

A MODEL-FREE FIRST-ORDER METHOD FOR LINEAR QUADRATIC REGULATOR WITH $\tilde{O}(1/\varepsilon)$ SAMPLING COMPLEXITY*

CALEB JU[†], GEORGIOS KOTSALIS[‡], AND GUANGHUI LAN[†]

Abstract. We consider the classic stochastic linear quadratic regulator (LQR) problem under an infinite horizon average stage cost. By leveraging recent policy gradient methods from reinforcement learning, we obtain a first-order method that finds a stabilizing matrix gain whose objective function gap is at most ε with high probability using $\tilde{O}(1/\varepsilon)$ samples, where \tilde{O} hides polylogarithmic dependence on ε . Our proposed method seems to have the best dependence on ε within the model-free literature and matches the best known rate from the model-based literature, up to logarithmic factors. Our developments that result in this improved sampling complexity fall in the category of actor-critic algorithms. The actor part involves a variational inequality formulation of the stochastic LQR problem and ensuing application of a projected operator method, while in the critic part we utilize a conditional stochastic primal-dual method and show that the algorithm has the optimal rate of convergence when paired with a shrinking multi-epoch scheme.

Key words. linear quadratic regulator, actor-critic, primal-dual methods, variational inequality, Markovian noise

MSC codes. 93C05, 65K05

1. Introduction. The linear-quadratic-regulator (LQR) problem is a classic problem in control theory that has been studied extensively since the work of Kalman. Of interest is the infinite horizon linear-quadratic stochastic control problem.

Techniques for solving this problem go back to the 1960s. It is well known that when this system is completely controllable, the optimal feedback law is a linear static state feedback of $u_t^* = -Kx_t$ for some matrix gain $K \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$. The optimal gain matrix K^* can be obtained by solving the algebraic Riccati equations (ARE), which can be numerically solved by, e.g., iterative methods or linear matrix inequalities [1, 2, 23, 15, 16, 4]. When the parameters of the system are unknown, estimates can be obtained using system identification [28] and robust control [44].

In recent years, methods from machine learning percolated into optimal control, in particular, for solving LQR. For example, one can estimate the system parameters using a regularized least-squares estimator. The estimated system is viewed as the nominal system and then solved by ARE. This is known as the certainty equivalence principle [31, 9, 37], which is a *model-based* method. In contrast, there are *model-free* methods, which aim to solve the problem in an “online” manner without explicitly estimating the system parameters. Many model-free methods are inspired by problems in reinforcement learning (RL) [38]. RL tackles problem such as LQR using optimization methods that only require an oracle that can simulate the costs and evolution of the system. There are a plethora of model-free methods, and most can be categorized as either approximate dynamic programming [39, 21] or gradient-based (first- or zeroth-order) methods [35, 36, 25, 26].

We focus on gradient-based methods. It is known LQR is non-convex (the set of stabilizing matrix gains is non-convex [12]), so generally speaking at best we can

*Initially released on arXiv on Dec 1st, 2022.

Funding: CJ is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research, Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship under Award Number DE-SC0022158

[†]H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial & Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA (cju33@gatech.edu, george.lan@isye.gatech.edu).

[‡]Amazon Core AI, Seattle, WA (kotsalis@amazon.com).

only find locally optimal solutions. The ubiquitous gradient descent has been used in practice [41] while its convergence to local optimal solution was proved in [42]. It was not until the breakthrough result of [13, 6] that showed gradient descent converges to the *global* optimal solution by proving the objective function of LQR satisfies the so-called Polyak-Lojasiewicz-condition [33, 29], or PL-condition.

In this paper, we develop and analyze a first-order method to efficiently solve LQR. In particular, we use an actor-critic method, which is a two-time scale algorithm [19]. The outer loop, or the actor step, views the LQR problem as a variational inequality, or VI, and improves the matrix gain using a projected operator method. Each step requires an estimate to the control Lyapunov equation, which is solved by the critic. The critic estimates this quantity to high accuracy via a primal-dual method for solving a stochastic fixed-point problem. We enhance this result using a shrinking multi-epoch approach to get the optimal rate of convergence. If we ignore terms except for the accuracy ε and failure rate δ , our method succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ with a sampling complexity of $O(\varepsilon^{-1}(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})(\ln(1/(\varepsilon\delta)))^{11/2})$.

It seems our result has improved dependence on ε (up to logarithmic dependence on ε) when compared to the best rates known in the literature thus far in the *model-free* case. The work of [43], which our work is heavily based on, used a similar actor-critic approach to achieve a sampling complexity of $O(\varepsilon^{-5})$ (which with a finer analysis can be improved to $O(\varepsilon^{-4})$). While not a first-order method, [21] used an approximate policy iteration method and showed that the sampling complexity here is $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$. Within the *model-based* case, it was shown the dynamics can be estimated with a least-squares estimator using $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ samples [9]. This was later improved to $O(\varepsilon^{-1})$ in [31] by noticing the error scales as the square of the estimation error. In a sense, our method shows the model-free case can be competitive with the model-based case in terms of the dependence on ε .

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we formulate the LQR optimization problem and detail some known properties of the problem to aid our theoretical developments. This helps compare our work with the related work at the end of the section. In section 3, we introduce the VI formulation for LQR and the projected operator method. This section also motivates the need for an accurate solution of *the control Lyapunov equation*, which is the solution to a stochastic projected fix point problem. We tackle this problem in section 4 by using a shrinking multi-epoch stochastic primal-dual method to achieve the optimal deterministic and stochastic error rates for estimating the solution. We finish with some preliminary numerical experiments in section 5.

2. Preliminaries, problem formulation, and related works.

2.1. Notation. Throughout this paper, we will assume the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is the standard ℓ_2 norm for vectors and the induced ℓ_2 norm for matrices. The norm $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm for a given matrix. The notation $\rho(A) := \max_i\{|\lambda_i(X)|\}$ is the spectral radius of the matrix. For symmetric matrices A and B , we use the standard Loewner order of $A - B \succeq 0$ to mean that $A - B$ is semidefinite and $A - B \succ 0$ to mean that it is positive definite. For any symmetric matrix X , let $\text{svec}(X)$ be the vectorization of the upper triangular part of X with the off-diagonals scaled by $\sqrt{2}$.

2.2. Linear systems and quadratic control. We consider a discrete-time, time-invariant linear dynamic system with disturbances,

$$(2.1) \quad x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t + w_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}_+,$$

where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control input, and w_t is the stochastic disturbance respectively. It is assumed that the basic random variables $\{x_0, w_0, w_1, \dots\}$ are jointly independent and Gaussian,

$$x_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0), \quad w_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Psi),$$

where the covariance matrices $\Sigma_0 \succ 0, \Psi \succ 0$ are known. The infinite horizon time-average cost to be minimized over casual policies is

$$(2.2) \quad J = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t^\top Q x_t + u_t^\top R u_t \right],$$

where $Q \succ 0$, and $R \succ 0$. We assume that the matrices (A, B) form a controllable pair. This is a classic problem in control theory whose solution can be reviewed in [8, 22]. The average cost is minimized by a linear state feedback policy

$$u_t = -K_* x_t = -(R + B^\top P B)^{-1} B^\top P A x_t, \quad t \in \mathcal{Z}_+,$$

with P being the unique positive definite solution to the algebraic Riccati equation

$$P = Q + A^\top P A - A^\top P B (R + B^\top P B)^{-1} B^\top P A.$$

In the model free case, we will restrict ourselves to linear state feedback laws of the form $u_t = -K x_t$. The terms feedback law and *policy* are used interchangeably. We also add standard Gaussian disturbances, $v_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$ for some sufficiently large known $\sigma > 0$, to the control law, i.e., $u_t = -K x_t + v_t$. This results in the closed loop dynamics

$$(2.3) \quad x_{t+1} = (A - BK)x_t + w_t + Bv_t.$$

The rationale of including more disturbances is to guarantee the matrix induced by the Bellman optimality conditions is positive definite, which will be essential in order to estimate the *control Lyapunov equation*. We denote the set of stabilizing feedback gains by

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{S} = \{K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \mid \rho(A - BK) < 1\}.$$

We will search in an iterative fashion for a feedback gain $K \in \mathcal{S}$ that yields an approximation to the optimum within a prespecified degree of fidelity. We write for the cost $J(K)$ to emphasize its parametric dependence and state the aforementioned policy optimization problem as

$$(2.5) \quad \min_K J(K) := \begin{cases} \text{Tr}[(Q + K^\top R K) \Sigma_K], & K \in \mathcal{S} \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The matrix Σ_K is the solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$(2.6) \quad \Sigma_K = \Psi + (A - BK) \Sigma_K (A - BK)^\top,$$

and corresponds to the steady state covariance matrix of the zero mean state vector. Given that Ψ is positive definite, so is Σ_K , i.e.,

$$(2.7) \quad \Sigma_K \succeq \Psi \succ 0.$$

The following lemma contains an expression for the policy gradient $\nabla J(K)$.

LEMMA 2.1. *For a given $K \in \mathcal{S}$ the gradient of the cost function $J(K)$ is*

$$(2.8) \quad \nabla J(K) = 2[(R + B^T P_K B)K - B^T P_K A] \Sigma_K$$

where P_K denotes the unique positive definite solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$(2.9) \quad P_K = Q + K^T R K + (A - BK)^T P_K (A - BK).$$

The proof of this lemma can be traced to [11] with minor adjustments to account for the fact that we are working in discrete time. For the remainder of this paper, we write the policy gradient compactly as

$$\nabla J(K) = 2E_K \Sigma_K,$$

where the matrix E_K , the natural gradient, is given by

$$(2.10) \quad E_K = (R + B^T P_K B)K - B^T P_K A.$$

If we can accurately estimate the gradient $2E_K \Sigma_K$ or the natural gradient $2E_K$, we can characterize the change in objective value when we descend along the negative of this direction. The following result, also known as the performance difference lemma, quantifies this statement.

