

Accelerating Nash Learning from Human Feedback via Mirror Prox

Daniil Tiapkin^{1,2} Daniele Calandriello³ Denis Belomestny^{4,5} Éric Moulines^{1,6}

Alexey Naumov⁵ Kashif Rasul⁷ Michal Valko⁸ Pierre Ménard⁹

¹CMAP, CNRS, École Polytechnique ²LMO, Université Paris-Saclay ³Google DeepMind

⁴Duisburg-Essen University ⁵HSE University ⁶Mohamed Bin Zayed University of AI

⁷Hugging Face ⁸Stealth Startup / Inria / ENS ⁹ENS Lyon

{daniil.tiapkin, eric.moulines}@polytechnique.edu dcalandriello@google.com

denis.belomestny@uni-due.de anaumov@hse.ru kashif.rasul@gmail.com

michal.valko@inria.fr pierre.menard@ens-lyon.fr

Abstract

Traditional Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) often relies on reward models, frequently assuming preference structures like the Bradley-Terry model, which may not accurately capture the complexities of real human preferences (e.g., intransitivity). Nash Learning from Human Feedback (NLHF) offers a more direct alternative by framing the problem as finding a Nash equilibrium of a game defined by these preferences. In this work, we introduce Nash Mirror Prox (NashMP), an online NLHF algorithm that leverages the Mirror Prox optimization scheme to achieve fast and stable convergence to the Nash equilibrium. Our theoretical analysis establishes that Nash-MP exhibits last-iterate linear convergence towards the β -regularized Nash equilibrium. Specifically, we prove that the KL-divergence to the optimal policy decreases at a rate of order $(1 + 2\beta)^{-N/2}$, where N is a number of preference queries. We further demonstrate last-iterate linear convergence for the exploitability gap and uniformly for the span semi-norm of log-probabilities, with all these rates being independent of the size of the action space. Furthermore, we propose and analyze an approximate version of Nash-MP where proximal steps are estimated using stochastic policy gradients, making the algorithm closer to applications. Finally, we detail a practical implementation strategy for fine-tuning large language models and present experiments that demonstrate its competitive performance and compatibility with existing methods.

1 Introduction

Aligning powerful pre-trained Large Language Models (LLMs) with complex, often subjective, human preferences and values is a critical challenge for ensuring safe and beneficial AI. Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) [Christiano et al., 2017] has emerged as a leading paradigm for this task, enabling agents to learn desired behaviors from human preference signals rather than sparse or hand-engineered reward functions. RLHF has been successfully applied to fine-tune LLMs for various tasks such as text summarization [Stiennon et al., 2020], dialogue generation, and question answering [Ziegler et al., 2019, Stiennon et al., 2020, Ouyang et al., 2022, Bai et al., 2022].

A common approach within RLHF, rooted in the literature on contextual dueling bandits [Yue et al., 2012, Zoghi et al., 2014, Bengs et al., 2021], is to posit an underlying reward model. The most prevalent choice is the Bradley-Terry (BT) model [Bradley and Terry, 1952, Zermelo, 1929], which assigns a scalar reward to each action and assumes that a preference between two actions is probabilistically determined by their reward difference. Under this model, the agent’s goal simplifies

to learning the reward function and selecting actions that maximize the inferred reward. Such an action, maximizing the average preference over all others, corresponds to a Condorcet winner in social choice theory.

However, relying on a reward model, particularly the Bradley-Terry model, comes with significant limitations [Dudík et al., 2015, Munos et al., 2023]. A fundamental issue is the inherent assumption of transitive preferences: if action a is preferred to b , and b to c , then a must be preferred to c . This assumption is often violated in real-world human judgments, which frequently exhibit intransitivity [Gardner, 1970, Tversky, 1969, Klimenko, 2015]. Moreover, even if individual preferences were transitive, aggregating preferences across a group can result in collective intransitivity [May, 1954, Kreweras, 1965]. Such non-transitive preferences preclude the existence of a Condorcet winner or a consistent scalar reward function that aligns with all comparisons.

Nash Learning from Human Feedback (NLHF). To circumvent the restrictive assumptions of reward models, particularly the existence of a consistent reward or Condorcet winner, Dudík et al. [2015] proposed a preference-based approach for dueling bandits, recently coined Nash Learning from Human Feedback (NLHF) by Munos et al. [2023]. This framework directly models pairwise preferences and formulates the problem as a symmetric two-player game where each player proposes an action. The natural objective is to find a symmetric Nash Equilibrium (NE, von Neumann 1928, Nash Jr 1950) of this preference game, known as a von Neumann winner (VNW) in the dueling bandits literature [Dudík et al., 2015]. Unlike a Condorcet winner (a single best action), a VNW is generally a distribution over actions (a mixed policy), representing a stable outcome in the face of potentially intransitive preferences.

Regularized NLHF. In practical RLHF settings, especially when fine-tuning pre-trained LLMs, it is crucial to learn a policy that aligns with human preferences while remaining close to the original reference policy (e.g., the pre-trained model). To satisfy this constraint, we consider finding the NE of a *regularized* preference game. This is achieved by adding a penalization term proportional to the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence from the current policy to the reference policy. This regularization encourages similarity to the reference policy and can also offer theoretical benefits for optimization, such as uniqueness of the NE.

Efficiently Finding the Regularized NE. Finding the Nash Equilibrium of such a game can be challenging. Munos et al. [2023] proposed the NashMD algorithm, an adaptation of Mirror Descent, to approximate the VNW of the regularized preference game. NashMD proceeds by first regularizing the current policy by mixing it with the reference policy, and then performing a mirror descent step against this regularized policy. They showed that the last iterate of NashMD converges to the regularized NE at a rate of $\mathcal{O}((\beta^2 N)^{-1})$, measured by the KL divergence to the NE, where N is the number of preference queries and β is the regularization parameter.

Mirror Prox and the Research Question. While NashMD provides a foundational algorithm, related optimization methods for finding Nash Equilibria, such as the Proximal Point (PP) method [Martinet, 1970] and its approximation Mirror Prox [Nemirovski, 2004], are known to achieve faster convergence rates, often linear, under certain conditions like strong concave-convexity. This raises a natural question: Can we develop an algorithm for NLHF, inspired by the powerful principles of Mirror Prox, that achieves a faster convergence rate than NashMD for the regularized preference game?

Contributions. We answer this question affirmatively and make the following contributions:

- We propose the Nash Mirror Prox (NashMP) algorithm, a novel method for finding the NE of the regularized preference game in NLHF. Inspired by the two-step structure of Mirror Prox, NashMP first computes an "improved" opponent policy via a mirror descent step and then updates the current policy by performing another mirror descent step against this improved opponent.
- We provide a rigorous theoretical analysis demonstrating that the last iterate of NashMP converges to the regularized NE at a linear rate of $\mathcal{O}((1 + 2\beta)^{-N/2}/\beta)$, where N is the number of preference queries and β is the regularization parameter. As shown in Table 1, this represents a significant improvement over the $\mathcal{O}((\beta^2 N)^{-1})$ rate of NashMD. Crucially, this linear convergence holds for the *last iterate*, which is highly desirable in practical deep learning settings where computing or storing policy averages can be challenging [McAleer et al., 2023]. We also analyze the relationship between the regularized NE found by NashMP and the VNW of the original unregularized game, providing an upper bound on the sub-optimality gap. Our analysis shows NashMP can find an

Algorithm	KL to β -regularized VNW	Original ε -VNW complexity
NashMD [Munos et al., 2023]	$\mathcal{O}((\beta^2 N)^{-1})$	Not provided
Online IPO [Calandriello et al., 2024]	Asymptotic	Not provided
SPO [Swamy et al., 2024]	Not provided	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\varepsilon^2)$
ONPO [Zhang et al., 2025a]	Not provided	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\varepsilon)$
INPO [Zhang et al., 2025b]	$\mathcal{O}((\beta^2 N)^{-1})$	Not provided
MMD [Wang et al., 2025]	$\mathcal{O}((1 + \beta^2)^{-N}/\beta)$	Asymptotic
EGPO [Zhou et al., 2025]	$\mathcal{O}((1 - \beta/(1 + \beta + 2Y))^N)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(Y/\varepsilon)$
NashMP (this paper)	$\mathcal{O}((1 + 2\beta)^{-N/2}/\beta)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\varepsilon)$

Table 1: Comparison of theoretical guarantees for finding a von Neumann winner (VNW) from human preference data. The first column shows the convergence rate of the KL divergence to the *regularized VNW* for the last iterate, where N is the number of calls to a comparison oracle and β is the regularization parameter. The second column shows the sample complexity (number of preference queries) required to find an ε -VNW in the *original (unregularized) game* (see Section 3 for definitions). NashMP achieves a faster rate than its competitor at finding the regularized NE and matches the state-of-the-art query complexity for finding an ε -VNW, with the added benefit of a last-iterate guarantee for the regularized problem.

ε -VNW of the original game with query complexity $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\varepsilon)$, matching recent state-of-the-art methods while offering last-iterate convergence guarantees (see Table 1).

- For the important case of parametrized policies, we provide an in-depth analysis of approximating NashMP’s steps using policy gradient methods. Specifically, we derive an improved analysis for softmax policy gradients in entropy-regularized multi-armed bandits, demonstrating a final complexity that depends only on the optimal policy and initial parameters, *not* on the number of actions or the scale of the reward function.
- We develop a practical variant of NashMP tailored for deep learning architectures, where the required mirror descent steps are approximated using policy gradients. This variant utilizes an exponential moving average of parameters to stabilize training and mimic the two-step structure. We present empirical results on a synthetic preference game and on fine-tuning large language models, showing competitive performance.

2 Related work

The field of Nash Learning from Human Feedback (NLHF) has rapidly evolved, drawing upon foundational game theory and modern optimization techniques to address the limitations of traditional reward modeling. The NLHF framework was formally introduced by Munos et al. [2023], who built upon the reformulation of contextual dueling bandits as a two-player symmetric game by Dudík et al. [2015]. They proposed the NashMD algorithm, demonstrating that its last iterate converges to the von Neumann Winner (VNW), or Nash Equilibrium (NE), of a regularized preference game at a polynomial rate. Subsequently, Calandriello et al. [2024] showed that an online version of the IPO algorithm [Gheshlaghi Azar et al., 2024] also converges to the VNW, though without providing explicit convergence rates.

These approaches, like much of the subsequent work, typically assume preferences are provided between individual actions or responses at a single decision point. Broadening the scope of preference feedback, Shani et al. [2025] addresses the limitations of single-turn preference emulation in settings requiring multi-turn planning via a self-play Mirror Descent-based policy optimization algorithm and proves its convergence to a Nash Equilibrium.

A significant line of research has focused on directly approximating a VNW in the original (unregularized) preference game. Swamy et al. [2024] (see also Wu et al. 2025) leveraged classical regret minimization tools for matrix games to develop the Self-Play Preference Optimization (SPO) algorithm. SPO requires $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\varepsilon^2)$ calls to the preference model to find a policy with an ε -suboptimality

gap¹, demonstrating the feasibility of finding approximate VNWs. Building on this, Zhang et al. [2025a] introduced the Optimistic Online Mirror Descent for NLHF (ONPO) algorithm, inspired by optimistic mirror descent [Rakhlin and Sridharan, 2013]. ONPO improved the complexity to $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\varepsilon)$ for finding an ε -VNW in the original game, though without convergence guarantees for the regularized game setting that is often critical for LLM alignment.

Efforts have also been directed towards improving convergence for the *regularized* NLHF game, which is central to our work. Zhang et al. [2025b] presented the Iterative Nash Policy Optimization (INPO) algorithm, which, similar to NashMD, achieves a $\mathcal{O}((\beta^2 N)^{-1})$ last-iterate convergence rate in KL divergence to the NE of the regularized game. A notable advancement came from Wang et al. [2025], who, adapting techniques from Sokota et al. [2023], introduced Magnetic Mirror Descent (MMD). MMD achieved a linear last-iterate convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}((1 + \beta^2)^{-N}/\beta)$ towards the NE of the regularized game. However, no guarantees were provided for convergence in the original, unregularized game. Our algorithm, NashMP, also achieves a linear last-iterate rate for the regularized game, but with a potentially better dependence on β parameter ($\mathcal{O}((1 + 2\beta)^{-N/2}/\beta)$ vs $\mathcal{O}((1 + \beta^2)^{-N}/\beta)$) and, importantly, we also provide guarantees for the original game complexity.

Most recently, and concurrently with our work, Zhou et al. [2025] proposed the Extragradient Preference Optimization (EGPO) algorithm. EGPO also draws inspiration from the Extragradient method (an alternative name for Mirror Prox, which also motivates NashMP) and achieves a linear convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}((1 - \beta/(1 + \beta + 2Y))^N)$ for exact updates in the regularized game. They also provide a $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(Y/\varepsilon)$ complexity for finding an ε -VNW in the original game. While EGPO offers strong results, its convergence rates and original game complexity exhibit a dependence on the number of actions Y . In contrast, NashMP achieves a linear rate for the regularized game and an $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\varepsilon)$ complexity for the original game that are independent of Y , which can be a significant advantage in settings with large action spaces, such as LLM fine-tuning. Table 1 provides detailed rate and complexity comparisons.

3 Setting

We consider a contextual dueling bandit setting $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{P})$, where \mathcal{X} is a context space, \mathcal{Y} is a finite action space, and $\mathcal{P}(y \succ y' | x) \in [0, 1]$ is the probability that action $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ is preferred to $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ given context $x \in \mathcal{X}$, which satisfies symmetry: $\mathcal{P}(y \succ y' | x) = 1 - \mathcal{P}(y' \succ y | x)$ for all x, y, y' . A policy $\pi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}$ maps contexts to probability distributions over actions, where $\Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}$ is the probability simplex over \mathcal{Y} . Let Π be the space of all such policies. For a context $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we define the expected preference of an action $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ over a policy $\pi' \in \Pi$, and of a policy $\pi \in \Pi$ over π' , as:

$$\mathcal{P}(y \succ \pi' | x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{y' \sim \pi'(x)}[\mathcal{P}(y \succ y' | x)], \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi' | x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi(x)}[\mathcal{P}(y \succ \pi' | x)].$$

For each context $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we define a preference matrix $\mathbf{P}_x \in [0, 1]^{|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{Y}|}$ with entries $(\mathbf{P}_x)_{y, y'} = \mathcal{P}(y \succ y' | x)$. Then, the expected preference $\mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi' | x)$ can be expressed as a bilinear form:

$$\mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi' | x) = \pi(x)^\top \mathbf{P}_x \pi'(x), \tag{1}$$

where $\pi(x)$ and $\pi'(x)$ are the vector representations of the policies' distributions at context x . In the context-free setting, we omit the dependence on x . We may abuse notation and write $\mathcal{P}(v \succ u | x)$ for $v^\top \mathbf{P}_x u$, where $v, u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}|}$ are arbitrary vectors, not necessarily probability distributions.

Preference game. Given a context distribution ρ over \mathcal{X} , we consider the following two-player zero-sum symmetric game:

1. A context $x \sim \rho$ is sampled and revealed to both players;
2. The max-player chooses an action $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and simultaneously, the min-player chooses $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$;
3. An outcome $o \sim \text{Ber}(\mathcal{P}(y \succ y' | x))$ is sampled. If $o = 1$, y wins; if $o = 0$, y' wins.

The max-player receives a reward of o , and the min-player receives $1 - o$. For a pair of policies (π, π') , the value of this game (expected reward for the max-player) is: $\mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi') \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho}[\mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi' | x)]$.

¹See Section 3 for a formal definition of the suboptimality gap. The $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ notation hides logarithmic factors in problem parameters like the number of actions Y or $1/\varepsilon$.

Von Neumann winner. The preference game is symmetric, so it admits a symmetric Nash Equilibrium (NE) (π^*, π^*) [von Neumann, 1928, Nash Jr, 1950]. The policy π^* is called a *von Neumann winner* (VNW) [Dudík et al., 2015] and satisfies $\pi^* \in \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \min_{\pi' \in \Pi} \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi')$.

The *suboptimality* of a policy π against π' is $\text{SubOpt}(\pi, \pi') \triangleq \frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi')$. The worst-case suboptimality of π , also known as its *exploitability gap*, is:

$$\text{SubOpt}(\pi) \triangleq \max_{\pi' \in \Pi} \text{SubOpt}(\pi, \pi') = \frac{1}{2} - \min_{\pi' \in \Pi} \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi'). \quad (2)$$

Due to game symmetry, $\mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi) = 1/2$ for any $\pi \in \Pi$, implying $\text{SubOpt}(\pi, \pi) = 0$. Thus, $\text{SubOpt}(\pi) \geq 0$, and $\text{SubOpt}(\pi) = 0$ if and only if π is a VNW. A policy π is an ε -VNW if $\text{SubOpt}(\pi) \leq \varepsilon$.

Regularized preference game. Given a reference policy $\pi^{\text{ref}} \in \Pi$ and a regularization parameter $\beta > 0$, the β -regularized preference of π over π' is defined as:

$$\mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi \succ \pi') \triangleq \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi') - \beta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \beta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi' \| \pi^{\text{ref}}), \quad (3)$$

where $\text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho} [\text{KL}(\pi(x) \| \pi^{\text{ref}}(x))]$ is an expected Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence. Similar to the preference game introduced earlier, one can define a β -regularized preference game [Munos et al., 2023] where the expected payoff of the max-player is the regularized preference while the min-player's payoff is the opposite of the regularized preference. This game is symmetric, and strongly convex-concave, and thus admits a unique symmetric NE $(\pi_\beta^*, \pi_\beta^*)$. The policy π_β^* is the β -regularized VNW and satisfies $\pi_\beta^* = \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \min_{\pi' \in \Pi} \mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi \succ \pi')$.

The β -regularized suboptimality of π against π' is $\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi, \pi') \triangleq \frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi \succ \pi')$. The worst-case β -regularized suboptimality of π is:

$$\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi) \triangleq \max_{\pi' \in \Pi} \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi, \pi') = \frac{1}{2} - \min_{\pi' \in \Pi} \mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi \succ \pi'). \quad (4)$$

A policy π is an ε -VNW in the β -regularized game if $\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi) \leq \varepsilon$.

Additional notations. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we define a span semi-norm of x as $\|x\|_{\text{sp}} = \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|x + c\mathbf{1}\|_\infty$, where $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^\top$ is a vector of all ones.

4 Nash Mirror Prox

In this section, we introduce Nash Mirror Prox (NashMP), an algorithm designed to solve the regularized preference game that enjoys last-iterate linear convergence to β -regularized NE.

4.1 Algorithm Description

Let us recall the problem we are aiming to solve, which is the following convex-concave saddle point optimization problem:

$$\max_{\pi \in \Pi} \min_{\pi' \in \Pi} \left\{ \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi') - \beta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \beta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi' \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where Π is the space of policies. Our algorithm, NashMP, is an adaptation of Mirror Prox [Nemirovski, 2004] with specific design choices tailored to this problem: 1) we directly incorporate the KL regularization towards π^{ref} , leveraging its prox-friendliness without additional linearization, and 2) we exploit the game's symmetry to simplify analysis and computations. The NashMP iterates are:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \left\{ \mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \pi) + \beta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + (\beta/\eta) \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi_k) \right\}, \\ \pi_{k+1} &= \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \left\{ \mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi) + \beta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + (\beta/\eta) \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi_k) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\eta > 0$ is a learning rate. It performs two iterations of self-improvement with respect to the current policy, while being regularized towards both reference policy π^{ref} and the *target* policy π_k . In particular, NashMP calls the preference model two times per step. We compare NashMP to existing methods in Appendix C.

Connection with Proximal Point method. The initial motivation of Mirror Prox, by Nemirovski [2004], was to approximate the proximal point (PP) method [Martinet, 1970, Rockafellar, 1976]. The iterations of PP method for our problem would be implicitly defined as:

$$\pi_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \{ \mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+1} \succ \pi) + \beta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + (\beta/\eta) \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi_k) \}. \quad (7)$$

This PP perspective is foundational and informs our practical implementation (see Section 5.3). Notably, as the learning rate $\eta \rightarrow +\infty$ (implying the proximal term $(\beta/\eta) \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi_k)$ vanishes), the solution to (7) converges to the β -regularized VNW π_β^* (see Lemma 2 in Appendix). This is because π_β^* satisfies: $\pi_\beta^* = \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \{ \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* \succ \pi) + \beta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) \}$. In practice, since the proximal step (7) is only approximated, finite learning rates $\eta > 0$ are necessary. A more accurate approximation of the proximal step generally permits larger learning rates.

4.2 Theoretical Guarantees

We now present the theoretical guarantees for the NashMP algorithm. The main result is a linear convergence to the β -regularized Nash equilibrium (NE) in KL-divergence, suboptimality gap, and uniformly in log-probabilities.

For simplicity of exposition, we consider a context-free version of the β -regularized preference game, i.e., $\mathcal{X} = \{x_0\}$ and $\rho(x_0) = 1$. For brevity, we omit dependence on x_0 in the discussions on theoretical results. Additionally, it is worth mentioning that since the contextual problem is an expectation of separate problems over the possible contexts, one may just run the algorithm above for any possible context separately (see Munos et al. [2023] for an additional discussion).

