

PROBABILISTIC FIXED POINT OF ITERATED RANDOM OPERATORS

ABHISHEK GUPTA*, RAHUL JAIN†, AND PETER GLYNN‡

Abstract. Consider a contraction operator T over a complete metric space \mathcal{X} with the fixed point x^* . In many computational applications, it is difficult to compute $T(x)$; therefore, one replaces the application contraction operator T at iteration k by a random operator \hat{T}_k^n using n independent and identically distributed samples of a random variable. Consider the Markov chain $(\hat{X}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, which is generated by $\hat{X}_{k+1}^n = \hat{T}_k^n(\hat{X}_k^n)$. In this paper, we identify some sufficient conditions under which (i) the distribution of \hat{X}_k^n converges to a Dirac mass over x^* as k and n go to infinity, and (ii) the probability that \hat{X}_k^n is far from x^* as k goes to infinity can be made arbitrarily small by an appropriate choice of n . We also derive an upper bound on the probability that \hat{X}_k^n is far from x^* as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We apply the result to study the convergence in probability of iterates generated by empirical value iteration algorithms for discounted and average cost Markov decision problems.

1. Introduction. Let (\mathcal{X}, ρ) be a complete metric space with the metric ρ . Let $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a contraction operator over this space, that is, there exists an $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ such that for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, we have

$$\rho(T(x), T(y)) \leq \alpha \rho(x, y).$$

According to the Banach contraction mapping theorem, for any starting point $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$, the sequence generated by $x_{k+1} = T(x_k), k \in \mathbb{N}$ converges to the unique fixed point x^* of T . Many recursive algorithms in optimization, such as value and policy iteration algorithm, gradient descent algorithms, primal-dual algorithms, etc. can be viewed as iterating a contraction operator on Euclidean spaces or complete function spaces.

There has been a tremendous growth in data-driven modeling and decision making. In these cases, evaluating $T(x)$ may be computationally challenging, particularly when it involves computing expectations of certain functions of random variables. For such cases, numerous approximation algorithms have been devised in the literature, in which a sample average approximation is used for approximating the expectation in the operator T . Thus, iteration k of the algorithm is an application of a random operator \hat{T}_k^n , where n is the number of samples. Here, \hat{T}_k^n is independent of the past random operators $(\hat{T}_l^n)_{l=0}^{k-1}$. Intuitively speaking, such independent random operators when applied recursively to any starting point x_0 lead to a random sequence $\{\hat{X}_k^n\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ that drifts towards the fixed point x^* of T . The goal of this paper is to devise a novel framework for understanding asymptotic behavior of the iterates generated from such iterated random operators. We introduce the notion of probabilistic fixed point of independent random operators and provide sufficient conditions under which iterated random operators have a probabilistic fixed point.

*Abhishek Gupta is with the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department at The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA. Email: gupta.706@osu.edu.

†Rahul Jain is with the Electrical Engineering Department at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA. Email: rahul.jain@usc.edu

‡Peter Glynn is with the Management Science and Engineering Department at Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA. Email: glynn@stanford.edu.

The authors would like to thank five anonymous reviewers and the associate editor for their insightful remarks. The results reported in Subsections 4.4 and 4.5 was suggested to us by the reviewers. The first author would also like to thank Dr. Hiteshi Sharma and Prof. William Haskell for numerous discussions on the results reported in this paper.

The analysis of iterated random operators were first carried out in [1–3]; see also the recent surveys on the topic [4–6]. Under the assumption that the random operators have negative Lyapunov exponent, these papers analyzed the Markov chain generated by the iterated random operators over Polish spaces. The authors developed a novel “backward iteration” argument and proved that the Markov chain converges to a unique invariant distribution at a geometric rate. While the rate of convergence could be inferred, it is not helpful when one is interested in sample complexity bounds for recursive stochastic algorithms and determine how far the Markov chain is from the fixed point x^* of the deterministic contraction operator.

Accordingly, this paper extend the analysis of iterated random operators with negative Lyapunov exponent to complete metric spaces. We derive an upper bound on the probability of the iterates being far from the fixed point x^* as the number of iterations escape to infinity. In addition, under the assumption that the function space is bounded, we derive a finite time sample complexity bound. Our assumptions are not stringent for the purposes of applications in machine and reinforcement learning algorithms. We demonstrate applicability of our general framework to empirical value iteration for the discounted-cost and average-cost continuous-state Markov decision problems. Let us first consider some learning examples that can be modeled within the iterated random operator framework.

Example 1: Consider the infinite horizon discounted cost Markov decision problem in which $s_k \in \mathcal{S}$ is system state, $a_k \in \mathcal{A}$ is control action, $c(s, a)$ is the one stage cost, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is a discount factor, and $S_{k+1} = g(S_k, A_k, Z_k)$ gives transition dynamics, where $Z_k \in \mathcal{Z}$ is the exogenous noise variable. We assume that the state and the action spaces are finite sets and $\{Z_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed random variables.

Let $\gamma(a|s)$ denotes a stationary policy, and let Γ denote the set of all such stationary policies. The goal of the decision maker is to minimize the total discounted cost by solving the following minimization problem:

$$v^*(s) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k c(S_k, A_k) \middle| s_0 = s, A_k \sim \gamma(\cdot | S_k) \right].$$

The optimal value function v^* is a fixed point of a contractive operator T , which is defined as

$$[T(v)](s) = \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ c(s, a) + \alpha \mathbb{E} [v(g(s, a, Z))] \right\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where the random variable Z has the same distribution as Z_k .

The operator T is called the Bellman operator. It is not difficult to show that T is a contraction operator over the normed vector space $\mathcal{V} := \{v : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$ endowed with the sup norm. The computation of the optimal value function v^* is the limit of

$$v_{k+1}(s) = [T(v_k)](s) = \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ c(s, a) + \alpha \mathbb{E} [v_k(g(s, a, Z))] \right\},$$

This is often approximated using empirical Bellman operator, defined as

$$\hat{v}_{k+1}^n(s) = [\hat{T}_k^n(\hat{v}_k^n)](s) = \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ c(s, a) + \alpha \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{v}_k^n(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) \right\},$$

where $\{Z_{k,i}\}_{i=1}^n$ are independent samples of the noise variable Z_k . At every iteration k , we draw $\{Z_{k,i}\}_{i=1}^n$ independently from the past samples. Note that \hat{T}_k^n is a random operator now, and in fact, $\mathbb{E} \left[[\hat{T}_k^n(v)](s) \right] \neq [T(v)](s)$.

The sequence $\hat{v}_0^n, \hat{v}_1^n, \dots$ yields a Markov chain sequence. It is natural to ask what can we say about how far \hat{v}_k^n is to v^* as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for a given n , and also as $n \rightarrow \infty$. ■

Based on the example above, we observe some important properties of the empirical operator \hat{T} . First, for every $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, the empirical operator satisfies a *probabilistic contraction property*:

$$\text{PCP}_1 : \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\hat{T}_k^n(v) - T(v)\| > \epsilon \right\} = 0. \quad (1.2)$$

In addition to this, it is not difficult to prove that for fixed noise samples that generates the empirical operator \hat{T}_k^n , it is a contraction operator over the space \mathcal{V} with contraction coefficient α .

We now consider relative value iteration for average cost case MDP.

Example 2. Consider the same setting as above, but instead of the discounted cost MDP, we will consider the average cost scenario. The decision maker aims at minimizing the average cost:

$$v^*(s) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^K c(S_k, A_k) \middle| s_0 = s, A_k \sim \gamma(\cdot | S_k) \right].$$

Under some conditions on the MDP's state transition function (called *unichain* condition), one can show that v^* exists. In this case, the optimality condition is given a tuple (v^*, g^*) , where v^* is the optimal value function and g^* is a real number called optimal gain. The Bellman operator T satisfies:

$$v^*(s) + g^* = [T(v^*)](s) = \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ c(s, a) + \mathbb{E} [v^*(g(s, a, Z))] \right\}.$$

Under the unichain condition, one can show that T is a contraction operator over a quotient space with the span seminorm (the details are provided later in Subsection 4.6). Here, the span seminorm is defined as

$$\text{span}(v) = \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v(s) - \min_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v(s).$$

The computation of the optimal value function v^* is the limit of the following iterative process, which is known as relative value iteration

$$v_{k+1}(s) = [T(v_k)](s) := \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \{c(s, a) + \mathbb{E} [v_k(g(s, a, Z))]\} - \inf_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v_k(s). \quad (1.3)$$

In this case, if the expectation operator is difficult to evaluate, then the empirical relative value iteration is defined as

$$\hat{v}_{k+1}^n(s) = [\hat{T}_k^n(\hat{v}_k^n)](s) = \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ c(s, a) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{v}_k^n(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) \right\} - \inf_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{v}_k^n(s),$$

where again, $\{Z_{k,i}\}_{i=1}^n$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed samples of the noise variable. These noise samples are generated independently from the past samples at every iteration k .

Once again, we see that \hat{T}_k^n is a random operator now. As we see in Subsection 4.6, we show using our technique that \hat{v}_k^n as $k, n \rightarrow \infty$ converges to v^* . ■

The empirical operator \hat{T}_k^n in the example above also satisfies the property stated in (1.2), where the norm is replaced with span seminorm. However, as we show in Subsection 4.6, the operator \hat{T}_k^n fails to be a contraction map. In fact, we show that if $\hat{\alpha}_k^n$ denotes the Lipschitz coefficient of \hat{T}_k^n , then it satisfies a *probabilistic contraction property*,

$$\text{PCP}_2 : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \{ \hat{\alpha}_k^n > 1 - \delta \} = 0 \text{ for all } \delta > 0. \quad (1.4)$$

As we see in one of the main results proved in this paper, the two properties, stated in (1.2) and (1.4), are crucial in bounding the probability of empirical Markov chain being far from the optimal value function as iterations go to infinity. We next consider another example of stochastic gradient descent, where this framework is applicable.

Example 3: Consider $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{E} [f(x, W)]$, where W is a random variable uniformly distributed in the interval $[0, 1]$ and f is strongly convex and twice differentiable in x . Assume that a minimum exists and is given by x^* . Since f is convex and differentiable in x , we have $\nabla_x \mathbb{E} [f(x, W)] = \mathbb{E} [\nabla_x f(x, W)]$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The proof of this equality follows from monotone convergence theorem. Due to the assumptions, the Hessian $\nabla_{xx}^2 \mathbb{E} [f(x, W)]$ is a positive definite matrix for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We further assume that there exists $l, L > 0$ such that $lI \prec \nabla_{xx}^2 \mathbb{E} [f(x, W)] \prec LI$ for all x , where I is the identity matrix and $A \prec B$ implies $B - A$ is a positive definite matrix.

We can use the gradient descent method as follows:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \beta \mathbb{E} [\nabla_x f(x, W)] \Big|_{x=x_k} =: T(x_k),$$

where $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the gradient descent map and $\beta > 0$ is the step size or “learning rate”. For β sufficiently small, the map T can be shown to be a contraction map with fixed point x^* , the minimum of the function $\mathbb{E} [f(x, W)]$. Evaluating $\mathbb{E} [\nabla_x f(x_k, W)]$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ may be computationally challenging, so we can use i.i.d. samples $W_{k,1}, \dots, W_{k,n}$ to approximate the map T with \hat{T}_k^n as follows:

$$\hat{X}_{k+1}^n = \hat{X}_k^n - \frac{\beta}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_x f(\hat{X}_k^n, W_{k,i}) =: \hat{T}_k^n(\hat{X}_k^n), \quad (1.5)$$

where the samples used to generate the random operators \hat{T}_k^n and \hat{T}_l^n for $l \neq k$ are independent. Further, we note here that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $\mathbb{E} [\hat{T}_k^n(x)] = T(x)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We would like to know how close the sequence $(\hat{X}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ thus generated is to x^* . More importantly, we want to obtain an upper bound on the limit of $\mathbb{P} \{ \rho(\hat{X}_k^n, x^*) \geq \epsilon \}$ for $\epsilon > 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$. ■

Let us now formulate the problem precisely. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a standard probability space. Define \hat{T}_k^n over this probability space such that (a) for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the operators $\hat{T}_k^n(x)$ and $\hat{T}_{k'}^n(x)$ are independent of each other for $k \neq k'$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and (b) for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho(\hat{T}_k^n(x), T(x))$ is small in some sense (which will be introduced in Section 2). We will investigate the convergence properties of the (random) sequence $\hat{X}_{k+1}^n = \hat{T}_k^n(\hat{X}_k^n)$. The two questions we address in this paper are:

- (i) For a fixed n , one can view the sequence $(\hat{X}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ as an \mathcal{X} -valued Markov chain. Does this Markov chain admit an invariant distribution? If it does, say π^n , then does the sequence of invariant distributions $(\pi^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converge to a limit as n goes to ∞ ? Moreover, under what conditions do we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi^n = \delta_{x^*}$, where $\delta_{(\cdot)}$ is the Dirac measure.
- (ii) For a fixed n , what is an upper bound on $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \rho(\hat{X}_k^n, x^*) \geq \epsilon \right\}$, where $\epsilon > 0$?

1.1. Related Work. Recursive stochastic algorithms (RSAs) form the backbone of learning algorithms, where randomization is used in diverse ways for approximating the exact operator T . Empirical operators covered in Examples 1-3 above are examples where the expectation operator is approximated using empirical expectation using samples of the noise variable; this approach is used in [7–10]. Random function fitting approach used in [11, 12] is another example, where the random operator involves projecting a function onto a random subspace of a function space that is isomorphic to a finite dimensional Euclidean space. In RL algorithms, non-parametric or parametric function approximation is frequently used to store value function, policy function, or advantage function; the general theory of function approximation is presented in the texts [13, 14] and the references therein. Here, a finite random subset of the state space is picked and value function are evaluated at those states using Bellman operator. The corresponding set of state and target values pairs and fitted using some universal function approximating class like neural networks, reproducing kernel Hilbert space, or non-parametric kernel methods. In these cases, randomization is essential for taming the computational complexity of the deterministic algorithms while generating a solution that performs remarkably well in practice.

Broadly speaking, these RSAs can be categorized into diminishing stepsize and constant stepsize algorithms [15, 16]. In diminishing stepsize algorithms, certain stepsize parameters (for example, β in Example 3) reduce to 0 in a specific manner as iteration grows to infinity. Since the stepsize reduces over time, the convergence of the iterates to the fixed point (or a neighborhood of the fixed point) x^* is slow. A natural outcome of diminishing stepsize is that the statistical properties of the operators $(\hat{T}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ change with iteration. Thus, iterated random function theory cannot be applied to this setting.

