

# Gibbs Sampling from Human Feedback: A Provable KL-constrained Framework for RLHF

Wei Xiong<sup>\*1</sup> Hanze Dong<sup>\*2</sup> Chenlu Ye<sup>\*2</sup> Han Zhong<sup>†2</sup> Nan Jiang<sup>1</sup> Tong Zhang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign <sup>2</sup>The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

## Abstract

This paper studies the theoretical framework of the alignment process of generative models with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF). We consider a standard mathematical formulation, the reverse-KL regularized contextual bandit for RLHF. Despite its widespread practical application, a rigorous theoretical analysis of this formulation remains open. We investigate its theoretical properties both in offline and online settings and propose efficient algorithms with finite-sample theoretical guarantees. Our work bridges the gap between theory and practice by linking our theoretical insights with existing practical alignment algorithms such as Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) and Rejection Sampling Optimization (RSO). Furthermore, these findings and connections also offer both theoretical and practical communities new tools and insights for future algorithmic design of alignment algorithms.

## 1 Introduction

*Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback* (RLHF) (Christiano et al., 2017; Ziegler et al., 2019) has emerged as a powerful paradigm to align modern generative models like Large Language Models (LLMs) and diffusion models with human values and preferences. This approach has shown significant effectiveness in applications such as ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2023), Claude (Anthropic, 2023), Bard (Google, 2023), and LLaMA2 (Touvron et al., 2023), by making the built AI system helpful, harmless, honest and controllable (Ouyang et al., 2022; Bai et al., 2022).

Despite its effectiveness, RLHF’s implementation often involves ad-hoc practices and extensive algorithmic tuning. This complexity arises from its three interconnected processes (Ouyang et al., 2022; Diao et al., 2023): human preference data collection, reward modeling, and reward optimization (refer to the conceptual illustration in Figure 1), each presenting unique challenges beyond traditional RL. For instance, the data collection often yields noisy and inconsistent preference data (Bansal et al., 2023), leading to mismatches between intended rewards and existing datasets. For reward modeling, due to such a distributional shift between data and target distribution, the statistical error is often not controllable, leading to bias and estimation error in the subsequent reward signals (Gao et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023c). For reward optimization, the prevalent DRL-based approach, PPO, lacks stability and efficiency compared to supervised learning (Choshen et al., 2019), and is sensitive to the hyper-parameter and code-level optimization (Engstrom et al., 2020), making the reward optimization expansive and tortuous. Meanwhile, the PPO (as well as other existing RLHF algorithms) can easily exploit the bias and imperfection of the reward model from the first two steps to chase a high reward. Moreover, it is known that LLMs after RLHF typically suffer from performance degeneration (referred to as the alignment tax in the literature (Askell et al., 2021)) and distribution collapsing (Casper et al., 2023; Song et al., 2023). Given these challenges, it is important to

<sup>\*</sup>Equal Contribution, wx13@illinois.edu, hdongaj@connect.ust.hk, cywab@connect.ust.hk.

<sup>†</sup>Work done during an internship at HKUST.

understand the mathematical principle of the RLHF process, as well as the connections among its different steps, which should be able to motivate future algorithmic design in principle.

In the standard RL theory setting, the only goal of the agent is to maximize an observed reward function, and the optimal policy is usually deterministic and greedy in the reward function (Agarwal et al., 2019). However, in practical applications of RLHF, merely maximizing the reward function is often insufficient and probably results in overfitting, as the generative model must simultaneously ensure both diversity and high fidelity in its outputs. A deterministic maximizer of the reward tends to compromise on these aspects significantly. For example, the maximizer of the “safety reward” tends to avoid providing answers all the time, which contradicts the LLM’s training objective. The situation is even worse due to the present bias and approximation error in reward modeling, which leads to the fundamental issue of reward hacking where the model typically repeats redundant nice but useless words or even makes up some false information beyond its knowledge boundary to cater to the reward model (Michaud et al., 2020; Tien et al., 2022; Casper et al., 2023). Thus, it is important to model diversity and high fidelity in the theoretical framework beyond the reward. Notably, the most widely used mathematical objective function for this goal can be regarded as a reverse-KL regularized contextual bandit problem (Ziegler et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2021; Ouyang et al., 2022; Rafailov et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023a). The KL regularized contextual bandit additionally imposes a constraint that the optimal policy cannot move too far away from the original policy (i.e. the starting checkpoint of the LLM). A major difference between this objective function from traditional contextual bandit is that the optimal policy is stochastic, which is closer to the practical generative models. Despite numerous proposed procedures for this formulation, a rigorous theoretical analysis remains absent. This paper provides a theoretical analysis of the regularized contextual bandit problem in both offline and online settings, aiming to inform and motivate practical algorithmic designs.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We formulate the RLHF process as a reverse-KL regularized contextual bandit problem, which more accurately reflects real-world alignment practices (Ouyang et al., 2022; Bai et al., 2022; Rafailov et al., 2023) compared to existing theoretical frameworks. Meanwhile, we deliver a comprehensive theoretical analysis in both offline and online settings for the formulated framework;
- We introduce algorithms designed to address this formulated problem, which incorporate new uncertainty estimation or version space construction, and different exploration structures to handle the introduced KL penalty, as well as the challenges of preference learning;
- We explore the underlying insights of our theoretical findings and discuss the practical implications of our algorithms by linking our theoretical insights with existing practical alignment algorithms like DPO (Rafailov et al., 2023) and RSO (Liu et al., 2023a).

## 1.1 Related Work

**RLHF** has attracted considerable attention in the past few years, especially after its tremendous success in ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2023). We refer interested readers to Wirth et al. (2017); Casper et al. (2023) for a detailed survey but focus on the most related works here. The standard RLHF was popularized by Christiano et al. (2017), which served to direct the attention of the RL community to the preference-based feedback. The most popular and standard RLHF framework is outlined in the InstructGPT paper (Ouyang et al., 2022), Claude (Bai et al., 2022) and the LLaMA2 report (Touvron et al., 2023) in detail, which typically consists of three steps starting from the pretrained model: supervised finetuning, reward modeling, and reward optimization. The effectiveness of this framework has been showcased by many recent generative models, like ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2023), Bard (Google, 2023), Claude (Anthropic, 2023), and LLaMA2 (Touvron et al., 2023). However, it is also noteworthy to indicate that the RLHF process often leads to degeneration in the performance of generation, commonly referred to as the “alignment tax” in the literature (Askell et al., 2021). This is usually because of the imperfection of the reward model and the model can make use of these




Figure 1: Standard RLHF pipeline: human preference data collection, reward modeling, reward optimization.

imperfections to chase for a high reward. This phenomenon is referred to as the reward hacking (Michaud et al., 2020; Tien et al., 2022). It is also possible to apply RLHF to general generative models, like the diffusion model (Hao et al., 2022; Wu et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2023; Dong et al., 2023). In this work, we use the terminology and analysis of LLMs for better illustration, and defer the study of general generative models to future work.

**RLHF algorithms.** Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al., 2017) is the most well-known algorithm in LLM alignment literature. However, its instability, inefficiency, and sensitivity to hyperparameters (Choshen et al., 2019) and code-level optimizations (Engstrom et al., 2020) present significant challenges in tuning for optimal performance. Additionally, it often necessitates incorporating an extra reward model, a value network (known as a critic), and a reference model, potentially as large as the aligned LLM (Ouyang et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023). This imposes a significant demand on GPU memory resources. Thus, researchers have attempted to design alternative approaches for LLM alignment to resolve the aforementioned issues. Dong et al. (2023); Yuan et al. (2023); Touvron et al. (2023); Gulcehre et al. (2023) propose reward ranked finetuning (RAFT) (also known as the iterative finetuning) by iteratively learning from the best-of-n policy (Nakano et al., 2021). There is also a line of work focusing on deriving an algorithm from the KL-regularized formulation (Rafailov et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2023b; Wang et al., 2023a; Liu et al., 2023a). Among them, Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023) has emerged as an attractive alternative approach to PPO with notable stability and competitive performance. There are also works aiming to optimize the LLMs without reward function and learn directly from the preference data, including (Rafailov et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023; Azar et al., 2023), and has sparked considerable debate on whether reward modeling, as well as RL, is necessary for alignment. However, while these algorithms are partly inspired by mathematical principles and intuitions, a comprehensive theoretical analysis remains open.

**Theoretical study of RLHF.** The theoretical understanding of RLHF can be traced back to research on dueling bandits (e.g., Yue et al., 2012; Saha, 2021; Bengs et al., 2021), a simplified setting within the RLHF framework. Recently, many works have focused on the more challenging RLHF problem (also known as the preference-based RL). Xu et al. (2020); Novoseller et al. (2020); Pacchiano et al. (2021) delve into the study of tabular online RLHF, where the state space is finite and small. Moving beyond the tabular setting, Chen et al. (2022) provides the first results for online RLHF with general function approximation, capturing real-world problems with large state spaces. Wang et al. (2023b) presents a reduction-based framework, which

can transform some sample-efficient algorithms for standard reward-based RL to efficient algorithms for online RLHF. Further advancements in algorithm designs are introduced by Zhan et al. (2023b); Wu & Sun (2023), encompassing the development of reward-free learning type algorithms and posterior sampling-based algorithms tailored for online RLHF. Initiating exploration into offline RLHF, Zhu et al. (2023a) presents a pessimistic algorithm that is provably efficient for offline RLHF. Additionally, Zhan et al. (2023a) and Li et al. (2023) extend these investigations into the broader scope of general function approximation settings within offline RLHF. In comparison to these existing studies, our work introduces a new theoretical formulation and goal for RLHF, as well as novel problem settings, such as hybrid RLHF in Section 5. The new mathematical formulation allows our framework to align more closely with recent advancements in LLMs, and we will discuss the connections between our theoretical findings and practical algorithms in Section 6, which also serve to motivate future algorithmic design in principle.

## 2 Formulation of RLHF

In this section, we formulate the mathematical framework of the RLHF process. We will motivate our formulation based on standard LLM alignment workflow (Ouyang et al., 2022; Diao et al., 2023). Specifically, the LLM will take a prompt, denoted by  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , and produce a response, denoted by  $a = [w_1, \dots, w_H]$ , where  $w_i$  is the  $i$ -th token generated by the model. Accordingly, we can take  $\mathcal{X}$  as the state space of the contextual bandit and the  $\mathcal{A}$  as the action space. Following Ouyang et al. (2022); Zhu et al. (2023a); Dong et al. (2023); Rafailov et al. (2023); Liu et al. (2023a), we assume that there exists a ground-truth reward function  $r^*(x, a) : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and the preference ranking satisfies the Bradley-Terry model (Bradley & Terry, 1952): given a prompt  $x$  and two responses  $a^1, a^2$ , the probability of  $a^1$  being preferred is

$$\mathbb{P}(a^1 \succ a^2 | x, a^1, a^2) = \frac{\exp(r^*(x, a^1))}{\exp(r^*(x, a^1)) + \exp(r^*(x, a^2))} = \sigma(r^*(x, a^1) - r^*(x, a^2)), \quad (1)$$

where  $a^1 \succ a^2$  means that  $a^1$  is preferred to  $a^2$ , and  $\sigma(z) = 1/(1 + \exp(-z))$  is the sigmoid function. We denote an LLM by a policy  $\pi$  that maps  $x$  to a distribution over the action space  $\mathcal{A}$ .

