arXiv:2012.00805v1 [cs.LG] 8 Apr 2020

Stochastic Approximation with Markov Noise: Analysis and applications in reinforcement learning

A THESIS

SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF

Doctor of Philosophy

IN THE

Faculty of Engineering

BY

Prasenjit Karmakar



Computer Science and Automation
Indian Institute of Science
Bangalore – 560 012 (INDIA)

February, 2022

Declaration of Originality

I, **Prasenjit Karmakar**, with SR No. **04-04-00-10-12-13-1-10390** hereby declare that the material presented in the thesis titled

Stochastic Approximation with Markov Noise: Analysis and applications in reinforcement learning

represents original work carried out by me in the **Department of Computer Science and Automation** at **Indian Institute of Science** during the years **Aug 2013- Jan 2018**. With my signature, I certify that:

- I have not manipulated any of the data or results.
- I have not committed any plagiarism of intellectual property. I have clearly indicated and referenced the contributions of others.
- I have explicitly acknowledged all collaborative research and discusions.
- I have understood that any false claim will result in severe disciplinary action.
- I have understood that the work may be screened for any form of academic misconduct.

Date: Student Signature

In my capacity as supervisor of the above-mentioned work, I certify that the above statements are true to the best of my knowledge, and I have carried out due diligence to ensure the originality of the report.

Advisor Name: Advisor Signature

© Prasenjit Karmakar
February, 2022
All rights reserved

DEDICATED TO

My Parents and My teachers

Acknowledgements

I take this opportunity to express my profound gratitude to the people who have helped and supported me throughout my PhD. I thank my guide, Prof. Shalabh Bhatnagar, for his constant and valuable suggestions during my research. Without his constant guidance and support this thesis would not have been possible. In all my time as a student, I never had one idea that didn't have his ear. I aspire to be able to bring the kind of rigour, commitment, and clarity to one's work as he does. I will always cherish our many lengthy discussions, especially when we were working on problems. Next I thank Prof. Csaba Szepesvári for several interesting and useful discussions when I started working on the first problem. I thank Rajkumar Maity, who was a project associate of Stochastic Systems Lab, for helping me in running the simulations related to the off-policy learning work in this thesis. I thank Prof. Narahari, Chairman of Electrical Sciences Division, who has always been keen to know how my thesis work is progressing. I am grateful to all the professors of CSA Department and Mathematics Department for sharing their knowledge and for their encouragement. I also thank all the anonymous reviewers of our papers, and the committee of my comprehensive examination. I, also, thank the CSA Dept office staff for their invaluable support. I would like to particularly acknowledge the help by Mrs. Suguna, Mrs. Kushael and Mrs. Padmavathi who promptly helped me on many occasions. Last but not the least, I express my heartfelt gratitude to the Almighty, my parents, and friends for their love and blessings.

Abstract

Stochastic approximation algorithms are sequential non-parametric methods for finding a zero or minimum of a function in the situation where only the noisy observations of the function values are available. Two time-scale stochastic approximation algorithms consist of two coupled recursions which are updated with different (one is considerably smaller than the other) step sizes which in turn facilitate convergence for such algorithms.

We present for the first time an asymptotic convergence analysis of two time- scale stochastic approximation driven by 'controlled' Markov noise. In particular, the faster and slower recursions have non-additive controlled Markov noise components in addition to martingale difference noise. We analyze the asymptotic behavior of our framework by relating it to limiting differential inclusions in both time scales that are defined in terms of the ergodic occupation measures associated with the controlled Markov processes.

Using a special case of our results, we present a solution to the off-policy convergence problem for temporal-difference learning with linear function approximation.

One of the important assumption in the earlier analysis is the point-wise boundedness (also called the 'stability') of the iterates. However, finding sufficient verifiable conditions for this is very hard when the noise is Markov as well as when there are multiple timescales. We compile several aspects of the dynamics of stochastic approximation algorithms with Markov iterate-dependent noise when the iterates are not known to be stable beforehand. We achieve the same by extending the lock-in probability (i.e. the probability of convergence to a specific attractor of the limiting o.d.e. given that the iterates are in its domain of attraction after a sufficiently large number of iterations (say) n_0) framework to such recursions. Specifically, with the more restrictive assumption of Markov iterate-dependent noise supported on a bounded subset of the Euclidean space we give a lower bound for the lock- in probability. We use these results to prove almost sure convergence of the iterates to the specified attractor when the iterates satisfy an 'asymptotic tightness' condition. This, in turn, is shown to be useful in analyzing the tracking ability of general 'adaptive' algorithms. Additionally, we show that our results can be used to derive a sample complexity estimate of such recursions, which then can be used for step-size selection.

Finally, we obtain the first informative error bounds on function approximation for the policy evaluation algorithm proposed by Basu et al. when the aim is to find the risk-sensitive cost represented using exponential utility. We also give examples where all our bounds achieve the "actual error" whereas the earlier bound given by Basu et al. is much weaker in comparison. We show that this happens due to the absence of difference term in the earlier bound which is always present in all our bounds when the state space is large. Additionally, we discuss how all

our bounds compare with each other.

Publications based on this Thesis

1. P. Karmakar and S. Bhatnagar (2018), "Two Timescale Stochastic Approximation with Controlled Markov noise and Off-policy temporal difference learning",*Mathematics of Operations Research, Vol. 43, No. 1*, https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.2017.0855.

2. P. Karmakar, R. Maity and S. Bhatnagar (2016), "On a convergent *off*-policy temporal difference learning algorithm in *on*-line learning environment", https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.06076.

3. P. Karmakar and S. Bhatnagar (2016), "Dynamics of stochastic approximation with Markov iterate-dependent noise with the stability of the iterates not ensured", *to be submiited in IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, https://arxiv.org/abs/1601.02217.

4. P. Karmakar and S. Bhatnagar (2017), " On the function approximation error for risk-sensitive reinforcement learning", *to be submiited in IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.07562.

Contents

Acknowledgements i

Abstract ii

Publications based on this Thesis iv

Contents v

List of Figures viii

1 Introduction 1

1.1 History of Stochastic Approximation algorithms . . . 1

1.1.1 Convergence Analysis: Probabilistic Method vs. ODE method . . . 1

1.1.2 Two time-scale stochastic approximation . . . 2

1.1.3 Stochastic Approximation with state-dependent Markov Noise . . . 3

1.1.4 Markov Decision Process, Dynamic Programming and Reinforcement learning . . . 6

1.1.4.1 The Agent-Environment Interface . . . 6

1.1.4.2 Goals and Rewards . . . 8

1.1.4.3 Returns . . . 8

1.1.4.4 The Markov Property . . . 9

1.1.4.5 Markov decision process . . . 10

1.1.4.6 Bellman Equation . . . 10

1.1.4.7 Temporal Difference Learning . . . 11

1.1.5 Risk-sensitive reinforcement learning . . . 18

1.1.5.1 Certainty Equivalence and the Idea Underlying Utility Functions 18

1.1.5.2 Motivation for studying risk-sensitive reinforcement learning . . 20

1.1.6 Motivation for the problems considered in this thesis . . . 21

1.1.6.1 Problem 1 . . . 21

1.1.6.2 Problem 2 . . . 21

1.1.6.3 Problem 3 . . . 23

1.1.6.4 Problem 4 . . . 25

1.1.7 Highlights of the thesis contributions . . . 26

1.1.7.1 Problem 1 . . . 26

1.1.7.2 Problem 2 . . . 27
1.1.7.3 Problem 3 . . . 27
1.1.7.4 Problem 4 . . . 28
1.1.8 Notations used to denote assumptions . . . 28

2 Two Time-scale Stochastic Approximation with Controlled Markov noise 30
2.1 Brief introduction and Organization . . . 30
2.2 Background, Problem Definition, and Assumptions . . . 31
2.2.1 Definition and Notation . . . 31
2.2.2 Problem Definition . . . 33
2.2.3 Other assumptions needed for two time-scale convergence analysis . . . 37
2.3 Main Results . . . 39
2.4 Discussion on the assumptions: Relaxation of (A2) . . . 53
2.5 Conclusion . . . 59

3 Off-policy temporal difference learning with linear function approximation in on-line learning environment 60
3.1 Brief Introduction and Organization . . . 60
3.2 Background and description of TDC with importance weighting . . . 60
3.3 Almost sure convergence proof of ONTDC . . . 62
3.4 Empirical results . . . 64
3.5 Conclusion . . . 69

4 Dynamics of stochastic approximation with Markov iterate-dependent noise with iterate-stability not ensured 70
4.1 Brief Introduction and Organization . . . 70
4.2 The Problem and Assumptions . . . 71
4.3 Lock-in probability calculation for single timescale stochastic approximation . . . 72
4.3.1 Discussion on the assumptions . . . 76
4.3.1.1 Y_n unbounded . . . 76
4.3.1.2 Y_n point-wise bounded . . . 77
4.4 Proof of almost sure convergence . . . 77
4.4.1 Almost sure convergence under asymptotic tightness . . . 77
4.4.2 Proof of stability and a.s. convergence using our results . . . 80
4.5 On the tracking ability of "general" adaptive algorithms using lock-in probability 81
4.6 Sample Complexity . . . 86
4.7 Conclusion . . . 87

5 On the function approximation error for risk-sensitive reinforcement learning 89
5.1 Brief Introduction and Organization . . . 89
5.2 Preliminaries and Background . . . 89
5.3 Related work and shortcomings . . . 91
5.4 Conditions under which error is zero . . . 92
5.4.1 Theoretical Conditions . . . 92

5.4.1.1 Condition 1 . . . 92
5.4.1.2 Condition 2 . . . 92
5.4.2 Verifiable Condition with doubly stochastic transition kernel . . . 93
5.5 New error bounds . . . 94
5.5.1 Bound based on Bapat and Lindqvist's inequality . . . 94
5.5.1.1 Some conditions . . . 96
5.5.2 Another bound when A is invertible . . . 97
5.6 Conclusion . . . 99

6 Conclusions and Future work **100**

7 Appendix **102**
7.1 Azuma's inequality . . . 102
7.1.1 Proof of conditional and maximal version of Azuma's inequality . . . 102
7.2 Gronwall's inequality . . . 103
7.2.1 Continuous version . . . 103
7.2.2 Discrete version . . . 103
7.2.3 General discrete Gronwall inequality . . . 103
7.3 Perron-Frobenius theorem . . . 103
7.3.1 For matrices with all the entries positive . . . 103
7.3.2 For irreducible matrices . . . 104

Bibliography **105**

List of Figures

1.1 The routing system, this figure is taken from [24, p 38, Fig. 3.1] 4
1.2 The agent-environment interaction in reinforcement learning, this figure is taken from [60, p 48] 7
1.3 The Baird's 7-star MDP. Every transition in this MDP receives zero reward. Each state, has two actions, represented by solid line and dotted line, respectively the solid line action only makes transition to state 7, while the dotted line action uniformly makes a transition to one of the states 1-6 with probability of 1/6. This figure is taken from [26, p 17, Fig. 2.4]. 16
1.4 The learning parameters in Baird's counterexample diverge to infinity. The parameters are updated according to the expected TD(0) update (similar to dynamic programming). This figure is taken from [26, p 18, Fig. 2.5]. 17

3.1 Comparison between TD(0), OFFTDC and ONTDC for Baird's counterexample 65
3.2 Comparison between TD(0), OFFTDC and ONTDC for $\theta \to 2\theta$ 65
3.3 OFFTDC vs. ONTDC for $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem: p=.01 66
3.4 OFFTDC and ONTDC for $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem: p=.001 66
3.5 OFFTDC vs. ONTDC for Baird's counterexample: q=.01 66
3.6 OFFTDC and ONTDC for Baird's counterexample: q=.001 66
3.7 on-policy learning on $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem 67
3.8 Variances of the performance metric for ONTDC: Baird's counterexample 68
3.9 Variances of the performance metric for ONTDC: $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem 68
3.10 Comparison of TD(λ) and TDC(λ): Baird's counterexample 68
3.11 Comparison of TD(λ) and TDC(λ): $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem 68
3.12 ONTDC with step size for Baird's counterexample $a(n) = \frac{.5}{n}$, $b(n) = \frac{.125}{n^{.95}}$ 69
3.13 ONTDC with step size for $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem $a(n) = \frac{7}{n+100}$, $b(n) = \frac{.5}{n^{.95}}$ 69

4.1 Sample complexity vs. step-size parameter; $y : N_0', x : k, \gamma = 0.1$, M = 1E-07: $\epsilon = 0.01$ 87
4.2 Sample complexity vs. step-size parameter; $y : N_0', x : k, \gamma = 0.1$, M = 1E-07: $\epsilon = 0.001$ 87
4.3 Sample complexity vs. step-size parameter; $y : N_0', x : k, \gamma = 0.1$, M = 100: $\epsilon = 0.01$ 88
4.4 Sample complexity vs. step-size parameter; $y : N_0', x : k, \gamma = 0.1$, M = 100: $\epsilon = 0.001$ 88

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 History of Stochastic Approximation algorithms

Optimization is ubiquitous in various research and application fields. It is quite often that an optimization problem can be reduced to finding zeros (roots) of an unknown function $f(\cdot) = E[g(\cdot, \eta)]$, which can be observed but the observation may be corrupted by errors (such is the case where distribution of the noise η is unknown, and say i.i.d samples of η, namely $\mathbb{R}^k$-valued $\{\eta_k\}$ are available). Here $g : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^d$. This is the topic of stochastic approximation (SA). The error source may be observation noise, but may also come from structural inaccuracy of the observed function. For example, suppose one wants to find zeros of $f(\cdot)$ but actually observes functions $f_k(\cdot) = g(\cdot, \eta_{k+1})$ which are different from $f(\cdot)$.

The basic recursive algorithm for finding roots of an unknown function on the basis of noisy observations is the Robbins-Monro (RM) algorithm [28] namely,

$$\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k + a(k)g(\theta_k, \eta_{k+1}), \tag{1.1}$$

where $\theta_n \in \mathbb{R}^d, n \geq 0$. Here $g(\theta_k, \eta_{k+1})$ is a noisy observation of the function $f(\cdot)$ when the parameter value is θ_k, η_{k+1} is the noise at instant $k+1$ and $a(k), k \geq 0$ is a step-size sequence. The algorithm thus incrementally updates the parameter θ at each instant by making use of the previous values of the updates.

1.1.1 Convergence Analysis: Probabilistic Method vs. ODE method

Robbins and Monro [28] have proved mean-square convergence to the point where a regression function assumes a given value. Wolfowitz [32] showed that under weaker assumptions we may still obtain convergence in probability to the root; and Blum [34] demonstrated that, under even weaker assumptions, there is not only convergence in probability but in fact also convergence with probability 1. Kiefer and Wolfowitz [35] have devised a method for approximating the point where the maximum of a regression function occurs. They proved that under suitable conditions there is convergence in probability and Blum [34] subsequently weakened somewhat the conditions and strengthened the conclusion to convergence with probability 1. Dvoretzky [3] deals with a vastly more general situation. The underlying idea is to think of the random

element as noise superimposed on a convergent deterministic scheme. The Robbins-Monro and Kiefer-Wolfowitz procedures, under conditions weaker than any previously considered, are included as very special cases and, despite this generality, the conclusion is stronger since his results assert that the convergence is both in the mean-square sense as well as with probability 1.

In another method [23, Chapter 1.2], Robbins-Siegmund Theorem [44, Theorem 1.3.12] is used to prove the almost sure convergence of the stochastic approximation algorithm. However, the classical probabilistic approach to analyzing stochastic approximation algorithms requires rather restrictive conditions on the observation noise (for example see A 1.2.4 in [23]). An alternative approach called the ordinary differential equation (o.d.e) method was proposed by Ljung [37] which treats the stochastic approximation algorithm as a noisy discretization (or Euler Scheme in numerical analysis parlance) for the o.d.e

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = f(\theta(t)). \tag{1.2}$$

Then a result from [39] (this also appeared in [40] later) says that almost surely the sequence $\{\theta_n\}$ generated by (1.1) converges to a (possibly sample path dependent) compact connected internally chain transitive invariant set of (1.2). Additionally, suppose there exists a continuously differentiable $V : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0, \infty)$ such that $\lim_{\|\theta\|\to\infty} V(\theta) = \infty$, $H := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d : V(\theta) = 0\} \neq \phi$, and $\langle f(\theta), \nabla V(\theta)\rangle \leq 0$ with equality if and only if $\theta \in H$ (thus V is a 'Lyapunov function'). Then a standard result ([78, Corollary 3], [40]) says that almost surely, $\{\theta_n\}$ converges to an internally chain transitive invariant set contained in H.

1.1.2 Two time-scale stochastic approximation

We first provide some motivation here. Suppose that an iterative algorithm calls for a particular subroutine in each iteration. Suppose also that this subroutine itself is another iterative algorithm. The traditional method would be to use the output of the subroutine after running it 'long enough' (i.e. until near-convergence) during each iterate of the outer loop. But the question is that can we get the same effect by running both the inner and the outer loops (i.e. the corresponding iterations) concurrently, albeit on different timescales i.e. using different step-size schedules, one of which governing the 'slower recursion' goes to zero at a rate faster than the other. Then the inner 'fast' loop sees the outer 'slow' loop as quasi-static while the latter sees the former as nearly equilibrated. Such iterations are described as:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)\left[h(\theta_n, w_n) + M_{n+1}^{(1)}\right], \tag{1.3}$$

$$w_{n+1} = w_n + b(n)\left[g(\theta_n, w_n) + M_{n+1}^{(2)}\right]. \tag{1.4}$$

Here $h : \mathbb{R}^{d+k} \to \mathbb{R}^d, g : \mathbb{R}^{d+k} \to \mathbb{R}^k$ are Lipschitz and $\{M_n^{(1)}\}, \{M_n^{(2)}\}$ are martingale difference sequences w.r.t. the increasing σ-fields

$$\mathcal{F}_n := \sigma(\theta_m, w_m, M_m^{(1)}, M_m^{(2)}, m \leq n), n \geq 0.$$

Stepsizes $\{a(n)\}, \{b(n)\}$ are positive scalars satisfying

$$\sum_n a(n) = \sum_n b(n) = \infty, \sum_n (a(n)^2 + b(n)^2) < \infty, \frac{a(n)}{b(n)} \to 0.$$

The last condition implies that $a(n) \to 0$ at a faster rate than $\{b(n)\}$, implying that (1.3) moves on a slower timescale than (1.4). Examples of such stepsizes are $b(n) = \frac{1}{n}, a(n) = \frac{1}{1+n\log n}$, or $b(n) = \frac{1}{n^{2/3}}, a(n) = \frac{1}{n}$.

The intuition of such a framework comes from comparing the above iterations to the singularly perturbed o.d.e. [11]

$$\dot{w}(t) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} g(\theta(t), w(t)), \tag{1.5}$$

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = h(\theta(t), w(t)), \tag{1.6}$$

in the limit $\epsilon \Downarrow 0$. Thus $w(\cdot)$ is the fast transient and $\theta(\cdot)$ the slow component. It then makes sense to think of $\theta(\cdot)$ as quasi-static (i.e. 'almost a constant') while analyzing the behaviour of $\theta(\cdot)$. This suggests looking at the o.d.e.

$$\dot{w}(t) = g(\theta, w(t)),$$

where θ is held fixed as a constant parameter. Suppose that the above o.d.e. has a globally asymptotically stable equilibrium $\lambda(\theta)$ where $\lambda : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^d$. Then clearly for sufficiently small values of ϵ, we expect $w(t)$ to closely track $\lambda(\theta(t))$ for $t > 0$. In turn this suggests looking at the o.d.e.

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = h(\theta(t), \lambda(\theta(t))),$$

which should capture the behaviour of $\theta(\cdot)$ in (1.6) to a good approximation. This technique of replacing fast variable w with $\lambda(\theta)$ is common in the literature of singularly perturbed o.d.e. [11, Section 1.2]. However, here in order to relate the discrete time system to its corresponding o.d.e, Borkar assumed λ to be a Lipschitz continuous map.

Then under **(A1)**, **(A2)** and **(A3)** from [78, Chapter 6], Borkar proved almost sure convergence of such iterates. Another analysis of similar two timescale systems can be found in [24, Chapter 8.6].

1.1.3 Stochastic Approximation with state-dependent Markov Noise

Stochastic Approximation algorithms with Markov Noise are algorithms where η_k's are trajectories of a parameterized (by the algorithm's iterates) Markov chain. Such noise arises in many important applications where evolution of the noise process depends more intimately on the iterate (also called the *state*) and there is a reasonably long-term "memory" in this dependence. In the following we investigate cases where such iterate-dependent Markov noise arises:




Figure 1.1: The routing system, this figure is taken from [24, p 38, Fig. 3.1]

1. The following adaptive "routing" example taken from [25, 24] illustrates this point in a simple way. Suppose that calls arrive at a switch randomly, but at discrete instants $n = 1, 2, \ldots$. No more than a single call can arrive at a time and

$$P\{\text{arrival at time } \ n|\text{data upto but not including time } \ n\} = \mu > 0$$

The assumptions concerning single calls and discrete time make the formulation simpler, but the analogous models in continuous time are treated in essentially the same manner. To have a clear sequencing of the events, suppose that each call in progress gets completed "just before" the next discrete instant, so if a call is completed at time n^-, then the circuit is available for use by a new call that arrives at time n. There are two possible routes for each call. The i-th route has N_i lines and can handle N_i calls simultaneously. The sets of call lengths and inter-arrival times are mutually independent, and $\lambda_i > 0$ is the probability that a call is completed at the $(n+1)$st instant, given that it is in the system at time n and handled by route i, and the rest of the past data. The system is illustrated in Fig. 1.1. The routing law is "random", and is updated by a stochastic approximation procedure with constant step size ϵ. Let $\eta_n^\epsilon = (\eta_{n,1}^\epsilon, \eta_{n,2}^\epsilon)$ denote the occupancies of the two routes at time n. If a call arrives at time $n+1$ then it is sent to route 1 with probability θ_n^ϵ and to route 2 with probability $1 - \theta_n^\epsilon$. If all lines of the selected route are occupied at that time, the call is redirected to the other route. If the alternative route is also full, the call is lost from the system. Let $J_{n,i}^\epsilon$ be the indicator function of the event that a call arrives at time $n+1$, is sent to route i, and is accepted there. The updating rule for θ_n^ϵ is

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{n+1}^\epsilon &= \Pi_{[a,b]}[\theta_n^\epsilon + \epsilon Y_n^\epsilon] \\ &= \Pi_{[a,b]}[\theta_n^\epsilon + \epsilon\left((1-\theta_n^\epsilon)\, J_{n.1}^\epsilon - \theta_n^\epsilon J_{n.2}^\epsilon\right)]\end{aligned}$$

where $0 < a < b < 1$ are truncation levels and $\Pi_{[a,b]}$ denotes the truncation operator.

The occupancies η_n^ϵ (and the random acceptances and routing choices) determine the effective noise in the system, and the evolution of η_n^ϵ depends on θ_n^ϵ in a complicated way and with significant memory. The dependence is of the Markovian type in that

$$P\{\eta_{n+1}^\epsilon = \tilde{\eta}|\eta_i^\epsilon, \theta_i^\epsilon, i \leq n\} = P\{\eta_{n+1}^\epsilon = \tilde{\eta}|\theta_n^\epsilon, \eta_n^\epsilon\}, \forall n.$$

2. Here we are concerned with a controlled Markov chain and average cost per unit time problem, where the control is parameterized. We seek the optimal parameter value. The approach is based on an estimate of the derivative of the invariant measure with respect to the parameter. This is an example of an optimization problem over an infinite time interval. The procedure attempts to approximate the gradient of the stationary cost with respect to the parameter.

   The process is a finite-state Markov chain $\{X_n\}$ with time-invariant and known transition probabilities $p(x, y|\theta)$ that depend continuously and differentiably on a parameter θ that takes values in some compact set. We will suppose that θ is real-valued and confined to some interval $[a, b]$. Write $p_\theta(x, y|\theta)$ for the θ-derivative. Let the chain be ergodic for each θ, and denote the unique invariant measure by $\mu(\theta)$. Let $E_{\mu(\theta)}$ denote expectation under the stationary probability and E_x^θ the expectation, given parameter value θ and initial condition x. The objective is to obtain

$$\min_\theta e(\theta) = E_{\mu(\theta)} k(X_0, X_1, \theta) = \sum_{x,y} \mu(x, \theta) p(x, y|\theta) k(x, y, \theta) \tag{1.7}$$

where $k(x, y, \cdot)$ is continuously differentiable in θ for each value of x and y, and $\mu(x, \theta)$ is the stationary probability of the point x.

Let $L(x, y, \theta) = \frac{p_\theta(x,y|\theta)}{p(x,y|\theta)}$. Then the following algorithm can be given for approximating the optimal value of θ.

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_{n+1} &= \theta_n - \epsilon_n k_\theta(X_n, X_{n+1}, \theta_n) - \epsilon_n L(X_n, X_{n+1}, \theta_n) k(X_n, X_{n+1}, \theta_n) - \epsilon_n (k(X_n, X_{n+1}, \theta_n) - \lambda_n) C_n \\
\lambda_{n+1} &= \lambda_n + \epsilon'_n \left[k(X_n, X_{n+1}, \theta_n) - \lambda_n\right] \\
C_{n+1} &= \beta C_n + L(X_n, X_{n+1}, \theta_n)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon'_n = q\epsilon_n$ for some $q > 0$ and $k_\theta(.,.,.)$ denotes derivative with respect to θ.

Clearly, the noise $\{X_n\}$ in the algorithm is iterate-dependent.

This scenario is sometimes referred as policy gradient algorithm in reinforcement learning.

Now, for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we consider a transition probability $\Pi_\theta(y; dx)$ on $\mathbb{R}^k$. This transition probability defines a controlled Markov chain on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Stochastic approximation iterates in $\mathbb{R}^d$ driven by Markovian noise are given by

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n) f(\theta_n, Y_{n+1}), n \geq 0, \tag{1.8}$$

where θ_0 is the initial point, $\{\theta_n\}$ are the iterates, $\{Y_n\}$ is an $\mathbb{R}^k$- valued 'Markov iterate-dependent' noise, i.e., satisfies

$$P[Y_{n+1} \in A|\mathcal{F}_n] = \int_A \Pi_{\theta_n}(Y_n; dx) \text{ a.s.}, \tag{1.9}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_n :=$ the σ-field generated by all random variables realized till time n, $a(n)$ is the n-th step-size and $f : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^d$.

It is well known that under reasonable assumptions [46, 2, 18, 47], (1.8) is an asymptotic pseudotrajectory (in the sense of [42]) and that by the results in [42, 39] its limit set can be precisely described as an internally chain transitive set of the o.d.e.

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = h(\theta(t)), \tag{1.10}$$

where $h(\theta) = \int f(\theta, y)\Gamma_\theta(dy)$, with Γ_θ being the unique stationary distribution of the Markov iterate-dependent process $\{Y_n\}$ for a fixed θ.

In another work, [77], Borkar studied the stochastic approximation algorithm where the noise is a controlled Markov process.

Note that Markov noise arises naturally in reinforcement learning situations because of the Markov decision process in the background. In the next subsection we briefly describe about reinforcement learning.

1.1.4 Markov Decision Process, Dynamic Programming and Reinforcement learning

This section is a summarized version of the materials present in the popular book [60] and Chapter 2 and 3 of [26]. Some nice books on these materials are [16, 15, 17, 13]

1.1.4.1 The Agent-Environment Interface

Reinforcement learning (RL) problem deals with the problem of learning from interaction to achieve a goal. The learner/decision- maker is called the *agent*. The agent interacts with the *environment*. These entities interact continually, the agent selecting actions and the environment responding to those actions and presenting new situations to the agent. The environment also gives the agent a *reward* each time the agent picks an action or control. The goal of the agent is to maximize a certain long-term reward objective. A complete specification of an environment defines a *task*, one instance of the reinforcement learning problem.

More specifically, the agent and environment interact at each of a sequence of discrete time steps, $t = 0, 1, 2, 3, ...$ At each time step t, the agent receives some representation of the environment's state, $S_t \in S$, where S is the set of possible states, and on that basis selects an action, $A_t \in \mathcal{A}(S_t)$, where $\mathcal{A}(S_t)$ is the set of actions available in state S_t . One time step later, in part as a consequence of its action, the agent receives a numerical reward , $R_{t+1} \in \mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{R}$, and moves to a new state, S_{t+1} . Figure 1.2 shows a diagram of the agent-environment interaction.

At each time step, the agent implements a mapping from states to probabilities of selecting each possible action. This mapping is called the agent's *policy* and is denoted π_t , where




Figure 1.2: The agent-environment interaction in reinforcement learning, this figure is taken from [60, p 48]

$\pi_t(a|s)$ is the probability that $A_t = a$ if $S_t = s$. This is called *stochastic policy*. Policy can be deterministic also where $\pi_t : S \to A$. Here we assume *stationary policy* where π_t is independent of t.

Reinforcement learning methods specify how the agent changes its policy as a result of its experience. The agent's goal, roughly speaking, is to maximize the total amount of reward it receives over the long run.

1.1.4.2 Goals and Rewards

In reinforcement learning, the purpose or goal of the agent is formalized in terms of a special reward signal that the environment gives to the agent. Informally, the agent's goal is to maximize the total amount of reward it receives. This means maximizing not immediate reward, but cumulative reward in the long run. The use of a reward signal to formalize the idea of a goal is one of the most distinctive features of reinforcement learning.

1.1.4.3 Returns

So far we have discussed the objective of learning informally. We have said that the agent's goal is to maximize the cumulative reward it receives in the long run. How might this be defined formally? If the sequence of rewards received after time step t is denoted $R_{t+1}, R_{t+2}, R_{t+3}, \ldots$, then what precise aspect of this sequence do we wish to maximize? In general, we seek to maximize the expected return, where the return G_t is defined as some specific function of the reward sequence. In the simplest case the return is simply the sum of the rewards:

$$G_t := R_{t+1} + R_{t+2} + R_{t+3} + \cdots + R_T, \tag{1.11}$$

where T is a final time step. This approach makes sense in applications in which there is a natural notion of a final time step, that is, when the agent-environment interaction breaks naturally into subsequences, which we call episodes. Each episode ends in a special state called the *terminal state*, followed by a reset to a standard starting state or to a sample from a standard distribution of starting states. Tasks with episodes of this kind are called *episodic tasks*. In episodic tasks one sometimes need to distinguish the set of all non-terminal states, denoted S, from the set of all states plus the terminal state, denoted $\mathcal{S}+$.

On the other hand, in many cases the agent-environment interaction does not break naturally into identifiable episodes, but goes on continually without limit. For example, this would be the natural way to formulate a continual process-control task, or an application to a robot with a long life span. The return formulation (1.11) is problematic for tasks that do not terminate because the final time step would be $T = \infty$, and the return, which is what we are trying to maximize, could itself easily be infinite (for example, suppose the agent receives a reward of $+1$ at each time step). The additional concept that we need is that of discounting. According to this approach, the agent tries to select actions so that the sum of the discounted rewards it receives over the future is maximized. In particular, it chooses A_t to maximize the expected discounted return:

$$G_t := R_{t+1} + \gamma R_{t+2} + \gamma^2 R_{t+3} + \cdots = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k R_{t+k+1}$$

where γ is a parameter, $0 \leq \gamma < 1$, called the discount rate.

In the cases considered thus far the total expected cost is finite either because of discounting or because of a cost-free termination state that the system eventually enters. In many situations, however, discounting is inappropriate and there is no natural cost-free termination state. In such situations it is often meaningful to optimize the average cost per stage starting from a state i, which is defined by

$$J_\pi(i) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} E\{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} g(x_k, \mu_k(x_k))|x_0 = i\} \tag{1.12}$$

where $g(i, a)$ is the cost of taking action a from state i. μ_k maps states x_k into controls $u_k = \mu_k(x_k)$. For details , see [16, Chapter 7.4].

1.1.4.4 The Markov Property

In the reinforcement learning framework, the agent makes its decisions as a function of a signal from the environment called the environment's state. In this section we discuss what is required of the state signal, and what kind of information we should and should not expect it to provide. In particular, we formally define a property of environments and their state signals that is of particular interest, called the Markov property.

In this section, by "the state" we mean whatever information is available to the agent. We assume that the state is given by some preprocessing system that is nominally part of the environment. In other words, our main concern is not with designing the state signal, but with deciding what action to take as a function of whatever state signal is available.

We now formally define the Markov property for the reinforcement learning problem. To keep the mathematics simple, we assume here that there are a finite number of states and reward values. Consider how a general environment might respond at time $t+1$ to the action taken at time t. In the most general, causal case this response may depend on everything that has happened earlier. In this case the dynamics can be defined only by specifying the complete joint probability distribution:

$$P\{S_{t+1} = s', R_{t+1} = r|S_0, A_0, R_1, \ldots, S_{t-1}, A_{t-1}, R_t, S_t, A_t\}$$

for all r, s' , and all possible values of the past events: $S_0, A_0, R_1, ..., S_{t-1}, A_{t-1}, R_t, S_t, A_t$. If the state signal has the Markov property, on the other hand, then the environment's response at $t+1$ depends only on the state and action representations at t, in which case the environment's dynamics can be defined by specifying only

$$p(s', r|s, a) := Pr\{S_{t+1} = s', R_{t+1} = r|S_t = s, A_t = a\} \tag{1.13}$$

for all r, s', s, and a. In other words, a state signal has the Markov property, and is a Markov state, if and only if (1.13) holds for all s', r, and histories, $S_0, A_0, R_1, \ldots, S_{t-1}$, A_{t-1}, R_t, S_t, A_t. In this case, the environment and task as a whole are also said to have the Markov property.

If an environment has the Markov property, then its one-step dynamics (1.13) enables us to predict the next state and expected next reward given the current state and action. One can show that, by iterating this equation, one can predict all future states and expected rewards from knowledge only of the current state as would be possible given the complete history up to the current time. It also follows that Markov states provide the best possible basis for choosing actions. That is, the best policy for choosing actions as a function of a Markov state is just as good as the best policy for choosing actions as a function of complete histories.

1.1.4.5 Markov decision process

A reinforcement learning task that satisfies the Markov property is called a Markov decision process, or MDP. If the state and action spaces are finite, then it is called a finite Markov decision process (finite MDP). A finite MDP is defined by its state and action sets and by the one-step dynamics of the environment. These quantities completely specify the dynamics of a finite MDP. Most of the theory we present in the rest of this section implicitly assumes the environment is a finite MDP. Given the dynamics as specified by (1.13), one can compute anything else one might want to know about the environment, such as the expected rewards for state-action pairs,

$$r(s,a) := E[R_{t+1}|S_t = s, A_t = a] = \sum_{r\in\mathcal{R}} r \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} p(s', r|s, a),$$

the state-transition probabilities,

$$p(s'|s,a) := Pr\{S_{t+1} = s'|S_t = s, A_t = a\} = \sum_{r\in\mathcal{R}} rp(s', r|s, a)$$

and the expected rewards for state-action-next-state triples,

$$r(s,a,s') := E[R_{t+1}|S_t = s, A_t = a, S_{t+1} = s'] = \frac{\sum_{r\in\mathcal{R}} rp(s', r|s, a)}{p(s'|s, a)}.$$

1.1.4.6 Bellman Equation

We mentioned that the goal of RL agent is to maximize a certain long-run reward criterion. received rewards in the long-run criterion. The infinite horizon expected discounted reward is a standard reward criteria. The state-value function of a policy, $\pi : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{A}$, is defined as:

$$V^\pi(s) = E\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_{t+1}|S_0 = s, \pi\right],$$

where $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ is the discount rate and $E[.]$ denotes expectation over random samples, which are generated by following policy π.

Let P^π denote the state-state transition probability matrix and $V^\pi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the value function vector, whose s-th element is $V^\pi(s)$. $V^\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}$ satisfies the following Bellman equation [17, 60]:

$$V^\pi = R^\pi + \gamma P^\pi V^\pi := T^\pi V^\pi$$

where R^π is the vector with components $E[R_{t+1}|S_t = s]$, and T^π is known as the Bellman operator for the policy π.

Analogously, we can also define the action-values, $Q^\pi(s,a)$ which evaluate the value of taking action a where the initial state is s while for the other subsequent states, actions are chosen according to the policy π:

$$Q^\pi(s,a) = E\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_{t+1} | S_0 = s, A_0 = a, \pi\right].$$

So far we have formulated the problem of policy evaluation or prediction. However, solving a reinforcement learning problem roughly means finding an optimal policy that achieves a large long-term reward or value. An optimal policy is a policy whose value function is better than (not necessarily strictly) the value function of other policies. The value function of an optimal policy is called the optimal value function. The optimal state-value function, denoted V^*, is obtained as:

$$V^*(s) := \max_\pi V^\pi(s), \forall s \in \mathcal{S},$$

and the optimal action-value function, denoted by Q^* is obtained as

$$Q^*(s,a) := \max_\pi Q^\pi(s,a), \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

In the next section, we review some of the most popular temporal-difference (TD) learning algorithms, also known as classical TD methods. One of the key properties of classical TD methods is their ability to learn from every single fragment of experience without waiting for the final outcome. Once the policy evaluation is done, the full control problem can be solved by on-policy TD control method such as Sarsa, see [60, Chapter 6.4] for details.

