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Abstract
In this paper, we consider the model-free reinforcement learning problem and study the popular Q-learning algorithm with linear function approximation for finding the optimal policy. Despite its popularity, it is known that Q-learning with linear function approximation may diverge in general due to off-policy sampling. Our main contribution is to provide a finite-time bound on the performance of Q-learning with linear function approximation with constant step size under an assumption on the sampling policy. Unlike some prior work in the literature, we do not need to make the unnatural assumption that the samples are i.i.d. (since they are Markovian), and do not require an additional projection step in the algorithm. To show this result, we first consider a more general nonlinear stochastic approximation algorithm with Markovian noise, and derive a finite-time bound on the mean-square error, which we believe is of independent interest. Our proof is based on Lyapunov drift arguments and exploits the geometric mixing of the underlying Markov chain. We also provide numerical simulations to illustrate the effectiveness of our assumption on the sampling policy, and demonstrate the rate of convergence of Q-learning with linear function approximation.

1 Introduction

Reinforcement learning (RL) is a framework to solve sequential decision-making problems [29]. In this context, an agent seeks to find an optimal policy by repeatedly interacting with the environment, with the goal of optimizing its long-term future reward. This approach has demonstrated tremendous successes for solving many practical problems in several different areas, such as robotics [20], power management [32], autonomous driving [26], and board games [27].

An RL problem is often modeled as a Markov decision process (MDP), where the underlying transition probabilities are unknown. In an MDP, the state of the system changes in a Markovian manner based on the action taken by the agent. The goal of the agent is to find an optimal policy to select actions so that the expected total future reward is maximized. Since the underlying transition probabilities (environment models) are unknown, traditional techniques from the theory of MDP and stochastic control are not directly applicable. This motivates model-free approach based on simulations for solving RL problems.

Among potential methods, Q-learning, studied in [35], has been recognized as a promising solution for finding the optimal policy since it does not require any knowledge of the environment model. In particular, Q-learning iteratively estimates the optimal Q-function (state-action value function) based on a sequence of samples generated by applying a sampling policy to the unknown model. The optimal policy is then computed based on the optimal Q-function. This makes Q-learning an off-policy approach since it learns the optimal policy through data generated by a (possibly) non-optimal policy. This further has the advantage that learning can be decoupled from sampling and can be performed using data that is already collected.
Given the popularity and success of Q-learning, its performance has been studied in the literature. The asymptotic convergence of Q-learning has been studied in [17, 33, 35] using a martingale-based approach, while the rate of convergence has been characterized in [2, 11, 13, 14, 31]. However, since Q-learning requires to store the Q-function values for all state-action pairs, it has been limited to problems with small state and action spaces, and this challenge is often referred to as the curse of dimensionality in RL. To overcome this drawback, we can approximate the Q-function by a parameterized function class with much smaller dimension. However, Q-learning with function approximation can in general diverge [1, 29]. The main reason is that Q-learning uses off-policy sampling to collect the data, making it potentially an expansion mapping [1, 15]. For this reason, the convergence of Q-learning with function approximation has been limited to special cases, such as, for optimal stopping problems [34], or when using state aggregation functions [1], or when using non-parametric regression method (nearest neighbor Q-learning) [25].

In this paper, we focus on studying Q-learning with linear function approximation [22, 37], where the Q-function is approximated by a linear combination of a given set of basis functions (or features). Q-learning with linear function approximation can diverge in general as illustrated by the counter examples in [1, 29]. So, we need to impose certain conditions on the sampling policy to guarantee the stability of this approach. One such condition was proposed in [22] to restrict the sampling policy to be close enough to the optimal policy. Later, based on the stability analysis in [22], the work in [37] studies the finite-time analysis of Q-learning with linear function approximation. In particular, the approach in [37] is mainly motivated by the work in [5], where the convergence rate of the popular temporal-difference learning method for solving policy evaluation problems was studied. One drawback of the techniques used in [5, 37] is that: to stabilize the iterates, their algorithm requires an additional projection step onto a bounded set related to the unknown stationary distribution of the underlying Markov chain, which in some cases is impractical.

Note that there are situations where simulation cannot be used and consequently generating sample trajectories is costly, a different objective is to minimize the cumulative loss in the first $T$ time slots, while the performance of the policy used in the end of the process (at $t = T$) is not the main concern. In such case, minimizing the total regret for $t \in [0, T]$ is taken as an objective [8, 18], which is fundamentally different to the problem studied in our paper.

### 1.1 Main Contributions

The contributions of this paper are threefold. Motivated by the work in [22], we first provide a new condition on the sampling policy in Q-learning to guarantee the stability of the algorithm. Second, we analyze a finite-time bound on the performance of Q-learning without requiring any projection steps. Our key technique is to view Q-learning as an stochastic approximation (SA) algorithm for finding the solution of a suitable nonlinear equation. We then study the convergence rate of such SA under general conditions, which we believe is of independent interest and may be applicable for other problems. Finally, we present some numerical experiments based on the example from [1] that shows divergence of Q-learning with linear function approximation. In particular, we illustrate the sufficiency of our proposed condition on the stability of the algorithm, and demonstrate the rate of convergence.

Unlike the work in [37], we do not require any projection steps in our finite-time analysis of Q-learning with linear function approximation. Our main motivation is to utilize the recent technique developed in [28] for studying the convergence rate of linear SA with Markovian noise. However, we note that Q-learning is a nonlinear SA even under linear function approximation. Therefore, extending the results in [28] to the work studied in this paper is not obvious. Indeed, our new stability condition on the sampling policy and some properties of Q-learning play an important role in our analysis.

### 2 MDP and Q-learning

Consider an MDP $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \gamma)$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is a finite state space of size $|\mathcal{S}| = n$, $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite action space of size $|\mathcal{A}| = m$, and $\mathcal{P} = \{P_a \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is a set of action dependent transition probability...
matrices. Moreover, \( R : S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) is the reward function and \( \gamma \in (0, 1) \) is the discount factor. The results in this paper may be generalized to the case of infinite but compact state and action spaces under some continuity assumptions. We restrict our attention to finite spaces for an ease of exposition.

At each time \( k \geq 0 \), the agent observes the current state \( S_k = s \) of the environment and takes an action \( A_k = a \) according to a policy \( \pi \), which can be stochastic \((a \sim \pi(\cdot|S_k))\) or deterministic \((a = \pi(S_k))\). The system then moves to the next state \( S_{k+1} = s' \) with probability \( P_a(s, s') \). Moreover, as the transition occurs, the agent receives an instantaneous reward \( R(s, a) \). The goal of the agent is to find an optimal policy \( \pi^* \) such that its long term cumulative reward is maximized. For solving this problem, we are interested in using the model-free Q-learning method proposed in [35].

Given a policy \( \pi \), we define the Q-function associated with a state-action pair \((s, a)\) as

\[
Q_\pi(s, a) = E_\pi \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k R(S_k, A_k) \left| S_0 = s, A_0 = a \right. \right],
\]

where the trajectory \( \{(S_k, A_k)\}_{k \geq 1} \) is generated by \( A_k \sim \pi(\cdot|S_k) \) and \( S_{k+1} \sim P(A_k(S_k, \cdot)) \). In words, \( Q_\pi(s, a) \) is the expected cumulative reward starting from state \( s \), taking action \( a \), and thereafter following policy \( \pi \). It is well-known that the Q-function associated with the optimal policy \( \pi^* \), denoted by \( Q^* \), satisfies the following Bellman equation \([4, 29]\):

\[
Q^*(s, a) = R(s, a) + E_{a' \in A} \left[ \gamma \max_{a' \in A} Q^*(s', a') \bigg| s, a \right],
\]

where the expectation is taken w.r.t. \( s' \sim P_a(s, \cdot) \), the successor state after taking action \( a \) at state \( s \). Once \( Q^* \) is obtained, an optimal policy \( \pi^* \) can be decided as

\[
\pi^*(s) = \arg \max_{a \in A} Q^*(s, a), \quad \forall s \in S,
\]

which does not require any knowledge about the transition probabilities, and so is a model-free approach. In terms of finding \( Q^* \), Q-learning can be viewed as an SA algorithm for finding the solution of the Bellman equation \([4]\). In particular, given a sample trajectory \( \{(S_k, A_k)\} \) generated by a policy \( \pi \), which can be fixed or time varying, Q-learning iteratively updates the estimate \( Q_k \) of \( Q^* \) as

\[
Q_{k+1}(S_k, A_k) = Q_k(S_k, A_k) + \epsilon_k(S_k, A_k) \left( R(S_k, A_k) + \gamma \max_{a \in A} Q_k(S_{k+1}, a) - Q_k(S_k, A_k) \right),
\]

where \( \{\epsilon_k(s, a)\} \) is the sequence of step sizes associated with the state-action pair \((s, a)\). Under some proper choice of step sizes, the sequence \( Q_k \) generated by Q-learning converges almost surely to \( Q^* \) as long as every state-action pair is visited infinitely often; see for example [4].

