

Inference on Optimal Dynamic Policies via Softmax Approximation

Qizhao Chen¹, Morgane Austern², and Vasilis Syrgkanis³

^{1,2}Department of Statistics, Harvard University

³MS&E Department, Stanford University

Abstract

Estimating optimal dynamic policies from offline data is a fundamental problem in dynamic decision making. In the context of causal inference, the problem is known as estimating the optimal dynamic treatment regime. Even though there exists a plethora of methods for estimation, constructing confidence intervals for the value of the optimal regime and structural parameters associated with it is inherently harder, as it involves non-linear and non-differentiable functionals of un-known quantities that need to be estimated. Prior work resorted to sub-sample approaches that can deteriorate the quality of the estimate. We show that a simple soft-max approximation to the optimal treatment regime, for an appropriately fast growing temperature parameter, can achieve valid inference on the truly optimal regime. We illustrate our result for a two-period optimal dynamic regime, though our approach should directly extend to the finite horizon case. Our work combines techniques from semi-parametric inference and g -estimation, together with an appropriate triangular array central limit theorem, as well as a novel analysis of the asymptotic influence and asymptotic bias of softmax approximations.

1 Introduction

In most real world decision making settings, subjects undergo multiple exposures to some treatment or multiple treatments over time; patients receive multiple therapies, plots of lands are treated with multiple seeds, digital economy users are marketed by multiple campaigns. A typical problem that arises frequently: having access to large amounts of data where many subjects underwent multiple treatments sequentially, based on some naturally occurring and unknown treatment policy, can we identify what would have been the optimal dynamic treatment policy. Moreover, can we estimate with confidence the value of that optimal policy and understand whether we can reap large benefits (with statistical significance) if we intervene and change the status quo. The problem is typically termed as off-policy optimization or off-policy reinforcement learning. However, typical approaches in off-policy reinforcement learning primarily focus on getting fast statistical learning rates (see e.g. [18, 8] for recent work), but not uncertainty quantification and construction of confidence intervals, which have been mostly studied in off-policy evaluation but not optimization (see e.g. [9] for recent work). Our aim is to make a step in filling this gap and address uncertainty quantification and confidence interval construction for off-policy optimization in reinforcement learning settings.

We consider a setting where we have collected data from multiple realizations of a two-period Markovian dynamic decision making process. The data stem from application of an unknown observational dynamic treatment policy on a sampled set of treated units. We assume we have access to i.i.d. samples, one for each treated unit, of the form $Z := (S, T_1, X, T_2, Y)$, where S is an initial state, T_1 a first period treatment, X a second period state, T_2 a second period treatment and Y a final observed outcome of interest. The data is assumed to adhere to the causal graph depicted in Figure 1a. Moreover, the treatments $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ are discrete and take K possible values, for a constant K . We note that our assumption that the decision process is Markovian is without loss of generality, since the state X is of arbitrary dimension and is allowed to capture all past history (for instance, we can set $X = (T_1, S, S')$ for some raw second period state S'). This formalism helps simplify notation.




Figure 1: Causal graphs describing observed data and counterfactual outcomes under alternative policy π

Our goal is to estimate and construct a confidence interval for the best dynamic policy in this setting. In particular, if we intervene and instead of the observed dynamic policy we deploy an alternative dynamic policy π (depicted in the single world intervention graph (SWIG) in Figure 1b), then we will observe counterfactual or potential outcomes $Y^{(\pi)}$ and our goal is to find the policy π^* that optimizes the mean counterfactual reward and construct a confidence interval for its value V^* defined as:

$$\pi^* = \arg \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi)} \right] \quad V^* = \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi^*)} \right] \quad (1)$$

The majority of prior work in off-policy evaluation and optimization in reinforcement learning has focused on the estimation of good policies with small regret. However, the focus of our work is in the ability to construct confidence intervals for the value of the optimal policy. Constructing confidence intervals is important in many high-stakes domains where we want to understand from offline data whether some candidate optimal policy will produce a positive improvement with statistical significance. If we are not very confident on the magnitude of the improvement that the optimal regime will bring, then most decision makers would go with the status quo policy. Hence, construction of valid confidence intervals is important in most high-stakes decision making scenarios.

Most prior works that provide confidence interval construction is focused on policy evaluation for a particular fixed policy as opposed to the optimal dynamic policy. Constructing confidence intervals for the optimal dynamic policy is an inherently harder problem as the target quantity tends to not be a smooth function of the distribution. The closest prior work to ours is that of [2] which also addresses inference on structural parameters associated with the dynamic optimal policy, but resorts to sub-sampling techniques that can potentially deteriorate the estimation quality of the point estimate. Instead, we take the route of using smooth approximations to the optimal policy and show that the level of smoothness can be tuned appropriately to obtain correct confidence intervals for the truly optimal (non-smooth) policy. Our smooth approximation can be thought as an analogue to soft-Q-learning [16, 13, 5, 6], but in the context of the G-estimation framework proposed by [15], which we elaborate next.

2 Identification of Optimal Dynamic Policies via G-Estimation

First note that by invoking the Markovianity of the policy and the conditional independencies implied by the intervention graphs, we can characterize the optimal dynamic policy in a backwards induction manner (see Appendix A.1 for a formal argument):

$$\pi_1^*(S) = \max_{\tau_1} \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\tau_1, \pi_2^*)} \mid S \right] \quad \pi_2^*(X) = \arg \max_{\tau_2} \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \tau_2)} \mid X \right]. \quad (2)$$

In essence, we go to the last period and we optimize our second period action given the second period state X , without any change to our first period policy. This provides the optimal second period policy π_2^* . Then we go to the first period and we fantasize that we are continuing with the second period policy that we have just constructed and under this fantasy, we optimize our first period action given the first period state.

g-estimation for optimal regimes A well-known method for estimating an optimal dynamic regime is *g-estimation* [15], which is a form of backwards dynamic programming or *Q-learning* and closely related to advantage or *A-learning* [12, 1, 11, 17]. This process generalizes to arbitrary number of periods, but we describe it here for simplicity in the two period case. The key argument in *g-estimation* is that the improvement that any policy π brings, as compared to the observed policy, can be decomposed as the sum of a sequence of “improvements”, one for each decision-making

period. Each of these improvement corresponds to “removing” the “effect” of the treatment that was given at that period and “adding” the “effect” of the treatment that would have been assigned by policy π at that period. For such a decomposition, we need an appropriate notion of “effect” of each treatment. As a side note, any appropriate notion of such an “effect” could potentially be useful in *credit assignment*, i.e. attributing parts of the outcome to an assigned treatment; hence estimating these “effect” functions is interesting in its own right.

More formally, we can write (see Appendix A.2 for details on the derivation):

$$\mathbb{E} [Y^{(\pi)} - Y] = \mathbb{E} [\gamma_1^{(\pi_2)}(\pi_1(S), S) - \gamma_1^{(\pi_2)}(T_1, S)] + \mathbb{E} [\gamma_2(\pi_2(X), X) - \gamma_2(T_2, X)] \quad (3)$$

The functions γ_t are known in the literature as the “blip effects” and correspond to the following quantity: what is the increase in reward if at the current moment we switch from the baseline treatment to some other treatment level τ , and then continue with the target policy π . More formally:

$$\gamma_2(\tau_2, x) := \mathbb{E} [Y^{(T_1, T_2)} - Y^{(T_1, 0)} \mid T_2 = \tau_2, X = x] \quad (4)$$

$$\gamma_1^{(\pi_2)}(\tau_1, s) := \mathbb{E} [Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(0, \pi_2)} \mid T_1 = \tau_1, S = s] \quad (5)$$

We will denote with γ_t^* the blip effects that correspond to the optimal target policy (note that this only matters for the definition of γ_1).

If we had some way of estimating the blip effect functions for any target policy, then this decomposition allows us to construct the optimal dynamic regime in a recursive manner. We go to the second period and we note that under the conditional independencies implied by the intervention graphs, one can easily argue that we can equivalently define the optimal policy π_2^* from Equation (2) as the policy that maximizes the blip effect $\gamma_2 = \gamma_2^*$, i.e.

$$\pi_2^*(X) = \arg \max_{\tau_2} \gamma_2^*(\tau_2, X) \quad (6)$$

We can then use this policy as the continuation policy when we define the blip effect for the first period, which we denote with γ_1^* (as it is the blip effect that is associated with the optimal target policy). Again, under the conditional independencies implied by the intervention graphs, we can easily argue that the optimal first period policy π_1^* , as defined in Equation (2) is the one that optimizes the first period blip effect, i.e.

$$\pi_1^*(S) = \arg \max_{\tau_1} \gamma_1^*(\tau_1, S) \quad (7)$$

Note that the conditional expectations that define the blip effects involve counterfactual quantities and therefore they don’t correspond to simple regression problems on the observed data. The ingenuity of the g estimation approach is that it provides a way to estimate the blip functions by noticing that they must satisfy a set of conditional moment restrictions. In particular, one can roughly make the following arguments [15, 10]: if we subtract from Y the blip effect of the observed last treatment, then the resulting random variable can roughly be thought as the counterfactual outcome $Y^{(T_1, 0)}$, which should be independent of T_2 conditional on X (see Figure 2). This then implies that for all functions f :

$$\mathbb{E} [(Y - \gamma_2^*(T_2, X)) (f(T_2, X) - \mathbb{E}[f(T_2, X) \mid X])] = 0 \quad (8)$$

This continuum of moment conditions can be used to identify the function γ_2^* . Similarly, if we subtract from the observed outcome the blip effect of the last period, add the blip effect of the optimal second period treatment and subtract the blip effect of the first period treatment, then the resulting variable can roughly be thought as the counterfactual outcome $Y^{(0, \pi_2^*)}$, which is independent of T_1 given S (see Figure 2). This then implies that for all functions f :

$$\mathbb{E} [(Y - \gamma_2^*(T_2, X) + \gamma_2^*(\pi_2^*(X), X) - \gamma_1^*(T_1, S)) (f(T_1, S) - \mathbb{E}[f(T_1, S) \mid S])] = 0 \quad (9)$$

This continuum of moment conditions can be used to identify the function γ_1^* .

This approach becomes very practical if one imposes semi-parametric restrictions on the data generating process that imply that the blip functions admit a parametric form. In particular, we will make a typical assumption that the blip effects that correspond to the optimal target policy are linear in some sufficiently expressive feature map (such a

modeling assumption is referred to in the literature as a Linear Structural Nested Mean Model; SNMM [7]), i.e. for some known d -dimensional feature map vectors ϕ, μ :

$$\gamma_2^*(\tau_2, x) = \psi_0' \phi(\tau_2, x) \quad \gamma_1^*(\tau_1, s) = \theta_0' \mu(\tau_1, s) \quad (\text{linear blip effects})$$

with the convention that $\phi(0, x) = \mu(0, s) = 0$. Then we can identify the structural parameters ψ_0 by simply solving for ψ the vector of moment restrictions:

$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_2(\psi) (\phi(T_2, X) - \mathbb{E}[\phi(T_2, X) | X])] = 0, \quad \epsilon_2(\psi) := Y - \psi' \phi(T_2, X) \quad (10)$$

then calculating the optimal second period policy:

$$\pi_2^*(X) = \arg \max_{\tau_2} \psi_0' \phi(\tau_2, X) \quad (11)$$

Similarly, we can define the residual outcome that emulates $Y^{(0, \pi_2^*)}$ as:

$$\epsilon_1(\theta, \psi) := Y - \psi' \phi(T_2, X) + \max_{\tau_2} \psi_0' \phi(\tau_2, X) - \theta' \mu(T_1, S) \quad (12)$$

and calculate the first period structural parameters θ_0 by solving for θ the vector of moment restrictions:

$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_1(\theta, \psi_0) (\mu(T_1, S) - \mathbb{E}[\mu(T_1, S) | S])] = 0, \quad (13)$$

and calculate the optimal first period policy:

$$\pi_1^*(S) = \arg \max_{\tau_1} \theta_0' \mu(\tau_1, S) \quad (14)$$

The value of the optimal policy is then given as:

$$V^* := \mathbb{E}[Y^{(\pi^*)}] = \mathbb{E} \left[Y - \psi_0' \phi(T_2, X) - \theta_0' \mu(T_1, S) + \max_{\tau_2} \psi_0' \phi(\tau_2, X) + \max_{\tau_1} \theta_0' \mu(\tau_1, S) \right]$$

3 Estimation and Inference on Optimal Policy Value and Structural Parameters

We can easily translate the identification recipe in the previous paragraph to a finite sample estimation strategy. In particular, we can replace the moment equations with their empirical analogues, estimate regression models for the conditional expectations of the feature maps and construct estimates $\hat{\psi}$ and $\hat{\theta}$ for the structural parameters using n samples. There are two caveats with this approach.

The first is that the estimation error of the regression functions $\mathbb{E}[\phi(T_2, X) | X]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mu(T_1, S) | S]$, will have a first order impact on the accuracy of our structural parameters and hence the quality of the resulting optimal policies. Moreover, if we want to use regularization based methods to flexibly estimate these regression with modern regression approaches, then the resulting estimates $\hat{\theta}, \hat{\psi}$ will be heavily biased, due to regularization bias. However, we can easily address this issue by resorting to existing techniques in the literature. In particular, instead of considering the raw moments in the previous section, we will consider Neyman orthogonal variants of them (see e.g. [15, 10]). For instance, for the second period structural parameter ψ_0 , we instead solve for ψ an empirical analogue of the moment:

$$\mathbb{E}[(\epsilon_2(\psi) - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_2(\psi) | X]) (\phi(T_2, X) - \mathbb{E}[\phi(T_2, X) | X])] = 0 \quad (\text{Orthogonal Moment for } \psi_0)$$

Note that we can write:

$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_2(\psi) | X] = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[Y | X]}_{h^*(X)} + \psi' \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\phi(T_2, X) | X]}_{r^*(X)}$$

Therefore we can estimate this term by finding the functions that correspond to the two regression problems:

$$h^*(X) := \mathbb{E}[Y | X], \quad r^*(X) := \mathbb{E}[\phi(T_2, X) | X] \quad (15)$$

This moment is the standard residual-on-residual regression moment appearing in the double/debiased machine learning literature. The extra centering terms we added in the first parenthesis, do not alter the solution, but decrease the variance of the moment. This leads to a more efficient estimation method and more importantly, as we will see formally, to small influence from estimation errors in the various regression models that appear in the moment. We can perform similar correction to the first stage moment. However, before we do that, let us elaborate on the second caveat of the estimation approach which is even more crucial and the main topic of this work!

