds using the properties of Gaussian distributions, as well as the relationship between convex distance and Wasserstein distance. See Appendix B.6.

### 3 Application to TD learning with linear function approximation

In the second part of the paper, we apply our results to study the properties of the TD learning algorithm with linear function approximation under Markovian samples in RL settings. We begin by introducing some background on TD learning; see, e.g., Sutton and Barto [2018].

#### 3.1 TD learning with linear function approximation

Consider a Markov Reward Process (MRP), where a Markov chain on a state space  $\mathcal{S}$  is associated with a *reward function*  $r : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  that maps each state to a reward. We observe a sequence of state-reward pairs,

$$(s_0, r_0), \dots, (s_t, r_t), \dots$$

where, for each  $t$ ,  $r_t = r(s_t)$  and  $s_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot | s_t)$ . The task of *value function* evaluation concerns with estimating a function  $V : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where for every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$V(s) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t) \right].$$

Here,  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  denotes a discounted factor of future rewards towards the current state. In practice, the state space  $\mathcal{S}$  used to describe the environment's configuration is often prohibitively large, making it necessary to consider various approximations of  $V$ . The most simple and tractable form of approximation is the linear function approximation, which has received considerable attention in literature; see, e.g., Bhandari et al. [2021], Patil et al. [2023], Dalal et al. [2018], Li et al. [2024], Samsonov et al. [2023, 2024], Wu et al. [2024]. Specifically, the value function  $V$  of a policy is approximated by the linear function

$$V_{\theta}(s) := \phi(s)^\top \theta, \quad s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (10)$$

for a set of feature maps  $\phi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and a linear coefficient vector  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Throughout the paper, we assume that  $\|\phi(s)\|_2 \leq 1$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Recall that we use  $\mu$  to denote the stationary distribution of the



Markov chain. The optimal coefficient vector, denoted as  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ , is defined by the projected Bellman equation [Tsitsiklis and Van Roy, 1997], which admits the fixed point equation

$$\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \mathbf{b}, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\mathbf{A} := \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu, s' \sim P(\cdot|s)} \left[ \boldsymbol{\phi}(s) (\boldsymbol{\phi}(s) - \gamma \boldsymbol{\phi}(s'))^\top \right] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{b} := \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu} \left[ \boldsymbol{\phi}(s) r(s) \right] \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (12)$$

Below we indicate  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  as the feature gram matrix, i.e.

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} := \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu} \left[ \boldsymbol{\phi}(s) \boldsymbol{\phi}^\top(s) \right], \quad (13)$$

and use  $\lambda_\Sigma$  and  $\lambda_0$  to denote its largest and smallest eigenvalues respectively. We assume  $\lambda_0 > 0$ .

**The TD learning algorithm.** Stochastic approximation (SA) is a standard tool to solve the fixed point equation problems of the form (11) given a sequence of random observations  $\{(\mathbf{A}_t, \mathbf{b}_t)\}_{t \geq 1}$ . When specialized to the above setting, it is referred to as the Temporal Difference (TD) learning algorithm [Sutton, 1988]. Specifically, given a sequence of pre-selected step size  $\{\eta_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  and an initial estimator  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ , TD proceeds using the updating rule

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_t = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1} - \eta_t (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1} - \mathbf{b}_t), \quad (14)$$

where

$$\mathbf{A}_t := \boldsymbol{\phi}(s_{t-1}) (\boldsymbol{\phi}(s_{t-1}) - \gamma \boldsymbol{\phi}(s_t))^\top \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{b}_t := \boldsymbol{\phi}(s_{t-1}) r_{t-1}. \quad (15)$$

After  $T$  iterations, we deploy Polyak-Ruppert averaging [Polyak and Juditsky, 1992, Ruppert, 1998] and compute

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\theta}_t, \quad (16)$$

as the estimator for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ . In this work, we follow the precedent of Polyak and Juditsky [1992], Ruppert [1998] and choose *polynomial-decaying* stepsizes  $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  with  $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ .

### 3.2 Convergence and Berry-Essen bounds for TD estimator

It is known from results on stochastic approximations that, in fixed dimensions, the TD estimator with polynomial-decaying stepsizes and Polyak-Ruppert averaging  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T$  satisfies the central limit theorem (CLT) [see, e.g., Fort, 2015, Mou et al., 2020, Li et al., 2023]

$$\sqrt{T}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*),$$

with asymptotic covariance matrix  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*$

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^* = \mathbf{A}^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}} \mathbf{A}^{-\top}, \quad (17)$$

where  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}$  is the time-averaging covariance matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}} &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{Var}_{s_0 \sim \mu, s_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot|s_t)} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top] + \sum_{t=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)(\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t)^\top + (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t)(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top]. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

However, the above results are asymptotic in nature and do not explicitly reveal the dependence on the dimension and other problem-related quantities. A line of recent work has made headway toward this goal, attaining non-asymptotic distributional characterization of the TD procedure. Nonetheless, most of the literature has focused on the independent setting where each  $(\mathbf{A}_t, \mathbf{b}_t)$  pair is an independent and identically distributed random variable [see, e.g., [Mou et al., 2020](#), [Wu et al., 2024](#), [Samsonov et al., 2024](#)]. To describe our results, throughout this section, we make the additional assumption that the Markov chain mixes exponentially fast, a standard condition in finite sample analyses of Markovian data.

**Assumption 3.** *There exists constants  $m > 0, \rho \in (0, 1)$ , such that for every positive integer  $t$ ,*

$$\sup_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_{\text{TV}}(P^t(\cdot | s), \mu) \leq m\rho^t.$$

We remark that, under this assumption, for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , the corresponding *mixing time*

$$t_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) := \min\{t : \sup_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_{\text{TV}}(P^t(\cdot | s), \mu) \leq \varepsilon\}, \quad (19)$$

satisfies the bound

$$t_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) \leq \frac{\log(m/\varepsilon)}{\log(1/\rho)}. \quad (20)$$

**Theorem 3.** [*High-probability convergence of TD estimator*] *Consider TD with Polyak-Ruppert averaging (3.1) with Markov samples and decaying stepsizes  $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-\alpha}$  for  $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ . Suppose that the Markov transition kernel has a unique stationary distribution, has a positive spectral gap, mixes exponentially as indicated by Assumption 3, and starts from a distribution satisfying Assumption 1. Then for every tolerance level  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , there exists  $\eta_0 = \eta_0(\delta)$  such that*

$$\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2^2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\text{Tr}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*)}{T} \log \frac{d}{\delta}} + o\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \log^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{d}{\delta}}\right),$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

Theorem 3, proved in Appendix C.3, establishes the first high-probability convergence guarantee for the TD estimation error with Markov samples that matches the asymptotic variance  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*/T$  up to a log factor. It may be regarded as the Markovian counterpart of Theorem 3.1 in [Wu et al. \[2024\]](#), which focuses on the TD estimation error with *independent* samples under the same settings.

Our analysis of the TD estimation error borrows tools and ideas from several previous contributions, starting from the seminal work of [Polyak and Juditsky \[1992\]](#) and including some of the most recent results; see, e.g., [Li et al. \[2023\]](#), [Samsonov et al. \[2024\]](#), [Srikant \[2024\]](#). In particular, we apply the induction technique of [Srikant and Ying \[2019\]](#), [Li et al. \[2024\]](#) and [Wu et al. \[2024\]](#), developed for TD learning with *independent* samples. The generalization from independent to Markov samples is highly nontrivial, and the novel theoretical results obtained in the first part of the paper, especially the newly-established matrix Bernstein inequality for Markovian martingales (Corollary 3), play a critical role in our analysis.

**Dependence on problem-related quantities.** We point out that the initial stepsize  $\eta_0$  depends on the probability tolerance level  $\delta$  as well as other problem-related quantities, as specified in Eq. (102) in Appendix C.2. Though not ideal, this dependence also appears in the independent setting in [[Wu et al., 2024](#), Theorem 3.1], who further argues that it is unavoidable. It is also notable that the choice of  $\eta_0$  does *not* depend on the sample size  $T$ , as is the case in [Samsonov et al. \[2023\]](#), who also considers TD with Markov samples, though with a *time-invariant* stepsize choice. The upper bound in Theorem 3 depends on various problem-related quantities, including the mixing speed of the Markov chain (specifically, the mixing factor  $\rho$  and the spectral gap  $1 - \lambda$ ), the discount factor  $\gamma$ , the initial stepsize  $\eta_0$ , the feature covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  and the time-averaging variance matrix of the TD error,  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}$ . These intricate dependencies impact the higher-order (in  $T$ ) reminder terms, which is not shown in our bound but can be tracked in our proofs.

In our next and final result, we give a novel high-dimensional Berry-Esseen bound for the TD estimator assuming Markovian data.

**Theorem 4.** *[Berry-Esseen bound for TD estimator] Consider TD with Polyak-Ruppert averaging (3.1) with Markov samples and decaying stepsizes  $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-\frac{3}{4}}$ , where  $\eta_0 < \frac{1}{2\lambda_S}$ . Suppose that the Markov transition kernel has a unique stationary distribution, has a positive spectral gap, mixes exponentially as indicated by Assumption 3, and is initiated from a distribution  $\nu$  satisfying Assumption 1. Further assume that  $\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\mathbf{\Gamma}}) > 0$ . Then when  $T$  is sufficiently large<sup>2</sup>,*

$$d_C(\sqrt{T}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*)) \lesssim \tilde{C}T^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log T + o(T^{-\frac{1}{4}}),$$

where  $\tilde{C}$  is a problem-related quantity independent of  $T$ , with exact form shown in Appendix C.4.

In a nutshell, Theorem 4, whose proof is given in Appendix C.4, ensures that the rescaled TD estimator with Polyak-Ruppert averaging converges to its Gaussian limit at a rate of  $T^{-1/4} \log T$  (holding all other parameters fixed) with respect to the convex distance. The dependence on the feature dimension  $d$ , as well as other problem-related parameters, is unwieldy and thus not given explicitly in the statement of the theorem. However, in principle it can be tracked through the various steps of the proof.

The closest contribution to ours, and indeed the impetus for some of our work, is the recent excellent paper by Srikant [2024], which claims the bound

$$d_W(\sqrt{T}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*)) \lesssim O(T^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log T).$$

In our analysis, we have filled in the gaps in some of their arguments concerning vector-valued martingales and their application to TD learning, while also strengthening the bound from Wasserstein to convex distance. Other recent and directly relevant contributions by Samsonov et al. [2024] and Wu et al. [2024] have also produced high-dimensional Berry-Esseen bound for TD learning with *independent samples*, with Wu et al. [2024] claiming the the state-of-the-art rate (in  $T$ ) of  $O(T^{-\frac{1}{3}})$ . Though it remains to be seen whether the rate of convergence of order  $O(T^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log T)$  for Markovian data that we obtain in Theorem 4 is sharp, the generalization from independent to Markov samples is nonetheless highly nontrivial and, we believe, significant. In any case, we are able to show in Appendix C.5 that, for any  $\alpha > \frac{3}{4}$  and when  $T$  is sufficiently large,

$$d_C(\sqrt{T}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*)) \gtrsim \Theta(T^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log T), \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \left(\frac{3}{4}, 1\right), \quad (21)$$

a partial clue that our rate might in fact be optimal.

## 4 Discussion and future directions

In this paper, we derive a novel matrix Hoeffding concentration inequality for Markov chains and a novel high-dimensional Berry-Esseen bound for martingales in the Wasserstein distance. We apply these results to obtain state-of-the-art finite sample convergence guarantees and Gaussian approximations for TD learning with Markovian observation. While this work addresses a wide range of theoretical problems, it also points to several directions for future research. First, it is of interest to further tighten the dependence on  $d$  in the matrix Hoeffding’s inequality of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1; secondly, a more favorable, polylogarithmic dependence in  $d$  in the Berry-Esseen bound in Corollary 4 should be expected under the Kolmogorov distance; see [Kojevnikov and Song \[2022\]](#). In regards to other applications, beyond TD learning, Corollaries 3 and 4 provide powerful tools for analyzing the statistical properties of other Markov chain-based ML algorithms like MCMC, stochastic approximation and Q-learning. Finally, closing the gap between the  $O(T^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log T)$  rate in the Berry-Esseen bound for TD with Markov data in Theorem 4 and the  $O(T^{-\frac{1}{3}})$  rate for its independent-sample counterpart is also worth exploring.

<sup>2</sup>The exact constraint on  $T$  is indicated in (44) in the Appendix.

## Acknowledgement

W. Wu and A.Rinaldo are supported in part by NIH under Grant R01 NS121913. Y. Wei is supported in part by the NSF grants CCF-2106778, CCF-2418156 and CAREER award DMS-2143215.

## References

- Andreas Anastasiou, Krishnakumar Balasubramanian, and Murat A. Erdogdu. Normal approximation for stochastic gradient descent via non-asymptotic rates of martingale clt, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.02130>.
- Alexandre Belloni and Roberto I. Oliveira. A high dimensional central limit theorem for martingales, with applications to context tree models, 2018.
- Jalaj Bhandari, Daniel Russo, and Raghav Singal. A finite time analysis of temporal difference learning with linear function approximation. *Operations Research*, 69(3):950–973, 2021.
- Eric A. Carlen. Trace inequalities and quantum entropy: An introductory course. 2009. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:15417540>.
- Matias D. Cattaneo, Ricardo P. Masini, and William G. Underwood. Yurinskii’s coupling for martingales, 2022.
- 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*, volume 32, 2018.
- Luc Devroye, Abbas Mehrabian, and Tommy Reddad. The total variation distance between high-dimensional gaussians. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.08693*, 2018.
- Jianqing Fan, Bai Jiang, and Qiang Sun. Hoeffding’s inequality for general markov chains and its applications to statistical learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(139):1–35, 2021. URL <https://jmlr.org/papers/v22/19-479.html>.
- Gersende Fort. Central limit theorems for stochastic approximation with controlled markov chain dynamics. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 19:60–80, 2015.
- Thomas Gallouët, Guillaume Mijoule, and Yvik Swan. Regularity of solutions of the stein equation and rates in the multivariate central limit theorem, 2018a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.01720>.
- Thomas Gallouët, Guillaume Mijoule, and Yvik Swan. Regularity of solutions of the stein equation and rates in the multivariate central limit theorem, 2018b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.01720>.
- Ankit Garg, Yin Tat Lee, Zhao Song, and Nikhil Srivastava. A matrix expander chernoff bound, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.03864>.
- Denis Kojevnikov and Kyungchul Song. A berry–esseen bound for vector-valued martingales. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 186:109448, 2022.
- Gen Li, Yuting Wei, Yuejie Chi, Yuantao Gu, and Yuxin Chen. Sample complexity of asynchronous q-learning: Sharper analysis and variance reduction. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(1): 448–473, 2021.
- Gen Li, Weichen Wu, Yuejie Chi, Cong Ma, Alessandro Rinaldo, and Yuting Wei. High-probability sample complexities for policy evaluation with linear function approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, pages 1–1, 2024. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2024.3394685.
- Xiang Li, Jiadong Liang, and Zhihua Zhang. Online statistical inference for nonlinear stochastic approximation with markovian data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07690*, 2023.

- Wenlong Mou, Chris Junchi Li, Martin J Wainwright, Peter L Bartlett, and Michael I Jordan. On linear stochastic approximation: Fine-grained polyak-ruppert and non-asymptotic concentration. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2947–2997. PMLR, 2020.
- Fedor Nazarov. On the maximal perimeter of a convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with respect to a gaussian measure. In *Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis: Israel Seminar 2001-2002*, pages 169–187. Springer, 2003.
- Ivan Nourdin, Giovanni Peccati, and Xiaochuan Yang. Multivariate normal approximation on the wiener space: new bounds in the convex distance, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.02188>.
- Roberto Oliveira. Sums of random Hermitian matrices and an inequality by Rudelson. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 15(none):203 – 212, 2010. doi: 10.1214/ECP.v15-1544. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/ECP.v15-1544>.
- Gandharv Patil, LA Prashanth, Dheeraj Nagaraaj, and Doina Precup. Finite time analysis of temporal difference learning with linear function approximation: Tail averaging and regularisation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 5438–5448. PMLR, 2023.
- Boris T Polyak and Anatoli B Juditsky. Acceleration of stochastic approximation by averaging. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, 30(4):838–855, 1992.
- Jiezhong Qiu, Chi Wang, Ben Liao, Richard Peng, and Jie Tang. A matrix chernoff bound for markov chains and its application to co-occurrence matrices, 2020.
- Herbert Robbins and Sutton Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 400–407, 1951.
- David Ruppert. Efficient estimators from a slowly converging robbins-monro process. Technical report, 1998.
- Adrian Röllin. On quantitative bounds in the mean martingale central limit theorem. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 138:171–176, July 2018. ISSN 0167-7152. doi: 10.1016/j.spl.2018.03.004. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.spl.2018.03.004>.
- Sergey Samsonov, Daniil Tiapkin, Alexey Naumov, and Eric Moulines. Finite-sample analysis of the temporal difference learning, 2023.
- Sergey Samsonov, Eric Moulines, Qi-Man Shao, Zhuo-Song Zhang, and Alexey Naumov. Gaussian approximation and multiplier bootstrap for polyak-ruppert averaged linear stochastic approximation with applications to td learning, 2024.
- R. Srikant. Rates of convergence in the central limit theorem for markov chains, with an application to td learning, 2024.
- Rayadurgam Srikant and Lei Ying. Finite-time error bounds for linear stochastic approximation and td learning. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2803–2830. PMLR, 2019.
- Richard S Sutton. Learning to predict by the methods of temporal differences. *Machine learning*, 3(1):9–44, 1988.
- Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- Joel A. Tropp. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 12(4):389–434, August 2011. ISSN 1615-3383. doi: 10.1007/s10208-011-9099-z. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10208-011-9099-z>.
- John Tsitsiklis and Benjamin Van Roy. An analysis of temporal-difference learning with function approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 42(5):674–690, 1997.
- Weichen Wu, Gen Li, Yuting Wei, and Alessandro Rinaldo. Statistical inference for temporal difference learning with linear function approximation, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.16106>.

# A Preliminary facts

## A.1 Markov chain basics

### A.1.1 Stationary distribution and corresponding norm

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  denote the state space of the Markov chain, which we assumed throughout to be a Borel space, and let  $\mathcal{F}$  denote the corresponding Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. For every  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ , the *transition kernel*  $P(x, \cdot)$  is a probability measure on  $\mathcal{S}$  defined as

$$P(x, B) = \mathbb{P}(s_2 \in B \mid s_1 = x), \quad B \in \mathcal{F}$$

which is guaranteed to be a regular conditional distribution. By definition, the *stationary distribution*  $\mu$  is a probability distribution on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$  satisfying

$$\mu(B) = \int_{y \in \mathcal{S}} P(y, B) \mu(dy), \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{F}.$$

For a vector-valued function  $\mathbf{g} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , we use  $\mu(\mathbf{G})$  to denote  $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu}[\mathbf{g}(x)]$ , if well-defined. Furthermore, for simplicity, we use  $\mathbf{g}^{\parallel}$  and  $\mathbf{g}^{\perp}$  to denote the functions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}^{\parallel}(x) &= \mu(\mathbf{g}), \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{g}^{\perp}(x) &= \mathbf{g}(x) - \mathbf{g}^{\parallel}(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{S}, \end{aligned}$$

provided that  $\mu(\mathbf{g})$  exists. We denote with  $L_2(\mu)$  the space of Borel functions  $\mathbf{f} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\int_{\mathcal{S}} \|\mathbf{f}(x)\|^2 \mu(dx) < \infty$ . Then,  $L_2(\mu)$  is a Hilbert space, with *inner product* given by

$$\langle \mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2 \rangle_{\mu} = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{g}_1^{\top}(x) \mathbf{g}_2(x) \mu(dx), \quad \mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2 \in L_2(\mu),$$

which, in turn, induces the  $\mu$ -norm

$$\|\mathbf{g}\|_{\mu} = \left( \int \|\mathbf{g}(x)\|_2^2 \mu(dx) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \mathbf{g} \in L_2(\mu).$$

Note that, for a fixed vector  $\mathbf{v}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mu}$  reduces to the Euclidean norm  $\|\mathbf{v}\|_2$ . We shall interchange these two ways of writing for ease of exposition.

To the transition kernel  $P$  admitting a stationary distribution  $\mu$  there corresponds a bounded linear operator, denoted as  $\mathcal{P}$ , which maps a vector-valued function  $\mathbf{g} \in L_2(\mu)$  to another vector-valued function in  $L_2(\mu)$ , denoted as  $\mathcal{P}\mathbf{g}$ , given by

$$x \in \mathcal{S} \mapsto \mathcal{P}\mathbf{g}(x) = \int_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{g}(y) P(x, dy) = \mathbb{E}_{s_2 \sim P(\cdot | s_1)}[\mathbf{g}(s_2) \mid s_1 = x],$$

where, with a slight abuse of notation, we write  $P(\cdot \mid s_1)$  for  $P(s_1, \cdot)$ . Correspondingly, the *adjoint operator*, denoted as  $\mathcal{P}^*$ , is a bounded operator mapping a vector valued function  $\mathbf{g} \in L_2(\mu)$  to another vector-valued function in  $L_2(\mu)$ , denoted as  $\mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g}$  such that

$$\langle \mathcal{P}\mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2 \rangle_{\mu} = \langle \mathbf{g}_1, \mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g}_2 \rangle_{\mu}. \tag{22}$$

The *adjoint transition kernel*  $P^*$  is the transition kernel (regular conditional probability) satisfying

$$\int_A \mu(dx) P^*(x, B) = \int_B P(y, A) \mu(dy), \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Accordingly,  $\mathcal{P}^*$  maps any  $\mathbf{g} \in L_2(\mu)$  to a new function  $\mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g} \in L_2(\mu)$  given by

$$x \in \mathcal{S} \mapsto \mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g}(x) = \int_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{g}(y) P^*(x, dy) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}(s_1) \mid s_2 = x],$$

and condition (22) can be equivalently expressed as

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} \mu(dx) P^*(x, dy) \mathbf{f}^\top(x) \mathbf{g}(y) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \mu(dy) P(y, dx) \mathbf{f}^\top(x) \mathbf{g}(y), \quad \forall \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \in L_2(\mu).$$

A Markov chain is called *self-adjoint*, or *reversible*, if  $P = P^*$  or, equivalently, if  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^*$ .

Finally, with a minor abuse of notation, for every measure  $\nu$  on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$ , we use  $\mathcal{P}\nu$  to denote the measure defined by

$$\mathcal{P}\nu(B) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} P(y, B) \nu(dy), \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{F}.$$

By definition, the stationary distribution  $\mu$  satisfies  $\mathcal{P}\mu = \mu$ .

