

Block Policy Mirror Descent *

GUANGHUI LAN [†], YAN LI [‡], AND TUO ZHAO [§]

Abstract. In this paper, we present a new class of policy gradient (PG) methods, namely the block policy mirror descent (BPMD) methods for solving a class of regularized reinforcement learning (RL) problems with (strongly) convex regularizers. Compared to the traditional PG methods with a batch update rule, which visits and updates the policy for every state, BPMD methods have cheap per-iteration computation via a partial update rule that performs the policy update on a sampled state. Despite the nonconvex nature of the problem and a partial update rule, BPMD methods achieve fast linear convergence to the global optimality. We further extend BPMD methods to the stochastic setting, by utilizing stochastic first-order information constructed from samples. We establish $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$) sample complexity for the strongly convex (resp. non-strongly convex) regularizers, where ϵ denotes the target accuracy, with different procedures for constructing the stochastic first-order information. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that block coordinate descent methods have been developed and analyzed for policy optimization in reinforcement learning, which provides a new perspective on solving large-scale RL problems.

Key words. Markov decision process, reinforcement learning, policy gradient, mirror descent, block coordinate descent, iteration and sample complexity.

AMS subject classifications. 90C40, 90C15, 90C26, 68Q25.

1. Introduction. We consider a discrete time Markov decision process (MDP) denoted by the quintuple $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}, C, \gamma)$, where \mathcal{S} is the finite state space, \mathcal{A} is the finite action space, $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Delta_{|\mathcal{S}|}$ is the transition kernel, C is the cost function, and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is the discount factor. Here $\Delta_{|\mathcal{X}|}$ denotes the standard simplex defined over finite set \mathcal{X} , i.e., $\Delta_{|\mathcal{X}|} = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}|} : p_i \geq 0, \forall i, \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} p_i = 1\}$. We also refer to \mathcal{P} as the environment parameters.

A randomized, stationary policy is a mapping $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta_{|\mathcal{A}|}$, and we denote the set of all such policies by Π . At any timestep t , the policy explicitly governs what action to be made given the current state s_t , by $a_t \sim \pi(\cdot|s_t)$. Then a cost $C(s_t, a_t)$ is incurred, followed by the transition to the next state $s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}(\cdot|s_t, a_t)$. The decision process is then repeated iteratively at future timesteps.

We consider the general scenario where costs are allowed to be policy dependent. Specifically, we assume the cost $C(s, a)$ decomposes as $C(s, a) = c(s, a) + h^\pi(s)$ for all state-action pair $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, with some function $c : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $h : \Pi \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The introduction of the regularization term $h^\pi(s)$ allows one to induce additional desirable properties to the optimal policy beyond mere cost-minimization (e.g., policy constraint [18], sufficient exploration [24, 29, 32]). We assume $h^\pi(s)$ is a closed convex function w.r.t. the policy $\pi(\cdot|s)$ for any $s \in \mathcal{S}$. That is, there exists some $\mu \geq 0$ such that, for any policy $\pi, \pi' \in \Pi$,

$$h^\pi(s) - h^{\pi'}(s) - \langle \partial h^{\pi'}(s), \pi(\cdot|s) - \pi'(\cdot|s) \rangle \geq \mu D_{\pi'}^\pi(s), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S},$$

where $\partial h^{\pi'}(s)$ denotes a subgradient w.r.t. $h^{\pi'}(s)$ of $\pi(\cdot|s)$, and $D_{\pi'}^\pi(s)$ denotes the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between $\pi(\cdot|s)$ and $\pi'(\cdot|s)$. Clearly, the generalized class of MDPs covers the standard MDP as a special case with $h \equiv 0$. We say that h is a strongly convex regularizer if $\mu > 0$.

For a given policy π , we measure its performance by its value function $V^\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by

$$(1.1) \quad V^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t (c(s_t, a_t) + h^\pi(s_t)) \mid s_0 = s, a_t \sim \pi(\cdot|s_t), s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}(\cdot|s_t, a_t) \right].$$

We also define its state-action value function (Q-function) $Q^\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, as

$$(1.2) \quad Q^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t (c(s_t, a_t) + h^\pi(s_t)) \mid s_0 = s, a_0 = a, a_t \sim \pi(\cdot|s_t), s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}(\cdot|s_t, a_t) \right].$$

One can readily verify, from the definition of V^π and Q^π , that

$$(1.3) \quad V^\pi(s) = \langle Q^\pi(s, \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s) \rangle, \quad Q^\pi(s, a) = c(s, a) + h^\pi(s) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{P}(s'|s, a) V^\pi(s').$$

The planning objective of the MDP \mathcal{M} is to find an optimal policy π^* satisfying the following property,

$$(1.4) \quad V^{\pi^*}(s) \leq V^\pi(s), \quad \forall \pi(\cdot|s) \in \Delta_{|\mathcal{A}|}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.$$

It should be noted that the existence of an optimal policy π^* simultaneously minimizing the value for every state is

*This research was partially supported by NSF grant CCF 1909298.

[†]H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, 30332. (E-mail: george.lan@isye.gatech.edu).

[‡]H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, 30332. (E-mail: yli939@gatech.edu).

[§]H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, 30332. (E-mail: tourzhao@gatech.edu).

well known in literature [30]. Hence we can succinctly reformulate (1.4) into a single-objective optimization problem

$$(1.5) \quad \min_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\rho} [V^{\pi}(s)], \quad \text{s.t. } \pi(\cdot|s) \in \Delta_{|A|}, \forall s \in \mathcal{S},$$

where ρ can be arbitrary distribution defined over \mathcal{S} . As pointed out by recent literature [22], setting ρ as the stationary state distribution induced by the optimal policy π^* , denoted by ν^* , can simplify the analyses of various algorithms. In such a case, (1.5) becomes

$$(1.6) \quad \min_{\pi} \{f(\pi) := \mathbb{E}_{\nu^*} [V^{\pi}(s)]\}, \quad \text{s.t. } \pi(\cdot|s) \in \Delta_{|A|}, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.$$

It is worth mentioning that even though the objective $f(\pi)$ explicitly depends on the unknown distribution ν^* , the algorithms we develop for solving (1.6) do not require the information of ν^* .

Related Literature. Solving (1.4) or (1.6) has been long studied in the literature of dynamic programming (DP) and reinforcement learning (RL). When the environment parameters are known in advance, DP based methods including the celebrated value iteration (VI) [4] and (modified) policy iteration (PI) [12] converge to the optimal value function or policy at linear rates [30]. In comparison, RL methods focus on the scenario when the information of the environment parameters is only available through the form of interactions, and the improvement of policy is made upon information learned from collected samples [34].

There has been a surge of interests in designing efficient first order algorithms for directly searching the optimal policy π^* in the RL literature [1, 9, 21, 32, 33], despite the objective (1.6) being non-convex w.r.t. the policy π [1]. In a nutshell, all these methods share a common similarity that gradient information of objective (1.6) is used for policy improvement, and hence termed policy gradient (PG) methods. In the simplest form, basic policy gradient method directly updates the policy by performing a projected gradient descent step with the simplex constraint defined in (1.6), and converges sublinearly with exact gradient information [1]. Natural policy gradient method [14] performs gradient update with pre-conditioning, using the Fisher information matrix of the policy, and also demonstrates sublinear convergence with a constant stepsize [1]. Results with strong linear convergence of PG methods have been discussed in [7, 9, 15]. The analyses therein heavily exploit the contraction properties of the Bellman optimality condition, making their extensions to the stochastic setting unclear without additional assumptions [9]. Connections between PG methods and the classical mirror descent method [2, 25, 26] have also been established and exploited to establish convergence of the former methods (e.g., TRPO [32, 33], REPS [28, 29]). Until recently, [18] proposes the policy mirror descent method and its stochastic variants for general convex regularizers, and establishes linear convergence, in terms of the number of policy updates, in both deterministic and stochastic settings, as well as optimal sampling complexity bounds w.r.t. target accuracy in the stochastic setting.

It is worth mentioning that all the aforementioned DP and PG methods update the policy in a batch fashion, i.e., at each iteration, the update of policy needs to be made for every state in the state space. Accordingly, the PG methods also need to evaluate the first-order information of the policy for every state. We will refer to PG methods with such a batch update rule as batch PG methods. A direct challenge rising as a consequence of the batch update rule is that, for problems with large state space, sweeping every state at each iteration quickly becomes a bottleneck for efficient computation.

To address such a challenge of scale, DP methods typically resort to sequential or parallel (and asynchronous) update order [5]. It is well known that Gauss-Seidel VI [30] still converges linearly to the optimal value function. By generalizing the relationship between the value iteration and policy iteration discussed in [30], one can further establish linear convergence of Gauss-Seidel PI. In addition, while asynchronous VI converges linearly under bounded communication delay [5], the convergence of asynchronous PI is significantly more fragile. To the best of our knowledge, only asymptotic convergence has been established in [6].

In terms of RL methods, handling the large state space has been mostly discussed by considering function approximation, which involves parameterizing policy and value functions within a pre-specified function class [1, 8, 22, 36]. The introduction of function approximation mainly aims to reduce the dependence of computations associated with each policy evaluation and policy improvement step on the potentially huge state space. Specifically, at each iteration, gradient of the policy parameters is calculated and used to update the policy, instead of updating the policy explicitly for each state. On the other hand, the convergence of policy gradient methods involving function approximation becomes much more subtle than their tabular counterparts, due to the approximation bias of the first-order information (i.e., state-action value function) [18] and the inexact policy improvement step. Existing convergence analyses for PG methods with function approximation often require restricted technical conditions (e.g., completeness of the value function class [22, 36]) depending on the function class adopted. In general settings, the global convergence of PG methods with function approximation still remains unclear [1]. Our developed methods provides a new perspective

on solving large-scale RL problems in addition to prior developments: one can perform policy updates on a subset of states at each policy improvement step, and thus significantly reducing the per-iteration computation.

Main Contributions. We outline our main contributions in this paper. First, we propose the block policy mirror descent method (BPMD), whose per-iteration computation involves only updating the policy of a single state, uniformly sampled from the state space. We show that despite only having single state updated at each iteration, BPMD achieves linear convergence for strongly convex regularizers. For non-strongly convex regularizers, we propose a variant of BPMD, named approximate block policy mirror descent (ABPMD), which adds an adaptive strongly convex perturbation to each update of BPMD, and achieve linear convergence similar to strongly convex regularizers. BPMD methods also share intimate connections with the block coordinate descent (BCD) methods in optimization literature [3, 10, 19, 20, 23, 27, 31, 35, 37, 38], which updates only a small subset of variables at each iteration with partial (sub)gradient information, and finds a wide spectrum of applications due to its scalability for solving high-dimensional problems [11, 39]. Yet in contrast to the sublinear convergence w.r.t. a randomly output iterate of BCD methods for general nonconvex objectives [10], BPMD methods achieve strong linear convergence of the last iterate. The analyses of BPMD methods crucially rely on a careful aggregation of the policy update characterizations, for both the updated state and the other states, while relating the aggregation to the generalized monotonicity observed in [18]. Such a technical treatment also appears to be new in the literature for BCD methods.

Second, we propose the stochastic block policy mirror descent (SBPMD) and the stochastic approximate block policy mirror descent (SABPMD) method, which can utilize stochastic estimates of the first-order information (i.e., the state-action value function) constructed from trajectories. The SBPMD methods take separate treatments on the bias and the variance of the stochastic first-order information, and exploit the fact that bias typically can be more efficiently controlled than the variance. We establish the convergence of the proposed methods under various bias-variance conditions. En route, we highlight a new bias-variance condition that is also applicable to batch PG method SPMD [18], leading to cheaper per-iteration sampling computation while maintaining the same sample complexity compared to its original development, a strict improvement over alternative methods (e.g. [9]).

Third, we establish the overall sample complexity of the proposed methods, with different schemes to obtain the stochastic estimate of the state-action value functions. Specifically, when assuming an access to a generative model of the MDP environment, the total number of samples required can be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ and $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ for the strongly convex regularizer, and the non-strongly convex regularizer, respectively. In addition, we exploit the recently developed conditional temporal difference learning (CTD) method [16] that is capable of estimating the state-action value function in an online fashion, for which we establish a similar sample complexity.

To the best of our knowledge, the proposed BPMD methods are the first policy gradient type method that allows the algorithm to perform policy updates on a subset of states at each iteration, and thus can be computationally favorable over batch PG methods in the presence of large state space. Our analysis focuses on the scenario where a single state is updated, and admits a straightforward extension to multi-state update rule (see Remark 2.1), which can further exploit the benefits of parallel computation.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we propose and analyze the deterministic block policy mirror descent methods. In Section 3, we consider stochastic settings and develop stochastic block policy mirror descent methods, and discuss their iteration complexity. We analyze the sample complexity for these methods in Section 4. Finally, we present numerical studies in Section 5, and demonstrate the practicality of the proposed methods compared to the batch PG methods.

Notation and Terminology. Without loss of generality, we denote the state space as $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{|\mathcal{S}|}\}$. We also denote $[m] = \{1 \dots m\}$ for any positive integer m . For any policy π and any $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, we define the discounted state visitation measure $d_{s_0}^\pi(s) = (1 - \gamma) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}^\pi(s_t = s | s_0)$, where $\mathbb{P}^\pi(s_t = s | s_0)$ denotes the probability of reaching state s at time t following policy π , when starting at state s_0 . We also denote the steady state distribution of policy π by ν^π , which satisfies $\nu^\pi(s) = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^\pi(s') \mathbb{P}^\pi(s | s')$ where $\mathbb{P}^\pi(s | s') = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a | s') \mathbb{P}(s | s', a)$. One can readily observe

$$(1.7) \quad \nu^\pi(s) = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^\pi(s') d_{s'}^\pi(s).$$

We use $D_{\pi'}^\pi(s) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a | s) \log \frac{\pi(a | s)}{\pi'(a | s)}$ to denote the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence between two probability distributions $\pi(\cdot | s), \pi'(\cdot | s) \in \Delta_{|\mathcal{A}|}$. Note that the KL-divergence is also well known as a prototypical example of Bregman divergence, with a distance-generating function given by $w(\pi(\cdot | s)) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a | s) \log(\pi(a | s))$. Equivalently,

$$(1.8) \quad D_{\pi'}^\pi(s) = w(\pi(\cdot | s)) - w(\pi'(\cdot | s)) - \langle \nabla w(\pi'(\cdot | s)), \pi(\cdot | s) - \pi'(\cdot | s) \rangle,$$

where $\nabla w(\pi'(\cdot | s))$ denotes the gradient of $w(\pi'(\cdot | s))$ w.r.t. $\pi(\cdot | s)$. We further denote $\phi(\pi, \pi^*) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^*(s) D_{\pi'}^{\pi^*}(s)$.

2. Deterministic Block Policy Mirror Descent. In this section, we present the basic deterministic block policy mirror descent (BPMD) method and establish its convergence properties for both strongly convex and non-strongly convex regularizers. For non-strongly convex regularizers, we further propose a variant, named approximate block policy mirror descent method, that improves the iteration complexity of BPMD significantly.

2.1. Basic BPMD Method. We present details of the basic BPMD method in Algorithm 1. The key difference between BPMD and batch PG methods (e.g., [1, 9, 18]) is that at each iteration k , BPMD samples a state s_{i_k} uniformly from \mathcal{S} , and then only updates the policy at the sampled state s_{i_k} .

Algorithm 1 The block policy mirror descent (BPMD) method

Input: Initial policy π_0 , and stepsizes $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$.

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

 Sample $i_k \sim \text{Unif}(|\mathcal{S}|)$.

 Update policy:

$$(2.1) \quad \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) = \begin{cases} \operatorname{argmin}_{p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \in \Delta_{|\mathcal{A}|}} \eta_k \left[\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \rangle + h^p(s_{i_k}) \right] + D_{\pi_k}^p(s_{i_k}), & s = s_{i_k}, \\ \pi_k(\cdot|s), & s \neq s_{i_k}. \end{cases}$$

end for

We next establish some generic properties of each update in BPMD. To proceed, we start with the following performance difference lemma adopted from [18], which generalizes the results in [13]. Lemma 2.1 establishes the connection between the value functions of two policies.

