

Optimization Landscape of Gradient Descent for Discrete-time Static Output Feedback

Jingliang Duan, Jie Li, Shengbo Eben Li, Lin Zhao

Abstract—In this paper, we analyze the optimization landscape of gradient descent methods for static output feedback (SOF) control of discrete-time linear time-invariant systems with quadratic cost. The SOF setting can be quite common, for example, when there are unmodeled hidden states in the underlying process. We first establish several important properties of the SOF cost function, including coercivity, L -smoothness, and M -Lipschitz continuous Hessian. We then utilize these properties to show that the gradient descent is able to converge to a stationary point at a dimension-free rate. Furthermore, we prove that under some mild conditions, gradient descent converges linearly to a local minimum if the starting point is close to one. These results not only characterize the performance of gradient descent in optimizing the SOF problem, but also shed light on the efficiency of general policy gradient methods in reinforcement learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

Reinforcement learning (RL) has achieved human-level performance in a variety of challenging domains, from games to robotic control [1]–[5]. For continuous control settings, policy gradient based RL algorithms such as DDPG [3], TRPO [6], PPO [7], SAC [8], DSAC [4], are widely used to find the nearly optimal parameterized policy function. Despite their success in various applications, the theoretical understandings of their performance and computational complexity are rather limited, even in the most basic settings such as linear systems.

Recent literature investigated the optimization landscape and the global convergence of policy gradient methods when applied to the linear quadratic regulator (LQR). It is well known that directly optimizing the LQR cost with respect to the linear policy is generally a nonconvex optimization. The domain of stabilizing linear policy can be nonconvex with non-smooth boundaries. As a pioneering work, Fazel *et al.* (2018) demonstrated the gradient dominance and the almost smoothness properties of the LQR cost in a discrete-time setting, leading to the global convergence at a linear rate for policy gradient methods [9]. This work has inspired a line of subsequent studies that examined similar properties through the lens of policy gradient methods for discrete-time and continuous-time LQR [10]–[13], finite-horizon noisy LQR [14], LQR tracking [15], Markovian jump LQR [16], distributed LQR [17], linear H_2 control with H_∞ constraints [18], as well as linear quadratic Gaussian problem [19], [20].

J. Duan and L. Zhao are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore, Singapore. Email: (duanj1, elezhli)@nus.edu.sg.

J. Li and S. E. Li are with the School of Vehicle and Mobility, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China. Email: jie-li18@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn, lishbo@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn.

The aforementioned literature mainly focuses on the full state feedback or dynamic output feedback control, whereas the convergence of the gradient method for static output feedback (SOF) LQR is barely studied. SOF is one of the most important open questions in control theory, which considers a linear time-invariant system with quadratic performance in the case when only some outputs (linear functions of the state) instead of the complete state are available [21]. Note that state feedback LQR can be regarded as a special case of SOF. Compared with state feedback LQR, the optimization landscape for SOF LQR is much more complicated. The domain of stabilizing SOF control gains can be disconnected and the stationary points in each component of the domain can be local minima, saddle points, or even local maxima [13], [22]–[24]. The recent work [13] analyzed the convergence rate to stationary points, which however only focused on continuous-time linear systems.

This paper aims to analyze the optimization landscape of the discrete-time SOF. The contributions are summarized as follows.

- 1) We establish several important properties of the SOF cost function, including coercivity, L -smoothness, and M -Lipschitz continuous Hessian. These results enable further convergence analysis of policy gradient for discrete-time SOF.
- 2) For the partially observed case, results on convergence to stationary points and the corresponding dimension-free convergence rate are formally established. Moreover, utilizing the Lipschitz continuity of Hessian, we demonstrate that under mild conditions, gradient descent converges linearly to a local minimum if the starting point is close to one.
- 3) For the fully observed case, we show that gradient descent converges to the global optimal controller at a linear rate if an initial stabilizing controller is used. Compared with the results given in [9], we provide a more explicit characterization of computational complexity.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we describe some preliminaries of SOF. Section III derives the formula of the gradient and establishes several key properties of the SOF cost function. Section IV shows the convergence results of gradient descent for SOF, and Section V concludes this article.

Notation: $\|X\|$ and $\rho(X)$ denote the spectral norm and spectral radius of a matrix X , respectively; $\text{Tr}(X)$, $\sigma_{\min}(X)$, and $\lambda_{\min}(X)$ denote the trace, minimal singular value,

and minimal eigenvalue of a square matrix, respectively. $\partial\mathbb{X}$ denotes the boundary of a set \mathbb{X} . $\text{vec}(X)$ denotes the vectorization of matrix X . $X \succ Y$ and $X \succeq Y$ represent that $X - Y$ is positive definite and positive semidefinite, respectively.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Consider the discrete-time time-invariant linear system

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= Ax_t + Bu_t, \\ y_t &= Cx_t, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

with state x , output y , and matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$. Without loss of generality, we assume C has full row rank. The objective of infinite-horizon LQR performance is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (x_t^\top Q x_t + u_t^\top R u_t) \right], \quad (2)$$

where initial state x_0 is assumed to be randomly distributed according to a distribution \mathcal{D} , and $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ are positive definite matrices.

The static output feedback is described by the form

$$u_t = -K y_t, \quad (3)$$

where $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$. Then the closed loop system can be written as

$$x_{t+1} = (A - BKC)x_t, \quad (4)$$

and the objective function becomes

$$J(K) = \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} x_t^\top (Q + C^\top K^\top R K C) x_t \right]. \quad (5)$$

We assume that a stabilizing controller exists. We denote the feasible set which contains all stabilizing K as \mathbb{K} , that is

$$\mathbb{K} = \{K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} : \rho(A - BKC) < 1\}.$$

Define P_K as the solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$P_K = Q + C^\top K^\top R K C + (A - BKC)^\top P_K (A - BKC), \quad (6)$$

and then the cost function can be expressed by

$$J(K) = \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} x_0^\top P_K x_0 = \text{Tr}(P_K X_0), \quad (7)$$

where

$$X_0 := \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} x_0 x_0^\top.$$

Define the state correlation matrix as

$$\Sigma_K := \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} x_t x_t^\top,$$

then it is straightforward that

$$\mu := \sigma_{\min}(X_0) \leq \sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_K).$$

It is also well-known that Σ_K satisfies the following Lyapunov equation

$$\Sigma_K = X_0 + (A - BKC)\Sigma_K(A - BKC)^\top. \quad (8)$$

III. GRADIENT AND COST PROPERTIES

In this section, we first derive the formula of the gradient and Hessian, and then establish several key properties of the SOF cost.

A. Gradient and Second Derivative

Lemma 1 (Policy Gradient Expression). *For $\forall K \in \mathbb{K}$, the policy gradient is*

$$\nabla J(K) = 2E_K \Sigma_K C^\top, \quad (9)$$

where $E_K = (R + B^\top P_K B)KC - B^\top P_K A$.