In a typical LLM training pipeline, the tuning process begins with a pretrained LLM, which is subsequently fine-tuned using specialized and instructional data, yielding an initial LLM policy denoted as  $\pi_0$ . We will then align the LLM on RLHF data (prompt set), which we assume is taken from a distribution  $x \sim d_0$ . In applications, we want the resulting aligned LLM  $\pi$  to be close to  $\pi_0$ , and we may assume that it belongs to a policy class  $\Pi$ . Our goal is to find a policy  $\pi \in \Pi$  so that

$$J(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} \left[ r^*(x, a) + \eta \log \frac{\pi_0(a|x)}{\pi(a|x)} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} [r^*(x, a)] - \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) || \pi_0(\cdot|x)) \right], \quad (2)$$

is maximized, where  $\eta > 0$  is a fixed parameter here but in practice we may try out different choices of  $\eta$  as an outer loop of the proposed framework to find the best models. This formulation is commonly studied in practice (Ziegler et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2021; Ouyang et al., 2022; Rafailov et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023a), and our paper aims to study its theoretical property. We also provide the intuitive illustration in Figure 2.

Usually, we have a reward model that is approximated by a function class  $\mathcal{F}$  for the ground truth  $r^* \in \mathcal{F}$ . Following Pacchiano et al. (2021); Kong & Yang (2022); Zhu et al. (2023a), we make the following assumption on the reward function for a clear presentation and analysis because it suffices to illustrate our ideas. But the algorithmic design in this paper can also apply to the general case and the analysis can also be readily generalized to general function using the complexity measures defined in standard RL theory literature (Gentile et al., 2022; Zhan et al., 2023a).

**Assumption 1** (Linear Reward). *Assume that the reward function is parameterized by  $r_\theta(x, a) = \langle \theta, \phi(x, a) \rangle$  for some known and fixed feature  $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ . We also assume that  $r^*(x, a) = \langle \theta^*, \phi(x, a) \rangle$  for some  $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . For regularization, we assume that  $\|\phi(x, a)\| \leq 1$  for all possible  $(x, a) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$  and  $\|\theta\| \leq B$ .*




Figure 2: Illustration of human preference in generative modeling. We present a two-dimensional visualization of both  $\pi_r$  and  $\pi_0$  to intuitively illustrate this concept. We consider a scenario where the initial data distribution, referred to as “pretrained”, is represented by a multi-modal Gaussian mixture, reflecting real-world data complexities. The “human preference” is expressed as a bias towards specific directions. This preference is mathematically captured by setting  $r$  as linearly dependent on  $a$ , with  $r = [1, 0]^\top a$  and  $\eta = 1$  for  $\pi_r$ . The role of KL regularization is critical in maintaining the desired behavior of  $\pi_r$ . By varying the values of  $\eta$ , we demonstrate the impact of KL regularization in (b)-(d). As  $\eta$  approaches zero,  $\pi_r$  increasingly focuses on maximizing rewards, often at the expense of the pretrained data’s structure, leading to a Gibbs distribution that potentially diverges infinitely. Thus, selecting an appropriate value for  $\eta$  is a crucial consideration in the RLHF framework.

## 2.1 Maximum Likelihood Estimation and Policy Improvement Oracle

The most common algorithm to estimate the reward model from a preference dataset is the Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) (Christiano et al., 2017; Faury et al., 2020; Pacchiano et al., 2021; Ouyang et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023).

**Maximum Likelihood Estimation.** A preference dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  consists of numerous tuples, such as  $(x, a^1, a^2, y)$ , where  $y$  denotes whether action  $a^1$  is preferred over  $a^2$  or vice versa. Specifically,  $y = 1$  signifies a preference for  $a^1$  over  $a^2$ , while  $y = 0$  indicates a preference for  $a^2$  over  $a^1$ . Given a dataset  $\mathcal{D} = \{(x, a^1, a^2, y)\}$ , we can write the log-likelihood function as follows:

$$\ell_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta) = \sum_{(x, a^1, a^2, y) \in \mathcal{D}} \left[ y \log \left( \sigma(r_{\theta}(x, a^1) - r_{\theta}(x, a^2)) \right) + (1 - y) \log \left( \sigma(r_{\theta}(x, a^2) - r_{\theta}(x, a^1)) \right) \right]. \quad (3)$$

The MLE is any  $\theta_{\text{MLE}} \in \Theta(B) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\theta\| \leq B\}$  so that  $\theta_{\text{MLE}} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta \in \Theta(B)} \ell_{\mathcal{D}}(\theta)$ . In practice, the MLE is also conducted with the base model of the  $\pi_0$  (von Werra et al., 2020; Touvron et al., 2023) on the preference dataset to get the reward model.

We define the following policy improvement oracle with respect to a given reward function  $r$ , and defer a discussion on its practical implementations in Section 6.

**Definition 1** (Policy Improvement Oracle: Information-theoretical consideration). *Given a fixed reward function  $r : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a reference policy  $\pi_0$ , for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , we can compute the optimal policy:*

$$\pi_r(\cdot|x) := \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} \left[ r(x, a) + \eta \log \frac{\pi_0(a|x)}{\pi(a|x)} \right],$$

which admits the following closed-form (Gibbs distribution, Lemma 8):  $\pi_r(\cdot|x) \propto \pi_0(\cdot|x) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} r(x, \cdot)\right)$ .

Accordingly, we take our policy class as:  $\Pi := \left\{ \pi(\cdot|x) \propto \pi_0(\cdot|x) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \langle \theta, \phi(x, \cdot) \rangle\right) : \theta \in \Theta(B) \right\}$ .

## 2.2 Preliminary

In this section, we present some technical tools and lemmas for subsequent analysis. We use  $\langle z_1, z_2 \rangle = z_1^\top z_2$  to denote the inner product of two vectors and  $\|z\|_{\Sigma}$  to denote the induced norm  $\sqrt{z^\top \Sigma z}$  for some positive-

definite matrix. We also define  $\phi(x, \pi) := \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} \phi(x, a)$  to simplify the presentation. For a sequence of random variables  $X_1, X_2, \dots$ , we say that  $X_n = O_P(1)$  if for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists an  $M$  such that  $\sup_{n > N} \mathbb{P}(X_n > M) < \epsilon$ , and we use  $\tilde{O}$  when we omit the logarithmic factors. A notation table is provided in Table 1 to improve the readability of this paper.

**Value decomposition.** We have the following lemma to decompose the value difference.

**Lemma 1.** *Given a reference policy  $\pi$ , we can decompose the suboptimality of a  $\hat{\pi}$  as follows:*

$$J(\pi) - J(\hat{\pi}) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [r^*(x, a) - \hat{r}(x, a)] + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\hat{r}(x, a) - r^*(x, a)] \right. \\ \left. + \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\hat{r}(x, a)] - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\hat{r}(x, a)] + \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{\pi}(\cdot|x) \parallel \pi_0(\cdot|x)) - \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) \parallel \pi_0(\cdot|x)) \right],$$

where  $\hat{r} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is arbitrary.

*Proof.* The equality can be verified directly by the definition of  $J(\cdot)$  in Equation (2) and basic algebra.  $\square$

**Policy improvement error.** In standard RL setting,  $\hat{\pi}$  is usually taken as a greedy policy of  $\hat{r}$ , leading to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\hat{r}(x, a)] - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\hat{r}(x, a)] \leq 0.$$

In our setting, since the policy is not greedy or deterministic, we need to additionally handle the policy improvement error in this case. The following lemma provides such an estimation when our policy is obtained by calling the Oracle 1 with  $\hat{r}$ . The analysis techniques are most similar to the policy gradient literature since they also consider the soft-max policies (Agarwal et al., 2021; Cai et al., 2020; Zanette et al., 2021b; Zhong & Zhang, 2023). The main difference is that in their iterative choices of policy, for choosing  $\pi_t$ , the reference policy they use is the policy of the last round, i.e.,  $\pi_{t-1}$ , while we always use the SFT-model  $\pi_0$  as our reference. We note that the algorithms in Agarwal et al. (2021); Cai et al. (2020); Zanette et al. (2021b); Zhong & Zhang (2023) essentially still use the non-KL-regularized reward as the target because in the final policy, the cumulative reward estimations are dominating.

**Lemma 2** (Policy optimization error). *Suppose that  $\pi, \hat{\pi} \in \Pi$  so that  $\text{support}(\pi_0) = \text{support}(\pi) = \text{support}(\hat{\pi})$  and the KL divergences between them are finite and well defined. If  $\hat{\pi}$  is induced by calling Oracle 1 with  $\hat{r}$ , it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\hat{r}(x, a)] - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\hat{r}(x, a)] + \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{\pi}(\cdot|x) \parallel \pi_0(\cdot|x)) - \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) \parallel \pi_0(\cdot|x)) \right] = -\eta \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) \parallel \hat{\pi}(\cdot|x)).$$

We will provide the proof in Appendix D for completeness.

**Covariance matrix, potential, and generalization.** In the rest of this paper, the algorithmic design and analysis will be centered on the covariance matrix. We briefly introduce the high-level intuition on these concepts here. Given a preference dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , and a fixed  $\lambda > 0$ , we denote  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$  as

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}} := \lambda I + \sum_{(x, a^1, a^2) \in \mathcal{D}} (\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2)) (\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2))^{\top}.$$

Then, the *in-sample* error on the observed data in  $\mathcal{D}$  is given by

$$\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}}^2 = \lambda \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2 + \sum_{(x, a^1, a^2) \in \mathcal{D}} \left( (r_{\theta_1}(x, a^1) - r_{\theta_1}(x, a^2)) - (r_{\theta_2}(x, a^1) - r_{\theta_2}(x, a^2)) \right)^2,$$

where we additionally add a regularization term  $\lambda \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2$ . Meanwhile, if we test the hypothesis  $(\theta_1 - \theta_2)$  on a newly observed data, the *out-of-sample* error would be given by  $|\langle \theta_1 - \theta_2, \phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2) \rangle|$ . The



ideal case would be that we can infer the out-of-sample error via the in-sample error, so we look at the ratio between them:

$$\frac{|\langle \theta_1 - \theta_2, \phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2) \rangle|}{\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}}} \leq \frac{\|\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2)\|_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}} \cdot \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}}}{\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}}} = \|\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2)\|_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}}$$

where we take a square root on the in-sample error to keep them being of the same order and use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Here, the  $\|\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2)\|_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}}$  is referred to as the elliptical potential in the literature of linear function approximation (Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011). The complexity of the reward model space is characterized by the following fact:

**Lemma 3** (Elliptical potential is usually small (Hu et al., 2022)). *For a fixed  $\lambda > 0$  and  $\{z_t\}_{t=1}^T \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\|z_t\| \leq 1$ , we define  $Z_t = \lambda I + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} z_s z_s^\top$ . Then, for any constant  $c > 0$ ,  $\|z_t\|_{Z_t^{-1}} > c$  happens at most  $\frac{3d}{\log(1+c^2)} \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda \log(1+c^2)}\right)$ .*

The ratio between the out-of-sample error and the in-sample error in the linear case can be readily generalized to the general function approximation using the variant of eluder dimension considered in Gentile et al. (2022); Zhang (2023); Ye et al. (2023); Agarwal et al. (2023), which essentially states that there is some low-rank structure in the reward model space so the generalization is limited. Moreover, if we can effectively estimate the in-sample error from the preference data, by Lemma 3, we can infer the out-of-sample error safely most of the time. The following lemma provides us with such an estimation.