LEMMA 2.1 (Lemma 2, [18]). *For any pair of policies π, π' ,*

$$(2.2) \quad V^{\pi'}(s) - V^\pi(s) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_s^{\pi'}} \left[\langle Q^\pi(s', \cdot), \pi'(\cdot|s') - \pi(\cdot|s') \rangle + h^{\pi'}(s') - h^\pi(s') \right].$$

Proof. The claim follows from Lemma 2 in [18], and identity $\langle A^\pi(s, \cdot), \pi'(\cdot|s) - \pi(\cdot|s) \rangle = \langle Q^\pi(s, \cdot), \pi'(\cdot|s) - \pi(\cdot|s) \rangle$ due to (1.3) and definition $A^\pi(s, a) = Q^\pi(s, a) - V^\pi(s, a)$. \square

The next lemma provides a characterization on the policy update of BPMD.

LEMMA 2.2. *For any $p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \in \Delta_{|\mathcal{A}|}$, the policy pair (π_k, π_{k+1}) in BPMD satisfies*

$$(2.3) \quad \eta_k \left[\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^p(s_{i_k}) \right] + D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \leq D_{\pi_k}^p(s_{i_k}) - (1 + \eta_k \mu) D_{\pi_{k+1}}^p(s_{i_k}).$$

Proof. From the optimality condition of the update (2.1), we have

$$\left\langle \eta_k \left[Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) + \partial h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \right] + \partial D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle \leq 0,$$

where $\partial D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k})$ denotes the subgradient of $D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k})$ w.r.t. $\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k})$. It remains to note that

$$\left\langle \partial h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle \geq h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^p(s_{i_k}) + \mu D_{\pi_{k+1}}^p(s_{i_k}),$$

and the fact that $\left\langle \partial D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle = -D_{\pi_k}^p(s_{i_k}) + D_{\pi_{k+1}}^p(s_{i_k}) + D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k})$. \square

Combining Lemma 2.1 and 2.2, we can characterize the progress of value function on the updated state s_{i_k} . In particular, we show that the value for all the other state $s \neq s_{i_k}$ that does not get updated in the current iteration never deteriorates from its current value. We remark that such an observation also draws an intimate connection with the classical policy improvement theorem [30].

LEMMA 2.3. *At each iteration k , with $\eta_k > 0$, the progress of value at each state satisfies*

$$(2.4) \quad V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) \leq V^{\pi_k}(s), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S},$$

$$(2.5) \quad V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - V^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) \leq \left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) < 0.$$

Proof. From Lemma 2.1, we have

$$V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) - V^{\pi_k}(s) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_s^{\pi_{k+1}}} \left[\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s', \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s') - \pi_k(\cdot|s') \rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s') - h^{\pi_k}(s') \right].$$

Note that $\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) = \pi_k(\cdot|s)$ for any $s \neq s_{i_k}$. In addition, by taking $p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) = \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k})$ in (2.3), we obtain

$$(2.6) \quad \left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) \leq -(1 + \eta_k \mu) D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) < 0.$$

Hence $V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) - V^{\pi_k}(s) \leq 0$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - V^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} d_{s_{i_k}}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) \right] \\ &\leq \left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) < 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (2.6), and the fact that $d_{s_{i_k}}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \geq 1 - \gamma$. \square

Combining Lemma 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3, we can establish the generic convergence property of BPMD, presented in the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.4. *At each iteration k of BPMD, the policy pair (π_k, π_{k+1}) satisfies*

$$(2.7) \quad \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \left[f(\pi_{k+1}) - f(\pi^*) + \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \mu \right) \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) \right] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right) (f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)) + \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \mu \right) \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*).$$

Proof. By taking $p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) = \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k})$ in (2.3), we have

$$\eta_k \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right] + D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \leq D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) - (1 + \eta_k \mu) D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}).$$

Combining the above relation with (2.5), we obtain

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} &\eta_k \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right] + \eta_k \left[V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - V^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) \right] + D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \\ &\leq D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) - (1 + \eta_k \mu) D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we make the following observation,

$$(2.9) \quad D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s_i) - (1 + \eta_k \mu) D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s_i) = -\eta_k \mu D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s_i), \quad \forall i \neq i_k.$$

Combining (2.4), (2.8), and (2.9), we have

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} &\eta_k \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^*(s) [V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) - V^{\pi_k}(s)] + \eta_k \nu^*(s_{i_k}) \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right] \\ &+ \nu^*(s_{i_k}) D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \leq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^*(s) \left[D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s) - (1 + \eta_k \mu) D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s) \right] + \sum_{s \neq s_{i_k}} \eta_k \mu \nu^*(s) D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s). \end{aligned}$$

Further taking expectation w.r.t. $i_k \sim \text{Unif}(|\mathcal{S}|)$, we observe that

$$(2.11) \quad \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \sum_{s \neq s_{i_k}} \nu^*(s) D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s) = \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^*(s) D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s) = \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*),$$

$$(2.12) \quad \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \nu^*(s_{i_k}) \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right] = \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} [f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)],$$

where (2.11) follows from the definition of ϕ , and (2.12) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*) &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^*(s) [V^{\pi_k}(s) - V^*(s)] \\ \text{(From (2.2))} \quad &= - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\nu^*(s)}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_s^{\pi^*}} \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(\cdot|s'), \pi^*(\cdot|s') - \pi_k(\cdot|s') \right\rangle + h^{\pi^*}(s') - h^{\pi_k}(s') \right] \\ \text{(From (1.7))} \quad &= \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\nu^*(s')}{1-\gamma} \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(\cdot|s'), \pi_k(\cdot|s') - \pi^*(\cdot|s') \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s') - h^{\pi^*}(s') \right] \\ &= \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \nu^*(s_{i_k}) \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation w.r.t. $i_k \sim \text{Unif}(|\mathcal{S}|)$ in (2.10), and using (2.11), (2.12), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{i_k} [f(\pi_{k+1}) - f(\pi_k)] + \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} [f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \frac{1}{\eta_k} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) - \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \mu \right) \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) + \frac{(|\mathcal{S}|-1)\mu}{|\mathcal{S}|} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*).$$

Simple rearrangement yields the desired result (2.7). \square

We next specialize the generic convergence in Lemma 2.4, and show that for strongly convex regularizers (i.e., $\mu > 0$), BPMD converges linearly with a constant stepsize rule.

THEOREM 2.1. *Suppose h satisfies $\mu > 0$. Let $\eta_t = \eta$ for all $t \geq 0$, where $\eta > 0$ satisfies $1 + \eta\mu \geq \frac{1}{\gamma}$, then after k iterations, BPMD produces policy π_k satisfying*

$$(2.13) \quad \mathbb{E} [(f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)) + \mu \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*)] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right)^k \left[f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu}{1-\gamma} \log |A| \right], \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

Proof. Given the choice of stepsizes $\eta_t = \eta$ satisfying $1 + \eta\mu \geq \frac{1}{\gamma}$, we conclude from (2.7) that

$$\mathbb{E}_{i_t} \left[(f(\pi_{t+1}) - f(\pi^*)) + \frac{1+\eta\mu}{\eta} \phi(\pi_{t+1}, \pi^*) \right] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right) \left[f(\pi_t) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{1+\eta\mu}{\eta} \phi(\pi_t, \pi^*) \right],$$

Applying the above inequality recursively from $t = 0$ to $k - 1$ gives

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)) + \frac{1+\eta\mu}{\eta}\phi(\pi_k, \pi^*)\right] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right)^k \left[f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{1+\eta\mu}{\eta}\phi(\pi_0, \pi^*)\right].$$

Since $\mu \leq \frac{1+\eta\mu}{\eta} \leq \frac{\mu}{1-\gamma}$, and $\phi(\pi_0, \pi^*) \leq \log|\mathcal{A}|$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[(f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)) + \mu\phi(\pi_k, \pi^*)] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right)^k \left[f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu}{1-\gamma}\log|\mathcal{A}|\right]. \quad \square$$

We compare the number of policy updates needed by BPMD to the best complexity of batch PG methods, achieved by PMD [18]. To obtain an ϵ -optimal policy, PMD needs $\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\epsilon))$ iterations, and requires updating every state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ at each iteration, implying $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|\log(1/\epsilon))$ total policy updates. In comparison, Theorem 2.1 states that to reach an ϵ -optimal policy, BPMD needs $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|\log(1/\epsilon))$ iterations, while only requiring one policy update per iteration. Thus the number of policy updates needed by BPMD is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|\log(1/\epsilon))$, matching that of PMD.

For non-strongly convex regularizers, we show that BPMD converges sublinearly for any positive constant step-size.

THEOREM 2.2. *Suppose h satisfies $\mu = 0$. Let $\eta_t = \eta$ for any $\eta > 0$ and all $k \geq 0$, then after k iterations, BPMD produces policy π_k satisfying*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \frac{|\mathcal{S}|\left[\eta(f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*)) + \log|\mathcal{A}|\right]}{\eta(1-\gamma)^k}.$$

Proof. By taking $\mu = 0$ in (2.7), simple rearrangements give

$$(2.14) \quad \eta_t \mathbb{E}_{i_t}[f(\pi_{t+1}) - f(\pi_t)] + \frac{\eta_t(1-\gamma)}{|\mathcal{S}|}[f(\pi_t) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \phi(\pi_t, \pi^*) - \mathbb{E}_{i_t}\phi(\pi_{t+1}, \pi^*).$$

Given the choice of stepsizes $\eta_t = \eta > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, we sum up (2.14) from $t = 0$ to $k - 1$. Taking total expectation, and using the fact that $\phi(\pi, \pi^*) \geq 0$ for all π , we obtain

$$\eta \mathbb{E}[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi_0)] + \frac{\eta(1-\gamma)}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[f(\pi_t) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \phi(\pi_0, \pi^*).$$

It remains to show that $f(\pi_{t+1}) \leq f(\pi_t)$ for all $t \geq 0$, which follows immediately from (2.4), (2.5), and the definition of f in (1.6). Combined with the fact that $\phi(\pi_0, \pi^*) \leq \log|\mathcal{A}|$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \frac{|\mathcal{S}|\left[\eta(f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*)) + \log|\mathcal{A}|\right]}{\eta(1-\gamma)^k}. \quad \square$$

Theorem 2.2 shows that $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|/\epsilon)$ iterations suffices to find an ϵ -optimal policy using BPMD, implying $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|/\epsilon)$ total policy updates. In comparison, PMD [18] needs $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ iterations. With $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|)$ policy updates per iteration, PMD requires $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|/\epsilon)$ total policy updates. Hence the total number of policy updates of BPMD matches that of PMD for non-strongly convex regularizer.

Remark 2.1 (Extensions to multi-state update). We make an important discussion on a multi-state BPMD variant, that extends the BPMD method to allow updating multiple states at each iteration. Specifically, the multi-state BPMD variant samples a block of states \mathcal{B} at each iteration, which contains $|\mathcal{B}|$ distinct states sampled uniformly from \mathcal{S} without replacement. The multi-state BPMD then performs policy update for every state within the block \mathcal{B} . One can verify that when replacing the role of i_k by \mathcal{B} and following similar analysis as in Lemma 2.4, one can obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{i_k}\left[f(\pi_{k+1}) - f(\pi^*) + \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \mu\right)\phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*)\right] \leq \left(1 - \frac{|\mathcal{B}|(1-\gamma)}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right)(f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)) + \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-|\mathcal{B}|}{|\mathcal{S}|}\mu\right)\phi(\pi_k, \pi^*).$$

As an immediate consequence, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)) + \mu\phi(\pi_k, \pi^*)] \leq \left(1 - \frac{|\mathcal{B}|(1-\gamma)}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right)^k \left[(f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*)) + \frac{\mu}{1-\gamma}\log|\mathcal{A}|\right], \quad \forall k \geq 0,$$

for strongly convex regularizers and

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \frac{|\mathcal{S}|\left[\eta(f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*)) + \log|\mathcal{A}|\right]}{|\mathcal{B}|\eta(1-\gamma)^k}$$

for non-strongly convex regularizers. Clearly, when $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{S}$, then this multi-state BPMD variant reduces to the PMD method in [18], and the above convergence rate also matches that of PMD method. Note that the choice of block size $|\mathcal{B}|$ does not affect the worst-case total policy update complexity. In general scenarios, the flexibility of choosing block size $|\mathcal{B}|$ also allows us to strike a balance between the convergence speed and the per-iteration complexity in a problem-dependent fashion (e.g., choosing $|\mathcal{B}| \approx |\mathcal{S}|$ for moderate $|\mathcal{S}|$, and $|\mathcal{B}| \ll |\mathcal{S}|$ for large $|\mathcal{S}|$).

Algorithm 2 The approximate block policy mirror descent (ABPMD) method

Input: Initial policy π_0 , perturbation parameters $\{\tau_k\}_{k \geq 0}$, and stepsizes $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$.

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

Sample $i_k \sim \text{Unif}(|\mathcal{S}|)$.

Update policy:

$$\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) = \begin{cases} \operatorname{argmin}_{p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \in \Delta_{|\mathcal{A}|}} \eta_k \left[\left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^p(s_{i_k}) + \tau_k D_{\pi_0}^p(s_{i_k}) \right] + D_{\tau_k}^p(s_{i_k}), & s = s_{i_k}, \\ \pi_k(\cdot|s), & s \neq s_{i_k}. \end{cases}$$

end for

It is also worth mentioning that the multi-state BPMD variant shares some algorithmic similarities with the block coordinate descent (BCD) method in optimization literature [3, 10, 19, 20, 23, 27, 31, 35, 37, 38], with an interesting and key difference being that the multi-state BPMD variant does not require partitioning the state space into disjoint blocks, as is required by the BCD methods. Finally, we remark that such a multi-state extension can also be extended to all ensuing BPMD methods to be developed, which can speed up their convergence in a similar fashion.

In the following subsection, we propose a variant of BPMD that can improve over BPMD, by achieving linear convergence for non-strongly convex regularizers.

2.2. Approximate Block Policy Mirror Descent. We propose the approximate block policy mirror descent (ABPMD) method, which adds a proper strongly convex perturbation to its update at each iteration. In contrast to BPMD, the proposed ABPMD achieves linear convergence even for non-strongly convex regularizers (i.e., $\mu = 0$).

For any $\tau \geq 0$, and any initial policy π_0 with $\pi_0(a|s) > 0, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}$, we define the perturbed value function V_τ^π , and the perturbed state-action value function Q_τ^π as

$$(2.15) \quad Q_\tau^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \left(r(s_t, a_t) + h^\pi(s_t) + \tau D_{\pi_0}^\pi(s_t) \right) | s_0 = s, a_0 = a \right], \quad V_\tau^\pi(s) = \langle Q_\tau^\pi(s, \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s) \rangle.$$

We also define the perturbed objective accordingly as

$$(2.16) \quad f_\tau(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu^*} [V_\tau^\pi(s)].$$

The algorithmic details of ABPMD are presented in Algorithm 2.

The following result generalizes Lemma 2.1 to the perturbed value functions, whose proof follows similar lines as in Lemma 2.1.

LEMMA 2.5. *For any pair of policies π, π' , and $\tau > 0$,*

$$(2.17) \quad V_\tau^{\pi'}(s) - V_\tau^\pi(s) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_s^{\pi'}} \left[\left\langle Q_\tau^\pi(s', \cdot), \pi'(\cdot|s') - \pi(\cdot|s') \right\rangle + h^{\pi'}(s') - h^\pi(s') + \tau \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\pi'}(s') - D_{\pi_0}^\pi(s') \right) \right].$$

In addition, we have the following analogy of Lemma 2.2, which characterizes the policy update of ABPMD.