Proof. Define the value function of state x_t as

$$V_K(x_t) := x_t^\top P_K x_t.$$

From (6), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V_K(x_0) &= x_0^\top P_K x_0 \\ &= x_0^\top (Q + C^\top K^\top R K C) x_0 \\ &\quad + x_0^\top (A - BKC)^\top P_K (A - BKC) x_0 \\ &= x_0^\top (Q + C^\top K^\top R K C) x_0 + V_K((A - BKC)x_0). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the gradient of $V_K(x_0)$ w.r.t. K , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla V_K(x_0) &= 2RKCx_0x_0^\top C^\top \\ &\quad - 2B^\top P_K (A - BKC)x_0x_0^\top C^\top \\ &\quad + x_1^\top \nabla P_K x_1 \big|_{x_1=(A-BKC)x_0} \\ &= 2[(R + B^\top P_K B)KC - B^\top P_K A]x_0x_0^\top C^\top \\ &\quad + \nabla V_K(x_1) \big|_{x_1=(A-BKC)x_0} \\ &= 2[(R + B^\top P_K B)KC - B^\top P_K A] \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (x_t x_t^\top) C^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we can observe that

$$\nabla J(K) = \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} \nabla V_K(x_0) = 2E_K \Sigma_K C^\top. \quad \square$$

The SOF cost $J(K)$ is twice differentiable. To avoid tensors, we analyze the Hessian of the SOF cost $J(K)$ applied to a nonzero direction $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$, which is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 J(K)[Z, Z] &:= \frac{d^2}{d\eta^2} \bigg|_{\eta=0} J(K + \eta Z) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} x_0^\top \frac{d^2}{d\eta^2} \bigg|_{\eta=0} P_{K+\eta Z} x_0 \\ &= \text{Tr} \left(\frac{d^2}{d\eta^2} \bigg|_{\eta=0} P_{K+\eta Z} X_0 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Lemma 2. *For $\forall K \in \mathbb{K}$, the Hessian of the SOF cost $J(K)$ applied to a direction $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 J(K)[Z, Z] &= 2\text{Tr}(C^\top Z^\top (R + B^\top P_K B) Z C \Sigma_K) \\ &\quad - 4\text{Tr}((BZC)^\top P'_K[Z](A - BKC)\Sigma_K). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where

$$P'_K[Z] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (A - BKC)^{\top j} (C^{\top} Z^{\top} E_K + E_K^{\top} ZC) (A - BKC)^j. \quad (12)$$

Proof. Denote $P'_K[Z] = \frac{d}{d\eta} \Big|_{\eta=0} P_{K+\eta Z}$. From (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} P'_K[Z] &= C^{\top} Z^{\top} RKC + C^{\top} K^{\top} RZC \\ &\quad - (BZC)^{\top} P_K (A - BKC) - (A - BKC)^{\top} P_K BZC \\ &\quad + (A - BKC)^{\top} P'_K[Z] (A - BKC) \\ &= C^{\top} Z^{\top} E_K + E_K^{\top} ZC \\ &\quad + (A - BKC)^{\top} P'_K[Z] (A - BKC) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (A - BKC)^{\top j} (C^{\top} Z^{\top} E_K + E_K^{\top} ZC) (A - BKC)^j. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Furthermore, its second derivative can be derived as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{d\eta^2} \Big|_{\eta=0} P_{K+\eta Z} &= C^{\top} Z^{\top} ((R + B^{\top} P_K B) ZC - B^{\top} P'_K[Z] (A - BKC)) \\ &\quad + ((R + B^{\top} P_K B) ZC - B^{\top} P'_K[Z] (A - BKC))^{\top} ZC \\ &\quad - (BZC)^{\top} P'_K[Z] (A - BKC) \\ &\quad - (A - BKC)^{\top} P'_K[Z] BZC \\ &\quad + (A - BKC)^{\top} \frac{d^2}{d\eta^2} \Big|_{\eta=0} P_{K+\eta Z} (A - BKC) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (A - BKC)^{\top j} S_1 (A - BKC)^j, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &:= 2(C^{\top} Z^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B) ZC \\ &\quad - (BZC)^{\top} P'_K[Z] (A - BKC) \\ &\quad - (A - BKC)^{\top} P'_K[Z] BZC). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using (10), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 J(K)[Z, Z] &= \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (A - BKC)^{\top j} S_1 (A - BKC)^j X_0 \right) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left(S_1 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (A - BKC)^j X_0 (A - BKC)^{\top j} \right) \\ &= \text{Tr}(S_1 \Sigma_K) \\ &= 2\text{Tr}(C^{\top} Z^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B) ZC \Sigma_K) \\ &\quad - 4\text{Tr}((BZC)^{\top} P'_K[Z] (A - BKC) \Sigma_K). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

B. Cost Function Properties

Given the analytical policy gradient, before moving forward to analyze the performance of gradient-based methods in solving the SOF problem, we first need to establish several key properties of the SOF cost. The intermediate lemmas

required by the property analysis are provided in Appendix A.

Lemma 3 (Coercivity). *The cost function $J(K)$ is coercive in the sense that for any sequence $\{K_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{K}$*

$$J(K_i) \rightarrow +\infty, \quad \text{if } \|K_i\| \rightarrow +\infty \text{ or } K_i \rightarrow K \in \partial\mathbb{K}.$$

Proof. From (7), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} J(K_i) &= \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} x_t^{\top} (Q + C^{\top} K_i^{\top} R K_i C) x_t \right] \\ &= \text{Tr}((Q + C^{\top} K_i^{\top} R K_i C) \Sigma_{K_i}) \\ &\geq \mu \sigma_{\min}(R) \sigma_{\min}(C C^{\top}) \|K_i\|_F^2 \\ &\geq \mu \sigma_{\min}(R) \sigma_{\min}(C)^2 \|K_i\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which directly leads to that $J(K_i) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\|K_i\| \rightarrow +\infty$.

From (6), P_K can be rewritten as

$$P_K = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (A - BKC)^{\top j} (Q + C^{\top} K^{\top} R K C) (A - BKC)^j. \quad (15)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J(K_i) &= \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (A - B K_i C)^{\top j} (Q + C^{\top} K_i^{\top} R K_i C) (A - B K_i C)^j X_0 \right) \\ &\geq \mu \sigma_{\min}(Q) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \|(A - B K_i C)^j\|_F^2 \\ &\geq \mu \sigma_{\min}(Q) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \|(A - B K_i C)^j\|^2 \\ &\geq \mu \sigma_{\min}(Q) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \rho(A - B K_i C)^{2j} \\ &= \mu \sigma_{\min}(Q) \frac{1 - \rho(A - B K_i C)^{\infty}}{1 - \rho(A - B K_i C)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\rho(A - BKC) = 1$ when $K \in \partial\mathbb{K}$, by continuity of the $\rho(A - B K_i C)$, we have $\rho(A - B K_i C) \rightarrow 1$ as $K_i \rightarrow K \in \partial\mathbb{K}$. Thereby, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $N(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1 - \rho(A - B K_i C) < \epsilon$ for all $i \geq N(\epsilon)$. That is $1 > \rho(A - B K_i C) > 1 - \epsilon$ for $i \geq N(\epsilon)$. Thereby, $J(K_i)$ is bounded below by

$$J(K_i) \geq \mu \sigma_{\min}(Q) \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \epsilon)^2}.$$

It thus follows that $J(K_i) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $K_i \rightarrow \partial\mathbb{K}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 3. \square

With the coercive property in place, we can easily show the compactness on the sublevel set of the SOF cost.

Lemma 4 (Compactness on the sublevel set). *The sublevel set $\mathbb{K}_{\alpha} = \{K \in \mathbb{K} : J(K) \leq \alpha\}$ is compact for $\forall \alpha \geq J(K^*)$.*

Proof. With the coercive property in place, by [25, Proposition 11.12], we know that \mathbb{K}_{α} is bounded. Since $J(K)$ is

continuous on \mathbb{K} , the set \mathbb{K}_α is also closed, which completes the proof. \square

Based on the compactness of the sublevel set, we can finally show that under certain conditions, the decrease of the cost ensures the line segment between two adjacent iterates stays inside \mathbb{K}_α .