Since the estimates \( Q_k \) in Q-learning are represented by a look-up table rather than an analytical expression, when the number of state-action pairs is very large, Q-learning can be intractable due to the curse of dimensionality. To overcome this difficulty, we use low-dimensional approximation \( \tilde{Q} \) of \( Q^* \), restricting \( \tilde{Q} \) to a linear subspace \( \mathcal{Q} \) with dimension \( d \ll mn \). While using more advanced nonlinear approximations such as neural networks as in the recent works \([23, 36]\) may lead to more powerful approximations, the simplicity of the linear model allows us to analyze it in detail. In particular, given a set of basis functions \( \phi_\ell : S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, d\} \) called features, the approximation of \( Q^* \), parameterized by a weight vector \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \), is given by

\[
\tilde{Q}_\theta(s, a) = \phi(s, a)\top \theta, \quad \forall(s, a),
\]

where \( \phi(s, a) := (\phi_1(s, a), \ldots, \phi_d(s, a))\top \in \mathbb{R}^d \). With the feature matrix \( \Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{mn \times d} \) being defined as

\[
\Phi = \begin{bmatrix}
\phi_1 & \cdots & \phi_d \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\phi_1 & \cdots & \phi_d
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\phantom{\phi(s_1, a_1)\top} & \cdots & \phantom{\phi(s_1, a_1)\top} \\
\cdots & \ddots & \cdots \\
\phantom{\phi(s_m, a_m)\top} & \cdots & \phantom{\phi(s_m, a_m)\top}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( n = |S| \), \( m = |A| \).
we have $\hat{Q}_\theta = \Phi \theta$. The $Q$-learning with linear function approximation for iteratively updating $\theta$ is then given by

$$
\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k + \epsilon \phi(S_k, A_k) \left( R(S_k, A_k) + \gamma \max_{a \in A} \phi(S_{k+1}, a)^\top \theta_k - \phi(S_k, A_k)^\top \theta_k \right),
$$

(5)

where $\epsilon > 0$ is the constant step size. Our goal is to provide a finite-time error bound for the convergence of $\theta_k$. Note that unlike the work in [37], in Algorithm (5), we do not assume a projection step to a predefined set related to the unknown transition probabilities of the underlying Markov chain. Our approach can be extended to the case of time-varying step sizes, which will be explored fully in future work. Finally, as mentioned above, $Q$-learning can be viewed as a nonlinear SA for solving the Bellman equation (2). Motivated by this observation, we first study the convergence rate of an SA algorithm for finding the solution of a general nonlinear equation in the next section. By utilizing this result, we then provide a finite-time bound for $Q$-learning with linear function approximation.

3 Finite-Time Analysis of Nonlinear SA

We consider here the problem of solving for $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in the equation

$$
\bar{F}(\theta) := E_\mu[F(X, \theta)] = 0,
$$

(6)

where $X$ is a random variable with finite state space $\mathcal{X}$ and distribution $\mu$, which is assumed to be unknown. The function $F : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a general nonlinear mapping. To solve this problem, we consider the celebrated SA algorithm proposed by in [24]. In particular, suppose that we can collect a sequence of samples $\{X_k\}$ of the random variable $X$. Then, with initialization $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, SA iteratively updates an estimate $\theta_k$ of $\theta^*$ as

$$
\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k + \epsilon F(X_k, \theta_k).
$$

(7)

A concrete example of this equation is the $Q$-learning update (5) given in the previous section. Under reasonable assumptions on the nonlinear mapping $F$, and i.i.d. assumption on the sequence $\{X_k\}$, the convergence properties of SA have been studied extensively in [6, 30]. In particular, in the context of optimization, [7] and the reference therein studied the same problem under the name of stochastic gradient descend (SGD). On the other hand, when the samples $\{X_k\}$ are obtained from a Markov chain with stationary distribution $\mu$, the asymptotic convergence of SA is provided in [3, 4, 6] using the ODE approach. That is, the sequence $\{\theta_k\}$ generated by Eq. (7) is shown to converge to the equilibrium point of the ODE

$$
\dot{\theta}(t) = \bar{F}(\theta(t)),
$$

(8)

under certain stability assumptions on the ODE [8]; see [3] for more details. As for the convergence rate, in the setting of linear SA, finite-time analysis has been performed in [9] with i.i.d. noise, and in [5, 28] with Markovian noise. In optimization, [12] studied the SGD under Markovian noise, but a projection step is required there to maintain the stability.

In this section, we expand the frontier by providing a finite-time bound for general a nonlinear SA (7) with Markovian noise and no additional projection step to control the size of the iterates $\{\theta_k\}$. To do that, we start by presenting a sequence of standard assumptions, which is often made in the literature of SA. All Assumptions stated below will be satisfied in the setting of $Q$-learning. Throughout this paper, $\| \cdot \|$ stands for the Euclidean norm for vectors, and induced 2-norm for matrices.

**Assumption 3.1.** The Markov chain $\{X_k\}$ is irreducible and aperiodic.

**Remark 3.1.** Assumption 3.1 is often assumed to study the asymptotic convergence of SA under Markovian noise; see for example [7, 4, 29]. By Theorem 4.9 in [27], this assumption implies the existence and uniqueness of a stationary distribution $\mu$, and geometrically convergence from $P(X_k = \cdot | X_0 = x)$ to $\mu$ in total-variation distance for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
Assumption 3.2. The function $F(x, \theta)$ is globally Lipschitz continuous w.r.t. $\theta$ uniformly in $x$, i.e.,

$$\exists L > 0, \text{ s.t. } \|F(x, \theta_1) - F(x, \theta_2)\| \leq L \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|, \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$ 

Remark 3.2. The Lipschitz continuity of $F$ is sufficient to study a nonlinear system, e.g., it guarantees that ODE (8) has a unique solution. When $F(x, \theta)$ is linear in terms of $\theta$ as considered in [4, 28], i.e., $F(x, \theta) = A(x)\theta + b(x)$, Assumption 3.2 is automatically satisfied.

Since we are in a finite state setting, we need only $F(x, \theta)$ being globally Lipschitz continuous for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. We directly assume the uniform result for the simplicity of notation, otherwise there is a Lipschitz constant $L_x > 0$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $L := \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} L_x$.

Note that Lipschitz continuity implies at most linear growth rate in terms of $\|\theta\|$ for both $\|F(x, \theta)\|$ and $\|F(\theta)\|$. To see this, assume w.l.o.g. that $L \geq \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|F(x, 0)\|$. By letting $\theta_1 = \theta$ and $\theta_2 = 0$ in Assumption 3.2 we have by triangular inequality that

$$\|F(x, \theta)\| \leq L\|\theta\| + \|F(x, 0)\| \leq L(\|\theta\| + 1), \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d, x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Moreover, using the previous Eq. together with Jensen’s inequality yields

$$\|F(\theta)\| = \|E_{\mu}[F(X, \theta)]\| \leq E_{\mu}[\|F(X, \theta)\|] \leq L(\|\theta\| + 1), \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Assumption 3.3. The equation $\dot{\theta} = F(\theta)$ has a solution $\theta^*$, and there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that:

$$(\theta - \theta^*)^T (\dot{F}(\theta) - \hat{F}(\theta^*)) \leq -\alpha \|\theta - \theta^*\|^2, \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (9)$$

Remark 3.3. This assumption can be viewed as a strongly monotone property of the nonlinear mapping $-F$, or an exponential dissipativeness property of the dynamical system [8, 10].