As we remind, our goal is the construction of a confidence interval. One route to constructing asymptotically valid confidence intervals is showing that the structural parameter estimates are asymptotically linear (i.e. asymptotically are equivalent to a simple average of some fixed function, known as the influence function). Asymptotic linearity implies asymptotic normality which can be used to provide confidence intervals for the parameter and, coupled with the delta method, for any smooth functional of the structural parameters. However, neither the moment that estimates the first period structural parameter θ is smooth ψ nor the policy value is smooth in θ, ψ . Both of these functionals contain the maximum operator, which introduces non-smoothness and leads to non-Gaussian asymptotic stochastic behavior and inability to construct confidence intervals.

The main idea of our work is that by replacing the maximum operator with the soft-maximum operator with an appropriate temperature parameter, growing at the right rate, we can obtain valid inference on the truly optimal policy and its corresponding structural parameters.

Remark 1. *We will focus our technical exposition on constructing confidence intervals for the first-period structural parameter θ , since this is the crux of the problem. Constructing confidence intervals for the policy value is simply a repetition of the soft-max analysis we will present, one more time. The key bottleneck is analyzing the asymptotic linearity of the first period parameter θ ; which will be our main theorem. Moreover, inference on the structural parameters is interesting in its own right, for instance when one is interested in understanding dimensions of heterogeneity of the effect of the treatment in the first period, under an optimal continuation policy.*

4 Inference on First-Period Structural Parameter via Softmax Approximation

We will define a softmax approximation to the moment conditions in Equation (13) that define θ_0 . To do so, it will be convenient to introduce a soft-max operator:

$$\text{smax}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}}^{\beta} f(\tau) := \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{\exp\{\beta f(\tau)\}}{\sum_t \exp\{\beta f(t)\}} f(\tau) \quad (\beta\text{-softmax})$$

We can then define the softmax analogue of the residual $\epsilon_1(\theta, \psi)$ defined in Equation (12) as:

$$\epsilon_1^{\beta}(\theta, \psi) := Y - \psi' \phi(T_2, X) + \text{smax}_{\tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}}^{\beta} \psi' \phi(\tau_2, X) - \theta' \mu(T_1, S) \quad (16)$$

Then the softmax approximation to the Neyman orthogonal moment condition that defines the parameter θ_0 can be written as:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\epsilon_1^{\beta}(\theta, \psi_0) - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_1^{\beta}(\theta, \psi_0) \mid S] \right) (\mu(T_1, S) - \mathbb{E}[\mu(T_1, S) \mid S]) \right] = 0 \quad (\text{Orthogonal Moment for } \theta_0)$$

We will denote with θ_0^{β} the solution to this softmax moment condition. Note that the term $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_1^{\beta}(\theta, \psi_0) \mid S]$ can be decomposed as:

$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_1^{\beta}(\theta, \psi_0) \mid S] = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[Y \mid S]}_{q^*(S)} - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\psi_0' \phi(T_2, X) - \text{smax}_{\tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}}^{\beta} \psi_0' \phi(\tau_2, X) \mid S]}_{p_{2,\beta}^*(S)} - \underbrace{\theta' \mathbb{E}[\mu(T_1, S) \mid S]}_{p_1(S)}$$

Therefore we can estimate this term by finding the functions that correspond to the following three regression problems:

$$q^*(S) := \mathbb{E}[Y \mid S], \quad p_1^*(S) := \mathbb{E}[\mu(T_1, S) \mid S], \quad p_{2,\beta}^*(S) := \mathbb{E}[\psi_0' \phi(T_2, X) - \text{smax}_{\tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}}^{\beta} \psi_0' \phi(\tau_2, X) \mid S]. \quad (17)$$

It will be convenient to denote with $m_\beta(Z; \theta, \psi, q, p_1, p_2)$ the softmax approximation to the Neyman orthogonal moment, parameterized by the aforementioned regression functions, i.e.:

$$m_\beta(Z; \theta, \psi, q, p_1, p_2) := \left(\epsilon_1^\beta(\theta, \psi) - q(S) + p_2(S) + \theta' p_1(S) \right) (\mu(T_1, S) - p_1(S)). \quad (18)$$

and it's expected value as:

$$M(\theta, \psi, q, p_1, p_2; \beta) := \mathbb{E} [m_\beta(Z; \theta, \psi, q, p_1, p_2)]$$

Then, for any $0 < \beta \leq \infty$, we let θ_0^β be the solution to the following moment condition, with respect to θ :

$$M(\theta, \psi_0, q^*, p_1^*, p_{2,\beta}^*; \beta) = 0.$$

Moreover, note that we have $\theta_0 := \theta_0^\infty$.

Notation. For any random variable X , we denote with $\|X\|_{L_p} := (\mathbb{E}[|X|^p])^{1/p}$ for any $p \geq 1$, and with $\|X\|_{L_\infty} := \inf\{c \geq 0 : \mathbb{P}(|X| \leq c) = 1\}$. Moreover, for any vector-valued function g that takes as input a random variable X , we define as $\|g\|_2 \triangleq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_X [\|g(X)\|_2^2]}$.

5 Estimation Algorithm and Main Theorems

We first define formally our estimation process. The process consists of two steps of backwards induction.

Step 1: construct estimate $\hat{\psi}$ of second period structural parameter ψ_0 .

1. Construct estimates \hat{h}, \hat{r} of the nuisance functions h^*, r^* defined in Equation (15).
2. Define residuals $\check{Y} := Y - \hat{h}(X)$ and $\check{\Phi} := \phi(T_2, X) - \hat{r}(X)$ and
3. $\hat{\psi}$ solves the empirical moment equation, with respect to ψ :

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\check{Y} - \psi' \check{\Phi}) \check{\Phi} = 0 \quad (19)$$

Step 2: construct estimate $\hat{\theta}$ of first period structural parameter θ_0 .

1. Construct estimates $\hat{q}, \hat{p}_1, \hat{p}_{2,\beta}$ of the nuisance functions $q^*, p_1^*, p_{2,\beta}^*$ defined in Equation (17). The estimate $\hat{p}_{2,\beta}$ is constructed by running a regression of $\hat{\psi}' \phi(T_2, X) - \text{smax}_{\tau_2}^{\beta} \hat{\psi}' \phi(\tau, X)$ on S . It will be useful to define the outcome of the regression estimate for any given parameter ψ as $\hat{p}_{2,\beta,\psi}$ and in that respect we note that $\hat{p}_{2,\beta} \equiv \hat{p}_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}$
2. Define residuals $\hat{Y} := Y - \hat{q}(S)$ and $\hat{\Phi} := \hat{\psi}' \phi(T_2, X) - \text{smax}_{\tau_2}^{\beta} \hat{\psi}' \phi(\tau_2, X) - \hat{p}_{2,\beta}(S)$ and $\hat{M} := \mu(T_1, S) - \hat{p}_1(S)$.
3. The estimate $\hat{\theta}$ of the first period structural parameter θ_0 is defined as the solution, with respect to θ , of the empirical moment equation:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{Y} - \hat{\Phi} - \theta' \hat{M}) \hat{M} = 0 \quad (20)$$

Having define our estimation process, we are now ready to prove our main result, which shows that we can construct asymptotically valid confidence intervals for the structural parameters θ_0, ψ_0 , assuming the temperature parameter β of the soft-max grows fast enough ($\omega(n^{1/4})$), but not too fast ($o(n^{1/2})$). We further need additional assumptions on the estimation quality of all the nuisance functions involved in the estimation process and require that the nuisance estimates lie in function classes of small statistical complexity, e.g. with critical radius of $o_p(n^{-1/4})$.

Theorem 1 (Main Theorem I). *Suppose that $\beta = \omega(n^{1/4})$ and $\beta = o(n^{1/2})$. Moreover, suppose that the nuisance estimates satisfy the rate conditions:*

$$\|h^* - \hat{h}\|_2, \|r^* - \hat{r}\|_2, \|q^* - \hat{q}\|_2, \|p_1^* - \hat{p}_1\|_2 = o_p(n^{-1/4}).$$

and

$$\|\hat{p}_{2,\beta} - p_{2,\beta}^*\|_2 = o_{p,\text{unif}(\beta)}(n^{-1/4})$$

Moreover, suppose that the critical radius δ_n of the function space where nuisance estimates take values from satisfies $\delta_n = o_p(n^{-1/4})$. (Here we use the classical definition of critical radius of a function class as in [3].) Assume the nuisance estimates are all almost surely bounded. Moreover, assume the following boundedness conditions:

$$\sup_{\beta>0} \|\theta_0^\beta\|_2, \sup_X \sum_\tau \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2, \|\tilde{M}\|_2, \|\tilde{Y}\|_2, \sup_{\beta>0} \|p_{2,\beta}^*(S)\|_2, \|\mu(T_1, S)\|_2 < \infty, a.s.$$

where $\tilde{M} := \mu(T_1, S) - p_1^*(S)$, $\tilde{Y} := Y - q^*(S)$. Assume that the matrix $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{M}\tilde{M}']$ is bounded and strictly positive definite so that its inverse matrix $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{M}\tilde{M}']^{-1}$ exists. Moreover, assume that the random variables $\{\max_t \psi'_0 \phi(t, X) - \psi'_0 \phi(\tau, X)\}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}}$ are almost surely bounded and there exists a constant c , such that they admit a bounded density in an interval $(0, c)$. Then the estimates $\hat{\psi}, \hat{\theta}$ are asymptotically linear, i.e.

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\psi} - \psi_0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\psi(Z_i) + o_p(1) \quad \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\theta(Z_i) + o_p(1) \quad (21)$$

Moreover, asymptotically valid confidence intervals, with target coverage level α , can be constructed via any consistent estimates $\hat{\sigma}_\psi^2, \hat{\sigma}_\theta^2$ of the variances $\sigma_\psi^2 = \mathbb{E}[\rho_\psi(Z)^2]$ and $\sigma_\theta^2 = \mathbb{E}[\rho_\theta(Z)^2]$ as:

$$CI_\psi(\alpha) := [\hat{\psi} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\sigma}_\psi / \sqrt{n}], \quad CI_\theta(\alpha) := [\hat{\theta} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\sigma}_\theta / \sqrt{n}], \quad (22)$$

where z_q is the q -th quantile of the standard normal distribution.

The more expansive theorems that we define in subsequent sections also provide an exact form of the asymptotic influence functions and the asymptotic variances, which we omit in the main theorem for succinctness of exposition. Furthermore, we note that a simpler sufficient condition that implies the condition that the random variables $\{\max_t \psi'_0 \phi(t, X) - \psi'_0 \phi(\tau, X)\}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}}$ have bounded density in some interval $(0, c)$ is that the variables $\{\psi'_0 \phi(\tau, X)\}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}}$ admit a joint density; which is a very benign regularity assumption. This follows from the following lemma:

Lemma 2. *Let $(U_t)_{t \in T}$ be a collection of real-valued random variables and write $U_{\max} := \max_{t \in T} U_t$. Suppose that the random variables $(U_t)_T$ admit a joint density; then for all $t \in T$, the probability measure of random variable $U_{\max} - U_t$ constrained on $(0, \infty)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $(0, \infty)$.*

Moreover, we note that the nuisance parameter $p_{2,\beta}^*$ depends on both β and ψ , hence its convergence is not a direct implication of standard results in empirical process theory. To facilitate analysis it will be useful to define $p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*(S) = \mathbb{E}[\psi'(\phi(T_2, X) - \phi_{\beta,\psi}(X) \mid S)]$ and $\hat{p}_{2,\beta,\psi}$ the outcome of the estimation algorithm when regressing $\psi'(\phi(T_2, X) - \phi_{\beta,\psi}(X))$ on S . As we show in Lemma 21 it suffices that we assume for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{N}, \beta > 0} \mathbb{P}\left(\|\hat{p}_{2,\beta,\psi} - p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon \cdot n^{-1/4}\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (23)$$

for some appropriately defined small set \mathcal{N} . This would follow easily for instance from results on oracle inequalities via localized complexities and a uniform cover argument over the low dimensional parametric space that the parameter ψ lies in.

Furthermore, the statistical complexity constraint on the nuisance function space can also be completely lifted if one performs nested sample splitting and uses fresh samples at each step of the recursion process, though this can lead to small samples in the many period case.

More specifically, we also consider a cross-fitted version of our estimation process, where we split the entire dataset into two parts and train the nuisance functions and the second period structural parameter estimator $\hat{\psi}$ using one data split, while we train the first period structural parameter estimator $\hat{\theta}$ using the other split. We formally define the process as follows: Randomly split the entire dataset into two disjoint sets S_1 and S_2 where without loss of generality let $|S_1| = |S_2| = \frac{n}{2}$.

Step 1: For each split $l \in \{1, 2\}$, construct estimate $\hat{\psi}^{(l)}$ of second period structural parameter ψ_0 using a further cross-fitting approach.

1. Further randomly split the data split S_l into two parts: $S_{l,1}$ and $S_{l,2}$.
2. For each further split $l' \in \{1, 2\}$, construct estimates $\hat{h}_{l'}^{(l)}, \hat{r}_{l'}^{(l)}$ of the nuisance functions h^*, r^* defined in Equation (15) using data split $S_{l,l'}$.
3. Define residuals $\check{Y}_l := Y - \hat{h}_{l'}^{(l)}(X)$ and $\check{\Phi}^{(l)} := \phi(T_2, X) - \hat{r}_{l'}^{(l)}(X)$, where l' is chosen correspondingly so that the data point does not lie in split $S_{l,l'}$, and
4. solve $\hat{\psi}^{(l)}$ from the empirical moment equation, with respect to ψ :

$$\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i \in S_l} (\check{Y}_i^{(l)} - \psi' \check{\Phi}_i^{(l)}) \check{\Phi}_i^{(l)} = 0 \quad (24)$$

Step 2: construct cross-fitted estimate $\hat{\theta}$ of first period structural parameter θ_0 .