In practice, it is common to use constant stepsize, since it dramatically speeds up the algorithm. However, in constant stepsize algorithms, the Markov chain quickly drifts towards a neighborhood of the fixed point x^* , but then does a random walk in that neighborhood. The size of the neighborhood typically depends on the stepsize – the smaller the stepsize, the smaller this neighborhood is. The key outcome of constant stepsize algorithms is that the statistical properties of operators $(\hat{T}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ do not change with iteration. As a result, iterated random function theory can be applied in this setting. This is the primary motivation of studying constant stepsize RSAs in this paper. We note here that Examples 1-3 noted above fall within the framework of constant stepsize RSAs.

Stochastic gradient descent (SGD) is among the most important class of RSAs widely used across various industries [17, 18]. This algorithm is briefly explained in Example 3 above. As discussed in Example 3, SGD approximates the gradient descent algorithm, which is a contraction operator under fairly general condition on the loss function assuming it is convex. Many variants of SGD have also been proposed in [19–21]; see [22] for a dated survey. Among these, the error analysis of constant stepsize SGD algorithms is presented in [23–25], among many others.

Reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms with function approximation has also received significant attention recently. The deterministic algorithms Broadly speaking, the literature can be divided into approximation in value/Q/advantage function space, approximation in policy space, approximation in both spaces, and temporal difference methods for evaluating a policy. RL algorithms leverage a combination of stochastic gradient descent and empirical dynamic programming for training. In RL algorithms, most authors consider diminishing stepsize [26–29], though there has been some recent effort in analyzing constant stepsize algorithms [8, 9, 11, 30].

In general, stochastic approximation theory is invoked to establish the convergence of iterates generated by RSAs when the underlying state space is Euclidean space. Under sufficiently general sufficient conditions, stochastic approximation theory allows us to conclude the almost sure convergence of iterates to the fixed point x^* under diminishing stepsize assumption. Several sufficient conditions with applications to learning are provided in [15, 16, 31–36] and the references therein.

Constant stepsize stochastic approximation theory has been covered in [36] and [37] for the case when the state space is a finite dimensional Euclidean space. The key result obtained in these references is that under certain conditions, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \rho(\hat{X}_k^n, x^*) > \epsilon \right\} \leq \delta$; here, δ is proportional to the constant stepsize. In this paper, we show that this result holds even in infinite dimensional complete metric spaces. More importantly, we provide an expression for δ in terms of n and statistical properties of the operators $(\hat{T}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. This broadens the applicability of the theory to reinforcement learning algorithms for continuous-state continuous-action MDPs.

Besides the above techniques, the analysis of random sequence generated by iterated random operators have been looked at from a different point of view in [1–3]; see also the survey [4, 6] for many applications of the iterated random operator theory. In [7], the authors studied the sample complexity of empirical value iteration within the context of finite state finite action discounted cost MDPs (Example 1 above). They cast the algorithm within the iterated random operators framework. Under the assumption that the random sequence is bounded almost surely by a constant (and some other assumptions), they obtain an upper bound on the probability of error being large via a novel stochastic dominance technique. This paper is partly inspired by this work and extends the convergence guarantee in [7] to more general spaces with operators satisfying more general properties.

To sum up, the emphasis here is to devise the probabilistic contraction analysis method for iterated random operators and to quantify the probability of a random sequence being far from the fixed point of the original contraction operator. In this process, we also devise sufficient conditions under which for a fixed n , the random sequence \hat{X}_k^n has an invariant distribution as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and the invariant distributions itself converge to the unit mass over the fixed point as the number of samples $n \rightarrow \infty$.

1.2. Notations and Preliminaries. For a Polish space \mathcal{X} , we use $C_b(\mathcal{X})$ to denote the set of all continuous and bounded functions over the set \mathcal{X} . The space of probability measures over the set \mathcal{X} is denoted by $\wp(\mathcal{X})$. We use $\mathbb{1}_{\{x\}}$ to denote the Dirac mass at a point $x \in \mathcal{X}$. We say that a sequence of measures μ_n converges to μ in weak topology (or weakly) if and only if for any $f \in C_b(\mathcal{X})$, $\int f d\mu_n \rightarrow \int f d\mu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

1.3. Outline of the Paper. In Section 2, we state the two main results of this paper: Theorem 2.2 delineates the conditions under which the convergence of π^n to δ_{x^*} in weak topology is established. Its proof is provided in Section 3. We apply this result on empirical dynamic programming for Markov decision problem with discounted cost case and show that the sequence generated by empirical Bellman operators converge in probability to the optimal value function.

In Section 2, Theorem 2.3 bounds $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \rho \left(\hat{X}_k^n, x^* \right) \geq \epsilon \right\}$ for $\epsilon > 0$. To prove the result in Section 4, we use the theory of stochastic dominance [38] to derive an upper bound on the probability of error being larger than ϵ in the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$. We apply the result to empirical dynamic programming for Markov decision problem with average cost case to arrive at the rate of convergence of the iterates to the optimal value function. In Section 6, we consider the case where the contraction operator comprises iterated composition of many non-expansive mappings. We identify some sufficient conditions on the individual mappings and their randomized counterparts, so that the composite operator and their randomized versions satisfy the assumption of Theorem 2.3. We apply these results to determine convergence of empirical dynamic programming for discounted and average cost MDPs with compact state and action spaces in Section 7. Finally, we present some concluding thoughts in Section 8.

2. Main Results. In this section, we state the two main results of this paper. Recall that since $(\hat{T}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of random operators, it generates a random sequence $\hat{X}_{k+1}^n = \hat{T}_k^n(\hat{X}_k^n)$, which may not converge in the limit, and thus, may not have a fixed point. However, as we show below, under sufficient restrictions on the random operators, the sequence will drift towards the fixed point x^* of T . To build the intuition for the result, we first discuss the definition of probabilistic fixed point from [7].

DEFINITION 2.1. *A point $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ is a probabilistic fixed point of $(\hat{T}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ if for any initial point $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and for every $\epsilon > 0$, the sequence \hat{X}_k^n satisfies*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \rho(\hat{X}_k^n, \bar{x}) > \epsilon \right\} = 0.$$

Given that $\hat{T}_k^n(x)$ provides a consistent estimate of $T(x)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we expect that x^* should be a probabilistic fixed point of $(\hat{T}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}, n \in \mathbb{N}}$. We now identify two sufficient conditions when this is indeed the case.

2.1. Existence of Invariant Measures. In the following result, we identify sufficient conditions on the random operators so that the distribution of the Markov chain $(\hat{X}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to an invariant distribution π^n as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, we show that the sequence of invariant measures is tight, and as a consequence, converges to the $\mathbb{1}_{\{x^*\}}$ in the weak topology. The key to proving this result is the assumption that \hat{T}_k^n is a continuous map with a negative Lyapunov exponent, which implies that the Markov chain $(\hat{X}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Feller chain and admits a unique invariant distribution π^n due to a result in [3, 4]. We then use Foster-Lyapunov theorem based arguments to establish the convergence of π^n to $\mathbb{1}_{\{x^*\}}$.

Below, we outline the assumptions on the random operators.

ASSUMPTION 2.1. *The following holds:*

- (i) \mathcal{X} is a locally compact Polish space.
- (ii) The map $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a contraction operator with contraction coefficient $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and fixed point $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$.

- (iii) $(\hat{T}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed operators.
- (iv) Let $\hat{\alpha}_k^n$ denote the contraction coefficient of \hat{T}_k^n . Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\delta \in (0, 1 - \alpha)$,

$$\mathbb{P} \{ \hat{\alpha}_k^n \geq 1 - \delta \} = 0 \text{ and } \hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 \text{ almost surely.}$$

- (v) There exist functions $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $V : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and a constant c , all possibly dependent on x^* , such that we have — (a) for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{x \in \mathcal{X} : V(x) \leq k\}$ is compact; and (b) for every $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[g(\hat{T}_k^n(x)) \right] \leq g(x) - V(x) + c. \quad (2.1)$$

- (vi) For every $\epsilon > 0$ and compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{X}$, there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$, possibly dependent on ϵ and \mathcal{K} , such that for all $n \geq M$

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E} \left[\rho(\hat{T}_k^n(x), T(x)) \right] < \epsilon \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

REMARK 2.1. In Assumption 2.1(v)(b) above, we only need the statement to hold for n sufficiently large.

Let $\mu_k^n \in \wp(\mathcal{X})$ denote the probability measure of the (\mathcal{X} -valued) random variable \hat{X}_k^n , where $\hat{X}_{k+1}^n = \hat{T}_k^n(\hat{X}_k^n)$. We now prove the existence of stationary distributions π^n and that the sequence of stationary distributions $(\pi^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to $\mathbb{1}_{\{x^*\}}$, the Dirac measure over x^* .

THEOREM 2.2. If Assumption 2.1 holds, then

1. For n sufficiently large, there exists a measure $\pi^n \in \wp(\mathcal{X})$ such that μ_k^n converges weakly to π^n as $k \rightarrow \infty$.
2. π^n converges weakly to $\mathbb{1}_{\{x^*\}}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
3. The fixed point of T is a probabilistic fixed point of the random operators $\{\hat{T}_k^n, n \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

While the above theorem establishes the convergence properties of the distribution of the iterates, it does not provide any useful insight about the rate of convergence, that is, a bound on $\pi^n(\rho(\hat{X}_k^n, x^*) \geq \epsilon)$. To derive such bounds, we need to place some assumptions on the operators \hat{T}_k^n that are not very restrictive as compared to the Assumption 2.1 above.

2.2. Existence of Probabilistic Fixed Point. One of the challenges with obtaining $\pi^n(\rho(\hat{X}_k^n, x^*) \geq \epsilon)$ is that the Markov chain \hat{X}_k^n sits in a Polish space, and thus, having such an estimate appears difficult using the Markov chain theory. Instead, we use stochastic dominance based argument to derive such a bound. In this process, we show that the probabilistic fixed point of $(\hat{T}_k^n)_{n,k}$ coincides with the fixed point of T . First, we need to place the following conditions on the random operators.

ASSUMPTION 2.2. The following holds:

- (i) \mathcal{X} is a complete metric space.
- (ii) $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a contraction operator with contraction coefficient $\alpha < 1$. Let x^* denote the fixed point of T .
- (iii) $(\hat{T}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed operators.
- (iv) Let $\hat{\alpha}_k^n$ denote the contraction coefficient of \hat{T}_k^n . Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1 - \alpha)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \{ \hat{\alpha}_k^n \geq 1 - \delta \} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 \text{ almost surely.}$$

(v) For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \rho \left(\hat{T}_k^n(x^*), T(x^*) \right) \geq \epsilon \right\} = 0.$$

(vi) There exists $\bar{w} > 0$ such that $\rho(\hat{T}_k^n(x^*), T(x^*)) \leq \bar{w}$ almost surely for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

THEOREM 2.3. *Suppose that Assumption 2.2 holds. Fix $\kappa > 0$ and pick $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{\kappa(1-\alpha)}{2}]$, $\delta \in (0, 1 - \alpha)$ such that $\lceil \frac{2}{\delta} \rceil \leq \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon}$. Let $w = \lceil \frac{\bar{w}}{\epsilon} \rceil$. Pick n sufficiently large so that $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n > 0$ can be picked satisfying*

$$\frac{2w}{2w+1} < p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 - \delta, \rho \left(\hat{T}_k^n(x^*), T(x^*) \right) \leq \epsilon \right\}.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \rho \left(\hat{X}_k^n, x^* \right) > \kappa \right\} &\leq \frac{1 - (p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)^w}{(p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)^w}, \\ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \rho \left(\hat{X}_k^n, x^* \right) > \kappa \right\} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now discuss conditions under which an RSA satisfies Assumption 2.2. Assumption 2.2 (i)-(iii) is routine and easy to ascertain in most cases. Assumption 2.2 (iv)-(v) is typically established using a concentration of measures result [39] or empirical processes theory [40–42]. Computing tight bounds on \bar{w} used in Assumption 2.2 (vi) is the one that requires some effort. We note that almost all variance reduction algorithms we have seen in the literature, for instance [19, 20, 43, 44], attempts to make \bar{w} as small as possible by a carefully constructed random operator \hat{T}_k^n . We present a more complete discussion on this part with several examples in a recent paper of the first author [45].

In order to prove the above theorem, we show that the error $E_k^n = \rho(\hat{X}_k^n, x^*)$ is stochastically dominated by a scaled version of a Markov chain Y_k^n constructed over the space of natural numbers. The invariant distribution of Y_k^n can be computed by simple algebraic manipulations, leading to an upper bound on the probability of asymptotic error being greater than ϵ . Through this approach, we can also compute the rate of convergence as $n \rightarrow \infty$, provided $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$ can be computed.

3. Existence of an Invariant Measure. In this section, we prove Theorem 2.2, that is, under Assumption 2.1, the Markov chain \hat{X}_k^n admits a stationary distribution π^n as $k \rightarrow \infty$, which in turn converges to $\mathbb{1}_{\{x^*\}}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The existence of a unique invariant measure for sufficiently large n follows from [4]. Then, we exploit Assumption 2.1(v) to show that the limit of (π^n) is tight, and that every convergent subsequence of (π^n) in weak* topology converges to $\mathbb{1}_{\{x^*\}}$. This proves Theorem 2.2. Let μ_k^n denote the distribution of \hat{X}_k^n , where \hat{X}_1^n is picked according to some known distribution μ_1^n . Our first result is as follows.

LEMMA 3.1. *If Assumption 2.1 holds, then for sufficiently large n , there exists a unique measure $\pi^n \in \wp(\mathcal{X})$ such that μ_k^n converges weakly to π^n as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} V(x) \pi^n(dx) \leq c, \tag{3.1}$$

where c is defined in (2.1).

Proof. The proof of the first assertion follows from [4, Theorem 1.1]. Indeed, for n sufficiently large, for any $\delta > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, Assumption 2.1 (iv) implies that $\mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n > 1 - \delta\} < 1$. Further, Assumption 2.1 (vi) with $\mathcal{K} = x^*$ implies that $\mathbb{E}\left[\rho\left(\hat{T}_k^n(x^*), x^*\right)\right] < \infty$. Thus, Theorem 1.1 of [4] is applicable and there exists a unique invariant measure of the Markov chain $\{\hat{X}_k^n\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

From Assumption 2.1(v) (see (2.1)), for all $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[g(\hat{T}_k^n(x))\right] \leq g(x) - V(x) + c.$$

Pick $C = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : V(x) \leq 1 + c\}$, which is a compact set by Assumption 2.1(iii). Then, we have $-V(x) + c \leq -1 + (1 + c)\mathbb{1}_{\{C\}}(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ (we use the fact that $V(x) \geq 0$), which further implies

$$\mathbb{E}\left[g(\hat{T}_k^n(x))\right] - g(x) \leq -1 + (1 + c)\mathbb{1}_{\{C\}}(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Equation (3.1) is a direct consequence of Assumption 2.1(v) and [46, Corollary 4, p. 202]. \square

We now prove that π^n converges weakly to $\mathbb{1}_{\{x^*\}}$. We first prove that $(\pi^n)_{n \geq 1}$ is a tight set of measures. Pick $\epsilon > 0$, $n \geq 1$, and $l > 0$ such that $c/l < \epsilon$. By Lemma 3.1 and Markov inequality, we have

$$\pi^n(\{x : V(x) > l\}) \leq \frac{\int_{\mathcal{X}} V(x) \pi^n(dx)}{l} < \epsilon.$$

Since $\{x : V(x) \leq l\}$ is a compact set by Assumption 2.1(iii), $(\pi^n)_{n \geq 1}$ is tight, and therefore, admits a convergent subsequence $(\pi^{n_i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ by Prohorov's theorem. Let π^∞ be the limiting measure of $(\pi^{n_i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. We next show that $\pi^\infty = \mathbb{1}_{\{x^*\}}$. Let $LC_b(\mathcal{X})$ be the space of functions $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that are Lipschitz continuous and bounded. To establish $\pi^\infty = \mathbb{1}_{\{x^*\}}$, we need the following claim:

LEMMA 3.2. *If Assumption 2.1 holds, then for every $f \in LC_b(\mathcal{X})$,*

$$\int f(T(x)) \pi^\infty(dx) = \int f(x) \pi^\infty(dx). \quad (3.2)$$

Consequently, $\pi^\infty = \mathbb{1}_{\{x^*\}}$.