Before presenting our results, we first provide some intuition. As mentioned in [3, 4], the asymptotic behavior of SA [7] can be captured by ODE [8]. To study the stability of ODE [8], we first choose a candidate Lyapunov function

$$V(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \|\theta - \theta^*\|^2,$$

and then consider the time derivative of $V(\theta)$ along the trajectory of the dynamical system [8]:

$$\dot{V}(\theta(t)) = (\theta(t) - \theta^*)^T (\dot{F}(\theta(t)) - \hat{F}(\theta^*)) \leq -\alpha \|\theta(t) - \theta^*\|^2 = -2\alpha V(\theta(t)), \quad (10)$$

where we used $\dot{F}(\theta^*) = 0$ as assumed in Assumption 3.3. The preceding inequality implies

$$V(\theta(t)) \leq V(\theta(0)) e^{-2\alpha t}, \forall t \geq 0.$$

Thus, any solution of ODE [8] converges to its equilibrium $\theta^*$ exponentially fast. The next thing to do is to "translate" the convergence rate of ODE [8] to the convergence rate of the sequence $\{\theta_k\}$ generated by SA [7]. To do that, we rewrite Eqs. (7) and (8) as

$$\frac{\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k}{\epsilon} = F(X_k, \theta_k), \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\theta}(t) = \hat{F}(\theta(t)).$$

The above formula indicates that, on average, SA [7] incrementally updates the amount $E[F(X_k, \theta_k)|X_0 = x]$, while ODE [8] updates the amount $E_{\mu}[F(X, \theta(t))]$. We would expect that the convergence rate of SA [7] to a neighborhood around $\theta^*$ is also exponential when $E[F(X_k, \theta)|X_0 = x]$ approaches $E_{\mu}[F(X, \theta)]$ fast enough for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The reason for converging to a neighborhood of $\theta^*$ rather than $\theta^*$ itself is that we are using constant step size. Even if we start at $\theta^*$, when the step size is a constant, the estimates $\theta_k$ wander in the neighborhood of $\theta^*$ because of the noise in the estimates $X_k$. The convergence from $E[F(X_k, \theta)|X_0 = x]$ to $E_{\mu}[F(X, \theta)]$ can be deduced from Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2. To see this,
Assumption 3.1 implies geometric convergence in total-variation distance from \( P(X_k = x | X_0 = x) \) to \( \mu \). In addition, the function \( F(x, \theta) \) is "well-behaved" under Assumption 3.2. Together, we would expect that
\[
E[F(X_k, \theta) | X_0 = x] \to E_{\mu}[F(X, \theta)]
\] (11)
geometrically fast for any \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Based on this observation, we first define the mixing time of the underlying Markov chain w.r.t. the function \( F \), then formally state the result of (11).

**Definition 3.1.** For any \( \delta > 0 \), let
\[
\tau_{\delta} := \min \{ t \in \mathbb{N}^+ : \|E[F(X_k, \theta) | X_0 = x] - \bar{F}(\theta)\| \leq \delta(\|\theta\| + 1), \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d, x \in \mathcal{X}, k \geq t \}.
\]

**Lemma 3.1.** Suppose Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold, then there exists an absolute constant \( L_1 > 0 \) such that for any \( \delta > 0 \):
\[
\tau_{\delta} \leq L_1 [\ln (1/\delta) + 1]
\]
(See Appendix A.1 for the proof).

**Remark 3.4.** Here \( \tau_{\delta} \) is referred to as the mixing time of the underlying Markov chain, which by Lemma 3.1 satisfies \( \lim_{\delta \to 0} \delta \tau_{\delta} = 0 \). Since we will always use \( \delta = \epsilon \), where \( \epsilon \) is the constant step size in SA (7), for convenience, we drop the subscript \( \epsilon \) in \( \tau_{\epsilon} \) in the following.

Next we present our main result, a finite-time error bound for SA (7), whose proof is presented in the Section 4.

**Theorem 3.1.** Consider \( \{\theta_k\} \) generated by SA (7). Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 3.3 hold, and \( \epsilon \tau \leq \min(\frac{\alpha}{2L}, \frac{\alpha}{114L^2}) \) (\( \alpha \) is given in (7)), then we have for all \( k \geq \tau \):
\[
E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2] \leq \beta_1 (1 - \alpha \epsilon)^{k-\tau} + \frac{\beta_2}{\alpha} \epsilon \tau,
\] (12)
where \( \beta_1 = (\|\theta_0\| + (\|\theta_0 - \theta^*\| + 1)^2, \) and \( \beta_2 = 114L^2(\|\theta^*\| + 1)^2 \).

First, the result in Theorem 3.1 implies that under a proper choice of the step size \( \epsilon \), the nonlinear SA achieves an exponential convergence rate in expectation to a ball centered at the optimal solution \( \theta^* \). In addition, since \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \epsilon \tau = 0 \), the ball shrinks to the point \( \theta^* \) as the step size \( \epsilon \) decreases. Therefore, a natural algorithm to guarantee the convergence of \( \theta_k \) to the solution \( \theta^* \) is to use SA (7) with diminishing step sizes, which will be explored fully in the future. Although we do not pursue this study in this paper, we would expect that this happens under the standard non-summable and squared summable conditions on the step sizes [3].

Second, note that the mean square error can be written as a combination of the bias and the variance:
\[
E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2] = \underbrace{E[\|\theta_k\| - \theta^*\|^2]}_{\text{bias}^2} + \underbrace{E[\|\theta_k - E[\theta_k]\|^2]}_{\text{variance}}.
\] (13)
The first term on the right hand side of Eq. (12) shows the impact of the bias, which converges geometrically fast to zero. Observe that the bias term is proportional to \( \beta_1 \), which mainly depends on the difference between the initial estimate \( \theta_0 \) and the targeting limit \( \theta^* \). Moreover, since the larger the step size \( \epsilon \) is, the faster we move from \( \theta_0 \) to \( \theta^* \) in expectation, the bias decreases faster as we increase the step size. The second term on the right hand side of Eq. (12) corresponds to the variance of the Markovian noise. Since we use constant step size, the variance does not go to zero. However, the fact that \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \epsilon \tau = 0 \) from Lemma 3.1 suggests that the variance vanishes when the step size diminishes to zero. The above analysis suggests a trade-off in choosing step size \( \epsilon \) when trying to balance the convergence rate of the bias and the variance.
Finally, to understand how tight our resulting finite-time bound is, consider the following special case. When \( F = \Delta f \) for some strongly convex function \( f \), SA (7) is essentially the SGD for minimizing \( f \). Indeed, under strong convexity it is well-known that SGD using constant step sizes can only converge to a ball centered at the minimizer of \( f \) with a linear rate. We observe the same result of nonlinear SA under Markovian noise in our paper. Thus, we would expect that our result is tight although we do not have a formal analysis for this conclusion.

In the next section, we formally present the proof of Theorem 3.1.

4 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Recall the idea for showing the exponential stability of ODE (8), using the explicit expression of the Lyapunov function \( V(\theta) \), the key step in establishing Eq. (10) is:

\[
\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta(t) - \theta^*\|^2 \leq -2\alpha\|\theta(t) - \theta^*\|^2.
\]

In the case of discrete iterates \( \theta_k \) generated by SA (7), similarly we want to show

\[
E[\|\theta_{k+1} - \theta^*\|^2] \leq (1 - \zeta_1)E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2] + \zeta_2,
\]

for some \( \zeta_1 \in (0, 1) \) and \( \zeta_2 > 0 \), where \( \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \) may be functions of \( \epsilon \) and \( \tau \). A finite-time bound on the mean squared error should immediately follow from recursively using Eq. (14). Based on the idea stated above, we begin by considering:

\[
E[\|\theta_{k+1} - \theta^*\|^2 - \|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] = E[\|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\|^2|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + 2E[(\theta_k - \theta^*)^T(\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k)]|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}]
\]

\[
= E[\|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\|^2|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + 2\epsilon E[(\theta_k - \theta^*)^T(F(X_k, \theta_k) - \bar{F}(\theta_k))|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}]
\]

\[
+ 2\epsilon E[(\theta_k - \theta^*)^T(\bar{F}(\theta_k) - \bar{F}(\theta^*))|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] = (a)
\]

\[
(b)
\]

where in the last equality we used the update rule (7) and \( \bar{F}(\theta^*) = 0 \). The next thing to do is to control the terms (a)–(c) to obtain the inequality (14). In particular, we show that the term (c) provides the desired drift term in Eq. (14), and the terms (a) and (b) are negligible compared to (c), hence the drift is maintained. We begin by consider the term (c), whose upper bound directly follows from Assumption 3.3:

\[
(c) \leq -2\alpha\epsilon E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}].
\]

For the term (a), using the update rule (7), we have the following result.