### A.1.2 Spectral expansion

For a Markov chain with transition kernel  $P$  and unique stationary distribution  $\mu$ , let  $\mathcal{L}_2$  denote the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{L}_2 := \{g : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \|g\|_\mu < \infty\}.$$

The *spectral expansion* of the Markov chain is defined as

$$\lambda = \lambda(P) := \sup_{g \in \mathcal{L}_2, \mu(g)=0} \frac{\|\mathcal{P}g\|_\mu}{\|g\|_\mu}.$$

We now present some properties of the spectral expansion.

**Proposition 1.** *For any Markov chain with transition kernel  $P$ , as long as the spectral expansion  $\lambda(P)$  and the adjoint transition kernel  $P^*$  are both well-defined, it can be guaranteed that*

$$\lambda(P) = \lambda(P^*).$$

*Proof.* Define  $\Pi$  as the projection of any function onto the subspace of constant functions:

$$\Pi g(x) := \mu(g), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{S}.$$

It is easy to verify that  $\lambda(P)$  is equal to the operator norm of  $\mathcal{P} - \Pi$ , and that  $\lambda(P^*)$  is equal to the operator norm of  $\mathcal{P}^* - \Pi$ . Furthermore, the operators  $\mathcal{P} - \Pi$  and  $\mathcal{P}^* - \Pi$  are adjoint. Therefore, the proposition follows from the facts that adjoint operators have the same spectrum in Hilbert spaces.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.** *For any dimension  $d$ , and  $\mathbf{g} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , it can be guaranteed that as long as  $\mu(\mathbf{g}) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\|\mathbf{g}\|_\mu < \infty$ ,*

$$\|\mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g}\|_\mu \leq \lambda \|\mathbf{g}\|_\mu$$

*Proof.* This property is easy to verify by representing  $\mathbf{g} = \{g_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.** *For any  $\mathbf{g} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , if  $\mu(\mathbf{g}) = \mathbf{0}$ , then  $\mu(\mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g}) = \mathbf{0}$  and therefore  $\|\mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g}\|_\mu \leq \lambda \|\mathbf{g}\|_\mu$ .*

*Proof.* By definition,  $\mu(\mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g})$  is featured by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g}) &= \int_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g}(x) \mu(dx) \\ &= \int_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \left[ \int_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{g}(y) \frac{P(y, dx)}{\mu(dx)} \mu(dy) \right] \mu(dx) \\ &= \int_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{g}(y) \left[ \int_{x \in \mathcal{S}} P(y, dx) \right] \mu(dy) \\ &= \int_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{g}(y) \mu(dy) = \mu(\mathbf{g}) = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,  $\|\mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g}\|_\mu \leq \lambda \|\mathbf{g}\|_\mu$  follows from Proposition 2.  $\square$

As a direct corollary of Proposition 3, it is easy to verify that  $(\mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g})^\parallel = \mathbf{g}^\parallel$  and  $(\mathcal{P}^*\mathbf{g})^\perp = \mathcal{P}^*(\mathbf{g}^\perp)$ .

## A.2 Algebraic facts

**Supplementary notation.** For any complex number  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , we use  $\text{Re}(z)$  to denote its real part. If a matrix  $\mathbf{M}$  is positive (semi-)definite, i.e.  $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{M}) > (\geq) 0$ , we write  $\mathbf{M} \succ (\succeq) \mathbf{0}$ ; when two matrices  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  satisfy  $\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Y} \succ (\succeq) \mathbf{0}$ , we write  $\mathbf{X} \succ (\succeq) \mathbf{Y}$  or equivalently  $\mathbf{Y} \prec (\preceq) \mathbf{X}$ . For a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we use  $\{x_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq d}$  to denote its entries; for a matrix  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , we use  $\{X_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n}$  to denote its entries. The *vectorization* of matrix  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , denoted as  $\text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$ , is defined as a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^{mn}$  with entries  $[\text{vec}(\mathbf{X})]_{(i-1)m+j} = X_{ij}$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . For any matrices  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , and  $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ , their *Kronecker product*, denoted as  $\mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{Y}$ , is a matrix of the size of  $mp \times nq$ , and can be written in blocked form as

$$\mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} X_{11}\mathbf{Y} & X_{12}\mathbf{Y} & \dots & X_{1n}\mathbf{Y} \\ X_{21}\mathbf{Y} & X_{22}\mathbf{Y} & \dots & X_{2n}\mathbf{Y} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ X_{m1}\mathbf{Y} & X_{m2}\mathbf{Y} & \dots & X_{mn}\mathbf{Y} \end{bmatrix}.$$

With subscripts, it can be represented as  $(\mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{Y})_{(i-1)m+j, (k-1)p+\ell} = X_{ik}Y_{j\ell}$ .

### A.2.1 General algebraic theorems

**Theorem 5.** *[Properties of the Kronecker product] The following properties hold:*

- (1) Let  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{W}$  be four matrices such that the matrix products  $\mathbf{XZ}$  and  $\mathbf{YW}$  are well-defined. Then  $(\mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{Y})(\mathbf{Z} \otimes \mathbf{W}) = (\mathbf{XZ}) \otimes (\mathbf{YW})$ ;
- (2) As a direct consequence of (1), let  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and  $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ , then  $\mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{I}_p)(\mathbf{I}_n \otimes \mathbf{Y})$ ;
- (3) For any matrices  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}$ ,  $(\mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{Y})^\top = \mathbf{X}^\top \otimes \mathbf{Y}^\top$ ;
- (4) For any matrices  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$  and  $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times n}$ , it can be guaranteed that  $(\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B})\text{vec}(\mathbf{Z}) = \text{vec}(\mathbf{YZX}^\top)$ ;
- (5) As a direct consequence of (4), let  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{I}_m \otimes \mathbf{y})\text{vec}(\mathbf{X})$ ;
- (6) Also as a direct consequence of (5), let  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , then  $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{XY}^\top) = [\text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d)]^\top (\mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{Y}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d)$ ;
- (7) For any  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , it can be guaranteed that  $\exp(\mathbf{X}) \otimes \exp(\mathbf{Y}) = \exp(\mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d^2} + \mathbf{I}_{d^2} \otimes \mathbf{Y})$ .

**Theorem 6.** *For any positive definite functions  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{S}^{d \times d}$ , it can be guaranteed that*

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^{-1}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})) \leq \text{Tr}(\log(\mathbf{A}) - \log(\mathbf{B})).$$

*Proof.* This conclusion is a direct application of the Klein's inequality (see, for example, Theorem 2.11 of Carlen [2009]), which states that

$$\text{Tr}(f(\mathbf{A}) - f(\mathbf{B}) - (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})^\top f'(\mathbf{A})) \geq 0 \quad (23)$$

for any concave function  $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , on the concave function  $f(x) = \log x$ . For the specific definition of  $f(\mathbf{X})$  where  $\mathbf{X}$  is a positive semidefinite matrix, and the proof of the inequality (23), we refer the readers to Carlen [2009].  $\square$

### A.2.2 Properties of the matrices involved in the paper regarding TD learning

In this section, we present several useful algebraic results, most of which were established by Wu et al. [2024]. The following lemma reveals several critical algebraic features of the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ .

**Lemma 1.** *[Lemma A.4 of Wu et al. [2024]] Let  $\mathbf{A}_t, \mathbf{A}$  be defined as in (15) and (12) respectively, and  $\Sigma$  be defined as in (13) with  $\lambda_0$  and  $\lambda_\Sigma$  being its smallest and largest eigenvalues. Then the following features hold:*

$$2(1 - \gamma)\Sigma \preceq \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A}^\top \preceq 2(1 + \gamma)\Sigma; \quad (24)$$



$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq d} \operatorname{Re}(\lambda_i(\mathbf{A})) \geq (1 - \gamma)\lambda_0; \quad (25)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_t^\top \mathbf{A}_t] \leq \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A}^\top; \quad (26)$$

$$\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \preceq \lambda_\Sigma(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A}^\top); \quad (27)$$

$$\|\mathbf{I} - \eta \mathbf{A}\| \leq 1 - \frac{1 - \gamma}{2} \lambda_0 \eta, \quad \forall \eta \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2\lambda_\Sigma}\right); \quad (28)$$

$$\|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_0(1 - \gamma)}. \quad (29)$$

Notice that the bound (29) directly implies that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\| \|\mathbf{b}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_0(1 - \gamma)}. \quad (30)$$

**Lemma 2.** [Lemma A.5 of Wu et al. [2024]] For any matrix  $\mathbf{E} \succeq \mathbf{0}$ , there exists a unique positive definite matrix  $\mathbf{X} \succeq \mathbf{0}$ , such that

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{X}\mathbf{A}^\top = \mathbf{E}.$$

Furthermore, it can be guaranteed that

$$\|\mathbf{X}\| \leq \frac{1}{2(1 - \gamma)\lambda_0} \|\mathbf{E}\|, \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{X}) \leq \frac{1}{2(1 - \gamma)\lambda_0} \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{E}).$$

The following lemma further features the compressive power of the matrix  $\prod_{k=1}^t (\mathbf{I} - \eta_k \mathbf{A})$ .

**Lemma 3.** [Lemma A.6 of Wu et al. [2024]] Assume that  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  and  $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ . Let  $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-\alpha}$  for all positive integer  $t$ , then the following inequalities hold:

$$t^\alpha \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) \leq e \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}; \quad (31)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^t i^{-\nu} \prod_{k=i+1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) \leq \frac{1}{\nu - 1} \left(\frac{2(\nu - \alpha)}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{\nu - \alpha}{1 - \alpha}} t^{\alpha - \nu}, \quad \forall \nu \in (1, \alpha + 1]; \quad (32)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^t i^{-2\alpha} \prod_{k=i+1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) = \frac{1}{\beta} t^{-\alpha} + o(t^{-\alpha}); \quad (33)$$

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq t} i^{-\alpha} \prod_{k=i+1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) \leq e \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} t^{-\alpha}. \quad (34)$$

**Lemma 4.** [Lemma A.7 of Wu et al. [2024]] For every  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and sufficiently large  $T$ , it can be guaranteed that

$$t^{-\alpha} \sum_{j=t}^T \prod_{k=t+1}^j (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) < 3 \left(\frac{2}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, \quad \text{and} \quad (35)$$

$$t^{-\alpha} \sum_{j=t}^{\infty} \prod_{k=t+1}^j (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) - \frac{1}{\beta} \lesssim \left(\frac{1}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right) t^{\alpha-1}. \quad (36)$$

**Lemma 5.** [Lemma A.8 of Wu et al. [2024]] Let  $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-\alpha}$  with  $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and  $0 \leq \eta_0 \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda_\Sigma}$ . For every  $t \in [T]$ , define  $\mathbf{Q}_t$  as

$$\mathbf{Q}_t = \eta_t \sum_{j=t}^T \prod_{k=t+1}^j (\mathbf{I} - \eta_k \mathbf{A}) \quad (37)$$

Then for any positive integer  $\ell < T$ , the following relation hold:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{Q}_t - \mathbf{A}^{-1}) = -\mathbf{A}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^T \prod_{k=1}^j (\mathbf{I} - \eta_k \mathbf{A}), \quad (38a)$$

Furthermore, there exist a sequence of matrix  $\{\mathbf{S}_t\}_{1 \leq t \leq T}$ , such that the difference between  $\mathbf{Q}_t$  and  $\mathbf{A}^{-1}$  can be represented as

$$\mathbf{Q}_t - \mathbf{A}^{-1} = \mathbf{S}_t - \mathbf{A}^{-1} \prod_{k=t}^T (\mathbf{I} - \eta_k \mathbf{A}), \quad (38b)$$

in which  $\mathbf{S}_t$  is independent of  $T$ , and its norm is bounded by

$$\|\mathbf{S}_t\| \lesssim \eta_0 \Gamma \left( \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \right) \left( \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)\lambda_0\eta_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} t^{\alpha-1}. \quad (38c)$$

**Lemma 6.** [Lemma A.10 of Wu et al. [2024]] Let  $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-\alpha}$  with  $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and  $0 \leq \eta \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda_\Sigma}$ . For  $\mathbf{Q}_t$  defined as in (37), it can be guaranteed that

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_t\| \leq 3\eta_0^{-\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \left( \frac{4\alpha}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, \quad \forall t \in [T]; \quad (39)$$

$$\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}_t\| \leq 2 + \eta_0 \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \Gamma \left( \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \right) t^{\alpha-1}; \quad \text{and} \quad (40)$$

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{Q}_t - \mathbf{A}^{-1}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} T^{\alpha-1} + \tilde{C} T^{2\alpha-2} \quad (41)$$

where  $\beta = \frac{1-\gamma}{2} \lambda_0 \eta_0$  and  $\tilde{C}$  depends on  $\alpha, \eta_0, \lambda_0, \gamma$ .

The following lemma bounds the norms and trace of the time-averaging variance matrix  $\tilde{\Gamma}$ .

**Lemma 7.** Under Assumption 3, when  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  is defined as in (18), it can be guaranteed that

$$\|\tilde{\Gamma}\| \leq \|\tilde{\Gamma}\|_{\text{F}} \leq \text{Tr}(\tilde{\Gamma}) \leq \left( 1 + \frac{2m}{1-\rho} \right) (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 \lesssim \frac{m}{1-\rho} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \right)^2.$$

*Proof.* The first two inequalities follow directly from the fact that  $\tilde{\Gamma}$ , a variance-covariance matrix, is positive semi-definite; the last inequality follows directly from (30). It now boils down to proving that

$$\text{Tr}(\tilde{\Gamma}) \leq \left( 1 + \frac{2m}{1-\rho} \right) (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1).$$

For every integer  $\ell > 1$ , we firstly use the iteration of expectations to derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr}(\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)(\mathbf{A}_{\ell+1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_{\ell+1})^\top]) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0 \sim \mu, s_1 \sim P(\cdot|s_0), s_\ell \sim P^{\ell-1}(\cdot|s_1), s_{\ell+1} \sim P(\cdot|s_\ell)} [(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top (\mathbf{A}_{\ell+1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_{\ell+1})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0 \sim \mu, s_1 \sim P(\cdot|s_0)} [\mathbb{E}_{s_\ell \sim P^{\ell-1}(\cdot|s_1)} [\mathbb{E}_{s_{\ell+1} \sim P(\cdot|s_\ell)} (\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top (\mathbf{A}_{\ell+1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_{\ell+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_1]]; \end{aligned}$$

meanwhile, by definition,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{s_\ell \sim \mu} [\mathbb{E}_{s_{\ell+1} \sim P(\cdot|s_\ell)} (\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top (\mathbf{A}_{\ell+1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_{\ell+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_1] \\ &= (\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top \mathbb{E}_{s_\ell \sim \mu, s_{\ell+1} \sim P(\cdot|s_\ell)} [\mathbf{A}_{\ell+1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_{\ell+1}] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the basic property of TV distance and Assumption 3 guarantees

$$\mathbb{E}_{s_\ell \sim P^{\ell-1}(\cdot|s_1)} [\mathbb{E}_{s_{\ell+1} \sim P(\cdot|s_\ell)} (\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top (\mathbf{A}_{\ell+1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_{\ell+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_1]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (\mathbb{E}_{s_\ell \sim P^{\ell-1}(\cdot | s_1)} - \mathbb{E}_{s_\ell \sim \mu}) [\mathbb{E}_{s_{\ell+1} \sim P(\cdot | s_\ell)} [(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top (\mathbf{A}_{\ell+1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_{\ell+1}) | \mathcal{F}_1]] \\
&\leq d_{\text{TV}}(P^{\ell-1}(\cdot | s_1), \mu) \cdot \sup_{s_\ell \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{s_{\ell+1} \sim P(\cdot | s_\ell)} [(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top (\mathbf{A}_{\ell+1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_{\ell+1}) | \mathcal{F}_1] \\
&\leq m\rho^{\ell-1} \cdot (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By taking expectations with regard to  $s_0$  and  $s_1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Tr}(\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)(\mathbf{A}_{\ell+1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_{\ell+1})^\top]) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{s_0 \sim \mu, s_1 \sim P(\cdot | s_0)} [\mathbb{E}_{s_\ell \sim P^{\ell-1}(\cdot | s_1)} [\mathbb{E}_{s_{\ell+1} \sim P(\cdot | s_\ell)} (\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top (\mathbf{A}_{\ell+1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_{\ell+1}) | \mathcal{F}_1]] \\
&\leq m\rho^{\ell-1} \cdot (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence by definition, the trace of  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}$  is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}) &= \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1\|_2^2 + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \text{Tr}(\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)(\mathbf{A}_{\ell+1} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_{\ell+1})^\top]) \\
&\leq (1 + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} m\rho^{\ell-1})(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 = \left(1 + \frac{2m}{1-\rho}\right) (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

**Theorem 7.** [Analogy to Theorem A.11 of Wu et al. [2024]] Define  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T$  as

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_t \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}} \mathbf{Q}_t^\top, \quad (42)$$

and let  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*$  be defined as in (17). Define  $\mathbf{X}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*)$  as the unique solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$\eta_0(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{X}\mathbf{A}^\top) = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*; \quad (43)$$

then as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , the difference between  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*$  is featured by

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^* - T^{\alpha-1} \mathbf{X}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*)\| &\leq \tilde{C} T^{2\alpha-2} \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\|, \quad \text{and} \\
\text{Tr}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^* - T^{\alpha-1} \mathbf{X}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*)) &\leq \tilde{C} T^{2\alpha-2} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\tilde{C}$  is a problem-related quantity that can be represented by  $\eta_0, \alpha$  and  $\gamma$ .

*Proof.* This theorem can be proved by replacing  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T$  by  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^*$  by  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$  by  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}$  in the proof of Theorem A.11 in Wu et al. [2024]. Details are omitted.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** [Analogy to Lemma A.12 of Wu et al. [2024]] Let  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*$  be defined as in (42) and (17) respectively. When

$$T \geq 4 \left( \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)\lambda_0\eta_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} (1-\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right) \text{cond}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}), \quad (44)$$

it can be guaranteed that

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T\mathbf{A}^\top) \geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}) = \frac{1}{2\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}^{-1}\|}.$$

*Proof.* This lemma can be proved by replacing  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T$  by  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^*$  by  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$  by  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}$  in the proof of Lemma A.12 in Wu et al. [2024]. Details are omitted.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.** Let  $\mathbf{Q}_t$  be defined as in (37), then it can be guaranteed that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{Q}_t - \mathbf{Q}_{t-1}\| \lesssim \eta_0 \left[ \eta_0 \Gamma \left( \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \right) + \alpha \right] \left( \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)\lambda_0\eta_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{\log T}{T}.$$

*Proof.* By definition, the matrices  $\mathbf{Q}_{t-1}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_t$  can be related by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_{t-1} &= \eta_{t-1} \mathbf{I} + \eta_{t-1} \sum_{j=t}^T \prod_{k=t}^j (\mathbf{I} - \eta_k \mathbf{A}) \\ &= \eta_{t-1} \mathbf{I} + \frac{\eta_{t-1}}{\eta_t} (\mathbf{I} - \eta_t \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{Q}_t; \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the difference between  $\mathbf{Q}_t$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_{t-1}$  is featured by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_t - \mathbf{Q}_{t-1} &= -\eta_{t-1} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_t) - \left( \frac{\eta_{t-1}}{\eta_t} - 1 \right) \mathbf{Q}_t \\ &= \eta_{t-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{S}_t - \eta_{t-1} \prod_{k=t}^T (\mathbf{I} - \eta_k \mathbf{A}) - \left( \frac{\eta_{t-1}}{\eta_t} - 1 \right) \mathbf{Q}_t \end{aligned}$$

where we invoked (38b) in the last equation. Hence by triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{Q}_t - \mathbf{Q}_{t-1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T} \|\mathbf{A}\| \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_{t-1} \|\mathbf{S}_t\| + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_{t-1} \left\| \prod_{k=t}^T (\mathbf{I} - \eta_k \mathbf{A}) \right\| + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \frac{\eta_{t-1}}{\eta_t} - 1 \right) \|\mathbf{Q}_t\|. \end{aligned}$$

By (38c), (39) and the telescoping method, it is easy to verify that the three terms on the right-hand-side can be bounded respectively by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \|\mathbf{A}\| \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_{t-1} \|\mathbf{S}_t\| &\lesssim \eta_0^2 \Gamma \left( \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \right) \left( \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)\lambda_0\eta_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{\log T}{T}, \\ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_{t-1} \left\| \prod_{k=t}^T (\mathbf{I} - \eta_k \mathbf{A}) \right\| &\leq \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)\lambda_0} \frac{1}{T}, \quad \text{and} \\ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \frac{\eta_{t-1}}{\eta_t} - 1 \right) \|\mathbf{Q}_t\| &\lesssim \alpha \left( \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)\lambda_0\eta_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{\log T}{T}. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows immediately.  $\square$

### A.3 Other basic facts

The following theorem proposed by Devroye et al. [2018] gives an upper bound for the total variation (TV) distance between two Gaussian random variables with same means and different covariance matrixes.

**Theorem 8.** [Devroye et al. [2018]] Let  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_1, \mathbf{\Lambda}_2 \in \mathbb{S}^{d \times d}$  be two positive definite matrices, and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  be any vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then the TV distance between Gaussian distributions  $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{\Lambda}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{\Lambda}_2)$  is bounded by

$$\min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{100} \left\| \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_2 \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d \right\|_{\text{F}} \right\} \leq d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{\Lambda}_1), \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{\Lambda}_2)) \leq \frac{3}{2} \left\| \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_2 \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d \right\|_{\text{F}}.$$

**Theorem 9.** [Nazarov [2003]] Let  $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Lambda})$  be a  $d$ -dimensional Gaussian random variable, and  $\mathcal{A}$  be any non-convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . For any  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ , we define

$$\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon := \{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon \}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathcal{A}^{-\varepsilon} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : B(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{A}\}, \quad (45)$$

where  $B(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon)$  represents the  $d$ -dimensional ball centered at  $\mathbf{x}$  with radius  $\varepsilon$ . Then it can be guaranteed that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon - \mathcal{A}) &\lesssim \|\mathbf{\Lambda}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}^{-\varepsilon}) &\lesssim \|\mathbf{\Lambda}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The following theorem from [Nourdin et al. \[2021\]](#) relates the distance on convex sets with the Wasserstein distance when one of the distributions being compared corresponds to a Gaussian random variable.

**Theorem 10.** *Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a random vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $\mathbf{y} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Lambda})$  where  $\mathbf{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{S}^{d \times d}$  is positive-definite. Then it can be guaranteed that*

$$d_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \lesssim \|\mathbf{\Lambda}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{d_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}.$$

We also recall the following concentration inequality.