Proof. See Appendix A. \square

The fact that x^* is the unique probabilistic fixed point of $\{\hat{T}_k^n\}_{n, k \in \mathbb{N}}$ follows immediately from Lemma 3.2. The proof of Theorem 2.2 is thus complete.

3.1. Application to Empirical Value Iteration: Discounted Cost Case.

We consider here empirical value iteration for a discounted Markov decision problem. We show that the iterates of empirical Bellman operator converge in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The precise problem is formulated below.

Let us consider an infinite-horizon finite Markov decision problem with discounted cost criteria introduced in Example 1 in Section 1.

LEMMA 3.3. *There exists a function $v^* : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$v^*(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \alpha \mathbb{E}[v^*(g(s, a, Z))] \right) \quad (3.3)$$

for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Moreover, the optimal decision rule γ^* for the MDP is given by

$$\gamma^*(s) \in \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \alpha \mathbb{E} [v^*(g(s, a, Z))] \right) \text{ for all } s \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Proof. See Theorem 8.4.3 in [47]. \square

Let $\mathcal{V} := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|} : \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |v(s)| \leq \|c\|_\infty / (1 - \alpha)\}$ denote the space of value functions with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\| := \|\cdot\|_\infty$. Let $T : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ be defined as

$$T(v)(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \alpha \mathbb{E} [v(g(s, a, Z))] \right),$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the uniform measure over the random noise W . The nonlinear operator T is called the Bellman operator.

We now describe the value iteration algorithm that is used to compute v^* .

1. *Initialization:* Pick an $\epsilon > 0$. Initialize $k = 0$ and $v_1 = 0$.
2. *For $k \geq 0$:* Set $v_{k+1} = T(v_k)$.
3. *Stopping criteria:* If $\|v_{k+1} - v_k\| < \epsilon$, then stop. Pick γ_ϵ as

$$\gamma_\epsilon(s) = \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \alpha \mathbb{E} [v_k(g(s, a, Z))] \right),$$

and return it as ϵ -optimal decision rule. Otherwise, $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to Step 2.

Notice that at step $k + 1$, one needs to compute $\mathbb{E} [v_k(g(s, a, Z))]$. If computing $\mathbb{E} [v_k(g(s, a, Z))]$ is computationally intensive, then one can use i.i.d. samples of the noise Z to compute an approximation of $\mathbb{E} [v_k(g(s, a, Z))]$. Let us define

$$\hat{T}_k^n(v)(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) \right),$$

where $(Z_{k,i})_{i=1}^n$ is a sequence of i.i.d. samples of the random variable Z_k . Consider the following approximate *empirical value iteration* algorithm.

1. *Initialization:* Pick an $\epsilon > 0$. Initialize $k = 0$ and $\hat{v}_1^n = 0$.
2. *For $k \geq 0$:* Set $\hat{v}_{k+1}^n = \hat{T}_k^n(\hat{v}_k^n)$.
3. *Stopping criteria:* If $\|\hat{v}_{k+1}^n - \hat{v}_k^n\| < \epsilon$, then stop. Pick $\hat{\gamma}_\epsilon^n$ as

$$\hat{\gamma}_\epsilon^n(s) = \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{v}_k^n(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) \right),$$

and return it as ϵ -optimal decision rule with high confidence. Otherwise, $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to Step 2.

Let μ_k^n denote the distribution of \hat{v}_k^n . Our main result is as follows:

THEOREM 3.4. *For a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the distribution μ_k^n converges weakly to π^n as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Further, π^n converges in probability to δ_{v^*} as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. We only need to show that Assumption 2.1 holds for this case. It is clear that \mathcal{V} is a locally compact normed space and T is a contraction operator with contraction coefficient α . Further, \hat{T}_k^n is also a contraction operator with contraction coefficient α , and therefore, it is Lipschitz continuous.

Define functions $g(v) = V(v) = \|v - v^*\|$. Note that \mathcal{V} is a compact set, and thus, $\{v \in \mathcal{V} : V(v) \leq k\}$ is a compact set for any $k \in [0, \infty)$. As a result, we have for any

$n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{T}_k^n(v) - v^*\| \right] - \|v - v^*\| \leq -V(v) + \frac{2\|c\|_\infty}{1-\alpha}.$$

Next, let $\epsilon > 0$ and $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{V}$ be a compact set. Let $\kappa = \max_{v \in \mathcal{K}} \|v\|$. Pick $v \in \mathcal{K}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{T}_k^n(v) - T(v)\| &\leq \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{s,a} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(v(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) - \mathbb{E}[v(g(s, a, Z))] \right) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{s,a} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(v(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) - \mathbb{E}[v(g(s, a, Z))] \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\{v(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) - \mathbb{E}[v(g(s, a, Z))]\}_{i=1}^n$ is a sequence of zero-mean i.i.d. random variables with variance at most $4\kappa^2$. Thus, for any state action pair (s, a) , $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(v(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) - \mathbb{E}[v(g(s, a, Z))] \right)$ has variance at most $4\kappa^2$. Also note that for any random variable U , we have $(\mathbb{E}[|U|])^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[U^2]$ by Jensen's inequality. This yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(v(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) - \mathbb{E}[v(g(s, a, Z))] \right) \right| \right] \leq \sqrt{4\kappa^2} = 2\kappa.$$

As a consequence of all the facts noted above, for $n > (2\alpha\kappa|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|/\epsilon)^2$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{T}_k^n(v) - T(v)\| \right] \leq \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{n}} 2\kappa|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| < \epsilon.$$

Since $v \in \mathcal{K}$ was arbitrary, we have

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{T}_k^n(v) - T(v)\| \right] \leq \epsilon.$$

Since all four assumptions are satisfied by this problem, we use Theorem 2.2 to conclude both the claims. \square

4. Convergence to the Probabilistic Fixed Point. We now turn our attention to proving Theorem 2.3. Consider the error process as $E_k^n := \rho(\hat{X}_k^n, x^*)$. Although we now know conditions under which the Markov chain $(\hat{X}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ admits an invariant distribution, it is hard to compute the functional form of the invariant distribution. Thus, we instead focus on the error process $(E_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and find an upper bound on the probability of large error for a given $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

4.1. Proof Technique. Given two random variables X and Y defined on the same probability space, we say that X stochastically dominates Y if $\mathbb{P}\{X > q\} \geq \mathbb{P}\{Y > q\}$ for all $q \in \mathbb{R}$. In order to prove the above theorem, we show that the error E_k^n is stochastically dominated by a scaled version of a Markov chain constructed over the space of natural numbers. We prove that if n is sufficiently high, then the dominating Markov chain has an invariant distribution, which allows us to compute an upper bound on the probability of asymptotic error to be greater than some specified threshold. Through this approach, we can also compute the rate of convergence as

$n \rightarrow \infty$. We now introduce some notation and proof technique in greater details below.

The error evolution can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} E_k^n &= \rho(\hat{X}_k^n, x^*) = \rho(\hat{T}_{k-1}^n(\hat{X}_{k-1}^n), x^*), \\ &\leq \rho(\hat{T}_{k-1}^n(\hat{X}_{k-1}^n), \hat{T}_{k-1}^n(x^*)) + \rho(\hat{T}_{k-1}^n(x^*), T(x^*)) \\ &\leq \hat{\alpha}_{k-1}^n E_{k-1}^n + W_{k-1}^n \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_{k-1}^n$ denotes the contraction coefficient of \hat{T}_{k-1}^n and

$$W_{k-1}^n := \rho(\hat{T}_{k-1}^n(x^*), T(x^*)).$$

We note here that by Assumption 2.2(vi), $W_k^n \leq \bar{w}$ almost surely for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

REMARK 4.1. Note that $(\hat{\alpha}_k^n, W_k^n)$ are functions of \hat{T}_k^n . Since \hat{T}_k^n is not correlated with \hat{T}_j^n for any $j \neq k$, we conclude that $(\hat{\alpha}_k^n, W_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. tuple of random variables. However, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\hat{\alpha}_k^n$ is correlated with W_k^n . \square




FIG. 4.1. An illustration of the Markov chain Y_k^n , where $\eta = \lceil \frac{2}{\delta} \rceil$.

We now focus on devising a Markov chain over the space of natural numbers that dominates the error process. Fix $\kappa > 0$ and pick $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{\kappa(1-\alpha)}{2}]$, $\delta \in (0, 1-\alpha)$ such that $\lceil \frac{2}{\delta} \rceil \leq \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon}$. For this choice of ϵ and δ , pick $\eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n := \lceil \frac{2}{\delta} \rceil$ and $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$ such that $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n \leq \mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1-\delta, W_k^n \leq \epsilon\}$. Recall that $w := \lceil \frac{\bar{w}}{\epsilon} \rceil$.

We now define a Markov chain $(Y_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ on the set of natural numbers as follows: Let $Y_1^n = \lceil E_1^n / \epsilon \rceil$, and assume that the chain evolves as

$$Y_{k+1}^n = \begin{cases} \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n & \text{with probability } p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n \text{ if } Y_k^n = \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n \\ Y_k^n - 1 & \text{with probability } p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n \text{ if } Y_k^n \geq \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n + 1 \\ Y_k^n + w & \text{with probability } 1 - p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

If n is sufficiently large such that $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$ satisfies $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n > w/(w+1)$, then we show that Y_k^n admits a unique invariant distribution since it is irreducible and has a negative drift. Further, we prove that at every step of the iteration k , ϵY_k^n stochastically dominates the error random variable E_k^n , that is, for any real number $q \in [0, \infty)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\epsilon Y_k^n > q\} \geq \mathbb{P}\{E_k^n > q\}.$$

This yields for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\{E_k^n > \kappa\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{\epsilon Y_k^n > \kappa\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{Y_k^n > \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n\}.$$

Let π^n denote the invariant distribution of the Markov chain $(Y_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then, the above inequality implies

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{E_k^n > \kappa\} \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{Y_k^n > \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n\} = 1 - \pi^n(\eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n).$$

Further, as n grows, we show that the invariant distribution at $\eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n, \pi^n(\eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)$, converges to 1, thereby proving the convergence of the error process E_k^n to 0 in probability as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$.

4.2. Dominating the Error with the Markov Chain (Y_k^n). Recall that the error evolves as $E_{k+1}^n \leq \hat{\alpha}_k^n E_k^n + W_k^n$, where $(\hat{\alpha}_k^n, W_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an i.i.d. sequence of random variables.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *Let n be large such that $\mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 - \delta, W_k^n \leq \epsilon\} > 1/2$. Pick $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n \in (0.5, 1)$ such that $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n \leq \mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 - \delta, W_k^n \leq \epsilon\}$ and consider the Markov chain $(Y_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ constructed in (4.1). If $\epsilon Y_1^n \geq E_1^n$, then at every iteration k , ϵY_k^n stochastically dominates E_k^n . In other words, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any real number $q \in [0, \infty)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\{\epsilon Y_k^n \geq q\} \geq \mathbb{P}\{E_k^n \geq q\}.$$

Proof. See Appendix B. \square

In the light of the proposition above, we need to identify a lower bound on the joint distribution $\mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 - \delta, W_k^n \leq \epsilon\}$ that can be used to determine $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$. We obtain a lower bound by using Fréchet-Hoeffding theorem [48, Theorem 3.1.1]: For any $a_1, a_2 \in [0, \infty)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq a_1, W_k^n \leq a_2\} \geq \mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq a_1\} + \mathbb{P}\{W_k^n \leq a_2\} - 1. \quad (4.2)$$

Suppose that we know the upper bounds $\varphi_1(n, \delta)$ and $\varphi_2(n, \epsilon)$ on the probability $\mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n > 1 - \delta\}$ and $\mathbb{P}\{W_k^n > \epsilon\}$, respectively:

$$\mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n > 1 - \delta\} \leq \varphi_1(n, \delta), \quad \mathbb{P}\{W_k^n > \epsilon\} \leq \varphi_2(n, \epsilon).$$

Typically, such bounds can be obtained using concentration of measures result such as the Hoeffding inequality or empirical processes theory. We let $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$ be defined as $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n = 1 - \varphi_1(n, \delta) - \varphi_2(n, \epsilon)$. This, together with (4.2), implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 - \delta, W_k^n \leq \epsilon\} &\geq \mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 - \delta\} + \mathbb{P}\{W_k^n \leq \epsilon\} - 1 \\ &\geq 1 - \varphi_1(n, \delta) - \varphi_2(n, \epsilon) = p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n. \end{aligned}$$

We make the following observation.

LEMMA 4.2. *If Assumption 2.2 holds, then for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1 - \alpha)$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n = 1$.*

Proof. The proof essentially follows from Assumption 2.2. Assumption 2.2(iv) implies that $\varphi_1(n, \delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\delta \in (0, 1 - \alpha)$. Assumption 2.2(v) implies that $\varphi_2(n, \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. The proof of the lemma is complete. \square

According to the Lemma above, by picking n sufficiently large, $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$ can be made as close to 1 as possible. As we show next, for $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$ sufficiently close to 1, the Markov chain $(Y_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ admits an invariant distribution.