Lemma 4.1. The following inequality holds for all \( k \geq \tau \):

\[
E[\|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\|^2|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \leq 2L^2\epsilon^2 \left[ E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + (\|\theta^*\| + 1)^2 \right]
\]

(See Appendix A.3 for the proof).

Lemma 4.1 provides an upper bound when comparing \( \theta_{k+1} \) and \( \theta_k \). Before we turn to the term (b), we first extend the result of Lemma 4.1 to the case where we compare \( \theta_k \) and \( \theta_{k-\tau} \) for any \( k \geq \tau \).

Lemma 4.2. The following inequalities hold for all \( k \geq \tau \):

\[
\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\| \leq 2Le\tau(\|\theta_{k-\tau}\| + 1),
\]

\[
\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\| \leq 4Le\tau(\|\theta_k\| + 1)
\]

(See Appendix A.4 for the proof).
We now control the size of the term (b) in the following lemma, whose proof involves the result of Lemma 4.2, the Lipschitz property of the nonlinear mapping $F$, and the geometric mixing of the underlying Markov chain $\{X_k\}$.

**Lemma 4.3.** The following inequality holds for any $k \geq \tau$:

$$E[(\theta_k - \theta^*)^T(F(X_k, \theta_k) - F(\theta_k))]_{X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}} \leq 56L^2 \epsilon \tau \left( E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2 | X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + (\|\theta^*\| + 1)^2 \right)$$

(See Appendix A.4 for the proof).

Observe that in the results of Lemmas 4.1 and 4.3, the conditional expectation $E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2 | X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}]$ is multiplied by $O(\epsilon^2)$ and $O(\epsilon \tau)$ respectively. Since Lemma 3.1 implies $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \epsilon \tau = 0$, by choosing $\epsilon$ small enough, the terms (a) and (b) are both of the order smaller than (c). Therefore, after combining the upper bounds, we have the following result.

**Lemma 4.4.** The following inequality holds for all $k \geq \tau$:

$$E[\|\theta_{k+1} - \theta^*\|^2] \leq (1 - \alpha \epsilon) E[\|\theta_{k} - \theta^*\|^2] + 114L^2 \epsilon^2 \tau (\|\theta^*\| + 1)^2$$

(See Appendix A.5 for the proof).

The result in Lemma 4.4 is exactly the key inequality (14) we want, which is used to prove Theorem 3.1 next.

**Proof of Theorem 3.1.** Let $z_k = E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2]$, Lemma 4.4 gives

$$z_{k+1} \leq az_k + b,$$

where $a = 1 - \alpha \epsilon \in (0, 1)$, and $b = 114L^2 \epsilon^2 \tau (\|\theta^*\| + 1)^2$. Note that the preceding Eq. can be equivalently written as

$$z_{k+1} - \frac{b}{1-a} \leq a \left( z_k - \frac{b}{1-a} \right),$$

which implies that $\{z_k - b/(1-a)\}$ is upper bounded by a geometric sequence with initial value $z_0 - b/(1-a)$ and common ratio $a$. Therefore, we have for all $k \geq \tau$:

$$z_k \leq a^{k-\tau} \left( z_\tau - \frac{b}{1-a} \right) + \frac{b}{1-a} \leq a^{k-\tau} z_\tau + \frac{b}{1-a}.$$

Plugging in the definition of $z_k$, $a$, and $b$, we obtain

$$E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2] \leq (1 - \alpha \epsilon)^k \tau E[\|\theta_\tau - \theta^*\|^2] + \frac{114L^2(\|\theta^*\| + 1)^2}{\alpha} \epsilon \tau.$$

The last thing to do is to control $E[\|\theta_\tau - \theta^*\|^2]$. By Lemma 4.2 and our assumption that $\epsilon \tau \leq \frac{1}{4\tau}$, we have

$$E[\|\theta_\tau - \theta^*\|^2] \leq E[(\|\theta_\tau - \theta_0\| + \|\theta_0 - \theta^*\|)^2] \leq (\|\theta_0\| + \|\theta_0 - \theta^*\| + 1)^2.$$  

Finally, we have the following finite-time error bound for SA (7):

$$E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2] \leq \beta_1 (1 - \alpha \epsilon)^{k-\tau} + \frac{\beta_2}{\alpha} \epsilon \tau,$$

where $\beta_1 = (\|\theta_0\| + \|\theta_0 - \theta^*\| + 1)^2$, and $\beta_2 = 114L^2(||\theta^*|| + 1)^2$.

After establishing a finite-time bound for the general nonlinear SA (7), we use Theorem 3.1 to derive the finite-time bound for Q-learning with linear function approximation in the following section.
5 Finite-Time Analysis of Q-Learning with Linear Function Approximation

In this section, we present finite-time analysis of Q-learning with linear function approximation and a constant step size. We first show that Q-learning can be reformulated as a variant of the nonlinear SA studied in the previous section. The finite-time error bound of Q-learning then follows from the result in Theorem 3.1. First, recall the update of Q-learning from Eq. (5)

\[ \theta_{k+1} = \theta_k + \epsilon \phi(S_k, A_k) \left( \mathcal{R}(S_k, A_k) + \gamma \max_{a \in A} \phi(S_{k+1}, a)^\top \theta_k - \phi(S_k, A_k)^\top \theta_k \right). \]

When \( \pi \) is predetermined and fixed, the MDP becomes a time-homogeneous Markov chain \( \{S_k\} \). Let \( X_k = (S_k, A_k, S_{k+1}) \), \( \forall k \geq 0 \).

It is clear that \( \{X_k\} \) is a also a Markov chain with state space

\[ \mathcal{X} = \{(s, a, s') : s \in \mathcal{S}, \tau(a|s) > 0, P_s(s, s') > 0\}. \]

Thus, Eq. (5) can now be rewritten in the same form as the nonlinear SA studied in the previous section:

\[ \theta_{k+1} = \theta_k + \epsilon F(X_k, \theta_k), \]

where the nonlinear mapping \( F \) is defined as

\[ F(x, \theta) = F((s, a, s'), \theta) = \phi(s, a) \left[ \mathcal{R}(s, a) + \gamma \max_{a' \in A} \phi(s', a')^\top \theta - \phi(s, a)^\top \theta \right]. \]

Similarly, we define \( \bar{F}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_\nu[F(X, \theta)] \) to be the expectation of \( F \) taken w.r.t. the stationary distribution. We next present the finite-time error bound of Q-learning with linear function approximation. Before that, we assume that the feature vectors \( \{\phi_t\}_{1 \leq t \leq d} \) are linearly independent and are normalized so that \( \|\phi(s, a)\| \leq 1 \) for all \( (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \). Note that this is without loss of generality since we can disregard dependent feature vectors. Let \( r_{\text{max}} := \max_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} |\mathcal{R}(s, a)| < \infty \).

**Theorem 5.1.** Consider \( \{\theta_k\} \) generated by Q-learning [18]. Suppose that

(a) The Markov chain \( \{S_k\} \) induced by \( \pi \) is irreducible and aperiodic.

(b) The equation \( \bar{F}(\theta) = 0 \) has a solution \( \theta^* \), and

\[ \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_\nu[\max_{a' \in A} (\phi(s, a')^\top \theta)^2] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[(\phi(s, a)^\top \theta)^2] \leq -\alpha \|\theta\|^2, \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d. \] (20)

(c) The constant step size \( \epsilon \) is chosen such that \( \epsilon \gamma \leq \min \left( \frac{1}{4L}, \frac{\alpha}{2 \mathbb{E}_\nu[\phi(s, a)^\top \theta]} \right) \), where \( L := \gamma + 1 + r_{\text{max}} \).

Then we have for all \( k \geq \tau \):

\[ E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2] \leq \beta_1 \left( 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \right)^{k-\tau} + \frac{2 \beta_2 \epsilon \gamma}{\alpha} \tau, \] (21)

where \( \beta_1 = (\|\theta_0\| + \|\theta_0 - \theta^*\| + 1)^2 \), and \( \beta_2 = 114L^2(\|\theta^*\|^2 + 1)^2 \).