1. For each split $l \in \{1, 2\}$, construct estimates $\hat{q}^{(l)}, \hat{p}_1^{(l)}, \hat{p}_{2,\beta}^{(l)}$ of the nuisance functions $q^*, p_1^*, p_{2,\beta}^*$ defined in Equation (17). The estimate $\hat{p}_{2,\beta}^{(l)}$ is constructed by running a regression of $\hat{\psi}^{(l)'} \phi(T_2, X) - \text{smax}_{\tau_2}^{\beta} \hat{\psi}^{(l)'} \phi(\tau, X)$ on S_l . It will be useful to define the outcome of the regression estimate for any given parameter ψ as $\hat{p}_{2,\beta,\psi}^{(l)}$ and in that respect we note that $\hat{p}_{2,\beta}^{(l)} \equiv \hat{p}_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}^{(l)}}$
2. Define residuals $\hat{Y} := Y - \hat{q}^{(l)}(S)$ and $\hat{\Phi}^{(l)} := \hat{\psi}^{(l)'} \phi(T_2, X) - \text{smax}_{\tau_2}^{\beta} \hat{\psi}^{(l)'} \phi(\tau, X) - \hat{p}_{2,\beta}^{(l)}(S)$ and $\hat{M}^{(l)} := \mu(T_1, S) - \hat{p}_1^{(l)}(S)$.
3. The estimate $\hat{\theta}$ of the first period structural parameter θ_0 is defined as the solution, with respect to θ , of the empirical moment equation:

$$\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i \in S_1} (\hat{Y}^{(2)} - \hat{\Phi}^{(2)} - \theta' \hat{M}^{(2)}) \hat{M}^{(2)} + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i \in S_2} (\hat{Y}^{(1)} - \hat{\Phi}^{(1)} - \theta' \hat{M}^{(1)}) \hat{M}^{(1)} = 0 \quad (25)$$

Theorem 3 (Main Theorem II). *Suppose that $\beta = \omega(n^{1/4})$ and $\beta = o(n^{1/2})$. Moreover, suppose that for each split $l, l' \in \{1, 2\}$, the nuisance estimates satisfy the rate conditions:*

$$\|h^* - \hat{h}_{l'}^{(l)}\|_2, \|r^* - \hat{r}_{l'}^{(l)}\|_2, \|q^* - \hat{q}^{(l)}\|_2, \|p_1^* - \hat{p}_1^{(l)}\|_2,$$

and that

$$\|\hat{p}_{2,\beta}^{(l)} - p_{2,\beta}^*\|_2 = o_{p,\text{unif}(\beta)}(n^{-1/4}).$$

Assume the nuisance estimates are all almost surely bounded. Moreover, assume the following boundedness conditions:

$$\sup_{\beta > 0} \|\theta_0^\beta\|_2, \sup_X \sum_{\tau} \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2, \|\tilde{M}\|_2, \|\tilde{Y}\|_2, \sup_{\beta > 0} \|p_{2,\beta}^*(S)\|_2, \|\hat{M}^{(1)}\|_2, \|\hat{M}^{(2)}\|_2 < \infty, a.s.$$

where $\tilde{M} := \mu(T_1, S) - p_1^*(S)$, $\tilde{Y} := Y - q^*(S)$. Assume that the matrix $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{M}\tilde{M}']$ is bounded and strictly positive definite so that its inverse matrix $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{M}\tilde{M}']^{-1}$ exists. Moreover, assume that the random variables $\{\max_t \psi'_0 \phi(t, X) - \psi'_0 \phi(\tau, X)\}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}}$ are almost surely bounded and there exists a constant c , such that they admit a bounded density in an interval $(0, c)$. Then the estimates $\hat{\psi}^{(1)}, \hat{\psi}^{(2)}, \hat{\theta}$ are asymptotically linear, i.e. for any $l \in \{1, 2\}$

$$\sqrt{n/2}(\hat{\psi}^{(l)} - \psi_0) = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i \in S_l} \rho_\psi(Z_i) + o_p(1) \quad \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\theta(Z_i) + o_p(1) \quad (26)$$

Moreover, asymptotically valid confidence intervals, with target coverage level α , can be constructed via any consistent estimates $\hat{\sigma}_\psi^2, \hat{\sigma}_\theta^2$ of the variances $\sigma_\psi^2 = \mathbb{E}[\rho_\psi(Z)^2]$ and $\sigma_\theta^2 = \mathbb{E}[\rho_\theta(Z)^2]$ as:

$$CI_\psi(\alpha) := [\hat{\psi}^{(l)} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\sigma}_\psi \sqrt{2/n}], \quad CI_\theta(\alpha) := [\hat{\theta} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\sigma}_\theta / \sqrt{n}], \quad (27)$$

where we can choose any one of $l \in \{1, 2\}$, and z_q is the q -th quantile of the standard normal distribution.

We devote the remainder of the paper in providing intermediate results that lead to the main theorem above. In particular, we provide crucial steps in bounding the ‘‘bias’’ introduced by the softmax approximation, as well as controlling the variance introduced by letting the temperature parameter grow to infinity.

6 Main Bias Lemma: Controlling Softmax Error

We first show that the bias introduced by the softmax approximation vanishes faster than $n^{-1/2}$, if the temperature parameter β grows faster than $n^{-1/4}$. We remind that θ_0^β is the solution to the softmax approximate moment condition $M(\theta, \psi_0, q^*, p_1^*, p_{2,\beta}^*; \beta) = 0$ with respect θ and θ_0 is the true structural parameter of the first period blip effect, which can also equivalently be thought as the solution to the later moment condition for $\beta = \infty$. To control the bias $\sqrt{n}(\theta_0^\beta - \theta_0)$, we need to control the discrepancy between $\max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \psi'_0 \phi(\tau, X)$ and $\text{smax}^\beta_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \psi'_0 \phi(\tau, X)$. This is exactly the crux of the proof of the following bias lemma.

Lemma 4 (Softmax Bias Control). *For each treatment $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, define random variable*

$$U_\tau := \psi'_0 \phi(\tau, X). \quad (28)$$

Taking the maximum of U_τ over all treatments $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, we define

$$U_{\max} := \max_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \{\psi'_0 \phi(t, X)\}. \quad (29)$$

Assume for each treatment $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ that $\|U_\tau\|_\infty < \infty$, and that there is a constant $c_\tau > 0$ such that on $(0, c_\tau)$ the random variable $U_{\max} - U_\tau$ admits a bounded density. Suppose that $\|\tilde{M}\|_2$ is uniformly bounded and that $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{M}\tilde{M}']$ is strictly positive definite. If $\beta = \omega(n^{1/4})$ then we get that as $n \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\sqrt{n}(\theta_0^\beta - \theta_0) = o(1) \quad (30)$$

To illustrate the main argument given in Appendix C, consider the case when there are only two actions, i.e. $\mathcal{T} = \{0, 1\}$. In this binary treatment case, letting $U_1 := \psi'_0 \phi(1, X)$ and noting that $U_0 = \psi'_0 \phi(0, X) = 0$, the term difference between the softmax and the max over the quantities $\{U_0, U_1\}$ is of the form:

$$U_1 \left(\mathbb{1}\{U_1 \geq 0\} - \frac{1}{1 + \exp\{-\beta U_1\}} \right)$$

which simplifies to:

$$\frac{|U_1| \exp\{-\beta U_1\}}{1 + \exp\{-\beta U_1\}} \mathbb{1}\{U_1 \geq 0\} + \frac{|U_1| \exp\{\beta U_1\}}{1 + \exp\{\beta U_1\}} \mathbb{1}\{U_1 < 0\} = \frac{|U_1| \exp\{-\beta |U_1|\}}{1 + \exp\{-\beta |U_1|\}} \leq |U_1| \exp\{-\beta |U_1|\}$$

Thus the bias term $\sqrt{n}(\theta_0^\beta - \theta_0)$ will be roughly upper bounded by $O(\sqrt{n} \mathbb{E}[|U_1| \exp\{-\beta |U_1|\}])$. Hence, if we can control quantities of the form $\mathbb{E}[|U_1| \exp\{-\beta |U_1|\}]$, then we will be able to control the bias. For instance, if we can show that quantities of the form $\mathbb{E}[|U_1| \exp\{-\beta |U_1|\}]$ decay faster than $1/\beta^2$, then we would need that $\sqrt{n}/\beta^2 = o(1)$, or equivalently, $\beta = \omega(n^{1/4})$, which is our desired target result. To prove such a statement we develop the following key lemma (whose proof is in Appendix B). This intuition extends beyond the binary case and we present the complete proof in Appendix C.

Lemma 5 (Key Bias Building Block). *Let U be a non-negative random variable. Assume that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that on $(0, c)$ the random variable U admits a bounded density, bounded by H . Choose any $\epsilon > 0$. Then for any β that is large enough, such that $\frac{(1+\epsilon)\log(\beta)}{\beta} \leq c$ and $(1+\epsilon)\log(\beta) > 1$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[U \exp(-\beta U)] \leq \frac{H}{\beta^2} + \frac{(1+\epsilon)\log(\beta)}{\beta^{2+\epsilon}}.$$

Applying this lemma, we directly get that in the binary case $\sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}[|U_1| \exp\{-\beta|U_1|\}] = O(\sqrt{n}/\beta^2)$, which was the desired result. Our main result goes beyond the binary case and shows that a similar argument can be made more broadly.

Remark 2. *Concluding this section, we want to remark on the importance of Lemma 5 and more generally our main bias Lemma 4. We note that a crude analysis of the difference between the max and the softmax would give a bound of the order of $1/\beta$. For instance, one way to analyze the difference between the max of the $\{U_\tau\}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}}$ vs the β -softmax is to use the equivalence between the softmax and an entropic regularized maximum. In particular, the β -softmax is equivalent to the maximum of the entropic regularized objective $\max_w \sum_\tau w_\tau U_\tau - \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_\tau w_\tau \log(w_\tau)$, where the vector w ranges over the $|\mathcal{T}|$ -dimensional simplex. From this we see that the distortion in the objective is of the order of $1/\beta$. Thus very quickly we can argue that the difference between the maximum and the soft-maximum is of the order of $1/\beta$. However, such a bound is not strong enough and if used to bound the soft-max bias $\sqrt{n}(\theta_0^\beta - \theta_0)$, would result in requiring that $\beta = \omega(\sqrt{n})$. However, the analysis of the variance part that we present in the subsequent sections, will be imposing that for asymptotic linearity of θ_0^β , we need that $\beta = o(\sqrt{n})$, which would result in a contradiction. Thus our more fine grained analysis of the difference between the max and the soft-max and our reduction to terms that look like the ones that are handled by Lemma 5, as well as the fact that the refined analysis in Lemma 5 provides a bound that decays much faster as $1/\beta^2$, is of significant importance for our main result.*

7 Asymptotic Linearity for Moment Equations with Growing Parameters

Our problem falls into a general class of semiparametric inference problems, defined as solutions to moment equations that apart from the target parameter, also depend on a set of auxiliary or nuisance parameters. One additional element that we need to add to the classical setting of semi-parametric inference with moment restrictions is that in our problem the moments themselves are parameterized by quantities (e.g. the temperature parameter β) that grow with the sample size. En route to our main theorem, we will analyze such types of moment problems in their full generality and then instantiate the general theorem to the setting of inference on optimal dynamic treatment regimes.

In this section, we consider the following generalized method of moments framework:

$$M(\theta, g, h; \beta) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_Z[m_\beta(Z; \theta, g, h)] \quad M(\theta_0^{\beta_n}, g_0^{\beta_n}, h_0; \beta_n) = 0 \quad (31)$$

where $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ is a vector of random variables that, apart from the target parameter $\theta_0 \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ of interest and some constants β_n that grows to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$, also depends on unknown nuisance parameter $h^* \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and unknown nuisance functions $g_{\beta_n}^* \in \mathcal{G}$, which need to be estimated in a flexible manner from the data.

For simplicity we will drop the subscript of β_n and write $\beta := \beta_n$, but it is worth noting that β is a function of n . Denote $\theta_0 := \theta_0^\infty$ and $g_0 := g_0^\infty$. The estimator satisfies:

$$M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, \hat{h}; \beta) = o_p(n^{-1/2}) \quad \text{with} \quad M_n(\theta, g, h; \beta) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m_\beta(Z; \theta, g, h).$$

To simplify the regularity assumptions required for asymptotic normality, we focus on the case where $m_\beta(Z; \theta, g, h)$ is linear in θ , i.e.

$$m_\beta(Z; \theta, g, h) = a_\beta(Z; g, h) \theta + \nu_\beta(Z; g, h) \quad (32)$$

where $a_\beta(Z; g, h) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is a $p \times p$ matrix and $\nu_\beta(Z; g, h) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a p -vector, and we denote with:

$$A(g, h; \beta) := \mathbb{E}_Z[a_\beta(Z; g, h)] \quad A_n(g) := \mathbb{E}_n[a_\beta(Z; g, h)] \quad (33)$$

$$V(g, h; \beta) := \mathbb{E}_Z[\nu_\beta(Z; g, h)] \quad V_n(g, h; \beta) := \mathbb{E}_n[\nu_\beta(Z; g, h)]. \quad (34)$$

Our general asymptotic linearity theorem will be based on a series of high-level assumptions that we provide next. In subsequent sections, we will verify each of these high-level assumptions from more primitive conditions, when applying our general asymptotic linearity theorem to the inference problem that arises in the optimal dynamic treatment regime setting.

Assumption 1 (Influence of h). *The functions $(\partial_h m_\beta(z, \cdot, \cdot, h_0))$ are equicontinuous: for all $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $\|g_1 - g_2\|_2 \leq \delta$, and all $\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_2 \leq \delta$ the following holds*

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}, \beta > 0} \left| \partial_h m_\beta(z, \theta_1, g_1, h_0) - \partial_h m_\beta(z, \theta_2, g_2, h_0) \right| \leq \epsilon.$$

Moreover the expected gradient $\partial_h m_\beta$ converges to some finite limit as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\partial_h m_\beta(Z_1, \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) \right] \xrightarrow{\beta \rightarrow \infty} J_* < \infty.$$

Finally, the derivative is uniformly bounded, i.e.

$$\sup_{\beta} \|\partial_h m_\beta(Z_1, \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0)\|_{L_1} < \infty, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (35)$$

The Hessian of each coordinate t of the moment vector m_β with respect to h , is uniformly bounded:

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}, h} \left\| \partial_{hh} m_{\beta,t}(z; \hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h) \right\|_{op} = o(n^{1/2}), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (36)$$

Assumption 2 (Limits of β). *The parameter β grows at an appropriate rate as n grows, such that functions $m_\beta(Z_1, \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0)$ and $A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta)$ each has a limit as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$. That is, we have that*

$$m_\beta(Z_1, \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) - m_*(Z_1, \theta_0, g_0, h_0) = o_p(1) \quad (37)$$

$$\|A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_*(g_0, h_0)\|_{op} = o(1) \quad (38)$$

for some limit functions m_* and A_* .

Assumption 3 (Orthogonality in g). *The moment satisfies the Neyman orthogonality condition with respect to nuisance g : for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$*

$$D_g M(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta)[g - g_0^\beta] \triangleq \frac{\partial}{\partial t} M(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta + t(g - g_0^\beta), h_0; \beta) \Big|_{t=0} = 0 \quad (\text{Neyman Orthogonality})$$

and a second-order smoothness condition: for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$, we have

$$\sup_{t_0 \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} M(\theta_0^\beta, g_0 + t(g - g_0^\beta), h_0; \beta) \Big|_{t=t_0} \right| = O_{\text{unif}(\beta)} \left(\|g - g_0^\beta\|_2^2 \right). \quad (\text{Smoothness})$$

As β increases the estimators and moment functions change. To be able to control all of this we need to control the impact of β on the convergence rate. In this goal, we introduce some new notations.