**Theorem 11.** *[Corollary A.16 of [Wu et al. \[2024\]](#)] Let  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \geq 1}$  be a martingale in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and let  $W_{\max}$  be a positive constant that satisfies*

$$W_{\max} \geq \sum_{i=1}^t \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{i-1}\|_2^2 \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

Then it can be guaranteed with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  that

$$\|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{2W_{\max} \log \frac{3}{\delta}}.$$

## B Proof of theoretical results regarding general Markov chains

### B.1 Proof of Theorem 1

A classic Chernoff argument indicates

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right\| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq 2 \inf_{t \geq 0} \exp(-nt\varepsilon) \mathbb{E}\left[\text{Tr}\left(\exp\left(t \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right)\right)\right]. \quad (46)$$

In order to bound the right-hand-side, [Garg et al. \[2018\]](#) illustrated in their Equation (11), through an application of the multi-matrix Golden-Thompson inequality, that there exists a probability distribution  $\phi$  on the interval  $[-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ , such that

$$\text{Tr}\left(\exp\left(t \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right)\right) \leq d^{1-\frac{\pi}{4}} \int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \text{Tr}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n \exp\left(\frac{2}{\pi} e^{i\theta} t \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right) \prod_{i=n}^1 \exp\left(\frac{2}{\pi} e^{-i\theta} t \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right)\right] d\phi(\theta). \quad (47)$$

Furthermore, by repeatedly applying the basic properties of Kronecker products, the trace on the right-hand-side can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Tr}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n \exp\left(\frac{2}{\pi} e^{i\theta} t \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right) \prod_{i=n}^1 \exp\left(\frac{2}{\pi} e^{-i\theta} t \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right)\right] \\ &= [\text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d)]^\top \left\{ \prod_{i=n}^1 \exp\left(\frac{2}{\pi} e^{-i\theta} t \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right) \otimes \prod_{i=1}^n \exp\left(\frac{2}{\pi} e^{i\theta} t \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right) \right\} \text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d) \\ &= [\text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d)]^\top \prod_{i=n}^1 \left\{ \exp\left(\frac{2}{\pi} e^{-i\theta} t \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right) \otimes \exp\left(\frac{2}{\pi} e^{i\theta} t \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right) \right\} \text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d) \end{aligned}$$

$$= [\mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d)]^\top \prod_{i=n}^1 \exp(t\mathbf{H}_i(s_i, \theta)) \mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d), \quad (48)$$

where we define, for simplicity,

$$\mathbf{H}_i(s_i, \theta) := \frac{2}{\pi} e^{-i\theta} \mathbf{F}_i(s_i) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d^2} + \mathbf{I}_{d^2} \otimes \frac{2}{\pi} e^{i\theta} \mathbf{F}_i(s_i). \quad (49)$$

Through the deduction of (48), we applied properties (6), (1) and (7) in Theorem 5 in the second, third and fourth line respectively. It is easy to verify that the matrix function  $\mathbf{H}_i$  defined as in (49) has the following properties:

$$\mathbb{E}_{s_i \sim \mu} [\mathbf{H}_i(s_i, \theta)] = \mathbf{0}, \quad \forall i \in [n], \theta \in \left[-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right]; \quad (50)$$

$$\|\mathbf{H}_i(s_i, \theta)\| \leq \frac{4}{\pi} M_i, \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad \forall i \in [n], \theta \in \left[-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right]. \quad (51)$$

As a combination of (46), (47) and (48), our goal is to bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i) \right\| \geq \varepsilon \right) \\ & \leq 2d^{1-\frac{\pi}{4}} \inf_{t \geq 0} \exp(-nt\varepsilon) [\mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d)]^\top \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \phi} \mathbb{E}_s \left[ \prod_{i=n}^1 \exp(t\mathbf{H}_i(s_i, \theta)) \mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d) \right] \\ & \leq 2d^{1-\frac{\pi}{4}} \inf_{t \geq 0} \sup_{\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]} \exp(-nt\varepsilon) [\mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d)]^\top \mathbb{E}_s \left[ \prod_{i=n}^1 \exp(t\mathbf{H}_i(s_i, \theta)) \mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Here, we use  $\mathbb{E}_s$  to denote the expectation taken over all the samples in the markov chain  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n$ , where  $s_1 \sim \mu$  and  $s_{i+1} \sim P(\cdot | s_i)$  for all  $1 \leq i < n$ . In order to bound this expectation, we define, for any  $t > 0$  and  $\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ , a sequence of vector-valued functions  $\{\mathbf{g}_k\}_{k \in [n]}$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^{d^2}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}_0(x) &= \mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d), \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{g}_k(x) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=k}^1 \exp(t\mathbf{H}_i(s_i, \theta)) \mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d) \middle| s_{k+1} = x \right], \quad k \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

In this way, the left-hand-side of (1) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i) \right\| \geq \varepsilon \right) & \leq 2d^{1-\frac{\pi}{4}} \inf_{t \geq 0} \sup_{\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]} \exp(-nt\varepsilon) [\mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d)]^\top \mu(\mathbf{g}_n) \\ & \leq 2d^{1-\frac{\pi}{4}} \inf_{t \geq 0} \sup_{\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]} \exp(-nt\varepsilon) \|\mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d)\|_2 \cdot \|\mu(\mathbf{g}_n)\|_2 \\ & = 2d^{1-\frac{\pi}{4}} \inf_{t \geq 0} \sup_{\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]} \exp(-nt\varepsilon) \sqrt{d} \cdot \|\mathbf{g}_n^\parallel\|_\mu \end{aligned}$$

where we applied the fact that  $s_{n+1} \sim \mu$  when  $s_1 \sim \mu$ . Recall that by definition,  $\mu(\mathbf{g}_n) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu} [\mathbf{g}_n(x)]$  and  $\mathbf{g}_n^\parallel$  represents the constant function taking this value. Next, we construct a recursive relation among the sequence  $\{\mathbf{g}_k\}_{k \in [n]}$  for the purpose of bounding the norm of  $\mathbf{g}_n$ . Notice that, on one hand,

$$\exp(t\mathbf{H}_k(x, \theta)) \mathbf{g}_{k-1}(x) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=k}^1 \exp(t\mathbf{H}_i(s_i)) \middle| s_k = x \right];$$

on the other hand,

$$\mathbf{g}_k(x) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=k}^1 \exp(t\mathbf{H}_i(s_i, \theta)) \mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d) \middle| s_{k+1} = x \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=k}^1 \exp(t\mathbf{H}_i(s_i, \theta)) \mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d) \Big| s_k = y \right] d\mathbb{P}(s_k = y \mid s_{k+1} = x) \\
&= \int_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=k}^1 \exp(t\mathbf{H}_i(s_i, \theta)) \mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d) \Big| s_k = y \right] \right\} P^*(x, dy);
\end{aligned}$$

here the contents in the curly bracket is equal to  $\exp(t\mathbf{H}_k(y, \theta)) \mathbf{g}_{k-1}(u)$ . Therefore, the sequence  $\{\mathbf{g}_k\}$  is featured by the recursive relation

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{g}_k(x) &= \int_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \exp(t\mathbf{H}_k(y, \theta)) \mathbf{g}_{k-1}(y) P^*(x, dy) \\
&= (\mathcal{P}^*(\exp(t\mathbf{H}_k) \mathbf{g}_{k-1}))(x).
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Based on this recursive relationship, the following proposition comes in handy for bounding the norm of  $\mathbf{g}_k$  recursively.

**Proposition 4.** *For any matrix function  $\mathbf{g} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  and any bounded symmetric matrix function  $\mathbf{H} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{m \times m}$  with  $\mu(\mathbf{H}) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\|\mathbf{F}(x)\| \leq M$  almost surely. Then the following hold for any  $t > 0$ :*

$$\left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H}) \mathbf{g}^{\parallel} \right) \right\|_{\mu} \leq \alpha_1 \|\mathbf{g}^{\parallel}\|_{\mu}, \quad \text{where } \alpha_1 = \exp(tM) - tM; \tag{53}$$

$$\left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H}) \mathbf{g}^{\perp} \right) \right\|_{\mu} \leq \alpha_2 \|\mathbf{g}^{\perp}\|_{\mu}, \quad \text{where } \alpha_2 = \lambda(\exp(tM) - 1); \tag{54}$$

$$\left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H}) \mathbf{g}^{\perp} \right) \right\|_{\mu} \leq \alpha_3 \|\mathbf{g}^{\perp}\|_{\mu}, \quad \text{where } \alpha_3 = \exp(tM) - 1; \tag{55}$$

$$\left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H}) \mathbf{g}^{\perp} \right) \right\|_{\mu} \leq \alpha_4 \|\mathbf{g}^{\perp}\|_{\mu}, \quad \text{where } \alpha_4 = \lambda \exp(tM). \tag{56}$$

*Proof.* See Appendix D.1. □

A recursive relation can be constructed to bound the norm of  $\mathbf{g}_n^{\parallel}$ . Specifically, for every  $k \in [n]$ , (52), the triangle inequality and (53), (54) guarantee that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{g}_k^{\parallel}\|_{\mu} &= \left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H}_k) \mathbf{g}_{k-1} \right) \right\|_{\mu} \\
&\leq \left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H}_k) \mathbf{g}_{k-1}^{\parallel} \right) \right\|_{\mu} + \left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H}_k) \mathbf{g}_{k-1}^{\perp} \right) \right\|_{\mu} \\
&\leq \alpha_{1k} \|\mathbf{g}_{k-1}^{\parallel}\|_{\mu} + \alpha_{2k} \|\mathbf{g}_{k-1}^{\perp}\|_{\mu};
\end{aligned}$$

here, we define  $\alpha_{1k} = \exp(\frac{4}{\pi}tM_k) - \frac{4}{\pi}tM_k$  and  $\alpha_{2k} = \lambda(\exp(\frac{4}{\pi}tM_k) - 1)$ . In order to iteratively bound the norm of  $\mathbf{g}_k^{\parallel}$ , we also need to bound the norm of  $\mathbf{g}_{k-1}^{\perp}$ . Towards this end, we observe, due to (52), the triangle inequality and (55), (56) that for every  $k \in [n]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{g}_k^{\perp}\|_{\mu} &= \left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H}_k) \mathbf{g}_{k-1} \right) \right\|_{\mu} \\
&\leq \left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H}_k) \mathbf{g}_{k-1}^{\parallel} \right) \right\|_{\mu} + \left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H}_k) \mathbf{g}_{k-1}^{\perp} \right) \right\|_{\mu} \\
&\leq \alpha_{3k} \|\mathbf{g}_{k-1}^{\parallel}\|_{\mu} + \alpha_{4k} \|\mathbf{g}_{k-1}^{\perp}\|_{\mu}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here again, we define  $\alpha_{3k} = \exp(\frac{4}{\pi}tM_k) - 1$  and  $\alpha_{4k} = \lambda \exp(\frac{4}{\pi}tM_k)$ . For simplicity, we denote

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{x}_0 &= \begin{pmatrix} \|\mathbf{g}_0^{\parallel}\|_{\mu} \\ \|\mathbf{g}_0^{\perp}\|_{\mu} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{d} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \\
\mathbf{x}_k &= \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1k} & \alpha_{3k} \\ \alpha_{3k} & \alpha_{4k} \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{U}_j} \mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \quad \forall k \in [n].
\end{aligned}$$

It can then be easily verified through an induction argument that

$$\|\mathbf{g}_n\|_\mu \leq x_{n1}.$$

Notice here that we applied the fact  $\alpha_{2k} < \alpha_{3k}$ , since  $\lambda < 1$ . Consequently,

$$\|\mathbf{g}_n\|_\mu \leq x_{n1} \leq \|\mathbf{x}_n\|_2 = \left\| \prod_{k=1}^n \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{x}_0 \right\|_2 \leq \prod_{k=1}^n \|\mathbf{U}_k\| \|\mathbf{x}_0\|_2 = \sqrt{d} \cdot \prod_{k=1}^n \|\mathbf{U}_k\|.$$

Since  $\mathbf{U}_k$  is a symmetric  $2 \times 2$  matrix, its operator norm is featured by

$$\|\mathbf{U}_k\| = \max\{|\sigma_{k1}|, |\sigma_{k2}|\}$$

where  $\sigma_{k1}$  and  $\sigma_{k2}$  are the two eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{U}_k$ . Recall from elementary linear algebra that  $\sigma_{j1}$  and  $\sigma_{j2}$  are solutions to the equation

$$(\alpha_{1k} - x)(\alpha_{4k} - x) - \alpha_{3k}^2 = 0.$$

Since  $\alpha_{1k} > 0$  and  $\alpha_{4k} > 0$ , it can be easily verified that

$$\|\mathbf{U}_k\| = \frac{\alpha_{1k} + \alpha_{4k}}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{(\alpha_{1k} - \alpha_{4k})^2 + 4\alpha_{3k}^2}}{2}.$$

The following lemma comes in handy for bounding the norm of  $\mathbf{U}_k$ .

**Lemma 10.** *For any  $x > 0$  and  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ , denote  $\alpha_1 = e^x - x$ ,  $\alpha_3 = e^x - 1$  and  $\alpha_4 = \lambda e^x$ . It can then be guaranteed that*

$$\frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_4}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{(\alpha_1 - \alpha_4)^2 + 4\alpha_3^2}}{2} \leq \exp\left(\frac{5}{1-\lambda}x^2\right).$$

*Proof.* See Appendix D.2. □

As a direct implication of lemma 10, the norm of  $\mathbf{U}_k$  is bounded by

$$\|\mathbf{U}_k\| \leq \exp\left(\frac{5}{1-\lambda}\left(\frac{4}{\pi}t\right)^2 M_k^2\right);$$

consequently, the norm of  $\mathbf{g}_n$  is bounded by

$$\|\mathbf{g}_n\|_\mu \leq \sqrt{d} \exp\left(\left(\frac{4}{\pi}\right)^2 \frac{5t^2}{1-\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^n M_k^2\right)$$

for any  $t \geq 0$  and  $\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ . Therefore, the left-hand-side of (1) is bounded by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right\| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq 2d^{2-\frac{\pi}{4}} \inf_{t \geq 0} \exp(-nt\varepsilon) \exp\left(\left(\frac{4}{\pi}\right)^2 \frac{5t^2}{1-\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^n M_k^2\right).$$

By letting

$$t = \frac{1-\lambda}{10} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^2 \frac{n}{\sum_{k=1}^n M_k^2} \cdot \varepsilon,$$

we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i)\right\| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq 2d^{2-\frac{\pi}{4}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1-\lambda}{20} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^2 \frac{n^2 \varepsilon^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n M_k^2}\right\}$$

which completes the proof.



## B.2 Proof of Corollary 1

For every  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ , define functions  $f(x)$  and  $g(x)$  as

$$f(x) := \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i) \right\| \geq \varepsilon \mid s_1 = x \right), \quad \text{and} \quad g(x) := \frac{\nu(dx)}{\mu(dx)}$$

respectively. Then by definition,  $g(x) \geq 0$  and  $f(x) \in [0, 1]$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ . Therefore, the Holder's inequality guarantees

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{s_1 \sim \nu} \left( \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i) \right\| \geq \varepsilon \right) &= \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(x) \nu(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(x) g(x) \mu(dx) \\ &= \|fg\|_{\mu,1} \leq \|f\|_{\mu,q} \|g\|_{\mu,p} = \|f\|_{\mu,q} \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu,p}, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where, since  $q > 1$  and  $f(x) \in [0, 1]$  almost surely,  $\|f\|_{\mu,q}$  is bounded by

$$\|f\|_{\mu,q} = \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}} f^q(x) d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(x) d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \left[ \mathbb{P}_{s_1 \sim \nu} \left( \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_i) \right\| \geq \varepsilon \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{q}}. \quad (58)$$

Corollary 1 follows by combining Theorem 1, with (57) and (58).

## B.3 Proof of Theorem 2

This proof is a correction and improvement of Theorem 1 in Srikant [2024], which applies Stein's method and Lindeberg's decomposition. Using notation from Anastasiou et al. [2019], we denote, for every  $k \in [n]$ ,

$$\mathbf{S}_k = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{x}_k, \quad \mathbf{T}_k = \sum_{j=k}^n \mathbf{V}_j^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z}_j, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{T}'_k = \mathbf{T}_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z}'.$$

Here,  $\{\mathbf{z}_k\}_{k=1}^n$  and  $\mathbf{z}'$  are *i.i.d.* standard Gaussian random variables in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and independent of the filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}_{k=0}^n$ . Note that since we assume  $\mathbf{P}_1 = n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$  almost surely, and that  $\{\mathbf{V}_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq k}$  are all measurable with respect to the filtration  $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ , the matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_k &= \mathbf{P}_1 - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{V}_j = n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{V}_j, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{P}_{k+1} &= \mathbf{P}_1 - \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{V}_j = n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n - \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{V}_j \end{aligned}$$

are both measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ . It can then be guaranteed that  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{T}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)$  and that

$$\begin{aligned} d_W \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{x}_k, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n) \right) &= \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}_1} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ h \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{S}_n \right) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ h \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{T}_1 \right) \right] \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}_1} |\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{T}_1)]| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}_1} |\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{T}'_1)]| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}_1} |\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{T}_1)] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{T}'_1)]| \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}_1} |\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{T}'_1)]| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}_1} \mathbb{E}|h(\mathbf{T}_1) - h(\mathbf{T}'_1)| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}_1} |\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{T}'_1)]| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z}\|_2 \\
&\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}_1} |\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{T}'_1)]| + \sqrt{\frac{\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})}{n}}, \tag{59}
\end{aligned}$$

where we applied the Jensen's inequality in (i)(iii) and Lipchitz property in (ii). Invoking the Lindeberg's decomposition, the triangle inequality yields

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{T}'_1)]| \leq \sum_{k=1}^n |\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_k + \mathbf{T}'_{k+1})] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_{k-1} + \mathbf{T}'_k)]|, \tag{60}$$

where we define  $\mathbf{S}_0 = \mathbf{T}_{n+1} = 0$  for consistency. For each  $k \in [n]$ , define

$$\tilde{h}_k(\mathbf{x}) := h(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{S}_{k-1}),$$

where we denote, for simplicity,

$$\mathbf{P}'_k = \mathbf{P}_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}.$$

Since  $h \in \text{Lip}_1$ ,  $\tilde{h}_k$  has Lipchitz coefficient  $L_k = \|\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|$ . Therefore, Lemma 1 in Srikant [2024] guarantees that there exists a function  $f_k : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\tilde{h}_k(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h}_k(\mathbf{z})] = \Delta f_k(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}^\top \nabla f_k(\mathbf{x})$$

holds for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $\mathbf{z}$  is the  $d$ -dimensional standard Gaussian random variable. Therefore, it can be guaranteed that

$$\begin{aligned}
&h(\mathbf{S}_k + \mathbf{T}'_{k+1}) - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_{k-1} + \mathbf{T}'_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \\
&= h(\mathbf{S}_k + \mathbf{T}'_{k+1}) - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_{k-1} + \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \\
&= \tilde{h}_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{T}'_{k+1})) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h}_k(\mathbf{z})] \\
&= \Delta f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{T}'_{k+1})) - \left[ \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{T}'_{k+1}) \right]^\top \nabla f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{T}'_{k+1})).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that by definition,  $\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{T}'_{k+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{P}'_{k+1} \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ . Therefore, we can denote  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k$  such that  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{P}'_{k+1} \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}})$  and that  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k$  is independent of  $\mathbf{x}_k$  when conditioned on  $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ . By taking conditional expectations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} [h(\mathbf{S}_k + \mathbf{T}'_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_{k-1} + \mathbf{T}'_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\Delta f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] - \mathbb{E} \left[ (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k)^\top \nabla f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since by definition,  $\Delta f_k = \text{Tr}(\nabla^2 f_k)$ , this can be further decomposed into

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} [h(\mathbf{S}_k + \mathbf{T}'_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_{k-1} + \mathbf{T}'_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \\
&= \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[ \text{Tr} \left( \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{P}'_{k+1} \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla^2 f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \right) - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k^\top \nabla f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \right] \Big| \mathcal{F}_{k-1}}_{I_1} \\
&+ \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[ \text{Tr} \left( \left( \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{P}'_{k+1} \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \nabla^2 f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \right) \right] \Big| \mathcal{F}_{k-1}}_{I_2} \\
&- \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[ (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \nabla f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \right] \Big| \mathcal{F}_{k-1}}_{I_3} - \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[ (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \left( \nabla f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) - \nabla f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \right) \right] \Big| \mathcal{F}_{k-1}}_{I_4}. \tag{61}
\end{aligned}$$

Of the four terms on the right-hand-side,  $I_1$  is equal to  $\mathbf{0}$  according to Lemma 2 in Srikant [2024];  $I_3$  is also  $\mathbf{0}$  according to martingale property.

**Control the term  $I_2$ .** We first make the observation that

$$I - \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{P}'_{k+1} \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{P}'_k - \mathbf{P}'_{k+1}) \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}};$$

Therefore, the term  $I_2$  can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{Tr} \left( \left( I - \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{P}'_{k+1} \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \nabla^2 f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{Tr} \left( \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla^2 f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \nabla^2 f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right\} \\ &= \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right\} \\ &+ \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \nabla^2 f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) - \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

where we invoked the linearity of trace and expectation in (i).

**Controlling  $I_4$ .** For clarity, we define a uni-dimensional function

$$F(t) := (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \nabla f_k(t \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k), \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

Since  $f_k$  is twice-differentiable, the derivative of  $F(t)$  is featured by

$$F'(t) = (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \nabla^2 f_k(t \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k).$$

Consequently, the Lagrange's mid-value theorem guarantees the existence of  $\Theta \in [0, 1]$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \left( \nabla f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) - \nabla f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \right) &= F(1) - F(0) \\ &= F'(\Theta) = (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \nabla^2 f_k(\Theta \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the term  $I_4$  is characterized by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \left( \nabla f_k(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) - \nabla f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \nabla^2 f_k(\Theta \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[ (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \left( \nabla^2 f_k(\Theta \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) - \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \right) (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where  $\Theta \in (0, 1)$ . Here, the first term on the right-most part of the equation can be further computed by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{Tr} \left( (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{Tr} \left( (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k) (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{=} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(iv)}{=} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \right\}; \quad (64)$$

notice that we applied the basic property of matrix trace in (i), the linearity of expectation in (ii), the conditional independence between  $\mathbf{x}_k$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k$  in (iii), and the definition of  $\mathbf{V}_k$  in (iv). The right-most part of this equation is exactly the same as the first term on the right-most part of (62).

