

Policy Mirror Descent with Temporal Difference Learning: Sample Complexity under Online Markov Data

Wenye Li, Hongxu Chen, Jiacai Liu, Ke Wei

School of Data Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, China.

January 1, 2026

Abstract

This paper studies the policy mirror descent (PMD) method, which is a general policy optimization framework in reinforcement learning and can cover a wide range of policy gradient methods by specifying difference mirror maps. Existing sample complexity analysis for policy mirror descent either focuses on the generative sampling model, or the Markovian sampling model but with the action values being explicitly approximated to certain pre-specified accuracy. In contrast, we consider the sample complexity of policy mirror descent with temporal difference (TD) learning under the Markovian sampling model. Two algorithms called Expected TD-PMD and Approximate TD-PMD have been presented, which are off-policy and mixed policy algorithms respectively. Under a small enough constant policy update step size, the $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ (a logarithm factor about ε is hidden in $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$) sample complexity can be established for them to achieve average-time ε -optimality. The sample complexity is further improved to $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ (without the hidden logarithm factor) to achieve the last-iterate ε -optimality based on adaptive policy update step sizes.

1 Introduction

The goal of Reinforcement learning (RL) is to solve a sequential decision problem via interacting with the environment [Sutton and Barto, 2018], and it plays an important role in various application fields including robotics [Hwangbo et al., 2019, Lee et al., 2020, Miki et al., 2022, Zhang et al., 2025a], structure explorations [Jumper et al., 2021, Fawzi et al., 2022], and the post-training in Large Language Models (LLMs) [Zhang et al., 2025b]. Markov decision process (MDP) is a fundamental model for RL. Let $\Delta(\mathcal{X})$ denotes the probabilistic simplex over set \mathcal{X} . An MDP can be described as a tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, \gamma)$, where \mathcal{S} is the state space, \mathcal{A} is the action space, $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ is the state transition model, $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the reward function, and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ is the discounted factor. To interact with the environment, the agent is equipped with a policy $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$. At each time, the agent chooses an action $a \in \mathcal{A}$ at state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ with probability $\pi(a|s)$, then it transfers to a new state s' with the probability $P(s'|s, a)$ with a reward $r(s, a)$. By repeating the procedure above, the agent obtains a trajectory $\{(s_t, a_t, r_t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, where $s_t \sim P(\cdot|s_{t-1}, a_{t-1})$, $a_t \sim \pi(\cdot|s_t)$, and $r_t = r(s_t, a_t)$. The state value induced by policy π at state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is defined as the expectation of the discounted cumulative rewards over trajectories,

$$V^\pi(s) := \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) \mid s_0 = s, \pi \right].$$

Similarly, the action value function induced by π is defined as

$$Q^\pi(s, a) := \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) \mid s_0 = s, a_0 = a, \pi \right].$$

The goal of RL is to seek the optimal policy which maximizes the state values or action values,

$$\max_{\pi \in \Pi} V^\pi(\mu) := \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu}[V^\pi(s)] \quad \text{or} \quad \max_{\pi \in \Pi} Q^\pi(\rho) := \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \rho}[Q^\pi(s,a)], \quad (1)$$

where $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, $\rho \in \Delta(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})$ are some distribution and Π denotes the set of all admissible policies.

Policy mirror descent (PMD) is an instance of policy optimization methods for solving (1). Let h be a function that is proper, closed, strictly convex, essentially smooth, and satisfying $\text{int dom}(h) \cap \Delta(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$ (see for example Beck [2017] for related definitions). The policy update of PMD is given by [Xiao, 2022, Lan, 2021]

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S} : \quad \pi^+(\cdot|s) = \arg \max_{p \in \Delta(\mathcal{A})} \{ \eta \langle p, Q^\pi(s, \cdot) \rangle - D_h(p \| \pi(\cdot|s)) \},$$

where $\eta > 0$ is the policy update step size and $D_h(p \| q) = h(p) - h(q) - \langle \nabla h(q), p - q \rangle$ is the Bregman divergence induced by h . The PMD update fits into the general mirror descent (MD) framework in optimization Xiao [2022] and covers a wide range of policy gradient methods by specifying different h . Thus, it has received intensive investigations recently.

1.1 Related works

PMD Finite-time global convergence of exact PMD (i.e., when action value Q^{π_k} can be computed exactly) have been studied in for example Xiao [2022], Lan [2021], Johnson et al. [2023]. Specifically, it is shown in Lan [2021], Xiao [2022] that exact PMD enjoys a $O(1/K)$ dimension-free global sublinear convergence with any constant step size. Moreover, the global linear convergence can be obtained with geometrically increasing step sizes [Xiao, 2022]. In Johnson et al. [2023], the γ -rate global linear convergence is established under adaptive step sizes. Another line of research considers the regularized setting, i.e., when the object value function (equation (1)) is equipped with a regularized term. Under such setting, PMD can achieve global linear convergence with a large constant step size [Lan, 2021]. The global linear convergence is then extended to the scenario for any constant step sizes [Zhan et al., 2023]. Furthermore, PMD enjoys the local super-linear convergence and the policy convergence under geometrically increasing the step sizes if the coefficient of regularization term decreases properly [Li et al., 2023b]. There are also works investigating the convergence of PMD with function approximation [Alfano et al., 2023], variance reduction PMD [Yang et al., 2019, Huang et al., 2022], and the acceleration of PMD [Chelu and Precup, 2024]. There are also other variants of PMD where Q^{π_k} is replaced by different Q-values. For instance, h -PMD [Protopapas and Barakat, 2024] applies an h -step lookahead of optimal Bellman operation over Q^{π_k} and achieves a γ^h -rate global linear convergence under adaptive step sizes. A TD-PMD algorithm (also known as MD-MPI Type I in Geist et al. [2019]) is considered in Liu et al. [2025b], which replaces exact action value Q^{π_k} with a temporal difference learning estimation. Despite the inaccuracy of the action value, it is shown in Liu et al. [2025b] that TD-PMD enjoys similar convergence as vanilla PMD, including the sublinear convergence for constant step sizes and linear convergence for adaptive step sizes.

Most of existing sample complexity analysis of PMD is based on the generative model, where one can generate arbitrary trajectories starting from any state-action pair $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$. The sample complexity for unregularized PMD to find a high-probability last-iterate ε -optimal policy under the generative model is $\tilde{O}((1 - \gamma)^{-8}\varepsilon^{-2})$ [Xiao, 2022, Johnson et al., 2023], and to find an average-time ε -optimal policy is $\tilde{O}((1 - \gamma)^{-6}\varepsilon^{-2})$ in Lan [2021]. TD-PMD [Liu et al., 2025b] and h -PMD [Protopapas and Barakat, 2024] improve the last-iterate sample complexity of PMD to $\tilde{O}((1 - \gamma)^{-7}\varepsilon^{-2})$. For regularized PMD, the $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ sample complexity is obtained in Lan [2021]. By carefully decreasing the coefficient of the regularization term, the $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity for obtaining the last-iterate ε -optimal solution of the unregularized MPD is established in Lan [2021], Li et al. [2023b]¹. Besides the generative model, there are several works investigating the sample complexity of PMD under the Markovian sampling model [Lan, 2021, Li et al., 2024, Li and

¹More concretely, the sample complexity in Li et al. [2023b] is $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon_0^{-2})$ with probability at least $O(1 - \varepsilon_0^{1/3})$ for any $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, where ε_0 is a sufficiently small constant.

Lan, 2025], i.e., sampling a single and complete trajectory $\{(s_t, a_t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ via the interaction with environment. In Lan [2021], Li et al. [2024]², conditional temporal difference learning (CTD) is adopted to evaluate the action value of current policy. More precisely, CTD takes samples every m steps based on the current policy, and then solves the Bellman equation in a stochastic manner to obtain an accurate approximation of Q^{π_k} . In Li and Lan [2025], it adopts an alternative approach based on Monte Carlo estimation (MC) to approximate Q^{π_k} from the Markov data. The sample complexity for unregularized PMD is $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ and is $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ for regularized PMD for both CTD [Lan, 2021, Li et al., 2024] and MC learning [Li and Lan, 2025].

Natural policy gradient When h is specified to the negative entropy, i.e., $h(p) = -\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} p(a) \log p(a)$, PMD reduces to NPG under the softmax policy parameterization (softmax NPG). The $O(1/\sqrt{K})$ global sublinear convergence of softmax NPG is established in Shani et al. [2020], and the rate is improved to $O(1/K)$ in Agarwal et al. [2021] with arbitrary constant step size. It is worth remarking that the $O(1/K)$ sublinear convergence of exact PMD in Xiao [2022] is indeed an extension of that for softmax NPG in Agarwal et al. [2021]. Though softmax NPG can be covered by PMD, specific results can be obtained for softmax NPG by leveraging its explicit policy update formula. For instance, by characterizing the policy over non-optimal actions, the local $\exp(-\eta\Delta(1 - 1/\lambda))$ linear convergence rate for softmax NPG is established in Khodadadian et al. [2021b], where $\lambda > 1$ is the parameter correlated to the local phase and $\Delta > 0$ is some MDP-dependent constant. Furthermore, the global linear convergence is achieved by applying adaptive step sizes [Khodadadian et al., 2021b]. Another linear convergence analysis can be found in Bhandari and Russo [2021], where the relation of softmax NPG and policy iteration algorithm (PI, see for instance Sutton and Barto [2018]) is discussed and the $\frac{1+\gamma}{2}$ -rate linear convergence is established with adaptive step sizes. The global linear convergence is then extended to the arbitrary constant step size $\eta > 0$ case in Liu et al. [2024] by computing the state improvement $\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{k+1}(a|s)[Q^{\pi_k}(s, a) - V^{\pi_k}(s)]$, though the convergence rate convergence rate is dynamic and cannot be expressed in terms of the problem parameters. Recently, it is shown in Li et al. [2025] that softmax NPG indeed converges in the policy domain and enjoys an exact asymptotic convergence rate of $\exp(-\eta\Delta)$. The analysis of regularized softmax NPG can be found in Shani et al. [2020], Cen et al. [2022], Liu et al. [2024], Cayci et al. [2024b], and we note that a tight local linear convergence rate of $1/(\eta\tau + 1)^2$ is established in Liu et al. [2024] for entropy regularized softmax NPG, where τ is the coefficient of the entropy regularization term.

Under softmax policy parameterization with a generative model, the $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity of NPG can be directly obtained by the aforementioned PMD analyzes [Xiao, 2022, Lan, 2021, Johnson et al., 2023]. For log-linear policy, NPG and its variant Q-NPG are studied in Agarwal et al. [2021] with the $O(1/\sqrt{K})$ global sublinear convergence rate. Further combined with an unbiased sampler for state/action values, the $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity is obtained in Yuan et al. [2023] where the regression sub-problem is solved by stochastic gradient descent. The $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity is also established in Feng et al. [2024] for general smooth and non-degenerate policies under Monte Carlo sampling through variance reduction, which is inspired by Fatkhullin et al. [2023]. Natural actor-critic methods (NAC [Konda and Tsitsiklis, 2000, Peters and Schaal, 2008]) under i.i.d. sampling³ [Wang et al., 2020, Fu et al., 2021] and Markov sampling [Khodadadian et al., 2021a, 2022, Gaur et al., 2024, Wang et al., 2024, Xu et al., 2020a,b, Cayci et al., 2024a] are also extensively investigated. In the softmax tabular case, the sample complexity for on-policy NAC is $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-6})$ [Khodadadian et al., 2022] and the one for off-policy NAC is $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ [Khodadadian et al., 2021a]. The best known sample complexity for NAC is $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ for general smooth policies as well as well as the neural policy parameterization [Xu et al., 2020a, Wang et al., 2024, Gaur et al., 2024].

Other related policy gradient methods For exact projected policy gradient (PPG) in the tabular case, its $O(1/\sqrt{K})$ global sublinear convergence with small constant step size is established in Agarwal et al. [2021], which is improved to $O(1/K)$ in Xiao [2022]. To get rid of the small step size constraint, Liu et al. [2025a] develops a new analysis by computing the policy improvement directly and establishes the $O(1/K)$ global sublinear convergence for any constant step size and the γ -rate global linear convergence with adaptive step

²Li et al. [2024] investigates the average-reward MDP case.

³Here the i.i.d. sampling assumes that there exists a sampler which can provide i.i.d. samples from the stationary distribution.

sizes. For exact softmax PG, the asymptotic convergence is first established in Agarwal et al. [2021]. The $O(1/K)$ global sublinear rate is firstly established in Mei et al. [2020b] for a small constant step size, and later is extended to any constant step size in [Liu et al., 2024]. These convergence bound, however, relies on some parameter which is problem dependent and can be very small, resulting an exponential-time convergence in some hard MDP instances [Li et al., 2023a]. To handle such issue, Mei et al. [2020a] proposes the escort PG, and one of its instances namely Hadamard PG [Liu et al., 2023] is shown to enjoy a global linear convergence. For the entropy regularization case, softmax PG enjoys a global linear convergence [Liu et al., 2024, Mei et al., 2020b]. There are also works that study PG under a general class of policies and investigate the convergence to the second-order stationary point and the global optimality convergence Zhang et al. [2020] and Bhandari and Russo [2021].

The sample complexity of stochastic PG is also widely studied. For stochastic tabular PG, we refer the readers to Yuan et al. [2022] for a summary of the sample complexity results. For the general smooth policies, the sample complexity of stochastic PG is shown to be $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ under an unbiased policy gradient sampler in Yuan et al. [2022]. The sample complexity of stochastic PG within the actor-critic framework has also received a lot of attention [Olshevsky and Gharesifard, 2023, Wang et al., 2020, Chen et al., 2021, Xu et al., 2020a,b, Wang et al., 2024, Chen and Zhao, 2023, Wu et al., 2020, Kumar et al., 2023, Xu et al., 2021, Qiu et al., 2021, Suttle et al., 2023, Barakat et al., 2022, Tian et al., 2023], where the actor is some general smooth policy or neural policy and the critic uses a linear approximation, compatible parameterization, or is approximated by a neural network. Overall, the sample complexity is $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ [Xu et al., 2020a, Chen and Zhao, 2023, Wang et al., 2024] to achieve a small gradient.

1.2 Motivation and main contributions

Existing sample complexity results for PMD-type algorithms mostly focus on the setting of generative model [Lan, 2021, Xiao, 2022, Johnson et al., 2023, Protopapas and Barakat, 2024] or the Markovian sampling but with nested-loop conditional temporal difference learning (CTD) estimation [Lan, 2021, Li et al., 2024], where action values are explicitly approximated to certain prerequisite accuracy. In contrast, TD-PMD [Geist et al., 2019, Liu et al., 2025b] updates the critic by applying only one-step Bellman operator over the last value estimate (without controlling the estimation accuracy). However, their analysis is limited to the exact setting and the generative model. In this paper, we consider the more practical setting which combines both Markovian sampling (with a mini-batch mechanism) and TD learning. In particular, two algorithms including off-policy Expected TD-PMD (Algorithm 1) and mixed-policy Approximate TD-PMD (Algorithm 3) are presented, and their sample complexities have been investigated. We focus on the tabular setting in this paper. Despite this, it is worth emphasizing that even though various policy gradient methods with policy/value function approximations have been studied, it often requires strong assumptions in the parameter domain (such as the smoothness and non-degeneracy of the policy) which are not applicable for the tabular setting. The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows.

- Under a small enough constant policy update step size, both Expected TD-PMD and Approximate TD-PMD enjoy a $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity to obtain an average ε -optimal solution, where some constants and poly-logarithmic factors are hidden in $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$. Note that existing average-time sample complexities for PMD are also $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ under the generative model or the Markovian sampling with an inner-loop CTD learning [Lan, 2021, Li et al., 2024]. In contrast, in Expected TD-PMD and Approximate TD-PMD, the new estimate of action value is obtained by applying only one step weighted Bellman operator (in sample form) to the last estimate, without an inner-loop critic learning to approximate the exact action values accurately. The crux in our analysis is the development of a route to bound the stochastic bias term⁴ in an inductive way.
- Based on adaptive policy update step sizes, we further improve the sample complexity of Expected TD-PMD and Approximate TD-PMD to the $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity for the last-iterate- ε optimality, where $O(\cdot)$ does not contain any poly-logarithmic factors about ε . To the best of our knowledge, it is

⁴See Lemma 3.7 for the detailed description of the stochastic bias term.

the first $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity for PMD-type methods under the unregularized MDP setting. In contrast, only the $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity for the last-iterate optimality has been obtained in Lan [2021], Xiao [2022], Johnson et al. [2023], Protopapas and Barakat [2024], Liu et al. [2025b] under the generative model. The key of removing the poly-logarithmic factors is the adoption of adaptive batch sizes. As a byproduct, by specifying the mirror map h to the squared ℓ_2 -norm, we have obtained the $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity for batch Q-learning with absolute constant learning step size which is not known a prior as far as we know.

The comparisons with typical sample complexity results for PMD-type methods (applicable for general mirror map h) are listed in Table 1. Overall, we have studied the more practical setting which combines the Markovian sampling and the TD learning, and still be able to establish the competitive $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity and the improved $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity.

Table 1: Comparison with typical sample complexity results for PMD-type algorithms.

	Sampling scheme	Critic update	Metric	Sample complexity
Lan [2021]	Generative model Markovian	MC CTD	Average-time & Last-iterate	$\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$
Xiao [2022] Johnson et al. [2023] Protopapas and Barakat [2024]	Generative model	MC	Last-iterate	$\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$
Li et al. [2024] (Average-reward)	Markovian	CTD	Average-time	$\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$
Li and Lan [2025]	Markovian	MC	Average-time	$\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$
Liu et al. [2025b]	Generative model	TD	Last-iterate	$\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$
This paper (Theorems 3.13 and 4.11)	Markovian	TD	Average-time (Constant step size)	$\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$
This paper (Theorems 3.17 and 4.15)	Markovian	TD	Last-iterate (Adaptive step sizes)	$O(\varepsilon^{-2})$

The rest of the paper is organized as below. In Section 2 we provide more preliminary knowledge about MDP and PMD. Section 3 and Section 4 introduce Expected TD-PMD and Approximated TD-PMD, and offers the sample complexity analyzes respectively. The proofs of critical lemmas are presented in Section 5. We conclude in Section 6 with a brief summary.