1.1.4.7 Temporal Difference Learning

TD learning is a key algorithm for prediction (i.e. the problem of estimating the value function corresponding to a given stationary policy π) and plays central role in reinforcement learning [59, 60]. It uses bootstrapping ideas developed in dynamic programming as well as Monte Carlo simulation. Classical TD methods such as TD(λ), Sarsa, and Q-learning are simple, sample-based, online, and incremental algorithms and as such are popular in the RL community.

TD methods use each fragment of experience to update the value of state S_t, $V_t(S_t)$, at time t. This would allow moment-to-moment prediction. This is different from the dynamic programming (DP) approach in the sense that the value of each state, in DP approach, is updated by sweeping over next states. In the next paragraph, we briefly describe the simplest TD method.

Tabular TD(0) algorithm for estimating V^π: The simplest TD method, known as tabular TD(0), estimates the value of each individual state; e.g. S_t, according to the following update:

$$V_{t+1}(S_t) = V_t(S_t) + \alpha_t \left[R_{t+1} + \gamma V_t(S_{t+1}) - V_t(S_t)\right], \tag{1.14}$$

$$= V_t(S_t) + \alpha_t S_t, \tag{1.15}$$

where $S_t = R_{t+1} + \gamma V_t(S_{t+1}) - V_t(S_t)$, is the one-step TD error, or in short TD error, and α_t is a deterministic positive step-size parameter, which is typically small, and for the purpose of convergence analysis is assumed to satisfy the Robbins-Monro conditions: $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \alpha_t = \infty, \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \alpha_t^2 < \infty$. Tabular TD(0) is guaranteed to converge to V^π under standard conditions.

Temporal-Difference learning with function approximation When the number of states and actions is excessive, estimating the true value function for any policy π can be computationally a nightmare. In such a case, it makes sense to consider a parametrization of the value function using low-dimension parameters. There is a version of TD with function approximation that we describe below.

The TD(0) algorithm (1.14), can be combined with parametrized value function $V_\theta, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The value function can be either linear or nonlinear and differentiable function (such as a neural network) with respect to the parameter vector, θ. The resulting algorithm has the following update rule:

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \alpha_t \delta_t(\theta_t) \nabla V_{\theta_t}(S_t)$$

where

$$\delta_t(\theta_t) = R_{t+1} + \gamma V_{\theta_t}(S_{t+1}) - V_{\theta_t}(S_t)$$

and $\nabla V_\theta(s) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the gradient of V_θ with respect to θ at s. We call this algorithm linear/nonlinear TD(0). Also, the TD(0)-solution (or TD(0)-fixpoint), θ, (if it exists), satisfies:

$$E\left[\delta_t(\theta) \nabla V_\theta(S_t)\right] = 0.$$

For simplicity, we adopt the following notation for TD error:

$$\delta_t \equiv \delta_t(\theta_t).$$

Sutton's TD(λ) with linear function approximation [59] is one of the simplest forms of TD learning with function approximation and, since its development, has played a central role in modern reinforcement learning. To begin first, we review the simplest form of TD(λ) with linear function approximation, that is referred to as linear TD(0). In the beginning, let's limit ourselves to on-policy training data. This refers to the case where the value function to be learned is for the same policy that is used for picking actions in any state that is visited by the Markov chain. The case when these policies are different is more interesting and is referred to as the off-policy case.

The linear TD(0) algorithm, starts with an arbitrary parameter vector, θ_0. Upon observing the t-th transition from state S_t to S_{t+1} (on-policy transitions), which follows with feature-vector observation $(\phi_t, R_{t+1}, \phi_{t+1})$, where $\phi_t := \phi(S_t)$, the learning parameter vector is updated according to

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \alpha_t \delta_t \phi_t,$$

where $\delta_t = R_{t+1} + \gamma\theta_t^T\phi_{t+1} - \theta_t^T\phi_t$ is the TD-error with linear function approximation. If the discount factor γ is zero, the problem becomes one of supervised learning and the linear TD(0) update rule becomes the conventional least-mean-square (LMS) algorithm in supervised learning. Thus, the key feature that distinguishes reinforcement learning from supervised learning is the existence of the bootstrapping term, $\theta_t^T\phi_{t+1}$, in the above update rule. This will allow the algorithm to guess about the future outcome without waiting for it - i.e. allows it to learn from single fragment of experience without waiting for the final outcome. Also, this is the key difference between TD learning and conventional Monte-Carlo methods (which are based on supervised learning ideas). Thus, TD methods have the ability to learn from single transitions without waiting for the final outcome; they do this by guessing from a guess! We will see how this key idea allows TD to learn from off-policy data. It is well known that the linear TD(0) algorithm is convergent under on-policy training ([33, 67]). From the theory of stochastic methods, the convergence point of linear TD(0), is a parameter vector, say θ, that satisfies

$$0 = E\left[\delta_t(\theta)\phi_t\right] = b - A\theta \tag{1.16}$$

where

$$\delta_t(\theta) = R_{t+1} + \gamma\theta^T\phi_{t+1} - \theta^T\phi_t,$$
$$A = E\left[\phi_t(\phi_t - \gamma\phi_{t+1})^T\right], b = E\left[R_{t+1}\phi_t\right]$$

and the expectation is over all random samples. In this thesis, the parameter vector θ, which satisfies the above equation, is called the TD(0) solution.

In general, the TD-solution refers to the fixed-point of the expected TD update. But under off-policy training, if this fixed-point exists, it may not be stable. Off-policy learning refers to learning about one way of behaving, called the target policy, from data generated by another way of selecting actions, called the behavior policy. The target policy is often a deterministic policy that approximates the optimal policy. Conversely, the behavior policy is often stochastic, exploring all possible actions in each state as part of finding the optimal policy. In other words, if θ does satisfy (1.16), then the TD(0) algorithm in expectation may cause it to move away and eventually diverge to infinity.

(1.16) gives us the TD-solution in the parameter space. In the value function space, the TD-solution, θ, satisfies

$$V_\theta = \Pi T V_\theta,$$

where $V_\theta = \Phi\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$, Φ is the matrix whose rows are the $\phi(s)^T$ for any given row entry s, and Π is the projection operator to the linear space. The projection operator, Π, takes any value function v and projects it to the nearest value function representable by the function approximator:

$$\Pi v = V_{\theta^*},$$

with $\theta^* = \arg\min_\theta \|V_\theta - v\|_\mu^2$, where μ is state-visitation probability distribution vector whose s-th component, $\mu(s)$, represents the probability of visiting state s, and

$$\|v\|_\mu^2 = \sum_s \mu(s) v^2(s).$$

In a linear architecture, in which $V_\theta = \Phi\theta$, the projection operator is linear and independent of θ:

$$\Pi = \phi(\phi^T D \phi)^{-1} \phi^T D$$

where D is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are $\mu(s)$.

Derivation of TD(0) with function approximation In this section, we briefly overview the derivation of TD(0) with function approximation. The purpose of this section it to show how linear/nonlinear TD(0) has been derived to get a better understanding of why it may diverge. Particularly, we will show that linear/nonlinear TD(0) is not a true gradient-descent method, which (partially) might suggest why TD methods with function approximation are not robust for general settings.

To start, let's consider the following mean-square-error (MSE) objective function:

$$MSE(\theta) = E\left[(V^\pi(S_t) - V_\theta(S_t))^2\right].$$

Following gradient-descent methods, the learning update can be obtained by adjusting the modifiable parameter θ along the steepest descent direction of the MSE objective function; that is, $\theta_{\text{new}} - \theta_{\text{old}} \propto -\frac{1}{2}\nabla \text{MSE}(\theta)|_{\theta=\theta_{\text{old}}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{2}\nabla \text{MSE}(\theta_{\text{old}}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\nabla (E\left[(V^\pi(S_t) - V_\theta(S_t))^2\right])_{\theta=\theta_{\text{old}}} \\ &= E[(V^\pi(S_t) - V_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(S_t))\nabla V_\theta(S_t)|_{\theta=\theta_{\text{old}}} \end{aligned} \tag{1.17}$$

assuming that the interchange between the gradient and the expectation above can be justified. Nonetheless, in general, it is not practical to compute the above update term because: 1) The target value, $V_\pi(S_t)$, is not known; 2) We do not have access to model of the environment and therefore cannot compute the expectation term.

We can get around the first problem by approximating the target value:

$$V^\pi(s) \approx E\left[R_{t+1} + \gamma V_\theta(S_{t+1}) | S_t = s, \pi\right].$$

This is called the bootstrapping step. To get around the second problem we use the theory of stochastic approximation; that is, at every time-step we conduct a direct sampling from (1.17) and update the parameters along (stochastic) direction of

$$(V^\pi(S_t) - V_\theta(S_t))\nabla V_\theta(S_t).$$

Putting these all together, we get the linear/nonlinear TD(0) algorithm:

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \alpha_t \delta_t \nabla V_{\theta_t}(S_t),$$

where δ_t is the one-step TD error.

The stability problem of linear TD(0) In the previous section, we overviewed the derivation of one of the simplest and popular TD methods; that is TD(0), in conjunction with function approximation. In this section, we raise one of its most outstanding problems, that is, the stability problem.

In the next paragraph, we consider one of the well-known counterexamples, which shows the divergence of linear TD(0) and its approximate dynamic programming counterpart (updating by sweeping over the states instead of sampling).

Baird's Off-policy Counterexample: Consider the 7-star version of the "star" counterexample [36]. The Markov decision process (MDP) is depicted in Fig. 1.3. The reward is zero in all transitions, thus the true value function for any given policy is zero; for all states. The behavior policy, in this example, chooses the solid line action with probability of 1/7 and the dotted line action with probability of 6/7. The goal is to learn the value of a target policy that chooses the solid line more often than the probability of 1/7. In this example, the target policy chooses the solid action with probability of 1.

The value functions are approximated linearly in the form of $V(i) = 2\theta(i) + \theta_0$, for $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 6\}$, and $V(7) = \theta(7) + 2\theta_0$. Here, the discount factor is $\gamma = 0.99$. The TD solution, in this example, is $\theta(i) = 0, i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 7\}$, and $\theta_0 = 0$. Both TD(0) and DP (with incremental updates), however, will diverge on this example; that is, their learning parameters will go to $\pm\infty$ as is illustrated in Fig. 1.4.

Why is TD(0) with linear/nonlinear function approximation sometimes unstable? To address this question, first we need to look at the way the algorithm is derived. Unlike supervised learning methods, which use a mean-square-error objective function, in RL, the objective is to estimate value functions that satisfy the Bellman equation. This would be straightforward to do if we use tabular representation. However, for the case of function approximation, it is not clear what is the underlying equation for the approximate value functions. In other words, it is not straight forward to do function approximation.

TD methods with function approximation are proposed as a way of conducting this approximation. In the previous section, we showed how linear/nonlinear TD(0) originally has been derived. To do this, we started with the idea of updating the learning parameters along the gradient-descent direction of the mean-square error objective function, but with an approximation step, $V^\pi(s) \approx E\left[R_{t+1} + \gamma V_\theta(S_{t+1}) | S_t = s\right]$. Thus, the resulting algorithm would not be true stochastic gradient-descent method. As a result, TD(0) with function approximation may diverge.

A good way to see why linear/nonlinear TD(0) is not a true gradient-descent method is to show that its update cannot be derived by taking the gradient of any function [19]. To do this, let's consider linear TD(0) with the update term, $\delta(\theta)\phi$, where $\delta(\theta) = R + \gamma\theta^T\phi' - \theta^T\phi$, $\phi \equiv \phi(S_t)$, $\phi' \equiv \phi(S_{t+1})$, where t represents the time-step.

Now, let's assume that there exists a function $J(\theta)$ whose gradient is the TD(0) update, $\delta(\theta)\phi$, that is, $\nabla J(\theta) = \delta(\theta)\phi$. Thus, the j-th element of $\nabla J(\theta)$ is

$$\frac{\partial J(\theta)}{\partial \theta_j} = \delta(\theta)\phi_j.$$




Figure 1.3: The Baird's 7-star MDP. Every transition in this MDP receives zero reward. Each state, has two actions, represented by solid line and dotted line, respectively the solid line action only makes transition to state 7, while the dotted line action uniformly makes a transition to one of the states 1-6 with probability of 1/6. This figure is taken from [26, p 17, Fig. 2.4].




Figure 1.4: The learning parameters in Baird's counterexample diverge to infinity. The parameters are updated according to the expected TD(0) update (similar to dynamic programming). This figure is taken from [26, p 18, Fig. 2.5].

Now, if we take another partial derivative with respect to the i-th component, we get

$$\frac{\partial^2 J(\theta)}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \neq \frac{\partial^2 J(\theta)}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_i}$$

This is a contradiction, because the second derivative of a differentiable function is independent of the order of derivatives. This derivation, however, shows that the second derivative of function J is not symmetric with respect to the order of derivative. As such, we conclude linear TD(0) update is not a gradient of any function.

Objective Function for Temporal-Difference Learning An objective function is some function of the modifiable parameter θ that we seek to minimize by updating θ. In (stochastic) gradient-descent, the updates to θ are proportional to the negative (sample) gradient of the objective function with respect to θ. In standard RL, the objective is to find a solution that satisfies the Bellman equation. However, in the case of function approximation, it is not clear how to combine the Bellman equation with value function approximation. In the previous section, we showed that the TD-solution for linear TD(0) satisfies

$$V_\theta = \Pi T V_\theta.$$

Thus, a nice choice for the objective function would be to take the mean-square projected Bellman-error (MSPBE) objective function:

$$J(\theta) = \|V_\theta - \Pi T V_\theta\|_\mu^2.$$

GTD [62], GTD2, TDC[63] algorithms are off-policy evaluation algorithms based on this objective function.

1.1.5 Risk-sensitive reinforcement learning

The most familiar metrics in infinite horizon sequential decision problems are additive costs such as discounted cost and long-run average cost respectively. However, there is another cost criterion namely multiplicative cost (or risk-sensitive cost as it is better known) which has important connections with dynamic games and robust control and is popular in certain applications, particularly related to finance where it offers the advantage of 'penalizing all moments', so to say, thus capturing the 'risk' in addition to mean return (hence the name). In the following we summarize a few key concepts (which is based on [14]) to analyzing attitude toward risk taking in decision analysis practice, with particular emphasis on the use of the exponential utility function.

1.1.5.1 Certainty Equivalence and the Idea Underlying Utility Functions

A difficulty with decision-making under uncertainty is illustrated by the following: Suppose we are offered an alternative with equal chances of winning Rs. 10,000 or losing Rs. 1,000. How much are we willing to pay for this? We certainly will not pay more than Rs. 10,000, and we will

certainly take the alternative if someone offers to give Rs. 1,000 in addition to the alternative. How can we settle on a number somewhere between these two extremes? A decision maker's attitude toward risk taking is addressed with the concept of the certainty (or certain) equivalent, which is the certain amount that is equally preferred to an uncertain alternative. If certainty equivalents are known for the alternatives in a decision, then it is easy to find the most preferred alternative: It is the one with the highest (lowest) certainty equivalence if we are considering profit (cost). The "Weak Law of Large Numbers" argues for using expected values as certainty equivalents when the stakes in a decision under uncertainty are small. This Law shows that under general conditions the average outcome for a large number of independent decisions stochastically converges to the average of the expected values for the selected alternatives in the decisions (the term stochastically converges means that the probability the actual value will differ from the expected value by any specified amount gets closer to zero as the number of independent decisions increases). Thus, if we value alternatives at more than their expected values, we will lose money over many decisions since we will only sell such alternatives for more than they will return on average. Similarly, if we value alternatives at less than their expected values, we will lose money because we will sell alternatives for less than they will return on average.

However, additional factors enter when the stakes are high. Most of us would be willing to pay up to the expected value of Rs. 2.50 for a lottery ticket giving us a 50:50 chance of winning Rs. 10.00 or losing Rs. 5.00. On the other hand, most of us would not be willing to pay as much as Rs. 25,000 for a lottery ticket with a 50:50 chance of winning Rs. 100,000 or losing Rs. 50,000 even though Rs. 25,000 is the expected value of this lottery. This is because a few Rs. 50,000 losses would leave most of us without the resources to continue. We cannot "play the averages" over a series of decisions where the stakes are this large, and thus considerations of long-run average returns are less relevant to our decision making. Many conservative business people are averse to taking risks. That is, they attempt to avoid the possibility of large losses. Such individuals have certainty equivalents that are lower than the expected values of uncertain alternatives if we are dealing with profits, or higher than the expected values if we are dealing with costs. That is, these individuals are willing to sell the alternatives for less than these alternatives will yield on average over many such decisions in order to avoid the risk of a loss. Intuitively, we might consider incorporating this aversion toward risk into an analysis by replacing expected value as a decision criterion by something else which weights less desirable outcomes more heavily. Thus, we might replace the expected value of alternative A, i.e.

$$E(x|A) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i p(x_i|A)$$

as a decision criterion by the expected value of some utility function $u(x)$, that is

$$E[u(x)|a] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} u(x_i) p(x_i|A)$$

where $p(x_i|A)$ is the probability of x_i given that A is selected.

If x is total assets in hundreds of thousands of dollars, then we might have $u(x) = \log(x+1)$. With this utility function, higher asset positions will not receive as much weight as with expected value and very low asset positions will receive large negative weight. This will tend to favor alternatives that have lower risk even if they also have lower expected values.

The certainty equivalent CE can be determined if a utility function $u(x)$ is known using the relationship $u(\text{CE}) = E[u(x)|A]$ where $E[u(x)|A]$ is the expectation of the utility for alternative A. As an example, consider again the decision above which has equal chances of either winning Rs. 100,000 or losing Rs. 50,000, and suppose that the decision maker's initial asset position is Rs. 100,000. The expected value of this alternative in terms of total assets is $0.5 \times Rs.200,000 + 0.5 \times Rs.50,000 = Rs.125,000$. Using the logarithmic utility function shown in the preceding paragraph, we can solve for the certainty equivalent from $\log(\text{CE} + 1) = 0.5 \log (2 + 1) + 0.5 \log(0.5 + 1)$ which gives CE = Rs. 112, 000. Thus, the alternative has a certainty equivalent which is Rs. 13,000 less than the expected value of Rs. 125,000 when it is evaluated with this utility function. This demonstrates the aversion to taking risks that was discussed above. Note that in the above, the problem is to maximize profit, therefore the utility function is taken as logarithm, however, if the problem is the minimization of certain cost, then the usual practice is to take exponential function as utility function. This is the basic idea underlying utility functions.

1.1.5.2 Motivation for studying risk-sensitive reinforcement learning

Consider an irreducible aperiodic Markov chain $\{X_n\}$ on a finite state space $S = \{1, 2, \ldots, s\}$, with transition matrix $P = [[p(j|i)]]i, j \in S$. Let $c : S \times S \to \mathbb{R}$ denote a prescribed 'running cost' function and C be the $s \times s$ matrix whose (i, j)-th entry is $e^{c(i,j)}$. The aim is to evaluate risk-sensitive cost defined as

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \left(E[e^{\sum_{m=0}^{n-1} c(X_m, X_{m+1})}] \right).$$

That this limit exists follows from the multiplicative ergodic theorem for Markov chains (see Theorem 1.2 of Balaji and Meyn (2000) [64], the sufficient condition (4) therein is trivially verified for the finite state case here).

Like other cost criteria, one can propose and justify iterative algorithms for solving the dynamic programming equation for risk-sensitive setting [83]. The issue we are interested in here is how to do so, even approximately, when the exact model is either unavailable or too unwieldy to afford analysis, but on the other hand simulated or real data is available easily, based on which one may hope to 'learn' the solution in an incremental fashion.

One important point to note here is that the usual simulation based technique of calculating average cost does not work when the objective is a risk-sensitive cost. The reason is that average cost is defined as

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} E[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c(X_i)],$$

where $c(i)$ is the cost of state i and X_n, $n \geq 0$ is an irreducible finite state Markov chain. Therefore the following iterative algorithm will almost surely converge to the average cost:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)\left[c(X_n) - \theta_n\right], \tag{1.18}$$

where the step sizes satisfy the Robbins-Monro conditions. This follows from the ergodic theorem for irreducible Markov chains as well as the convergence analysis of stochastic approximation with Markov noise [77]. On the contrary one needs to apply the multiplicative ergodic theorem ([64]) when the cost is risk-sensitive. However, this does not have any closed-form limit. Moreover, one cannot even write iterative algorithms like (1.18) in this setting because of the non-linear nature of the cost. Due to the same reason, methods of [53] also don't work in this setting when one is solving the full control problem.

This takes us into the domain of reinforcement learning. In [76] and [74], Q-learning and actor-critic methods have been proposed respectively for such a cost-criterion. These are 'raw' schemes in the sense that there is no further approximation involved. Since complex control problems lead to dynamic programming equations in very large dimensions ('curse of dimensionality'), one often looks for an approximation based scheme. One such learning algorithm with function approximation is proposed in [1].

1.1.6 Motivation for the problems considered in this thesis

In this section we provide the motivation for the problems considered in this thesis. In Section 1.1.7 we summarize our solutions to these problems.

1.1.6.1 Problem 1

There are many reinforcement learning applications (precisely those where parameterization of value function is implemented) where non-additive Markov noise is present in one or both iterates thus requiring the current two-time scale framework to be extended to include Markov noise (for example, in [66, p. 5] it is mentioned that in order to generalize the analysis to Markov noise, the theory of two time-scale stochastic approximation needs to include the latter). This is our prime motivation to show a general analysis of convergence of stochastic iterates with Markov noise.

1.1.6.2 Problem 2

All learning control methods face a dilemma: They seek to learn action values conditional on subsequent optimal behavior, but they need to behave non-optimally in order to explore all actions (to find the optimal actions). How can they learn about the optimal policy while behaving according to an exploratory policy? The on-policy approach is actually a compromise-it learns action values not for the optimal policy, but for a near-optimal policy that still explores. A more straightforward approach is to use two policies, one that is learned about and that becomes the optimal policy, and one that is more exploratory and is used to generate behavior. The policy being learned about is called the *target policy*, and the policy used to generate

behavior is called the *behavior policy*. In this case we say that learning is from data "off" the target policy, and the overall process is termed *off-policy learning*. It is well known that popular off-policy learning algorithms such as Q-learning may diverge when function approximation is deployed [36]. Therefore as earlier, the off-policy learning involves two-step procedure: off-policy prediction and off-policy control.

We consider the problem of estimating the value function corresponding to a target policy given the realization of a finite state Markov decision process under a behaviour policy which is different from the target policy. This is well known in literature as the off-policy evaluation problem. This is often the case when the simulation device can simulate states only according to a certain preset policy and cannot adaptively take in newer policies as they are computed. See [60] for additional uses.

It is well-known that for this problem the standard temporal difference learning with linear function approximation may diverge ([36], [61, Section 3]). Further, the usual single time-scale stochastic approximation kind of argument may not be useful as the associated ordinary differential equation (o.d.e) may not have the TD(0) solution as its globally asymptotically stable equilibrium. In [62, 63, 26] the gradient temporal difference learning (GTD) algorithms were proposed to solve this problem. The per time-step computational complexity for these algorithms scales only linearly in the size d of the function approximator. However, the authors make the assumption that either

1. one uses "sub-sampling" (see [26, Section 4.1],[62] for details) to filter the data relevant to target policy given the trajectory corresponding to behaviour policy, or

2. the data itself is available in the off-policy setting i.e. one has direct access to quadruples of the form (state, action, reward, next state) where the first component of the quadruples are sampled independently from the stationary distribution of the underlying Markov chain corresponding to the behaviour policy and the quadruples are formed according to the target policy.

Amongst all algorithms with the above assumptions, the TDC (temporal difference learning with gradient correction) algorithm was empirically found to be the most efficient in terms of the rate of convergence. It was shown in [63] that such an algorithm can be proved to be convergent using the classical convergence proof for two time-scale stochastic approximation with martingale difference noise [73]. The reason for using two time-scale framework for the TDC algorithm is to make sure that the O.D.E's have globally asymptotically stable equilibrium. However, one can prove the convergence using single time-scale convergence analysis as in [26, Theorem 3]; however the extra condition on the step-size ratio η mentioned there is hard to verify as the stationary distribution there is typically unknown or is hard to compute particularly in the face of large state/action spaces.

Note that such works incorporate the off-policy issue into the data as they don't take the full behaviour trajectory as input to the algorithm. The assumptions therein on off-policy algorithms are highly restrictive as

1. although in the first case the Markov chain sampled at increasing stopping times is time-homogeneous, its transition probabilities will be different from those of the Markov

chain corresponding to behaviour policy. Further, we are interested in an *online* learning scheme. Also,

2. the second situation is not realistic too as the aforementioned stationary distribution is usually unknown; one has access to only the trajectory corresponding to behaviour policy from which the goal is to evaluate the target policy.

Keeping this in mind, another algorithm introduced in [26], namely, TDC with importance weighting solves the above off-policy evaluation problem in a more realistic scenario. The idea is to handle the off-policy issue in the algorithm rather than in the data by weighting the updates by the likelihood of action taken by the target policy (as opposed to the behavior policy). The advantage is that, unlike sub-sampling, here all the data from the given trajectory corresponding to the behaviour policy is used which is necessary in an *online* learning scenario. Another advantage of this method is that we can allow both the behaviour and target policies to be randomized unlike the sub-sampling scenario where one can use only a deterministic policy to be a target policy. However, to the best of our knowledge, both its theoretical and empirical convergence properties have not yet been analyzed. Note that one cannot represent the algorithm in the usual two time-scale stochastic approximation framework to prove its convergence and one needs to extend such a framework to non-additive Markov noise and additive martingale difference noise. The Markov noise appears in the algorithm as the full trajectory of the realization of the underlying Markov decision process corresponding to the behaviour policy and is taken as input to the algorithm.

1.1.6.3 Problem 3

As mentioned in the Section 1.1.3, the most important assumption to prove convergence of stochastic approximation algorithms with Markov noise is the *stability* of the iterates, i.e.,

$$\sup_n \|\theta_n\| < \infty \ a.s. \tag{1.19}$$

In the literature sufficient conditions that guarantee (1.19) are available (e.g. based on a Lyapunov function [24, Chap. 6.7], [9, 10] and scaled trajectory [77, Chap 6, Theorem 9]), etc. As mentioned in [9, 10], proving stability of the iterates is a tedious task with the Markovian dynamics due to the noise term $f(\theta_n, Y_{n+1}) - h(\theta_n)$. In [9], the truncations on adaptive truncation sets from [23] has been extended to the case where the noise is Markov. It is clearly mentioned there that the procedure they follow is different in some respects from the original procedure proposed by [23]. To prove that the number of re-initializations of the procedure described in [9, Section 3.2] is finite, they establish a bound on the probability that the n-th reinitialization time is finite in terms of the fluctuations of the noise sequence of the algorithm between successive re-initializations. In order to control the fluctuations some less classical assumptions have been imposed on the transition kernel as well as on the vector field $g(\cdot, \cdot)$ (see (DRI2) and (DRI3)) and the discussion thereafter. Further, the stability theorem stated in the second work also requires assumptions such as 1) continuity of the transition kernel, 2) Lipschitz continuity of f in the first component *uniformly* w.r.t the second, and that 3) f is jointly continuous.

In this work, we investigate the dynamics of stochastic approximation with Markov iterate-dependent noise when (1.19) is not known to be satisfied beforehand. We achieve the same by extending the *lock-in probability* framework of Borkar [75] to such a recursion. Note that similar results [50, 51] using large deviation theory were present in prior literature. However, assumptions made in Borkar's work are easily verifiable in applications.

The motivation for lock-in probability comes from a phenomenon noticed by W.B.Arthur in simple urn models ([77, Chap. 1]) of increasing return economics: if occurrences predominantly of one type tend to fetch more occurrences of the same type, then after some initial randomness the process gets *locked into* that type of (possibly undesirable) occurrence. Moreover, it is known that under reasonable conditions, every asymptotically stable equilibrium will have a positive probability of emerging as $\lim_{n\to\infty}\theta_n$ [86], while this probability is zero for unstable equilibria under mild conditions on the noise [49, 58].

With this picture in mind and to give a quantitative explanation of this phenomenon, Borkar defined lock-in probability [75] for the iterates of the form

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)(h(\theta_n) + M_{n+1}), \tag{1.20}$$

where $\{M_n\}$ is a martingale difference noise sequence, as the probability of convergence of θ_n to an asymptotically stable attractor H of (1.10) *given* that the iterate is in a neighbourhood B thereof after a *sufficiently large* n_0, i.e.,

$$P(\theta_n \to H | \theta_{n_0} \in B)$$

for a compact $\bar{B}$ where $H \subset B \subset \bar{B} \subset G$ where G is the domain of attraction of the local attractor. He also found a lower bound for this quantity by studying the *local* behavior of iterates in a neighborhood of the attractor. Clearly, n_0 depends on the specific H. Specifically, under the assumption $E[\|M_{n+1}\|^2|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq K(1+\|\theta_n\|^2)$ a.s. the bound obtained is $1 - O(\sum_{i\geq n_0} a(i)^2)$ and under the more restrictive condition $\|M_{n+1}\| \leq K_0(1+\|\theta_n\|)$ a.s., a tighter bound of $1 - O(e^{-\frac{1}{\sum_{i\geq n_0} a(i)^2}})$ has been obtained [75]. There are recent results [22, 65] which obtain tighter bounds under much weaker assumptions on martingale and step-size sequences.

The fact that lock-in probability is not just a theoretical metric to explain the lock-in phenomenon of information economics was shown by Kamal [65]. If the iterates are *tight* then lock-in probability results are used in [65] to prove almost sure convergence of the stochastic approximation scheme albeit with (with only martingale difference noise) to the *global* attractor.

The phenomenon described earlier can be observed in reinforcement learning (RL) applications where the limiting o.d.e. has multiple equilibria, e.g., several instances of stochastic gradient descent in machine learning.

We extend in our work the currently available lock-in probability estimates to the case where the vector field includes a Markov iterate-dependent noise sequence. This is for instance the case with many reinforcement learning algorithms.

Although the recursion (1.8) covers most of the cases of stochastic approximation with Markov iterate-dependent noise, there are reinforcement learning scenarios where there can be a dependence on both the present and the next sample of the Markov iterate-dependent noise in the vector field [52]. For such scenarios the general recursion is:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n) f(\theta_n, Y_n, Y_{n+1}). \tag{1.21}$$

One can write (1.21) as

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)\left[E[f(\theta_n, Y_n, Y_{n+1})|\mathcal{F}_n] + M_{n+1}\right],$$

where $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta_m, Y_m, m \leq n)$ and $M_{n+1} = f(\theta_n, Y_n, Y_{n+1}) - E[f(\theta_n, Y_n, Y_{n+1})|\mathcal{F}_n]$ is now a martingale difference sequence. Therefore, with abuse of notation, the general recursion which takes care of Markov iterate-dependent noise can be described as

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)\left[f(\theta_n, Y_n) + M_{n+1}\right]. \tag{1.22}$$

In fact, this also covers the situation where both Markov iterate-dependent *and* martingale difference noise are present. In this work, we give a lower bound on the lock-in probability estimate of iterates of the form (1.22) using the *Poisson equation* based analysis as in [46, 2]. Under some assumptions in [46] and some further assumptions, we get a lower bound of $1 - O(e^{-\frac{C}{\sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} a(i)^2}})$ for the recursion (1.22), and thus also for the special case (1.8). Therefore, with the more general assumption of Markov iterate-dependent noise, we recover the *same bounds* available for the setting of martingale noise [78, p. 38] albeit under some additional assumptions on the Markov iterate-dependent process and step size sequence.

Very few results [43] are available on non-asymptotic rate of convergence of general stochastic approximation iterates (1.8), see also [5] for stochastic gradient descent and [21] for finite sample analysis of temporal difference learning. But lock-in probability estimates can be used to calculate an upper bound for the sample complexity of stochastic approximation [77, chap. 4.2],[65]. Given a desired accuracy $\epsilon > 0$ and confidence γ, the sample complexity estimate is defined to be the minimum number of iterations $N(\epsilon, \gamma)$ after which the iterates are within a certain neighbourhood (which is a function of ϵ) of H with probability at least $1 - \gamma$. This is slightly different from the sample complexity estimate arising in the context of consistent supervised learning algorithms in statistical learning theory [38]. The differences are:

1. In the case of statistical learning theory, sample complexity corresponds to the number of *i.i.d training samples* needed for the algorithm to successfully learn a target function. However, in our case, we have a *recursive* scheme whose sample complexity depends on the step-size.

2. Ours is a *conditional* estimate, i.e., the estimate is conditioned on the event $\{\theta_{n_0} \in B\}$ where B is an open subset of the domain of attraction of $H \subset B$ and has compact closure, and n_0 is sufficiently large.

Another point worth noting is that sample complexity results are much weaker than lock-in probability and do not require existence of Lyapunov function.

1.1.6.4 Problem 4

In the approximation architectures as mentioned in Section 1.1.5 an important problem is to obtain a good error bound for the approximation. This has been pointed out by Borkar in the future work sections of [79, 1, 80]. While [1] provides such a bound when the problem is

of policy evaluation, it is also mentioned there that the bound obtained is not good when the state space is large.

In our work we investigate the problems with the existing bound and then improve upon the same. We show that good approximations are captured in our bounds whereas the earlier bound will infer them as bad approximation.

1.1.7 Highlights of the thesis contributions

As described earlier convergence analysis of stochastic approximation with Markov Noise has been studied extensively in the seminal work of [46, 47, 2]. The main aim of this thesis is to present convergence analysis of such recursions or such recursions with two time-scales under general assumptions which has not been done earlier, thus facilitating applications in reinforcement learning. Chapter 2 - 5 describe the four problems considered in this thesis. Chapter 6 describes conclusions and future directions based on the work in this thesis. In the following we summarize the contributions of Chapter 2 - 5.

1.1.7.1 Problem 1

We present for the first time an asymptotic convergence analysis of two time-scale stochastic approximation driven by "controlled" Markov noise. In particular, the faster and slower recursions have non-additive iterate-dependent Markov noise components that depend on an additional control sequence and this is in addition to martingale difference noise. We analyze the asymptotic behavior of our framework by relating it to limiting differential inclusions in both time scales that are defined in terms of the ergodic occupation measures associated with the controlled Markov processes. Note that the results of [77] assume that the state space of the controlled Markov process is Polish which may impose additional conditions that are hard to verify. In this section, other than proving our two time-scale results, we prove many of the results in [77] (which were only stated there) assuming the state space to be compact and thus can be easily verified. Additionally, we generalize the global attractor assumption of the faster o.d.e in [78, Chapter 6, (A1)] to local attractors. We then prove almost sure convergence of the iterates under the requirement that the faster iterate belongs to a compact subset of the intersection (over all θ) of the domain of attraction of the local attractors *eventually*. The requirement on the faster iterate is much stronger than the usual local attractor statement for the Kushner-Clarke lemma [46, Section II.C] which requires the iterates to enter a compact set in the domain of attraction for the local attractor *infinitely often* only. Additionally, we prove the tracking lemma of [77, Lemma 2.2] using the Borel-Cantelli Lemma (the main idea is to prove $X_n \to 0$ a.s by showing that $\forall \epsilon > 0$, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(|X_n| > \epsilon) < \infty$ for a sequence of random variables $X_n, n \geq 0$) so that we can allow the Lipschitz constant of the vector fields to depend on the state space. Although there is a recent work [84] which relaxes many of the assumptions of our work (such as vector fields in both iterates as well as $\lambda(\theta)$ are set-valued Marchaud maps), however, this is done under the assumption that $\lambda(\theta)$ is a global attractor and the constant in the point-wise boundedness assumption of the Marchaud map does not depend on the state space of the Markov process.

This work is described in Chapter 2.

1.1.7.2 Problem 2

In this work we give a rigorous almost sure convergence proof of TDC algorithm with importance weighting by formulating it into the two time-scale stochastic approximation framework with non-additive Markov noise and additive martingale difference noise. To the best of our knowledge this is the first time an almost sure convergence proof of off-policy temporal difference learning algorithm with linear function approximation is presented for step-sizes satisfying the standard Robbins-Monro conditions. We also support these theoretical results by providing empirical results. Our results show that due to the aforementioned importance weighting factor, *online* TDC with importance weighting performs much better than the sub-sampling version of TDC for standard off-policy counterexamples when the behaviour policy is much different from the target policy.

Recently, emphatic temporal difference learning has been introduced in [61] to solve the off-policy evaluation problem. However, such algorithms are proven to be almost surely convergent for special step-size sequences and weakly convergent for a large range of step-sizes [30].

Another related work is the much complex off-policy learning algorithms that obtain the benefits of weighted importance sampling (to reduce variance) with $O(d)$ computational complexity [6]. However, nothing is known about the convergence of such algorithms. In this context, we empirically show that in the case of TDC with importance weighting the variance of the difference between true value function and the estimated one for standard off-policy counterexamples such as [36] becomes small eventually.

This work is described in Chapter 3.