Theorem 1. *Assume $\beta \leq 1/2$. After K iterations of NashMP with a learning rate $\eta \leq 2\beta$ an initial policy $\pi_0 = \pi^{\text{ref}}$, the suboptimality gap and KL-divergence to the optimal solution satisfy*

$$\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_{K+\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \frac{1}{2\eta}(1+\eta)^{-K} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta}(1+\eta)^{-K}}, \quad \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi_K) \leq \frac{1}{2\beta}(1+\eta)^{-K}.$$

At the same time, the algorithm enjoys linear rates to the optimal solution in the span semi-norm

$$\max\{\|\log \pi_K - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}}, \|\log \pi_{K+\frac{1}{2}} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}}\} \leq \frac{1}{\beta}(1+\eta)^{-K} + \frac{3}{2\beta}\sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta}(1+\eta)^{-K}}.$$

We refer to Appendix A for a full proof. In essence, we tailor a standard proof of Mirror Prox (see, e.g. Beznosikov et al. [2023]) to achieve convergence in KL-divergence and afterwards heavily use the properties of the game and optimal solutions to achieve convergence in suboptimality and a strong uniform notion in span semi-norm. Next, we provide iteration and oracle complexity results.

Corollary 1. *Assume $\beta \leq 1/2$. Then, for $\varepsilon > 0$, the final policy of NashMP with $\eta = 2\beta$ is ε -VNW in a β -regularized preference game after $K = \left\lceil \frac{1+\beta}{\beta} \log\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon\beta}\right) \right\rceil$ iterates and $N = 2K$ preference oracle calls. Additionally, for a uniform reference policy $\pi^{\text{ref}}(y) = 1/Y$ for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, a specifically chosen $\beta = \beta^*(\varepsilon)$ and an initial policy $\pi_0 = \pi^{\text{ref}}$, the final policy $\pi_{K+1/2}$ is ε -VNW in the original preference game after $K = \left\lceil \frac{8 \log(Y)}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{8 \log(Y)}{\varepsilon}\right) \right\rceil$ iterates.*

The proof is presented in Appendix A and essentially directly follows from Theorem 1. In practice, we recommend using a reference policy that is not uniform over all actions but uniform over support of some von Neumann winner π^* . In this case, the convergence guarantee will persist.

Comparison to existing results. NashMP achieves a linear convergence rate to the VNW of the regularized preference game, which is in sharp contrast to the results obtained for NashMD or INPO. Furthermore, NashMP also outperforms its competitors, achieving linear convergence either with respect to β , the regularization parameter, or the number of actions Y . Refer to Table 1 for details.

5 Approximate Nash Mirror Prox

This section introduces a more practical algorithm that approximates the iterates of NashMP (defined in (6)) using stochastic policy gradients. For clarity, we focus on a context-free setting, noting that these approaches readily generalize to the contextual setting.

5.1 Algorithm

In practice, computing the exact updates from (6) is infeasible due to the need to solve high-dimensional optimization problems over parameterized policy classes. To overcome this, we propose an approximate algorithm where iterates $p \in \{1, 2\}$ are found via inexact updates:

$$\hat{\pi}_{k+p/2} \approx \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \{ \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+(p-1)/2} \succ \pi) + \beta \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + (\beta/\eta) \text{KL}(\pi \| \hat{\pi}_k) \}, \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{\pi}_{k+p/2}$ denote the approximate solutions to the corresponding subproblems at iteration k . To solve these subproblems, we adopt the following common strategy: (1) parameterize the policy π as π_θ using a softmax function: $\pi_\theta(y) \triangleq \exp(\theta_y) / \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \exp(\theta_y)$, and (2) optimize objectives over θ using stochastic gradient descent. The objective for subproblem steps $p = \{1, 2\}$ at outer iteration k :

$$J_{k+p/2}(\theta) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{y' \sim \pi_\theta} [\mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+(p-1)/2} \succ y')] + \beta \text{KL}(\pi_\theta \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + (\beta/\eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\theta \| \hat{\pi}_k). \quad (9)$$

Each of these optimization problems can be viewed as a *regularized multi-armed bandit problem*. This perspective allows the application of a well-studied theory of softmax policy gradient methods [Agarwal et al., 2020, Mei et al., 2020]. Specifically, the update of parameters $\theta_{k+p/2,t}$ are defined as:

$$\theta_{k+\frac{p}{2},t+1} = \theta_{k+\frac{p}{2},t} - \gamma \hat{\nabla} J_{k+\frac{p}{2}}(\theta_{k+\frac{p}{2},t}), \quad (10)$$

where $\hat{\nabla} J_{k+\frac{p}{2}}$ is a REINFORCE-style estimator [Williams, 1992]. A complete algorithmic description is provided in Algorithm 1 in Appendix B.2.

5.2 Theoretical Guarantees

We now analyze the convergence properties of this approximate algorithm. First, we establish what the guarantees of approximation of (8) are needed to guarantee overall convergence of the algorithm.

Theorem 2. Assume $\beta \leq 1/2$ and assume that $\|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+p/2} - \log \pi_{k+p/2}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$ for $\bar{\varepsilon} \in (0, 1)$ for all $k \in \{0, \dots, K-1\}$, $p \in \{1, 2\}$, where $\pi_{k+p/2}$ denotes the exact minimizer to the corresponding objective in (8). Then after $K = \left\lceil \frac{1+\beta}{2\beta} \log\left(\frac{1}{\bar{\varepsilon}}\right) \right\rceil$ iterates, a policy $\hat{\pi}_{K+1/2}$ is $\frac{4\sqrt{\bar{\varepsilon}}}{\beta}$ -VNW in a β -regularized game.

We refer to Appendix B.1 for a proof. This theorem shows that if we can approximate the true subproblem solution $\pi_{k+p/2}$ with an accuracy $\bar{\varepsilon} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2 \beta^2)$ for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, the final policy of the approximation NashMP is ε -VNW in a β -regularized game. We emphasize that achieving an $\bar{\varepsilon}$ -optimal solution in terms of the objective function value $J_{k+\frac{p}{2}}$ might be insufficient. Instead, we require the approximate policy to be close to the true subproblem minimizer $\pi_{k+p/2}$ in span semi-norm, which is a stronger notion of convergence.

Our next goal is to achieve a $\bar{\varepsilon}$ -solution for an arbitrary $\bar{\varepsilon} \in (0, 1)$ in terms of span semi-norm $\|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+p/2} - \log \pi_{k+p/2}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$, using policy gradient method.

Lemma 1. Assume $\bar{\varepsilon} < 1/3$ and assume that the stochastic gradient $\hat{\nabla} J_{k+\frac{p}{2}}$ is estimated using a batch size of size $B = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}((c_\beta^* \cdot \bar{\varepsilon})^{-2})$, where the constant c_β^* is defined in Appendix in (33) and depends only on β, η and optimal policy π_β^* . Then, after $T = \mathcal{O}((c_\beta^*)^{-1} \log(1/(\beta \bar{\varepsilon})))$ steps of a stochastic gradient descent with a step size $\gamma = \eta/(\beta(1+\eta))$, it holds $\|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+p/2} - \log \pi_{k+p/2}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$ for all $k \in \{0, \dots, K-1\}$ and $p \in \{1, 2\}$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

We refer to Appendix B.2 for a proof and additional details. This result relies on two key technical elements: (1) establishing dimension-free convergence rates for the stochastic policy gradient method in this regularized bandit setting, and (2) ensuring convergence in span semi-norm for the iterates of NashMP. Notably, our policy gradient analysis yields an improvement over Mei et al. [2020] in dependence of a constant c_β^* on Y by a factor of $\exp(\sqrt{Y})$. We refer to Appendix D for further details.

5.3 Practical Deep Learning Implementation

In this section, we consider a contextual setting in full generality. To propose a more practical algorithm, we first notice that the approximate version of NashMP presented in Section 5.1 performs

T gradient steps to approximate each of the two global mirror steps. However, as discussed in Section 4, Mirror Prox also serves as an approximation to the Proximal Point (PP) method, and, therefore, we may want to rebalance the outer and inner approximation steps.

We consider the following policies: online policy π_t with parameters θ_t , a target π_t^{target} with parameters θ_t^{target} , and a fixed reference policy π^{ref} . We introduce the parameter update $\theta_{t+1} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{NashMP}}(\theta; \theta_t, \theta_t^{\text{target}}, \pi^{\text{ref}})$, for the loss function

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NashMP}}(\theta; \theta', \theta^{\text{target}}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim \rho \\ y \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|x) \\ y' \sim \pi_{\theta'}(\cdot|x)}} \left[\mathcal{P}(y \succ y'|x) + \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y|x)}{\pi^{\text{ref}}(y|x)} + \frac{\beta}{\eta} \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y|x)}{\pi_{\theta^{\text{target}}}(y|x)} \right]. \quad (11)$$

To obtain NashMP one should update the target policy parameter θ_t^{target} with θ_t every *two* steps. Remark that if we update it every n steps, we obtain an algorithm that is closer to the PP method.

The previous approximation approach with T inner gradient steps to optimize (11) till convergence might be very impractical. Instead, we find it more practical and elegant to update the online parameter with one (or few) gradient update with the loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NashMP}}$ and slowly update the target with an exponential moving average:

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{NashMP}}(\theta_t; \theta_t, \theta_t^{\text{target}}), \quad \theta_{t+1}^{\text{target}} = \kappa \theta_t + (1 - \kappa) \theta_t^{\text{target}},$$

where α is some learning rate and the parameter $\kappa \in [0, 1]$ controls implicitly the number of steps for one proximal update. Thus, we approximate the resolution of one proximal subproblem with $n \approx 1/\kappa$ gradient steps. Also, we would like to note that this strategy is very common in deep reinforcement learning [Mnih et al., 2015, Lillicrap et al., 2016].

Gradient estimation. Instead of using an exact gradient, we estimate it with a batch of observations $(x_i, y_i, y'_i)_{i=1}^B$ for $x_i \sim \rho$ sampled from an offline prompt dataset, y_i and y'_i sampled from the online network π_t . We notice that both y and y' are sampled from the same distribution; therefore, we can *symmetrize* a standard REINFORCE estimate with a baseline $1/2$ and get the following form of gradient estimator

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\nabla}_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{NashMP}}(\theta_t; \theta_t, \theta_t^{\text{target}}) &\triangleq \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B (\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta_t}(y_i|x_i) - \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta_t}(y'_i|x_i)) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{P}(y_i \succ y'_i|x_i) \right) \\ &\quad + \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta_t}(y_i|x_i) \left[\beta \log \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(y_i|x_i)}{\pi^{\text{ref}}(y_i|x_i)} \right) + \frac{\beta}{\eta} \log \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(y_i|x_i)}{\pi_{\theta_t^{\text{target}}}(y_i|x_i)} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta_t}(y'_i|x_i) \left[\beta \log \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(y'_i|x_i)}{\pi^{\text{ref}}(y'_i|x_i)} \right) + \frac{\beta}{\eta} \log \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(y'_i|x_i)}{\pi_{\theta_t^{\text{target}}}(y'_i|x_i)} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The first term of this gradient expression resembles the gradient that appears in DPO [Rafailov et al., 2024] in an even more contrastive nature: if two responses y_i and y'_i are the same from the perspective of the preference model \mathcal{P} , then $\mathcal{P}(y_i \succ y'_i|x_i) \approx \frac{1}{2}$ and they do not give any gradient signal. But if one of the responses is better than the other, we increase its likelihood and decrease the likelihood of a worse answer. Notice that if we have only a duel feedback, we can replace the preference model above with the duel results. The other two terms in the gradient expression represent the regularization to reference and target models.

6 Experiments

6.1 Matrix Games

We use the simple contextual dueling bandit problem as an initial experiment to study the deep learning implementation of Nash Mirror Prox.

Game definition. Let us fix a number of actions $Y \geq 2$ and a positive integer $r \geq 1$. We consider a dueling bandit game with a context space $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ and an action space $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, Y\}$. Preference probabilities are defined as follows

$$\mathcal{P}(y \succ y'|x) \triangleq \sigma(A_{y,y'} - A_{y',y}), \quad A \triangleq U \Theta_x V^{\top},$$




Figure 1: Comparison of NashMP (in red) with baseline methods across different optimization horizons $K \in \{10^3, 10^4, 5 \times 10^4\}$. Our method consistently achieves lower suboptimality as the optimization horizon increases. Suboptimality is averaged over 10 random seeds; shaded regions indicate one standard deviation.

where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{Y \times r}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{Y \times r}$ are fixed matrices, $\Theta_x \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is a corresponding context matrix, and $\sigma(\cdot)$ is a sigmoid function. This type of dueling bandit instance is a generalization of a low-rank linear bandit problem. Notice that for any $r \geq 2$ this problem does not admit a Bradley-Terry model. The distribution over contexts ρ is assumed to be a standard Gaussian random matrix (i.e., elements of Θ_x are i.i.d. with distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$). We aim to find a policy $\pi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta_Y$ that approximates a β -regularized VNW. We refer to Appendix E for more details on the setup.

Results. We compare our method with the following baselines: Online DPO [Rafailov et al., 2024], Online IPO [Calandriello et al., 2024], Nash MD [Munos et al., 2023], NashMP with an adaptive κ , Mirror Descent (MD) corresponding to Nash MD without the mixture coefficient equal to 0, and EGPO [Zhou et al., 2025].

The results are presented in Figure 1. We can observe that for 500 steps, NashMP does not provide improvements upon Online IPO; however, starting from approximately 1000 optimization steps, NashMP with an adaptive $\kappa = 10/(k + 10)$ starts outperforming all the baselines, and the relative improvement increases as optimization continues. Additionally, we observe that the confidence interval for our method is much smaller, showing the influence of additional stabilization. We also notice that the 2-step stabilization procedure of EGPO is insufficient to stabilize in the functional approximation setting, and Online DPO diverges since it does not solve a preference game. Also, in Appendix E we provide an additional study on the influence of κ on the optimization procedure.

6.2 LLM Alignment

In this section, we apply NashMP to perform alignment of a large language model (LLM).

Experiment setup For our LLM-based experiments, we use the Gemma-2B [Gemma Team, 2024] pretrained model checkpoints and train on the RLHFlow Dong et al. [2024] datasets for all the analysis. In particular, we first perform SFT on the RLHFlow SFT dataset [RLHFlow Team, 2024c] and then all our NLHF experiments on the resulting checkpoint, using a subset of RLHFlow Prompt collection [RLHFlow Team, 2024b]. The pairwise judge model is Gemma-2B trained via the Robust Reward Models [Liu et al., 2025] method. All the experiments were performed using the TRL library [von Werra et al., 2020].

Baselines We compare the practical version of NashMP described in Section 5.3 for $\kappa = 0.1$ with the following baselines: Online DPO [Guo et al., 2024], Online IPO [Calandriello et al., 2024], NashMD [Munos et al., 2023], and NashMP with $\eta = +\infty$ that we refer to as Regularized Self-Play. We refer to Appendix E for more details on baselines and used hyperparameters.

Results We report in Table 2 the pairwise win-rates between the different methods for the judge. We observe that NashMP outperforms all the baselines, including Regularized Self-Play. The only difference between NashMP and Regularized Self-Play is the use of additional regularization with respect to a target model, and our results show the value of this regularization.

Table 2: Pairwise Win Rates (mean $\pm 3\sigma$ -confidence intervals). Statistically significant wins are in **bold**. Confidence intervals are in a smaller font size. Row/column for NashMP, $\kappa = 0.1$ is highlighted.

Win rate	SFT	Online DPO	Online IPO	NashMD	Reg. Self-Play	NashMP, $\kappa = 0.1$
SFT	—	0.1623 \pm 0.0087	0.1554 \pm 0.0091	0.1974 \pm 0.0098	0.1536 \pm 0.0087	0.1283 \pm 0.0081
Online DPO	0.8377 \pm 0.0087	—	0.4743 \pm 0.0115	0.5788 \pm 0.0116	0.4730 \pm 0.0113	0.4392 \pm 0.0116
Online IPO	0.8446 \pm 0.0091	0.5257 \pm 0.0115	—	0.6115 \pm 0.0121	0.5036 \pm 0.0118	0.4706 \pm 0.0117
NashMD	0.8026 \pm 0.0098	0.4212 \pm 0.0116	0.3885 \pm 0.0121	—	0.4031 \pm 0.0119	0.3605 \pm 0.0115
Reg. Self-Play	0.8464 \pm 0.0087	0.5270 \pm 0.0113	0.4964 \pm 0.0118	0.5969 \pm 0.0119	—	0.4620 \pm 0.0118
NashMP, $\kappa = 0.1$	0.8717 \pm 0.0081	0.5608 \pm 0.0116	0.5294 \pm 0.0117	0.6395 \pm 0.0115	0.5380 \pm 0.0118	—

7 Conclusion

In this work, we addressed the challenge of efficiently finding NE in regularized preference games arising in NLHF, a crucial task for aligning LLMs with human preferences while maintaining proximity to a reference policy. We introduced NashMP, a novel algorithm inspired by the Mirror Prox method, designed to leverage its strong convergence properties. Our theoretical analysis demonstrates that it achieves a linear convergence rate to the NE of the regularized game for its last iterate, a significant improvement over the polynomial rates of prior methods. This last-iterate guarantee, coupled with a rate independent of the action space size, makes it particularly well-suited for practical applications with large models. However, determining the optimal rates remains an open question, as we are not aware of any established lower bound for this specific setting, to the best of our knowledge. Furthermore, we showed that we can efficiently approximate a VNW in the original unregularized game with a sample complexity matching state-of-the-art results while offering stronger guarantees for the regularized setting. Our analysis extended to parametrized policies, providing insights into the use of policy gradient methods, and we presented a practical deep learning variant that showed competitive performance.

Broader impact. Our work advances the efficient alignment of LLMs with human preferences, potentially enhancing AI systems’ ability to make decisions that are more aligned with human values.

References

- 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.
- Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, Nicholas Joseph, Saurav Kadavath, John Kernion, Tom Conerly, Sheer El-Showk, Nelson Elhage, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Tristan Hume, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Liane Lovitt, Neel Nanda, Catherine Olsson, Dario Amodei, Tom B. Brown, Jack Clark, Sam McCandlish, Christopher Olah, Benjamin Mann, and Jared Kaplan. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *ArXiv*, abs/2204.05862, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:248118878>.
- Viktor Bengs, Róbert Busa-Fekete, Adil El MESAoudi-Paul, and Eyke Hüllermeier. Preference-based online learning with dueling bandits: a survey. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 22(1), jan 2021. ISSN 1532-4435.
- Aleksandr Beznosikov, Darina Dvinskikh, Andrei Semenov, and Alexander Gasnikov. Bregman proximal method for efficient communications under similarity, 2023.
- Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3/4):324–345, 1952.
- Daniele Calandriello, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Remi Munos, Mark Rowland, Yunhao Tang, Bernardo Avila Pires, Pierre Harvey Richemond, Charline Le Lan, Michal Valko, Tianqi Liu, Rishabh Joshi, Zeyu Zheng, and Bilal Piot. Human alignment of large language models through online preference optimisation. In Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Zico Kolter, Katherine Heller, Adrian Weller, Nuria Oliver, Jonathan Scarlett, and Felix Berkenkamp, editors, *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5409–5435. PMLR, 21–27 Jul 2024. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/calandriello24a.html>.

- Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/d5e2c0adad503c91f91df240d0cd4e49-Paper.pdf.
- Tri Dao. FlashAttention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- Hanze Dong, Wei Xiong, Bo Pang, Haoxiang Wang, Han Zhao, Yingbo Zhou, Nan Jiang, Doyen Sahoo, Caiming Xiong, and Tong Zhang. RLHF workflow: From reward modeling to online RLHF. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2024. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=a13aYUU9eU>.
- Miroslav Dudík, Katja Hofmann, Robert E Schapire, Aleksandrs Slivkins, and Masrour Zoghi. Contextual dueling bandits. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 563–587. PMLR, 2015.
- Martin Gardner. Mathematical games: The paradox of the nontransitive dice and the elusive principle of indifference. *Scientific American*, 223(12):110–114, 1970.
- Gemma Team. Gemma2-2b. 2024. doi: 10.34740/KAGGLE/M/3301. URL <https://huggingface.co/google/gemma-2-2b>.
- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Bilal Piot, Remi Munos, Mark Rowland, Michal Valko, and Daniele Calandriello. A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences. In Sanjoy Dasgupta, Stephan Mandt, and Yingzhen Li, editors, *Proceedings of The 27th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 238 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4447–4455. PMLR, 02–04 May 2024. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v238/gheshlaghi-azar24a.html>.
- Shangmin Guo, Biao Zhang, Tianlin Liu, Tianqi Liu, Misha Khalman, Felipe Llinares, Alexandre Rame, Thomas Mesnard, Yao Zhao, Bilal Piot, et al. Direct language model alignment from online AI feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04792*, 2024.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *ICLR (Poster)*, 2015. URL <http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/conf/iclr/iclr2015.html#KingmaB14>.
- Alexander Y. Klimenko. Intransitivity in theory and in the real world. *Entropy*, 17(6):4364–4412, 2015. ISSN 1099-4300. doi: 10.3390/e17064364. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/1099-4300/17/6/4364>.
- Germain Kreweras. Aggregation of preference orderings. *Mathematics and Social Sciences I: Proceedings of the seminars of Menthon-Saint-Bernard, France (1–27 July 1960) and of Gössing, Austria (3–27 July 1962)*, pages 73–79, 1965.
- 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. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *4th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2016, San Juan, Puerto Rico, May 2-4, 2016, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2016. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.02971>.
- Tianqi Liu, Wei Xiong, Jie Ren, Lichang Chen, Junru Wu, Rishabh Joshi, Yang Gao, Jiaming Shen, Zhen Qin, Tianhe Yu, Daniel Sohn, Anastasia Makarova, Jeremiah Zhe Liu, Yuan Liu, Bilal Piot, Abe Ittycheriah, Aviral Kumar, and Mohammad Saleh. RRM: Robust reward model training mitigates reward hacking. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=88AS5MQnmC>.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bkg6RiCqY7>.