PROPOSITION 4.3. *If $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n > w/(w + 1)$, then the Markov chain $(Y_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ admits a unique invariant distribution π^n . If $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n > 2w/(2w + 1)$, then*

$$\pi^n(\eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n) \geq \frac{2(p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)^w - 1}{(p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)^w}.$$

Proof. We first note that $(Y_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an irreducible Markov chain, in which all integers greater than or equal to $\eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$ are accessible. Consider the Lyapunov function

as $V(y) = y$ for all $y \in \mathbb{N}$, $y \geq \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$. Then, $\mathbb{E}[V(Y_2^n)|Y_1^n = y] - V(y) < 0$ for all $y \geq \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n + 1$. The uniqueness of the invariant distribution follows from [39, Theorem 7.5.3, p.153]. See Appendix C for a derivation on the lower bound on $\pi^n(\eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)$. \square

4.3. Proof of Theorem 2.3. We now prove Theorem 2.3 using Propositions 4.1 and 4.3 as follows. For n sufficiently large (so that $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n > 2w/(2w + 1)$), we can use Proposition 4.1 to conclude that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{E_k^n \geq \kappa\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{\epsilon Y_k^n \geq \kappa\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{\epsilon Y_k^n > \epsilon \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n\}.$$

From Proposition 4.3, we conclude that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{Y_k^n > \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n\} = 1 - \pi^n(\eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n) \leq \frac{(1 - (p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)^w)}{(p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)^w},$$

Consequently, we have

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{E_k^n \geq \kappa\} \leq \frac{(1 - (p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)^w)}{(p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)^w}. \quad (4.3)$$

The proof of the theorem is complete.

4.4. Discussions. There is another simpler way to determine an upper bound on the probability of error being large using Markov's inequality. Let us consider the inequality $E_k^n \leq \hat{\alpha}_{k-1}^n E_{k-1}^n + W_{k-1}^n$. Define $\bar{\alpha}^n = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\alpha}_k^n]$ and $\bar{w}^n = \mathbb{E}[W_k^n]$. Then, we get $\mathbb{E}[E_k^n] \leq \bar{\alpha}^n \mathbb{E}[E_{k-1}^n] + \bar{w}^n$. This immediately yields

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[E_k^n] \leq \frac{\bar{w}^n}{1 - \bar{\alpha}^n}.$$

We can now use Markov's inequality to conclude that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{E_k^n \geq \kappa\} \leq \frac{\bar{w}^n}{\kappa(1 - \bar{\alpha}^n)}. \quad (4.4)$$

The upper bound on the right side of (4.3) is always strictly less than 1 since it is computed using the invariant distribution of a Markov chain; in fact, Remark C.1 in Appendix C implies that $\frac{(1 - (p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)^w)}{(p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)^w} \leq \sqrt{e} - 1 \approx 0.65$ for n sufficiently large so that $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n > 2w/(2w + 1)$. On the other hand, the upper bound in the right side of (4.4) need not be less than 1.

We note, however, that (4.4) holds for any n , whereas (4.3) holds only when n is sufficiently large. It is easy to see that the bound in (4.4) can be tighter than the one given in (4.3) if $\bar{w}^n \ll \bar{w}$.

4.5. A Sample Path Solidarity Result. Assumption 2.2 also provides another insight into the trajectory generated by the iterated random operators. Let x and \tilde{x} be two points in the space \mathcal{X} . Let $\hat{X}_k^n(x)$ and $\hat{X}_k^n(\tilde{x})$ denote the trajectory when the same sequence of random operators are applied to x and \tilde{x} as initial points, respectively. Then, we have

$$\rho(\hat{X}_k^n(x), \hat{X}_k^n(\tilde{x})) \leq \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \hat{\alpha}_j^n \rho(x, \tilde{x}).$$

Pick $\delta > 0$ and n sufficiently large so that $\mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n > 1 - \delta\} < 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It then follows from [4, Lemma 5.4] that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $A > 0$ and $r \in (0, 1)$, both possibly dependent on ϵ , such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \hat{\alpha}_j^n > \exp(-k\epsilon)\right\} < Ar^k \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This implies that for $\rho(\hat{X}_k^n(x), \hat{X}_k^n(\tilde{x}))$ decays to zero exponentially fast with high probability. In summary, we have the following result.

LEMMA 4.4. *Let $\delta > 0$ and n be sufficiently large so that $\mathbb{P}\{\hat{\alpha}_k^n > 1 - \delta\} < 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for any $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{\rho(\hat{X}_k^n(x), \hat{X}_k^n(\tilde{x})) > \epsilon\right\} = 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\rho(\hat{X}_k^n(x), \hat{X}_k^n(\tilde{x}))\right] = 0.$$

Thus, starting from any initial condition, the trajectories generated by the iterated random operators collapse to the same path eventually with probability 1, then do a random walk in a neighborhood of the fixed point x^* with high probability.

REMARK 4.2. *We note here that the underlying state space of the Markov chain in [4] is assumed to be a Polish space, whereas in our case, the space is assumed to be a complete metric space. This is not a problem, since the particular result we are using, Lemma 5.4 of [4], does not require any assumption on the state space; it only needs $(\hat{\alpha}_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ to be an i.i.d. process.*

4.6. Application to Empirical Value Iteration: Average Cost Case. Let us consider an infinite-horizon finite Markov decision problem with average cost criterion considered in Example 2 in Section 1. Given a stationary strategy $\gamma : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, the decision maker's infinite-horizon average cost is given by

$$J(\gamma) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^t c(S_k, A_k) \middle| A_k = \gamma(S_k)\right].$$

We assume that the decision maker minimizes this average cost by choosing a strategy γ^* .

Let $p(j|s_t, a_t)$ denote the transition kernel, which represents the probability that the state at time $t + 1$ is $j \in \mathcal{S}$ given that the state and action at time t is s_t and a_t , respectively. We make the following assumption.

ASSUMPTION 4.1. *The MDP is unichain, that is, for every decision rule $\gamma : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, the Markov chain $(s_t^\gamma)_{t=1}^\infty$, defined as $s_{t+1}^\gamma = g(s_t^\gamma, \gamma(s_t^\gamma), Z_t)$ is unichain. Furthermore, we have*

$$\min_{(s,a),(s',a')} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \min\{p(j|s,a), p(j|s',a')\} > 0.$$

□

A MDP is said to be unichain if under any (stationary) strategy of the decision maker, the resulting Markov chain visits all the states infinitely often. The second part of the assumption states that for any two current state-action pairs, there exists at least one state j , possibly dependent on the state-action pairs, such that the proba-

bility that the future state is j is positive. Note that the two parts of the assumptions are not equivalent to each-other.

LEMMA 4.5. *If Assumption 4.1 is satisfied, then there exists a function $v^* : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a gain $g^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$v^*(s) + g^* = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}(s)} \left(c(s, a) + \mathbb{E} [v^*(g(s, a, Z))] \right) \quad (4.5)$$

for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Moreover, the optimal decision rule γ^* for the MDP is given by

$$\gamma^*(s) \in \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}(s)} \left(c(s, a) + \mathbb{E} [v^*(g(s, a, Z))] \right) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Proof. See Theorem 8.4.3 in [47]. \square

REMARK 4.3. *It can be readily checked that if v^* satisfies (4.5), then $v^* + \lambda$ also satisfies (4.5) for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$; thus, v^* is not unique, but g^* is unique.* \square

We now formulate the relative value iteration algorithm within the operator framework considered in this paper. Let $\mathcal{V} := \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ denote the space of value functions. Let $T : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ be defined as

$$T(v)(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \mathbb{E} [v(g(s, a, Z))] \right),$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the uniform measure over the random noise Z .

We endow \mathcal{V} with the span seminorm $\text{span}(\cdot)$, defined as

$$\text{span}(v) = \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v(s) - \min_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v(s).$$

Note that $\text{span}(v + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{S}\}}) = \text{span}(v)$. It is shown in [47, Theorem 6.6.2, Theorem 8.5.2] that $T : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ satisfies

$$\text{span}(T(v_1) - T(v_2)) \leq \alpha \text{span}(v_1 - v_2),$$

where α is given by

$$\alpha = 1 - \min_{(s,a),(s',a')} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \min \left\{ p(j|s, a), p(j|s', a') \right\}.$$

Thus, if Assumption 4.1 holds, then T is a contraction map over the seminormed space \mathcal{V} . Now, we can define two elements $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}$ to be equivalent, $v_1 \sim v_2$, if $v_1 - v_2$ is a constant function. The quotient space \mathcal{V}/\sim with the span seminorm is a Banach space (the seminorm becomes a norm on this space) (see the discussion in Section 1.5 of [49]), and $T : \mathcal{V}/\sim \rightarrow \mathcal{V}/\sim$ is a contraction map.

We now describe (a variant of) relative value iteration algorithm. This algorithm is used to compute the value function v^* for the average cost MDP.

1. *Initialization:* Pick an $\epsilon > 0$. Initialize $k = 0$ and $v_1 = 0$.
2. *For $k \geq 0$:* Set $\tilde{v}_{k+1} = T(v_k)$ and $v_{k+1} = \tilde{v}_{k+1} - \left(\min_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \tilde{v}_{k+1}(s) \right) \mathbb{1}_{|\mathcal{S}|}$.
3. *Stopping criteria:* If $\text{span}(v_{k+1} - v_k) < \epsilon$, then stop. Pick γ_ϵ as

$$\gamma_\epsilon(s) = \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \mathbb{E} [v_k(g(s, a, Z))] \right),$$

and return it as ϵ -optimal decision rule. Otherwise, $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to Step 2.

Notice that at step $k + 1$, one needs to compute $\mathbb{E}[v_k(g(s, a, Z))]$. If computing $\mathbb{E}[v_k(g(s, a, Z))]$ is computationally intensive, then one can use i.i.d. samples of the noise Z to compute an approximation of $\mathbb{E}[v_k(g(s, a, Z))]$. Let us define

$$\hat{T}_k^n(v)(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) \right),$$

where $(Z_{k,i})_{i=1}^n$ is a sequence of i.i.d. samples of the random variable Z_k . Consider the following approximate *empirical relative value iteration* algorithm.

1. *Initialization:* Pick an $\epsilon > 0$. Initialize $k = 0$ and $\hat{v}_1^n = 0$.
2. *For* $k \geq 0$: Set $\hat{v}_{k+1} = \hat{T}_k^n(\hat{v}_k^n)$ and $\hat{v}_{k+1}^n = \hat{v}_{k+1} - \left(\min_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{v}_{k+1}(s) \right) \mathbb{1}_{|\mathcal{S}|}$.
3. *Stopping criteria:* If $\text{span}(\hat{v}_{k+1}^n - \hat{v}_k^n) < \epsilon$, then stop. Pick $\hat{\gamma}_\epsilon^n$ as

$$\hat{\gamma}_\epsilon^n(s) = \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{v}_k^n(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) \right),$$

and return it as ϵ -optimal decision rule with high confidence. Otherwise, $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to Step 2.

Our main result is as follows:

THEOREM 4.6. *If Assumption 4.1 holds, then v^* is the probabilistic fixed point of (\hat{T}_k^n) , that is, for any $\kappa > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \{ \text{span}(\hat{v}_k^n - v^*) > \kappa \} = 0,$$

Proof. Since Assumption 4.1 holds, we know that $T : \mathcal{V} / \sim \rightarrow \mathcal{V} / \sim$ satisfies $\text{span}(T(v_1) - T(v_2)) \leq \alpha \text{span}(v_1 - v_2)$. For n sufficiently large, $\text{span}(\hat{T}_k^n(v) - T(v))$ is close to zero with high probability. To see this, note that

$$\text{span}(\hat{T}_k^n(v) - T(v)) \leq 2 \max_{(s,a)} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) - \mathbb{E}[v(g(s, a, Z))] \right|.$$

For n sufficiently large, Hoeffding inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{(s,a)} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) - \mathbb{E}[v(g(s, a, Z))] \right| \geq \epsilon \right\} \\ \leq 2|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \exp \left(-\frac{2n\epsilon^2}{\|v\|_\infty^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \{ \text{span}(\hat{T}_k^n(v) - T(v)) \geq \epsilon \} = 0$ for every $\epsilon > 0$.

Let $\hat{p}^n(\cdot | \cdot, \cdot)$ be the transition probability under \hat{T}_k^n , and $\hat{\alpha}^n$ be the corresponding contraction coefficient, given by

$$\hat{\alpha}^n = 1 - \min_{(s,a),(s',a')} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \min \{ \hat{p}^n(j|s, a), \hat{p}^n(j|s', a') \},$$

which follows from Proposition 6.6.1 in [47]. Note that for any three-tuple $j, s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $\hat{p}^n(j|s, a)$ converges almost surely to $p(j|s, a)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, for n sufficiently large and $\delta \in (0, 1 - \alpha)$, the probability of $\hat{\alpha}^n$ being greater than $1 - \delta$ is vanishingly small. Thus, Theorem 2.3 implies that v^* is the probabilistic fixed point of (\hat{T}_k^n) . \square

5. Sample Complexity of Computing Probabilistic Fixed Point. The dominating Markov chain construction can provide us with a (somewhat loose) sample complexity bound in the number of samples required to get close to the fixed point x^* with high probability. We use here the same notation introduced in Section 4. For a fixed $\kappa > 0$ and confidence level ξ , let $N_{\kappa,\xi}$ be defined as

$$N_{\kappa,\xi} = \inf_{\epsilon \in (0, \kappa(1-\alpha)/2], \delta \in (0, 1-\alpha)} \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \mathbb{P} \{ \hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 - \delta, W_k^n \leq \epsilon \} \geq \sqrt[w]{\frac{1}{1+\xi}} \right\}.$$

Then, for any $n \geq N_{\kappa,\xi}$, we have

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \rho(\hat{X}_k^n, x^*) \geq \kappa \right\} \leq \xi.$$

The proof of the above result follows immediately from Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 4.3. We note here that the sample complexity is only in terms of number of samples n picked to approximate the operator at every time step; we allow the number of iterations to go to infinity, which implies the true sample complexity is infinite.

One of the main reasons why sample complexity bound cannot be computed for the general setting is that the Markov chain Y_k^n is constructed over the space of natural numbers. For this Markov chain, it is easy to deduce that a unique invariant distribution exists due to irreducibility and negative drift outside of a compact set. However, it is unclear how quickly this Markov chain converges to this invariant distribution starting from any initial state. Such problems are studied under the umbrella of mixing time of Markov chains, for which a large literature is available; see, for instance, [50, 51]. For finite state space, the mixing time bounds for certain Markov chains are available [51]. For infinite state space, on the other hand, very limited results exist [52].

To provide a finite sample complexity bound, we further need to bound the space as well, that is, we expect \mathcal{X} to be a bounded space satisfying:

$$D := \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) = \sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} \rho(x, y) < \infty.$$

This condition is readily satisfied in many optimization and empirical dynamic programming algorithms, where the operator \hat{T}_k^n is a contraction operator with contraction coefficient α almost surely and one knows the region in the space \mathcal{X} where the solution lies.

This is also satisfied if we allow the random operator to project the iterates back to \mathcal{X} if the iterates become large. This will be composition of a projection operator and a random operator. It is well-known that if \mathcal{X} is a Hilbert space (say Euclidean space with the ℓ_2 norm or a reproducing kernel Hilbert space), then the projection operation is non-expansive. In case \mathcal{X} is not a Hilbert space, then the projection operation must be picked carefully so that it remains a non-expansive operator. In these situations, the property of the random operators remain unchanged due to projection operation.