1.1.7.3 Problem 3

This work compiles several aspects of the dynamics of stochastic approximation algorithms with Markov iterate-dependent noise when the iterates are not known to be stable beforehand. We achieve the same by extending the lock-in probability (i.e., the probability of convergence to a specific attractor of the limiting o.d.e. given that the iterates are in its domain of attraction after a sufficiently large number of iterations (say) n_0) framework to such recursions. Specifically, with the more restrictive assumption of Markov iterate-dependent noise supported on a bounded subset of the Euclidean space we give a lower bound for the lock-in probability, leading in turn to the following:

1. Let H be an asymptotically stable attractor of (1.10) and G its domain of attraction. If $\{\theta_n\}$ is *asymptotically tight* (which is a much weaker condition than (1.19)) and $\liminf_n P(\theta_n \in G) = 1$, then $P(\theta_n \to H) = 1$ under reasonable set of assumptions satisfied in application areas such as reinforcement learning [81]. To the best of our knowledge this is the first time an almost sure convergence proof for such recursion is presented without assuming the stability of the iterates, however, following the classic Poisson equation model of Metivier and Priouret [46] for such recursion which is designed keeping in mind the stability of the iterates. Additionally, a simple test for asymptotic tightness is also provided.

2. We show that for common step-size sequences such as $\{\frac{1}{n^k}\}$, $\frac{1}{2} < k \leq 1$ and $\frac{1}{n(\log n)^k}, k \leq 1$, if the iterates belong to some special open set with compact closure in the domain of attraction of the local attractor infinitely often w.p. 1, the iterates are stable and converge a.s. to the local attractor.

3. We show that our results can be used to analyze the tracking ability of general (not necessarily linear) stochastic approximation driven by another "slowly" varying stochastic approximation process when the iterates are not known to be stable. Note that in two time-scale stochastic approximation the coupled o.d.e has no attractor. Therefore we need to consider two quantities describing difference (over compact time interval) between algorithm and o.d.e., one for the coupled algorithm/o.d.e and another for the slower algorithm/o.d.e. This gives rise to a situation where the conditioning event in the martingale concentration inequality will not belong to the first σ-field in the current collection of σ-fields (unlike in case of single timescale stochastic approximation where the conditioning event always belongs to the first σ-field in the current collection of σ-fields [78, p 40]).

   Such results are useful in the context of adaptive algorithms [70] as not much is known about the stability of frameworks with different timescales. There is some recent work [20] that also calculates lock-in probability for multiple timescales, however, under the assumption that the vector fields are "linear".

4. We give a sample complexity estimate for the setting where the recursion is a *stochastic fixed point* iteration driven by a Markov iterate-dependent noise. This shows a *quantitative* estimate of *large vs. small step size trade-off* well known in stochastic approximation literature that is shown to be useful in choosing the *optimal step-size*.

This work is described in Chapter 4.

1.1.7.4 Problem 4

In this work we obtain the several informative error bounds on function approximation for the policy evaluation algorithm proposed by [1] when the aim is to find the risk-sensitive cost represented using exponential utility. We also give examples where all our bounds achieve the *actual error* whereas the earlier bound given by [1] is much weaker in comparison. We show that this happens due to the absence of a difference term in the earlier bound which is always present in all our bounds when the state space is large. Additionally, we discuss how all our bounds compare with each other. We also describe a temporal difference learning algorithm in this setting and show that if the stationary distribution is available (in the case of doubly stochastic transition kernel), then one can choose the features appropriately so that the algorithm converges to the actual risk-sensitive cost.

This work is described in Chapter 5.

1.1.8 Notations used to denote assumptions

In the following chapters we have used **(Ai)**, **(Bi)**, **(Si)** and **(S'i)** (where $i \geq 1$) to denote assumptions under which the stated theorems and lemmas are true. Unless stated explicitly,

(Ai), **(Bi)**, **(Si)** and **(S'i)** will denote the same defined in the corresponding chapter.

Chapter 2

Two Time-scale Stochastic Approximation with Controlled Markov noise

2.1 Brief introduction and Organization

Here we present a more general framework of two time-scale stochastic approximation with "controlled" Markov noise, i.e., the noise is not simply Markov; rather it is driven by the iterates and an additional control process as well. We analyze the asymptotic behaviour of our framework by relating it to limiting differential inclusions in both timescales that are defined in terms of the ergodic occupation measures associated with the controlled Markov processes. To the best of our knowledge there are related works such as [68, 70, 71, 69] where two time-scale stochastic approximation algorithms with algorithm iterate dependent non-additive Markov noise is analyzed. In all of them the Markov noise in the recursion is handled using the classic Poisson equation based approach of [2, 46] and applied to the asymptotic analysis of many algorithms used in machine learning, system identification, signal processing, image analysis and automatic control. However, we show that our method also works if there is another additional control process as well and if the underlying Markov process has non-unique stationary distributions. Additionally, our assumptions are quite different from the assumptions made in the mentioned literature and we give a detailed comparison in Section 2.2.2.

The results described in this chapter are mainly based on the proof techniques of [73] and [77]. To the best of our knowledge, we believe that the assumption of Polish state space of [77] will impose extra conditions that are hard to verify. In our work, we prove many of the results in [77] (which were only stated there) assuming the state space to be compact. Also, in our work we allow the Lipschitz constant of the vector field to depend on the state space of the Markov process which was assumed independent of the state space in [77]. We also relax the assumption of global attractor [73] by allowing the o.d.e in the faster timescale to have local attractors.

The organization of this chapter is as follows: Section 2.2 formally defines the problem and provides background and assumptions. Section 2.3 shows the main results. Section 2.4 discusses

how one of our assumptions of Section 2.2 can be relaxed. Finally, we conclude by providing some future research directions.

2.2 Background, Problem Definition, and Assumptions

In the following we describe the preliminaries and notation used in our proofs. Most of the definitions and notation are from [41, 78, 31].

2.2.1 Definition and Notation

Let F denote a set-valued function mapping each point $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ to a set $F(\theta) \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. F is called a *Marchaud map* if the following hold:

(i) F is *upper-semicontinuous* in the sense that if $\theta_n \to \theta$ and $w_n \to w$ with $w_n \in F(\theta_n)$ for all $n \geq 1$, then $w \in F(\theta)$. In order words, the graph of F defined as $\{(\theta, w) : w \in F(\theta)\}$ is closed.

(ii) $F(\theta)$ is a non-empty compact convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^m$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

(iii) $\exists c > 0$ such that for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\sup_{z \in F(\theta)} \|z\| \leq c(1 + \|\theta\|),$$

where $\|.\|$ denotes any norm on $\mathbb{R}^m$.

A solution for the differential inclusion (D.I.)

$$\dot{\theta}(t) \in F(\theta(t)) \tag{2.1}$$

with initial point $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is an absolutely continuous (on compacts) mapping $\theta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\theta(0) = \theta_0$ and

$$\dot{\theta}(t) \in F(\theta(t))$$

for almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. If F is a Marchaud map, it is well-known that (2.1) has solutions (possibly non-unique) through every initial point. The differential inclusion (2.1) induces a *set-valued dynamical system* $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ defined by

$$\Phi_t(\theta_0) = \{\theta(t) : \theta(\cdot) \text{ is a solution to (2.1) with } \theta(0) = \theta_0\}.$$

Consider the autonomous ordinary differential equation (o.d.e.)

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = h(\theta(t)), \tag{2.2}$$

where h is Lipschitz continuous. One can write (2.2) in the format of (2.1) by taking $F(\theta) = \{h(\theta)\}$. It is well-known that (2.2) is well-posed, i.e., it has a *unique solution* for every initial point. Hence the set-valued dynamical system induced by the o.d.e. or *flow* is $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ with

$$\Phi_t(\theta_0) = \{\theta(t)\},$$

where $\theta(\cdot)$ is the solution to (2.2) with $\theta(0) = \theta_0$. It is also well-known that $\Phi_t(\cdot)$ is a *continuous function* for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

A set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is said to be *invariant* (for F) if for all $\theta_0 \in A$ there exists a solution $\theta(\cdot)$ of (2.1) with $\theta(0) = \theta_0$ such that $\theta(\mathbb{R}) \subset A$.

Given a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\theta'', w'' \in A$, we write $\theta'' \hookrightarrow_A w''$ if for every $\epsilon > 0$ and $T > 0$ $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$, solutions $\theta_1(\cdot), \ldots, \theta_n(\cdot)$ to (2.1) and real numbers $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n$ greater than T such that

(i) $\theta_i(s) \in A$ for all $0 \leq s \leq t_i$ and for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$,

(ii) $\|\theta_i(t_i) - \theta_{i+1}(0)\| \leq \epsilon$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$,

(iii) $\|\theta_1(0) - \theta''\| \leq \epsilon$ and $\|\theta_n(t_n) - w''\| \leq \epsilon$.

The sequence $(\theta_1(\cdot), \ldots, \theta_n(\cdot))$ is called an (ϵ, T) chain (in A from θ'' to w'') for F. A set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is said to be *internally chain transitive*, provided that A is compact and $\theta'' \hookrightarrow_A w''$ for all $\theta'', w'' \in A$. It can be proved that in the above case, A is an invariant set.

A compact invariant set A is called an *attractor* for Φ, provided that there is a neighbourhood U of A (i.e., for the induced topology) with the property that $d(\Phi_t(\theta''), A) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$ *uniformly* in $\theta'' \in U$. Here $d(X, Y) = \sup_{\theta'' \in X} \inf_{w'' \in Y} \|\theta'' - w''\|$ for $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. Such a U is called a *fundamental neighbourhood* of the attractor A. *An attractor of a well-posed o.d.e.* is an attractor for the set-valued dynamical system induced by the o.d.e.

The set

$$\omega_\Phi(\theta'') = \bigcap_{t \geq 0} \overline{\Phi_{[t,\infty)}(\theta'')}$$

is called the *ω-limit* set of a point $\theta'' \in \mathbb{R}^m$. If A is a set, then

$$B(A) = \{\theta'' \in \mathbb{R}^m : \omega_\Phi(\theta'') \subset A\}$$

denotes its *basin of attraction*. A *global attractor* for Φ is an attractor A whose basin of attraction consists of all $\mathbb{R}^m$. Then the following lemma will be useful for our proofs, see [41] for a proof.

Lemma 1. *Suppose Φ has a global attractor A. Then every internally chain transitive set lies in A.*

We also require another result which will be useful to apply our results to the RL application we mention. Before stating it we recall some definitions from Appendix 11.2.3 of [78]:

A point $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is called *Lyapunov stable* for the o.d.e (2.2) if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that every trajectory of (2.2) initiated in the δ-neighbourhood of θ^* remains in its ϵ-neighbourhood. θ^* is called *globally asymptotically stable* if θ^* is Lyapunov stable and *all* trajectories of the o.d.e. converge to it.

Lemma 2. *Consider the autonomous o.d.e. $\dot{\theta}(t) = h(\theta(t))$ where h is Lipschitz continuous. Let θ^* be globally asymptotically stable. Then θ^* is the global attractor of the o.d.e.*

Proof. We refer the readers to Lemma 1 of [78, Chapter 3] for a proof. □

We end this subsection with a notation which will be used frequently in the convergence statements in the following sections.

Definition 1. *For function $\theta(\cdot)$ defined on $[0,\infty)$, the notation "$\theta(t) \to A$ as $t \to \infty$" means that $A = \cap_{t\geq 0}\overline{\{\theta(s) : s \geq t\}}$. Similar definition applies for a sequence $\{\theta_n\}$.*

2.2.2 Problem Definition

Our goal is to perform an asymptotic analysis of the following coupled recursions:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)\left[h(\theta_n, w_n, Z_n^{(1)}) + M_{n+1}^{(1)}\right], \tag{2.3}$$

$$w_{n+1} = w_n + b(n)\left[g(\theta_n, w_n, Z_n^{(2)}) + M_{n+1}^{(2)}\right], \tag{2.4}$$

where $\theta_n \in \mathbb{R}^d, w_n \in \mathbb{R}^k, n \geq 0$ and $\{Z_n^{(i)}\}, \{M_n^{(i)}\}, i = 1, 2$ are random processes that we describe below.

We make the following assumptions:

(A1) $\{Z_n^{(i)}\}$ takes values in a compact metric space $S^{(i)}, i = 1, 2$. Additionally, the processes $\{Z_n^{(i)}\}, i = 1, 2$ are controlled Markov processes that are controlled by three different control processes: the iterate sequences $\{\theta_m\}, \{w_m\}$ and a random process $\{A_n^{(i)}\}$ taking values in a compact metric space $U^{(i)}$ respectively with their individual dynamics specified by

$$P(Z_{n+1}^{(i)} \in B^{(i)} | Z_m^{(i)}, A_m^{(i)}, \theta_m, w_m, m \leq n) = \int_{B^{(i)}} p^{(i)}(dy | Z_n^{(i)}, A_n^{(i)}, \theta_n, w_n), n \geq 0,$$

for $B^{(i)}$ Borel in $S^{(i)}, i = 1, 2$, respectively.

Remark 1. *In this context one should note that [2, 46] requires the Markov process to take value in a normed Polish space.*

Remark 2. *In [77] it is assumed that the state space where the controlled Markov Process takes values is Polish. This space is then compactified using the fact that a Polish space can be homeomorphically embedded into a dense subset of a compact metric space. The vector field $h(.,.) : \mathbb{R}^d \times S \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is considered bounded when the first component lies in a compact set. This would, however, require a continuous extension of $h' : \mathbb{R}^d \times \phi(S) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by $h'(x, s') = h(x, \phi^{-1}(s'))$ to $\mathbb{R}^d \times \overline{\phi(S)}$. Here $\phi(\cdot)$ is the homeomorphism defined by $\phi(s) = (\rho(s, s_1), \rho(s, s_2), \dots) \in [0, 1]^\infty$, and $\{s_i\}$ and ρ is a countable dense subset and metric of the Polish space respectively. A sufficient condition for the above is h' to be uniformly continuous [87, Ex:13, p. 99]. However, this is hard to verify. This is the main motivation for us to take the range of the Markov process as compact for our problem. However, there are other reasons for taking compact state space which will be clear in the proofs of this section and the next.*

(A2) $h : \mathbb{R}^{d+k} \times S^{(1)} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is jointly continuous as well as Lipschitz in its first two arguments uniformly w.r.t the third. The latter condition means that

$$\forall z^{(1)} \in S^{(1)}, \|h(\theta, w, z^{(1)}) - h(\theta', w', z^{(1)})\| \leq L^{(1)}(\|\theta - \theta'\| + \|w - w'\|).$$

Same thing is also true for g where the Lipschitz constant is $L^{(2)}$. Note that the Lipschitz constant $L^{(i)}$ does not depend on $z^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Remark 3. *We later relax the uniformity of the Lipschitz constant w.r.t the Markov process state space by putting suitable moment assumptions on Markov process.*

(A3) $\{M_n^{(i)}\}, i = 1, 2$ are martingale difference sequences w.r.t increasing σ-fields

$$\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta_m, w_m, M_m^{(i)}, Z_m^{(i)}, m \leq n, i = 1, 2), n \geq 0,$$

satisfying

$$E[\|M_{n+1}^{(i)}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_n] \leq K(1 + \|\theta_n\|^2 + \|w_n\|^2), i = 1, 2,$$

for $n \geq 0$ and a given constant $K > 0$.

(A4) The stepsizes $\{a(n)\}, \{b(n)\}$ are positive scalars satisfying

$$\sum_n a(n) = \sum_n b(n) = \infty, \sum_n (a(n)^2 + b(n)^2) < \infty, \frac{a(n)}{b(n)} \to 0.$$

Moreover, $a(n), b(n), n \geq 0$ are non-increasing.

Before stating the assumption on the transition kernel $p^{(i)}, i = 1, 2$ we need to define the metric in the space of probability measures $\mathcal{P}(S)$. Here we mention the definitions and main theorems on the spaces of probability measures that we use in our proofs (details can be found in Chapter 2 of [72]). We denote the metric by d and is defined as

$$d(\mu, \nu) = \sum_j 2^{-j} | \int f_j d\mu - \int f_j d\nu |, \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(S),$$

where $\{f_j\}$ are countable dense in the unit ball of $C(S)$. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) $d(\mu_n, \mu) \to 0$,

(ii) for all bounded f in $C(S)$,

$$\int_S f d\mu_n \to \int_S f d\mu, \tag{2.5}$$

(iii) $\forall f$ bounded and uniformly continuous,

$$\int_S f d\mu_n \to \int_S f d\mu.$$

Hence we see that $d(\mu_n, \mu) \to 0$ iff $\int_S f_j d\mu_n \to \int_S f_j d\mu$ for all j. Any such sequence of functions $\{f_j\}$ is called a convergence determining class in $\mathcal{P}(S)$. Sometimes we also denote $d(\mu_n, \mu) \to 0$ using the notation $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$.
Also, we recall the characterization of relative compactness in $\mathcal{P}(S)$ that relies on the definition of tightness. $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}(S)$ is a tight set if for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact $K_\epsilon \subset S$ such that $\mu(K_\epsilon) > 1-\epsilon$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{A}$. Clearly, if S is compact then any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}(S)$ is tight. By Prohorov's theorem, $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}(S)$ is relatively compact if and only if it is tight. With the above definitions we assume the following:

(A5) The map $S^{(i)} \times U^{(i)} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+k} \ni (z^{(i)}, a^{(i)}, \theta, w) \to p^{(i)}(dy|z^{(i)}, a^{(i)}, \theta, w) \in \mathcal{P}(S^{(i)})$ is continuous. **(A5)** is much simpler than the assumptions on n-step transition kernel in [2, Part II,Chap. 2, Theorem 6].

Additionally, unlike [77, p 140 line 13], we do not require the extra assumption of the continuity in the θ variable of $p(dy|z, a, \theta)$ to be uniform on compacts w.r.t the other variables. This means: $\forall \epsilon > 0, K \subset S \times U$ and K compact, $\exists \delta_K$ (i.e. this same δ works for all $(z, a) \in K$) s.t. if $\|\theta - \theta'\| < \delta_K$, then $d(p(dy|z, a, \theta), p(dy|z, a, \theta')) < \epsilon \ \forall (z, a) \in K$. Here $d(.,.)$ is the metric in the space of probability measures [72, Chap. 2]

The above is much stronger than the combination of the state space being compact and continuity of the transition kernel. We only use uniform continuity of functions like $g'|_A$ where $g'(z, a, \theta) = \int_S f(y)p(dy|z, a, \theta)$ and $A = S \times U \times (\{\theta_n\} \bigcup \theta)$ or similar functions in our proofs.

For $\theta_n = \theta, w_n = w$ for all n with a fixed deterministic $(\theta, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+k}$ and under any stationary randomized control $\pi^{(i)}$, it follows from Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 3.1 of [77] that the time-homogeneous Markov processes $Z_n^{(i)}, i = 1, 2$ have (possibly non-unique) invariant distributions $\eta^{(i)}_{\theta,w,\pi^{(i)}}, i = 1, 2.$.

Now, it is well-known that the ergodic occupation measure defined as

$$\Psi^{(i)}_{\theta,w,\pi^{(i)}}(dz, da) := \eta^{(i)}_{\theta,w,\pi^{(i)}}(dz)\pi^{(i)}(z, da) \in \mathcal{P}(S^{(i)} \times U^{(i)})$$

satisfies the following:

$$\int_{S^{(i)}} f^{(i)}(z)\Psi^{(i)}_{\theta,w,\pi^{(i)}}(dz, U^{(i)}) = \int_{S^{(i)} \times U^{(i)}} \int_{S^{(i)}} f^{(i)}(y)p^{(i)}(dy|z, a, \theta, w)\Psi^{(i)}_{\theta,w,\pi^{(i)}}(dz, da) \tag{2.6}$$

for $f^{(i)} : S^{(i)} \to \mathcal{R} \in C_b(S^{(i)})$.

We denote by $D^{(i)}(\theta, w), i = 1, 2$ the set of all such ergodic occupation measures for the prescribed θ and w. In the following we prove some properties of the map $(\theta, w) \to D^{(i)}(\theta, w)$.

Lemma 3. *For all (θ, w), $D^{(i)}(\theta, w)$ is convex and compact.*

Proof. The proof trivially follows from **(A1)**, **(A5)** and (2.6). □

Lemma 4. *The map $(\theta, w) \to D^{(i)}(\theta, w)$ is upper-semi-continuous.*

Proof. Let $\theta_n \to \theta, w_n \to w$ and $\Psi_n^{(i)} \Rightarrow \Psi^{(i)} \in \mathcal{P}(S^{(i)} \times U^{(i)})$ such that $\Psi_n^{(i)} \in D^{(i)}(\theta_n, w_n)$. Let $g_n^{(i)}(z,a) = \int_{S^{(i)}} f^{(i)}(y) p^{(i)}(dy|z,a,\theta_n,w_n)$ and $g^{(i)}(z,a) = \int_{S^{(i)}} f^{(i)}(y) p^{(i)}(dy|z,a,\theta,w)$. From (2.6) we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{S^{(i)}} f^{(i)}(z)\Psi^{(i)}(dz,U^{(i)}) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{S^{(i)}} f^{(i)}(z)\Psi_n^{(i)}(dz,U^{(i)}) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{S^{(i)}\times U^{(i)}} \int_{S^{(i)}} f^{(i)}(y) p^{(i)}(dy|z,a,\theta_n,w_n)\Psi_n^{(i)}(dz,da) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{S^{(i)}\times U^{(i)}} g_n^{(i)}(z,a)\Psi_n^{(i)}(dz,da).\end{aligned}$$

Now, $p^{(i)}(dy|z,a,\theta_n,w_n) \Rightarrow p^{(i)}(dy|z,a,\theta,w)$ implies $g_n^{(i)}(\cdot,\cdot) \to g^{(i)}(\cdot,\cdot)$ pointwise. We prove that the convergence is indeed uniform. It is enough to prove that this sequence of functions is equicontinuous. Then along with pointwise convergence it will imply uniform convergence on compacts [87, p. 168, Ex: 16]. This is also a place where **(A1)** is used.

Define $g' : S^{(i)} \times U^{(i)} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+k} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $g'(z',a',\theta',w') = \int_{S^{(i)}} f^{(i)}(y) p^{(i)}(dy|z,a',\theta',w')$. Then g' is continuous. Let $A = S^{(i)} \times U^{(i)} \times (\{\theta_n\} \cup \theta) \times (\{w_n\} \cup w)$. So, A is compact and $g'|_A$ is uniformly continuous. This implies that for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $\rho'(s_1,s_2) < \delta, \mu'(a_1,a_2) < \delta, \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| < \delta, \|w_1 - w_2\| < \delta$, then $|g'(s_1,a_1,\theta_1,w_1) - g'(s_2,a_2,\theta_2,w_2)| < \epsilon$ where $s_1,s_2 \in S^{(i)}, a_1,a_2 \in U^{(i)}, \theta_1,\theta_2 \in (\{\theta_n\} \cup \theta), w_1,w_2 \in (\{w_n\} \cup w)$ and ρ' and μ' denote the metrics in $S^{(i)}$ and $U^{(i)}$ respectively. Now use this same δ for the $\{g_n^{(i)}(\cdot,\cdot)\}$ to get for all n the following for $\rho'(z_1,z_2) < \delta, \mu'(a_1,a_2) < \delta$:

$$|g_n^{(i)}(z_1,a_1) - g_n^{(i)}(z_2,a_2)| = |g'(z_1,a_1,\theta_n,w_n) - g'(z_2,a_2,\theta_n,w_n)| < \epsilon.$$

Hence $\{g_n^{(i)}(\cdot,\cdot)\}$ is equicontinuous. For large n, $\sup_{(z,a)\in S^{(i)}\times U^{(i)}} |g_n^{(i)}(z,a) - g^{(i)}(z,a)| < \epsilon/2$ because of uniform convergence of $\{g_n^{(i)}(\cdot,\cdot)\}$, hence $\int_{S^{(i)}\times U^{(i)}} |g_n^{(i)}(z,a) - g^{(i)}(z,a)|\Psi_n^{(i)}(dz,da) < \epsilon/2$. Now (for n large),

$$\begin{aligned}&|\int_{S^{(i)}\times U^{(i)}} g_n^{(i)}(z,a)\Psi_n^{(i)}(dz,da) - \int_{S^{(i)}\times U^{(i)}} g^{(i)}(z,a)\Psi^{(i)}(dz,da)| \\ &= |\int_{S^{(i)}\times U^{(i)}} [g_n^{(i)}(z,a) - g^{(i)}(z,a)]\Psi_n^{(i)}(dz,da) + \int_{S^{(i)}\times U^{(i)}} g^{(i)}(z,a)\Psi_n^{(i)}(dz,da) \\ &- \int_{S^{(i)}\times U^{(i)}} g^{(i)}(z,a)\Psi^{(i)}(dz,da)| \\ &< \epsilon/2 + |\int_{S^{(i)}\times U^{(i)}} g^{(i)}(z,a)\Psi_n^{(i)}(dz,da) - \int_{S^{(i)}\times U^{(i)}} g^{(i)}(z,a)\Psi^{(i)}(dz,da)| \\ &< \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

The last inequality follows the fact that $\Psi_n^{(i)} \Rightarrow \Psi^{(i)}$. Hence from (2.7) we get,

$$\int_{S^{(i)}} f^{(i)}(z)\Psi^{(i)}(dz,U^{(i)}) = \int_{S^{(i)}\times U^{(i)}} \int_{S^{(i)}} f^{(i)}(y) p^{(i)}(dy|z,a,\theta,w)\Psi^{(i)}(dz,da)$$

proving that the map is upper-semi-continuous. □

Define $\tilde{g}(\theta, w, \nu) = \int g(\theta, w, z)\nu(dz, U^{(2)})$ for $\nu \in P(S^{(2)} \times U^{(2)})$ and $\hat{g}_\theta(w) = \{\tilde{g}(\theta, w, \nu) : \nu \in D^{(2)}(\theta, w)\}$.

Lemma 5. *$\forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\hat{g}_\theta(\cdot)$ is a Marchaud map.*

Proof. (i) Convexity and compactness follow trivially from the same for the map $(\theta, w) \to D^{(2)}(\theta, w)$.

(ii)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\tilde{g}(\theta, w, \nu)\| \\
&= \| \int g(\theta, w, z)\nu(dz, U^{(2)})\| \\
&\leq \int \|g(\theta, w, z)\|\nu(dz, U^{(2)}) \\
&\leq \int L^{(2)}(\|w\| + \|g(\theta, 0, z)\|)\nu(dz, U^{(2)}) \\
&\leq \max(L^{(2)}, L^{(2)} \int \|g(\theta, 0, z)\|\nu(dz, U^{(2)}))(1 + \|w\|).
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $K(\theta) = \max(L^{(2)}, L^{(2)} \int \|g(\theta, 0, z)\|\nu(dz, U^{(2)})) > 0$. The above is true for all $\tilde{g}(\theta, w, \nu) \in \hat{g}_\theta(w), \nu \in D^{(2)}(\theta, w)$.

(iii) Let $w_n \to w, \tilde{g}(\theta, w_n, \nu_n) \to m, \nu_n \in D^{(2)}(\theta, w_n)$. Now, $\{\nu_n\}$ is tight, hence has a convergent sub-sequence $\{\nu_{n_k}\}$ with ν being the limit. Then using the arguments similar to the proof of Lemma 4 one can show that $m = \tilde{g}(\theta, w, \nu)$ whereas $\nu \in D^{(2)}(\theta, w)$ follows directly from the upper-semi-continuity of the map $w \to D^{(2)}(\theta, w)$ for all θ.

□

2.2.3 Other assumptions needed for two time-scale convergence analysis

We now list the other assumptions required for two time-scale convergence analysis:

(A6) for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the differential inclusion

$$\dot{w}(t) \in \hat{g}(\theta, w(t)) \tag{2.8}$$

has a singleton global attractor $\lambda(\theta)$ where $\lambda : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^k$ is a Lipschitz map with constant K. Additionally, there exists a continuous function $V : \mathbb{R}^{d+k} \to [0, \infty)$ satisfying the hypothesis of Corollary 3.28 of [41] with $\Lambda = \{(\theta, \lambda(\theta)) : \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$. This is the most important assumption as it links the fast and slow iterates.

(A7) Stability of the iterates: $\sup_n(\|\theta_n\| + \|w_n\|) < \infty$ a.s.

Let $\bar{\theta}(\cdot), t \geq 0$ be the continuous, piecewise linear trajectory defined by $\bar{\theta}(t(n)) = \theta_n, n \geq 0$, with linear interpolation on each interval $[t(n), t(n+1))$, i.e.,

$$\bar{\theta}(t) = \theta_n + (\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n)\frac{t - t(n)}{t(n+1) - t(n)}, t \in [t(n), t(n+1)).$$

The following theorem is our main result:

Theorem 1 (Slower timescale result)**.** *Under assumptions* ***(A1)-(A7)****,*

$$(\theta_n, w_n) \to \cup_{\theta^* \in A_0}(\theta^*, \lambda(\theta^*)) a.s. \text{ as } n \to \infty.,$$

where $A_0 = \cap_{t \geq 0}\overline{\{\bar{\theta}(s) : s \geq t\}}$ is almost everywhere an internally chain transitive set of the differential inclusion

$$\dot{\theta}(t) \in \hat{h}(\theta(t)), \tag{2.9}$$

where $\hat{h}(\theta) = \{\tilde{h}(\theta, \lambda(\theta), \nu) : \nu \in D^{(1)}(\theta, \lambda(\theta))\}$. We call (2.8) and (2.9) as the faster and slower d.i. to correspond with faster and slower recursions, respectively.

Corollary 1. *Under the additional assumption that the inclusion*

$$\dot{\theta}(t) \in \hat{h}(\theta(t))),$$

has a global attractor set A_1,

$$(\theta_n, w_n) \to \cup_{\theta^* \in A_1}(\theta^*, \lambda(\theta^*)) a.s. \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Remark 4. *To prove the required convergence one has to prove that the internally chain transitive set mentioned there is a subset of the set $\{(\theta, \lambda(\theta)) : \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ (this does not directly follow from the asymptotic stability of the faster d.i (2.8) for every θ). For this reason we need V which is Lyapunov function for the differential inclusion*

$$\dot{w}(t) \in \hat{g}(\theta(t), w(t)), \dot{\theta}(t) = 0.$$

with $\Lambda = \{(\theta, \lambda(\theta)), \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ and then apply Proposition 3.27 or Corollary 3.28 of [41].

Remark 5. *In case where the set $D^{(2)}(\theta, w)$ is singleton, we can relax* ***(A6)*** *to local attractors also. The relaxed assumption will be*

(A6)' *The function $\hat{g}(\theta, w) = \int g(\theta, w, z)\Gamma^{(2)}_{\theta,w}(dz)$ is Lipschitz continuous where $\Gamma^{(2)}_{\theta,w}$ is the only element of $D^{(2)}(\theta, w)$. Further, for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the o.d.e*

$$\dot{w}(t) = \hat{g}(\theta, w(t)) \tag{2.10}$$

has an asymptotically stable equilibrium $\lambda(\theta)$ with domain of attraction G_θ where $\lambda : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^k$ is a Lipschitz map with constant K. Also, assume that $\bigcap_\theta G_\theta$ is non-empty. Moreover, the function $V' : G \to [0, \infty)$ defined by $V'(\theta, w) = V_\theta(w)$ is continuously differentiable where $V_\theta(\cdot)$ is the Lyapunov function (for definition see [78, Chapter 11.2.3]) for the o.d.e. (2.10) with $\lambda(\theta)$ as its attractor, and $G = \bigcup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d}\{\{\theta\} \times G_\theta\}$. This extra condition is needed so that the set graph(λ):=$\{(\theta, \lambda(\theta)) : \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ becomes an asymptotically stable set of the coupled o.d.e

$$\dot{w}(t) = \hat{g}(\theta(t), w(t)), \dot{\theta}(t) = 0.$$

*Note that **(A6)'** allows multiple attractors (at least one of them have to be a point, others can be sets) for the faster o.d.e for every θ.*

Then the statement of Theorem 1 will be modified as in the following:

Theorem 2 (Slower timescale result when $\lambda(\theta)$ is a local attractor)**.** *Under assumptions **(A1)-(A5), (A6)'** and **(A7)**, on the event "$\{w_n\}$ belongs to a compact subset B (depending on the sample point) of $\bigcap_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}^d} G_\theta$ **eventually**",*

$$(\theta_n, w_n) \to \cup_{\theta^*\in A_0}(\theta^*, \lambda(\theta^*)) a.s.\ \text{as}\ n\to\infty.$$

The requirement on $\{w_n\}$ is much stronger than the usual local attractor statement for Kushner-Clarke lemma [46, Section II.C] which requires the iterates to enter a compact set in the domain for attraction of the local attractor infinitely often only. The reason for imposing this strong assumption is that graph(λ) is not a subset of any compact set in $\mathbb{R}^{d+k}$, and hence the usual tracking lemma kind of arguments do not go through directly. One has to relate the limit set of the coupled iterate (θ_n, w_n) to graph(λ) (See the proof of Lemma 11).

For the special case when the d.i is the o.d.e (for the case described in **(A6)'**), one can construct the Lyapunov function V' for the coupled o.d.e from the Lyapunov function V_θ for the faster o.d.e for every θ. The reason is that

$$\langle \nabla_{\theta,w} V'(\theta, w), \hat{G}(\theta, w)\rangle = \langle \nabla_w V_\theta(w), \hat{g}(\theta, w)\rangle$$

where $\hat{G}(\theta, w) = (0, \hat{g}(\theta, w))$. Such V_θ exist due to the converse Lyapunov theorem [48]. This is not known for the general d.i. case as we are not aware of a converse Lyapunov theorem in the case of d.i. That is why a separate Lyapunov function V for the coupled d.i. is assumed.

We present the proof of our main results in the next section.

2.3 Main Results

We first discuss an extension of the single time-scale controlled Markov noise framework of [77] under our assumptions to prove our main results. Note that the results of [77] assume that the state space of the controlled Markov process is Polish which may impose additional conditions that are hard to verify. In this section, other than proving our two time-scale results, we prove many of the results in [77] (which were only stated there) assuming the state space to be compact and thus can be easily verified. In [77] the map $\theta \to D(\theta)$ was argued to be upper semicontinuous using the fact that (4) thereof is preserved under convergence in $P(S\times U)$. We observe (Lemma 4) that this may not be enough to prove the same as in this case the control θ is also changing with n unlike the proof of $D(\theta)$ being closed where only the measure changes with n. As shown there with a Polish space, we can prove uniform convergence of

$$g_n(\cdot,\cdot) = \int_S f(y)p(dy|\cdot,\cdot,\theta_n) \to \int_S f(y)p(dy|\cdot,\cdot,\theta) = g(\cdot,\cdot)$$

only on some compact subset $S_c\times U$ of $S\times U$ where $\theta_n\to\theta$, $f\in C_b(S)$ and $p(\cdot|\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$ is the continuous transition kernel of the controlled Markov process. Here pointwise convergence is obvious.

However, we can get uniform continuity only for $g'|_A$ where $g'(z,a,\theta) = \int_S f(y)p(dy|z,a,\theta)$ and $A = S_c \times U \times (\{\theta_n\} \bigcup \theta)$. For similar reasons the proof of upper semicontinuity of $\hat{h}(\cdot)$ (defined near (13) of [77]) as well as the proof of (12) of [77] may require conditions that are hard to verify if Polish state space is assumed. However, under the compact state space assumptions our proofs are seen to go through easily. There are other minor differences from the proofs of [77]:

1. In Lemma 3.1 of [77], we need to use martingale convergence theorem for square integrable martingales to conclude a.s. convergence. We correct that in Lemma 7.

2. As we assume state space to be compact, assumptions such as $(\star)$ ([77, p 140]) and $(\dagger)$ ([77, p 141]) are not required.

We begin by describing the intuition behind the proof techniques in [77].

The space $C([0,\infty);\mathbb{R}^d)$ of continuous functions from $[0,\infty)$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ is topologized with the coarsest topology such that the map that takes any $f \in C([0,\infty);\mathbb{R}^d)$ to its restriction to $[0,T]$ when viewed as an element of the space $C([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$, is continuous for all $T > 0$. In other words, $f_n \to f$ in this space iff $f_n|_{[0,T]} \to f|_{[0,T]}$. The other notations used below are the same as those in [77, 78]. We present a few for easy reference.

Consider the single time-scale stochastic approximation recursion with controlled Markov noise:

$$x_{n+1} = x_n + a(n)\left[h(x_n, Y_n) + M_{n+1}\right]. \tag{2.11}$$

Define time instants $t(0) = 0, t(n) = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} a(m), n \geq 1$. Let $\bar{x}(t), t \geq 0$ be the continuous, piecewise linear trajectory defined by $\bar{x}(t(n)) = x_n, n \geq 0$, with linear interpolation on each interval $[t(n), t(n+1))$, i.e.,

$$\bar{x}(t) = x_n + (x_{n+1} - x_n)\frac{t - t(n)}{t(n+1) - t(n)}, t \in [t(n), t(n+1)).$$

Now, define $\tilde{h}(x,\nu) = \int h(x,z)\nu(dz,U)$ for $\nu \in P(S \times U)$. Let $\mu(t), t \geq 0$ be the random process defined by $\mu(t) = \delta_{Y_n,Z_n}$ for $t \in [t(n), t(n+1)), n \geq 0$, where $\delta_{y,a}$ is the Dirac measure corresponding to y. Consider the non-autonomous o.d.e.

$$\dot{x}(t) = \tilde{h}(x(t), \mu(t)). \tag{2.12}$$

Let $x^s(t), t \geq s$, denote the solution to (2.12) with $x^s(s) = \bar{x}(s)$, for $s \geq 0$. Note that $x^s(t), t \in [s, s+T]$ and $x^s(t), t \geq s$ can be viewed as elements of $C([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $C([0,\infty);\mathbb{R}^d)$ respectively. With this abuse of notation, it is easy to see that $\{x^s(\cdot)|_{[s,s+T]}, s \geq 0\}$ is a pointwise bounded and equicontinuous family of functions in $C([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$ $\forall T > 0$. By Arzela-Ascoli theorem, it is relatively compact. From Lemma 2.2 of [77] one can see that $\forall s(n) \uparrow \infty, \{\bar{x}(s(n) + .)|_{[s(n),s(n)+T]}, n \geq 1\}$ has a limit point in $C([0,T];\mathbb{R}^d)$ $\forall T > 0$. With the above topology for $C([0,\infty);\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\{x^s(\cdot), s \geq 0\}$ is also relatively compact in $C([0,\infty);\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\forall s(n) \uparrow \infty, \{\bar{x}(s(n) + .), n \geq 1\}$ has a limit point in $C([0,\infty);\mathbb{R}^d)$.