2 Preliminary

2.1 More on MDP

Throughout the paper, we use vectors $V \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ and $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$ to represent the value functions associated with the state and action, respectively. In addition, for any $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, and $\rho \in \Delta(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})$, let $V(\mu) = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu}[V(s)]$ and $Q(\rho) = \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \rho}[Q(s,a)]$. Note that we will arrange any $\pi \in \Pi$ and vector $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$ first by states and then by actions, that is,

$$Q = [Q(s_1, a_1), \dots, Q(s_1, a_{|\mathcal{A}|}), Q(s_2, a_1), \dots, Q(s_2, a_{|\mathcal{A}|}), \dots, Q(s_{|\mathcal{S}|}, a_{|\mathcal{A}|})]^\top,$$

$$\pi = [\pi(a_1|s_1), \dots, \pi(a_{|\mathcal{A}|}|s_1), \pi(a_1|s_2), \dots, \pi(a_{|\mathcal{A}|}|s_2), \dots, \pi(a_{|\mathcal{A}|}|s_{|\mathcal{S}|})]^\top.$$

Define the state/action Bellman operator

$$[\mathcal{T}^\pi V](s) := \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|s), s' \sim P(\cdot|s,a)}[r(s,a) + \gamma V(s')],$$

$$[\mathcal{F}^\pi Q](s, a) := \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s,a), a' \sim \pi(\cdot|s')}[r(s,a) + \gamma Q(s', a')].$$

It can be easily verified that V^π and Q^π satisfy $\mathcal{T}^\pi V^\pi = V^\pi$ and $\mathcal{F}^\pi Q^\pi = Q^\pi$, and both \mathcal{T}^π and \mathcal{F}^π are γ -contraction operators over $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$ with respect to the l_∞ -norm. Furthermore, define the state/action transition matrix as

$$P_s^\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{S}|} : \quad P_s^\pi(s, s') = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) P(s'|s, a),$$

$$P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|} : \quad P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^\pi((s, a), (s', a')) = P(s'|s, a) \pi(a'|s').$$

That is, P_s^π is the transition matrix in the state space and $P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^\pi$ is the transition matrix in the state-action space. Then the Bellman operators can be written in the following vector form

$$\mathcal{T}^\pi V = r^\pi + \gamma P_s^\pi V, \quad \mathcal{F}^\pi Q = r + \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^\pi Q,$$

where $r^\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ with $r^\pi(s) = \sum_a \pi(a|s) r(s, a)$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$ is the reward function. Moreover, define the optimal Bellman operators:

$$[\mathcal{T}V](s) := \max_{\pi \in \Pi} [\mathcal{T}^\pi V](s) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}_{s'}[r(s, a) + \gamma V(s')],$$

$$[\mathcal{F}Q](s, a) := \max_{\pi \in \Pi} [\mathcal{F}^\pi Q](s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s'} \left[\max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q(s', a') \right].$$

Let V^* and Q^* be the fixed point of \mathcal{T} , \mathcal{F} , respectively. It is well-known [Sutton and Barto, 2018] that V^* and Q^* is the optimal solution to the problem (1), i.e.,

$$\forall s, a : \quad V^*(s) = \max_{\pi \in \Pi} V^\pi(s), \quad Q^*(s, a) = \max_{\pi \in \Pi} Q^\pi(s, a),$$

and there exists at least one optimal (deterministic) policy π^* such that $V^{\pi^*} = V^*$ and $Q^{\pi^*} = Q^*$. Let $\Pi^* := \{\pi^* \in \Pi : V^{\pi^*} = V^*\}$ be the optimal policy set.

For conciseness, it is assumed that $r(s, a) \in [0, 1]$. Then, for any policy $\pi \in \Pi$, there holds

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A} : \quad 0 \leq V^\pi(s) \leq V^*(s) \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}, \quad 0 \leq Q^\pi(s, a) \leq Q^*(s, a) \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}. \quad (2)$$

Define the state/action visitation measure as

$$d_\mu^\pi(s) := (1-\gamma) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \cdot \mathbf{1}(s_t = s) \mid s_0 \sim \mu \right],$$

$$v_\rho^\pi(s, a) := (1-\gamma) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \cdot \mathbf{1}(s_t = s, a_t = a) \mid (s_0, a_0) \sim \rho \right].$$

The visitation measures corresponding to an optimal policy will be denoted as d_μ^* and v_ρ^* . The performance difference lemma is a fundamental result in policy optimization.

Lemma 2.1 (Performance difference lemma [Kakade and Langford, 2002, Liu et al., 2025b]). *For any $\pi \in \Pi$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$, $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$, $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, and $\rho \in \Delta(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})$, there holds*

$$[V^\pi - V](\mu) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} [\mathcal{T}^\pi V - V](d_\mu^\pi),$$

$$[Q^\pi - Q](\rho) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} [\mathcal{F}^\pi Q - Q](v_\rho^\pi).$$

As a corollary, we can obtain the following useful result.

Lemma 2.2. *For arbitrary $\pi, \pi' \in \Pi$,*

$$\|Q^\pi - Q^{\pi'}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\gamma|\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^2} \cdot \|\pi - \pi'\|_\infty.$$

Proof. By the performance difference lemma, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} : \quad |Q^\pi(s, a) - Q^{\pi'}(s, a)| &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} |[\mathcal{F}^\pi Q^{\pi'} - Q^{\pi'}](d_{s,a}^\pi)| \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} |[\mathcal{F}^\pi Q^{\pi'} - \mathcal{F}^{\pi'} Q^{\pi'}](d_{s,a}^\pi)| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \|\mathcal{F}^\pi Q^{\pi'} - \mathcal{F}^{\pi'} Q^{\pi'}\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \forall (s, a) : \quad |\mathcal{F}^\pi Q^{\pi'}(s, a) - \mathcal{F}^{\pi'} Q^{\pi'}(s, a)| &= \gamma \cdot |\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s,a)} [\langle Q^{\pi'}(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi'(\cdot|s') \rangle]| \\ &\leq \gamma \cdot |\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s,a)} [\frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{1-\gamma} \cdot \|\pi(\cdot|s') - \pi'(\cdot|s')\|_\infty]| \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma|\mathcal{A}|}{1-\gamma} \cdot \|\pi - \pi'\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\forall \pi, \pi' : \quad \|Q^\pi - Q^{\pi'}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\gamma|\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^2} \cdot \|\pi - \pi'\|_\infty,$$

which completes the proof. \square

2.2 More on TD-PMD

As mentioned previously, TD-PMD updates the critic by tracking a sequence of TD learning of the action values which does not only involve current policy but also relies on the last value estimator. More precisely, TD-PMD admits the following form in the exact setting:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall s \in \mathcal{S} : \quad \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) &= \arg \max_{p \in \Delta(\mathcal{A})} \{ \eta_k \langle p, Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle - D_\pi^p(s) \}, \\ Q^{k+1} &= \mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\eta_k > 0$ is the step size, h is a convex function over $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$, and $D_h(p \| q)$ is the Bregman divergence induced by h . Note that here and in the rest of the paper, we will omit the subscript h in D_h and use the short notation $D_{\pi'}^p(s)$ for $D_h(\pi(\cdot|s) \| \pi'(\cdot|s))$ and $D_\pi^p(s)$ for $D_h(p \| \pi(\cdot|s))$. In contrast to the classical PMD which utilizes the true value function Q^{π_k} as the critic, TD-PMD obtains the new critic by only performing one-step of Bellman iteration based on the current policy and the last critic estimation. When h is specified to the negative entropy $h(p) = -\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} p(a) \log p(a)$ and quadratic function $h(p) = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|_2^2$, TD-PMD reduces to TD-NPG and TD-PQA, respectively, with the following policy update rules:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{TD-NPG}) \quad \pi_{k+1}(a|s) &\propto \pi_k(a|s) \cdot \exp(\eta Q^k(s, a)), \\ (\text{TD-PQA}) \quad \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) &= \text{Proj}_{\Delta(\mathcal{A})} [\pi_k(\cdot|s) + \eta Q^k(s, \cdot)], \end{aligned}$$

where in TD-PQA, $\text{Proj}_{\Delta(\mathcal{A})}$ denotes the projection on the probabilistic simplex $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$.

The following three-point-descent lemma (see for example Xiao [2022], Chen and Teboulle [1993]) is essential in the analysis of the PMD type methods.

Lemma 2.3. For any $\pi \in \Pi$, $\eta > 0$, and $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$, consider the following update:

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S} : \quad \pi^+(\cdot|s) = \arg \max_{p \in \Delta(\mathcal{A})} \{\eta \langle p, Q(s, \cdot) \rangle - D_\pi^p(s)\}.$$

There holds $\pi^+(\cdot|s) \in \text{rint dom } h \cap \Delta(\mathcal{A})$ and

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, p \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}) : \quad \eta \langle \pi^+(\cdot|s) - p, Q(s, \cdot) \rangle \geq D_\pi^{\pi^+}(s) + D_{\pi^+}^p(s) - D_\pi^p(s).$$

For the mirror map h being the negative entropy, there holds $\text{rint dom } h = \text{int } \Delta(\mathcal{A})$. Hence the policies generated by softmax NPG update always stay in $\text{rint } \Delta(\mathcal{A})$ if the initial policy lies in $\text{rint } \Delta(\mathcal{A})$.

3 Expected TD-PMD with Off-Policy Markov Data

As shown in Liu et al. [2025b], TD-PMD admits the same sublinear convergence as PMD in the exact setting. Moreover, under the generative model where $[\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k](s, a)$ in (3) is estimated via random samples for every (s, a) , the $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity of TD-PMD is also established therein. In contrast, we will consider the sample complexity of TD-PMD under the more practical and challenging online Markov sampling model.

This section first considers the case where the Markov data are obtained through an behavior policy π_b which is sufficiently exploratory. Let τ_k be the trajectory data of length B_k , i.e.,

$$\tau_k = \{(s_t^k, a_t^k, r_t^k, s_{t+1}^k)\}_{t=0}^{B_k-1}, \quad \text{where } a_t^k \sim \pi_b(\cdot|s_t^k), \quad r_t^k = r(s_t^k, a_t^k), \quad s_{t+1}^k \sim P(\cdot|s_t^k, a_t^k).$$

For each tuple $(s_t^k, a_t^k, r_t^k, s_{t+1}^k)$, the expected TD error of critic Q^k with respect to the target policy π_{k+1} is constructed by

$$\forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} : \quad \delta_t^k(s, a) := \mathbb{1}_{(s_t^k, a_t^k) = (s, a)} \cdot \left[r_t^k + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{t+1}^k)} [Q^k(s_{t+1}^k, a)] - Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k) \right].$$

Notice that when conditioned on $(s_t, a_t) = (s, a)$, the term $r_t^k + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{t+1}^k)} [Q^k(s_{t+1}^k, a)]$ is an unbiased estimator of $[\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k](s, a)$. The expected TD error constructed from the whole trajectory τ_k is defined as the weighted average of δ_t^k ,

$$\forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} : \quad \bar{\delta}_k(s, a) := \sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} c_t^k \cdot \delta_t^k(s, a),$$

where $c_t^k \geq 0$ are weights satisfying $\sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} c_t^k = 1$. We then update the critic via the TD learning method, i.e.,

$$\forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} : \quad Q^{k+1}(s, a) = Q^k(s, a) + \alpha_k \cdot \bar{\delta}_k(s, a),$$

where $\alpha_k > 0$ is the critic update step size.

The formal description of the Expected TD-PMD with the Off-Policy Markov data is given in Algorithm 1, with an illustration given in Figure 1. First note that “expected” refers to the expectation term $\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{t+1}^k)} [Q^k(s_{t+1}^k, a)]$, which is computable in the tabular case since π_{k+1} is known. Moreover, Algorithm 1 is an off-policy algorithm, as the behavior policy π_b for sampling the data is not the target policy π_{k+1} . It is worth remarking that when the policy update step size η_k goes to infinity, the updated policy π_{k+1} is actually the greedy policy induced by the action value Q^k . In such case, Expected TD-PMD reduces to the Q-learning algorithm [Sutton and Barto, 2018] with batch Markov data. Thus the Expected TD-PMD can be viewed as a “smoothed” Q-learning algorithm. Furthermore, for the on-policy version with infinity critic update step size, i.e., $\eta_k = \infty$ and $\pi_b = \pi_{k+1}$, Expected TD-PMD with $B_k = 1$ reduces to the expected SARSA algorithm [Sutton and Barto, 2018].




Figure 1: An illustration of Expected TD-PMD with off-policy Markov data (Algorithm 1),

Algorithm 1 Expected TD-PMD with Off-Policy Markov Data

Input: Iterations K . Initial action value $Q^0 = 0$, initial policy π_0 , critic step size α_k , policy update step size η_k , initial state s_0 , batch size B_k , average weights c_t^k .
Set $s_0^0 = s_0$.

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$ **do**

 (**Policy update**) Update the target policy by

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S} : \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) = \arg \max_{p \in \Delta(\mathcal{A})} \left\{ \eta_k \left\langle p, Q^k(s, \cdot) \right\rangle - D_{\pi_k}^p(s) \right\}.$$

 (**Sampling**) Obtain τ_k by obeying behavior policy π_b starting from s_0^k ,

$$\tau_k = \{(s_t^k, a_t^k, r_t^k, s_{t+1}^k)\}_{t=0}^{B_k-1}, \quad \text{where } r_t^k = r(s_t^k, a_t^k), \quad a_t^k \sim \pi_b(\cdot|s_t^k), \quad s_{t+1}^k \sim P(\cdot|s_t^k, a_t^k),$$

 and set $s_0^{k+1} = s_{B_k}^k$.

 (**Critic update**) Construct the expected TD error,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_t^k(s, a) &:= \mathbb{1}_{(s_t^k, a_t^k)=(s, a)} \cdot \left[r_t^k + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{t+1}^k)} [Q^k(s_{t+1}^k, a)] - Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k) \right], \\ \bar{\delta}_k(s, a) &:= \sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} c_t^k \cdot \delta_t^k(s, a). \end{aligned}$$

 Update the critic by

$$Q^{k+1}(s, a) = Q^k(s, a) + \alpha_k \cdot \bar{\delta}_k(s, a).$$

end for

 Sample \hat{K} from $\{0, 1, \dots, K\}$ with uniform probability.

 Output π_K and $\pi_{\hat{K}}$.

Before proceeding to the sample complexity analysis of Expected TD-PMD, we give some intuition about the critic update formula. Conditioned on the first state s_0^k , the critic Q^k and the target policy π_{k+1} , it is straightforward to compute the expectation of the TD error,

$$\mathbb{E} [\delta_t^k(s, a)] = \mathbb{P}(s_t^k = s) \pi_b(a|s) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a).$$

Therefore the conditional expectation of Q^{k+1} is given by

$$\mathbb{E} [Q^{k+1}(s, a)] = \mathbb{E} \left[Q^k(s, a) + \alpha_k \cdot \sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} c_t^k \cdot \underbrace{\mathbb{P}(s_t^k = s) \pi_b(a|s)}_{\text{exploration}} \cdot \underbrace{[\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a)}_{\text{exploitation}} \right]. \quad (4)$$

From this equation, it can be seen that there are two parts in the TD error: the exploration part and the exploitation part. The exploitation part is a Bellman operator, offering a shift for the critic to approach $Q^{\pi_{k+1}}$. The exploration part is indeed the probability for the behavior policy π_b to obtain action-state (s, a) . Noticing that the critic update will fail if the exploration part goes to 0, we require the following two assumptions to ensure the sufficient exploration over all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$.

Assumption 3.1 (Sufficient exploration of behavior policy). We have $\tilde{\pi}_b := \min_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \pi_b(a|s) > 0$.

Assumption 3.2 (Ergodicity). The state transition matrix induced by π_b , i.e., $P_s^{\pi_b}$, is ergodic over \mathcal{S} .

Assumption 3.1 guarantees the exploration over the action space. Note that if there exists a pair $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ such that $\pi_b(a|s) = 0$, then $(s_t^k, a_t^k) \neq (s, a)$ almost surely and $Q^k(s, a)$ will not be updated. Assumption 3.2 is very standard for the analysis of the actor-critic algorithms with the Markov data, see for example Li et al. [2024], Khodadadian et al. [2021a, 2022]. This assumption can guarantee the sufficient exploration over the state space.

Proposition 3.3. *Under Assumption 3.2, there exists a unique stationary distribution $\nu^{\pi_b} \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ for the transition kernel $P_s^{\pi_b}$ which satisfies*

$$(\nu^{\pi_b})^\top P_s^{\pi_b} = (\nu^{\pi_b})^\top \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\nu}_b := \min_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^{\pi_b}(s) > 0.$$

Furthermore, letting $\{s_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the Markov chain induced by $P_s^{\pi_b}$, then it is geometrically mixing. That is, there exists two constants $m_b > 0$ and $\kappa_b \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, n \geq 0, t \geq 0 : d_{TV}(\nu^{\pi_b}(\cdot), \mathbb{P}(s_{n+t} = \cdot | s_n = s)) \leq m_b \kappa_b^t,$$

where d_{TV} denotes the total variation distance.

The proof of Proposition 3.3 can be found for example in Khodadadian et al. [2021a], which is the application of Levin and Peres [2017, Theorem 4.9]. Noticing that at any k -th iteration of Expected TD-PMD, the generated state trajectory $\{s_t^k\}_{t \geq 0}$ is the Markov chain with transition kernel of $P_s^{\pi_b}$. Thus by Proposition 3.3,

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K, s \in \mathcal{S}, n \geq 0, t \geq 0 : d_{TV}(\nu^{\pi_b}(\cdot), \mathbb{P}(s_{n+t}^k = \cdot | s_n^k = s)) \leq m_b \kappa_b^t, \quad (5)$$

implying that the exploration part $\mathbb{P}(s_t^k = s) \pi_b(a|s)$ converges to $\nu^{\pi_b}(s) \pi_b(a|s) \geq \tilde{\nu}_b \tilde{\pi}_b > 0$ as B_k increases. Therefore, Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 together can guarantee sufficient exploration over $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$.

We need to make an additional assumption on the mirror map h for the subsequent analysis when η_k is a small constant step size.

Assumption 3.4. The mirror map h is further λ -strongly convex w.r.t. ℓ_p -norm over $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ where $p \in [1, +\infty]$ is some constant.