In the following theorem, we present a sample complexity bound for this case, which is based on the analysis in [7] and has been used in [8, 9, 53–55] to provide the sample complexity bounds for various empirical dynamic programming algorithms with function approximation.

THEOREM 5.1. *Suppose that Assumption 2.2 (i)-(v) holds with a bounded complete metric space \mathcal{X} with diameter D . Let $d := \lceil D/\epsilon \rceil$, $p := p_{\epsilon,\delta}^n$, and $\eta := \eta_{\epsilon,\delta}^n$. For*

$\kappa > 0$ and $\xi > 0$, define $N_{\kappa, \xi}$ and $K_{\kappa, \xi}$ as

$$N_{\kappa, \xi} := \inf_{\substack{\epsilon \in (0, \kappa(1-\alpha)/2], \\ \delta \in (0, 1-\alpha)}} \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \mathbb{P} \{ \hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 - \delta, W_k^n \leq \epsilon \} \geq \right. \\ \left. \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \left(1 - \frac{\xi}{3} \right)^{1/(d-\eta-1)} \right\} \right\},$$

$$K_{\kappa, \xi} := \log \left(\frac{3}{\xi(1-p)p^{d-\eta-1}} \right).$$

Then, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \rho(\hat{X}_k^n, x^*) > \kappa \right\} < \xi \text{ for all } k \geq K_{\kappa, \xi} \text{ and } n \geq N_{\kappa, \xi}.$$

Proof. This is established in Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.3 in [7]. \square

6. Composition of Operators. In many complex optimization and reinforcement learning problems, the operator T may be composition of multiple mappings each of whom may be non-expansive or contraction. In these cases, one can replace the mappings using random ones. Our goal in this section is to study such cases and identify sufficient conditions on the random mappings that implies Assumption 2.2.

To be precise, let $\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{L+1}$ be $L+1$ metric spaces with $\mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{X}_{L+1} = \mathcal{X}$, which is by assumption a complete metric space. Let ρ_l denote the metric on the space \mathcal{X}_l . Let $T_l : \mathcal{X}_l \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{l+1}$, $l = 1, \dots, L$ be a sequence of mappings such that T_l is Lipschitz with coefficient $\alpha_l \in [0, 1]$, that is,

$$\rho_{l+1}(T_l(x), T_l(y)) \leq \alpha_l \rho_l(x, y).$$

Define $T := T_L \circ \dots \circ T_1$, and let $\alpha := \prod_{l=1}^L \alpha_l < 1$ denote the contraction coefficient of T . We do not assume completeness of $\mathcal{X}_2, \dots, \mathcal{X}_L$. Let x^* be the fixed point of T . Define $x_1^* = x^*$ and recursively define

$$x_{l+1}^* = T_l(x_l^*), \quad l = 1, \dots, L.$$

It is obvious that $x_{L+1}^* = x^*$.

Let $\hat{H}_{k,l}^n : \mathcal{X}_l \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{l+1}$ be the random mapping at time k that replaces the map T_l (here, $l = 1, \dots, L$). Define $\hat{T}_k^n := \hat{H}_{k,L}^n \circ \dots \circ \hat{H}_{k,1}^n$ to be the random operator that approximates T . Let $\hat{\alpha}_{k,l}^n$ denote the Lipschitz constant of $\hat{H}_{k,l}^n$. We make the following assumption on the random mappings.

ASSUMPTION 6.1. *The following holds:*

- (i) For each $l = 1, \dots, L$, the sequence $(\hat{H}_{k,l}^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed mappings. Each mapping $\hat{H}_{k,l}^n$ is independent of all the other mappings.
- (ii) For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\hat{\alpha}_{k,l}^n \leq 1$ almost surely. Further, there exists at least one $l_0 \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ such that for any $\delta \in (0, 1 - \alpha)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \{ \hat{\alpha}_{k,l_0}^n \geq 1 - \delta \} = 0.$$

(iii) For all $l = 1, \dots, L$, every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \rho \left(\hat{H}_{k,l}^n(x_l^*), T_l(x_l^*) \right) \geq \epsilon \right\} = 0.$$

(iv) There exists $\bar{w}_l > 0$ such that $\rho \left(\hat{H}_{k,l}^n(x_l^*), T_l(x_l^*) \right) \leq \bar{w}_l$ almost surely for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

THEOREM 6.1. *If Assumption 6.1 is satisfied, then the composite operators T and \hat{T}_k^n satisfies Assumption 2.2 (iii)-(vi).*

Proof. It is easy to observe that Assumption 6.1 immediately implies Assumption 2.2 (iii) and (iv). We only need to show that Assumption 2.2 (v) and (vi) holds.

Let us consider the case of $L = 2$ for simplicity, and the general case can then be easily deduced. For any $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$, define $x_1^* := x^*$, $x_2^* := T_1(x_1^*)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\hat{T}_k^n(x^*), T(x^*)) &= \rho_3 \left(\hat{H}_{k,2}^n(\hat{H}_{k,1}^n(x_1^*)), T_2(T_1(x_1^*)) \right), \\ &\leq \rho_3 \left(\hat{H}_{k,2}^n(\hat{H}_{k,1}^n(x_1^*)), \hat{H}_{k,2}^n(T_1(x_1^*)) \right) + \rho_3 \left(\hat{H}_{k,2}^n(T_1(x_1^*)), T_2(T_1(x_1^*)) \right), \\ &\leq \hat{\alpha}_{k,2}^n \rho_2 \left(\hat{H}_{k,1}^n(x_1^*), T_1(x_1^*) \right) + \rho_3 \left(\hat{H}_{k,2}^n(x_2^*), T_2(x_2^*) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now extend the same argument to the general case. Using triangle inequality and Assumption 6.1 (ii), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\hat{T}_k^n(x^*), T(x^*)) &= \rho_{L+1}(\hat{H}_{k,L}^n \circ \dots \circ \hat{H}_{k,1}^n(x^*), T_L \circ \dots \circ T_1(x^*)), \\ &\leq \sum_{l=1}^L \left(\prod_{m=l+1}^L \hat{\alpha}_{k,m}^n \right) \rho_{l+1} \left(\hat{H}_{k,l}^n(x_l^*), T_l(x_l^*) \right), \quad (6.1) \\ &\leq \sum_{l=1}^L \rho_{l+1} \left(\hat{H}_{k,l}^n(x_l^*), T_l(x_l^*) \right), \quad (6.2) \end{aligned}$$

where we take $\prod_{m=L+1}^L \hat{\alpha}_{k,m}^n = 1$. The last inequality immediately yields for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \rho \left(\hat{T}_k^n(x^*), T(x^*) \right) \geq \epsilon \right\} \leq \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbb{P} \left\{ \rho_{l+1} \left(\hat{H}_{k,l}^n(x_l^*), T_l(x_l^*) \right) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{L} \right\}.$$

This implies that Assumption 2.2 (v) holds. To see that Assumption 2.2 (vi) holds, we only need to take $\bar{w} = \sum_{l=1}^L \bar{w}_l$. The proof is hence complete. \square

Typically, all $(\hat{H}_{k,l}^n)_{l=1}^L$ may not use the same number of samples n . In these cases, we can replace the number of samples n_l as a function of n such that $n_l(n)$ monotonically increases as n increases.

We now use the above result for establishing the fixed point of empirical MDPs with compact state and action space.

7. Empirical Value Iteration for MDPs with Compact State and Action Spaces. In this section, we consider the problem of empirical value iteration for MDPs with continuous state and action spaces with a function approximator used for approximating the value function (recall that in value iteration, the policies are not computed, and thus, we do not need to use a function approximator for the policy space).

This problem has been studied under different names within the reinforcement learning literature. References [43, 56–58] consider finite-state finite-action setting (as was done in Subsections 3.1 and 4.6), and refer to this algorithm as an MDP with a generative model (no function approximation is used here). Reference [11] consider the MDPs with continuous-state finite-action setting and refers to this algorithm as fitted value iteration. In our previous work, this algorithm has been referred to as empirical value iteration [7–9, 53–55, 59].

In our previous work, we identified a variety of sufficient conditions such that the optimal value function of the MDP is the probabilistic fixed point of the random operators. In this section, we use the techniques developed here to show essentially the same results, albeit under very different assumptions on the MDPs, some of which relaxes the assumptions made in our previous work. In the process, we also derive some minor extensions to previously known results on MDPs with Borel state and action spaces.

We consider here the same model as introduced in Examples 1 and 2 in Section 1, but with compact state and action setting. In the sequel, we used both the transition probability matrix $P(ds'|s, a)$ induced from the state space model $s' = g(s, a, z)$.

7.1. Discounted MDPs. Let us consider the case of MDPs with discounted cost criterion. Discounted MDPs are perhaps the most common form of MDPs considered in the literature. Classical works on discounted MDPs on general state space has shown that under very mild assumptions, there exists an optimal stationary policy in discounted MDPs. The computation of the optimal policy is usually achieved through the value iteration algorithm. We refer to the standard texts [47, 60–62] for more discussion on the value iteration algorithm and general conditions under which they converge.

The goal of this subsection is to identify conditions under which a discounted MDP admits an optimal value function that is continuous in state. Although a large body of literature exists that identifies conditions under which the optimal value function is Lipschitz continuous, we could not find any result that establishes the existence of an optimal value function that is continuous. Consequently, the first result below shows that value iteration algorithm acts upon the space of continuous and bounded functions over the state space, and converges to a continuous value function. This is a simple extension to a result in [63], where essentially the same result is established for upper semicontinuous value functions. We make the following assumption on the MDP.

ASSUMPTION 7.1. *The following holds:*

- (i) \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} are compact subsets of Euclidean Spaces.
- (ii) If $(s_l, a_l) \rightarrow (s, a)$, then $P(\cdot|s_l, a_l)$ converges to $P(\cdot|s, a)$ in the weak* sense.
- (iii) The cost function $c(s, a)$ is continuous.

It is easy to observe that if the state transition function $g : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is continuous in (s, a) for every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and is measurable in z , then Assumption 7.1 (ii) is readily satisfied. This is established via an appeal to dominated convergence theorem.

Since $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ is compact, $\sup_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} c(s, a)$ exists and let c_{\max} denote the maximum value. We define the space \mathcal{V} , endowed with the supremum norm, as the space of continuous and bounded functions over \mathcal{S} :

$$\mathcal{V} = \left\{ v : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : v \text{ is continuous and } \|v\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{c_{\max}}{1 - \alpha} \right\}.$$

It is routine to show that \mathcal{V} is a closed subset of a Banach space, and is therefore, a Banach space. However, \mathcal{V} space is not compact. For a $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we use Pv to denote the integral $\int v(s')P(ds'|s, a) = \mathbb{E}[v(g(s, a, Z))]$. Recall the definition of the Bellman operator from (1.1).

THEOREM 7.1. *$T : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ is a contraction operator with coefficient α and fixed point $v^* \in \mathcal{V}$.*

Proof. A proof is presented in Lemma 4.3 (and the discussion preceding this lemma) of [63]. The setting considered in [63] is for the case of upper semicontinuous cost function. However, we note that if c and v are continuous, then $c + Pv$ is continuous and $\min_{a \in \mathcal{A}}(c + Pv)(s, a)$ is lower semicontinuous. From Lemma 3.5 of [63], $\min_{a \in \mathcal{A}}(c + Pv)(s, a)$ is also upper semicontinuous. Therefore, $\min_{a \in \mathcal{A}}(c + Pv)(s, a)$ is continuous. The rest of the proof follows the same line of analysis as presented in [63]. \square

For the result of [63] to hold, we only need the action space to be compact; the state space can be any standard Borel space as long as the cost is bounded. As a result, Theorem 7.1 holds even when the state space is the entire Euclidean space. However, we assume the state space to be compact to facilitate use of the empirical process theory in the sequel.

7.1.1. Discounted MDPs with Lipschitz Value Functions. In this section, we extend the previous result to the case where the value functions generated through the value iteration algorithm is Lipschitz continuous. Some recent papers, such as [8, 27, 55], have been established the convergence of certain reinforcement learning algorithms with Lipschitz continuous value functions. The reason for this restriction is that the space \mathcal{V} is too large to establish convergence of algorithms using existing methods.

We use $Lip(\cdot)$ to denote the Lipschitz coefficient of a function (\cdot) that maps objects from one metric space to another metric space, where the metrics used will be clear from the context. We use KD to denote for Kantorovich distance between two probability measures μ and ν , and it is defined as

$$KD(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{f: Lip(f) \leq 1} \left| \int f d\mu - \int f d\nu \right|.$$

We follow [64] to establish the existence of Lipschitz continuous optimal value function and place the following assumption on the MDP.

ASSUMPTION 7.2. *The following holds:*

- (i) \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} are compact subsets of Euclidean spaces. Let $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}$ denote a metric on \mathcal{S} , $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}$ denote a metric on \mathcal{A} and $\rho_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$ denote the metric on $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ defined as

$$\rho_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}((s, a), (s', a')) = \rho_{\mathcal{S}}(s, s') + \rho_{\mathcal{A}}(a, a').$$

- (ii) There exists $L_P < 1/\alpha$ such that

$$KD(P(\cdot|s, a), P(\cdot|s', a')) \leq L_P \rho_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}((s, a), (s', a')).$$

- (iii) The cost function $c(s, a)$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz coefficient L_c .

As noted in [64, Remark 3, p. 6], this class of MDPs is quite large, since it includes Hölder continuous MDPs as well as a special case. To see this, consider a function $f(x) = \sqrt{x}$ over the compact interval $\mathcal{S} = [0, 1]$. This function is not Lipschitz continuous with respect to the usual Euclidean distance, but it is Lipschitz

continuous if we instead consider the metric over \mathcal{S} as $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}(x, y) = \sqrt{|x - y|}$. This is a valid metric due to Theorem 2.4.3 of [65, p. 49] and noting that for any real numbers $a, b \geq 0$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$, $(a + b)^\beta \leq a^\beta + b^\beta$.

Under the assumption introduced above, we can use a result from [64] to conclude that the optimal value function is Lipschitz continuous.

THEOREM 7.2. *If Assumption 7.2 holds, then v^* is a Lipschitz continuous function with Lipschitz coefficient $L_{v^*} \leq \frac{L_c}{1 - \alpha L_P}$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that Assumption 7.2 implies Assumption 7.1. Due to Theorem 7.1, the value iteration algorithm converges for this MDP. The result then follows from [64, Theorem 4.2(c), p.13]. \square

In fact, the result from [64, Theorem 4.2(a), p.13] implies that starting from $v_0 = 0$, the entire sequence $v_{k+1} = T(v_k)$ is Lipschitz continuous. However, if v_0 is not Lipschitz continuous, then the sequence generated may not be Lipschitz continuous. For our purpose, we do not need the sequence $\{v_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ to be Lipschitz continuous.