**Lemma 4** (In-sample error of MLE (Fauray et al., 2020; Pacchiano et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2023a)). *For a fixed  $\lambda > 0$ , we denote  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$  as*

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}} := \lambda I + \sum_{(x, a^1, a^2) \in \mathcal{D}} (\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2)) (\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2))^\top.$$

*Assume that  $\|\phi(x, a)\| \leq 1$  for all  $(x, a) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$  and  $\|\theta\| \leq B$ . Then, it follows that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have*

$$\|\theta_{\text{MLE}} - \theta^*\|_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}} \leq C \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{\gamma^2} + \lambda B^2},$$

where  $\gamma = 1/(2 + \exp(-B) + \exp(B))$ .

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We start with the offline setting in Section 3, where we learn from a pre-determined (open-source) dataset, without further interaction with the human. Then, in Section 4, we study the proposed framework in the online setting, where we can query human feedback along the line of learning. We then extend the analysis to a more realistic scenario in Section 5, where we start with some offline dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  but also further query the feedback from the human in an online manner as in (Bai et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023). We discuss the connections with the existing works in Section 6 and conclude in Section 7.

### 3 Offline learning

In the offline setting, we aim to learn a good policy from a pre-collected dataset without further interactions with the human. We suppose that we are given an offline dataset:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}} = \{(x_i, a_i^1, a_i^2, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{off}}},$$

where the responses  $(a_1^1, a_1^2), \dots, (a_{n_{\text{off}}}^1, a_{n_{\text{off}}}^2)$  are generated from some behavior policy which can be different from  $\pi_0$ , and  $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$  is the independent preference signal from human. We denote  $\Sigma_{\text{off}} := \Sigma_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}}$  for offline

setting and measure the suboptimality of the obtained policy  $\hat{\pi}$  by comparing it with some reference policy  $\pi$ :

$$J(\pi) - J(\hat{\pi}) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} [r^*(x, a) + \eta \log \frac{\pi_0(a|x)}{\pi(a|x)}] - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \hat{\pi}(\cdot|x)} [r^*(x, a) + \eta \log \frac{\pi_0(a|x)}{\hat{\pi}(a|x)}] \right]. \quad (4)$$

The algorithm for offline learning is presented in Algorithm 1, which is based on the principle of pessimism (Jin et al., 2021b; Rashidinejad et al., 2021; Xie et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2023a). We do not maintain a confidence set but use a modified target that is biased toward pessimism by penalizing the uncertainty, similar to Xie et al. (2021); Zhang (2022), which may be easier to approximate in practice (Liu et al., 2023b). Moreover, to handle the additional trade-off between the reward and the KL term, we also incorporate the KL divergence into the policy computation.

We have the following theoretical guarantee for Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1** Offline Gibbs Sampling from Human Feedback

---

- 1: Input:  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $\beta > 0$ , reference vector  $\nu$ , and prompt distribution  $d_0$ .
- 2: Compute  $\theta_{\text{MLE}}$  based on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  by maximizing the likelihood given in Equation (3)
- 3: **Option I**: Output  $\hat{\pi}$  by constructing expected uncertainty estimator  $\Gamma^e(\pi, \nu, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}})$  and solving

$$\hat{\pi} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi \in \Pi} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0, a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} [r_{\text{MLE}}(x, a)] - \beta \cdot \Gamma^e(\pi, \nu, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}) - \eta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) \| \pi_0(\cdot|x))] \right]. \quad (5)$$

- 4: **Option II**: Output  $\hat{\pi}$  by constructing uncertainty estimator  $\Gamma(x, a, \nu, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}})$  and calling Oracle 1 with  $\hat{r}(x, a) = r_{\text{MLE}}(x, a) - \beta \cdot \Gamma(x, a, \nu, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}})$ .
- 

**Theorem 1.** Under Assumption 1, let  $\beta := O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{\gamma^2}} + \lambda B^2\right)$ , for any  $\lambda > 0$  and comparator policy  $\pi \in \Pi$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the output policy of Algorithm 1 with Option I and  $\Gamma^e(\pi, \nu, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}) = \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi) - \nu]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}}$  satisfies

$$J(\pi) - J(\hat{\pi}) \leq 2\beta \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi)] - \nu\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}},$$

and the output policy of Algorithm 1 with Option II and  $\Gamma(x, a, \nu, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}) = \|\phi(x, a) - \nu\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}}$  satisfies

$$J(\pi) - J(\hat{\pi}) \leq 2\beta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0, a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} \|\phi(x, a) - \nu\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} - \eta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) \| \hat{\pi}(\cdot|x))].$$

The proof is rather standard in offline learning based on the principle of pessimism but with a different analysis to handle the KL and the stochastic policy. We defer the proof of the theorem to Appendix A.

The reference vector in Algorithm 1 is typically set as  $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})]$  for some known  $\pi_{\text{ref}}$ . As showcased by Zhu et al. (2023a), the subtracted reference vector can serve as a pre-conditioner for a better suboptimality bound. In practice, the reference vector  $\nu$  is typically taken as the mean vector of the SFT-policy  $\pi_0$  so that the SFT model achieves a reward of zero (Ouyang et al., 2022; Gao et al., 2023; Dong et al., 2023).

In comparison, the first Option I achieves a sharper bound in the uncertainty term because the expectation is inside the norm and by Jensen’s inequality we know that

$$2\beta \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi)] - \nu\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} \leq 2\beta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0, a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} \|\phi(x, a) - \nu\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}}.$$

Moreover, Option I has a desirable robust improvement property. If we take  $\nu = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})]$  for some reference policy, the resulting policy will be better than  $\pi_{\text{ref}}$ , regardless of the coverage of the  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  according to Theorem 1, which is similar to the original offline RL literature for a robust policy improvement (Bhardwaj et al., 2023). We will also see that the use of a reference policy can also serve to simplify our algorithmic design in subsequent Section 5. However, the main advantage of Option II is that the Oracle 1 may be well approximated by some empirical counterpart. We defer a detailed discussion to Section 6.



## 4 Batch Online Learning with Enhancer

While offline learning is efficient when the dataset provides sufficient coverage, in many cases, it is not feasible to expect such a high-quality pre-determined dataset. In particular, learning from the proxy reward model learned from  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  can introduce approximation errors and bias. To mitigate this issue, further interactions with the environment and human are necessary to improve the reward model. In practice, [Bai et al. \(2022\)](#); [Touvron et al. \(2023\)](#) typically iterate the RLHF process on a weekly cadence, where the fresh RLHF models are deployed to interact with crowdworkers and new human preference data is collected to further improve the reward model. We formulate the process as a batch online framework in this section because calling the oracle can be expansive and time-consuming, and we provide the analysis for the sequential setting in [Appendix B](#). It is shown that such a batch online framework can significantly improve the aligned LLMs as evaluated by the humans ([Bai et al., 2022](#); [Touvron et al., 2023](#)).

Mathematically, consider the batch online setting of  $T$  batches with fixed batch size  $m$ . At the beginning of each batch  $t \in [T]$ , An agent updates the policies  $\pi_t^1$  and  $\pi_t^2$ . Then,  $m$  prompts  $\{x_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^m$  are sampled from  $d_0$ . Based on each prompt  $x_{t,i}$ , two responses  $(a_{t,i}^1, a_{t,i}^2)$  are generated from two policies  $(\pi_t^1, \pi_t^2)$ , and a human preference signal  $y_{t,i} \in \{0, 1\}$  is yielded according to the ground-truth BT model.

Our ultimate goal is to design a sample-efficient algorithm, which finds a policy  $\hat{\pi}$  so that the suboptimality  $J(\pi^*) - J(\hat{\pi}) < \epsilon$  with the number of samples polynomial in the accuracy number  $1/\epsilon$ , feature dimension  $d$ , and other problem-dependent parameters. In practical applications, it is observed that the diversity of the outputs is critical, and the response pairs  $(a_t^1, a_t^2)$  are recommended to be collected by different model variants with different temperature hyper-parameter ([Touvron et al., 2023](#)). To understand this choice, we recall the decomposition [Lemma 1](#) and [Lemma 2](#) to obtain for each batch  $t \in [T]$

$$\begin{aligned} & J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_t^1) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} [r^*(x_t, a) - \hat{r}(x_t, a)] + \mathbb{E}_{\pi_t^1} [\hat{r}(x_t, a) - r^*(x_t, a)] - \eta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi^*(\cdot|x_t) \parallel \pi_t^1(\cdot|x_t))] \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} \left[ \left\langle \hat{\theta} - \theta^*, \phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi^*) \right\rangle \right] - \eta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi^*(\cdot|x_t) \parallel \pi_t^1(\cdot|x_t))]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The main technical challenge is to relate the uncertainty of  $\phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi^*)$  (analysis target) to the uncertainty of  $\phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi_t^2)$  (the accessible data). Our algorithmic idea is built on optimism and non-symmetric structures, similar to the study of two-player zero-sum Markov game ([Jin et al., 2021a](#); [Huang et al., 2021](#); [Xiong et al., 2022](#)). We present the complete algorithm in [Algorithm 2](#). The main agent  $\pi_t^1$  always takes the policy induced by  $r^t$  from [Oracle 1](#). On the other hand, the second agent  $\pi_t^2$ , referred to as the enhancer, seeks to maximize the uncertainty (similar to the practical choice of different model variants and temperature) for the fixed  $\pi_t^1$ , so that the uncertainty compared to  $\pi^*$  is upper bounded by that of  $\pi_t^2$ , which is referred to as the principle of optimism in the literature ([Auer et al., 2002](#)). Notably, in contrast to the case of Markov game ([Jin et al., 2021a](#); [Huang et al., 2021](#); [Xiong et al., 2022](#)), the enhancer also converges to  $\pi^*$  in terms of the metric of  $J(\pi)$ . We borrow the terminology to stress the non-symmetric algorithmic structure. Moreover, if we just regard the enhancer  $\pi_t^2$  as an auxiliary policy and only care about the performance of  $\pi_t^1$ , there is no need to maintain the confidence set  $\Pi_t$ . Due to the realizability:  $\pi^* \in \Pi$ , we can construct  $\pi_t^2$  as the solution of the following unconstrained problem:

$$\pi_t^2 = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi_t^2 \in \Pi} \sum_{i=1}^m \Gamma(x_{t,i}, \pi_t^1, \pi_t^2, \mathcal{D}^{1:t-1}). \quad (7)$$

Note that in [Algorithm 2](#), we formulate that the agent first observes  $m$  prompts and then establishes the enhancer. This is only for simplicity of analysis so that we can estimate the uncertainty and obtain the enhancer by maximizing the estimation. If we consider the standard online contextual bandit, we can first collect  $m$  contexts, and estimate the uncertainty based on them. Then, for the next  $m$  contexts, we interact with the environment in a strictly sequential manner using the policies determined by the first  $m$  contexts. This will only incur a constant factor 2 in the final sample complexity.

---

**Algorithm 2** Online Gibbs Sampling from Human Feedback with Enhancer

---

- 1: Input:  $\Pi, \mathcal{D}^0 = \emptyset, m \geq 1$ .
  - 2: **for**  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  **do**
  - 3:   Observe  $m$  independent prompts  $\{x_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^m \sim d_0$ ;
  - 4:   Compute the MLE estimator  $\theta^t$  based on  $\mathcal{D}^1, \mathcal{D}^2, \dots, \mathcal{D}^{t-1}$  by maximizing the likelihood given in Equation (3) and set  $r^t = r_{\text{MLE}}$ ;
  - 5:   Compute the policy  $\pi_t^1$  by calling the oracle in Assumption 1 with  $r^t$ ;
  - 6:   Construct the confidence set of the policy as in Lemma 5;
  - 7:   Compute the enhancer policy  $\pi_t^2$  as in Equation (7);
  - 8:   Independently sample actions  $a_{t,i}^1 \sim \pi_t^1(\cdot|x_{t,i})$ ,  $a_{t,i}^2 \sim \pi_t^2(\cdot|x_{t,i})$  and receive human feedback  $y_{t,i}$ , and collect  $\mathcal{D}^t = \{(x_{t,i}, a_{t,i}^1, a_{t,i}^2, y_{t,i})\}_{i=1}^m$
  - 9: **end for**
- 

To achieve optimism, we need to maintain a confidence set, that contains the  $\pi^*$  for all iterations with high probability. The constructions of the confidence set are different compared to the dueling RL (Fauray et al., 2020; Pacchiano et al., 2021) due to the reverse-KL regularized contextual bandit formulation, as well as the non-symmetric structure in our algorithm. We summarize the confidence set construction for the online setting in the following lemma.