One can write from (2.11) the following:

$$\bar{x}(u(n) + t) = \bar{x}(u(n)) + \int_0^t h(\bar{x}(u(n) + \tau), \nu(u(n) + \tau))d\tau + W^n(t),$$

where $u(n) \uparrow \infty, \bar{x}(u(n)+.) \to \tilde{x}(\cdot), \nu(t) = (Y_n, Z_n)$ for $t \in [t(n), t(n+1)), n \geq 0$ and $W^n(t) = W(t+u(n)) - W(u(n)), W(t) = W_n + (W_{n+1} - W_n)\frac{t-t(n)}{t(n+1)-t(n)}, W_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k) M_{k+1}, n \geq 0$. From here one cannot directly take limit on both sides as limit points of $\nu(s+.)$ as $s \to \infty$ is not meaningful. Now, $h(x,y) = \int h(x,z)\delta_{y,a}(dz \times U)$. Hence by defining $\tilde{h}(x,\rho) = \int h(x,z)\rho(dz)$ and $\mu(t) = \delta_{\nu(t)}$ one can write the above as

$$\bar{x}(u(n)+t) = \bar{x}(u(n)) + \int_0^t \tilde{h}(\bar{x}(u(n)+\tau), \mu(u(n)+\tau))d\tau + W^n(t). \tag{2.13}$$

The advantage is that the space $\mathcal{U}$ of measurable functions from $[0,\infty)$ to $\mathcal{P}(S \times U)$ is compact metrizable, so subsequential limits exist. Note that $\mu(\cdot)$ is not a member of $\mathcal{U}$, rather we need to fix a sample point, i.e., $\mu(.,\omega) \in \mathcal{U}$. For ease of understanding, we abuse the terminology and talk about the limit points $\tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$ of $\mu(s+.)$.

From (2.13) one can infer that the limit $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ of $\bar{x}(u(n)+.)$ satisfies the o.d.e. $\dot{x}(t) = \tilde{h}(x(t), \mu(t))$ with $\mu(\cdot)$ replaced by $\tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$. Here each $\tilde{\mu}(t), t \in \mathbb{R}$ in $\tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$ is generated through different limiting processes each one associated with the compact metrizable space U_t = space of measurable functions from $[0,t]$ to $\mathcal{P}(S \times U)$. This will be problematic if we want to further explore the process $\tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$ and convert the non-autonomous o.d.e. into an autonomous one.

Hence the main result is proved using one auxiliary lemma [77, Lemma 2.3] other than the tracking lemma (Lemma 2.2 of [77]). Let $u(n(k)) \uparrow \infty$ be such that $\bar{x}(u(n(k))+.) \to \tilde{x}(\cdot)$ and $\mu(u(n(k))+.) \to \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$, then using Lemma 2.2 of [77] one can show that $x^{u(n(k))}(\cdot) \to \tilde{x}(\cdot)$. Then the auxiliary lemma shows that the o.d.e. trajectory $x^{u(n(k))}(\cdot)$ associated with $\mu(u(n(k))+.)$ tracks (in the limit) the o.d.e. trajectory associated with $\tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$. Hence Lemma 2.3 of [77] links the two limiting processes $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$ in some sense. Note that Lemma 2.3 of [77] involves only the o.d.e. trajectories, not the interpolated trajectory of the algorithm.

Consider the iteration

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)\left[h(\theta_n, Y_n) + \epsilon_n + M_{n+1}\right], \tag{2.14}$$

where $\epsilon_n \to 0$ and the rest of the notations are same as [77]. Specifically, $\{Y_n\}$ is the controlled Markov process driven by $\{\theta_n\}$ and $M_{n+1}, n \geq 0$ is a martingale difference sequence. Let $\bar{\theta}(t), t \geq 0$ be the continuous, piecewise linear trajectory of (2.14) defined by $\bar{\theta}(t(n)) = \theta_n, n \geq 0$, with linear interpolation on each interval $[t(n), t(n+1))$. Also, let $\theta^s(t), t \geq s$, denote the solution to (2.12) with $\theta^s(s) = \bar{\theta}(s)$, for $s \geq 0$.

The convergence analysis of (2.14) requires some changes in Lemma 2.2 and 3.1 of [77]. The modified versions of them are precisely the following two lemmas.

Lemma 6. *For any $T > 0$, $\sup_{t \in [s,s+T]} \|\bar{\theta}(t) - \theta^s(t)\| \to 0$, a.s. as $s \to \infty$.*

Proof. The proof follows from the Lemma 2.2 and the remark 3 thereof (p. 144) of [77]. □

Now, μ can be viewed as a random variable taking values in $\mathcal{U}$ = the space of measurable functions from $[0,\infty)$ to $\mathcal{P}(S \times U)$. This space is topologized with the coarsest topology such that the map

$$\nu(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U} \to \int_0^T g(t) \int f d\nu(t) dt \in \mathbb{R}$$

is continuous for all $f \in C(S), T > 0, g \in L_2[0,T]$. Note that $\mathcal{U}$ is compact metrizable.

Lemma 7. *Almost surely every limit point of* $(\mu(s+.), \bar{\theta}(s+.))$ *as* $s \to \infty$ *is of the form* $(\tilde{\mu}(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}(\cdot))$ *where* $\tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$ *satisfies* $\tilde{\mu}(t) \in D(\tilde{\theta}(t))$ *a.e.* t.

Proof. Suppose that $u(n) \uparrow \infty$, $\mu(u(n)+.) \to \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\theta}(u(n)+.) \to \tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$. Let $\{f_i\}$ be countable dense in the unit ball of $C(S)$, hence a separating class, i.e., $\forall i, \int f_i d\mu = \int f_i d\nu$ implies $\mu = \nu$. For each i,

$$\zeta_n^i = \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} a(m)(f_i(Y_{m+1}) - \int f_i(y) p(dy|Y_m, Z_m, \theta_m)), n \geq 1,$$

is a zero-mean martingale with $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta_m, Y_m, Z_m, m \leq n)$. Moreover, it is a square integrable martingale due to the fact that f_i's are bounded and each ζ_n^i is a finite sum. Its quadratic variation process

$$A_n = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} a(m)^2 E[(f_i(Y_{m+1}) - \int f_i(y) p(dy|Y_m, Z_m, \theta_m))^2 | \mathcal{F}_m] + E[(\zeta_0^i)^2]$$

is almost surely convergent. By the martingale convergence theorem, $\zeta_n^i, n \geq 0$ converges a.s. $\forall i$. As before let $\tau(n,t) = \min\{m \geq n : t(m) \geq t(n) + t\}$ for $t \geq 0, n \geq 0$. Then as $n \to \infty$,

$$\sum_{m=n}^{\tau(n,t)} a(m)(f_i(Y_{m+1}) - \int f_i(y) p(dy|Y_m, Z_m, \theta_m)) \to 0, \text{ a.s.}$$

for $t > 0$. By our choice of $\{f_i\}$ and the fact that $\{a(n)\}$ is an eventually non-increasing sequence (the latter property is used only here and in Lemma 14), we have

$$\sum_{m=n}^{\tau(n,t)} (a(m) - a(m+1)) f_i(Y_{m+1}) \to 0, \text{ a.s.}$$

From the foregoing,

$$\sum_{m=n}^{\tau(n,t)} (a(m+1) f_i(Y_{m+1}) - a(m) \int f_i(y) p(dy|Y_m, Z_m, \theta_m)) \to 0, \text{ a.s.}$$

$\forall t > 0$, which implies

$$\sum_{m=n}^{\tau(n,t)} a(m)(f_i(Y_m) - \int f_i(y) p(dy|Y_m, Z_m, \theta_m)) \to 0, \text{ a.s.}$$

$\forall t > 0$ due to the fact that $a(n) \to 0$ and $f_i(\cdot)$ are bounded. This implies

$$\int_{t(n)}^{t(n)+t} (\int (f_i(z) - \int f_i(y) p(dy|z, a, \hat{\theta}(s))) \mu(s, dzda)) ds \to 0, \text{ a.s.}$$

and that in turn implies

$$\int_{u(n)}^{u(n)+t}(\int(f_i(z)-\int f_i(y)p(dy|z,a,\hat{\theta}(s)))\mu(s,dzda))ds\to 0,\ \text{a.s.}$$

(this is true because $a(n)\to 0$ and $f_i(\cdot)$ is bounded) where $\hat{\theta}(s)=\theta_n$ when $s\in[t(n),t(n+1))$ for $n\geq 0$. Now, one can claim from the above that

$$\int_{u(n)}^{u(n)+t}(\int(f_i(z)-\int f_i(y)p(dy|z,a,\bar{\theta}(s)))\mu(s,dzda))ds\to 0,\ \text{a.s.}$$

This is due to the fact that the map $S\times U\times\mathbb{R}^d\ni(z,a,\theta)\to\int f(y)p(dy|z,a,\theta)$ is continuous and hence uniformly continuous on the compact set $A=S\times U\times M$ where M is the compact set s.t. $\theta_n\in M\ \forall n$. Here we also use the fact that $\|\bar{\theta}(s)-\theta_m\|=\|h(\theta_m,Y_m)+\epsilon_m+M_{m+1}\|(s-s_m)\to 0, s\in[t_m,t_{m+1})$ as the first two terms inside the norm in the R.H.S are bounded. The above convergence is equivalent to

$$\int_0^t(\int(f_i(z)-\int f_i(y)p(dy|z,a,\bar{\theta}(s+u(n)))\mu(s+u(n),dzda))ds\to 0,\ \text{a.s.}$$

Fix a sample point in the probability one set on which the convergence above holds for all i. Then the convergence above leads to

$$\int_0^t(\int f_i(z)-\int f_i(y)p(dy|z,a,\tilde{\theta}(s)))\tilde{\mu}(s,dzda)ds=0\ \forall i. \tag{2.15}$$

Here we use one part of the proof from Lemma 2.3 of [77] that if $\mu^n(\cdot)\to\mu^\infty(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}$ then for any $t>0$,

$$\int_0^t\int\tilde{f}(s,z,a)\mu^n(s,dzda)ds-\int_0^t\int\tilde{f}(s,z,a)\mu^\infty(s,dzda)ds\to 0,$$

for all $\tilde{f}\in C([0,t]\times S\times A)$ and the fact that $\tilde{f}_n(s,z,a)=\int f_i(y)p(dy|z,a,\bar{\theta}(s+u(n)))$ converges uniformly to $\tilde{f}(s,z,a)=\int f_i(y)p(dy|z,a,\tilde{\theta}(s))$. To prove the latter, define $g:C([0,t])\times[0,t]\times S\times A\to\mathbb{R}$ by $g(\theta(\cdot),s,z,a)=\int f_i(y)p(dy|z,a,\theta(s)))$. To see that g is continuous we need to check that if $\theta_n(\cdot)\to\theta(\cdot)$ uniformly and $s(n)\to s$, then $\theta_n(s(n))\to\theta(s)$. This is because $\|\theta_n(s(n))-\theta(s)\|=\|\theta_n(s(n))-\theta(s(n))+\theta(s(n))-\theta(s)\|\leq\|\theta_n(s(n))-\theta(s(n))\|+\|\theta(s(n))-\theta(s)\|$. The first and second terms go to zero due to the uniform convergence of $\theta_n(\cdot), n\geq 0$ and continuity of $\theta(\cdot)$ respectively. Let $A=\{\bar{\theta}(u(n)+.)|_{[u(n),u(n)+t]},n\geq 1\}\cup\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)|_{[0,t]}$. A is compact as it is the union of a sequence of functions and their limit. So, $g|_{(A\times[0,t]\times S\times U)}$ is uniformly continuous. Then using the same arguments as in Lemma 4 we can show equicontinuity of $\{\tilde{f}_n(.,.)\}$, that results in uniform convergence and thereby (2.15). An application of Lebesgue's theorem in conjunction with (2.15) shows that

$$\int(f_i(z)-\int f_i(y)p(dy|z,a,\tilde{\theta}(t)))\tilde{\mu}(t,dzda)=0\ \forall i$$

for a.e. t. By our choice of $\{f_i\}$, this leads to

$$\tilde{\mu}(t, dy \times U) = \int p(dy|z, a, \tilde{\theta}(t))\tilde{\mu}(t, dzda)$$

a.e. t. Therefore the conclusion follows by disintegrating such measure as the product of marginal on S and the regular conditional law on U ([77, p 140]). □

Remark 6. *Note that the above invariant distribution does not come "naturally"; rather it arises from the assumption made to match the natural timescale intuition for the controlled Markov noise component, i.e., the slower iterate should see the average effect of the Markov component.*

The proof of the following lemma, in this case, will be unchanged from its original version, so we just mention it for completeness and refer the reader to Lemma 2.3 of [77] for its proof.

Lemma 8. *Let $\mu^n(\cdot) \to \mu^\infty(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$. Let $\theta^n(\cdot), n = 1, 2, \ldots, \infty$ denote solutions to (2.12) corresponding to the case where $\mu(\cdot)$ is replaced by $\mu^n(\cdot)$, for $n = 1, 2, \ldots \infty$. Suppose $\theta^n(0) \to \theta^\infty(0)$. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|\theta^n(t) - \theta^\infty(t)\| = 0$$

for every $T > 0$.

Lemma 9. *Almost surely, $\{\theta_n\}$ converges to an internally chain transitive invariant set of the differential inclusion*

$$\dot{\theta}(t) \in \hat{h}(\theta(t)), \tag{2.16}$$

where $\hat{h}(\theta) = \{\tilde{h}(\theta, \nu) : \nu \in D(\theta)\}$.

Proof. Lemma 8 shows that every limit point $(\tilde{\mu}(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}(\cdot))$ of $(\mu(s + .), \bar{\theta}(s + .))$ as $s \to \infty$ is such that $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$ satisfies (2.12) with $\mu(\cdot) = \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$. Hence, $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$ is absolutely continuous. Moreover, using Lemma 7, one can see that it satisfies (2.16) a.e. t, hence is a solution to the differential inclusion (2.16). Hence the proof follows. □

Lemma 10 (Faster timescale result)**.** $(\theta_n, w_n) \to \{(\theta, \lambda(\theta)) : \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ *a.s.*

Proof. We first rewrite (2.3) as

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + b(n)\left[\epsilon_n + M^{(3)}_{n+1}\right],$$

where $\epsilon_n = \frac{a(n)}{b(n)} h(\theta_n, w_n, Z^{(1)}_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ a.s. and $M^{(3)}_{n+1} = \frac{a(n)}{b(n)} M^{(1)}_{n+1}$ for $n \geq 0$. Let $\alpha_n = (\theta_n, w_n), \alpha = (\theta, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+k}, G(\alpha, z) = (0, g(\alpha, z)), \epsilon'_n = (\epsilon_n, 0), M^{(4)}_{n+1} = (M^{(3)}_{n+1}, M^{(2)}_{n+1})$. Then one can write (2.3) and (2.4) in the framework of (2.14) as

$$\alpha_{n+1} = \alpha_n + b(n)\left[G(\alpha_n, Z^{(2)}_n) + \epsilon'_n + M^{(4)}_{n+1}\right], \tag{2.17}$$

with $\epsilon'_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. $\alpha_n, n \geq 0$ converges almost surely to an internally chain transitive set of the differential inclusion

$$\dot{\alpha}(t) \in \hat{G}(\alpha(t)),$$

where $\hat{G}(\alpha) = \{\tilde{G}(\alpha, \nu) : \nu \in D^{(2)}(\theta, w)\}$. In other words, $(\theta_n, w_n), n \geq 0$ converges to an internally chain transitive set of the differential inclusion

$$\dot{w}(t) \in \hat{g}_{\theta(t)}(w(t)), \dot{\theta}(t) = 0.$$

The rest follows from the second part of **(A6)**. □

Remark 7. *Under the conditions mentioned in Remark 4 the above faster timescale result should be modified as follows:*

Lemma 11 (Faster timescale result when $\lambda(\theta)$ is a local attractor)**.** *Under assumptions **(A1) - (A5), (A6)'** and **(A7)**, on the event "$\{w_n\}$ belongs to a compact subset B (depending on the sample point) of $\bigcap_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} G_\theta$ eventually",*

$$(\theta_n, w_n) \to \{(\theta, \lambda(\theta)) : \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \quad a.s.$$

Proof. Fix a sample point ω. The proof follows from these observations:

1. continuity of flow for the coupled o.d.e around the initial point,
2. $\sup_n \|\theta_n\| = M_1 < \infty$,
3. the fact that the set graph(λ) is Lyapunov stable ($V'(\cdot)$ as mentioned in **(A6)'** will be a Lyapunov function for this set), and
4. the fact that $\bigcap_{t \geq 0} \overline{\bar{\alpha}(s) : s \geq t}$ is an internally chain transitive set of the coupled o.d.e

$$\dot{w}(t) = \hat{g}(\theta(t), w(t)), \dot{\theta}(t) = 0, \tag{2.18}$$

where $\bar{\alpha}(\cdot)$ is the interpolated trajectory of the coupled iterate $\{\alpha_n\}$.

As $\{\theta : \|\theta\| \leq M_1\} \times B \subset \bigcup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{\{\theta\} \times G_\theta\}$, the first three observations show that for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $T_\epsilon > 0$ such that any o.d.e trajectory for (2.18) with starting point on the compact set $\{\theta : \|\theta\| \leq M_1\} \times B$ reaches the ϵ-neighbourhood of graph(λ) after time T_ϵ. Further,

$$\bigcap_{t \geq 0} \overline{\bar{\alpha}(s) : s \geq t} \subset \{\theta : \|\theta\| \leq M_1\} \times B.$$

Then one can use the last observation by choosing $T > T_\epsilon$ to show the required convergence to the set graph(λ). □

In other words, $\|w_n - \lambda(\theta_n)\| \to 0$ a.s., i.e, $\{w_n\}$ asymptotically tracks $\{\lambda(\theta_n)\}$ a.s.

Remark 8. *One interesting question in this context is to analyze whether one can extend the single timescale local attractor convergence statements to the two time-scale setting under some verifiable conditions. More specifically, if there is a global attractor A_1 for*

$$\dot{\theta}(t) \in \hat{h}(\theta(t)),$$

then can one provide verifiable conditions to show

$$P[(\theta_n, w_n) \to \cup_{\theta \in A_1}(\theta, \lambda(\theta))] > 0.$$

*Here $\lambda(\theta)$ is a local attractor as mentioned in **(A6)'**.*

There are two ways in which this could possibly be tried:

1. *Use Theorem 2 where we show that on the event $\{w_n\}$ belongs to a compact subset B (depending on the sample point) of $\bigcap_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} G_\theta$ "eventually",*

$$(\theta_n, w_n) \to \cup_{\theta^* \in A_1}(\theta^*, \lambda(\theta^*)) a.s. \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

which is an extension of Kushner-Clarke Lemma to the two time-scale case. Therefore the task would be to impose verifiable assumptions so that $P(\{w_n\}$ belongs to a compact subset B (depending on the sample point) of $\bigcap_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} G_\theta$ "eventually") > 0. In a stochastic approximation scenario it is not immediately clear how one could possibly impose verifiable assumptions so that such a probabilistic statement becomes true.

2. *The second approach would be to extend the analysis of [40, 41] to the two time-scale case. In our opinion this is very hard as this analysis is based on the attractor introduced by Benaim et al. whereas the coupled o.d.e (2.18) which tracks the coupled iterate (θ_n, w_n) (therefore the interpolated trajectory of the coupled iterate will be an asymptotic pseudo-trajectory [40] for (2.18)) has no attractor. The reason is that one cannot obtain a fundamental neighbourhood for sets like $\cup_{\theta \in A_1}(\theta, \lambda(\theta))$ as the θ component will remain constant for any trajectory of the above coupled o.d.e.*

However, in the following we discuss one possible approach (without coupling both the iterates) to the closest implementation of the above for the following recursion:

$$w_{n+1} = w_n + b(n)\left[g(\theta_n, w_n, Z_n^{(2)}) + M_{n+1}^{(2)}\right] \tag{2.19}$$

that are driven by a single timescale stochastic approximation process:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)\left[h(\theta_n, Z_n^{(1)}) + M_{n+1}^{(1)}\right]. \tag{2.20}$$

Note that there is a unilateral coupling between (2.19) and (2.20) in that (2.19) depends on (2.20) but not the other way. Here we assume that the step-sizes $a(n), b(n), n \geq 0$ satisfies only the Robbins-Monro conditions. Assume that $Z_n^{(2)}$ is an uncontrolled Markov process. Now, assume that the o.d.e

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = \hat{h}(\theta(t))$$

has a globally asymptotically stable attractor θ^*. Consider the following version of (2.19)

$$w'_{n+1} = w'_n + b(n)\left[g(\theta^*, w'_n, Z_n^{(2)}) + M_{n+1}^{(2)}\right].$$

Let $\bar{w'}(\cdot)$ be the interpolated trajectory of $w'_n, n \geq 0$. Then using Benaim's result [40, Theorem 7.3] one can see that if $Att(\bar{w'}) \cap G_{\theta^*} \neq \phi$ then

$$P(w'_n \to \lambda(\theta^*)) > 0.$$

Therefore

$$P((\theta_n, w'_n) \to (\theta^*, \lambda(\theta^*)) > 0.$$

However, one can easily observe that

$$\|w_n - w'_n\| \leq L^{(2)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\theta_i - \theta^*\| b(i) \Pi_{k=i}^{n-1}(1 + b(k+1)).$$

which shows how w'_n is related to the actual iterate of interest w_n. However, for common step-size sequence such as $b(n) = \frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{1+n\log n}$ the R.H.S sequence diverges to infinity implying that such result should be used in a non-asymptotic sense. Also, with $b(n) = \frac{1}{n}$, $\|w_n - w'_n\| \leq O(n)$ whereas with $b(n) = \frac{1}{1+n\log n}$ it is $O(\log n)$ suggesting to use the latter to get the closest statement of the following:

$$P((\theta_n, w_n) \to (\theta^*, \lambda(\theta^*)) > 0.$$

Now, consider the non-autonomous o.d.e.

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = \tilde{h}(\theta(t), \lambda(\theta(t)), \mu(t)), \tag{2.21}$$

where $\mu(t) = \delta_{Z_n^{(1)}, A_n^{(1)}}$ when $t \in [t(n), t(n+1))$ for $n \geq 0$ and $\tilde{h}(\theta, w, \nu) = \int h(\theta, w, z)\nu(dz)$. Let $\theta^s(t), t \geq s$ denote the solution to (2.21) with $\theta^s(s) = \bar{\theta}(s)$, for $s \geq 0$. Then

Lemma 12. *For any $T > 0, \sup_{t\in[s,s+T]} \|\bar{\theta}(t) - \theta^s(t)\| \to 0$, a.s.*

Proof. The slower recursion corresponds to

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)\left[h(\theta_n, w_n, Z_n^{(1)}) + M_{n+1}^{(1)}\right].$$

Let $t(n+m) \in [t(n), t(n) + T]$. Let $[t] = \max\{t(k) : t(k) \leq t\}$. Then by construction,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\theta}(t(n+m)) &= \bar{\theta}(t(n)) + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} a(n+k)h(\bar{\theta}(t(n+k)), w_{n+k}, Z_{n+k}^{(1)}) + \delta_{n,n+m} \\ &= \bar{\theta}(t(n)) + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} a(n+k)h(\bar{\theta}(t(n+k)), \lambda(\bar{\theta}(t(n+k))), Z_{n+k}^{(1)})\end{aligned}$$

$$+\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} a(n+k)(h(\bar{\theta}(t(n+k)), w_{n+k}, Z_{n+k}^{(1)}) - h(\bar{\theta}(t(n+k)), \lambda(\theta_{n+k}), Z_{n+k}^{(1)}))$$
$$+\delta_{n,n+m},$$

where $\delta_{n,n+m} = \zeta_{n+m} - \zeta_n$ with $\zeta_n = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} a(m) M_{m+1}^{(1)}, n \geq 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^{t(n)}(t(m+n)) &= \bar{\theta}(t(n)) + \int_{t(n)}^{t(n+m)} \tilde{h}(\theta^{t(n)}(t), \lambda(\theta^{t(n)}(t)), \mu(t))dt \\ &= \bar{\theta}(t(n)) + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} a(n+k) h(\theta^{t(n)}(t(n+k)), \lambda(\theta^{t(n)}(t(n+k))), Z_{n+k}^{(1)}) \\ &+ \int_{t(n)}^{t(n+m)} (h(\theta^{t(n)}(t), \lambda(\theta^{t(n)}(t), \mu(t))) - h(\theta^{t(n)}([t]), \lambda(\theta^{t(n)}([t]), \mu([t]))))dt.\end{aligned}$$

Let $t(n) \leq t \leq t(n+m)$. Now, if $0 \leq k \leq (m-1)$ and $t \in (t(n+k), t(n+k+1)]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\theta^{t(n)}(t)\| &\leq \|\bar{\theta}(t(n)\| + \| \int_{t(n)}^{t} \tilde{h}(\theta^{t(n)}(\tau), \lambda(\theta^{t(n)}(\tau)), \mu(\tau))d\tau\| \\ &\leq \|\theta_n\| + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \int_{t(n+l)}^{t(n+l+1)} (\|h(0,0,Z_{n+l}^{(1)})\| + L^{(1)}(\|\lambda(0)\| + (K+1)\|\theta^{t(n)}(\tau)\|))d\tau \\ &+ \int_{t(n+k)}^{t} (\|h(0,0,Z_{n+k}^{(1)})\| + L^{(1)}(\|\lambda(0)\| + (K+1)\|\theta^{t(n)}(\tau)\|))d\tau \\ &\leq C_0 + (M + L^{(1)}\|\lambda(0)\|)T + L^{(1)}(K+1)\int_{t(n)}^{t} \|\theta^{t(n)}(\tau)\|d\tau,\end{aligned}$$

where $C_0 = \sup_n \|\theta_n\| < \infty, \sup_{z \in S^{(1)}} \|h(0,0,z)\| = M$. By Gronwall's inequality, it follows that

$$\|\theta^{t(n)}(t)\| \leq (C_0 + (M + L^{(1)}\|\lambda(0)\|)T)e^{L^{(1)}(K+1)T}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\theta^{t(n)}(t) - \theta^{t(n)}(t(n+k))\| &\leq \int_{t(n+k)}^{t} \|h(\theta^{t(n)}(s), \lambda(\theta^{t(n)}(s)), Z_{n+k}^{(1)})\|ds \\ &\leq (\|h(0,0,Z_{n+k}^{(1)})\| + L^{(1)}\|\lambda(0)\|)(t - t(n+k)) \\ &+ L^{(1)}(K+1)\int_{t(n+k)}^{t} \|\theta^{t(n)}(s)\|ds \\ &\leq C_T a(n+k),\end{aligned}$$

where $C_T = (M + L^{(1)}\|\lambda(0)\|) + L^{(1)}(K+1)(C_0 + (M + L^{(1)}\|\lambda(0)\|)T)e^{L^{(1)}(K+1)T}$. Thus,

$$\| \int_{t(n)}^{t(n+m)} (h(\theta^{t(n)}(t), \lambda(\theta^{t(n)}(t)), \mu(t)) - h(\theta^{t(n)}([t]), \lambda(\theta^{t(n)}([t])), \mu([t])))dt\|$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \int_{t(n+k)}^{t(n+k+1)} \|h(\theta^{t(n)}(t), \lambda(\theta^{t(n)}(t)), Z_{n+k}^{(1)}) - h(\theta^{t(n)}([t]), \lambda(\theta^{t(n)}([t])), Z_{n+k}^{(1)})\| dt \\
&\leq L \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \int_{t(n+k)}^{t(n+k+1)} \|\theta^{t(n)}(t) - \theta^{t(n)}(t(n+k))\| dt \\
&\leq C_T L \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} a(n+k)^2 \\
&\leq C_T L \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a(n+k)^2 \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty, \text{where } L = L^{(1)}(K+1).
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\bar{\theta}(t(n+m)) - \theta^{t(n)}(t(n+m)) \leq\ & L \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} a(n+k) \|\bar{\theta}(t(n+k)) - \theta^{t(n)}(t(n+k))\| \\
&+ C_T L \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a(n+k)^2 + \sup_{k \geq 0} \|\delta_{n,n+k}\| \\
&+ L^{(1)} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} a(n+k) \|w_{n+k} - \lambda(\theta_{n+k})\| \\
&\leq L \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} a(n+k) \|\bar{\theta}(t(n+k)) - \theta^{t(n)}(t(n+k))\| \\
&+ C_T L \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a(n+k)^2 + \sup_{k \geq 0} \|\delta_{n,n+k}\| \\
&+ L^{(1)} T \sup_{k \geq 0} \|w_{n+k} - \lambda(\theta_{n+k})\|, \text{ a.s.}
\end{aligned}
$$

Define

$$
K_{T,n} = C_T L \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a(n+k)^2 + \sup_{k \geq 0} \|\delta_{n,n+k}\| + L^{(1)} T \sup_{k \geq 0} \|w_{n+k} - \lambda(\theta_{n+k})\|.
$$

Note that $K_{T,n} \to 0$ a.s. The remainder of the proof follows in the exact same manner as the tracking lemma, see Lemma 1, Chapter 2 of [78]. □

Lemma 13. *Suppose, $\mu^n(\cdot) \to \mu^\infty(\cdot) \in U^{(1)}$. Let $\theta^n(\cdot), n = 1, 2, \ldots, \infty$ denote solutions to (2.21) corresponding to the case where $\mu(\cdot)$ is replaced by $\mu^n(\cdot)$, for $n = 1, 2, \ldots, \infty$. Suppose $\theta^n(0) \to \theta^\infty(0)$. Then*

$$
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\theta^n(t) - \theta^\infty(t)\| \to 0
$$

for every $T > 0$.

Proof. It is shown in Lemma 2.3 of [77] that

$$\int_0^t \int \tilde{f}(s,z)\mu^n(s,dz)ds - \int_0^t \int \tilde{f}(s,z)\mu^\infty(s,dz)ds \to 0$$

for any $\tilde{f} \in C([0,T] \times S)$. Using this, one can see that

$$\| \int_0^t (\tilde{h}(\theta^\infty(s), \lambda(\theta^\infty(s)), \mu^n(s)) - \tilde{h}(\theta^\infty(s), \lambda(\theta^\infty(s)), \mu^\infty(s)))ds\| \to 0.$$

This follows because λ is continuous and h is jointly continuous in its arguments. As a function of t, the integral on the left is equicontinuous and pointwise bounded. By the Arzela-Ascoli theorem, this convergence must in fact be uniform for t in a compact set. Now for $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\theta^n(t) - \theta^\infty(t)\| \\
&\leq \|\theta^n(0) - \theta^\infty(0)\| + \int_0^t \|\tilde{h}(\theta^n(s), \lambda(\theta^n(s)), \mu^n(s)) - \tilde{h}(\theta^\infty(s), \lambda(\theta^\infty(s)), \mu^\infty(s))\|ds \\
&\leq \|\theta^n(0) - \theta^\infty(0)\| + \int_0^t (\|\tilde{h}(\theta^n(s), \lambda(\theta^n(s)), \mu^n(s)) - \tilde{h}(\theta^\infty(s), \lambda(\theta^\infty(s)), \mu^n(s))\|)ds \\
&+ \int_0^t (\|\tilde{h}(\theta^\infty(s), \lambda(\theta^\infty(s)), \mu^n(s)) - \tilde{h}(\theta^\infty(s), \lambda(\theta^\infty(s)), \mu^\infty(s))\|)ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, using the fact that λ is Lipschitz with constant K the remaining part of the proof follows in the same manner as Lemma 2.3 of [77]. □

Note that Lemma 13 shows that every limit point $(\tilde{\mu}(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}(\cdot))$ of $(\mu(s+.), \bar{\theta}(s+.))$ as $s \to \infty$ is such that $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$ satisfies (2.21) with $\mu(\cdot) = \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$.

Lemma 14. *Almost surely every limit point of $(\mu(s+.), \bar{\theta}(s+.))$ as $s \to \infty$ is of the form $(\tilde{\mu}(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}(\cdot))$, where $\tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$ satisfies $\tilde{\mu}(t) \in D^{(1)}(\tilde{\theta}(t), \lambda(\tilde{\theta}(t)))$.*

Proof. Suppose that $u(n) \uparrow \infty$, $\mu(u(n)+.) \to \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\theta}(u(n)+.) \to \tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$. Let $\{f_i\}$ be countable dense in the unit ball of $C(S)$, hence it is a separating class, i.e., $\forall i \int f_i d\mu = \int f_i d\nu$ implies $\mu = \nu$. For each i,

$$\zeta_n^i = \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} a(m)(f_i(Z_{m+1}^{(1)}) - \int f_i(y)p(dy|Z_m^{(1)}, A_m^{(1)}, \theta_m, w_m)),$$

is a zero-mean martingale with $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta_m, w_m, Z_m^{(1)}, A_m^{(1)}, m \leq n), n \geq 1$. Moreover, it is a square-integrable martingale due to the fact that f_i's are bounded and each ζ_n^i is a finite sum. Its quadratic variation process

$$A_n = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} a(m)^2 E[(f_i(Z_{m+1}^{(1)}) - \int f_i(y)p(dy|Z_m^{(1)}, A_m^{(1)}, \theta_m, w_m))^2|\mathcal{F}_m] + E[(\zeta_0^i)^2]$$

is almost surely convergent. By the martingale convergence theorem, $\{\zeta_n^i\}$ converges a.s. Let $\tau(n,t) = \min\{m \geq n : t(m) \geq t(n) + t\}$ for $t \geq 0, n \geq 0$. Then as $n \to \infty$,

$$\sum_{m=n}^{\tau(n,t)} a(m)(f_i(Z_{m+1}^{(1)}) - \int f_i(y)p(dy|Z_m^{(1)}, A_m^{(1)}, \theta_m, w_m)) \to 0, \text{ a.s.},$$

for $t > 0$. By our choice of $\{f_i\}$ and the fact that $\{a(n)\}$ are eventually non-increasing,

$$\sum_{m=n}^{\tau(n,t)} (a(m) - a(m+1))f_i(Z_{m+1}^{(1)}) \to 0, \text{a.s.}$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{m=n}^{\tau(n,t)} a(m)(f_i(Z_m^{(1)}) - \int f_i(y)p(dy|Z_m^{(1)}, A_m^{(1)}, \theta_m, w_m)) \to 0, \text{ a.s.}$$

which implies

$$\int_{t(n)}^{t(n)+t} (\int (f_i(z) - \int f_i(y)p(dy|z, a, \hat{\theta}(s), \hat{w}(s)))\mu(s, dzda))ds \to 0, \text{ a.s.}$$

Recall that $u(n)$ can be any general sequence other than $t(n)$. Therefore

$$\int_{u(n)}^{u(n)+t} (\int (f_i(z) - \int f_i(y)p(dy|z, a, \hat{\theta}(s), \hat{w}(s)))\mu(s, dzda))ds \to 0, \text{ a.s.},$$

(this follows from the fact that $a(n) \to 0$ and f_i's are bounded) where $\hat{\theta}(s) = \theta_n$ and $\hat{w}(s) = w_n$ when $s \in [t(n), t(n+1)), n \geq 0$. Now, one can claim from the above that

$$\int_{u(n)}^{u(n)+t} (\int (f_i(z) - \int f_i(y)p(dy|z, a, \bar{\theta}(s), \lambda(\bar{\theta}(s))))\mu(s, dzda))ds \to 0, \text{ a.s.}$$

This is due to the fact that the map $S^{(1)} \times U^{(1)} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+k} \ni (z, a, \theta, w) \to \int f_i(y)p(dy|z, a, \theta, w)$ is continuous and hence uniformly continuous on the compact set $A = S^{(1)} \times U^{(1)} \times M_1 \times M_2$ where M_1 is the compact set s.t. $\theta_n \in M_1 \ \forall n$ and $M_2 = \{w : \|w\| \leq \max(\sup \|w_n\|, K')\}$ where K' is the bound for the compact set $\lambda(M_1)$. Here we also use the fact that $\|w_m - \lambda(\bar{\theta}(s))\| \to 0$ for $s \in [t_m, t_{m+1})$ as λ is Lipschitz and $\|w_m - \lambda(\theta_m)\| \to 0$. The above convergence is equivalent to

$$\int_0^t (\int (f_i(z) - \int f_i(y)p(dy|z, a, \bar{\theta}(s + u(n)), \lambda(\bar{\theta}(s + u(n)))))\mu(s + u(n), dzda))ds \to 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

Fix a sample point in the probability one set on which the convergence above holds for all i. Then the convergence above leads to

$$\int_0^t (\int f_i(z) - \int f_i(y)p(dy|z, a, \tilde{\theta}(s), \lambda(\tilde{\theta}(s))))\tilde{\mu}(s, dzda)ds = 0 \ \forall i. \tag{2.22}$$

For showing the above, we use one part of the proof from Lemma 2.3 of [77] that if $\mu^n(\cdot) \to \mu^\infty(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$ then for any t,

$$\int_0^t \int \tilde{f}(s,z,a)\mu^n(s,dzda)ds - \int_0^t \int \tilde{f}(s,z,a)\mu^\infty(s,dzda)ds \to 0$$

for all $\tilde{f} \in C([0,t] \times S^{(1)} \times U^{(1)})$. In addition, we make use of the fact that $\tilde{f}_n(s,z,a) = \int f_i(y)p(dy|z,a,\bar{\theta}(s+u(n)),\lambda(\bar{\theta}(s+u(n))))$ converges uniformly to $\tilde{f}(s,z,a) = \int f_i(y)p(dy|z,a,\tilde{\theta}(s),\lambda(\tilde{\theta}(s)))$. To prove this, define $g : C([0,t]) \times [0,t] \times S^{(1)} \times U^{(1)} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $g(\theta(\cdot),s,z,a) = \int f_i(y)p(dy|z,a,\theta(s),\lambda(\theta(s)))$. Let $A' = \{\bar{\theta}(u(n)+.)|_{[u(n),u(n)+t]}, n \geq 1\} \cup \tilde{\theta}(\cdot)|_{[0,t]}$. Using the same argument as in Lemma 7 and **(A6)**, i.e., λ is Lipschitz (the latter helps to claim that if $\theta_n(\cdot) \to \theta(\cdot)$ uniformly then $\lambda(\theta_n(\cdot)) \to \lambda(\theta(\cdot))$ uniformly), it can be seen that g is continuous. Then A' is compact as it is a union of a sequence of functions and its limit. So, $g|_{(A' \times [0,t] \times S^{(1)} \times U^{(1)})}$ is uniformly continuous. Then a similar argument as in Lemma 4 shows equicontinuity of $\{\tilde{f}_n(.,.)\}$ that results in uniform convergence and thereby (2.22). An application of Lebesgue's theorem in conjunction with (2.22) shows that

$$\int (f_i(z) - \int f_i(y)p(dy|z,a,\tilde{\theta}(t),\lambda(\tilde{\theta}(t)))\tilde{\mu}(t,dzda) = 0 \ \forall i$$

for a.e. t. By our choice of $\{f_i\}$, this leads to

$$\tilde{\mu}(t,dy \times U^{(1)}) = \int p(dy|z,a,\tilde{\theta}(t),\lambda(\tilde{\theta}(t)))\tilde{\mu}(t,dzda),$$

a.e. t. □

Lemma 13 shows that every limit point $(\tilde{\mu}(\cdot),\tilde{\theta}(\cdot))$ of $(\mu(s+.),\bar{\theta}(s+.))$ as $s \to \infty$ is such that $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$ satisfies (2.21) with $\mu(\cdot) = \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$. Hence, $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$ is absolutely continuous. Moreover, using Lemma 14, one can see that it satisfies (2.9) a.e. t, hence is a solution to the differential inclusion (2.9).