Lemma 5 (Smoothness on the sublevel set). *For any $K \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$, we have $\|\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K))\| \leq L$, where the smoothness constant L is*

$$L = 2\|C\|^2 \left(\|R\| + \|B\|^2 \left(1 + \frac{2\zeta_1}{\|C\|\|B\|} \right) \frac{\alpha}{\mu} \right) \frac{\alpha}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)},$$

with

$$\zeta_1 = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} \left((1 + \|C\|^2 \|B\|^2) \frac{\alpha}{\mu} + \|C\|^2 \|R\| \right) - 1. \quad (16)$$

This means that for any $K, K' \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$ satisfying $K + \delta(K' - K) \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$, $\forall \delta \in [0, 1]$, the following inequality holds

$$J(K') \leq J(K) + \text{Tr}(\nabla J(K)^\top (K' - K)) + \frac{L}{2} \|K' - K\|_F^2. \quad (17)$$

Proof. From (10), applying the Taylor series expansion about direction Z , we can show that

$$\nabla^2 J(K)[Z, Z] = \text{vec}(Z)^\top \nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K)) \text{vec}(Z).$$

Since $\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K))$ is symmetric, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K))\| &= \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} |\text{vec}(Z)^\top \nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K)) \text{vec}(Z)| \\ &= \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} |\nabla^2 J(K)[Z, Z]|. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Using (11), we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K))\| &\leq 2 \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} |\text{Tr}(C^\top Z^\top (R + B^\top P_K B) Z C \Sigma_K)| \\ &\quad + 4 \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} |\text{Tr}((BZC)^\top P'_K[Z] (A - BKC) \Sigma_K)| \\ &=: 2q_1 + 4q_2. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Therefore, we only need to analyze the upper bounds of q_1 and q_2 , separately. Firstly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_1 &\leq \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} (\|C^\top Z^\top (R + B^\top P_K B) Z C\| \text{Tr}(\Sigma_K)) \\ &\leq \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} (\|C\|^2 \|Z\|^2 \|R + B^\top P_K B\| \text{Tr}(\Sigma_K)) \\ &\leq \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} (\|C\|^2 \|Z\|_F^2 (\|R\| + \|B\|^2 \|P_K\|) \text{Tr}(\Sigma_K)) \\ &\leq \|C\|^2 (\|R\| + \|B\|^2) \frac{J(K)}{\mu} \frac{J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where the last step follows from Lemma 9 in the appendix.

Next, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_2 &\leq \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} (\|(BZC)^\top P'_K[Z] (A - BKC) \Sigma_K^{1/2}\|_F \|\Sigma_K^{1/2}\|_F) \\ &\leq \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} (\|C\| \|Z\| \|B\| \|P'_K[Z]\| \\ &\quad \|(A - BKC) \Sigma_K^{1/2}\|_F \sqrt{\text{Tr}(\Sigma_K)}) \\ &\leq \|C\| \|B\| \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} (\|P'_K[Z]\|) \\ &\quad \sqrt{\text{Tr}((A - BKC) \Sigma_K (A - BKC)^\top)} \sqrt{\text{Tr}(\Sigma_K)} \\ &\leq \|C\| \|B\| \text{Tr}(\Sigma_K) \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} \|P'_K[Z]\| \\ &\leq \|C\| \|B\| \frac{J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} \|P'_K[Z]\|, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where the last step follows from Lemma 9. Combining (20) and (21), the only thing left is to show the following bound holds:

$$\sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} \|P'_K[Z]\| \leq \zeta_1 \|P_K\|,$$

where ζ_1 is as given by (16).

We will prove the above inequality by showing that $P'_K[Z] \preceq \zeta_1 P_K$. Given (6) and (12), if $(C^\top Z^\top E_K + E_K^\top ZC) \preceq \zeta_1 (Q + C^\top K^\top RKC)$ for some $\zeta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we immediately have $P'_K[Z] \preceq \zeta_1 P_K$. Therefore, it remains to find ζ_1 . It follows from (6) that

$$\begin{aligned} &C^\top Z^\top E_K + E_K^\top ZC \\ &= C^\top Z^\top RKC + C^\top K^\top RZC - C^\top Z^\top B^\top P_K (A - BKC) \\ &\quad - (A - BKC)^\top P_K BZC \\ &\preceq C^\top Z^\top RZC + C^\top K^\top RKC \\ &\quad + (A - BKC)^\top P_K (A - BKC) + (BZC)^\top P_K BZC \\ &= P_K - Q + C^\top Z^\top RZC + (BZC)^\top P_K BZC \\ &\preceq \|P_K + C^\top Z^\top RZC + (BZC)^\top P_K BZC\| I - Q \\ &\preceq (\|P_K\| + \|C\|^2 \|R\| + \|C\|^2 \|B\|^2 \|P_K\|) I - Q \\ &\preceq \left((1 + \|C\|^2 \|B\|^2) \frac{\alpha}{\mu} + \|C\|^2 \|R\| \right) \frac{Q}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} - Q. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Therefore, we proved that $P'_K[Z] \preceq \zeta_1 P_K$, which directly leads to

$$\begin{aligned} q_2 &\leq \zeta_1 \|C\| \|B\| \|P_K\| \frac{J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} \\ &\leq \zeta_1 \|C\| \|B\| \frac{J(K)^2}{\mu \sigma_{\min}(Q)}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Combining (19), (20), and (23), for $K \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$, we finally have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K))\| &\leq 2\|C\|^2 (\|R\| + \|B\|^2) \frac{\alpha}{\mu} \frac{J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} + 4\zeta_1 \|C\| \|B\| \frac{\alpha^2}{\mu \sigma_{\min}(Q)} \\ &\leq 2\|C\|^2 \left(\|R\| + \|B\|^2 \left(1 + \frac{2\zeta_1}{\|C\|\|B\|} \right) \frac{\alpha}{\mu} \right) \frac{\alpha}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

If $J(K)$ is globally L -smooth, it is well known that gradient descent can converge to a stationary point with

a dimension-free iteration complexity [26], [27]. However, Lemma 5 only shows that $\|\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K))\| \leq L$ for $K \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$. Since the sublevel set \mathbb{K}_α can be nonconvex with a non-smooth boundary, or even disconnected [13], the inequality (17) cannot be directly applied to any $K, K' \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$. Hence, the convergence analysis is non-trivial.

Lemma 6 (Performance difference lemma). *Suppose $K, K' \in \mathbb{K}$. It holds that:*

$$J(K') - J(K) = 2\text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K'}(K'C - KC)^\top E_K) + \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K'}(K'C - KC)^\top (R + B^\top P_K B)(K'C - KC)).$$

We provide a brief proof of Lemma 6 in Appendix B. The performance difference lemma, also known as almost smoothness [9], is the basis for deriving the following gradient domination condition.

Lemma 7 (Gradient domination). *Define the set \mathbb{C} as $\mathbb{C} = \{C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : \text{rank}(C) = n\}$. Let K^* be the global optimal SOF policy, and J_s^* be the global optimal cost of the corresponding state feedback LQR. Suppose K has finite cost and $\mu > 0$. It holds that*

$$J(K) - J(K^*) \leq \frac{\|\Sigma_{K^*}\| \text{Tr}(E_K^\top E_K)}{\sigma_{\min}(R)}. \quad (24)$$

If $C \in \mathbb{C}$, one further has

$$J(K) - J_s^* \leq \frac{\|\Sigma_{K^*}\| \|\nabla J(K)\|_F^2}{4\mu^2 \sigma_{\min}(C)^2 \sigma_{\min}(R)}, \quad \forall C \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (25)$$

Moreover, we have the following lower bound

$$J(K) - J_s^* \geq \frac{\mu \text{Tr}(E_K^\top E_K)}{\|R + B^\top P_K B\|}, \quad \forall C \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (26)$$

These results can be proved in a similar way to [9, Lemma 3] where $C = I_n$ (see Appendix C for details). The gradient dominance condition indicates that there are no stationary points other than the global minimum, which is crucial to achieve global convergence for policy gradient [26], [28]. However, when $\text{rank}(C) < n$, gradient dominance does not hold. Therefore, in the latter case, it is hard to expect anything better than converging to a stationary point.