Definition 1 (Uniform in β Convergence). *Let (X_n^β) be a sequence of random variables. We say that $X_n^\beta = o_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)}(1)$ if for all $\epsilon > 0$ the following holds:*

$$\sup_{\beta > 0} P\left(|X_n^\beta| \geq \epsilon\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Similarly we say that $X_n^\beta = O_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)}(1)$ if for all $\delta > 0$ there is an $M > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\beta > 0, n \in \mathbb{N}} P(|X_n^\beta| > M) \leq \delta.$$

Note that the condition $X_n^\beta = o_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)}(1)$ is significantly weaker than assuming that $\sup_{\beta > 0} |X_n^\beta| = o_p(1)$, which would often prove to be a prohibitively strong assumption in many settings.

Assumption 4 (Rates for g). *Suppose that the nuisance estimates $\hat{g}^\beta \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfy:*

$$\|\hat{g}^\beta - g_0^\beta\|_2^2 \triangleq \mathbb{E}_X \left[\|\hat{g}^\beta(X) - g_0^\beta(X)\|_2^2 \right] = o_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)} \left(n^{-1/2} \right). \quad (\text{Consistency Rate})$$

Assumption 5 (Equicontinuity). *Suppose that β grows at rate such that the moment m satisfies the stochastic equicontinuity conditions:*

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} \left\| A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (A_n(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_n(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta)) \right\|_{op} &= o_p(1) \\ \sqrt{n} \left\| V(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - V(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (V_n(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - V_n(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta)) \right\|_2 &= o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Assumption 6 (Regularity). *Assume that $A_*(g_0, h_0)^{-1}$ exists, that for any $j, k \leq p$*

$$\sup_{\beta > 0} \|\theta_0^\beta\|_2, \sup_{\beta > 0} \|a_{\beta, j, k}(Z, g_0^\beta, h_0)\|_{L_1}, \sup_{\beta > 0} \|\nu_{\beta, j, k}(Z, g_0^\beta, h_0)\|_{L_1} < \infty. \quad (40)$$

Moreover, assume that for any $i, j \in [p] \times [p]$, the random variables $(a_{\beta, i, j}(Z; g_0, h_0))_{i, j}$ has bounded variances. Moreover, assume that for any $g, g' \in \mathcal{G}$:

$$\sup_{\beta > 0} \|A(g, h_0; \beta) - A(g', h_0; \beta)\|_{op} = O(\|g - g'\|_2). \quad (41)$$

Theorem 6. *Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, if the nuisance parameter estimate \hat{h} is asymptotically linear with some influence function f_h such that $\mathbb{E}[f_h(Z_i)] = 0$:*

$$\hat{h} - h_0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_h(Z_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \quad (\text{Asymptotic Linearity of } \hat{h})$$

then the parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}^\beta$ is asymptotically linear around θ_0^β :

$$\sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_{\theta, \beta}(Z_i) + o_p(1) \quad (42)$$

with influence function:

$$\rho_{\theta, \beta}(Z) := -A_*(g_0, h_0)^{-1} (m_*(Z; \theta_0, g_0, h_0) + \mathbb{E}[J_*(Z; h_0)]' f_h(Z)) \quad (43)$$

Remark 3. *Note here if we instead exploit a cross-fitting approach which trains \hat{g}^β and \hat{h} on one half of the entire dataset while evaluating the empirical moment on the other half of the data, the theorem still applies. More specifically, we can split the entire dataset $S := [n]$ into two disjoint sets S_1 and S_2 where without loss of generality let $|S_1| = |S_2| = \frac{n}{2}$. Then consider cross-fitted estimator $\hat{\theta}^\beta$ obtained where \hat{h} and \hat{g}^β have been trained on one split of the data while the empirical moments have been trained on the other. That is, suppose the estimator satisfies*

$$\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i \in S_1} m_\beta(Z_i; \hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}_{(2)}^\beta, \hat{h}_{(2)}) + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i \in S_2} m_\beta(Z_i; \hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, \hat{h}_{(1)}) = o_p(n^{-1/2}), \quad (44)$$

where we let the estimators trained on split l be $\hat{h}_{(l)}$ and $\hat{g}_{(l)}^\beta$, for $l = 1, 2$. Then all of $\hat{h}_{(1)}$, $\hat{h}_{(2)}$, $\hat{\theta}^\beta$ will be asymptotically linear with the same corresponding influence function as stated in Theorem 6, given accordingly adjusted conditions where we replace the entire dataset with the corresponding data splits.

8 Instantiating Asymptotic Linearity Theorem to Dynamic Treatment Regime Setting

Our goal in this section is to apply Theorem 6 to the problem of estimating the first period structural parameter θ_0 of the blip function that corresponds to the optimal regime. Note that estimating θ_0 falls exactly into the framework of the previous section, with θ_0 being the first period structural parameter, h being the second period structural parameter

ψ_0 and g_0^β being the first period nuisance functions $g_0^\beta := (q^*, p_1^*, p_{2,\beta}^*)$. Finally, the moment function is the moment m_β presented in Equation (18) and the quantities $a_\beta(Z; g, h)$ and $\nu_\beta(Z; g, h)$ correspond to:

$$a_\beta(Z; \psi, g) := (\mu(T_1, S) - p_1(S)) (\mu(T_1, S) - p_1(S))' \quad (45)$$

$$\nu_\beta(Z; \psi, g) := (Y - \psi' \phi(T_2, X) + \text{smax}_{\tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}}^\beta \psi' \phi(\tau_2, X) - q(S) + p_2(S)) (\mu(T_1, S) - p_1(S)) \quad (46)$$

Thus to apply Theorem 6, we need to show that all Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 are satisfied, under the conditions of our main Theorem 1. We present Lemmas verifying each of these assumptions and conclude with a corollary that is an instantiation of Theorem 6 to the problem of estimating the first period structural parameter θ_0 . For proofs that we present in this section, we will drop all data split indices for the cross-fitting approach for simplicity.

Lemma 7 (Verifying Assumption 1: Influence of ψ). *Under the conditions of Theorem 1, we have that Assumption 1 is satisfied for the problem of estimating the first period structural parameter. Moreover, the limit J_* is of the form:*

$$J_* = \mathbb{E}[(\phi_\infty(X) - \phi(T_2, X)) \tilde{M}'] \quad (47)$$

where if we denote $\mathcal{M}(X) := \{\tau : \psi'_0 \phi(\tau, X) = \max_t \psi'_0 \phi(t, X)\}$,

$$\phi_\infty(X) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}(X)|} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{M}(X)} \phi(\tau, X). \quad (48)$$

We will highlight the proof of Lemma 7 in Section 9.

Lemma 8 (Verifying Assumption 2: Limits of β). *Under the conditions of Theorem 1, we have that Assumption 2 is satisfied for the problem of estimating the first period structural parameter, with limit functions:*

$$m_*(Z; \theta, \psi, g) := (\epsilon_1(\theta, \psi) - q(S) + p_2(S) + \theta' p_1(S)) (\mu(T_1, S) - p_1(S)) \quad (49)$$

$$A_*(\psi, g) := \mathbb{E}[(\mu(T_1, S) - p_1(S)) (\mu(T_1, S) - p_1(S))'] \quad (50)$$

where $\epsilon_1(\theta, \psi)$ is defined in Equation (12).

Proof. Note that for any Z we have that $m_\beta(Z, \theta_0, g_0, h_0)$, converges as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ to the original moment with the maximum instead of the softmax, simply because the softmax converges to the max as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. $\text{smax}_{\tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}}^\beta \psi' \phi(\tau_2, X) \rightarrow \max_{\tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}} \psi' \phi(\tau_2, X)$. Moreover, note that in this case the quantity a_β is independent of β , thus the second property in Assumption 2 is trivially satisfied. \square

Lemma 9 (Verifying Assumption 3: Orthogonality in g). *Under the conditions of Theorem 1, we have that Assumption 2 is satisfied for the problem of estimating the first period structural parameter.*

We will provide a proof of Lemma 8 in Appendix F.

Lemma 10 (Verifying Assumption 4: Rates for g). *Under the conditions of Theorem 1, we have that Assumption 4 is satisfied for the problem of estimating the first period structural parameter.*

This implication is immediate. Note that here the $o(n^{-1/4})$ consistency rate condition for the nuisance function $\hat{p}_{2,\beta}$ is not exactly requiring a $o(n^{-1/4})$ consistency rate for the algorithm used to estimate the nuisance $p_{2,\beta}^*$. This is because $p_{2,\beta}^*(S) = p_{2,\beta,\psi_0}^*(S) = \mathbb{E}[\psi'_0(\phi(T_2, X) - \phi_{\beta,\psi_0}(X) \mid S)]$ is a function of the unknown estimand ψ_0 , while $\hat{p}_{2,\beta} = \hat{p}_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}$ uses $\hat{\psi}$ in place of ψ_0 in the regression algorithm. We will present a lemma in Section 10.3 that states that the consistency rate condition $\|\hat{p}_{2,\beta} - p_{2,\beta}^*\|_2 = o_{p,\text{unif}(\beta)}(n^{-1/4})$ is in fact implied by a uniform consistency rate of the regression algorithm itself. We will provide a proof for the lemma in Appendix G.

Lemma 11 (Verifying Assumption 5: Equicontinuity). *Under the conditions of Theorem 1, we have that Assumption 5 is satisfied for the problem of estimating the first period structural parameter.*

In Section 10, we will establish that when the nuisance function space is of low statistical complexity or when we use the cross-fitted estimation approach, we will automatically have that stochastic equicontinuity holds, and hence Lemma 11 holds.

Lemma 12 (Verifying Assumption 6: Regularity). *Under the conditions of Theorem 1, we have that Assumption 6 is satisfied for the problem of estimating the first period structural parameter.*

Proof. That $A_*(g_0, h_0)^{-1}$ exists follows immediately from the fact that $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{M}\tilde{M}']$ is strictly positive definite. The boundedness conditions in Assumption 6 follow from triangle inequality and our boundedness conditions listed in our main theorems. The bounded variances conditions naturally follow since $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{M}\tilde{M}']$ is bounded. The last condition in Assumption 6 follows from almost sure boundedness of \tilde{M} . \square

Corollary 13. *Suppose estimator $\hat{\psi}$ has influence function ρ_ψ*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\psi} - \psi_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\psi(Z_i) + o_p(1).$$

with $\mathbb{E}[\rho_\psi(Z)] = 0$. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1, the estimate $\hat{\theta}$ is asymptotically linear around θ_0^β :*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_{\theta, \beta}(Z_i) + o_p(1) \quad (51)$$

with influence function:

$$\rho_{\theta, \beta}(Z) := -\mathbb{E}[\tilde{M}\tilde{M}']^{-1} (m_*(Z; \theta_0, g_0, h_0) + J'_* \rho_\psi(Z)) \quad (52)$$

where m_* as defined in Equation (49) and J_* as defined in Equation (47).

9 Main Variance Lemma 7: Asymptotically Bounded Influence from Second Period

We need to verify that the functions $(\partial_\psi m_\beta(z, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot))$ are equicontinuous and that the expected gradient $\mathbb{E}[\partial_\psi m_\beta(Z; \theta_0^\beta, \psi_0, g_0^\beta)]$ converges to some finite limit as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ and, finally, that the expected absolute value of the derivative is uniformly in β bounded, i.e.

$$\sup_{\beta} \|\partial_\psi m_\beta(Z_1, \theta_0^\beta, \psi_0, g_0^\beta)\|_{L_1} < \infty, \quad a.s. \quad (53)$$

We note that ψ appears in the moment $m_\beta(Z; \theta, \psi, g)$ in a term of the form:

$$u_\beta(Z; \theta, \psi, g) = (\mu(T_1, S) - p_1(S)) (\text{smax}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}}^\beta \psi' \phi(\tau, X) - \psi' \phi(T_2, X)) \quad (54)$$

Thus to understand $\partial_\psi m_\beta$, we need to analyze the derivative of the softmax, with respect to the vector ψ . To express this derivative it helps to define the following notation for the weights that the softmax assigns to each treatment, i.e.

$$W_\tau^{\beta, \psi} := \frac{\exp\{\beta \psi' \phi(\tau, X)\}}{\sum_t \exp\{\beta \psi' \phi(t, X)\}} \quad (55)$$

And the shorthand notation for the softmax random variable:

$$V_{\beta, \psi} := \text{smax}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}}^\beta \psi' \phi(\tau, X) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^{\beta, \psi} \psi' \phi(\tau, X) \quad (56)$$

Then we will use throughout the following useful lemma:

Lemma 14 (Derivative of Softmax). *The derivative of the softmax $V_{\beta, \psi}(X)$ with respect to ψ is of the form:*

$$\partial_\psi V_{\beta, \psi} = \underbrace{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^{\beta, \psi} \phi(\tau, X)}_{A_{\beta, \psi} := \text{soft argmax of feature map}} + \underbrace{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^{\beta, \psi} \beta \psi' \phi(\tau, X) \left(\phi(\tau, X) - \sum_t W_t^{\beta, \psi} \phi(t, X) \right)}_{Q_{\beta, \psi} := \text{derivative of softmax weights}} \quad (57)$$

Proof. The proof follows by a simple chain rule of differentiation and numerical manipulations. \square

From this lemma we get that:

$$\partial_\psi m_\beta(Z; \theta, \psi, g) = (\mu(T_1, S) - p_1(S)) (A_{\beta, \psi} + Q_{\beta, \psi} - \phi(T_2, X))' \quad (58)$$

Our goal is to analyze the properties of this function. First note that the term $\|A_{\beta, \psi}\|_2$ is upper bounded by $\max_\tau \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2$. Second we show a similar upper bound for the quantity $Q_{\beta, \psi}$. In that respect it will be easy to re-write the derivative of the soft-max in a manner that is more amenable to analysis:

Lemma 15 (Re-writting $Q_{\beta, \psi}$). *Let $U_{\tau, \psi}^\beta = \beta\psi'\phi(\tau, X)$. Then we have:*

$$Q_{\beta, \psi} = \sum_\tau \phi(\tau, X) \sum_t (U_{\tau, \psi}^\beta - U_{t, \psi}^\beta) \frac{\exp\{U_{t, \psi}^\beta\} \exp\{U_{\tau, \psi}^\beta\}}{\left(\sum_t \exp\{U_{t, \psi}^\beta\}\right)^2} \quad (59)$$