LEMMA 2.2. *For any pair of stabilizing policies K' and K ,*

$$\begin{aligned} J(K') - J(K) &= 2\text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K'}(K' - K)^T E_K) + \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K'}(K' - K)^T (R + B^T P_K B)(K' - K)). \end{aligned}$$

A proof can be found in [12, Lemma 6].

The above result is akin to the smoothness of a function, where the change in $J(K') - J(K)$ can be upper bounded by a linear plus quadratic term. It turns out this quadratic term, when choosing K' appropriately w.r.t. to a matrix gain K , satisfies the so-called PL-condition or gradient domination condition.

LEMMA 2.3. *For any stable policy K_t ,*

$$\frac{\sigma_{\min}(\Psi)}{\|R + B^T P_{K_t} B\|} \|E_{K_t}\|_F^2 \leq J(K_t) - J(K_*) \leq \frac{\|\Sigma_{K_*}\|}{\sigma_{\min}(R)} \|E_{K_t}\|_F^2.$$

A proof of this lemma can be readily deduced from [11]. In view of Lemma 2.1, an accurate estimate matrix E_K requires one to estimate the solution P_K to the Lyapunov equation (2.9) as well as the system parameters R , B , and A . Alternatively, one can estimate E_K without such knowledge. Here is how it is done. We introduce the differential cost is $V : \mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$V(K, x) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} x_t^T (Q + K^T R K)x_t - f(K) \mid x_0 = x\right],$$

while the corresponding Q -function is

$$Q(K, x, u) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} x_t^T (Q + K^T R K)x_t - J(K) \mid x_0 = x, u_0 = u\right]$$

Note that

$$Q(K, x, -Kx) = V(K, x)$$

and the explicit formulas are

$$\begin{aligned} V(K, x) &= x^\top P_K x - \text{Tr}[P_K \Sigma_K], \\ Q(K, x, u) &= x^\top \Theta(K)_{11} x + x^\top \Theta(K)_{12} u + u^\top \Theta(K)_{21} x + u^\top \Theta(K)_{22} u - \text{Tr}[P_K \Sigma_K], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(2.11) \quad \Theta(K) = \begin{bmatrix} A^\top \\ B^\top \end{bmatrix} P_K \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} Q & 0 \\ 0 & R \end{bmatrix},$$

The above decomposition makes evident of the fact that $\Theta(K) \succ 0$. The basis of the online learning algorithm lies in the relationship

$$(2.12) \quad \nabla J(K) = 2 \left[\underbrace{\Theta(K)_{22} K - \Theta(K)_{21}}_{=E_K} \right] \Sigma_K,$$

where $\Theta(K)_{ij}$ is the (i, j) -th block of Θ_K if we view it as a 2×2 block matrix. The relative Q function satisfies the Bellman equation

$$\begin{aligned} J(K) + Q(K, x, u) &= x^\top Q x + u^\top R u + \mathbb{E}[Q(K, x_+, -Kx_+) | x, u] \\ &= x^\top Q x + u^\top R u + \mathbb{E}[V(K, x_+) | x, u] \end{aligned}$$

where given (x, u) the random variable x_+ satisfies the system dynamics

$$x_+ = Ax + Bu + w, \quad w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Psi).$$

For a given state-action pair $z = [x \quad u]$, define

$$(2.13) \quad \phi(z) = \text{svec}(zz^\top), \quad \theta(K) = \text{svec}(\Theta(K)), \quad \vartheta(K) = \begin{bmatrix} f(K) \\ \theta(K) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Denote the stationary measure on the state and control space w.r.t. to the current matrix gain K as Π_K . We define a variable metric via the inner product

$$\langle \phi_i(x, u), \phi_j(x, u) \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\Pi_K}[\phi_i(x, u) \phi_j(x, u)]$$

It follows from the Bellman equation for the differential Q -function that

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \mathbb{E}[\phi(x, u)] & \Xi_K \end{bmatrix} \vartheta(K) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[x^\top Q x + u^\top R u] \\ b_K \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$(2.15) \quad \Xi_K = \mathbb{E}[\phi(x, u)(\phi(x, u) - \phi(x_+, -Kx_+))^\top], \quad b_K = \mathbb{E}[(x^\top Q x + u^\top R u)\phi(x, u)].$$

2.3. Related Works. Two prominent paradigms of LQR being studied are the *random initialization* and *noisy dynamics* model [30]. The random initialization assumes only the initial state is random, and the remaining state transitions are deterministic. The noisy dynamics model, which we study in this paper, considers both a random initialization and perturbations in each state transition.

Within the noisy dynamics setting, an infinite-horizon average-cost was studied by [43] using an actor-critic method. Around the same time, [21] used an approximate policy iteration from the RL literature. Both these methods are model-free. As for model-based methods, [9] used a least-squares estimator for the transition dynamics and then use tools from system level synthesis to obtain their controller. [31] later improved the sampling complexity by noticing the function gap scales as the square of the parameter error.

Similar problems include the infinite-horizon discounted objective value. The PhD thesis of [5] investigated the setting where there was no noise. In the noisy dynamic setting, [14] developed PAC bounds, or probably approximately correct for this problem, which are nearly optimal solutions with high probability guarantees. The authors of [39] studied the sampling complexity of a least-squares temporal differencing in this setting. A question of minimizing a discount factor of one on the random initialization setting was first shown to be solvable to global optimality by the breakthrough paper of [12]. Since their work, improvements in the sampling complexity have been proposed in the works of [30] and [32]. It should be mentioned these last two works explored the use of zeroth-order methods. This setting, while model-free, requires a generative model, where one can start running the linear dynamics from any initial state.

3. The actor: Policy optimization via a variational inequality. Our goal is to solve the unconstrained optimization problem

$$\min_K J(K).$$

Since the gradient is $\nabla J(K) = 2E_K \Sigma_K$, one can run gradient descent. Here, the matrix E_{K_t} is often referred to as the *natural gradient* in the reinforcement learning literature [18, 12]. It turns out the asymptotic covariance matrix Σ_K can be ignored. Since the problem is unconstrained and $\Sigma_K \succeq \Psi \succ 0$, it suffices to solve the variational inequality:

$$\text{find } K_* \text{ s.t. } \langle E_{K_*}, K - K_* \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall K.$$

One can solve this in an iterative fashion using the projected operator method. We write this method in Algorithm 3.1. Each iteration requires an estimate of the natural gradient E_{K_t} , which we recall requires the solution P_{K_t} to the Lyapunov equation (2.9), as defined by the linear system of equations in (2.14). In the next section, we provide a primal-dual method to complete this task. We then compute a prox-mapping for the variational inequality using the stochastic estimate of the natural gradient E_{K_t} .

Algorithm 3.1 Natural Policy Gradient Descent

Input: $K_1, \eta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$
for $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do**
 Compute the matrix E_{K_t} by (2.12) using Algorithm 4.2
 $K_{t+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_K \{ \eta \langle 2E_{K_t}, K \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|K - K_t\|_F^2 \}$
end for
return K_{T+1}

The solution to this VI problem is related to our original LQR problem thanks to the performance difference lemma. It satisfies a generalized monotonicity prop-

erty [10]. Choosing $K' = K_*$ and rearranging terms,

$$2\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{K_*})} [\langle xx^T E_K, K - K_* \rangle] \geq J(K) - J(K_*) \geq 0.$$

This VI shows the connection of our method to the VI formulations in RL, e.g. [25, 27, 26] explicitly. This method is equivalent to the *natural policy gradient method* seen in the reinforcement learning literature. To be consistent, we give Algorithm 3.1 the same name.

Let us now move onto proving the convergence of solving LQR using Algorithm 3.1. For the sake of presentation, we will reserve the following constants throughout the course of this section.

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} C_1 &:= 2[\|R\| + 2\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\Psi)\|B\|^2 J(K_0)] \\ C_2 &:= \sigma_{\min}(R)\sigma_{\min}(Q) \\ C_3 &:= J(K_0)/\sigma_{\min}(Q). \end{aligned}$$

Using the performance difference Lemma 2.2, we will show that solving the VI ensures a contraction-like property for the LQR problem. First, we introduce the following standard result on the relation between the objective value and the solution of Lyapunov equations.

LEMMA 3.1. *When K is a stable policy, then*

$$\|\Sigma_K\| \leq \text{Tr}(\Sigma_K) \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(Q)J(K) \text{ and } \|P_K\| \leq \text{Tr}(P_K) \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\Psi)J(K).$$

It will be helpful to define the matrix error

$$(3.2) \quad \delta_t := E_{K_t}^* - E_{K_t},$$

where $E_{K_t}^*$ is the true natural gradient matrix and E_{K_t} is the stochastic estimate.

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Let K_t be a stable controller and suppose $J(K_t) \leq 2J(K_0)$. At iteration t of Algorithm 3.1, choose the step size*

$$\eta_t \equiv \eta = 1/C_1,$$

and let K_{t+1} be the computed (stochastic) matrix gain. Under the assumption K_{t+1} is stable, then

$$(3.3) \quad J(K_{t+1}) - J(K_*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{C_2}{2J(K_*)C_1}\right)[J(K_t) - J(K_*)] + \epsilon_t,$$

where

$$(3.4) \quad \epsilon_t := \frac{1}{C_1} \left[\|\delta_t\|_F^2 \|\Sigma_{K_{t+1}}\| + \text{Tr}([E_t^*]^T \delta_t) \right].$$