LEMMA 2.6. *For any $p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \in \Delta_{|\mathcal{A}|}$, the policy pair (π_k, π_{k+1}) in ABPMD satisfies*

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} & \eta_k \left[\left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^p(s_{i_k}) + \tau_k \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - D_{\pi_0}^p(s_{i_k}) \right) \right] + D_{\tau_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \\ & \leq D_{\tau_k}^p(s_{i_k}) - (1 + \eta_k \tau_k) D_{\tau_{k+1}}^p(s_{i_k}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining Lemma 2.5 and 2.6, we can show the state-wise progress of ABPMD in the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.7. *At each iteration of ABPMD, the progress of value at each state satisfies*

$$(2.19) \quad V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) \leq V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S},$$

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) & \leq \left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) \\ & \quad + \tau_k \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - D_{\pi_0}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

All lemmas above can be proved by following similar lines as their counterparts in Section 2.1. Combining above lemmas, we can now establish the following generic convergence properties of ABPMD.

PROPOSITION 2.1. *For any iteration $k \geq 0$, the policy pair (π_k, π_{k+1}) satisfies*

$$(2.21) \quad \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_{k+1}) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) + \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \tau_k \right) \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) \right] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right) \left(f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) \right) + \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \tau_k \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right) \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*).$$

Proof. By taking $p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) = \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k})$ in (2.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta_k \left[\left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) + \tau_k \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right) \right] + D_{\tau_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \\ & \leq D_{\tau_k}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) - (1 + \eta_k \tau_k) D_{\tau_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_{k+1}}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above relation with (2.20), we obtain

$$(2.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & \eta_k \left[\left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) + \tau_k \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right) \right] + D_{\tau_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \\ & + \eta_k \left[V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) \right] \leq D_{\tau_k}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) - (1 + \eta_k \tau_k) D_{\tau_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we also make the following observation,

$$(2.23) \quad D_{\tau_k}^{\pi^*}(s_i) - (1 + \eta_k \tau_k) D_{\tau_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s_i) = -\eta_k \tau_k D_{\tau_k}^{\pi^*}(s_i), \quad \forall i \neq i_k.$$

Then combining (2.19), (2.22) and (2.23), we have

$$(2.24) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \eta_k v^*(s) \left[V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) - V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s) \right] + v^*(s_{i_k}) D_{\tau_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \\ & + \eta_k v^*(s_{i_k}) \left[\left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) + \tau_k \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right) \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v^*(s) \left[D_{\tau_k}^{\pi^*}(s) - (1 + \eta_k \tau_k) D_{\tau_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s) \right] + \sum_{s \neq s_{i_k}} \eta_k \tau_k D_{\tau_k}^{\pi^*}(s). \end{aligned}$$

Further taking expectation w.r.t. $i_k \sim \text{Unif}(|\mathcal{S}|)$, we observe that

$$(2.25) \quad \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \sum_{s \neq s_{i_k}} v^*(s) D_{\tau_k}^{\pi^*}(s) = \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v^*(s) D_{\tau_k}^{\pi^*}(s) = \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*),$$

$$(2.26) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{i_k} v^*(s_{i_k}) \left[\left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) + \tau_k \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right) \right] \\ & = \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where (2.25) follows from the definition of ϕ , and (2.26) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} & f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v^*(s) \left[V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s) - V_{\tau_k}^{\pi^*}(s) \right] \\ \text{(From (2.17))} \quad & = - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{v^*(s)}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_s^{\pi^*}} \left[\left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(\cdot|s'), \pi^*(\cdot|s') - \pi_k(\cdot|s') \right\rangle + h^{\pi^*}(s') - h^{\pi_k}(s') + \tau_k \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\pi_k}(s') - D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}(s') \right) \right] \\ \text{(From (1.7))} \quad & = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{v^*(s')}{1-\gamma} \left[\left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(\cdot|s'), \pi_k(\cdot|s') - \pi^*(\cdot|s') \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s') - h^{\pi^*}(s') + \tau_k \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\pi_k}(s') - D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}(s') \right) \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \frac{v^*(s_{i_k})}{1-\gamma} \left[\left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) + \tau_k \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then by taking expectation w.r.t $i_k \sim \text{Unif}(|\mathcal{S}|)$ in (2.24), and making use of (2.25), (2.26), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{i_k} \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_{k+1}) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) \right] + \frac{(1-\gamma)}{|\mathcal{S}|} \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) \right] \leq \frac{1}{\eta_k} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) - \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \tau_k \right) \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) + \tau_k \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*).$$

Simple rearrangement gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{i_k} \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_{k+1}) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) + \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \tau_k \right) \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) \right] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right) \left(f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) \right) + \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \tau_k \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right) \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*). \quad \square$$

We are now ready to establish the linear convergence of ABPMD for properly chosen perturbation sequence $\{\tau_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and stepsizes $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$.

THEOREM 2.3. *Suppose that h satisfies $\mu = 0$. Let $\tau_t = \tau_0 \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right)^t$ and $1 + \eta_t \tau_t = \frac{1}{\gamma}$ for all $t \geq 0$, then after k iterations, ABPMD produces policy π_k satisfying*

$$(2.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_k}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) \right] & \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right)^k \left(f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_0}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_0, \pi^*) \right) \\ & + \frac{\tau_0 k}{|\mathcal{S}|} \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right)^k \log |\mathcal{A}| + \tau_0 \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right)^k \frac{\log |\mathcal{A}|}{1-\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By definition, we have $1 + \eta_t \tau_t = \frac{1}{\gamma}$, and $\tau_{t+1} \leq \tau_t$. Combined with (2.21), one can readily verify

$$(2.28) \quad \mathbb{E}_{i_t} \left[f_{\tau_t}(\pi_{t+1}) - f_{\tau_t}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_{t+1}}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_{t+1}, \pi^*) \right] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right) \left(f_{\tau_t}(\pi_t) - f_{\tau_t}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_t}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_t, \pi^*) \right).$$

In addition, we observe that $f_{\tau_{t+1}}(\pi) \leq f_{\tau_t}(\pi)$, and

$$(2.29) \quad |f_{\tau_{t+1}}(\pi) - f_{\tau_t}(\pi)| \leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |V_{\tau_{t+1}}^\pi(s) - V_{\tau_t}^\pi(s)| = \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} d_s^\pi(s') D_{\pi_0}^\pi(s') (\tau_{t+1} - \tau_t) \right| \leq \frac{\tau_t - \tau_{t+1}}{1-\gamma} \log |\mathcal{A}|.$$

Plugging (2.29) into (2.28), we obtain

$$(2.30) \quad \mathbb{E}_{i_t} \left[f_{\tau_{t+1}}(\pi_{t+1}) - f_{\tau_{t+1}}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_{t+1}}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_{t+1}, \pi^*) \right] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right) \left(f_{\tau_t}(\pi_t) - f_{\tau_t}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_t}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_t, \pi^*) \right) + \frac{\tau_t - \tau_{t+1}}{1-\gamma} \log |\mathcal{A}|.$$

Applying previous inequality recursively yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_k}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) \right] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right)^k \left(f_{\tau_0}(\pi_0) - f_{\tau_0}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_0}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_0, \pi^*) \right) + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \frac{\tau_t - \tau_{t+1}}{1-\gamma} \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right)^{k-t} \log |\mathcal{A}|.$$

Combining the above inequality with (2.29), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_k}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) \right] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right)^k \left(f_{\tau_0}(\pi_0) - f_{\tau_0}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_0}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_0, \pi^*) \right) + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \frac{\tau_t - \tau_{t+1}}{1-\gamma} \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right)^{k-t} \log |\mathcal{A}| + \frac{\tau_k}{1-\gamma} \log |\mathcal{A}|.$$

By plugging in the definition of $\tau_t = \tau_0 \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right)^t$, and noting that $f_{\tau_0}(\pi_0) = f(\pi_0)$, $f_{\tau_0}(\pi^*) \geq f(\pi^*)$, the result (2.27) follows immediately. \square

Given Theorem 2.3, when the total number of iteration k is given a priori, by choosing the initial perturbation strength $\tau_0 = 1/k$, the convergence rate of of ABPMD is given by $\mathcal{O}\left((1 - (1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|)^k\right)$. Below we present another choice of $\{(\eta_t, \tau_t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in ABPMD that can also achieve linear convergence without fixing the total number of iterations. To proceed, we adopt the following lemma from [18], which we will also make use of when analyzing stochastic versions of BPMD and ABPMD in Section 3.

LEMMA 2.8 (Lemma 11, [18]). *Suppose nonnegative sequences $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 0}$, $\{y_k\}_{k \geq 0}$, $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ satisfy*

$$(2.31) \quad x_{k+1} \leq \alpha x_k + (y_k - y_{k+1}) + z_k.$$

where $y_k = y \cdot 2^{-\lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor + 1}$, $z_k = z \cdot 2^{-\lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor + 2}$ for some $y, z \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Denote $l = \lceil \log_\alpha \frac{1}{4} \rceil$, then

$$x_k \leq 2^{-\lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor} \left(x_0 + y + \frac{5z}{4(1-\alpha)} \right).$$

Combining Lemma 2.8 and Proposition 2.1, we can establish the following convergence result for non-strongly convex regularizers, without fixing the total number of iterations.

THEOREM 2.4. *Suppose $\mu = 0$ hold for h^π . Let $\tau_t = 2^{-\lfloor \frac{t}{l} \rfloor + 1}$ with $l = \lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(1/4) \rceil$, and η_t satisfies $1 + \eta_t \tau_t = \frac{1}{\gamma}$ for all $t \geq 0$, then after k iterations, ABPMD produces policy π_k satisfying*

$$(2.32) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_k}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) \right] \leq 2^{-\lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor} \left[f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{2 \log |\mathcal{A}|}{1-\gamma} \right].$$

Proof. Note that (2.30) holds for any sequences of $\{\tau_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ and $\{\eta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ such that $\tau_{t+1} \leq \tau_t$ and $1 + \eta_t \tau_t = 1/\gamma$.

Taking $\tau_t = 2^{-\lfloor \frac{t}{l} \rfloor + 1}$ in (2.30), then applying Lemma 2.8 with

$$x_k = f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_k}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*), \quad y_t = \frac{\tau_t \log |\mathcal{A}|}{1-\gamma}, \quad z_t = 0, \quad \alpha = 1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|},$$

and $l = \lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(1/4) \rceil$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_k}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) \right] \leq 2^{-\lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor} \left[f_{\tau_0}(\pi_0) - f_{\tau_0}(\pi^*) + \frac{\log |\mathcal{A}|}{1-\gamma} \right],$$

which combined with (2.29), and the fact that $f_{\tau_0}(\pi_0) = f(\pi_0)$ and $f_{\tau_0}(\pi^*) \geq f(\pi^*)$, implies the desired result (2.32). \square

To reach an ϵ -optimal policy, the total number of iterations required by ABPMD is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \log(1/\epsilon))$, which translates to $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \log(1/\epsilon))$ total policy updates with only one policy update at each iteration.

Compared with BPMD in Section 2.1, the complexity improves significantly for the non-strongly convex regularizer. In addition, the batch PG method APMD in [18] also requires $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|\log(1/\epsilon))$ total policy updates, with $\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\epsilon))$ iterations and $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|)$ policy updates per iteration. Hence the ABPMD method achieves the same policy update complexity as APMD [18], the best complexity for batch PG methods to date.

Despite having the same worst-case computational complexity for both strongly convex regularizer and non-strongly convex regularizer, we highlight the practicality of BPMD (ABPMD), especially for problems with huge state space \mathcal{S} . From Theorem 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3, BPMD (ABPMD) improves the objective by only updating the policy for the selected state. This sharply contrasts with PMD (APMD), which has to iterate over the entire state space before making improvements to the objective. In practice, this qualitative behavior of BPMD and ABPMD allows the policy to make gradual progress towards the optimal one after every cheap compute, without having to wait prohibitively long to complete a sweep over the state space as required by batch PG methods. As will be demonstrated in Section 3 and 5, this qualitative trait of deterministic BPMD methods carries over to their stochastic variants.

3. Stochastic Block Policy Mirror Descent. The BPMD and ABPMD methods presented in Section 2 require the exact value of Q-function at each iteration. For typical reinforcement learning problems, the environment parameters \mathcal{P} are unknown in advance of learning. Instead, one needs to use samples (also known as trajectories) collected through historical interactions with the environment to facilitate policy improvement. In this section, we propose and analyze stochastic counterparts of BPMD and ABPMD methods, which only require a stochastic estimation, instead of the exact value of Q-function at each iteration.

3.1. Basic Stochastic Block Policy Mirror Descent. We present the basic stochastic block policy mirror descent method in Algorithm 3, and establish its convergence properties. Throughout this subsection, we make the following assumption on the stochastic estimation.

ASSUMPTION 1. *At any iteration k , for the sampled state i_k , we have an access to a stochastic oracle, which produces a stochastic estimation $Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}$ that satisfies*

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k | i_k} \left[Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right] = \bar{Q}^{\pi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot),$$

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k, i_k} \left[\left\| Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_\infty^2 \right] \leq \sigma_k^2,$$

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \left[\left\| \bar{Q}^{\pi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_\infty^2 \right] \leq v_k^2,$$

where ξ_k is the random vector used to construct the stochastic estimator Q^{π_k, ξ_k, i_k} . Note that the construction of Q^{π_k, ξ_k, i_k} not only can depend on the random vector ξ_k , but can also depend on the sampled state s_{i_k} .

It is worth noting that the definitions of bias and variance in (3.2), (3.3) involve an averaging operation over states (represented by \mathbb{E}_{i_k} where $i_k \sim \text{Unif}(|\mathcal{S}|)$). As will be clear later, such a definition allows us to provide a unified analysis on the sample complexity of SBPMD methods, with two different schemes of constructing stochastic oracles.

Algorithm 3 The stochastic block policy mirror descent (SBPMD) method

Input: Initial policy π_0 , and stepsizes $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$.

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

 Sample $i_k \sim \text{Unif}(|\mathcal{S}|)$.

 Update policy:

$$\pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s) = \begin{cases} \operatorname{argmin}_{p(\cdot | s_{i_k}) \in \Delta_{|\mathcal{A}|}} \eta_k \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), p(\cdot | s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^P(s_{i_k}) \right] + D_{\pi_k}^P(s_{i_k}), & s = s_{i_k}, \\ \pi_k(\cdot | s), & s \neq s_{i_k}. \end{cases}$$

end for

We first present some generic convergence characterizations of SBPMD update at each iteration. The following lemma generalizes Lemma 2.2 for the deterministic BPMD method.

LEMMA 3.1. *We have for any $p(\cdot | s_{i_k}) \in \Delta_{|\mathcal{A}|}$,*

$$(3.4) \quad \eta_k \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s_{i_k}) - p(\cdot | s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^P(s_{i_k}) \right] + D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \leq D_{\pi_k}^P(s_{i_k}) - (1 + \eta_k \mu) D_{\pi_{k+1}}^P(s_{i_k}).$$

The proof of Lemma 3.1 follows the same arguments as in Lemma 2.2. Similar to the deterministic BPMD method in Section 2.1, we can also characterize the progress of each state in the following lemma. The key difference is that the value for the state $s \neq s_{i_k}$ that does not get policy update in the current iteration can indeed degrade after the

policy update, due to stochastic error in the estimation of Q-function. From this perspective, the following Lemma 3.2 generalizes the classical policy improvement theorem [30] to the stochastic setting.