Proof. For simplicity, let $U_\tau := \beta\psi'\phi(\tau, X)$ and $Q_\beta := Q_{\beta, \psi}$ and $W_\tau^\beta = W_{\tau, \psi}^{\beta, \psi}$. First we note that Q_β can be re-written in a more convenient manner for analysis, by simply re-arranging the sums and doing a change of variable names:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\beta &= \sum_\tau W_\tau^\beta U_\tau \left(\phi(\tau, X) - \sum_{\tau'} W_{\tau'}^\beta \phi(\tau', X) \right) \\ &= \sum_\tau W_\tau^\beta U_\tau \phi(\tau, X) - \sum_\tau W_\tau^\beta U_\tau \sum_{\tau'} W_{\tau'}^\beta \phi(\tau', X) \\ &= \sum_\tau W_\tau^\beta U_\tau \phi(\tau, X) - \sum_{\tau'} W_{\tau'}^\beta \phi(\tau', X) \sum_\tau W_\tau^\beta U_\tau \\ &= \sum_\tau W_\tau^\beta U_\tau \phi(\tau, X) - \sum_\tau W_\tau^\beta \phi(\tau, X) \sum_{\tau'} W_{\tau'}^\beta U_{\tau'} \\ &= \sum_\tau W_\tau^\beta \left(U_\tau - \sum_{\tau'} W_{\tau'}^\beta U_{\tau'} \right) \phi(\tau, X) \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the definition of the softmax weights W_τ^β we get:

$$\begin{aligned} J_\tau^\beta &:= W_\tau^\beta \left(U_\tau - \sum_{\tau'} W_{\tau'}^\beta U_{\tau'} \right) \\ &= \frac{\exp\{U_\tau\}}{\sum_t \exp\{U_t\}} \left(U_\tau - \sum_t \frac{U_t \exp\{U_t\}}{\sum_t \exp\{U_t\}} \right) = \sum_t (U_\tau - U_t) \frac{\exp\{U_t\} \exp\{U_\tau\}}{\left(\sum_t \exp\{U_t\}\right)^2} \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 16 (Boundedness of $Q_{\beta, \psi}$). *The quantity $Q_{\beta, \psi}$ is absolutely bounded as:*

$$\|Q_{\beta, \psi}\|_2 \leq \frac{K}{e} \sum_\tau \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \quad (60)$$

Proof. For simplicity, let $U_\tau := \beta\psi'\phi(\tau, X)$ and $Q_\beta := Q_{\beta,\psi}$ and $W_\tau^\beta = W_\tau^{\beta,\psi}$. We note that:

$$|J_\tau^\beta| := \left| \sum_t (U_\tau - U_t) \frac{\exp\{U_t\} \exp\{U_\tau\}}{(\sum_t \exp\{U_t\})^2} \right| \quad (61)$$

$$\leq \sum_t |U_\tau - U_t| \frac{\exp\{U_t\} \exp\{U_\tau\}}{(\sum_t \exp\{U_t\})^2} \quad (62)$$

$$\leq \sum_t |U_\tau - U_t| \frac{\exp\{U_t + U_\tau\}}{\exp\{2U_t\} + \exp\{2U_\tau\}} \quad (63)$$

$$\leq \sum_t |U_\tau - U_t| \frac{1}{\exp\{U_t - U_\tau\} + \exp\{U_\tau - U_t\}} \quad (64)$$

$$\leq \sum_t \frac{|U_\tau - U_t|}{\exp\{|U_t - U_\tau\}} \leq \frac{K}{e} \quad (65)$$

Thus we have:

$$\|Q_\beta\|_2 \leq \sum_\tau |J_\tau^\beta| \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \leq \frac{K}{e} \sum_\tau \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \quad (66)$$

□

Thus we get that the derivative $\partial_\psi m$ is lipschitz in p_1 with lipschitz constant:

$$2 \max_\tau \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 + \frac{K}{e} \sum_\tau \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 < C \quad (67)$$

for some universal constant C , by the assumptions of our main Theorem 1. Moreover, note that the gradient $\partial_\psi m_\beta$ is independent of θ . Thus we get that the gradient is equicontinuous in both θ and g , which is the first condition of Assumption 1. Moreover, by the aforementioned bounds we get that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_\psi m_\beta(Z; \theta_0^\beta, \psi, g_0^\beta)\|_\infty &= \|\tilde{M}(A_{\beta,\psi_0} + Q_{\beta,\psi_0} - \phi(T_2, X))'\|_\infty \leq \|\tilde{M}\|_\infty \|A_{\beta,\psi_0} + Q_{\beta,\psi_0} - \phi(T_2, X)\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|\tilde{M}\|_\infty C \leq C' \end{aligned}$$

by our assumption of our main Theorem 1 on the boundedness of $\|\tilde{M}\|_2$. Thus we get that the second condition of Assumption 1 is satisfied.

It remains to argue the limit behavior of $A_{\beta,\psi}$ and $Q_{\beta,\psi}$. Note that the first term $A_{\beta,\psi}$ in the derivative converges trivially, by the definition of the softmax to the feature map of the best action under ψ ; or a uniform distribution over the best actions if there are ties. Hence, this implies that as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$

$$A_{\beta,\psi} \rightarrow \frac{1}{|\arg \max_\tau \psi' \phi(\tau, X)|} \sum_{\tau^* \in \arg \max_\tau \psi' \phi(\tau, X)} \phi(\tau^*, X) =: \phi_\infty(X) \quad (68)$$

The second term is the problematic one, as it involves how the argmax changes as a function of ψ . However, we show that the second term converges to zero!

Lemma 17 (Key Variance Building Block). *The term $Q_{\beta,\psi}$ in the derivative of the softmax $\partial_\psi \phi_{\beta,\psi}(X)$, converges to zero, i.e. as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$:*

$$Q_{\beta,\psi} \rightarrow 0 \quad (69)$$

Proof. For simplicity, let $U_\tau := \beta\psi'\phi(\tau, X)$ and $Q_\beta := Q_{\beta,\psi}$ and $W_\tau^\beta = W_\tau^{\beta,\psi}$ and:

$$J_\tau^\beta := \sum_t (U_\tau - U_t) \frac{\exp\{U_t\} \exp\{U_\tau\}}{(\sum_t \exp\{U_t\})^2}$$

It suffices to show that:

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} |J_\tau^\beta| = 0$$

Since:

$$0 \leq |J_\tau^\beta| \leq \sum_t \frac{|U_\tau^\beta - U_t^\beta|}{\exp\{|U_t - U_\tau|\}} = \sum_t \frac{\beta |Z_\tau - Z_t|}{\exp\{\beta |Z_\tau - Z_t|\}} \quad (70)$$

where $Z_\tau = \psi' \phi(\tau, X)$. Since:

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta |U_\tau - U_t|}{\exp\{\beta |U_\tau - U_t|\}} = 0 \quad (71)$$

we get the desired statement that $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} |J_\tau^\beta| = 0$. \square

Thus we have shown that the gradient converges to the limit:

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \partial_\psi m_\beta(Z; \theta_0^\beta, \psi_0, g_0^\beta) = \tilde{M}(\phi(\pi_2^*(X), X) - \phi(T_2, X)) \quad (72)$$

and is uniformly upper bounded by a constant. Thus by the dominated convergence theorem we get that:

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\partial_\psi m_\beta(Z; \theta_0^\beta, \psi_0, g_0^\beta) \right] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{M}(\phi(\pi_2^*(X), X) - \phi(T_2, X))] \quad (73)$$

Thus we conclude that the third condition in Assumption 1 is satisfied, with:

$$J_* = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{M}(\phi(\pi_2^*(X), X) - \phi(T_2, X))] \quad (74)$$

Lemma 18 (Order of Hessian). *When β grows as $o(n^{1/2})$, the Hessian of each coordinate t of the moment vector m_β with respect to ψ , grows as:*

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} \left\| \partial_{\psi\psi} m_{\beta,t}(z; \hat{\theta}^\beta, \psi, \hat{g}^\beta) \right\|_{op} = o(n^{1/2}), \quad a.s. \quad (75)$$

Proof. Define for simplicity

$$K_\tau^{\beta,\psi} := \phi(\tau, X) - \sum_t W_t^{\beta,\psi} \phi(t, X) \quad (76)$$

and write

$$U_\tau^\psi := \beta \psi' \phi(\tau, X). \quad (77)$$

We calculate that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} W_\tau^{\beta,\psi} = \beta W_\tau^{\beta,\psi} \left(\phi(\tau, X) - \sum_t W_t^{\beta,\psi} \phi(t, X) \right) = \beta W_\tau^{\beta,\psi} K_\tau^{\beta,\psi}. \quad (78)$$

Recall that the first order derivative of the moment function satisfies

$$\partial_\psi m_{\beta,t}(z; \theta, \psi, g) = (\mu(T_1, S) - p_1(S)) (A_{\beta,\psi} + Q_{\beta,\psi} - \phi(T_2, X))' \quad (79)$$

$$= (\mu(T_1, S) - p_1(S)) \left(A_{\beta,\psi} + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^{\beta,\psi} U_\tau^\psi K_\tau^{\beta,\psi} - \phi(T_2, X) \right) \quad (80)$$

$$= (\mu(T_1, S) - p_1(S)) \left(A_{\beta,\psi} + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^{\beta,\psi} \left(U_\tau^\psi - \sum_t W_t^{\beta,\psi} U_t^\psi \right) K_\tau^{\beta,\psi} - \phi(T_2, X) \right), \quad (81)$$

where we were able to set in the last equality that

$$\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} U_{\tau}^{\psi} K_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} \left(U_{\tau}^{\psi} - \sum_t W_t^{\beta, \psi} U_t^{\psi} \right) K_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} \quad (82)$$

since

$$\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} K_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} = 0 \quad (83)$$

by exploiting the fact that $\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} = 1$. Hence, differentiating with respect to ψ again, by chain rule, we obtain that the second order derivative of the moment function

$$\partial_{\psi\psi} m_{\beta, t}(z; \theta, \psi, g) = (\mu_t(T_1, S) - p_{1, t}(S)) (R_{1, \beta, \psi} + R_{2, \beta, \psi} + R_{3, \beta, \psi} - R_{4, \beta, \psi}) \quad (84)$$

where

$$R_{1, \beta, \psi} := \beta \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} \phi(\tau, X) (K_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi})' \quad (85)$$

$$R_{2, \beta, \psi} := \beta \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} \left(U_{\tau}^{\psi} - \sum_t W_t^{\beta, \psi} U_t^{\psi} \right) K_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} (K_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi})' \quad (86)$$

$$R_{3, \beta, \psi} := \beta \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} K_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} (K_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi})' \quad (87)$$

$$R_{4, \beta, \psi} := \beta \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} \left(U_{\tau}^{\psi} - \sum_t W_t^{\beta, \psi} U_t^{\psi} \right) \right) \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} \phi(\tau, X) (K_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi})' \right). \quad (88)$$

We would like to establish that all of

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} \|R_{1, \beta, \psi}\|_{op}, \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} \|R_{2, \beta, \psi}\|_{op}, \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} \|R_{3, \beta, \psi}\|_{op}, \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} \|R_{4, \beta, \psi}\|_{op} = O_p(\beta). \quad (89)$$

To achieve this, it suffices to show that for any coordinates $j, k \leq n$, we have that each component

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} |R_{1, \beta, \psi, j, k}|, \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} |R_{2, \beta, \psi, j, k}|, \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} |R_{3, \beta, \psi, j, k}|, \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} |R_{4, \beta, \psi, j, k}| = O_p(\beta). \quad (90)$$

For $R_{1, \beta, \psi}$, we note that

$$|R_{1, \beta, \psi, j, k}| \leq \beta \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} \cdot |\phi_j(\tau, X)| \cdot |K_{\tau, k}^{\beta, \psi}| \leq \beta \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \right)^2 \quad (91)$$

where we have used the fact that

$$|K_{\tau, k}^{\beta, \psi}| \leq \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |\phi_k(\tau, X)| \leq \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2. \quad (92)$$

Hence, we have that

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} |R_{1, \beta, \psi, j, k}| \leq \beta \left(\sup_X \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \right)^2 = O_p(\beta) \quad (93)$$

by boundedness conditions. For $R_{2, \beta, \psi}$, we similarly note that

$$|R_{2, \beta, \psi, j, k}| \leq \beta \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_{\tau}^{\beta, \psi} \cdot \left| U_{\tau}^{\psi} - \sum_t W_t^{\beta, \psi} U_t^{\psi} \right| \cdot |K_{\tau, j}^{\beta, \psi}| \cdot |K_{\tau, k}^{\beta, \psi}|. \quad (94)$$

Now we comment that

$$W_\tau^{\beta,\psi} \cdot \left| U_\tau^\psi - \sum_t W_t^{\beta,\psi} U_t^\psi \right| = |J_\tau^{\beta,\psi}| \quad (95)$$

where

$$J_\tau^{\beta,\psi} := W_\tau^{\beta,\psi} \left(U_\tau^\psi - \sum_t W_t^{\beta,\psi} U_t^\psi \right), \quad (96)$$

and we have shown in Eqn (65) that

$$|J_\tau^{\beta,\psi}| \leq \frac{K}{e}. \quad (97)$$

Hence, by Eqn (92) we get that

$$|R_{2,\beta,\psi,j,k}| \leq \beta \cdot \frac{K}{e} \cdot \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |K_{\tau,j}^{\beta,\psi}| \cdot |K_{\tau,k}^{\beta,\psi}| \leq \beta \cdot \frac{K^2}{e} \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \right)^2. \quad (98)$$

Hence, we have that

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} |R_{2,\beta,\psi,j,k}| \leq \beta \cdot \frac{K^2}{e} \left(\sup_X \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \right)^2 = O_p(\beta) \quad (99)$$

by boundedness conditions. Similarly for $R_{3,\beta,\psi}$, we have

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} |R_{3,\beta,\psi,j,k}| \leq \beta \left(\sup_X \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \right)^2 = O_p(\beta). \quad (100)$$

For $R_{4,\beta,\psi}$, we note that

$$|R_{4,\beta,\psi,j,k}| \leq \beta \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} J_\tau^{\beta,\psi} \right) \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^{\beta,\psi} \cdot |\phi_j(\tau, X)| \cdot |K_{\tau,k}^{\beta,\psi}| \right) = O_p(\beta). \quad (101)$$

By invoking Eqn (65) and Eqn (92), we have that

$$|R_{4,\beta,\psi,j,k}| \leq \beta \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} J_\tau^{\beta,\psi} \right) \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^{\beta,\psi} \cdot |\phi_j(\tau, X)| \cdot |K_{\tau,k}^{\beta,\psi}| \right) \quad (102)$$

$$\leq \beta \cdot \frac{K^2}{e} \cdot \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \right)^2 = O_p(\beta). \quad (103)$$

Hence, we obtain that

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \psi} |R_{4,\beta,\psi,j,k}| \leq \beta \cdot \frac{K^2}{e} \cdot \left(\sup_X \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \right)^2 = O_p(\beta). \quad (104)$$

Hence, provided that $\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}, g} |\mu_t(T_1, S) - \hat{p}_{1,t}(S)|$ is uniformly bounded, a.s., for $\beta = o(n^{1/2})$ the lemma follows. \square

10 Proof Outlines for Further High Level Assumptions

10.1 Verifying Lemma 5: Small Critical Radius Implies Stochastic Equicontinuity

In this section, we show that the assumptions in Theorem 1 suffice to imply stochastic equicontinuity (Assumption 5). To achieve this, we first present a general lemma claiming that small critical radius would imply equicontinuity in the general setting of Section 7, and then we will verify that our special instantiation of dynamic treatment regime in Theorem 1 falls under the scope of the general lemma, by commenting on the uniform lipschitz requirement in the following lemma.