**Lemma 5** (Confidence set). *For the linear model in Assumption 1, given the policy of the main agent  $\pi_t^1$ , we consider the following confidence set with  $\beta = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d+\log(T/\delta)}{\gamma^2 m}}\right)$ :*

$$\Pi_t = \left\{ \tilde{\pi} \in \Pi : \beta \sum_{i=1}^m \|\phi(x_{t,i}, \tilde{\pi}) - \phi(x_{t,i}, \pi_t^1)\|_{\Sigma_{t,m}^{-1}} - \eta \sum_{i=1}^m D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{\pi}(\cdot|x_{t,i}) \|\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_{t,i})) \geq 0 \right\},$$

where we define

$$\Sigma_{t,m} = \lambda I + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \sum_{j=1}^m (\phi(x_{i,j}, a_{i,j}^1) - \phi(x_{i,j}, a_{i,j}^2)) (\phi(x_{i,j}, a_{i,j}^1) - \phi(x_{i,j}, a_{i,j}^2))^\top.$$

Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we know that  $\pi^* \in \Pi_t$  for all  $t \in [T]$ .

We defer the proof to Appendix B. Intuitively, the enhancer aims to maximize the uncertainty of the feature difference, thus facilitating the learning of the main agent. In particular, the largest cost of KL divergence scales with the uncertainty of the difference, demonstrating the trade-off between the two considerations. Since  $\pi^* \in \Pi_t$ , we can upper-bound the first term on the right-hand side of Equation (6) by  $\sum_{t=1}^T \beta \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} \|\phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi_t^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}$ , which can be further bounded by elliptical potential lemma. Hence, we can obtain the probably approximately correct (PAC) learning result in the following theorem. The proof is provided in Appendix B.3.

**Theorem 2.** *For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we set the batch size  $m = d/(\gamma^2 \epsilon^2)$ . Under Assumption 1 with the uncertainty estimator defined as*

$$\Gamma(x, \pi_t^1, \pi_t^2, \mathcal{D}^{1:t-1}) = \|\phi(x, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x, \pi_t^2)\|_{\Sigma_{t,m}^{-1}}, \quad (8)$$

with  $\beta := O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d+\log(T/\delta)}{\gamma^2 m}} + \lambda B^2\right)$  and  $\lambda = \Theta(d \log(T/\delta)/mB^2)$ , after  $T = \{\min n \in \mathbb{N}^+ : n \geq d \log(n)\}$  iterations, we have with probability at least  $1 - 3\delta$ , there exists a  $t_0 \in [T]$ ,

$$J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_{t_0}^1) \leq \epsilon - \eta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{t_0}^1(\cdot|x_{t_0}) \|\pi^*(\cdot|x_{t_0}))],$$

where the number of collected samples is at most  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{d^2}{\gamma^2 \epsilon^2}\right)$ .

**The advantage of reward modeling.** Theorem 2 reveals a key characteristic of reward modeling: the sample complexity is dependent on the complexity of the reward model rather than the generative models. For simple reward functions, such as sentiment or politeness evaluation, the required function class is substantially smaller compared to the generative model. This is corroborated by evidence showing that even compact models like BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) can yield accurate reward assessments. Besides, the reward function can also be recognized as a density ratio estimator, similar to the discriminator in Generative Adversarial Models (Goodfellow et al., 2014). The density ratio estimator can be applied to generative models without explicit likelihood (GAN, Energy-based models). Johnson & Zhang (2019) suggest that the distribution induced by the density ratio estimator is more stable than optimizing the generative model. Meanwhile, the density ratio estimator approximates the functional gradient in probability space, iterative reward modeling provides a provable path towards the target distribution. This may illustrate the advantage of the most popular RLHF framework used by Ouyang et al. (2022); Bai et al. (2022); Touvron et al. (2023), in contrast to the idea of bypassing reward modeling (Rafailov et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023; Azar et al., 2023), especially when the reward models can be further improved by online interactions with the environment and human. In summary, reward learning typically exhibits lower sample dependency and results in a more stable induced distribution compared to that learned directly through generative modeling. Iterative reward modeling approximates the functional gradient in probability space. Furthermore, it can be effectively applied to universal generative models, even those without explicit likelihood (Goodfellow et al., 2014; Grathwohl et al., 2019; Du & Mordatch, 2019).

While we mainly care about finding a good model, with a slightly more involved analysis for the enhancer, we can also derive an upper bound for the average regret as in Pacchiano et al. (2021); Chen et al. (2022):

$$\text{Reg}_{\text{ave}}(T) := \sum_{t=1}^T \left[ \frac{2J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_t^1) - J(\pi_t^2)}{2} \right],$$

We defer a detailed discussion to Appendix B.2 for a clear presentation.

## 5 Hybrid RLHF

One notable drawback of Algorithm 2 is the need to construct the uncertainty estimator for achieving optimism, which may be difficult in practice. Meanwhile, in practice, we typically do not start RLHF from scratch. For instance, in the project of LLaMA2 (Touvron et al., 2023), the authors start with approximate 1500K open-source comparison pairs  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  and keep  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  in the data mixture for reward modeling.

To motivate the algorithm, we also start with the value decomposition Lemma 1:

$$J(\pi^*) - J(\hat{\pi}) \leq \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} [r^*(x, a) - \hat{r}(x, a)] + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\hat{r}(x, a) - r^*(x, a)] \right],$$

where the policy optimization error is omitted for simplicity. The idea is similar to the hybrid RL theory to use the offline data to handle the term related to  $\pi^*$  (Song et al., 2022). However, for preference-based learning, one major difference is that the uncertainty is evaluated on the feature difference instead of a single state-action pair. To this end, we introduce an additional reference policy  $\pi_{\text{ref}}$  as an intermediate in two parts simultaneously, which satisfies the following two conditions. First, the  $\pi_{\text{ref}}$  may serve as the pre-conditioner for the offline coverage similar to Theorem 1.

**Assumption 2** (Partial Coverage of Offline Data). *For the linear model, there exists a reference policy  $\pi_{\text{ref}}$ , a ratio coefficient  $\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}) \in (0, 1)$  and a coverage constant  $C_{\text{cov}} > 0$  such that*

$$T^{1-\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}})} \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})]\|_{(\Sigma_{\text{off}})^{-1}} \leq C_{\text{cov}}.$$

Meanwhile, the reference policy should be available for collecting new data so the analysis of the target and accessible data are the same. In this case, we can drop the need for optimism as required in the online setting.

To better elaborate the quantify  $\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}})$  in Assumption 2, we provide the following proposition, whose proof is provided in Appendix C.1.

**Proposition 1.** *Under Assumption 1, assuming that there exists an absolute constant  $c^\dagger$  such that*

$$T^{\alpha^\dagger}/n_{\text{off}} = c^\dagger, \quad \Sigma_{\text{off}} \succeq B^2 I + c^\dagger \cdot n_{\text{off}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})] (\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})])^\top,$$

we have  $\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}) = 1 - \frac{\alpha^\dagger}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \log T} \log \left( \frac{c^\dagger d}{c^\dagger C_{\text{cov}}^2} \right)$ .

Proposition 1 states that  $\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}})$  mainly depends on the ratio between the online data size  $T$  and the offline data size  $n_{\text{off}}$ . It requires that  $n_{\text{off}}$  is comparable to the total number of online samples, which seems to be more realistic for LLMs. For instance, in LLaMA2 project, the  $n_{\text{off}} \approx 1.5 \times 10^6$ , while the total number of online data is  $1.4 \times 10^6$ . Since  $n_{\text{off}}$  and  $T$  are of the same order,  $\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}})$  approximates 1/2.

We present the complete algorithm in Algorithm 3 and the theoretical guarantee as follows.

---

**Algorithm 3** Hybrid Gibbs Sampling from Human Feedback

---

- 1: Input:  $\Pi, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}, \mathcal{D}^0 = \emptyset$ , and  $\pi_{\text{ref}}$ .
  - 2: **for**  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  **do**
  - 3:   Compute the MLE estimator  $\theta^t$  based on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}^{t-1}$  by maximizing the likelihood given in Equation (3).
  - 4:   Compute the reward estimator:  $r^t = r_{\text{MLE}}$ .
  - 5:   Compute the policy  $\pi_t^1$  by calling the oracle in Assumption 1 with  $r^t$ ;
  - 6:   Sample  $a_t^1 \sim \pi_t$  and  $a_t^2 \sim \pi_{\text{ref}}$  and receive human feedback.
  - 7: **end for**
- 

**Theorem 3.** *Under Assumption 1, let  $\beta := O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d + \log(T/\delta)}{\gamma^2} + \lambda B^2}\right)$ , for any  $\lambda = d \log(T/\delta)$ . Under Assumption 2, with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ , the output policy of Algorithm 3 satisfies*

$$\sum_{t=1}^T [J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_t^1)] \leq \beta T^{\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}})} \cdot C_{\text{cov}} + \beta \sqrt{6Td \log(1 + T/d\lambda)} - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_t) \parallel \pi^*(\cdot|x_t))].$$

The proof of Theorem 3 is deferred to Appendix C.2.

## 6 Connection with Practical Algorithms

In this section, we investigate the connections between our theoretical findings and the existing practical algorithms in the literature, including both Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023) and Rejection Sampling Optimization (RSO) (Liu et al., 2023a).

### 6.1 Direct Preference Optimization (DPO)

DPO is a practical algorithm derived from the reverse-KL regularized contextual bandit framework presented in this paper, which skips the reward modeling step with a clever reparameterization technique and directly optimizes the LLMs based on preference data by fitting the reparametrized BT model in Equation (1). We first recall the motivation behind DPO and discuss the potential connections between its algorithmic design and the theoretical insights. For each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , the KL-regularized optimization in Equation (2) admits the closed-form solution (Lemma 8):

$$\pi^*(a|x) = \frac{1}{Z(x)} \pi_0(a|x) \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} r^*(x, a)\right),$$

where  $Z(x) = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_0(\cdot|x)} \exp(\frac{1}{\eta} r^*(x, a))$  is the normalizing constant. We can rewrite the reward function as

$$r^*(x, a) = \eta \log \frac{\pi^*(a|x)}{\pi_0(a|x)} + \eta \log Z(x). \quad (9)$$

Plugging the reward reparameterization into the BT model in Equation (1) gives

$$p^*(a^1 \succ a^2|x, a^1, a^2) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp\left(\eta \log \frac{\pi^*(a^2|x)}{\pi_0(a^2|x)} - \eta \log \frac{\pi^*(a^1|x)}{\pi_0(a^1|x)}\right)} = \sigma\left(\eta \log \frac{\pi^*(a^1|x)}{\pi_0(a^1|x)} - \eta \log \frac{\pi^*(a^2|x)}{\pi_0(a^2|x)}\right), \quad (10)$$

where  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is the sigmoid function. Then DPO chooses to fit this reparametrized BT model based on the offline preference data  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  by the following loss function

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \pi_0) = - \sum_{(x, \tilde{a}^1, \tilde{a}^2) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}} \left[ \log \sigma\left(\eta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(\tilde{a}^1|x)}{\pi_0(\tilde{a}^1|x)} - \eta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(\tilde{a}^2|x)}{\pi_0(\tilde{a}^2|x)}\right) \right], \quad (11)$$

where  $\tilde{a}^1$  is the preferred response instead of the first response of the pair. Given  $x, a^1, a^2$ , fitting the model specified in Equation (10) yields a MLE for the preference probability (Lemma 9). This process, however, necessitates considering the generation distributions of  $a^1$  and  $a^2$ , which is missing in the original DPO paper. We now discuss the influence of the offline data distribution.