LEMMA 3.2. *For each iteration k in SBPMD method, the progress of value at the sampled state s_{i_k} and other states satisfy*

$$(3.5) \quad V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) - V^{\pi_k}(s) \leq \frac{\eta_k}{2(1-\gamma)} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2, \quad \forall s \neq s_{i_k},$$

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - V^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) + \left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) \\ & \leq \frac{\eta_k}{2(1-\gamma)} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) - \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \mu \right) D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \\ & \quad + \left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For any state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$(Lemma 2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) - V^{\pi_k}(s) &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_s^{\pi_{k+1}}} \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s', \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s') - \pi_k(\cdot|s') \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(\cdot|s') - h^{\pi_k}(\cdot|s') \right] \\ &= \frac{d_s^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k})}{1-\gamma} \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right] \\ &= \frac{d_s^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k})}{1-\gamma} \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality comes from $\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) = \pi_k(\cdot|s)$ for any $s \neq s_{i_k}$. Note that $w(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{|A|} x_i \log(x_i)$ is 1-strongly convex w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_1$ norm, which combined with (1.8), gives $D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) \geq 1/2 \|\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) - \pi_k(\cdot|s)\|_1^2$. Hence

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) - V^{\pi_k}(s) &\leq \frac{d_s^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k})}{1-\gamma} \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2\eta_k} \left\| \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\|_1^2 + \frac{\eta_k}{2} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{d_s^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k})}{1-\gamma} \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) + \frac{\eta_k}{2} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, by taking $p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) = \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k})$ in (3.4), we have

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\langle Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) + \frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \\ & \leq -\frac{1+\eta_k\mu}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - \frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

For the sampled state s_{i_k} , we obtain from (3.7) that

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - V^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) &\leq \frac{d_{s_{i_k}}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k})}{1-\gamma} \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \right] + \frac{\eta_k d_{s_{i_k}}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k})}{2(1-\gamma)} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \\ &\leq \left\langle Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) + \frac{\eta_k}{2(1-\gamma)} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from the observation that $1-\gamma \leq d_{s_{i_k}}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \leq 1$ and (3.8). On the other hand, for any $s \neq s_{i_k}$, by combining (3.7) and (3.8), we have

$$V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) - V^{\pi_k}(s) \leq \frac{d_s^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k})}{1-\gamma} \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \left] + \frac{\eta_k d_s^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k})}{2(1-\gamma)} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \\
& \leq \frac{\eta_k}{2(1-\gamma)} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have shown the first claim (3.5). To show the progress of value at the sampled state, let us now take $p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) = \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k})$ in (3.4), then

$$\left\langle Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) + \frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) \leq \frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) - \frac{1+\eta_k\mu}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}).$$

Plugging the above relation into (3.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - V^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) + \left\langle Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \\
& \leq \frac{\eta_k}{2(1-\gamma)} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) - \frac{1+\eta_k\mu}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}).
\end{aligned}$$

The second claim (3.6) then follows after simple rearrangement. \square

Combining Lemma 3.1 and 3.2, we are now ready to establish the generic convergence properties of the SBPMD method in the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *With Assumption 1, the per-iteration progress of SBPMD method satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.10) \quad \mathbb{E}_k [f(\pi_{k+1}) - f(\pi^*) + \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \mu\right) \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*)] & \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right) [f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)] + \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \mu\right) \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) \\
& + \frac{\eta_k \sigma_k^2}{2(1-\gamma)} + \frac{2v_k}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Combining (3.5), (3.6) in Lemma 3.2, and observing that $D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s) - (1 + \eta_k \mu) D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s) = -\eta_k \mu D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s)$ for all $s \neq s_{i_k}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v^*(s) [V^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) - V^{\pi_k}(s)] + v^*(s_{i_k}) \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right] \\
& \leq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v^*(s) \left[\frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s) - \frac{1+\eta_k\mu}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s) \right] + \mu \sum_{s \neq s_{i_k}} v^*(s) D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s) + \frac{\eta_k}{2(1-\gamma)} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} v^*(s) \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \\
& + v^*(s_{i_k}) \left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Conditioned on i_k , we first take expectation w.r.t. ξ_k and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.11) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k | i_k} [f(\pi_{k+1}) - f(\pi_k)] + v^*(s_{i_k}) & \left[\left\langle Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right] \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\eta_k} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) - \frac{1+\eta_k\mu}{\eta_k} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) + \mu \sum_{s \neq s_{i_k}} v^*(s) D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s) + \frac{\eta_k}{2(1-\gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k | i_k} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \\
& + 2v^*(s_{i_k}) \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - \overline{Q}^{\pi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}.
\end{aligned}$$

We also make the following observations based on (3.2) and (3.3) in Assumption 1,

$$(3.12) \quad \sum_{i \in [|\mathcal{S}|]} \frac{v^*(s_i)}{|\mathcal{S}|} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_i, \cdot) - \overline{Q}^{\pi_k, i}(s_i, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty} \leq \left(\sum_{i \in [|\mathcal{S}|]} \frac{v^*(s_i)^2}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{i \in [|\mathcal{S}|]} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_i, \cdot) - \overline{Q}^{\pi_k, i}(s_i, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|}} v_k,$$

$$(3.13) \quad \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k | i_k} \left\| Q^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \leq \sigma_k^2.$$

We then further take expectation of (3.11) w.r.t. $i_k \sim \text{Unif}([|\mathcal{S}|])$ and denote $\mathbb{E}_k[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k | i_k}[\cdot]$. By combining (3.12), (3.13) and (2.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_k [f(\pi_{k+1}) - f(\pi_k)] + \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} [f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)] & \leq \frac{1}{\eta_k} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) - \frac{1+\eta_k\mu}{\eta_k} \mathbb{E}_k \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) \\
& + \mu \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) + \frac{2v_k}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|}} + \frac{\eta_k \sigma_k^2}{2(1-\gamma)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The desired result (3.10) follows immediately after simple rearrangement. \square

For the strongly convex regularizer, we specialize the generic convergence of SBPMD method in Proposition 3.1, with properly chosen constant stepsize. We first show that if both the variance σ_k^2 and the bias v_k converge linearly, then SBPMD converges linearly for the strongly-convex regularizer.

THEOREM 3.1. *Suppose h satisfies $\mu > 0$, and Assumption 1 holds with*

$$(3.14) \quad v_t = 2^{-\lfloor \frac{t}{l} \rfloor + 2}, \quad \sigma_t^2 = 2^{-\lfloor \frac{t}{l} \rfloor + 2},$$

where $l = \lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|S|} \frac{1}{4} \rceil$. Take constant stepsize $\eta_t = \eta > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, with $1 + \mu\eta = \frac{1}{\gamma}$. Then after k iterations, SBPMD method finds a policy π_k satisfying

$$\mathbb{E} \left[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) \right] \leq 2^{-\lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor} \left[f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu \log |A|}{1-\gamma} + \frac{5|S|}{4(1-\gamma)} \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma\mu} + 2 \right) \right].$$

Proof. Given (3.10) and (3.14), we apply Lemma 2.8 with

$$x_t = f(\pi_t) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_t, \pi^*), \quad y_t = 0, \quad z_t = \frac{\sigma_t^2}{2\gamma\mu} + 2v_t, \quad \alpha = 1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|S|},$$

and $l = \lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|S|} (1/4) \rceil$, from which we can obtain

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) \right] &\leq 2^{-\lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor} \left[f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_0, \pi^*) + \frac{5|S|}{4(1-\gamma)} \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma\mu} + 2 \right) \right] \\ &\leq 2^{-\lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor} \left[f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu \log |A|}{1-\gamma} + \frac{5|S|}{4(1-\gamma)} \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma\mu} + 2 \right) \right]. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

As will be demonstrated in Section 4.1, the strong decaying condition on the noise (3.14) often requires exponential growth on the number of samples needed at each iteration, and hence much longer execution time for later iterations. To address this, we next show that even with constant bias and variance, i.e., $\sigma_k^2 = \sigma^2, v_k = v, \forall k \geq 0$ for some (σ, v) , SBPMD still converges to the ϵ -optimal policy. Moreover, we will show in Section 4 that both noise conditions lead to the same $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ sample complexity. A practical advantage of the following noise condition is a much smaller number of samples required at each iteration, while naturally leads to faster computation of each iteration.

It is also worth mentioning that a similar bias-variance condition of the following Theorem 3.2 can also be applied to the batch PG method SPMD developed in [18], and allow one to use constant number of samples per iteration while maintaining an $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ sample complexity for strongly convex regularizers. To the best of knowledge, this leads to a strict improvement over the sample complexity $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ achieved by NPG for solving entropy-regularized MDP, with a similar sampling strategy [9].

THEOREM 3.2. *Suppose that h satisfies $\mu > 0$, and the stochastic oracle Q^{π_t, ξ_t, i_t} satisfies*

$$(3.16) \quad v_t = v, \quad \sigma_t^2 = \sigma^2, \quad v\sqrt{|S|}/\mu = \epsilon, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. Take stepsize $\eta_t = \frac{1-\gamma}{\mu\gamma}$ for all $t \leq \max \left\{ \lceil \frac{|S|}{1-\gamma} \rceil, 4|S| \right\}$ and $\eta_t = |S| / \left(\frac{t+2}{2} - |S| \right) \mu$ otherwise. Then SBPMD method finds a policy π_k that $\mathbb{E} [\phi(\pi_k, \pi^*)] \leq \epsilon$ with

$$(3.17) \quad k = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{|S|^2 \sigma^2}{\mu^2 (1-\gamma) \epsilon} + |S| \sqrt{\frac{f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \mu \log |A|}{\mu (1-\gamma) \epsilon}} \right).$$

Proof. We define $\Delta_t = \mathbb{E} [f(\pi_t) - f(\pi^*)]$, $\phi_t = \phi(\pi_t, \pi^*)$, and $\gamma_S = 1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|S|}$. Then from (3.10), we obtain

$$\Delta_{t+1} + \left(\mu + \frac{1}{\eta_t} \right) \phi_{t+1} \leq \gamma_S \Delta_t + \left(\frac{|S|-1}{|S|} \mu + \frac{1}{\eta_t} \right) \phi_t + \frac{\eta_t \sigma^2}{2(1-\gamma)} + \frac{2v}{\sqrt{|S|}}.$$

By multiplying both sides by some positive constant w_t to be specified later, we have

$$(3.18) \quad w_t \Delta_{t+1} + w_t \left(\mu + \frac{1}{\eta_t} \right) \phi_{t+1} \leq w_t \gamma_S \Delta_t + w_t \left(\frac{|S|-1}{|S|} \mu + \frac{1}{\eta_t} \right) \phi_t + \frac{w_t \eta_t \sigma^2}{2(1-\gamma)} + \frac{2w_t v}{\sqrt{|S|}}.$$

Suppose we choose w_t, η_t satisfying

$$(3.19) \quad w_{t-1} \geq w_t \gamma_S,$$

$$(3.20) \quad w_{t-1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta_{t-1}} + \mu \right) \geq w_t \left(\frac{1}{\eta_t} + \frac{|S|-1}{|S|} \mu \right),$$

for all $t \geq 1$. Summing up (3.18) from $t = 0$ to k , and combining with (3.19), (3.20), we obtain

$$(3.21) \quad w_k \Delta_{k+1} + w_k \left(\mu + \frac{1}{\eta_k} \right) \phi_{k+1} \leq w_0 \gamma_S \Delta_0 + w_0 \left(\frac{|S|-1}{|S|} \mu + \frac{1}{\eta_0} \right) \phi_0 + \sum_{t=0}^k \frac{w_t \eta_t \sigma^2}{2(1-\gamma)} + \sum_{t=0}^k \frac{2w_t v}{\sqrt{|S|}}.$$

Define $t_0 = \lceil \frac{|S|}{1-\gamma} \rceil$, and choose $w_t = \gamma_S^{-t}$ for $t \leq t_0$, and $w_t = \gamma_S^{-t_0} \frac{t+2}{t_0+2}$ otherwise. Then we can verify that (3.19) is satisfied. On the other hand, let $\bar{t}_0 = \max\{t_0, 4|S|\}$, and define η_t as

$$(3.22) \quad \eta_t = \begin{cases} \eta, & t \leq \bar{t}_0, \text{ where } \frac{\frac{1}{\eta} + \frac{|S|-1}{|S|} \mu}{\frac{1}{\eta} + \mu} \leq \gamma_S, \\ \frac{|S|}{\left(\frac{t+2}{2} - |S|\right) \mu}, & t \geq \bar{t}_0, \end{cases}$$

then one can verify that (3.20) holds. In particular, taking $\eta = \frac{1-\gamma}{\mu\gamma}$ suffices to satisfy the condition of η in (3.22). To apply (3.21) and get a concrete convergence rate, we make the following observations. For $k > k_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_k \left(\mu + \frac{1}{\eta k} \right) &= \gamma_S^{-t_0} \frac{k+2}{t_0+2} \left[\mu + \frac{\left(\frac{k+2}{2} - |S|\right) \mu}{|S|} \right] = \mathcal{O} \left(\gamma_S^{-t_0} \frac{k^2 \mu}{t_0 |S|} \right), \\ \sum_{t=1}^k w_t \eta_t &= \sum_{t=1}^{t_0} \gamma_S^{-t} \eta + \sum_{t=t_0}^{\bar{t}_0} \gamma_S^{-t} \eta + \sum_{t=\bar{t}_0}^k \gamma_S^{-t} \frac{t+2}{t_0+2} \frac{|S|}{\left(\frac{t+2}{2} - |S|\right) \mu} = \mathcal{O} \left(\gamma_S^{-t_0} \left[\bar{t}_0 \eta + \frac{k|S|}{t_0 \mu} \right] \right), \\ \sum_{t=1}^k w_t &= \sum_{t=1}^{t_0} \gamma_S^{-t} + \sum_{t=t_0}^{\bar{t}_0} \gamma_S^{-t} + \sum_{t=\bar{t}_0}^k \gamma_S^{-t} \frac{t+2}{t_0+2} = \mathcal{O} \left(\gamma_S^{-t_0} \left[\bar{t}_0 + \frac{k^2}{t_0} \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose we use constant variance and bias, i.e., $\sigma_t^2 = \sigma^2$, $v_t = v$ for all $t \geq 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{k+1} &\leq \left[w_k \left(\frac{1}{\eta k} + \mu \right) \right]^{-1} \left[w_1 \gamma_S \Delta_1 + w_1 \left(\mu + \frac{1}{\eta} \right) \phi_1 + \sum_{t=1}^k w_t \left(\frac{\eta_t \sigma^2}{2(1-\gamma)} + \frac{2v}{2\sqrt{|S|}} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{t_0 |S| [\Delta_1 + (\mu + 1/\eta) \phi_1]}{\mu k^2} + \frac{t_0 \bar{t}_0 |S| \eta \sigma^2}{\mu (1-\gamma) k^2} + \frac{|S|^2 \sigma^2}{\mu^2 (1-\gamma) k} + \frac{t_0 \bar{t}_0 \sqrt{|S|} v}{\mu k^2} + \frac{v \sqrt{|S|}}{\mu} \right). \end{aligned}$$

To get an ϵ -optimal policy, it suffices to choose v satisfying $\frac{v \sqrt{|S|}}{\mu} = \epsilon$, and run k SBPMD iterations with

$$\begin{aligned} k &= \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{t_0 |S| (f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + (\mu + 1/\eta) \log |A|)}{\mu \epsilon}} + \sqrt{\frac{t_0 \bar{t}_0 |S| \eta \sigma^2}{\mu (1-\gamma) \epsilon}} + \frac{|S|^2 \sigma^2}{\mu^2 (1-\gamma) \epsilon} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{|S|^2 \sigma^2}{\mu^2 (1-\gamma) \epsilon} + |S| \sqrt{\frac{f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \mu \log |A|}{\mu (1-\gamma)^2 \epsilon}} \right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We next show that for non-strongly convex regularizers, the direction application of SBPMD method yields sub-linear convergence for any positive constant stepsize.

THEOREM 3.3. *Suppose h satisfies $\mu = 0$, and Assumption 1 holds with $v_t \leq v$, $\sigma_t^2 \leq \sigma^2$ for all $t \geq 0$. If the total number of iterations k is given a priori, let $\eta_t = \eta = \left(\frac{2(1-\gamma) \log |A|}{\sigma^2 k} \right)^{1/2}$ for all $t \leq k$, we have*

$$(3.23) \quad \mathbb{E}[f(\pi_\tau) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \frac{|S| [f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*)]}{(1-\gamma)k} + \frac{2\sqrt{|S|}v}{(1-\gamma)} + \frac{|S| \sqrt{\log |A|} \sigma}{(1-\gamma)^{3/2} \sqrt{k}},$$

where we sample $\tau \sim \text{Unif}[k-1]$.