Proof of Theorem 1 and 2. From the previous three lemmas it is easy to see that $A_0 = \cap_{t \geq 0}\overline{\{\bar{\theta}(s) : s \geq t\}}$ is almost everywhere an internally chain transitive set of (2.9). □

Corollary 2. *Under the additional assumption that the inclusion*

$$\dot{\theta}(t) \in \hat{h}(\theta(t))),$$

has a global attractor set A_1,

$$(\theta_n, w_n) \to \cup_{\theta^* \in A_1}(\theta^*, \lambda(\theta^*)) a.s. \ as \ n \to \infty.$$

Proof. Follows directly from Theorem 1 and Lemma 1. □

2.4 Discussion on the assumptions: Relaxation of (A2)

We discuss relaxation of the uniformity of the Lipschitz constant w.r.t state of the controlled Markov process for the vector field. The modified assumption here is

(A2)' $h : \mathbb{R}^{d+k} \times S^{(1)} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is jointly continuous as well as Lipschitz in its first two arguments with the third argument fixed to same value and Lipschitz constant is a function of this value. The latter condition means that

$$\forall z^{(1)} \in S^{(1)}, \|h(\theta, w, z^{(1)}) - h(\theta', w', z^{(1)})\| \leq L^{(1)}(z^{(1)})(\|\theta - \theta'\| + \|w - w'\|).$$

A similar condition holds for g where the Lipschitz constant is $L^{(2)} : S^{(2)} \to \mathbb{R}^+$.

Note that this allows $L^{(i)}(\cdot)$ to be an unbounded measurable function making it discontinuous due to **(A1)**. The straightforward solution for implementing this is to additionally assume the following:

(A8) $\sup_n L^{(i)}(Z_n^{(i)}) < \infty$ a.s.

still allowing $L^{(i)}(\cdot)$ to be an unbounded function. As all our proofs in Section 2.3 are shown for every sample point of a probability 1 set, our proofs will go through. In the following we give such an example for the case where the Markov process is uncontrolled.

It is enough to consider examples with locally compact $S^{(i)}$ (because then we can take the standard one-point compactification and define $L^{(i)}$ arbitrarily at the extra point).

Let $S^{(i)} = \mathbb{Z}$ and let $Z_n^{(i)}, n \geq 0$ be the Markov Chain on $\mathbb{Z}$ starting at 0 with transition probabilities $p(n, n+1) = p$ and $p(n, n-1) = 1 - p$. We assume $1/2 < p < 1$. Let $L^{(i)}(n) = \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^n$.

Note that $Z_n^{(i)}, n \geq 0$ is a transient Markov Chain with $Z_n^{(i)} \to +\infty$ a.s. From this it follows that $\inf_n Z_n^{(i)} > -\infty$, and thus $\sup_n L^{(i)}(Z_n^{(i)}) < \infty$ almost surely. It follows that $(L^{(i)}(Z_n^{(i)}))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded sequence with probability 1, but this bound is clearly not deterministic since there is a non-zero probability that the sample path reaches large negative values.

However in the following we discuss on the idea of using moment assumptions to analyze the convergence of single timescale controlled Markov noise framework of [77]. We show that the iterates (2.14) (with $\epsilon_n = 0$) converge to an internally chain transitive set of the o.d.e. (2.12). For this we prove Lemma 6 under the following assumptions: For all $T > 2, i = 1, 2$,

(S1) The controlled Markov process Y_n as described in [77] takes values in a compact metric space.

(S2) $1 \geq a(n) > 0$, $\sum_n a(n) = \infty$, $\sum_n a(n)^2 < \infty$ and $a(n+1) \leq a(n), n \geq 0$.

(S3) $h : \mathbb{R}^d \times S \to \mathbb{R}^d$ Lipschitz in its first argument w.r.t the second. The condition means that

$$\forall z \in S, \|h(\theta, z) - h(\theta', z)\| \leq L(z)(\|\theta - \theta'\|)..$$

(S4) Let $\phi(n,T) = \max(m : a(n) + a(n+1) + \cdots + a(n+m) \leq T)$ with the bound depending on T. Then

$$\sup_n E\left[\left(\sup_{0\leq m\leq \phi(n,T)} L(Y_{n+m})\right)^{16}\right] < \infty.$$

(S5)

$$\sup_n E\left[e^{8\sum_{m=0}^{\phi(n,T)} a(n+m)L(Y_{n+m})}\right] < \infty.$$

Note that **(S4)** and **(S5)** are trivially satisfied in the case when $L(z) = L$ for all $z \in S$ i.e. the case of Section 2.2.

Remark 9. *As long as one can prove Lemma 6 for all $T > 2$ it will hold for all $T > 0$, thus one can combine **(S4)** and **(S5)** into the following assumption:*

$$\sup_n E\left[e^{8T\sup_{0\leq m\leq \phi(n,T)} L(Y_{n+m})}\right] < \infty.$$

As an instance where such an assumption is verified, consider the Markov process of [46, (3.4)] defined by

$$Y_{n+1} = A(\theta_n)Y_n + B(\theta_n)W_{n+1}$$

where $A(\theta), B(\theta), \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, are $k \times k$-matrices and $(W_n)_{n\geq O}$ are independent and identically distributed $\mathbb{R}^k$-valued random variables. Assume that the following conditions hold true for all $x, y \in S$:

(a) $L(Y_n)$ is a non-decreasing sequence.

(b) For $r > 0, R > 0$,

$$\sup_{\|\theta\|\leq R} e^{rL(A(\theta)x+B(\theta)y)} \leq L_R{\alpha_R}^r e^{rL(x)} + M_R e^{C_R L(y)}$$

for some $C_R, M_R, L_R > 0$ and $\alpha_R < 1$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left[e^{rL(Y_n)}|Y_{n-1} = x, \theta_{n-1} = \theta\right] \\
&\leq \int e^{rL(A(\theta)x+B(\theta)y)}\mu_n(dy) \\
&\leq L_R{\alpha_R}^r e^{rL(x)} + M_R E\left[e^{C_R L(W_n)}\right] \\
&= L_R{\alpha_R}^r e^{rL(x)} + K_R,
\end{aligned}$$

with $K_R = M_R E\left[e^{C_R L(W_n)}\right]$ (this follows from the fact that W_n are i.i.d if we assume that $E\left[e^{C_R L(W_1)}\right] < \infty$). Choosing large values of r, one can show that

$$E\left[e^{rL(Y_n)}|Y_{n-1} = x, \theta_{n-1} = \theta\right] \leq \beta_R e^{rL(x)} + K_R$$

where $\beta_R = L_R {\alpha_R}^r < 1$. *Using the above, for large* r

$$E\left[e^{rL(Y_n)}\right] = E\left[E\left[e^{rL(Y_n)}|Y_{n-1},\theta_{n-1}\right]\right] \leq \beta_R E\left[e^{rL(Y_{n-1})}\right] + K_R,$$

which shows that

$$\sup_n E\left[e^{rL(Y_n)}\right] < \infty.$$

Choosing $r > 8T$,

$$\sup_n E\left[e^{8TL(Y_n)}\right] < \infty.$$

Note that this is a much weaker assumption that ***(A8)***.

(S6) The noise sequence $M_n, n \geq 0$ (need not be a martingale difference sequence) satisfies the following condition

$$\sup_n E\left[\left(\sum_{m=0}^{\phi(n,T)} \|M_{n+m+1}\|\right)^4\right] < \infty.$$

(S7) $\sup_n \|\theta_n\| < \infty$.

With the above assumptions we prove the following tracking lemma:

Lemma 15. *For any* $T > 0, \sup_{t\in[s,s+T]} \|\bar{\theta}(t) - \theta^s(t)\| \to 0$, *a.s.*

Proof. Let $t(n) \leq t \leq t(n+m)$. Now, if $0 \leq k \leq (m-1)$ and $t \in (t(n+k), t(n+k+1)]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\theta^{t(n)}(t)\| &\leq \|\bar{\theta}(t(n)\| + \| \int_{t(n)}^{t} \tilde{h}(\theta^{t(n)}(\tau), \mu(\tau))d\tau\| \\
&\leq \|\theta_n\| + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \int_{t(n+l)}^{t(n+l+1)} (\|h(0, Y_{n+l})\| + L(Y_{n+l})\|\theta^{t(n)}(\tau)\|))d\tau \\
&+ \int_{t(n+k)}^{t} (\|h(0, Y_{n+k})\| + L(Y_{n+k})\|\theta^{t(n)}(\tau)\|))d\tau \\
&\leq C_0 + MT + \int_{t(n)}^{t} L(Y(\tau))\|\theta^{t(n)}(\tau)\|d\tau
\end{aligned}$$

where $Y(\tau) = Y_n$ if $\tau \in [t(n), t(n+1))$. Then it follows from an application of Gronwall inequality that

$$\|\theta^{t(n)}(t)\| \leq Ce^{\int_{t(n)}^{t} L(Y(\tau))d\tau} \text{ a.e. } t$$

where $C = C_0 + MT$. Next,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\theta^{t(n)}(t) - \theta^{t(n)}(t(n+k))\| &\leq \int_{t(n+k)}^{t} \|h(\theta^{t(n)}(s), Y_{n+k})\|ds \\
&\leq \|h(0, Y_{n+k})\|(t - t(n+k)) + L(Y_{n+k}) \int_{t(n+k)}^{t} \|\theta^{t(n)}(s)\|ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq Ma(n+k) + CL(Y_{n+k}) \int_{t(n+k)}^{t} e^{\int_{t(n)}^{s} L(Y(\tau))d\tau} ds.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\| \int_{t(n)}^{t(n+m)} (h(\theta^{t(n)}(t), \mu(t)) - h(\theta^{t(n)}([t]), \mu([t])))dt \| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \int_{t(n+k)}^{t(n+k+1)} \|h(\theta^{t(n)}(t), Y_{n+k}) - h(\theta^{t(n)}([t]), Y_{n+k})\| dt \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} L(Y_{n+k}) \int_{t(n+k)}^{t(n+k+1)} \|\theta^{t(n)}(t) - \theta^{t(n)}(t(n+k))\| dt \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} c_k
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$c_k = L(Y_{n+k}) a(n+k)^2 \left[M + CL(Y_{n+k}) e^{\sum_{i=0}^{k} a(n+i)L(Y_{n+i})} \right].$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\bar{\theta}(t(n+m)) - \theta^{t(n)}(t(n+m))\| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} L(Y_{n+k}) a(n+k) \|\bar{\theta}(t(n+k)) - \theta^{t(n)}(t(n+k))\| \\
+ \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} c_k + \|\delta_{n,n+m}\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{n,n+m} = \sum_{k=n}^{n+m-1} a(k) M_{k+1}$.

Therefore using discrete Gronwall inequality we get

$$\|\bar{\theta}(t(n+m)) - \theta^{t(n)}(t(n+m))\| \leq r(m,n) e^{\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} a(n+k)L(Y_{n+k})}$$

where $r(m,n) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (c_k + a(n+k)\|M_{n+k+1}\|)$.

Now, for some $\lambda \in [0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\theta^{t(n)}(t) - \bar{\theta}(t)\| \\
&\leq (1-\lambda)\|\theta^{t(n)}(t(n+m+1)) - \bar{\theta}(t(n+m+1)) + \lambda \|\theta^{t(n)}(t(n+m)) - \bar{\theta}(t(n+m))\| \\
&+ \max(\lambda, 1-\lambda) \int_{t(n+m)}^{t(n+m+1)} \|\tilde{h}(\theta^{t(n)}(s), \mu(s))\| ds \\
&\leq r(m+1,n) e^{\sum_{k=0}^{m} a(n+k)L(Y_{n+k})} + a(n+m) \left[M + CL(Y_{n+m}) e^{\sum_{k=0}^{m} a(n+k)L(Y_{n+k})} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\rho(n,T) := \sup_{t \in [t(n), t(n)+T]} \|\theta^{t(n)}(t) - \bar{\theta}(t)\| \leq r(\phi(n,T+1), n) e^{\sum_{k=0}^{\phi(n,T)} a(n+k)L(Y_{n+k})}$$

$$+ a(n)\left[M + C \sup_{0\le m\le \phi(n,T)} L(Y_{n+m}) e^{\sum_{k=0}^{\phi(n,T)} a(n+k)L(Y_{n+k})}\right].$$

Now to prove the a.s. convergence of the quantity in the left hand side as $n \to \infty$, we have using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[\rho(n,T)^2] \le 2K_T \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(E\left[(r(\phi(n,T+1),n))^4\right]\right)^{1/2} + 4M^2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a(n)^2 + 4C^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(n)^2 E\left[\left(\sup_{0\le m\le \phi(n,T)} L(Y_{n+m})\right)^2 e^{2\sum_{k=0}^{\phi(n,T)} a(n+k)L(Y_{n+k})}\right],$$

where $K_T = \sqrt{\sup_n E[e^{4\sum_{k=0}^{\phi(n,T)} a(n+k)L(Y_{n+k})}]}$ which depends only on T due to **(S5)**. Now, the third term in the R.H.S is clearly finite from the assumptions **(S4)** and **(S5)**. Now we analyze the first term i.e.

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(E\left[r(\phi(n,T+1),n)^4\right]\right)^{1/2} \le 2\sqrt{2}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(E\left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\phi(n,T)} c_k\right)^4\right]\right)^{1/2} + 2\sqrt{2}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(E\left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\phi(n,T)} a(n+k)\|M_{n+k+1}\|\right)^4\right]\right)^{1/2}. \quad (2.23)$$

Next we analyze the first term in the R.H.S of (2.23) again using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(E\left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\phi(n,T)} c_k\right)^4\right]\right)^{1/2} \le 8M^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi(n,T)^2 a(n)^4 \left(E\left[\left(\sup_{0\le k\le \phi(n,T)} L(Y_{n+k})\right)^4\right]\right)^{1/2} + 8C^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi(n,T)^2 a(n)^4 \left(E\left[\left(\sup_{0\le k\le \phi(n,T)} L(Y_{n+k})\right)^8 e^{4\sum_{i=0}^{\phi(n,T)} a(n+i)L(Y_{n+i})}\right]\right)^{1/2}.$$

Therefore the the R.H.S will be finite if we can show that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi(n,T)^2 a(n)^4$ is finite. For common step-size sequence $a(n) = \frac{1}{n}$, $\phi(n,T) = O(n)$ thus the above series converges clearly. One can make the series converge for all $a(n) = \frac{1}{n^k}$ with $\frac{1}{2} < k \le 1$ by putting assumptions on higher moments in **(S4)** and **(S5)** .

In the above we have used the following inequality repeatedly for non-negative random variables X and Y:

$$\sqrt{E\left[(X+Y)^{2^n}\right]} \le 2^{\frac{2n-1}{2}}\left[\sqrt{E[X^{2^n}]} + \sqrt{E[Y^{2^n}]}\right]$$

with $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(E\left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\phi(n,T)} a(n+k)\|M_{n+k+1}\|\right)^4\right]\right)^{1/2}$$
$$\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(n)^2\left(E\left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\phi(n,T)} \|M_{n+k+1}\|\right)^4\right]\right)^{1/2}$$

which is finite under assumption **(S5)** and the fact that $a(n)$ are non-increasing. □

Remark 10. *However there are problems in the method of using moment assumptions. Even for the single timescale case the proof of Lemma 2.3 of [77] does not go through. This lemma is used to prove that the o.d.e. trajectory $\theta^{u(n(k))}(\cdot)$ associated with $\mu(u(n(k))+.)$ tracks (in the limit) the o.d.e. trajectory $\theta^{\infty}(\cdot)$ associated with $\tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$ for the o.d.e (12). Here $u(n(k)) \uparrow \infty$ is such that $\bar{\theta}(u(n(k))+.) \to \tilde{\theta}(\cdot)$ and $\mu(u(n(k))+.) \to \tilde{\mu}(\cdot)$. In this context, the statement of Lemma 2.3 [77] will be changed to the following:*

Lemma 16.

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|\theta^{u(n(k))}(t) - \theta^{\infty}(t)\| = 0 \ a.s.$$

for every $T > 1$ and $L : S \to [1,\infty)$.

Proof. Following the same lines as in [77, Lemma 2.3]

$$\rho'(u(n(k)),T) := \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|\theta^{u(n(k))}(t) - \theta^{\infty}(t)\|$$
$$\leq K_{T,u(n(k))}\left(\|\theta^{u(n(k))}(0) - \theta^{\infty}(0)\| + \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|\int_0^t (\tilde{h}(\theta^{\infty}(s),\mu(u(n(k))+s)) - \tilde{h}(\theta^{\infty}(s),\tilde{\mu}(s)))ds\|\right),$$

where the second term goes to zero a.s. and

$$K_{T,u(n(k))} = 1 + \left[\int_0^T \left(\int L(z)\mu(u(n(k))+s,dzda)\right)ds\right] e^{\int_0^T\left(\int L(z)\mu(u(n(k))+s,dzda)\right)ds}$$
$$= 1 + \left[\sum_{m=0}^{\phi(u(n(k)),T)} a(u(n(k))+m)L(Y_{u(n(k))+m})\right] e^{\sum_{m=0}^{\phi(u(n(k)),T)} a(u(n(k))+m)L(Y_{u(n(k))+m})}$$
$$\leq 2\left[\sum_{m=0}^{\phi(u(n(k)),T)} a(u(n(k))+m)L(Y_{u(n(k))+m})\right] e^{\sum_{m=0}^{\phi(u(n(k)),T)} a(u(n(k))+m)L(Y_{u(n(k))+m})}.$$

It is not clear how to apply Borel-Cantelli lemma here to prove as in the proof of Lemma 15 of the as there is no step-size factor in the r.h.s of the above.

Similar problem will arise if we are using this method for two time-scale analysis. Then even in Lemma 12 we have to make strong assumptions such as

$$\sup_n E\left[\left(\sum_{m=0}^{\phi(n,T)} \|w_{n+m} - \lambda(\theta_{n+m})\|\right)^8\right] < \infty.$$

The reason is that our proofs are based on Gronwall's inequality, using which we bound the difference between the o.d.e trajectory and algorithm's iterates by a quantity which is a product of a constant and a term going to zero (e.g. Lemma 2.2 of [77]). Therefore the fact that additional errors vanish asymptotically may not be useful in the proof if we use moment assumptions unless the term going to zero is determined by step-size (this is the case for Lemma 15).

2.5 Conclusion

We considered in this chapter two time-scale stochastic approximations with both iterates driven by different controlled Markov processes as well as martingale difference noise sequences and provided a proof of convergence of such recursions under general assumptions. Note that we have assumed stability of the iterates to prove our results. A nice future direction will be to find sufficient and verifiable condition for this assumption. To our knowledge this is not a natural extension of the result for single time-scale stochastic approximation (also called the Borkar-Meyn theorem, see [78, Chapter 3] for details) into two time-scale as the coupled o.d.e has no attractor. One possible approach may be to use Lyapunov function.

In the next chapter, we shall study an application of the results developed here for proving convergence of off-policy temporal difference learning algorithm with linear function approximation which is a reinforcement learning algorithm for the problem of prediction. For this problem, classical Poisson equation can be used to handle Markov noise if we assume state space of the underlying Markov chain is finite. However, we show that the results developed under general assumptions still can be applied for this special case.

Chapter 3

Off-policy temporal difference learning with linear function approximation in on-line learning environment

3.1 Brief Introduction and Organization

In this chapter we present an application of the general results developed in the previous chapter to show that the assumptions made for the general case are still satisfied for the special case. This is achieved by providing an almost sure convergence analysis of off-policy temporal difference learning algorithm (only policy evaluation) with linear function approximation in on-line learning environment using the results of previous chapter. The algorithm considered is TDC with importance weighting as mentioned in Chapter 1 as popular off-policy learning algorithm such as Q-learning [12] may diverge when function approximation is deployed. An important point to note is that this is not a usual two time-scale scenario such as actor-critic method [71], however, two time-scale stochastic approximation is used so that the associated o.d.es have global attractor.

The organization of this chapter is as follows: Section 3.2 describes the TDC algorithm with importance weighting. Section 3.3 gives the convergence proof of the algorithm. Section 3.4 shows empirical results supporting our theoretical results. Finally we conclude by providing some interesting future directions.

3.2 Background and description of TDC with importance weighting

We need to estimate the value function for a target policy π given the continuing evolution of the underlying MDP (with finite state and action spaces S and A respectively, specified by expected reward $r(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$ and transition probability kernel $p(\cdot|\cdot,\cdot)$) for a behaviour policy π_b with $\pi \neq \pi_b$. Suppose, the above-mentioned on-policy trajectory is $(X_n, A_n, R_n, X_{n+1}), n \geq 0$ where $\{X_n\}$ is a time-homogeneous irreducible Markov chain with unique stationary distribution ν

and generated from the behavior policy π_b. Here the quadruplet (s, a, r, s') represents (current state, action, reward, next state). Also, assume that $\pi_b(a|s) > 0 \ \forall s \in S, a \in A$. We need to find the solution θ^* for the following:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_{s,a,s'} \nu(s)\pi(a|s)p(s'|s,a)\delta(\theta; s, a, s')\phi(s) = E[\rho_{X,A}\delta_{X,R,Y}(\theta)\phi(X)] \\ &= b - A\theta, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where

(i) $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the parameter for value function,

(ii) $\phi : S \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vector of state features,

(iii) $X \sim \nu$,

(iv) $0 < \gamma < 1$ is the discount factor,

(v) $E[R|X = s, Y = s'] = \sum_{a\in A} \pi_b(a|s)r(s, a, s')$,

(vi) $P(Y = s'|X = s) = \sum_{a\in A} \pi_b(a|s)p(s'|s, a)$,

(vii) $\delta(\theta; s, a, s') = r(s, a, s') + \gamma\theta^T\phi(s') - \theta^T\phi(s)$ is the temporal difference term with expected single-stage reward,

(viii) $\rho_{X,A} = \frac{\pi(A|X)}{\pi_b(A|X)}$,

(ix) $\delta_{X,R,Y} = R + \gamma\theta^T\phi(Y) - \theta^T\phi(X)$,

(x) $A = E[\rho_{X,A}\phi(X)(\phi(X) - \gamma\phi(Y))^T]$, $b = E[\rho_{X,A}R\phi(X)]$.

The desired approximate value function under the target policy π is $V_\pi^* = \theta^{*T}\phi$. Let $V_\theta = \theta^T\phi$. It is well-known ([26]) that θ^* (solution to (3.1)) satisfies the projected fixed point equation namely

$$V_\theta = \Pi_{\mathcal{G},\nu} T^\pi V_\theta,$$

where

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{G},\nu}\hat{V} = \arg\min_{f\in\mathcal{G}}(\|\hat{V} - f\|_\nu),$$

with $\mathcal{G} = \{V_\theta|\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ and the Bellman operator

$$T^\pi V_\theta(s) = \sum_{s'\in S}\sum_{a\in A} \pi(a|s)p(s'|s,a)\left[\gamma V_\theta(s') + r(s,a,s')\right].$$

Here $\|\cdot\|_\nu$ is the weighted Euclidean norm defined by $\|f\|_\nu^2 = \sum_{s\in S} f(s)^2\nu(s)$, Therefore to find θ^*, the idea is to minimize the mean square projected Bellman error (MSPBE) $J(\theta) = \|V_\theta - \Pi_{\mathcal{G},\nu}T^\pi V_\theta\|_\nu^2$ using stochastic gradient descent. It can be shown that the expression of gradient contains product of multiple expectations. Such framework can be modelled by two

time-scale stochastic approximation where one iterate stores the quasi-stationary estimates of some of the expectations and the other iterate is used for sampling.

We consider the TDC (Temporal Difference with Correction) algorithm with importance-weighting from Sections 4.2 and 5.2 of [26]. The gradient in this case can be shown to satisfy

$$-\frac{1}{2}\nabla J(\theta) = E[\rho_{X,A}\delta_{X,R,Y}(\theta)\phi(X)] - \gamma E[\rho_{X,A}\phi(Y)\phi(X)^T]w(\theta),$$
$$w(\theta) = E[\phi(X)\phi(X)^T]^{-1}E[\rho_{X,A}\delta_{X,R,Y}(\theta)\phi(X)].$$

Define $\phi_n = \phi(X_n)$, $\phi'_n = \phi(X_{n+1})$, $\delta_n(\theta) = \delta_{X_n,R_n,X_{n+1}}(\theta)$ and $\rho_n = \rho_{X_n,A_n}$. Therefore the associated iterations in this algorithm are:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)\rho_n \left[\delta_n(\theta_n)\phi_n - \gamma\phi'_n\phi_n^T w_n\right], \tag{3.2}$$
$$w_{n+1} = w_n + b(n)\left[(\rho_n\delta_n(\theta_n) - \phi_n^T w_n)\phi_n\right], \tag{3.3}$$

with $\{a(n)\}, \{b(n)\}$ satisfying conditions which will be specified later. Note that the second term inside bracket in (3.2) is essentially an adjustment or correction of the TD update so that it follows the gradient of the MSPBE objective function thus helping in the desired convergence.

Note that the sub-sampling version of TDC algorithm (therefore the offline version of TDC algorithm) can be written in the following way:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)I_{\{A_n=\pi(X_n)\}}\left[\delta_n(\theta_n)\phi_n - \gamma\phi'_n\phi_n^T w_n\right],$$
$$w_{n+1} = w_n + b(n)I_{\{A_n=\pi(X_n)\}}\left[(\delta_n(\theta_n) - \phi_n^T w_n)\phi_n\right],$$

where $I_{\{A_n=\pi(X_n)\}} = 1$ if $A_n = \pi(X_n)$ and 0 otherwise. In the rest of the chapter both the above algorithms will be denoted by ONTDC and OFFTDC respectively except the figures in Section 3.4 where we mention the full name.

3.3 Almost sure convergence proof of ONTDC

Theorem 3 (Convergence of TDC with importance-weighting)**.** *Consider the iterations (3.3) and (3.2) of the TDC. Assume the following:*

- $\{a(n)\}, \{b(n)\}$ *satisfy* ***(A4)****.*
- $\{(X_n, R_n, X_{n+1}), n \geq 0\}$ *is such that* $\{X_n\}$ *is a time-homogeneous finite state irreducible Markov chain generated from the behavior policy* π_b *with unique stationary distribution* ν*.* $E[R_n|X_n = s, X_{n+1} = s'] = \sum_{a\in A}\pi_b(a|s)r(s,a,s')$ *and* $P(X_{n+1} = s'|X_n = s) = \sum_{a\in A}\pi_b(a|s)p(s'|s,a)$ *where* π_b *is the behaviour policy,* $\pi \neq \pi_b$*. Also,* $E[R_n^2|X_n, X_{n+1}] < \infty\ \forall n$ *almost surely, and*
- $C = E[\phi(X)\phi(X)^T]$ *and* $A = E[\rho_{X,R_n}\phi(X)(\phi(X) - \gamma\phi(X_{n+1}))^T]$ *are non-singular where* $X \sim \nu$*.*

- $\pi_b(a|s) > 0 \ \forall s \in S, a \in A.$
- $\sup_n(\|\theta_n\| + \|w_n\|) < \infty$ *w.p. 1.*

Then the parameter vector θ_n *converges with probability one as* $n \to \infty$ *to the TD(0) solution (3.1).*

Proof. The iterations (3.3) and (3.2) can be cast into the framework of Section 2.2.2 with

- $Z_n^{(i)} = X_{n-1}$,
- $h(\theta, w, z) = E[(\rho_n(\delta_n(\theta)\phi_n - \gamma\phi_n'\phi_n^T w))|X_{n-1} = z]$,
- $g(\theta, w, z) = E[((\rho_n\delta_n(\theta) - \phi_n^T w)\phi_n)|X_{n-1} = z]$,
- $M_{n+1}^{(1)} = \rho_n(\delta_n(\theta_n)\phi_n - \gamma\phi_n'\phi_n^T w_n) - E[\rho_n(\delta_n(\theta_n)\phi_n - \gamma\phi_n'\phi_n^T w_n)|X_{n-1}, \theta_n, w_n]$,
- $M_{n+1}^{(2)} = (\rho_n\delta_n(\theta_n) - \phi_n^T w_n)\phi_n - E[(\rho_n\delta_n(\theta_n) - {\phi_n}^T w_n)\phi_n|X_{n-1}, \theta_n, w_n]$,
- $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta_m, w_m, R_{m-1}, X_{m-1}, A_{m-1}, m \le n, i = 1, 2), n \ge 0.$

Note that in (ii) and (iii) we can define h and g independent of n due to time-homogeneity of $\{X_n\}$.

Now, we verify the assumptions **(A1)-(A7)** (mentioned in Sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 of Chapter 2) for our application:

- **(A1)**: $Z_n^{(i)}, \forall n, i = 1, 2$ takes values in compact metric space as $\{X_n\}$ is a finite state Markov chain.
- **(A5)**: Continuity of transition kernel follows trivially from the fact that we have a finite state MDP.
- **(A2)**
  - $$\begin{aligned}&\|h(\theta, w, z) - h(\theta', w', z)\| \\ &= \|E[\rho_n(\theta - \theta')^T(\gamma\phi(X_{n+1}) - \phi(X_n))\phi(X_n) - \gamma\rho_n\phi(X_{n+1})\phi(X_n)^T(w - w')|X_{n-1} = z]\| \\ &\le L(2\|\theta - \theta'\|M^2 + \|w - w'\|M^2),\end{aligned}$$

    where $M = \max_{s\in S}\|\phi(s)\|$ with S being the state space of the MDP and $L = \max_{(s,a)\in(S\times A)}\frac{\pi(a|s)}{\pi_b(a|s)}$. Hence h is Lipschitz continuous in the first two arguments uniformly w.r.t the third. In the last inequality above, we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.
  - As with the case of h, g can be shown to be Lipschitz continuous in the first two arguments uniformly w.r.t the third.

– Joint continuity of h and g follows from (iii)(a) and (b) respectively as well as the finiteness of S.

- **(A3)**: Clearly, $\{M_{n+1}^{(i)}\}, i = 1, 2$ are martingale difference sequences w.r.t. increasing σ-fields $\mathcal{F}_n$. Note that $E[\|M_{n+1}^{(i)}\|^2|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq K(1 + \|\theta_n\|^2 + \|w_n\|^2)$ a.s., $n \geq 0$ since $E[R_n^2|X_n, X_{n+1}] < \infty$ for all n almost surely and S is finite.

- **(A4)**: This follows from the conditions (i) in the statement of Theorem 3.

Now, one can see that the faster o.d.e. becomes

$$\dot{w}(t) = E[\rho_{X,A_n}\delta_{X,R_n,X_{n+1}}(\theta)\phi(X)] - E[\phi(X)\phi(X)^T]w(t).$$

Clearly, $C^{-1}E[\rho_{X,A_n}\delta_{X,R_n,X_{n+1}}(\theta)\phi(X)]$ is the globally asymptotically stable equilibrium of the o.d.e. The corresponding Lyapunov function $V(\theta, w) = \frac{1}{2}\|Cw - E[\rho_{X,A_n}\delta_{X,R_n,X_{n+1}}(\theta)\phi(X)]\|^2$ is continuously differentiable. Additionally, $\lambda(\theta) = C^{-1}E[\rho_{X,A_n}\delta_{X,R_n,X_{n+1}}(\theta)\phi(X)]$ and it is Lipschitz continuous in θ, verifying **(A6)'**. For the slower o.d.e., the global attractor is $A^{-1}E[\rho_{X,A_n}R_n\phi(X)]$ verifying the additional assumption in Corollary 2. The attractor set here is a singleton. Also, **(A7)** is (v) in the statement of Theorem 3. Therefore the assumptions **(A1)** – **(A7)** are verified. The proof would then follow from Corollary 2. □

Remark 11. *The reason for using two time-scale framework for the TDC algorithm is to make sure that the O.D.E's have globally asymptotically stable equilibrium.*

Remark 12. *Because of the fact that the gradient is a product of two expectations the scheme is a "pseudo"-gradient descent which helps to find the global minimum here.*

Remark 13. *Here we assume the stability of the iterates (3.3) and (3.2). Certain sufficient conditions have been sketched for showing stability of single timescale stochastic recursions with controlled Markov noise [78, p. 75, Theorem 9]. This subsequently needs to be extended to the case of two time-scale recursions.*

Another way to ensure boundedness of the iterates is to use a projection operator. However, projection may introduce spurious fixed points on the boundary of the projection region and finding globally asymptotically stable equilibrium of a projected o.d.e. is hard. Therefore we do not use projection in our algorithm.

Remark 14. *Convergence analysis for TDC with importance weighting along with eligibility traces cf. [26, p. 74] where it is called GTD(λ)can be done similarly using our results. The main advantage is that it works for $\lambda < \frac{1}{L\gamma}$ ($\lambda \in [0, 1]$ being the eligibility function) whereas the analysis in [29] is shown only for λ very close to 1.*

3.4 Empirical results

For the assessment of the algorithm experimentally we have compared the result on a variation of the classic Baird's off-policy counter-example [26, Fig. 2.4] and $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem [61, Section 3].




Figure 3.1: Comparison between TD(0), OFFTDC and ONTDC for Baird's counterexample




Figure 3.2: Comparison between TD(0), OFFTDC and ONTDC for $\theta \to 2\theta$

In both cases, we compare the TD(0), OFFTDC and ONTDC. Unlike [63] where updating was done synchronously in dynamic-programming-like sweeps through the state space, we consider the usual stochastic approximation scenario where only simulated sample trajectories are taken as input to the algorithms i.e. the algorithms do not use any knowledge of the probabilities for the underlying Markov decision process. For Baird's problem our performance metric is Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) defined to be the square root of the average of the square of the deviation between true value function and the estimated value function. For $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem the y-axis is θ itself. The average is taken over 1000 simulation runs and the metric is plotted against the number of times θ_n is updated. While the analysis has been shown for the diminishing step-size case, we implement here the algorithm with constant step-sizes as in [26, 63].