Proof. By the fact both K_t and K_{t+1} are stabilizing matrix gains, then by the performance difference Lemma 2.2 and taking note of the step size η and constant C_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} & J(K_{t+1}) - J(K_t) \\ &= -2\eta_t \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K_{t+1}} E_t^T \delta_t) - 2\eta_t \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K_{t+1}} E_t^T E_t) + \eta_t^2 \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K_{t+1}} E_t (R + B^T P_{K_t} B) E_t) \\ &\leq \eta_t \|\Sigma_{K_{t+1}}^{1/2} E_t\|_F^2 + \eta_t \|\delta_t \Sigma_{K_{t+1}}^{1/2}\|_F^2 - (2\eta_t - \eta_t^2 \|R + B^T P_{K_t} B\|) \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K_{t+1}} E_t^T E_t) \\ &= \eta_t \|\delta_t \Sigma_{K_{t+1}}^{1/2}\|_F^2 - (\eta_t - \eta_t^2 \|R + B^T P_{K_t} B\|) \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{K_{t+1}} E_t^T E_t) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{C_1} \|\delta_t\|_F^2 \|\Sigma_{K_{t+1}}\| - \frac{1}{2C_1} \text{Tr}(E_t^T E_t). \end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we used the fact

$$(3.5) \quad \|R + B^T P_{K_t} B\| \leq \|R\| + \|B\|^2 \|P_{K_t}\| \leq \|R\| + \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\Psi) J(K_t) \|B\|^2 \leq C_1/2,$$

which is due to Lemma 3.1. Now, using the decomposition,

$$\mathrm{Tr}(E_t^T E_t) \geq \mathrm{Tr}([E_t^*]^T E_t^*) - 2\mathrm{Tr}([E_t^*]^T \delta_t),$$

the PL-condition from Lemma 2.3, and the bound on $\|\Sigma_{K_*}\|$ from Lemma 3.1, we ensure

$$\begin{aligned} J(K_{t+1}) - J(K_t) &\leq -\frac{1}{2C_1} \mathrm{Tr}([E_t^*]^T E_t^*) + \frac{1}{C_1} \left[\|\delta_t\|_F^2 \|\Sigma_{K_{t+1}}\| + \mathrm{Tr}([E_t^*]^T \delta_t) \right] \\ &\leq -\frac{C_2}{2J(K_*)C_1} [J(K_t) - J(K_*)] + \epsilon_t \end{aligned}$$

Adding $J(K_t) - J(K_*)$ to both sides finishes the proof. \square

Assuming δ_t is sufficiently small, the above proposition ensures a contraction property. But two things still need to be taken care of. First, we assumed K_{t+1} to be stable. Second, we need to bound $\|\Sigma_{K_{t+1}}\| \|\delta_t\|_F^2$ by ϵ , but the two multipliers are correlated. We will address both these issues next using the following lemmas, which establish the stability of the matrix gain if we knew the true natural gradient, and bounds for $\|\Sigma_{K_{t+1}}\|$. Both results can be found in [12] as Lemma 15 and 16, respectively.

LEMMA 3.3. *Let K_t be stable and suppose E_{K_t} is computed exactly in Algorithm 3.1. If the step size is not too large, i.e.,*

$$\eta_t \leq \|R + B^T P_{K_t} B\|^{-1}$$

then the subsequent matrix gain K_{t+1} is stabilizing.

Under the assumption $J(K_t) \leq 2J(K_0)$ for all t , it can be shown our choice of step size from Proposition 3.2 satisfies this bound thanks to Lemma 3.1.

LEMMA 3.4. *For any stable controller K , let K' be an arbitrary controller where*

$$\|K' - K\| \leq \frac{\sigma_{\min}(Q)\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_K)}{4J(K)\|B\|(\|A - BK\| + 1)}.$$

Then K' is stable, and moreover,

$$\|\Sigma_{K'} - \Sigma_K\| \leq 4 \left(\frac{J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} \right)^2 \frac{\|B\|(\|A - BK\| + 1)}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_K)} \|K' - K\|.$$

In the above lemma, we set K as $K_{t+1}^* = K_t + \eta_t E_t^*$, which is guaranteed to be stable with an appropriate step size. The matrix gain K_{t+1} is the stochastic estimate produced during Algorithm 3.1.

PROPOSITION 3.5. *Suppose the assumptions from Proposition 3.2 hold. Also suppose $\|K_{t+1} - K_{t+1}^*\|$ satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 3.4. Then the matrix gain K_{t+1} computed by Algorithm 3.1 satisfies*

$$J(K_{t+1}) - J(K_*) \leq \left(1 - \frac{C_2}{4J(K_*)C_1} \right) [J(K_t) - J(K_*)] + \epsilon'_t,$$

where

$$(3.6) \quad \epsilon'_t = \frac{1}{C_1} \left[\frac{J(K_*)C_1}{2C_2} \cdot \|\delta\|_F^2 + 2C_3 \|\delta_t\|_F^2 + \frac{32C_3^2 \|B\|}{\sigma_{\min}(\Psi)C_1} \|\delta_t\|_F^3 \right].$$

Proof. We start with the decomposition, $\|\Sigma_{K_{t+1}}\| \leq \|\Sigma_{K_{t+1}^*}\| + \|\Sigma_{K_{t+1}} - \Sigma_{K_{t+1}^*}\|$. We can bound the second summand with Lemma 3.4. Thus, using the assumption $J(K_t) \leq 2J(K_0)$ and choice in C_3 , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Sigma_{K_{t+1}}\| &\leq \|\Sigma_{K_{t+1}^*}\| + 4(2C_3)^2 \frac{\|B\|(\|A - BK_{t+1}^*\| + 1)}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_{K_{t+1}^*})} \|K_{t+1} - K_{t+1}^*\| \\ &\leq 2C_3 + 16C_3^2 \frac{2\|B\|}{\sigma_{\min}(\Psi)C_1} \|\delta_t\|, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line, the bound on the first term comes from combining Lemma 3.1 and $J(K_{t+1}^*) \leq J(K_t) \leq 2J(K_0)$ (thanks to Proposition 3.2). The bound on the second term comes from recalling the natural gradient error (3.2), that K_{t+1}^* is a stabilizing matrix gain, and $\Sigma_K \succeq \Psi$ from (2.6). Thus, we have a bound on $\|\Sigma_{K_{t+1}}\|$, which is a part of the first term in ϵ_t from (3.4).

We still need to bound the second term in ϵ_t , which is $\text{Tr}([E_{K_t}^*]\delta_t)/C_1$. By Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}([E_{K_t}^*]^T \delta_t) &\leq \frac{\sigma_{\min}(\Psi)C_2}{4J(K_*)\|R + B^T P_{K_t} B\|} \cdot \|E_t^*\|_F^2 + \frac{J(K_*)\|R + B^T P_{K_t} B\|}{\sigma_{\min}(\Psi)C_2} \cdot \|\delta\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \frac{C_2}{4J(K_*)} \cdot [J(K_t) - J(K_*)] + \frac{J(K_*)C_1}{2C_2} \cdot \|\delta\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line, we bound the first term by the PL-condition from Lemma 2.3 and the second term by the inequality (3.5).

Combining both these bounds into (3.3) derives the promised result. \square

We can now prove convergence results for Algorithm 3.1. To simplify notation, define the *condition number* as $\kappa_{PO} := 8J(K_*)C_1/C_2$.

THEOREM 3.6. *Suppose $\kappa_{PO} > 3$ and K_0 is a stabilizing controller. Let $l := \lceil \kappa_{PO} \rceil$ and fix an error tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$. If at every iteration we use the step size from Proposition 3.5 and have $\|\delta_t\|_F^2 \equiv \|E_t - E_t^*\|_F^2 \leq \min\{C_4, C_5, C_6\}$ in Algorithm 3.1, where*

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} C_4 &:= \left(\frac{\sigma_{\min}(Q)\sigma_{\min}(\Psi)C_1}{16J(K_0)\|B\|} \right)^2, \quad C_5 := \frac{C_2}{120J(K_0)C_1} \min\left(\frac{C_2}{J(K_*)}, \frac{1}{2C_3} \right) \varepsilon, \\ C_6 &:= \left(\frac{\sigma_{\min}(\Psi)C_2}{3840J(K_0)\|B\|C_3^2} \varepsilon \right)^{2/3}, \end{aligned}$$

then the following holds for every iteration iterations $t \geq 0$:

1. *Stability:* K_t is stabilizing matrix gain.
2. *Monotone or converge:* $J(K_{t+1}) \leq J(K_t)$ or $J(K_t) - J(K_*) \leq \varepsilon$.
3. *Linear Rate:* $J(K_t) - J(K_*) \leq 2^{-\lfloor t/l \rfloor} J(K_0)$ as long as $t \leq l \cdot \log_2(J(K_0)/\varepsilon)$.

Proof. We use mathematical induction, where the base case of $t = 0$ holds by our assumptions. Now consider some $t + 1$, and suppose the claim holds for all values less than or equal to t .

We first show K_{t+1} is a stabilizing matrix gain. We have

$$\|K_{t+1} - K_{t+1}^*\| \leq \frac{\sigma_{\min}(Q)\sigma_{\min}(\Psi)}{16J(K_0)\|B\|} \leq \frac{\sigma_{\min}(Q)\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_{K_t})}{4J(K_t)\|B\|(\|A - BK_t\| + 1)},$$

where the second inequality is from $\|E_t - E_t^*\|_F^2 \leq C_4$ and the third is by $\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_{K_t}) \geq \sigma_{\min}(\Psi)$ from (2.7) as well as both $J(K_t) \leq J(K_0) + J(K_*) \leq 2J(K_0)$ and $\|A -$

$BK_t\| < 1$ from the inductive hypothesis. Therefore, the hypothesis for Lemma 3.4 is satisfied, and we have K_{t+1} is a stabilizing matrix gain.

Next, we prove monotone or converge. Suppose $J(K_t) - J(K_*) > \varepsilon$. By the inductive hypothesis, K_t is stable and $J(K_t) \leq 2J(K_0)$. So invoking Proposition 3.5 and adding $J(K_*) - J(K_t)$,

$$(3.8) \quad J(K_{t+1}) - J(K_t) \leq -\frac{C_2}{4J(K_*)C_1}[J(K_t) - J(K_*)] + \epsilon'_t$$

where we recall ϵ'_t is defined in (3.6). By our bounds $\|\delta_t\|_F^2 \leq \min\{C_5, C_6\}$, we ensure

$$(3.9) \quad \epsilon'_t \leq \frac{C_2\varepsilon}{40J(K_0)C_1} \leq \frac{C_2\varepsilon}{40J(K_*)C_1},$$

where upon plugging back into (3.8) and noticing $J(K_t) - J(K_*) > \varepsilon$, we deduce $J(K_{t+1}) \leq J(K_t)$.