Proof. Given the condition $v_t \leq v$, $\sigma_t^2 \leq \sigma^2$ for all $t \geq 0$, and let $\mu = 0$ in Proposition 3.1, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_t [f(\pi_{t+1}) - f(\pi_t)] + \frac{1-\gamma}{|S|} [f(\pi_t) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \frac{1}{\eta_t} (\phi(\pi_t, \pi^*) - \mathbb{E}_t \phi(\pi_{t+1}, \pi^*)) + \frac{2v}{\sqrt{|S|}} + \frac{\eta_t \sigma^2}{2(1-\gamma)}.$$

By taking constant stepsize $\eta_t = \eta$ for all $t \geq 0$, summing up the previous inequality from $t = 0$ to $k-1$, and taking total expectation, we obtain

$$f(\pi^*) - f(\pi_0) + \frac{1-\gamma}{|S|} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[f(\pi_t) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \phi(\pi_0, \pi^*) + \frac{2kv}{\sqrt{|S|}} + \frac{\eta k \sigma^2}{2(1-\gamma)}.$$

Since $\tau \sim \text{Unif}[k-1]$, and $\phi(\pi_0, \pi^*) \leq \log |A|$, we have equivalently,

$$\frac{1-\gamma}{|S|} k \mathbb{E}[f(\pi_\tau) - f(\pi^*)] \leq f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\log |A|}{\eta} + \frac{2kv}{\sqrt{|S|}} + \frac{\eta k \sigma^2}{2(1-\gamma)},$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\pi_\tau) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \frac{|S| [f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*)]}{(1-\gamma)k} + \frac{|S| \log |A|}{(1-\gamma)k\eta} + \frac{2v\sqrt{|S|}}{(1-\gamma)} + \frac{\eta \sigma^2 |S|}{2(1-\gamma)^2}.$$

Given a fixed total number of iterations k , set $\eta = (2(1-\gamma)\log|\mathcal{A}|/\sigma^2k)^{1/2}$, we obtain the desired result. \square

Compared to the convergence of SBPMD for strongly convex regularizers, the convergence for non-strongly convex regularizers in Theorem 3.3 has several potential drawbacks. First of all, we need to randomly output a historical policy, which adds an undesirable additional randomness to the method. Moreover, the sublinear convergence in (3.23) implies at least $\mathcal{O}(|S|/\epsilon)$ iterations and policy updates, which significantly increases from that of $\mathcal{O}(|S|\log(1/\epsilon))$ for strongly convex regularizers, presented in Theorem 3.1. In the next subsection, we address these issues by proposing a variant of the SBPMD method that can achieve linear convergence for non-strongly convex regularizers.

3.2. Stochastic Approximate Block Policy Mirror Descent. The stochastic approximate block policy mirror descent (SABPMD) method can be viewed as the stochastic counterpart of the ABPMD method proposed in Section 2.2. The updates of SABPMD are presented in Algorithm 4. With a slight overloading of notations, we assume that the stochastic oracle $Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}$ in the SABPMD method satisfies the following assumption.

ASSUMPTION 2. *At any iteration k , for the sampled state i_k , we have an access to a stochastic oracle, which produces a stochastic estimation $Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}$ that satisfies*

$$(3.24) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k, i_k} \left[Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right] = \overline{Q}_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot),$$

$$(3.25) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k, i_k} \left[\left\| Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \right] \leq \sigma_k^2,$$

$$(3.26) \quad \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \left[\left\| \overline{Q}_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \right] \leq v_k^2,$$

where ξ_k is the random vector used to construct the stochastic estimator $Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}$. Note that the construction of $Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}$ can depend both on the random vector ξ_k and the sampled state s_{i_k} .

Algorithm 4 The stochastic approximate block policy mirror descent (SABPMD) method

Input: Initial policy π_0 , perturbation parameters $\{\tau_k\}_{k \geq 0}$, and stepsizes $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$.

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

 Sample $i_k \sim \text{Unif}(|S|)$.

 Update policy:

$$\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) = \begin{cases} \underset{p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \in \Delta_{|\mathcal{A}|}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left[\eta_k \left[\left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), p(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^p(s_{i_k}) + \tau_k D_{\pi_0}^p(s_{i_k}) \right] + D_{\pi_k}^p(s_{i_k}), & s = s_{i_k}, \\ \pi_k(\cdot|s), & s \neq s_{i_k}. \end{cases}$$

end for

The following lemma characterizes the progress of value for each state after one update of the SABPMD method.

LEMMA 3.3. *For each iteration k in SABPMD method, the progress of value at the sampled state s_{i_k} and other states can be characterized by*

$$(3.27) \quad V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) - V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s) \leq \frac{\eta_k}{2(1-\gamma)} \left\| Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2, \quad \forall s \neq s_{i_k},$$

$$(3.28) \quad \begin{aligned} & V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) + \left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + h^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) + \tau_k \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - D_{\pi_0}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{\eta_k}{2(1-\gamma)} \left\| Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) - \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \tau_k \right) D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \\ & \quad + \left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot|s_{i_k}) \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The proof follows similar lines as in Lemma 3.2, except that we apply Lemma 2.5 to the perturbed value functions $(V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}, Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k})$. Using Lemma 3.3, we can establish the generic convergence properties of the SABPMD method.

PROPOSITION 3.2. *With Assumption 2, choose τ_k, η_k satisfying $1 + \eta_k \tau_k = \frac{1}{\gamma}$ and $\tau_{k+1} \leq \tau_k$, then the per-iteration progress of SABPMD method satisfies*

$$(3.29) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[f_{\tau_{k+1}}(\pi_{k+1}) - f_{\tau_{k+1}}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_{k+1}}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) \right] \\ & \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|S|} \right) \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_k}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) \right] + \frac{\sigma_k^2}{2\gamma\tau_k} + 2v_k + \frac{\tau_k - \tau_{k+1}}{1-\gamma} \log|\mathcal{A}|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Combining (3.27), (3.28) in Lemma 3.3, and observing $D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s) - (1 + \eta_k \tau_k) D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s) = -\eta_k \tau_k D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s)$ for all

$s \neq s_{i_k}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^*(s) \left[V_{\tau_k}^{\pi_{k+1}}(s) - V_{\tau_k}^{\pi^*}(s) \right] + \nu^*(s_{i_k}) \left[\left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot | s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot | s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + \tau_k \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\tau_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + h^{\tau_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^*(s) \left[\frac{1}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s) - \frac{1+\eta_k \tau_k}{\eta_k} D_{\pi_{k+1}}^{\pi^*}(s) \right] + \nu^*(s_{i_k}) \left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot | s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot | s_{i_k}) \right\rangle \\ & \quad + \tau_k \sum_{s \neq s_{i_k}} \nu^*(s) D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s) + \frac{\eta_k}{2(1-\gamma)} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \nu^*(s) \left\| Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Conditioned on i_k and taking expectation w.r.t. ξ_k gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k | i_k} \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_{k+1}) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) \right] + \nu^*(s_{i_k}) \left[\left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot | s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot | s_{i_k}) \right\rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \tau_k \left(D_{\pi_0}^{\tau_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - D_{\pi_0}^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right) + h^{\tau_{k+1}}(s_{i_k}) - h^{\pi^*}(s_{i_k}) \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\eta_k} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) - \frac{1+\eta_k \tau_k}{\eta_k} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) + \frac{\eta_k}{2(1-\gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k | i_k} \left\| Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \\ & \quad + \nu^*(s_{i_k}) \left\langle Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - \bar{Q}^{\pi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot | s_{i_k}) - \pi^*(\cdot | s_{i_k}) \right\rangle + \tau_k \sum_{s \neq s_{i_k}} \nu^*(s) D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s) \\ (3.30) \quad & \leq \frac{1}{\eta_k} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) - \frac{1+\eta_k \tau_k}{\eta_k} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k} \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) + \frac{\eta_k}{2(1-\gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k | i_k} \left\| Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \\ & \quad + 2\nu^*(s_{i_k}) \left\| Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - \bar{Q}^{\pi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty} + \tau_k \sum_{s \neq s_{i_k}} \nu^*(s) D_{\pi_k}^{\pi^*}(s). \end{aligned}$$

We make the following observations based on (3.25) and (3.26) in Assumption 2,

$$(3.31) \quad \sum_{i \in [|\mathcal{S}|]} \frac{\nu^*(s_i)}{|\mathcal{S}|} \left\| Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_i, \cdot) - \bar{Q}^{\pi_k, i}(s_i, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty} \leq \left(\sum_{i \in [|\mathcal{S}|]} \frac{\nu^*(s_i)^2}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{i \in [|\mathcal{S}|]} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \left\| Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_i, \cdot) - \bar{Q}^{\pi_k, i}(s_i, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|}} \nu_k,$$

$$(3.32) \quad \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k | i_k} \left\| Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) - Q_{\tau_k}^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s_{i_k}, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty}^2 \leq \sigma_k^2.$$

We then take expectation w.r.t i_k in (3.30) and denote $\mathbb{E}_k = \mathbb{E}_{i_k} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_k | i_k} [\cdot]$. Combining (3.31), (3.32) and (2.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_{k+1}) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) \right] + \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\eta_k} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) - \frac{1+\eta_k \tau_k}{\eta_k} \mathbb{E}_k \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) + \tau_k \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) + \frac{2\nu_k}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|}} + \frac{\eta_k \sigma_k^2}{2(1-\gamma)}. \end{aligned}$$

Simple rearrangement yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_k \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_{k+1}) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) + \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \tau_k \right) \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) \right] \\ & \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right) \left(f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) \right) + \left(\frac{1}{\eta_k} + \frac{|\mathcal{S}|-1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \tau_k \right) \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) + \frac{\eta_k \sigma_k^2}{2(1-\gamma)} + 2\nu_k. \end{aligned}$$

Now choosing τ_k, η_k with $1 + \eta_k \tau_k = \frac{1}{\gamma}$ and $\tau_{k+1} \leq \tau_k$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_k \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_{k+1}) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_{k+1}}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_{k+1}, \pi^*) \right] \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right) \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_k}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) \right] + \frac{\sigma_k^2}{2\gamma\tau_k} + 2\nu_k.$$

Combining the above relation with (2.29) and the fact that $f_{\tau_{k+1}}(\pi) \leq f_{\tau_k}(\pi)$ for any π , we obtain (3.29). \square

We are now ready to establish the linear convergence of SABPMD for properly chosen perturbation sequence $\{\tau_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and stepsizes $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$.

THEOREM 3.4. *Suppose $\mu = 0$ holds for h , and Assumption 2 holds with*

$$(3.33) \quad \sigma_t^2 = 4^{-\left(\lfloor \frac{t}{l} \rfloor + 2\right)}, \quad \nu_t = 2^{-\left(\lfloor \frac{t}{l} \rfloor + 2\right)}, \quad l = \lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|} (1/4) \rceil.$$

Let $\tau_t = 2^{-\left(\lfloor \frac{t}{l} \rfloor + 1\right)}$ and η_t satisfies $1 + \eta_t \tau_t = \frac{1}{\gamma}$ for all $t \geq 0$, then after k iterations, SABPMD produces policy π_k satisfying

$$(3.34) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_k}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) \right] \leq 2^{-\lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor} \left[f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{2 \log |\mathcal{A}|}{1-\gamma} + \frac{5|\mathcal{S}|}{4(1-\gamma)} \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma} + 1 \right) \right].$$

Proof. By taking $\tau_t = 2^{-\lfloor \frac{t}{l} \rfloor + 1}$, $\sigma_t^2 = 4^{-\lfloor \frac{t}{l} \rfloor + 2}$, $v_t = 2^{-\lfloor \frac{t}{l} \rfloor + 2}$ in (3.29), and applying Lemma 2.8 with

$$x_t = f_{\tau_t}(\pi_t) - f_{\tau_t}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_t}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_t, \pi^*), \quad y_t = \frac{\tau_t \log|A|}{1-\gamma}, \quad z_t = \frac{\sigma_t^2}{2\gamma\tau_t} + 2v_t, \quad \alpha = 1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{|\mathcal{S}|},$$

and $l = \lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(1/4) \rceil$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[f_{\tau_k}(\pi_k) - f_{\tau_k}(\pi^*) + \frac{\tau_k}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*) \right] \leq 2^{-\lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor} \left[f_{\tau_0}(\pi_0) - f_{\tau_0}(\pi^*) + \frac{\log|A|}{1-\gamma} + \frac{5|\mathcal{S}|}{4(1-\gamma)} \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma} + 2 \right) \right],$$

which combined with (2.29), and the fact that $f_{\tau_0}(\pi_0) = f(\pi_0)$ and $f_{\tau_0}(\pi^*) \geq f(\pi^*)$, implies the desired results (3.34). \square

We make several remarks on the advantages that SABPMD method enjoys over SBPMD method in Section 3.1 for non-strongly convex regularizers, by comparing Theorem 3.4 and Theorem 3.3. First of all, we do not need to fix the total number of iterations beforehand, as required by SBPMD method. Moreover, SABPMD guarantees convergence for the last iterate π_k , thus dropping the necessity of randomly outputting a historical iterate π_τ required by the SPMD method. Finally, SABPMD converges linearly, improving significantly over the sublinear convergence of SBPMD.

4. Stochastic Estimation of State-action Value Functions. Our previous discussions of SBPMD and SABPMD methods in Section 3 require various conditions on the bias and variance for the stochastic estimation of the (perturbed) state-action value function (i.e., Q-function). In this section, we introduce two different methods that utilize collected samples from interacting with the environment, to obtain the stochastic estimation of the Q-function satisfying these conditions. For each of the estimation method, we establish the required sample complexity of SBPMD and SABPMD for both strongly convex and non-strongly convex regularizers. Throughout this section, we assume the cost and the regularizer satisfy

$$(4.1) \quad c(s, a) \leq \bar{c}, \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}; \quad h^\pi(s) \leq \bar{h}, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \pi \in \Pi.$$

In subsection 4.1, we discuss the method of multiple independent trajectories by assuming a generative model at hand. In subsection 4.2, we utilize the recently developed conditional temporal difference (CTD) learning method [16], which relaxes the assumption of a generative model, and only needs one trajectory collected by following the current policy. We focus on presenting the details of applying these two methods to estimate the state-action value function Q^π , while the estimation for the perturbed state-action value function Q_τ^π follows similar procedures.

4.1. Multiple Independent Trajectories. The method of multiple independent trajectories assumes a generative model with the following capability. For any state-action pair $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, we can generate M_k independent trajectories, each with length T_k , by following policy π_k starting from (s, a) . The i -th trajectory, denoted by $\zeta_k^i(s, a)$, takes the form of $\zeta_k^i(s, a) = \{(s_0^i = s, a_0^i = a), (s_1^i, a_1^i), \dots, (s_{T_k-1}^i, a_{T_k-1}^i)\}$.

Let s_{i_k} denote the sampled state at iteration k , we denote the set of random variables for constructing the stochastic estimate as $\xi_k = \{\zeta_k^i(s_{i_k}, a), a \in \mathcal{A}, i \in [M_k]\}$. Then the stochastic estimator Q^{π_k, ξ_k, i_k} is defined by

$$Q^{\pi_k, \xi_k, i_k}(s, a) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{M_k} \sum_{i=1}^{M_k} \sum_{t=0}^{T_k-1} \gamma^t [c(s_t^i, a_t^i) + h^{\pi_k}(s_t^i)], & s = s_{i_k}, a \in \mathcal{A} \\ 0, & \forall s \neq s_{i_k}, a \in \mathcal{A}. \end{cases}$$

Given the boundedness condition in (4.1), one can readily verify that Q^{π_k, ξ_k, i_k} satisfies (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3) with

$$(4.2) \quad v_k = \frac{(\bar{c} + \bar{h})\gamma^{T_k}}{1-\gamma}, \sigma_k^2 = 2v_k^2 + \frac{2(\bar{c} + \bar{h})^2}{(1-\gamma)^2 M_k} = \frac{2(\bar{c} + \bar{h})^2}{(1-\gamma)^2} \left(\gamma^{2T_k} + \frac{1}{M_k} \right).$$

We first show that for strongly convex regularizers, if the suboptimality gap ϵ is given a priori, then the SBPMD method requires only a small number of samples collected at each iteration. Specifically, using only one trajectory of length $\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\epsilon))$ at each iteration suffices to guarantee the sublinear convergence of the SBPMD method.