Assumption 3.4 is also common in the convergence analysis of mirror descent methods (see for example Beck [2017, Chapter 9]), and typical mirror maps including quadratic function and negative entropy satisfy this assumption. Indeed, one can verify that $h(p) = \frac{1}{2} \|p\|_2^2$ is 1-strongly convex with respect to the ℓ_2 -norm, while $h(p) = -\sum_a p(a) \log p(a)$ is 1-strongly convex with respect to the ℓ_1 -norm. By Assumption 3.4, it is clear that for PMD-type update (including the policy update in Expected TD-PMD) there holds

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K, s \in \mathcal{S} : D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s)\|_p^2 \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s)\|_\infty^2. \quad (6)$$

Moreover, the policy shift $\|\pi_{k+1} - \pi_k\|_\infty$ in after the PMD-type update can be bounded by the policy update step size based on the strong convexity of mirror map h and the three-point-descent lemma.

Lemma 3.5. Consider the PMD-type policy update in (3). Under Assumption 3.4, there holds

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K : \quad \|\pi_{k+1} - \pi_k\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|Q^k(s, \cdot)\|_1}{\lambda} \eta_k.$$

Proof. By Assumption 3.4, one has

$$\forall x, y \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}) : \quad D_h(x \| y) = h(x) - h(y) - \langle \nabla h(y), x - y \rangle \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x - y\|_p^2.$$

By Hölder's inequality and the three-point descent lemma (Lemma 2.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_k \|\pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s) - \pi_k(\cdot | s)\|_p \cdot \|Q^k(s, \cdot)\|_{\frac{p}{p-1}} &\geq \eta_k \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s) - \pi_k(\cdot | s), Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle \\ &\geq D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) + D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi_k}(s) \\ &\geq \lambda \cdot \|\pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s) - \pi_k(\cdot | s)\|_p^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|Q^k(s, \cdot)\|_{\frac{p}{p-1}} \leq \|Q^k(s, \cdot)\|_1$, we obtain

$$\|\pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s) - \pi_k(\cdot | s)\|_p \leq \frac{\|Q^k(s, \cdot)\|_1}{\lambda} \eta_k,$$

which implies that $\|\pi_{k+1} - \pi_k\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|Q^k(s, \cdot)\|_1}{\lambda} \eta_k$. \square

The following property about the boundedness of Q^k can be verified easily.

Lemma 3.6. Consider Expected TD-PMD (Algorithm 1) with critic step size α_k satisfying $\alpha_k \in (0, 1]$. There holds

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K, (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} : \quad 0 \leq Q^k(s, a) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma}.$$

3.1 Expected TD-PMD with constant step size

We are now ready to provide the sample complexity analysis for Expected TD-PMD. This subsection focuses on the constant policy update step size setting, i.e., $\eta_k = \eta > 0$. We begin with the following upper bound for Expected TD-PMD.

Lemma 3.7. Consider Expected TD-PMD (Algorithm 1). Suppose that Assumption 3.4 holds. Let $\eta_k = \eta > 0$ and $\alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1]$. Fixing any optimal policy $\pi^* \in \Pi^*$ and $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V^*(\mu) - V^{\pi_{\hat{K}}}(\mu)] &\leq \underbrace{\frac{1}{K+1} \left[\frac{\|D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}\|_\infty}{\eta(1-\gamma)} + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2} \right]}_{\text{Exact PMD bound}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{K+1} \cdot \frac{\eta |\mathcal{A}|^2}{2(1-\gamma)^2 \lambda} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \|Q^k - Q^{\pi_k}\|_\infty^2 \right]}_{\text{Stochastic Variance term}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{K+1} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_{\mu}^*} [\langle \pi^*(\cdot | s) - \pi_k(\cdot | s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) - Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle] \right]}_{\text{Stochastic Bias term}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}\|_\infty := \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}(s)$ and \hat{K} is a random time index that is uniformly sampled from $0, \dots, K$.

The proof of Lemma 3.7 follows the standard route of the stochastic PMD/NAC analysis, see for example Lan [2021], Khodadadian et al. [2022], Xu et al. [2020a,b], Fu et al. [2021], Xiao [2022], Li et al. [2024], Liu et al. [2025b], Li and Lan [2025], and we present the proof in Section 5.1 for completeness. In the exact vanilla PMD setting (i.e., $Q^k = Q^{\pi_k}$), the stochastic variance and bias terms vanish and the upper bound in Lemma 3.7 reduces to the same upper bound for the exact PMD in Xiao [2022, Theorem 8].

Note that the exact PMD bound vanishes in Lemma 3.7 as K grows, and it is also not hard to see that the stochastic variance term can be well controlled if the policy update step size η is small enough. Thus the challenge is to bound the stochastic bias term, which closely relies on the critic update formula of Expected TD-PMD and occupies most of the proof. To this end, we reformulate the critic update formula of Expected TD-PMD into a more concise form. By equation (4) we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Q^{k+1}(s, a)] &= \mathbb{E}\left[Q^k(s, a) + \alpha_k \cdot \sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} c_t^k \cdot \underbrace{\mathbb{P}(s_t^k = s)}_{\rightarrow \nu^{\pi_b}(s) \text{ by equation (5)}} \pi_b(a|s) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a)\right] \quad (7) \\ &\approx \mathbb{E}[Q^k(s, a) + \alpha_k \cdot \sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a)], \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma^{\pi_b}(a|s) := \nu^{\pi_b}(s)\pi_b(a|s)$. One can verify that σ^{π_b} is the stationary distribution of $\{(s_t^k, a_t^k)\}_{t \geq 0}$, that is, $(\sigma^{\pi_b})^\top P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_b} = (\sigma^{\pi_b})^\top$. For simplicity, assume $\alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1]$. It is natural to define the following σ^{π_b} -weighted Bellman operator,

$$\forall \pi \in \Pi, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|} : \quad \mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^\pi Q(s, a) := Q(s, a) + \alpha \cdot \sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a) [\mathcal{F}^\pi Q - Q](s, a),$$

or equivalently,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^\pi Q := Q + \alpha \cdot \Sigma^{\pi_b} [\mathcal{F}^\pi Q - Q],$$

where $\Sigma^{\pi_b} = \text{diag}(\sigma^{\pi_b}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$. When $\alpha = 1$, we simply denote $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^\pi$ by $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b}^\pi$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b}^\pi Q := Q + \Sigma^{\pi_b} [\mathcal{F}^\pi Q - Q].$$

By Assumption 3.1, Assumption 3.2 and Proposition 3.3, it is easily shown that

$$\tilde{\sigma}_b := \min_{s, a} \sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a) \geq \tilde{\nu}_b \tilde{\pi}_b > 0.$$

In this case, one can show that $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^\pi$ shares similar properties with the vanilla Bellman operator \mathcal{F}^π .

Proposition 3.8. *Suppose Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2 hold. Then for any $\pi \in \Pi$,*

- (a) $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^\pi Q^\pi = Q^\pi$;
- (b) $\forall Q, Q' \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|} : \|\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^\pi Q - \mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^\pi Q'\|_\infty \leq (1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b) \|Q - Q'\|_\infty$.

Proof. Claim (a) follows directly from the fact that $\mathcal{F}^\pi Q^\pi = Q^\pi$. Notice that for any $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^\pi Q(s, a) - \mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^\pi Q'(s, a)| &= |(1 - \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a))(Q(s, a) - Q'(s, a)) + \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a) [\mathcal{F}^\pi Q(s, a) - \mathcal{F}^\pi Q'(s, a)]| \\ &\leq (1 - \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)) \|Q - Q'\|_\infty + \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a) \underbrace{\|\mathcal{F}^\pi Q - \mathcal{F}^\pi Q'\|_\infty}_{\leq \gamma \|Q - Q'\|_\infty} \\ &\leq (1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma)\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)) \cdot \|Q - Q'\|_\infty \\ &\leq (1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b) \cdot \|Q - Q'\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (b) directly. \square

Let $A^\pi = I - \alpha \Sigma^{\pi_b} (I - \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^\pi)$. One has

$$\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^\pi Q - \mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^\pi Q' = A^\pi (Q - Q').$$

It follows immediately from Proposition 3.8 that

$$\forall \pi \in \Pi : \|A^\pi\|_\infty \leq (1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b). \quad (8)$$

Define the stochastic noise $\bar{\omega}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_t^k(s, a) &= \delta_t^k(s, a) - [\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a), \\ \bar{\omega}_k(s, a) &= \sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} c_t^k \cdot \omega_t^k(s, a) = \bar{\delta}_k(s, a) - [\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We can rewrite the critic update of Expected TD-PMD into the following two equivalent ways:

$$Q^{k+1} = \mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k + \alpha \cdot \bar{\omega}_k \quad \text{or} \quad Q^{k+1} = Q^k + \alpha \cdot \Sigma^{\pi_b} [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k] + \alpha \cdot \bar{\omega}_k. \quad (10)$$

This expression means that the critic update in Expected TD-PMD is essentially the application of the σ^{π_b} -weighted Bellman operator $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^{\pi_{k+1}}$ with an additive stochastic Markov noise $\bar{\omega}_k$. Moreover, we will consider the following average weight:

$$c_t^k = \frac{\vartheta^{B_k-t-1}}{\sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} \vartheta^t}, \quad (11)$$

where $\vartheta \in [0, 1]$ is some preset parameter. Note that when $\vartheta = 0$, we define $0^0 = 1$ here, therefore only the last sample in the batch will be used.

To bound the stochastic bias part, it is convenient to define the following index matrix:

$$E_s = \begin{bmatrix} & & 1 & & & \\ \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & & \ddots & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ & & & & & 1 & & \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}, \quad (12)$$

$$J_s = E_s^\top E_s \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|},$$

where $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}$, and each 1 corresponds to an action associated with state s . Then it is evident that $Q(s, \cdot) = E_s Q$ and $\pi(\cdot | s) = E_s \pi$, and thus we have

$$\langle \pi(\cdot | s), Q(s, \cdot) \rangle = \langle E_s \pi, E_s Q \rangle = \langle E_s^\top E_s \pi, Q \rangle = \langle J_s \pi, Q \rangle.$$

We first have the following decomposition for the stochastic bias, whose proof is presented in Section 5.2.

Lemma 3.9. *Consider Expected TD-PMD (Algorithm 1). Let $\eta_k = \eta > 0$ and $\alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1]$. Fixing any optimal policy $\pi^* \in \Pi^*$, for any $0 \leq k \leq K$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$, there holds*

$$|\mathbb{E} [\langle \pi^*(\cdot | s) - \pi_k(\cdot | s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) - Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle]| \leq \left| B_0^{(k)} \right| + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E} [\left| C_j^{(k)} \right| + \left| D_j^{(k)} \right| + \left| E_j^{(k)} \right|] + \sum_{j=1}^k \left| \mathbb{E} [F_j^{(k)}] \right|,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_0^{(k)} &= \left\langle [(A_0)^k]^\top J_s [\pi^* - \pi_0], Q^{\pi_0} - Q^0 \right\rangle, \\ C_j^{(k)} &= \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j+1}]^\top J_s [\pi^* - \pi_j], [Q^{\pi_j} - Q^{\pi_{j-1}}] \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
D_j^{(k)} &= \left\langle \left[(A_j)^{k-j+1} \right]^\top J_s[\pi_{j-1} - \pi_j], [Q^{\pi_{j-1}} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle, \\
E_j^{(k)} &= \left\langle \left[(A_j)^{k-j+1} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j+1} \right]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_{j-1}], [Q^{\pi_{j-1}} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle, \\
F_j^{(k)} &= \left\langle \left[(A_j)^{k-j} \right]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], \alpha \bar{\omega}_{j-1} \right\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

with $A_j = A^{\pi_j} = I - \alpha \Sigma^{\pi_b} (I - \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_j})$.

Remark 3.1. In Lan [2021], Li et al. [2024], the stochastic bias term is bounded by explicitly controlling $|\mathbb{E}[Q^{\pi_k}(s, a) - Q^k(s, a) | \pi_k]| \leq \varsigma$ with sufficiently small $\varsigma > 0$ for all iteration k via incorporating the inner-loop CTD learning, which constructs an empirical Bellman operator \hat{F}^{π_k} by interval samples and applies it multiple times. In contrast, we track the critic update process without introducing any inner-loop critic learning algorithm. In order to bound the stochastic bias term, we decompose it into the accumulation of policy shifts and stochastic noises terms and we bound them separately.

The first term $B_0^{(k)}$ is a remainder term that vanishes exponentially by the contraction of $(A_0)^k$. Suppose that Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold. Noting $\|A_j\|_\infty \leq (1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b)$ (see equation (8)), the term with $B_0^{(k)}$ can be bounded easily as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
|B_0^{(k)}| &= \left| \left\langle \left[(A_0)^k \right]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_0], Q^{\pi_0} - Q^0 \right\rangle \right| \\
&\leq \left\| \left[(A_0)^k \right]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_0] \right\|_1 \cdot \|Q^{\pi_0} - Q^0\|_\infty \\
&\leq \underbrace{\left\| (A_0)^\top \right\|_1^k}_{=\|A_0\|_\infty^k} \times \underbrace{\left\| J_s[\pi^* - \pi_0] \right\|_1}_{\leq 2} \times \underbrace{\|Q^{\pi_0} - Q^0\|_\infty}_{\leq (1-\gamma)^{-1} \text{ by equation (2) and Lemma 3.6}} \\
&\leq \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \cdot [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^k. \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

The terms $C_j^{(k)}$, $D_j^{(k)}$, and $E_j^{(k)}$ can be controlled by the policy shift $\|\pi_j - \pi_{j-1}\|_\infty$ (which is further controlled by η in Lemma 3.5) using the Lipschitz-continuity (w.r.t. π) of Q^π and $P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^\pi$. The term $F_j^{(k)}$ is the stochastic noise term in terms of $\bar{\omega}_{j-1}$, which can be bounded by the batch size. The bounds for the terms with $C_j^{(k)}$, $D_j^{(k)}$, $E_j^{(k)}$ and $F_j^{(k)}$ are presented in the following three lemmas whose proofs are deferred to Sections 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5, respectively.

Lemma 3.10 (Bounds for terms with $C_j^{(k)}$ and $D_j^{(k)}$). *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4 hold. One has*

$$\sum_{j=1}^k |C_j^{(k)}| \leq \frac{2\gamma|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\alpha\lambda\tilde{\sigma}_b(1-\gamma)^4} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^k |D_j^{(k)}| \leq \frac{|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\alpha\lambda\tilde{\sigma}_b(1-\gamma)^3}.$$

Lemma 3.11 (Bound for term with $E_j^{(k)}$). *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4 hold. One has*

$$\sum_{j=1}^k |E_j^{(k)}| \leq \frac{2\gamma|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\alpha\lambda\tilde{\sigma}_b^2(1-\gamma)^4}.$$

Lemma 3.12 (Bound for term with $F_j^{(k)}$). *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold. Recall the average weight c_t^k in equation (11). Assume $B_k = B$, $k = 0, \dots, K$. One has*

$$\sum_{j=1}^k |\mathbb{E}[F_j^{(k)}]| \leq \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b} \Psi(B, \vartheta, m_b, \kappa_b),$$

where

$$\Psi(B, \vartheta, m_b, \kappa_b) := \begin{cases} \frac{m_b}{(1-\gamma)(\kappa_b - \vartheta)} \cdot \kappa_b^B, & \text{if } 0 \leq \vartheta < \kappa_b, \\ \frac{m_b}{(1-\gamma)} B \cdot \vartheta^{B-1}, & \text{if } \vartheta = \kappa_b, \\ \frac{m_b}{(1-\gamma)(\vartheta - \kappa_b)} \cdot \vartheta^B, & \text{if } 1 > \vartheta > \kappa_b, \\ \frac{m_b}{B(1-\gamma)(1-\kappa_b)}, & \text{if } \vartheta = 1. \end{cases}$$

Based on the above results, we are now ready to present the first sample complexity for Expected TD-PMD.

Theorem 3.13. *Consider Expected TD-PMD (Algorithm 1). Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4 hold. Let*

$$\eta_k = \eta = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b^2 (1-\gamma)^4 \|D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}\|_\infty}{6|\mathcal{A}|^2(K+1)}}, \quad \alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1], \quad B_k = B > 0,$$

and assume c_t^k takes the form in equation (11). Fixing any optimal policy $\pi^* \in \Pi^*$ and $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, there holds

$$\mathbb{E}[V^*(\mu) - V^{\pi_K}(\mu)] \leq \frac{1}{K+1} \cdot \frac{3}{\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b (1-\gamma)^3} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{K+1}} \cdot \left(\frac{6|\mathcal{A}|^2 \|D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}\|_\infty}{\alpha \lambda \tilde{\sigma}_b^2 (1-\gamma)^6} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{2}{\tilde{\sigma}_b (1-\gamma)^2} \Psi(B, \vartheta, m_b, \kappa_b).$$

Proof. First recall the error decomposition in Lemma 3.7. For the stochastic variance term, it is easy to see that

$$\frac{1}{K+1} \cdot \frac{\eta |\mathcal{A}|^2}{2(1-\gamma)^2 \lambda} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \|Q^k - Q^{\pi_k}\|_\infty^2 \right] \leq \frac{\eta |\mathcal{A}|^2}{2(1-\gamma)^4 \lambda}$$

since $\|Q^k - Q^{\pi_k}\|_\infty \leq (1-\gamma)^{-1}$. For the stochastic bias term, based on equation (13) and Lemmas 3.9–3.12, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*} [\langle \pi^*(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) - Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E} [\langle \pi^*(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) - Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle] \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \left| \mathbb{E} [\langle \pi^*(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) - Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle] \right| \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \left(\left| B_0^{(k)} \right| + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E} \left| C_j^{(k)} \right| + \left| D_j^{(k)} \right| + \left| E_j^{(k)} \right| + \sum_{j=1}^k \left| \mathbb{E} [F_j^{(k)}] \right| \right) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{2}{1-\gamma} (1 - \alpha(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b)^k \right] + \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{2\gamma|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b\lambda(1-\gamma)^4} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b\lambda(1-\gamma)^3} \right] + \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*} \left[\frac{2\gamma|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\alpha\lambda\tilde{\sigma}_b^2(1-\gamma)^4} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*} \left[\frac{2}{(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b} \Psi(B, \vartheta, m_b, \kappa_b) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{K+1} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*} [\langle \pi^*(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) - Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle] \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{K+1} \cdot \frac{2}{\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b (1-\gamma)^3} + \frac{5|\mathcal{A}|^2 \eta}{\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b^2 \lambda (1-\gamma)^5} + \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)^2 \tilde{\sigma}_b} \Psi(B, \vartheta, m_b, \kappa_b). \end{aligned}$$

Putting them all together in Lemma 3.7 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K (V^*(\mu) - V^{\pi_k}(\mu)) \right] & \leq \frac{1}{K+1} \left[\frac{D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}(d_\mu^*)}{\eta(1-\gamma)} + \frac{3}{\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b (1-\gamma)^3} \right] + \frac{6|\mathcal{A}|^2 \eta}{\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b^2 \lambda (1-\gamma)^5} \\ & \quad + \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)^2 \tilde{\sigma}_b} \Psi(B, \vartheta, m_b, \kappa_b). \end{aligned}$$

Choose the best η such that the minimal is achieved completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.2. Assume $0 < \vartheta < \kappa_b$. By Theorem 3.13, Expected TD-PMD can find an ε -optimal solution provided the iteration complexity and batch-size satisfying

$$K \asymp \max \left\{ \frac{9}{\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b (1-\gamma)^3 \varepsilon}, \frac{216 |\mathcal{A}|^2 \|D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}\|_\infty}{\alpha \lambda \tilde{\sigma}_b^2 (1-\gamma)^6 \varepsilon^2} \right\}, \quad B \asymp (\log \kappa_b^{-1})^{-1} \cdot \log \left(\frac{6}{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{m_b}{\tilde{\sigma}_b (1-\gamma)^3 (\kappa_b - \vartheta)} \right).$$

Thus, the total sample complexity is $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$, where some constants and logarithm terms are hidden in $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$. In particular, if we restrict the mirror map h to be the negative entropy and let π_b be the uniform policy, then $\lambda = 1$ and $\|D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}\|_\infty \leq \log |\mathcal{A}|$. By further setting $\alpha = 1$, the overall sample complexity becomes

$$S = KB = O \left(\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{\sigma}_b^{-2} (1-\gamma)^{-6} |\mathcal{A}|^2 \log |\mathcal{A}| \times (\log \kappa_b^{-1})^{-1} \cdot \log (\varepsilon^{-1} m_b \tilde{\sigma}_b^{-1} (1-\gamma)^{-3} (\kappa_b - \vartheta)^{-1}) \right).$$

Compared to the $O(\varepsilon^{-2} (1-\gamma)^{-5} |\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}| \log |\mathcal{A}| (\log \gamma^{-1})^{-1} (\log \varepsilon^{-1})) \asymp O(\varepsilon^{-2} (1-\gamma)^{-6} |\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}| \log |\mathcal{A}| (\log \varepsilon^{-1}))$ sample complexity of PMD with generative model in Lan [2021, Proposition 2], the sample complexity of Expected TD-PMD has same dependence on the accuracy ε and similar dependence on the decision horizon $(1-\gamma)^{-1}$ and the state/action space size. Note that the dependence on $\tilde{\sigma}_b$, m_b , and κ_b is for the Markov sampling to sufficiently explore the whole state-action space $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, while the exploration is not an issue for generative model.