Lemma 8 (M -Lipschitz continuous Hessian). *For any $K, K' \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$ satisfying $K + \delta(K' - K) \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha, \forall \delta \in [0, 1]$, the following inequality holds*

$$\|\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K)) - \nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K'))\| \leq M \|K - K'\|,$$

where

$$M = \frac{2\alpha^2}{\mu \sigma_{\min}(Q)} \|B\| \|C\| ((2\zeta_1 + \zeta_2) \|B\| \|C\| + 2\zeta_3 + \zeta_4),$$

and $\zeta_{\{1,2,3,4\}}$ are defined in Lemma 5 and 11.

Proof. Similar to (18), since $\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K)) - \nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K'))$ is symmetric, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K)) - \nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K'))\| \\ &= \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} |\nabla^2 J(K)[Z, Z] - \nabla^2 J(K')[Z, Z]|. \end{aligned}$$

By (10), we define

$$g(\delta) := \nabla^2 J(K + \delta(K' - K))[Z, Z],$$

and denote $\bar{K} := K + \delta(K' - K)$, $\Delta K := K' - K$, and $P_K''[Z] := \frac{d^2}{d\eta^2} \Big|_{\eta=0} P_{K+\eta Z}$. Then, from (14), one has

$$g'(\delta) = \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} \left(x_0^\top \frac{\partial^3}{\partial \eta^2 \partial \delta} \Big|_{\eta=0} P_{K+\delta(K'-K)+\eta Z} x_0 \right).$$

By the fundamental theorem of calculus, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K)) - \nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K'))\| \\ &= \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} |g(0) - g(1)| \\ &= \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} \left| \int_0^1 g'(\delta) d\delta \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} |g'(\delta)| d\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Based on (14), we can observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial^3}{\partial \eta^2 \partial \delta} \Big|_{\eta=0} P_{K+\delta(K'-K)+\eta Z} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (A - B\bar{K}C)^\top \Delta K^j S_2 (A - B\bar{K}C)^j, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 := & 2C^\top Z^\top B^\top \frac{\partial P_{\bar{K}}}{\partial \delta} B Z C + 2C^\top Z^\top B^\top P_{\bar{K}}' [Z] B \Delta K C \\ & + 2C^\top \Delta K^\top B^\top P_{\bar{K}}' [Z] B Z C \\ & - 2(B Z C)^\top \frac{\partial P_{\bar{K}}' [Z]}{\partial \delta} (A - B\bar{K}C) \\ & - 2(A - B\bar{K}C)^\top \frac{\partial P_{\bar{K}}' [Z]}{\partial \delta} (B Z C) \\ & - (B \Delta K C)^\top P_{\bar{K}}'' [Z] (A - B\bar{K}C) \\ & - (A - B\bar{K}C)^\top P_{\bar{K}}'' [Z] (B \Delta K C). \end{aligned}$$

Then, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} g'(\delta) = & \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\partial^3}{\partial \eta^2 \partial \delta} \Big|_{\eta=0} P_{K+\delta(K'-K)+\eta Z} X_0 \right) \\ = & 2\text{Tr}(C^\top Z^\top B^\top \frac{\partial P_{\bar{K}}}{\partial \delta} B Z C \Sigma_{\bar{K}}) \\ & + 4\text{Tr}(C^\top Z^\top B^\top P_{\bar{K}}' [Z] B \Delta K C \Sigma_{\bar{K}}) \\ & - 4\text{Tr}((B Z C)^\top \frac{\partial P_{\bar{K}}' [Z]}{\partial \delta} (A - B\bar{K}C) \Sigma_{\bar{K}}) \\ & - 2\text{Tr}((B \Delta K C)^\top P_{\bar{K}}'' [Z] (A - B\bar{K}C) \Sigma_{\bar{K}}). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Utilizing the results of Lemma 11, we can further show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} |g'(\delta)| \\ &\leq 2\zeta_2 \|B\|^2 \|Z\|^2 \|C\|^2 \|P_{\bar{K}}\| \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{\bar{K}}) \|\Delta K\| \\ &\quad + 4\zeta_1 \|B\|^2 \|Z\| \|C\|^2 \|P_{\bar{K}}\| \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{\bar{K}}) \|\Delta K\| \\ &\quad + 4\zeta_3 \|B\| \|Z\| \|C\| \|A - B\bar{K}C\| \|P_{\bar{K}}\| \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{\bar{K}}) \|\Delta K\| \\ &\quad + 2\zeta_4 \|B\| \|C\| \|A - B\bar{K}C\| \|P_{\bar{K}}\| \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{\bar{K}}) \|\Delta K\| \\ &\leq 2\|B\| \|C\| ((2\zeta_1 + \zeta_2) \|B\| \|C\| + 2\zeta_3 + \zeta_4) \frac{\alpha^2 \|\Delta K\|}{\mu \sigma_{\min}(Q)}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

By plugging (29) into (27), we finally complete the proof. \square

The Lipschitz continuity of the Hessian can be used to obtain a stronger result of convergence to a local minimum for nonconvex optimization under mild assumptions [27]. Besides, this property has also been widely used in [29]–[31] to achieve efficient strict saddle point escape.

IV. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

In this section, we prove several novel convergence results of the gradient descent method for SOF LQR. Since $J(K)$ is nonconvex, the properties of the cost function obtained in Section III-B will play a key role in the convergence analysis.

A. Convergence to Stationary Points

We consider the following gradient descent update rule

$$K_{i+1} = K_i - \eta \nabla J(K_i), \quad (30)$$

where $K_0 \in \mathbb{K}$. By Lemma 5, if we can ensure that the line segment between K_i and $K_i - \eta \nabla J(K_i)$ is in \mathbb{K}_α , the convergence of policy descent (30) for SOF can be proved by invoking a similar analysis to the case of global L -smoothness. Before presenting the main theorem, we introduce the following definition for convenience.

Definition 1. For a differentiable function $J(\cdot)$, we say K is a first-order stationary point if $\|\nabla J(K)\|_F = 0$; we also say K is an ϵ -first-order stationary point if $\|\nabla J(K)\|_F \leq \epsilon$.

Theorem 1. Suppose $J(K_0) = \alpha$, $\mu > 0$, and L is as defined in Lemma 5. If we run gradient descent (30) with any step size $\eta \leq 1/L$, $J(K_i)$ is monotone decreasing, and the algorithm will output an ϵ -first-order stationary point within the following number of iterations

$$\frac{2\alpha}{\eta\epsilon^2}.$$

Besides, the line segment between K_i and K_{i+1} is in \mathbb{K}_α for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, denoted as $[K_i, K_{i+1}] \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$. Furthermore, if $C \in \mathbb{C}$, for $\epsilon_J > 0$, the iterate K_N satisfies $J(K_N) - J_s^* \leq \epsilon_J$ given

$$N \geq \frac{\|\Sigma_{K^*}\|}{2\eta\mu^2\sigma_{\min}(C)^2\sigma_{\min}(R)} \log\left(\frac{J(K_0) - J_s^*}{\epsilon_J}\right). \quad (31)$$

Proof. Firstly, we define $\mathbb{K}_\alpha^o := \{K \in \mathbb{K} : J(K) < \alpha\}$, and denote its complement as $(\mathbb{K}_\alpha^o)^c$, which is closed. From Lemma 5, given $\phi \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\varsigma > 0$ such that $\|\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K))\| \leq (1 + \phi)L$ for $K \in \mathbb{K}_{\alpha+\varsigma}$. It is clear that $\mathbb{K}_\alpha \cap (\mathbb{K}_{\alpha+\varsigma}^o)^c = \emptyset$.