Finally, let us show linear rate of convergence. To simplify our notation, let us define the constant $Z = \frac{C_2}{5C_1}$. We already showed (3.9), which is equivalent to $\epsilon'_t \leq \frac{Z\varepsilon}{8J(K_0)}$. Recalling that we consider iterations $t \leq l \cdot \log_2(J(K_0)/\varepsilon)$, this implies $\epsilon'_t \leq 2^{-\lfloor t/l \rfloor - 2}(Z/2)$. Thus, using our bound on ϵ'_t and choice of l , the recursion (3.8) can be simplified into (see, e.g., [24, Lemma 11])

$$J(K_{t+1}) - J(K_*) \leq 2^{-\lfloor (t+1)/l \rfloor} \left(J(K_0) - J(K_*) + \frac{5l \cdot Z}{16} \right) \leq 2^{-\lfloor (t+1)/l \rfloor} J(K_0),$$

where the last inequality is because $\kappa_{\text{PO}} > 1$, so $\lceil \kappa_{\text{PO}} \rceil / 2 \leq \kappa_{\text{PO}}$. This completes the proof of convergence and finishes our proof by induction. \square

Some remarks are in order. For the second property of monotone or converge, a corollary is that once $J(K_t) - J(K_*) \leq \varepsilon$, all future gains $K_{t'}$ must also satisfy the inequality. Finally, the linear rate is restricted to finite t . This is not surprising, since we only ask the gradient error to be $O(\varepsilon)$, so it makes sense that the gap cannot be guaranteed to go below $O(\varepsilon)$.

The theorem suggests the number of policy optimization iterations is

$$\frac{16J(K_*)[\|R\| + \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\Psi_\sigma)\|B\|^2 J(K_0)] \ln(J(K_0)/\varepsilon)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)\sigma_{\min}(R)}.$$

As we saw in the theorem, we need to ensure the error $\|E_t - E_t^*\|_F^2$ is sufficiently small. In the next section, we show how to do so with arbitrarily high probability.

4. The critic: Policy evaluation via stochastic primal-dual. Given a controller a stabilizing matrix gain K , recall from (2.14) we can estimate the gradient by solving the linear system of equations,

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}]x = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}]$$

where the stochastic matrix \tilde{A} and stochastic vector \tilde{b} are defined in (2.14) and (2.15). We re-formulate the problem as the general minmax problem of

$$(4.2) \quad \min_{x \in X} f(x) := \max_{y \in Y} \{ \langle y, \mathbb{E}[A]x - \mathbb{E}[b] \rangle - \hat{h}(y) \},$$

where $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is some closed set which includes the optimal solution x^* , $\hat{h} : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a relatively simple, proper, convex, lower semicontinuous function that is easy to

solve, and A is a linear operator such that $\|A(u-x)\|_* \leq \|A\| \|u-x\|$ for all $x, u \in X$. In the case of solving a linear system, $\hat{h} \equiv 0$ and $Y := \{y : \|y\| \leq 1\}$.

To facilitate our analysis, let us define some useful notation. Let $\omega : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be some strongly convex function of modulus σ_ω , which we assume to be 1 by scaling. We define the *Bregman divergence* associated with a X and ω as

$$V(x, y) := \omega(y) - \omega(x) - \langle \omega'(x), y - x \rangle, \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

We define diameter of a set X

$$D_X^2 := \max_{x, y \in X} V(x, y)$$

We introduce the random variables $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_t$ (for any $t \geq 1$) to be a stochastic process generated according to some probability measure $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ on a state space Ξ , e.g., $\Xi \equiv \mathbb{R}^d$. Define $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_t)$ as the σ -algebra generated by the first t random variables.

We will assume access to only a stochastic oracle for the matrix $A = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}]$ and vector $b = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}]$. The first assumption generalizes both the bounded and strong-tail decay of our stochastic operators.

ASSUMPTION 4.1. *There exists $M_A, M_b \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\varsigma_A, \varsigma_b \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and $\rho \in [0, 1)$ such that for any $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and $\xi_t \in \Xi$,*

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tilde{A}(\xi_t)\| &\leq M_A \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta} \right)^\beta \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{b}(\xi_t)\| \leq M_b \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta} \right)^\beta \quad \text{w.p. } 1 - \delta, \\ \|\tilde{A}(\xi_t) - A\| &\leq \varsigma_A \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta} \right)^\beta \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{b}(\xi_t) - b\| \leq \varsigma_b \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta} \right)^\beta \quad \text{w.p. } 1 - \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Later, Lemma 4.10 will show the bound on the norms of the stochastic matrix and vector within LQR, while Lemma 4.13 will help show the variance-like bound.

Next, we show we can reduce the bias sufficiently fast.

ASSUMPTION 4.2. *Conditioned on the event that (4.3) holds, there exist $C \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\rho \in (0, 1]$ such that for any $t, \tau \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|A - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}(\xi_{t+\tau}) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]\| &\leq CM_A \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta} \right)^\beta \rho^\tau \\ \|b - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}(\xi_{t+\tau}) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]\| &\leq CM_b \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta} \right)^\beta \rho^\tau. \end{aligned}$$

We verify this assumption in Lemma 4.14.

To measure progress, we use (where $\tilde{z} \equiv (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in Z := X \times Y$)

$$Q(\tilde{z}, z) := Q([\tilde{x}; \tilde{y}], [x; y]) = [\langle A\tilde{x} - b, y \rangle - \hat{g}(y)] - [\langle Ax - b, \tilde{y} \rangle - \hat{g}(\tilde{y})]$$

and the corresponding primal-dual gap function

$$g(\tilde{z}) := \max_{z \in Z} Q(\tilde{z}, z).$$

In view of this definition, we introduce our last assumption, which is a regularity condition known as sharpness, as first introduced by Polyak [34, 7].

ASSUMPTION 4.3. *There exists a $\mu > 0$ such that*

$$\mu \sqrt{V(x, x^*)} \leq g(z) - g(z^*), \quad \forall z \equiv (x, y) \in X \times Y.$$

With $g([x; y]) := \|Ax - b\|$, the constant μ is the smallest singular value of A .

4.1. A stochastic primal-dual algorithm. We employ a primal-dual method, as seen in Algorithm 4.1 to solve the min-max problem of (4.2). Besides a dual and primal step, where we recall in the dual step that \hat{g} is relatively simple to solve, the algorithm separately collects τ samples to form our stochastic estimates of \tilde{A} and \tilde{b} for both the dual and primal step. This method is similar to the conditional temporal differencing methods studied in [20]. The reason we need separate samples is to reduce the bias in both the primal and dual step. Finally, at the end we take a weighted average of all past k points to calculate our final solution.

Algorithm 4.1 Conditional stochastic primal-dual (CSPD)

Input: $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$; $x_{-1} = x_0 \in X$; $k, \tau \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$; $\{\eta_t, \lambda_t, \theta_t\}_{t=1}^k$ Choose an arbitrary $y_0 \in Y$
for $t = 1, \dots, k$ **do**
 $z_t = x_{t-1} + \theta_t(x_{t-1} - x_{t-2})$
 Collect τ samples, set $(\tilde{A}_{Y,t}, \tilde{b}_{Y,t}) \leftarrow (A(\xi_{(2t-1)\tau}), b(\xi_{(2t-1)\tau}))$
 $y_t = \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in Y} \{ \langle -\tilde{A}_{Y,t} z_t + \tilde{b}_{Y,t}, y \rangle + \hat{g}(y) + \lambda_t V(y_{t-1}, y) \}$
 Collect τ more samples, set $\tilde{A}_{X,t} \leftarrow A(\xi_{2t\tau})$
 $x_t = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in X} \{ \langle y_t, \tilde{A}_{X,t} x \rangle + \eta_t V(x_{t-1}, x) \}$
end for
 $(\bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_k) = \frac{2}{k(k+1)} \sum_{t=1}^k t \cdot (x_t, y_t)$
return \bar{x}_k

We provide the general convergence result regarding the primal-dual algorithm of Algorithm 4.1.

PROPOSITION 4.4. *Let $\{\gamma_t, \eta_t, \lambda_t, \theta_t\}_t$ be a sequence of non-negative reals satisfying*

$$\gamma_{t-1}\eta_{t-1} \leq \gamma_t\eta_t, \quad \gamma_{t-1}\lambda_{t-1} \leq \gamma_t\lambda_t, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_t\theta_t = \gamma_{t-1},$$

and there exist some $p, q \in (0, 1)$ for all t satisfying

$$\|A\|^2 / (p\lambda_t) - q\eta_t \leq 0.$$

If all these conditions hold, then

$$\sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t Q(z_t, z) \leq \gamma_k \eta_k D_X^2 + \gamma_k \lambda_k D_Y^2 + \sum_{t=1}^k \Lambda_t(x, y),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_t(x, y) := & -\frac{\gamma_t \lambda_t}{2} (1-p) \|y_t - y_{t-1}\|^2 - \frac{(1-q)\gamma_t \eta_t}{2} \|x_t - x_{t-1}\|^2 \\ & + \gamma_t \langle (\tilde{A}_{Y,t} - A)z_t - (\tilde{b}_{Y,t} - b), y_t - y \rangle - \gamma_t \langle (\tilde{A}_{X,t} - A)^T y_t, x_t - x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The proof follows the standard primal-dual approach, see, e.g., [24]. Next, we provide a bound for the stochastic error term. Since the error bound pertains to both the primal space X and dual space Y , we write the result for a general convex space U . Due to space constraints, we only sketch the main idea of the proof.