Remark 3.3. If we set $\vartheta = 1$, then the average weight in equation (11) reduces to $1/B$, and $\bar{\delta}_k$ reduces to the arithmetic mean of δ_t^k . In such setting, the sample complexity of Expected TD-PMD is $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3})$. In the next section, we will establish the $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ (without hidden logarithm term) last-iterate sample complexity for the case $\vartheta = 1$ by using an adaptive policy update step size.

Remark 3.4. The careful reader may find out that in our analysis, we do not use the stationary property of the entire Markov chain induced by π_b , but only use the stationary property of every segment. It may be possible to improve the sample complexity on the dependency of other parameters, but the ε^{-2} sample complexity on ε overall cannot be improved, as far as we know. In addition, we will consider a mixed policy setting in Section 4, which involves Markov chains induced by varying policies in contrast to the static π_b . Thus, it is convenient to keep the analysis within a similar framework.

3.2 Expected TD-PMD with adaptive step sizes

As stated above, this section focuses on the later iteration complexity of Expected TD-PMD with adaptive step sizes when $\vartheta = 1$. In this case, it can be shown the $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity without a logarithm term can be established. Moreover, the mirror map h is not required to be strongly convex in this section.

The main idea is to approximate the classic value iteration algorithm (VI) [Sutton and Barto, 2018] by using a sufficiently large adaptive policy update step size. More precisely, recall the policy update formula of Expected TD-PMD

$$\forall k : \quad \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) = \arg \max_{p \in \Delta(\mathcal{A})} \left\{ \eta_k \langle p, Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle - D_{\pi_k}^p(s) \right\}.$$

Notice that when $\eta_k \rightarrow \infty$, the updated policy π_{k+1} tends to be greedy, i.e., choosing the action with largest critic value

$$\pi_{k+1} \xrightarrow{\eta_k \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{\text{greedy}}^k : \quad \pi_{\text{greedy}}^k(a'|s) = 0, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \forall a' \notin \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^k(s, a).$$

Therefore, one has $\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}^k} Q^k \approx \mathcal{F} Q^k$, and the critic update in equation (10) becomes

$$Q^{k+1} \approx Q^k + \alpha_k \Sigma^{\pi_b} [\mathcal{F} Q^k - Q^k] + \alpha_k \bar{\omega}_k.$$

Noting that $\Sigma^{\pi_b} \succeq \tilde{\sigma}_b \cdot I \succ \mathbf{0}$, the critic update above can be viewed as a weighted VI with step size α_k . Thus we can bound $\|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty$ directly by using the γ -contraction property of \mathcal{F} .

Lemma 3.14. *Suppose Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2 hold. Consider Expected TD-PMD (Algorithm 1) with constant critic step size $\alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1]$. There holds*

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K : \quad \|Q^* - Q^{k+1}\|_\infty \leq [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b] \cdot \|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty + \frac{\alpha \gamma}{\eta_k} \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty + \alpha \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty,$$

where

$$\|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty := \max_s D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}(s),$$

and $\tilde{\pi}_k$ is any policy that satisfies $\langle \tilde{\pi}_k(\cdot|s), Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle = \max_a Q^k(s, a)$, $\forall s$.

Lemma 3.14 establishes the linear convergence rate of the critic error $\|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty$ and the proof can be found in Section 5.6. The following lemma shows that the error of the policy value can be bounded by the critic error.

Lemma 3.15. *Suppose Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2 hold. Consider Expected TD-PMD (Algorithm 1) with constant critic step size $\alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1]$. Then there holds*

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K : \quad \|Q^* - Q^{\pi_{k+1}}\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{\alpha(1 - \gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b} (\|Q^* - Q^{k+1}\|_\infty + \|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty + \alpha \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty).$$

Proof. By the critic update formula (equation (10)),

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q^{\pi_{k+1}} - Q^{k+1}\|_\infty &= \|Q^{\pi_{k+1}} - \mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - \alpha \bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty \\ &= \|\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^{\pi_{k+1}} - \mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - \alpha \bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty \\ &\leq \underbrace{\|\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^{\pi_{k+1}} - \mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k\|_\infty}_{\text{Applying Proposition 3.8}} + \alpha \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty \\ &\leq [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b] \|Q^{\pi_{k+1}} - Q^k\|_\infty + \alpha \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty \\ &\leq [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b] (\|Q^* - Q^{\pi_{k+1}}\|_\infty + \|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty) + \alpha \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty \\ &\leq [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b] \|Q^* - Q^{\pi_{k+1}}\|_\infty + \|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty + \alpha \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed by noting that $\|Q^* - Q^{\pi_{k+1}}\|_\infty \leq \|Q^* - Q^{k+1}\|_\infty + \|Q^{\pi_{k+1}} - Q^{k+1}\|_\infty$. \square

It remains to bound the stochastic error term $\|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty$, which is given in Lemma 3.16 below. The proof of this lemma is deferred to Section 5.7. It is worth noting that Lemma 3.12 establishes the bound for $\|\mathbb{E}[\bar{\omega}_k | \mathcal{G}_k]\|_\infty$ but here we need to compute a bound for $\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty]$.

Lemma 3.16. *Consider Expected TD-PMD (Algorithm 1). Suppose Assumption 3.2 hold. Let $c_t^k = 1/B_k$. Then there holds*

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K : \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty] \leq \left(\frac{4|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left(1 + \frac{m_b}{1-\kappa_b} \right) \right)^{1/2} \cdot (B_k)^{-1/2}.$$

Theorem 3.17. *Suppose Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2 hold. Consider Expected TD-PMD (Algorithm 1) with constant critic step size $\alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1]$ and the adaptive policy update step size*

$$\eta_k \geq \eta \cdot \|D_{\pi_k}^{\bar{\pi}_k}\|_\infty \quad \text{with} \quad \eta > 0.$$

Let $c_t^k = 1/B_k$. Then there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|Q^* - Q^{\pi_K}\|_\infty] &\leq \frac{2}{\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b(1-\gamma)^2} [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^{K-1} + \frac{2\gamma}{\alpha\eta(1-\gamma)^2\tilde{\sigma}_b^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_b(1-\gamma)} \left(\frac{4|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left(1 + \frac{m_b}{1-\kappa_b} \right) \right)^{1/2} \left(\Xi(K) + \Xi(K-1) + (B_{K-1})^{-1/2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Xi(t) := \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^{t-1-k} (B_k)^{-1/2}$.

Proof. Taking an expectation on both sides of the inequality in Lemma 3.14 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \forall 0 \leq k \leq K : \quad \mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^{k+1}\|_\infty &\leq [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b] \cdot \mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\alpha\gamma}{\eta_k} \|D_{\pi_k}^{\bar{\pi}_k}\|_\infty\right]}_{\text{Applying } \eta_k \geq \eta \|D_{\pi_k}^{\bar{\pi}_k}\|_\infty} + \alpha \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty}_{\text{Applying Lemma 3.16}} \\ &\leq [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b] \cdot \mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty + \alpha\gamma\eta^{-1} + \alpha C_1 (B_k)^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = \left(\frac{4|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left(1 + \frac{m_b}{1-\kappa_b} \right) \right)^{1/2}$. Iterating from $K-1$ to 0 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^K\|_\infty &\leq [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^K \cdot \|Q^* - Q^0\|_\infty \\ &\quad + \alpha \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^{K-1-k} [\gamma\eta^{-1} + C_1(B_k)^{-1/2}] \\ &\leq [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^K \cdot \frac{1}{1-\gamma} + \frac{\gamma}{\eta(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b} + \alpha C_1 \Xi(K). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Similarly, there holds

$$\mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^{K-1}\|_\infty \leq [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^{K-1} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\gamma} + \frac{\gamma}{\eta(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b} + \alpha C_1 \Xi(K-1).$$

On the other hand, taking an expectation on both sides of the inequality in Lemma 3.15 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^{\pi_K}\|_\infty &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b} \left(\mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^K\|_\infty + \mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^{K-1}\|_\infty + \alpha \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\|\bar{\omega}_{K-1}\|_\infty}_{\text{Applying Lemma 3.16}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b} \left(\mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^K\|_\infty + \mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^{K-1}\|_\infty + \alpha C_1 (B_{K-1})^{-1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the above bounds for $\mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^K\|_\infty$ and $\mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^{K-1}\|_\infty$ completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.5. Theorem 3.17 implies that $\mathbb{E}\|Q^* - Q^{\pi_K}\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ provided

$$K = \log \left(\frac{6}{\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b (1-\gamma)^2 \varepsilon} \right) \left[\log \left(\frac{1}{1 - (1-\gamma) \alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b^2} \right) \right]^{-1} + 1, \quad \eta = \frac{6\gamma}{\alpha (1-\gamma)^2 \tilde{\sigma}_b^2 \varepsilon},$$

$$B_k = \frac{81}{\tilde{\sigma}_b^2 (1-\gamma)^2} \left(\frac{4|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left(1 + \frac{m_b}{1-\kappa_b} \right) \right) \frac{1}{(1 - [1 - (1-\gamma) \alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b]^{1/2})^2} \times [1 - (1-\gamma) \alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b]^{K-k-2} \varepsilon^{-2}.$$

Thus the total sample complexity is

$$S = \sum_{k=0}^K B_k \leq \frac{81}{\tilde{\sigma}_b^2 (1-\gamma)^2} \left(\frac{4|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left(1 + \frac{m_b}{1-\kappa_b} \right) \right) \frac{1}{(1 - [1 - (1-\gamma) \alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b]^{1/2})^2} \times \frac{[1 - (1-\gamma) \alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b]^{-2}}{(1-\gamma) \alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b} \varepsilon^{-2}$$

$$= O((1-\gamma)^{-7} |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \alpha^{-3} \tilde{\sigma}_b^{-5} \varepsilon^{-2} \cdot m_b (1-\kappa_b)^{-1})$$

which does not contain an logarithmic term. In contrast, existing sample complexities for PMD type methods under both the generative model [Lan, 2021, Xiao, 2022, Johnson et al., 2023, Protopapas and Barakat, 2024, Liu et al., 2025b] and the Markov sampling [Li and Lan, 2025, Li et al., 2024] are all $O(\varepsilon^{-2} \log(1/\varepsilon))$.

Remark 3.6. Note that the adaptive step sizes η_k in Theorem 3.17 is computable. In particular, for some specific mapping function h , the upper bound of $\|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty$ can be easily derived. For instance, for $h(p) = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|_2^2$ there holds $\|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty \leq 1$ and for $h(p) = -\sum_a p(a) \log p(a)$ there holds $\|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty \leq \log[(\min_{s,a} \pi_k(a|s))^{-1}]$.

3.2.1 Batch Q-learning

As mentioned previously, Expected TD-PMD approaches batch Q-learning (see Algorithm 2) with $\eta_k \rightarrow +\infty$. In particular, by picking $h(p) = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|_2^2$, Proposition 3.19 below tells us that under an adaptive but finite policy update step size, Expected TD-PMD is exactly equivalent to batch Q-learning.

Algorithm 2 Batch Q-learning

Input: Iterations K . Initial action value $Q^0 = 0$, critic step size α_k , initial state s_0 , batch size B_k , average weight c_t^k .

Set $s_0^0 = s_0$.

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$ **do**

(Sampling) Obtain τ_k by obeying behavior policy π_b starting from s_0^k ,

$$\tau_k = \{(s_t^k, a_t^k, r_t^k, s_{t+1}^k)\}_{t=0}^{B_k-1}, \quad \text{where } r_t^k = r(s_t^k, a_t^k), \quad a_t^k \sim \pi_b(\cdot|s_t^k), \quad s_{t+1}^k \sim P(\cdot|s_t^k, a_t^k),$$

and set $s_0^{k+1} = s_{B_k}^k$.

(Critic update) Construct

$$\delta_t^k(s, a) := \mathbb{1}_{(s_t^k, a_t^k) = (s, a)} \cdot \left[r_t^k + \gamma \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left[Q^k(s_{t+1}^k, a) \right] - Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k) \right],$$

$$\bar{\delta}_k(s, a) := \sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} c_t^k \cdot \delta_t^k(s, a).$$

Update the critic by

$$Q^{k+1}(s, a) = Q^k(s, a) + \alpha_k \cdot \bar{\delta}_k(s, a).$$

end for

Output Q^K .

Lemma 3.18 (Liu et al. [2025a, Lemma 7]). *Let \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} be two disjoint non-empty sets such that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C}$. Given an arbitrary vector $p = (p_a)_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$, let $y = \text{Proj}_{\Delta(\mathcal{A})}(p)$. Then*

$$\forall a' \in \mathcal{C}, \quad y_{a'} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B}} \left(p_a - \max_{a' \in \mathcal{C}} p_{a'} \right)_+ \geq 1.$$

Proposition 3.19. *Consider Expected TD-PMD (Algorithm 1) with $h(p) = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|_2^2$. At each iteration k , let $\mathcal{A}_s^k := \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^k(s, a)$ for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$, and also define the following value gap*

$$\Delta_{k,s} := \begin{cases} \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^k(s, a) - \max_{a' \notin \mathcal{A}_s^k} Q^k(s, a') & \text{if } \mathcal{A}_s^k \neq \mathcal{A}, \\ +\infty & \text{if } \mathcal{A}_s^k = \mathcal{A}. \end{cases}$$

If the policy update step size of Expected TD-PMD satisfies

$$\forall k \geq 0 : \quad \eta_k \geq 2 \cdot \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} (\Delta_{k,s})^{-1}, \quad (15)$$

then one has $\pi_{k+1} = \pi_{\text{greedy}}^k$. That is, Expected TD-PMD is equivalent to batch Q-learning under the step size condition in (15).

Proof. Letting $h(p) = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|_2^2$, the policy update of Expected TD-PMD becomes

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S} : \quad \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) = \text{Proj}_{\Delta(\mathcal{A})} [\pi_k(\cdot|s) + \eta_k \cdot Q^k(s, \cdot)].$$

For the state such that $\mathcal{A}_s^k = \mathcal{A}$, we have $\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) = \pi_{\text{greedy}}^k(\cdot|s)$ for any $\eta_k > 0$. Consider the state that $\mathcal{A}_s^k \neq \mathcal{A}$. Let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}_s^k$, $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_s^k$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \forall a' \in \mathcal{C} : \quad & \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B}} [\pi_k(a|s) + \eta_k Q^k(s, a) - \pi_k(a'|s) - \eta_k Q^k(s, a')]_+ \\ & \geq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B}} [(\pi_k(a|s) - \pi_k(a'|s)) + \eta_k (Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a'))] \\ & \geq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B}} [-1 + \eta_k \cdot \Delta_{k,s}] \geq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B}} [-1 + 2] \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.18,

$$\forall a' \in \mathcal{C} : \quad \pi_{k+1}(a'|s) = \text{Proj}_{\Delta(\mathcal{A})} [\pi_k(\cdot|s) + \eta_k \cdot Q^k(s, \cdot)](a') = 0,$$

which implies that $\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) = \pi_{\text{greedy}}^k(\cdot|s)$ and Expected TD-PMD reduces to batch Q-learning. \square

By Proposition 3.19, batch Q-learning can be viewed as a special instance of Expected TD-PMD with $h(p) = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|_2^2$ provided the policy update step size η_k is large. Thus the analysis in Section 4.2 also applies for batch Q-learning.

Corollary 3.20. *Suppose Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2 hold. Consider batch Q-learning with $\alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1]$ and let $c_t^k = 1/B_k$ (i.e., the form in equation (11) with $\vartheta = 1$). There holds*

$$\mathbb{E} [\|Q^* - Q^K\|_\infty] \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^K + \alpha \left(\frac{4|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left(1 + \frac{m_b}{1-\kappa_b} \right) \right)^{1/2} \Xi(K),$$

where Ξ is defined in Theorem 3.17.