Since \mathbb{K}_α is compact by Lemma 4, the distance between \mathbb{K}_α and $(\mathbb{K}_{\alpha+\varsigma}^o)^c$, defined as $\omega := \inf\{\|x - y\|, \forall x \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha, y \in (\mathbb{K}_{\alpha+\varsigma}^o)^c\}$, must be strictly positive. Let $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^+ \leq \min\{\omega/\|\nabla J(K)\|, 2/((1 + \phi)L)\}$. It follows from $\tau \leq \omega/\|\nabla J(K)\|$ that the line segment between K and $K - \tau \nabla J(K)$ is in $\mathbb{K}_{\alpha+\varsigma}$. Since $\|\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K))\| \leq (1 + \phi)L$, by (17), we can show that

$$J(K - \tau \nabla J(K)) \leq J(K) - \tau(1 - \frac{(1 + \phi)L}{2}\tau)\|\nabla J(K)\|_F^2.$$

Since $\tau \leq 2/((1 + \phi)L)$, we have $J(K - \tau \nabla J(K)) \leq J(K)$. Thereby, $K - \tau \nabla J(K) \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$. It is then obvious that the line segment $[K, K - \tau \nabla J(K)] \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$. Then, it follows that segment $[K, K - 2\tau \nabla J(K)] \in \mathbb{K}_{\alpha+\varsigma}$. We can apply the same argument based on (17) of Lemma 5 to show that $[K, K - 2\tau \nabla J(K)] \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$ if $2\tau \leq 2/((1 + \phi)L)$.

By induction, we can show that the line segment $[K, K - T\tau \nabla J(K)] \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$ if $T\tau \leq 2/((1 + \phi)L)$. Let $\eta \leq 1/L$, and we can choose $\tau > 0$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $\eta = T\tau \leq 2/((1 + \phi)L)$. Therefore, $[K, K - \eta \nabla J(K)] \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$. Applying (17) again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J(K - \eta \nabla J(K)) &\leq J(K) - \eta(1 - \frac{L}{2}\eta)\|\nabla J(K)\|_F^2 \\ &\leq J(K) - \frac{\eta}{2}\|\nabla J(K)\|_F^2, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where the last step utilizes the fact that $\eta \leq 1/L$. Note that the boundary $1/L$ is chosen because it leads to the fastest convergence rate.

Since $J(K_0) = \alpha$, according to (32), K_1 generated by (30) is in \mathbb{K}_α . By induction, we can show that

$$J(K_{i+1}) \leq J(K_i) - \frac{\eta}{2}\|\nabla J(K_i)\|_F^2 \quad (33)$$

holds for any i , which also means that $[K_i, K_{i+1}] \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$ for any i . Let us sum (33) for $i = 0, \dots, N$. We can obtain

$$\frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{i=0}^N \|\nabla J(K_i)\|_F^2 \leq J(K_0) - J(K_{N+1}) \leq J(K_0) - J(K^*).$$

Thereby, it is clear that

$$\min_{0 \leq i \leq N} \|\nabla J(K_i)\|_F^2 \leq \frac{2(J(K_0) - J(K^*))}{\eta N} \leq \frac{2\alpha}{\eta N}.$$

Therefore, the policy descent method will output an ϵ -first-order stationary point within the following number of iterations:

$$N \leq \frac{2\alpha}{\eta\epsilon^2}.$$

If $C \in \mathbb{C}$, by (33) and (25), we further have

$$J(K_{i+1}) - J(K_i) \leq -\frac{2\eta\mu^2\sigma_{\min}(C)^2\sigma_{\min}(R)}{\|\Sigma_{K^*}\|} (J(K_i) - J_s^*),$$

which directly leads to

$$J(K_i) - J_s^* \leq \left(1 - \frac{2\eta\mu^2\sigma_{\min}(C)^2\sigma_{\min}(R)}{\|\Sigma_{K^*}\|}\right)^i (J(K_0) - J_s^*),$$

Therefore, when $C \in \mathbb{C}$, for

$$N \geq \frac{\|\Sigma_{K^*}\|}{2\eta\mu^2\sigma_{\min}(C)^2\sigma_{\min}(R)} \log\left(\frac{J(K_0) - J_s^*}{\epsilon_J}\right),$$

the gradient descent (30) enjoys that $J(K_N) - J_s^* \leq \epsilon_J$. \square

From Theorem 1, given an initial stabilizing controller, one can ensure that the gradient descent method will stay in the feasible set and lead to monotone policy improvement. In particular, if $C \in \mathbb{C}$, it globally converges to the unique minimum point at a linear rate; if $\text{rank}(C) < n$, it converges to a stationary point. Our analysis assumes the model parameters (A, B, C, Q, R) to have analytical characterizations

of the convergence rate, which provides a baseline to the model-free settings. In the latter case, existing policy learning techniques, such as the zeroth-order optimization approach, provide effective ways to obtain an unbiased estimation of $\nabla J(K)$ from data [32], [33]. The work in [9] showed that with enough samples and roll-out length, the zeroth-order optimization approach could estimate the gradient within a desired accuracy. The same can be said of discrete-time SOF as well.

B. Convergence to Local Minima

Theorem 2. Let ω denote the distance between \mathbb{K}_β and $(\mathbb{K}_\alpha^o)^c$. Suppose $\beta < \alpha$, i.e., $\mathbb{K}_\beta \subset \mathbb{K}_\alpha$. Set L and M as described in Lemma 5 and 8, respectively. Assume the initial point K_0 be close enough to a local minimum $K^\dagger \in \mathbb{K}_\beta$ with positive definite Hessian, i.e., $l = \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K^\dagger))) > 0$. Define $\bar{r} := 2l/M$. If $r_0 = \|K_0 - K^\dagger\|_F < \bar{r}$ and $\bar{r}r_0/(\bar{r} - r_0) \leq \omega$, then the gradient descent with a fixed step-size $\eta \leq 1/L$ converges with the following rate:

$$\|K_i - K^\dagger\|_F \leq \frac{\bar{r}r_0}{\bar{r} - r_0} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \eta l} \right)^i.$$

Proof. Given a certain local minimum K^\dagger , define set $\mathbb{K}^\dagger = \{K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} : \|K - K^\dagger\|_F \leq \bar{r}r_0/(\bar{r} - r_0)\}$. Since both \mathbb{K}_β and $(\mathbb{K}_\alpha^o)^c$ are compact, suppose $\bar{r}r_0/(\bar{r} - r_0) \leq \omega$, it is clear that $\mathbb{K}^\dagger \subset \mathbb{K}_\alpha$. For any $K, K' \in \mathbb{K}^\dagger$, we can show that $K + \delta(K' - K) \in \mathbb{K}^\dagger \subset \mathbb{K}_\alpha$, $\forall \delta \in [0, 1]$. Then, from Lemma 5 and 8, it is straightforward that for any $K, K' \in \mathbb{K}^\dagger$, it holds:

$$\|\nabla J(K') - \nabla J(K)\| \leq L\|K' - K\|,$$

and

$$\|\nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K')) - \nabla^2 J(\text{vec}(K))\| \leq M\|K' - K\|.$$

The end of the proof can be completed by directly applying [27, Theorem 1.2.4] because we are able to use L -smoothness and M -Hessian Lipschitz along the entire descent domain. \square

Theorem 2 implies that gradient descent will converge to the local minimum at a linear rate if the starting point is sufficiently close to one. Note that the above is linear convergence in terms of the sequence and not the function value.

C. Influence of the Initial Distribution

Proposition 1. Denote the stationary points of SOF as K^\dagger . If $1 \leq \text{rank}(C) < n$, K^\dagger depends on the initial state distribution \mathcal{D} , unless $K^\dagger C = K_s^*$, where K_s^* is the optimal control gain of the state feedback LQR (i.e., $C = I_n$).

Proof. By (9) in Lemma 1 and (25) in Lemma 7, we have

$$\|E_{K^*}\|_F = 0, \text{ for } C \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (34)$$

From (3), one has

$$u_t = -Ky_t = -KCx_t,$$

which means KC can be deemed as a state-feedback gain.