THEOREM 4.1 (Sample complexity, SBPMD – $\mu > 0$, sublinear convergence). *Suppose the number of independent trajectories M_k and trajectory length T_k at iteration k in SBPMD method satisfy*

$$(4.3) \quad M_k \geq 1, T_k \geq \log_\gamma((1-\gamma)\mu\epsilon/|\mathcal{S}|),$$

where $l = \lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(1/4) \rceil$. Then condition (3.16) holds, and SBPMD finds a policy π_k with $\mathbb{E}[\phi(\pi_k, \pi^*)] \leq \epsilon$ in

$$(4.4) \quad k = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{|\mathcal{S}|^2}{\mu^2(1-\gamma)^3\epsilon} + |\mathcal{S}| \sqrt{\frac{f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \mu \log|A|}{\mu(1-\gamma)\epsilon}} \right)$$

iterations. In addition, the total number of samples required by SBPMD can be bounded by

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{O}\left(|\mathcal{S}|^2|\mathcal{A}|\log(|\mathcal{A}|)\frac{\log_\gamma((1-\gamma)\mu\epsilon/|\mathcal{S}|)}{\mu^2(1-\gamma)^3\epsilon}\right).$$

Proof. One can readily verify that with the choice of M_k and T_k in (4.3), and the bias-variance characterization in (4.2), the condition (3.16) holds. In addition, by taking $M_k = 1$, we also have $\sigma^2 = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2})$. Applying (3.17) in Theorem 3.2 shows that (4.4) holds. Hence the total sample complexity is given by

$$\sum_{s=0}^k T_s|\mathcal{A}| = kT_S|\mathcal{A}| = \mathcal{O}\left(|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|\log_\gamma((1-\gamma)\mu\epsilon/|\mathcal{S}|)\sqrt{\frac{f(\pi_0)-f(\pi^*)+\mu\log|\mathcal{A}|}{\mu(1-\gamma)\epsilon}} + \frac{|\mathcal{S}|^2|\mathcal{A}|\log_\gamma((1-\gamma)\mu\epsilon/|\mathcal{S}|)}{\mu^2(1-\gamma)^3\epsilon}\right). \quad \square$$

We next show that by progressively increasing the number of trajectories and the trajectory length, SBPMD can achieve linear convergence as prescribed by Theorem 3.1.

THEOREM 4.2 (Sample complexity, SBPMD with $\mu > 0$, linear convergence). *Suppose the number of independent trajectories M_k and trajectory length T_k at iteration k in SBPMD method satisfy*

$$(4.6) \quad T_k \geq \log_\gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\left[\lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor + \log_2 \frac{\bar{c}+\bar{h}}{1-\gamma} + 2\right], M_k \geq \frac{(\bar{c}+\bar{h})^2}{(1-\gamma)^2} 2^{\lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor + 4},$$

where $l = \lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(1/4) \rceil$. Then condition (3.14) holds, and SBPMD finds $\mathbb{E}\left[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu}{1-\gamma}\phi(\pi_k, \pi^*)\right] \leq \epsilon$ in $k = \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|\log_\gamma(\epsilon))$ iterations. In addition, the total number of samples required by SBPMD can be bounded by

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{O}\left(|\mathcal{S}|^2|\mathcal{A}|\log(|\mathcal{A}|)\frac{\log_\gamma(1/2)\log_\gamma\epsilon}{\mu(1-\gamma)^3\epsilon}\right).$$

Proof. One can readily verify that with (4.6) and (4.2), condition (3.14) holds. Hence from (3.15) in Theorem 3.1, to find a policy π_k with $\mathbb{E}\left[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu}{1-\gamma}\phi(\pi_k, \pi^*)\right] \leq \epsilon$, the total number of iterations k needs to satisfy

$$\lfloor k/l \rfloor = \log_2\left(\left[f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu\log|\mathcal{A}|}{1-\gamma} + \frac{5|\mathcal{S}|}{4(1-\gamma)}\left(\frac{1}{2\gamma\mu} + 2\right)\right]/\epsilon\right),$$

from which we can conclude that the total number of iterations $k = l \log_2(1/\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(\log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(\epsilon)) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|\log_\gamma(\epsilon))$, where we use $\log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|\log_\gamma\epsilon)$. Moreover, the total number of samples required can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=0}^k |\mathcal{A}|T_s M_s &= |\mathcal{A}|l \sum_{p=0}^{\lfloor k/l \rfloor} \log_\gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\left[p + \log_2 \frac{\bar{c}+\bar{h}}{1-\gamma} + 2\right] \frac{(\bar{c}+\bar{h})^2}{(1-\gamma)^2} 2^{p+4} \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(|\mathcal{A}|\log_\gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)l\left(\lfloor k/l \rfloor + \log_2 \frac{\bar{c}+\bar{h}}{1-\gamma}\right) \frac{(\bar{c}+\bar{h})^2}{(1-\gamma)^2} 2^{k/l}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(|\mathcal{A}|\log_\gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{(\log|\mathcal{A}|+|\mathcal{S}|)\log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(\epsilon)}{\mu(1-\gamma)^3\epsilon}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(|\mathcal{S}|^2|\mathcal{A}|\log(|\mathcal{A}|)\frac{\log_\gamma(1/2)\log_\gamma\epsilon}{\mu(1-\gamma)^3\epsilon}\right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.1. We make a few remarks regarding the iteration and sample complexity of SBPMD when comparing the two sampling strategies presented in (4.3) and (4.6). First of all, despite yielding sublinear convergence of SBPMD when using (4.3), the total number of samples required by the two strategies are both at the order of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(|\mathcal{S}|^2|\mathcal{A}|/\epsilon)$. The convergence of SBPMD when using constant-sample strategy (4.3) in some sense shares the same spirit as the convergence of stochastic gradient descent with a constant variance applied to a strongly convex objective [17], albeit with more involved analyses. Moreover, despite having linear convergence, (4.6) requires the number of samples to increase exponentially w.r.t. the iteration, leading to excessive time for sample collection in the later stage (see also Table 1 in Section 5). In such scenarios, strategy (4.3) can be more practically appealing as one does not have wait prohibitively long for sample collection required by the strategy (4.6).

We next characterize the sample complexity of SBPMD method for non-strongly convex regularizers.

THEOREM 4.3 (Sample Complexity, SBPMD with $\mu = 0$). *Suppose the number of iteration k is given a priori, the number of independent trajectories M_s and trajectory length T_s at each iteration s in SBPMD method satisfy*

$$(4.8) \quad M_s \geq 1, \quad T_s \geq \log_\gamma\left((1-\gamma)^2\epsilon/|\mathcal{S}|\right), \quad \forall s \leq k.$$

Then SBPMD finds a policy π_τ with $\mathbb{E}[f(\pi_\tau) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \epsilon$ in $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{S}|^2\log(|\mathcal{A}|)}{(1-\gamma)^3\epsilon^2}\right)$ iterations. In addition, the total number

of samples required can be bounded by

$$(4.9) \quad \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{S}|^2|\mathcal{A}|\log(|\mathcal{A}|)}{(1-\gamma)^5\epsilon^2} \log_\gamma\left(\frac{\epsilon(1-\gamma)^2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right)\right).$$

Proof. With the sampling strategy in (4.8) and the bias-variance characterization in (4.2), the bias v and the variance σ^2 satisfy $\frac{2\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|}v}{(1-\gamma)} \leq \epsilon$, and $\sigma = \mathcal{O}(1/(1-\gamma))$. Combined with (3.23) in Theorem 3.3, one could readily verify that when the number of iterations k satisfies

$$k \geq \frac{|\mathcal{S}|(f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*))}{(1-\gamma)\epsilon} + \frac{|\mathcal{S}|^2 \log(|\mathcal{A}|)}{(1-\gamma)^5\epsilon^2},$$

then SBPMD produces a policy π_τ , where $\tau \sim \text{Unif}([k-1])$, such that $\mathbb{E}[f(\pi_\tau) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \epsilon$. Moreover, the total number of required samples can be bounded by

$$\sum_{s=0}^{t_k} T_s |\mathcal{A}| = k T_s |\mathcal{A}| = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{S}|^2|\mathcal{A}|\log(|\mathcal{A}|)}{(1-\gamma)^5\epsilon^2} \log_\gamma\left(\frac{\epsilon(1-\gamma)^2}{|\mathcal{S}|}\right)\right). \quad \square$$

Comparing (4.8) in Theorem 4.3 and (4.3) in Theorem 4.1, one can observe that despite both adopting a constant-sample strategy, both the iteration and sample complexity of SBPMD for non-strongly convex regularizers has worse dependence on the suboptimality gap ϵ than that of strongly convex regularizers. We proceed to characterize the sample complexity of the SABPMD method for non-strongly convex regularizers.

THEOREM 4.4 (Sample Complexity, SABPMD). *Suppose the number of independent trajectories M_k and trajectory length T_k at iteration k in SABPMD method satisfy*

$$(4.10) \quad M_k \geq \left(\frac{\bar{c} + \bar{h}}{1-\gamma}\right)^2 4^{\lfloor k/l \rfloor}, \quad T_k \geq \log_\gamma\left(\frac{1-\gamma}{\bar{c} + \bar{h}}\right) + \lfloor \frac{k}{l} \rfloor \log_\gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right),$$

where $l = \lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(1/4) \rceil$. Then condition (3.33) holds. Consequently, SABPMD method finds a policy π_k such that $\mathbb{E}[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \epsilon$ in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \log_\gamma(\epsilon))$ iterations. The total number of samples can be bounded by

$$(4.11) \quad \mathcal{O}\left(\log_\gamma^2\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{|\mathcal{S}|^3|\mathcal{A}|\log|\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^4\epsilon^2}\right).$$

Proof. One can readily verify that condition (3.33) holds given the sampling strategy (4.10) and the bias-variance characterization (4.2). Hence we can apply Theorem 3.4, and conclude that the total number of iterations k to find a policy π_k with $\mathbb{E}[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \epsilon$ can be bounded by

$$k = l \log_2\left(\left[f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{2\log|\mathcal{A}|}{1-\gamma} + \frac{5|\mathcal{S}|}{4(1-\gamma)}\left(\frac{1}{2\gamma} + 1\right)\right] / \epsilon\right) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \log_\gamma(\epsilon)),$$

where the second equality uses $\lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(1/4) \rceil \log_2(1/\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \log_\gamma(\epsilon))$. Note that from the definition of k we know $4^{k/l} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{S}|^2 \log^2|\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^2\epsilon^2}\right)$. Hence the total number of samples required is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=0}^k M_s T_s |\mathcal{A}| &= l \sum_{p=1}^{k/l} \left[\log_\gamma\left(\frac{1-\gamma}{\bar{c} + \bar{h}}\right) + p \log_\gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right] \left(\frac{\bar{c} + \bar{h}}{1-\gamma}\right)^2 4^p |\mathcal{A}| \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\log_\gamma(1/2) k 4^{k/l} |\mathcal{A}| / (1-\gamma)^2\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{S}|^3|\mathcal{A}|\log^2|\mathcal{A}|}{(1-\gamma)^4\epsilon^2} \log_\gamma(1/2) \log_\gamma(\epsilon)\right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.2. Comparing Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.3, we observe that for non-strongly convex regularizers, SABPMD method requires only $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \log_\gamma(\epsilon))$ policy updates, which improves over SBPMD method with $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|^2/\epsilon^2)$ policy updates. Similar to our Remark 4.1, however, the linear convergence of SABPMD comes at a price, since exponentially many samples needs to be collected per iteration. As a consequence, the sample complexity of the SABPMD method has a worse dependence on the size of state space $|\mathcal{S}|$ than that of basic SBPMD method. In light of this, we recommend that whether to use SABPMD or SBPMD method for non-strongly convex regularizers should depend on specific problem instances, with a focus on balancing computing resources devoted to the policy updates and sampling, and some other practical considerations, e.g., whether frequent updates of policy is desirable or not.

We make several concluding remarks on the sample complexity developed in this subsection. First, for strongly convex regularizers, the total sample complexity required by both sampling strategy (constant (4.3) and exponential growth (4.6)) are at the order of $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$. For non-strongly convex regularizer, the total sample complexity of both SBPMD and SABPMD are at the order of $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$. To the best of knowledge, as SBPMD and SABPMD methods are the first class of PG methods with a partial update rule, all the sample complexities obtained here appear to be new,

and match the best complexity of batch PG methods [18] in terms of their dependence on the suboptimality ϵ .

Second, the sample complexity in (4.5), (4.7) and (4.9) seem to have an additional factor on $|S|$ compared to that of SPMD methods in [18]. This additional factor of $|S|$ in fact represents the effective number of blocks in SBPMD methods, and can be reduced when we increase the block size \mathcal{B} by applying the multi-state SBPMD variant (see also our discussions in Remark 2.1). We highlight that the linear dependence of the sample complexity on the number of blocks also applies to BCD methods developed in the optimization literature [10]. Even more surprisingly, as we will demonstrate in our numerical study in Section 5, this additional dependence on the number of blocks $|S|$ might arise solely as a proof artifact, and is not strictly necessary in applications.

Finally, we remark that in the stochastic setting, SBPMD methods have cheaper computation not only due to its single-state policy update, but also a much smaller number of samples required per-iteration to obtain the stochastic estimate of the Q-function. This trait also carries over to the next estimation method, and will also be demonstrated in our numerical study (e.g., see Table 1).

4.2. Conditional Temporal Difference Learning. The conditional temporal difference (CTD) learning method [16] offers a scheme to obtain a stochastic estimate of the state-action value function in an online fashion, using a single trajectory. In contrast to the method of independent trajectories, CTD does not require the access to a generative model of the MDP and hence enjoys wider applicability.

For a given policy π , CTD generates a trajectory of π , and collects transition pairs at some pre-specified timesteps. Suppose at timestep t , the collected transition pair is denoted by $\zeta_t = (s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})$, where $a_t \sim \pi(\cdot|s_t)$, $a_{t+1} \sim \pi(\cdot|s_{t+1})$, and $s_{t+1} \sim \mathbb{P}(\cdot|s_t, a_t)$. CTD then construct a stochastic operator $\widetilde{F}^\pi : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$, given by

$$(4.12) \quad \widetilde{F}^\pi(\Theta; \zeta_t) = [\langle \Theta, e(s_t, a_t) \rangle - c(s_t, a_t) - h^\pi(s_t) - \gamma \langle \Theta, e(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) \rangle] e(s_t, a_t),$$

where $e(s, a)$ denotes the one-hot vector with non-zero entry corresponding to the (s, a) state-action pair. The stochastic operator \widetilde{F}^π is then used to update the estimated Q-function. Such a procedure is iterated until an estimate with the desired accuracy is obtained. We present the details of applying the CTD method to estimate Q^π in Algorithm 5. The estimation for the perturbed state-action value function defined in (2.15) follows the similar procedure and analysis.

Algorithm 5 Conditional temporal difference (CTD) for estimating Q^π

Input: Initial estimate $\widehat{Q}_0^\pi = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$, nonnegative parameter α , and stepsizes $\{\beta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$.

for $t = 0, \dots, T - 1$ **do**

 Disregard $\alpha - 1$ transition pairs, given by $\zeta_{\alpha t+1}, \dots, \zeta_{\alpha(t+1)-1}$.