PROPOSITION 4.5. Let $\{\gamma_t\}$, $\{\alpha_t\}$, and $\{c_t\}$ be a non-negative constants with $\gamma_{t-1}\alpha_{t-1} \leq \gamma_t\alpha_t$. Assume a given sequence of stochastic vectors $\{\tilde{G}_t\}_t$ respects

$$(4.4) \quad \|\tilde{G}_{t\tau} - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}_{t\tau} | \mathcal{F}_{(t-1)\tau}]\| \leq \varsigma,$$

$$(4.5) \quad \|G - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}_{t\tau} | \mathcal{F}_{(t-1)\tau}]\|_* \leq CM\rho^\tau,$$

where $C, M, \varsigma, \tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\rho \in [0, 1)$, and $G \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are fixed constants. Then for any vectors $\{u_t \in U\}_t$ and $\{v_t \in U\}_t$ where u_t and v_t are $\mathcal{F}_{t\tau}$ -measurable, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t \langle G - \tilde{G}_{t\tau}, u_t - u \rangle - \frac{c_t \gamma_t}{2} \|u_t - u_{t-1}\|^2 \\ & \leq \gamma_k c_k D_U^2 + \sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t \left(C M D_U \rho^\tau + \frac{2(2C^2 M^2 \rho^{2\tau} + \varsigma^2)}{c_t} \right) + \varsigma D_U \sqrt{8 \sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof sketch. Let us define a set of points from U to inject into the summation. With $u_0^v = u_0$ and $\Delta_t = G - \tilde{G}_{t\tau}$, let u_t^v be defined recursively by

$$u_t^v = \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in U} \{ \langle \Delta_t, u \rangle + \alpha_t V(u, u_{t-1}^v) \},$$

Since G is a constant, $\tilde{G}_{t\tau}$ is assumed to be $\mathcal{F}_{t\tau}$ -measurable, and one can (inductively) show u_{t-1}^v is $\mathcal{F}_{(t-1)\tau}$ -measurable, then u_t^v is $\mathcal{F}_{t\tau}$ -measurable.

Now, we consider decomposing our quantity of interest via

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t \langle \Delta_t, u_t - u \rangle - \frac{c_t \gamma_t}{2} \|u_t - u_{t-1}\|^2 = \sum_{t=1}^k \left[\gamma_t \langle \Delta_t, u_t - u_{t-1} \rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{c_t \gamma_t}{2} \|u_t - u_{t-1}\|^2 + \gamma_t \langle \Delta_t, u_{t-1} - u_{t-1}^v \rangle + \gamma_t \langle \Delta_t, u_{t-1}^v - u \rangle \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Young's inequality, the first two summands can be bounded by $\frac{\gamma_t}{2c_t} \|G - \tilde{G}_{t\tau}\|_*^2$, which can be further bounded using the inequality $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$, (4.4), and (4.5). The sum over third summand can be bounded by application of the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality with a martingale difference sequence of $Z_t := \gamma_t \langle G - \tilde{G}_{t\tau}, u_{t-1} - v_{t-1} \rangle$; see [40, Lemma 7] for an idea of this step. Finally, the summation over the fourth summand can be bounded by a similar argument to [24, Lemma 4.10]. \square

We are now ready to complete the proof of convergence. Recall the gap function $g(\bar{z}) \equiv \max_{z \in Z} Q(\bar{z}, z)$ and the weighted average solution $\bar{z}_k \equiv (\bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_k)$.

THEOREM 4.6. Let Assumption 4.1 Assumption 4.2 take place. If the hypothesis of Proposition 4.4 holds, then with probability at least $1 - 2(k+1)\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t \right) g(\bar{z}_k) & \leq 2\gamma_k (\eta_k D_X^2 + \lambda_k D_Y^2) + \sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t \left[C(D_X M_X + D_Y M_Y) \rho^\tau \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{2\varsigma_X^2}{\eta_t(1-q)} + \frac{2\varsigma_Y^2}{\lambda_t(1-p)} + 4C^2 \left(\frac{M_X^2}{\eta_t(1-q)} + \frac{M_Y^2}{\lambda_t(1-p)} \right) \rho^{2\tau} \right] \\ & \quad + (D_X \varsigma_X + D_Y \varsigma_Y) \sqrt{8 \sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $S_Y := \max\{\|y\| : y \in Y\}$, $\bar{\theta} = \max_t \theta_t$, and (M_A and M_b are from Assumption 4.1)

$$\begin{aligned}
\varsigma_X &:= [M_A \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta}\right)^\beta + \|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_{X,t} | \mathcal{F}_{(2t-1)\tau}]\|] S_Y \\
\varsigma_Y &:= [M_A \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta}\right)^\beta + \|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_{Y,t} | \mathcal{F}_{(2t-2)\tau}]\|] (\|x^*\| + (1 + \bar{\theta})\sqrt{2}D_X) \\
&\quad + [M_b \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta}\right)^\beta + \|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}_{Y,t} | \mathcal{F}_{(2t-2)\tau}]\|_*] \\
M_X &:= M_A S_Y \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta}\right)^\beta, \quad M_Y := (M_A (\|x^*\| + (1 + \bar{\theta})\sqrt{2}D_X) + M_b) \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta}\right)^\beta.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. We first bound the stochastic error, defined in Proposition 4.4, which can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^k \Lambda_t(x, y) &= \sum_{t=1}^k -\frac{\gamma_t \lambda_t}{2} (1-p) \|y_t - y_{t-1}\|^2 - \frac{(1-q)\gamma_t \eta_t}{2} \|x_t - x_{t-1}\|^2 \\
&\quad + \gamma_t \left\langle \underbrace{(\tilde{A}_{Y,t} z_t - \tilde{b}_{Y,t})}_{\tilde{G}_{Y,t}^\tau} - \underbrace{(Az_t - b)}_{G_Y}, y_t - y \right\rangle - \gamma_t \left\langle \underbrace{\tilde{A}_{X,t}^\tau y_t}_{\tilde{G}_{X,t}^\tau} - \underbrace{A^\tau y_t}_{G_X}, x_t - x \right\rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Our intention is to bound the summations using the previous Proposition 4.5. To do so, we need to verify conditions (4.4) and (4.5). Observe from Algorithm 4.1 that $\tilde{A}_{Y,t}$ and $\tilde{b}_{Y,t}$ are generated using the $(2t-1)\tau$ -th sample. Recalling $z_t = x_{t-1} + \theta_t(x_{t-1} - x_{t-2})$ and using Assumption 4.1, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\tilde{G}_{Y,t}^\tau - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}_{Y,t}^\tau | \mathcal{F}_{(2t-2)\tau}]\|_* \\
&\leq [\|\tilde{A}_{Y,t}\|_* + \|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_{Y,t} | \mathcal{F}_{(2t-2)\tau}]\|] (\|x^*\| + \|x_{t-1} - x^*\| + \theta_t \|x_{t-1} - x_{t-2}\|) \\
&\quad + \|\tilde{b}_{Y,t}\|_* + \|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}_{Y,t} | \mathcal{F}_{(2t-2)\tau}]\|_* \\
&\leq [M_A \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta}\right)^\beta + \|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_{Y,t} | \mathcal{F}_{(2t-2)\tau}]\|] (\|x^*\| + (1 + \theta_t)\sqrt{2}D_X) \\
&\quad + [M_b \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta}\right)^\beta + \|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}_{Y,t} | \mathcal{F}_{(2t-2)\tau}]\|_*] \leq \varsigma_Y.
\end{aligned}$$

By definition of M_Y , one can similarly show

$$\|G_Y - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}_{Y,t}^\tau | \mathcal{F}_{(2t-2)\tau}]\|_* \leq CM_Y \rho^\tau.$$

Therefore, we have satisfied (4.4) with ς_X and (4.5) with M_X by conditioning on the sample paths that ensure these bounds hold true, which holds with probability $1 - \delta$. Consequently, Proposition 4.5 is available to us. Fixing $U \equiv Y$, $u_t \equiv y_t$, and $u \equiv y$, we can bound the summation over the first and third terms from (4.7) via

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t \langle \tilde{G}_{Y,t}^\tau - G_Y, y_t - y \rangle - \frac{\gamma_t \lambda_t}{2} (1-p) \|y_t - y_{t-1}\|^2 \\
&\leq \gamma_k \lambda_k D_Y^2 + \sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t \left(CM_Y D_Y \rho^\tau + \frac{2(2C^2 M_Y^2 \rho^{2\tau} + \varsigma_Y^2)}{\lambda_t (1-p)} \right) + \varsigma_Y D_Y \sqrt{8 \sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t^2 \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This holds with probability at least $1 - (k + 1)\delta$, where the $k\delta$ probability of failure comes by union bounds to ensure our conditions (4.4) and (4.5) hold true, and the additional δ probability of failure is from Proposition 4.5. A nearly identical argument can be made for the second and fourth terms from (4.7). Combining everything back derived so far into (4.7) yields a bound on $\sum_{t=1}^k \Lambda_t(x, y)$.

Now, by definition of the primal-dual gap and convexity of Q ,

$$\left(\sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t\right) \cdot g(\bar{z}_k) = \max_{z \in Z} \left(\sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t\right) Q(\bar{z}_k, z) \leq \max_{z \in Z} \sum_{t=1}^k \gamma_t Q(z_t, z).$$

Then upon plugging our bound on $\sum_{t=1}^k \Lambda_t(x, y)$ into Proposition 4.4 and noting it holds for any $z \in Z$, and dividing through by the sum over γ_t , we finish the proof. \square

We now specify a choice of step size. The proof is nearly identical to [24, Corollary 4.3], hence we skip it.

COROLLARY 4.7. *Let $\eta_t = \frac{3\sqrt{2}\|A\|D_Y t + 3\varsigma_X t^{3/2}}{2\sqrt{2}D_X t}$, $\lambda_t = \frac{3\sqrt{2}\|A\|D_X t + 3\varsigma_Y t^{3/2}}{2\sqrt{2}D_Y t}$, and $\theta_t = \frac{t-1}{t}$, where the variance and gradient bound terms ς_I and M_I for $I \in \{X, Y\}$ are defined in (4.6). Then with probability at least $1 - 2(k + 1)\delta$,*

$$g(\bar{z}_k) \leq \frac{12\|A\|D_X D_Y}{k+1} + \frac{(3\sqrt{2} + 8 + 2\sqrt{\frac{2\ln \delta^{-1}}{3}})(D_X \varsigma_X + D_Y \varsigma_Y)}{\sqrt{k}} + C(D_X M_X + D_Y M_Y)\rho^\tau + \frac{4C^2}{\sqrt{k}} \left(\frac{D_X M_X^2}{\varsigma_X} + \frac{D_Y M_Y^2}{\varsigma_Y} \right) \rho^{2\tau}.$$

For minimizing $\|x - x^*\|^2 \leq \epsilon$, this result implies we have a convergence rate of $O\left(\frac{\|A\|}{\mu^2 k^2} + \frac{\text{var}}{\mu^2 k}\right)$, where var bounds the statistical errors. However, when $\text{var} = 0$, i.e., the deterministic case, this rate is not optimal for solving linear systems.