By the gradient dominance property, we know the stationary point K_s^* of state feedback LQR (when $C = I_n$) is unique, it is straightforward that

$$\|E_K\|_F = 0 \text{ iff } KC = K_s^*.$$

Note that if $\text{rank}(C) < n$, such an output feedback K that makes $KC = K_s^*$ hold may not exist.

The classical control theory [34, Lemma 2] shows that (8) has a unique positive definite solution Σ_K if $K \in \mathbb{K}$ and $X_0 \succ 0$. Given two different initial distributions $\mathcal{D}' \neq \mathcal{D}$, it follows from (8) that

$$\Sigma'_{K^\dagger} \neq \Sigma_{K^\dagger} \text{ if } X_0 = \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} x_0 x_0^\top \neq X'_0 = \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}'} x_0 x_0^\top.$$

From (9), given a stationary point K^\dagger , we can observe that

$$\|\nabla J(K^\dagger)\|_F = 2\|E_{K^\dagger} \Sigma_{K^\dagger} C^\top\|_F = 0.$$

However, if $\|E_{K^\dagger}\|_F \neq 0$ (i.e., $K^\dagger C \neq K_s^*$), we cannot ensure that $\|\nabla J(K^\dagger)\|_F = \|E_{K^\dagger} \Sigma'_{K^\dagger} C^\top\|_F = 0$ for all possible distribution \mathcal{D}' due to the impact of \mathcal{D}' on Σ'_{K^\dagger} . This indicates that the stationary point of SOF when $C \notin \mathbb{C}$ depends on the initial state distribution \mathcal{D} , that is, different initial distribution will lead to a different stationary point, unless $K^\dagger C = K_s^*$. \square

Proposition 1 suggests that in practice, the initial state distribution should be chosen to be close to the actual application scenario to minimize the expected cost.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have analyzed the optimization landscape of the gradient descent method for the static output feedback (SOF) linear quadratic control. First, we established several important properties of the SOF cost function, such as coercivity, L -smoothness, and M -Lipschitz continuous Hessian. Based on these results, we showed that the gradient descent method converges to the global optimal controller at a linear rate in the fully observed case. Novel results on convergence (and rate of convergence) to stationary points were obtained in the partially observed case. The dependence of the stationary points on the initial state distribution is characterized explicitly. We further demonstrated that under mild assumptions, gradient descent converges linearly to a local minimum if the starting point is close to one for partially observed SOF. Our results provided a baseline for evaluating the sample complexities of other model-free gradient descent methods in reinforcement learning, where only estimated gradients are utilized.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to acknowledge Yang Zheng and Shengbo Eben Li for their valuable suggestions.

APPENDIX

A. Intermediate Lemmas

Lemma 9. The upper bound of $\|P_K\|$ and $\|\Sigma_K\|$ are given by

$$\|P_K\| \leq \frac{J(K)}{\mu}, \quad \|\Sigma_K\| \leq \text{Tr}(\Sigma_K) \leq \frac{J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)}.$$

Proof. From (7), one has

$$J(K) = \text{Tr}(P_K X_0) \geq \mu \|P_K\|.$$

Then, the first claim can be directly obtained. Similarly, $J(K)$ can also be lower bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} J(K) &= \text{Tr}((Q + C^\top K^\top R K C) \Sigma_K) \\ &\geq \sigma_{\min}(Q) \text{Tr}(\Sigma_K) \\ &\geq \sigma_{\min}(Q) \|\Sigma_K\|, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to the second claim. \square

Lemma 10. For any $K \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$, it holds that

$$\|KC\| \leq q_3 := \frac{\sqrt{\|R\| + \|B\|^2 \alpha^2 / \mu}}{\sqrt{\mu} \sigma_{\min}(R)} + \frac{\|B\| \|A\| \alpha}{\mu \sigma_{\min}(R)}.$$

Proof. First, we can observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|KC\| &= \|(R + B^\top P_K B)^{-1} (R + B^\top P_K B) KC\| \\ &\leq \|(R + B^\top P_K B)^{-1}\| \|(R + B^\top P_K B) KC\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(R)} \|(R + B^\top P_K B) KC - B^\top P_K A + B^\top P_K A\| \\ &\leq \frac{\|E_K\| + \|B^\top P_K A\|}{\sigma_{\min}(R)} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\text{Tr}(E_K^\top E_K)} + \|B^\top P_K A\|}{\sigma_{\min}(R)}. \end{aligned}$$

From (26), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(E_K^\top E_K) &\leq \frac{\|R + B^\top P_K B\|}{\mu} (J(K) - J_S^*) \\ &\leq \frac{\|R + B^\top P_K B\|}{\mu} J(K). \end{aligned}$$

Thereby, we finally have

$$\begin{aligned} \|KC\| &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\|R + B^\top P_K B\| J(K)}}{\sqrt{\mu} \sigma_{\min}(R)} + \frac{\|B^\top P_K A\|}{\sigma_{\min}(R)} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\|R\| J(K) + \|B\|^2 \|J(K)\|^2 / \mu}}{\sqrt{\mu} \sigma_{\min}(R)} + \frac{\|B\| \|A\| J(K)}{\mu \sigma_{\min}(R)} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\|R\| \alpha + \|B\|^2 \alpha^2 / \mu}}{\sqrt{\mu} \sigma_{\min}(R)} + \frac{\|B\| \|A\| \alpha}{\mu \sigma_{\min}(R)}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 11. Define $\gamma := \max_{K \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha} \|A - BKC\|$. Let

$$g(\delta) := \nabla^2 J(K + \delta(K' - K))[Z, Z].$$

Denote $\bar{K} := K + \delta(K' - K)$, $\Delta K := K' - K$, and $P_K''[Z] := \frac{d^2}{d\eta^2} \Big|_{\eta=0} P_{K+\eta Z}$. Suppose $K, \bar{K} \in \mathbb{K}_\alpha$, it holds that: $\frac{\partial P_K}{\partial \delta} \preceq$

$\zeta_2 \|\Delta K\| P_{\bar{K}}$, $\frac{\partial P_K'[Z]}{\partial \delta} \preceq \zeta_3 \|\Delta K\| P_{\bar{K}}$, and $P_K''[Z] \preceq \zeta_4 P_{\bar{K}}$. The expression of ζ_2 , ζ_3 , and ζ_4 are expressed as

$$\zeta_2 = \frac{2}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} \left(\|C\| \|R\| q_3 + \gamma \|C\| \|B\| \frac{\alpha}{\mu} \right),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_3 &= \frac{2}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} (\|C\|^2 \|R\| + \|C\| \|B\| (\|C\| \|B\| \\ &\quad + \zeta_1 \gamma + \zeta_2 \gamma) \frac{\alpha}{\mu}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\zeta_4 = \frac{2}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} \left(\|C\|^2 \|R\| + \|C\| \|B\| (\|C\| \|B\| + \zeta_1 \gamma) \frac{\alpha}{\mu} \right).$$

Proof. First, from (12), it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial P_{\bar{K}}}{\partial \delta} &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (A - B\bar{K}C)^\top (C^\top \Delta K^\top E_{\bar{K}} \\ &\quad + E_{\bar{K}}^\top \Delta K C) (A - B\bar{K}C)^j. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Then, we can observe that

$$\begin{aligned} C^\top \Delta K^\top E_{\bar{K}} + E_{\bar{K}}^\top \Delta K C &= C^\top \Delta K^\top R \bar{K} C + C^\top \bar{K}^\top R \Delta K C \\ &\quad - C^\top \Delta K^\top B^\top P_{\bar{K}} (A - B\bar{K}C) \\ &\quad - (A - B\bar{K}C)^\top P_{\bar{K}} B \Delta K C \\ &\leq (2\|C\| \|R\| \|\bar{K}C\| \|\Delta K\| \\ &\quad + 2\|C\| \|B\| \|P_{\bar{K}}\| \|A - B\bar{K}C\| \|\Delta K\|) I \\ &\leq 2(\|C\| \|R\| q_3 + \gamma \|C\| \|B\| \frac{\alpha}{\mu}) \|\Delta K\| \frac{Q}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where the last step follows from Lemma 10. Therefore, according to (15), we have $\frac{\partial P_{\bar{K}}}{\partial \delta} \preceq \zeta_2 \|\Delta K\| P_{\bar{K}}$.