Lemma 19. *Assume that function $a_\beta(Z; g, h_0)$ is uniformly Lipschitz with respect to $g(X)$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}$ over all $\beta > 0$. Assume that the nuisance estimator is almost surely bounded: $\|\hat{g}^\beta(X)\|_2 \leq B$ a.s. for some $B > 0$. Let δ_n bounds the critical radius of $\mathcal{G}_B := \{g \in \mathcal{G} : \|g\|_2 \leq B \text{ a.s.}\}$. Then if the nuisance estimator \hat{g}^β satisfies the consistency rate*

$$\|\hat{g}^\beta - g_0^\beta\|_2 = o_p(n^{-1/4})$$

and if

$$\delta_n = o_p(n^{-1/4}),$$

we have that stochastic equicontinuity conditions hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (a_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}^\beta, h_0) - a_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \right\} \right\|_{op} &= o_p(1) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ V(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - V(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (\nu_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}^\beta, h_0) - \nu_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \right\} \right\|_2 &= o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we only prove the first statement here, and similar proofs should apply to when we switch data splits and apply to function ν . For the first statement, it suffices to show that for any $j, k \leq p$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ A_{j,k}(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_{j,k}(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (a_{\beta,j,k}(Z_i; \hat{g}^\beta, h_0) - a_{\beta,j,k}(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \right\} \right| = o_p(1) \quad (106)$$

In the remainder of the proof we look at a particular (j, k) and hence for simplicity we overload notation and we let $a_\beta := a_{\beta,j,k}$ and $A := A_{j,k}$. For any $\zeta \in (0, 1)$, let $\delta_{n,\zeta} := \delta_n + c_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log(c_1/\zeta)}{n}}$, where δ_n upper bounds the critical radius of function class \mathcal{G}_B , for some appropriately defined universal constants c_0 and c_1 . By Lemma 8 of [4], we know that with probability $1 - \zeta$: $\forall g \in \mathcal{G}_B$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (a_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}^\beta, h_0) - a_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \right) \right| \leq O(\delta_{n,\zeta} \cdot \|\hat{g}^\beta - g_0^\beta\|_2 + \delta_{n,\zeta}^2). \quad (107)$$

Taking $\zeta = \frac{1}{n}$, we obtain that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (a_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}^\beta, h_0) - a_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \right) \right| \leq O_p(\delta_{n,*} \cdot \|\hat{g}^\beta - g_0^\beta\|_2 + \delta_{n,*}^2). \quad (108)$$

where we let $\delta_{n,*} = \delta_n + c_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log(c_1 n)}{n}}$. Hence, if we have $\hat{g}^\beta - g_0^\beta = o_p(n^{-1/4})$ and $\delta_n = o_p(n^{-1/4})$, and thus $\delta_{n,*} = o_p(n^{-1/4})$, we can conclude stochastic equicontinuity. \square

Remark 4. *Our dynamic treatment regime satisfies the uniform Lipschitz condition because of the almost sure boundedness of $\mu(T_1, S)$ and that of the nuisance estimates.*

10.2 Verifying Lemma 5: Sample Splitting Approach Gives Stochastic Equicontinuity

In this section, we directly present a general lemma claiming that performing cross fitting would automatically imply a cross-fitted version of equicontinuity (Assumption 5) in the general setting of Section 7. Then it will naturally follow that our cross-fitting approach in Theorem 3 guarantees the cross-fitted version of Assumption 5.

Lemma 20. *Assume that the estimators are consistent for the sequence of $\beta = \beta_n$ that we choose:*

$$\|\hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta - g_0^\beta\|_2 = o_p(1) \quad (109)$$

$$\|\hat{g}_{(2)}^\beta - g_0^\beta\|_2 = o_p(1). \quad (110)$$

and that the nuisance estimates are almost surely bounded:

$$\|\hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta(X)\|_2, \|\hat{g}_{(2)}^\beta(X)\|_2 < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

Assume the moment function satisfies mean-squared continuity condition: for all $j, k \leq p$, for all $g, g' \in \mathcal{G}$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(a_{\beta,j,k}(Z_i; g, h_0) - a_{\beta,j,k}(Z_i; g', h_0))^2 \right] \leq L \cdot \|g - g'\|_2^q \quad (111)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\nu_{\beta,j}(Z_i; g, h_0) - \nu_{\beta,j}(Z_i; g', h_0))^2 \right] \leq L \cdot \|g - g'\|_2^q \quad (112)$$

for some $q < \infty$ and $L > 0$. Then the following stochastic equicontinuity statements hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i \in S_2} \left\{ A(\hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (a_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0) - a_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \right\} \right\|_{op} &= o_p(1) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i \in S_1} \left\{ A(\hat{g}_{(2)}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (a_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}_{(2)}^\beta, h_0) - a_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \right\} \right\|_{op} &= o_p(1) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i \in S_2} \left\{ V(\hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - V(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (\nu_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0) - \nu_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \right\} \right\|_2 &= o_p(1) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i \in S_1} \left\{ V(\hat{g}_{(2)}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - V(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (\nu_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}_{(2)}^\beta, h_0) - \nu_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \right\} \right\|_2 &= o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we only prove the first statement here, and similar proofs should apply to when we switch data splits and apply to function ν . For the first statement, it suffices to show that for any $j, k \leq p$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i \in S_2} \left\{ A_{j,k}(\hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_{j,k}(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (a_{\beta,j,k}(Z_i; \hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0) - a_{\beta,j,k}(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \right\} \right\|_{L_2} = o(1) \quad (114)$$

In the remainder of the proof we look at a particular (j, k) and hence for simplicity we overload notation and we let $a_\beta := a_{\beta,j,k}$ and $A := A_{j,k}$. Moreover, for simplicity we denote for each $i \in S_2$:

$$K_i := A(\hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (a_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0) - a_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \quad (115)$$

Then if we take the square, for any $i, j \in S_2$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in S_2} K_i \right)^2 \right] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[K_i^2] + \frac{n-2}{4} \mathbb{E}[K_i K_j] \quad (116)$$

the first term can be bounded using mean-squared-continuity:

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[K_i^2] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(A(\hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (a_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0) - a_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \right)^2 \right] \quad (117)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(A(\hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) \right)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(a_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0) - a_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0) \right)^2 \right] \quad (118)$$

$$\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\left(a_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0) - a_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0) \right)^2 \right] \leq 2L \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta - g_0^\beta\|_2^q] = o(1), \quad (119)$$

where the second to last inequality exploits Jensen's inequality, and the last equality exploits dominated convergence theorem. Moreover, the second term can also be simplified using tower law:

$$\mathbb{E}[K_i K_j] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[K_i K_j | \{Z_l\}_{l \in S_1}]] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[K_i | \{Z_l\}_{l \in S_1}] \mathbb{E}[K_j | \{Z_l\}_{l \in S_1}]] = 0, \quad (120)$$

since conditional on the first data split, K_i and K_j are independent with zero means. Hence, we have indeed proved that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \sum_{i \in S_2} \left\{ A(\hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - (a_\beta(Z_i; \hat{g}_{(1)}^\beta, h_0) - a_\beta(Z_i; g_0^\beta, h_0)) \right\} \right\|_{L_2} = o(1). \quad (121)$$

□

10.3 Lemma 10: β -Uniform Rates on Nuisance Functions

Lemma 21. *Suppose that for some open neighborhood \mathcal{N} of ψ_0 in the nuisance space, for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, we have that $\phi(\tau, X)$ and $\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{N}} |\psi' \phi(\tau, X)|$ are uniformly bounded. Let $\hat{p}_{2,\beta,\psi}(S)$ denote the estimator for*

$$p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*(S) := \mathbb{E}[\psi'(\phi(T_2, X) - \phi_\beta(X)) | S].$$

Note that then our estimator $\hat{p}_{2,\beta} = \hat{p}_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}$. For any $\psi \in \mathcal{N}$, define

$$\|\hat{p}_{2,\beta,\psi} - p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*\|_2 := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_S \left[\left(\hat{p}_{2,\beta,\psi}(S) - p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*(S) \right)^2 \right]}.$$

Suppose that our estimation algorithm satisfies the following consistency condition: for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a neighborhood \mathcal{N} of ψ_0 :

$$\sup_{\beta > 0} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{N}} \|\hat{p}_{2,\beta,\psi} - p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon \cdot n^{-1/4} \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (122)$$

Then the consistency condition required of our estimator to achieve asymptotic normality,

$$\|\hat{p}_{2,\beta} - p_{2,\beta}^*\|_2^2 := \mathbb{E}_X \left[\|\hat{p}_{2,\beta}(S) - p_{2,\beta}^*(S)\|_2^2 \right] = o_{p,\text{unif}(\beta)} \left(n^{-1/2} \right), \quad (123)$$

will be satisfied.

References

- [1] Doron Blatt, Susan A Murphy, and Ji Zhu. A-learning for approximate planning. *Ann Arbor*, 1001:48109–2122, 2004.
- [2] Bibhas Chakraborty, Susan Murphy, and Victor Strehler. Inference for non-regular parameters in optimal dynamic treatment regimes. *Statistical methods in medical research*, 19(3):317–343, 2010.
- [3] Victor Chernozhukov, Whitney Newey, Rahul Singh, and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Adversarial estimation of riesz representers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00009*, 2020.
- [4] Dylan J Foster and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Orthogonal statistical learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.09036*, 2019.
- [5] Tuomas Haarnoja, Haoran Tang, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Reinforcement learning with deep energy-based policies. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1352–1361. PMLR, 2017.
- [6] Tuomas Haarnoja, Aurick Zhou, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Soft actor-critic: Off-policy maximum entropy deep reinforcement learning with a stochastic actor. In Jennifer Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1861–1870. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018.

- [7] Miguel A Hernán and James M Robins. Causal inference, 2010.
- [8] Nathan Kallus and Masatoshi Uehara. Statistically efficient off-policy policy gradients. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5089–5100. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020.
- [9] Nikos Karampatziakis, Paul Mineiro, and Aaditya Ramdas. Off-policy confidence sequences. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5301–5310. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021.
- [10] Greg Lewis and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Double/debiased machine learning for dynamic treatment effects via g-estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07285*, 2020.
- [11] Erica E. M. Moodie, Thomas S. Richardson, and David A. Stephens. Demystifying optimal dynamic treatment regimes. *Biometrics*, 63(2):447–455, 2007.
- [12] Susan A Murphy. Optimal dynamic treatment regimes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 65(2):331–355, 2003.
- [13] Ofir Nachum, Mohammad Norouzi, Kelvin Xu, and Dale Schuurmans. Bridging the gap between value and policy based reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [14] Emmanuel Rio. Moment inequalities for sums of dependent random variables under projective conditions. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 22(1):146–163, 2009.
- [15] James M Robins. Optimal structural nested models for optimal sequential decisions. In *Proceedings of the Second Seattle Symposium in Biostatistics: analysis of correlated data*, pages 189–326. Springer, 2004.
- [16] John Schulman, Xi Chen, and Pieter Abbeel. Equivalence between policy gradients and soft q-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.06440*, 2017.
- [17] Phillip J Schulte, Anastasios A Tsiatis, Eric B Laber, and Marie Davidian. Q-and a-learning methods for estimating optimal dynamic treatment regimes. *Statistical science: a review journal of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics*, 29(4):640, 2014.
- [18] Chengchun Shi, Shikai Luo, Yuan Le, Hongtu Zhu, and Rui Song. Statistically efficient advantage learning for offline reinforcement learning in infinite horizons. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–14, 2022.

A Characterization and Identification of Optimal Dynamic Policies

A.1 Characterization of Optimal Policy

By invoking the Markovianity of the policy and the conditional independencies implied by the intervention graphs, we can characterize the optimal dynamic policy as follows:

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi)} \right] = \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi)} \mid S \right] \right] = \max_{\pi_2} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{\pi_1} \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\tau_1, \pi_2)} \mid S \right] \right]$$

Thus the optimal first period policy is defined as:

$$\pi_1^*(S) = \max_{\pi_1} \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\tau_1, \pi_2^*)} \mid S \right].$$

Moreover, we can further write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{\pi_2} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{\tau_1} \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\tau_1, \pi_2)} \mid S \right] \right] &= \max_{\pi_2} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{\tau_1} \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\tau_1, \pi_2)} \mid T_1 = \tau_1, S \right] \right] \\
&= \max_{\pi_2} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{\tau_1} \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} \mid T_1 = \tau_1, S \right] \right] \\
&= \max_{\pi_2} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{\tau_1} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} \mid X, T_1, S \right] \mid T_1 = \tau_1, S \right] \right] \\
&= \max_{\pi_2} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{\tau_1} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} \mid X \right] \mid T_1 = \tau_1, S \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{\tau_1} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{\tau_2} \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \tau_2)} \mid X \right] \mid T_1 = \tau_1, S \right] \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the optimal second period policy is defined as

$$\pi_2^*(X) = \arg \max_{\tau_2} \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \tau_2)} \mid X \right].$$

A.2 Blip Effect Decomposition of Policy Improvement

The improvement that any counterfactual policy π brings, as compared to the observed policy, can be decomposed as the sum of a sequence of “improvements”

$$\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi)} - Y \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(T_1, T_2)} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(T_1, T_2)} \right]$$

We can further “center” each of the terms around a baseline treatment, typically 0 and write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(T_1, T_2)} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(T_1, 0)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, T_2)} - Y^{(T_1, 0)} \right] \\
\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(0, \pi_2)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(0, \pi_2)} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

The values of these various counterfactual random variables can also be easily depicted in a SWIG (Figure 2). We can further see easily from the intervention graphs that $Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} \perp\!\!\!\perp T_2 \mid X$ and $Y^{(T_1, 0)} \perp\!\!\!\perp T_2 \mid X$ and $Y^{(\pi_1, \pi_2)} \perp\!\!\!\perp T_1 \mid S$ and $Y^{(\pi_1, \pi_2)} \perp\!\!\!\perp T_1 \mid S$.




Figure 2: Various interventions graphs that appear in improvement decomposition terms.