- B. Martinet. Brève communication. Régularisation d'inéquations variationnelles par approximations successives. *Revue française d'informatique et de recherche opérationnelle. Série rouge*, 4(R3): 154–158, 1970. URL https://www.numdam.org/item/M2AN_1970__4_3_154_0/.
- Kenneth O. May. Intransitivity, utility, and the aggregation of preference patterns. *Econometrica*, 22: 1, 1954. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:156169619>.
- Stephen McAleer, Gabriele Farina, Marc Lanctot, and Tuomas Sandholm. Escher: Eschewing importance sampling in games by computing a history value function to estimate regret. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- Jincheng Mei, Chenjun Xiao, Csaba Szepesvari, and Dale Schuurmans. On the global convergence rates of softmax policy gradient methods. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6820–6829. PMLR, 2020.
- Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A. Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G. Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K. Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, Stig Petersen, Charles Beattie, Amir Sadik, Ioannis Antonoglou, Helen King, Dharmashan Kumaran, Daan Wierstra, Shane Legg, and Demis Hassabis. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529–533, February 2015. ISSN 00280836. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature14236>.
- Rémi Munos, Michal Valko, Daniele Calandriello, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Mark Rowland, Daniel Guo, Yunhao Tang, Matthieu Geist, Thomas Mésnard, Andrea Michi, Marco Selvi, Sertan Girgin, Nikola Momchev, Olivier Bachem, Daniel J. Mankowitz, Doina Precup, and Bilal Piot. Nash learning from human feedback, 2023.
- John F Nash Jr. Equilibrium points in N-person games. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 36(1):48–49, 1950.
- Arkadi Nemirovski. Prox-method with rate of convergence $o(1/t)$ for variational inequalities with lipschitz continuous monotone operators and smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 15(1):229–251, 2004.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 27730–27744, 2022.
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alch'e-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/bdbca288fee7f92f2bfa9f7012727740-Paper.pdf.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Alexander Rakhlin and Karthik Sridharan. Optimization, learning, and games with predictable sequences. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 2*, NIPS'13, page 3066–3074, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2013. Curran Associates Inc.
- Jeff Rasley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. Deepspeed: System optimizations enable training deep learning models with over 100 billion parameters. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 3505–3506, 2020.

- Morgane Rivière, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, Johan Ferret, et al. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. *CoRR*, 2024.
- RLHFlow Team. Rlhflow pairwise preference dataset, 2024a. URL https://huggingface.co/datasets/RLHFlow/pair_preference_model_dataset.
- RLHFlow Team. Rlhflow prompt collection, 2024b. URL <https://huggingface.co/datasets/RLHFlow/prompt-collection-v0.1>.
- RLHFlow Team. Rlhflow-sft-dataset, 2024c. URL <https://huggingface.co/datasets/RLHFlow/RLHFlow-SFT-Dataset-ver2>.
- R Tyrrell Rockafellar. Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, 14(5):877–898, 1976.
- Lior Shani, Aviv Rosenberg, Asaf Cassel, Oran Lang, Daniele Calandriello, Avital Zipori, Hila Noga, Orgad Keller, Bilal Piot, Idan Szepkter, et al. Multi-turn reinforcement learning with preference human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:118953–118993, 2025.
- Samuel Sokota, Ryan D’Orazio, J Zico Kolter, Nicolas Loizou, Marc Lanctot, Ioannis Mitliagkas, Noam Brown, and Christian Kroer. A unified approach to reinforcement learning, quantal response equilibria, and two-player zero-sum games. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=DpE5UYUQzZH>.
- Nisan Stiennon, Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Daniel Ziegler, Ryan Lowe, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, and Paul F Christiano. Learning to summarize with human feedback. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 3008–3021. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/1f89885d556929e98d3ef9b86448f951-Paper.pdf.
- Gokul Swamy, Christoph Dann, Rahul Kidambi, Steven Wu, and Alekh Agarwal. A minimaximalist approach to reinforcement learning from human feedback. In Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Zico Kolter, Katherine Heller, Adrian Weller, Nuria Oliver, Jonathan Scarlett, and Felix Berkenkamp, editors, *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 47345–47377. PMLR, 21–27 Jul 2024. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/swamy24a.html>.
- Amos Tversky. Intransitivity of preferences. *Psychological Review*, 76:31–48, 1969. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:144609998>.
- J. von Neumann. Zur Theorie der Gesellschaftsspiele. *Mathematische Annalen*, 100:295–320, 1928. ISSN 0025-5831; 1432-1807/e.
- Leandro von Werra, Younes Belkada, Lewis Tunstall, Edward Beeching, Tristan Thrush, Nathan Lambert, Shengyi Huang, Kashif Rasul, and Quentin Gallouédec. Trl: Transformer reinforcement learning. <https://github.com/huggingface/trl>, 2020.
- Mingzhi Wang, Chengdong Ma, Qizhi Chen, Linjian Meng, Yang Han, Jiancong Xiao, Zhaowei Zhang, Jing Huo, Weijie J Su, and Yaodong Yang. Magnetic preference optimization: Achieving last-iterate convergence for language model alignment. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=PDnEDS244P>.
- Ronald J Williams. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine learning*, 8:229–256, 1992.
- Yue Wu, Zhiqing Sun, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, Yiming Yang, and Quanquan Gu. Self-play preference optimization for language model alignment. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=a3PmRgAB5T>.
- Yisong Yue, Josef Broder, Robert Kleinberg, and Thorsten Joachims. The k-armed dueling bandits problem. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 78(5):1538–1556, sep 2012. ISSN 0022-0000. doi: 10.1016/j.jcss.2011.12.028. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2011.12.028>.

- E. Zermelo. Die berechnung der turnier-ergebnisse als ein maximumproblem der wahrheitsrechnung. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 29:436–460, 1929. URL <http://eudml.org/doc/168081>.
- Yuheng Zhang, Dian Yu, Tao Ge, Linfeng Song, Zhichen Zeng, Haitao Mi, Nan Jiang, and Dong Yu. Improving llm general preference alignment via optimistic online mirror descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.16852*, 2025a.
- Yuheng Zhang, Dian Yu, Baolin Peng, Linfeng Song, Ye Tian, Mingyue Huo, Nan Jiang, Haitao Mi, and Dong Yu. Iterative nash policy optimization: Aligning LLMs with general preferences via no-regret learning. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025b. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Pujt3ADZgI>.
- Runlong Zhou, Maryam Fazel, and Simon S Du. Extragradients preference optimization (egpo): Beyond last-iterate convergence for nash learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.08942*, 2025.
- Daniel M. Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Jeff Wu, Tom B. Brown, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, Paul Christiano, and Geoffrey Irving. Fine-tuning language models from human preferences. *ArXiv*, abs/1909.08593, 2019. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:202660943>.
- Masrour Zoghi, Shimon Whiteson, Remi Munos, and Maarten Rijke. Relative upper confidence bound for the k-armed dueling bandit problem. In Eric P. Xing and Tony Jebara, editors, *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 32 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 10–18, Beijing, China, 22–24 Jun 2014. PMLR. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v32/zoghi14.html>.

Appendix

Table of Contents

A	Analysis of Nash Mirror Prox	16
A.1	Exact case	16
A.2	Technical lemmas	19
B	Analysis of Approximate Nash Mirror Prox	22
B.1	General Approximate Case	22
B.2	Sample-Based Approximate Nash Mirror Prox	27
B.3	Technical Lemmas	31
C	Relationship to Existing Algorithms.	33
D	Softmax Policy Gradients for Entropy-Regularized Multi-Armed Bandits	34
D.1	Deterministic case	34
D.2	Stochastic case	36
D.3	Technical Lemmas	40
E	Detailed Experiment Description	41
E.1	Matrix Games	41
E.2	LLM Alignment	42

A Analysis of Nash Mirror Prox

Let us recall an optimal solution to the β -regularized preference game as π_β^* :

$$(\pi_\beta^*, \pi_\beta^*) = \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \arg \min_{\pi' \in \Pi} \mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi \succ \pi'),$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi \succ \pi') \triangleq \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi') - \beta \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \beta \text{KL}(\pi' \| \pi^{\text{ref}}).$$

A.1 Exact case

We start from a theorem that states the convergence of the exact version of the Nash Mirror Prox NashMP algorithm, where all the steps can be computed exactly. We also recall that for theoretical analysis, we use a context-free setting.

Theorem (Restatement of Theorem 1). *Assume that $\beta \leq 1/2$ then after K iterations of Nash Mirror Prox with a learning rate $\eta \leq 2\beta$ and an initial policy $\pi_0 = \pi^{\text{ref}}$, the suboptimality satisfies the inequality*

$$\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_{K+\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \frac{1}{2\eta}(1+\eta)^{-K} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta}}(1+\eta)^{-K}.$$

At the same time, the algorithm enjoys the following linear convergence to the optimal solution in KL-divergence:

$$\text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi_K) \leq \frac{1}{2\beta}(1+\eta)^{-K}.$$

Moreover, one has the uniform convergence in the span semi-norm:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\log \pi_K - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq \frac{(1+\eta)^{-K}}{2\beta} + \frac{1+\eta}{\beta} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta}}(1+\eta)^{-K}, \\ \|\log \pi_{K+\frac{1}{2}} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq \frac{(1+\eta)^{-K}}{2(1+\eta)\beta} + \frac{3}{2\beta} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta}}(1+\eta)^{-K}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us consider an arbitrary step $k \geq 1$. Then we can write down optimality conditions that hold for steps $\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$ and π_{k+1} , using Lemma 6 for $\mu = \pi_{k+1}$ and $v_k = \frac{1}{\beta}\mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \cdot)$

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta/\beta)[\mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \pi_{k+1}) - \mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}})] + \eta \text{KL}(\pi_{k+1} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi_{k+1} \| \pi_k) \\ - \eta \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi_k) \geq (1+\eta) \text{KL}(\pi_{k+1} \| \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

and for $\mu = \pi_\beta^*$ and $v_{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{\beta}\mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \cdot)$

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta/\beta)[\mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_\beta^*) - \mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_{k+1})] + \eta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi_k) \\ - \left(\eta \text{KL}(\pi_{k+1} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi_{k+1} \| \pi_k) \right) \geq (1+\eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Summing up these inequalities, the underlined terms cancel out, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta/\beta)[\mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \pi_{k+1}) - \mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_\beta^*) - \mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_{k+1})] \\ \geq (1+\eta) \text{KL}(\pi_{k+1} \| \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \eta \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi_k) \\ + (1+\eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi_{k+1}) - \eta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi_k) \end{aligned}$$

Let us recall the definition

$$\mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi \succ \pi') \triangleq \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi') - \beta \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \beta \text{KL}(\pi' \| \pi^{\text{ref}}),$$

when we have

$$(\eta/\beta)\mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_\beta^*) - \eta \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \eta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) = (\eta/\beta)\mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_\beta^*).$$

Also, using the fact that $\mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) = 1/2$, we can rearrange as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & (\eta/\beta) \underbrace{[\mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_\beta^*) - 1/2]}_{-\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \pi_\beta^*)} + (\eta/\beta) \cdot \mathcal{P}(\pi_k - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \pi_{k+1}) \\ & \geq (1+\eta) \text{KL}(\pi_{k+1} \parallel \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \parallel \pi_k) \\ & \quad + (1+\eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_{k+1}) - \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_k), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\pi_k - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \pi_{k+1})$ is an expression that follows from the bilinear representation of preferences, see (1). To analyze $\mathcal{P}(\pi_k - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \pi_{k+1})$, we apply Lemma 4, an inequality $2ab \leq a^2 + b^2$ and the Pinsker's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{P}(\pi_k - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \pi_{k+1})| & \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\pi_k - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}\|_1 \cdot \|\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \pi_{k+1}\|_1 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4} \left(\|\pi_k - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}\|_1^2 + \|\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \pi_{k+1}\|_1^2 \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \parallel \pi_k) + \text{KL}(\pi_{k+1} \parallel \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, combining this with the assumption $\eta \leq 2\beta$, (12) implies

$$(1+\eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_{k+1}) \leq \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_k) - (\eta/\beta) \cdot \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \pi_\beta^*). \quad (13)$$

Convergence in argument Now we shall use (13) to show the linear convergence of the iterates of Nash Mirror Prox in the argument.

First, let us show that using the optimality of π_β^* for any $\mu \in \Pi$ $\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\mu, \pi_\beta^*) \geq 0$,

$$\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\mu, \pi_\beta^*) = \frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{P}_\beta(\mu \succ \pi_\beta^*) = \underbrace{\mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi_\beta^* \succ \mu) - \frac{1}{2}}_{-\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_\beta^*, \mu)} \geq 0,$$

Therefore, taking $\mu = \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$ and using non-negativity of KL-divergence, we have for any $k \geq 1$,

$$(1+\eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_{k+1}) \leq \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_k) \Rightarrow \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_k) \leq (1+\eta)^{-k} \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_0).$$

Finally, using $\pi_0 = \pi^{\text{ref}}$ and Lemma 3 allows us to simplify the statement.

Convergence in suboptimality Notably, since the underlying function is not smooth, convergence in argument does not directly imply the convergence for the exploitability gap. To prove the convergence in suboptimality, let us start from (13) and rearrange it

$$(\eta/\beta) \cdot \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \pi_\beta^*) \leq \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_k) \leq \frac{1}{2\beta} (1+\eta)^{-k}. \quad (14)$$

However, convergence in suboptimality to an equilibrium is not enough. Before we turn to the suboptimality with respect to any competitor. Let us apply the first part of Lemma 6 with another competitor $\mu = \pi_\beta^*$ and $v_k = \frac{1}{\beta} \mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \cdot)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\eta/\beta) [\mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \pi_\beta^*) - \mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}})] + \eta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_k) \\ & \quad - \eta \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \parallel \pi_k) \geq (1+\eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

By rearranging the terms similar to (12), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (1+\eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) & \leq \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_k) + \frac{\eta}{\beta} \left(\mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_\beta^*) - 1/2 \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{\eta}{\beta} \mathcal{P}(\pi_k - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \pi_\beta^*) - \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \parallel \pi_k). \end{aligned}$$

Next, Lemma 4, an inequality $ab \leq a^2/2 + b^2/2$, and the Pinsker's inequality imply

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{P}(\pi_k - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \pi_\beta^*)| & \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \|\pi_k - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}\|_1 \cdot \|\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \pi_\beta^*\|_1 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \parallel \pi_k) + \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \parallel \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the inequality $\eta \leq 2\beta$, we have

$$\eta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \|\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \|\pi_k). \quad (15)$$

Given this preliminary result, Lemma 5 implies for any policy $\mu \in \Pi$,

$$\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \mu) \leq \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \pi_\beta^*) + \|\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \pi_\beta^*\|_1.$$

By the Pinsker's inequality and (15), we derive

$$\|\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \pi_\beta^*\|_1 \leq \sqrt{2 \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \|\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}})} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\eta} \cdot \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \|\pi_k)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta} \cdot (1+\eta)^{-k}}, \quad (16)$$

Overall, we have

$$\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \mu) \leq \frac{1}{2\eta}(1+\eta)^{-k} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta}(1+\eta)^{-k}}.$$

Uniform convergence in span semi-norm. Next, we establish convergence in terms of the span semi-norm of log-probabilities. We notice that the policy at the step π_{k+1} can be written as follows

$$\beta(1+1/\eta) \log \pi_{k+1}(y) = \beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(y) + \beta/\eta \log \pi_k(y) - \mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ y) + c_{k+1},$$

where c_{k+1} is a normalization constant. Next, Lemma 2 implies

$$\beta(1+1/\eta) \log \pi_\beta^*(y) = \beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(y) + \beta/\eta \log \pi_\beta^*(y) - \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* \succ y) + c.$$

Combining these two representations, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(1+1/\eta)(\log \pi_{k+1}(y) - \log \pi_\beta^*(y)) &= \beta/\eta \cdot (\log \pi_k(y) - \log \pi_\beta^*(y)) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* \succ \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ y) + (c_{k+1} - c). \end{aligned}$$

Taking span-norm and applying Lemma 4 yields

$$(1+\eta)\|\log \pi_{k+1} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \|\log \pi_k - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{\eta}{2\beta}\|\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \pi_\beta^*\|_1.$$

Applying inequality (16), we have

$$(1+\eta)\|\log \pi_{k+1} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \|\log \pi_k - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{\eta}{2\beta}\sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta} \cdot (1+\eta)^{-k}}.$$

Rolling out this expression, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|\log \pi_{k+1} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq (1+\eta)^{-(k+1)}\|\log \pi_0 - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\eta}{2\beta}\sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta}} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^k (1+\eta)^{-(k-j)}(1+\eta)^{-j/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second term could be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^k (1+\eta)^{-(k-j)}(1+\eta)^{-j/2} &= (1+\eta)^{-k/2} \sum_{j=0}^k (\sqrt{1+\eta})^{-j} \leq (1+\eta)^{-k/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\sqrt{1+\eta})^{-j} \\ &\leq \frac{(1+\eta)^{-k/2}}{\sqrt{1+\eta}-1} = (1+\eta)^{-k/2} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{1+\eta}+1}{\eta} \leq \frac{2(1+\eta)^{-(k-1)/2}}{\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\|\log \pi_{k+1} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq (1+\eta)^{-(k+1)}\|\log \pi_0 - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{1+\eta}{\beta}\sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta}}(1+\eta)^{-(k+1)}.$$

Using the fact that $\pi_0 = \pi^{\text{ref}}$, we can simplify the latest expression since by Lemma 2

$$\beta \log \pi_\beta^*(y) = \beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(y) - \frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* \succ y) + c \Rightarrow \|\log \pi_0 - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \frac{1}{2\beta}.$$

Next, we establish the uniform convergence to an intermediate point. By the optimality conditions on $\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$, we get

$$\beta(1+\eta) \log \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(y) = \beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(y) + \beta/\eta \log \pi_k(y) - \mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ y) + c_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$$

for some constant $c_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$. Using this expression, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(1+1/\eta) \left(\log \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(y) - \log \pi_\beta^*(y) \right) &= \beta/\eta \cdot (\log \pi_k(y) - \log \pi_\beta^*(y)) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* - \pi_k \succ y) + (c_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - c), \end{aligned}$$

and thus, using Lemma 4

$$(1+\eta) \|\log \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \|\log \pi_k - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{\eta}{2\beta} \|\pi_k - \pi_\beta^*\|_1.$$

By the Pinsker's inequality and already established results on the convergence of π_k , we have

$$\|\log \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \frac{1}{\beta} (1+\eta)^{-(k+1)} + \frac{1}{\beta} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta} (1+\eta)^{-k}} + \frac{\eta}{2\beta(1+\eta)} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\beta} (1+\eta)^{-k}}.$$

Finally, we prove the required statement by noting that $\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta}} + \frac{\eta}{2(1+\eta)} \right) \leq \frac{3}{2\sqrt{\eta}}$ for $\eta \leq 2\beta \leq 1$. \square

Corollary (Restatement of Corollary 1). *Assume that $\beta \leq 1/2$, then for $\varepsilon > 0$, the final policy of NashMP with $\eta = 2\beta$ is ε -VNW in a β -regularized preference game after $K = \left\lceil \frac{1+\beta}{\beta} \log\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon\beta}\right) \right\rceil$ iterates and $2K$ preference oracle calls. Additionally, for a uniform reference policy $\pi^{\text{ref}}(y) = 1/Y$ for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, a specifically chosen $\beta = \beta^*(\varepsilon)$ and an initial policy $\pi_0 = \pi^{\text{ref}}$, the final policy $\pi_{K+1/2}$ is ε -VNW in the original preference game after $K = \left\lceil \frac{8 \log(Y)}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{8 \log(Y)}{\varepsilon}\right) \right\rceil$ iterates.*

Proof. The first statement is a corollary of Theorem 1 and the inequality $\log(1+x) \geq x/(1+x/2)$ for any $x > 0$. The second statement follows from the following representation of β -regularized suboptimality:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_{K+\frac{1}{2}}) &= \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \left\{ \text{SubOpt}(\pi_{K+\frac{1}{2}}, \pi) + \beta \text{KL}(\pi_{K+\frac{1}{2}} \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \beta \text{KL}(\pi \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}) \right\} \\ &\geq \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \text{SubOpt}(\pi_{K+\frac{1}{2}}, \pi) - \beta \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \text{KL}(\pi \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}) = \text{SubOpt}(\pi_{K+\frac{1}{2}}) - \beta \log(Y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, after K steps,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\pi_{K+\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_{K+\frac{1}{2}}) + \beta \log(Y).$$

Taking $\beta = \beta^*(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon/2 \cdot 1/\log(Y)$, we have to guarantee the inequality $\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_K) \leq \varepsilon/2$, that holds after $K = \left\lceil \frac{1+\beta}{\beta} \log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon\beta}\right) \right\rceil$ iterates. Substituting $\beta = \beta^*(\varepsilon)$, we conclude the proof. \square

A.2 Technical lemmas

Lemma 2. *Let π_β^* be a von Neumann winner in a β -regularized preference game:*

$$(\pi_\beta^*, \pi_\beta^*) = \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \min_{\pi' \in \Pi} \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi') - \beta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \beta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi' \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}).$$

Then π_β^ satisfies for any $x \in \text{supp}(\rho)$, $y \in \text{supp}(\pi^{\text{ref}}(x))$:*

$$\beta \log \pi_\beta^*(y|x) = \beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(y|x) - \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* \succ y|x) + c(x),$$

where $c(x)$ is a function that depends only on x .