Next, we will prove that $\frac{\partial P_K'[Z]}{\partial \delta} \preceq \zeta_3 \|\Delta K\| P_{\bar{K}}$. Based on (13), we get

$$\frac{\partial P_K'[Z]}{\partial \delta} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (A - B\bar{K}C)^\top S_3 (A - B\bar{K}C)^j, \quad (37)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_3 &:= C^\top Z^\top (R + B^\top P_{\bar{K}} B) \Delta K C - (BZC)^\top \frac{\partial P_{\bar{K}}}{\partial \delta} (A - B\bar{K}C) \\ &\quad + C^\top \Delta K^\top (R + B^\top P_{\bar{K}} B) ZC - (A - B\bar{K}C)^\top \frac{\partial P_{\bar{K}}}{\partial \delta} BZC \\ &\quad - (B\Delta K C)^\top P_{\bar{K}}'[Z] (A - B\bar{K}C) \\ &\quad - (A - B\bar{K}C)^\top P_{\bar{K}}'[Z] B\Delta K C. \end{aligned}$$

We can also show that

$$\begin{aligned}
S_3 &\leq 2(\|C\|^2\|Z\|\|R + B^T P_{\bar{K}} B\|\|\Delta K\| \\
&\quad + \|B\|\|Z\|\|C\|\|A - B\bar{K}C\|\|\frac{\partial P_{\bar{K}}}{\partial \delta}\| \\
&\quad + \|B\|\|C\|\|A - B\bar{K}C\|\|P'_{\bar{K}}[Z]\|\|\Delta K\|)I \\
&\leq 2(\|C\|^2\|R\| + \|C\|^2\|B\|^2\|P_{\bar{K}}\| + \zeta_2\gamma\|B\|\|C\|\|P_{\bar{K}}\| \\
&\quad + \zeta_1\gamma\|B\|\|C\|\|P_{\bar{K}}\|)\|\Delta K\|I \\
&\leq 2(\|C\|^2\|R\| + \|C\|\|B\|(\|C\|\|B\| \\
&\quad + \zeta_1\gamma + \zeta_2\gamma)\frac{\alpha}{\mu})\|\Delta K\|\frac{Q}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get $\frac{\partial P'_{\bar{K}}[Z]}{\partial \delta} \preceq \zeta_3\|\Delta K\|P_{\bar{K}}$.

Similarly, for $P''_{\bar{K}}[Z]$, from (14), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 &\leq 2(\|C\|^2\|Z\|^2\|R + B^T P_K B\| \\
&\quad + \|B\|\|Z\|\|C\|\|A - BKC\|\|P'_K[Z]\|)I \\
&\leq 2(\|C\|^2\|R\| + \|C\|^2\|B\|^2\|P_K\| + \zeta_1\gamma\|B\|\|C\|\|P_K\|)I \\
&\leq 2(\|C\|^2\|R\| + \|C\|\|B\|(\|C\|\|B\| + \zeta_1\gamma)\frac{\alpha}{\mu})\frac{Q}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)}.
\end{aligned}$$

So, it is clear $P''_{\bar{K}}[Z] \preceq \zeta_4 P_{\bar{K}}$, which completes the proof. \square

B. Proof of Lemma 6

Proof. Let x'_t and u'_t be the state and action sequences generated by K' , and $c'_t = x'^{\top}_t Q x'_t + u'^{\top}_t R u'_t$. Then, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
J(K') - J(K) &= \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} c'_t - V_K(x_0) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (c'_t + V_K(x'_t) - V_K(x'_t)) - V_K(x_0) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (c'_t + V_K(x'_{t+1}) - V_K(x'_t)) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step utilizes the fact that $x_0 = x'_0$.

Let $A_K(x_t, K') = c_t + V_K(x_{t+1}) - V_K(x_t)|_{u_t = -K'Cx_t}$, which can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned}
A_K(x_t, K') &= x_t^{\top} (Q + C^{\top} K'^{\top} R K' C) x_t \\
&\quad + x_t^{\top} (A - B K' C)^{\top} P_K (A - B K' C) x_t - V_K(x_t) \\
&= x_t^{\top} (Q + (K' C - K C + K C)^{\top} R (K' C - K C + K C)) x_t \\
&\quad + x_t^{\top} (A - B(K' C - K C + K C))^{\top} P_K (A \\
&\quad - B(K' C - K C + K C)) x_t - V_K(x_t) \\
&= 2x_t^{\top} (K' C - K C)^{\top} ((R + B^{\top} P_K B) K C - B^{\top} P_K A) x_t \\
&\quad + x_t^{\top} (K' C - K C)^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B) (K' C - K C) x_t \\
&= 2x_t^{\top} (K' C - K C)^{\top} E_K x_t \\
&\quad + x_t^{\top} (K' C - K C)^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B) (K' C - K C) x_t.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
J(K') - J(K) &= \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} A_K(x'_t, K') \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_0 \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left(2\text{Tr}(x'_t x'^{\top}_t (K' C - K C)^{\top} E_K) + \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \text{Tr}(x'_t x'^{\top}_t (K' C - K C)^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B) (K' C - K C)) \right) \right] \\
&= 2\text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K'} (K' C - K C)^{\top} E_K) + \\
&\quad \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K'} (K' C - K C)^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B) (K' C - K C)).
\end{aligned}$$

\square

C. Proof of Lemma 7

Proof. Denote $\mathcal{L}_K = C \Sigma_K C^{\top}$. Let $X = (R + B^{\top} P_K B)^{-1} E_K \Sigma_{K'} C^{\top} \mathcal{L}_{K'}^{-1}$. From Lemma 6, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
J(K') - J(K) &= 2\text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K'} (K' C - K C)^{\top} E_K) \\
&\quad + \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K'} (K' C - K C)^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B) (K' C - K C)) \\
&= \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K'} C^{\top} (\Delta K + X)^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B) (\Delta K + X) C) \\
&\quad - \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K'} C^{\top} \mathcal{L}_{K'}^{-1} C \Sigma_{K'} E_K^{\top} (R + \\
&\quad \quad B^{\top} P_K B)^{-1} E_K \Sigma_{K'} C^{\top} \mathcal{L}_{K'}^{-1} C) \\
&\geq -\text{Tr}(\mathcal{L}_{K'}^{-1} C \Sigma_{K'} E_K^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B)^{-1} E_K \Sigma_{K'} C^{\top}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta K = K' - K$ and the equality holds when $K' = K - X$.