For simplicity, we assume that the data is collected by some behavior policy  $\pi_{\text{off}}$ , the prompt  $x$  with  $d_0(x) > 0$  is specified and the size of the offline dataset  $|\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}|$  approaches infinity. In this case, given a prompt  $x$ , the loss function in Equation (11) converges to:

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(\theta, \pi_0, x) = -\mathbb{E}_{a^1, a^2 \sim \pi_{\text{off}}(\cdot|x)} \left[ p^*(a^1 \succ a^2|x, a^1, a^2) \log p^\theta(a^1 \succ a^2|x, a^1, a^2) + p^*(a^2 \succ a^1|x, a^1, a^2) \log p^\theta(a^2 \succ a^1|x, a^1, a^2) \right],$$

where  $p^\theta$  is the preference model associated with  $\pi_\theta$ .

Given a prompt  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  so that  $d_0(x) > 0$ , we define  $\Omega_x = \{a \in \mathcal{A} : \pi_{\text{off}}(a|x) = 0, \pi^*(a|x) > 0\}$  as the set of outputs that can be generated by  $\pi^*$  but not by  $\pi_{\text{off}}$ . For simplicity, we consider the case that  $\mathcal{A} = \text{support}(\pi^*(\cdot|x))$  as otherwise the situation would be unnecessarily complicated. Given  $x, a^1, a^2$ ,  $p^\theta = p^*$  uniquely minimizes the loss (Lemma 9). Therefore, if  $p^\theta$  is the minimizer of the loss, we have  $p^\theta = p^*$  for any  $a^1, a^2$  on  $\text{support}(\pi_{\text{off}})$ . For any  $a^1, a^2 \in \text{support}(\pi^*) \cap \text{support}(\pi_{\text{off}})$ , we can further obtain that  $\frac{\pi_\theta(a^1|x)}{\pi^*(a^1|x)} = \frac{\pi_\theta(a^2|x)}{\pi^*(a^2|x)} := C$  (Lemma 9). We fix  $a^2$  and go over  $a^1$  to get  $\pi_\theta(\cdot|x) = C \cdot \pi^*(\cdot|x)$  on  $\text{support}(\pi_{\text{off}})$ . Conversely, for  $(x, a)$  pairs where  $\pi_{\text{off}}(a|x) = 0$ , the choice of  $p^\theta$  (or  $\pi^\theta$ ) does not impact the loss function and can be arbitrary. Assume that  $\pi_\theta = C' \pi$  for some  $\pi(\cdot|x) \in \Delta(\mathcal{A})$  for all  $a \in \text{support}(\pi^*) \setminus \text{support}(\pi_{\text{off}})$ . Then the policy  $\pi^\theta(a|x) \propto (1 - \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_x}(a))\pi^*(a|x) + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_x}(a)\pi(a|x)$  minimizes  $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\theta, \pi_0, x)$ , where  $\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_x}(\cdot)$  is the indicator function for  $\Omega_x$  and the normalizing constant  $C, C'$  can be determined by the normalization condition  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta(a|x)} 1 = 1$ .

This suggests that for outputs not covered by  $\pi_{\text{off}}$ ,  $\pi^\theta$  can be an arbitrary solution. Therefore, to ensure that  $\pi_\theta$  converges to  $\pi^*$  for every action-state pair  $(x, a)$  where  $\pi^*(a|x) > 0$ , it is essential to have  $|\Omega_x| = \emptyset$  or

$$\sup_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\pi^*(a|x)}{\pi_{\text{off}}(a|x)} < \infty, \quad \text{for any } x \in \text{support}(d_0),$$

where we use the convention of  $0/0 = 0$ . In practice, the available sample is finite. One ideal choice may be that  $\pi_{\text{off}} = \pi^*$ , as showcased by the fact that the impressive result (Xu et al., 2023; Dubois et al., 2023) of DPO is mostly achieved when the data is from the powerful teacher models (e.g. the closed-source ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2023)), where for LLMs with moderate size, the ChatGPT is close to  $\pi^*$ . However, this procedure is similar to knowledge distillation and cannot scale to the state-of-the-art models. In general, in addition

to the support, we should also take the density ratio between the optimal policy and the data distribution into consideration as the ratio characterizes the sample complexity for approximating the desired population loss:

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \mathbb{E}_{a^1, a^2 \sim \pi^*(\cdot|x)} [p^*(a^1 \succ a^2|x, a^1, a^2) \log p^\theta(a^1 \succ a^2|x, a^1, a^2) + p^*(a^2 \succ a^1|x, a^1, a^2) \log p^\theta(a^2 \succ a^1|x, a^1, a^2)] \\
& \leq \sup_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\pi^*(a|x)}{\pi_{\text{off}}(a|x)} \mathcal{L}_\infty(\theta, \pi_0, x).
\end{aligned}$$

We consider several common choices of  $\pi_{\text{off}}$  as follows.

If we consider the pre-collected offline (open-source) dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$ , since DPO is not based on the principle of pessimism (as in Algorithm 1), it cannot automatically adapt to the useful information of the dataset. Therefore, if the coverage of the  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  is not sufficient or  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  contains noisy samples, the performance of DPO can degenerate, as reported in Liu et al. (2023a). In practice, Gao et al. (2023) observed that overfitting the MLE-based reward model without pessimism, also referred to as the proxy reward model, can lead to reward over-optimization, which means that while the proxy reward always increases, the ground-truth reward only increases at the initial stage of RLHF and eventually decreases when the LLM overfits the proxy reward model. In practical applications, Coste et al. (2023) uses the idea of ensemble to get the pessimistic reward model. Specifically, they independently train 5 reward models  $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^5$  and take the minimum as the final reward model:  $\hat{r}(x, a) := \min_{i \in [5]} r_i(x, a)$ . It is shown that such a pessimistic version of the reward model can significantly reduce the reward over-optimization for PPO and best-of-n sampling (Nakano et al., 2021).

If we take  $\pi_{\text{off}} = \pi_0$  as suggested by Rafailov et al. (2023), for any point that  $\pi^*(a|x) > 0$ , we have

$$\frac{\pi^*(a|x)}{\pi_{\text{off}}(a|x)} = \frac{\exp(\frac{1}{\eta} r^*(x, a))}{\mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \pi_0(\cdot|x)} \exp(\frac{1}{\eta} r^*(x, a'))} \leq \frac{1}{\pi_0(a|x)} < \infty.$$

However, since the outpace  $\mathcal{A}$  is exponentially large with respect to the sequence length, the ratio of using  $\pi_0$  can be extremely large in the worst case, which may also lead to an inferior performance in practice, as shown in Liu et al. (2023a).

## 6.2 Rejection Sampling Optimization (RSO)

After DPO, Liu et al. (2023a) aims to mitigate the issue of distribution-shift issue between  $\pi^*$  and data distribution. The idea is that we can first train a reward model  $r$  based on the preference dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  and we can repeat the derivation of DPO but with  $\pi_r$ , which is the policy induced by Oracle 1. Then, we have

$$p^r(a^1 \succ a^2|x, a^1, a^2) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp\left(\eta \log \frac{\pi_r(a^2|x)}{\pi_0(a^2|x)} - \eta \log \frac{\pi_r(a^1|x)}{\pi_0(a^1|x)}\right)}. \quad (12)$$

The core idea is to generate the samples  $(x, a^1, a^2)$  by  $\pi_r$  and  $p^r$  (the BT model associated with  $r$ ) to get  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}} = \{(x, a^1, a^2, y)\}$  and run DPO on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}$  so the distribution shift issue is mitigated. However, due to computational constraints, we may not solve  $\pi_r$  directly in practice. RSO proposes to use rejection sampling to approximate  $\pi_r$  and generate  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}$ . The RSO could be viewed as the practical approximation of Algorithm 1 with Option II. Conversely, our analysis also theoretically validates the impressive performance of RSO as it is shown that RSO outperforms DPO (Rafailov et al., 2023), and other stable baselines like RAFT (Dong et al., 2023), REST (Gulcehre et al., 2023), SLiC (Zhao et al., 2023).

One major difference still lies in the absence of pessimism and this could introduce errors and bias in later data generation for  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}$  and reward optimization steps, regardless of the number of samples. Moreover, another major concern in terms of RSO is that it takes  $\pi_r$  as the learning target, which can be sub-optimal if the pre-collected  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  may not provide sufficient coverage, as compactly summarized by Theorem 1, without further updates from interactions with the environment and human. In contrast, both Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 are statistically efficient when more human feedback signals are available in an online manner.






Figure 3: Illustration of the rejection rate by setting  $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , where  $\eta_i = N\eta/i$ . The model follows the setting of Figure 2, where we choose Gaussian mixture as  $\pi_0$  and the preference is mathematically captured by setting  $r$  as linearly dependent on  $a$ , with  $r = [1, 0]^\top a$  and  $\eta = 1$  for  $\pi_r$ .

### 6.3 GSHF: Gibbs Sampling from Human Feedback

The intuition is that learning the optimal policy directly from a pre-collected dataset that do not interact with the environment and human (i.e., offline algorithms) imposes strict constraint on the dataset, often difficult to meet in practical scenarios. In contrast, our analysis highlights the significant potential of online RLHF, which may be intuitively understood as dividing learning  $\pi^*$  into multiple steps to make the task easier. Therefore, one natural idea is to design algorithm that can be adopted in the online setting.

Another key issue for RSO is the large rejection rate and ineffective sampling strategy. Specifically, for compact  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$ , assume that  $R = \sup_{a \in \{a_x: a_x \sim \mathcal{A}, \pi_0(a|x) > 0\}} r(x, a)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{a|x \sim d_0} \exp(-\frac{1}{\eta} r(x, a)) = O(1)$ . To conduct rejection sampling for  $\pi_r$  with  $\eta = O(1)$  using  $\pi_0$ , the expected acceptance rate for  $\pi_r \propto \pi_0 \exp(\frac{1}{\eta} r)$  is

$$\mathbb{E}_{a|x \sim d_0} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\eta}(R - r(x, a))\right) = O(\exp(-R)) \approx 0.$$

Thus, it is necessary to find a way to increase the acceptance rate to make the algorithm more effective.

Consider that we have a sequence of distributions  $\{\pi_0, \pi_0 \exp(\frac{1}{\eta_1} r), \dots, \pi_0 \exp(\frac{1}{\eta_N} r)\}$ , where  $\eta_0 = \infty$ ,  $\eta_N = \eta$ . By defining  $\delta_\eta = \frac{1}{\eta_i} - \frac{1}{\eta_{i-1}}$ , we find the acceptance rate for sampling  $\pi_0 \exp(\frac{1}{\eta_i} r)$  from  $\pi_0 \exp(\frac{1}{\eta_{i-1}} r)$  is  $O(-\delta_\eta R)$ . Setting  $\delta_\eta = 1/R$  significantly improves the acceptance rate to  $O(1)$ . Figure 3 demonstrates that by selecting a sequence of  $\eta_i$ , the rejection rate can be markedly reduced. Furthermore, by tracing the path from  $\eta \rightarrow \infty$  to a small  $\eta$ , we can also perform early stopping to prevent over-chosen  $\eta$ .