To achieve the optimal deterministic error rate, we introduce a multi-epoch shrinking algorithm in Algorithm 4.2. It repeatedly calls Algorithm 4.1 and uses the solution to the previous call to warm-start the next call. We call each an *epoch*. Each epoch s will use an updated feasible set for the primal variable X_s that is shrunk from the previous epoch. The feasible set for the dual variable Y remains unchanged. A key feature is that $x^* \in X_s$ always. Since X_s gets smaller, we update the diameter D_{X_s} to be shrinking by roughly one half. The choice of step sizes still adheres to those prescribed in Corollary 4.7 up to the difference in the diameter D_{X_s} , while the number of iterations k_s and mixes per iteration τ_s increases.

We now establish the main convergence result. Recall the gradient bounds M_I and variance terms ς_I for $I \in \{X, Y\}$ are defined as in (4.6). We skip the proof due to space constraints, though it is similar to the one for [24, Proposition 4.5], where we apply the previous result, the sharpness condition from Assumption 4.3, and the shrinking property from Algorithm 4.2.

PROPOSITION 4.8. *Let the step sizes $\{\eta_t, \lambda_t, \theta_t\}_{t=1}^{k_s}$ be defined as in Corollary 4.7*

Algorithm 4.2 Shrinking multi-epoch CSPD

Input: $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$; $p_0 \in X$; D_0 s.t. $V(p_0, x^*) \leq D_0^2$; $k, \tau, S \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$
for $s = 1, \dots, S$ **do**

$$D_s^2 := 2^{-(s-1)} D_0^2$$

$$X_s := \{x \in X : V(x, p_{s-1}) \leq D_s^2\}$$

 $p_s \leftarrow$ Algorithm 4.1 with $X_s, p_{s-1}, k_s, \tau_s, \{\eta_t, \lambda_t, \theta_t\}_t$ specified by Proposition 4.8 and Corollary 4.7

end for
return p_S

and the number of iterations and mixes per iteration as

$$k_s = \left\lceil \max \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{8064} \|A\| D_Y}{\mu}, \frac{112(300 + 8 \ln \delta^{-1})}{\mu^2} \max\{\varsigma_X^2, \frac{2^{s-1} D_Y^2 \varsigma_Y^2}{D_0^2}\} \right\} \right\rceil,$$

$$\tau_s = \left\lceil \max \left\{ \frac{\max\{\ln \frac{112 M_X^2}{\mu^2}, \ln \frac{112 \cdot 2^{s-1} D_Y^2 M_Y^2}{\mu^2 D_0^2}, \ln C\}}{\ln(1/\rho)}, \frac{\max\{\ln \frac{C^4 M_X^4}{\varsigma_X^4}, \ln \frac{C^4 M_Y^4}{\varsigma_Y^4}\}}{\ln(1/\rho)} \right\} \right\rceil.$$

When $S = \lceil \log_2 \frac{2D_0^2}{\epsilon} \rceil$, then $\|p_S - x^*\|^2 \leq \epsilon$ with probability at least $1 - 2(N_S + S)\delta$, and the total iterations is at most

$$N_S = \max \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{8064} \|A\| D_Y}{\mu} \log_2 \left(\frac{4D_0^2}{\epsilon} \right), \frac{112(300 + 8 \ln \delta^{-1})}{\mu^2} \max\{\varsigma_X^2 \log_2 \left(\frac{4D_0}{\epsilon} \right), \frac{8D_Y^2 \varsigma_Y^2}{\epsilon}\} \right\},$$

while the sample complexity is at most

$$N_S \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{\max\{\ln \frac{112 M_X^2}{\mu^2}, \ln \frac{448 D_Y^2 M_Y^2}{\mu^2 \epsilon}, \ln C\}}{\ln(1/\rho)}, \frac{\max\{\ln \frac{C^4 M_X^4}{\varsigma_X^4}, \ln \frac{C^4 M_Y^4}{\varsigma_Y^4}\}}{\ln(1/\rho)} \right\}.$$

In view of this proposition, we have achieved the optimal deterministic and stochastic error rate. Comparing this to our iteration and sampling complexity from Corollary 4.7, we reduced our dependence of $\|A\|\epsilon^{-1}$ to $\|A\|\ln \epsilon^{-1}$ without compromising the iteration or sampling complexities for other error terms. Next, we apply this generic primal-dual method to the setting of estimating the natural gradient matrix E_{K_t} .

4.2. Sampling complexity of policy optimization and evaluation. This section brings everything together to establish the sampling complexity. Recall we use Algorithm 3.1 to improve the matrix gain and Algorithm 4.2 to estimate the natural gradient matrix E_{K_t} . To use the latter, we need Assumption 4.1, Assumption 4.2, Assumption 4.3.

First, we show the gradient is bounded with high probability. The proof, which is skipped due to space constraints, follows from the Hanson-Wright inequality (e.g., [3, Example 2.12]) and a change of variables.

LEMMA 4.9. *Let $z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$. For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \|z\|^2 > \frac{(4\|\Sigma\| \sqrt{\ln(1/\delta)} + \|\Sigma\|_F)^2 - \|\Sigma\|_F^2 + \text{Tr}(\Sigma) + 2\|\mu\|^2}{8\|\Sigma\|} \right\} \leq \delta.$$

In view of the previous lemma, we construct the event for the t -th random variable, which holds w.p. at least $1 - \delta$:

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{E}_t := \left\{ \|x_t\|^2 + \|u_t\|^2 \leq (4\|\tilde{\Sigma}^{(t)}\| + \text{Tr}(\tilde{\Sigma}^{(t)}) + 2(\|x_0\|^2 + \|u_0\|^2))\sqrt{\ln \frac{e}{\delta}} \right\},$$

where I_k is an identity of size k ,

$$(4.9) \quad \tilde{\Sigma}_K^{(t)} := \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_K^{(t)} & -\Sigma_K^{(t)} K^T \\ -K \Sigma_K^{(t)} & K \Sigma_K^{(t)} K^T + \sigma^2 I_k \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } \Sigma_K^{(t)} := \sum_{p=0}^{t-1} (A - BK)^p \Psi [(A - BK)^T]^p.$$

The matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}_K^{(t)}$ is the covariance matrix of the state-action pair $[x_t \ u_t]$ with $u_t = -Kx_t$ conditioned on x_0 , and similarly, $\Sigma_K^{(t)}$ is the covariance matrix of the state x_t .

Since we collect every τ -th and $(\tau + 1)$ -th sample in Algorithm 4.1, let us define the intersection of all such events at intervals of $0, 1, \tau, \tau + 1, 2\tau, 2\tau + 1, \dots, T\tau, T\tau + 1$ for some $T \geq 1$:

$$\mathcal{E} := \bigcap_{0 \leq t \leq T-1} (\mathcal{E}_{t \cdot (\tau+1)} \cap \mathcal{E}_{t \cdot (\tau+1)+1}).$$

Notice that by union bound, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 1 - 2T\delta$.

Now we are ready to show Assumption 4.1. Recall the controls lie in $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

LEMMA 4.10. *Let K be the current controller, assumed to be stable, and the events \mathcal{E}_t and \mathcal{E}_{t+1} take place. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{A}_t\| &\leq M_A \ln \frac{e}{\delta} := 17(1 + \|K\|)^4 \max \left\{ 1, \left(\frac{5J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} + 2\|x_0\|^2 + (4+k)\sigma^2 \right)^2 \right\} \ln \frac{e}{\delta}, \\ \|\tilde{b}_t\| &\leq M_b \ln \frac{e}{\delta} := M_A \max\{\|Q\|, \|R\|\} \ln \frac{e}{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

A proof can be found in Appendix A.1. To bound the variance-like term in Assumption 4.1, we now bound the norm of the expected matrix and vector, $A = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}]$ and $b = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}]$. First, we'll need a couple helper lemmas.

LEMMA 4.11. *For symmetric positive semidefinite matrix S , $\|S\|_F \leq \text{Tr}(S)$*

Proof. This follows from $\|H\|_F \leq |\text{Tr}(H)|$ when H is Hermitian and semidefinite [17, Section 7.1 P5]. \square

LEMMA 4.12. *Let K be the current stable controller and define the radius $R_* := (\|Q\|_F + \|R\|_F) + (\|A\|_F^2 + \|B\|_F^2) \cdot \frac{J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(\Psi)}$. Then the optimal solution to (4.1) satisfies $\|x^*\| \leq R_*$.*

This fact comes from [43, Eqn 5.4] and Lemma 4.11.

We now obtain upper bounds on the norm.

LEMMA 4.13. *Matrix $A = \mathbb{E}_{\Pi_K}[\tilde{A}]$ and vector $b = \mathbb{E}_{\Pi_K}[\tilde{b}]$ have norms bounded by*

$$\|A\| \leq L_A := 1 + 4(1 + \|K\|_F^2) \frac{J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} + \sigma^2(k+2) \text{ and } \|b\| \leq L_A R_*.$$

The bound on $\|A\|$ can be shown by [43, Lemma B.2]. As for $\|b\|$, we use the previous lemma with the fact $b = Ax^*$. Thus, using the crude bound $\|\tilde{A}(\xi_t) - A\| \leq \|\tilde{A}(\xi_t)\| +$

$\|A\|$ and $\|\tilde{b}(\xi_t) - b\| \leq \|\tilde{b}(\xi_t)\| + \|b\|$ and the last few results, we complete verification of Assumption 4.1.

Next, we show the fast mixing property, or the geometrically decreasing bias of these stochastic elements of Assumption 4.2 with $\beta = 5/4$. This is a corollary of the geometrically fast mixing property of a linear dynamic system [39, Proposition 3.1].