**Remark 5.1.** Condition (b) essentially guarantees the stability of Q-learning [18]. When \( \gamma = 0 \), there always exists an \( \alpha > 0 \) satisfying Eq. (20), and the problem is easy to analyze since [18] becomes a linear SA. However, when \( \gamma > 0 \) as considered in this paper, the Q-learning update is a nonlinear SA, which makes establishing its convergence properties more complicated.

**Remark 5.2.** The solution \( \theta^* \) to Eq. \( \bar{F}(\theta) = 0 \) can be characterized as a solution to a projected Bellman equation [22]. It is known that a fixed point to such equation may not exist in general [10]. Nevertheless, once there is a solution, and Eq. (20) is satisfied, \( \theta^* \) would be the unique globally exponentially stable equilibrium point to ODE (8) with \( F \) being given in [19].
Proof of Theorem 5.1. To apply Theorem 3.1, we need to show Assumptions 3.1-3.3 are satisfied in the setting of Q-learning, which is done by the following sequence of Lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. The function \( F(x, \theta) \) defined in (17) is globally Lipschitz continuous w.r.t. \( \theta \) uniformly in \( x \), and \( L = \gamma + 1 + r_{\max} \) is a valid Lipschitz constant (See Appendix B.1 for the proof).

Lemma 5.2. The Markov chain \( \{X_k\} \) defined in (16) with state space \( \mathcal{X} \) given in (17) is irreducible and aperiodic (See Appendix B.2 for the proof).

Lemma 5.3. The following inequality holds for all \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \):

\[
(\theta - \theta^*)^T(\bar{F}(\theta) - \bar{F}(\theta^*)) \leq -\frac{\alpha}{2} \|\theta - \theta^*\|^2,
\]

where \( \alpha \) is given in (20) (See Appendix B.3 for the proof).

Under the sequence of Lemmas stated above, Theorem 3.1 is applicable, and we have the desired finite-time error bound (21) of Q-learning with linear function approximation.

Theorem 5.1 is qualitatively similar to Theorem 3.1 in that Q-learning achieves an exponential convergence rate in expectation to a ball centered at \( \theta^* \), and the size of this ball shrinks as a function of the step size \( \epsilon \). Condition Eq. (20) is similar to Assumption 3.3 in the case of nonlinear SA, which is used to establish the stability of SA (7). Note that condition (20) depends on the choice of the sampling policy \( \pi \), the choice of feature vectors \( \{\phi_k\}_{1 \leq k \leq d} \), and the underlying transition probabilities \( \mathcal{P} \). A weaker form of (20) is

\[
\gamma^2 E_{\mu}[\max_{a \in A}(\phi(s, a^*)^T\theta)^2] < E_{\mu}[(\phi(s, a)^T\theta)^2], \quad \forall \theta \neq 0,
\]

which does not give exponential rate, but can be used to establish the almost sure convergence (22). In the next section, we present further discussion about when condition (22) may be satisfied and also present numerical simulations to verify its sufficiency.

6 Discussion and Numerical Experiments

Consider Eq. (22). The term inside the expectation on the right-hand side can be interpreted as \( \bar{Q}_{\theta}^2(s, a_1) \) with \( a_1 \sim \pi(s|s) \). On the other hand, the term \( \max_{a \in A}(\phi(s, a)^T\theta)^2 \) on the left-hand side is essentially \( \bar{Q}_{\theta}^2(s, a_2) \) where \( a_2 \) is chosen greedily, i.e., \( a_2 \in \arg \max_{a \in A} |\bar{Q}_{\theta}(s, a)| \). So, it is clear that

\[
E_{\mu}[\max_{a \in A}(\phi(s, a)^T\theta)^2] \geq E_{\mu}[(\phi(s, a)^T\theta)^2], \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d.
\]

Next, to meet condition (22), besides the presence of \( \gamma^2 < 1 \), there should be some requirements on the sampling policy \( \pi \). Consider

\[
\delta(\pi) := \min_{\theta \neq 0} \frac{E_{\mu}[(\phi(s, a)^T\theta)^2]}{E_{\mu}[\max_{a \in A}(\phi(s, a)^T\theta)^2]} = \min_{\theta \neq 0} \frac{\sum_{s \in S} \mu(s) \sum_{a \in A} \pi(a|s)(\phi(s, a)^T\theta)^2}{\sum_{s \in S} \mu(s) \max_{a \in A}(\phi(s, a)^T\theta)^2}.
\]

We note that \( \delta(\pi) \in [0, 1] \) for any policy \( \pi \), and the smaller \( 1 - \delta(\pi) \), the closer \( \pi \) to \( \pi^* \). In addition, when \( \delta(\pi) > \gamma^2 \) and \( \pi \) is used as the sampling policy, we have (22) and \( \lim_{k \to \infty} \theta_k = \theta^* \) w.p. 1, as shown in (22). If \( \delta(\pi) \approx 1 \), \( \pi \) is close to the optimal policy \( \pi^* \), and we expect the convergence of Q-learning. On the other hand, when \( \delta(\pi) \) is close to 0, the policy \( \pi \) and \( \pi^* \) are significantly different. Hence, to guarantee the stability of Q-learning, the discount factor \( \gamma \) should be sufficiently small. Finally, if \( \delta(\pi) = 0 \), for any discount factor \( \gamma \), there is no guarantee on the convergence of Q-learning using this sampling policy \( \pi \). This, however, does not imply the divergence of Q-learning since (22) is only a sufficient condition.

We next present one way to compute \( \delta(\pi) \) for an MDP with a chosen policy \( \pi \) when the underlying model is known. We will then use this to perform numerical simulations. Before that, the following definitions are needed.
Definition 6.1. Let $D_{\mu,\pi} \in \mathbb{R}^{mn \times mn}$ be a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $\{\mu(s)\pi(a|s)\}_{(s,a) \in S \times A}$, and let $\Sigma_{\mu,\pi} := \Phi^T D_{\mu,\pi} \Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, where $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{mn \times d}$ is the feature matrix given in (4).

Definition 6.2. Let $B = \mathcal{A}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be the set of all deterministic policies.

Definition 6.3. Let $D_{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $\{\mu(s)\}_{s \in S}$, and let $\Sigma_{\mu,b} := \Phi^T D_{\mu} \Phi_b \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, where $\Phi_b = [\phi(s_1, b_1), \phi(s_2, b_2), \ldots, \phi(s_n, b_n)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ for any $b \in B$.

We now compute $\delta(\pi)$ given in the following lemma.

Lemma 6.1. Suppose that $\mu(s)\pi(a|s) > 0$ for all $(s,a) \in S \times A$. Let $\delta(\pi)$ be defined in (23) and let $\lambda_{\text{max}}(M)$ be the largest eigenvalue of a positive semi-definite matrix $M$. Then we have

$$
\delta(\pi) = \min_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \left[ 1/\lambda_{\text{max}}(\Sigma_{\mu,\pi}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{\mu,b} \Sigma_{\mu,\pi}^{-1/2}) \right]
$$

(See Appendix C for the proof).

We next present our numerical experiments to illustrate the relation between $\delta(\pi)$ and the performance of Q-learning. In our simulation, we consider the divergent example of Q-learning introduced in [1], where there are 7 states and 2 actions, and the reward function is set to zero. The dashed action takes the system to one of the six upper states with equal probability, whereas the solid action takes the system to the seventh state with probability one. The sampling policy $\pi$ selects the dashed and solid actions with equal probability.

Consider estimating the Q-function under the linear parameterization indicated by the expression showing along each arrow in Figure 1. For example, the estimated value of state 1 taking the solid action is $\theta_0 + 2\theta_1$, where the subscript corresponds to the component of the overall weight vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{14}$. It is easy to check that the feature matrix $\Phi$ is full column rank in this example.

Since the reward function is identically zero, $Q^*$ is zero, implying $\theta^*$ is zero. Because of this structure, it is possible for the Q-learning algorithm to converge even when constant step size is used. We now compute $\delta(\pi)$ according to Lemma 6.1. It turns out that $\delta(\pi) \approx 0.5$, giving the threshold for $\gamma$ being $\delta(\pi)^{1/2} \approx 0.7$. In our simulation, we choose $\epsilon = 0.01$, $\gamma \in \{0.7, 0.9, 0.97\}$, and plot $||\theta_k||$ as a function of the number of iterations $k$ in Figure 2. Here, $\theta_k$ converges when $\gamma = 0.7$ and also when $\gamma = 0.9$ and diverges when $\gamma = 0.97$. This demonstrates that condition (22) is sufficient but not necessary for convergence. This also shows that by changing the discount factor and ensuring (22), the counter example from [11] can be made to converge.