Then, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
J(K) - J(K^*) &\leq \text{Tr}(\mathcal{L}_{K^*}^{-1} C \Sigma_{K^*} E_K^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B)^{-1} E_K \Sigma_{K^*} C^{\top}) \\
&\leq \|\Sigma_{K^*} C^{\top} \mathcal{L}_{K^*}^{-1} C \Sigma_{K^*}\| \text{Tr}(E_K^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B)^{-1} E_K) \\
&\leq \|\Sigma_{K^*} C^{\top} \mathcal{L}_{K^*}^{-1} C\| \|\Sigma_{K^*}\| \text{Tr}(E_K^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B)^{-1} E_K) \\
&\leq \frac{\|\Sigma_{K^*}\| \text{Tr}(E_K^{\top} E_K)}{\sigma_{\min}(R)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

From (9), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla J(K)\|_F^2 &= 4\text{Tr}(C \Sigma_K E_K^{\top} E_K \Sigma_K C^{\top}) \\
&\geq 4\mu^2 \sigma_{\min}(C)^2 \text{Tr}(E_K^{\top} E_K), \quad \forall C \in \mathbb{C}.
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

By (38) and (39), it holds that

$$J(K) - J(K^*) \leq \frac{\|\Sigma_{K^*}\| \|\nabla J(K)\|_F^2}{4\mu^2 \sigma_{\min}(C)^2 \sigma_{\min}(R)}, \quad \forall C \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{40}$$

Suppose K' satisfies that $K' = K - X$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
J(K) - J(K^*) &\geq J(K) - J(K') \\
&= \text{Tr}(\mathcal{L}_{K'}^{-1} C \Sigma_{K'} E_K^{\top} (R + B^{\top} P_K B)^{-1} E_K \Sigma_{K'} C^{\top}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we further have

$$J(K) - J(K^*) \geq \frac{\mu \text{Tr}(E_K^{\top} E_K)}{\|R + B^{\top} P_K B\|}, \quad \forall C \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{41}$$

In addition, when $C \in \mathbb{C}$, since we can always identify the state x by $x = (C^\top C)^{-1}Cy$, it is clear that $J(K^*) = J_s^*$ for every $C \in \mathbb{C}$. By replacing $J(K^*)$ in (40) and (41) with J_s^* , we finally complete the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, A. A. Rusu, J. Veness, M. G. Bellemare, A. Graves, M. Riedmiller, A. K. Fidjeland, G. Ostrovski, *et al.*, “Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning,” *Nature*, vol. 518, no. 7540, p. 529, 2015.
- [2] D. Silver, A. Huang, C. J. Maddison, A. Guez, L. Sifre, G. Van Den Driessche, J. Schrittwieser, I. Antonoglou, V. Panneershelvam, M. Lanctot, *et al.*, “Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search,” *Nature*, vol. 529, no. 7587, p. 484, 2016.
- [3] T. P. Lillicrap, J. J. Hunt, A. Pritzel, N. Heess, T. Erez, Y. Tassa, D. Silver, and D. Wierstra, “Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning,” in *4th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2016)*, (San Juan, Puerto Rico), 2016.
- [4] J. Duan, Y. Guan, S. E. Li, Y. Ren, Q. Sun, and B. Cheng, “Distributional soft actor-critic: Off-policy reinforcement learning for addressing value estimation errors,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2021.
- [5] J. Duan, S. E. Li, Y. Guan, Q. Sun, and B. Cheng, “Hierarchical reinforcement learning for self-driving decision-making without reliance on labelled driving data,” *IET Intelligent Transport Systems*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 297–305, 2020.
- [6] J. Schulman, S. Levine, P. Abbeel, M. I. Jordan, and P. Moritz, “Trust region policy optimization,” in *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2015)*, (Lille, France), pp. 1889–1897, 2015.
- [7] J. Schulman, F. Wolski, P. Dhariwal, A. Radford, and O. Klimov, “Proximal policy optimization algorithms,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [8] T. Haarnoja, A. Zhou, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine, “Soft actor-critic: Off-policy maximum entropy deep reinforcement learning with a stochastic actor,” in *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2018)*, (Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm Sweden), pp. 1861–1870, PMLR, 2018.
- [9] M. Fazel, R. Ge, S. Kakade, and M. Mesbahi, “Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1467–1476, PMLR, 2018.
- [10] J. Bu, A. Mesbahi, M. Fazel, and M. Mesbahi, “LQR through the lens of first order methods: Discrete-time case,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.08921*, 2019.
- [11] J. Bhandari and D. Russo, “Global optimality guarantees for policy gradient methods,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01786*, 2019.
- [12] H. Mohammadi, A. Zare, M. Soltanolkotabi, and M. R. Jovanović, “Global exponential convergence of gradient methods over the non-convex landscape of the linear quadratic regulator,” in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 7474–7479, IEEE, 2019.
- [13] I. Fatkhullin and B. Polyak, “Optimizing static linear feedback: Gradient method,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 3887–3911, 2021.
- [14] B. Hambly, R. Xu, and H. Yang, “Policy gradient methods for the noisy linear quadratic regulator over a finite horizon,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 3359–3391, 2021.
- [15] Z. Ren, A. Zhong, and N. Li, “LQR with tracking: A zeroth-order approach and its global convergence,” in *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 2562–2568, IEEE, 2021.
- [16] J. P. Jansch-Porto, B. Hu, and G. Dullerud, “Policy optimization for markovian jump linear quadratic control: Gradient-based methods and global convergence,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.11852*, 2020.
- [17] L. Furieri, Y. Zheng, and M. Kamgarpour, “Learning the globally optimal distributed LQ regulator,” in *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pp. 287–297, PMLR, 2020.
- [18] K. Zhang, B. Hu, and T. Basar, “Policy optimization for H_2 linear control with H_∞ robustness guarantee: Implicit regularization and global convergence,” in *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pp. 179–190, PMLR, 2020.
- [19] Y. Tang, Y. Zheng, and N. Li, “Analysis of the optimization landscape of linear quadratic gaussian (LQG) control,” in *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pp. 599–610, PMLR, 2021.
- [20] Y. Zheng, L. Furieri, M. Kamgarpour, and N. Li, “Sample complexity of linear quadratic gaussian (LQG) control for output feedback systems,” in *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pp. 559–570, PMLR, 2021.
- [21] V. L. Syrmos, C. T. Abdallah, P. Dorato, and K. Grigoriadis, “Static output feedback—a survey,” *Automatica*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 125–137, 1997.
- [22] H. Feng and J. Lavaei, “Connectivity properties of the set of stabilizing static decentralized controllers,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 2790–2820, 2020.
- [23] J. Bu, A. Mesbahi, and M. Mesbahi, “On topological and metrical properties of stabilizing feedback gains: the mimo case,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.02737*, 2019.
- [24] E. N. Gryazina, B. T. Polyak, and A. A. Tremba, “D-decomposition technique state-of-the-art,” *Automation and Remote Control*, vol. 69, no. 12, pp. 1991–2026, 2008.
- [25] H. H. Bauschke, P. L. Combettes, *et al.*, *Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces*, vol. 408. Springer, 2011.
- [26] B. T. Polyak, “Gradient methods for minimizing functionals,” *Zhurnal vychislitel’noi matematiki i matematicheskoi fiziki*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 643–653, 1963.
- [27] Y. Nesterov, “Introductory lectures on convex programming volume i: Basic course,” *Lecture notes*, vol. 3, no. 4, p. 5, 1998.
- [28] S. Łojasiewicz, “A topological property of real analytic subsets,” *Coll. du CNRS, Les équations aux dérivées partielles*, vol. 117, no. 87-89, p. 2, 1963.
- [29] C. Jin, R. Ge, P. Netrapalli, S. M. Kakade, and M. I. Jordan, “How to escape saddle points efficiently,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1724–1732, PMLR, 2017.
- [30] R. Ge, F. Huang, C. Jin, and Y. Yuan, “Escaping from saddle points—online stochastic gradient for tensor decomposition,” in *Conference on learning theory*, pp. 797–842, PMLR, 2015.
- [31] Y. Carmon, J. C. Duchi, O. Hinder, and A. Sidford, “Accelerated methods for nonconvex optimization,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 1751–1772, 2018.
- [32] A. R. Conn, K. Scheinberg, and L. N. Vicente, *Introduction to derivative-free optimization*. SIAM, 2009.
- [33] Y. Nesterov and V. Spokoiny, “Random gradient-free minimization of convex functions,” *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 527–566, 2017.
- [34] D. Lee and J. Hu, “Primal-dual Q-learning framework for LQR design,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 9, pp. 3756–3763, 2018.