7.1.2. Empirical Value Iteration for Discounted MDP. We view the operator T and composition of an identity operator with the Bellman operator. Since a continuous function is difficult to store in a computer, one usually use a parametric or a non-parametric function approximator to store the value function; such a projection approximates the identity operator. On the other hand, in empirical value iteration, the Bellman operator is approximated using empirical mean.

Let $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{S})$ denote the set of all bounded measurable functions over \mathcal{S} endowed with the supremum norm. We define the map $\hat{H}_k^n : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{S})$ as

$$\hat{H}_k^n(v)(s) := \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) \right). \quad (7.1)$$

We note here that the range of \hat{H}_k^n is the space of measurable functions. However, depending on the continuity property of g , it may well be the case that the range of \hat{H}_k^n is within the class of continuous and bounded function \mathcal{V} . Since $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{S})$, we have chosen to let $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{S})$ denote the range of \hat{H}_k^n .

Let $\hat{\Pi}_k^m : \mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ denote the projection operator that uses m independent samples of the states and values from the output of \hat{H}_k^n to a continuous and bounded function. The usual method adopted for this step is as follows. Let $\{s_{k,i}\}_{i=1}^m$ be m i.i.d. samples of the states picked from a uniform distribution over \mathcal{S} . A dataset is created $\{(s_{k,i}, \hat{H}_k^n(v)(s_{k,i}))\}_{i=1}^m$ and this dataset is fitted using a parametric regression model [9, 53] or a non-parametric regression model [8, 27]. Typical parameteric regression functions include neural networks or reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces. For non-parametric regression functions, nearest neighbor or kernel estimates are used.

We now define the random operator $\hat{T}_k^n(v) := \hat{\Pi}_k^{n_2(n)} \circ \hat{H}_k^{n_1(n)}(v)$, where $n_2(n)$ and $n_1(n)$ are monotonically increasing functions of n . We now make the following assumptions on the state transition function and the projection operator.

ASSUMPTION 7.3. *The state transition function g satisfies one of the following two conditions:*

- (i) *g is Lipschitz continuous in $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ for every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ with Lipschitz coefficient $L_g(z)$ and $\int L_g(z) \mathbb{P}\{dz\} < \infty$; or*
- (ii) *g is uniformly Lipschitz continuous in z with Lipschitz coefficient M_g , that is,*

$$\sup_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \rho_{\mathcal{S}}(g(s, a, z_1), g(s, a, z_2)) \leq M_g \|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Z}}$ is any norm on \mathcal{Z} .

The projection operator $\hat{\Pi}_k^n : \mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ satisfies two conditions:

- (iii) $\hat{\Pi}_k^n$ is non-expansive, that is, $\|\hat{\Pi}_k^n(v_1) - \hat{\Pi}_k^n(v_2)\|_\infty \leq \|v_1 - v_2\|_\infty$.
- (iv) For any $\epsilon > 0$, and $\delta > 0$, there exists $N_2 := N_2(v, \epsilon, \delta)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\hat{\Pi}_k^n(v^*) - v^*\|_\infty > \epsilon \right\} < \delta \text{ for all } n \geq N_2.$$

REMARK 7.1. If g is Lipschitz continuous in (s, a) with Lipschitz coefficient $L_g(z)$, then $L_P \leq \int L_g(z) \mathbb{P}\{dz\}$. Thus, if $\int L_g(z) \mathbb{P}\{dz\} < 1/\alpha$, then it automatically satisfies Assumption 7.2 (ii).

We now study the properties of the operator \hat{H}_k^n in the following theorem.

THEOREM 7.3. The map $\hat{H}_k^n : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ is almost surely contraction with respect to the contraction coefficient α . If either Assumption 7.3 (i) or (ii) is satisfied, then for any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, there exists $N_1 := N_1(v^*, \epsilon, \delta)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\hat{H}_k^n(v^*) - T(v^*)\|_\infty \geq \epsilon \right\} < \delta \text{ for all } n \geq N_1.$$

Proof. To establish the result, we need to introduce some notations. Let \mathcal{D} be the set of functions given by

$$\mathcal{D} = \{d : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \exists (s, a) \text{ such that } d(z) = v^*(g(s, a, z))\} = \bigcup_{(s, a)} \{v^*(g(s, a, \cdot))\}.$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{H}_k^n(v^*) - T(v^*)\|_\infty &= \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v^*(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s, a) + \alpha \int v^*(g(s, a, z)) \mathbb{P}\{dz\} \right) \right|, \\ &\leq \sup_{s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v^*(g(s, a, Z_{k,i})) - \int v^*(g(s, a, z)) \mathbb{P}\{dz\} \right|, \\ &= \sup_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d(Z_{k,i}) - \int d(z) \mathbb{P}\{dz\} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

This immediately yields

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\hat{H}_k^n(v^*) - T(v^*)\|_\infty > \epsilon \right\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d(Z_{k,i}) - \int d(z) \mathbb{P}\{dz\} \right| > \epsilon \right\}.$$

To obtain bounds on the right side of the equation above, we need to show that the bracketing number of the class of functions \mathcal{D} is finite for every $\epsilon > 0$. We show this for the two cases below.

For the first case, the finiteness of bracketing number is established in [41, Theorem 2.7.11, p. 164]. To see this, let us write $d_{s,a}(z) = v^*(g(s, a, z))$. Since v^* and g are Lipschitz continuous functions, we have

$$|d_{s,a}(z) - d_{s',a'}(z)| \leq L_{v^*} L_g(z) \rho_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}((s, a), (s', a')).$$

This immediately implies that the bracketing number of \mathcal{D} is upper bounded by the covering number of $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ by [41, Theorem 2.7.11, p. 164]. Since $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ is compact, it is totally bounded; thus, its covering number is finite for any $\epsilon > 0$.

For the second case, the finiteness of the bracketing number is established in [41, Corollary 2.7.2, p. 157]. Thus, under either of the two hypotheses, the bracketing number of \mathcal{D} is finite for every $\epsilon > 0$. We now invoke [41, Theorem 2.4.1, p. 122] to conclude that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d(Z_{k,i}) - \int d(z) \mathbb{P} \{dz\} \right| > \epsilon \right\} = 0,$$

which yields the desired result. \square

REMARK 7.2. *If one knows the exact covering number of $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ under the metric $\rho_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$, then the sample complexity bound can also be given. For more information on covering and bracketing numbers, we refer the reader to [40, 41, 66].*

THEOREM 7.4. *If Assumptions 7.2 and 7.3 holds, then for any $\kappa > 0$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \{ \|\hat{v}_k^n - v^*\|_\infty > \kappa \} = 0.$$

Proof. Theorem 7.3, coupled with Assumption 7.3 on the projection operator, implies that Assumption 6.1 is satisfied by the two operators $\hat{H}_k^{n_1(n)}$ and $\hat{\Pi}_k^{n_2(n)}$. The result then immediately follows from Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 2.3. \square

7.2. Average Cost MDPs. We now turn our attention to average cost MDPs and follow the same steps as in the previous section. We first proceed by identifying some sufficient conditions on the MDP such that the relative value iteration algorithm is a contraction map over an appropriate quotient space formed using the space of continuous and bounded functions. We further identify conditions under which the optimal value function is Lipschitz continuous. Thereafter, we study the empirical value iteration for average cost MDPs under the assumption of an isolated state – a formulation motivated by recent works [67, 68].

Relative value iteration algorithm for average cost MDP is presented in [60–62, 69]; however, the sufficient conditions found in these references are too strong for our problem, as these references establish the convergence of relative value iteration over the space of measurable and bounded functions. Instead, we place the following assumptions on the MDP.

ASSUMPTION 7.4. *The following holds:*

- (i) \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} are compact subsets of Euclidean Spaces.
- (ii) If $(s_l, a_l) \rightarrow (s, a)$, then $P(\cdot | s_l, a_l)$ converges to $P(\cdot | s, a)$ in the weak* sense.
- (iii) The cost function $c(s, a)$ is continuous.
- (iv) There exists $\alpha < 1$ such that

$$\sup_{(s,a),(s',a')} \|P(\cdot | s, a) - P(\cdot | s', a')\|_{TV} \leq 2\alpha.$$

Recall the discussion from Subsection 4.6, where we define the Bellman operator over a quotient space. We follow the same steps here, and define \mathcal{V}/ \sim to be the quotient space

$$\mathcal{V}/ \sim = \left\{ [v] \subset C_b(\mathcal{S}) : v_1, v_2 \in [v] \text{ implies } v_1 - v_2 \text{ is a constant function} \right\}.$$

Under these assumptions, we establish the following result.

THEOREM 7.5. *The quotient space \mathcal{V}/\sim is a Banach space. If Assumption 7.4 holds, then we have*

1. $T : \mathcal{V}/\sim \rightarrow \mathcal{V}/\sim$ is a contraction operator with coefficient α and $[v^*] \in \mathcal{V}/\sim$.
2. Any representative element $\tilde{v}^* \in [v^*]$ satisfies $\text{span}(\tilde{v}^*) \leq \frac{\text{span}(c)}{1-\alpha}$.
3. If in addition, Assumption 7.2 holds with $L_P < 1$, then any representative element v^* that lies within the unique equivalence class of the fixed points of T is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz coefficient $\frac{L_c}{1-L_P}$.

Proof. The fact that the quotient space \mathcal{V}/\sim is a Banach space is established in [69, Theorem 6.26, p. 151]. The operator T is a span norm contraction, which is established in [69, Theorem 6.28, p. 154]. The only thing that needs to be established is that the value function lies in the class of continuous functions. Since our action space is compact, the continuity of the sequence of value functions generated by value iteration algorithm follows from [63, Lemma 4.3] or from Berge's maximum theorem [49, Theorem 17.31, p. 570]. The Lipschitz continuity of v^* follows from [64, Theorem 4.2(c), p.13]. \square

In what follows, we drop the notation $[v]$ to denote an element of \mathcal{V}/\sim and instead just use v , with the understanding that any representative element $\tilde{v} \in [v]$ can be taken to perform the operation involved.

7.2.1. Average MDP with an Isolated State. In [67,68], the authors identified conditions under which a total cost or an average cost MDP can be converted into an equivalent discounted cost MDP for general state spaces. This requires the existence of an isolated state that will be visited infinitely often with a finite mean hitting time. As a concrete example, consider a capacitated inventory problem from [67, Section 5]. In this problem, the random demand can be higher than the maximum order that can be placed with a small probability. Thus, at infinitely many time steps, the inventory suffers from lost sales (see Proposition 8 in [67]). We note here that such a reduction is already known for finite state MDPs; see, for instance, the corresponding results in [70].

To ease the analysis here, we place a slightly stronger assumptions on the MDP as compared to the ones in [67].

ASSUMPTION 7.5. *The following holds:*

- (i) \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} are compact subsets of Euclidean spaces. Further, there exists an isolated point $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying $\inf_{s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{s_0\}} \|s_0 - s\| > 0$.
- (ii) If $(s_l, a_l) \rightarrow (s, a)$, then $P(\cdot | s_l, a_l)$ converges to $P(\cdot | s, a)$ in the weak* sense.
- (iii) The cost function $c(s, a)$ is continuous.
- (iv) There exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\inf_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(s_0 | s, a) = 1 - \alpha \iff \sup_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} P(\mathcal{S} \setminus \{s_0\} | s, a) = \alpha.$$

THEOREM 7.6. *Assumption 7.5 implies Assumption 7.4. Hence, Theorem 7.5 holds for average cost MDP satisfying Assumption 7.5.*

Proof. The only part that needs proof is that Assumption 7.5 (iv) implies Assumption 7.4 (iv). We need an auxiliary result to establish this implication.

Let \mathcal{B} be a measure space and let $\mu, \nu \in \wp(\mathcal{B})$ such that there exists $\beta > 0$ and $b_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfying $\mu(b_0) \geq \nu(b_0) \geq \beta > 0$. We claim that $\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} \leq 2(1 - \beta)$.

Define $\lambda := \mu - \nu$ with the Jordan decomposition denoted by $\lambda = \lambda^+ - \lambda^-$. Then, the total variation distance $\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} = \lambda^+(B) + \lambda^-(B^c)$, where $B \subset \mathcal{B}$ is the support of λ^+ . Since $\lambda(\mathcal{B}) = 0$, we conclude that $\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} = 2\lambda^+(B) = 2(\mu(B) - \nu(B))$.

Further, since $\mu(b_0) \geq \nu(b_0)$, we conclude that $b_0 \in B$. This implies that $\nu(B) \geq \beta$, which further implies $\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} \leq 2(1 - \beta)$.

Using this identity, we now have

$$\sup_{(s,a),(s',a')} \|P(\cdot|s,a) - P(\cdot|s',a')\|_{TV} \leq 2(1 - (1 - \alpha)) = 2\alpha.$$

This completes the proof. \square

7.2.2. Empirical Relative Value Iteration for Average Cost MDPs. We focus our attention on empirical relative value iteration for the average cost MDP with an isolated state. We define the empirical Bellman map $\hat{H}_k^n : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathcal{S})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{v}(s) &= \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left(c(s,a) + \frac{\alpha}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(g(s,a, Z_{k,i})) \right), \\ \hat{H}_k^n(v)(s) &= \tilde{v}(s) - \inf_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \tilde{v}(s'). \end{aligned}$$

This is the relative empirical value iteration map, which was introduced in Subsection 4.6. The property of \hat{H}_k^n is derived in the following lemma.

LEMMA 7.7. *Suppose that Assumption 7.5 holds for the average cost MDP. For any $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}$, then the following holds:*

$$\text{span}(\hat{H}_k^n(v_1), \hat{H}_k^n(v_2)) \leq \hat{\alpha}_k^n \text{span}(v_1, v_2).$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_k^n$ satisfies the following condition: For any $\delta \in (0, 1 - \alpha)$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \{ \hat{\alpha}_k^n > 1 - \delta \} = 0. \quad (7.2)$$

Further, $\hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1$ almost surely.

Proof. It is clear that $\hat{\alpha}_k^n$ satisfies

$$\hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 - \inf_{(s,a)} \hat{P}_k^n(s_0|s,a).$$

The fact that $\hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1$ almost surely follows from Theorem 4.22 in [69, p. 81]. The statement will be proved if we show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \inf_{(s,a)} \hat{P}_k^n(s_0|s,a) > \delta \right\} = 0.$$

Let \mathcal{Z}_0 be the set such that $P(\mathcal{Z}_0) = 1 - \alpha$ and $g(s,a,z_0) = s_0$ for all (s,a) and $z_0 \in \mathcal{Z}_0$. This implies that $\inf_{(s,a)} \hat{P}_k^n(s_0|s,a) = \hat{P}_k^n(\mathcal{Z}_0)$. Using Hoeffding inequality, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{P}_k^n(\mathcal{Z}_0) - (1 - \alpha) < \alpha + \delta - 1 \right\} \leq \exp(-n(\alpha + \delta - 1)^2).$$

This readily yields the (7.2), which establishes the lemma. \square

Following the same argument as in Subsection 7.1.2, we now define $\hat{T}_k^n(v) = \hat{\Pi}_k^{n_2(n)} \circ \hat{H}_k^{n_1(n)}(v)$, where $n_2(n)$ and $n_1(n)$ are monotonically increasing functions of n .