Proof. By the definition of a VNW, we have

$$\forall \mu \in \Pi : \mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi_\beta^* \succ \mu) \geq \frac{1}{2} \iff \min_{\mu \in \Pi} \mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi_\beta^* \succ \mu) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

By the symmetry of the game, we get $\mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi_\beta^\star \succ \pi_\beta^\star) = 1/2$. Thus,

$$\pi_\beta^\star \in \arg \min_{\mu \in \Pi} \mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi_\beta^\star \succ \mu).$$

In particular, it implies for any $x \in \text{supp}(\rho)$,

$$\pi_\beta^\star(\cdot|x) \in \arg \min_{\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{Y})} \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^\star \succ \mu|x) + \beta \text{KL}(\mu \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}|x),$$

and, by strong convexity of the problem, the solution is unique and has the following form for all $y \in \text{supp}(\pi^{\text{ref}}(x))$,

$$\pi_\beta^\star(y|x) \propto \pi^{\text{ref}}(y|x) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{1}{\beta} \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^\star \succ y|x)\right).$$

Taking the logarithm, we conclude the proof. \square

Lemma 3. *Let π_β^\star be a VNW in a β -regularized preference game. Then*

$$\text{KL}_\rho(\pi^\star \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}) \leq \frac{1}{2\beta}.$$

Proof. First, we note that since π_β^\star is a VNW, then

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi_\beta^\star \succ \pi^{\text{ref}}) = \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^\star \succ \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \beta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi_\beta^\star \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}).$$

After rearranging the terms, we have

$$\text{KL}(\pi_\beta^\star \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}) \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \left(\mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^\star \succ \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2\beta}.$$

\square

Lemma 4. *Consider a context-free setting, i.e., $\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$. Then, for any policies $\pi, \pi', \mu, \mu' \in \Pi$, it holds*

$$|\mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \mu) - \mathcal{P}(\pi' \succ \mu)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\pi - \pi'\|_1,$$

and

$$|\mathcal{P}(\pi - \pi' \succ \mu - \mu')| \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \|\pi - \pi'\|_1 \cdot \|\mu - \mu'\|_1.$$

Proof. Let us define a vector v with components $v(y) = \mathcal{P}(y \succ \mu) - 1/2$. Notice that $v(y) \in [-1/2, 1/2]$. Hence, we derive

$$|\mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \mu) - \mathcal{P}(\pi' \succ \mu)| = |\langle \pi - \pi', v \rangle| \leq \|v\|_\infty \cdot \|\pi - \pi'\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\pi - \pi'\|_1.$$

For the second part, we apply the representation (1) to get

$$|\mathcal{P}(\pi - \pi' \succ \mu - \mu')| = |\langle \pi - \pi', \mathbf{P}(\mu - \mu') \rangle| \leq \|\pi - \pi'\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{P}(\mu - \mu')\|_\infty.$$

Next, using the fact that $\langle \mu - \mu', \mathbf{1} \rangle = 0$, we have for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{P}(\mu - \mu')_y| &= \left| \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{P}(y \succ y') (\mu(y') - \mu'(y')) \right| = \left| \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} (\mathcal{P}(y \succ y') - 1/2) (\mu(y') - \mu'(y')) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} |(\mathcal{P}(y \succ y') - 1/2) (\mu(y') - \mu'(y'))| \leq \max_{y'} |\mathcal{P}(y \succ y') - 1/2| \|\mu - \mu'\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

and thus, we have

$$\|\mathbf{P}(\mu - \mu')\|_\infty \leq \max_{y, y'} |\mathcal{P}(y \succ y') - 1/2| \cdot \|\mu - \mu'\|_1.$$

Finally, since $\mathcal{P}(y, y') \in [0, 1]$ for any y, y' , we have $|\mathcal{P}(y, y') - 1/2| \leq 1/2$. \square

Lemma 5. *Let us consider a context-free preference game and let $\pi_\beta^* \in \Pi$ be a VNW in β -regularized preference game. Then, for any policies π, μ , it holds*

$$\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi, \mu) \leq \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi, \pi_\beta^*) + \|\pi - \pi_\beta^*\|_1.$$

Proof. By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi, \mu) &= \frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \mu) + \beta \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \beta \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi_\beta^*) + \beta \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \beta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi^{\text{ref}})}_{\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi, \pi_\beta^*)} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* \succ \mu) + \beta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \beta \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi^{\text{ref}})}_{\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_\beta^*, \mu)} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{P}(\pi - \pi_\beta^* \succ \pi_\beta^* - \mu), \end{aligned}$$

where by the bilinearity of \mathcal{P} (see (1)), we have $\mathcal{P}(\pi - \pi_\beta^* \succ \pi_\beta^* - \mu) = \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi_\beta^*) - \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \mu) - \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* \succ \pi_\beta^*) + \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* \succ \mu)$, and by the symmetry $\mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* \succ \pi_\beta^*) = 1/2$. For the last term, Lemma 4 implies

$$|\mathcal{P}(\pi - \pi_\beta^* \succ \pi_\beta^* - \mu)| \leq \|\pi - \pi_\beta^*\|_1.$$

Thus we have

$$\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi, \mu) \leq \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi, \pi_\beta^*) + \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_\beta^*, \mu) + \|\pi - \pi_\beta^*\|_1.$$

Next, we notice that by the definition of VNW,

$$\forall \mu \in \Pi : \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi_\beta^*, \mu) = \frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* \succ \mu) \leq 0.$$

□

A.2.1 Mirror Prox Lemmas

Let us consider the generalized Nash Mirror Prox iterates defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= \arg \min_{\pi} \{ \eta \langle v_k, \pi \rangle + \eta \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi_k) \}, \\ \pi_{k+1} &= \arg \min_{\pi} \{ \eta \langle v_{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \pi \rangle + \eta \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi_k) \}. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

In particular, if we consider $v_k = \frac{1}{\beta} \mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \cdot)$ and $v_{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{\beta} \mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \cdot)$, we recover the deterministic version of Nash Mirror Prox.

Lemma 6. *Each iterate $\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$ and π_{k+1} of (17) satisfies for any $\mu, \mu' \in \Pi$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta \langle v_k, \mu - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \rangle + \eta \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi_k) \\ &\quad - \eta \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi_k) \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta \langle v_{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \mu - \pi_{k+1} \rangle + \eta \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi_k) \\ &\quad - \eta \text{KL}(\pi_{k+1} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\pi_{k+1} \| \pi_k) \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\mu' \| \pi_{k+1}) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First, let us notice that the proof of the first relation automatically results in the proof of the second one due to the same structure; thus, without loss of generality, we prove only the first relation. Let us consider the first-order optimality conditions of the first equation in (17) for the constrained optimization problem:

$$\forall \mu \in \Pi : \langle \eta v_k + \eta \nabla \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \nabla \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi_k), \mu - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \rangle \geq 0, \tag{18}$$

where the gradient of the KL divergence is taken with respect to the first argument. In particular, we have

$$\nabla \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi') = \log \pi - \log \pi' + 1,$$

where the logarithm is taken element-wise. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}), \mu - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \rangle &= \langle \log \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \log \mu + \log \mu - \log \pi^{\text{ref}}, \mu - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \rangle \\ &= -\text{KL}(\mu \| \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the same argument, we derive

$$\langle \nabla \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi_k), \mu - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \rangle = -\text{KL}(\mu \| \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) + \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi_k) - \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi_k).$$

Plugging-in the derived expression to (18) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \langle v_k, \mu - \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \rangle + \eta \left(\text{KL}(\mu \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \right) \\ + \left(\text{KL}(\mu \| \pi_k) - \text{KL}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \| \pi_k) - \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \right) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

and after rearranging the terms, we conclude the proof. \square

B Analysis of Approximate Nash Mirror Prox

B.1 General Approximate Case

In this section, we assume that we do not have access to the true preference model but only to the duels' results. In this case, the inner optimization step of Nash Mirror Prox becomes infeasible, and we need to approximate it.

The iterates of the approximate Nash Mirror Prox are defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} &\approx \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \{ (\eta/\beta) \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \pi) + \eta \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi \| \hat{\pi}_k) \}, \\ \hat{\pi}_{k+1} &\approx \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \{ (\eta/\beta) \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \pi) + \eta \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi \| \hat{\pi}_k) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the approximate solution is defined as follows: $\|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_{k+1/2}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \varepsilon_{k+1/2}$, $\|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1} - \log \pi_{k+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \varepsilon_{k+1}$, where $\pi_{k+1/2}$ and π_{k+1} are the exact minimizes of the corresponding problems in (19).

Theorem 3 (Convergence of Approximate Nash Mirror Prox). *Assume $\beta < 1/2$. Let $\hat{\pi}_k$ be the iterates generated by the approximate Nash Mirror Prox algorithm (19) with $\max_k \{\varepsilon_{k+1/2}, \varepsilon_k\} \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$. After K iterations with a constant learning rate $\eta \leq 2\beta \leq 1$ and $\pi_0 = \pi^{\text{ref}}$, the suboptimality $\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{K+1/2}) \triangleq \max_{\mu \in \Pi} \{\frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{P}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{K+1/2} \succ \mu)\}$ satisfies*

$$\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{K+1/2}) \leq \frac{\beta}{\eta} \left(\frac{(1+\eta)^{-K}}{2\beta} + \frac{6\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} \right) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\eta} \cdot \left(\frac{(1+\eta)^{-K}}{2\beta} + \frac{6\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} \right)}.$$

At the same time, the algorithm enjoys convergence to a neighborhood of the optimal solution in KL divergence:

$$\text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_K) \leq \frac{1}{2\beta} (1+\eta)^{-K} + \frac{4\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta},$$

as well as the uniform convergence in the span semi-norm:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\log \hat{\pi}_K - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq \frac{(1+\eta)^{-K}}{2\beta} + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} + \frac{1+\eta}{\beta} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta} (1+\eta)^{-K}} + \frac{\sqrt{2(1+\eta) \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}}}{\beta\eta}, \\ \|\log \hat{\pi}_{K+\frac{1}{2}} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq \frac{(1+\eta)^{-K}}{2\beta(1+\eta)} + \frac{(1+\eta)\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} + \frac{3}{2\beta} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta} (1+\eta)^{-K}} + \frac{2\sqrt{2(1+\eta)\bar{\varepsilon}}}{\beta \cdot \eta \cdot (1+\eta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us consider an arbitrary step $k \geq 0$. First, apply the first inequality of Lemma 8 with $\mu = \hat{\pi}_{k+1}$, $v_k = \frac{1}{\beta} \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \cdot)$ and the proximal center $\hat{\pi}_k$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \langle v_k, \hat{\pi}_{k+1} - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle + \eta \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ & \quad - \eta \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ & \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) - 2(1 + \eta) \varepsilon_{k+1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $v_k = \frac{1}{\beta} \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \cdot)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & (\eta/\beta) [\mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2})] + \underline{\eta \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_k)} \\ & \quad - \eta \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ & \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) - 2(1 + \eta) \varepsilon_{k+1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Secondly, we apply the second inequality of Lemma 8 with $\mu = \pi_\beta^*$, $v_{k+1/2} = \frac{1}{\beta} \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \cdot)$ and the proximal center $\hat{\pi}_k$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta \langle v_{k+1/2}, \pi_\beta^* - \hat{\pi}_{k+1} \rangle + \eta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ & \quad - \eta \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ & \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) - 2(1 + \eta) \varepsilon_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $v_{k+1/2} = \frac{1}{\beta} \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \cdot)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & (\eta/\beta) [\mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \pi_\beta^*) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1})] + \eta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ & \quad - \left(\underline{\eta \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_k)} \right) \\ & \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) - 2(1 + \eta) \varepsilon_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these two inequalities, the underlined terms cancel out and we get

$$\begin{aligned} & (\eta/\beta) [\mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) + \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \pi_\beta^*) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1})] \\ & \quad + \eta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k) - \eta \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ & \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) + (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) - 2(1 + \eta) (\varepsilon_{k+1/2} + \varepsilon_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the identity $\mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi \succ \pi') = \mathcal{P}(\pi \succ \pi') - \beta \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \beta \text{KL}(\pi' \| \pi^{\text{ref}})$, we can group terms like

$$(\eta/\beta) \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \pi_\beta^*) - \eta \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \eta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) = (\eta/\beta) \mathcal{P}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \pi_\beta^*).$$

Substituting this into the previous inequality and rearranging yields

$$\begin{aligned} & (\eta/\beta) [\mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1})] \\ & \quad + (\eta/\beta) \mathcal{P}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \pi_\beta^*) + \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ & \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) + (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) - 2(1 + \eta) (\varepsilon_{k+1/2} + \varepsilon_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Using $\mathcal{P}(\pi, \pi) = 1/2$ and the definition of suboptimality $\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\pi, \pi') = 1/2 - \mathcal{P}_\beta(\pi \succ \pi')$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & (\eta/\beta) [-\mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) - 1/2] \\ & \quad + (\eta/\beta) [1/2 - \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \pi_\beta^*)] + \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ & \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) + (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) - 2(1 + \eta) (\varepsilon_{k+1/2} + \varepsilon_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

and after rearranging

$$\begin{aligned} & -(\eta/\beta) \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \pi_\beta^*) - (\eta/\beta) \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) \\ & \quad + \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ & \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) + (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) \\ & \quad - 2(1 + \eta) (\varepsilon_{k+1/2} + \varepsilon_{k+1}). \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Bounding the bilinear term as in the proof of Theorem 1, we get

$$|\mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \hat{\pi}_{k+1})| \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k) + \frac{1}{2} \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}).$$

Substituting this bound into (20) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & -(\eta/\beta) \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \pi_\beta^*) + \frac{\eta}{2\beta} [\text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k) + \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2})] \\ & \quad + \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ & \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) + (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) \\ & \quad - 2(1 + \eta)(\varepsilon_{k+1/2} + \varepsilon_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\eta \leq 2\beta$, we have $\eta/(2\beta) - 1 \leq 0$. Dropping the non-positive term involving $\text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k)$ and bounding the term with $\text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2})$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & -(\eta/\beta) \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \pi_\beta^*) + \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k) - \eta \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) \\ & \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) - 2(1 + \eta)(\varepsilon_{k+1/2} + \varepsilon_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, rearranging gives the following inequality for the approximate case:

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) & \leq \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k) - (\eta/\beta) \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \pi_\beta^*) \\ & \quad + 2(1 + \eta)(\varepsilon_{k+1/2} + \varepsilon_{k+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

At the same time, if we plug in π_{k+1} instead of $\hat{\pi}_{k+1}$ in all the previous bounds, we get

$$(1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi_{k+1}) \leq \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k) - (\eta/\beta) \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \pi_\beta^*) + 2(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_{k+1/2}. \quad (22)$$

Convergence in argument Let $\Delta_k \triangleq \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k)$ and $E_k \triangleq (\varepsilon_{k+1/2} + \varepsilon_{k+1})$. Since $\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \pi_\beta^*) \geq 0$, we have $(1 + \eta)\Delta_{k+1} \leq \Delta_k + 2(1 + \eta)E_k$. Unrolling this recurrence from $k = 0$ to $K - 1$ yields

$$\Delta_K \leq (1 + \eta)^{-K} \Delta_0 + 2 \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} (1 + \eta)^{-(K-1-j)} (\varepsilon_{j+1/2} + \varepsilon_{j+1}), \quad (23)$$

where the accumulated error can be bounded as follows

$$2 \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} (1 + \eta)^{-(K-1-j)} (\varepsilon_{j+1/2} + \varepsilon_{j+1}) \leq 4 \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} (1 + \eta)^{-(K-1-j)} \bar{\varepsilon} \leq \frac{4\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta}.$$

The choice $\pi_0 = \pi^{\text{ref}}$ and the bound on Δ_0 from Lemma 3 finish the proof.

Convergence in suboptimality From (22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta/\beta) \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \pi_\beta^*) & \leq \Delta_k - (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi_{k+1}) + 2(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_{k+1/2} \\ & \leq \Delta_k + 2(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_{k+1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

First, apply the first inequality of Lemma 8 with $\mu = \pi_\beta^*$ and $v_k = \frac{1}{\beta} \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \cdot)$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} & (\eta/\beta) [\mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \pi_\beta^*) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \pi_{k+1/2})] + \eta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ & \quad - \eta \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k) \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) - 2(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_{k+1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By rearranging the terms similarly to (12), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) & \leq \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \| \hat{\pi}_k) + \frac{\eta}{\beta} (\mathcal{P}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \pi_\beta^*) - 1/2) + 2(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_{k+1/2} \\ & \quad + \frac{\eta}{\beta} \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \pi_\beta^*) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k). \end{aligned}$$

Next, Lemma 4, an inequality $ab \leq a^2/2 + b^2/2$, and the Pinsker's inequality imply

$$|\mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \pi_{k+1/2} - \pi_\beta^*)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \|\hat{\pi}_k) + \frac{1}{2} \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \|\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}).$$

Thus, by the inequality $\eta \leq 2\beta$, we have

$$\eta \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \|\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) \leq \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \|\hat{\pi}_k) + 2(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_{k+1/2}. \quad (25)$$

Applying Lemma 5 for any policy $\mu \in \Pi$ and the Pinsker's inequality gives

$$\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \mu) \leq \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \pi_\beta^*) + \|\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \pi_\beta^*\|_1.$$

Using the Pinsker's inequality again and the bound, we derive (25):

$$\|\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \pi_\beta^*\|_1 \leq \sqrt{2 \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \|\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2})} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\eta} \cdot (\Delta_k + 2(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_{k+1/2})}. \quad (26)$$

Now substitute this and the bound (24) for $\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \pi_\beta^*)$ into the overall suboptimality expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \mu) &\leq \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \pi_\beta^*) + \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \pi_\beta^* \succ \pi_\beta^* - \mu) \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{\eta} (\Delta_k + 2(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_{k+1/2}) + \sqrt{\frac{2(\Delta_k + 2(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_{k+1/2})}{\eta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we use the bound (23) and the fact that $\Delta_0 \leq 1/2\beta$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_k + 2(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_{k+\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \frac{(1 + \eta)^{-k}}{2\beta} + 2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (1 + \eta)^{-(k-1-j)} (\varepsilon_{j+\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon_{j+1}) + 2(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{(1 + \eta)^{-k}}{2\beta} + 4\bar{\varepsilon} \sum_{j=0}^k (1 + \eta)^{-(k-1-j)} \leq \frac{(1 + \eta)^{-k}}{2\beta} + \frac{4(1 + \eta)\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Since $1 + \eta \leq 3/2$,

$$\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \mu) \leq \frac{\beta}{\eta} \left(\frac{(1 + \eta)^{-k}}{2\beta} + \frac{6\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} \right) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\eta} \cdot \left(\frac{(1 + \eta)^{-k}}{2\beta} + \frac{6\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} \right)}.$$

Uniform convergence in span semi-norm. Next, we use the same arguments as in the exact case. First, the optimal policy for a step $k + 1$ can be represented as follows

$$\beta(1 + 1/\eta) \log \pi_{k+1}(y) = \beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(y) + \beta/\eta \log \hat{\pi}_k(y) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ y) + c_{k+1},$$

where c_{k+1} is a some normalization constant. Next, Lemma 2 implies

$$\beta(1 + 1/\eta) \log \pi_\beta^*(y) = \beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(y) + \beta/\eta \log \pi_\beta^*(y) - \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* \succ y) + c.$$

Combining these two representations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(1 + 1/\eta) (\log \pi_{k+1}(y) - \log \pi_\beta^*(y)) &= \beta/\eta \cdot (\log \hat{\pi}_k(y) - \log \pi_\beta^*(y)) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ y) + (c_{k+1} - c). \end{aligned}$$

Taking span-norm and applying Lemma 4 yields

$$(1 + \eta) \|\log \pi_{k+1} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \|\log \hat{\pi}_k - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{\eta}{2\beta} \|\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \pi_\beta^*\|_1.$$

Applying inequality (26), we derive

$$(1 + \eta) \|\log \pi_{k+1} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \|\log \hat{\pi}_k - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{\eta}{2\beta} \sqrt{\frac{2(\Delta_k + 2(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_{k+1/2})}{\eta}}. \quad (28)$$

Using the definition of approximation by $\hat{\pi}_k$ and (27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1+\eta)\|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq \|\log \hat{\pi}_k - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + (1+\eta)\varepsilon_{k+1} \\ &\quad + \frac{\eta}{2\beta} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\eta} \left((1+\eta)^{-k} \Delta_0 + \frac{4(1+\eta)\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} \right)} \\ &\leq \|\log \hat{\pi}_k - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + (1+\eta)\bar{\varepsilon} + \frac{\eta}{2\beta} \sqrt{\frac{(1+\eta)^{-k}}{\eta\beta}} + \frac{\sqrt{2(1+\eta)\bar{\varepsilon}}}{\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Rolling out this expression, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq (1+\eta)^{-(k+1)} \|\log \pi_0 - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \sum_{j=0}^k (1+\eta)^{-(k-j)} \bar{\varepsilon} \\ &\quad + \frac{\eta}{2\beta} \sum_{j=0}^k (1+\eta)^{-(k-j)} \sqrt{\frac{(1+\eta)^{-j}}{\eta\beta}} + \sum_{j=0}^k (1+\eta)^{-(k-j)} \frac{\sqrt{2(1+\eta)\bar{\varepsilon}}}{\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

The third term could be controlled in the same manner as in the proof of the exact case (see Theorem 1):

$$\frac{\eta}{2\beta} \sum_{j=0}^k (1+\eta)^{-(k-j)} \sqrt{\frac{(1+\eta)^{-j}}{\eta\beta}} \leq \frac{1+\eta}{\beta} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta} (1+\eta)^{-(k+1)}},$$

whereas all other error terms are controlled by a geometric sum:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq (1+\eta)^{-(k+1)} \|\log \pi_0 - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} \\ &\quad + \frac{2(1+\eta)}{\beta} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta} (1+\eta)^{-(k+1)}} + \frac{\sqrt{2(1+\eta)\bar{\varepsilon}}}{\beta \cdot \eta}. \end{aligned}$$

A bound $\|\log \pi^{\text{ref}} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq 1/(2\beta)$ allows us to conclude the proof.