We can use these conditional independencies to further put more structure in the aforementioned improvements. Invoking the tower law of expectations and the conditional independencies, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(T_1, 0)} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(T_1, 0)} \mid X \right] \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(T_1, 0)} \mid T_2 = \pi_2(X), X \right] \right] \\
\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, T_2)} - Y^{(T_1, 0)} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, T_2)} - Y^{(T_1, 0)} \mid T_2, X \right] \right] \\
\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(0, \pi_2)} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(0, \pi_2)} \mid S \right] \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(0, \pi_2)} \mid T_1 = \pi_1(S), S \right] \right] \\
\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(0, \pi_2)} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(0, \pi_2)} \mid T_1, S \right] \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we see that it suffices to estimate the conditional expectation functions:

$$\gamma_2(\tau_2, x) = \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, T_2)} - Y^{(T_1, 0)} \mid T_2 = \tau_2, X = x \right] \quad (124)$$

$$\gamma_1(\tau_1, s) = \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(T_1, \pi_2)} - Y^{(T_1, 0)} \mid T_1 = \tau_1, S = s \right] \quad (125)$$

Then we can write the improvement of any policy π as:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(\pi)} - Y \right] = \mathbb{E} [\gamma_1(\pi_1(S), S) - \gamma_1(T_1, S)] + \mathbb{E} [\gamma_2(\pi_2(X), X) - \gamma_2(T_2, X)] \quad (126)$$

B Proof of Lemma 5




Figure 3: Behavior of function $x \exp\{-x\}$.

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Suppose that β is large enough such that $\alpha := \frac{(1+\epsilon)\log(\beta)}{\beta} < c$ and such that $(1 + \epsilon) \log(\beta) \geq 1$. Then we remark that the following decomposition holds

$$\mathbb{E} [\beta^2 U \exp(-\beta U)] = \underbrace{\mathbb{E} [\beta^2 U \exp(-\beta U) \mathbb{1}\{0 < U \leq \alpha\}]}_{A_\beta} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} [\beta^2 U \exp(-\beta U) \mathbb{1}\{U > \alpha\}]}_{B_\beta}$$

We will successively upper bound each of the terms A_β and B_β . Firstly we remark that as $\frac{(1+\epsilon)\log(\beta)}{\beta} < c$ then by assumption we know that there is a constant $H < \infty$ such that the density of U is upper bounded by H in the region $(0, c)$. Then the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} A_\beta &:= \mathbb{E} [\beta^2 U \exp(-\beta U) \mathbb{1}\{0 < U \leq \alpha\}] \\ &\leq H \cdot \int_0^\alpha \beta^2 u \exp(-\beta u) du \\ &= H \int_0^{(1+\epsilon)\log \beta} v \exp(-v) dv && \text{(by a change of variable, } \beta u = v \text{ and } dv = \frac{1}{\beta} du) \\ &= H \int_0^\infty v \exp(-v) dv = H \end{aligned}$$

We now move on to bounding (B_β) . In this goal remark that when $U > \alpha := \frac{(1+\epsilon)\log \beta}{\beta}$, we have

$$\beta^2 U \exp(-\beta U) \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \beta^2 \alpha \exp(-\beta \alpha) = \beta^{-\epsilon} \cdot (1 + \epsilon) \log \beta,$$

where to obtain (a) we used the fact that the function $x \mapsto x \exp(-x)$ is decreasing for $x > 1$ (see Figure 3) and we assumed that β was large enough such that $(1 + \epsilon) \log(\beta) > 1$. Combining the two upper bounds yields the result. \square

C Proof of Lemma 4

Proof. For simplicity define

$$\tilde{Y} := Y - \mathbb{E}[Y | S] = Y - q^*(S),$$

and define

$$\tilde{\Phi}_\beta := \psi'_0(\phi(T_2, X) - \phi_\beta(X)) - \mathbb{E}[\psi'_0(\phi(T_2, X) - \phi_\beta(X)) | S] \quad (127)$$

$$= \psi'_0(\phi(T_2, X) - \phi_\beta(X)) - p_{2,\beta}^*(S). \quad (128)$$

Then by definition of θ_0^β and θ_0 we have

$$M(\theta_0^\beta, \psi_0, q^*, p_1^*, p_{2,\beta}^*; \beta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\tilde{Y} - \tilde{\Phi}_\beta \right) \tilde{M} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{M} \tilde{M}' \right] \theta_0^\beta = 0 \quad (129)$$

and

$$M(\theta_0, \psi_0, q^*, p_1^*, p_{2,\infty}^*; \infty) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\tilde{Y} - \tilde{\Phi}_\infty \right) \tilde{M} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{M} \tilde{M}' \right] \theta_0 = 0. \quad (130)$$

By subtracting the two we obtain that:

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{M} \tilde{M}'] \left(\theta_0^\beta - \theta_0 \right) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\tilde{\Phi}_\infty - \tilde{\Phi}_\beta \right) \tilde{M} \right]. \quad (131)$$

That is, we get that

$$\theta_0^\beta - \theta_0 = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{M} \tilde{M}']^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\psi'_0(\phi_\beta(X) - \phi_\infty(X)) \tilde{M} + (p_{2,\beta}^*(S) - p_{2,\infty}^*(S)) \tilde{M} \right]. \quad (132)$$

Now by the tower law, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(p_{2,\beta}^*(S) - p_{2,\infty}^*(S)) \tilde{M} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[(p_{2,\beta}^*(S) - p_{2,\infty}^*(S)) \mathbb{E}[\tilde{M} | S] \right] = 0, \quad (133)$$

Hence, we obtain that

$$\theta_0^\beta - \theta_0 = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{M} \tilde{M}']^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\psi'_0(\phi_\beta(X) - \phi_\infty(X)) \tilde{M} \right] \quad (134)$$

Note that $\psi'_0 \phi_\beta(X) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^\beta U_\tau$ and that $\psi'_0 \phi_\infty(X) = \max_\tau U_\tau = U_{\max}$. Thus we have:

$$\theta_0^\beta - \theta_0 = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{M} \tilde{M}']^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{M} \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^\beta U_\tau - U_{\max} \right) \right] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{M} \tilde{M}']^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{M} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^\beta (U_\tau - U_{\max}) \right].$$

where we used the simple fact that $\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^\beta = 1$ in the last equality. Since we assumed that $\|\tilde{M}\|_2$ is uniformly bounded a.s., and that the covariance matrix $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{M} \tilde{M}']$ is well-posed, we have that for some constant c :

$$\left| \theta_0^\beta - \theta_0 \right| \leq c \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^\beta (U_\tau - U_{\max}) \right| \right] \leq c \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} W_\tau^\beta |U_\tau - U_{\max}| \right] = c \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E} [W_\tau^\beta |U_\tau - U_{\max}|]$$

Finally, note that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [W_\tau^\beta |U_\tau - U_{\max}|] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\exp\{\beta U_\tau\} (U_{\max} - U_\tau)}{\sum_t \exp\{\beta U_t\}} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\exp\{\beta U_\tau\} (U_{\max} - U_\tau)}{\exp\{\beta U_{\max}\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\exp\{-\beta(U_{\max} - U_\tau)\} (U_{\max} - U_\tau)] \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 5, we have that for n sufficiently large, such that $\frac{(1+\epsilon)\log(\beta)}{\beta} \leq c$ and $(1+\epsilon)\log(\beta) \geq 1$:

$$\mathbb{E} [\exp\{-\beta(U_{\max} - U_\tau)\} (U_{\max} - U_\tau)] \leq \frac{H}{\beta^2} + \frac{(1+\epsilon)\log(\beta)}{\beta^{2+\epsilon}} \quad (135)$$

We therefore can conclude that

$$\sqrt{n} |\theta_0^\beta - \theta_0| \leq c|\mathcal{T}| \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}H}{\beta^2} + \frac{\sqrt{n}(1+\epsilon)\log(\beta)}{\beta^{2+\epsilon}} \right) \quad (136)$$

If $\beta = \omega(n^{1/4})$, then the latter upper bound converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. □

D Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. Firstly we remark that for all variables t we have $U_{\max} - U_t = \max_{s \in \mathcal{T}} (U_s - U_t) = \max \left(\max_{s \neq t} (U_s - U_t), 0 \right)$. Note that as the random variables $(U_t)_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ admit a joint density then for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$ the random variables $(U_s - U_t)_{\substack{s \in \mathcal{T} \\ s \neq t}}$ also admit a joint density. Therefore the real-valued random variable $\max_{s \neq t} (U_s - U_t)$ is a continuous random variable. This implies that $\left(\max_{s \neq t} (U_s - U_t) \right)^+$ admits a density on $(0, \infty)$. □

E Proof Theorem 6

Proof. By the linearity of the moment with respect to θ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \left(\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta \right) &= M(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - M(\theta_0^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \\ &= M(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - M(\theta_0^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \\ &\quad + M(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \\ &\quad + M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, \hat{h}; \beta) \\ &\quad + M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, \hat{h}; \beta) - M(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta). \end{aligned}$$

Note that by definition of $\hat{\theta}^\beta$ and of θ_0^β we have

$$M(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) = 0$$

and

$$M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, \hat{h}; \beta) = 0.$$

Therefore we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \left(\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta \right) &= M(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - M(\theta_0^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \\ &\quad + M(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \\ &\quad + M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, \hat{h}; \beta) \end{aligned}$$

We will analyze separately each term on the right-hand side. In this goal and for ease of notations, we write

$$I_{1,n} := M(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - M(\theta_0^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \quad (137)$$

$$I_{2,n} := M(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \quad (138)$$

$$I_{3,n} := M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, \hat{h}; \beta). \quad (139)$$

We will prove that the terms $I_{1,n}$ is negligible and re-express the terms $I_{2,n}$ and $I_{3,n}$. Moreover, we remark that by assumption we have $\|A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_*(g_0, h_0)\|_{op} = o(1)$ for some limit function A_* , and hence by triangle inequality

$$\|A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_*(g_0, h_0)\|_{op} \quad (140)$$

$$\leq \|A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta)\|_{op} + \|A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_*(g_0, h_0)\|_{op} \quad (141)$$

$$= O_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)}(\|\hat{g}^\beta - g_0^\beta\|_2) + o(1) = o_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)}(1). \quad (142)$$

Therefore the following holds

$$A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \left(\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta \right) = A_*(g_0, h_0) \left(\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta \right) + \left(A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_*(g_0, h_0) \right) \left(\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta \right) \quad (143)$$

$$= A_*(g_0, h_0) \left(\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta \right) + o_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)} \left(\|\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta\|_2 \right). \quad (144)$$

Hence, we have

$$A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \left(\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta \right) = I_{1,n} + I_{2,n} + I_{3,n} + o_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)} \left(\|\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta\|_2 \right). \quad (145)$$

In the following, we analyze the asymptotic behaviors of $I_{1,n}, I_{2,n}, I_{3,n}$ separately, starting with $I_{1,n}$. By exploiting the Neyman orthogonality assumption and the Smoothness hypothesis, we obtain that:

$$M(\theta_0^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - M(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) \stackrel{(a)}{=} D_g M(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) [\hat{g}^\beta - g_0^\beta] + O_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)} \left(\|\hat{g}^\beta - g_0^\beta\|_2^2 \right) \quad (146)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} O_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)} \left(\|\hat{g}^\beta - g_0^\beta\|_2^2 \right) = o_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)}(n^{-1/2}). \quad (147)$$

where to get (a) we used the Smoothness condition and where to obtain (b) we used the Neyman orthogonality assumption. This implies that the first term $I_{1,n}$ is negligible meaning that

$$I_{1,n} = o_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)}(n^{-1/2}). \quad (148)$$

We now move on to analyzing $I_{2,n}$. In this goal, let $G_n(\theta, g, h; \beta) := M(\theta, g, h; \beta) - M_n(\theta, g, h; \beta)$. Then we remark that $I_{2,n}$ can be reformulated as

$$I_{2,n} = G_n \left(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta \right). \quad (149)$$

Now we decompose this empirical process into an asymptotically normal component and an asymptotically negligible part. To achieve this we use the shorthand notation:

$$G_n(\theta_0, g_0, h_0; \infty) := \mathbb{E}[m_*(Z; \theta_0, g_0, h_0)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m_*(Z_i; \theta_0, g_0, h_0) \quad (150)$$

Indeed we remark that

$$G_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) = G_n(\theta_0, g_0, h_0; \infty) + \left(G_n(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - G_n(\theta_0, g_0, h_0; \infty) \right) \quad (151)$$

$$+ \left(G_n(\theta_0^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - G_n(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) \right) \quad (152)$$

$$+ \left(G_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - G_n(\theta_0^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \right). \quad (153)$$

We analyze each one of those terms separately. Firstly we remark that the second term:

$$G_n(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - G_n(\theta_0, g_0, h_0; \infty)$$

is of the form:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ m_*(Z_i, \theta_0, g_0, h_0) - m_\beta(Z_i, \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) \right\} - \mathbb{E} \left[m_*(Z_i, \theta_0, g_0, h_0) - m_\beta(Z_i, \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) \right]$$

We easily remark that $(m_*(Z_i, \theta_0, g_0, h_0) - m_\beta(Z_i, \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0))$ is a sequence of i.i.d observations. Therefore by the Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund inequality [14] we obtain that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ m_*(Z_i, \theta_0, g_0, h_0) - m_\beta(Z_i, \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) \right\} - \mathbb{E} \left[m_*(Z_i, \theta_0, g_0, h_0) - m_\beta(Z_i, \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) \right] \right\|_{L_1} \quad (154)$$

$$\leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| m_*(Z_1, \theta_0, g_0, h_0) - m_\beta(Z_1, \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) \right\|_{L_1} = o_p(n^{-1/2}) \quad (155)$$

for some universal constant c , where to obtain the last identity we exploited the assumption that

$$m_\beta(Z_1, \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) - m_*(Z_1, \theta_0, g_0, h_0) = o_p(1) \quad (156)$$

and the dominated convergence theorem. Therefore as long as we take $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain that

$$G_n(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - G_n(\theta_0, g_0, h_0; \infty) = o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (157)$$

By the linearity of the moment, the last term in Equation (153) can be written as:

$$G_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - G_n(\theta_0^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) = (A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_n(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta))' (\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta). \quad (158)$$

Therefore to successfully upper-bound eq. (158) we need to upper bound $\|A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_n(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta)\|_{op}$. In this goal, note that by the triangle inequality, the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_n(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta)\|_{op} &\leq \|A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_n(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta)\|_{op} \\ &\quad + \left\| A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - \left(A_n(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_n(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) \right) \right\|_{op} \end{aligned} \quad (159)$$

We can prove that each term on the right-hand side of eq. (159) is negligible. In this goal, note that for all $j, k \leq p$ we have by the Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund inequality [14]