LEMMA 4.14. *Suppose the event \mathcal{E} takes place with some $\delta \in (0, 1]$. Using $\|\cdot\| \equiv \|\cdot\|_2$, then Assumption 4.2 is satisfied with M_A and M_b as defined in Lemma 4.10, $\beta = 5/4$, and*

$$C := \frac{1}{2} \left(M_A + \sqrt{\frac{n}{1-\rho}} \right).$$

The proof is in Appendix A.2. This verifies Assumption 4.2.

Our final assumption is Assumption 4.3, which addresses the sharpness condition. In the context of solving a linear system involving a positive definite matrix A , this is equal to the smallest singular value since $\|Ax - b\| \geq \sigma_{\min}(A)\|x - x^*\|$.

LEMMA 4.15. *Denote $A = \mathbb{E}_{\Pi}[\tilde{A}]$ and let K be the stable controller with the induced spectrum of $\rho \equiv \rho(A - BK)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\min}(A) \geq & \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ 1, \left(1 + (1 + \|K\|)^2 \frac{J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} + \sigma^2 \right)^{-1} (1 - \rho^2) \right. \\ & \left. \cdot \min \{ \max(0, \sigma^2 - \sigma_{\min}(\Psi)\|K\|^2), \sigma_{\min}(\Psi) \} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is given in Appendix A.3. Thus, we have verified Assumption 4.1, Assumption 4.2, and Assumption 4.3.

The following corollary is a result of combining Theorem 3.6 and Proposition 4.8 as well as the constants provided in results above. If we want the total success rate across all invocations of Proposition 4.8 to be at least $1 - \delta^*$, then we pass in the parameter

$$(4.10) \quad \delta = \delta^* \cdot O(1) \left(\frac{(1 - \rho^2)^2 \varepsilon}{J(K_0)^{11}} \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta} \right)^{11/2} \right)^p \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$$

(where we assume p is some small constant mildly dependent on ε and δ^*) into Proposition 4.8. Here, we treat all terms except for ε , $J(K_0)$, $1 - \rho^2$, and the failure rate δ as constants. To simplify our result, we will assume $\ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} < \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ and $J(K_0) \geq 1$.

COROLLARY 4.16. *Consider using parameters from in Theorem 3.6 to run Algorithm 3.1 and Proposition 4.8 to run Algorithm 4.2 with $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ and the initial solution x_0 satisfying $\|x_0\| = O(R_*)$ from Lemma 4.12. Set the error tolerance of Algorithm 4.2 to*

$$\epsilon = O(1) \min \{ 1, \varepsilon/J(K_0)^2, \varepsilon/J(K_0)^3, \varepsilon^{2/3}/J(K_0)^{8/3} \}.$$

If either ε and/or the failure rate δ^ are sufficiently small so that there exists a constant p where (4.10) holds, then it suffices to run Algorithm 4.2 for*

$$N_{in} := O(1) \left(\frac{J(K_0)^{11}}{\varepsilon(1 - \rho^2)^2} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon \delta^*} \right)^{11/2} \right)$$

iterations to estimate E_{K_t} for the hypothesis of Theorem 3.6 is met w.p. at least $1 - \delta^* O(1)(\ln 1/\varepsilon)^{-1}$. So, the sampling complexity to ensure $J(K_t) - J(K_*) \leq \varepsilon$ w.p. at least $1 - \delta^*$ is

$$O(1) \frac{N_{in} \ln(1/\varepsilon) \ln(n)}{\ln(1/\rho)}.$$

Thus, the overall sampling complexity with success at least $1 - \delta^*$ is

$$O\left\{ \frac{J(K_0)^{11}}{\varepsilon(1-\rho^2)^3} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta^*} \right)^{11/2} (\ln 1/\varepsilon)(\ln n) \right\}$$

Some remarks are in order. We decided to keep the initial objective value $J(K_0)$ in the final sampling complexity, since it can be shown this is proportional to the mixing rate $1 - \rho$. If indeed some of the constant parameters, e.g., $\|A\|$, $\text{Tr}(\Psi)$, $\sigma_{\min}(\Psi)$, are constants, then our sampling complexity only has a mild dependence on the state dimension n . And while our work studies the infinite-horizon average-reward setting, our work should be able to be extended to the infinite-horizon discounted setting. While this problem will have a different Bellman optimality condition and performance different lemmas (c.f. Lemma 2.2), they share properties very similar to our problem, such as PL-condition and the ability to formulate the natural gradient as the solution to a linear system of equations. Thus, our algorithmic approach and complexity results can potentially be used for that problem.

5. Numerical Experiments. We consider a scalar linear dynamical system (i.e., the state and control dimension, n and k , are both one) where the transition matrices A and B as well as the cost matrices Q and R are the identity matrix. We set the system noise level to $\Psi = 0.3$ and controller noise to $\sigma = 0.3$. Figure 1 shows the relative error when using natural policy gradient (Algorithm 3.1) with a step size of $\eta = 0.005$. For the policy evaluation, we warm-started each call with the solution to the linear system involving an empirical average of $\mathbb{E}[\hat{A}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\hat{b}]$ using 50 samples (which we accounted for in the total samples used) and then ran Algorithm 4.2 for one epoch with 50 iterations. We found one epoch sufficed to get a sufficient accuracy while not requiring too many samples. We also added a safeguard of rejecting a gradient if the policy evaluation returns an unreasonable solution, e.g., the cost is large or negative.

In Figure 1, we see the algorithm on average improves the matrix gain every iteration. However, the reason we do not have monotonicity, i.e., $J(K_{t+1}) \leq J(K_t)$, as promised by Theorem 4.6, is because we do not solve policy evaluation to a sufficiently high accuracy (this would require many samples). Also, there is large variability in performance. Again, this is likely due to the fact we do not solve policy evaluation to high accuracy. One reason we cannot rapidly solve to high accuracy is because the variance of the gradient can be large. Variance reduction techniques can potentially be useful here, which we leave for future work.

6. Conclusion. Using a variational inequality formulation for the actor step and conditional stochastic primal-dual method in the critic step to estimate the natural gradient E_{K_t} , we obtain a sampling complexity of $\tilde{O}(1/\varepsilon)$ to ensure $J(K_t) - J(K_*) \leq \varepsilon$ with high probability. Our analysis exploits the fact that the accuracy of the overall algorithm scales with the variance rather than the standard deviation for estimating E_{K_t} . This motivates us to formulate the critic step as a non-smooth problem to obtain the optimal rate of convergence.




FIG. 1. Relative error for a scalar control system. The shaded regions is the 10th to 90th percentile over 100 random seeds, and the solid blue line is the median performance.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. D. ANDERSON AND J. B. MOORE, *Optimal control: linear quadratic methods*, Courier Corporation, 2007.
- [2] M. ATHANS AND P. L. FALB, *Optimal control: an introduction to the theory and its applications*, Courier Corporation, 2013.
- [3] S. BOUCHERON, G. LUGOSI, AND P. MASSART, *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*, Oxford university press, 2013.
- [4] S. BOYD, L. EL GHAOUL, E. FERON, AND V. BALAKRISHNAN, *Linear matrix inequalities in system and control theory*, SIAM, 1994.
- [5] S. J. BRADTKE, *Incremental dynamic programming for on-line adaptive optimal control*, PhD thesis, Citeseer, 1994.
- [6] J. BU, A. MESBAHI, M. FAZEL, AND M. MESBAHI, *Lqr through the lens of first order methods: Discrete-time case*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.08921, (2019).
- [7] J. V. BURKE AND M. C. FERRIS, *Weak sharp minima in mathematical programming*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 31 (1993), pp. 1340–1359.
- [8] P. E. CAINES, *Linear Stochastic Systems*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2018.
- [9] S. DEAN, H. MANIA, N. MATNI, B. RECHT, AND S. TU, *On the sample complexity of the linear quadratic regulator*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics, 20 (2020), pp. 633–679.
- [10] F. FACCHINEI AND J.-S. PANG, *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems*, Springer, 2003.
- [11] I. FATKHULLIN AND B. POLYAK, *Optimizing static linear feedback: Gradient method*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 59 (2021), pp. 3887–3911, <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1329858>.
- [12] M. FAZEL, R. GE, S. KAKADE, AND M. MESBAHI, *Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator*, in Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, J. Dy and A. Krause, eds., vol. 80 of Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018, pp. 1467–1476.
- [13] M. FAZEL, R. GE, S. KAKADE, AND M. MESBAHI, *Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2018, pp. 1467–1476.
- [14] C.-N. FIECHTER, *Pac adaptive control of linear systems*, in Proceedings of the tenth annual conference on Computational learning theory, 1997, pp. 72–80.
- [15] M. HAUTUS, *Stabilization controllability and observability of linear autonomous systems*, in Indagationes mathematicae (proceedings), vol. 73, North-Holland, 1970, pp. 448–455.
- [16] G. HEWER, *An iterative technique for the computation of the steady state gains for the discrete optimal regulator*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 16 (1971), pp. 382–384.
- [17] R. A. HORN AND C. R. JOHNSON, *Matrix analysis*, Cambridge university press, 2012.
- [18] S. M. KAKADE, *A natural policy gradient*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, T. Dietterich, S. Becker, and Z. Ghahramani, eds., vol. 14, MIT Press, 2001.