Finally, we establish the uniform convergence to an intermediate point. By the optimality conditions on $\pi_{k+1/2}$ we have

$$\beta(1+1/\eta) \log \pi_{k+1/2}(y) = \beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(y) + \beta/\eta \log \hat{\pi}_k(y) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ y) + c_{k+1/2}$$

for some constant $c_{k+1/2}$. Using this expression, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(1+1/\eta) (\log \pi_{k+1/2}(y) - \log \pi_\beta^*(y)) &= \beta/\eta \cdot (\log \hat{\pi}_k(y) - \log \pi_\beta^*(y)) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* - \hat{\pi}_k \succ y) + (c_{k+1/2} - c), \end{aligned}$$

and using Lemma 4

$$(1+\eta)\|\log \pi_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \|\log \hat{\pi}_k - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{\eta}{2\beta} \|\hat{\pi}_k - \pi_\beta^*\|_1. \quad (29)$$

By the Pinsker's inequality and already established results on the convergence of $\hat{\pi}_k$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\log \pi_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq \frac{(1+\eta)^{-k}}{2\beta(1+\eta)} + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta(1+\eta)} + \frac{1}{\beta} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta} (1+\eta)^{-k}} + \frac{\sqrt{2\bar{\varepsilon}}}{\beta \cdot \eta \cdot \sqrt{1+\eta}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\eta}{2\beta(1+\eta)} \sqrt{2 \left(\frac{(1+\eta)^{-k}}{2\beta} + \frac{4\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we simplify this expression by using the bounds $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$ for $a, b \geq 0$, $\eta/(1+\eta) \leq 1/\sqrt{\eta}$ for $\eta \leq 1$, and $\sqrt{\eta/(1+\eta)} \leq 1/\eta$:

$$\|\log \pi_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \frac{(1+\eta)^{-k}}{2\beta(1+\eta)} + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta(1+\eta)} + \frac{3}{2\beta} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta\beta} (1+\eta)^{-k}} + \frac{2\sqrt{2\bar{\varepsilon}}}{\beta \cdot \eta \cdot \sqrt{1+\eta}}. \quad (30)$$

Finally, we apply the approximation of $\pi_{k+1/2}$ by $\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}$ and notice that

$$\frac{1}{\eta(1+\eta)} + 1 \leq \frac{1+\eta}{\eta}.$$

Now the choice $k = K$ allows us to conclude the proof. \square

Next, we provide an iteration complexity result.

Theorem (Restatement of Theorem 2). *Assume that $\beta \leq 1/2$ and $\|\hat{\pi}_{k+p/2} - \pi_{k+p/2}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$ for $\bar{\varepsilon} \in (0, 1)$ and c all $k \in \{0, \dots, K-1\}, p \in \{1, 2\}$, where $\pi_{k+p/2}$ are exact solutions to the corresponding problems in (8). Then after $K = \left\lceil \frac{1+\beta}{2\beta} \log\left(\frac{1}{\bar{\varepsilon}}\right) \right\rceil$ iterations, the policy $\hat{\pi}_{K+1/2}$ is a $\frac{4\sqrt{\bar{\varepsilon}}}{\beta}$ -VNW in β -regularized game.*

Proof. From Theorem 3 it holds for $\eta = 2\beta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{K+1/2}) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{(1+2\beta)^{-K}}{2\beta} + \frac{3\bar{\varepsilon}}{\beta} \right) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{\beta} \cdot \left(\frac{(1+2\beta)^{-K}}{2\beta} + \frac{3\bar{\varepsilon}}{\beta} \right)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4\beta} ((1+2\beta)^{-K} + 6\bar{\varepsilon}) + \frac{1}{\beta\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{(1+2\beta)^{-K} + 6\bar{\varepsilon}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we see that the inequality $(1+2\beta)^{-K} \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$ is achieved after $\lceil \frac{1+\beta}{2\beta} \log(\frac{1}{\bar{\varepsilon}}) \rceil$ iterations. Then with $\bar{\varepsilon} \leq 1$, we get

$$\text{SubOpt}_\beta(\hat{\pi}_{K+1/2}) \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \left(\frac{7\bar{\varepsilon}}{4} + \sqrt{\frac{7\bar{\varepsilon}}{2}} \right) \leq \frac{4\sqrt{\bar{\varepsilon}}}{\beta}.$$

\square

B.2 Sample-Based Approximate Nash Mirror Prox

In this section, we propose a direct way to approximate Nash Mirror Prox's steps using only the sample-available information on the preference model. In particular, to approximate each step of Nash Mirror Prox in (19), we use the stochastic policy gradient method with softmax parametrization, that is, we parameterize our policies in the following way

$$\pi_\theta(y) \triangleq \frac{\exp\{\theta(y)\}}{\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \exp\{\theta(y)\}}.$$

Given this parameterization, we define θ_β^* as the optimal parameters that correspond to π_β^* .

Approximation of the intermediate update. We rewrite the first part of (19) using our parameterization:

$$J_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\theta) \triangleq \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \pi_\theta) + \beta \text{KL}(\pi_\theta \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \frac{\beta}{\eta} \cdot \text{KL}(\pi_\theta \| \hat{\pi}_k), \quad (31)$$

and we define $\theta_{k+1/2}^*$ as a minimizer to this problem. As a result, $\pi_{k+1/2} = \pi_{\theta_{k+1/2}^*}$. Our goal is to compute an approximation of $\theta_{k+1/2}^*$ that we denote by $\theta_{k+1/2}$. This approximation shall satisfy $\|\log \pi_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_{\theta_{k+1/2}}\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_{k+1/2}$. To construct such an approximation we apply stochastic gradient descent of the form

$$\theta_{k+1/2,t+1} = \theta_{k+1/2,t} - \gamma \hat{\nabla} J_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\theta_{k+1/2,t}),$$

where the stochastic gradient can be computed using a standard REINFORCE estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\nabla} J_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\theta_{k+1/2,t}) &= \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^B \left(o_{k+1/2,t}^j - \frac{1}{2} + \beta \log \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta_{k+1/2,t}}(y_{k+1/2,t}^j)}{\pi^{\text{ref}}(y_{k+1/2,t}^j)} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\beta}{\eta} \log \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta_{k+1/2,t}}(y_{k+1/2,t}^j)}{\hat{\pi}_k(y_{k+1/2,t}^j)} \right) \right) \nabla \log \pi_{\theta_{k+1/2,t}}(y_{k+1/2,t}^j), \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\tilde{y}_{k+1/2,t}^j\}_{j=1}^B$ is an i.i.d. sample from $\hat{\pi}_k$, $\{y_{k+1/2,t}^j\}_{j=1}^B$ is an i.i.d. sample from $\pi_{\theta_{k+1/2,t}}$, and $\{o_{k+1/2,t}^j\}_{j=1}^B$ are comparison results of $\tilde{y}_{k+1/2,t}^j$ against $y_{k+1/2,t}^j$, that is, $o_{k+1/2,t}^j \sim \text{Ber}(\mathcal{P}(\tilde{y}_{k+1/2,t}^j \succ y_{k+1/2,t}^j))$. We perform $T_{k+1/2}$ updates of this form with a value of $T_{k+1/2}$ to specified later and θ_k as an initial value. Finally we define $\theta_{k+1/2} = \theta_{k+1/2,T_{k+1/2}}$ and $\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} = \pi_{\theta_{k+1/2}}$.

Approximation of the final update. Next, we rewrite the second part of (19)

$$J_{k+1}(\theta) \triangleq \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \pi_\theta) + \beta \text{KL}(\pi_\theta \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \frac{\beta}{\eta} \cdot \text{KL}(\pi_\theta \| \hat{\pi}_k), \quad (32)$$

and we define θ_{k+1}^* as a minimizer to this problem and set $\pi_{k+1} = \pi_{\theta_{k+1}^*}$. To approximate this step, we also apply stochastic gradient descent

$$\theta_{k+1,t+1} = \theta_{k+1,t} - \gamma \hat{\nabla} J_{k+1}(\theta_{k+1,t}),$$

where the stochastic gradient is again computed using a standard REINFORCE estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\nabla} J_{k+1}(\theta_{k+1,t}) = & \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^B \left(o_{k+1,t}^j - \frac{1}{2} + \beta \log \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta_{k+1,t}}(y_{k+1,t}^j)}{\pi^{\text{ref}}(y_{k+1,t}^j)} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\beta}{\eta} \log \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta_{k+1,t}}(y_{k+1,t}^j)}{\hat{\pi}_k(y_{k+1,t}^j)} \right) \right) \nabla \log \pi_{\theta_{k+1,t}}(y_{k+1,t}^j), \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\tilde{y}_{k+1,t}^j\}_{j=1}^B$ is an iid sample from $\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}$, $\{y_{k+1,t}^j\}_{j=1}^B$ is an iid sample from $\pi_{\theta_{k+1,t}}$, and $\{o_{k+1,t}^j\}_{j=1}^B$ are comparison results of $\tilde{y}_{k+1,t}^j$ against $y_{k+1,t}^j$, that is, $o_{k+1,t}^j \sim \text{Ber}(\mathcal{P}(\tilde{y}_{k+1,t}^j \succ y_{k+1,t}^j))$. We perform T_{k+1} updates of this form with a value of T_{k+1} to be specified later. After these steps, we define $\theta_{k+1} = \theta_{k+1,T_{k+1}}$ and $\hat{\pi}_{k+1} = \pi_{\theta_{k+1}}$. For a complete algorithm description, we refer to Algorithm 1.

Analysis. To perform analysis of this approximate version of the algorithm, we first notice that the problem of minimization of $J_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\theta)$ and $J_{k+1}(\theta)$ is an entropy regularized multi-armed bandit problem with the reward function equal to $r(y) = -\mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+p} \succ y) + \beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(y) + \beta/\eta \cdot \log \hat{\pi}_k(y)$ for $p \in \{0, 1/2\}$, and an entropy regularization coefficient equal to $\beta(1 + 1/\eta)$. Thus, we can apply the results on stochastic policy gradients for this type of problem, in particular, Proposition 2.

Let us define a problem-dependent quantity:

$$c_\beta^* \triangleq \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \pi_\beta^*(y) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{34}{\beta \cdot \eta}\right). \quad (33)$$

Lemma 7. For $\bar{\varepsilon} < 1/3$ and under the choice

$$T(\bar{\varepsilon}) = \frac{4}{c_\beta^*} \log\left(\frac{12}{\beta \bar{\varepsilon}}\right), \quad B(\bar{\varepsilon}) = \left(\frac{16 \log(12|\mathcal{Y}|KT^2/\delta)}{c_\beta^* \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}}\right)^2, \quad \gamma = \frac{\eta}{\beta \cdot (1 + \eta)},$$

the following event

$$\mathcal{E}(\delta) = \left\{ \forall k \in [K] : \|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_{k+1/2}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \bar{\varepsilon}, \|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1} - \log \pi_{k+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \bar{\varepsilon} \right\},$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. First, note that under the choice $\theta_0 = \log \pi^{\text{ref}}$, Lemma 2 implies

$$\|\theta_0 - \theta_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} = \|\log \pi^{\text{ref}} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \|\mathcal{P}(\pi_\beta^* \succ \cdot) - 1/2\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \frac{1}{2\beta}. \quad (34)$$

Next, we prove the initial statement by induction over k . Let us define a sequence of events

$$\mathcal{E}_k(\delta) = \left\{ \|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_{k+1/2}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \bar{\varepsilon}, \|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1} - \log \pi_{k+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \bar{\varepsilon} \right\},$$

and we show that $\mathbb{P}[-\mathcal{E}_k(\delta) | \bigcap_{j < k} \mathcal{E}_j(\delta)] \leq \delta/K$ for every $k \in [K]$.

Assume that $\bigcap_{j < k} \mathcal{E}_j(\delta)$ holds. In particular, it implies that for any $j < k$, it holds $\varepsilon_{j+1/2}, \varepsilon_{j+1} \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$. For $k = 0$, the condition trivially holds.

Let us define $c_{k+1/2}(\theta_k) \triangleq \min_y \pi_{k+1/2}(y) \cdot \exp(-2\|\theta_k - \theta_{k+1/2}^*\|_{\text{sp}})$ and $c_{k+1}(\theta_{k+1/2}) \triangleq \min_y \pi_{k+1}(y) \cdot \exp(-2\|\theta_{k+1/2} - \theta_{k+1}^*\|_{\text{sp}})$. Our next goal is to bound the distance to the optimal policy, $c_{k+1/2}$ and c_{k+1} .

Bound on $\|\theta_k - \theta_{k+1/2}^*\|_{\text{sp}}$. We want to show that $\|\theta_k - \theta_{k+1/2}^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq 10/\beta$.

We can select the following optimal solution to this problem

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{k+1/2}^* &= \frac{\beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(\cdot) + \beta/\eta \cdot \log \hat{\pi}_k(\cdot) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \cdot)}{\beta(1 + 1/\eta)} \\ &= \frac{\eta}{1 + \eta} \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(\cdot) - \frac{\eta}{\beta \cdot (1 + \eta)} \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \cdot) + \frac{1}{1 + \eta} \log \hat{\pi}_k. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\log \hat{\pi}_k = \theta_k + c_k \mathbf{1}$ for some constant $c_k \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\|\theta_{k+1/2}^* - \theta_k\|_{\text{sp}} = \frac{\eta}{\beta(1 + \eta)} \left\| \beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(\cdot) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \cdot) - \beta \log \hat{\pi}_k(\cdot) \right\|_{\text{sp}}.$$

Lemma 2 implies

$$\beta \log \pi_{\beta}^*(y) = \beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(y) - \mathcal{P}(\pi_{\beta}^* \succ y) + c \mathbf{1}$$

for a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus,

$$\|\theta_{k+1/2}^* - \theta_k\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \frac{\eta}{\beta(1 + \eta)} \cdot (\|\mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k - \pi_{\beta}^* \succ \cdot)\|_{\text{sp}} + \|\beta \log \hat{\pi}_k - \beta \log \pi_{\beta}^*\|_{\text{sp}}).$$

Next, we use Lemma 4 and the Pinsker's inequality to derive

$$\|\theta_{k+1/2}^* - \theta_k\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \frac{\eta}{\beta(1 + \eta)} \cdot \left(\sqrt{2 \text{KL}(\pi_{\beta}^* \|\hat{\pi}_k)} + \|\beta \log \hat{\pi}_k - \beta \log \pi_{\beta}^*\|_{\text{sp}} \right).$$

Now we use the convergence guarantees from Theorem 3:

$$\sqrt{2 \text{KL}(\pi_{\beta}^* \|\hat{\pi}_k)} \leq \sqrt{2(1 + \eta)^{-k} \text{KL}(\pi_{\beta}^* \|\pi_0)} + 2\sqrt{\frac{2\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta}},$$

the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta \log \hat{\pi}_k - \beta \log \pi_{\beta}^*\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq (1 + \eta)^{-k} \|\beta \log \pi_0 - \beta \log \pi_{\beta}^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{\beta \bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} \\ &\quad + 2(1 + \eta) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\eta} (1 + \eta)^{-k} \text{KL}(\pi_{\beta}^* \|\pi_0)} + \frac{\sqrt{2(1 + \eta) \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}}}{\eta}, \end{aligned}$$

the inequality $\text{KL}(\pi_{\beta}^* \|\pi_0) \leq \|\log \pi_0 - \log \pi_{\beta}^*\|_{\text{sp}}$ and (34) to derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_{k+1/2}^* - \theta_k\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq \frac{\eta}{\beta(1 + \eta)} \left(\frac{1}{2} (1 + \eta)^{-k} + \frac{\beta \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 3(1 + \eta) \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta \cdot \beta} (1 + \eta)^{-k}} + 3 \frac{\sqrt{2(1 + \eta) \bar{\varepsilon}}}{\eta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we can simplify this bound using assumptions $\bar{\varepsilon} \leq 1$ and $\eta \leq \beta \leq 1$:

$$\|\theta_{k+1/2}^* - \theta_k\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \frac{1}{2(1 + \eta)} + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{1 + \eta} + \frac{3\sqrt{\eta}}{\beta^{3/2}} + 3 \frac{\sqrt{2\bar{\varepsilon}(1 + \eta)}}{\beta(1 + \eta)} \leq \frac{4(1 + \sqrt{2})}{\beta} \leq \frac{10}{\beta}. \quad (35)$$

Bound on $\|\theta_{k+1/2} - \theta_{k+1}^*\|_{\text{sp}}$. We want to show that $\|\theta_{k+1/2} - \theta_{k+1}^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq 12/\beta$. We start from the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{k+1}^* &= \frac{\beta \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(\cdot) + \beta/\eta \cdot \log \hat{\pi}_k(\cdot) - \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \succ \cdot)}{\beta(1+1/\eta)} \\ &= \frac{\eta}{1+\eta} \log \pi^{\text{ref}}(\cdot) - \frac{\eta}{\beta \cdot (1+\eta)} \mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_k \succ \cdot) + \frac{1}{1+\eta} \log \hat{\pi}_k,\end{aligned}$$

which together with Lemma 4 implies

$$\|\theta_{k+1}^* - \theta_{k+1/2}^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \frac{\eta}{\beta(1+\eta)} \|\mathcal{P}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \hat{\pi}_k \succ \cdot)\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \frac{\eta}{2\beta(1+\eta)} \|\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \hat{\pi}_k\|_1.$$

Then, we apply the triangle inequality and Lemma 14 to connect ℓ_1 -norm with the span semi-norm of parameters:

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \hat{\pi}_k\|_1 \leq \|\theta_{k+1/2} - \theta_{k+1/2}^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \|\theta_k - \theta_{k+1/2}^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \bar{\varepsilon} + \frac{10}{\beta} \leq \frac{11}{\beta}.$$

Thus, by the triangle inequality

$$\|\theta_{k+1}^* - \theta_{k+1/2}\| \leq \bar{\varepsilon} + \frac{\eta}{\beta(1+\eta)} (\bar{\varepsilon} + \frac{10}{\beta}) \leq \frac{12}{\beta}.$$

Bound on $c_{k+1/2}(\theta_k)$. We want to show that $c_{k+1/2}(\theta_k) \geq c_\beta^*$. Let us apply Lemma 9 with softmax parameters equal to log-probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned}\log c_{k+1/2}(\theta_k) &\geq \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \log \pi_\beta^*(y) - \|\log \pi_\beta^* - \log \pi_{k+1/2}\|_\infty - 2\|\theta_k - \theta_{k+1/2}^*\|_{\text{sp}} \\ &\geq \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \log \pi_\beta^*(y) - 2\|\log \pi_\beta^* - \log \pi_{k+1/2}\|_{\text{sp}} - 2\|\theta_k - \theta_{k+1/2}^*\|_{\text{sp}}.\end{aligned}$$

To control the second term, we apply (30) from the proof of Theorem 3 and do similar simplifications as in (35):

$$\begin{aligned}\|\log \pi_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq (1+\eta)^{-(k+1)} \|\theta_0 - \theta_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta(1+\eta)} \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{2\beta} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\eta} (1+\eta)^{-k} \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \|\pi_0)} + \frac{2\sqrt{2(1+\eta)\bar{\varepsilon}}}{\beta \cdot \eta \cdot (1+\eta)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\beta(1+\eta)} + \frac{3}{2\beta \cdot \eta} + \frac{3\sqrt{2}}{\beta \cdot \eta} \leq \frac{2+3\sqrt{2}}{\beta \cdot \eta} \leq \frac{7}{\beta\eta}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, combining these two bounds, we derive

$$\log c_{k+1/2}(\theta_k) \geq \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \log \pi_\beta^*(y) - \frac{34}{\beta \cdot \eta} = \log c_\beta^*.$$

Bound on $c_{k+1}(\theta_{k+1/2})$. We want to show that $c_{k+1}(\theta_{k+1/2}) \geq c_\beta^*$.