Finally, to show the convergence rate of Q-learning, we consider the convergence of $\theta_k$ when $\gamma = 0.7$ given in Figure 2 where we plot $\log E[||\theta_k||^2]$ as a function of the number of iterations $k$. The expectation is estimated over a hundred sample paths $\{\theta_k\}$. In this case, $\theta_k$ seems to converge exponentially to 0, which agrees with our theoretical result given in Theorem 5.1.
Figure 2: Convergence of Q-learning with linear function approximation for different discount factor $\gamma$

Figure 3: Exponentially fast convergence of Q-learning with linear function approximation for $\gamma = 0.7$.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we establish a finite-time bound for the performance of Q-learning with linear function approximation and a constant step size, without either making an i.i.d. noise assumption, or requiring an additional projection step to bound the iterates. Our approach is to obtain finite-time bounds on a more general nonlinear SA algorithm with Markovian noise. Sufficient conditions on the sampling policy to guarantee the stability of Q-learning are also presented and verified numerically in the context of a well-known counter example. Future work includes obtaining finite-time error bounds under diminishing step sizes. Since (20) is quite restrictive on the sampling policy $\pi$, another future direction is to relax condition (20) by either designing a specific Lyapunov function for ODE (8), or using a time varying sampling policy. Studying finite-time error bounds for the on-policy variant of Q-learning called SARSA is probably a first step in this direction.
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A Proof of all lemmas for Theorem 3.1

A.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1
Since \( \{X_k\} \) is irreducible and aperiodic, by Theorem 4.9 in [21], it has a unique stationary distribution \( \mu \), and there exist constants \( C > 0 \) and \( \rho \in (0, 1) \) such that

\[
\|P(X_k = |X_0 = x), \mu\| \leq C \rho^k, \quad \forall k \geq 0, \forall x \in \mathcal{X},
\]

where \( d_{TV}(\cdot, \cdot) \) is the total-variation distance defined as

\[
d_{TV}(P, Q) = \sup_{\{f: \|f\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\}} \left| \int f dP - \int f dQ \right|.
\] (24)

Next, let \( F_i(x, \theta) \) be the \( i \)-th component of \( F(x, \theta) \). By Assumption 3.2 we have

\[
|F_i(x, \theta)| \leq \|F(x, \theta)\| \leq L(||\theta|| + 1), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d.
\]

Therefore, we obtain for any \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( x \in \mathcal{X} \)

\[
\|E[F(X_k, \theta)|X_0 = x] - E_{\mu}[F(X, \theta)]\|
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{d} |E[F_i(X_k, \theta)|X_0 = x] - E_{\mu}[F_i(X, \theta)]|
= 2L(||\theta|| + 1) \sum_{i=1}^{d} E \left[ \frac{F_i(X_k, \theta)}{2L(||\theta|| + 1)} \bigg| X_0 = x \right] - E_{\mu} \left[ \frac{F_i(X, \theta)}{2L(||\theta|| + 1)} \right]
\leq 2L(||\theta|| + 1) dC \rho^k.
\]

Solve

\[
2L(||\theta|| + 1) dC \rho^t \leq \delta(||\theta|| + 1)
\]

and we get

\[
t \geq \frac{\log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log (2LCd)}{\log \frac{1}{\rho}}.
\]

Thus, by definition of \( \tau_\delta \), we have

\[
\tau_\delta \leq \frac{\log \frac{1}{\delta} + \log (2LCd)}{\log \frac{1}{\rho}} \leq L_1(||\theta|| + 1),
\]

where

\[
L_1 = \frac{1 + \log (2LCd)}{\log \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \right)}.
\]

A.2 Proof of Lemma 4.1
First, Assumption 3.2 implies \( \|F(x, \theta)\| \leq L(||\theta|| + 1) \) for all \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Thus, using the update rule (7) we have

\[
\|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\| = \epsilon \|F(X_k, \theta_k)\| \leq L \epsilon (||\theta_k|| + 1), \quad \forall k \geq 0.
\] (25)
The preceding inequality implies for all \( k \geq \tau \):
\[
E[\|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\|^2 | X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \leq L^2 \epsilon^2 E[\|\theta_k\| + 1)^2 | X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}]
\leq L^2 \epsilon^2 E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\| + \|\theta^*\| + 1)^2 | X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}]
\leq 2L^2 \epsilon^2 \left[ E[\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2 | X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + (\|\theta^*\| + 1)^2 \right]
\]
where the last inequality follows from \((x + y)^2 \leq 2(x^2 + y^2)\) for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R} \).

### A.3 Proof of Lemma 4.2

For any \( k \geq \tau \), we first upper bound \( \|\theta_t\| \) for \( t \in [k - \tau, k] \). Indeed, by (25) we have
\[
\|\theta_{t+1} - \theta_t\| \leq L\epsilon (\|\theta_t\| + 1), \quad \forall \ k - \tau \leq t \leq k - 1,
\]
which by the triangular inequality gives
\[
(\|\theta_{t+1}\| + 1) \leq (L\epsilon + 1)(\|\theta_t\| + 1), \quad \forall \ k - \tau \leq t \leq k - 1.
\]

Recursively using the preceding inequality gives
\[
\|\theta_t\| + 1 \leq (L\epsilon + 1)^{k-t}(\|\theta_{k-\tau}\| + 1), \quad \forall \ k - \tau \leq t \leq k.
\]

Therefore,
\[
\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\| \leq \sum_{t=k-\tau}^{k-1} \|\theta_{t+1} - \theta_t\|
\leq L\epsilon \sum_{t=k-\tau}^{k-1} (\|\theta_t\| + 1)
\leq L\epsilon \sum_{t=k-\tau}^{k-1} (L\epsilon + 1)^{t-k+\tau}
\leq [(L\epsilon + 1)^{\tau - 1} (\|\theta_{k-\tau}\| + 1)
\leq (e^{L\epsilon\tau} - 1)(\|\theta_{k-\tau}\| + 1)
\leq 2Le\tau(\|\theta_{k-\tau}\| + 1),
\]

where in the last two inequalities we used \( 1 + x \leq e^x \leq 1 + 2x \) for all \( x \in [0, \frac{1}{4}] \). It follows from the preceding inequality that
\[
\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\| \leq 2Le\tau(\|\theta_{k-\tau}\| + 1) \leq 2Le\tau(\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\| + \|\theta_k\| + 1),
\]
which implies
\[
(1 - 2Le\tau)\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\| \leq 2Le\tau(\|\theta_k\| + 1).
\]

Since \( Le\tau \leq \frac{1}{4} \), we have
\[
\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\| \leq 4Le\tau(\|\theta_k\| + 1).
\]

(27)
A.4 Proof of Lemma 4.3

We begin by considering the left-hand side of the desired inequality as follows

\[
E[(\theta_k - \theta^*)^T(F(X_k, \theta_k) - \bar{F}(\theta_k))|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
(28)
\]

\[
= E[(\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau})^T(F(X_k, \theta_k) - \bar{F}(\theta_k))|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + E[(\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*)^T(F(X_k, \theta_k) - \bar{F}(\theta_k))|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
(T_1) + (T_2)
\]

First, we analyze the term \((T_1)\) using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and Lemma 4.2

\[
(T_1) = E[(\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau})^T(F(X_k, \theta_k) - \bar{F}(\theta_k))|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
\leq E[\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\|\|F(X_k, \theta_k) - \bar{F}(\theta_k)\||X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
\leq E[\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\|\|F(X_k, \theta_k)\| + \|\bar{F}(\theta_k)\||X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
\leq 2LE[\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\|\|\theta_k\| + 1\|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
\leq 8L^2\epsilon\tau[E(\|\theta_k\| + 1)^2|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}]
\]