- [19] V. KONDA AND J. TSITSIKLIS, *Actor-critic algorithms*, Advances in neural information processing systems, 12 (1999).
- [20] G. KOTSALIS, G. LAN, AND T. LI, *Simple and optimal methods for stochastic variational inequalities, ii: Markovian noise and policy evaluation in reinforcement learning*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 32 (2022), pp. 1120–1155.
- [21] K. KRAUTH, S. TU, AND B. RECHT, *Finite-time analysis of approximate policy iteration for the linear quadratic regulator*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 32 (2019).
- [22] P. R. KUMAR AND P. VARAIYA, *Stochastic Systems*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2015.
- [23] H. KWAKERNAAK AND R. SIVAN, *Linear optimal control systems*, vol. 1072, Wiley-interscience, 1969.
- [24] G. LAN, *First-order and stochastic optimization methods for machine learning*, Springer, 2020.
- [25] G. LAN, *Policy mirror descent for reinforcement learning: Linear convergence, new sampling complexity, and generalized problem classes*, Mathematical programming, (2022), pp. 1–48.
- [26] T. LI, F. WU, AND G. LAN, *Stochastic first-order methods for average-reward markov decision processes*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.05800, (2022).
- [27] Y. LI, T. ZHAO, AND G. LAN, *Homotopic policy mirror descent: Policy convergence, implicit regularization, and improved sample complexity*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.09457, (2022).
- [28] L. LJUNG, *System identification*, in Signal analysis and prediction, Springer, 1998, pp. 163–173.
- [29] S. LOJASIEWICZ, *Une propriété topologique des sous-ensembles analytiques réels*, Les équations aux dérivées partielles, 117 (1963), pp. 87–89.
- [30] D. MALIK, A. PANANJADY, K. BHATIA, K. KHAMARU, P. BARTLETT, AND M. WAINWRIGHT, *Derivative-free methods for policy optimization: Guarantees for linear quadratic systems*, in The 22nd international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics, PMLR, 2019, pp. 2916–2925.
- [31] H. MANIA, S. TU, AND B. RECHT, *Certainty equivalence is efficient for linear quadratic control*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 32 (2019).
- [32] H. MOHAMMADI, A. ZARE, M. SOLTANOLKOTABI, AND M. R. JOVANOVIĆ, *Convergence and sample complexity of gradient methods for the model-free linear-quadratic regulator problem*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 67 (2021), pp. 2435–2450.
- [33] B. T. POLYAK, *Gradient methods for the minimisation of functionals*, USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, 3 (1963), pp. 864–878.
- [34] B. T. POLYAK, *Sharp minima. institute of control sciences lecture notes, moscow, ussr, 1979*, in IIASA workshop on generalized Lagrangians and their applications, IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria, 1979.
- [35] J. SCHULMAN, S. LEVINE, P. ABBEEL, M. JORDAN, AND P. MORITZ, *Trust region policy optimization*, in International conference on machine learning, PMLR, 2015, pp. 1889–1897.
- [36] J. SCHULMAN, F. WOLSKI, P. DHARIWAL, A. RADFORD, AND O. KLIMOV, *Proximal policy optimization algorithms*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347, (2017).
- [37] M. SIMCHOWITZ AND D. FOSTER, *Naive exploration is optimal for online lqr*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2020, pp. 8937–8948.
- [38] R. S. SUTTON AND A. G. BARTO, *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*, MIT press, 2018.
- [39] S. TU AND B. RECHT, *Least-squares temporal difference learning for the linear quadratic regulator*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2018, pp. 5005–5014.
- [40] Y. WANG, W. CHEN, Y. LIU, Z.-M. MA, AND T.-Y. LIU, *Finite sample analysis of the gtd policy evaluation algorithms in markov setting*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 30 (2017).
- [41] D. WILSON, R. SHARP, AND S. HASSAN, *The application of linear optimal control theory to the design of active automotive suspensions*, Vehicle System Dynamics, 15 (1986), pp. 105–118.
- [42] W.-Y. YAN, K. L. TEO, AND J. B. MOORE, *A gradient flow approach to computing lq optimal output feedback gains*, Optimal Control Applications and Methods, 15 (1994), pp. 67–75.
- [43] Z. YANG, Y. CHEN, M. HONG, AND Z. WANG, *Provably global convergence of actor-critic: A case for linear quadratic regulator with ergodic cost*, Advances in neural information processing systems, 32 (2019).
- [44] K. ZHOU, J. DOYLE, AND K. GLOVER, *Robust and optimal control*, Prentice hall, 1996.

Appendix A. Proofs from section 4.

A.1. Proof of Lemma 4.10.

Proof of Lemma 4.10. Recall from (2.13) that $\phi_t \equiv \phi(x_t, -Kx_t) = \text{svec}(z_t z_t^T)$ and $z_t = \begin{bmatrix} x_t & -Kx_t \end{bmatrix}$. And since the events \mathcal{E}_t and \mathcal{E}_{t+1} (defined in (4.8)) take

place, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{A}_t\| &= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0^T \\ \phi_t & \phi_t[\phi_t - \phi_{t+1}]^T \end{bmatrix} \right\| \\ &\leq 2 + 2\|z_t\|^4 + \|z_t\|^2\|z_{t+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq 2 + 3 \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \left((4\|\tilde{\Sigma}_K^{(t)}\| + \text{Tr}(\tilde{\Sigma}_K^{(t)}) + 2(\|x_0\|^2 + \|u_0\|^2)) \sqrt{\ln \frac{e}{\delta}} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of $\tilde{\Sigma}_K^{(t)}$ supplied in (4.9), we can help bound each term in the max above with

(A.1)

$$\begin{aligned} &4\|\tilde{\Sigma}_K^{(t)}\| + \text{Tr}(\tilde{\Sigma}_K^{(t)}) + 2(\|x_0\|^2 + \|u_0\|^2) \\ &\leq 4((1 + \|K\|)^2\|\Sigma_K^{(t)}\| + \sigma^2) + ((1 + \|K\|^2)\text{Tr}(\Sigma_K^{(t)}) + \sigma^2 \cdot k) + 2(\|x_0\|^2 + \|u_0\|^2) \\ &\leq 5(1 + \|K\|)^2 \cdot \left(\frac{5J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} + 2\|x_0\|^2 + (4+k)\sigma^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line used $\|\Sigma_K^{(t)}\| \leq \text{Tr}(\Sigma_K^{(t)}) \leq \text{Tr}(\Sigma_K) \leq J(K)/\sigma_{\min}(Q)$ thanks in part to Lemma 3.1. Combining the last two inequalities gets us the upper bound on $\|\tilde{A}_t\|$. One can similarly bound $\|\tilde{b}_t\|$ by recalling $c(x_t, u_t) = x_t^T Q x_t + u_t^T R u_t$. \square

A.2. Proof of Lemma 4.14. We'll first need the geometrically fast mixing property of a linear dynamic system with a stabilizing matrix gain.

PROPOSITION A.1 (Proposition 3.1 [39]). *Suppose that $\|A^k\| \leq \Gamma\rho^k$ for all $k \geq 0$, where $\Gamma > 0$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Let $\mathbb{P}_{X_k}(\cdot | X_0 = x)$ denote the conditional distribution of X_k given $X_0 = x$. We have that for all $k \geq 0$ and any distribution ν_0 over x ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \nu_0} [\|\mathbb{P}_{X_k}(\cdot | X_0 = x) - \nu_\infty\|_{\text{tv}}] \leq \frac{\Gamma}{2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\nu_0} [\|x\|^2] + \frac{n}{1 - \rho^2}} \rho^k.$$

We can now prove Lemma 4.14.

Proof of Lemma 4.14. Let $dP_{t+\tau|t}$ be the conditional probability density function for $z_{t+\tau}$ conditioned on $z_t := [x_t \ u_t]$. Recalling $A = \mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim \Pi}[\tilde{A}(\xi)]$ and our conditioning on $\mathcal{E} \ni \mathcal{E}_{t+\tau}, \mathcal{E}_{t+\tau+1}$, the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\|A - \mathbb{E}[A(\xi_{t+\tau}) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]\|_* \\ &= \left\| \int_{\Xi} A(\xi) [d\Pi(\xi) - dP_t^\tau(\xi)] \right\|_* \\ &\leq \int_{\Xi} \|A(\xi)\|_* |d\Pi(\xi) - dP_{t+\tau|t}(\xi)| \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \left(\frac{M_A}{2} \sqrt{\|z_t\|^2 + \frac{n}{1 - \rho^2}} \right) \ln \frac{e}{\delta} \rho^\tau \\ &\leq \left(\frac{M_A}{2} \sqrt{\underbrace{(4\|\tilde{\Sigma}_K^{(t)}\| + \text{Tr}(\tilde{\Sigma}_K^{(t)}) + 2\|z_0\|^2)}_{\leq M_A \text{ by (A.1)}}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{e}{\delta} + \frac{n}{1 - \rho^2}} \right) \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta} \right) \rho^\tau \\ &\leq \frac{M_A}{2} \left(M_A + \sqrt{\frac{n}{1 - \rho^2}} \right) \left(\ln \frac{e}{\delta} \right)^{5/4} \rho^\tau \end{aligned}$$

where (i) is by Proposition A.1 with $\Gamma = 1$ and the application of Lemma 4.10

An identical argument can be made to bound $\|b - \mathbb{E}[b(\xi_{t+\tau})|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}]\|_*$ simply by replacing the first M_A above with M_b . \square

A.3. Proof of Lemma 4.15.

Proof of Lemma 4.15. Recall $A = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}]$. In [43, Lemma B.2], it was shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A^{-1}\| &\leq 1 + (1 + \|\tilde{\Sigma}_K\|_F)\|\Xi_K^{-1}\| \\ &\leq 1 + (1 + \|\tilde{\Sigma}_K\|_F)(1 - \rho^2)^{-1} \max\left\{\frac{1}{\max\{0, \sigma^2 - \sigma_{\min}(\Psi)\|K\|^2\}}, \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\Psi)}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

We can further refine this bound by observing $\tilde{\Sigma}_K$ is symmetric and positive definite:

$$\|\tilde{\Sigma}_K\|_F \leq (1 + \|K\|)^2 \|\Sigma_K\|_F + \sigma^2 \leq (1 + \|K\|)^2 \frac{J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} + \sigma^2,$$

where the inequality is by Lemma (3.1) and Lemma 4.11. Combining the two bounds, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\min}(A) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \min\left\{1, (1 + (1 + \|K\|)^2 \frac{J(K)}{\sigma_{\min}(Q)} + \sigma^2)^{-1}(1 - \rho^2)\right. \\ &\quad \left.\cdot \min\{\max(0, \sigma^2 - \sigma_{\min}(\Psi)\|K\|^2), \sigma_{\min}(\Psi)\}\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$