We start with Lemma 9 and softmax parameters equal to log-probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned}\log c_{k+1}(\theta_{k+1/2}) &\geq \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \log \pi_\beta^*(y) - \|\log \pi_\beta^* - \log \pi_{k+1}\|_\infty - 2\|\theta_{k+1/2} - \theta_{k+1}^*\|_{\text{sp}} \\ &\geq \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \log \pi_\beta^*(y) - 2\|\log \pi_\beta^* - \log \pi_{k+1}\|_{\text{sp}} - 2\|\theta_{k+1/2} - \theta_{k+1}^*\|_{\text{sp}}.\end{aligned}$$

Next, we use the convergence in the span semi-norm from Theorem 3 considering $\varepsilon_{k+1} = 0$ (and, correspondingly, $\hat{\pi}_{k+1} = \pi_{k+1}$):

$$\begin{aligned}\|\log \pi_{k+1} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} &\leq (1+\eta)^{-(k+1)} \|\log \pi_0 - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} \\ &\quad + \frac{2(1+\eta)}{\beta} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\eta} (1+\eta)^{-(k+1)} \text{KL}(\pi_\beta^* \|\pi_0)} + \frac{\sqrt{2(1+\eta)\bar{\varepsilon}}}{\beta \cdot \eta} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1+\eta} \|\theta_0 - \theta_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\eta} + \frac{2}{\beta\sqrt{\eta(1+\eta)}} \sqrt{2\|\theta_0 - \theta_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}}},\end{aligned}$$

and, applying (34), we have

$$\|\log \pi_{k+1} - \log \pi_\beta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \frac{1}{2\beta} + \frac{1}{\eta} + \frac{2}{\beta\eta} \leq \frac{4}{\beta\eta},$$

thus

$$\log c_{k+1}(\theta_{k+1/2}) \geq \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \log \pi_\beta^*(y) - \frac{32}{\beta\eta} \geq \log c_\beta^*.$$

Accuracy bound. The next step is to apply Proposition 2. First, it is easy to verify that Assumption 1 holds with $M = 1$, and our setting corresponds to $\lambda = \beta(1 + 1/\eta)$. Thus, taking $\gamma = 1/(1 + \eta) \cdot \eta/\beta$, we can see that for

$$T(\bar{\varepsilon}) = \frac{4}{c_\beta^*} \log\left(\frac{12}{\beta\bar{\varepsilon}}\right),$$

and

$$B(\bar{\varepsilon}) = \left(\frac{16 \log(12|\mathcal{Y}|KT^2/\delta)}{(1 + \eta) \cdot c_\beta^*} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2},$$

Proposition 2 implies that the following event holds with probability at least $1 - \delta/K$ on the event $\bigcap_{j < k} \mathcal{E}_j(\delta)$:

$$\mathcal{E}_k(\delta) = \left\{ \|\theta_{k+1/2} - \theta_{k+1/2}^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \bar{\varepsilon}, \|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_{k+1}^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \bar{\varepsilon} \right\}.$$

Applying a union bound, we conclude the proof. \square

B.3 Technical Lemmas

Let us consider a generalized iterates of the approximate Nash Mirror Prox iterates defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{k+1/2} &= \arg \min_{\pi} \{ \eta \langle v_k, \pi \rangle + \eta \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi \| \hat{\pi}_k) \}, \\ \pi_{k+1} &= \arg \min_{\pi} \{ \eta \langle v_{k+1/2}, \pi \rangle + \eta \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\pi \| \hat{\pi}_k) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where $\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}$ and $\hat{\pi}_{k+1}$ are approximation of $\pi_{k+1/2}$ and π_{k+1} in the following sense

$$\|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_{k+1/2}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \varepsilon_{k+1/2}, \quad \|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1} - \log \pi_{k+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \varepsilon_{k+1}. \quad (37)$$

Lemma 8. Let $\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}$ and $\hat{\pi}_{k+1}$ be approximate Nash Mirror Prox iterates (36) in the sense of (37). Then for any $\mu, \mu' \in \Pi$

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta \langle v_k, \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle + \eta \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\mu \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ &- \eta \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k) \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\mu \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) - 2(1 + \eta) \varepsilon_{k+1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta \langle v_{k+1/2}, \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1} \rangle + \eta \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}(\mu \| \hat{\pi}_k) \\ &- \eta \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1} \| \hat{\pi}_k) \geq (1 + \eta) \text{KL}(\mu' \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1}) - 2(1 + \eta) \varepsilon_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First, let us notice that the proof of the first relation automatically results in the proof for the second one due to the same structure; thus, without loss of generality, we prove only the first one.

Let us consider the first-order optimality conditions of the first equation in (17) for the constrained optimization problem:

$$\forall \mu \in \Pi : \langle \eta v_k + \eta \nabla \text{KL}(\pi_{k+1/2} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \nabla \text{KL}(\pi_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k), \mu - \pi_{k+1/2} \rangle \geq 0, \quad (38)$$

where the gradient of KL divergence is assumed to be taken with respect to the first argument:

$$\nabla \text{KL}(\pi \| \pi') = \log \pi - \log \pi' + \mathbf{1},$$

Algorithm 1 Sample-Based Approximate Nash Mirror Prox

Require: Initial policy parameters θ_0 , reference policy π^{ref} , Nash MP learning rate $\eta > 0$, policy gradient learning rate $\gamma > 0$, reference regularization parameter β , batch size B , number of gradient updates per phase T , total iterations K .

Ensure: Final policy parameters θ_K .

```

1: for  $k = 0$  to  $K - 1$  do                                     ▷ Main loop over iterations
2:   Set opponent policy  $\hat{\pi}_k$  (corresponding to  $\theta_k$ )
3:   Phase 1: Intermediate Update ( $k \mapsto k + 1/2$ )
4:   Initialize  $\theta_{k+1/2,0} \leftarrow \theta_k$ 
5:   for  $t = 0$  to  $T - 1$  do
6:     Sample batch  $\{\tilde{y}_{k+1/2,t}^j\}_{j=1}^B$  i.i.d. from  $\hat{\pi}_k$ 
7:     Sample batch  $\{y_{k+1/2,t}^j\}_{j=1}^B$  i.i.d. from  $\pi_{\theta_{k+1/2,t}}$ 
8:     Obtain duel results  $\{o_{k+1/2,t}^j\}_{j=1}^B$  comparing  $\tilde{y}_{k+1/2,t}^j$  against  $y_{k+1/2,t}^j$ 
9:     Compute stochastic gradient:


$$\hat{\nabla} J_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\theta_{k+1/2,t}) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^B \left( \left( o_{k+1/2,t}^j - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \beta \log \left( \frac{\pi_{\theta_{k+1/2,t}}(y_{k+1/2,t}^j)}{\pi^{\text{ref}}(y_{k+1/2,t}^j)} \right) \right. \quad (\text{SG1})$$


$$\left. + \frac{\beta}{\eta} \log \left( \frac{\pi_{\theta_{k+1/2,t}}(y_{k+1/2,t}^j)}{\hat{\pi}_k(y_{k+1/2,t}^j)} \right) \right) \nabla \log \pi_{\theta_{k+1/2,t}}(y_{k+1/2,t}^j)$$


10:    Update parameters:


$$\theta_{k+1/2,t+1} \leftarrow \theta_{k+1/2,t} - \gamma \hat{\nabla} J_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\theta_{k+1/2,t})$$


11:   end for
12:   Set intermediate policy parameters  $\theta_{k+1/2} \leftarrow \theta_{k+1/2,T_{k+1/2}}$ 
13:   Set intermediate opponent policy  $\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}$  (corresponding to  $\theta_{k+1/2}$ )
14:   Phase 2: Final Update ( $k + 1/2 \mapsto k + 1$ )
15:   Initialize  $\theta_{k+1,0} \leftarrow \theta_{k+1/2}$ 
16:   for  $t' = 0$  to  $T - 1$  do
17:     Sample batch  $\{\tilde{y}_{k+1,t'}^j\}_{j=1}^B$  i.i.d. from  $\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}$ 
18:     Sample batch  $\{y_{k+1,t'}^j\}_{j=1}^B$  i.i.d. from  $\pi_{\theta_{k+1,t'}}$ 
19:     Obtain duel results  $\{o_{k+1,t'}^j\}_{j=1}^B$  comparing  $\tilde{y}_{k+1,t'}^j$  against  $y_{k+1,t'}^j$ 
20:     Compute stochastic gradient (analogous to SG1):


$$\hat{\nabla} J_{k+1}(\theta_{k+1,t'}) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^B \left( \left( o_{k+1,t'}^j - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \beta \log \left( \frac{\pi_{\theta_{k+1,t'}}(y_{k+1,t'}^j)}{\pi^{\text{ref}}(y_{k+1,t'}^j)} \right) \right. \quad (\text{SG2})$$


$$\left. + \frac{\beta}{\eta} \log \left( \frac{\pi_{\theta_{k+1,t'}}(y_{k+1,t'}^j)}{\hat{\pi}_k(y_{k+1,t'}^j)} \right) \right) \nabla \log \pi_{\theta_{k+1,t'}}(y_{k+1,t'}^j)$$


21:    Update parameters:


$$\theta_{k+1,t'+1} \leftarrow \theta_{k+1,t'} - \gamma \hat{\nabla} J_{k+1}(\theta_{k+1,t'})$$


22:   end for
23:   Set final policy parameters for this iteration  $\theta_{k+1} \leftarrow \theta_{k+1,T_{k+1}}$ 
24: end for                                                     ▷ End main loop
25: return  $\theta_K$ 

```

where the logarithm is taken element-wise and $\mathbf{1}$ is a vector of all ones. We want to show that $\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}$ approximately satisfies (38) for any $\mu \in \Pi$:

$$\langle \eta v_k + \eta \nabla \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \nabla \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k), \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle \geq -2(1 + \eta) \varepsilon_{k+1/2}, \quad (39)$$

Let us define the left-hand side of this expression as $\psi(\hat{\pi}_k, \mu)$. Next, let us denote $x_k = \eta v_k - \eta \log \pi^{\text{ref}} - \log \hat{\pi}_k$. Notice that $\log \pi_{k+1/2} = -x_k/(1 + \eta) + Z_{k+1/2} \mathbf{1}$, where $Z_{k+1/2}$ is a log-normalization constant and $\mathbf{1}$ is a vector of all ones. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \mu) &= \langle x_k + (1 + \eta) \log \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}, \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle \\ &= \langle x_k + (1 + \eta)(\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_{k+1/2}) + (1 + \eta) \log \pi_{k+1/2}, \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle \\ &= \underbrace{\langle x_k + (1 + \eta) \log \pi_{k+1/2}, \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle}_{=(1+\eta)Z_{k+1/2}\mathbf{1}} \\ &\quad + (1 + \eta) \langle \log \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_{k+1/2}, \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We notice that in the final decomposition, the first term is equal to zero since $\langle \mathbf{1}, \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle = 0$, and for the second term, by the same reason, we have for any constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \log \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_{k+1/2}, \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle &= \langle \log \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_{k+1/2} + c\mathbf{1}, \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle \\ &\geq -\|\mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}\|_1 \|\log \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \log \pi_{k+1/2} + c\mathbf{1}\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}\|_1 \leq 2$, minimization of the expression above over $c \in \mathbb{R}$ implies (39). Next, we continue from the following expression

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}), \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle &= \langle \log \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} - \log \mu + \log \mu - \log \pi^{\text{ref}}, \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle \\ &= -\text{KL}(\mu \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) + \text{KL}(\mu \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the same argument, we have

$$\langle \nabla \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k), \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle = -\text{KL}(\mu \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2}) + \text{KL}(\mu \| \hat{\pi}_k) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k).$$

Plugging-in the derived expression to (39) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \langle v_k, \mu - \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \rangle + \eta (\text{KL}(\mu \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) - \text{KL}(\mu \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2})) \\ + (\text{KL}(\mu \| \hat{\pi}_k) - \text{KL}(\hat{\pi}_{k+1/2} \| \hat{\pi}_k) - \text{KL}(\mu \| \hat{\pi}_{k+1/2})) \geq -2(1 + \eta) \varepsilon_{k+1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and after rearranging the terms, we conclude the statement. \square

C Relationship to Existing Algorithms.

In this appendix we situate NashMP relative to several existing methods.

Nash Mirror Descent (NashMD): The NashMD algorithm of Munos et al. [2023] has iterates defined as:

$$\pi_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \{ \eta \mathcal{P}(\pi_k^{\text{ref}} \succ \pi) + \eta \beta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + (1 - \eta \beta) \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi_k) \},$$

where π_k^{ref} is a geometric mixture between π_k and π^{ref} : $\pi_k^{\text{ref}}(y|x) \propto (\pi_k(y|x))^{1-\eta\beta} (\pi^{\text{ref}}(y|x))^{\eta\beta}$ and $\eta > 0$ is a learning rate. By defining a rescaled learning rate $\tilde{\eta} = \eta\beta/(1 - \eta\beta)$, the NashMD updates can be expressed in a two-step form:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \{ \tilde{\eta} \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi_k) \} \\ \pi_{k+1} &= \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \left\{ (\tilde{\eta}/\beta) \mathcal{P}(\pi_{k+\frac{1}{2}} \succ \pi) + \tilde{\eta} \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi_k) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Comparing this to NashMP (6), NashMD's first step omits the preference term $\mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \pi)$ present in NashMP's first step. This can be viewed as an approximation where this preference term is treated as a constant (e.g., if one assumes $\mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \pi) \approx 1/2$ for π close to π_k). NashMP, by contrast, explicitly includes this game interaction term in its extrapolation step.

Magnetic Mirror Descent (MMD): MMD [Sokota et al., 2023, Wang et al., 2025] performs a single-step update:

$$\pi_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \{ (\eta/\beta) \mathcal{P}(\pi_k \succ \pi) + \eta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}}) + \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi_k) \}. \quad (41)$$

While MMD also incorporates regularization towards π^{ref} and π_k , it lacks the two-step extrapolation-and-update structure of NashMP.

Optimistic Nash Policy Optimization (ONPO): Compared to ONPO by Zhang et al. [2025a], NashMP additionally includes explicit regularization towards the reference policy π^{ref} via the term $\eta \text{KL}_\rho(\pi \| \pi^{\text{ref}})$. This regularization can enhance stability and incorporate prior knowledge.

Extra-Gradient Policy Optimization (EGPO): Concurrent work by Zhou et al. [2025] on EGPO also utilizes an extra-gradient type procedure. The primary distinction lies in the operational geometry: EGPO performs updates in a softmax-parameter space, whereas NashMP applies the Mirror Prox procedure directly in the policy space Π .

D Softmax Policy Gradients for Entropy-Regularized Multi-Armed Bandits

In this section, we consider the following optimization problem

$$\max_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^A} f(\theta) \triangleq \langle \pi_\theta, r \rangle + \lambda \mathcal{H}(\pi_\theta),$$

where π_θ is defined by a softmax parametrization as follows

$$\pi_\theta(a) \triangleq \frac{e^{\theta_a}}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} e^{\theta_a}}.$$

The maximum value of this problem is known to be equal to $f^* = \lambda \log(\sum_a \exp(r(a)/\lambda))$, and the set of optimal parameters Θ^* is defined as

$$\Theta^* = \{r/\lambda + c\mathbf{1} \mid c \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

where $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^A$ is a vector that contains all the ones. The direct computations shows that the corresponding policy, denoted as π_λ^* , has the following form $\pi_\lambda^*(a) \propto \exp(r(a)/\lambda)$ up to a proportionality constant, equal to f^*/λ .

We are interested in this problem because it models the inexact computation of the proximal steps in the Nash Mirror Prox algorithm, which we need to perform in the functional approximation setting.

Notation. Let us define the following matrix

$$H(\pi) \triangleq \text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^\top, \quad (42)$$

in particular, $H(\pi_\theta)$ is a Jacobian of the map $\theta \mapsto \pi_\theta$. As a result, we have $\nabla f(\theta) = H(\pi_\theta)(r - \lambda \log \pi_\theta)$.

Additionally, we define a span semi-norm as follows

$$\|x\|_{\text{sp}} = \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|x - c\mathbf{1}\|_\infty = \frac{1}{2}(\max_i x_i - \min_j x_j) = \frac{1}{2} \max_{i,j} (x_i - x_j). \quad (43)$$

We define the log-sum-exp map as follows

$$\text{LogSumExp}(x) \triangleq \log\left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} e^{x_a}\right),$$

that have the following variational characterization: $\text{LogSumExp}(x) = \max_{p \in \Delta^A} \{\langle x, p \rangle + \mathcal{H}(p)\}$. Additionally, it holds

$$\log \pi_\theta(a) = \theta_a - \text{LogSumExp}(\theta).$$

D.1 Deterministic case

In the deterministic case, since $\nabla f(\theta)$, the updates of the policy gradient method are defined as follows

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \gamma H(\pi_{\theta_t})(r - \lambda \log \pi_{\theta_t}), \quad (44)$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is a learning rate parameter.

Comparison with Mei et al. [2020] Compared to the results of Mei et al. [2020], our bound does not depend directly on the number of actions, improving the bound by a factor of $\exp(\sqrt{A})$. Our bound depends only on the distance between the initial parameters and the optimal ones, properties of the optimal policy, a learning rate, and a strength of regularization.

Proposition 1. Let $\{\theta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be iterates of the update rule (44) with a learning rate $\gamma \cdot \lambda \leq 1$. Then it holds for any $t \geq 0$

$$\|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \exp(-\lambda\gamma t \cdot c(\theta_0)) \cdot \|\theta_0 - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}},$$

where

$$c(\theta_0) \triangleq \exp(-2\|\theta_0 - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}}) \min_a \pi_\lambda^*(a).$$

Proof. Let us consider a solution $\theta^* = r/\lambda \in \Theta^*$. Let us consider the following vector,

$$\zeta_t = \theta_t - \theta^* = \theta_t - r/\lambda,$$

them using the update rule (44) we have

$$\zeta_{t+1} = \theta_t - r/\lambda - \gamma H(\pi_{\theta_t})(\lambda(\theta_t - r/\lambda) - \lambda \text{LogSumExp}(\theta_t) \mathbf{1}) = (I - \lambda\gamma H(\pi_{\theta_t}))\zeta_t,$$

where we used the fact that $H(\pi) \mathbf{1} = 0$. Then, using Lemma 12 and Lemma 13, under condition $\lambda\gamma \leq 1$, we have

$$\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq (1 - \lambda\gamma \min_a \pi_{\theta_t}(a)) \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}},$$

thus, for any $t \geq 1$, we have

$$\|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \exp\left(-\lambda\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \min_a \pi_{\theta_j}(a)\right) \cdot \|\zeta_1\|_{\text{sp}}. \quad (45)$$

Next, to lower-bound the minimal probability. To do it, we apply Lemma 9 and got

$$\min_a \log \pi_{\theta_t}(a) \geq \min_a \{\log \pi_{\theta_t}(a) - \log \pi_{\theta^*}(a)\} + \min_a \log \pi_{\theta^*}(a) \geq \min_a \log \pi_{\theta^*}(a) - 2\|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}}.$$

Notice that from (45) follows that $\|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} = \|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \|\zeta_1\|_{\text{sp}}$, thus

$$\min_a \pi_{\theta_j}(a) \geq \min_a \pi_\lambda^*(a) \cdot \exp(-2\|\theta_1 - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}}),$$

thus, from (45) it follows

$$\|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \exp\left(-\lambda\gamma t \cdot \exp(-2\|\theta_1 - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}}) \min_a \pi_\lambda^*(a)\right) \cdot \|\theta_1 - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}}.$$

□

Lemma 9. Let $\theta, \theta' \in \mathbb{R}^A$ be a softmax parameters, then it holds

$$\|\log \pi_\theta - \log \pi_{\theta'}\|_\infty \leq 2\|\theta - \theta'\|_{\text{sp}}.$$

Proof. For an arbitrary $c \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \pi_\theta - \log \pi_{\theta'} &= (\theta - \text{LogSumExp}(\theta) \cdot \mathbf{1}) - (\theta' - \text{LogSumExp}(\theta') \cdot \mathbf{1}) \\ &= \theta - \theta' - c\mathbf{1} + (\text{LogSumExp}(\theta') - \text{LogSumExp}(\theta) + c)\mathbf{1}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us analyze the second term. Here we have for any θ

$$\text{LogSumExp}(\theta) = \max_{p \in \Delta^A} \{\langle \theta, p \rangle + \mathcal{H}(p)\} = \langle \theta, \pi_\theta \rangle + \mathcal{H}(\pi_\theta).$$

thus

$$\langle \pi_\theta, \theta' - \theta + c \rangle \leq \text{LogSumExp}(\theta') - \text{LogSumExp}(\theta) + c \leq \langle \pi_\lambda^*, \theta' - \theta + c\mathbf{1} \rangle,$$

and, as a result,

$$|\text{LogSumExp}(\theta') - \text{LogSumExp}(\theta) + c| \leq \|\theta - \theta' - c\mathbf{1}\|_\infty.$$

Overall, we have for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\|\log \pi_\theta - \log \pi_{\theta'}\|_\infty \leq 2\|\theta - \theta' - c\mathbf{1}\|_\infty,$$

and, minimizing over a free variable $c \in \mathbb{R}$ in the right-hand side, we have

$$\|\log \pi_\theta - \log \pi_{\theta'}\|_\infty \leq 2\|\theta - \theta'\|_{\text{sp}}.$$

□

D.2 Stochastic case

Now we consider a more realistic setting where we do not have access to a reward function but can only sample from a distribution $\mathcal{R}(a)$ such that $\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{R}(a)}[R] = r(a)$.