 Collect transition pair $\zeta_{\alpha(t+1)}$ and update:

$$\widehat{Q}_{t+1}^\pi = \widehat{Q}_t^\pi - \beta_t \widetilde{F}^\pi(\widehat{Q}_t^\pi; \zeta_{\alpha(t+1)}).$$

end for

It should be noted that from its construction, the stochastic operator \widetilde{F}^π is a biased estimator of the operator $F^\pi : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}$, defined by $F^\pi(Q) = M^\pi R^\pi(Q)$, where

$$R^\pi(Q)(s, a) = Q(s, a) - c(s, a) - h^\pi(s) - \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{P}(s'|s, a) \pi(a'|s') Q(s', a')$$

denotes the residual of Bellman equation associated with Q-function, and $M^\pi = \text{diag}(\sigma^\pi)$ with $\sigma^\pi(s, a) = v^\pi(s) \pi(a|s)$ denoting the stationary state-action distribution induced by π . Under the condition $M^\pi > 0$, the convergence of CTD has been discussed in [16] and further extended in [18]. A salient feature of CTD, compared to the method of independent trajectories, is that an estimate is obtained for every state-action pair $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, which makes them suitable for batch PG methods, as such methods need the value information for every state-action pair in order to complete batch policy update at each iteration [18].

At first sight, it appears using CTD as the estimation scheme in the SBPMD (or SABPMD) method is unnecessarily lavish. After all, both methods update the policy for only a single state, and thus require only the the state-action values associated the updated state. The values of state-action pair associated with the untouched states are simply disregarded at this iteration and hence seems wasted. Drawing from this observation, it seems that CTD applied to SBPMD methods should yield worse sample complexity than that of independent trajectories.

In our ensuing developments, we show that the aforementioned intuition can be too pessimistic, and CTD is in fact as efficient as the method of independent trajectories. Our key observation is to exploit the averaging notion in definition of bias and variance in (3.2) and (3.3). More specifically, controlling (3.2) and (3.3) does not require a small bias and variance for every state. Instead, small averaged bias and variance across different states are sufficient for a

good estimate, which in turn requires a smaller number of samples. We make such a statement precise as follows.

LEMMA 4.1. Denote $\Lambda_{\min} = (1 - \gamma)\lambda_{\min}(M^\pi)$, and $\Lambda_{\max} = (1 - \gamma)\lambda_{\max}(M^\pi)$. At iteration k of SBPMD, let Q^{π_k, ξ_k, i_k} be the output of CTD method with T_k updates, and parameters

$$(4.13) \quad \alpha \geq \frac{\log(1/\Lambda_{\min}) + \log(9C)}{\log(1/\rho)}, \quad \beta_t = \frac{2}{\Lambda_{\min}(t+t_0-1)}.$$

Here $t_0 = 8 \max(\Lambda_{\max}^2, 8(1 + \gamma)^2) / \Lambda_{\min}^2$, $C > 0$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$ are constants dependent on the Markov chain over state-action space induced by π with a single ergodic class. Then Assumption 1 holds with

$$(4.14) \quad \sigma_k^2 \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \left(\frac{2(t_0+1)(t_0+2)\bar{\theta}^2 |\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}|}{(T_k+t_0)(T_k+t_0+1)} + \frac{12T_k\sigma_F^2}{\Lambda_{\min}^2 (T_k+t_0)(T_k+t_0+1)} \right),$$

$$(4.15) \quad v_k^2 \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \left(\frac{(t_0-1)(t_0-2)(t_0-3)\bar{\theta}^2 |\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}|}{(T_k+t_0-1)(T_k+t_0-2)(T_k+t_0-3)} + \frac{8CR^2\rho^{\alpha_k}}{3\Lambda_{\min}} + \frac{C^2R^2\rho^{2\alpha_k}}{\Lambda_{\min}^2} \right).$$

where $\bar{\theta} = (\bar{c} + \bar{h}) / (1 - \gamma)$, $\sigma_F^2 = 4(1 + \gamma)^2 R^2 + \bar{\theta}^2 |\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}| + 2(\bar{c} + \bar{h})^2$, and $R^2 = 8\bar{\theta}^2 |\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}| + 3 \frac{\bar{\theta}^2 |\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}| + 2(\bar{c} + \bar{h})^2}{4(1 + \gamma)^2}$.

Proof. The proof follows from Proposition 6.2 of [16], Lemma 18 of [18], the definition of (σ_k, v_k) given in (3.2), (3.3), and the observation that $\mathbb{E}_{i \sim \text{Unif}(|\mathcal{S}|)} \|A^i\|_\infty^2 \leq \|A\|_F^2 / |\mathcal{S}|$ for matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}$, where A^i denotes the i -th row. \square

We proceed to establish the sample complexity of SBPMD for strongly convex regularizers, while focusing on the linearly convergent variant (Theorem 3.1). The sample complexity for the sublinearly converging variant (Theorem 3.2) can also be established following similar arguments.

THEOREM 4.5 (Sample Complexity, SBPMD with $\mu > 0$, linear convergence). At iteration k of SBPMD, let Q^{π_k, ξ_k, i_k} be the output of CTD method with T_k updates, with stepsizes $\{\beta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ set as (4.13). Suppose T_k and α_k satisfy

$$(4.16) \quad T_k \geq (3t_0^3 \bar{\theta}^2 2^{\lfloor k/l \rfloor} |\mathcal{A}|)^{1/3} + (4t_0^2 \bar{\theta}^2 2^{\lfloor k/l \rfloor} |\mathcal{A}|)^{1/2} + \sigma_F^2 \Lambda_{\min}^{-2} 2^{\lfloor k/l \rfloor} / |\mathcal{S}|,$$

$$(4.17) \quad \alpha_k \geq \max\left(\lfloor k/l \rfloor + 2\right) \log_\rho(1/2) + \log_\rho \frac{\Lambda_{\min}}{8CR^2}, \left(\lfloor k/l \rfloor + 2\right) / 2 \log_\rho(1/2) + \log_\rho \frac{\Lambda_{\min}}{8C^2R^2}.$$

where $l = \lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(1/4) \rceil$. Then condition (3.14) holds, and SBPMD finds $\mathbb{E}\left[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*)\right] \leq \epsilon$ in $k = \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \log_\gamma(\epsilon))$ iterations. The total number of samples required by SBPMD can be bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log_\rho(1/2) |\mathcal{S}|^2 |\mathcal{A}| \log_\gamma(\frac{1}{\epsilon})}{\Lambda_{\min}^2 (1-\gamma)^3 \mu \epsilon}\right).$$

Proof. From the sampling strategy (4.16), (4.17), and the bias-variance characterization in (4.14) and (4.15), one can readily verify that condition (3.14) is satisfied. Hence from (3.15) in Theorem 3.1, to find a policy π_k with $\mathbb{E}\left[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu}{1-\gamma} \phi(\pi_k, \pi^*)\right] \leq \epsilon$, the total number of iterations k needs to satisfy

$$\lfloor k/l \rfloor = \log_2 \left(\left[f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{\mu \log |\mathcal{A}|}{1-\gamma} + \frac{5|\mathcal{S}|}{4(1-\gamma)} \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma\mu} + 2 \right) \right] / \epsilon \right),$$

from which we can conclude that the total number of iterations $k = l \log_2(1/\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(\log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(\epsilon)) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \log_\gamma(\epsilon))$. The total number of samples can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=0}^k T_s \alpha_s &= \mathcal{O}\left(l \sum_{p=0}^{\lfloor k/l \rfloor} \frac{\sigma_F^2 \Lambda_{\min}^{-2p}}{|\mathcal{S}|} (p \log_\rho(1/2) + \log_\rho \frac{\Lambda_{\min}}{8CR^2})\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{l \sigma_F^2 \Lambda_{\min}^{-2} 2^{\lfloor k/l \rfloor}}{|\mathcal{S}|} (\lfloor k/l \rfloor \log_\rho(1/2) + \log_\rho \frac{\Lambda_{\min}}{8CR^2})\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log_\rho(1/2) \log_\gamma(\epsilon) \sigma_F^2 (\log |\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{S}|) |\mathcal{S}|}{\Lambda_{\min}^2 (1-\gamma) \mu \epsilon}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log_\rho(1/2) \log_\gamma(\epsilon) |\mathcal{S}|^2 |\mathcal{A}| \log |\mathcal{A}|}{\Lambda_{\min}^2 (1-\gamma)^3 \mu \epsilon}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the final inequality we use $\sigma_F^2 = \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}| / (1 - \gamma)^2)$. \square

We then establish the sample complexity of the SBPMD method for non-strongly convex regularizers.

THEOREM 4.6 (Sampling Complexity, SBPMD with $\mu = 0$). At iteration k of SBPMD, let Q^{π_k, ξ_k, i_k} be the output of CTD method with T_k updates, with stepsizes $\{\beta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ set as in (4.13) and nonnegative parameter α_k . Suppose

$$(4.18) \quad T_k \geq \left(\frac{\sigma_F^2 \log |\mathcal{A}|}{\Lambda_{\min}^2}\right) + (|\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{A}|)^{1/2} + \left(\frac{\bar{\theta}^2 |\mathcal{S}|^2 |\mathcal{A}|}{\epsilon^2 (1-\gamma)^2}\right)^{1/3},$$

$$(4.19) \quad \alpha_k \geq \Theta \left(\log_\rho \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\min}(1-\gamma)\epsilon}{|\mathcal{S}|^2 CR^2} \right) \right).$$

Then SBPMD finds a policy π_τ with $\mathbb{E}[f(\pi_\tau) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \epsilon$ in $\mathcal{O} \left(\frac{|\mathcal{S}|^2 \log(|\mathcal{A}|)}{(1-\gamma)^5 \epsilon^2} \right)$ iterations. In addition, the total number of samples required can be bounded by

$$(4.20) \quad \mathcal{O} \left(\left[\frac{|\mathcal{S}|^{8/3} |\mathcal{A}|^{1/3} \log(|\mathcal{A}|)}{(1-\gamma)^6 \epsilon^{8/3}} + \frac{|\mathcal{S}|^3 |\mathcal{A}| \log(|\mathcal{A}|)}{\Lambda_{\min}^2 (1-\gamma)^5 \epsilon^2} \right] \log_\rho \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\min}(1-\gamma)\epsilon}{|\mathcal{S}|^2 CR^2} \right) \right).$$

Proof. With the sampling strategy in (4.18), (4.19), and the bias-variance characterization in (4.14) and (4.15), the bias v and the variance σ^2 satisfy $\frac{2\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}|}v}{(1-\gamma)} \leq \epsilon$, and $\sigma = 1/(1-\gamma)$. Combined with (3.23) in Theorem 3.3, one could verify that when the number of iterations $k \geq \frac{|\mathcal{S}|(f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*))}{(1-\gamma)\epsilon} + \frac{|\mathcal{S}|^2 \log(|\mathcal{A}|)}{(1-\gamma)^5 \epsilon^2}$, SBPMD produces a policy π_τ , where $\tau \sim \text{Unif}([k-1])$, such that $\mathbb{E}[f(\pi_\tau) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \epsilon$. The total number of required samples can be bounded by

$$\sum_{s=0}^k \alpha_s T_s = \mathcal{O} \left(\left[\frac{|\mathcal{S}|^{8/3} |\mathcal{A}|^{1/3} \log(|\mathcal{A}|)}{(1-\gamma)^6 \epsilon^{8/3}} + \frac{|\mathcal{S}|^3 |\mathcal{A}| \log(|\mathcal{A}|)}{\Lambda_{\min}^2 (1-\gamma)^5 \epsilon^2} \right] \log_\rho \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\min}(1-\gamma)\epsilon}{|\mathcal{S}|^2 CR^2} \right) \right). \quad \square$$

Finally, we discuss the sample complexity of the SABPMD method for the non-strongly convex regularizer.

THEOREM 4.7 (Sampling Complexity, SABPMD – Conditional Temporal Difference). *At iteration k of the SABPMD method, let Q^{π_k, ξ_k, i_k} be the output of CTD with T_k updates, with stepsizes $\{\beta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ set as in (4.13), and nonnegative parameter α_k . Suppose T_k and α_k satisfy*

$$(4.21) \quad T_k \geq (3t_0^3 \bar{\theta}^2 4^{\lfloor k/l \rfloor} |\mathcal{A}|)^{1/3} + (4t_0^2 \bar{\theta}^2 4^{\lfloor k/l \rfloor} |\mathcal{A}|)^{1/2} + \sigma_F^2 \Lambda_{\min}^{-2} 4^{\lfloor k/l \rfloor} / |\mathcal{S}|,$$

$$(4.22) \quad \alpha_k \geq \max \left\{ (\lfloor k/l \rfloor + 2) \log_\rho(1/2) + \log_\rho \frac{\Lambda_{\min}}{8CR^2}, (\lfloor k/l \rfloor + 2)/2 \log_\rho(1/2) + \log_\rho \frac{\Lambda_{\min}}{8C^2 R^2} \right\}.$$

where $l = \lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(1/4) \rceil$. Then condition (3.33) holds. Consequently, the SABPMD method finds a policy π_k such that $\mathbb{E}[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \epsilon$ in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \log_\gamma(\epsilon))$ iterations. The total number of samples can be bounded by

$$(4.23) \quad \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\log_\rho(\frac{1}{2}) \log_\gamma(\epsilon) |\mathcal{S}|^3 |\mathcal{A}| \log^2 |\mathcal{A}|}{\Lambda_{\min}^2 (1-\gamma)^4 \epsilon^2} \right).$$

Proof. One can readily verify that condition (3.33) holds given the sampling strategy (4.21), (4.22) and the bias-variance characterization (4.14) and (4.15). Hence we can apply Theorem 3.4, and conclude that the total number of iterations k to find a policy π_k with $\mathbb{E}[f(\pi_k) - f(\pi^*)] \leq \epsilon$ can be bounded by

$$k = l \log_2 \left(\left[f(\pi_0) - f(\pi^*) + \frac{2 \log |\mathcal{A}|}{1-\gamma} + \frac{5|\mathcal{S}|}{4(1-\gamma)} \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma} + 1 \right) \right] / \epsilon \right) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \log_\gamma(\epsilon)),$$

where the second equality uses $\lceil \log_{1-(1-\gamma)/|\mathcal{S}|}(1/4) \rceil \log_2(1/\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}| \log_\gamma(\epsilon))$. In addition, the total sample complexity can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=0}^k T_s \alpha_s &= \mathcal{O} \left(l \sum_{p=0}^{\lfloor k/l \rfloor} \sigma_F^2 \Lambda_{\min}^{-2} 4^p / |\mathcal{S}| \left(p \log_\rho(1/2) + \log_\rho \frac{\Lambda_{\min}}{8CR^2} \right) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\sigma_F^2 l \Lambda_{\min}^{-2} 4^{\lfloor k/l \rfloor} / |\mathcal{S}| \left(\lfloor k/l \rfloor \log_\rho(1/2) + \log_\rho \frac{\Lambda_{\min}}{8CR^2} \right) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\sigma_F^2 \log_\rho(\frac{1}{2}) \log_\gamma(\epsilon) |\mathcal{S}|^2 \log^2 |\mathcal{A}|}{\Lambda_{\min}^2 (1-\gamma)^2 \epsilon^2} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\log_\rho(\frac{1}{2}) \log_\gamma(\epsilon) |\mathcal{S}|^3 |\mathcal{A}| \log^2 |\mathcal{A}|}{\Lambda_{\min}^2 (1-\gamma)^4 \epsilon^2} \right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We make some concluding remarks on the sample complexity developed in this subsection. The sample complexities of two different estimation schemes (CTD and independent trajectories) are comparable, for both SBPMD with strongly convex regularizers, and SABPMD with non-strongly convex regularizers. It is also worth noting that for non-strongly regularizers, SABPMD is strictly favorable over SBPMD when using CTD as the estimation scheme, as it has better policy update complexity and sample complexity.