Proof. Notice that $\|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty \leq 1$ when $h(p) = \frac{1}{2}\|p\|_2^2$. Thus, if we set $\eta_k = \max\{2 \cdot \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}}(\Delta_{k,s})^{-1}, \eta\} \geq \eta$ for Expected TD-PMD, it follows from equation (14) that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Q^* - Q^K\|_\infty] \leq [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^K \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} + \frac{\gamma}{\eta(1 - \gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b} + \alpha \left(\frac{4|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}{(1 - \gamma)^2} \left(1 + \frac{m_b}{1 - \kappa_b} \right) \right)^{1/2} \Xi(K).$$

Moreover, Proposition 3.19 implies that Expected TD-PMD is equivalent to batch Q-learning, thus the upper bound above is valid for batch Q-learning for any $\eta > 0$. Letting $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.7. *It is worth noting that, since for (batch) Q-learning the policy is greedy, we do not need to obtain the error bound of the policy value through Theorem 3.17. In fact we can transform the error bound from $\|Q^* - Q^K\|_\infty$ to $\|Q^* - Q^{\pi_K}\|_\infty$ through the error amplification lemma, see for example Agarwal et al. [2019, Lemma 1.11].*

Remark 3.8. *Corollary 3.20 implies that $\mathbb{E}[\|Q^* - Q^K\|_\infty] \leq \varepsilon$ provided*

$$K = \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon(1 - \gamma)} \cdot \left[\log \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b} \right]^{-1},$$

$$B_k = \frac{16\alpha^2|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}{\varepsilon^2(1 - \gamma)^2} \left(1 + \frac{m_b}{1 - \kappa_b} \right) [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^{K-k-1} \frac{1}{(1 - [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^{1/2})^2}.$$

Thus the total sample complexity is

$$S = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} B_k \leq \frac{16\alpha^2|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}{\varepsilon^2(1 - \gamma)^2} \left(1 + \frac{m_b}{1 - \kappa_b} \right) \frac{1}{(1 - \gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b} \frac{1}{(1 - [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^{1/2})^2}$$

$$= O((1 - \gamma)^{-5}|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|\alpha^{-1}\tilde{\sigma}_b^{-3}\varepsilon^{-2} \cdot m_b(1 - \kappa_b)^{-1}).$$

Considering the dependency on $(1 - \gamma)$ and ε , the sample complexity of batch Q-learning is $O((1 - \gamma)^{-5}\varepsilon^{-2})$. In Li et al. [2021], a tight sample complexity of $O((1 - \gamma)^{-4}\varepsilon^{-2}|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|\log^2((1 - \gamma)^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1}))$ is established for Q-learning (i.e., batch Q-learning with $B_k = 1$) with a small critic step size $\alpha = \tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$. In contrast, we have established the sample complexity of Q-learning with absolute constant critic step size by utilizing batch. Though their result has a better dependency on $(1 - \gamma)$, our sample complexity improves it by a logarithm factor. Moreover, it is interesting to see whether the sample complexity of batch Q-learning can be further improved to match that in Li et al. [2021] or not. As discussed in Remark 3.4, maybe this can be achieved by considering the stationary property of the entire Markov chain.

4 Approximate TD-PMD with Mixed-Policy Markov Data

Notice that in Expected TD-PMD, it requires to compute the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_t^k)}[Q^k(s_t^k, a)]$ when reconstructing the TD error. Thus, it is natural to ask what about we replacing the expectation with a sample mean? In this section we will investigate this problem.

In this setting, the trajectory τ_k admits the following form

$$\tau_k = (s_t^k, a_t^k, r_t^k, s_t'^k, a_t'^k)_{t=0}^{B_k-1},$$

where

$$a_t^k \sim \pi_b(\cdot|s_t^k), \quad r_t^k = r(s_t^k, a_t^k), \quad s_t'^k \sim P(\cdot|s_t^k, a_t^k), \quad a_t'^k \sim \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_t'^k), \quad s_{t+1}^k \sim P(\cdot|s_t'^k, a_t'^k).$$

That is, a_t^k is the action sampled from a behavior policy π_b , while $a_t'^k$ is the action sampled from the target policy π_{k+1} . Moreover, the TD error is constructed by

$$\delta_t^k(s, a) = \mathbb{1}_{(s_t^k, a_t^k)=(s, a)} \cdot [r_t^k + \gamma [Q^k(s_t'^k, a_t'^k)] - Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k)].$$

Based on the new TD error, we obtain the Approximate TD-PMD algorithm, see Algorithm 3 for a detailed description with the illustration presented in Figure 2. It is evident that Approximate TD-PMD is an online mixed-policy learning algorithm (off-policy for sampling an action to update the value while on-policy for estimating the expectation). As will be shown next, similar sample complexities can be established for Approximate TD-PMD.

Algorithm 3 Approximate TD-PMD with Mixed-Policy Markov Data

Input: Iterations K . Initial action value $Q^0 = 0$, initial policy π_0 , critic step size α_k , policy update step size η_k , initial state s_0 , batch size B_k , average weight c_t^k .

Set $s_0^0 = s_0$.

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$ **do**

(Policy update) Update the target policy by

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S} : \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) = \arg \max_{p \in \Delta(\mathcal{A})} \left\{ \eta_k \left\langle p, Q^k(s, \cdot) \right\rangle - D_{\pi_k}^p(s) \right\}.$$

(Sampling) Starting from s_0^k . obtain τ_k by

$$\tau_k = \{(s_t^k, a_t^k, r_t^k, s_t^{k'}, a_t^{k'})\}_{t=0}^{B_k-1},$$

where $a_t^k \sim \pi_b(\cdot|s_t^k)$, $r_t^k = r(s_t^k, a_t^k)$, $s_t^{k'} \sim P(\cdot|s_t^k, a_t^k)$, $a_t^{k'} \sim \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_t^{k'})$, $s_{t+1}^k \sim P(\cdot|s_t^{k'}, a_t^{k'})$,

and set $s_0^{k+1} = s_{B_k}^k$.

(Critic update) Construct the approximate TD error,

$$\delta_t^k(s, a) = \mathbb{1}_{(s_t^k, a_t^k)=(s, a)} \cdot \left[r_t^k + \gamma \left[Q^k(s_t^{k'}, a_t^{k'}) \right] - Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k) \right],$$

$$\bar{\delta}_k(s, a) := \sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} c_t^k \cdot \delta_t^k(s, a).$$

 Update the critic by

$$Q^{k+1}(s, a) = Q^k(s, a) + \alpha_k \cdot \bar{\delta}_k(s, a).$$

end for

Sample \hat{K} from $\{0, 1, \dots, K\}$ with uniform probability.

Output π_K and $\pi_{\hat{K}}$.

For Approximate TD-PMD, the expectation of the critic update conditioned on s_0^k , Q^k , and π_{k+1} is given by

$$\mathbb{E} [Q^{k+1}(s, a)] = \mathbb{E} \left[Q^k(s, a) + \alpha_k \cdot \sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} c_t^k \cdot \mathbb{P}(s_t^k = s) \pi_b(a|s) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k] \right]. \quad (16)$$

In contrast to the expression in Expected TD-PMD, the term $\mathbb{P}(s_t^k = s)$ does not converge to the stationary distribution $\sigma^{\pi_b}(s)$ due to alternative sampling. To obtain the stationary distribution of chain $\{s_t^k\}_{t \geq 0}$ (note that the complete state chain is $\{s_t^k, s_t^{k'}\}_{t \geq 0}$), for any $\pi, \pi' \in \Pi$, define the following composition transition matrix:

$$P_s^{\pi \circ \pi'} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{S}|} : P_s^{\pi \circ \pi'}(s, \tilde{s}) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}, s' \in \mathcal{S}, a' \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) P(s'|s, a) \pi'(a'|s') P(\tilde{s}|s', a') = [P_s^\pi P_s^{\pi'}](s, \tilde{s}).$$

One can verify that $P_s^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}$ is the transition matrix of the state chain $\{s_t^k\}_{t \geq 0}$ when π_{k+1} is given. Thus, we make the following assumption for the ergodicity of $\{s_t^k\}_{t \geq 0}$.

Assumption 4.1. For any $\pi \in \Pi$, the state transition matrix $P_s^{\pi_b \circ \pi}$ is ergodic over \mathcal{S} .




Figure 2: An illustration of Approximate TD-PMD with mixed-policy Markov data (Algorithm 3).

As the target policy π_k varies over from iteration to iteration, here we assume $P_s^{\pi_b \circ \pi}$ is ergodic for any policy $\pi \in \Pi$. This is an assumption that is common in the analysis of AC algorithms. In fact, in existing works such as Khodadadian et al. [2022], Li et al. [2024], Wang et al. [2024], they assume the ergodicity of P_s^π for any $\pi \in \Pi$. Under Assumption 4.1, a result similar to Proposition 3.3 can be obtained.

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds. For any policy $\pi \in \Pi$, there exists a unique stationary distribution for transition kernel $P_s^{\pi_b \circ \pi}$,*

$$\nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi} \in \Delta(\mathcal{S}) : \quad (\nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi})^\top P_s^{\pi_b \circ \pi} = (\nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi})^\top.$$

Additionally, there exists a constant $\tilde{\nu} > 0$ such that

$$\forall \pi \in \Pi, s \in \mathcal{S} : \quad \nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi}(s) \geq \tilde{\nu} > 0.$$

Furthermore, for any π , let $\{s_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the Markov chain with transition kernel of $P_s^{\pi_b \circ \pi}$. Then the chain $\{s_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is (uniform) geometrically mixing, i.e., there exists $m > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ (independent of π) such that

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, n \geq 0, t \geq 0 : \quad d_{TV}(\nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi}(\cdot), \mathbb{P}(s_{n+t} = \cdot | s_n = s)) \leq m\kappa^t.$$

Proposition 4.2 can be proved similarly as Khodadadian et al. [2022, Lemma 7] and the details are omitted. At the k -th iteration of Approximate TD-PMD, the trajectory $\{s_t^k\}_{t \geq 0}$ is the Markov chain with transition kernel of $P_s^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}$ when π_{k+1} is fixed. Thus by Proposition 4.2,

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K, s \in \mathcal{S}, n \geq 0, t \geq 0 : \quad d_{TV}(\nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(\cdot), \mathbb{P}(s_{n+t}^k = \cdot | s_n^k = s) \mid \pi_{k+1}) \leq m\kappa^t. \quad (17)$$

Let $\sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi}(s, a) := \nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi}(s) \cdot \pi_b(a|s)$. One can directly verify that $\sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}$ is the stationary distribution of chain $\{(s_t^k, a_t^k)\}_{t \geq 0}$. By Proposition 4.2, we have $\mathbb{P}(s_t^k = s) \rightarrow \nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s)$ and $\mathbb{P}(s_t^k = s, a_t^k = a) \rightarrow \sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s, a)$ as B_k increases.

As in Expected TD-PMD (see Lemma 3.6), the Q-values in Approximate TD-PMD are also bounded.

Lemma 4.3. *Consider Approximate TD-PMD (Algorithm 3) with critic step size satisfying $\alpha_k \in (0, 1]$. We have*

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K, (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} : \quad 0 \leq Q^k(s, a) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma}.$$

In the sequel, we will extend the analysis for Expected TD-PMD to establish the sample complexity of Approximate TD-PMD under constant and adaptive policy update step sizes. The major difference is to handle the time-varying stationary distribution $\sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}$, which requires following lemma.

Lemma 4.4 (Mitrophanov [2005, Corollary 3.1]). *Let $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ and $\{\tilde{X}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be two Markov chains over $|\mathcal{X}| < \infty$ with transition kernels P and \tilde{P} . Denote by $\nu, \tilde{\nu}$ the stationary distribution of $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \{\tilde{X}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ respectively, and assume $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is geometrically mixing, i.e.,*

$$\exists m > 0, \exists \kappa \in (0, 1), \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \forall n \geq 0, \forall t \geq 0 : d_{TV}(\nu(\cdot), \mathbb{P}(X_{n+t} = \cdot | X_n = x)) \leq m\kappa^t.$$

Then there holds

$$d_{TV}(\nu(\cdot), \tilde{\nu}(\cdot)) \leq \left(\lceil \log_\kappa m^{-1} \rceil + \frac{1}{1-\kappa} \right) \|P - \tilde{P}\|_\infty.$$

4.1 Approximate TD-PMD with constant step size

Notice that the proof of Lemma 3.7 does not rely on the sampling scheme and the critic update formula. Thus the upper bound in Lemma 3.7 still applies for Approximate TD-PMD, which is presented below for readers' convenience.

Lemma 4.5. *Consider Approximate TD-PMD (Algorithm 3). Suppose that Assumptions 3.4 holds. Let $\eta_k = \eta > 0$ and $\alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1]$. Fixing any optimal policy $\pi^* \in \Pi$ and $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, one has*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V^*(\mu) - V^{\pi_K}(\mu)] &\leq \underbrace{\frac{1}{K+1} \left[\frac{\|D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}\|_\infty}{\eta(1-\gamma)} + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2} \right]}_{\text{Exact PMD bound}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{K+1} \cdot \frac{\eta|\mathcal{A}|^2}{2(1-\gamma)^2 \lambda} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \|Q^k - Q^{\pi_k}\|_\infty^2 \right]}_{\text{Stochastic Variance term}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{K+1} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*} [\langle \pi^*(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) - Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle] \right]}_{\text{Stochastic Bias term}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, the key is still to bound the stochastic bias, which requires us to rewrite the update of the critic. By Proposition 4.2, under Assumption 4.1, we have $\mathbb{P}(s_t^k = s) \rightarrow \nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s)$. Thus it follows from equation (16) that

$$\mathbb{E}[Q^{k+1}(s, a)] \approx \mathbb{E}[Q^k(s, a) + \alpha_k \cdot \sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s, a) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a)].$$

This inspires us to define the $\sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi}$ -weighted Bellman operator with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$,

$$\forall \pi \in \Pi, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|} : \mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi, \alpha}^\pi Q(s, a) := Q(s, a) + \alpha \cdot \sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi}(s, a) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^\pi Q(s, a) - Q(s, a)],$$

or equivalently,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi, \alpha}^\pi Q = Q + \alpha \Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi} [\mathcal{F}^\pi Q - Q],$$

where $\Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi} := \text{diag}(\sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \times |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$. When $\alpha = 1$ we simply denote $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi, \alpha}^\pi$ by $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi}^\pi$,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi}^\pi Q := Q + \Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi} [\mathcal{F}^\pi Q - Q].$$

By Proposition 4.2, we know that under Assumption 4.1 and Assumption 3.1 there holds

$$\tilde{\sigma} := \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \min_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi}(s,a) > 0,$$

implying that $\Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi} \succeq \tilde{\sigma} \cdot I$. Such a positive lower bound offers further implies the contraction property of $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi, \alpha}^{\pi}$.

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 4.1 hold. Then for any $\pi \in \Pi$,*

- (a) $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi, \alpha}^{\pi} Q^{\pi} = Q^{\pi}$;
- (b) $\forall Q, Q' \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|} : \|\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi, \alpha}^{\pi} Q - \mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi, \alpha}^{\pi} Q'\|_{\infty} \leq (1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma)\tilde{\sigma})\|Q - Q'\|_{\infty}$.

The proof is same with the one for Proposition 3.8. Similarly, letting $A^{\pi_b \circ \pi} = I - \alpha \Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi} (I - \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi})$, one has

$$\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi, \alpha}^{\pi} Q - \mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi, \alpha}^{\pi} Q' = A^{\pi_b \circ \pi}(Q - Q'),$$

and thus

$$\forall \pi \in \Pi : \|A^{\pi_b \circ \pi}\|_{\infty} \leq (1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma)\tilde{\sigma}).$$

Based on the operator $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi, \alpha}^{\pi}$, we can reformulate the critic update of Approximate TD-PMD as

$$Q^{k+1} = \mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}, \alpha}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k + \alpha \cdot \bar{\omega}_k \quad \text{or} \quad Q^{k+1} = Q^k + \alpha \cdot \Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}} [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k] + \alpha \cdot \bar{\omega}_k, \quad (18)$$

where $\bar{\omega}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$ is the stochastic term defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_t^k(s, a) &= \delta_t^k(s, a) - [\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a), \\ \bar{\omega}_k(s, a) &= \sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} c_t^k \cdot \omega_t^k(s, a) = \bar{\delta}_k(s, a) - [\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

In Approximate TD-PMD, we adopt the same weights c_t^k as in Expected TD-PMD, see equation (11). The following lemma is a counterpart of Lemma 3.9, and the proof details are omitted.

Lemma 4.7. *Consider Approximate TD-PMD (Algorithm 3). Let $\eta_k = \eta > 0$ and $\alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1]$. Fixing any optimal policy $\pi^* \in \Pi^*$, for any $0 \leq k \leq K$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$, there holds*

$$|\mathbb{E} [\langle \pi^*(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) - Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle]| \leq |B_0^{(k)}| + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E} [|C_j^{(k)}| + |D_j^{(k)}| + |E_j^{(k)}|] + \sum_{j=1}^k |\mathbb{E} [F_j^{(k)}]|,$$

where $B_0^{(k)}$, $C_j^{(k)}$, $D_j^{(k)}$, $E_j^{(k)}$, and $F_j^{(k)}$ admit the same expressions as in Lemma 3.9, and $A_j = A^{\pi_b \circ \pi_j} = I - \alpha \Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_j} (I - \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_j})$.

The upper bounds for the terms with $B_0^{(k)}$, $C_j^{(k)}$, and $D_j^{(k)}$ can be similarly established as in the analysis for Expected TD-PMD by leveraging $\|A_j\|_{\infty} \leq (1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma)\tilde{\sigma})$ and Lemma 3.5. Thus we only present them in the following lemma without proofs.

Lemma 4.8 (Bounds for terms with $B_0^{(k)}$, $C_j^{(k)}$, and $D_j^{(k)}$). *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 4.1, and 3.4 hold. One has*

$$|B_0^{(k)}| \leq \frac{2}{1 - \gamma} \cdot [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}]^k, \quad \sum_{j=1}^k |C_j^{(k)}| \leq \frac{2\gamma|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\alpha\lambda\tilde{\sigma}(1 - \gamma)^4}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^k |D_j^{(k)}| \leq \frac{|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\alpha\lambda\tilde{\sigma}(1 - \gamma)^3}.$$

The bound for the term with $E_j^{(k)}$ is presented in the following lemma, whose proof is provided in Section 5.8. Differing from the analysis for Expected TD-PMD, it requires us to bound the drift between $\Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_j}$ and $\Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{j-1}}$ by leveraging Lemma 4.4.