In this case, the exact gradient computation is no longer available. However, given the following form of the gradients:

$$\nabla f(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_\theta} [(r(a) - \lambda \log \pi_\theta(a)) \nabla \log \pi_\theta(a)],$$

we can derive a REINFORCE-style stochastic gradient. For each $t \in \mathbb{N}$ let B_t be a batch size, then we can sample actions $a_1^t, \dots, a_{B_t}^t \sim \pi_{\theta_t}$ and the corresponding rewards $R_1^t \sim \mathcal{R}(a_1^t), \dots, R_{B_t}^t \sim \mathcal{R}(a_{B_t}^t)$ to have the following gradient estimate

$$\hat{\nabla} f(\theta_t) \triangleq \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} (R_j^t - \lambda \log \pi_{\theta_t}(a_j^t)) \nabla \log \pi_{\theta_t}(a_j^t). \quad (46)$$

Next, let us define $\xi_j^t = R_j^t - r(a_j^t)$ as a stochastic noise, $n_t(a) = \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \mathbb{1}\{a = a_j^t\}$, $\hat{\pi}_t(a) = \frac{n_t(a)}{B_t}$ and $\xi^t(a) = \frac{1}{n_t(a)} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \xi_j^t \mathbb{1}\{a = a_j^t\}$. Then we can rewrite (46) as follows

$$\hat{\nabla} f(\theta_t) = \hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t})(r + \xi^t - \lambda \log \pi_{\theta_t}),$$

where $\hat{H}(\hat{\pi}, \pi)$ is defined as follows

$$\hat{H}(\hat{\pi}, \pi) \triangleq \text{diag}(\hat{\pi}) - \hat{\pi} \pi^\top \quad (47)$$

and the stochastic updates look as follows

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \gamma_t \cdot \hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t})(r + \xi^t - \lambda \log \pi_{\theta_t}). \quad (48)$$

We will make the following assumption on the noise.

Assumption 1. Let R_a be a random variable distributed according to $\mathcal{R}(a)$. Then $|R_a - r(a)| \leq M$ holds almost surely for any $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

Let us define the following events

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{(1)}(\delta) &\triangleq \left\{ \forall (t, a) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathcal{A}, \alpha \in (0, 1) : \hat{\pi}_t(a) \geq (1 - \alpha) \pi_{\theta_t}(a) - \frac{3\beta_t(\delta)}{\alpha B_t} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{E}^{(2)}(\delta) &\triangleq \left\{ \forall (t, a) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathcal{A} : \left| \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \xi_j^t w_j^t(a, a') \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2M^2 \beta_t(\delta)}{B_t} \cdot \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} (w_j^t(a, a'))^2}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. w_j^t(a, a') \triangleq (\mathbb{1}\{a_j^t = a\} - \mathbb{1}\{a_j^t = a'\} - (\hat{\pi}_t(a) - \hat{\pi}_t(a'))) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{E}^{(3)}(\delta) &\triangleq \left\{ \forall t \in \mathbb{N} : \left| \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \xi_j^t \left(1 - \frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(a_j^t)}{\hat{\pi}_t(a_j^t)} \right) \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2M^2 \beta_t(\delta)}{B_t} \cdot \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \left(1 - \frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(a_j^t)}{\hat{\pi}_t(a_j^t)} \right)^2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, we define $\mathcal{E}(\delta) \triangleq \mathcal{E}^{(1)}(\delta) \cap \mathcal{E}^{(2)}(\delta) \cap \mathcal{E}^{(3)}(\delta) \cap \mathcal{E}^{(4)}(\delta)$.

Lemma 10. Assume Assumption 1. Then, under the choice

$$\beta_t(\delta) = \log(6At(t+1)/\delta),$$

it holds $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\delta)] \geq 1 - \delta/3$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. In particular, $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}(\delta)] \geq 1 - \delta$.

Proof. Let us define

$$\mathcal{E}_{t,a}^{(1)} = \left\{ \hat{\pi}_t(a) \geq \frac{1}{2} \pi_{\theta_t}(a) - \frac{3\beta_t(\delta)}{B_t} \right\}.$$

By the one-sided Bernstein inequality we have for any $\delta' \in (0, 1)$

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{B_t} (\mathbb{1}\{a_j^t = a\} - \pi_{\theta_t}(a)) \leq -\sqrt{2B_t\pi_{\theta_t}(a)(1-\pi_{\theta_t}(a))\log(1/\delta')} - \frac{1}{3}\log(1/\delta') \middle| \theta_t \right] \leq \delta'.$$

Next, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ an inequality $\sqrt{2ab} \leq a + b$ implies

$$\sqrt{2B_t\pi_{\theta_t}(a)(1-\pi_{\theta_t}(a))\log(1/\delta')} \leq \sqrt{2\alpha B_t\pi_{\theta_t}(a) \cdot 1/\alpha \log(1/\delta')} \leq \alpha B_t\pi_{\theta_t}(a) + \frac{2}{\alpha} \log(1/\delta'),$$

thus, taking $\delta' = \delta/(4At(t+1))$ we have for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$\hat{\pi}_t(a) - \pi_{\theta_t}(a) \geq -\alpha\pi_{\theta_t}(a) - \frac{3}{\alpha B_t} \log(3At(t+1)/\delta).$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta/(3At(t+1))$. Applying a union bound over t and A we conclude $\mathbb{P}[\neg \mathcal{E}^{(1)}(\delta)] \leq \delta/3$.

To analyze events $\mathcal{E}^{(2)}(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{E}^{(3)}(\delta)$, we notice that a values of $\{a_j^t\}_{j \in [B_t]}$ determines distribution of $\{\xi_j^t\}_{j \in [B_t]}$, thus, we can apply Hoeffding inequality conditionally on random variables $\{a_j^t\}_{j \in [B_t]}$ and a union bound to achieve $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}^{(2)}(\delta)] \geq 1 - \delta/3$ and $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}^{(3)}(\delta)] \geq 1 - \delta/3$. \square

Lemma 11. Assume conditions of Lemma 10. Then, on the event $\mathcal{E}(\delta)$, the following inequality holds for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and any $t \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \left(1 - (1 - \alpha)\lambda\gamma_t \min_a \pi_{\theta_t}(a) + \frac{3\beta_t(\delta)}{\alpha B_t}\right) \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} + \gamma_t \sqrt{\frac{16M^2 \cdot \beta_t^2(\delta)}{B_t}}.$$

Proof. Let us rewrite the update rule (48) in the following manner

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \gamma_t \hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t})(r - \lambda \log \pi_{\theta_t}) + \gamma_t \hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t}) \xi^t.$$

Notice that the softmax parametrization implies that $\log \pi_{\theta_t} = \theta_t - \text{LogSumExp}(\theta_t) \cdot \mathbf{1}$. Thus, by an inequality $\hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t})\mathbf{1} = 0$, and defining $\zeta_t = \theta_t - r/\lambda$, we have

$$\zeta_{t+1} = (I - \lambda\gamma_t \hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t}))\zeta_t + \gamma_t \hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t}) \xi^t.$$

Next, we compute the span semi-norm of ζ_{t+1} . By Lemma 12 and triangle inequality

$$\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \underbrace{\sigma_{\text{sp}}(1 - \lambda\gamma_t \hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t})) \cdot \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}}}_{(\mathbf{A})} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \max_{a, a'} |(\gamma_t \hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t}) \xi^t)_a - (\gamma_t \hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t}) \xi^t)_{a'}|}_{(\mathbf{B})}.$$

Next, we analyze these terms separately.

Term (A). By Lemma 13 and on the event $\mathcal{E}^{(1)}(\delta) \supseteq \mathcal{E}(\delta)$, the first term can be expressed as follows

$$\sigma_{\text{sp}}(1 - \lambda\gamma_t \hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t})) \leq 1 - \lambda\gamma_t \min_a \hat{\pi}_t(a) \leq 1 - (1 - \alpha)\lambda\gamma_t \min_a \pi_{\theta_t}(a) + \frac{3\lambda\gamma_t\beta_t(\delta)}{\alpha B_t}.$$

Thus,

$$(\mathbf{A}) \leq \left(1 - (1 - \alpha)\lambda\gamma_t \min_a \pi_{\theta_t}(a) + \frac{3\lambda\gamma_t\beta_t(\delta)}{\alpha B_t}\right) \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}}.$$

Term (B). Next, we study a noise term (B). Let us define for any two fixed a, a'

$$\Delta_{a, a'} \triangleq \gamma_t |(\hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t}) \xi^t)_a - (\hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t}) \xi^t)_{a'}|.$$

Then, we have

$$(\mathbf{B}) = \frac{1}{2} \max_{a, a' \in \mathcal{A}} \Delta_{a, a'}.$$

To analyze $\Delta_{a,a'}$, we notice that

$$(\hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t})\xi^t)_a = \hat{\pi}_t(a)(\xi^t(a) - \langle \pi_{\theta_t}, \xi^t \rangle) = \hat{\pi}_t(a)(\xi^t(a) - \langle \hat{\pi}_t, \xi^t \rangle) + \langle \hat{\pi}_t - \pi_{\theta_t}, \xi^t \rangle.$$

By a definition of ξ^t and $\hat{\pi}_t$, we have

$$\hat{\pi}_t(a)\xi^t(a) = \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \xi_j^t \mathbb{1}\{a_j^t = a\}, \quad \langle \hat{\pi}_t, \xi^t \rangle = \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \xi_j^t,$$

thus

$$(\hat{H}(\hat{\pi}_t, \pi_{\theta_t})\xi^t)_a = \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \xi_j^t (\mathbb{1}\{a_j^t = a\} - \hat{\pi}_t(a)) + \hat{\pi}_t(a) \langle \hat{\pi}_t - \pi_{\theta_t}, \xi^t \rangle.$$

The difference between such terms is equal to

$$\Delta_{a,a'} \leq \gamma_t \left| \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \xi_j^t (\mathbb{1}\{a_j^t = a\} - \mathbb{1}\{a_j^t = a'\} - (\hat{\pi}_t(a) - \hat{\pi}_t(a'))) \right| + \gamma_t |\langle \hat{\pi}_t - \pi_{\theta_t}, \xi^t \rangle|. \quad (49)$$

Let us define $w_j^t(a, a') = (\mathbb{1}\{a_j^t = a\} - \mathbb{1}\{a_j^t = a'\} - (\hat{\pi}_t(a) - \hat{\pi}_t(a')))$. On the event $\mathcal{E}^{(2)}(\delta) \supseteq \mathcal{E}(\delta)$, we have the following bound for the first term in the decomposition above

$$\left| \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \xi_j^t w_j^t(a, a') \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2M^2\beta_t(\delta)}{B_t} \cdot \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} (w_j^t(a, a'))^2}.$$

Then we define random variable $Y = \mathbb{1}\{a'' = a\} - \mathbb{1}\{a'' = a'\}$ with $a'' \sim \hat{\pi}_t$. We notice that $\mathbb{E}[Y] = \hat{\pi}_t(a) - \hat{\pi}_t(a')$ and thus

$$\frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} (w_j^t(a, a'))^2 = \text{Var}[Y] = \hat{\pi}_t(a) + \hat{\pi}_t(a') - (\hat{\pi}_t(a) - \hat{\pi}_t(a'))^2 \leq \hat{\pi}_t(a) + \hat{\pi}_t(a') \leq 1.$$

Thus, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \xi_j^t w_j^t(a, a') \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2M^2\beta_t(\delta)}{B_t}}. \quad (50)$$

For the second term, on the event $\mathcal{E}(\delta)$, we have the following decomposition

$$|\langle \hat{\pi}_t - \pi_{\theta_t}, \xi^t \rangle| = \left| \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \xi_j^t \left(1 - \frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(a_j^t)}{\hat{\pi}_t(a_j^t)} \right) \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2M^2\beta_t(\delta)}{B_t} \cdot \frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \left(1 - \frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(a_j^t)}{\hat{\pi}_t(a_j^t)} \right)^2}.$$

Next, we note that the term under the square root resembles χ^2 -divergence between π_{θ_t} and $\hat{\pi}_t$

$$\frac{1}{B_t} \sum_{j=1}^{B_t} \left(1 - \frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(a_j^t)}{\hat{\pi}_t(a_j^t)} \right)^2 = \sum_{a: \hat{\pi}_t(a) > 0} \hat{\pi}_t(a) \left(1 - \frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(a)}{\hat{\pi}_t(a)} \right)^2 \leq \sum_{a: \hat{\pi}_t(a) > 0} \frac{(\pi_{\theta_t}(a))^2}{\hat{\pi}_t(a)} + 1.$$

To bound this term, we notice that on the event $\mathcal{E}^{(1)}(\delta)$ we have taking arbitrary $\alpha' \in (0, 1/2)$

$$\hat{\pi}_t(a) \geq (1 - \alpha')\pi_{\theta_t}(a) - \frac{3\beta_t(\delta)}{\alpha' B_t}.$$

Next, we separate actions into two groups:

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \left\{ a \in \mathcal{A} \mid \alpha' \pi_{\theta_t}(a) \geq \frac{3\beta_t(\delta)}{\alpha' B_t} \right\} \text{ and } \mathcal{A}_2 = \left\{ a \in \mathcal{A} \mid \hat{\pi}_t(a) > 0, \alpha' \pi_{\theta_t}(a) < \frac{3\beta_t(\delta)}{\alpha' B_t} \right\}.$$

For all actions from the first group $a \in \mathcal{A}_1$ it holds $\frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(a)}{\hat{\pi}_t(a)} \leq \frac{1}{1-2\alpha'}$, whereas for the second group $a \in \mathcal{A}_2$ we also have $\hat{\pi}_t(a) \geq 1/B_t$ and thus

$$\frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(a)}{\hat{\pi}_t(a)} \leq B_t \pi_{\theta_t}(a) = \frac{B_t}{\alpha'} \cdot \alpha' \pi_{\theta_t}(a) \leq \frac{3\beta_t(\delta)}{(\alpha')^2}.$$

Overall, we have

$$\sum_{a: \hat{\pi}_t(a) > 0} \frac{(\pi_{\theta_t}(a))^2}{\hat{\pi}_t(a)} + 1 \leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{1 - 2\alpha'}, \frac{3\beta_t(\delta)}{(\alpha')^2} \right\} + 1,$$

thus, taking $\alpha' = \sqrt{3}/4$, we have

$$|\langle \hat{\pi}_t - \pi_{\theta_t}, \xi^t \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2M^2\beta_t(\delta)}{B_t} \cdot (16\beta_t(\delta) + 1)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{34M^2\beta_t^2(\delta)}{B_t}}. \quad (51)$$

Overall, combining bounds (50) and (51) in (49), we get

$$\Delta_{a,a'} \leq \gamma_t \left(\sqrt{\frac{2M^2 \cdot \beta_t(\delta)}{B_t}} + \sqrt{\frac{34M^2 \cdot \beta_t^2(\delta)}{B_t}} \right) \leq \gamma_t \sqrt{\frac{64M^2 \cdot \beta_t^2(\delta)}{B_t}},$$

thus we have

$$(\mathbf{B}) \leq \gamma_t \sqrt{\frac{16M^2 \cdot \beta_t^2(\delta)}{B_t}}.$$

Combining bounds Combining all the results, we have on the event $\mathcal{E}(\delta)$

$$\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \left(1 - (1 - \alpha)\lambda\gamma_t \min_a \pi_{\theta_t}(a) + \frac{3\lambda\gamma_t\beta_t(\delta)}{\alpha B_t} \right) \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} + \gamma_t \sqrt{\frac{16M^2 \cdot \beta_t^2(\delta)}{B_t}}.$$

□

Proposition 2. Assume conditions of Lemma 10. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \|\theta_0 - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}})$ and suppose B_t is chosen such that

$$B_t \geq \max \left\{ \frac{768\beta_t(\delta)}{c(\theta_0)}, \frac{256M^2\beta_t^2(\delta)}{\lambda^2 c(\theta_0)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \right\},$$

where $c(\theta_0) = \exp(-2\|\theta_0 - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}}) \cdot \min_a \pi_{\lambda^*}(a)$, and $\gamma_t \equiv \gamma$, and $\beta_t(\delta)$ is defined in Lemma 10. Then, on the event $\mathcal{E}(\delta)$, for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds $\min_a \pi_{\theta_t}(a) \geq c(\theta_0)$. Additionally, it holds

$$\|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \max \left\{ \varepsilon, \exp \left(-\frac{\lambda\gamma c(\theta_0)}{4} \cdot t \right) \|\theta_0 - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}} \right\}.$$

Proof. Let us prove the first statement by induction over t . For $t = 0$ we have by Lemma 9

$$\min_a \log \pi_{\theta_0}(a) \geq \min_a \log \pi_{\lambda^*}(a) - 2\|\theta_0 - \theta^*\|_{\text{sp}} = \log c(\theta_0).$$

Now, we assume that the statement holds for a fixed $t \geq 1$. We want to show that given $\min_a \pi_{\theta_t}(a) \geq c(\theta_0)$, we have $\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \max\{\varepsilon, \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}}\}$.

By the inequality for an update rule for $\alpha = 1/4$ (Lemma 11)

$$\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \left(1 - \frac{3}{4}\lambda\gamma_t \min_a \pi_{\theta_t}(a) + \frac{12\beta_t(\delta)}{B_t} \right) \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} + \gamma_t \sqrt{\frac{16M^2 \cdot \beta_t^2(\delta)}{B_t}}.$$

We apply the induction statement $\min_a \pi_{\theta_t}(a) \geq c(\theta_0)$ to achieve

$$\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \left(1 - \frac{3}{4}\lambda\gamma_t c(\theta_0) + \frac{12\beta_t(\delta)}{B_t} \right) \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} + \gamma_t \sqrt{\frac{16M^2 \cdot \beta_t^2(\delta)}{B_t}}.$$

Next, we apply our conditions on B_t

$$\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda\gamma_t c(\theta_0) \right) \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} + \frac{1}{4}\lambda\gamma_t c(\theta_0)\varepsilon. \quad (52)$$

Now, let us assume that $\|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} > \varepsilon$. Then we have

$$\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda\gamma_t c(\theta_0)\right) \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}}. \quad (53)$$

Next, we assume that $\|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \varepsilon$, then (52) implies

$$\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda\gamma_t c(\theta_0)\right) \varepsilon + \frac{1}{4}\lambda\gamma_t c(\theta_0) \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon.$$

Thus, we have $\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \max\{\varepsilon, \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}}\}$. Additionally, given an assumption $\varepsilon < \|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}}$, we have $\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \|\zeta_0\|_{\text{sp}}$, thus

$$\min_a \log \pi_{\theta_{t+1}}(a) \geq \min_a \log \pi_{\lambda}^*(a) - 2\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \geq \min_a \log \pi_{\lambda}^*(a) - 2\|\zeta_0\|_{\text{sp}} = \log c(\theta_0).$$

Thus, we have for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$ $\min_a \pi_{\theta_t}(a) \geq c(\theta_0)$. Thus, (52) holds for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

Given the previous structure of the proof, we notice that if $\|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \varepsilon$, then $\|\zeta_{t+1}\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \varepsilon$ and if $\|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} > \varepsilon$, then the first inequality of (53) holds for any $t' \leq t$. Thus, we have for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\|\zeta_t\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \max \left\{ \varepsilon, \left(1 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda\gamma c(\theta_0)\right)^t \|\zeta_0\|_{\text{sp}} \right\}.$$

□

D.3 Technical Lemmas

Lemma 12. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be an matrix, then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ it holds

$$\|Ax\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \sigma_{\text{sp}}(A) \|x\|_{\infty},$$

where

$$\sigma_{\text{sp}}(A) \triangleq \max_{1 \leq i, k \leq d} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d |A_{ij} - A_{kj}|$$

Moreover, if $\mathbf{1}$ is an eigenvector of A , i.e., $A\mathbf{1} = \lambda\mathbf{1}$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\|Ax\|_{\text{sp}} \leq \sigma_{\text{sp}}(A) \|x\|_{\text{sp}}.$$

Proof. Let a_1, \dots, a_d be rows of the matrix A . Then, by the span semi-norm characterization

$$\|Ax\|_{\text{sp}} = \frac{1}{2} \max_{1 \leq i, k \leq d} \langle a_i - a_k, x \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2} \|a_i - a_k\|_1 \|x\|_{\infty}.$$

By noticing $\|a_i - a_k\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^d |A_{ij} - A_{kj}|$ we conclude the first statement.