THEOREM 7.8. *Suppose that the average cost MDP satisfies Assumption 7.2 with $L_P < 1$ and Assumption 7.5. Further, if Assumption 7.3 holds with $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ replaced with $\text{span}(\cdot)$, then for any $\kappa > 0$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \{ \text{span}(\hat{v}_k^n - v^*) > \kappa \} = 0.$$

Proof. The result then immediately follows from Theorem 7.5 and Theorem 2.3.

□

8. Conclusion. In this paper, we have introduced a novel approach at analyze recursive stochastic algorithms when viewed as iteration of independent random operators. The approach presented here provides an alternative to the Foster-Lyapunov method which is rather difficult to use in infinite dimensional spaces. We hope that this paper can accelerate the development of new algorithms by a careful design of the random operator that reduces the probability of error being large. In future work, we will also consider other characterizations of probabilistic fixed points (e.g., a mean square version), and explore application to analysis of various algorithms for stochastic optimization problems in machine learning.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. E. Dubins and D. A. Freedman, “Invariant probabilities for certain markov processes,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 837–848, 1966.
- [2] M. F. Barnsley and S. Demko, “Iterated function systems and the global construction of fractals,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, vol. 399, no. 1817, pp. 243–275, 1985.
- [3] M. F. Barnsley, J. H. Elton, and D. P. Hardin, “Recurrent iterated function systems,” *Constructive approximation*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 3–31, 1989.
- [4] P. Diaconis and D. Freedman, “Iterated random functions,” *SIAM review*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 45–76, 1999.
- [5] Ö. Stenflo, “A survey of average contractive iterated function systems,” *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications*, vol. 18, no. 8, pp. 1355–1380, 2012.
- [6] M. Duflo, *Random iterative models*, vol. 34. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [7] W. B. Haskell, R. Jain, and D. Kalathil, “Empirical dynamic programming,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 402–429, 2016.
- [8] H. Sharma, M. Jafarnia-Jahromi, and R. Jain, “Approximate relative value learning for average-reward continuous state MDPs,” in *Proceedings UAI*, 2019.
- [9] W. B. Haskell, R. Jain, H. Sharma, and P. Yu, “A universal empirical dynamic programming algorithm for continuous state MDPs,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 115–129, 2019.
- [10] F. Dufour and T. Prieto-Rumeau, “Approximation of average cost markov decision processes using empirical distributions and concentration inequalities,” *Stochastics An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, vol. 87, no. 2, pp. 273–307, 2015.
- [11] R. Munos and C. Szepesvári, “Finite-time bounds for fitted value iteration,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 9, no. May, pp. 815–857, 2008.
- [12] A. Rahimi and B. Recht, “Weighted sums of random kitchen sinks: Replacing minimization with randomization in learning,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1313–1320, 2009.
- [13] L. Györfi, *Principles of nonparametric learning*, vol. 434. Springer, 2002.
- [14] I. Steinwart and A. Christmann, *Support vector machines*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [15] V. S. Borkar, *Stochastic approximation: A dynamical systems viewpoint*, vol. 48. Springer, 2009.
- [16] H. Kushner and G. G. Yin, *Stochastic approximation and recursive algorithms and applications*, vol. 35. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [17] L. Bottou, “Large-scale machine learning with stochastic gradient descent,” in *Proceedings of COMPSTAT’2010*, pp. 177–186, Springer, 2010.

- [18] L. Bottou, F. E. Curtis, and J. Nocedal, "Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning," *Siam Review*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 223–311, 2018.
- [19] A. Defazio, F. Bach, and S. Lacoste-Julien, "SAGA: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 1646–1654, 2014.
- [20] R. Harikandeh, M. O. Ahmed, A. Virani, M. Schmidt, J. Konečný, and S. Sallinen, "Stopwasting my gradients: Practical SVRG," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2251–2259, 2015.
- [21] A. Dieuleveut and F. Bach, "Nonparametric stochastic approximation with large step-sizes," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 1363–1399, 2016.
- [22] S. Ruder, "An overview of gradient descent optimization algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04747*, 2016.
- [23] A. Dieuleveut, A. Durmus, and F. Bach, "Bridging the gap between constant step size stochastic gradient descent and Markov chains," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06386*, 2017.
- [24] J. Chee and P. Toulis, "Convergence diagnostics for stochastic gradient descent with constant learning rate," in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1476–1485, 2018.
- [25] D. Babichev and F. Bach, "Constant step size stochastic gradient descent for probabilistic modeling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.05567*, 2018.
- [26] A. M. Devraj and S. Meyn, "Zap q-learning," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2235–2244, 2017.
- [27] D. Shah and Q. Xie, "Q-learning with nearest neighbors," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 3111–3121, 2018.
- [28] A. M. Devraj and S. P. Meyn, "Q-learning with uniformly bounded variance: Large discounting is not a barrier to fast learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.10301*, 2020.
- [29] G. Qu and A. Wierman, "Finite-time analysis of asynchronous stochastic approximation and q-learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.00260*, 2020.
- [30] R. Srikant and L. Ying, "Finite-time error bounds for linear stochastic approximation and TD learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.00923*, 2019.
- [31] L. Ljung, "Analysis of recursive stochastic algorithms," *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 551–575, 1977.
- [32] T. Jaakkola, M. I. Jordan, and S. P. Singh, "Convergence of stochastic iterative dynamic programming algorithms," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 703–710, 1994.
- [33] J. N. Tsitsiklis and B. Van Roy, "Analysis of temporal-difference learning with function approximation," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 1075–1081, 1997.
- [34] D. P. Bertsekas and J. N. Tsitsiklis, *Neuro-Dynamic Programming*. Athena Scientific, 1996.
- [35] J. N. Tsitsiklis, "Asynchronous stochastic approximation and Q-learning," *Machine learning*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 185–202, 1994.
- [36] V. S. Borkar and S. P. Meyn, "The ODE method for convergence of stochastic approximation and reinforcement learning," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 447–469, 2000.
- [37] J. Huang, I. Kontoyiannis, and S. P. Meyn, "The ODE method and spectral theory of Markov operators," in *Stochastic Theory and Control*, pp. 205–221, Springer, 2002.
- [38] M. Shaked and J. G. Shanthikumar, *Stochastic Orders*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [39] R. Douc, E. Moulines, P. Priouret, and P. Soulier, *Markov chains*. Springer, 2018.
- [40] D. Pollard, *Convergence of stochastic processes*. Springer Series in Statistics, Springer-Verlag New York, 1984.
- [41] A. W. Van Der Vaart and J. A. Wellner, *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes With Applications to Statistics*. Springer-Verlag New York, 1996.
- [42] M. Ledoux, *The concentration of measure phenomenon*. No. 89, American Mathematical Soc., 2001.
- [43] A. Sidford, M. Wang, X. Wu, L. Yang, and Y. Ye, "Near-optimal time and sample complexities for solving markov decision processes with a generative model," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 5186–5196, 2018.
- [44] M. J. Wainwright, "Variance-reduced q-learning is minimax optimal," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.04697*, 2019.
- [45] A. Gupta and W. B. Haskell, "Convergence of recursive stochastic algorithms using wasserstein divergence," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.11403*, 2020.
- [46] P. W. Glynn and A. Zeevi, "Bounding stationary expectations of Markov processes," in *Markov processes and related topics: A Festschrift for Thomas G. Kurtz*, pp. 195–214, Institute of

- Mathematical Statistics, 2008.
- [47] M. L. Puterman, *Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
 - [48] S. T. Rachev and L. Rüschendorf, *Mass Transportation Problems: Volume I: Theory*, vol. 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.
 - [49] C. D. Aliprantis and K. Border, *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: A Hitchhiker’s Guide*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2006.
 - [50] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie, *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
 - [51] D. A. Levin and Y. Peres, *Markov chains and mixing times*, vol. 107. American Mathematical Soc., 2017.
 - [52] D. Aldous, L. Lovász, and P. Winkler, “Mixing times for uniformly ergodic Markov chains,” *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, vol. 71, no. 2, pp. 165–185, 1997.
 - [53] W. B. Haskell, P. Yu, H. Sharma, and R. Jain, “Randomized function fitting-based empirical value iteration,” in *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 2467–2472, IEEE, 2017.
 - [54] H. Sharma and R. Jain, “An approximately optimal relative value learning algorithm for averaged MDPs with continuous states and actions,” in *2019 57th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pp. 734–740, IEEE, 2019.
 - [55] H. Sharma, R. Jain, and A. Gupta, “An empirical relative value learning algorithm for non-parametric MDPs with continuous state space,” in *2019 18th European Control Conference (ECC)*, pp. 1368–1373, IEEE, 2019.
 - [56] S. Kakade, M. J. Kearns, and J. Langford, “Exploration in metric state spaces,” in *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-03)*, pp. 306–312, 2003.
 - [57] T. Lattimore and M. Hutter, “Pac bounds for discounted mdps,” in *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pp. 320–334, Springer, 2012.
 - [58] B. Szörényi, G. Kedenburg, and R. Munos, “Optimistic planning in markov decision processes using a generative model,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1035–1043, 2014.
 - [59] A. Gupta, R. Jain, and P. W. Glynn, “An empirical algorithm for relative value iteration for average-cost MDPs,” in *Proc. of 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 5079–5084, Dec 2015.
 - [60] O. Hernández-Lerma, *Adaptive Markov control processes*, vol. 79. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
 - [61] O. Hernández-Lerma and J. B. Lasserre, *Discrete-time Markov control processes: basic optimality criteria*, vol. 30. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
 - [62] O. Hernández-Lerma and J. B. Lasserre, *Further topics on discrete-time Markov control processes*, vol. 42. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
 - [63] A. Maitra, “Discounted dynamic programming on compact metric spaces,” *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, pp. 211–216, 1968.
 - [64] K. Hinderer, “Lipschitz continuity of value functions in markovian decision processes,” *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 3–22, 2005.
 - [65] R. M. Dudley, *Real Analysis and Probability*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 2 ed., 2002.
 - [66] M. Anthony and P. L. Bartlett, *Neural network learning: Theoretical foundations*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
 - [67] E. A. Feinberg and J. Huang, “Reduction of total-cost and average-cost MDPs with weakly continuous transition probabilities to discounted mdps,” *Operations research letters*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 179–184, 2018.
 - [68] E. A. Feinberg and J. Huang, “On the reduction of total-cost and average-cost mdps to discounted MDPs,” *Naval Research Logistics (NRL)*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 38–56, 2019.
 - [69] A. L. Almudevar, *Approximate iterative algorithms*. CRC Press, 2014.
 - [70] D. P. Bertsekas, *Dynamic programming and optimal control, Vol. I and II*, vol. 1. Athena scientific Belmont, MA, 1995.
 - [71] Y. Coudène, *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*. Universitext, Springer, 2016.
 - [72] T. Kamae, U. Krengel, and G. L. O’Brien, “Stochastic inequalities on partially ordered spaces,” *The Annals of Probability*, pp. 899–912, 1977.

Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 3.2. Let $\hat{T}^n := \hat{T}_k^n$. Let us consider the

following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \int f(x)\pi^{n_i}(dx) &= \int \mathbb{E} \left[f(\hat{T}^{n_i}(x)) \right] \pi^{n_i}(dx) \\ &= \int f(T(x)) + \left(\mathbb{E} \left[f(\hat{T}^{n_i}(x)) \right] - f(T(x)) \right) \pi^{n_i}(dx). \end{aligned}$$

We next show that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int \left(\mathbb{E} \left[f(\hat{T}^{n_i}(x)) \right] - f(T(x)) \right) \pi^{n_i}(dx) = 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Pick $\epsilon > 0$ and a compact set $\mathcal{K}_\epsilon \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that $\pi^{n_i}(\mathcal{K}_\epsilon^c) < \epsilon$. This implies

$$\int_{\mathcal{K}_\epsilon^c} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[f(\hat{T}^{n_i}(x)) \right] - f(T(x)) \right) \pi^{n_i}(dx) < 2\epsilon \|f\|_\infty.$$

Pick $M_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq M_\epsilon$, we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\rho(\hat{T}^n x, T x) \right] < \epsilon.$$

Let L_f denote the Lipschitz constant of the function f . Then, for $n_i \geq M_\epsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{K}_\epsilon} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[f(\hat{T}^{n_i}(x)) \right] - f(T(x)) \right) \pi^{n_i}(dx) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{K}_\epsilon} L_f \mathbb{E} \left[\rho(\hat{T}^{n_i}(x), T(x)) \right] \pi^{n_i}(dx) \leq L_f \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists M_ϵ such that for all $n_i \geq M_\epsilon$, we have

$$\int \left(\mathbb{E} \left[f(\hat{T}^{n_i}(x)) \right] - f(T(x)) \right) \pi^{n_i}(dx) < \epsilon(2\|f\|_\infty + L_f),$$

which establishes (A.1). This immediately implies

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int f(x)\pi^{n_i}(dx) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int f(T(x))\pi^{n_i}(dx).$$

Since f and $f \circ T$ are bounded continuous functions from \mathcal{X} to \mathbb{R} , we get the expression in (3.2) by taking the limit on both sides above.

Next, we show that $\pi^\infty = \delta_{x^*}$. Since (3.2) holds for every $f \in LC_b(\mathcal{X})$, we conclude that the tuple T is a measure preserving map under the measure π^∞ , that is, $(\mathcal{X}, T, \pi^\infty)$ is a measure preserving system. Now note that since T is a contraction, for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $T^k(x) \rightarrow x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, the only forward recurrent point of T is x^* . By Poincare recurrence theorem [71, Proposition 5.4, p. 52]¹, π^∞ -a.e. x is forward recurrent, which implies that the support for π^∞ must be contained in the set of fixed points of the map T . This implies $\pi^\infty = \delta_{x^*}$. Now notice that

¹There are several versions of Poincare recurrence theorem, and the one we use here requires \mathcal{X} to be a second countable Hausdorff space, which is readily satisfied if \mathcal{X} is a Polish space.

any limit point of the sequence $(\pi^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is δ_{x^*} . Thus, we conclude that the sequence $(\pi^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to δ_{x^*} in the weak sense. This completes the proof of the lemma.

Appendix B. Proof of Proposition 4.1. Let \mathcal{E}_k denote the event $E_k^n \leq \epsilon \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$ and \mathcal{F}_k denote the event $\{W_k^n \leq \epsilon, \hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 - \delta\}$.