Consequently, putting relations (61), (62), (63) and (64), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [h(\mathbf{S}_k + \mathbf{T}'_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] - \mathbb{E} [h(\mathbf{S}_{k-1} + \mathbf{T}'_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \\ &= \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \nabla^2 f_k(\mathbf{P}_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) - \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right\} \\ & - \mathbb{E} \left[ (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top (\nabla^2 f_k(\Theta \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) - \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k)) (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Both terms on the right-hand-side can be bounded by the Holder's property of  $\nabla^2 f_k$ . Specifically, we have the following proposition:

**Proposition 5.** *Let  $h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \in \text{Lip}_1$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \succ \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{S}^{d \times d}$ . Further define  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as*

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and use  $f_g$  to denote the solution to Stein's equation

$$\Delta f(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}^\top \nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = g(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{z})]$$

where  $\mathbf{z}$  is the  $d$ -dimensional standard Gaussian distribution. It can then be guaranteed that

$$\|\nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{y})\| \lesssim (2 + \log(d\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|))^+ \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})\|_2 + e^{-1}. \quad (66)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix D.3. □

Proposition 5 guarantees for every  $\Theta \in [0, 1]$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \nabla^2 f_k(\Theta \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) - \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \right\| &\leq (2 + \log(d\|\mathbf{P}'_k\|))^+ \|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 + e^{-1} \\ &\leq (2 + \log(d\|(n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \boldsymbol{\Sigma})\|))^+ \|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 + e^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Consequently, the first term on the right hand side of (65) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \nabla^2 f_k(\mathbf{P}_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) - \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right\} \right| \\ & \leq (2 + \log(d\|(n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \boldsymbol{\Sigma})\|))^+ \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] + e^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Here, we further notice that since  $\mathbf{P}'_k$  is measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}$ , and that  $\|\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2$  and  $\|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2$  are positively correlated <sup>3</sup>,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right]. \quad (68)$$

Therefore, the upper bound can be further simplified by

$$\left| \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \nabla^2 f_k(\mathbf{P}_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) - \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right\} \right|$$

---

<sup>3</sup>We refer readers to Appendix D.4 for the details of this claim.

$$\leq (2 + \log(d\|(n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \boldsymbol{\Sigma})\|))^+ \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right].$$

Meanwhile, the second term can also be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k)^\top (\nabla^2 f_k(\Theta \mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k) - \nabla^2 f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k)) (\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right| \\ & \leq (2 + \log(d\|(n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \boldsymbol{\Sigma})\|))^+ \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since these two bounds are equivalent, in combination, the triangle inequality guarantees

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_k + \mathbf{T}_{k+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_{k-1} + \mathbf{T}_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \right| \\ & \lesssim (2 + \log(d\|(n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \boldsymbol{\Sigma})\|))^+ \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging into (60), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{T}'_1)]| & \leq \sum_{k=1}^n |\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_k + \mathbf{T}'_{k+1})] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{S}_{k-1} + \mathbf{T}'_k)]| \\ & \lesssim (2 + \log(d\|(n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \boldsymbol{\Sigma})\|))^+ \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right] \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

We now aim to proof the last summation on the right-hand-side of (69). The law of total expectation directly implies, for every  $k \in [n]$ , that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right] = \mathbb{E} [\text{Tr}(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-1} \mathbf{V}_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_0].$$

To further feature the summation, we invoke a telescoping technique. By taking  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}'_k$  and  $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{P}'_{k+1}$  in Theorem 6, the summand can be bounded by

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-1} \mathbf{V}_k) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-1} (\mathbf{P}'_k - \mathbf{P}'_{k+1})) \leq \text{Tr}(\log(\mathbf{P}'_k)) - \text{Tr}(\log(\mathbf{P}'_{k+1})).$$

Summing from  $k = 1$  through  $k = n$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right] & = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E} [\text{Tr}(\mathbf{P}'_k{}^{-1} \mathbf{V}_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_0] \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E} [\text{Tr}(\log(\mathbf{P}'_k)) - \text{Tr}(\log(\mathbf{P}'_{k+1})) \mid \mathcal{F}_0] \\ & = \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\log \mathbf{P}'_1)] - \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\log \mathbf{P}'_n)] \\ & = \text{Tr}(\log(n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \boldsymbol{\Sigma})) - \log(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}). \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Our target result follows by combining (59), (69) and (70).

## B.4 Proof of Corollary 2

In order to simplify the upper bound in Theorem 2, we firstly take  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$ , yielding

$$d_W \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{x}_k, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n) \right) \lesssim \frac{(2 + \log(dn\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|))^+}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{P}'_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right]$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} [\text{Tr}(\log((n+1)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)) - \log(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)] + \sqrt{\frac{\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)}{n}}.$$

For the first term on the second line, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\log((n+1)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)) - \log(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n) &= \sum_{i=1}^d \log(\lambda_i((n+1)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)) - \sum_{i=1}^d \log(\lambda_i(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d (\log(n+1) + \log \lambda_i(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)) - \log \lambda_i(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n) = d \log(n+1). \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, the condition (6) can be invoked on the first term to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| (\mathbf{P}_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k \right\|_2^2 \left\| \mathbf{x}_k \right\|_2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right] &\leq M \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| (\mathbf{P}_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}_k \right\|_2^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \right] \\ &= M \cdot [\text{Tr}(\log((n+1)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)) - \log(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)] \\ &= Md \log(n+1), \end{aligned}$$

where the third line follows from (70). In combination, the Wasserstein distance can be bounded by

$$d_W \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{x}_k, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n) \right) \lesssim \frac{M(2 + \log(dn \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|))^+ + 1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot d \log n + \sqrt{\frac{\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)}{n}}.$$

**Comparison with the corresponding uni-dimensional Corollary 2.3 in Röllin [2018].** When  $d = 1$ , the condition (6) reduces to

$$\mathbb{E}|x_k|^3 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \leq M \mathbb{E}[x_k^2] \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}, \quad \forall k \in [n].$$

Notice that this is a weaker assumption than the one outlined in Equation (2.13) of Röllin [2018], which further assumes that the conditional third momentum of  $x_k$  is uniformly bounded. In our proof of Corollary 2, we invoke a telescoping method that not only simplifies the proof but also yields a tighter upper bound.

**Comments on Corollary 3 in Anastasiou et al. [2019].** In a similar attempt to generalize this uni-dimensional corollary from Röllin [2018] to multi-dimensional settings, Corollary 3 of Anastasiou et al. [2019] made the assumption that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2^3 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq \beta \vee \delta \text{Tr}(\mathbf{V}_k), \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{71}$$

and applied the technique used by Röllin [2018], which involved defining a sequence of stopping times  $\{\tau_k\}_{k \in [n]}$ . However, this generalization is non-trivial since the positive semi-definite order of symmetric matrices is *incomplete*; in other words, when  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{S}^{d \times d}$ ,  $\mathbf{A} \not\leq \mathbf{B}$  does not imply  $\mathbf{A} \succ \mathbf{B}$ . Consequently, the derivation from Equation (A.36) to (A.37) in the proof of Corollary 3 of Anastasiou et al. [2019] is invalid: apparently, the authors' reasoning was, under their notation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\tau_k} - \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\tau_{k-1}}) &= \text{Tr}(\overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\tau_k} - \overline{\mathbf{V}}_{\tau_{k-1}+1}) + \text{Tr}(\mathbf{V}_k) \\ &\leq \text{Tr} \left( \frac{k}{n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n - \frac{k-1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n \right) + \beta^{\frac{2}{3}} = \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n) + \beta^{\frac{2}{3}} \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality on the second line follows from  $\mathbf{V}_{\tau_k} \preceq \frac{k}{n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$ , and that  $\mathbf{V}_{\tau_{k-1}+1} \not\leq \frac{k-1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$ . However, since the positive semi-definite order is incomplete, the fact that  $\mathbf{V}_{\tau_{k-1}+1} \not\leq \frac{k-1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$  is not equivalent to  $\mathbf{V}_{\tau_{k-1}+1} \succ \frac{k-1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$ ; neither is there any guarantee that  $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{V}_{\tau_{k-1}+1})$  is greater than  $\frac{k-1}{n} \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)$ .

In our proof of Corollary 2, we solve this problem by invoking a different assumption (6) than (71), and the telescoping method.

## B.5 Proof of Corollary 3

Since  $\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s)}[\mathbf{F}_i(s, s')] = \mathbf{0}$  holds almost surely on  $\mathcal{S}$  for every  $i \in [n]$ , it can be guaranteed that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_{i-1}, s_i)$$

is a matrix-valued martingale; therefore, if we define

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\mathbf{F}_i^2(s_{i-1}, s_i)],$$

the matrix Freedman's inequality can be invoked on this martingale. Specifically, for every  $\sigma^2$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , it can be guaranteed with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$  that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}_i(s_{i-1}, s_i) \right\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \log \frac{d}{\delta}} + \frac{M}{n} \log \frac{d}{\delta}, \quad \text{or} \quad \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n\| \geq \sigma^2. \quad (72)$$

In what follows, we aim to bound the norm of  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n$  by controlling its different from  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$ . Specifically, define

$$\mathbf{G}_{i-1}(s_{i-1}) = \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\mathbf{F}_i^2(s_{i-1}, s_i)] - \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu, s' \sim P(\cdot|s)}[\mathbf{F}_i^2(s, s')].$$

It can be easily verified that  $\mu(\mathbf{G}_{i-1}) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\|\mathbf{G}_{i-1}\| \leq M^2$  almost surely for every  $i \in [n]$ . Therefore, Theorem 1 can be applied to the sequence  $\{\mathbf{G}_{i-1}\}_{i \in [n]}$  to obtain

$$\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{G}_{i-1}(s_{i-1}) \right\| \lesssim \frac{p}{p-1} \frac{M^2}{(1-\lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \log^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{d}{\delta} \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} \right)$$

with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$ . Hence, the triangle inequality directly yields

$$\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n\| \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| + \frac{p}{p-1} \frac{M^2}{(1-\lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \log^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{d}{\delta} \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} \right). \quad (73)$$

The theorem follows by combining (72), (73) using a union bound argument and taking

$$\sigma^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| + \frac{p}{p-1} \frac{M^2}{(1-\lambda)^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \log^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{d}{\delta} \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} \right).$$

## B.6 Proof of Corollary 4

Part of the proof is inspired by the proof of Lemma B.8 in Cattaneo et al. [2022] and Theorem 2.1 in Belloni and Oliveira [2018]. Borrowing the notation from the proof of Theorem 2 and Corollary 2, we define, for each  $k = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_k &:= \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{f}_j(s_{j-1}, s_j), \\ \mathbf{V}_k &:= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}_k(s_{k-1}, s_k) \mathbf{f}_k^\top(s_{k-1}, s_k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \\ \mathbf{T}_k &:= \sum_{j=k}^n \mathbf{V}_j^{1/2} \mathbf{z}_j, \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{P}_k &:= \sum_{j=k}^n \mathbf{V}_j. \end{aligned}$$

This proof approaches the theorem in four steps:

1. Find a value  $\kappa = \kappa(n) = O(\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}})$ , such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{P}_1 - n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| \geq n\kappa) \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

2. Construct a martingale  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_j\}_{j=1}^N$ , whose differentiation satisfies the condition of Theorem 2, such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N^\top] = n(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N\|_2 > \sqrt{2d\kappa n \log n}\right) \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

3. Apply Theorem 2 to  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N$  to derive a Berry-Esseen bound between the distributions of  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N$  and  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, n(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}))$ ;

4. Combine the results above to achieve the desired Berry-Esseen bound.

**Step 1: find  $\kappa$ .** Due to the Markovian property, the matrix  $\mathbf{V}_k$  is a function of  $s_{k-1}$  for every  $k \in [n]$ . Define

$$\bar{\mathbf{V}}_k = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu, s' \sim P(\cdot|s)}[\mathbf{f}_i(s, s') \mathbf{f}_i^\top(s, s')],$$

then it can be guaranteed that

$$\mathbb{E}_{s_{k-1} \sim \mu}[\mathbf{V}_k] = \bar{\mathbf{V}}_k,$$

and that

$$\|\mathbf{V}_k - \bar{\mathbf{V}}_k\| \leq M_k^2, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

hold for every  $k \in [n]$ . Consequently, a direct application of Theorem 1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{P}_1 - n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| &= n \cdot \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{V}_i - \bar{\mathbf{V}}_i) \right\| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n M_i^4} \sqrt{\frac{20q}{1-\lambda} \log \left( \frac{2d}{n^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} \right)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n M_i^4} \sqrt{\frac{40q}{1-\lambda} \log \left( 2dn \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} \right)}, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . In what follows, we take

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n M_i^4}{n} \frac{40q}{1-\lambda} \log \left( 2dn \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} \right)} = \frac{\bar{M}^2}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\frac{40q}{1-\lambda} \log \left( 2dn \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu, p} \right)}.$$

**Step 2: Construct  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_j\}_{j=1}^N$ .** Define the stopping time

$$\tau := \sup \left\{ t \leq n : \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{V}_i \preceq n(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}) \right\},$$

and let

$$m := \left\lceil \frac{1}{M^2} \text{Tr} \left( n(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}) - \sum_{i=1}^{\tau} \mathbf{V}_i \right) \right\rceil, \quad \text{and} \quad N := \left\lceil \frac{\text{Tr}(n(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}))}{M^2} \right\rceil + n.$$

By definition, it can be guaranteed that  $n + m \leq N$ , and that  $N \asymp n$ . We now construct a martingale difference process  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\}_{i=1}^N$  in the following way: for  $1 \leq i \leq \tau$ , let  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = \mathbf{f}_i(s_{i-1}, s_i)$  and for  $\tau < i \leq \tau + m$ , let

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=1}^d \epsilon_{ij} \sqrt{\lambda_j} \mathbf{u}_j,$$



where the  $\lambda_j$ 's and  $\mathbf{u}_j$ 's are (possibly random) eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the spectral decomposition

$$n(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}) - \sum_{i=1}^{\tau} \mathbf{V}_i = \sum_{j=1}^d \lambda_j \mathbf{u}_j \mathbf{u}_j^\top,$$

and  $\{\epsilon_{ij}\}_{\tau < i \leq \tau+m, 1 \leq j \leq d}$  are *i.i.d.* Rademacher random variables independent of the  $s_i$ 's, i.e.

$$\epsilon_{ij} = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{w.p. } \frac{1}{2}; \\ -1, & \text{w.p. } \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

In particular, it holds that, for any  $\tau < i \leq \tau + m$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i] = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^d \lambda_j \mathbf{u}_j \mathbf{u}_j^\top,$$

and

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{m} \text{Tr} \left( n(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}) - \sum_{i=1}^{\tau} \mathbf{V}_i \right) \leq M^2 l$$

almost surely. Finally, if  $\tau + m < i \leq N$ , we simply set  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = \mathbf{0}$ .

The martingale  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_j\}_{j=1}^N$  is naturally constructed by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_j = \sum_{i=1}^j \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i.$$

In this step, we explore the difference between  $\mathbf{S}_n$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N$ . Specifically, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left( \|\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N\|_2 > \sqrt{2d\kappa n \log n} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N\|_2 > \sqrt{2d\kappa n \log n}, \|\mathbf{P}_1 - n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| \leq \kappa n) \\ &+ \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N\|_2 > \sqrt{2d\kappa n \log n}, \|\mathbf{P}_1 - n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| > \kappa n) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N\|_2 > \sqrt{2d\kappa n \log n}, \|\mathbf{P}_1 - n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| \leq \kappa n) + \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{P}_1 - n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| > \kappa n) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N\|_2 > \sqrt{2d\kappa n \log n}, \|\mathbf{P}_1 - n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| \leq \kappa n) + n^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

To bound the first term on the left hand side of the last inequality, notice that, when  $\|\mathbf{P}_1 - n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| \leq \kappa n$ ,

$$\mathbf{P}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{V}_i \preceq n(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}).$$

Thus, on the same event,  $\tau = n$  and for every  $j \in [d]$ ,

$$\lambda_j \leq \|n(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}) - \mathbf{P}_1\| \leq \|n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n - \mathbf{P}_1\| + \|n\kappa \mathbf{I}\| = 2\kappa n.$$

Consequently,

$$\|\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N\|_2^2 = \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+m} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \right\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{m} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\lambda_j} \left( \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+m} \epsilon_{ij} \right) \mathbf{u}_j \right\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2\kappa n}{m} \sum_{j=1}^d \left( \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+m} \epsilon_{ij} \right)^2.$$

Since  $\{\epsilon_{ij}\}_{n+1 \leq i \leq n+m, 1 \leq j \leq d}$  are *i.i.d.* Rademacher random variables, the Hoeffding's inequality guarantees that

$$\left| \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+m} \epsilon_{ij} \right| \lesssim \sqrt{m \log n}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . As a direct consequence, the difference between  $\mathbf{S}_n$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N$  can be bounded by

$$\|\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N\|_2^2 \lesssim 2d\kappa n \log n$$

with probability at least  $1 - 2n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . In combination, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N\|_2 \gtrsim \sqrt{2d\kappa n \log n}) \leq 3n^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

**Step 3: Berry-Esseen bound on  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N$ .** It can be easily verified that the sequence  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\}_{i=1}^N$  is a martingale difference such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = n(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}), \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\|_2 \leq M \quad \text{a.s., } \forall i \in [N].$$

Hence, Theorem 2 can be applied on  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N$  to obtain

$$d_W \left( \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}}, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}) \right) \lesssim M d \log(d \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}\|) \frac{\log^2 n}{\sqrt{n}},$$

where we applied the fact that  $M \geq 1$  and  $\|d\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\| \geq 1$ .

**Step 4: Completing the proof.** By the triangle inequality,

$$d_C \left( \frac{\mathbf{S}_n}{\sqrt{n}}, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n) \right) \leq d_C \left( \frac{\mathbf{S}_n}{\sqrt{n}}, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}) \right) + d_C(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I})) \quad (74)$$

where the second term on the right-hand-side can be bounded using a direct application of Theorem 8 by

$$d_C(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I})) \lesssim \kappa \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n^{-1}\|_F \leq \kappa \frac{\sqrt{d}}{c} = O \left( \sqrt{\frac{d}{c^2 n} \log n} \right), \quad (75)$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumption that  $\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n) \geq c$  and the choice of  $\kappa$ . For the first term, consider any convex set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , the triangle inequality guarantees, for every  $x > 0$ , that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{\mathbf{S}_n}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A} \right) &= \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{\mathbf{S}_n}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}, \left\| \frac{\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right\|_2 \leq x \right) + \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{\mathbf{S}_n}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}, \left\| \frac{\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right\|_2 > x \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}^x \right) + \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \frac{\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right\|_2 > x \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}^x \right) + d_C \left( \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \frac{\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right\|_2 > x \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A} \right) + \left( \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|_F^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{\kappa} d^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) x \\ &\quad + d_C \left( \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \frac{\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right\|_2 > x \right). \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Here,  $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, n(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}))$  and we applied Theorem 9 on the last line. On the right-most part of the inequality, the third term can be bounded by the Berry-Esseen bound on  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N$  and Theorem 10:

$$d_C \left( \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa \mathbf{I}\|_F^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{d_W \left( \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right)}$$

$$\leq \left( \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{4}} + (\kappa\sqrt{d})^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) \sqrt{M} d^{\frac{1}{2}} \log^{\frac{1}{2}}(d\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa\mathbf{I}\|) n^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log n.$$

Therefore, taking  $x = \sqrt{2d\kappa \log n}$  in (76) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\mathbf{S}_n}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}\right) + \left(\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{\kappa} d^{\frac{1}{4}}\right) \cdot \sqrt{2d\kappa \log n} \\ &\quad + \left(\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{4}} + (\kappa\sqrt{d})^{\frac{1}{4}}\right) \sqrt{M} d^{\frac{1}{2}} \log^{\frac{1}{2}}(d\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n + \kappa\mathbf{I}\|) n^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log n + 3n^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sqrt{\kappa} = o(1)$ , a simple reorganization yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\mathbf{S}_n}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}\right) \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \overline{M} \left(\frac{q}{1-\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{1}{4}}\left(d \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu,p}\right) \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{M} \log^{\frac{1}{2}}(d\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|) \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{4}} \right\} \sqrt{dn}^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log n. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Meanwhile, a union bound argument and the triangle inequality guarantee

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\mathbf{S}_n}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\mathbf{S}_n}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A} \cup \left\| \frac{\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right\|_2 > x\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\left\| \frac{\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right\|_2 > x\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}^{-x}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\left\| \frac{\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right\|_2 > x\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}^{-x}\right) - d_{\mathcal{C}}\left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\left\| \frac{\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right\|_2 > x\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}\right) - \left(\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{\kappa} d^{\frac{1}{4}}\right) x \\ &\quad - d_{\mathcal{C}}\left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\left\| \frac{\mathbf{S}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \right\|_2 > x\right); \end{aligned}$$

consequently, it can be symmetrically proved that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_N}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\mathbf{S}_n}{\sqrt{n}} \in \mathcal{A}\right) \\ &\leq \left\{ \overline{M} \left(\frac{q}{1-\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{1}{4}}\left(d \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu,p}\right) \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{M} \log^{\frac{1}{2}}(d\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|) \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{4}} \right\} \sqrt{dn}^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log n. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

The theorem follows by combining (74), (75), (77), (78) and taking a supremum over  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ .

## C Proof of results regarding TD learning

Throughout this section, we denote

$$\boldsymbol{\Delta}_t = \boldsymbol{\theta}_t - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \quad \forall t \in [T], \quad \text{and} \quad (79)$$

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T = \overline{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*. \quad (80)$$

Furthermore, for every  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T$ , we denote

$$\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot \mid s_0, s_1, \dots, s_t].$$

Without any subscript, the operator  $\mathbb{E}$  represents taking expectation with respect to all the samples starting from  $s_0$ .

## C.1 $L^2$ convergence of the TD estimation error

The following theorem captures the asymptotic property of  $\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_t\|_2^2$  with Markov samples and is useful in our proofs for other results. Note that the bound holds, non-asymptotically, for all  $t \geq t^*$  where  $t^*$  is a problem-dependent quantity; we state it as an asymptotic result only for convenience.