5. Numerical Study. We conduct numerical experiments to illustrate the efficiency of the proposed BPMD methods, with the benchmark RL environment GridWorld. The environment specifies a square-shaped grid with a given size, and a learning agent. Each gridpoint is associated with a cost, and there exists four types of gridpoints: goal, trap, regular, and block, taking up f_G, f_T, f_R, f_B -fraction of the total points within the grid, respectively. At each timestep, the agent has four actions available (moving left/right/up/down by one gridpoint). Upon choosing an action, the agent then moves along the chosen direction with probability p , or a randomly chosen direction with probability $1-p$. If the gridpoint to be moved to is either a block or a point outside the grid, then the agent remains at the




Fig. 1: Comparison of ABPMD with batch PG methods on randomly generated GridWorld environments, each with different number of states.

current location. The agent then receives a reward associated with the updated gridpoint and the process repeats itself at the next timestep. The costs of goal, target, and regular gridpoints are denoted by c_G , c_T , and c_R respectively, with $c_G < c_R < c_T$. When either at a goal or a trap point, the agent would transit to a fixed regular gridpoint specified by the environment. Given the size parameter d , we generate a random GridWorld environment whose grid length equals to d , and different types of gridpoints are randomly distributed on the grid with their ratio specified by (f_G, f_T, f_R, f_B) . For all realizations of GridWorld environments in our experiments, we set discount factor $\gamma = 0.9$, $p = 0.7$, $(f_G, f_T, f_R, f_B) = (0.05, 0.05, 0.8, 0.1)$, and $(c_G, c_R, c_T) = (-10, 0.1, 10)$. Observing that $h \equiv 0$ for the GridWorld environment, we focus on the ABPMD and the SABPMD method in our experiments.

5.1. Deterministic Setting. For the deterministic setting, we compare our developed ABPMD with batch PG methods, including APMD [18], the standard policy gradient method (SPG) [1] and the natural policy gradient (NPG) method [14]. For ABPMD, the stepsize $\{\eta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ and perturbation strength $\{\tau_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ are set according to Theorem 2.4. For APMD, the stepsize and the perturbation strength are set according to Theorem 4 in [18]. For SPG, we set the stepsize according to Theorem 4.1 in [1]. For NPG, we set the stepsize as $\eta_t = 1$, according to Theorem 5.3 in [1]. It is worth mentioning that NPG is equivalent to the PMD method in [18] for the tabular setting considered here [1].

For batch PG methods, the majority of per-iteration computation involves evaluating the policy with matrix inversion $(I - \gamma \mathbb{P}^{\pi_t})^{-1}$, where \mathbb{P}^{π_t} is the transition matrix of the Markov chain over \mathcal{S} induced by policy π_t . Each inversion takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|^3)$ via Gauss–Jordan elimination. For ABPMD methods, instead of solving $(I - \gamma \mathbb{P}^{\pi_t})^{-1}$ directly, we exploit the fact that \mathbb{P}^{π_t} and $\mathbb{P}^{\pi_{t-1}}$ differ in only one row, and hence one can invoke Sherman–Morrison–Woodbury formula and compute $(I - \gamma \mathbb{P}^{\pi_t})^{-1}$ via matrix-vector multiplication, which takes only $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}|^2)$ time. Thus, each iteration of ABPMD is $|\mathcal{S}|$ -times cheaper compared to the batch PG methods. Note that the same technique can also be applied to the multi-state update setting in Remark 2.1, where \mathbb{P}^{π_t} and $\mathbb{P}^{\pi_{t-1}}$ differ in $|\mathcal{B}|$ rows and hence $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{B}||\mathcal{S}|^2)$ time is required for computing the inverse.

Since ABPMD only updates policy for one state at each iteration, while APMD/SPG/NPG updates the policy for all the states at each iteration. For a fair comparison on their computational efficiency, we normalize the iteration of ABPMD by the number of states of the GridWorld environments. Figure 1 reports the optimality gap of each algorithm versus the normalized iteration. We observe that across different GridWorld environments, ABPMD closely traces the performance of the APMD method while having a much cheaper per-iteration complexity, which is consistent with the prescription of Theorem 2.4 and its following discussions in Section 2.2. It is also clear that both ABPMD and APMD enjoy linear convergence, while NPG exhibits sublinear convergence and is outperformed by ABPMD/APMD as training proceeds. Finally, SPG demonstrates the worst performance compared to other methods.

5.2. Stochastic Setting. We compare the developed SABPMD method with stochastic batch PG methods including SAPMD [18] and the stochastic natural policy gradient (SNPG) method. We choose not to include stochastic SPG method in the comparison given (1) its clear disadvantage in the deterministic setting; (2) lack of clear guidance on how to specify the number of samples required for computing the stochastic policy gradient at each iteration. For SNPG method, due to its equivalence to SPMD method [18] for the tabular case considered here, we choose to specify relevant parameters of SNPG according to developments of SPMD in [18]. As discussed in Section 3, we consider two methods of obtaining the stochastic estimation of the state-action value function: the method of independent trajectories (IT) and conditional temporal difference learning (CTD).

Method of Independent Trajectories: For the SABPMD method, we set the trajectory length $\{T_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and the number of trajectories $\{M_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ according to Theorem 4.4. For the SNPG (SPMD) method, the stepsize $\{\eta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, the




Fig. 2: Comparison of SABPMD with batch PG methods on randomly generated GridWorld environments. All methods use the method of independent trajectories to obtain the stochastic estimation of Q^π . Each dot indicates another $|\mathcal{S}|$ policy updates have been made.

trajectory length and the number of trajectories are set according to Proposition 2 in [18]. For the SAPMD method, the stepsize $\{\eta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, perturbation strength $\{\tau_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, trajectory length and the number of trajectories are set according to Proposition 3 in [18]. It is also worth mentioning that such parameter settings imply that the per-iteration samples required by SABPMD is $|\mathcal{S}|$ -times smaller than that of SAPMD.

For each environment with the state space \mathcal{S} , we run SABPMD for $16|\mathcal{S}|$ iterations, and SAPMD for 16 iterations. Since sampling takes up the majority of computation (and thus time) for these methods, we report their progresses of optimality gap versus the number of samples in Figure 2. Note that the convergence of optimality gap is no longer linear when measuring w.r.t. number of samples.

As can be seen from Figure 2, the practical performance of the SABPMD method closely tracks that of SAPMD method, and both outperforms the stochastic NPG method by a significant margin. The degradation of NPG in the stochastic setting compared to the deterministic setting is largely due to the fact that the stepsize needs to be as small as $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{k\sigma^2})$ in order to control the effect of noise on the optimality gap (Proposition 2, [18]). In addition, we highlight that since SABPMD requires less samples for estimating the Q-function and only updates policy for one state, it enjoys steady progress towards the optimum with much cheaper per-iteration computation. This difference is also clearly demonstrated in Table 1, which compares the time spent executing the last iteration of SABPMD and SAPMD. The observation in Figure 2 also seems to provide support to our discussions at the end of Section 4.1, showing that the additional dependence on the size of state space $|\mathcal{S}|$ in the sample complexity of SABPMD might only be a proof artifact and not necessary in practical performances.

Conditional Temporal Difference Learning: For the SABPMD method, we set the number of updates $\{T_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and parameter $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ by following Theorem 4.7. For the SAPMD method, we set $\{T_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ by following Proposition 5 in [18]. For the stochastic NPG method, we set $\{T_k\}_{k \geq 0}$, $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and the stepsize $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ according to

Method	$ \mathcal{S} $	Q^π Estimation	# (seconds) for the last iteration
SABPMD	225	IT	2.9
SAPMD	225	IT	670.9
SABPMD	400	IT	2.9
SAPMD	400	IT	1192.6
SABPMD	625	IT	2.9
SAPMD	625	IT	1863.5
SABPMD	225	CTD	4.4
SAPMD	225	CTD	981.8
SABPMD	400	CTD	4.9
SAPMD	400	CTD	1976.5
SABPMD	625	CTD	5.1
SAPMD	625	CTD	3176.5

Table 1: Time spent in the last iteration for SABPMD and SAPMD, while estimating Q^π with either the method of independent trajectories (IT) or the conditional temporal difference learning (CTD) method.




Fig. 3: Comparison of SABPMD with batch PG methods on randomly generated GridWorld environments. All methods use the method of independent trajectories to obtain the stochastic estimation of Q^π . Each dot indicates another $|\mathcal{S}|$ policy updates have been made.

Theorem 6, Lemma 17 and Lemma 18 in [18]. As CTD often provides only a limited coverage of state-action space for the GridWorld environments, we use the estimation of the $Q^{\pi_{k-1}}$ as the warm-start for the estimation of Q^{π_k} . We report the progress of optimality gap for each method versus the number of samples in Figure 3.

As can be seen from Figure 3, the performance of SABPMD method first closely tracks that of SAPMD method, and then gradually improves upon it at the later iterations. Both methods outperform the stochastic NPG by a significant margin. Similar to the method of independent trajectories, Figure 3 also suggests that when using CTD as the estimation scheme for Q-functions, the additional dependence on $|\mathcal{S}|$ of SABPMD might be not strictly necessary. In addition, as we can see from Table 1, the per-iteration computation of SABPMD method is also much cheaper than that of SAPMD method due to less samples required at each iteration. This allows the SABPMD method to make steady progress with cheap iterations without the need to wait excessively long for sample collection as required by SAPMD method.

6. Concluding Remarks. In this paper we develop the block policy mirror descent (BPMD) method for solving reinforcement learning problems. Compared to prior policy gradient methods with a batch update rule that evaluate and update the policy for all states, BPMD adopts a partial update rule by evaluating and updating the policy for a subset of states at each iteration, and hence enjoys cheaper per-iteration computation. In deterministic settings, we establish linear convergence and sublinear convergence of BPMD for strongly convex and non-strongly convex regularizers, respectively. We further develop the ABPMD method with adaptive regularizations, and show its linear convergence for non-strongly convex regularizers. In stochastic settings, we develop stochastic variants of BPMD and ABPMD, and establish conditions on the bias and variance to guarantee their convergence. We analyze the sample complexity of the developed stochastic variants, by using either the method of independent trajectories when having access to a generative model, or the conditional temporal difference learning method that only needs a single trajectory from the policy. Finally, we conduct numerical study of the proposed methods to demonstrate their practicality compared to prior policy gradient methods with batch update rules.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alekh Agarwal, Sham M Kakade, Jason D Lee, and Gaurav Mahajan. Optimality and approximation with policy gradient methods in markov decision processes. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 64–66. PMLR, 2020.
- [2] Amir Beck and Marc Teboulle. Mirror descent and nonlinear projected subgradient methods for convex optimization. *Operations Research Letters*, 31(3):167–175, 2003.
- [3] Amir Beck and Luba Tetruashvili. On the convergence of block coordinate descent type methods. *SIAM journal on Optimization*, 23(4):2037–2060, 2013.
- [4] Richard Bellman. Dynamic programming. *Science*, 153(3731):34–37, 1966.
- [5] Dimitri Bertsekas and John Tsitsiklis. *Parallel and distributed computation: numerical methods*. Athena Scientific, 2015.
- [6] Dimitri P Bertsekas and Huizhen Yu. Distributed asynchronous policy iteration in dynamic programming. In *2010 48th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pages 1368–1375. IEEE, 2010.
- [7] Jalaj Bhandari and Daniel Russo. A note on the linear convergence of policy gradient methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.11120*, 2020.
- [8] Semih Cayci, Niao He, and R Srikant. Linear convergence of entropy-regularized natural policy gradient with linear function approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04096*, 2021.
- [9] Shicong Cen, Chen Cheng, Yuxin Chen, Yuting Wei, and Yuejie Chi. Fast global convergence of natural policy gradient methods with entropy regularization. *Operations Research*, 2021.
- [10] Cong D Dang and Guanghui Lan. Stochastic block mirror descent methods for nonsmooth and stochastic optimization. *SIAM Journal on*

- Optimization*, 25(2):856–881, 2015.
- [11] Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, and Rob Tibshirani. Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *Journal of statistical software*, 33(1):1, 2010.
 - [12] Ronald A Howard. Dynamic programming and markov processes. 1960.
 - [13] Sham Kakade and John Langford. Approximately optimal approximate reinforcement learning. In *In Proc. 19th International Conference on Machine Learning*. Citeseer, 2002.
 - [14] Sham M Kakade. A natural policy gradient. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 14, 2001.
 - [15] Sajad Khodadadian, Prakirt Raj Jhunjhunwala, Sushil Mahavir Varma, and Siva Theja Maguluri. On the linear convergence of natural policy gradient algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.01424*, 2021.
 - [16] Georgios Kotsalis, Guanghui Lan, and Tianjiao Li. Simple and optimal methods for stochastic variational inequalities, ii: Markovian noise and policy evaluation in reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.08434*, 2020.
 - [17] Guanghui Lan. *First-order and Stochastic Optimization Methods for Machine Learning*. Springer Nature, 2020.
 - [18] Guanghui Lan. Policy mirror descent for reinforcement learning: Linear convergence, new sampling complexity, and generalized problem classes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.00135*, 2021.
 - [19] Dennis Leventhal and Adrian S Lewis. Randomized methods for linear constraints: convergence rates and conditioning. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 35(3):641–654, 2010.
 - [20] Xingguo Li, Tuo Zhao, Raman Arora, Han Liu, and Mingyi Hong. On faster convergence of cyclic block coordinate descent-type methods for strongly convex minimization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):6741–6764, 2017.
 - [21] Timothy P Lillicrap, Jonathan J Hunt, Alexander Pritzel, Nicolas Heess, Tom Erez, Yuval Tassa, David Silver, and Daan Wierstra. Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971*, 2015.
 - [22] Boyi Liu, Qi Cai, Zhuoran Yang, and Zhaoran Wang. Neural trust region/proximal policy optimization attains globally optimal policy. 2019.
 - [23] Zhaosong Lu and Lin Xiao. On the complexity analysis of randomized block-coordinate descent methods. *Mathematical Programming*, 152(1):615–642, 2015.
 - [24] Volodymyr Mnih, Adria Puigdomenech Badia, Mehdi Mirza, Alex Graves, Timothy Lillicrap, Tim Harley, David Silver, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Asynchronous methods for deep reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1928–1937. PMLR, 2016.
 - [25] Arkadi Nemirovski, Anatoli Juditsky, Guanghui Lan, and Alexander Shapiro. Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on optimization*, 19(4):1574–1609, 2009.
 - [26] Arkadij Semenovič Nemirovskij and David Borisovich Yudin. Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization. 1983.
 - [27] Yu Nesterov. Efficiency of coordinate descent methods on huge-scale optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(2):341–362, 2012.
 - [28] Gergely Neu, Anders Jonsson, and Vicenç Gómez. A unified view of entropy-regularized markov decision processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07798*, 2017.
 - [29] Jan Peters, Katharina Mulling, and Yasemin Altun. Relative entropy policy search. In *Twenty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2010.
 - [30] Martin L Puterman. *Markov decision processes: discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 2005.
 - [31] Peter Richtárik and Martin Takáč. Iteration complexity of randomized block-coordinate descent methods for minimizing a composite function. *Mathematical Programming*, 144(1):1–38, 2014.
 - [32] John Schulman, Sergey Levine, Pieter Abbeel, Michael Jordan, and Philipp Moritz. Trust region policy optimization. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1889–1897. PMLR, 2015.
 - [33] Lior Shani, Yonathan Efroni, and Shie Mannor. Adaptive trust region policy optimization: Global convergence and faster rates for regularized mdps. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 5668–5675, 2020.
 - [34] Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
 - [35] Paul Tseng. Convergence of a block coordinate descent method for nondifferentiable minimization. *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, 109(3):475–494, 2001.
 - [36] Lingxiao Wang, Qi Cai, Zhuoran Yang, and Zhaoran Wang. Neural policy gradient methods: Global optimality and rates of convergence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.01150*, 2019.
 - [37] Stephen J Wright. Coordinate descent algorithms. *Mathematical Programming*, 151(1):3–34, 2015.
 - [38] Yangyang Xu and Wotao Yin. Block stochastic gradient iteration for convex and nonconvex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 25(3):1686–1716, 2015.
 - [39] Tuo Zhao, Han Liu, and Tong Zhang. Pathwise coordinate optimization for sparse learning: Algorithm and theory. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(1):180–218, 2018.