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \leq n} a_{\beta, j, k}(Z_i, g_0^\beta, h_0) - \mathbb{E}[a_{\beta, j, k}(Z_i, g_0^\beta, h_0)] \right\|_{L_1} \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \|a_{\beta, j, k}(Z_1, g_0^\beta, h_0)\|_{L_1} = o(1). \quad (160)$$

Therefore this directly implies that

$$\left\| A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_n(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) \right\|_{op} = o_{p, \text{unif}(\beta)}(1) \quad (161)$$

Moreover, for the sequence of β that we chose, according to our stochastic equicontinuity condition, we have that:

$$\left\| A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - \left(A_n(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_n(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) \right) \right\|_{op} = o_p(n^{-1/2}) = o_p(1).$$

Thus we get that $\|A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_n(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta)\|_{op} = o_p(1)$, and therefore:

$$G_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - G_n(\theta_0^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) = o_p(\|\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta\|_2). \quad (162)$$

Moreover, by using the triangle inequality, the definition of the operator norm, the condition that $\sup_{\beta > 0} \|\theta_0^\beta\|_2$ is finite; and the stochastic equicontinuity conditions we obtain that

$$\left\| G_n(\theta_0^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - G_n(\theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) \right\|_2 \quad (163)$$

$$\leq \left\| A(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - \left(A_n(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - A_n(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) \right) \right\|_{op} \|\theta_0^\beta\|_2 \quad (164)$$

$$+ \left\| V(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - V(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) - \left(V_n(\hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - V_n(g_0^\beta, h_0; \beta) \right) \right\|_2 \quad (165)$$

$$= o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (166)$$

Altogether, we obtain that

$$I_{2,n} = G_n(\theta_0, g_0, h_0; \infty) + o_p(n^{-1/2} + \|\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta\|_2).$$

Finally we want to analyze the term $I_{3,n}$. By the a second order Taylor expansion of each coordinate of the moment vector and our assumption on the Hessian of each coordinate of the moment vector, we have that

$$I_{3,n} = M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) - M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, \hat{h}; \beta) \quad (167)$$

$$= \left(\partial_h M_n(\hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0; \beta) \right)' (h_0 - \hat{h}) + o(\sqrt{n}) \|h_0 - \hat{h}\|_2^2. \quad (168)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_h m_\beta(Z_i; \hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0) \right)' (h_0 - \hat{h}) + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (169)$$

We will first show that $(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_h m_\beta(Z_i; \hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0))$ concentrates to a deterministic quantity. In this goal, by exploiting the uniform continuity in θ, g assumption we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_h m_\beta(Z_i; \hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_h m_\beta(Z_i; \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) + O_p(\|\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta\|_2) + o_{p,\text{unif}(\beta)}(1).$$

Moreover notice that the observations $(\partial_h m_\beta(Z_i; \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0))$ are i.i.d.. By the Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund inequality [14]:

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_h m_\beta(Z_i; \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) - \mathbb{E} \left(\partial_h m_\beta(Z_1; \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) \right) \right\|_{L_1} \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \partial_h m_\beta(Z_1; \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) \right\|_{L_1} \leq \frac{c'}{\sqrt{n}}$$

for some universal constants c, c' . Finally, by assumption, we have assumed that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\partial_h m_\beta(Z_1; \theta_0^\beta, g_0^\beta, h_0) \right) = J_* + o_\beta(1).$$

All of this combined together implies that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_h m_\beta(Z_i; \hat{\theta}^\beta, \hat{g}^\beta, h_0) = J_* + o_{p,\text{unif}(\beta)}(1) + O_p(\|\hat{\theta}_0^\beta - \theta_0^\beta\|).$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$I_{3,n} = -J_*'(\hat{h} - h_0) + O_p(\|h_0 - \hat{h}\|_2 \|\hat{\theta}_0^\beta - \theta_0^\beta\|_2) + o_p(n^{-1/2}) = -J_*'(\hat{h} - h_0) + o_p(n^{-1/2} + \|\hat{\theta}_0^\beta - \theta_0^\beta\|_2).$$

According to the asymptotic linearity assumption we know that

$$\hat{h} - h_0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_h(Z_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

This implies that

$$I_{3,n} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n J_*' f_h(Z_i) + o_{p,\text{unif}(\beta)}(n^{-1/2}) + o(\|\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta\|_2). \quad (170)$$

By combining the analysis of $I_{1,n}, I_{2,n}$, and $I_{3,n}$ together, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} A_*(g_0, h_0) (\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta) &= G_n(\theta_0, g_0, h_0, \infty) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n J_*' f_h(Z_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2} + \|\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta\|_2) \\ &= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (m_*(Z; \theta_0, g_0, h_0) + J_*' f_h(Z_i)) + o_p(n^{-1/2} + \|\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta\|_2). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption the matrix $A_*(g_0, h_0)$ is invertible and therefore we obtain that

$$(\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta) = -A_*(g_0, h_0)^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (m_*(Z; \theta_0, g_0, h_0) + J_*' f_h(Z_i)) \right] + o_p(n^{-1/2} + \|\hat{\theta}^\beta - \theta_0^\beta\|_2).$$

The desired result immediately follows. \square

F Proof of Lemma 8: Verifying Neyman Orthogonality

Proof. To prove Neyman orthogonality it suffices to show that if we view the moment function as a function of the output of each nuisance function, then the derivative with respect to that finite dimensional vector output, conditional on the variables that correspond to the input of each function is equal to zero. In other words if we write:

$$m_\beta(z; \theta, \psi, g) = \tilde{m}_\beta(Z; \theta, \psi, (q(S), p_1(S), p_{2,\beta}(S))) \quad (171)$$

then we need the function $\tilde{m}_\beta(z; \theta, \psi, \gamma)$ to satisfy:

$$J_g(S) := \mathbb{E}[\partial_\gamma \tilde{m}(Z; \theta_0^\beta, \psi_0, g_0^\beta(S)) \mid S] = 0 \quad (172)$$

We verify this property for each component $g = (q, p_1, p_{2,\beta})$ and each coordinate t of the moment vector separately: for $t' \neq t$

$$\begin{aligned} J_{q,t}(S) &= \mathbb{E}[-(\mu_t(T_1, S) - p_{1,t}^*(S)) \mid S] = 0 \\ J_{p_{1,t'},t}(S) &= \mathbb{E}\left[(\mu_t(T_1, S) - p_{1,t}^*(S)) \theta_{0,t'}^\beta \mid S\right] = 0 \\ J_{p_{1,t},t}(S) &= \mathbb{E}\left[-(\epsilon_1^\beta(\theta_0^\beta, \psi_0) - q^*(S) + p_{2,\beta}^*(S) + (\theta_0^\beta)^\top p_1^*(S)) + (\mu_t(T_1, S) - p_{1,t}^*(S)) \theta_{0,t}^\beta \mid S\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[-\left(\epsilon_1^\beta(\theta_0^\beta, \psi_0) - \mathbb{E}\left[\epsilon_1^\beta(\theta_0^\beta, \psi_0) \mid S\right]\right) + (\mu_t(T_1, S) - p_{1,t}^*(S)) \theta_{0,t}^\beta \mid S\right] = 0 \\ J_{p_{2,\beta},t}(S) &= \mathbb{E}[\mu(T_1, S) - p_1^*(S) \mid S] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the smoothness part, it suffices to bound the operator norm of the conditional Hessian, for each coordinate of the moment:

$$H_{g,t}(S) := \mathbb{E}[\partial_{\gamma\gamma} \tilde{m}_t(Z; \theta_0^\beta, \psi_0, g_0^\beta(S)) \mid S] \quad (173)$$

We analyze each block of the Hessian separately: for $t' \neq t$

$$H_{q,q,t}(S) = 0, \quad H_{q,p_{t'},t}(S) = 0, \quad H_{q,p_t,t}(S) = 1, \quad H_{q,p_{2,\beta},t}(S) = 0 \quad (174)$$

$$H_{p_{t'},p_{t'},t}(S) = 0, \quad H_{p_{t'},p_t,t}(S) = -\theta_{0,t'}^\beta, \quad H_{p_{t'},p_{2,\beta},t}(S) = 0 \quad (175)$$

$$H_{p_t,p_t,t}(S) = -2\theta_{0,t}^\beta, \quad H_{p_t,p_{2,\beta},t}(S) = -1 \quad (176)$$

$$H_{p_{2,\beta},p_{2,\beta},t}(S) = 0 \quad (177)$$

Since we assumed that $\sup_\beta \|\theta_0^\beta\|_2 < \infty$ is bounded and the dimension d is a constant, we get that the conditional Hessian, is uniformly in β , upper bounded by a constant. Thus we get the uniform in β smoothness property. \square

G Proof of Lemma 21

Proof. Note that by triangle inequality we can decompose

$$\|\hat{p}_{2,\beta} - p_{2,\beta}^*\|_2 \quad (178)$$

$$= \left\| \left(\hat{p}_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}} - p_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}^* \right) + \left(p_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}^* - p_{2,\beta,\psi_0}^* \right) \right\|_2 \quad (179)$$

$$= \left\| \hat{p}_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}} - p_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}^* \right\|_2 + \left\| p_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}^* - p_{2,\beta,\psi_0}^* \right\|_2. \quad (180)$$

Now by our assumptions, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a neighborhood \mathcal{N} of ψ_0 such that

$$\sup_{\beta > 0} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{N}} \|\hat{p}_{2,\beta,\psi} - p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon \cdot n^{-1/4} \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad (181)$$

which then implies that

$$\sup_{\beta>0} \mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{p}_{2,\beta} - p_{2,\beta}^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon \cdot n^{-1/4} \right) \quad (182)$$

$$\leq \sup_{\beta>0} \mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{p}_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}} - p_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon \cdot n^{-1/4} \right) + \sup_{\beta>0} \mathbb{P} \left(\|p_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}^* - p_{2,\beta,\psi_0}^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon \cdot n^{-1/4} \right) \quad (183)$$

$$\leq \sup_{\beta>0} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{N}} \|\hat{p}_{2,\beta,\psi} - p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon \cdot n^{-1/4} \right) + \sup_{\beta>0} \mathbb{P} \left(\|p_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}^* - p_{2,\beta,\psi_0}^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon \cdot n^{-1/4} \right) \quad (184)$$

$$= \sup_{\beta>0} \mathbb{P} \left(\|p_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}^* - p_{2,\beta,\psi_0}^*\|_2 \geq \epsilon \cdot n^{-1/4} \right) + o(1) \quad (185)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now by Mean Value Theorem, we have that

$$\|p_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}^* - p_{2,\beta,\psi_0}^*\|_2^2 = \mathbb{E}_S \left[\left(p_{2,\beta,\hat{\psi}}^*(S) - p_{2,\beta,\psi_0}^*(S) \right)^2 \right] \quad (186)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_S \left[\left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*(S) \Big|_{\psi=\bar{\psi}} \right)' (\hat{\psi} - \psi_0) \right)^2 \right] \text{ for some } \bar{\psi} \text{ between } \hat{\psi} \text{ and } \psi_0. \quad (187)$$

Here

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*(S) \quad (188)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\phi(T_2, X) - \phi_{\beta,\psi}(X) - \sum_{\tau} \psi' \phi(\tau, X) \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} W_{\tau}^{\beta,\psi} \Big| S \right) \right] \quad (189)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\phi(T_2, X) - \phi_{\beta,\psi}(X) - \beta \sum_{\tau} \psi' \phi(\tau, X) W_{\tau}^{\beta,\psi} \left(\phi(\tau, X) - \sum_t W_t^{\beta,\psi} \phi(t, X) \right) \Big| S \right) \right], \quad (190)$$

where in the first equality, we could interchange differentiation with conditional expectation by uniform boundedness conditions. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we know that

$$\mathbb{E}_S \left[\left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*(S) \Big|_{\psi=\bar{\psi}} \right)' (\hat{\psi} - \psi_0) \right)^2 \right] \quad (191)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_S \left[\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*(S) \Big|_{\psi=\bar{\psi}} \right\|_2^2 \cdot \|\hat{\psi} - \psi_0\|_2^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}_S \left[\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*(S) \Big|_{\psi=\bar{\psi}} \right\|_2^2 \right] \cdot \|\hat{\psi} - \psi_0\|_2^2. \quad (192)$$

By Jensen's inequality and Tower Law, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_S \left[\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} p_{2,\beta,\psi}^*(S) \Big|_{\psi=\bar{\psi}} \right\|_2^2 \right] \quad (193)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_S \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\phi(T_2, X) - \phi_{\beta,\psi}(X)) - \beta \sum_{\tau} \psi' \phi(\tau, X) W_{\tau}^{\beta,\psi} \left(\phi(\tau, X) - \sum_t W_t^{\beta,\psi} \phi(t, X) \right) \right\|_2^2 \Big| S \right] \right] \quad (194)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_S \left[\left\| (\phi(T_2, X) - \phi_{\beta,\psi}(X)) - \beta \sum_{\tau} \psi' \phi(\tau, X) W_{\tau}^{\beta,\psi} \left(\phi(\tau, X) - \sum_t W_t^{\beta,\psi} \phi(t, X) \right) \right\|_2^2 \right] \quad (195)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_S \left[\left\| (\phi(T_2, X) - \phi_{\beta,\psi}(X)) - \beta \sum_{\tau} \left(\psi' \phi(\tau, X) - \sum_t \psi' \phi(t, X) \right) W_{\tau}^{\beta,\psi} \left(\phi(\tau, X) - \sum_t W_t^{\beta,\psi} \phi(t, X) \right) \right\|_2^2 \right] \quad (196)$$

$$\leq 2\mathbb{E}_S \left[\left(\sum_{\tau} \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \right)^2 + \left\| \beta \sum_{\tau} \left(\psi' \phi(\tau, X) - \sum_t \psi' \phi(t, X) \right) W_{\tau}^{\beta,\psi} \left(\phi(\tau, X) - \sum_t W_t^{\beta,\psi} \phi(t, X) \right) \right\|_2^2 \right] \quad (197)$$

$$\text{by triangle inequality and the fact } (a+b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2) \quad (198)$$

$$\leq 2\mathbb{E}_S \left[\left(\sum_{\tau} \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \right)^2 + |\mathcal{T}| \exp(-1) \left(\sum_{\tau} \|\phi(\tau, X)\|_2 \right)^2 \right] \quad (199)$$

$$= O_{p,\text{unif}(\beta)}(1). \quad (200)$$

Hence, we obtain that

$$\left\| p_{\beta,\hat{\psi}}^* - p_{\beta,\psi_0}^* \right\|_2 = O_{p,\text{unif}(\beta)}(n^{-1/2}) = o_{p,\text{unif}(\beta)}(n^{-1/4}).$$

Hence, indeed

$$\|\hat{p}_{2,\beta} - p_{2,\beta}^*\|_2 = o_{p,\text{unif}(\beta)}(n^{-1/4}).$$

□