**Theorem C.1.** *Consider TD with Polyak-Ruppert averaging (3.1) with Markov samples and decaying stepsizes  $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-\alpha}$  for  $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ . Suppose that the Markov transition kernel has a unique stationary distribution, a strictly positive spectral gap, and mixes exponentially as indicated by Assumption 3. It can then be guaranteed that when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|_2^2] \lesssim (2\|\theta^*\|_2 + 1)^2 \left[ \frac{1}{(1-\rho)^2} \frac{\eta_0}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} t^{-\alpha} \log^2 t + o(t^{-\alpha} \log^2 t) \right].$$

*Proof.* We firstly construct an iterative relation along the sequence  $\{\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_t\|_2^2\}_{t \geq 0}$  in general, and then refine our analysis using a specific choice of stepsizes. The TD iteration rule (3.1) directly implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_t\|_2^2 &= \|\Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2 - 2\eta_t \Delta_{t-1}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \theta_{t-1} - \mathbf{b}_t) + \eta_t^2 \|\mathbf{A}_t \theta_{t-1} - \mathbf{b}_t\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|\Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2 - 2\eta_t \Delta_{t-1}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \theta^* + \mathbf{A}_t \Delta_{t-1} - \mathbf{b}_t) + 2\eta_t^2 (\|\mathbf{A}_t \Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{A}_t \theta^* - \mathbf{b}_t\|_2^2) \\ &= \|\Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2 - 2\eta_t \Delta_{t-1}^\top \mathbf{A} \Delta_{t-1} - 2\eta_t \Delta_{t-1}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{t-1} \\ &\quad - 2\eta_t \Delta_{t-1}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \theta^* - \mathbf{b}_t) + 2\eta_t^2 (\|\mathbf{A}_t \Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{A}_t \theta^* - \mathbf{b}_t\|_2^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Delta_{t-1}^\top \mathbf{A} \Delta_{t-1} \geq \lambda_0(1-\gamma)\|\Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2$  due to (24) and  $\|\mathbf{A}_t\| \leq 1+\gamma$ , we can bound  $\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_t\|_2^2$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_t\|_2^2 &\leq \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2 - 2\lambda_0(1-\gamma)\eta_t \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2 + 2\eta_t^2(1+\gamma)^2 \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2 \\ &\quad - 2\eta_t \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{t-1}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{t-1}] - 2\eta_t \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{t-1}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \theta^* - \mathbf{b}_t)] + 2\eta_t^2 \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{A}_t \theta^* - \mathbf{b}_t\|_2^2 \\ &= \underbrace{(1 - 2\lambda_0(1-\gamma)\eta_t + 2\eta_t^2(1+\gamma)^2)}_{I_1} \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2 + \underbrace{2\eta_t^2 \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{A}_t \theta^* - \mathbf{b}_t\|_2^2}_{I_2} \\ &\quad - 2\eta_t \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{t-1}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{t-1}]}_{I_3} - 2\eta_t \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{t-1}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \theta^* - \mathbf{b}_t)]}_{I_4}. \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

In this expression,  $I_1$  is contractive with respect to  $\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2$  as long as  $\eta_t$  is sufficiently small, while  $I_2$  is proportional to  $\eta_t^2$  since  $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{A}_t \theta^* - \mathbf{b}_t\|_2^2$  is independent of  $t$ . These two terms are desirable and can be left as they are;

The difficulty of this proof lies in bounding  $I_3$  and  $I_4$  using Markov samples. Notice that with *i.i.d.* sampling, both terms are actually 0; hence, we aim to bound them by applying the mixing property of the Markov chain.

To simplify notation, throughout the proof, we denote

$$t_{\text{mix}} := t_{\text{mix}}(\eta_t) + 1,$$

so that with Markov samples,  $s_{t-1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} \sim P^{t_{\text{mix}}-1}(\cdot \mid s_{t-t_{\text{mix}}})$ , and that

$$d_{\text{TV}}(P^{t_{\text{mix}}-1}(\cdot \mid s_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}), \mu) \leq \eta_t.$$

Meanwhile, Assumption 3 implies that

$$t_{\text{mix}} \leq \frac{\log(m/\eta_t)}{\log(1/\rho)} + 1 = \frac{\log(m/\eta_0) + \alpha \log t}{\log(1/\rho)} + 1 < \frac{\log(m/\eta_0) + \alpha \log t}{1-\rho} + 1. \tag{82}$$

In other words,  $t_{\text{mix}}(\eta_t)$  grows at most by  $O(\log t)$ ; therefore, in what follows, we can assume that  $t$  is large enough such that  $t \geq 2t_{\text{mix}}$ . The essential idea of bounding  $I_3$  and  $I_4$  involves decomposing  $\Delta_{t-1}$  by

$$\Delta_{t-1} = (\Delta_{t-1} - \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}) + \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}},$$

where the norm of  $(\Delta_{t-1} - \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}})$  is bounded by the decaying stepsizes, while the correlation between  $\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}$  and  $\mathbf{A}_t, \mathbf{b}_t$  is bounded by the mixing property of the Markov chain.

We address  $I_3$  and  $I_4$  respectively.

**Bounding  $I_3$ .** The definition of  $t_{\text{mix}}$  implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}] \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}[\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}] \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{s_{t-1} \sim P^{t_{\text{mix}}-1}(\cdot | s_{t-t_{\text{mix}}})} [\mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim P(\cdot | s_{t-1})} [\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top \mathbf{A}_t \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}] - \mathbb{E}_{s_{t-1} \sim \mu} [\mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim P(\cdot | s_{t-1})} [\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top \mathbf{A}_t \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}] \right] \right| \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{s_{t-1}} |\mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim P(\cdot | s_{t-1})} \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top \mathbf{A}_t \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}| \cdot d_{\text{TV}}(P^{t_{\text{mix}}-1}(\cdot | s_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}), \mu) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[2\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2] \cdot \eta_t;
\end{aligned}$$

notice that the inequality on the fourth line follows from the basic property of the TV distance. As a direct consequence,  $I_3$  is featured by

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &= \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}] + 2\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t - \mathbf{A})(\Delta_{t-1} - \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}})] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_{t-1} - \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}})^\top (\mathbf{A}_t - \mathbf{A})(\Delta_{t-1} - \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}})] \\
&\geq -2\eta_t \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 - 4\mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 \|\Delta_{t-1} - \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2] - 2\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-1} - \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 \\
&= -2\eta_t \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 - 4\mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2] - 2\mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

To lower bound the right-hand-side of the last expression, the following lemma comes in handy, with its proof postponed to Appendix D.5.

**Lemma 11.** *For the TD iterations (3.1) with Markov samples and non-increasing stepsizes  $\eta_1 \geq \dots \geq \eta_T$  it holds that, for all  $t \geq t_{\text{mix}}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 \leq t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) + 2\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_i\|_2; \quad (83a)$$

$$\mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 \leq 2t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^2 \left[ t_{\text{mix}}(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 + 4 \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_i\|_2^2 \right]; \quad (83b)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2] \\
&\leq t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 + \eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_i\|_2^2 + t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2. \quad (83c)
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 11 directly leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &\geq -2\eta_t \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 - 4t_{\text{mix}}^2\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^2(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 - 16t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^2 \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_i\|_2^2 \\
&\quad - 4t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 - 4\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_i\|_2^2 - 4t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 \\
&= -(2\eta_t + 4t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}})\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 - (16t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^2 + 4\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}) \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \mathbb{E}\|\Delta_i\|_2^2 \\
&\quad - 4t_{\text{mix}}^2\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^2(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 - 4t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)\mathbb{E}\|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2. \quad (84)
\end{aligned}$$

**Bounding  $I_4$ .** Similarly, we decompose  $I_4$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
I_4 &= \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t)] + \mathbb{E}[(\Delta_{t-1} - \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}})^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t)] + \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}})^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t)].
\end{aligned}$$

The first term can be bounded using the  $t_{\text{mix}}$  separation:

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t)] \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= |\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}[\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t)]]| \\
&= |\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{s_{t-1} \sim P^{t_{\text{mix}}-1}(\cdot | s_{t-t_{\text{mix}}})}[\mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim P(\cdot | s_{t-1})}[\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t)]] - \mathbb{E}_{s_{t-1} \sim \mu}[\mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim P(\cdot | s_{t-1})}[\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t)]]]| \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{s_{t-1}} |\mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim P(\cdot | s_{t-1})} \Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t)| \cdot d_{\text{TV}}(P^{t_{\text{mix}}-1}(\cdot | s_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}), \mu) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \cdot \eta_t,
\end{aligned}$$

while the second term can be bounded by stepsizes:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}})^\top (\mathbf{A}_t \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_t)] \\
&\geq -(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 \\
&\geq -(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \left[ t_{\text{mix}} \eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) + 2\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_i\|_2 \right] \\
&= -\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \left[ t_{\text{mix}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) + 2 \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_i\|_2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $I_4$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
I_4 &\geq -\eta_t \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \\
&\quad - \eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \left[ t_{\text{mix}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) + 2 \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_i\|_2 \right]. \tag{85}
\end{aligned}$$

**Combining terms.** With  $I_3$  and  $I_4$  bounded, we now return to Equation (81).  $\mathbb{E} \|\Delta_t\|_2^2$  can be upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\Delta_t\|_2^2 &\leq I_1 + I_2 - 2\eta_t (I_3 + I_4) \\
&\leq [1 - 2\lambda_0(1 - \gamma)\eta_t + 2\eta_t^2(1 + \gamma)^2] \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2 + 2\eta_t^2 (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 + 1)^2 \\
&\quad + 2\eta_t (2\eta_t + 4t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}) \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 + 2\eta_t (16t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^2 + 4\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}) \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_i\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + 8\eta_t t_{\text{mix}}^2 \eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^2 (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 + 8\eta_t t_{\text{mix}} \eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 \\
&\quad + 2\eta_t^2 \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) + 2\eta_t \eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) t_{\text{mix}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \\
&\quad + 4\eta_t \eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \mathbb{E} \|\Delta_i\|_2. \tag{86}
\end{aligned}$$

**Specifying the polynomially-decaying stepsizes.** With polynomially-decaying stepsizes, when  $t$  is sufficiently large, it can be guaranteed that  $t > 2t_{\text{mix}}$ , and therefore  $\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} \geq 2^{-\alpha}\eta_t$ . Furthermore, for sufficiently large  $t$ ,  $\eta_t(1 + \gamma)^2 < \lambda_0(1 - \gamma)$ . Therefore, by dividing  $(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2$  on both sides and combining terms, we can simplify Equation (86) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathbb{E} \|\Delta_t\|_2^2}{(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2} &\leq (1 - \tilde{C}_1 t^{-\alpha}) \frac{\mathbb{E} \|\Delta_{t-1}\|_2^2}{(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2} + \tilde{C}_2 t^{-2\alpha} \log^2 t + \tilde{C}_3 t^{-2\alpha} \log t \frac{\mathbb{E} \|\Delta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2}{(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2} \\
&\quad + \tilde{C}_4 t^{-2\alpha} \log t \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \frac{\mathbb{E} \|\Delta_i\|_2^2}{(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2} + \tilde{C}_5 t^{-2\alpha} \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-2} \frac{\mathbb{E} \|\Delta_i\|_2}{2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1}, \tag{87}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{C}_1$  through  $\tilde{C}_5$  are constants depending on  $\alpha, \eta_0, m$  and  $\rho$ . Notice that the  $\log t$  terms occur due to  $t_{\text{mix}} = O(\log t)$ ; see (82). We will use an induction argument based on the relation (87). For simplicity, let

$$X_t = \frac{\|\Delta_t\|_2}{2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1};$$

now suppose that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t^2] \leq \tilde{C} \cdot \frac{\log^2 t}{t^\alpha}, \quad \forall 1 < t \leq k, \quad (88)$$

for some  $\tilde{C}$ .

Our goal is to demonstrate, inductively, that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{k+1}^2] \leq \tilde{C} \cdot \frac{\log^2(k+1)}{(k+1)^\alpha}. \quad (89)$$

Towards this end, the iterative relation (87) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_{k+1}^2] &\leq \left(1 - \tilde{C}_1(k+1)^{-\alpha}\right) \mathbb{E}[X_k^2] + \tilde{C}_2(k+1)^{-2\alpha} \log^2(k+1) \\ &\quad + \tilde{C}_3(k+1)^{-2\alpha} \log(k+1) \mathbb{E}[X_{k+1-t_{\text{mix}}}^2] \\ &\quad + \tilde{C}_4(k+1)^{-2\alpha} \log(k+1) \sum_{i=k+1-t_{\text{mix}}}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] \\ &\quad + \tilde{C}_5(k+1)^{-2\alpha} \sum_{i=k+1-t_{\text{mix}}}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[X_i]. \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

Here, the induction assumption guarantees that, as long as  $k > 2t_{\text{mix}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_k^2] &\leq \tilde{C} k^{-\alpha} \log^2 k, \\ \mathbb{E}[X_{k+1-t_{\text{mix}}}^2] &\leq \tilde{C}(k+1-t_{\text{mix}})^{-\alpha} \log^2(k+1-t_{\text{mix}}) < 2^{-\alpha} \tilde{C}(k+1)^{-\alpha} \log^2(k+1), \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=k+1-t_{\text{mix}}}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[X_i] &\leq t_{\text{mix}} \cdot \tilde{C}(k+1-t_{\text{mix}})^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \log(k+1-t_{\text{mix}}) \\ &\lesssim \tilde{C} \cdot (k+1)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \log^2(k+1), \\ \sum_{i=k+1-t_{\text{mix}}}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] &\leq t_{\text{mix}} \cdot \tilde{C}(k+1-t_{\text{mix}})^{-\alpha} \log^2(k+1-t_{\text{mix}}) \\ &\lesssim \tilde{C} \cdot (k+1)^{-\alpha} \log^3(k+1). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging these inequalities into the iteration relation (90), we obtain that for sufficiently large  $k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_{k+1}^2] &\leq \tilde{C} \cdot \left[ k^{-\alpha} \log^2 k - \tilde{C}_1(k+1)^{-\alpha} k^{-\alpha} \log^2 k + \tilde{C}_3(k+1)^{-\frac{5}{2}\alpha} \log^2(k+1) \right] \\ &\quad + \tilde{C}_2(k+1)^{-2\alpha} \log^2(k+1). \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2$  and  $\tilde{C}_3$  are again constants independent of  $t$ , with their exact values can change from (90). Therefore, it suffices to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C} \cdot \left[ k^{-\alpha} \log^2 k - \tilde{C}_1(k+1)^{-\alpha} k^{-\alpha} \log^2 k + \tilde{C}_3(k+1)^{-\frac{5}{2}\alpha} \log^2(k+1) \right] \\ + \tilde{C}_2(k+1)^{-2\alpha} \log^2(k+1) \leq \tilde{C}(k+1)^{-\alpha} \log^2(k+1). \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

Notice that when  $x$  is sufficiently large, the function  $f(x) = x^{-\alpha} \log^2(x)$  is monotonically decreasing; therefore, for sufficiently large  $k$ , it can be guaranteed that  $k^{-\alpha} \log^2 k > (k+1)^{-\alpha} \log^2(k+1)$ . Therefore, the left-hand-side of (91) is upper bounded by

$$\tilde{C} \cdot \left[ k^{-\alpha} \log^2 k - \tilde{C}_1(k+1)^{-\alpha} k^{-\alpha} \log^2 k + \tilde{C}_3(k+1)^{-\frac{5}{2}\alpha} \log^2(k+1) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \tilde{C}_2(k+1)^{-2\alpha} \log^2(k+1) \\
& \leq \tilde{C} \cdot \left[ k^{-\alpha} \log^2(k+1) - \tilde{C}_1(k+1)^{-\alpha} (k+1)^{-\alpha} \log^2(k+1) + \tilde{C}_3(k+1)^{-\frac{5}{2}\alpha} \log^2(k+1) \right] \\
& + \tilde{C}_2(k+1)^{-2\alpha} \log^2(k+1) \\
& = \tilde{C} \log^2(k+1) \cdot \left[ k^{-\alpha} + \left( \frac{\tilde{C}_2}{\tilde{C}} - \tilde{C}_1 \right) (k+1)^{-2\alpha} + \tilde{C}_3(k+1)^{-\frac{5}{2}\alpha} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, in order to prove (91), it suffices to show that

$$k^{-\alpha} + \left( \frac{\tilde{C}_2}{\tilde{C}} - \tilde{C}_1 \right) (k+1)^{-2\alpha} + \tilde{C}_3(k+1)^{-\frac{5}{2}\alpha} \leq (k+1)^{-\alpha},$$

which is equivalent to

$$(k+1)^{2\alpha} [k^{-\alpha} - (k+1)^{-\alpha}] + \tilde{C}_3(k+1)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \leq \tilde{C}_1 - \frac{\tilde{C}_2}{\tilde{C}}.$$

Here, we further notice that the function  $f(x) = x^{-\alpha}$  is monotonically decreasing and convex, so  $k^{-\alpha} - (k+1)^{-\alpha} = f(k) - f(k+1) \leq -f'(k+1) = \alpha(k+1)^{-\alpha-1}$ . Hence, the proof boils down to showing

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{C}_1 - \frac{\tilde{C}_2}{\tilde{C}} & \geq (k+1)^{2\alpha} \cdot \alpha(k+1)^{-\alpha-1} + \tilde{C}_3(k+1)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \\
& = \alpha(k+1)^{\alpha-1} + \tilde{C}_3(k+1)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

for an appropriate  $\tilde{C}$  that is independent of  $t$  and satisfies the induction assumption (88). Towards this end, we define a function  $f(\tilde{C}, k)$  as

$$f(\tilde{C}, k) := \tilde{C}_1 - \frac{\tilde{C}_2}{\tilde{C}} - \alpha(k+1)^{\alpha-1} - \tilde{C}_3(k+1)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$$

It is easy to verify that for any  $\tilde{C}$ ,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(\tilde{C}, k) = \tilde{C}_1 - \frac{\tilde{C}_2}{\tilde{C}}.$$

Therefore, we can take

$$\begin{aligned}
k^* & = \min \left\{ k : f \left( \max_{1 \leq t \leq k} \frac{t^\alpha}{\log^2 t} \mathbb{E}[X_t^2], k \right) \geq 0 \right\}, \quad \text{and} \\
\tilde{C} & = \max_{1 \leq t \leq k^*} \frac{t^\alpha}{\log^2 t} \mathbb{E}[X_t^2].
\end{aligned}$$

On one hand, if  $k^*$  does not exist, then from our analysis we can conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t^2] \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_2 \log^2 t}{\tilde{C}_1 t^\alpha}$$

for all  $t \geq 1$ ; on the other hand, if  $k^*$  does exist, then an induction argument guarantees that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t^2] \leq \tilde{C} \frac{\log^2 t}{t^\alpha}$$

for all  $t \geq 1$ . In both cases, (89) holds true.



**Specification of the coefficient.** We next try to specify the coefficient corresponding to the leading term of the upper bound. In the previous paragraph, we have essentially proved that, there exists a  $t^* \in \mathbb{N}$  depending on  $\alpha, \eta_0, \lambda_0, m$  and  $\rho$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t^2] \leq 1, \quad \text{for all } t \geq t^*.$$

Hence, when  $t > t^*$ , a closer examination of (86) yields

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t^2] \leq (1 - \lambda_0(1 - \gamma)\eta_t)\mathbb{E}[X_{t-1}^2] + C \frac{\eta_0^2}{(1 - \rho)^2} t^{-2\alpha} \log^2 t$$

for a *universal constant*  $C$ . Hence by iteration, it can be guaranteed that when  $t > t^*$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t^2] \leq \underbrace{\prod_{i=t^*+1}^t (1 - \beta i^{-\alpha})}_{I_1} X_{t^*} + C \underbrace{\frac{\eta_0^2}{(1 - \rho)^2} \sum_{i=t^*}^t (i^{-2\alpha} \log^2 i) \prod_{k=i+1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha})}_{I_2}.$$

Here, it is easy to verify that  $I_1$  converges exponentially with respect to  $t$ , and that  $I_2$  is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq \frac{\eta_0^2}{(1 - \rho)^2} \log^2 t \sum_{i=t^*}^t i^{-2\alpha} \prod_{k=i+1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) \\ &\leq \frac{\eta_0^2}{(1 - \rho)^2} \log^2 t \sum_{i=1}^t i^{-2\alpha} \prod_{k=i+1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \frac{\eta_0^2}{(1 - \rho)^2} \log^2 t \left( \frac{1}{\beta} t^{-\alpha} + O(t^{-1}) \right) \\ &= \frac{\eta_0}{(1 - \rho)^2 \lambda_0 (1 - \gamma)} t^{-\alpha} \log^2 t + o(t^{-\alpha} \log^2 t). \end{aligned}$$

The theorem follows immediately. □

## C.2 High-probability convergence guarantee for the original TD estimation error

Similar to the case with *i.i.d.* samples, we firstly state the following theorem for the high-probability convergence rate for the original TD estimation error  $\Delta_t$  with Markov samples.

**Theorem C.2.** *Consider TD with Polyak-Ruppert averaging (3.1) with Markov samples and decaying step-sizes  $\eta_t = \eta_0 t^{-\alpha}$  for  $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ . Suppose that the Markov transition kernel has a unique stationary distribution  $\mu$ , a strictly positive spectral gap  $1 - \lambda > 0$ , and Assumption 3 holds true. Then for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , there exists  $\eta_0 > 0$ , such that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_t\|_2 &\leq \frac{13}{2} \|\theta^*\|_2 + \frac{5}{4} \quad \text{and} \\ \|\Delta_t\|_2 &\lesssim \eta_0 \sqrt{\frac{2t_{\text{mix}}(t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})}{(2\alpha - 1)} \log \frac{9T t_{\text{mix}}(t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})}{\delta}} (2\|\theta^*\|_2 + 1) \left( \frac{(1 - \gamma)\lambda_0\eta_0}{4\alpha} \right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}} t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

hold simultaneously for all  $t \in [T]$ .

*Proof.* Recalling the TD update rule (3.1), we represent  $\Delta_t$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_t = \theta_t - \theta^* &= (\theta_{t-1} - \eta_t(\mathbf{A}_t \theta_{t-1} - \mathbf{b}_t)) - \theta^* \\ &= \Delta_{t-1} - \eta_t(\mathbf{A} \theta_{t-1} - \mathbf{b} + \zeta_t) \\ &= (\mathbf{I} - \eta_t \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{t-1} - \eta_t \zeta_t, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\zeta_t$  is defined as

$$\zeta_t := (\mathbf{A}_t - \mathbf{A})\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1} - (\mathbf{b}_t - \mathbf{b}). \quad (92)$$

Therefore by induction,  $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_t$  can be expressed as a weighted sum of  $\{\zeta_i\}_{0 \leq i < t}$ , namely

$$\boldsymbol{\Delta}_t = \prod_{k=1}^t (\mathbf{I} - \eta_k \mathbf{A}) \boldsymbol{\Delta}_0 - \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{R}_i^t \zeta_i, \quad (93)$$

$$\text{where } \mathbf{R}_i^t = \eta_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{t-1} (\mathbf{I} - \eta_k \mathbf{A}). \quad (94)$$

The difficulty in bounding the second term of (93) lies in the fact that with Markov samples,  $\{\zeta_i\}_{i>0}$  is no longer a martingale difference process. Therefore, we further decompose  $\zeta_i$  into three parts, namely

$$\zeta_i = \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}] + (\zeta_{i,\text{mix}} - \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}]) + (\zeta_i - \zeta_{i,\text{mix}}). \quad (95)$$

In order to simplify notation, throughout this proof we denote

$$t_{\text{mix}} = t_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) + 1,$$

where  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  is to be specified later. Furthermore, for every  $t > 0$ , we denote

$$i_{\text{mix}} = \max\{0, i - t_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon)\}, \quad \text{and} \quad (96)$$

$$\zeta_{i,\text{mix}} = (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A})\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i_{\text{mix}}} - (\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}), \quad (97)$$

The intuition behind the construction of  $\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}$  is to guarantee that the samples  $(\mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{b}_i)$  and the iterated estimator  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i_{\text{mix}}}$  are separated in the Markov chain by at least  $t_{\text{mix}}$  samples, so that their distributions are close to independent. Recall from (127) that the mixing property of the Markov chain featured by Assumption 3 guarantees

$$t_{\text{mix}} \leq \frac{\log(m/\varepsilon)}{\log(1/\rho)} + 1. \quad (98)$$

Furthermore, the difference between  $\zeta_i$  and  $\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}$  is

$$\zeta_i - \zeta_{i,\text{mix}} = (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A})(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i_{\text{mix}}}). \quad (99)$$

Therefore, with the decomposition (95),  $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_t$  can be characterized as

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_t &= \underbrace{\prod_{k=1}^t (\mathbf{I} - \eta_k \mathbf{A}) \boldsymbol{\Delta}_0}_{I_1} - \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}]}_{I_2} - \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A})(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i_{\text{mix}}})}_{I_3} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\zeta_{i,\text{mix}} - \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}])}_{I_4}. \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

In what follows, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= \frac{1-\gamma}{2} \lambda_0 \eta_0, \\ R &= \frac{13}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + \frac{5}{4}, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathcal{H}_t &= \left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_i\|_2 \leq R \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for any given  $\delta$ , let<sup>4</sup>

$$t^* = t^*(\delta) := \inf \left\{ t \in \mathbb{N}^+ : \int_t^\infty \exp \left( -\frac{2\alpha-1}{2^{11}\eta_0^2} \frac{\log(1/\rho)}{\log(8m\eta_0/\beta)} \left( \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{1-\alpha}} x^{-\alpha} \right) dx \leq \frac{\delta}{27} \cdot \frac{\log(8m\eta_0/\beta)}{\log(1/\rho)} \right\}, \quad (101)$$

and assume that

$$\eta_0 \sqrt{\frac{2}{2\alpha-1} \frac{\log(8m\eta_0/\beta)}{\log(1/\rho)}} \max \left\{ \frac{1}{4\sqrt{1-\alpha}}, \log \frac{9 \log(8m\eta_0/\beta) t^*}{\log(1/\rho) \delta} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{32}. \quad (102)$$

We break down the proof of the theorem into a sequence of steps:

1. We obtain convergence rates for the four terms on the right-hand-side of (100);
2. We lower bound the probability of  $\mathcal{H}_{t^*}$  by  $1 - \frac{\delta}{3}$ ;
3. We lower bound the probability of  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  by  $1 - \frac{2\delta}{3}$ ;
4. Using the results from the first steps, we arrive at a final bound on  $\|\Delta_t\|_2$ .