Lemma 4.9 (Bound for terms with $E_j^{(k)}$). *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 4.1, and 3.4 hold. One has*

$$\sum_{j=1}^k |E_j^{(k)}| \leq \frac{2|\mathcal{A}|^2 \cdot [2L+1]}{\alpha \lambda \tilde{\sigma}^2 (1-\gamma)^4} \eta,$$

where $L := |\mathcal{A}| (\lceil \log_\kappa m^{-1} \rceil + (1-\kappa)^{-1})$.

The bound for the Markov noise part is presented in the following lemma. The proof is overall similar to the one for Lemma 3.12 and can be found in Section 5.9.

Lemma 4.10 (Bound for term with $F_j^{(k)}$). *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1 and 4.1 hold. Recall the average weight c_t^k in equation (11). Assume $B_k = B$, $k = 0, \dots, K$. One has*

$$\sum_{j=1}^k |\mathbb{E} [F_j^{(k)}]| \leq \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}} \Psi(B, \vartheta, m, \kappa),$$

where Ψ is defined in Lemma 3.12.

Finally, one can obtain the upper bound for the stochastic bias term and then establish the convergence for Approximate TD-PMD with the constant step size. Moreover, the $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity of Approximate TD-PMD follows immediately from this convergence result.

Theorem 4.11. *Consider Approximate TD-PMD (Algorithm 3). Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 4.1, and 3.4 hold. Let*

$$\eta_k = \eta \sqrt{\frac{\alpha \lambda \tilde{\sigma}^2 (1-\gamma)^4 \|D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}\|_\infty}{(6+4L)|\mathcal{A}|^2(K+1)}}, \quad \alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1], \quad B_k = B > 0,$$

and c_t^k takes the form in equation (11). Fixing any optimal policy $\pi^* \in \Pi^*$ and $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, there holds

$$\mathbb{E} [V^*(\mu) - V^{\pi_K}(\mu)] \leq \frac{1}{K+1} \cdot \frac{3}{\alpha \tilde{\sigma} (1-\gamma)^3} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{K+1}} \cdot \left(\frac{(6+4L)|\mathcal{A}|^2 \|D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}\|_\infty}{\alpha \lambda \tilde{\sigma}^2 (1-\gamma)^6} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{2}{\tilde{\sigma} (1-\gamma)^2} \Psi(B, \vartheta, m, \kappa),$$

where Ψ is defined in Lemma 3.12 and L is given in Lemma 4.9.

Proof. The proof is the same with that for Theorem 3.13 by gathering Lemma 4.5 and Lemmas 4.7–4.10 together. \square

4.2 Approximate TD-PMD with adaptive step sizes

The analysis for the adaptive step sizes in Section 3.2 can be similarly extended to Approximate TD-PMD. Recall that the key ingredient of the adaptive step sizes analysis in Section 3.2 is the utilization of the contraction property of $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^\pi$ to establish the convergence rate of the critic $\|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty$. Since the contraction property also holds for $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi, \alpha}^\pi$ (Proposition 4.6), the analysis in Section 3.2 can be easily generalized to Approximate TD-PMD.

Lemma 4.12. *Suppose Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 4.1 hold. Consider Approximate TD-PMD (Algorithm 3) with constant critic step size $\alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1]$. There holds*

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K : \|Q^* - Q^{k+1}\|_\infty \leq [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha \tilde{\sigma}] \cdot \|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty + \frac{\alpha \gamma}{\eta_k} \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty + \alpha \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty,$$

where

$$\|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty := \max_s D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}(s),$$

and $\tilde{\pi}_k$ is any policy that satisfies $\langle \tilde{\pi}_k(\cdot|s), Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle = \max_a Q^k(s, a), \forall s$.

Proof. Using the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.14, we have

$$\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k(s, a) \geq \mathcal{F} Q^k(s, a) - \frac{\gamma}{\eta_k} \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty.$$

By the critic update formula (equation (18)),

$$\begin{aligned} & [Q^* - Q^{k+1}](s, a) \\ &= [1 - \alpha \sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s, a)][Q^*(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)] + \alpha \sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s, a)[Q^*(s, a) - \mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k(s, a)] - \alpha \bar{\omega}_k(s, a), \end{aligned}$$

we can similarly show that

$$\begin{aligned} & |Q^*(s, a) - Q^{k+1}(s, a)| \\ & \leq [1 - \alpha \sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s, a)] |Q^*(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)| + \alpha \sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s, a) |\mathcal{F} Q^*(s, a) - \mathcal{F} Q^k(s, a)| \\ & \quad + \alpha \sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s, a) \frac{\gamma}{\eta_k} \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty + \alpha |\bar{\omega}_k(s, a)| \\ & \leq [1 - (1 - \gamma) \alpha \sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s, a)] \|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty + \alpha \gamma \eta_k^{-1} \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty + \alpha |\bar{\omega}_k(s, a)| \\ & \leq [1 - (1 - \gamma) \alpha \tilde{\sigma}] \|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty + \alpha \gamma \eta_k^{-1} \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty + \alpha \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.13. *Consider Approximate TD-PMD (Algorithm 3). Suppose Assumption 4.1 hold. Let c_t^k take the form in equation (11) with $\vartheta = 1$. Then there holds*

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K : \quad \mathbb{E} [\|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty] \leq \left(\frac{4|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left(1 + \frac{m}{1-\kappa} \right) \right)^{1/2} \cdot (B_k)^{-1/2}.$$

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{G}_k = \{s_t^k, \pi_{k+1}, Q^k\}$ and let $o_t^k := (s_t^k, a_t^k, s_t'^k, a_t'^k, s_{t+1}^k)$. By Lemma 4.3, there holds $|\omega_t^k(s, a)| \leq 2(1-\gamma)^{-1}$ and $|\bar{\omega}_k(s, a)| \leq 2(1-\gamma)^{-1}$. For any $0 \leq i < j \leq B_k - 1$, following the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.16 we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\omega_i^k(s, a) \omega_j^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k] \leq \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbb{E} [\omega_j^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k, o_i^k] \right| \middle| \mathcal{G}_k \right].$$

By the same computation as in equation (25), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\delta_j^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k, o_i^k] &= \mathbb{P} [(s_j^k, a_j^k) = (s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k, o_i^k] \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)] \\ &= \mathbb{P} [s_j^k = s | \pi_{k+1}, s_{i+1}^k] \cdot \pi_b(a|s) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E} [\omega_j^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k, o_i^k]| \\ &= |\mathbb{E} [\delta_j^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k, o_i^k] - [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a)| \\ &= |\mathbb{P} [s_j^k = s | \pi_{k+1}, s_{i+1}^k] \cdot \pi_b(a|s) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)] - \sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s, a) [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a)| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left| \mathbb{P}[s_j^k = s \mid \pi_{k+1}, s_{i+1}^k] - \nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s) \right| \cdot |\pi_b(a|s)| \cdot \underbrace{[\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)]}_{\leq (1-\gamma)^{-1} \text{ by Lemma 4.3}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \underbrace{d_{TV}(\mathbb{P}[s_j^k = \cdot \mid s_{i+1}^k], \nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(\cdot) \mid \pi_{k+1})}_{\text{Applying equation (17)}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} m \kappa^{j-i-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then the remaining proof is the same with that for Lemma 3.16. \square

Lemma 4.14. *Suppose Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 4.1 hold. Consider Approximate TD-PMD (Algorithm 3) with constant critic step size $\alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1]$. There holds*

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq K : \|Q^* - Q^{\pi_{k+1}}\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{\alpha(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}} (\|Q^* - Q^{k+1}\|_\infty + \|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty + \alpha \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty).$$

Proof. By substituting equation (18) for equation (10), $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}, \alpha}^{\pi_{k+1}}$ for $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b, \alpha}^{\pi_{k+1}}$, and Proposition 4.6 for Proposition 3.8, the proof remains same with that for Lemma 3.15. \square

Theorem 4.15. *Suppose Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 4.1 hold. Consider Approximate TD-PMD (Algorithm 3) with constant critic step size $\alpha_k = \alpha \in (0, 1]$ and the adaptive policy update step size*

$$\eta_k \geq \eta \cdot \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty \quad \text{with } \eta > 0.$$

There holds

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|Q^* - Q^{\pi_k}\|_\infty] &\leq \frac{2}{\alpha \tilde{\sigma} (1-\gamma)^2} [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha \tilde{\sigma}]^{K-1} + \frac{2\gamma}{\alpha \eta (1-\gamma)^2 \tilde{\sigma}^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma} (1-\gamma)} \left(\frac{4|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left(1 + \frac{m}{1-\kappa} \right) \right)^{1/2} \cdot \left(B_{K-1}^{-1/2} + \tilde{\Xi}(K) + \tilde{\Xi}(K-1) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\Xi}(t) := \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha \tilde{\sigma}]^{t-1-k} B_k^{-1/2}$.

Proof. By substituting Lemma 4.13 for Lemma 3.16, Lemma 4.12 for Lemma 3.14, and Lemma 4.14 for Lemma 3.15, the proof remains same with that for Theorem 3.17. \square

Base on the same parameter settings as in Remark 3.5, one can similarly establish the $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity of Approximate TD-PMD with adaptive step sizes.

5 Proofs of critical lemmas

5.1 Proof of Lemma 3.7

For any state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, applying the three-point-descent lemma (Lemma 2.3) with $p = \pi_k(\cdot|s)$ and $p = \pi^*(\cdot|s)$ gives that

$$\eta \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle \geq D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) + D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi_k}(s), \quad (20)$$

$$\eta \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi^*(\cdot|s), Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle \geq D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) + D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s) - D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s). \quad (21)$$

Subtracting $\langle \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle$ on both of sides of equation (21) and after rearrangement we have

$$\underbrace{\eta \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle - D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s)}_{:=I_k(s)} \geq \eta \langle \pi^*(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) \rangle + D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s) - D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s) \\ + \underbrace{\eta \langle \pi^*(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^k(s, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) \rangle}_{:=G_k(s)}.$$

For arbitrary $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, taking expectation with respect to $s \sim d_\mu^*$ on both sides gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[I_k(s)] \geq \eta \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[\langle \pi^*(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) \rangle] + \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s) - D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s)] + \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[G_k(s)] \\ = \eta(1 - \gamma)(V^*(\mu) - V^{\pi_k}(\mu)) + [D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(d_\mu^*) - D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(d_\mu^*)] + \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[G_k(s)],$$

where we have applied the performance difference lemma (Lemma 2.1) and set $D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(d_\mu^*) = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s)]$, and $D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(d_\mu^*) = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s)]$. Summing it from $k = 0$ to $k = K$ yields

$$\sum_{k=0}^K (V^*(\mu) - V^{\pi_k}(\mu)) \leq \frac{1}{\eta(1 - \gamma)} \left[D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}(d_\mu^*) - D_{\pi_{K+1}}^{\pi^*}(d_\mu^*) + \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[I_k(s)] - \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[G_k(s)] \right] \\ \leq \frac{1}{\eta(1 - \gamma)} \left[\|D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}\|_\infty + \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[I_k(s)] - \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[G_k(s)] \right]. \quad (22)$$

Next we need to bound $\sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[I_k(s)]$. Noticing that $I_k(s) \geq 0$ by equation (20) and the fact that $d_{d_\mu^*}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) \geq (1 - \gamma)d_\mu^*(s)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[I_k(s)] \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_{d_\mu^*}^{\pi_{k+1}}}[I_k(s)].$$

Then $I_k(s)$ can be upper bounded as follows,

$$I_k(s) = \eta \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) \rangle \\ + \eta \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^k(s, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) \rangle - D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) \\ \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \eta \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) \rangle \\ + \left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{|\mathcal{A}|^2}} \cdot \|\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s)\|_1 \right) \cdot \left(\eta \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}|^2}{\lambda}} \cdot \|Q^k(s, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot)\|_\infty \right) - D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) \\ \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \eta \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) \rangle \\ + \underbrace{\frac{\lambda}{2|\mathcal{A}|^2} \cdot \|\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s)\|_1^2 - D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) + \frac{\eta^2 |\mathcal{A}|^2}{2\lambda} \cdot \|Q^k(s, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot)\|_\infty^2}_{\leq 0 \text{ by equation (6)}} \\ \leq \eta \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) \rangle + \frac{\eta^2 |\mathcal{A}|^2}{2\lambda} \cdot \|Q^k - Q^{\pi_k}\|_\infty^2,$$

where we apply Hölder's inequality in (a) and Young's inequality in (b). Together with the performance difference lemma (Lemma 2.1), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*}[I_k(s)] \leq \frac{\eta}{1 - \gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_{d_\mu^*}^{\pi_{k+1}}}[\langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) \rangle] + \frac{\eta^2 |\mathcal{A}|^2}{2(1 - \gamma)\lambda} \cdot \|Q^k - Q^{\pi_k}\|_\infty^2$$

$$= \eta [V^{\pi_{k+1}}(d_\mu^*) - V^{\pi_k}(d_\mu^*)] + \frac{\eta^2 |\mathcal{A}|^2}{2(1-\gamma)\lambda} \cdot \|Q^k - Q^{\pi_k}\|_\infty^2.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_\mu^*} [I_k(s)] &\leq \eta [V^{\pi_{K+1}}(d_\mu^*) - V^{\pi_0}(d_\mu^*)] + \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\eta^2 |\mathcal{A}|^2}{2(1-\gamma)\lambda} \cdot \|Q^k - Q^{\pi_k}\|_\infty^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\eta}{1-\gamma} + \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\eta^2 |\mathcal{A}|^2}{2(1-\gamma)\lambda} \cdot \|Q^k - Q^{\pi_k}\|_\infty^2. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging it back to equation (22), taking the total expectation, and using the fact $\mathbb{E}[V^*(\mu) - V^{\pi_K}(\mu)] = (K+1)^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{E}[V^*(\mu) - V^{\pi_k}(\mu)]$ complete the proof.

5.2 Proof of Lemma 3.9

Define

$$B_j^{(k)} = \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s(\pi^* - \pi_j), Q^{\pi_j} - Q^j \right\rangle.$$

Recalling the definition of E_s and J_s in equation (12), it is evident that

$$\langle \pi^*(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) - Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle = \langle E_s(\pi^* - \pi_k), E_s(Q^{\pi_k} - Q^k) \rangle = B_k^{(k)}.$$

Therefore,

$$\langle \pi^*(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s), Q^{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) - Q^k(s, \cdot) \rangle = B_0^{(k)} + \sum_{j=1}^k [B_j^{(k)} - B_{j-1}^{(k)}]. \quad (23)$$

To compute $B_j^{(k)} - B_{j-1}^{(k)}$, first one has

$$\begin{aligned} B_j^{(k)} &= \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], Q^{\pi_j} - Q^j \right\rangle \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], Q^{\pi_j} - Q^{j-1} - \alpha \Sigma^{\pi_b} [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_j} Q^{j-1} - Q^{j-1}] - \alpha \bar{\omega}_{j-1} \right\rangle \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], [I - \alpha \Sigma^{\pi_b}] [Q^{\pi_j} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], \alpha \Sigma^{\pi_b} [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_j} Q^{\pi_j} - \mathcal{F}^{\pi_j} Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle \\ &\quad - \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], \alpha \bar{\omega}_{j-1} \right\rangle \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], [I - \alpha \Sigma^{\pi_b}] [Q^{\pi_j} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], (\alpha \Sigma^{\pi_b}) (\gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_j}) [Q^{\pi_j} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle \\ &\quad - \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], \alpha \bar{\omega}_{j-1} \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], [I - \alpha \Sigma^{\pi_b} (I - \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_j})] [Q^{\pi_j} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle - \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], \alpha \bar{\omega}_{j-1} \right\rangle \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j+1}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], [Q^{\pi_j} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle - \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], \alpha \bar{\omega}_{j-1} \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is from the critic update formula (equation (10)), (b) uses the fact that $\mathcal{F}^{\pi_j} Q^{\pi_j} = Q^{\pi_j}$, (c) is from the fact that $\mathcal{F}^\pi Q = r + \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^\pi Q$ for any $\pi \in \Pi$ and $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}$, and (d) is from $A_j = [I - \alpha \Sigma^{\pi_b} (I - \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_j})]$. By Further decomposing the first term yields

$$B_j^{(k)} = \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j+1}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], [Q^{\pi_j} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle - \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j], \alpha \bar{\omega}_{j-1} \right\rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \underbrace{\left\langle \left[(A_{j-1})^{k-j+1} \right]^\top J_s [\pi^* - \pi_{j-1}], [Q^{\pi_{j-1}} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle}_{=: B_{j-1}^{(k)}} \\
&+ \underbrace{\left\langle \left[(A_j)^{k-j+1} \right]^\top J_s [\pi^* - \pi_j], [Q^{\pi_j} - Q^{\pi_{j-1}}] \right\rangle}_{=: C_j^{(k)}} + \underbrace{\left\langle \left[(A_j)^{k-j+1} \right]^\top J_s [\pi_{j-1} - \pi_j], [Q^{\pi_{j-1}} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle}_{=: D_j^{(k)}} \\
&+ \underbrace{\left\langle \left[(A_j)^{k-j+1} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j+1} \right]^\top J_s [\pi^* - \pi_{j-1}], [Q^{\pi_{j-1}} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle}_{=: E_j^{(k)}} - \underbrace{\left\langle \left[(A_j)^{k-j} \right]^\top J_s [\pi^* - \pi_j], \alpha \bar{\omega}_{j-1} \right\rangle}_{=: F_j^{(k)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging it back to (23), taking the expectation, and taking the absolute value completes the proof.