The $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem consists of only 2 states where θ and 2θ are the estimated value of the states. According to its behavior policy with probability $p = \frac{1}{2}$ it stays on the same state and chooses the other state. The target policy is to choose the action that accesses the second state with probability 1 (See Fig. 1 in [61, Section 3] for details). The constant step-sizes are chosen as $a(n) = .075; b(n) = .05$ for the two time-scale algorithms and $\alpha = .075$ for single timescale algorithms. The simulations are run for 1000 different sample paths. Rewards in all transitions are zero. The initial values are $\theta = 1$ and $w = 0$. The results are summarized in Figure 3.2.

Next we consider the '7-star' version of Baird's counter example from [26, p .17] All the rewards in transitions are zero and true value function for each state is zero. The value functions are approximated as $V(s) = 2\theta(s) + \theta_0 \ \forall s \in \{1, 2 \dots 6\}$ and $V(7) = \theta(7) + 2\theta_0$. The behaviour policy is to choose the state 7 with probability $q = \frac{1}{7}$ and choose uniformly states $1 - 6$ with probability $(1 - q) = \frac{6}{7}$. The target policy is to choose the state 7 with probability 1. The step size chosen for this setting is $a = .005, b = .05$. The initial parameters are $\theta = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 10, 1)$ and $w = \mathbf{0}$. The results in this case are summarized in Figure 3.1.




Figure 3.3: OFFTDC vs. ONTDC for $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem: p=.01




Figure 3.4: OFFTDC and ONTDC for $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem: p=.001




Figure 3.5: OFFTDC vs. ONTDC for Baird's counterexample: q=.01




Figure 3.6: OFFTDC and ONTDC for Baird's counterexample: q=.001




Figure 3.7: on-policy learning on $\theta \rightarrow 2\theta$ problem

In both cases (Fig. 3.2 and 3.1) ONTDC performs better than the OFFTDC. The difference becomes more apparent when behaviour policy differs significantly from the target policy (Fig 3.3, Fig 3.4, Fig 3.5 and Fig 3.6). The intuition is that in case of OFFTDC the TD update is weighted by only step-size whereas in case of ONTDC it is additionally weighted by ρ_n. Therefore by changing the behaviour policy one can improve the rate of convergence of the algorithm. In the case of on-policy learning for the $\theta \rightarrow 2\theta$ problem, Figure 3.7 shows that with eligibility traces the performance of ONTDC is much closer to $TD(\lambda)$ compared to the case with $\lambda = 0$.

Although ONTDC uses importance weighting in its update, this is not importance sampling used in Monte-Carlo algorithms which is the source of high variance. Further, ONTDC does not have any follow-on trace like emphatic TD which has a high variance. We show in Fig 3.8 and Fig 3.9 that the variances of the performance metric for the ONTDC is negligible eventually for the two standard counterexamples.

For both the aforementioned examples the results for the extension to eligibility traces (the algorithm is called GTD(λ) or TDC(λ)) can be seen in Fig 3.10 and Fig 3.11 with $\lambda = 0.1$.

Fig 3.12 and Fig 3.13 shows the results of experiments where the step-size sequences obey the requirements in **(A5)**. We observe good convergence behaviour in this case that is also better when compared with the case of constant step-sizes as considered in this work.




Figure 3.8: Variances of the performance metric for ONTDC: Baird's counterexample




Figure 3.9: Variances of the performance metric for ONTDC: $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem




Figure 3.10: Comparison of TD(λ) and TDC(λ): Baird's counterexample




Figure 3.11: Comparison of TD(λ) and TDC(λ): $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem




Figure 3.12: ONTDC with step size for Baird's counterexample $a(n) = \frac{.5}{n}$, $b(n) = \frac{.125}{n^{.95}}$




Figure 3.13: ONTDC with step size for $\theta \to 2\theta$ problem $a(n) = \frac{7}{n+100}$, $b(n) = \frac{.5}{n^{.95}}$

3.5 Conclusion

We presented almost sure convergence proof for an off-policy temporal difference learning algorithm that is also extendible to eligibility traces (for a sufficiently large range of λ) with linear function approximation under the assumption that the "on-policy" trajectory for a behaviour policy is only available. This has previously not been done to our knowledge.

A future direction would be to similarly extend algorithms for off-policy control ([27]) to the more realistic settings as we consider in this chapter.

Note that in this chapter we assume point-wise boundedness (also called the 'stability') of the iterates to prove convergence of the stochastic approximation algorithms. However, finding sufficient verifiable conditions for this is very hard when the noise is Markov as well as when there are multiple timescales. In the next chapter, we compile several aspects of the dynamics of stochastic approximation algorithms with Markov iterate-dependent noise when the iterates are not known to be stable beforehand.

Chapter 4

Dynamics of stochastic approximation with Markov iterate-dependent noise with iterate-stability not ensured

4.1 Brief Introduction and Organization

As discussed in Chapter 1, stability of the iterates is an important assumption to prove almost sure convergence of the stochastic approximation iterates. However, in the presence of Markov noise, it is very difficult to provide verifiable sufficient conditions for this assumption. In this chapter we investigate the dynamics of stochastic approximation with Markov iterate-dependent noise when iterate-stability is not ensured by extending the lock-in probability framework of Borkar [75] to such recursions by using the classical Poisson equation [46, 47]. We apply our results to the problem of tracking ability [8, 70] which requires extending these results to two stochastic approximation iterates with different time-scales (the slower iterate is a single timescale stochastic approximation), where we can see that the coupled o.d.e has no attractor as mentioned in [52]. Therefore we need to consider two quantities describing difference (over compact time interval) between algorithm and o.d.e., one for the coupled algorithm/o.d.e and another for the slower algorithm/o.d.e. This gives rise to a situation where the conditioning event in the martingale concentration inequality will not belong to the first σ-field in the current collection of σ- fields (unlike in case of single timescale stochastic approximation where the conditioning event always belongs to the first σ-field in the current collection of σ-fields [78, p 40]).

The organization of this chapter is as follows: Section 4.2 formally defines the problem and provides background and assumptions. Section 4.3 shows our main *lock-in probability* results. Section 4.4 shows how to prove *almost sure convergence* to a *local* attractor using our results along with *asymptotic tightness* of the iterates. Moreover, this section shows that stability of the iterates can be proved using our results. Section 4.5 analyzes the tracking ability of adaptive algorithms using our results. Section 4.6 describes the results on sample complexity. Finally, we conclude by providing some future research directions.

4.2 The Problem and Assumptions

In the following we describe the preliminaries and notation that we use in our proofs. Most of the definitions and notation are from [46, 78, 65]. The notations used for ordinary differential equation is from [78, Appendix 11.2]. In the following we describe the lock-in probability settings based on the approach in [46]. The main idea is to assume existence of a solution to the Poisson equation (Assumption (M4) from Section III B of [46]), thus converting Markov iterate-dependent noise into a martingale difference sequence and additional additive errors. We refer the readers to [2, Part II,Chap. 2, Theorem 6], [46, Section III D, Appendix A] for details on the existence and properties of solution of Poisson equation for a Markov iterate-dependent process.

In this work we prove almost sure convergence for recursion (1.22) without assuming stability of the iterates, however following the classic Poisson equation model stated above where the assumptions are designed keeping in mind the stability of the iterates. To make up for this we need to strengthen some existing assumptions of [46] (shown next), these are standard assumptions satisfied in application areas such as reinforcement learning.

Recall $h : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ from Section 1.1.3. Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be open and let $V : G \to [0, \infty)$ be such that $\langle \nabla V, h \rangle : G \to \mathbb{R}$ is non-positive. We shall assume as in [78] that $H := \{\theta : V(\theta) = 0\}$ is equal to the set $\{\theta : \langle \nabla V(\theta), h(\theta) \rangle = 0\}$ and is a compact subset of G. Thus V is a strict Lyapunov function. Then H is an asymptotically stable invariant set of the differential equation $\dot{\theta}(t) = h(\theta(t))$. Let there be an open set B with compact closure such that $H \subset B \subset \bar{B} \subset G$. In this setting, the lock-in probability is defined to be the probability that the sequence $\{\theta_n\}$ is convergent to H, conditioned on the event that $\theta_{n_0} \in B$ for some n_0 sufficiently large.

Recall that, Theorem 8 of [78, p. 37], shows that for the case of martingale difference noise, $\mathbb{P}[\theta_n \to H | \theta_{n_0} \in B] \geq 1 - O(e^{-\frac{1}{s(n_0)}})$, where $s(n_0) := \sum_{m=n_0}^{\infty} a(m)^2$. In this work we obtain these results when the noise is Markov iterate-dependent under the following assumptions:

(A1) $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|Y_n\| < \bar{C}$ a.s. for some $\bar{C} > 0$. This is stronger than $\limsup_n E[\|Y_n\|^2] < \infty$ which is implied by **(M2)** of [46].

(A2) $\sup_y \|f(\theta, y)\| \leq K(1 + \|\theta\|)$ for all θ.

> **Remark 15.** *(A2) is a standard assumption satisfied in reinforcement learning scenarios as pointed in [75, p 6]. Clearly, this is stronger than the hypothesis (F) on f as mentioned in [46, p. 143].*

(A3) The step-sizes $\{a(n)\}$ are non-increasing positive scalars satisfying

$$\sum_n a(n) = \infty, \sum_n a(n)^2 < \infty.$$

(A4) For every θ, the Markov chain Π_θ has a unique invariant probability Γ_θ. (**(M1)** from [46]). Further, $h(\theta) = \int f(\theta, y)\Gamma_\theta(dy)$ is Lipschitz continuous in θ with Lipschitz constant $0 < L < \infty$.

(A5) $\|M_{n+1}\| \leq K'(1+\|\theta_n\|)$ a.s. $\forall n$.

(A6) For every θ the Poisson equation

$$(1-\Pi_\theta)v_\theta = f(\theta,\cdot) - \int f(\theta,y)\Gamma_\theta(dy)$$

has a solution v_θ. This is **(M4)** from [46].

(A7) For all $R>0$ there exist constants $C_R>0$ such that

(a) $\sup_{\|\theta\|\leq R}\|v_\theta(x)\| \leq C_R(1+\|x\|)$.

(b) $\|v_\theta(x)-v_{\theta'}(x)\| \leq C_R\|\theta-\theta'\|(1+\|x\|)$ for all $\|\theta\|\leq R$, $\|\theta'\|\leq R$.

This is **(M5)b,c** from [46].

Under the above assumptions we show that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\theta_n \to H|\theta_{n_0}\in B\right] \geq 1 - O\left(e^{-\frac{c}{s(n_0)}}\right)$$

for sufficiently large n_0.

We provide a more detailed discussion on assumptions **(A1)** and **(A2)** as well as possible relaxations of these in Section 4.3.1.

4.3 Lock-in probability calculation for single timescale stochastic approximation

In this subsection we give a lower bound for $\mathbb{P}[\theta_n \to H|\theta_{n_0}\in B]$ in terms of $s(n_0)$ when n_0 is sufficiently large based on the settings described in Section 4.2. How large n_0 needs to be will be specified soon. Before proceeding further we describe our notations and recall some known results. For $\delta>0$, $N_\delta(A)$ for a set A denotes its δ-neighborhood $\{y : \|y-x\|<\delta\ \forall\ x\in A\}$. Let $H^a = N_a(H)$. Fix some $0<\epsilon_1<\epsilon$ and $\delta_B>0$ such that $N_{\delta_B}(H^{\epsilon_1})\subset H^\epsilon \subset B$.

Let T be an upper bound for the time required for a solution of the o.d.e. (1.10) to reach the set H^{ϵ_1}, starting from an initial condition in $\bar{B}$. The existence of such a T independent of the starting point in $\bar{B}$ can be proved using the continuity of flow of the o.d.e (1.10) around the initial point and the fact that H is an asymptotically stable set of the same o.d.e; see Lemma 1 of [78, Chapter 3] for a similar proof. Let $t(n)=\sum_{m=0}^{n-1}a(m)$, $n\geq 1$ with $t(0)=0$. Let $n_0\geq 0, n_m = \min\{n : t(n)\geq t(n_{m-1})+T\}$ and $T_m = t(n_m)$, $m\geq 1$. Define $\bar{\theta}(t)$ by: $\bar{\theta}(t(n))=\theta_n$, with linear interpolation on $[t(n),t(n+1))$ for all n. Let $\theta^{t(n_m)}(\cdot)$ be the solution of the limiting o.d.e. (1.10) on $[t(n_m),t(n_{m+1}))$ with the initial condition $\theta^{t(n_m)}(t(n_m))=\bar{\theta}(t(n_m))=\theta_{n_m}$. Let

$$\rho_m := \sup_{t\in[t(n_m),t(n_{m+1}))}\|\bar{\theta}(t)-\theta^{t(n_m)}(t)\|.$$

We recall here a few key results from [75]. As shown there, if $\theta_{n_0}\in B$, and $\rho_m<\delta_B$ for all $m\geq 0$, then $\bar{\theta}(T_n)$ is in $H^\epsilon\subset B$ for all $n\geq 1$. This follows from the following: because

of the way we defined T, it follows that $\theta^{T_0}(T_1) \in H^{\epsilon_1}$. Since $\rho_0 < \delta_B$ and $N_{\delta_B}(H^{\epsilon_1}) \subset H^{\epsilon}$, $\bar{\theta}(T_1) \in H^{\epsilon}$. Since H^{ϵ} is a positively invariant subset of $\bar{B}$, it follows that $\theta^{T_1}(\cdot)$ lies in H^{ϵ} on I_1 , and that $\theta^{T_1}(T_2) \in H^{\epsilon_1}$. Hence $\bar{\theta}(T_2) \in H^{\epsilon}$. Continuing in this way it follows that for all $m \geq 1$, $\theta^{T_m}(\cdot)$ lies inside H^{ϵ} on I_m. Therefore using discrete Gronwall's inequality we can show that $\sup_{t \geq T_0} \bar{\theta}(t) < \infty$. It is also known ([46], section IIC) that if the sequence of iterates $\{\theta_n\}$ remains bounded almost surely on a prescribed set of sample points, and if on this set the iterates belongs to a compact set in the domain of attraction of any local attractor infinitely often then it converges almost surely on this set to that local attractor. Using this fact gives the following estimate on the probability of convergence, conditioned on $\theta_{n_0} \in B$ ([78], Lemma 1, p. 33):

$$P\left[\bar{\theta}(t) \to H | \theta_{n_0} \in B\right] \geq P\left[\rho_m < \delta_B \ \forall m \geq 0 | \theta_{n_0} \in B\right].$$

Let $\mathcal{B}_m$ denote the event that $\theta_{n_0} \in B$ and $\rho_k < \delta_B$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, m$. Clearly, $\mathcal{B}_m \in \mathcal{F}_{n_{m+1}}$. The following lower bound for the above probability has been obtained in ([78], Lemma 2, p. 33):

$$P\left[\rho_m < \delta_B \ \forall m \geq 0 | \theta_{n_0} \in B\right] \geq 1 - \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P\left[\rho_m \geq \delta_B | \mathcal{B}_{m-1}\right].$$

Subsequently the idea is to find an upper bound of ρ_m consisting of errors (asymptotically negligible on $\mathcal{B}_{m-1}$) as well as martingale terms. Then for some large n_0, one may bound $P(\rho_m \geq \delta_B | \mathcal{B}_{m-1})$ using a suitable martingale concentration inequality. In the following we describe how to achieve the above in our setting.

Using the Poisson equation one can write the recursion (1.22) as

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)h(\theta_n) + a(n)\left[v_{\theta_n}(Y_n) - \Pi_{\theta_n} v_{\theta_n}(Y_n) + M_{n+1}\right]$$

where $\Pi_\theta \phi(x) = \int \phi(y) \Pi_\theta(x; dy)$. Let $\zeta_{n+1} = v_{\theta_n}(Y_n) - \Pi_{\theta_n} v_{\theta_n}(Y_n)$. We decompose

$$\zeta_{n+1} = v_{\theta_n}(Y_{n+1}) - \Pi_{\theta_n} v_{\theta_n}(Y_n) + v_{\theta_n}(Y_n) - v_{\theta_{n+1}}(Y_{n+1}) + v_{\theta_{n+1}}(Y_{n+1}) - v_{\theta_n}(Y_{n+1})$$

and set

$$A_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k)\zeta_{k+1}^{(1)}, \ B_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k)\zeta_{k+1}^{(2)}, \ C_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k)\zeta_{k+1}^{(3)},$$
$$D_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k) M_{k+1}, n \geq 1$$

where

$$\zeta_{n+1}^{(1)} = v_{\theta_n}(Y_{n+1}) - \Pi_{\theta_n} v_{\theta_n}(Y_n), \ \zeta_{n+1}^{(2)} = v_{\theta_n}(Y_n) - v_{\theta_{n+1}}(Y_{n+1}),$$
$$\zeta_{n+1}^{(3)} = v_{\theta_{n+1}}(Y_{n+1}) - v_{\theta_n}(Y_{n+1}).$$

Then one can easily see that as in the proof of Lemma 3 of [78, p. 34]

$$\rho_m \leq (Ca(n_0) + K_T C L s(n_0)) + K_T [\max_{n_m \leq j \leq n_{m+1}} \|A_j - A_{n_m}\| +$$

$$\max_{n_m \le j \le n_{m+1}} \|B_j - B_{n_m}\| + \max_{n_m \le j \le n_{m+1}} \|C_j - C_{n_m}\| + \max_{n_m \le j \le n_{m+1}} \|D_j - D_{n_m}\|], \tag{4.1}$$

where C is a bound on $\|h(\Phi_t(\theta)\|$, with Φ_t the time-t flow map for the o.d.e (1.10), $0 \le t \le T+1$ and $\theta \in \bar{B}$. Also, $K_T = e^{LT}$.

Choose an $n_0^{(1)}$ such that

$$(Ca(n_0^{(1)}) + K_T C Ls(n_0^{(1)})) < \delta_B/2. \tag{4.2}$$

The following important lemma shows that $\forall m \ge 1$, on $\mathcal{B}_{m-1}$, iterates are stable over T-length interval with the stability constant independent of m. This is enough for our proofs to go through and justifies the importance of assumptions **(A2)** and **(A5)**.

Lemma 17. *On $\mathcal{B}_{m-1}$, $\|\theta_j\| \le K''$ for any $n_m \le j \le n_{m+1}$ where the constant K' is independent of m.*

Proof. From the definition of $\mathcal{B}_{m-1}$, we know that $\theta_{n_m} \in B$ on this event. Let $\|\theta_{n_m}\| \le \tilde{C}\ \forall m$. Clearly, for $n_m \le j \le n_{m+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\theta_j\| &\le \|\theta_{n_m}\| + \sum_{k=n_m}^{j-1} a(k)\left[\|f(\theta_k, Y_k)\| + \|M_{k+1}\|\right] \\ &\le \tilde{C} + \tilde{K} \sum_{k=n_m}^{j-1} a(k)(1 + \|\theta_k\|)\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{K} = \max(K, K')$. As $\sum_{k=n_m}^{j-1} a(k) \le T$, discrete Gronwall inequality gives the result. □

Lemma 18. *For sufficiently large n_m, $\max_{n_m \le j \le n_{m+1}} \|B_j - B_{n_m}\| < \frac{\delta_B}{8K_T}$ a.s. on the event $\mathcal{B}_{m-1}$.*

Proof. Now, if we write $B_{n_m} = a(0)v_{\theta_0}(Y_0) + \sum_{k=1}^{n_m-1}(a(k)-a(k-1))v_{\theta_k}(Y_k) - a(n_m-1)v_{\theta_{n_m}}(Y_{n_m})$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}B_j - B_{n_m} = &\sum_{k=n_m}^{j-1} (a(k) - a(k-1))v_{\theta_k}(Y_k) + \\ &a(n_m - 1)v_{\theta_{n_m}}(Y_{n_m}) - a(j-1)v_{\theta_j}(Y_j).\end{aligned}$$

As $\|\theta_i\| \le K'$ on $\mathcal{B}_{m-1}$

$$\begin{aligned}\|B_j - B_{n_m}\| \le C_R &\sum_{k=n_m}^{j-1} (a(k-1) - a(k))(1 + \|Y_k\|) + \\ &C_R\left[a(n_m - 1)(1 + \|Y_{n_m}\|) + a(j-1)(1 + \|Y_j\|)\right]\end{aligned}$$

using **(A7a)**. Now using **(A1)**, **(A3)**[1] we see that

$$\|B_j - B_{n_m}\| \leq 2C''_R a(n_m - 1),$$

for some $C''_R > 0$. Now choose $n_0^{(2)}$ such that

$$2C''_R a(n_0^{(2)} - 1) < \frac{\delta_B}{8K_T}. \tag{4.3}$$

The claim follows $\forall n_m \geq n_0^{(2)}$. □

Lemma 19. *For sufficiently large* n_m, $\max_{n_m \leq j \leq n_{m+1}} \|C_j - C_{n_m}\| < \frac{\delta_B}{8K_T}$ *a.s. on the event* $\mathcal{B}_{m-1}$.

Proof. Using **(A7b)** we see that

$$\|\zeta_{k+1}^{(3)}\| \leq C_R \|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\|(1 + \|Y_{k+1}\|).$$

Again using the stability of the iterates in the T length interval on $\mathcal{B}_{m-1}$ and the assumptions **(A1)** and **(A2)** we see that

$$\|\zeta_{k+1}^{(3)}\| \leq C_R \tilde{K} \bar{C} a(k).$$

Therefore

$$\|C_j - C_{n_m}\| \leq C_R \tilde{K} \bar{C} \sum_{k=n_m}^{j-1} a(k)^2.$$

Now choose $n_0^{(3)}$ such that

$$C_R \tilde{K} \bar{C} \sum_{k=n_0^{(3)}}^{j-1} a(k)^2 < \frac{\delta_B}{8K_T}. \tag{4.4}$$

This is possible due to **(A3)**. The claim follows for $n_m \geq n_0^{(3)}$. □

Theorem 4. *Under* ***(A1)*** *-* ***(A7)****, for* n_0 *sufficiently large,*

$$P(\bar{\theta}(t) \to H | \theta_{n_0} \in B) \geq 1 - 2de^{-\frac{\hat{K}\delta_B^2}{ds(n_0)}} - 2de^{-\frac{\hat{C}\delta_B^2}{ds(n_0)}}.$$

Proof. Set

$$n_0 = \max(n_0^{(1)}, n_0^{(2)}, n_0^{(3)}). \tag{4.5}$$

[1] This is the only place where the requirement that step size is non-increasing in **(A3)** is used.

From (4.1) we see that for this (large) n_0

$$P(\rho_m \geq \delta_B|\mathcal{B}_{m-1}) \leq P(\max_{n_m \leq j \leq n_{m+1}} \|A_j - A_{n_m}\| > \frac{\delta_B}{8K_T}|\mathcal{B}_{m-1}) + P(\max_{n_m \leq j \leq n_{m+1}} \|D_j - D_{n_m}\| > \frac{\delta_B}{8K_T}|\mathcal{B}_{m-1}).$$

Again using the stability of the iterates in the T length interval on $\mathcal{B}_{m-1}$ and assumption **(A7a)** we see that $\zeta_{k+1}^{(1)}$ is bounded a.s. on $\mathcal{B}_{m-1}$ by the constant $C_0 = 2C_R(1+\bar{C})$ for $n_m \leq k \leq j-1$. Therefore each of the components in this vector is also bounded by the same constant. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(\max_{n_m \leq j \leq n_{m+1}} \|A_j - A_{n_m}\| > \delta_B/8K_T|\mathcal{B}_{m-1}) \\
&\leq P(\max_{n_m \leq j \leq n_{m+1}} \|A_j - A_{n_m}\|_\infty > \frac{\delta_B}{8K_T\sqrt{d}}|\mathcal{B}_{m-1}) \\
&= P(\max_{n_m \leq j \leq n_{m+1}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |A_j^i - A_{n_m}^i| > \frac{\delta_B}{8K_T\sqrt{d}}|\mathcal{B}_{m-1}) \\
&= P(\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} \max_{n_m \leq j \leq n_{m+1}} |A_j^i - A_{n_m}^i| > \frac{\delta_B}{8K_T\sqrt{d}}|\mathcal{B}_{m-1}) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{d} P(\max_{n_m \leq j \leq n_{m+1}} |A_j^i - A_{n_m}^i| > \frac{\delta_B}{8K_T\sqrt{d}}|\mathcal{B}_{m-1}) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{d} 2\exp\{-\frac{\delta_B^2}{32K_T^2 d C_0^2 (\sum_{j=n_m}^{n_{m+1}} a(j)^2)}\} \\
&\leq 2d\exp\{-\frac{\delta_B^2}{32K_T^2 d C_0^2 (\sum_{j=n_m}^{n_{m+1}} a(j)^2)}\} \\
&= 2d\exp\{-\frac{\delta_B^2}{32K_T^2 d C_0^2 [s(n_m) - s(n_{m+1})]}\}
\end{aligned}$$

In the third inequality above we use the conditional version of the martingale concentration inequality [78, p. 39, chap. 4]. We give a proof outline of it in Appendix (Chapter 7). Now it can be shown as in Theorem 11 of [78, Chapter 4] that for sufficiently large n_0,

$$P(\rho_m < \delta_B \ \forall m \geq 0 | \theta_{n_0} \in B) \geq 1 - 2de^{-\frac{\hat{K}\delta_B^2}{ds(n_0)}} - 2de^{-\frac{\hat{C}\delta_B^2}{ds(n_0)}}$$

where $\hat{K} = 1/32K_T^2C_0^2$ and $\hat{C}$ is same as in Theorem 11 [78, p. 40]. □

4.3.1 Discussion on the assumptions

4.3.1.1 Y_n unbounded

Even if Y_n is unbounded and iterate-dependent our analysis will go through in the following case by creating functional dependency between $\{Y_n\}$ and $\{\theta_n\}$.

(A1)' For large n, $\|Y_{n+1}\| \leq K_0(1 + \|\theta_n\|)$ for some $0 < K_0 < \infty$.

Accordingly we may replace **(A2)** by the point-wise boundedness of f *i.e.,*

(A2)' $\|f(\theta, y)\| \leq K(1 + \|\theta\| + \|y\|)$.

4.3.1.2 Y_n point-wise bounded

Our analysis will also go through (with the addition of an error term) for the following relaxation of **(A1)**:

(A1)" $\limsup_n \|Y_n\| < \infty$ a.s..

In this case the lock-in probability statement in Theorem 4 will be as follows: For $\nu > 0$, $n_0(\nu)$ sufficiently large,

$$P(\bar{\theta}(t) \to H | \theta_{n_0} \in B) \geq 1 - 2de^{-\frac{\hat{K}(\nu)\delta_B^2}{ds(n_0)}} - 2de^{-\frac{\hat{C}(\nu)\delta_B^2}{ds(n_0)}} - 2\nu.$$

The proof will work by selecting a large compact set $C(\nu)$ s.t. $P(\limsup_n \|Y_n\| < C(\nu)) > 1-\nu$ and doing the same calculation as in Section 4.3 on this set with probability at least $1 - \nu$.

4.4 Proof of almost sure convergence

4.4.1 Almost sure convergence under asymptotic tightness

Definition 2. *A sequence of random variables $\{\theta_n\}$ is called asymptotically tight if for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set K_ϵ such that*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} P(\theta_n \in K_\epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon. \tag{4.6}$$

Clearly, (4.6) is a much weaker condition than (1.19). In the following, we give a sufficient condition to guarantee the above:

Lemma 20. *If there is a $\phi \geq 0$ so that $\phi(\theta) \to \infty$ as $\|\theta\| \to \infty$ and*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} E[\phi(\theta_n)] < \infty, \tag{4.7}$$

then $\{\theta_n\}$ is asymptotically tight.

Proof. Proof by contradiction and similar to the proof of sufficient condition for full tightness as given in Theorem 3.2.8 of [57, p. 104]. □

Next, we show that if the stochastic approximation iterates are asymptotically tight then we can prove almost sure convergence to H under some reasonable assumptions.

Theorem 5. *Under **(A1)-(A7)**, if $\{\theta_n\}$ is asymptotically tight and $\liminf_n P(\theta_n \in G) = 1$ then $P(\theta_n \to H) = 1$.*

Proof. Choose an open B with compact closure such that $H, K_\epsilon \cap G \subset B \subset \bar{B} \subset G$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n_0\to\infty} P(\theta_{n_0} \in B) \\
&\geq \limsup_{n_0\to\infty} P(\theta_{n_0} \in G \cap K_\epsilon) \\
&= \limsup_{n_0\to\infty} [P(\theta_{n_0} \in K_\epsilon) + P(\theta_{n_0} \in G) - P(\theta_{n_0} \in G \cup K_\epsilon)] \\
&\geq \limsup_{n_0\to\infty} P(\theta_{n_0} \in K_\epsilon) + \liminf_{n_0\to\infty} P(\theta_{n_0} \in G) - \limsup_{n_0\to\infty} P(\theta_{n_0} \in G \cup K_\epsilon) \\
&\geq 1 - \epsilon + 1 - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus there exists a subsequence $n_0(k)$ s.t. $P(\theta_{n_0(k)} \in B) > 0$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{k\to\infty} P(\theta_{n_0(k)} \in B, \theta_n \to H) = \lim_{k\to\infty} P(\theta_{n_0(k)} \in B) P(\theta_n \to H | \theta_{n_0(k)} \in B) \\
&= \lim_{k\to\infty} P(\theta_{n_0(k)} \in B) \quad \text{using Theorem 4}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\theta_n \to H) &\geq \limsup_{n_0\to\infty} P(\theta_n \to H, \theta_{n_0} \in B) \\
&= \limsup_{n_0\to\infty} P(\theta_{n_0} \in B) \geq 1 - \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Now let $\epsilon \to 0$. □

Remark 16. *We compare Theorem 5 to the main convergence result (Kushner-Clark Lemma) from [2, Section II C] where stability of the iterates was assumed. Note that in that case much weaker condition, namely $\theta_n \in A$ infinitely often where A is some compact subset of G was sufficient to draw the conclusion. Here we need a much stronger condition such as $\liminf_{n_0} P(\theta_{n_0} \in G) = 1$.*

Remark 17. *Theorem 5 is valid for any 'local' attractor H whereas in [65, Theorem 1] H was a 'global' attractor.*

There are sufficient conditions to guarantee tightness ([24, Chapter 6, Theorem 7.4]) of the iterates in literature. In the following we describe another set of sufficient conditions which guarantee (4.7):

Lemma 21. *Suppose there exists a $\phi \geq 0$ and $\phi(\theta) \to \infty$ as $\|\theta\| \to \infty$ with the following properties: Outside the unit ball*

(S1) *ϕ is twice differentiable and all second order derivatives are bounded by some constant c.*

(S2) *for every θ, $K \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ compact, $\langle \nabla\phi(\theta), f(\theta, y)\rangle \leq 0$ for all $y \in K$.*

Then for the step size sequences of the form $a(n) = \frac{1}{n(\log n)^p}$ with $0 < p \leq 1$, we have (4.7).

Proof. Following similar steps as in [65, Theorem 3] and **(S2)** we get

$$E[\phi(\theta_{n+1})|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq \phi(\theta_n) + ca(n)^2(1 + \|\theta_n\|^2) \text{ a.s..} \tag{4.8}$$

Now we know that, for $n \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\theta_n\| &\leq \|\theta_0\| + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k) \left[\|f(\theta_k, Y_k)\| + \|M_{k+1}\|\right] \\ &\leq \|\theta_0\| + \tilde{K}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k) + \tilde{K}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k)\|\theta_k\|.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore using a general version of discrete Gronwall inequality (See Appendix i.e. Chapter 7) and the fact that $\|\theta_0\| + \tilde{K}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k)$ is an increasing function of n, we get that

$$\|\theta_n\| \leq \left[\|\theta_0\| + \tilde{K}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k)\right] \exp(\tilde{K}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k)).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_n E[\phi(\theta_n)] < \phi(\theta_0) + ca(0)^2(1 + \|\theta_0\|^2) + c\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(n)^2 + \\ c\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(n)^2[\|\theta_0\| + \tilde{K}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k)]^2 \exp(2\tilde{K}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a(k)).\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

In the following, we show that for the mentioned step-size sequence the R.H.S converges. Assume $0 < p < 1$. Then

$$\sum_{i=2}^{n-1} a(i) \leq \int_1^{n-1} \frac{1}{i(logi)^p} di \leq \frac{1}{1-p}(\log n)^{1-p}.$$

Then,

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\log n)^{2(1-p)}}{n^2(\log n)^{2p}} \exp\left[\frac{2\tilde{K}}{1-p}(\log n)^{1-p}\right] = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\log n)^{2-4p}}{n^{2+\frac{2\tilde{K}}{(p-1)(\log n)^p}}}.$$

This is a convergent series for $0 < p < 1$ as there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for large n

$$(\log n)^{2-4p} \leq n^{1-\frac{2\tilde{K}}{(1-p)(\log n)^p}-\epsilon}.$$

Also, the following series converges

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{\exp\left[\frac{2\tilde{K}}{1-p}(\log n)^{1-p}\right]}{n^2(\log n)^{2p}}. \tag{4.10}$$

Moreover, it is easy to check that the above arguments also hold for $p = 1$. □

Thus we show that **(A5)** in Theorem 3 in [65] is not required for the step size sequence of the form $a(n) = \frac{1}{n(\log n)^p}$ with $0 < p \leq 1$ which is clearly a divergent series but $\sum_n a(n)^2 < \infty$.

Remark 18. *Theorem 3 of [65] imposes assumptions on the strict Lyapunov function $V(\cdot)$ for the attractor H to ensure tightness of the iterates. For that reason H is required to be a global attractor there. However, we observe that $\phi(\cdot)$ can be different from $V(\cdot)$ because we only require properties like **(S2)** to ensure tightness of the iterates.*

Remark 19. *Note that the series in R.H.S of (4.9) won't converge if $a(n) = \frac{1}{n^k}$ with $1/2 < k \leq 1$. In such a case **(A5)** from [65] will be required.*

4.4.2 Proof of stability and a.s. convergence using our results

Note that if the iterates belong to some arbitrary compact set (depending on the sample point) infinitely often, it may not imply stability if the time interval between successively visiting it runs to infinity. We show that this does not happen if the compact set and the step-size have special properties. Using the lock-in probability results from Section 4.3, we prove stability and therefore convergence of the iterates on the set $\{\theta_n \in B \text{ i.o.}\}$ when the step-size is $a(n) = \frac{1}{n^k}, \frac{1}{2} < k \leq 1$.

Consider the settings described in Section 4.3. Let $A = \{\omega : \exists m \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } \rho_m(\omega) \geq \delta\}$. Then Theorem 4 shows that for sufficiently large n_0,

$$\begin{aligned} P(A|\theta_{n_0} \in B) &< 4de^{-\frac{C}{s(n_0)}} \\ \implies P(A \cap \{\theta_{n_0} \in B\}) &< 4de^{-\frac{C}{s(n_0)}} \\ \implies \sum_{n_0=1}^{\infty} P(A \cap \{\theta_{n_0} \in B\}) &< \sum_{n_0=1}^{\infty} 4de^{-\frac{C}{s(n_0)}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Now, for $n \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} s(n) = \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^{2k}} &< \int_{i=n-1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^{2k}} di = \frac{1}{(2k-1)(n-1)^{2k-1}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(2k-1)(\frac{n}{2})^{2k-1}} \end{aligned}$$

Now, for large n, $e^{(2k-1)(\frac{n}{2})^{2k-1}} > n^2$. Therefore R.H.S in (4.11) is finite for the mentioned step-size. The same argument follows for the step-size $\frac{1}{n(\log n)^k}, k \leq 1$ as for large n, $(\log n)^{2k} \geq 1$. Therefore,

$$E[\sum_{n_0=1}^{\infty} I_{A \cap \{\theta_{n_0} \in B\}}] < \infty \implies I_A \sum_{n_0=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\theta_{n_0} \in B\}} < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

Therefore on the event $\{\theta_{n_0} \in B \text{ i.o}\}$, $I_A = 0$ a.s. which is nothing but $\sup_n \|\theta_n\| < \infty$ a.s. The result can be summarized as follows:

Corollary 3. *Under the assumptions made in Section 4.2 and the following assumptions:*

(W1) $\forall N \quad \exists n \geq N$ *s.t.* $P(\theta_n \in B) > 0$ *where* B *is chosen as in Section 4.2,*

(W2) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(\theta_n \in B | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = \infty \quad a.s.,$

we have

$$\sup_n \|\theta_n\| < \infty \quad a.s. \text{ and } \quad \theta_n \to H \quad a.s.$$

for the step-size sequence of the form $a(n) = \frac{1}{n^k}, 0.5 < k \leq 1$ *and* $\frac{1}{n(logn)^k}, k \leq 1.$

4.5 On the tracking ability of "general" adaptive algorithms using lock-in probability

In this section we investigate the tracking ability of algorithms of the type:

$$w_{n+1} = w_n + b(n) \left[g(\theta_n, w_n, Z_n^{(2)}) + M_{n+1}^{(2)} \right], \tag{4.12}$$

that are driven by a "slowly" varying single timescale stochastic approximation process:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n) \left[h(\theta_n, Z_n^{(1)}) + M_{n+1}^{(1)} \right], \tag{4.13}$$

when none of the iterates are known to be stable. Here, $\theta_n \in \mathbb{R}^d, w_n \in \mathbb{R}^k, Z_n^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^l, Z_n^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Note that there is a unilateral coupling between (4.12) and (4.13) in that (4.12) depends on (4.13) but not the other way. Suppose w_n converges to a function $\lambda(\theta)$ in case θ_n is kept constant at θ, then an interesting question is that if θ_n changes slowly can w_n track the changes in θ_n i.e. what can we say about the quantity $\|w_n - \lambda(\theta_n)\|$ in the limit. As mentioned in [70] such algorithms may arise in the context of adaptive algorithms. However, in that work tracking was proved under the restrictive assumption that the stochastic approximation driven by the slowly varying process is linear (see (1) in the same paper) and the underlying Markov process in the faster iterate is driven by only the slow iterate. Using the lock-in probability results of Section 4.3 we prove convergence as well as tracking ability of much general algorithms such as (4.12)-(4.13) under the following assumptions (we also give a detailed comparison with the assumptions of [70]):

(B1) $h, Z_n^{(1)}$ and $M_{n+1}^{(1)}$ satisfy the same assumptions satisfied by similar quantities $(f, Y_n, M_n$ respectively) of Section 4.2. g satisfies the following assumption: $\sup_z \|g(\theta, w, z)\| \leq K_1(1 + \|\theta\| + \|w\| + \|z\|)$ for all θ, w, z where $K_1 > 0$. Additionally, $\hat{g}(\theta, w) = \int g(\theta, w, z)\Gamma_{\theta,w}^{(2)}(dz)$ is Lipschitz continuous, $\Gamma_{\theta,w}^{(2)}$ being the unique stationary distribution of $Z_n^{(2)}$ for a fixed (θ, w).