For the second statement, let us consider $\tilde{x} \triangleq x + c_x \mathbf{1}$, where c_x is chosen to guarantee $\|\tilde{x}\|_{\infty} = \|x\|_{\text{sp}}$. Then, by using a fact that $A\mathbf{1} = \lambda\mathbf{1}$, we have $\|Ax\|_{\text{sp}} = \|A(\tilde{x} - c_x \mathbf{1})\|_{\text{sp}} = \|A\tilde{x} - \lambda c_x \mathbf{1}\|_{\text{sp}} = \|A\tilde{x}\|_{\text{sp}}$. Thus, the first statement applied to \tilde{x} concludes the second one. □

Lemma 13. For any two policies $\pi, \tilde{\pi} \in \Pi$ and any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\sigma_{\text{sp}}(I - \lambda H(\pi)) \leq 1 - \lambda \min_a \pi(a), \quad \sigma_{\text{sp}}(I - \lambda \hat{H}(\pi, \tilde{\pi})) \leq 1 - \lambda \min_a \pi(a),$$

where a matrix H is defined in (42) and a matrix \hat{H} is defined in (47).

Proof. Notice that it is enough to prove only the second statement as the first one follows from it if we take $\pi = \tilde{\pi}$.

By definition of σ_{sp} , we have

$$\sigma_{\text{sp}}(1 - \lambda \hat{H}(\pi, \tilde{\pi})) = \frac{1}{2} \max_{a, a' \in \mathcal{A}} \underbrace{\sum_{a'' \in \mathcal{A}} |(I - \lambda \hat{H}(\pi, \tilde{\pi}))_{a, a''} - (I - \lambda \hat{H}(\pi, \tilde{\pi}))_{a', a''}|}_{\Delta_{a, a'}}.$$

Let us study a separate element of maximization $\Delta_{a,a'}$. Notice that $\Delta_{a,a'} = 0$ for $a = a'$, thus we consider only $a \neq a'$. Also, without loss of generality, we can assume that $\pi(a) \geq \pi(a')$ since $\Delta_{a,a'} = \Delta_{a',a}$.

By definition we have $\hat{H}(\pi, \tilde{\pi})_{a,a'} = \mathbb{1}\{a = a'\}\pi(a) - \pi(a)\tilde{\pi}(a')$, thus we need to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{a,a'} &= \sum_{a'' \in \mathcal{A}} |\mathbb{1}\{a'' = a\}(1 - \lambda\pi(a)) + \mathbb{1}\{a'' = a'\}(1 - \lambda\pi(a')) + \lambda(\pi(a) - \pi(a'))\tilde{\pi}(a'')| \\ &= \lambda(\pi(a) - \pi(a'))(1 - \tilde{\pi}(a) - \tilde{\pi}(a')) + |1 - \lambda\pi(a) + \lambda(\pi(a) - \pi(a'))\tilde{\pi}(a)| \\ &\quad + |1 - \lambda\pi(a') + \lambda(\pi(a') - \pi(a))\tilde{\pi}(a')|.\end{aligned}$$

By a choice of $\lambda \leq 1$, we can remove the absolute values from the second and third terms in the decomposition above. Thus, since $\pi(a) \geq \pi(a')$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{a,a'} &= 2 - \lambda\pi(a) - \lambda\pi(a') + \lambda(\pi(a) - \pi(a'))(1 - 2\tilde{\pi}(a')) \\ &= 2(1 - \lambda\pi(a')) - \lambda(\pi(a) - \pi(a')) + \lambda(\pi(a) - \pi(a'))(1 - 2\tilde{\pi}(a')) \leq 2(1 - \lambda\pi(a')).\end{aligned}$$

After maximizing over $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$, we conclude the statement. \square

Lemma 14. *Let $\pi, \pi' \in \Pi$ be any two policies. Then we have*

$$\|\pi - \pi'\|_1 \leq 2\|\log \pi - \log \pi'\|_{\text{sp}}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume $|\log \pi|, |\log \pi'| < +\infty$, since otherwise the inequality is trivial. Next, let us define $\theta = \log \pi, \theta' = \log \pi'$ two softmax parameters. Next, by the fundamental theorem of calculus applied to a map $\theta \mapsto \pi_\theta \propto \exp(\theta)$, we have

$$\pi_\theta - \pi_{\theta'} = H(\pi_\xi)(\theta - \theta'),$$

where $H(\pi_\theta)$ is a Jacobian of the map $\theta \mapsto \pi_\theta$ that have the following form

$$H(\pi) = \text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^\top,$$

and ξ is an intermediate point between θ and θ' . Also, since $H(\pi)\mathbf{1} = 0$ for a vector of all ones $\mathbf{1}$, we have for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\pi_\theta - \pi_{\theta'} = H(\pi_\xi)(\theta - \theta' + c\mathbf{1}),$$

and, then, we have

$$\|\pi_\theta - \pi_{\theta'}\|_1 \leq \|H(\pi_\xi)\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1} \cdot \|\theta - \theta' + c\mathbf{1}\|_\infty.$$

In general, computation of $\ell_\infty \rightarrow \ell_1$ norm is NP-hard, but in our case we can estimate this norm as follows:

$$\|H(\pi)x\|_1 = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a) \underbrace{|x_a - \langle \pi, x \rangle|}_{\leq 2\|x\|_\infty} \leq 2\|x\|_\infty.$$

Taking minimum over a free parameter $c \in \mathbb{R}$, we conclude the statement. \square

E Detailed Experiment Description

E.1 Matrix Games

Experiment setup In our experiments, we fixed $r = 2, Y = 100, \beta = 0.01$ and a reference policy to be a uniform distribution $\pi^{\text{ref}}(y|x) = 1/Y$. The matrices U and V are generated as random Gaussian matrices. To parameterize the space of policies, we utilize a 3-layer MLP with ReLU action function with 128 hidden units that takes a flattened matrix $\Theta_x \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ as an input and outputs logits over possible actions. We use the Adam optimizer [Kingma and Ba, 2015] with learning rate 10^{-3} and sample random games using a batch size of 128.




Figure 2: Effect of the soft update parameter κ on the performance of NashMP across optimization horizons $K \in \{10^3, 10^4, 5 \times 10^4\}$. Smaller κ values are needed for effective optimization as K increases. Suboptimality is averaged over 10 random seeds; shaded regions indicate one standard deviation.

The influence of κ We study the influence of the soft update parameter κ on the performance of the Nash Mirror Prox algorithm. We utilize a theoretically optimal value of mirror prox learning rate $\eta = 2\beta$ and vary a value of $\kappa \in \{10^{-1}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}\}$ and an adaptive $\kappa = 10/(10 + k)$ across different optimization horizons of $K \in \{10^3, 10^4, 5 \times 10^4\}$. The results are presented in Figure 2.

In particular, it turns out that for longer optimization horizons, the choice of a smaller value of κ is more optimal. Since the average number of steps to fully update the model is equal to $1/\kappa$, we can interpret that the algorithm performs $K \cdot \kappa$ full steps of a PP method with an optimization quality of each step depending on the value of $1/\kappa$. This interpretation also allows us to provide an adaptive schedule $\kappa = 10/(k + 10)$ that gives a dynamic trade-off between a number of proximal steps and the accuracy of each proximal step.

E.2 LLM Alignment

In this section, we provide implementation and details as well as details on hyperparameter selection.

E.2.1 Loss implementation

We use a library TRL von Werra et al. [2020] as a base for our implementation. Following the discussion in Section 5.3, we use the following surrogate loss function to achieve the correct gradients using automatic differentiation in PyTorch Paszke et al. [2019]

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{NashMP}}(\theta_t; \theta_t, \theta_t^{\text{target}}) \triangleq & \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B (\log \pi_{\theta_t}(y_i|x_i) - \log \pi_{\theta_t}(y'_i|x_i)) \cdot \text{SG}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{P}(y_i \succ y'_i|x_i)\right) \\ & + \log \pi_{\theta_t}(y_i|x_i) \cdot \text{SG}\left(\beta \log\left(\frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(y_i|x_i)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_i|x_i)}\right) + \frac{\beta}{\eta} \log\left(\frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(y_i|x_i)}{\pi_{\theta_t^{\text{target}}}(y_i|x_i)}\right)\right) \\ & + \log \pi_{\theta_t}(y'_i|x_i) \cdot \text{SG}\left(\beta \log\left(\frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(y'_i|x_i)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y'_i|x_i)}\right) + \frac{\beta}{\eta} \log\left(\frac{\pi_{\theta_t}(y'_i|x_i)}{\pi_{\theta_t^{\text{target}}}(y'_i|x_i)}\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\{x_i\}_{i \in [B]}$ are samples from the prompt dataset, $\{(y_i, y'_i)\}_{i \in [B]}$ are generated from a policy π_{θ_t} using a temperature sampling with a temperature 1, and SG is a stop-gradient operations. $\log \pi(y|x)$ is computed in an auto-regressive manner as $\log \pi_{\theta}(y|x) = \sum_{i=1}^{|y|} \log \pi_{\theta}(y_i|x, y_{<i}) = \sum_{i=1}^{|y|} \text{logit}_{\theta}(y_i|x, y_{<i}) - \text{LogSumExp}(\text{logit}_{\theta}(\cdot|x, y_{<i}))$, where logit_{θ} are raw logits outputted by the model with parameters θ . For a full algorithm description, we refer to Algorithm 2.

E.2.2 Experiment description

We start our experiments from the Google Gemma-2-2B² [Rivière et al., 2024] pretrained checkpoint.

²Published under Gemma license.

Algorithm 2 Deep Learning Implementation of NashMP

Require: Reference policy π^{ref} with parameters θ_0 , a preference model \mathcal{P} , prompt dataset $\mathcal{X} = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$, number of steps T , batch size B , hyperparameters β, η, κ .

- 1: Initialize $\theta = \theta_0, \bar{\theta} = \theta_0$ and $\pi^{\text{target}} = \pi_{\bar{\theta}}$;
- 2: **for** $t = 1$ to T **do**
- 3: Sample a batch of prompts $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^B$ from a prompt dataset \mathcal{X} ;
- 4: Sample completions $\{(y_i, y'_i)\}_{i=1}^B$ from $\pi_{\theta}(\cdot|x)$ using a temperature sampling ($\tau = 1$);
- 5: Compute preferences $p_i = \mathcal{P}(y_i \succ y'_i)$ using a preference model for $i \in \{1, \dots, B\}$;
- 6: Compute preference REINFORCE loss

$$\text{pref_loss}(\theta) \leftarrow \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B (\log \pi_{\theta}(y_i|x_i) - \log \pi_{\theta}(y'_i|x_i)) \cdot \text{SG}\left(\frac{1}{2} - p_i\right)$$

- 7: Compute KL regularization terms

$$\text{kl_ref}_i \leftarrow \text{SG}\left(\log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(y_i|x_i)}{\pi^{\text{ref}}(y_i|x_i)}\right), \quad \text{kl_ref}'_i \leftarrow \text{SG}\left(\log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(y'_i|x_i)}{\pi^{\text{ref}}(y'_i|x_i)}\right).$$

$$\text{kl_target}_i \leftarrow \text{SG}\left(\log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(y_i|x_i)}{\pi^{\text{target}}(y_i|x_i)}\right), \quad \text{kl_tar}'_i \leftarrow \text{SG}\left(\log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(y'_i|x_i)}{\pi^{\text{target}}(y'_i|x_i)}\right).$$

- 8: Compute KL regularization loss

$$\text{kl_ref_loss}(\theta) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B (\text{kl_ref}_i \cdot \log \pi_{\theta}(y_i|x_i) + \text{kl_ref}'_i \cdot \log \pi_{\theta}(y'_i|x_i))$$

$$\text{kl_target_loss}(\theta) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B (\text{kl_tar}_i \cdot \log \pi_{\theta}(y_i|x_i) + \text{kl_tar}'_i \cdot \log \pi_{\theta}(y'_i|x_i)),$$

- 9: Update θ by backpropagation through

$$\text{loss}(\theta) = \text{pref_loss}(\theta) + \beta \cdot \text{kl_ref_loss}(\theta) + \frac{\beta}{\eta} \cdot \text{kl_target_loss}(\theta);$$

- 10: Update target network paramters by a soft update $\bar{\theta} \leftarrow (1 - \kappa) \cdot \bar{\theta} + \kappa \cdot \theta$

- 11: **end for**

Supervised fine-tuning (SFT). For SFT, we use the RLHFlow/RLHFlow-SFT-Dataset-ver2 dataset [RLHFlow Team \[2024c\]](#). This dataset, structured as conversations, is processed using a chat template following the Gemma format (`<bos><start_of_turn>role\ncontent<end_of_turn>\n...`), where the template maps the assistant role to model. System messages are dropped from the input, and training is performed on the train split. The dataset samples are tokenized, with the maximum sequence length set to 8,192 tokens. We utilize sample packing for efficient training on long sequences and pad sequences to the maximum length. Following standard practice for SFT, the loss is computed only on the model’s output tokens (the assistant’s turns), and not on the input prompts.

The model was fully fine-tuned (no LoRA PEFT adapter was used). Training was conducted for 2 epochs. Optimization was performed using the Paged AdamW [Loshchilov and Hutter \[2019\]](#) 32-bit optimizer with a learning rate of 2×10^{-5} . A cosine learning rate schedule was applied with a warmup ratio of 0.05 of the total training steps. We used a micro batch size of 1 sequence per device and accumulated gradients over 16 steps, resulting in an effective batch size of 16 sequences per device. On the 8 GPUs, we thus had an effective batch size of 128. Gradient clipping was applied with a maximum norm of 1.0, and no weight decay was used.

For improved memory efficiency and speed, we enabled gradient checkpointing and leveraged Flash Attention [Dao \[2024\]](#). Training utilized BFloat16 (BF16) and TF32 precision where supported.

Nash Learning from Human Feedback All subsequent NLHF experiments started from the SFT checkpoint described above. This SFT model also served as the initial policy and the reference policy

Table 3: Hyperparameter settings for the evaluated algorithms.

Algorithm	Learning Rate	β	Algorithm-Specific Parameters
Online DPO	1×10^{-6}	1×10^{-3}	N/A
Online IPO	1×10^{-6}	1×10^{-4}	N/A
Nash MD	1×10^{-6}	1×10^{-4}	Mixture parameter $\alpha = 0.25$
NashMP	1×10^{-6}	1×10^{-4}	Soft update $\kappa = 0.1$, Mirror Prox learning rate $\eta = 0.1$
Reg. Self-Play	1×10^{-6}	1×10^{-3}	N/A

(π^{ref}). Consistent with the SFT stage, all models underwent full fine-tuning; no LoRA adapters were employed.

Datasets. For generating responses during NLHF training and for final evaluation, we used prompts from the RLHFlow/prompt-collection-v0.1 dataset [RLHFlow Team \[2024b\]](#). We created fixed training and test splits by randomly selecting $N_{\text{train}} = 60,000$ prompts for the train set and $N_{\text{test}} = 5,000$ prompts for the test set, using a random seed of 42 for reproducibility. Both sets were filtered to include only prompts with a length of less than 256 tokens. For further details on the original data mixtures within RLHFlow/prompt-collection-v0.1 and their licenses, we refer to [\[Dong et al., 2024\]](#).

Preference model. The pairwise preference model, used to provide comparison signals, was a Gemma-2-2B model. This model was trained on the RLHFlow/pair_preference_model_dataset dataset [RLHFlow Team \[2024a\]](#), with its training methodology detailed in [Liu et al. \[2025\]](#). We employed a separate, more capable judge for the final evaluation of model performance: a Gemma-2-9B model. This judge was trained on the same RLHFlow/pair_preference_model_dataset dataset using the identical methodology as the 2B preference model. The primary evaluation metric was side-by-side pairwise win rate, and for the hyperparameter selection, we also actively used a win rate against the SFT reference policy. Confidence intervals were computed as 3σ -confidence intervals ($3 \cdot \text{std} / \sqrt{N_{\text{test}}}$), justified by a normal approximation.

Training Configuration and Hyperparameter Tuning. For all NLHF experiments, we used the AdamW optimizer [Loshchilov and Hutter \[2019\]](#). The learning rate schedule featured a 0.1 warmup period (as a fraction of total training steps) followed by a linear decay. The effective global batch size was 128 prompts, achieved using a per-device micro-batch size of 4 prompts, 8 GPUs, and 4 gradient accumulation steps (4 prompts/GPU \times 8 GPUs \times 4 grad_accum_steps). Training was conducted for 1 epoch over the $N_{\text{train}} = 60,000$ prompts, corresponding to approximately 467 update steps ($60000/128 \approx 468.75$). We employed gradient clipping with a maximum norm of 1.0.

For each algorithm, we perform a grid search over its key hyperparameters: learning rate over $\text{lr} \in \{10^{-6}, 3 \times 10^{-6}\}$, regularization parameter $\beta \in \{10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-2}\}$, Nash MD mixture parameter $\alpha \in \{0.125, 0.250\}$, NashMP soft update parameter $\kappa \in \{0.5, 0.1, 0.01\}$. For NashMP, we use a constant parameter $\eta = 0.1$.

For each algorithm, we selected the top 3 performing hyperparameter configurations based on the win rate against the SFT reference policy, evaluated using the Gemma-2-9B. These selected checkpoints were then compared side-by-side in the final evaluation using the Gemma-2-9B judge model. The final reported results (see Table 3) represent the performance of the best configuration found through this process.

To manage memory and improve throughput during all NLHF training phases, we utilized DeepSpeed ZeRo-2 [\[Rasley et al., 2020\]](#) and BFloat16 (BF16) mixed-precision.

Computational Resources and Runtimes. All experiments were conducted on 8 NVIDIA A100 (80GB) GPUs. A full training and evaluation cycle for NLHF and most baselines averaged 9.5 hours per algorithm. The Nash-MD algorithm required approximately 24 hours for a complete run.

Generation Parameters. During response generation, both for collecting experiences within NLHF algorithms (e.g., generating samples per prompt) and for final evaluation on the test set, we used temperature sampling with a temperature of $\tau = 1.0$. The maximum generation length was capped at 256 tokens.

Table 4: Pairwise Win Rates (mean $\pm 3\sigma$ -confidence intervals). Statistically significant wins are in **bold**. Confidence intervals are in a smaller font size.

Win rate	NashMP, $\kappa = 0.5$	NashMP, $\kappa = 0.1$	NashMP, $\kappa = 0.01$
NashMP, $\kappa = 0.5$	—	0.4659 ± 0.0121	0.4788 ± 0.0115
NashMP, $\kappa = 0.1$	0.5341 ± 0.0121	—	0.5149 ± 0.0118
NashMP, $\kappa = 0.01$	0.5212 ± 0.0115	0.4851 ± 0.0118	—

On hyperparameters of NashMP. During our hyperparameter selection procedure of NashMP, its versions with different values of κ were the top-3 in win rate against the reference model among all other produced checkpoints; thus, according to our protocol, we performed a side-by-side comparison. We refer to Table 4 for results. We see that both values $\kappa = 0.1$ and $\kappa = 0.01$ outperform a value $\kappa = 0.5$. We explain this effect by the low accuracy of the approximation of the proximal step by one gradient update, and we need to perform $n \approx 1/\kappa$ gradient updates, which is equal to 10 or 100 in our case.

At the same time, this inexactness explains the chosen value $\eta = 0.1$ that is much larger than the theoretical value $\eta = 2\beta = 2 \cdot 10^{-4}$. In particular, in our preliminary experiments, we observed that a value of $\eta = \beta$ results in an overly conservative policy due to extremely strong regularization. Indeed, if we compute the total power of regularization as a sum of two regularization coefficients, the choice $\eta = \beta$ implies regularization of strength $1 + \beta$, which is overly pessimistic. Current choice implies the total power of regularization is equal to $\beta(1 + 1/\eta) = 11 \times \beta$, which is comparable with all the baselines.

Limitations. We notice that using the target network increases the memory footprint of the model, which is a limitation of our method. However, it does not significantly increase the running time of the algorithm and is straightforward to implement.