5.3 Proof of Lemma 3.10

For the term with $C_j^{(k)}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^k |C_j^{(k)}| &= \sum_{j=1}^k \left| \left\langle \left[(A_j)^{k-j+1} \right]^\top J_s [\pi^* - \pi_j], [Q^{\pi_j} - Q^{\pi_{j-1}}] \right\rangle \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^k \|A_j\|_\infty^{k-j+1} \cdot \|J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j]\|_1 \cdot \underbrace{\|Q^{\pi_j} - Q^{\pi_{j-1}}\|_\infty}_{\text{applying Lemma 2.2}} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\gamma |\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^2} \cdot \|A_j\|_\infty^{k-j+1} \cdot \underbrace{\|J_s[\pi^* - \pi_j]\|_1}_{\leq 2} \cdot \underbrace{\|\pi_j - \pi_{j-1}\|_\infty}_{\text{applying Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6}} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{2\gamma |\mathcal{A}|^2 \eta}{\lambda(1-\gamma)^3} \cdot [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b]^{k-j+1} \\
&\leq \frac{2\gamma |\mathcal{A}|^2 \eta}{\alpha \lambda \tilde{\sigma}_b (1-\gamma)^4}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the term with $D_j^{(k)}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^k |D_j^{(k)}| &= \sum_{j=1}^k \left| \left\langle \left[(A_j)^{k-j+1} \right]^\top J_s [\pi_{j-1} - \pi_j], [Q^{\pi_{j-1}} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^k \|A_j\|_\infty^{k-j+1} \cdot \underbrace{\|J_s[\pi_{j-1} - \pi_j]\|_1}_{\leq |\mathcal{A}| \cdot \|\pi_{j-1} - \pi_j\|_\infty} \cdot \underbrace{\|Q^{\pi_{j-1}} - Q^{j-1}\|_\infty}_{\leq (1-\gamma)^{-1}} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{|\mathcal{A}|^2 \eta}{\lambda(1-\gamma)^2} \cdot [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha \tilde{\sigma}_b]^{k-j+1} \\
&\leq \frac{|\mathcal{A}|^2 \eta}{\alpha \lambda \tilde{\sigma}_b (1-\gamma)^3}.
\end{aligned}$$

5.4 Proof of Lemma 3.11

First, one has

$$|E_j^{(k)}| = \left| \left\langle \left[(A_j)^{k-j+1} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j+1} \right]^\top J_s [\pi^* - \pi_{j-1}], [Q^{\pi_{j-1}} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \|(A_j)^{k-j+1} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j+1}\|_\infty \cdot \|J_s[\pi^* - \pi_{j-1}]\|_1 \cdot \|Q^{\pi_{j-1}} - Q^{j-1}\|_\infty \\
&\leq \frac{2}{1-\gamma} \cdot \|(A_j)^{k-j+1} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j+1}\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

For the term $\|(A_j)^{k-j+1} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j+1}\|_\infty$, notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(A_j)^{k-j+1} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j+1}\|_\infty &= \|(A_j)^{k-j+1} - (A_j) \cdot (A_{j-1})^{k-j} + (A_j) \cdot (A_{j-1})^{k-j} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j+1}\|_\infty \\
&\leq \|(A_j) \cdot [(A_j)^{k-j} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j}]\|_\infty + \|[A_j - A_{j-1}] \cdot (A_{j-1})^{k-j}\|_\infty \\
&\leq [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b] \cdot \|(A_j)^{k-j} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j}\|_\infty \\
&\quad + \|A_j - A_{j-1}\|_\infty \cdot [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^{k-j} \\
&= [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b] \cdot \|(A_j)^{k-j} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j}\|_\infty \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\|(\alpha\gamma\Sigma^{\pi_b})(P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_j} - P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_{j-1}})\|_\infty}_{\leq \|\alpha\gamma\Sigma^{\pi_b}\|_\infty \cdot \|P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_j} - P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_{j-1}}\|_\infty \leq \alpha\gamma|\mathcal{A}| \cdot \|\pi_j - \pi_{j-1}\|_\infty} \times [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^{k-j} \\
&\leq [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b] \cdot \|(A_j)^{k-j} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j}\|_\infty + [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^{k-j} \cdot \frac{\alpha\gamma|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\lambda(1-\gamma)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we leverage the fact that $\|P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi} - P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi'}\|_\infty \leq |\mathcal{A}| \cdot \|\pi - \pi'\|_\infty$ which can be directly verified. By induction we have

$$\|(A_j)^{k-j+1} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j+1}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\alpha\gamma|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\lambda(1-\gamma)} \cdot (k-j+1) \cdot [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^{k-j}.$$

Plugging it back yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^k |E_j^{(k)}| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{2\alpha\gamma|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\lambda(1-\gamma)^2} \cdot (k-j+1) \cdot [1 - (1-\gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b]^{k-j} \\
&\leq \frac{2\alpha\gamma|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\lambda(1-\gamma)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\alpha^2\tilde{\sigma}_b^2(1-\gamma)^2} \\
&\leq \frac{2\gamma|\mathcal{A}|^2\eta}{\alpha\lambda\tilde{\sigma}_b^2(1-\gamma)^4},
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the following inequality:

$$0 < q < 1 : \sum_{j=1}^k (k-j+1) \cdot q^{k-j} = \sum_{j=1}^k j \cdot q^{j-1} = \frac{1 - (k+1)q^k + kq^{k+1}}{(1-q)^2} \leq \frac{1}{(1-q)^2}.$$

5.5 Proof of Lemma 3.12

Define $\mathcal{G}_k = \{Q^k, \pi_{k+1}, s_0^k\}$. A direct calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \mathbb{E} \left[F_j^{(k)} \right] \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s(\pi^* - \pi_j), \alpha\bar{\omega}_{j-1} \right\rangle \right] \right| = \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s(\pi^* - \pi_j), \alpha\bar{\omega}_{j-1} \right\rangle \middle| \mathcal{G}_{j-1} \right] \right] \right| \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s(\pi^* - \pi_j), \alpha\bar{\omega}_{j-1} \right\rangle \middle| \mathcal{G}_{j-1} \right] \right| \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j}]^\top J_s(\pi^* - \pi_j), \alpha\mathbb{E}[\bar{\omega}_{j-1} | \mathcal{G}_{j-1}] \right\rangle \right| \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[\|A_j\|_\infty^{k-j} \cdot \|J_s(\pi^* - \pi_j)\|_1 \cdot \alpha \|\mathbb{E}[\bar{\omega}_{j-1} | \mathcal{G}_{j-1}]\|_\infty] \\
&\leq 2\alpha(1 - \alpha(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b)^{k-j} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\bar{\omega}_{j-1} | \mathcal{G}_{j-1}]\|_\infty].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, it suffices to consider $|\mathbb{E}[\bar{\omega}_k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k]|$ next. Recall that

$$\omega_t^k(s, a) = \delta_t^k(s, a) - [\mathcal{F}_{\pi_b}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\omega}_k(s, a) = \sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} c_t^k \cdot \omega_t^k(s, a).$$

One has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\delta_t^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k] &= \mathbb{E}[1_{(s_t^k, a_t^k)=(s, a)} \left[r_t^k + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s_{t+1}^k)} [Q^k(s_{t+1}^k, a)] - Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k) \right] | \mathcal{G}_k] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[1_{(s_t^k, a_t^k)=(s, a)} \mathbb{E} \left[r_t^k + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s_{t+1}^k)} [Q^k(s_{t+1}^k, a)] - Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k) | \mathcal{G}_k, s_t^k, a_t^k \right] | \mathcal{G}_k \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[1_{(s_t^k, a_t^k)=(s, a)} \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s_t^k, a_t^k) | \mathcal{G}_k \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[1_{(s_t^k, a_t^k)=(s, a)} \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k \right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}[s_t^k = s | \mathcal{G}_k] \pi_b(a | s) [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a) \\ &= \mathbb{P}[s_t^k = s | s_0^k] \cdot \pi_b(a | s) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[\omega_t^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k]| &= |\mathbb{E}[\delta_t^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k] - \sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a) [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a)| \\ &= |\mathbb{E}[\delta_t^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k] - \nu^{\pi_b}(s) \pi_b(a | s) [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a)| \\ &= |\mathbb{P}[s_t^k = s | s_0^k] \cdot \pi_b(a | s) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a) - \nu^{\pi_b}(s) \pi_b(a | s) [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a)| \\ &= |\mathbb{P}[s_t^k = s | s_0^k] - \nu^{\pi_b}(s)| \cdot \pi_b(a | s) \cdot \underbrace{[\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k - Q^k](s, a)}_{\leq 1/(1-\gamma) \text{ by Lemma 3.6}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} |\mathbb{P}[s_t^k = s | s_0^k] - \nu^{\pi_b}(s)| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \underbrace{d_{TV}(\mathbb{P}[s_t^k = s | s_0^k], \nu^{\pi_b}(\cdot))}_{\text{applying equation (5)}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} m_b \kappa_b^t. \end{aligned}$$

Under the weight setting in (11),

- When $\vartheta = 0$, then $c_t^k = 0, t = 1, \dots, B_k - 1$ and $c_{B_k-1}^k = 1$, and one has

$$|\mathbb{E}[\bar{\omega}_k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k]| = |\mathbb{E}[\omega_{B-1}^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k]| \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} m_b \kappa_b^{B-1};$$

- When $\vartheta = 1$,

$$|\mathbb{E}[\bar{\omega}_k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k]| = \left| \frac{1}{B} \sum_{t=0}^{B-1} \mathbb{E}[\omega_t^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k] \right| \leq \frac{m_b}{1-\gamma} \left| \frac{1}{B} \sum_{t=0}^{B-1} \kappa_b^t \right| \leq \frac{m_b}{B(1-\gamma)(1-\kappa_b)};$$

- When $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$ and $\vartheta \neq \kappa_b$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[\bar{\omega}_k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k]| &= \left| \frac{1}{\sum_{\ell=1}^{B-1} \vartheta^\ell} \sum_{t=0}^{B-1} \vartheta^{B-t-1} \mathbb{E}[\omega_t^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k] \right| \\ &\leq \frac{m_b}{1-\gamma} \frac{1}{\sum_{\ell=0}^{B-1} \vartheta^\ell} \sum_{t=0}^{B-1} \vartheta^{B-t-1} \kappa_b^t \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{m_b}{1-\gamma} \frac{1-\vartheta}{1-\vartheta^B} \frac{\vartheta^B - \kappa_b^B}{\vartheta - \kappa_b} \\
&\leq \begin{cases} \frac{m_b}{1-\gamma} \frac{\kappa_b^B}{\kappa_b - \vartheta}, & \text{if } \vartheta < \kappa_b \\ \frac{m_b}{1-\gamma} \frac{\vartheta^B}{\vartheta - \kappa_b}, & \text{if } \vartheta > \kappa_b; \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

- When $\vartheta = \kappa_b$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{E}[\bar{\omega}_k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k]| &= \left| \frac{1}{\sum_{\ell=1}^{B-1} \vartheta^\ell} \sum_{t=0}^{B-1} \vartheta^{B-t-1} \mathbb{E}[\omega_t^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k] \right| \\
&\leq \frac{m_b}{1-\gamma} \frac{1}{\sum_{\ell=0}^{B-1} \vartheta^\ell} \sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} \vartheta^{B-t-1} \kappa_b^t \\
&= \frac{m_b}{1-\gamma} \frac{1-\vartheta}{1-\vartheta^B} \cdot B \cdot \vartheta^{B-1} \\
&\leq \frac{m_b \cdot B \cdot \vartheta^{B-1}}{1-\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^k |\mathbb{E}[F_j^k]| &\leq 2\alpha \sum_{j=1}^k (1 - \alpha(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b)^{k-j} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\bar{\omega}_{j-1} | \mathcal{G}_{j-1}]\|_\infty] \\
&\leq 2\alpha \sum_{j=1}^k (1 - \alpha(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b)^{k-j} \Psi(B_{j-1}, \vartheta, m_b, \kappa_b) \\
&\leq \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)\tilde{\sigma}_b} \Psi(B, \vartheta, m_b, \kappa_b).
\end{aligned}$$

5.6 Proof of Lemma 3.14

We start with applying the three-point-descent lemma (Lemma 2.3) with $p = \tilde{\pi}_k(\cdot | s')$ for any $s' \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\eta_k \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s') - \tilde{\pi}_k(\cdot | s'), Q^k(s', \cdot) \rangle \geq D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s') + D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}(s') - D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}(s') \geq -D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}(s'),$$

yielding that

$$\langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s'), Q^k(s', \cdot) \rangle \geq \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^k(s', a) - \frac{1}{\eta_k} \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k(s, a) &= r(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot | s, a)} [\langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s'), Q^k(s', \cdot) \rangle] \\
&\geq r(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot | s, a)} \left[\max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q^k(s', a') \right] - \frac{\gamma}{\eta_k} \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty \\
&= \mathcal{F} Q^k(s, a) - \frac{\gamma}{\eta_k} \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

According to the critic update formula (equation (10)), for any $(s, a) \in \Delta(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})$,

$$[Q^* - Q^{k+1}](s, a)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= [1 - \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)][Q^*(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)] + \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)[Q^*(s, a) - \mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}}Q^k(s, a)] - \alpha\bar{\omega}_k(s, a) \\
&\leq [1 - \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)][Q^*(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)] + \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)[\mathcal{F}Q^*(s, a) - \mathcal{F}Q^k(s, a) + \gamma\eta_k^{-1}\|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty] - \alpha\bar{\omega}_k(s, a),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use $\mathcal{F}Q^* = Q^*$ and apply the lower bound of $\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}}Q^k(s, a)$ above. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
&[Q^* - Q^{k+1}](s, a) \\
&= [1 - \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)][Q^*(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)] + \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)[Q^*(s, a) - \mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}}Q^k(s, a)] - \alpha\bar{\omega}_k(s, a) \\
&\geq [1 - \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)][Q^*(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)] + \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)[\mathcal{F}Q^*(s, a) - \mathcal{F}Q^k(s, a)] - \alpha\bar{\omega}_k(s, a),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $\mathcal{F}Q^k(s, a) \geq \mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}}Q^k(s, a)$. Combining the upper and lower bounds for $[Q^* - Q^{k+1}](s, a)$ together, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&|Q^*(s, a) - Q^{k+1}(s, a)| \\
&\leq [1 - \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)] \underbrace{|Q^*(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)|}_{\leq \|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty} + \alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a) \underbrace{|\mathcal{F}Q^*(s, a) - \mathcal{F}Q^k(s, a)|}_{\leq \|\mathcal{F}Q^* - \mathcal{F}Q^k\|_\infty \leq \gamma \|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty} \\
&\quad + \alpha\gamma\eta_k^{-1} \underbrace{\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a) \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty}_{\leq 1} + \alpha \underbrace{|\bar{\omega}_k(s, a)|}_{\leq \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty} \\
&\leq [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha\sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)] \cdot \|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty + \frac{\alpha\gamma}{\eta_k} \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty + \alpha \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty \\
&\leq [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}_b] \cdot \|Q^* - Q^k\|_\infty + \frac{\alpha\gamma}{\eta_k} \|D_{\pi_k}^{\tilde{\pi}_k}\|_\infty + \alpha \|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

5.7 Proof of Lemma 3.16

Recall that $\mathcal{G}_k = \{s_0^k, \pi_{k+1}, Q^k\}$ and let $o_t^k := (s_t^k, a_t^k, s_{t+1}^k)$. By Lemma 3.6, there holds $|\omega_t^k(s, a)| \leq 2(1 - \gamma)^{-1}$ and $|\bar{\omega}_k(s, a)| \leq 2(1 - \gamma)^{-1}$. For any $0 \leq i < j \leq B_k - 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [\omega_i^k(s, a)\omega_j^k(s, a) \mid \mathcal{G}_k] &= \mathbb{E} [\omega_i^k(s, a) \cdot \mathbb{E} [\omega_j^k(s, a) \mid \mathcal{G}_k, o_i^k] \mid \mathcal{G}_k] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[|\omega_i^k(s, a)| \cdot |\mathbb{E} [\omega_j^k(s, a) \mid \mathcal{G}_k, o_i^k]| \mid \mathcal{G}_k \right] \\
&\leq \frac{2}{1 - \gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathbb{E} [\omega_j^k(s, a) \mid \mathcal{G}_k, o_i^k]| \mid \mathcal{G}_k \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By the same computation as in equation (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [\delta_j^k(s, a) \mid \mathcal{G}_k, o_i^k] &= \mathbb{P} [(s_j^k, a_j^k) = (s, a) \mid \mathcal{G}_k, o_i^k] \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}}Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)] \\
&= \mathbb{P} [(s_j^k, a_j^k) = (s, a) \mid s_{i+1}^k] \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}}Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)] \\
&= \mathbb{P} [s_j^k = s \mid s_{i+1}^k] \cdot \pi_b(a|s) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}}Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbb{E} [\omega_j^k(s, a) \mid \mathcal{G}_k, o_i^k]| \\
&= |\mathbb{E} [\delta_j^k(s, a) \mid \mathcal{G}_k, o_i^k] - [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}}Q^k - Q^k](s, a)| \\
&= |\mathbb{P} [s_j^k = s \mid s_{i+1}^k] \cdot \pi_b(a|s) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}}Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)] - \sigma^{\pi_b}(s, a)[\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}}Q^k - Q^k](s, a)| \\
&= |\mathbb{P} [s_j^k = s \mid s_{i+1}^k] - \nu^{\pi_b}(s)| \cdot |\pi_b(a|s)| \cdot |[\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}}Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)]|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \underbrace{d_{TV}(\nu^{\pi_b}(\cdot), \mathbb{P}[s_j^k = \cdot | s_{i+1}^k])}_{\text{Applying equation (5)}} \cdot \underbrace{\pi_b(a|s)}_{\leq 1} \cdot \underbrace{[\mathcal{F}^{\pi_b+1}Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)]}_{\leq (1-\gamma)^{-1} \text{ by Lemma 3.6}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} m_b \cdot \kappa_b^{j-i-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\forall j > i : \mathbb{E} [\omega_i^k(s, a) \omega_j^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k] \leq \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)^2} m_b \kappa_b^{j-i-1}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [\bar{\omega}_k(s, a)^2] &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [\bar{\omega}_k(s, a)^2 | \mathcal{G}_k]] \\
&= \frac{1}{B_k^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{B_k-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\underbrace{\omega_t^k(s, a)^2}_{\leq 4(1-\gamma)^{-2}} | \mathcal{G}_k \right] + 2 \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{E} [\omega_i^k(s, a) \omega_j^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k] \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{B_k^2} \left[\frac{4B_k}{(1-\gamma)^2} + 2B_k \cdot \frac{2}{(1-\gamma)^2} \frac{m_b}{1-\kappa_b} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{B_k} \cdot \frac{4}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left[1 + \frac{m_b}{1-\kappa_b} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus there holds

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\bar{\omega}_k\|_\infty] \leq \mathbb{E} [\|\omega_k\|_2] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} [\|\omega_k\|_2^2]} = \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \bar{\omega}_k(s, a)^2 \right]}.$$