**Step 1: Basic convergence properties of the four terms on the right-hand-side of (100).** As is shown in the proof of Theorem B.1 in Wu et al. [2024], the norm of  $I_1$  is bounded by

$$\left\| \prod_{k=0}^{t-1} (I - \eta_k \mathbf{A}) \Delta_0 \right\| \leq \left( \frac{1-\gamma}{2} \lambda_0 \eta_0 \right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} t^{-\alpha} \|\Delta_0\|_2. \quad (103)$$

For the term  $I_2$ , we observe that for  $i \leq t_{\text{mix}}$ , since  $i_{\text{mix}} = 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}} [\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}] = \mathbb{E}_0[(\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A})\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - (\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b})] = \mathbf{0};$$

otherwise when  $i > t_{\text{mix}}$ , since  $i_{\text{mix}} = i - t_{\text{mix}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}} [\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}]\|_2 &\leq \|(\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\mathbf{A}_i] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_i])\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 + \|\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\mathbf{b}_i] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{b}_i]\|_2 \\ &\leq d_{\text{TV}}(P^{t_{\text{mix}}}(\cdot | s_{i_{\text{mix}}}), \mu) \left( \sup_{s_{i-1}, s_i \in \mathcal{S}} \|\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 + \sup_{s_i \in \mathcal{S}} \|\mathbf{b}_i\|_2 \right) \\ &\leq (2 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) d_{\text{TV}}(P^{t_{\text{mix}}}(\cdot | s_{i_{\text{mix}}}), \mu) \\ &\leq \varepsilon (2 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1). \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

Meanwhile, we observe that the sum of  $\|\mathbf{R}_i^t\|$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^t \|\mathbf{R}_i^t\| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^t \eta_i \prod_{k=i+1}^t \|I - \eta_k \mathbf{A}\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^t \eta_0 i^{-\alpha} \prod_{k=i+1}^t \left( 1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{2} \lambda_0 \eta_0 k^{-\alpha} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^t \eta_0 i^{-\alpha} \prod_{k=i+1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

<sup>4</sup>Notice that the existence of  $t^*(\delta)$  is guaranteed by a similar reasoning to that in the proof of Theorem B.1 in Wu et al. [2024].

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\eta_0}{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^t \left( \prod_{k=i+1}^t - \prod_{k=i}^t \right) (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) \\
&= \frac{\eta_0}{\beta} \left( 1 - \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) \right) < \frac{\eta_0}{\beta},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (28) in Lemma 1. Therefore, the norm of  $I_2$  is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}} [\zeta_{i, \text{mix}}] \right\| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^t \|\mathbf{R}_i^t\| \|\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}} [\zeta_{i, \text{mix}}]\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon \eta_0}{\beta} (2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

For the term  $I_3$ , we firstly bound the difference between  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i, \text{mix}}$  by  $R$  and the initial stepsize  $\eta_0$ . Notice that given the induction assumption,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i, \text{mix}}\|_2 &= \left\| \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}+1}^{i-1} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_j - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{j-1}) \right\|_2 = \left\| \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}+1}^{i-1} \eta_j (\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}_{j-1} - \mathbf{b}_j) \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}}^{i-1} \eta_j \|\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}_{j-1} - \mathbf{b}_j\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{t_{\text{mix}}}{1-\alpha} \eta_i (2 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the norm of  $I_3$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i, \text{mix}}) \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^t \|\mathbf{R}_i^t\| \|\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}\| \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i, \text{mix}}\|_2 \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^t \left( \eta_i \prod_{k=i+1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) \right) \cdot 4 \cdot \frac{t_{\text{mix}}}{1-\alpha} \eta_i (2 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^t \eta_i^2 \prod_{k=i+1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) \cdot \frac{t_{\text{mix}}}{1-\alpha} (2 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \\
&\leq \frac{\eta_0^2 t_{\text{mix}}}{(1-\alpha)} (2 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^t i^{-2\alpha} \prod_{k=i+1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha}) \\
&\leq \frac{\eta_0^2 t_{\text{mix}}}{1-\alpha} (2 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \cdot \frac{1}{2\alpha-1} \left( \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} t^{-\alpha}.
\end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

Notice that the last inequality follows by taking  $\nu = 2\alpha$  in (32) in Lemma 3.

For the term  $I_4$ , we again invoke the vector Azuma's inequality (Theorem 11). For simplicity, we define

$$\mathbf{X}_i := \zeta_{i, \text{mix}} - \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}} [\zeta_{i, \text{mix}}]. \tag{107}$$

By definition, we can see that for every integer  $r \in [t_{\text{mix}}]$ , the sequence  $\{\mathbf{X}_{r+i t_{\text{mix}}}\}_{i=0,1,\dots}$  form a martingale difference process. Throughout this part, we assume, without loss of generality that  $t = t' \cdot t_{\text{mix}}$  for a positive integer  $t'$ . Hence, we can first consider the norm of the summation

$$\sum_{i'=0}^{t'} \mathbf{R}_{r+i' t_{\text{mix}}}^t \mathbf{X}_{r+i' t_{\text{mix}}}, \tag{108}$$

which we will bound using vector Azuma's inequality. Towards that goal, we define

$$W_{\max}^r := \sum_{i'=0}^{t'} \sup \|\mathbf{R}_{r+i't_{\text{mix}}}^t \mathbf{X}_{r+i't_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2.$$

By definition, this term is bounded by

$$W_{\max}^r \leq \sum_{i'=0}^{t'} \|\mathbf{R}_{r+i't_{\text{mix}}}^t\|^2 \sup \|\mathbf{X}_{r+i't_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{i'=0}^{t'} \|\mathbf{R}_{r+i't_{\text{mix}}}^t\|^2 \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} \sup \|\mathbf{X}_i\|_2^2;$$

by summing over  $r = 1$  through  $r = t_{\text{mix}}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\text{mix}}} W_{\max}^r &\leq \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\text{mix}}} \sum_{i'=0}^{t'} \|\mathbf{R}_{r+i't_{\text{mix}}}^t\|^2 \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} \sup \|\mathbf{X}_i\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \left( \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} \sup \|\mathbf{X}_i\|_2^2 \right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^t \|\mathbf{R}_i^t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, the triangle inequality directly implies

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} \sup \|\mathbf{X}_i\|_2^2 &= \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} \sup \|\zeta_{i,\text{mix}} - \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}]\| \\ &\leq 4 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1. \end{aligned}$$

In combination, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\text{mix}}} \sqrt{W_{\max}^r} &\leq \sqrt{t_{\text{mix}}} \sqrt{\sum_{r=1}^{t_{\text{mix}}} W_{\max}^r} \\ &\leq \sqrt{t_{\text{mix}}} \sup \|\mathbf{X}_i\|_2 \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^t \|\mathbf{R}_i^t\|^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{t_{\text{mix}}} (4 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^t \|\mathbf{R}_i^t\|^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{t_{\text{mix}}} (4 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^t \eta_i^2 \prod_{k=i+1}^t (1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{2} \lambda_0 \eta_k)^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{t_{\text{mix}}} (4 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \cdot \eta_0 \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^t i^{-2\alpha} \prod_{k=i+1}^t (1 - \beta k^{-\alpha})} \\ &\leq \sqrt{t_{\text{mix}}} (4 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \cdot \eta_0 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\alpha - 1} \left(\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}} t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we invoked Lemma 3 in the last inequality, following the same logic as in the last line of (106). Consequently, the vector Azuma's inequality (Theorem 11), combined with a union bound argument, yields the bound on the norm of  $I_4$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\zeta_{i,\text{mix}} - \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}]) \right\|_2 &\leq 2 \sqrt{2 \log \frac{9t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta_t}} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\text{mix}}} \sqrt{W_{\max}^r} \\ &\leq 2\eta_0 \sqrt{\frac{2t_{\text{mix}}}{2\alpha - 1} \log \frac{3t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta_t}} (4 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \cdot \left(\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}} t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta_t/3$ .

**Step 2: Bounding  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_{t^*})$ .** By definition,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_0) = 1$ . We will show via induction that, for all other  $1 \leq t \leq t^*$

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_t) \geq 1 - \frac{t}{3t^*}\delta.$$

By taking  $\varepsilon = \frac{\beta}{8\eta_0}$  in (105), we obtain that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t \mathbb{E}_{i,\text{mix}}[\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}] \right\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{8} \left( 2 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1 \right).$$

Next, putting together (106), condition (102) and the bound on  $t_{\text{mix}}$  as specified by (20) guarantees that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A})(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i,\text{mix}}) \right\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{8} \left( 2 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1 \right).$$

Similarly, setting  $\delta_t = \frac{\delta}{3t^*}$  in (109) and using the condition (102), we have that, with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\delta}{3t^*}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\zeta_{i,\text{mix}} - \mathbb{E}_{i,\text{mix}}[\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}]) \right\|_2 &\leq 2t_{\text{mix}}\eta_0 \sqrt{2 \log \frac{9t_{\text{mix}}t^*}{\delta}} (4 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{16} (4 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when  $\mathcal{H}_{t-1}$  holds true, the norm of  $\Delta_t$  can be bounded using the triangle inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_t\|_2 &\leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + \frac{1}{8} (2R + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) + \frac{1}{8} (2R + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) + \frac{1}{16} (4R + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \\ &= \frac{3}{4}R + \frac{13}{8}\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + \frac{5}{16} = R, \end{aligned} \tag{110}$$

with probability of at least  $1 - \frac{\delta}{3t^*}$ . It then follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_{t-1} \setminus \mathcal{H}_t) \leq \frac{\delta}{3t^*},$$

and thus that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_{t^*}) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{3}.$$

**Step 3: Bounding  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_\infty)$ .** For  $t > t^*$ , we sharpen the induction argument by a more refined choice of  $\delta_t$ . In detail, let

$$\delta_t = 3t_{\text{mix}}(\beta/8\eta_0) \exp \left\{ -\frac{2\alpha - 1}{2^{11}\eta_0^2} \left( \frac{1}{t_{\text{mix}}(\beta/8\eta_0)} \right) \left( \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} t^{-\alpha} \right\}.$$

Then the norm of  $I_4$  is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\zeta_{i,\text{mix}} - \mathbb{E}_{i,\text{mix}}[\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}]) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq 2\eta_0 \sqrt{\frac{2t_{\text{mix}}}{2\alpha - 1} \log \frac{3t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta_t}} (4 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \cdot \left( \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}} t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{16} (4 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta_t$ . Hence, using induction, when  $\mathcal{H}_{t-1}$  holds true, the bound in (110) implies that  $\mathcal{H}_t$  also holds true with probability at least  $1 - \delta_t$ . In other words,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_{t-1}) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_t) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{t-1} \setminus \mathcal{H}_t) \leq \delta_t.$$

Consequently, the definition of  $t^*$  (101) guarantees

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_\infty) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_{t^*}) - \sum_{t=t^*+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_{t-1}) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_t) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{3}\right) - \sum_{t=t^*+1}^{\infty} \delta_t \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{3}\right) - \int_{t^*}^{\infty} 3t_{\text{mix}}(\beta/8\eta_0) \exp\left\{-\frac{2\alpha-1}{2^{11}\eta_0^2} \left(\frac{1}{t_{\text{mix}}(\beta/8\eta_0)}\right) \left(\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} x^{-\alpha}\right\} dx \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{3}\right) - \frac{\delta}{3} = 1 - \frac{2\delta}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

**Step 4: Refining the bound on  $\|\Delta_t\|_2$ .** In order to bound the norm of  $\Delta_t$  by  $O(t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})$  and thus conclude the proof, we take  $\varepsilon = t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ . Then,

$$t_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) \leq \frac{\log m + \frac{\alpha}{2} \log t}{\log(1/\rho)}.$$

With this bound, (105), (106) and (109) yield that, with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\delta}{3T}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}] \right\| &\leq \frac{\eta_0}{\beta} (2 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\theta^*\|_2 + 1) t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \\ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A})(\theta_i - \theta_{i,\text{mix}}) \right\|_2 &\leq \frac{\eta_0^2}{(1-\alpha)(2\alpha-1)} \cdot t_{\text{mix}} (2 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\theta^*\|_2 + 1) \left(\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}\right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} t^{-\alpha}, \\ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\zeta_{i,\text{mix}} - \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\zeta_{i,\text{mix}}]) \right\|_2 &\leq 2\eta_0 \sqrt{\frac{2t_{\text{mix}}}{(2\alpha-1)} \log \frac{9Tt_{\text{mix}}}{\delta}} (4 \max_{1 \leq i < t} \|\Delta_i\|_2 + 2\|\theta^*\|_2 + 1) \left(\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}\right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}} t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The final result follows from the triangle inequality and the union bound.  $\square$

### C.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Recall from Theorem 7 that

$$\text{Tr}(\tilde{\Lambda}_T - \Lambda^*) = T^{\alpha-1} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}(\tilde{\Lambda}^*)) + O(T^{2\alpha-2}),$$

where  $\mathbf{X}(\tilde{\Lambda}^*)$  is the solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$\eta_0(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{X}\mathbf{A}^\top) = \tilde{\Lambda}^*.$$

By combining Lemma 1, Lemma 2 and Lemma 7, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}(\tilde{\Lambda}^*)) &\leq \frac{\text{Tr}(\tilde{\Lambda}^*)}{\eta_0\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\|^2 \text{Tr}(\tilde{\Gamma})}{\eta_0\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \leq \frac{\text{Tr}(\tilde{\Gamma})}{\eta_0\lambda_0^3(1-\gamma)^3} \\ &\lesssim \frac{m}{1-\rho} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_0\lambda_0^5(1-\gamma)^5}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the difference between  $\tilde{\Lambda}_T$  and  $\Lambda^*$  is given by

$$\text{Tr}(\tilde{\Lambda}_T - \Lambda^*) \leq \tilde{C}T^{\alpha-1},$$

where  $\tilde{C}$  can be represented by  $\lambda_0, \eta_0$  and  $\gamma$ . Therefore, it suffices to show that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the averaged TD error can be bounded by

$$\|\bar{\Delta}_T\|_2 \lesssim 2\sqrt{\frac{2\text{Tr}(\tilde{\Lambda}_T)}{T} \log \frac{6d}{\delta}} + o\left(T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{dT}{\delta}\right).$$

As a direct implication of (93),  $\bar{\Delta}_T$  can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Delta}_T &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \Delta_t \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \prod_{k=1}^t (I - \eta_k \mathbf{A}) \Delta_0 - \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{i-1} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \prod_{k=1}^t (I - \eta_k \mathbf{A}) \Delta_0 - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{R}_i^t (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{i-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \prod_{k=1}^t (I - \eta_k \mathbf{A}) \Delta_0 - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{t=i}^T \mathbf{R}_i^t (\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{t=i}^T \mathbf{R}_i^t (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{i-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have switched the order of summation in the last equation. The definition of  $\mathbf{Q}_t$  (37) implies

$$\bar{\Delta}_T = \underbrace{\frac{1}{T\eta_0} \mathbf{Q}_0 \Delta_0}_{I_1} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i)}_{I_2} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{i-1}}_{I_3},$$

where  $I_1$  can be bounded by

$$\left\| \frac{1}{T\eta_0} \mathbf{Q}_0 \Delta_0 \right\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{T\eta_0} \|\mathbf{Q}_0\| \|\Delta_0\| \leq \frac{3}{T} \left( \frac{2}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \|\Delta_0\|_2.$$

We now proceed to bounding  $I_2$  and  $I_3$  respectively.

Throughout the proof, we let

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= \frac{1-\gamma}{2} \lambda_0 \eta_0, \\ R &= \frac{13}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + \frac{5}{4}, \\ t_{\text{mix}} &= t_{\text{mix}}(T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) \leq \frac{\log m + (\alpha/2) \log T}{\log(1/\rho)} \quad \text{and} \\ R' &= \eta_0 \sqrt{\frac{2t_{\text{mix}}}{2\alpha-1} \log \frac{27Tt_{\text{mix}}}{\delta} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)} \left( \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} \right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}}, \end{aligned}$$

and, for each  $1 \leq t \leq T$ ,

$$\mathcal{H}_t = \left\{ \|\Delta_j\|_2 \leq \min\{R' j^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, R\}, \forall j \leq t \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Delta}_t = \Delta_t \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{H}_t).$$

Theorem C.2 shows that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_T) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{3}$ .

**Bounding  $I_2$ .** In order to invoke the matrix Freedman's inequality on the term  $I_2$ , we firstly relate it to a martingale. Specifically, for every  $i \in [T]$ , we define  $\mathbf{U}_i$  as

$$\mathbf{U}_i = \mathbb{E}_i \left[ \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} (\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_j) \right]. \quad (111)$$



It is then easy to verify that on one hand, the norm of  $\mathbf{U}_i$  is uniformly bounded due to the exponential convergence of the Markov chain. Specifically, since for any positive integers  $i < j$ , it can be guaranteed that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbb{E}_i[\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_j]\|_2 \\
&= \left\| \mathbb{E}_{s_{j-1} \sim P^{j-i-1}(\cdot | s_i), s_j \sim P(\cdot | s_{j-1})} [\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_j] \right\|_2 \\
&= \left\| \mathbb{E}_{s_{j-1} \sim P^{j-i-1}(\cdot | s_i), s_j \sim P(\cdot | s_{j-1})} [\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_j] - \mathbb{E}_{s_{j-1} \sim \mu, s_j \sim P(\cdot | s_{j-1})} [\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_j] \right\|_2 \\
&\leq d_{\text{TV}}(P^{j-i-1}(\cdot | s_i), \mu) \cdot \sup_{s_{j-1}, s_j} \|\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_j\|_2 \\
&\leq m \rho^{j-i-1} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the norm of  $\mathbf{U}_i$  is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{U}_i\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i\|_2 + \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_i \|\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_j\|_2 \\
&\leq (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \left( 1 + \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} m \rho^{j-i-1} \right) \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{1-\rho} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1);
\end{aligned} \tag{112}$$

On the other hand,  $\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i$  can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i &= \mathbf{U}_i - \mathbb{E}_i[\mathbf{U}_{i+1}] \\
&= (\mathbf{U}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\mathbf{U}_i]) + (\mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\mathbf{U}_i] - \mathbb{E}_i[\mathbf{U}_{i+1}]) \\
&=: \mathbf{m}_i + (\mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\mathbf{U}_i] - \mathbb{E}_i[\mathbf{U}_{i+1}])
\end{aligned} \tag{113}$$

Here, the first term  $\mathbf{U}_i - \mathbf{U}_{i+1}$  can be analyzed by the telescoping technique, while

$$\mathbf{m}_i := \mathbf{U}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\mathbf{U}_i] \tag{114}$$

is a martingale difference process. Furthermore, we observe that when  $s_0$  is drawn from the stationary distribution  $\mu$ , the covariance matrix  $\mathbb{E}_0[\mathbf{m}_i \mathbf{m}_i^\top]$  is time-invariant, and can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{m}_i \mathbf{m}_i^\top] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{m}_1 \mathbf{m}_1^\top] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{U}_1 - \mathbb{E}_0[\mathbf{U}_1])(\mathbf{U}_1 - \mathbb{E}_0[\mathbf{U}_1])^\top] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{U}_1^\top] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_0[\mathbf{U}_1] \mathbb{E}_0[\mathbf{U}_1^\top]] \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{U}_1^\top] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_1[\mathbf{U}_2] \mathbb{E}_1[\mathbf{U}_2^\top]] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbb{E}_1[\mathbf{U}_2])(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbb{E}_1[\mathbf{U}_2])^\top] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_1[\mathbf{U}_2] \mathbb{E}_1[\mathbf{U}_2^\top]] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top] + \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1) \mathbb{E}_1[\mathbf{U}_2]^\top] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_1[\mathbf{U}_2] (\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top] \\
&+ \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)(\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_j)^\top + (\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_j)(\mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_1)^\top] \\
&= \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}},
\end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

according to the definition of  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}$  (as in eq. (18)). Notice here that we applied the rule of total expectation throughout this deduction, and took advantage of the time-invariant property of the distribution of  $\{\mathbf{U}_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq T}$  in (i).