Based on our analysis, we propose an algorithm that extends beyond DPO and RSO. The complete algorithm is presented in Algorithm 4, which features the following two algorithmic ideas:

- Our approach includes a multi-step approximation of the targeted Gibbs distribution, enhancing sample efficiency. This strategy can also allow for the selection of appropriate  $\eta_i$  values in real-world scenarios;
- we expand the algorithm to an online version, broadening its applicability and utility.

**Remark.** In our paper (and standard RL settings), the term “online” algorithm refers to the dynamic interplay between actions and real-world feedback, enabling the acquisition of new labels from preference data, such as GPT-4 or human annotations. Notably, if the reward model remains static without new supervisory inputs, the iterative process retains an “offline” characteristic, despite the reward model’s potential to generalize to out-of-domain data pairs.

---

**Algorithm 4** GSHF: Gibbs Sampling from Human Feedback

---

- 1: **Input:** Offline dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$ , KL regularization strength  $\eta_1 > \dots > \eta_N = \eta$ , Online iterations  $T$  (for offline setting,  $T = 1$ ),  $\pi_{\text{ref}}$ .
  - 2: Compute the reward estimator  $r^1$  based on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  by maximizing the likelihood given in Equation (3) and set  $r^0(x, a) = 0$ .
  - 3: **for**  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  **do**
  - 4:   **for**  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  **do**
  - 5:     Compute unnormalized density  $\pi_r^{t,i}(\cdot|x) \propto \pi_0(\cdot|x) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta_i} r^t(x, \cdot)\right)$
  - 6:     Sample from  $\pi_{t-1,i}$  and  $\pi_r^{t,i}$ , where  $\pi_r^{t,i}$  is obtained by rejection sampling. Use  $r^t$  to label the paired samples. Wrap up the data as  $\mathcal{D}_i^t$ .
  - 7:     Training  $\pi_{t,i}$  with  $\mathcal{D}_i^t$ , so that  $\pi_{t,i} \approx \pi_r^{t,i}$ .
  - 8:   **end for**
  - 9:   **Option I:** Set  $\pi_t = \pi_{t,N}$ .
  - 10:   **Option II:** Randomly choose  $\pi_t$  from  $\{\pi_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^N$ .
  - 11:   **if**  $t < T$  **then**
  - 12:     Sample  $a_t^1 \sim \pi_t$  and  $a_t^2 \sim \pi_{\text{ref}}$  and receive human feedback. Wrap up them as  $\mathcal{D}^t$ .
  - 13:     Compute the reward estimator  $r^{t+1}$  based on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}^t$  by maximizing the likelihood given in Equation (3).
  - 14:   **end if**
  - 15: **end for**
  - 16: **Output:**  $\{\pi_{T,i}\}_{i=1}^N$
- 

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we formulate the real-world RLHF process as a reverse-KL regularized contextual bandit problem. Compared to existing theoretical RLHF frameworks, the proposed framework admits a stochastic optimal policy, that more accurately reflects the dynamics of foundation generative models and aligns closely with current alignment practices (Ouyang et al., 2022; Bai et al., 2022; Rafailov et al., 2023). We design statistically efficient algorithms in both offline and online settings, featuring the standard algorithmic ideas of pessimism and optimism in the new framework, while also handling the distinct challenges of preference learning as well as the newly introduced KL constraint. We also extend our analysis to the more realistic scenario, where we start with the collected open-source (offline) dataset, but can also interact with the environment to collect more human feedback signals (Bai et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023). Our theoretical analysis not only partially validates the practical powerful algorithms like rejection sampling optimization (RSO) (Liu et al., 2023a), but also sheds light on innovative pathways for future algorithmic development, as discussed in Section 6.

Our work represents an initial step towards a more realistic model of real-world RLHF, opening avenues for further exploration in this domain. First, we formulate the RLHF process as a reverse-KL regularized contextual bandit, where the response is considered as a whole. In many situations (Lightman et al., 2023), it is possible to use process-supervised feedback, which calls for a more refined formulation based on the Markov decision process. Additionally, our analysis is based on the Bradley-Terry model, which may not perfectly capture the pattern of real-world human feedback. It is interesting to consider more general feedback models, which may further take the model misspecification into consideration, a scenario where the MLE considered in this paper may not be optimal. Finally, while our algorithmic designs demonstrate general applicability, the analysis is mostly based on linear parameterization. One interesting direction is to extend the analysis to the scenario where the model is not strictly linear but admits some low-rank structure.

We hope our work can draw the attention of the theoretical community to the more realistic formulation of RLHF proposed in this paper and inspire practitioners with the theoretical insights behind our analysis.

## References

- Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori, Dávid Pál, and Csaba Szepesvári. Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- Alekh Agarwal, Nan Jiang, Sham M Kakade, and Wen Sun. Reinforcement learning: Theory and algorithms. *CS Dept., UW Seattle, Seattle, WA, USA, Tech. Rep*, 32, 2019.
- Alekh Agarwal, Sham M Kakade, Jason D Lee, and Gaurav Mahajan. On the theory of policy gradient methods: Optimality, approximation, and distribution shift. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(1):4431–4506, 2021.
- Alekh Agarwal, Yujia Jin, and Tong Zhang. Vo  $q$  l: Towards optimal regret in model-free rl with nonlinear function approximation. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 987–1063. PMLR, 2023.
- Anthropic. Introducing claude. 2023. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/index/introducing-claude>.
- Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, Andy Jones, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Nova DasSarma, et al. A general language assistant as a laboratory for alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00861*, 2021.
- Peter Auer, Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, and Paul Fischer. Finite-time analysis of the multiarmed bandit problem. *Machine learning*, 47:235–256, 2002.
- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Mark Rowland, Bilal Piot, Daniel Guo, Daniele Calandriello, Michal Valko, and Rémi Munos. A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12036*, 2023.
- Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*, 2022.
- Hritik Bansal, John Dang, and Aditya Grover. Peering through preferences: Unraveling feedback acquisition for aligning large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15812*, 2023.
- Viktor Bengs, Róbert Busa-Fekete, Adil El Mesaoudi-Paul, and Eyke Hüllermeier. Preference-based online learning with dueling bandits: A survey. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(1):278–385, 2021.
- Mohak Bhardwaj, Tengyang Xie, Byron Boots, Nan Jiang, and Ching-An Cheng. Adversarial model for offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11048*, 2023.
- Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3/4):324–345, 1952.
- Qi Cai, Zhuoran Yang, Chi Jin, and Zhaoran Wang. Provably efficient exploration in policy optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1283–1294. PMLR, 2020.
- Stephen Casper, Xander Davies, Claudia Shi, Thomas Krendl Gilbert, Jérémy Scheurer, Javier Rando, Rachel Freedman, Tomasz Korbak, David Lindner, Pedro Freire, et al. Open problems and fundamental limitations of reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15217*, 2023.
- Xiaoyu Chen, Han Zhong, Zhuoran Yang, Zhaoran Wang, and Liwei Wang. Human-in-the-loop: Provably efficient preference-based reinforcement learning with general function approximation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3773–3793. PMLR, 2022.
- Leshem Choshen, Lior Fox, Zohar Aizenbud, and Omri Abend. On the weaknesses of reinforcement learning for neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.01752*, 2019.

- Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Thomas Coste, Usman Anwar, Robert Kirk, and David Krueger. Reward model ensembles help mitigate overoptimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02743*, 2023.
- Varsha Dani, Thomas P Hayes, and Sham M Kakade. Stochastic linear optimization under bandit feedback. 2008.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- Shizhe Diao, Rui Pan, Hanze Dong, Ka Shun Shum, Jipeng Zhang, Wei Xiong, and Tong Zhang. Lmflow: An extensible toolkit for finetuning and inference of large foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.12420*, 2023.
- Hanze Dong, Wei Xiong, Deepanshu Goyal, Yihan Zhang, Winnie Chow, Rui Pan, Shizhe Diao, Jipeng Zhang, KaShun SHUM, and Tong Zhang. RAFT: Reward ranked finetuning for generative foundation model alignment. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=m7p507zb1Y>.
- Yilun Du and Igor Mordatch. Implicit generation and modeling with energy based models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Rohan Taori, Tianyi Zhang, Ishaan Gulrajani, Jimmy Ba, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. AlpacaFarm: A simulation framework for methods that learn from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14387*, 2023.
- Logan Engstrom, Andrew Ilyas, Shibani Santurkar, Dimitris Tsipras, Firdaus Janoos, Larry Rudolph, and Aleksander Madry. Implementation matters in deep policy gradients: A case study on ppo and trpo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.12729*, 2020.
- Louis Faury, Marc Abeille, Clément Calauzènes, and Olivier Fercoq. Improved optimistic algorithms for logistic bandits. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3052–3060. PMLR, 2020.
- Leo Gao, John Schulman, and Jacob Hilton. Scaling laws for reward model overoptimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 10835–10866. PMLR, 2023.
- Claudio Gentile, Zhilei Wang, and Tong Zhang. Fast rates in pool-based batch active learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.05448*, 2022.
- Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.
- Google. Bard. 2023. URL <https://bard.google.com/>.
- Will Grathwohl, Kuan-Chieh Wang, Jörn-Henrik Jacobsen, David Duvenaud, Mohammad Norouzi, and Kevin Swersky. Your classifier is secretly an energy based model and you should treat it like one. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.03263*, 2019.
- Caglar Gulcehre, Tom Le Paine, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Ksenia Konyushkova, Lotte Weerts, Abhishek Sharma, Aditya Siddhant, Alex Ahern, Miaosen Wang, Chenjie Gu, et al. Reinforced self-training (rest) for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08998*, 2023.
- Yaru Hao, Zewen Chi, Li Dong, and Furu Wei. Optimizing prompts for text-to-image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09611*, 2022.

- Pihe Hu, Yu Chen, and Longbo Huang. Nearly minimax optimal reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 8971–9019. PMLR, 2022.
- Baihe Huang, Jason D Lee, Zhaoran Wang, and Zhuoran Yang. Towards general function approximation in zero-sum markov games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.14702*, 2021.
- Chi Jin, Qinghua Liu, and Tiancheng Yu. The power of exploiter: Provable multi-agent rl in large state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.03352*, 2021a.
- Ying Jin, Zhuoran Yang, and Zhaoran Wang. Is pessimism provably efficient for offline rl? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5084–5096. PMLR, 2021b.
- Rie Johnson and Tong Zhang. A framework of composite functional gradient methods for generative adversarial models. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 43(1):17–32, 2019.
- Dingwen Kong and Lin Yang. Provably feedback-efficient reinforcement learning via active reward learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:11063–11078, 2022.
- Kimin Lee, Hao Liu, Moonkyung Ryu, Olivia Watkins, Yuqing Du, Craig Boutilier, Pieter Abbeel, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, and Shixiang Shane Gu. Aligning text-to-image models using human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12192*, 2023.
- Zihao Li, Zhuoran Yang, and Mengdi Wang. Reinforcement learning with human feedback: Learning dynamic choices via pessimism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18438*, 2023.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20050*, 2023.
- Tianqi Liu, Yao Zhao, Rishabh Joshi, Misha Khalman, Mohammad Saleh, Peter J Liu, and Jialu Liu. Statistical rejection sampling improves preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06657*, 2023a.
- Zhihan Liu, Miao Lu, Wei Xiong, Han Zhong, Hao Hu, Shenao Zhang, Sirui Zheng, Zhuoran Yang, and Zhaoran Wang. Maximize to explore: One objective function fusing estimation, planning, and exploration. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023b.
- Eric J Michaud, Adam Gleave, and Stuart Russell. Understanding learned reward functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.05862*, 2020.
- Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, et al. Webgpt: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09332*, 2021.
- Ellen Novoseller, Yibing Wei, Yanan Sui, Yisong Yue, and Joel Burdick. Dueling posterior sampling for preference-based reinforcement learning. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 1029–1038. PMLR, 2020.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.08774, 2023.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- Aldo Pacchiano, Aadirupa Saha, and Jonathan Lee. Dueling rl: reinforcement learning with trajectory preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.04850*, 2021.

- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D Manning, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18290*, 2023.
- Paria Rashidinejad, Banghua Zhu, Cong Ma, Jiantao Jiao, and Stuart Russell. Bridging offline reinforcement learning and imitation learning: A tale of pessimism. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:11702–11716, 2021.
- Paat Rusmevichientong and John N Tsitsiklis. Linearly parameterized bandits. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 35(2):395–411, 2010.
- Aadirupa Saha. Optimal algorithms for stochastic contextual preference bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:30050–30062, 2021.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- Yuda Song, Yifei Zhou, Ayush Sekhari, J Andrew Bagnell, Akshay Krishnamurthy, and Wen Sun. Hybrid rl: Using both offline and online data can make rl efficient. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06718*, 2022.
- Ziang Song, Tianle Cai, Jason D Lee, and Weijie J Su. Reward collapse in aligning large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17608*, 2023.
- Jeremy Tien, Jerry Zhi-Yang He, Zackory Erickson, Anca D Dragan, and Daniel S Brown. Causal confusion and reward misidentification in preference-based reward learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06601*, 2022.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- Leandro von Werra, Younes Belkada, Lewis Tunstall, Edward Beeching, Tristan Thrush, Nathan Lambert, and Shengyi Huang. Trl: Transformer reinforcement learning. <https://github.com/huggingface/trl>, 2020.
- Chaoqi Wang, Yibo Jiang, Chenghao Yang, Han Liu, and Yuxin Chen. Beyond reverse kl: Generalizing direct preference optimization with diverse divergence constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16240*, 2023a.
- Yuanhao Wang, Qinghua Liu, and Chi Jin. Is rlhf more difficult than standard rl? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14111*, 2023b.
- Ziqi Wang, Le Hou, Tianjian Lu, Yuexin Wu, Yunxuan Li, Hongkun Yu, and Heng Ji. Enable language models to implicitly learn self-improvement from data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00898*, 2023c.
- Christian Wirth, Riad Akrou, Gerhard Neumann, Johannes Fürnkranz, et al. A survey of preference-based reinforcement learning methods. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(136):1–46, 2017.
- Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Daniel M Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Ryan Lowe, Jan Leike, and Paul Christiano. Recursively summarizing books with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.10862*, 2021.
- Runzhe Wu and Wen Sun. Making rl with preference-based feedback efficient via randomization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14554*, 2023.
- Xiaoshi Wu, Keqiang Sun, Feng Zhu, Rui Zhao, and Hongsheng Li. Better aligning text-to-image models with human preference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14420*, 2023.
- Tengyang Xie, Ching-An Cheng, Nan Jiang, Paul Mineiro, and Alekh Agarwal. Bellman-consistent pessimism for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:6683–6694, 2021.



- Wei Xiong, Han Zhong, Chengshuai Shi, Cong Shen, and Tong Zhang. A self-play posterior sampling algorithm for zero-sum markov games. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 24496–24523. PMLR, 2022.
- Canwen Xu, Corby Rosset, Luciano Del Corro, Shweti Mahajan, Julian McAuley, Jennifer Neville, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, and Nikhil Rao. Contrastive post-training large language models on data curriculum. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02263*, 2023.
- Yichong Xu, Ruosong Wang, Lin Yang, Aarti Singh, and Artur Dubrawski. Preference-based reinforcement learning with finite-time guarantees. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:18784–18794, 2020.
- Chenlu Ye, Wei Xiong, Quanquan Gu, and Tong Zhang. Corruption-robust algorithms with uncertainty weighting for nonlinear contextual bandits and markov decision processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 39834–39863. PMLR, 2023.
- Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Chuanqi Tan, Wei Wang, Songfang Huang, and Fei Huang. Rrhf: Rank responses to align language models with human feedback without tears. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05302*, 2023.
- Yisong Yue, Josef Broder, Robert Kleinberg, and Thorsten Joachims. The k-armed dueling bandits problem. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 78(5):1538–1556, 2012.
- Andrea Zanette, Ching-An Cheng, and Alekh Agarwal. Cautiously optimistic policy optimization and exploration with linear function approximation. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 4473–4525. PMLR, 2021a.
- Andrea Zanette, Martin J Wainwright, and Emma Brunskill. Provable benefits of actor-critic methods for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:13626–13640, 2021b.
- Wenhao Zhan, Masatoshi Uehara, Nathan Kallus, Jason D Lee, and Wen Sun. Provable offline reinforcement learning with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14816*, 2023a.
- Wenhao Zhan, Masatoshi Uehara, Wen Sun, and Jason D Lee. How to query human feedback efficiently in rl? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18505*, 2023b.
- Tong Zhang. Feel-good thompson sampling for contextual bandits and reinforcement learning. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 4(2):834–857, 2022.
- Tong Zhang. *Mathematical Analysis of Machine Learning Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2023. doi: 10.1017/9781009093057.
- Yao Zhao, Rishabh Joshi, Tianqi Liu, Misha Khalman, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J Liu. Slic-hf: Sequence likelihood calibration with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10425*, 2023.
- Han Zhong and Tong Zhang. A theoretical analysis of optimistic proximal policy optimization in linear markov decision processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08841*, 2023.
- Banghua Zhu, Jiantao Jiao, and Michael I Jordan. Principled reinforcement learning with human feedback from pairwise or  $k$ -wise comparisons. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11270*, 2023a.
- Banghua Zhu, Hiteshi Sharma, Felipe Vieira Frujeri, Shi Dong, Chenguang Zhu, Michael I Jordan, and Jiantao Jiao. Fine-tuning language models with advantage-induced policy alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02231*, 2023b.
- Daniel M Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Jeffrey Wu, Tom B Brown, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, Paul Christiano, and Geoffrey Irving. Fine-tuning language models from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08593*, 2019.

## A Proof of the Offline Learning

Notation	Description
$\langle z_1, z_2 \rangle$	The inner product of two vectors $z_1^\top z_2$ .
$\ z\ _\Sigma$	The induced norm $\sqrt{z^\top \Sigma z}$ .
$\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}$	The context (prompt) space and the action (response) space.
$\phi(x, a), \theta$	The feature map and parameter of the linear parameterization in Assumption 1.
$\pi, \Pi$	Policy and policy class.
$\ell_{\mathcal{D}}$	The log-likelihood of the BT model on $\mathcal{D}$ defined in Equation (3).
$y \in \{0, 1\}$	Preference signal.
$J(\pi)$	The KL-regularized target defined in Equation (2).
$\eta$	The coefficient of KL penalty, defined in Equation (2).
$d_0$	Distribution of context (prompt).
$\Theta(B)$	$\{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d : \ \theta\  \leq B\}$ .
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}, \mathcal{D}^t$	The offline dataset and the dataset collected in online iteration $t$ .
$\Sigma_{\text{off}}, \Sigma_t$	The covariance matrix with $\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}$ and $\mathcal{D}^t$ .
$\sigma(\cdot)$	$\sigma(z) = 1/(1 + \exp(-z))$ is the sigmoid function.
$C_{\text{cov}}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}, \pi_{\text{ref}}, \alpha)$	The coverage of the offline dataset defined in Definition 2.

Table 1: The table of notations used in this paper.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* We start with Option I. If we set  $\hat{r}(x, a) = \langle \theta_{\text{MLE}}, \phi(x, a) \rangle$ , and take the policy by

$$\hat{\pi} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi \in \Pi} \left[ \langle \theta_{\text{MLE}}, \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} \phi(x, \pi) \rangle - \beta \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi) - \nu]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} - \eta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x)|\pi_0(\cdot|x))] \right].$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \theta_{\text{MLE}}, \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi) - \phi(x, \hat{\pi})] \rangle + \beta \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \hat{\pi}) - \nu]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} - \beta \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi) - \nu]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} \\ & + \eta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{\pi}(\cdot|x)|\pi_0(\cdot|x)) - D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x)|\pi_0(\cdot|x))] \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

For simplicity, we denote the LHS of Equation (13) as  $(\star)$ . We plugging this into the estimation of  $J(\pi) - J(\hat{\pi})$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & J(\pi) - J(\hat{\pi}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} [r^*(x, a) + \eta \log \frac{\pi_0(a|x)}{\pi(a|x)}] - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \hat{\pi}(\cdot|x)} [r^*(x, a) + \eta \log \frac{\pi_0(a|x)}{\hat{\pi}(a|x)}] \right] \\ &= (\star) + \langle \theta^* - \theta_{\text{MLE}}, \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi)] \rangle + \langle \theta_{\text{MLE}} - \theta^*, \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \hat{\pi})] \rangle \\ & \quad - \beta \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \hat{\pi}) - \nu]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} + \beta \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi) - \nu]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} \\ & \leq \langle \theta^* - \theta_{\text{MLE}}, \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi) - \nu] \rangle + \langle \theta_{\text{MLE}} - \theta^*, \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \hat{\pi}) - \nu] \rangle \\ & \quad - \beta \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \hat{\pi}) - \nu]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} + \beta \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi) - \nu]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} \\ & \leq 2\beta \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi) - \nu]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is from the Equation (13) and the second inequality uses Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 4.