5.8 Proof of Lemma 4.9

We first bound $\|A_j - A_{j-1}\|_\infty$. To this end, for any $\pi, \tilde{\pi} \in \Pi$, let $\{s_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ and $\{\tilde{s}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the Markov chains with the transition kernels of $P_s^{\pi_b \circ \pi}$, $P_s^{\pi_b \circ \tilde{\pi}}$, respectively. By Assumption 4.1 and Proposition 4.2 we know that both of these two chains are ergodic and geometrically mixing with parameters $m > 0$ and $0 < \kappa < 1$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P_s^{\pi_b \circ \pi} - P_s^{\pi_b \circ \tilde{\pi}}\|_\infty &= \|P_s^{\pi_b} P_s^\pi - P_s^{\pi_b} P_s^{\tilde{\pi}}\|_\infty \\
&\leq \|P_s^\pi - P_s^{\tilde{\pi}}\|_\infty \\
&= \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} |P_s^\pi(s, s') - P_s^{\tilde{\pi}}(s, s')| \\
&= \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} (\pi(a|s) - \tilde{\pi}(a|s)) P(s'|s, a) \right| \leq |\mathcal{A}| \cdot \|\pi - \tilde{\pi}\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

The application of Lemma 4.4 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi} - \Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \tilde{\pi}}\|_\infty &\leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |\nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi}(s) - \nu^{\pi_b \circ \tilde{\pi}}(s)| \\
&\leq d_{TV}(\nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi}(\cdot), \nu^{\pi_b \circ \tilde{\pi}}(\cdot)) \\
&\leq \left(\lceil \log_\kappa m^{-1} \rceil + \frac{1}{1-\kappa} \right) \|P_s^{\pi_b \circ \pi} - P_s^{\pi_b \circ \tilde{\pi}}\|_\infty \\
&\leq |\mathcal{A}| \left(\lceil \log_\kappa m^{-1} \rceil + \frac{1}{1-\kappa} \right) \|\pi - \tilde{\pi}\|_\infty = L \cdot \|\pi - \tilde{\pi}\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

By setting $\pi = \pi_j$ and $\tilde{\pi} = \pi_{j-1}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A_j - A_{j-1}\|_\infty &= \alpha \|\Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_j} (I - \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_j}) - \Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{j-1}} (I - \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_{j-1}})\|_\infty \\
&= \alpha \|(\Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_j} - \Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{j-1}})(I - \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_j}) + \Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{j-1}} [(I - \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_j}) - (I - \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_{j-1}})]\|_\infty \\
&\leq \alpha \underbrace{\|\Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_j} - \Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{j-1}}\|_\infty}_{\leq L \cdot \|\pi_j - \pi_{j-1}\|_\infty} \cdot \underbrace{\|I - \gamma P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_j}\|_\infty}_{\leq 1 + \gamma} + \alpha \gamma \underbrace{\|\Sigma^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{j-1}}\|_\infty}_{\leq 1} \cdot \underbrace{\|P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_j} - P_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}^{\pi_{j-1}}\|_\infty}_{\leq |\mathcal{A}| \cdot \|\pi_j - \pi_{j-1}\|_\infty} \\
&\leq \alpha((1 + \gamma)L + \gamma|\mathcal{A}|) \cdot \underbrace{\|\pi_j - \pi_{j-1}\|_\infty}_{\text{Applying Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 4.3}} \\
&\leq \frac{\alpha|\mathcal{A}| \cdot [(1 + \gamma)L + \gamma|\mathcal{A}|]}{\lambda(1 - \gamma)} \eta.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(A_j)^{k-j+1} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j+1}\|_\infty &\leq [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}] \cdot \|(A_j)^{k-j} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j}\|_\infty + [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}]^{k-j} \cdot \|A_j - A_{j-1}\|_\infty \\
&\leq \frac{\alpha|\mathcal{A}| \cdot [(1 + \gamma)L + \gamma|\mathcal{A}|]}{\lambda(1 - \gamma)} \eta \cdot (k - j + 1) \cdot [1 - (1 - \gamma)\alpha\tilde{\sigma}]^{k-j}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^k |E_j^{(k)}| &= \sum_{j=1}^k \left| \left\langle [(A_j)^{k-j+1} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j+1}]^\top J_s[\pi^* - \pi_{j-1}], [Q^{\pi_{j-1}} - Q^{j-1}] \right\rangle \right| \\
&\leq \frac{2}{1 - \gamma} \sum_{j=1}^k \|(A_j)^{k-j+1} - (A_{j-1})^{k-j+1}\|_\infty \\
&\leq \frac{2|\mathcal{A}| \cdot [(1 + \gamma)L + \gamma|\mathcal{A}|]}{\alpha\lambda\tilde{\sigma}^2(1 - \gamma)^4} \eta \leq \frac{2|\mathcal{A}|^2 \cdot [2L + 1]}{\alpha\lambda\tilde{\sigma}^2(1 - \gamma)^4} \eta.
\end{aligned}$$

5.9 Proof of Lemma 4.10

Recall that $\mathcal{G}_k = \{Q^k, \pi_{k+1}, s_0^k\}$. One has

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [\delta_t^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{(s_t^k, a_t^k) = (s, a)} \cdot [r_t^k + \gamma Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k) - Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k)] \mid \mathcal{G}_k \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{(s_t^k, a_t^k) = (s, a)} \cdot \mathbb{E} [r_t^k + \gamma Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k) - Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k) \mid \mathcal{G}_k, s_t^k, a_t^k] \mid \mathcal{G}_k \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{(s_t^k, a_t^k) = (s, a)} \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k) - Q^k(s_t^k, a_t^k)] \mid \mathcal{G}_k \right] \\
&= \mathbb{P} [(s_t^k, a_t^k) = (s, a) \mid \mathcal{G}_k] \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)] \\
&= \mathbb{P} [s_t^k = s \mid \pi_{k+1}, s_0^k] \cdot \pi_b(a|s) \cdot [\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)]. \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{E} [\omega_t^k(s, a) | \mathcal{G}_k]| &= |\mathbb{P} [s_t^k = s \mid \pi_{k+1}, s_0^k] - \nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(s)| \cdot \pi_b(a|s) \cdot |\mathcal{F}^{\pi_{k+1}} Q^k(s, a) - Q^k(s, a)| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \underbrace{d_{TV}(\mathbb{P} [s_t^k = \cdot \mid s_0^k], \nu^{\pi_b \circ \pi_{k+1}}(\cdot) \mid \pi_{k+1})}_{\text{Applying equation (17)}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} m\kappa^t.
\end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is the same with that for Lemma 3.12.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we investigate the sample complexity of policy mirror descent with temporal difference learning under online Markov sampling. Two algorithms including Expected TD-PMD (off-policy) and Approximate TD-PMD (mixed-policy) have been considered, and a comprehensive sample complexity analysis have been conducted. Under the constant policy update step size, both algorithms can find the average-time ε -optimal solution with the $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity, which is further improved to the last-iterate ε -optimal solution with $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ sample complexity when utilizing adaptive step sizes.

For future work, it is interesting to extend our analysis to the RL problem with entropy regularization. In addition, it is also possible to consider the more general setting with policy or critic function approximation. Any progress towards these directions will be reported separately.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank Gen Li and Luo Luo for fruitful discussion regarding Q-learning and stochastic gradient methods, respectively.

References

Alekh Agarwal, Nan Jiang, and Sham M. Kakade. *Reinforcement Learning: Theory and Algorithms (Draft)*. 2019.

Alekh Agarwal, Sham M. Kakade, Jason D. Lee, and Gaurav Mahajan. On the theory of policy gradient methods: Optimality, approximation, and distribution shift. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(98):1–76, 2021.

Carlo Alfano, Rui Yuan, and Patrick Rebeschini. A novel framework for policy mirror descent with general parameterization and linear convergence. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.

Anas Barakat, Pascal Bianchi, and Julien Lehmann. Analysis of a target-based actor-critic algorithm with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2022.

Amir Beck. *First-order methods in optimization*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2017.

Jalaj Bhandari and Daniel Russo. On the linear convergence of policy gradient methods for finite MDPs. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 130, pages 2386–2394, 2021.

Semih Cayci, Niao He, and R. Srikant. Finite-time analysis of entropy-regularized neural natural actor–critic algorithm. In *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2024a.

Semih Cayci, Niao He, and R. Srikant. Convergence of entropy-regularized natural policy gradient with linear function approximation. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 34(3):2729–2755, 2024b.

Shicong Cen, Chen Cheng, Yuxin Chen, Yuting Wei, and Yuejie Chi. Fast global convergence of natural policy gradient methods with entropy regularization. *Operations Research*, 70(4):2563–2578, 2022.

Veronica Chelu and Doina Precup. Functional acceleration for policy mirror descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.16602*, 2024.

Gong Chen and Marc Teboulle. Convergence analysis of a proximal-like minimization algorithm using bregman functions. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 3(3):538–543, 1993.

Tianyi Chen, Yuejiao Sun, and Wotao Yin. Closing the gap: tighter analysis of alternating stochastic gradient methods for bilevel problems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.

Xuyang Chen and Lin Zhao. Finite-time analysis of single-timescale actor–critic. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.

Ilyas Fatkhullin, Anas Barakat, Anastasia Kireeva, and Niao He. Stochastic policy gradient methods: Improved sample complexity for Fisher-non-degenerate policies. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 9827–9869. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023.

Alhussein Fawzi, Matej Balog, Aja Huang, Thomas Hubert, Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Mohammadamin Barekatain, Alexander Novikov, Francisco J. R. Ruiz, Julian Schrittwieser, Grzegorz Swirszcz, David Silver, Demis Hassabis, and Pushmeet Kohli. Discovering faster matrix multiplication algorithms with reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 610:47–53, 2022.

Jie Feng, Ke Wei, and Jinchi Chen. Global convergence of natural policy gradient with hessian-aided momentum variance reduction. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 101(2):44, 2024.

Zuyue Fu, Zhuoran Yang, and Zhaoran Wang. Single-timescale actor–critic provably finds globally optimal policy. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

Mudit Gaur, Amrit Singh Bedi, Di Wang, and Vaneet Aggarwal. Closing the gap: Achieving global convergence (last iterate) of actor–critic under Markovian sampling with neural network parameterization. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.

Matthieu Geist, Bruno Scherrer, and Olivier Pietquin. A theory of regularized markov decision processes. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2160–2169, 2019.

Feihu Huang, Shangqian Gao, and Heng Huang. Bregman gradient policy optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.

Jemin Hwangbo, Joonho Lee, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Dario Bellicoso, Vassilios Tsounis, Vladlen Koltun, and Marco Hutter. Learning agile and dynamic motor skills for legged robots. *Science Robotics*, 4(26), 2019.

Emmeran Johnson, Ciara Pike-Burke, and Patrick Rebeschini. Optimal convergence rate for exact policy mirror descent in discounted markov decision processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.

John Jumper, Richard Evans, Alexander Pritzel, Tim Green, Michael Figurnov, Olaf Ronneberger, Kathryn Tunyasuvunakool, Russ Bates, Augustin Žídek, Anna Potapenko, Alex Bridgland, Clemens Meyer, Simon A. A. Kohl, Andrew J. Ballard, Andrew Cowie, Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Stanislav Nikolov, Rishabh Jain, Jonas Adler, Trevor Back, Stig Petersen, David Reiman, Ellen Clancy, Michal Zielinski, Martin Steinegger, Michalina Pacholska, Tamas Berghammer, Sebastian Bodenstein, David Silver, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew W. Senior, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Pushmeet Kohli, and Demis Hassabis. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold. *Nature*, 596:583–589, 2021.

Sham M. Kakade and John Langford. Approximately optimal approximate reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 267–274, 2002.

Sajad Khodadadian, Zaiwei Chen, and Siva Theja Maguluri. Finite-sample analysis of off-policy natural actor–critic algorithm. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5420–5431. PMLR, 2021a.

Sajad Khodadadian, Prakirt Raj Jhunjhunwala, Sushil Mahavir Varma, and Siva Theja Maguluri. On the linear convergence of natural policy gradient algorithm. In *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 3794–3799, 2021b.

Sajad Khodadadian, Thinh T Doan, Justin Romberg, and Siva Theja Maguluri. Finite-sample analysis of two-time-scale natural actor–critic algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(6):3273–3284, 2022.

Vijay R. Konda and John N. Tsitsiklis. Actor-critic algorithms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2000.

Harshat Kumar, Alec Koppel, and Alejandro Ribeiro. On the sample complexity of actor–critic method for reinforcement learning with function approximation. *Machine Learning*, 112:2433–2467, 2023.

Guanghui Lan. Policy mirror descent for reinforcement learning: Linear convergence, new sampling complexity, and generalized problem classes. *Mathematical Programming*, 198(1):1059–1106, 2021.

Joonho Lee, Jemin Hwangbo, Lorenz Wellhausen, Vladlen Koltun, and Marco Hutter. Learning quadrupedal locomotion over challenging terrain. *Science Robotics*, 5(47), 2020.

David A Levin and Yuval Peres. *Markov chains and mixing times*, volume 107. American Mathematical Soc., 2017.

Gen Li, Changxiao Cai, Yuxin Chen, Yuting Wei, and Yuejie Chi. Is q-learning minimax optimal? a tight sample complexity analysis. *Operations Research*, 72:222–236, 2021.

Gen Li, Yuting Wei, Yuejie Chi, and Yuxin Chen. Softmax policy gradient methods can take exponential time to converge. *Mathematical Programming*, 201:707–802, 2023a.

Tianjiao Li, Feiyang Wu, and Guanghui Lan. Stochastic first-order methods for average-reward markov decision processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2024.

Wenye Li, Jiacai Liu, and Ke Wei. ϕ -update: A class of policy update methods with policy convergence guarantee. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.

Yan Li and Guanghui Lan. Policy mirror descent inherently explores action space. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 35(1):116–156, 2025.

Yan Li, Guanghui Lan, and Tuo Zhao. Homotopic policy mirror descent: Policy convergence, algorithmic regularization, and improved sample complexity. *Mathematical Programming*, 2023b.

Jiacai Liu, Jinchi Chen, and Ke Wei. On the linear convergence of policy gradient under Hadamard parameterization. *arXiv:2305.19575*, 2023.

Jiacai Liu, Wenye Li, and Ke Wei. Elementary analysis of policy gradient methods. *arxiv:2404.03372*, 2024.

Jiacai Liu, Wenye Li, Dachao Lin, Ke Wei, and Zhihua Zhang. On the convergence of projected policy gradient for any constant step sizes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 26:1–35, 2025a.

Jiacai Liu, Wenye Li, and Ke Wei. On the convergence of policy mirror descent with temporal difference evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.18822*, 2025b.

Jincheng Mei, Chenjun Xiao, Bo Dai, Lihong Li, Csaba Szepesvári, and Dale Schuurmans. Escaping the gravitational pull of softmax. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020a.

Jincheng Mei, Chenjun Xiao, Csaba Szepesvári, and Dale Schuurmans. On the global convergence rates of softmax policy gradient methods. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6820–6829, 2020b.

Takahiro Miki, Joonho Lee, Jemin Hwangbo, Lorenz Wellhausen, Vladlen Koltun, and Marco Hutter. Learning robust perceptive locomotion for quadrupedal robots in the wild. *Science Robotics*, 7(62), 2022.

A. Yu. Mitrophanov. Sensitivity and convergence of uniformly ergodic markov chains. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 42(4):1003–1014, 2005.

Alex Olshevsky and Bahman Gharesifard. A small gain analysis of single timescale actor critic. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 61(2):980–1007, 2023.

Jan Peters and Stefan Schaal. Natural actor–critic. *Neurocomputing*, 71(7-9):1180–1190, 2008.

Kimon Protopapas and Anas Barakat. Policy mirror descent with lookahead. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:26443–26481, 2024.

Shuang Qiu, Zhuoran Yang, Jieping Ye, and Zhaoran Wang. On finite-time convergence of actor-critic algorithm. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, 2(2):652–664, 2021.

Lior Shani, Yonathan Efroni, and Shie Mannor. Adaptive trust region policy optimization: Global convergence and faster rates for regularized MDPs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 5668–5675, 2020.

Wesley A. Suttle, Amrit Singh Bedi, Bhrij Patel, Brian M. Sadler, Alec Koppel, and Dinesh Manocha. Beyond exponentially fast mixing in average-reward reinforcement learning via multi-level Monte Carlo actor-critic. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023.

Richard S. Sutton and Andrew G. Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. MIT Press, Cambridge, 2018.

Haoxing Tian, Alex Olshevsky, and Yannis Paschalidis. Convergence of actor-critic with multi-layer neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.

Lingxiao Wang, Qi Cai, Zhuoran Yang, and Zhaoran Wang. Neural policy gradient methods: Global optimality and rates of convergence. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.

Yudan Wang, Yue Wang, Yi Zhou, and Shaofeng Zou. Non-asymptotic analysis for single-loop (natural) actor–critic with compatible function approximation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.

Yue Wu, Weitong Zhang, Pan Xu, and Quanquan Gu. A finite-time analysis of two time-scale actor–critic methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.

Lin Xiao. On the convergence rates of policy gradient methods. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(282):1–36, 2022.

Tengyu Xu, Zhe Wang, and Yingbin Liang. Improving sample complexity bounds for (natural) actor–critic algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:4358–4369, 2020a.

Tengyu Xu, Zhe Wang, and Yingbin Liang. Non-asymptotic convergence analysis of two time-scale (natural) actor–critic algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03557*, 2020b.

Tengyu Xu, Zhuoran Yang, Zhaoran Wang, and Yingbin LIANG. Doubly robust off-policy actor-critic: Convergence and optimality. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.

Long Yang, Yu Zhang, Gang Zheng, Qian Zheng, Pengfei Li, Jianhang Huang, and Gang Pan. Policy optimization with stochastic mirror descent. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:195584163>.

Rui Yuan, Robert M Gower, and Alessandro Lazaric. A general sample complexity analysis of vanilla policy gradient. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3332–3380. PMLR, 2022.

Rui Yuan, Simon S Du, Robert M Gower, Alessandro Lazaric, and Lin Xiao. Linear convergence of natural policy gradient methods with log-linear policies. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.

Wenhai Zhan, Shicong Cen, Baihe Huang, Yuxin Chen, Jason D. Lee, and Yuejie Chi. Policy mirror descent for regularized reinforcement learning: A generalized framework with linear convergence. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 33(2):1061–1091, 2023.

Jiahui Zhang, Ze Huang, Chun Gu, Zipei Ma, and Li Zhang. Reinforcing action policies by prophesying. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.20633*, 2025a.

Kaiqing Zhang, Alec Koppel, Hao Zhu, and Tamer Basar. Global convergence of policy gradient methods to (almost) locally optimal policies. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 58(6):3586–3612, 2020.

Kaiyan Zhang et al. A survey of reinforcement learning for large reasoning models. *arxiv preprint arXiv:2509.08827*, 2025b.