Next we consider the term \((T_2)\). Using the Lipschitz continuity of \(F(x, \theta)\) and \(\bar{F}(\theta)\), we have

\[
(\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*)^T(F(X_k, \theta_k) - \bar{F}(\theta_k)) - (\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*)^T(F(X_k, \theta_{k-\tau}) - \bar{F}(\theta_{k-\tau})) \\
\leq E[(\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*)^T(F(X_k, \theta_k) - F(X_k, \theta_{k-\tau})) + (\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*)^T(F(\bar{theta}_{k-\tau}) - \bar{F}(\theta_{k-\tau}))] \\
\leq \|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*\|\|F(X_k, \theta_k) - F(X_k, \theta_{k-\tau})\| + \|\bar{F}(\theta_k) - \bar{F}(\theta_{k-\tau})\| \\
\leq 2L\|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*\|\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\||X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau} \\
(29)
\]

which gives

\[
(T_2) = E[(\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*)^T(F(X_k, \theta_k) - \bar{F}(\theta_k))|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
\leq E[(\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*)^T(F(X_k, \theta_k) - F(X_k, \theta_{k-\tau}))|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
+ 2L\|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*\|E(\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\|\|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}) \\
= (\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*)^T(E[F(X_k, \theta_{k-\tau})|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] - \bar{F}(\theta_{k-\tau})) \\
+ 2L\|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*\|E(\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\|\|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}) \\
(30)
\]

On the one hand, Lemma 3.1 implies

\[
(\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*)^T(E[F(X_k, \theta_{k-\tau})|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] - \bar{F}(\theta_{k-\tau})) \\
\leq \|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*\|E(\|F(X_k, \theta_{k-\tau})|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] - \bar{F}(\theta_{k-\tau})| \\
\leq \epsilon\|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*\|\|\theta_k\| + 1.
\]

On the other hand, Lemma 4.2 gives

\[
\|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*\|E(\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\||X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}) \leq 2L\epsilon\tau\|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*\|(\|\theta_k\| + 1).
\]

Using the preceding two relations into Eq. (29) gives

\[
(T_2) \leq \epsilon\|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*\|(\|\theta_k\| + 1) + 4L^2\epsilon\tau\|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*\|(\|\theta_k\| + 1) \\
\leq 5L^2\epsilon\tau\|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta^*\|(\|\theta_k\| + 1) \\
\leq 5L^2\epsilon\tau E((\|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta_k\| + \|\theta_k - \theta^*\|)(\|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\| + \|\theta_{k-\tau} - \theta_k\| + \|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\| + 2))|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau} \\
\leq 5L^2\epsilon\tau E((\|\theta_k\| + 1 + \|\theta_k - \theta^*\|)(\|\theta_k\| + \|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\| + \|\theta_k - \theta_{k-\tau}\| + 2)(\|\theta_{k-\tau}\| + \|\theta_{k-\tau}\| + 2))|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau} \\
\leq 20L^2\epsilon\tau E((\|\theta_k - \theta^*\| + \|\theta^*\| + 1)^2|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau} \\
\leq 40L^2\epsilon\tau [E(\|\theta_k - \theta^*\|^2|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}) + (\|\theta^*\| + 1)^2],
\]
where (30) follows from Lemma 4.2 and our assumption that $Lc\tau \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Combine the upper bounds for $(T_1)$ and $(T_2)$, and we obtain

\begin{align*}
E[(\theta_k - \theta^*)^T (F(X_k, \theta_k) - \tilde{F}(\theta_k))]X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
= (T_1) + (T_2) \\
\leq 56L^2c\tau \left[ E[||\theta_k - \theta^*||^2 |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + (||\theta^*|| + 1)^2 \right].
\end{align*}

### A.5 Proof of Lemma 4.4

For any $k \geq \tau$, we have

\begin{align*}
E[||\theta_{k+1} - \theta^*||^2 - ||\theta_k - \theta^*||^2 |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
= E[(\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k)^T(\theta_{k+1} + \theta_k - 2\theta^*)|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
= E[||\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k||^2 |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + 2E[(\theta_k - \theta^*)^T(\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k)|X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
= E[||\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k||^2 |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + 2\epsilon E[(\theta_k - \theta^*)^T F(X_k, \theta_k) |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
= E[||\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k||^2 |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + 2\epsilon E[(\theta_k - \theta^*)^T F(X_k, \theta_k) - F(\theta_k)) |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
+ 2\epsilon E[(\theta_k - \theta^*)^T (F(\theta_k) - \tilde{F}(\theta^*)) |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
\leq 2L^2\epsilon^2 [E[||\theta_k - \theta^*||^2 |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + (||\theta^*|| + 1)^2] \\
+ 112L^2c^2\tau \left[ E[||\theta_k - \theta^*||^2 |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + (||\theta^*|| + 1)^2 \right] \\
- 2\alpha E[||\theta_k - \theta^*||^2 |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] \\
\leq (114L^2c^2\tau - 2\alpha)\epsilon E[||\theta_k - \theta^*||^2 |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + 114L^2\epsilon^2 (||\theta^*|| + 1)^2 \\
\leq -\alpha E[||\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k||^2 |X_{k-\tau}, \theta_{k-\tau}] + 114L^2\epsilon^2 (||\theta^*|| + 1)^2.
\end{align*}

where (32) follows from Lemma 4.1, (33) follows from Lemma 4.3 and (34) follows from Assumption 3.3. In the last inequality we used the assumption that $\epsilon \tau \leq \min \left( \frac{\alpha}{\epsilon L}, \frac{\alpha}{c\tau} \right)$. Taking expectation with respect to $X_{k-\tau}$ and $\theta_{k-\tau}$ on both side of Eq. (35) gives the desired result.

### B Proof of all lemmas for Theorem 5.1

#### B.1 Proof of Lemma 5.1

Since $||\phi(s, a)|| \leq 1$ for all state-action pairs, we have for any $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$:

\begin{align*}
||F(x, \theta_1) - F(x, \theta_2)|| \\
= ||\phi(s, a)(R(s, a) + \gamma \max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)\theta_1 - \phi(s, a)\theta_1) \\
- \phi(s, a)(R(s, a) + \gamma \max_{a_2 \in A} \phi(s', a_2)\theta_2 - \phi(s, a)\theta_2)|| \\
\leq \gamma ||\phi(s, a)(\max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)\theta_1 - \phi(s, a)\theta_1) + ||\phi(s, a)\phi(s, a)\theta_1 - \theta_2)|| \\
\leq \gamma \max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)\theta_1 - \max_{a_2 \in A} \phi(s', a_2)\theta_2|| + ||\theta_1 - \theta_2||. \\
\end{align*}

To control $\max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)\theta_1 - \max_{a_2 \in A} \phi(s', a_2)\theta_2$, let $\bar{a} \in \arg \max_{a_2 \in A} \phi(s', a_2)\theta_2$, we have

\begin{align*}
\max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)\theta_1 - \max_{a_2 \in A} \phi(s', a_2)\theta_2 = \max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)\theta_1 - \phi(s', a_1)\bar{a} \theta_2 \\
\geq \phi(s', \bar{a} \theta_2) \theta_2 \\
\geq \min_{a' \in A} \phi(s', a') \theta_2.
\end{align*}
Similarly, we also have
\[
\max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)T\theta_1 - \max_{a_2 \in A} \phi(s', a_2)T\theta_2 \leq \max_{a' \in A} \phi(s', a')T(\theta_1 - \theta_2).
\]
Therefore,
\[
\left| \max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)T\theta_1 - \max_{a_2 \in A} \phi(s', a_2)T\theta_2 \right| \leq \max\left(\min_{a' \in A} \phi(s', a')T(\theta_1 - \theta_2), \max_{a' \in A} \phi(s', a')T(\theta_1 - \theta_2)\right)
\]
\[
= \max_{a' \in A} |\phi(s', a')T(\theta_1 - \theta_2)|
\]
\[
\leq \max_{a' \in A} |\phi(s', a')|\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|
\]
\[
\leq \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|.
\]

It follows that
\[
\|F(x, \theta_1) - F(x, \theta_2)\| \leq |\max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)T\theta_1 - \max_{a_2 \in A} \phi(s', a_2)T\theta_2| + |\theta_1 - \theta_2|
\]
\[
\leq (\gamma + 1)|\theta_1 - \theta_2|, \quad \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall x \in X.
\]

Note that
\[
\|F(x, 0)\| = \|\phi(a, a)\mathcal{R}(s, a)\| = r_{\max}, \quad \forall x \in X.
\]

It is clear that \(L = \gamma + 1 + r_{\max}\) can be served as a Lipschitz constant for \(F(x, \theta)\), and \(L \geq \max_{x \in X} \|F(x, \theta)\|\).