Remark 20. *In (1) of [70], the vector field in the faster iterate is linear in the faster iterate variable. Also, the slower iterate is not a stochastic approximation iteration there.*

(B2) $\{a(n)\}$ is as in **(A3)**. $\{b(n)\}$ satisfies the similar assumptions as $\{a(n)\}$. Additionally, $a(n) < b(n)$ for all n and $\frac{a(n)}{b(n)} \to 0$. Also, $b(n) < 1$ for all n.

Remark 21. *The latter is much weaker than Assumption 4 of [70].*

(B3) The dynamics of $Z_n^{(2)}$ is specified by

$$P(Z_{n+1}^{(2)} \in B | Z_m^{(2)}, \theta_m, w_m, m \leq n) = \int_B \Pi_{\theta_n, w_n}^{(2)}(Z_n^{(2)}; dz), \text{ a.s.} n \geq 0,$$

for B Borel in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Assumptions similar to **(A1)**, **(A4)**, **(A6)** and **(A7)** will be true in case of $Z_n^{(2)}$ also with the exception that now θ will be replaced by the tuple (θ, w).

Remark 22. *In [70], the Markov process depends on only the slow parameter.*

(B4) $\{M_n^{(i)}\}, i = 1, 2$ are martingale difference sequences w.r.t increasing σ-fields

$$\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\theta_m, w_m, M_m^{(i)}, Z_m^{(i)}, m \leq n, i = 1, 2), n \geq 0,$$

where $M_n^{(2)}$ satisfies the following:

$$\|M_{n+1}^{(2)}\| \leq K_2(1 + \|\theta_n\| + \|w_n\|), K_2 > 0.$$

Remark 23. *Our assumptions on martingale difference noise is stronger than the same in [70](See Assumption 5).*

(B5) The o.d.e

$$\dot{w}(t) = \hat{g}(\theta, w(t))$$

has a global attractor $\lambda(\theta)$ with $\lambda : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^k$ Lipschitz continuous.

The o.d.e

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = \hat{h}(\theta(t)) \tag{4.14}$$

has an asymptotically stable set H^s with domain of attraction G^s where $\hat{h}(\theta) = \int h(\theta, y)\Gamma_\theta^{(1)}(dy)$ is Lipschitz continuous with $\Gamma_\theta^{(1)}$ same as Γ_θ in **(A4)**.

For every compact set $C_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ the set $\{(\theta, \lambda(\theta)) : \theta \in C_1\}$ is Lyapunov stable set of the coupled o.d.e.

$$\dot{w}(t) = \hat{g}(\theta(t), w(t)), \dot{\theta(t)} = 0$$

(B6) The iterates $\{\theta_n, w_n\}$ are asymptotically tight (for which a sufficient condition is stated latter).

Remark 24. *In [70] one important step in the proof is the proof of the stability of the iterates.*

Let there be an open set B_1 with compact closure such that $H^s \subset B_1 \subset \bar{B}_1 \subset G^s$. From the results of Section 4.3, we can find a T^s such that any trajectory for the o.d.e (4.14) starting in $\bar{B}_1$ will be within some ϵ_1 neighborhood of H^s after time T^s. Let, $S_1 = \left[\sup_{\theta \in \bar{B}_1} \|\theta\| + \tilde{K}\right] e^{\tilde{K}T^s}$ and $C_1 = \{\theta : \|\theta\| \leq S_1\}$. Let there be an open set B_2 with compact closures such that $\lambda(C_1) \subset B_2 \subset \bar{B}_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^k$. Choose δ_{B_1} in the same way δ_B is chosen in Section 4.3. Choose $\delta_{B_2}, 0 < \epsilon_1'' < \epsilon''$ such that $N_{\delta_{B_2}+\epsilon_1''}(\lambda(C_1)) \subset N_{\epsilon''}(\lambda(C_1)) \subset B_2$. If the coupled o.d.e starts at a point such that its θ and w co-ordinates are in C_1 and $\bar{B}_2$ respectively then as in Section 4.3 one can find a $T^f > 0$ (independent of the starting point) such that after that time the o.d.e will be in the ϵ_1'' neighbourhood of $\{(\theta, \lambda(\theta)) : \theta \in C_1\}$. Now, let $T^c = \max(T^f, T^s + 1)$ and for $m \geq 1$ define,

$$n_0^c = n_0^s = n_0.$$

$$t^c(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} b(i), n_m^c = \min\{n : t^c(n) \geq t^c(n_{m-1}^c) + T^c\}.$$

$$t^s(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a(i), n_m^s = \min\{n : t^s(n) \geq t^s(n_{m-1}^s) + T^s\}.$$

Similarly, for $m \geq 0$ define

$$T_m^c = t^c(n_m^c), I_m^c = [T_m^c, T_{m+1}^c], \tag{4.15}$$

$$T_m^s = t^s(n_m^s), I_m^s = [T_m^s, T_{m+1}^s], \tag{4.16}$$

$$l_m = \max(k : t^s(n_k^s) \leq t^c(n_m^c)).$$

Now define,

$$\rho_m^c := \sup_{t \in I_m^c} \|\bar{\alpha}(t) - \alpha^{T_m^c}(t)\|$$

where $\bar{\alpha}(\cdot)$ is the interpolated trajectory for the coupled iterate

$$\alpha_{n+1} = \alpha_n + b(n)\left[G(\alpha_n, Z_n^{(2)}) + \epsilon_n' + M_{n+1}^{(4)}\right] \tag{4.17}$$

where $\alpha_n = (\theta_n, w_n), \epsilon_n = \frac{a(n)}{b(n)} h(\theta_n, Z_n^{(1)})$ and $M_{n+1}^{(3)} = \frac{a(n)}{b(n)} M_{n+1}^{(1)}$ for $n \geq 0$. Let , $\alpha = (\theta, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+k}, G(\alpha, z) = (0, g(\alpha, z)), \epsilon_n' = (\epsilon_n, 0), M_{n+1}^{(4)} = (M_{n+1}^{(3)}, M_{n+1}^{(2)})$, and $\alpha^{T_m^c}(\cdot)$ is the solution of the o.d.e

$$\dot{w}(t) = \hat{g}(\theta(t), w(t)), \dot{\theta}(t) = 0,$$

on I_m^c with the initial point $\alpha^{T_m^c}(T_m^c) = \bar{\alpha}(T_m^c)$. Also, define

$$\rho_m^s := \sup_{t \in I_m^s} \|\bar{\theta}(t) - \theta^{T_m^s}(t)\|$$

where $\theta^{T_m^s}(\cdot)$ denotes the solution of the o.d.e (4.14) on I_m^s with the initial point $\theta^{T_m^s}(T_m^s) = \bar{\theta}(T_m^s)$. Let us assume for the moment that $\theta_{n_0} \in B_1, w_{n_0} \in B_2$, and that $\rho_m^s < \delta_{B_1}$ and $\rho_m^c < \delta_{B_2}$ for all $m \geq 0$. Then using similar arguments as in Section 4.3, one can show that $\sup_{t \geq T_0^c}(\bar{\theta}(t), \bar{w}(t)) < \infty$ a.s.. Further, (θ_n, w_n) infinitely often visits the compact set $C_1 \times \bar{B}_2$ which is in the domain of attraction $C_1 \times \mathbb{R}^d$ of the set $\{(\theta, \lambda(\theta)) : \theta \in C_1\}$. Therefore,

$$(\theta_n, w_n) \to \{(\theta, \lambda(\theta)) : \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \text{ a.s.}$$

This, in turn, implies that $\|w_n - \lambda(\theta_n)\| \to 0$ a.s. which implies that $(\theta_n, w_n) \to \bigcup_{\theta \in H^s}(\theta, \lambda(\theta))$. Let $\mathcal{B}_m^s$ denote the event that $\theta_{n_0} \in B_1, w_{n_0} \in B_2$ and $\rho_k^s < \delta_{B_1}$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, m$. Also, let $\mathcal{B}'_{m,k}$ denote the event that $\theta_{n_0} \in B_1, w_{n_0} \in B_2$, $\rho_j^c < \delta_{B_2}$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, m$ and $\rho_j^s < \delta_{B_1}$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, k$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&P((\theta_n, w_n) \to \bigcup_{\theta \in H^s}(\theta, \lambda(\theta)) | \theta_{n_0} \in B_1, w_{n_0} \in B_2) \\
&\geq P\left[\rho_m^c < \delta_{B_2} \forall m \geq 0, \rho_m^s < \delta_{B_1} \forall m \geq 0 | \theta_{n_0} \in B_1, w_{n_0} \in B_2\right] \\
&\geq P\left[\rho_m^s < \delta_{B_1} \forall m \geq 0 | \theta_{n_0} \in B_1, w_{n_0} \in B_2\right] P\left[\rho_m^c < \delta_{B_2} \forall m \geq 0 | \theta_{n_0} \in B_1, w_{n_0} \in B_2, \rho_m^s < \delta_{B_1} \forall m \geq 0\right] \\
&\geq \left[1 - \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P(\rho_m^s > \delta_{B_1} | \mathcal{B}_{m-1}^s)\right] P\left[\rho_m^c < \delta_{B_2} \forall m \geq 0 | \theta_{n_0} \in B_1, w_{n_0} \in B_2, \rho_m^s < \delta_{B_1} \forall m \geq 0\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Now, using the simple fact that $P(A|BC) \leq \frac{P(A|B)}{P(C|B)}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\left[\rho_m^c < \delta_{B_2} \forall m \geq 0 | \theta_{n_0} \in B_1, w_{n_0} \in B_2, \rho_m^s < \delta_{B_1} \forall m \geq 0\right] \\
&\geq \left[1 - \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{P(\rho_m^c > \delta_{B_2} | \mathcal{B}'_{m-1,l_m-1})}{P\left[\rho_k^s < \delta_{B_1} \forall k \geq l_m | \mathcal{B}'_{m-1,l_m-1}\right]}\right] \\
&= \left[1 - \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{P(\rho_m^c > \delta_{B_2} | \mathcal{B}'_{m-1,l_m-1})}{1 - f(m) - g(m)}\right]
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

where $f(m) = P(\rho_{l_m}^s > \delta_{B_1} | \mathcal{B}'_{m-1,l_m-1})$ and $g(m) = \sum_{k=l_m+1}^{\infty} P\left[\rho_k^s > \delta_{B_1} | \mathcal{B}'_{m-1,k-1}\right]$. Clearly, $\mathcal{B}'_{m-1,l_m-1} \in \mathcal{F}_{n_m^c}$ and $\mathcal{B}'_{m-1,k-1} \in \mathcal{F}_{n_k^s}$ for all $k \geq l_m + 1$. However, $\mathcal{B}'_{m-1,l_m-1} \notin \mathcal{F}_{l_m}$. Therefore, the tedious task is to calculate upper bound of $f(m)$. We describe the procedure in detail. Now, due to the way T^c is chosen

$$f(m) \leq \frac{P(\rho_{l_m}^s > \delta_{B_1} | \mathcal{B}'_{m-2,l_m-1})}{1 - \frac{P(\rho_{m-1}^c > \delta_{B_2} | \mathcal{B}'_{m-2,l_{m-1}-1})}{1 - f(m-1) - \sum_{k=l_{m-1}+1}^{l_m-1} h(k)}} \tag{4.20}$$

where $h(k) = P(\rho_k^s > \delta_{B_1} | \mathcal{B}'_{m-2,k-1})$.

Let $S_1(n_0) = \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} a(i)^2$ and $S_2(n_0) = \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} b(i)^2$. From (4.20) we can see that

$$f(m) \leq \frac{o(S_1(n_0))}{1 - \frac{o(S_2(n_0))}{1 - f(m-1) - o(S_1(n_0))}}.$$

One can recursively calculate the expression. At the bottom level one calculates the following expression:

$$1 - P(\rho^s_{l_1-1} > \delta_{B_1} | \mathcal{B}^s_{l_1-2})$$

Using the fact that $S_1(n_0) < S_2(n_0)$ we see from the above that for all $m \geq 0$, $f(m) \leq o(S_2(n_0))$. One can easily show using the technique of Section 4.3 that for all $m \geq 0$, $g(m) \leq o(S_1(n_0))$.

Lemma 22. *Under **(B1)-(B6)**, for sufficiently large n_0,*

$$P((\theta_n, w_n) \to \bigcup_{\theta \in H^s} (\theta, \lambda(\theta)) | \theta_{n_0} \in B_1, w_{n_0} \in B_2)$$
$$\geq (1 - o(S_1(n_0))) \left(1 - \frac{o(S_2(n_0))}{1 - o(S_1(n_0)) - o(S_2(n_0))}\right)$$

Remark 25. *For the case of Section 4.2 i.e. $\theta_n = \theta$ for all n, either 1) $a(n) = 0$ or 2) $h(\theta_n, Z_n^{(1)}) + M_{n+1}^{(1)} = 0$ for all n. Further, all the assumptions* **(B1)** – **(B6)** *are satisfied and we can recover the results of Section 4.3 by observing that either 1) $S_1(n_0) = 0$ or 2) $M_n^{(1)} = 0$ for all n (follows from the fact that $\{M_n^{(1)}\}$ is a martingale difference sequence).*

Proof Outline. Handling the first term in the last inequality of (4.18) is exactly same as in Section 4.3. The numerator of the term inside the summation in (4.19) can also be handled in a similar manner except the fact that the additional error ϵ'_n in (4.17) can be made negligible on $\mathcal{B}'_{m-1,l_m-1}$ using the stability of the iterates there over T^c length intervals (the latter can be proved as in Lemma 17). n_0 will be the maximum of its versions arising to handle these two parts. □

From this one can easily prove almost sure convergence under tightness

Theorem 6. *Under **(B1)-(B6)**, if $\{\alpha_n\}$ is asymptotically tight and $\liminf_n P(\theta_n \in G^s) = 1$ then $P((\theta_n, w_n) \to \bigcup_{\theta \in H^s}(\theta, \lambda(\theta))) = 1$ i.e. $\|w_n - \lambda(\theta_n)\| \to 0$ a.s.*

The sufficient conditions for tightness can be derived in the exact similar way as in Section 4.4.

Lemma 23. *Suppose there exists a $V' : \mathbb{R}^{d+k} \to [0, \infty)$ and $V'(\alpha) \to \infty$ as $\|\alpha\| \to \infty$ with the following properties: Outside the unit ball*

(S'1) *V' is twice differentiable and all second order derivatives are bounded by some constant c.*

(S'2) *for every α, $K \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ compact, $\langle (\nabla V'(\alpha))_{1\ldots d}, h((\alpha)_{1\ldots d}, z)\rangle \leq 0$ for all $z \in K$.*

(S'3) *for every α, $K \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ compact, $\langle (\nabla V'(\alpha))_{d+1\ldots d+k}, g(\alpha, z)\rangle \leq 0$ for all $z \in K$.*

where the notation $(v)_{m\ldots n}$ is the vector $(v_m, \ldots, v_n)$ with $v = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{d+k}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+k}$.

Then for the step size sequences of the form $b(n) = \frac{1}{n(\log n)^p}$ with $0 < p \leq 1$, the iterate $\{\alpha_n\}$ is asymptotically tight.

4.6 Sample Complexity

It is easy to check that using the results in the previous section one can get a similar probability estimate for sample complexity as in [78, Chapter 4, Corollary 14]. Note that here T can be any positive real number unlike in the lock-in probability calculation where we need to choose T appropriately. Therefore we can extend the sample complexity calculation for stochastic fixed point point iteration in the setting of Markov iterate-dependent noise as follows:

Consider the example as shown in [78, p. 43]. Let $u(\theta) = \int f(\theta, y)\Gamma_\theta(dy)$ with u being a contraction, so that $\|u(\theta) - u(\theta')\| < \alpha\|\theta - \theta'\|$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. θ^* be the unique fixed point of $u(\cdot)$. Let $T > 0$. B can be chosen to be $\{\theta : \|\theta - \theta^*\| < r\}$ with $r \geq \frac{3\epsilon}{2}$. For the analysis next choose $r = \frac{3\epsilon}{2}$. Therefore the sample complexity estimate can be stated as follows:

Corollary 4. *Let a desired accuracy $\epsilon > 0$ and confidence $0 < \gamma < 1$ be given. Let $\bar{\theta}$ be the value at iteration n_0 with n_0 satisfying:*

1. *n_0 sufficiently large as in (4.5), $s(n_0) < \frac{\hat{C}\epsilon^2}{4}$ and $a(n_0) < \frac{\hat{C}\epsilon^2}{4}$ (Theorem 11 of [78, Chapter 4]).*
2. *$s(n_0) < \frac{c\epsilon^2}{\ln(\frac{4d}{\gamma})}$.*

Then on the event $\{\bar{\theta} \in B\}$, one needs

$$N_0 := \min\left[n : \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} a(i) \geq \frac{(T+1)}{(1 - e^{-(1-\alpha)T})}\right] - n_0$$

more iterates to get within 2ϵ of θ^* with probability at least $1 - \gamma$.

Remark 26. *The results clearly show large vs. small step-size trade-off for non-asymptotic rate of convergence well-known in the stochastic convex optimization literature [4]. For large step-size, the algorithm will make fast progress whereas the errors due to noise/discretization will be much higher simultaneously. However, our results show the quantitative estimate of this progress and the error. For large step-size, n_0 satisfying the hypothesis in Corollary 6.1 will be higher whereas N_0 will be lower compared to small-step size and the opposite is true for small step-size. Therefore the optimal step-size should be somewhere in between.*

However, it is not possible to calculate accurately the threshold n_0 as the constants such as $C, \hat{K}$ depend on B which indeed depends on θ^*. If we consider some special cases where the range for θ^* is given although the actual θ^* is unknown, we can replace the terms involving constants in (4.5) by a single constant M. For those cases the following analysis will be useful.

In the following we state an upper bound N_0' of $N_0 + n_0$ when $a(n) = \frac{1}{n^k}, \frac{1}{2} < k < 1$ under the following crucial assumption:

(T1) $P(\theta_{n_0} \in B) = 1$.



Figure 4.1: Sample complexity vs. step-size parameter; $y : N_0', x : k, \gamma = 0.1$, M = 1E-07: $\epsilon = 0.01$




Figure 4.2: Sample complexity vs. step-size parameter; $y : N_0', x : k, \gamma = 0.1$, M = 1E-07: $\epsilon = 0.001$

Let $\alpha = 0.9$. Under the assumptions made, the estimates of n_0 and N_0' are

$$n_0 = \max((\frac{M}{\epsilon})^{\frac{1}{k}}, (\frac{M}{\epsilon(2k-1)})^{\frac{1}{2k-1}}, (\frac{M}{\epsilon^2(2k-1)})^{\frac{1}{2k-1}}, (\frac{M}{\epsilon})^{\frac{2}{k}}, (\frac{M(\ln(\frac{1}{\gamma}))}{\epsilon^2(2k-1)})^{\frac{1}{2k-1}}, (\frac{2Mk}{\epsilon(2k-1)})^{\frac{1}{2k-1}}),$$

$$N_0' = \left((n_0)^{(1-k)} + 15.16(1-k)\right)^{\frac{1}{1-k}}.$$

Then from N_0' onwards the iterates will be within 2ϵ of θ^* with probability at least $1-\gamma$. Note that the minimum value of the quantity $\frac{2(T+1)}{(1-e^{-(1-\alpha)T})}$ for $\alpha = 0.9$ is 15.16.

To understand what should be the optimal step-size i.e. the value of k for which N_0' will be minimum, we plot N_0' as a function of k for two different values of M each with two different values of ϵ (Fig. 4.1, Fig. 4.2, Fig. 4.3 and Fig. 4.4).

4.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, we describe asymptotic and non-asymptotic convergence analysis of stochastic approximation recursions with Markov iterate-dependent noise using the lock-in probability framework. Our results show that we are able to recover the same bound available for lock-in probability in the literature for the case of i.i.d noise. Such results are used to calculate sample complexity estimate of such stochastic approximation recursions which are then used for predicting the optimal step size. Moreover, our results are extremely useful to prove almost sure convergence to specific attractors in cases where asymptotic tightness of the iterates can be




Figure 4.3: Sample complexity vs. step-size parameter; $y : N_0', x : k, \gamma = 0.1$, $M = 100$: $\epsilon = 0.01$




Figure 4.4: Sample complexity vs. step-size parameter; $y : N_0', x : k, \gamma = 0.1$, $M = 100$: $\epsilon = 0.001$

proved easily. An interesting future direction will be to extend this analysis for two-timescale scenarios, both with and without Markov iterate-dependent noise. We now provide a couple of appendices on a couple of results referred in the analysis.

Chapter 5

On the function approximation error for risk-sensitive reinforcement learning

5.1 Brief Introduction and Organization

As described in Chapter 1, risk-sensitive cost takes care of other moments except the average thus making it more realistic. In this chapter we provide several informative error bounds on function approximation error for the policy evaluation algorithm in this setting. The main idea is to use Bapat's inequlaity [54] and to use Perron-Frobenius eigenvectors to get the new bounds. With this new bounds we got better results compared to earlier spectral variation bound used in [1] in some cases. In our new bounds we use the irreducibility of the transition probability matrix whereas the earlier used spectral variation bound is true for any matrix.

This chapter is organized as follows: Section 5.2 describes the preliminaries and background of the problem considered. Section 5.3 discusses the shortcomings of the bound proposed by [1]. Section 5.4 shows the theoretical conditions under which there is no error. This section also describes verifiable conditions when the transition kernel is doubly stochastic. Section 5.5 describes the new error bounds as well as how they compare with each other and with the state of the art bound. Section 5.6 presents conclusions and some future research directions.

5.2 Preliminaries and Background

We begin by recalling the risk-sensitive framework. Consider an irreducible aperiodic Markov chain $\{X_n\}$ on a finite state space $S = \{1, 2, \ldots, s\}$, with transition matrix $P = [[p(j|i)]] i, j \in S$. While our real concern is a controlled Markov chain, we aim at a policy evaluation algorithm for a fixed stationary policy. Thus we have suppressed the explicit control dependence. Let $c : S \times S \to \mathbb{R}$ denote a prescribed 'running cost' function and C be the $s \times s$ matrix whose (i, j)-th entry is $e^{c(i,j)}$. The aim is to evaluate

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \left(E[e^{\sum_{m=0}^{n-1} c(X_m, X_{m+1})}] \right).$$

That this limit exists follows from the multiplicative ergodic theorem for Markov chains (see Theorem 1.2 of Balaji and Meyn (2000) [64], the sufficient condition (4) therein is trivially verified for the finite state case here). Associated with this is the multiplicative Poisson equation (see, e.g., Balaji and Meyn (2000) [64, Theorem 1.2 (ii)]): We know from [64] that there exists $\lambda > 0$ and $V : S \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that the multiplicative Poisson equation holds as follows:

$$V(i) = \frac{\sum_j p(j|i) e^{c(i,j)} V(j)}{\lambda}.$$

For an explicit expression for $V(\cdot)$ see (5) in [64].

Thus λ and V are respectively the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue and eigenvector of the non-negative matrix $[[e^{c(i,j)} p(j|i)]]_{i,j \in S}$, whose existence is guaranteed by the Perron-Frobenius theorem (See Appendix i.e. Chapter 7). Furthermore, under our irreducibility assumption, V is specified uniquely up to a positive multiplicative scalar and λ is uniquely specified. Also, the risk-sensitive cost defined as above is $\ln \lambda$.

We know from [83, 76, 74] that in case of both value iteration and reinforcement learning algorithms based on value iteration, the i_0-th component of the sequence of iterates will converge to λ. The linear function approximation version in [1] provides the following parameter update for $n \geq 0$:

$$r_{n+1} = r_n + a(n) \left(\frac{B_n^{-1} A_n}{\max(\phi^T(i_0) r_n, \epsilon)} - I \right) r_n, \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&\epsilon > 0, \quad \text{is fixed,} \\
&V(i) \simeq \sum_{k=1}^{M} r^k \phi_k(i) = \phi^T(i) r, \\
&r = \left(r^1, \ldots, r^M\right)^T \text{ is a vector of coefficients,} \\
&\phi^k(\cdot), 1 \leq k \leq M, \text{ are the basis functions or features chosen a priori,} \\
&\phi(i) = \left(\phi^1(i), \ldots, \phi^M(i)\right)^T, \\
&\Phi = \text{an } s \times M \text{ matrix whose } (i,k) \text{ -th entry is } \phi^k(i) \text{ for} \\
&1 \leq i \leq s \text{ and } 1 \leq k \leq M, \\
&\phi(i) = \text{ feature of state } i, \\
&A_n = \sum_{m=0}^{n} e^{c(X_m, X_{m+1})} \phi(X_m) \phi^T(X_{m+1}), \\
&B_n = \sum_{m=0}^{n} \phi(X_m) \phi^T(X_m), \\
&I = M \times M \text{ identity matrix } .
\end{aligned}$$

We also know from [1, Theorem 5.3] that under a crucial assumption (see (†) in p 883 there) on the feature matrix, the iterates r_n satisfy the following:

$$\phi^T(i_0)r_n \to \mu,$$

where $\mu > 0$ is a Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of the non-negative matrix $Q = \Pi\mathcal{M}$ with $\Pi = \Phi(\Phi^T D\Phi)^{-1}\Phi^T D$ and $\mathcal{M} = C \circ P$ (unlike [1] we consider only a synchronous implementation for ease of understanding). Here D is a diagonal matrix with the i-th diagonal entry being π_i where $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_s)^T$ is the stationary distribution of $\{X_n\}$. Also, $e^{c(i,j)}p(j|i)$ is the (i,j)-th entry of $C \circ P$ where '$\circ$' denotes the component-wise product of two matrices with identical row and column dimensions. Assume that γ_{ij} and δ_{ij} are the (i,j)-th entries of the matrix $C \circ P$ and $\Pi\mathcal{M}$ matrices respectively.

Therefore $\ln \mu$ serves as an approximation to the original risk-sensitive cost $\ln \lambda$. Our aim is to investigate the difference between these two, i.e., $\ln(\frac{\lambda}{\mu})$.

Remark 27. *Throughout this chapter the results are stated in general for matrices A and B with largest eigenvalues of A and B as $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu > 0$ respectively. It should be clear from the context what the entries of A and B are.*

5.3 Related work and shortcomings

Let $\|A\|$ be the operator norm of a matrix defined by $\|A\| = \inf\{c > 0 : \|Av\| \leq c\|v\| \quad \forall v\}$ where $\|v\| = \sum_{i=1}^{s} |v_i|$. Let $A = C \circ P$ and $B = \Pi\mathcal{M}$. The following bound was given in [1]:

$$\ln\left(\frac{\lambda}{\mu}\right) \leq \ln\left(1 + \frac{(\|A\| + \|B\|)^{1-\frac{1}{s}}\|A - B\|^{\frac{1}{s}}}{\mu}\right), \tag{5.2}$$

using the spectral variation bound from [56, Theorem VIII.1.1], namely that if A and B are two $s \times s$ matrices with eigenvalues $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s$ and $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s$ respectively, then

$$\max_j \min_i |\alpha_i - \beta_j| \leq (\|A\| + \|B\|)^{1-\frac{1}{s}}(\|A - B\|)^{\frac{1}{s}}. \tag{5.3}$$

This follows from the observation that if $\alpha_1 > 0$ and $\beta_1 > 0$ are the leading eigenvalues of A and B respectively and $\alpha_1 \leq \beta_1$, then $|\alpha_1 - \beta_1| < \max_j \min_i |\alpha_i - \beta_j|$. A similar thing happens for the case $\alpha_1 > \beta_1$ except the fact that the roles of α_i and β_i and hence the roles of A and B get reversed thus keeping the right hand side (R.H.S) of (5.3) the same.

An important point to note is that when $\alpha_1 \leq \beta_1$, the fact that β_1 is the leading eigenvalue of B is not used. Same thing happens for the other case where α_1 replaces β_1.

Another important point above is that for large s the bound given above cannot differentiate between the cases with two pairs of matrices (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) such that $\|A_1\| + \|B_1\| = \|A_2\| + \|B_2\|$ but $\|A_1 - B_1\|$ and $\|A_2 - B_2\|$ vary dramatically. This will be clear from the next toy example: Consider $A_1 = (x_{ij})_{s\times s}, B_1 = (y_{ij})_{s\times s}, A_2 = (z_{ij})_{s\times s}, B_2 = (w_{ij})_{s\times s}$. Suppose $x_{ij} = p, y_{ij} = q, z_{ij} = p', w_{ij} = q'$ for $i, j \in 1, 2, \ldots, s$ with $p + q = p' + q'$, $p' - q' > 0$ and $p - q > 0$. It is easy to see that $\|A_1\| + \|B_1\| = \|A_2\| + \|B_2\|$ and $r(A_1) = ps, r(B_1) =$

$qs, r(A_2) = p's, r(B_2) = q's$. Clearly, $p - q \neq p' - q'$ unless $pq = p'q'$. Here $r(A)$ denotes the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of matrix A.

In summary, when one is giving a bound between two quantities, the R.H.S should have terms involving the difference. However this does not occur while using spectral variation bound in the above example as $(p-q)^{\frac{1}{s}}$ will converge to 1 as $s \to \infty$. In Sections 5.5, using the above example we show that the new error bounds that we obtain contain always the difference terms irrespective of the state space size s.

5.4 Conditions under which error is zero

We provide here a couple of conditions under which the error is zero and the corresponding results.

5.4.1 Theoretical Conditions

5.4.1.1 Condition 1

Lemma 24. *Let* $\mathbf{x}$ *be the left Perron eigen vector of the non-negative matrix* $C \circ P$ *i.e.* $\mathbf{x}^T C \circ P = \lambda \mathbf{x}^T$. *If* Φ *is an* $s \times 1$ *matrix and* $\phi_i = y_i$ *where* $y_i = \frac{x_i}{\pi_i}$, *then* $\mu = \lambda$, *i.e., there will be no error when function approximation is deployed.*

Proof. It is easy to check that $\delta_{ij} = \frac{\phi^{k(i)}(i) \sum_{l=1}^{s} \phi^{k(i)}(l) \pi_l \gamma_{lj}}{\sum_{m=1}^{s} \phi^{k(i)}(m)^2 \pi_m}$, where $\gamma_{ij} = e^{c(i,j)} p(j|i)$.

We claim that with the choice of feature matrix as stated in the theorem, λ is the eigenvalue of B with eigenvector being $\mathbf{y} = (y_i)_{i \in \{1,2,\ldots s\}}$.

$$(\Pi \mathcal{M} y)_i = \sum_{k=1}^{s} \delta_{ik} y_k = \sum_{k=1}^{s} \frac{y_i \sum_{l=1}^{s} x_l \gamma_{lk}}{\sum_{m=1}^{s} \frac{x_m{}^2}{\pi_m}} y_k = \sum_{k=1}^{s} \frac{y_i \sum_{l=1}^{s} x_l \gamma_{lk}}{\sum_{m=1}^{s} \frac{x_m{}^2}{\pi_m}} y_k = \lambda y_i \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{s} \frac{x_k{}^2}{\pi_k}}{\sum_{m=1}^{s} \frac{x_m{}^2}{\pi_m}} \tag{5.4}$$

□

The claim follows.

5.4.1.2 Condition 2

Recall the assumption (†) on the feature matrix Φ from [1] which says that the feature matrix Φ has all non-negative entries and any two columns are orthogonal to each other. In this work we strengthen the later part as follows:

($\star$) Every row of the feature matrix Φ has exactly one positive entry, i.e., for all i there exist $1 \leq k(i) \leq M$ such that $\phi^j(i) > 0$ if $j = k(i)$, otherwise $\phi^j(i) = 0$.

From [54, Theorem 1] it is easy to see that (this theorem is applicable due to Lemma 5.1 (ii) of [1] and ($\star$)) the error can be zero even if $C \circ P \neq \Pi \mathcal{M}$, namely under the following conditions:

1. there exists positive $\lambda_0, \beta_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, s$ such that

$$\delta_{ij} = \frac{\lambda_0 \gamma_{ij} \beta_i}{\beta_j}, i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, s.$$

2. $\Pi_{i,j=1}^{s}\delta_{ij}{}^{\gamma_{ij}x_iy_j} = \Pi_{i,j=1}^{s}\gamma_{ij}{}^{\gamma_{ij}x_iy_j}$.

Remark 28. *Note that if the matrix Φ has a row i with all 0s, then $\delta_{ij} = 0$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, s$ whereas $\gamma_{ij} > 0$ for at least one $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, s\}$ which violates the conditions for zero error stated above.*

5.4.2 Verifiable Condition with doubly stochastic transition kernel

Note that if the transition kernel is a doubly stochastic matrix then it is very hard to find easily verifiable condition on the feature matrix such that $C \circ P = \Pi\mathcal{M}$. The reason is that this requires to find a feature matrix Φ which under $(\star)$ satisfies $\Phi(\Phi^T\Phi)^{-1}\Phi^T = I$. This will not be true under $(\star)$ as this requires $k(i) \neq k(j)$ to hold if $i \neq j$. This problem can be alleviated by the temporal difference learning algorithm for this setting as under:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + a(n)\left[\frac{e^{c(X_n,X_{n+1})}\phi^T(X_{n+1})\theta_n}{\phi^T(i_0)\theta_n \vee \epsilon} - \phi^T(X_n)\theta_n\right]\phi(X_n). \tag{5.5}$$

The following theorem shows its convergence.

Theorem 7. *If $\Phi\Phi^T = D^{-1}$ and $\sup_n \|\theta_n\| < \infty$ a.s. then $\phi^T(i_0)\theta_n \to \lambda$.*

Proof. First, we analyze the $\epsilon = 0$ case. Note that the algorithm tracks the o.d.e

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = \left(\frac{A'}{\phi^T(i_0)\theta(t)} - B'\right)\theta(t),$$

where $A' = \Phi^T DC \circ P\Phi$ and $B' = \Phi^T D\Phi$.

This follows because it is easy to see that the algorithm tracks the o.d.e

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = h(\theta(t)),$$

where $h(\theta) = \sum_i \sum_j \pi(i)p(j|i)\left[\frac{\phi^T(j)\theta}{\phi^T(i_0)\theta} - \phi^T(i)\theta\right]\phi(i)$.

The above statement follows from the convergence theorem for differential inclusion with Markov noise [85] as the vector field in (5.5) is merely continuous.

Now, the k-th entry of $A'\theta$ is

$$\langle\left(\sum_{i=1}^{s}\phi^k(i)\sum_{j=1}^{s}e^{c(i,j)}p(j|i)\phi(j)\right), \theta\rangle. \tag{5.6}$$

Similarly, the k-th entry of $B'\theta$ can be shown to be the k-th entry of $\sum_i \sum_j \pi(i)p(j|i)\left[\phi^T(i)\theta\right]\phi(i)$.

Now, the claim follows directly from [1, Theorem 5.3] (the synchronous implementation). □

5.5 New error bounds

5.5.1 Bound based on Bapat and Lindqvist's inequality

Motivated by the discussion in Section 5.3 and the fact that risk-sensitive cost is $\ln\lambda$ rather than λ we need to find an upper bound for $\ln\frac{\lambda}{\mu}$. Let $r(A)$ denote the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of matrix $A=(a_{ij})_{s\times s}$. In the following we obtain three different bounds for the same quantity under the assumptions that a) $\lambda>\mu$, b) the matrix $P=p(j|i)$ has positive entries and impose conditions under which one is better than the other. Suppose A admits left and right Perron eigenvectors $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}$ respectively, with $\sum_i x_i y_i=1$ (this is satisfied, for example, if A is irreducible). The three upper bounds of $\ln\lambda-\ln\mu$ are (5.7) -(5.9).