LEMMA B.1. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} [E_{k+1}^n \mid \mathcal{E}_k, \mathcal{F}_k] &< \epsilon \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n \quad \text{almost surely,} \\ [E_{k+1}^n - E_k^n \mid \mathcal{E}_k^{\mathbf{C}}, \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq -\epsilon \quad \text{almost surely,} \\ E_{k+1}^n - E_k^n &\leq \bar{w} \quad \text{almost surely.} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For establishing the first inequality, we readily obtain

$$[E_{k+1}^n \mid \mathcal{E}_k, \mathcal{F}_k] = \hat{\alpha}_k^n E_k^n + W_k^n \leq (1 - \delta) \left(\frac{2\epsilon}{\delta} + \epsilon \right) + \epsilon = \epsilon \left(\frac{2}{\delta} - \delta \right) < \epsilon \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n.$$

To establish the second inequality, note that

$$E_{k+1}^n - E_k^n \leq \hat{\alpha}_k^n E_k^n + W_k^n - E_k^n = W_k^n - (1 - \hat{\alpha}_k^n) E_k^n. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Under the event $\mathcal{E}_k^{\mathbf{C}}$ and \mathcal{F}_k , we have

$$[E_{k+1}^n - E_k^n \mid \mathcal{E}_k^{\mathbf{C}}, \mathcal{F}_k] \leq \epsilon - \delta E_k^n \leq \epsilon - \delta \times 2\epsilon/\delta = -\epsilon.$$

Moreover, from (B.1) and due to the fact that $\hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1$ and $E_k^n \geq 0$ almost surely, we readily conclude that $E_{k+1}^n - E_k^n \leq \bar{w}$ almost surely. \square

We now construct another Markov chain $(Z_k^n)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ as follows: Let $Z_1^n = \lceil E_1^n / \epsilon \rceil$, and the chain evolves as

$$Z_{k+1}^n = \begin{cases} \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n & \text{if } Z_k^n = \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n \\ Z_k^n - 1 & \text{if } W_k^n \leq \epsilon, \hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 - \delta, \text{ and } Z_k^n \geq \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n + 1 \\ Z_k^n + \lceil \frac{\bar{w}}{\epsilon} \rceil & \text{if } W_k^n \geq \epsilon \text{ or } \hat{\alpha}_k^n \geq 1 - \delta. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

By construction and Lemma B.1, we have

$$E_k^n \leq \epsilon Z_k^n \text{ almost surely,}$$

which can be shown via induction. The statement is obviously true for $k = 1$. Assume that the statement is true for some k . Then, two cases can occur:

1. If $E_k^n \leq \epsilon \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$, which implies that E_{k+1}^n will be less than $\epsilon \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$ in the event \mathcal{F}_k by Lemma B.1. By construction, $Z_{k+1}^n \geq \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$, and thus, $E_{k+1}^n \leq \epsilon Z_{k+1}^n$.
2. On the other hand, if $E_k^n > \epsilon \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$, then by Lemma B.1, E_{k+1}^n is less than or equal to $E_k^n - \epsilon$ under the event in \mathcal{F}_k . Since $Z_k^n \geq E_k^n / \epsilon$, we have $Z_k^n \geq \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n + 1$ and $Z_{k+1}^n = Z_k^n - 1$ under the event \mathcal{F}_k .
3. It is clear from Lemma B.1 that $E_{k+1}^n \leq E_k^n + \bar{w} \leq Z_k^n + \bar{w}$ in the event $\mathcal{F}_k^{\mathbf{C}}$, which implies $E_{k+1}^n \leq \epsilon Z_{k+1}^n$ under the event $\mathcal{F}_k^{\mathbf{C}}$.

As a result of the assertion above, Z_k^n stochastically dominates E_k^n / ϵ . We now have the following lemma.

LEMMA B.2. *Let T_Y and T_Z denote the transition kernel of (Y_k^n) and (Z_k^n) , respectively. Then, for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$, $q \geq \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$, $T_Y(q, \cdot)$ stochastically dominates $T_Z(q, \cdot)$. Consequently, Y_k^n stochastically dominates Z_k^n .*




FIG. C.1. An illustration of the communication structure of the Markov chains P_k (above) and Q_k (below).

Proof. Since $p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n \leq \mathbb{P}\{W_k^n \leq \epsilon, \hat{\alpha}_k^n \leq 1 - \delta\}$, $T_Y(q, \cdot)$ stochastically dominates $T_Z(q, \cdot)$ for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$, $q \geq \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$. The fact that Y_k^n stochastically dominates Z_k^n then follows from Proposition 1 in [72, p. 901] (see also the remarks following this proposition). \square

Consequently, we proved that ϵY_{k+1}^n stochastically dominates ϵZ_{k+1}^n , which in turn stochastically dominates E_{k+1}^n . The induction step is complete and we arrive at the result.

Appendix C. Proof of Proposition 4.3. Let $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ be a standard probability space. On this probability space, we define two different Markov chains: (P_k) and (Q_k) . Pick $w \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \in (0, 1]$. Markov chains P_k and Q_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, evolves as

$$P_{k+1} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } p \text{ if } P_k = 0 \\ P_k - 1 & \text{with probability } p \text{ if } P_k \geq 1 \\ P_k + w & \text{with probability } 1 - p \end{cases},$$

$$Q_{k+1} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } p \text{ if } Q_k = 0 \\ Q_k - 1 & \text{with probability } p \text{ if } Q_k \geq 1 \\ w(\lceil Q_k/w \rceil + 1) & \text{with probability } 1 - p \end{cases}.$$

Both Markov chains thus constructed are supported over the space of non-negative integers, are irreducible, and all non-negative integers are accessible. It is also clear that if $p > 2w/(2w + 1)$, then by Theorem 7.5.3 of [39], both Markov chains admit a unique invariant distribution. We next have the following claim:

CLAIM 1. *If $P_1 = Q_1$, then Q_k stochastically dominates P_k for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. We show that along every sample path, $Q_k(\tilde{\omega}) \geq P_k(\tilde{\omega})$. Suppose that $P_k = Q_k = q$ for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for any $\tilde{\omega} \in \tilde{\Omega}$, either $P_{k+1} = Q_{k+1} = \max\{0, q - 1\}$, or

$$Q_{k+1} = w(\lceil Q_k/w \rceil + 1) \geq w(Q_k/w + 1) = Q_k + w = P_k + w.$$

Thus, $Q_{k+1} \geq P_{k+1}$. The result then holds from Theorem 1.A.6 in [38]. \square As a result of the claim above, if both Markov chains (P_k) and (Q_k) admit invariant distributions

π^P and π^Q , respectively, then $\pi^P(0) \geq \pi^Q(0)$. We next identify certain sufficient conditions under which the two Markov chains admit invariant distributions.

THEOREM C.1. *The following holds true:*

1. *If $p > w/(w+1)$, then the Markov chain (P_k) has an invariant distribution $(\pi^P(n))_{n=0}^\infty$.*
2. *If $p > 2w/(2w+1)$, then Q_k has an invariant distribution $(\pi^Q(n))_{n=0}^\infty$.*

Proof. We show that both Markov chains are weak Feller chains since they are defined over a countable state space.

Let $\gamma_P = (w+1)p - w > 0$. Consider $V_P(i) = (i+1)/\gamma_P$ and compact set $C_P = \{0\}$. Then, given $P_k = i \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[V_P(P_{k+1})|P_k] - V_P(P_k) = \frac{pP_k + (1-p)(P_k + w + 1) - (P_k + 1)}{\gamma_P} = -1.$$

For $P_k = 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[V_P(P_{k+1})|P_k = 0] - V_P(0) = \frac{p + (1-p)(w+1) - 1}{\gamma_P} = -1 + \frac{p}{\gamma_P}.$$

Thus, by Theorem 12.3.4 of [50], an invariant probability distribution π^P for the Markov chain (P_k) exists.

Let $\gamma_Q = (2w+1)p - 2w > 0$. Consider $V_Q(i) = (i+1)/\gamma_Q$ and compact set $C_Q = \{0\}$. Then, given $Q_k = i \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V_Q(Q_{k+1})|Q_k] - V_Q(Q_k) &= \frac{pQ_k + (1-p)(w\lceil \frac{Q_k}{w} \rceil + w + 1) - (Q_k + 1)}{\gamma_Q} \\ &\leq \frac{pQ_k + (1-p)(Q_k + 2w + 1) - (Q_k + 1)}{\gamma_Q} \\ &= -1. \end{aligned}$$

For $Q_k = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V_Q(Q_{k+1})|Q_k = 0] - V_Q(0) &= \frac{p + (1-p)(w+1) - 1}{\gamma_Q} \\ &\leq \frac{p + (1-p)(2w+1) - 1}{\gamma_Q} = -1 + \frac{p}{\gamma_Q}. \end{aligned}$$

Again, we invoke Theorem 12.3.4 of [50] to conclude the existence of an invariant probability distribution π^Q for the Markov chain (Q_k) . \square

We characterize the invariant distribution π^Q in the following claim.

CLAIM 2. *Assume that $p > 2w/(2w+1)$. Then, the invariant distribution of the Markov chain (Q_k) satisfies $\pi^Q(0) = \frac{2p^w - 1}{p^w}$ and*

$$\pi^Q(nw + i) = \pi^Q(0) \frac{(1-p)}{p^{nw+i}} (1-p^w)^n \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0, i \in \{1, \dots, w\}.$$

Proof. See Subsection C.1 below. \square

COROLLARY C.2. *Assume that $p > 2w/(2w+1)$. Then, an invariant distribution π^P exists and $\pi^P(0) \geq \pi^Q(0) = \frac{2p^w - 1}{p^w}$.*

Proof. Note that $2w/(2w+1) > w/(w+1)$ for any $w \in \mathbb{N}$. The proof then follows immediately from Theorem C.1 and Claim 2. \square

It is now easy to observe that if $p = p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$, then the evolution of Y_k^n is the same as that of $P_k^n + \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$. Thus, their invariant distribution is a “shifted” version of the other, that is, $\pi^n(i) = \pi^P(i - \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)$ for all $i \geq \eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n$. Thus, $\pi^n(\eta_{\epsilon, \delta}^n) \geq \frac{2(p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)^w - 1}{(p_{\epsilon, \delta}^n)^w}$. This completes the proof of Proposition 4.3.

C.1. Proof of Claim 2. The invariant distribution π^Q exists by Theorem C.1 above. It must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^Q(0) &= p\pi^Q(0) + p\pi^Q(1) \implies \pi^Q(1) = \frac{(1-p)}{p}\pi^Q(0), \\ \pi^Q(i) &= p\pi^Q(i+1) \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, w-1\},\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\pi^Q(i) = \frac{(1-p)}{p^i}\pi^Q(0)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, w\}$. Thus, the statement holds for $n = 0$ and all $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, w\}$. For any $n = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^Q(w) &= (1-p)\pi^Q(0) + p\pi^Q(w+1), \\ \pi^Q(w+i) &= p\pi^Q(w+i+1) \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, w-1\},\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^Q(w+1) &= \frac{1}{p}(\pi^Q(w) - (1-p)\pi^Q(0)) = \frac{(1-p)}{p^{w+1}}\pi^Q(0)(1-p^w) \\ \pi^Q(w+i) &= \frac{(1-p)}{p^{w+i}}\pi^Q(0)(1-p^w) \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, w\}.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the statement holds for $n = 1$ as well. We now prove the result for arbitrary $n \geq 2$. Suppose that the result holds for all $m \leq n-1$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, w\}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^Q(mw+1) &+ \dots + \pi^Q(mw+w) \\ &= \frac{(1-p)}{p^{mw+w}}\pi^Q(0)(1-p^w)^m(1+\dots+p^{w-1}), \\ &= \frac{1}{p^{(m+1)w}}\pi^Q(0)(1-p^w)^{m+1}.\end{aligned}\tag{C.1}$$

Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^Q(nw) &= (1-p)\left(\pi^Q((n-2)w+1) + \dots + \pi^Q((n-2)w+w)\right) \\ &\quad + p\pi^Q(nw+1), \\ &= \frac{(1-p)}{p^{(n-1)w}}\pi^Q(0)(1-p^w)^{n-1} + p\pi^Q(nw+1), \\ \pi^Q(nw+i) &= p\pi^Q(nw+i+1) \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, w-1\}.\end{aligned}$$

Using similar approach as for the previous cases, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^Q(nw + 1) &= \frac{1}{p} \left(\pi^Q((n-1)w + w) - \frac{(1-p)}{p^{(n-1)w}} \pi^Q(0)(1-p^w)^{n-1} \right), \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \times \frac{(1-p)}{p^{nw}} \pi^Q(0)(1-p^w)^{n-1} (1-p^w), \\ \pi^Q(nw + i + 1) &= \frac{1}{p} \pi^Q(nw + i) = \frac{(1-p)}{p^{nw+i+1}} \pi^Q(0)(1-p^w)^n,\end{aligned}$$

which holds for all $i \in \{1, \dots, w-1\}$. Thus, the statement is true for n . By the principle of mathematical induction, the statement is established.

We can now compute $\pi^Q(0)$ by noting that

$$\pi^Q(0) + \pi^Q(0) \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^{(m+1)w}} (1-p^w)^{m+1} = 1,$$

where we used (C.1). The above expression yields

$$\pi^Q(0) \left(1 + \frac{\frac{1-p^w}{p^w}}{1 - \frac{1-p^w}{p^w}} \right) = \pi^Q(0) \frac{p^w}{2p^w - 1} = 1,$$

which implies $\pi^Q(0) = \frac{2p^w - 1}{p^w}$. The proof of the claim is complete.

Note that for $\pi^Q(0)$ to be non-negative, we need $p^w \geq 0.5$. We show in the following remark that this is indeed true as long as $p \geq 2w/(2w+1)$.

REMARK C.1. *We show that if $p > 2w/(2w+1)$, then $p^w > 0.6$, which further implies $\pi^Q(0) > 0$. To establish this result, we prove that the map $r \mapsto (1 + \frac{1}{r})^r$ is monotonically increasing in $r \in (1, \infty)$. Indeed,*

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left(1 + \frac{1}{r} \right)^r = \left(1 + \frac{1}{r} \right)^r \left(\ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{r} \right) - \frac{1}{r+1} \right).$$

Now, since for $t \in (1, 1 + \frac{1}{r})$, $t < \frac{r+1}{r}$ or $\frac{1}{t} > \frac{r}{r+1}$, we have

$$\ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{r} \right) - \frac{1}{r+1} = \int_1^{1+\frac{1}{r}} \left(\frac{1}{t} - \frac{r}{r+1} \right) dt > 0.$$

Thus, $\frac{d}{dr} \left(1 + \frac{1}{r} \right)^r > 0$, which implies $(1 + \frac{1}{r})^r$ is monotonically increasing in r in the domain $[1, \infty)$. Thus, if $p > 2w/(2w+1)$, we have

$$p^w \geq \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{1}{2w}\right)^w} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{1}{2w}\right)^{2w}}} \geq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{1}{r}\right)^r}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{e}} \approx 0.606.$$