### B.2 Proof of Lemma 5.2

Let \(p^n(s, s')\) be the probability of the transition from \(s\) to \(s'\) in \(n\) steps following policy \(\pi\). Consider two arbitrary states \(x_1 = (s_1, a_1, s'_1), x_2 = (s_2, a_2, s'_2) \in X\). Since \(\{S_k\}\) is irreducible, there exists \(n > 0\) such that \(p^n(s'_1, s_2) > 0\). Hence we have
\[
p^{n+1}(x_1, x_2) = p^n(s'_1, s_2)p(a_2|s_2)p(s_2|a_2) > 0.
\]

It follows that \(\{X_k\}\) is irreducible. To show \(\{X_k\}\) is aperiodic, assume for a contradiction that \(\{X_k\}\) is periodic with period \(T \geq 2\). Since \(\{X_k\}\) is irreducible, every state in \(X\) has the same period. Therefore, for any \(x = (s, a, s') \in X\),
\[
p^n(x, x) = 0 \text{ for all } n \text{ not divisible by } T.
\]

However, notice that for any \(n\) not divisible by \(T\), we have
\[
p^n(s', s') = \sum_{s \in S} p^{n-1}(s', s)p(s, s')
\]
\[
= \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{a \in A} p^{n-1}(s', s)\pi(a|s)p_a(s, s')
\]
\[
= \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{a \in A} p^n((s, a, s'), (s, a, s'))
\]
\[
= \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{a \in A} 0
\]
\[
= 0. \quad (36)
\]

To see (36), since \(\{S_k\}\) is a Markov chain, we have
\[
p^n((s, a, s'), (s, a, s')) = P(S_n = s, A_n = a, S_{n+1} = s'|S_0 = s, A_0 = a, S_1 = s')
\]
\[
= P(S_n = s, A_n = a, S_{n+1} = s'|S_1 = s')
\]
\[
= p^{n-1}(s', s)\pi(a|s)p_a(s, s').
\]

Therefore, (37) shows that the period of \(s'\) is at least \(T\), which is a contradiction to the fact that \(\{S_k\}\) being aperiodic.
B.3 Proof of Lemma [5.3]

The existence of a solution to $\bar{F}(\theta) = 0$ is also assumed in Theorem [5.1] condition (b), it is enough to show the drift.

$$(\theta - \theta^*)^T(\bar{F}(\theta) - \bar{F}(\theta^*))$$

$$= (\theta - \theta^*)^T(\gamma E_\mu[\phi(s, a)(\max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)^T \theta - \max_{a_2 \in A} \phi(s', a_2)^T \theta^*)] - E_\mu[\phi(s, a) \phi(s, a)^T(\theta - \theta^*)]$$

$$\leq \gamma \sqrt{E_\mu[(\phi(s, a)^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2]} \sqrt{E_\mu[(\max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)^T \theta - \max_{a_2 \in A} \phi(s', a_2)^T \theta^*)^2] - E_\mu[(\phi(s, a)^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2]}.$$ 

Note that we have shown in Lemma [4.4] that

$$|\max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)^T \theta - \max_{a_2 \in A} \phi(s', a_2)^T \theta^*| \leq \max_{a' \in A} |\phi(s', a')^T(\theta - \theta^*)|,$$

which gives

$$\max_{a_1 \in A} \phi(s', a_1)^T \theta - \max_{a_2 \in A} \phi(s', a_2)^T \theta^* \leq (\max_{a' \in A} |\phi(s', a')^T(\theta - \theta^*)|)^2$$

$$= \max_{a' \in A} (\phi(s', a')^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2.$$ 

Therefore, we have

$$(\theta - \theta^*)^T(\bar{F}(\theta) - \bar{F}(\theta^*))$$

$$\leq \sqrt{E_\mu[(\phi(s, a)^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2]} \sqrt{E_\mu[(\max_{a' \in A} (\phi(s', a')^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2] - E_\mu[(\phi(s, a)^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2]}$$

$$= \sqrt{E_\mu[(\phi(s, a)^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2]} \left( \gamma^2 E_\mu[\max_{a' \in A} (\phi(s', a')^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2] - \sqrt{E_\mu[(\phi(s, a)^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2]} \right)$$

$$= \sqrt{E_\mu[(\phi(s, a)^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2]} \left( \frac{\gamma^2 E_\mu[\max_{a' \in A} (\phi(s', a')^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2] - E_\mu[(\phi(s, a)^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2]}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 E_\mu[\max_{a' \in A} (\phi(s', a')^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2] + \sqrt{E_\mu[(\phi(s, a)^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2]}} + 1} \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{-\alpha}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 E_\mu[\max_{a' \in A} (\phi(s', a')^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2] + \sqrt{E_\mu[(\phi(s, a)^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2]}}} \||\theta - \theta^*||^2$$

$$= \frac{-\alpha}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 E_\mu[\max_{a' \in A} (\phi(s', a')^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2] + \sqrt{E_\mu[(\phi(s, a)^T(\theta - \theta^*))^2]}}} \||\theta - \theta^*||^2$$

$$\leq -\frac{\alpha}{2} ||\theta - \theta^*||^2.$$ 

C Proof of Lemma [6.1]

Recall our definition for $\delta(\pi)$:

$$\delta(\pi) := \min_{\theta \neq 0} \frac{E_\mu[(\phi(s, a)^T \theta)^2]}{E_\mu[\max_{a \in A}(\phi(s, a)^T \theta)^2]} = \min_{\theta \neq 0} \frac{\sum_{s \in S} \mu(s) \sum_{a \in A} \pi(a|s)(\phi(s, a)^T \theta)^2}{\sum_{s \in S} \mu(s) \max_{a \in A}(\phi(s, a)^T \theta)^2}. \tag{38}$$

Let $f(\theta)$ be the numerator, we have

$$f(\theta) = \sum_{s \in S} \mu(s) \sum_{a \in A} \pi(a|s)(\phi(s, a)^T \theta)^2 = \theta^T \Phi^T D_{\mu, \pi} \Phi \theta = \theta^T \Sigma_{\mu, \pi} \theta.$$ 

Since the diagonal entries of $D_{\mu, \pi}$ are all positive, and $\Phi$ is full column rank, $\Sigma_{\mu, \pi}$ is symmetric and positive definite. To represent the denominator of (38) in a similar form, let

$$g(\theta, b) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(s_i)(\phi(s_i, b_i)^T \theta)^2 = \theta^T \Phi^T b D_{\mu} \Phi b \theta = \theta^T \Sigma_{\mu, b} \theta, \quad \text{where } b \in B.$$
Since the columns of $\Phi_b$ can be dependent, $\Sigma_{\mu,b}$ is in general only symmetric and positive semi-definite. With the definition of $f(\theta)$ and $g(\theta, b)$, $\delta(\pi)$ can be represented as

$$
\delta(\pi) = \min_{\theta \neq 0} \frac{f(\theta)}{\max_{b \in B} g(\theta, b)} = \min_{\theta \neq 0} \min_{b \in B} \frac{f(\theta)}{g(\theta, b)} = \min_{b \in B} \min_{\theta \neq 0} \frac{f(\theta)}{g(\theta, b)}.
$$

Now since $\Sigma_{\mu,\pi}$ is positive definite, $\Sigma_{\mu,\pi}^{1/2}$ and $\Sigma_{\mu,\pi}^{-1/2}$ are both well-defined and positive definite, we have

$$
\min_{\theta \neq 0} \frac{f(\theta)}{g(\theta, b)} = \left[ \max_{\theta \neq 0} \frac{g(\theta, b)}{f(\theta)} \right]^{-1} = \left[ \max_{\theta \neq 0} \frac{\partial \Sigma_{\mu,b} \partial \theta}{\partial \Sigma_{\mu,\pi} \partial \theta} \right]^{-1} = \left[ \left( \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|\Sigma_{\mu,b}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{\mu,\pi}^{-1/2} x\|}{\|x\|} \right)^2 \right]^{-1}
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{\mu,\pi}^{1/2} \Sigma_{\mu,b} \Sigma_{\mu,\pi}^{-1/2})},
$$

where the function $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ returns the largest eigenvalue. It follows that

$$
\delta(\pi) = \min_{b \in B} \left[ \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{\mu,\pi}^{1/2} \Sigma_{\mu,b} \Sigma_{\mu,\pi}^{-1/2})} \right].
$$