In order to relate  $I_2$  to the martingale difference process  $\mathbf{m}_i$ , we invoke the relation (113) to obtain

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\mathbf{U}_i] - \mathbb{E}_i[\mathbf{U}_{i+1}])$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T (\mathbf{Q}_{i-1} \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\mathbf{U}_i] - \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbb{E}_i[\mathbf{U}_{i+1}]) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T (\mathbf{Q}_i - \mathbf{Q}_{i-1}) \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\mathbf{U}_i] \\
&= \underbrace{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i}_{I_{21}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{T} (\mathbf{Q}_0 \mathbb{E}_0[\mathbf{U}_1] - \mathbf{Q}_T \mathbb{E}_T[\mathbf{U}_{T+1}])}_{I_{22}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T (\mathbf{Q}_i - \mathbf{Q}_{i-1}) \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\mathbf{U}_i]}_{I_{23}}
\end{aligned}$$

where we applied the telescoping technique in the last equation. The uniform boundedness of  $\|\mathbf{Q}_t\|$ , as indicated by Lemma 6, and the uniform boundedness of  $\|\mathbf{U}_i\|_2$ , as indicated by (112), guarantee that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{1}{T} (\mathbf{Q}_0 \mathbb{E}_0[\mathbf{U}_1] - \mathbf{Q}_T \mathbb{E}_T[\mathbf{U}_{T+1}]) \right\|_2 &\leq \frac{1}{T} (\|\mathbf{Q}_0\| \sup \|\mathbf{U}_1\|_2 + \|\mathbf{Q}_T\| \sup \|\mathbf{U}_T\|_2) \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{2}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \left(\frac{2m}{1-\rho}\right) (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)
\end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

deterministically. Meanwhile, the norm of  $I_{23}$  is bounded by invoking Lemma 9:

$$\left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T (\mathbf{Q}_i - \mathbf{Q}_{i-1}) \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\mathbf{U}_i] \right\|_2 \lesssim \eta_0 \left[ \eta_0 \Gamma \left( \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \right) + \alpha \right] \left(\frac{1}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \left(\frac{2m}{1-\rho}\right) (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \frac{\log T}{T} \tag{117}$$

almost surely.

It now boils down to bounding the norm of  $I_{21}$ . Towards this end, we firstly observe that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{s_{i-1} \sim \mu, s_i \sim P(\cdot | s_{i-1})} \|\mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i\|_2^2 = \text{Tr}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T),$$

and that

$$\frac{1}{T} \|\mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{T} \eta_0 \left(\frac{2}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \left(\frac{2m}{1-\rho}\right) (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)$$

almost surely for all  $i \in [T]$ , according to Lemma 6 and Equation (112). Now consider a sequence of matrix-valued functions  $\mathbf{F}_i : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times (d+1)}$ , defined as

$$\mathbf{F}_i(s, s') = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i(s, s'))^\top \\ \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i(s, s') & \mathbf{0}_{d \times d} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall i \in [T].$$

It can then be verified that

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu, s' \sim P(\cdot | s)} [\mathbf{F}_i^2(s, s')] \right\| = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu, s' \sim P(\cdot | s)} \|\mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i(s, s')\|_2^2,$$

and that

$$\|\mathbf{F}_i(s, s')\| = \|\mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i(s, s')\|_2, \quad \forall s, s' \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Therefore, a direct application of Corollary 3 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i \right\|_2 &\lesssim 2 \sqrt{\frac{2 \text{Tr}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T)}{T} \log \frac{12d}{\delta}} \\
&+ \eta_0 \left(\frac{2}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \left(\frac{2m}{1-\rho}\right) (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) (1-\lambda)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \frac{1}{T} \log^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{6d}{\delta},
\end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\delta}{3}$ .

**Bounding  $I_3$ .** Applying a similar technique as in the proof of Theorem C.2, we decompose the term  $I_3$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{i-1} \\
&= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A})(\Delta_{i-1} - \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}}) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}} \\
&= \underbrace{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A})(\Delta_{i-1} - \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}})}_{I_{31}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\mathbf{A}_i]) \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}}}_{I_{32}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\mathbf{A}_i] - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}}}_{I_{33}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{119}$$

Recall from the proof of Theorem C.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta_{i-1} - \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 &= \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 \\
&\leq \frac{t_{\text{mix}}}{1-\alpha} \eta_i (2 \max_{1 \leq j < i} \|\Delta_j\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1);
\end{aligned}$$

hence the norm of  $I_{31}$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A})(\Delta_{i-1} - \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}}) \right\|_2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \|\mathbf{Q}_i\| \cdot \frac{t_{\text{mix}}}{1-\alpha} \eta_i (2 \max_{1 \leq j < i} \|\Delta_j\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \\
&\lesssim \frac{t_{\text{mix}}}{(1-\alpha)T} \left(\frac{2}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \sum_{i=1}^T \eta_i (2 \max_{1 \leq j < T} \|\Delta_j\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \\
&\lesssim \frac{t_{\text{mix}} \eta_0}{(1-\alpha)^2} \left(\frac{2}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} (2 \max_{1 \leq j < T} \|\Delta_j\|_2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) T^{-\alpha}.
\end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

The term  $I_{32}$  can be decomposed into  $t_{\text{mix}}$  martingales and bounded by the vector Azuma's inequality, invoking a similar technique to the tackling of the term  $I_4$  in the proof of Theorem C.2. With details omitted, we obtain with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\delta}{3}$  that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\mathbf{A}_i]) \tilde{\Delta}_{i_{\text{mix}}} \right\|_2^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{2}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \sqrt{\frac{t_{\text{mix}}}{1-\alpha} \log \frac{9t_{\text{mix}}}{\delta} R' T^{-\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}}. \tag{121}$$

The term  $I_{33}$  is bounded by the mixing property of the Markov chain, specifically

$$\left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\mathbf{A}_i] - \mathbf{A}) \tilde{\Delta}_{i_{\text{mix}}} \right\|_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{T} \left(\frac{2}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^T R'(i_{\text{mix}})^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \lesssim \left(\frac{2}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} R' T^{-\alpha}. \tag{122}$$

**Completing the proof.** Combining (118), (116), (117), (120), (121), and (122) by a union bound argument and plugging in the definition of  $R'$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\bar{\Delta}_T\|_2 &\lesssim 2 \sqrt{\frac{2\text{Tr}(\tilde{\Lambda}_T)}{T} \log \frac{6d}{\delta}} \\
&+ \frac{\eta_0 t_{\text{mix}} (T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})}{(1-\alpha)^2} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{2} \lambda_0 \eta_0\right)^{-\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} T^{-\alpha} \\
&+ \eta_0 \sqrt{\frac{2t_{\text{mix}} (T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})}{2\alpha-1} \log \frac{27T t_{\text{mix}} (T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})}{\delta}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{2} \lambda_0 \eta_0\right)^{-\frac{2+\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}} T^{-\alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{\eta_0 t_{\text{mix}}(T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})}{\sqrt{(1-\alpha)(2\alpha-1)}} \log \frac{27T t_{\text{mix}}(T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})}{\delta} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{2}\lambda_0\eta_0\right)^{-\frac{2+\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}} T^{-\frac{\alpha+1}{2}} \\
& + \eta_0 \frac{m}{1-\rho} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{4}\lambda_0\eta_0\right)^{-\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} T^{-1} \\
& \cdot \left[ (1-\lambda)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{6d}{\delta} + \left(\eta_0 \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right) + \alpha\right) \log T \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that all the terms beginning from the second line can all be bounded by

$$\tilde{C} T^{-\alpha} \log^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{dT}{\delta},$$

where  $\tilde{C}$  is a problem-related quantity depending on  $\alpha, \eta_0, \lambda_0, \gamma, m, \rho$  and  $\lambda$ . The theorem follows immediately.

#### C.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Following the precedent of Wu et al. [2024], we approach this Berry-Esseen bound by introducing a Gaussian comparison term. Specifically, the triangle inequality indicates

$$d_{\mathcal{C}}(\sqrt{T}\bar{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*)) \leq d_{\mathcal{C}}(\sqrt{T}\bar{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T)) + d_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*)) \quad (123)$$

where the second term on the right-hand-side can be bounded by the following proposition.

**Lemma 12.** *With  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T$  defined as in (17) and (42) respectively, it can be guaranteed for any  $\eta_0 \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda_{\Sigma}}$  that*

$$d_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*)) \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{d\text{cond}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}})}}{(1-\gamma)\lambda_0\eta_0} T^{\alpha-1} + O(T^{2\alpha-2}).$$

*Proof.* This lemma is a direct generalization of Theorem 3.3 in Wu et al. [2024], where  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T$  is replaced by  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^*$  is replaced by  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^*$ .  $\square$

We next focus on the first term on the right-hand-side of (123). For this, we notice that

$$d_{\mathcal{C}}(\sqrt{T}\bar{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T)) = d_{\mathcal{C}}(\sqrt{T}\mathbf{A}\bar{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{A}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T\mathbf{A}^{\top}));$$

and we will focus on bounding the latter.

Recall that  $\sqrt{T}\mathbf{A}\bar{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T$  can be decomposed as

$$\sqrt{T}\mathbf{A}\bar{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T = \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{T}\eta_0}\mathbf{Q}_0\boldsymbol{\Delta}_0}_{I_1} - \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A})\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i-1}}_{I_2} - \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{T}}\sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_i(\mathbf{A}_i\boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i)}_{I_3}. \quad (124)$$

In order to derive the non-asymptotic rate at which  $\sqrt{T}\mathbf{A}\bar{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T$  converges to its Gaussian distribution, we derive the convergence of  $I_1, I_2$  and  $I_3$  accordingly in the following paragraphs. For readability concerns, we will only keep track of dependence on  $T$  and  $d$  in this proof, and use  $\tilde{C}$  to denote any problem-related parameters that are related to  $\alpha, \gamma, \eta_0, \lambda_0, m, \rho$ .

**The a.s. convergence of  $I_1$ .** Lemma 6 directly implies that as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $I_1$  is bounded by

$$\left\| \frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{T}\eta_0}\mathbf{Q}_0\boldsymbol{\Delta}_0 \right\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}\eta_0} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}_0\| \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_0\|_2 \lesssim \lambda_{\Sigma} \left(\frac{2}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 T^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (125)$$

almost surely.

**Bounding  $I_2$  with high probability.** The convergence of  $I_2$  is result of the uniform boundedness of  $\mathbf{Q}_i$ , the convergence of  $\{\Delta_i\}$ , and the mixing property of the Markov chain. Specifically, we again apply the technique in the proof of Theorem C.2 and define

$$t_{\text{mix}} = t_{\text{mix}}(T^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \quad \text{and} \quad i_{\text{mix}} = \max\{i - t_{\text{mix}}, 0\}. \quad (126)$$

Assumption 3 implies that (see 82)

$$t_{\text{mix}} \leq \frac{\log m + \frac{1}{2} \log T}{\log(1/\rho)} \lesssim \frac{\log T}{1 - \rho}. \quad (127)$$

The term  $I_2$  can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) (\Delta_i - \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}} \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) (\Delta_{i-1} - \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}})}_{I_{21}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\mathbf{A}_i]) \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}}}_{I_{22}} \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\mathbf{A}_i] - \mathbf{A}) \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}}}_{I_{23}}; \end{aligned}$$

for the term  $I_{21}$ , recall that the difference between  $\Delta_{i-1}$  and  $\Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}}$  can be further decomposed into

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{i-1} - \Delta_{i_{\text{mix}}} &= \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i_{\text{mix}}} = \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}+1}^{i-1} \eta_j (\boldsymbol{\theta}_j - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{j-1}) \\ &= - \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}+1}^{i-1} \eta_j (\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}_{j-1} - \mathbf{b}_j) \\ &= - \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}+1}^{i-1} \eta_j (\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_j) - \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}+1}^{i-1} \eta_j \mathbf{A}_j \Delta_{j-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the decomposition of  $I_2$  can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= - \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \left[ \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}+1}^{i-1} \eta_j (\mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_j) \right]}_{I_{20}} \\ &- \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \left[ \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}+1}^{i-1} \eta_j \mathbf{A}_j \Delta_{j-1} \right]}_{I'_{21}} + I_{22} + I_{23}, \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

where the norm of  $I_{20}$  is bounded almost surely by

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_{20}\|_2 &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i\| \|\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}\| \cdot \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}+1}^{i-1} \eta_j (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T (2 + \tilde{C}i^{\alpha-1}) \cdot t_{\text{mix}} \eta_i (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \left[ \frac{\eta_0}{1-\rho} T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} \log T + \tilde{C} T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log^2 T \right] \\
&= \frac{\eta_0}{1-\rho} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} \log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}).
\end{aligned} \tag{129}$$

Here, the second line follows from Lemma 6, and the third line uses the bound (127) on  $t_{\text{mix}}$ .

For the term  $I'_{21}$ , we invoke the fact that for any vectors  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , it can be guaranteed that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \right\|_2^2 \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2;$$

Consequently, the norm of  $I'_{21}$  is bounded, in expectation, by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|I'_{21}\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}+1}^{i-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) \eta_j \mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{j-1} \right\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{T} \cdot (T t_{\text{mix}}) \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}+1}^{i-1} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}) \eta_j \mathbf{A}_j \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{j-1}\|_2^2 \\
&\leq t_{\text{mix}} \sum_{i=1}^T \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i\|^2 \|\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}\|^2 \cdot \left( 4 \sum_{j=i_{\text{mix}}+1}^{i-1} \eta_j^2 \mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{j-1}\|_2^2 \right) \\
&\lesssim \eta_0^2 t_{\text{mix}}^2 (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 \sum_{i=1}^T (2 + \tilde{C} i^{\alpha-1}) i^{-2\alpha} \left( \frac{\eta_0}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{(1-\rho)^2} i^{-\alpha} \log^2 i + \tilde{C}' i^{-1} \log^2 i \right) \\
&\lesssim \tilde{C} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 T^{1-3\alpha} \log^4 T = o(T^{\frac{3}{2}-3\alpha}),
\end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

where we invoke Theorem C.1 in the fourth line.

The term  $I_{22}$  can be decomposed into  $t_{\text{mix}}$  martingales:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}}[\mathbf{A}_i]) \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i_{\text{mix}}} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{T} \left\| \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\text{mix}}} \sum_{i=0}^{T'-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r} (\mathbf{A}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r} - \mathbb{E}_{(i-1)t_{\text{mix}}+r}[\mathbf{A}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r}]) \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(i-1)t_{\text{mix}}+r} \right\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \frac{t_{\text{mix}}}{T} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\text{mix}}} \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{T'-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r} (\mathbf{A}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r} - \mathbb{E}_{(i-1)t_{\text{mix}}+r}[\mathbf{A}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r}]) \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(i-1)t_{\text{mix}}+r} \right\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice here that for any  $r \in [t_{\text{mix}}]$ , the sequence

$$\left\{ \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r} (\mathbf{A}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r} - \mathbb{E}_{(i-1)t_{\text{mix}}+r}[\mathbf{A}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r}]) \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(i-1)t_{\text{mix}}+r} \right\}_{i=0}^{T'-1}$$

is a martingale difference. Therefore, its expected norm can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{T'-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r} (\mathbf{A}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r} - \mathbb{E}_{(i-1)t_{\text{mix}}+r}[\mathbf{A}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r}]) \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(i-1)t_{\text{mix}}+r} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{T'-1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r} (\mathbf{A}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r} - \mathbb{E}_{(i-1)t_{\text{mix}}+r}[\mathbf{A}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r}]) \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(i-1)t_{\text{mix}}+r} \right\|_2^2 \\
&\lesssim \sum_{i=0}^{T'-1} \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_{it_{\text{mix}}+r}\|^2 \mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(i-1)t_{\text{mix}}+r}\|_2^2
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the norm of  $I_{22}$  is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}} [\mathbf{A}_i]) \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i_{\text{mix}}} \right\|_2^2 \\
& \leq \frac{t_{\text{mix}}}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i\|^2 \mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 \\
& \leq \frac{\log T}{(1-\rho)T} \sum_{i=1}^T (2 + O(i^{\alpha-1}))^2 \left[ \frac{\eta_0}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{(1-\rho)^2} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 i^{-\alpha} \log^2 i + O(i_{\text{mix}}^{-1} \log^2 i) \right] \\
& \leq \frac{\eta_0}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{(1-\rho)^3} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 T^{-\alpha} \log^3 T + O(T^{-1} \log^3 T) \\
& = \frac{\eta_0}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{(1-\rho)^3} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 T^{-\alpha} \log^3 T + o(T^{-\alpha}). \tag{131}
\end{aligned}$$

For  $I_{23}$ , we make use of the fact that since

$$\max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_{\text{TV}}(P^{t_{\text{mix}}}(\cdot | s), \mu) \leq T^{-1/2},$$

the difference between  $\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}} [\mathbf{A}_i]$  and  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbb{E}_{\mu} [\mathbf{A}_i]$  is bounded by

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}} [\mathbf{A}_i] - \mathbb{E}_{\mu} [\mathbf{A}_i]\| \leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d_{\text{TV}}(P^{t_{\text{mix}}}(\cdot | s), \mu) \cdot \sup_{s_{i-1}, s_i} \|\mathbf{A}_i\| \leq 2T^{-1/2}.$$

Hence, by AM-GM inequality, the expected norm of  $I_{23}$  is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}} [\mathbf{A}_i] - \mathbf{A}) \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i_{\text{mix}}} \right\|_2^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}} [\mathbf{A}_i] - \mathbf{A}) \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbb{E} \{ \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i\|^2 \|\mathbb{E}_{i_{\text{mix}}} [\mathbf{A}_i] - \mathbf{A}\|^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 \} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^T (2 + O(i^{\alpha-1})) (T^{-1}) \left[ \frac{\eta_0}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{(1-\rho)^2} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 i^{-\alpha} \log^2 i + O(i_{\text{mix}}^{-1} \log^2 i) \right] \\
& \lesssim \frac{\eta_0}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{(1-\rho)^2} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 T^{-\alpha} \log^2 T + O(T^{-1} \log^2 T) \\
& = \frac{\eta_0}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{(1-\rho)^2} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 T^{-\alpha} \log^2 T + o(T^{-\alpha}). \tag{132}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (128), (129), (130), (131) and (132), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\| I_2 - \tilde{C}'_1 T^{\frac{1-2\alpha}{2}} \log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}) \right\|_2^2 &= \mathbb{E} \|I_2 - I_{20}\|_2^2 \\
&\leq 3 (\mathbb{E} \|I'_{21}\|_2^2 + \mathbb{E} \|I_{22}\|_2^2 + \mathbb{E} \|I_{23}\|_2^2) \\
&\lesssim (\tilde{C}'_2)^3 T^{-\alpha} \log^3 T + o(T^{\frac{3}{2}-3\alpha} + T^{-\alpha}),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use  $\tilde{C}'_1$  and  $\tilde{C}'_2$  to denote problem-related quantities

$$\tilde{C}'_1 = \frac{\eta_0}{1-\rho} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1), \quad \text{and} \tag{133}$$

$$\tilde{C}'_2 = \frac{1}{1-\rho} \left( \frac{\eta_0 (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}. \tag{134}$$

Therefore, the Chebyshev's inequality directly implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| I_2 - \tilde{C}'_1 T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} \log T - o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}) \right\|_2 \gtrsim \tilde{C}'_2 T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} \log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}}) \right) \\ \lesssim \tilde{C}'_2 T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} \log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}}). \end{aligned}$$

Applying the triangle inequality, we obtain the bound on  $I_2$  with high probability by triangle inequality:

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \|I_2\|_2 \gtrsim \tilde{C}'_1 T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} \log T + \tilde{C}'_2 T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} \log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}}) \right) \lesssim \tilde{C}'_2 T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} \log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}}). \quad (135)$$

**A Berry-Esseen bound for  $I_3$ .** Following the decomposition of the term  $I_2$  in the proof of Theorem 3, we represent  $I_3$  as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i (\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i) \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i}_{I_{31}} + \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{T}} (\mathbf{Q}_0 \mathbb{E}_0[\mathbf{U}_1] - \mathbf{Q}_T \mathbb{E}_T[\mathbf{U}_{T+1}])}_{I_{32}} + \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T (\mathbf{Q}_i - \mathbf{Q}_{i-1}) \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[\mathbf{U}_i]}_{I_{33}} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{U}_i$  is defined as in (111) and  $\mathbf{m}_i$  is defined as in (114). Here, the norm of  $I_{32}$  and  $I_{33}$  can be bounded by  $O(T^{-\frac{1}{2}})$  almost surely; it now boils down to the term  $I_{31}$ , for which we aim to apply Corollary 4. Specifically, let

$$\mathbf{f}_i(s_i, s_{i-1}) = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i,$$

it is easy to verify that for all  $i \in [T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{f}_i(s_i, s_{i-1})\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i\| \|\mathbf{m}_i\|_2 \\ &\leq (2 + O(i^{\alpha-1})) \cdot \frac{m}{1-\rho} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \\ &\lesssim \eta_0 \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{m}{1-\rho} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1), \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}_i \mathbf{f}_i^\top] &= \mathbf{A} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T \mathbf{A}^\top, \quad \text{with} \\ \|\mathbf{A} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T \mathbf{A}^\top - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\| &\leq O(T^{\alpha-1}). \end{aligned}$$

and when  $T$  satisfies (44), it can be guaranteed that  $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T \mathbf{A}^\top) \geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}})$ . Hence, a direct application of Corollary 4 reveals that

$$d_C \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{A} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T \mathbf{A}^\top) \right) \leq \tilde{C}_3 T^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log T + o(T^{-\frac{1}{4}}), \quad (136)$$

where  $\tilde{C}_3$  is a problem-related quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}_3 &= \left\{ \left( \frac{p}{(p-1)(1-\lambda)} \log \left( d \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right\|_{\mu,p} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \cdot \frac{m}{1-\rho} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{\frac{m}{1-\rho}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \cdot \eta_0 \left( \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)\lambda_0\eta_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{2(1-\alpha)}} \log^{\frac{1}{4}}(d\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\|) \right\} \cdot \sqrt{d\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\|_{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}}^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (137) \end{aligned}$$



**Completing the proof.** The proof now boils down to combining the convergence rate of  $I_1, I_2$  and the Berry-Esseen bound on  $I_3$ . For simplicity, we denote

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_T := \sqrt{T} \mathbf{A} \overline{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i = I_1 - I_2 - I_{32} - I_{33}.$$

From the previous calculations, we have shown that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_T\|_2 \gtrsim \tilde{C}'_1 T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} \log T + \tilde{C}'_2 T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} \log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}}) \right) \lesssim \tilde{C}'_2 T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} \log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}}),$$

and that

$$\sup_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i \in \mathcal{A} \right) - \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{A} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}) \right| \leq \tilde{C}_3 T^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log T + o(T^{-\frac{1}{4}}).$$

We now combine these two results to bound the difference between the distributions of  $\sqrt{T} \mathbf{A} \overline{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T$  and  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{A} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T \mathbf{A}^\top)$ . Considering any convex set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , define

$$\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}^{-\varepsilon} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : B(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Direct calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{T} \mathbf{A} \overline{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T \in \mathcal{A}) &= \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{T} \mathbf{A} \overline{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T \in \mathcal{A}, \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_T\|_2 > \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{T} \mathbf{A} \overline{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T \in \mathcal{A}, \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_T\|_2 \leq \varepsilon) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|\boldsymbol{\delta}_T\|_2 > \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{T} \mathbf{A} \overline{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T \in \mathcal{A}, \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_T\|_2 \leq \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the triangle inequality implies

$$\left( \sqrt{T} \mathbf{A} \overline{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T \in \mathcal{A}, \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_T\|_2 \leq \varepsilon \right) \Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i \in \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon.$$