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}\sum_{i,j=1}^{s} e^{c(i,j)}p(j|i)x_iy_j\left[c(i,j)+\ln p(j|i)-\ln\phi^{k(i)}(i)-\ln\left(\sum_{l=1}^{s}\phi^{k(i)}(l)\pi_l a_{lj}\right)+\ln\left(\sum_{m=1}^{s}\phi^{k(i)}(m)^2\pi_m\right)\right], \tag{5.7}$$

$$\ln(\lambda)-\ln\left(\lambda-\sum_{i=1}^{s}x_iy_i\left(e^{c(i,i)}p(i|i)-\frac{\phi^{k(i)}(i)\sum_{l=1}^{s}\phi^{k(i)}(l)\pi_l e^{c(l,i)}p(i|l)}{\sum_{m=1}^{s}\phi^{k(i)}(m)^2\pi_m}\right)-\sum_{i\neq j}e^{c(i,j)}p(j|i)x_iy_j\left(c(i,j)+\ln p(j|i)+\ln\left(\frac{\sum_{m=1}^{s}\phi^{k(i)}(m)^2\pi_m}{\sum_{l=1}^{s}\phi^{k(i)}(l)\pi_l e^{c(l,j)}p(j|l)}\right)-\ln\phi^{k(i)}(i)\right)\right), \tag{5.8}$$

$$\ln\left(1+\frac{1}{\mu}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{s}x_iy_i\left(e^{c(i,i)}p(i|i)-\frac{\phi^{k(i)}(i)\sum_{l=1}^{s}\phi^{k(i)}(l)\pi_l e^{c(l,i)}p(i|l)}{\sum_{m=1}^{s}\phi^{k(i)}(m)^2\pi_m}\right)+\sum_{i\neq j}e^{c(i,j)}p(j|i)x_iy_j\left(c(i,j)+\ln p(j|i)+\ln\left(\frac{\sum_{m=1}^{s}\phi^{k(i)}(m)^2\pi_m}{\sum_{l=1}^{s}\phi^{k(i)}(l)\pi_l e^{c(l,j)}p(j|l)}\right)-\ln\phi^{k(i)}(i)\right)\right)\right). \tag{5.9}$$

The bounds (5.7) -(5.9) of $\frac{\ln\lambda}{\ln\mu}$ follow from (5.10)-(5.12).

$$\frac{r(A)}{r(B)}\leq\Pi_{i,j=1}^{s}\left(\frac{a_{ij}}{b_{ij}}\right)^{\frac{a_{ij}x_iy_j}{r(A)}}, \tag{5.10}$$

$$\frac{r(A)}{r(B)}\leq\frac{r(A)}{r(A)+\sum_{i=1}^{s}x_iy_i(b_{ii}-a_{ii})+\sum_{i\neq j}a_{ij}x_iy_j\ln\left(\frac{b_{ij}}{a_{ij}}\right)}, \tag{5.11}$$

$$\frac{r(A)}{r(B)}\leq 1+\frac{1}{r(B)}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{s}x_iy_i(a_{ii}-b_{ii})+\sum_{i\neq j}a_{ij}x_iy_j\ln\left(\frac{a_{ij}}{b_{ij}}\right)\right]. \tag{5.12}$$

Remark 29. *Note that in general it is hard to compare the bound given in (5.2) with the same in (5.7) -(5.9). We will only show that for the toy example of Section 5.3 the bounds*

given in (5.10)-(5.12) are much better than the spectral variation bound when the state space is large. Therefore A and B will refer to matrices A_1 and B_1 respectively. It is easy to calculate $\|A\|, r(A), \mathbf{x}$ with this choice of A and B. Note that the actual error is $\ln(1+\frac{\epsilon}{q})$ where $p = q+\epsilon$ where $\epsilon << q$. If we use (5.2) then the error is bounded by $\ln(3+\frac{\epsilon}{q})$. However, if we use (5.10) the error is bounded by $\ln(1+\frac{\epsilon}{q})$ i.e., the actual error. If we use (5.12) the error is bounded by $\ln\left(1+\left(1+\frac{\epsilon}{q}\right)\ln\left(1+\frac{\epsilon}{q}\right)\right)$ which reduces to $\ln\left(1+\frac{\epsilon}{q}\right)$ (using $x+x^2 \sim x$ if $x << 1$). If we use (5.11) the error is bounded by $\ln\left(1+\frac{\epsilon}{q}\right)$ (using Binomial approximation theorem).

If A is such that all its diagonal elements are p and the off-diagonal elements are q then for large state space the actual error is zero. If we use (5.10) then the bound is also zero whereas the right hand side of (5.2) is $\ln 3$.

If A is such that the entry in the first row and first column is p and the rest are all q, then also similar thing happens except the fact that now the right hand side of (5.2) is $\ln\left(1+2e^{-\frac{4q}{3}}\right)$.

Note that here $a_{ij} > b_{ij} \forall i,j \in \{1,2,\ldots,s\}$ in the above example. Our bound will be much more useful in cases where there will be i,j such that $b_{ij} > a_{ij}$. From the definition of δ_{ij}, γ_{ij} it is clear that for all j there exists i such that $\delta_{ij} > \gamma_{ij}$. In such a case, for every j there will be at least one non-positive term inside the summation over i which will make the bound small. The bound given in (5.2) does not capture such cases for large s.

Also, from the proof of [56, Theorem VIII.1.1] we know that the bound (5.2) is a strict inequality if the matrix P has all the entries positive whereas from the main theorem in [54] we see that there are cases when equality condition holds in (5.10).

Here (5.8) holds under (5.14) which follows from the fact that the following condition is necessary and sufficient for (5.11) to be true:

$$r(A) > \sum_{i=1}^{s} x_i y_i (a_{ii} - b_{ii}) + \sum_{i \neq j} a_{ij} x_i y_j \ln\left(\frac{a_{ij}}{b_{ij}}\right) \tag{5.13}$$

and $\min_i \sum_j a_{ij} \leq r(A)$. Later in the proof of Lemma 27 we will see that, in our setting, under $(\star)$, (5.13) gets satisfied if the assumptions in Lemma 27 are true.

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_i \sum_j e^{c(i,j)} p(j|i) > \sum_i x_i y_i \left(e^{c(i,i)} p(i|i) - \frac{\phi^{k(i)}(i) \sum_{l=1}^{s} \phi^{k(i)}(l) \pi_l e^{c(l,i)} p(i|l)}{\sum_{m=1}^{s} \phi^{k(i)}(m)^2 \pi_m} \right) + \\ &\sum_{i \neq j} x_i y_j e^{c(i,j)} p(j|i) \left(c(i,j) + \ln p(j|i) + \ln\left(\frac{\sum_{m=1}^{s} \phi^{k(i)}(m)^2 \pi_m}{\sum_{l=1}^{s} \phi^{k(i)}(l) \pi_l e^{c(l,j)} p(j|l)} \right) - \ln \phi^{k(i)}(i) \right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

(5.10)-(5.12) immediately follow from the classic results of [54, Theorem 1] and [7, Theorem 2]. In [7, Theorem 3], it is shown that under one condition on matrix entries, (5.7) is better than (5.8) whereas under some other condition, it is opposite. In the following we investigate how (5.9) compares to the other two.

Lemma 25. *The bound (5.9) is always better than (5.8).*

Proof. Let $L = \sum_{i=1}^{s} x_i y_i (a_{ii} - b_{ii}) + \sum_{i,j=1, i\neq j}^{s} a_{ij} x_i y_j \ln\left(\frac{a_{ij}}{b_{ij}}\right)$. Now, from [7, Theorem 2] we know that $L \geq r(A) - r(B)$ which implies that

$$L(L - r(A) + r(B)) \geq 0.$$

which again implies that

$$\frac{r(B) + L}{r(B)} \leq \frac{r(A)}{r(A) - L}.$$

This means that (5.9) is better than (5.8). □

5.5.1.1 Some conditions

In this section we describe some conditions. They are sufficient conditions under which (5.7)-(5.8) compare with each other. They will be referred in the next two lemmas.

$$\forall i, e^{c(i,i)} p(i|i) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{s} \phi^{k(i)}(m)^2 \pi_m - \phi^{k(i)}(i)^2 \pi_i \right) = \phi^{k(i)}(i) \sum_{l=1, l\neq i}^{s} \phi^{k(i)}(l) \pi_l a_{li} \tag{5.15}$$

$$\forall i \neq j, e^{c(i,j)} p(j|i) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{s} \phi^{k(i)}(m)^2 \pi_m - \phi^{k(i)}(i)^2 \pi_i \right) = \phi^{k(i)}(i) \sum_{l=1, l\neq i}^{s} \phi^{k(i)}(l) \pi_l a_{lj} \tag{5.16}$$

$$\exists i \text{ s.t } e^{c(i,i)} p(i|i) > \max_{1\leq l\leq s, l\neq i} e^{c(l,i)} p(i|l) \text{ or,} \tag{5.17}$$

$$\exists i \text{ s.t } e^{c(i,i)} p(i|i) < \min_{1\leq l\leq s, l\neq i} e^{c(l,i)} p(i|l) \tag{5.18}$$

Lemma 26. *Assume that for all i, $b_{ii} = a_{ii}$ [7, Theorem 3 (i)]. Then (5.7) is better than (5.8)*

Proof. Under the condition mentioned in [7, Theorem 3 (i)],

$$r(A) \Pi_{i\neq j} \left(\frac{b_{ij}}{a_{ij}}\right)^{\frac{a_{ij} x_i y_j}{r(A)}} \geq r(A) - L.$$

Therefore (5.7) is better than (5.8). □

Remark 30. *One such example where the condition of Lemma 26 gets satisfied is: $A = (a_{ij})_{s\times s}$ with $a_{ij} = q$ if $i = j$ and $a_{ij} = p$ otherwise, and $B = (b_{ij})_{s\times s}$ with $b_{ij} = q$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq s$ with $p - q \leq q$. It is easy to check that (5.13) gets satisfied for this example.*

Remark 31. *In our setting the condition mentioned in Lemma 26 gets satisfied if (5.15) is true. If the feature matrix is a single column matrix with all entries equal then a sufficient condition for (5.16) is that for every j, $e^{c(i,j)} p(j|i)$ is same for all i (for example, the transition probability satisfies $p(j|i) = e^{-c(i,j)}$ with the cost function $c(.,.)$ being non-negative).*

Lemma 27. *Assume that for all $i \neq j$, $b_{ij} = a_{ij}$ and there is at least one i such that $b_{ii} \neq a_{ii}$ [7, Theorem 3 (ii)]. Then (5.8) is better than first (5.7).*

Proof. Under the condition mentioned in [7, Theorem 3 (ii)],

$$r(A)\Pi_{i=1}^{s}\left(\frac{b_{ii}}{a_{ii}}\right)^{\frac{a_{ii}x_iy_i}{r(A)}} \leq r(A) - L.$$

Therefore (5.13) gets satisfied trivially if for all i, $b_{ii} \neq 0$ (which is true in our setting under $(\star)$ and b)). Therefore (5.8) is better than (5.7). □

Remark 32. *In our setting the condition mentioned in Lemma 27 gets satisfied if (5.16) is true and there exist at least one i for which either (5.17) or (5.18) is true (assuming that feature matrix is a single column matrix with all entries equal). If the feature matrix is a single column matrix with all entries equal then a necessary and sufficient condition for (5.17) is that for every j, $e^{c(i,j)}p(j|i)$ is same for all $i \neq j$.*

Remark 33. *Similar bounds can be derived in the same way if $\lambda < \mu$.*

5.5.2 Another bound when A is invertible

Let, $\alpha(A) = \max_i(x_A)_i^{-1}$ where x_A is Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of A which has positive components if A is irreducible.

Theorem 8. *Under the assumptions*

(A1) *A is invertible*

(A2) *A positive semidefinite*

$$\ln\left(\frac{\lambda}{\mu}\right) \leq \ln\left(\frac{det(A)}{\mu(\mu - \alpha(A)\|A - B\|)}\right). \tag{5.19}$$

Proof. If λ is an eigenvalue of matrix A with eigenvector x_A, then $\frac{det(A)}{\lambda}$ is an eigenvalue of the adjoint A^* with the same eigenvector.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{det(A)}{\lambda} - \mu\right)\langle x_A, x_B\rangle \\
&= \langle A^*x_A, x_B\rangle - \langle x_A, Bx_B\rangle \\
&= \langle x_A, Ax_B\rangle - \langle x_A, Bx_B\rangle \\
&= \langle x_A, (A - B)x_B\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\langle x_A, x_B\rangle \geq \alpha(A)^{-1}\|x_B\| = \alpha(A)^{-1}.$$

Then the proof follows from the observation that

$$|\langle x_A, (A - B)x_B\rangle| \leq \|A - B\|.$$

Here all the eigenvectors are normalized so that their norm is 1.

From the above one can easily see that

$$|\frac{det(A)}{\lambda} - \mu| \leq \alpha(A)\|A - B\|.$$

The result trivially follows from the above. □

Remark 34. *If $A = C \circ P$,*

1. *Using Oppenheim's Inequality [55, p 144]* ***(A1)*** *is satisfied if P is positive definite.*
2. ***(A2)*** *is satisfied if C and P are both positive semidefinite.*

Remark 35. *Let us take $A = (a_{ij})_{s\times s}$ with $a_{ij} = p$ if $i = j$ and $a_{ij} = q$ otherwise and $b_{ij} = q$ for all i, j with $p > q$. Also, let $\epsilon := p - q$. Then $det(A) = (p + (s-1)q)(p-q)^{s-1}$. $\alpha(A) = s$. The right hand side of (5.19) becomes $\ln\left(\frac{(p-q+sq)(p-q)^{s-1}}{qs(qs-(p-q)s)}\right)$.*

$$\begin{aligned}
f(s) &= \ln\left(\frac{(p+(s-1)q)(p-q)^{s-1}}{qs(qs-(p-q)s)}\right)\\
&= \ln\left(\frac{(p+(s-1)q)(p-q)^{s-1}}{qs^2(q-(p-q))}\right)\\
&= \ln\left(\frac{(p+(s-1)q)(p-q)^{s-1}}{qs^2(2q-p)}\right)\\
&= \ln\left(\frac{(p-q+sq)(p-q)^{s-1}}{qs^2(2q-p)}\right)\\
&= \ln\left(\frac{(\epsilon+sq)\epsilon^{s-1}}{qs^2(q-\epsilon)}\right) \quad \epsilon = p-q > 0\\
&= \ln\left(\frac{(\epsilon+sq)\epsilon^{s-1}}{qs^2(q-\epsilon)}\right)\\
&= \ln\left(\frac{(\epsilon+sq)\epsilon^{s}}{q\epsilon s^2(q-\epsilon)}\right)\\
&= \ln((\epsilon+sq)\epsilon^s) - \ln(q\epsilon s^2(q-\epsilon))\\
&= \ln(\epsilon+sq) + s\ln(\epsilon) - \ln(q\epsilon(q-\epsilon)) + \ln(s^2)\\
&= \ln(s(\epsilon/s+q)) + s\ln(\epsilon) - \ln(q\epsilon(q-\epsilon)) + 2\ln(s)\\
&= \ln(s) + \ln(\epsilon/s+q) + s\ln(\epsilon) - \ln(q\epsilon(q-\epsilon)) + 2\ln(s)\\
&= s\ln(\epsilon) + 3\ln(s) + \ln(\epsilon/s+q) - \ln(q\epsilon(q-\epsilon))\\
&= s\ln(\epsilon) + 3\ln(s) + \ln(q) + \ln(\epsilon/(sq)+1) - \ln(q\epsilon(q-\epsilon))
\end{aligned}$$

Since $2q > p > q$, $q > p - q > 0$ so $q > \epsilon > 0$.
Since $\ln(s)/s \to 0$ and $\ln(1 + c/s) \approx c/s$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{f(s)}{s} &= \ln(\epsilon) + 3\frac{\ln(s)}{s} + \frac{\ln(q) + \ln(1+\epsilon/(sq))) - \ln(q\epsilon(q-\epsilon))}{s} \\ &\approx \ln(\epsilon) + 3\frac{\ln(s)}{s} + \frac{\ln(q) + \epsilon/(sq) - \ln(q\epsilon(q-\epsilon))}{s} \\ &\approx \ln(\epsilon) + 3\frac{\ln(s)}{s} + \frac{-\ln(\epsilon(q-\epsilon))}{s} + \frac{\epsilon}{s^2 q} \\ &\to \ln(\epsilon)\end{aligned}$$

Therefore if $\epsilon = 1$ *then* $f(s) \approx 3\frac{\ln(s)}{s} + \frac{-\ln(q-1))}{s} + \frac{1}{s^2 q} \to 0$. *The actual error for large* s *becomes zero. The right hand side of (5.2) becomes* $\ln 3$.

Remark 36. *Note that* B *need not be irreducible under the assumption* (†) *in [1]. Therefore,* x_B *need not have all the components positive.*

5.6 Conclusion

In this chapter we gave several new bounds on the function approximation error for policy evaluation algorithm in the context of risk-sensitive reinforcement learning. An important future direction will be to design and analyze suitable learning algorithms to find the optimal policy with the accompanying error bounds. It will be interesting to see whether one can use our bounds for policy evaluation problem to provide error bounds for the full control problem.

Chapter 6

Conclusions and Future work

In this thesis we analyze several kinds of stochastic approximation algorithms with Markov noise under general conditions that was previously not done. This allows one to apply such results for convergence analysis of several reinforcement learning algorithms under general conditions. One such interesting application described in detail is the convergence analysis of off-policy learning algorithms in an on-line learning environment. Finally, we provide several informative error bounds for function approximation for a policy evaluation based algorithm in the case of risk-sensitive reinforcement learning.

Several interesting future directions (to our understanding that are not natural extensions of earlier work) are as follows:

- In our analysis of two time-scale stochastic approximation we have assumed pointwise boundedness of the iterates. Certain sufficient conditions for this assumption which is verifiable (also called the Borkar-Meyn theorem [82]) has already been proposed by Borkar and Meyn in the case of single time-scale stochastic approximation. It may not be possible to 'naturally' extend the sufficient condition (which is verifiable) for single timescale stochastic approximation to two time-scale recursions as well as recursion with Markov noise under classical assumptions such as in [46]. One needs to check whether the Lyapunov function based method [9, 24] is useful here. Additionally, the dependency of Lipschitz constant on the state space of the Markov process needs to be incorporated in case of two time-scale recursions also.

- Another interesting future direction is to extend the lock-in probability results to two time-scale recursions.

- Note that the results of Chapter 2 are true if we assume that the range of the underlying controlled Markov process is a compact metric space. Similarly, in Chapter 4 we assume the range of the Markov process to be a bounded subset of the Eucledian space. Therefore an interesting future direction is to extend these results for general state space such as Polish space.

- Finally, in case of risk-sensitive reinforcement learning, we need to find whether our bound is better than the spectral variation bound in general. Also, one needs to find

whether the assumption of knowing stationary distribution apriori can be relaxed in case of convergence analysis of temporal-difference learning in this setting.

Chapter 7

Appendix

7.1 Azuma's inequality

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a probability space and $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ a family of increasing sub σ- fields of $\mathcal{F}$. Let X_n be a martingale with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_n$. Suppose that

$$|X_n - X_{n-1}| \leq k_n < \infty$$

for some deterministic constants $\{k_n\}$. Then for $\lambda > 0$,

$$P(\sup_{m \leq n} |X_m| > \lambda) \leq 2e^{-\frac{\lambda^2}{\Sigma_{m \leq n} k_m^2}}$$

7.1.1 Proof of conditional and maximal version of Azuma's inequality

Let P_B denote probability measure defined by $P_B(A) = \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)}$ where $B \in \mathcal{F}_1$. If we can show that with this new probability measure $\{S_n\}$ is a martingale, then we can follow the steps in [45, (3.30), p. 227] to conclude the proof.

Let us denote by E_B the expectation with respect to P_B. Clearly, $E_B(X) = \frac{\int_B X dP}{P(B)}$. Let $G \in \mathcal{F}_n$. Now,

$$\int_G E_B[S_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] dP_B = E_B[E_B[I_G S_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n]] = E_B[I_G S_{n+1}] = \frac{E[I_{G \cap B} S_{n+1}]}{P(B)}$$
$$= \frac{E[I_{G \cap B} E[S_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n]]}{P(B)} = \frac{E[I_{G \cap B} S_n]}{P(B)} = \int_G S_n dP_B.$$

7.2 Gronwall's inequality

7.2.1 Continuous version

For continuous $u(\cdot), v(\cdot) \geq 0$ and scalars $C, K, T \geq 0$,

$$u(t) \leq C + K \int_0^t u(s)v(s)ds \quad \forall \quad t \in [0, T],$$

implies

$$u(t) \leq Ce^{K \int_0^T v(s)ds}, t \in [0, T]$$

7.2.2 Discrete version

Let $\{x_n, n \geq 0\}$ (resp. $\{a_n, n \geq 0\}$) be non-negative (resp. positive) sequences and $C, L \geq 0$ scalars such that for all n,

$$x_{n+1} \leq C + L \left(\sum_{m=0}^{n} a_m x_m \right).$$

Then for $T_n = \sum_{m=0}^{n} a_m$,

$$x_{n+1} \leq Ce^{LT_n}.$$

7.2.3 General discrete Gronwall inequality

Let $\{\theta_n, n \geq 0\}$ (respectively $\{a_n, n \geq 0\}$) be non-negative (respectively positive) sequences, $L \geq 0$ and $f(n)$ be a increasing function of n such that for all n

$$\theta_{n+1} \leq f(n) + L(\sum_{m=0}^{n} a_m \theta_m).$$

Then for $T_n = \sum_{m=0}^{n} a_m$,

$$\theta_{n+1} \leq f(n)e^{LT_n}$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma 8 in Appendix B of [78]. □

7.3 Perron-Frobenius theorem

7.3.1 For matrices with all the entries positive

Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be an $n \times n$ positive matrix: $a_{ij} > 0$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Then the following statements hold:

1. There is a positive real number r, called the Perron root or the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue, such that r is an eigenvalue of A and any other eigenvalue λ (possibly, complex) is strictly smaller than r in absolute value, $|\lambda| < r$. Thus, r is also called the spectral radius $\rho(A)$ of A.

2. The Perron–Frobenius eigenvalue is simple: r is a simple root of the characteristic polynomial of A. Consequently, the eigenspace associated to r is one-dimensional. (The same is true for the left eigenspace, i.e., the eigenspace for A^T.)

3. There exists an eigenvector $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ of A with eigenvalue r (called the Perron eigenvector) such that all components of v are positive: $Av = rv, v_i > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. (Respectively, there exists a positive left eigenvector $w : w^T A = rw^T, w_i > 0$.) There are no other positive (moreover non-negative) eigenvectors except positive multiples of v (respectively, left eigenvectors except w), i.e., all other eigenvectors must have at least one negative or non-real component.

4. The Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue satisfies the inequalities

$$\min_i \sum_j a_{ij} \leq r \leq \max_i \sum_j a_{ij}$$

7.3.2 For irreducible matrices

Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be a non-negative irreducible (for every pair of indices i and j, there exists a natural number m such that the (i, j)-th entry of the matrix A^m is not equal to 0) square matrix. Then the last three statements holds as in the earlier case, however, the first statement is replaced by the following:

There is a positive real number r, called the Perron root or the Perron–Frobenius eigenvalue, such that r is an eigenvalue of A and any other eigenvalue λ (possibly, complex) is less or equal than r in absolute value, $|\lambda| \leq r$.

Bibliography

[1] A.Basu, T.Bhattacharya, and V.S.Borkar. A Learning Algorithm for Risk-sensitive Cost. *Mathematics of operations research*, 55(2):880–898, 2008. 21, 25, 28, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 99

[2] A.Benveniste, M.Metivier, and P.Priouret. *Adaptive Algorithms and Stochastic Approximation*. Springer Verlag, Berlin - New York, 1990. 6, 25, 26, 30, 33, 35, 71, 78

[3] A.Dvoretzky. On Stochastic Approximation. *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, 11:39–56, 1956. 1

[4] A.Nemirovski, A.Juditsky, G.Lan, and A.Shapiro. Robust Stochastic Approximation Approach to Stochastic Programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19(4):1574–1609, 2009. 86

[5] A.Rakhlin, O.Shamir, and K.Sridharan. *Making Stochastic Gradient Descent Optimal for Strongly Convex Problems*. ICML, 2012. 25

[6] A.R.Mahmood and R.S.Sutton. Off-policy learning based on weighted importance sampling with linear computational complexity. Proceedings of the 31st Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, 2015. 27

[7] B.H.Lindqvist. On Comparison of the Perron-Frobenious eigenvalues of two ML-matrices. *Linear Algebra and its applications*, 353(2):257–266, 2002. 95, 96, 97

[8] B.Kumar, V.S.Borkar, and A.Shetty. Bounds for Tracking Error in Constant Stepsize Stochastic Approximation. 70

[9] C.Andrieu, E.Moulines, and P.Priouret. Stability of stochastic approximation under verifiable conditions. *SIAM Journal on control and optimization*, 44(1):283–312, 2005. 23, 100

[10] C.Andrieu, V.B.Tadic, and M.Vihola. On the stability of some controlled Markov chains and its applications to stochastic approximation with Markovian dynamic. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 25(1):1–45, 2015. 23

[11] C.Hartmann. Singularly perturbed differential equations. *Lecture notes on singularly perturbed differential equations*, 2010. 3

[12] C.J.C.H.Watkins and P.Dayan. Q-learning for risk-sensitive control. *Machine Learning*, 8(3-4):279–292, May 1992. 60

[13] C.Szepesvári. *Algorithms for reinforcement learning*. Morgan and Claypool, 2009. 6

[14] C.W.Kirkwood. Notes on Attitude Toward Risk Taking and the Exponential Utility Function. Technical Report 85287-4006, 1991. 18

[15] D.Bertsekas. *Dynamic Programming and Optimal Control*, volume II. Athena Scientific, 4th edition, 2012. 6

[16] D.Bertsekas. *Dynamic Programming and Optimal Control*, volume I. Athena Scientific, 4th edition, 2017. 6, 9

[17] D.Bertsekas and J.N.Tsitsiklis. *Neuro-Dynamic Programming*. Athena Scientific, September 1996. 6, 10

[18] D.J.MA, A.M.Makowski, and A.Shwartz. Stochastic approximations for finite state Markov chains. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 35:27–45, 1990. 6

[19] E.Barnard. Temporal-difference methods and Markov models. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 23(2):357–365, 1993. 15

[20] G.Dalal, B.Szorenyi, G.Thoppe, and S.Mannor. Concentration Bounds for Two Timescale Stochastic Approximation with Applications to Reinforcement Learning. *https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.05376*, 2017. 28

[21] G.Dalal, B.Szorenyi, G.Thoppe, and S.Mannor. Finite Sample Analyses for TD(0) with Function Approximation. *AAAI Conference on Aritificial Intelligence*, 2018. 25

[22] G.Thoppe and V.S.Borkar. A concentration bound for stochastic approximation via Alekseev's formula. Technical report, 2015. 24

[23] H.-F.Chen. *Stochastic Approximation and Its Applications*. Kluwer Academic, 2003. 2, 23

[24] H.J.Kushner and G.Yin. *Stochastic Approximation and Recursive Algorithms and Applications*. Springer, New York, 2nd edition, 2003. viii, 3, 4, 23, 78, 100

[25] H.J.Kushner and H.Huang. Averaging methods for the asymptotic analysis of learning and adaptive systems, with small adjustment rate. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 19:635–650, 1981. 4

[26] H.R.Maei. *Gradient temporal-difference learning algorithms*. PhD thesis, University of Alberta, 2011. viii, 6, 16, 17, 22, 23, 61, 62, 64, 65

[27] H.R.Maei, C.Szepesvári, S.Bhatnagar, and R.S.Sutton. Toward Off-Policy Learning Control with Function Approximation. International Conference on Machine Learning, 2010. 69

[28] H.Robbins and S.Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *Annals of Mathematical Staistics*, 22:400–407, 1951. 1

[29] H.Yu. Least squares temporal difference methods: an analysis under general conditions. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 50(6):3310–3343, 2012. 64

[30] H.Yu. Weak Convergence Properties of Constrained Emphatic Temporal-difference Learning with Constant and Slowly Diminishing Stepsize. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(220):1–58, 2016. 27

[31] J.Aubin and A.Cellina. *Differential Inclusions: Set-Valued Maps and Viability Theory*. Springer, 1984. 31

[32] J.Kiefer and J.Wolfowitz. Stochastic estimation of the maximum of a regression function. *Annals of Mathematical Staistics*, 23:462–466, 1952. 1

[33] J.N.Tsitsiklis and B.V.Roy. An Analysis of Temporal-Difference Learning with Function Approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 42(5), May 1997. 13

[34] J.R.Blum. Approximation methods which converge with probability one. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 25:382–386, 1954. 1

[35] J.Wolfowitz. On the stochastic approximation method of Robbins and Monro. *Annals of Mathematical Staistics*, 23:457–461, 1952. 1

[36] L.C.Baird. Residual algorithms: Reinforcement learning with function approximation. pages 30–37. In Proceedings of the 12th Int. Conf. on Machine Learning, 1995. 15, 22, 27

[37] L.Ljung. Analysis of recursive stochastic algorithms. *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, 22:551–575, 1977. 2

[38] L.Rosasco and T.Poggio. Consistency, Learnability, and Regularization. *Lecture Notes for MIT Course 9.520*, 2015. 25

[39] M.Benaïm. A Dynamical System Approach to Stochastic Approximations. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 34(2):437–472, March 1996. 2, 6

[40] M.Benaïm. Dynamics of stochastic approximation algorithms. *Séminaire de probabilités (Strasbourg)*, pages 1–68, 1999. 2, 46, 47

[41] M.Benaïm, J.Hofbauer, and S.Sorin. Stochastic approximations and differential inclusions. *SIAM Journal of Control and Optimization*, 44(1):328–348, 2005. 31, 32, 37, 38, 46

[42] M.Benaïm and M.W.Hirsch. Asymptotic pseudotrajectories and chain recurrent flows, with applications. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, 8(1):141–176, January 1996. 6

[43] M.Broadie, D.Cicek, and A.Zeevi. General Bounds and Finite-Time Improvement for the Kiefer-Wolfowitz Stochastic Approximation Algorithm. *Operations Research*, 59(5):1211–1224, 2010. 25

[44] M.Duflo. *Random Iterative Algorithms*. Springer-Verlag, 1997. 2

[45] M.Habib, C.McDiarmid, J.Ramirez-Alfonsin, and B.Reed. *'Concentration', in Probabilistic Methods for Algorithmic Discrete Mathematics*. Springer Verla, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1998. 102

[46] M.Metivier and P.Priouret. Applications of a Kushner-Clark lemma to general classes of stochastic algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, (30):140–151, 1984. 6, 25, 26, 27, 30, 33, 39, 54, 70, 71, 72, 73, 100

[47] M.Metivier and P.Priouret. Théorèmes de convergence presque sure pour une classe d'algorithmes stochastiques à pas décroissant. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 74(3):403–428, 1987. 6, 26, 70

[48] N.N.Krasovskii. *Stability of Motion* . Stanford University Press. 39

[49] O.Brandiere. Some pathological traps for stochastic approximation. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 36(4):1293–1314, 1998. 24

[50] P.Dupuis and H.J.Kushner. Stochastic approximation via large deviations: Asymptotic properties. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 23:675–696, 1985. 24

[51] P.Dupuis and H.J.Kushner. Stochastic approximation and large deviations: Upper bounds and w.p.1 convergence. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 27:1108–1135, 1989. 24

[52] P.Karmakar and S.Bhatnagar. Two Timescale Stochastic Approximation with Controlled Markov noise and Off-policy temporal difference learning. *Mathematics of operations research(To Appear)*, 43(1):130–151, 2018. 24, 70

[53] P.Marbach and J.N.Tsitsiklis. Simulation-Based Optimization of Markov Reward Processes. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 46(2):191–209, 2001. 21

[54] R.B.Bapat. Comparing the Spectral Radii of Two Nonnegative Matrices. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 96(2):137–139, 1989. 89, 92, 95

[55] R.B.Bapat and T.E.S Raghavan. *Nonnegative Matrices and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 1997. 98

[56] R.Bhatia. *Matrix Analysis*. Springer, 1997. 91, 95

[57] R.Durrett. *Probability Theory and Examples*. Cambridge University Press, 4th edition, 2010. 77

[58] R.Permantle. Nonconvergence to unstable points in urn models and stochastic approximations. *Annals of Probability*, 18:698–712, 1990. 24

[59] R.S.Sutton. Learning to predict by the methods of temporal differences. *Machine Learning*, 3(1):9–44, 1988. 11, 12

[60] R.S.Sutton and A.G.Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England, 2nd edition, 2015. viii, 6, 7, 10, 11, 22

[61] R.S.Sutton, A.R.Mahmood, and M.White. An Emphatic Approach to the Problem of Off-policy Temporal-Difference Learning. Technical report, University of Alberta. 22, 27, 64, 65

[62] R.S.Sutton, H.R.Maei, and C.Szepesvári. *A convergent O(n) algorithm for off-policy temporal-difference learning with linear function approximation*. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, Vancouver, B.C., Canada, 2008. 18, 22

[63] R.S.Sutton, H.R.Maei, D.Precup, S.Bhatnagar, D.Silver, and E.Wiewiora. *Fast gradient-descent methods for temporal-difference learning with linear function approximation*. International Conference on Machine Learning, Montreal, Canada, 2009. 18, 22, 65

[64] S.Balaji and S.P.Meyn. Multiplicative ergodicity and large deviations for an irreducible Markov chain. *Stochastic Processes and Their Appl.*, 90:123–144, 2000. 20, 21, 90

[65] S.Kamal. On the Convergence, Lock-In Probability, and Sample Complexity of Stochastic Approximation. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 48:5178–5192, 2010. 24, 25, 71, 78, 79, 80

[66] T.Degris, M.White, and R.S.Sutton. *Off-policy actor-critic*. International Conference on Machine Learning, Scotland, UK, 2012. 21

[67] V.B.Tadić. On the Convergence of Temporal-Difference Learning with Linear Function Approximation. *Machine Learning*, 42(30):241–267, March 2001. 13

[68] V.B.Tadić. *Almost sure convergence of two time-scale stochastic approximation algorithms*. American Control Conference, Boston, 2004. 30

[69] V.B.Tadić. Convergence and Convergence Rate of Stochastic Gradient Search in the Case of Multiple and Non-Isolated Extrema. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 125:1715–1755, 2015. 30

[70] V.R.Konda and J.N.Tsitsiklis. Linear stochastic approximation driven by slowly varying Markov chains. *Systems and Control Letters*, 50:95–102, 2003. 28, 30, 70, 81, 82, 83

[71] V.R.Konda and J.N.Tsitsiklis. On actor-critic algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 42:1143–1166, 2003. 30, 60

[72] V.S.Borkar. *Probability Theory : An Advanced Course*. Springer, 1995. 34, 35

[73] V.S.Borkar. Stochastic approximation with two time scales. *Systems and Control Letters*, 29(5):291–294, 1997. 22, 30

[74] V.S.Borkar. A sensitivity formula for the risk-sensitive cost and the actor-critic algorithm. *Systems and Control Letters*, 44:339–346, 2001. 21, 90

[75] V.S.Borkar. On the lock-in probability of stochastic approximation. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 11:11–20, 2002. 24, 70, 71, 72

[76] V.S.Borkar. Q-learning for risk-sensitive control. *Mathematics of operations research*, 27:294–311, 2002. 21, 90

[77] V.S.Borkar. Stochastic approximation with 'controlled Markov noise'. *Systems and Control Letters*, 55(2):139–145, 2006. 6, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30, 33, 35, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 50, 52, 53, 58, 59

[78] V.S.Borkar. *Stochastic Approximation : A Dynamic Systems Viewpoint*. Cambridge University Press, 2008. 2, 3, 25, 26, 28, 31, 32, 38, 40, 49, 59, 64, 70, 71, 72, 73, 76, 86, 103

[79] V.S.Borkar. Reinforcement learning – a bridge between numerical methods and Markov Chain Monte Carlo. *Perspectives in Mathematical Sciences(N. S. N. Sastry, B. Rajeev, Mohan Delampady, T. S. S. R. K. Rao, eds.)*, 2009. 25

[80] V.S.Borkar. Learning Algorithms for Risk-Sensitive Control. *19th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems*, 2010. 25

[81] V.S.Borkar and S.P.Meyn. The o.d.e. method for convergence of stochastic approximation and reinforcement learning. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 38(2):447–469, 2000. 27

[82] V.S.Borkar and S.P.Meyn. The O.D.E. method for convergence of stochastic approximation and reinforcement learning. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 38:447–469, 2000. 100

[83] V.S.Borkar and S.P.Meyn. Risk-sensitive optimal control for Markov decision processes with monotone cost. *Mathematics of operations research*, 27:192–209, 2002. 20, 90

[84] V.Yaji and S.Bhatnagar. Stochastic Recursive Inclusions in two timescales with non-additive iterate dependent Markov noise. *https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.05961*, 2016. 26

[85] V.Yaji and S.Bhatnagar. Stochastic recursive inclusions with non-additive iterate-dependent Markov noise. *Stochastics:An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, 2017. 93

[86] W.B.Arthur. *Increasing returns and path dependence in the economy*. University of Michigan Press, 1994. 24

[87] W.Rudin. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. McGraw-Hill Science/Engineering/Math, 3rd edition, 1976. 33, 36