Hence,  $\mathbb{P}(\sqrt{T} \mathbf{A} \overline{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T \in \mathcal{A})$  is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{T} \mathbf{A} \overline{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T \in \mathcal{A}) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|\boldsymbol{\delta}_T\|_2 > \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{m}_i \in \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|\boldsymbol{\delta}_T\|_2 > \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P} \left( \mathbf{A} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^\varepsilon \right) + \tilde{C}_3 T^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log T + o(T^{-\frac{1}{4}}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|\boldsymbol{\delta}_T\|_2 > \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P} \left( \mathbf{A} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A} \right) + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon + \tilde{C}_3 T^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log T + o(T^{-\frac{1}{4}}), \end{aligned}$$

where we invoked Theorem 9 in the last inequality. By letting

$$\varepsilon \asymp \tilde{C}'_1 T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} \log T + \tilde{C}'_2 T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} \log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}}),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{T} \mathbf{A} \overline{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_T \in \mathcal{A}) &\leq \tilde{C}'_2 T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} \log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}}) + \mathbb{P} \left( \mathbf{A} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A} \right) \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \tilde{C}'_1 T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} \log T + \tilde{C}'_2 T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} \log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}}) \right) + \tilde{C}_3 T^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log T + o(T^{-\frac{1}{4}}) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left( \mathbf{A} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A} \right) + (\tilde{C}'_1 T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + \tilde{C}'_2 T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} + \tilde{C}_3 T^{-\frac{1}{4}}) \log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} + T^{-\frac{1}{4}}). \end{aligned}$$

Here, in the last equality, we denote, for simplicity,

$$\tilde{C}_1 = \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{C}'_1 = \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\eta_0}{1-\rho} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1), \quad \text{and} \quad (138)$$

$$\tilde{C}_2 = (\|\tilde{\Gamma}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1)\tilde{C}'_2 = (\|\tilde{\Gamma}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1)\frac{1}{1-\rho} \left( \frac{\eta_0(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2}{\lambda_0(1-\gamma)} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}. \quad (139)$$

Using the same technique as in the proof of Corollary 4, a lower bound can be derived symmetrically. By taking a supremum over  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{E}$ , it can be guaranteed that

$$d_{\mathbb{C}}(\sqrt{T}\mathbf{A}\overline{\Delta}_T, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{A}\tilde{\Lambda}_T\mathbf{A}^\top)) \lesssim (\tilde{C}_1 T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + \tilde{C}_2 T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} + \tilde{C}_3 T^{-\frac{1}{4}})\log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} + T^{-\frac{1}{4}}). \quad (140)$$

Further combining (140) with (123) and Lemma 12, we obtain the Berry-Esseen bound

$$d_{\mathbb{C}}(\sqrt{T}\overline{\Delta}_T, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Lambda}^*)) \lesssim (\tilde{C}_1 T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + \tilde{C}_2 T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} + \tilde{C}_3 T^{-\frac{1}{4}} + \tilde{C}_4 T^{\alpha-1})\log T + o(T^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} + T^{-\frac{\alpha}{3}} + T^{-\frac{1}{4}} + T^{\alpha-1})$$

with  $\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2, \tilde{C}_3$  defined as in (138), (139), (137) respectively, and

$$\tilde{C}_4 = \frac{\sqrt{d\text{cond}(\tilde{\Gamma})}}{(1-\gamma)\lambda_0\eta_0}.$$

Finally, when  $\alpha = \frac{3}{4}$ , we have, coincidentally,

$$\frac{1}{2} - \alpha = -\frac{\alpha}{3} = -\frac{1}{4} = \alpha - 1.$$

Hence, Theorem 4 follows from taking  $\tilde{C} = \max\{\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2, \tilde{C}_3, \tilde{C}_4\}$ .

## C.5 Proof of Relation (21)

Following the same logic as Appendix B.4.1 in Wu et al. [2024], we can obtain a lower bound on the difference between  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Lambda}_T)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Lambda}^*)$ . Specifically, when  $T$  is sufficiently large,

$$d_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Lambda}_T), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Lambda}^*)) = d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Lambda}_T), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Lambda}^*)) \gtrsim O(T^{\alpha-1}).$$

Meanwhile, when  $\alpha > \frac{3}{4}$ , both  $\frac{1}{2} - \alpha$  and  $-\frac{\alpha}{3}$  are less than  $-\frac{1}{4}$ . Therefore, the upper bound (140) is transformed as

$$d_{\mathbb{C}}(\sqrt{T}\overline{\Delta}_T, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Lambda}_T)) \leq O(T^{-\frac{1}{4}}).$$

In combination, the triangle inequality reveals

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{C}}(\sqrt{T}\overline{\Delta}_T, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Lambda}^*)) &\geq d_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Lambda}_T), \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Lambda}^*)) - d_{\mathbb{C}}(\sqrt{T}\overline{\Delta}_T, \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Lambda}_T)) \\ &\gtrsim O(T^{\alpha-1}) - O(T^{-\frac{1}{4}}) \\ &\gtrsim O(T^{\alpha-1}) \gtrsim O(T^{-\frac{1}{4}}). \end{aligned}$$

Here, in the last line, we applied the fact that since  $\alpha > \frac{3}{4}$ ,  $\alpha - 1 \geq -\frac{1}{4}$ .

**Choose of stepsizes.** We conclude by noting that choice of the stepsize in Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 are different: in Theorem 3,  $\eta_0$  depends on  $\delta$  and other problem-related quantities like  $\lambda_0$  and  $\gamma$ , and  $\alpha$  can take any value between  $\frac{1}{2}$  and 1; however, in Theorem 4, the initial stepsize  $\eta_0$  can take any value less than  $1/2\lambda_{\Sigma}$ , while  $\alpha$  is set to the specific value of  $\frac{3}{4}$ . In fact, our proof of Theorem 4 allows for a general choice of  $\alpha$ ; however, using other values of  $\alpha$  other than  $3/4$  appears to be suboptimal.

## D Proof of supportive lemmas and propositions

### D.1 Proof of Proposition 4

We address these recursive relations in order.

**Proof of (53).** By definition and according to Proposition 3, the left-hand-side is featured by

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H})\mathbf{g}^\parallel \right)^\parallel \right\|_\mu &= \left\| \left( \exp(t\mathbf{H})\mathbf{g}^\parallel \right)^\parallel \right\|_\mu \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \exp(t\mathbf{H})\mathbf{g}^\parallel \right] = \|\mathbb{E}_\mu[\exp(t\mathbf{H})]\| \cdot \|\mathbf{g}^\parallel\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mu(\mathbf{H}) = \mathbf{0}$ , the expectation of  $\exp(t\mathbf{H})$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}_\mu \exp(t\mathbf{H})\| &= \left\| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_\mu \frac{1}{k!} (t\mathbf{H})^k \right\| \leq \|\mathbf{I}\| + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \|\mathbb{E}_\mu (t\mathbf{H})^2\| \\ &\leq 1 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} (tM)^k = \exp(tM) - tM. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof of (54).** Since  $\mathbf{g}^\parallel(x) = \mu(\mathbf{g}) = \|\mathbf{g}^\parallel\|_\mu$  is a constant function, the left hand side can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H})\mathbf{g}^\parallel \right)^\perp \right\|_\mu &= \|\mathbf{g}^\parallel\|_\mu \cdot \left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H}) \right)^\perp \right\|_\mu = \|\mathbf{g}^\parallel\|_\mu \cdot \left\| \mathcal{P}^* (\exp(t\mathbf{H}))^\perp \right\|_\mu \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{g}^\parallel\|_\mu \cdot \lambda \left\| (\exp(t\mathbf{H}))^\perp \right\|_\mu \\ &= \|\mathbf{g}^\parallel\|_\mu \cdot \lambda \left\| (\exp(t\mathbf{H}) - \mathbf{I})^\perp \right\|_\mu \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{g}^\parallel\|_\mu \cdot \lambda \sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \|\exp(t\mathbf{H}(x)) - \mathbf{I}\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{g}^\parallel\|_\mu \cdot \lambda (\exp(tM) - 1). \end{aligned}$$

**Proof of (55).** By definition, the left-hand-side can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H})\mathbf{g}^\perp \right)^\parallel \right\|_\mu &= \|\mu(\mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H})\mathbf{g}^\perp)\| = \|\mu(\exp(t\mathbf{H})\mathbf{g}^\perp)\| \\ &= \|\mu((\exp(t\mathbf{H}) - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{g}^\perp)\| \\ &\leq \|(\exp(t\mathbf{H}) - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{g}^\perp\|_\mu \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \|\exp(t\mathbf{H}) - \mathbf{I}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{g}^\perp\|_\mu \\ &\leq (\exp(tM) - 1) \|\mathbf{g}^\perp\|_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof of (56).** As a direct implication of Proposition 3, the left-hand-side is featured by

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left( \mathcal{P}^* \exp(t\mathbf{H})\mathbf{g}^\perp \right)^\perp \right\|_\mu &= \left\| \mathcal{P}^* (\exp(t\mathbf{H})\mathbf{g}^\perp)^\perp \right\|_\mu \leq \lambda \left\| (\exp(t\mathbf{H})\mathbf{g}^\perp)^\perp \right\|_\mu \\ &\leq \lambda \|\exp(t\mathbf{H})\mathbf{g}^\perp\|_\mu \\ &\leq \lambda \sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \|\exp(t\mathbf{H}(x))\| \|\mathbf{g}^\perp\|_\mu \\ &\leq \lambda \exp(tM) \|\mathbf{g}^\perp\|_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

## D.2 Proof of Lemma 10

Direct calculation reveals

$$\frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_4}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{(\alpha_1 - \alpha_4)^2 + 4\alpha_3^2}}{2} = \alpha_1 + \frac{\sqrt{(\alpha_1 - \alpha_4)^2 + 4\alpha_3^2}}{2} - \frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_4}{2}$$

$$= \alpha_1 + \frac{2\alpha_3^2}{\sqrt{(\alpha_1 - \alpha_4)^2 + 4\alpha_3^2} + (\alpha_1 - \alpha_4)}. \quad (141)$$

In what follows, we firstly illustrate that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{(\alpha_1 - \alpha_4)^2 + 4\alpha_3^2} + (\alpha_1 - \alpha_4) \\ &= \sqrt{((1 - \lambda)e^x - x)^2 + 4(e^x - 1)^2} + (1 - \lambda)e^x - x \\ &=: f(x) \geq 2(1 - \lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (142)$$

In fact, since  $f(0) = 2(1 - \lambda)$ , it suffices to show that  $f'(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x \geq 0$ . Towards this end, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} f'(x) &= \frac{((1 - \lambda)e^x - x)((1 - \lambda)e^x - 1) + 4(e^x - 1)e^x}{\sqrt{((1 - \lambda)e^x - x)^2 + 4(e^x - 1)^2}} + (1 - \lambda)e^x - 1 \\ &= \frac{[(1 - \lambda)e^x - 1] \left[ \sqrt{((1 - \lambda)e^x - x)^2 + 4(e^x - 1)^2} - ((1 - \lambda)e^x - x) \right] + 4(e^x - 1)e^x}{\sqrt{((1 - \lambda)e^x - x)^2 + 4(e^x - 1)^2}} \end{aligned}$$

Since the denominator is always positive, we now focus on showing that the numerator. Specifically, we discuss the following three cases:

1. If  $(1 - \lambda)e^x - 1 \geq 0$ , then since  $\sqrt{((1 - \lambda)e^x - x)^2 + 4(e^x - 1)^2} > (1 - \lambda)e^x - x$ , the numerator is positive;
2. If  $(1 - \lambda)e^x - 1 < 0$  and  $(1 - \lambda)e^x - x \geq 0$ , then by triangle inequality,

$$\sqrt{((1 - \lambda)e^x - x)^2 + 4(e^x - 1)^2} - ((1 - \lambda)e^x - x) \leq 2(e^x - 1).$$

Meanwhile, since  $(1 - \lambda)e^x - 1 > -1 > -e^x$ , it can be guaranteed that

$$\begin{aligned} & [(1 - \lambda)e^x - 1] \left[ \sqrt{((1 - \lambda)e^x - x)^2 + 4(e^x - 1)^2} - ((1 - \lambda)e^x - x) \right] + 4(e^x - 1)e^x \\ & > -e^x[2(e^x - 1)] + 4(e^x - 1)e^x > 0. \end{aligned}$$

3. If  $(1 - \lambda)e^x - 1 < 0$  and  $(1 - \lambda)e^x - x < 0$ , then also by triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{((1 - \lambda)e^x - x)^2 + 4(e^x - 1)^2} - ((1 - \lambda)e^x - x) &\leq 2(e^x - 1) + 2(x - (1 - \lambda)e^x) \\ &< 2(e^x - 1 + x) < 4(e^x - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, again because  $(1 - \lambda)e^x - 1 > -1 > -e^x$ , the numerator is bounded below by

$$\begin{aligned} & [(1 - \lambda)e^x - 1] \left[ \sqrt{((1 - \lambda)e^x - x)^2 + 4(e^x - 1)^2} - ((1 - \lambda)e^x - x) \right] + 4(e^x - 1)e^x \\ & > e^{-x} \cdot 4(e^x - 1) + 4(e^x - 1)e^x > 0. \end{aligned}$$

In all three cases, we have proved that  $f'(x) > 0$ . This complete the proof of (142). As a direct consequence of (141) and (142), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_4}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{(\alpha_1 - \alpha_4)^2 + 4\alpha_3^2}}{2} \\ & \leq \alpha_1 + \frac{\alpha_3^2}{1 - \lambda} = (e^x - x) + \frac{(e^x - 1)^2}{1 - \lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

We now proceed to further bound this upper bound. On one hand, when  $x \in (0, 1)$ , It can be guaranteed that  $e^x - x < 1 + x^2$  and  $e^x - 1 < 2x$ . Therefore,

$$(e^x - x) + \frac{(e^x - 1)^2}{1 - \lambda} \leq 1 + x^2 + \frac{(2x)^2}{1 - \lambda}$$

$$< 1 + \frac{5x^2}{1-\lambda} < \exp\left(\frac{5x^2}{1-\lambda}\right)$$

where we invoked the fact that  $1 + x < e^x$  in the last inequality. On the other hand, when  $x > 1$ , define

$$g(x) = \exp\left(\frac{5x^2}{1-\lambda}\right) - \left[(e^x - x) + \frac{(e^x - 1)^2}{1-\lambda}\right];$$

it is easy to illustrate that  $g'(x) > 0$  for any  $x > 1$ , and therefore  $g(x)$  is monotonically increasing with respect to  $x$ . This completes the proof of the Lemma.

### D.3 Proof of Proposition 5

This proposition is a generalization of Proposition 2.2 in Gallouët et al. [2018a], and the proofs are similar to each other. Recall from Gallouët et al. [2018a], proof of Proposition 2.2, that for any  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\| = 1$ ,

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{x}) \boldsymbol{\alpha} = - \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1) g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) \right] dt.$$

Hence, the difference between  $\nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{y})$  can be featured by

$$\begin{aligned} & \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top (\nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{y})) \boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ &= - \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1) \left( g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) - g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{y} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) \right) \right] dt \\ &= - \underbrace{\int_0^{1-\eta} \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1) \left( g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) - g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{y} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) \right) \right] dt}_{I_1} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\int_{1-\eta}^1 \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1) g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) \right] dt}_{I_2} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\int_{1-\eta}^1 \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1) g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{y} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) \right] dt}_{I_3}, \end{aligned} \tag{143}$$

where  $\eta \in (0, 1]$  is a variable to be determined later. We address the terms  $I_1$ ,  $I_2$  and  $I_3$  accordingly.

**Bounding  $I_1$ .** Since  $g(\mathbf{x}) = h(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\mu})$  and  $h \in \text{Lip}_1$ , it can be guaranteed that

$$\left| g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) - g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{y} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) \right| \leq \sqrt{t} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \right\|_2;$$

hence,  $I_1$  can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^{1-\eta} \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1) \left( g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) - g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{y} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) \right) \right] dt \right| \\ & \leq \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \right\|_2 \mathbb{E} |(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1| \int_0^{1-\eta} \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2(1-t)} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Here, since  $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$  and  $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_2 = 1$ , we have  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and therefore  $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 \sim \chi^2(1)$ . Consequently,  $\mathbb{E} |(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1|$  is the standard error of  $\chi^2(1)$  distribution, thus a universal constant. Meanwhile, the integral is bounded by

$$\int_0^{1-\eta} \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2(1-t)} dt \leq \int_0^{1-\eta} \frac{1}{2(1-t)} dt = -\frac{1}{2}(\log \eta).$$

In combination, the term  $I_1$  is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^{1-\eta} \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1) \left( g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) - g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{y} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) \right) \right] dt \right| \\ & \lesssim \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \right\|_2 (-\log \eta). \end{aligned} \quad (144)$$

**Bounding  $I_2$ .** Since  $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 \sim \chi^2(1)$ , we naturally have  $\mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2] = 1$ . Therefore,  $I_2$  can be rephrased as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{1-\eta}^1 \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1) g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) \right] dt \\ & = \int_{1-\eta}^1 \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1) \left( g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) - g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x}) \right) \right] dt, \end{aligned}$$

and its absolute value can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{1-\eta}^1 \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1) g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) \right] dt \right| \\ & \leq \int_{1-\eta}^1 \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ |(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1| \left| g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) - g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x}) \right| \right] dt \\ & \leq \int_{1-\eta}^1 \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ |(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1| \sqrt{1-t} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{z}\|_2 \right] dt \\ & \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \mathbb{E}[|(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1| \|\mathbf{z}\|_2] \int_{1-\eta}^1 \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1-t}} dt \end{aligned}$$

As is illustrated by Equation (26) in [Gallouët et al. \[2018a\]](#), the expectation is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[|(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1| \|\mathbf{z}\|_2] \lesssim \sqrt{d},$$

and the integral is bounded by

$$\int_{1-\eta}^1 \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1-t}} dt \leq \sqrt{\eta}.$$

So in combination, the term  $I_2$  is bounded by

$$\left| \int_{1-\eta}^1 \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{z})^2 - 1) g(\sqrt{t}\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{z}) \right] dt \right| \quad (145)$$

$$\lesssim \sqrt{d} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \sqrt{\eta}. \quad (146)$$

The term  $I_3$  can be bounded by a similar manner.

**Completing the proof.** Combining (143), (144) and (145) by triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top (\nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{y})) \boldsymbol{\alpha}| \\ & \lesssim \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \right\|_2 (-\log \eta) + \sqrt{d} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \sqrt{\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

In the case where  $2\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})\|_2 > \sqrt{d}\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|$ , we can simply take  $\eta = 1$ , yielding the bound

$$|\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top (\nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{y})) \boldsymbol{\alpha}| \lesssim \sqrt{d} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|; \quad (147)$$

otherwise, when  $2\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d}\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|$ , we can set

$$\eta = \frac{4\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})\|_2^2}{d\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|},$$

yielding the bound

$$|\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top (\nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{y})) \boldsymbol{\alpha}| \lesssim 2 \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})\|_2 \left( 1 + \log \frac{\sqrt{d} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})\|_2} \right). \quad (148)$$

For simplicity, we use  $f(x, a)$  to denote the piecewise function

$$f(x, a) = \begin{cases} x + x \log a - x \log x, & \text{if } x \in [0, a]; \\ a, & \text{if } x > a. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to illustrate that

$$f(x) \leq (1 + \log a)^+ x + e^{-1}.$$

Therefore, by combining (147) and (148), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top (\nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla^2 f_g(\mathbf{y})) \boldsymbol{\alpha}| &\leq f(2 \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})\|_2, \sqrt{d} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|) \\ &\leq (2 + \log(d \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|))^+ \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})\|_2 + e^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

#### D.4 Proof of Equation (68)

Essentially, it suffices to show that for any fixed matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and random vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_2. \quad (149)$$

To see this, we use

$$\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{P}^\top$$

to denote the eigen decomposition of  $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ , where  $\mathbf{P}$  is a ortho-normal matrix and  $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d\}$  where  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d \geq 0$ . Further denote  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{x}$ , then the norms of  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$  can be represented by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 &= \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{y} = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i y_i^2, \quad \text{and} \\ \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 &= \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d y_i^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For every  $i \in [d]$ , it is easy to verify that

$$y_i^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{y}\|_2$$

are positively correlated, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i y_i^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \mathbb{E}[y_i^2] \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \mathbb{E}[y_i^2 \|\mathbf{y}\|_2] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i y_i^2 \right) \cdot \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the inequality on the third line follows from the Chebyshev's association inequality.

## D.5 Proof of Lemma 11

The TD update rule (3.1) directly implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\theta}_t - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} &= \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i (\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \mathbf{b}_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i (\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i) + \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i \mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\Delta}_i.
\end{aligned} \tag{150}$$

We will apply this relation to prove the three bounds respectively.

**Proof of Equation (83a).** By triangle inequality, (150) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_t - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 &\leq \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i \mathbb{E} \|(\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i)\|_2 + \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\Delta}_i\| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) + \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i 2\mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_i\|_2 \\
&\leq t_{\text{mix}} \eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) + 2\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}} \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_i\|_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the fact that the stepsizes  $\{\eta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  are non-increasing.

**Proof of Equation (83b).** We firstly notice that for a set of  $n$  vectors  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ , it always holds true that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \right\|_2^2 \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2.$$

Therefore, (150) implies the following bound for  $\mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_t - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_t - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 &\leq 2t_{\text{mix}} \cdot \left\{ \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i^2 \mathbb{E} \|(\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i)\|_2^2 + \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i^2 \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\Delta}_i\|_2^2 \right\} \\
&\leq 2t_{\text{mix}} \cdot \left\{ t_{\text{mix}} \eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^2 (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 + 4\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^2 \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_i\|_2^2 \right\} \\
&= 2t_{\text{mix}} \eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}^2 \left[ t_{\text{mix}} (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)^2 + 4 \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_i\|_2^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

**Proof of Equation (83c).** By triangle inequality, (150) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} [\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_t - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i \mathbb{E} [\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \mathbf{b}_i\|_2] + \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i \mathbb{E} [\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\Delta}_i\|_2] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i (2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1) \mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 + \sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1} \eta_i \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}_i \boldsymbol{\Delta}_i\|_2^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$



$$\leq t_{\text{mix}}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}(2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_2 + 1)\mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2 + \frac{1}{2}\eta_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\left(\mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{t-t_{\text{mix}}}\|_2^2 + 2\sum_{i=t-t_{\text{mix}}}^{t-1}\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_i\|_2^2\right).$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.