For Option II, we use the point-wise pessimism:

$$\hat{r}(x, a) = r_{\text{MLE}}(x, a) - \beta \|\phi(x, a) - \nu\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}}.$$

Then, we call Oracle 1 with  $\hat{r}$  to get  $\hat{\pi}$ . By Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J(\pi) - J(\hat{\pi}) &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [r^*(x, a) - \hat{r}(x, a)] + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\hat{r}(x, a) - r^*(x, a)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\hat{r}(x, a)] - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\hat{r}(x, a)] + \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{\pi}(\cdot|x) \| \pi_0(\cdot|x)) - \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) \| \pi_0(\cdot|x)) \right], \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\hat{r}$  is obtained from the Oracle 1 with  $\hat{r}$ , it follows from Lemma 2:

$$\begin{aligned} J(\pi) - J(\hat{\pi}) &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [r^*(x, a) - \hat{r}(x, a)] + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\hat{r}(x, a) - r^*(x, a)] - \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) \| \hat{\pi}(\cdot|x)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0, a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} \left[ \langle \theta^* - \theta_{\text{MLE}}, \phi(x, a) - \nu \rangle + \beta \|\phi(x, a) - \nu\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0, a \sim \hat{\pi}(\cdot|x)} \left[ \langle \theta_{\text{MLE}} - \theta^*, \phi(x, a) - \nu \rangle - \beta \|\phi(x, a) - \nu\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} - \eta \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) \| \hat{\pi}(\cdot|x))] \right] \\ &\leq 2\beta \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0, a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} \beta \|\phi(x, a) - \nu\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} - \nu \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) \| \hat{\pi}(\cdot|x))], \end{aligned}$$

where we use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the last inequality. □

## B Proof of the online setting

### B.1 Construction of the Confidence Set

*Proof of Lemma 5.* By the definition of the  $\pi^*$  that  $\pi^*$  is optimal at every context, for any  $\pi_t^1 \in \Pi$  and any  $x_{t,i} \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \langle \theta^*, \phi(x_{t,i}, \pi^*) - \phi(x_{t,i}, \pi_t^1) \rangle + \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_{t,i}) \| \pi_0(\cdot|x_{t,i})) - \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi^*(\cdot|x_{t,i}) \| \pi_0(\cdot|x_{t,i})) \\ &= \underbrace{\langle \theta^* - \theta_t, \phi(x_{t,i}, \pi^*) - \phi(x_{t,i}, \pi_t^1) \rangle}_{\text{Term(i)}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\langle \theta_t, \phi(x_{t,i}, \pi^*) - \phi(x_{t,i}, \pi_t^1) \rangle + \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_{t,i}) \| \pi_0(\cdot|x_{t,i})) - \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi^*(\cdot|x_{t,i}) \| \pi_0(\cdot|x_{t,i}))}_{\text{Term(ii)}}, \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

For Term (i), by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 4 with  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}} = m\Sigma_{t,m}$  and  $\lambda' = m\lambda$ , we have

$$\text{Term(i)} \leq \beta \cdot \|\phi(x_{t,i}, \pi^*) - \phi(x_{t,i}, \pi_t^1)\|_{\Sigma_{t,m}^{-1}},$$

where  $\beta = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d + \log(T/\delta)}{\gamma^2 m}}\right)$  and the additional  $\log T$  factor is because of the union bound over the  $T$  iterations. Meanwhile, by invoking Lemma 2 with  $\pi = \pi^*$ ,  $\hat{\pi} = \pi_t$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term(ii)} &= \langle \theta_t, \phi(x_{t,i}, \pi^*) - \phi(x_{t,i}, \pi_t^1) \rangle + \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_{t,i}) \| \pi_0(\cdot|x_{t,i})) - \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi^*(\cdot|x_{t,i}) \| \pi_0(\cdot|x_{t,i})) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} [r^t(x_{t,i}, a)] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_t^1} [r^t(x_{t,i}, a)] + \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_{t,i}) \| \pi_0(\cdot|x_{t,i})) - \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi^*(\cdot|x_{t,i}) \| \pi_0(\cdot|x_{t,i})) \\ &= -\eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi^*(\cdot|x_{t,i}) \| \pi_t^1(\cdot|x_{t,i})). \end{aligned}$$

Taking respective upper bounds for Terms (i) and (ii) back into Equation (14) and summing over  $i \in [m]$ , we have

$$\beta \sum_{i=1}^m \|\phi(x_{t,i}, \pi^*) - \phi(x_{t,i}, \pi_t^1)\|_{\Sigma_{t,m}^{-1}} - \eta \sum_{i=1}^m D_{\text{KL}}(\pi^*(\cdot|x_{t,i}) \| \pi_t^1(\cdot|x_{t,i})) \geq 0,$$

which implies that  $\pi^* \in \Pi_t$ . Therefore, we finish the proof of Lemma 5. □

## B.2 Sequential Online Setting

For the sequential case, we set  $m = 1$  in Algorithm 2 and consider two kinds of regrets: (1) cumulative suboptimality for the main policy  $\pi_t^1$  compared to  $\pi^*$ :

$$\text{Reg}(T) := \sum_{t=1}^T [J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_t^1)],$$

and (2) the average suboptimality:

$$\text{Reg}_{\text{ave}}(T) := \sum_{t=1}^T \left[ \frac{2J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_t^1) - J(\pi_t^2)}{2} \right].$$

In this case, our goal is to output a sequence of policy pair  $\{\pi_t^1, \pi_t^2\}_{t=1}^T$  so that the regrets  $\text{Reg}(T)$  and  $\text{Reg}_{\text{ave}}(T)$  are sublinear. To achieve this goal, the enhancer computes its policy by maximizing the uncertainty estimator

$$\pi_t^2 = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi_t^2 \in \Pi_t} \sum_{i=1}^m \Gamma(x_{t,i}, \pi_t^1, \pi_t^2, \mathcal{D}^{1:t-1}), \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}^{1:t-1} = \cup_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathcal{D}^s$ .

**Theorem 4** (Online learning). *Under Assumption 1 with the uncertainty estimator defined in Equation (8), with  $\lambda = \Omega(d \log(T/\delta))$  and  $\beta := O(\sqrt{\frac{d + \log(T/\delta)}{\gamma^2}} + \lambda B^2)$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ , the regret of Algorithm 2 with  $m = 1$  satisfies*

$$\text{Reg}_{\text{ave}}(T) \lesssim \sqrt{T\beta^2 d} - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_t) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_t))],$$

which further implies that

$$\text{Reg}(T) \lesssim \sqrt{T\beta^2 d} - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_t) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_t))].$$

*Proof of Theorem 4.* First, recalling the regret decomposition in Equation (6), we deduce that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T [J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_t^1)] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} \left[ \langle \theta^t - \theta^*, \phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi^*) \rangle \right] - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_t) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_t))] \\ &\leq \beta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} \min \{1, \|\phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi^*)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}\} - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_t) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_t))] \\ &\leq \beta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} \min \{1, \|\phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi_t^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}\} - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_t) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_t))] \\ &\leq \beta \sqrt{T \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0, (a_t^1, a_t^2) \sim (\pi_t^1, \pi_t^2)} \min \{1, \|\phi(x_t, a_t^1) - \phi(x_t, a_t^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}^2\}} - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_t) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_t))], \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the first inequality uses the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Lemma 4 and reward  $r \leq 1$  for any  $r \in \mathcal{F}$ , the second inequality uses  $\pi^* \in \Pi_t$  according to Lemma 5, and the last inequality uses the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Jensen's inequality.

Then, we define

$$\bar{\Sigma}_t = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0, (a_t^1, a_t^2) \sim (\pi_t^1, \pi_t^2)} [(\phi(x_t, a_t^1) - \phi(x_t, a_t^2))(\phi(x_t, a_t^1) - \phi(x_t, a_t^2))^\top] + \lambda I.$$

According to the concentration of the covariance matrix in Lemma 7, since  $\lambda = \Omega(d \log(T/\delta))$ , we have with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for any  $t \in [T]$ ,

$$\Sigma_t^{-1} \preceq 3\bar{\Sigma}_t^{-1},$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0, (a_t^1, a_t^2) \sim (\pi_t^1, \pi_t^2)} \min \{1, \|\phi(x_t, a_t^1) - \phi(x_t, a_t^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}^2\} \\ & \leq 3 \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0, (a_t^1, a_t^2) \sim (\pi_t^1, \pi_t^2)} \min \{1, \|\phi(x_t, a_t^1) - \phi(x_t, a_t^2)\|_{\bar{\Sigma}_t^{-1}}^2\} \\ & \leq 6d \log(1 + T/d\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

By taking the result above back into Equation (16), we get with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T [J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_t^1)] \leq \beta \sqrt{T6d \log(1 + T/d\lambda)} - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_t) \|\pi^*(\cdot|x_t))], \quad (17)$$

where the inequality uses Lemma 6.

Moreover, to analyze the average regret  $\text{Reg}_{\text{ave}}(T)$ , we make the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T J(\pi_t^1) - J(\pi_t^2) &= \sum_{t=1}^T \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [\mathbb{E}_{\pi_t^1} [r^*(x_t, a) - r^t(x_t, a)] + \mathbb{E}_{\pi_t^2} [r^t(x_t, a) - r^*(x_t, a)]]}_{(\Delta_t^1)} \\ &+ \sum_{t=1}^T \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [\mathbb{E}_{\pi_t^1} [r^t(x_t, a)] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_t^2} [r^t(x_t, a)] + \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^2(\cdot|x_t) \|\pi_0(\cdot|x_t)) - \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_t) \|\pi_0(\cdot|x_t))]}_{(\Delta_t^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

For Term  $(\Delta_t^1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta_t^1) &= \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [\langle \phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi_t^2), \theta^* - \theta_t \rangle] \\ &\leq \beta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} \|\phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi_t^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}} \end{aligned}$$

We can deal with the Term  $(\Delta_t^2)$  by invoking Lemma 5 with  $\pi = \pi_t^2$  and using the definition of the confidence set:

$$(\Delta_t^2) = \eta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^2(\cdot|x_t) \|\pi_t^1(\cdot|x_t)) \leq \beta \cdot \|\phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi_t^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}.$$

Combining the above two inequalities and Equation (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^T J(\pi_t^1) - J(\pi_t^2) &\leq 2\beta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} \|\phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi_t^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}} \\
&\leq 2\beta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0, (a_t^1, a_t^2) \sim (\pi_t^1, \pi_t^2)} \|\phi(x_t, a_t^1) - \phi(x_t, a_t^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}} \\
&\leq 2\beta \sqrt{3T \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0, (a_t^1, a_t^2) \sim (\pi_t^1, \pi_t^2)} \|\phi(x_t, a_t^1) - \phi(x_t, a_t^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}^2} \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{T\beta^2 d},
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where the last inequality uses Lemma 6. Combining the results of  $\text{Reg}(T)$  and the upper bound of  $\sum_{t=1}^T J(\pi_t^1) - J(\pi_t^2)$  in Equation (19), we can obtain the bound for the average regret in the following theorem.

Therefore, by combining the results above and Equation (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^T (2J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_t^1) - J(\pi_t^2)) &= \sum_{t=1}^T 2(J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_t^1)) + (J(\pi_t^1) - J(\pi_t^2)) \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{T\beta^2 d} - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_1^t(\cdot|x_t) \|\pi^*(\cdot|x_t))],
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

### B.3 Proof of Batch Online Setting

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Recall the definition of the covariance matrix:

$$\Sigma_{t,m} = \lambda I + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \sum_{j=1}^m (\phi(x_{i,j}, a_{i,j}^1) - \phi(x_{i,j}, a_{i,j}^2)) (\phi(x_{i,j}, a_{i,j}^1) - \phi(x_{i,j}, a_{i,j}^2))^\top.$$

Then, by invoking Lemma 4 for  $\theta_t$  with  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}} = m\Sigma_{t,m}$  and  $\lambda' = m\lambda$ , we have with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for any  $t \in [T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\theta^t - \theta^*\|_{\Sigma_{t,m}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|\theta^t - \theta^*\|_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{m}} \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(T/\delta)}{\gamma^2} + m\lambda B^2} \\
&= C \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(T/\delta)}{\gamma^2 m} + \lambda B^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Let

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_t = \lambda I + \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0, a^1 \sim \pi_i^1, a^2 \sim \pi_i^2} [(\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2)) (\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2))^\top].$$



Now, by elliptical potential lemma (Lemma 6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \log(1 + \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} \|\phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi_t^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}^2) &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \log(1 + \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0, a^1 \sim \pi_t^1, a^2 \sim \pi_t^2} \|\phi(x_t, a^1) - \phi(x_t, a^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}^2) \\ &\leq \log \frac{\det(\tilde{\Sigma}_T)}{\det(\lambda I)} \\ &\leq d \log(1 + TL^2/\lambda d) := \gamma_T(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Since each term on the left-hand side is positive, we know that there exists at least a  $t_0 \in [T]$ , the value is smaller or equal than the average value:

$$\log(1 + \psi_{t_0}^2) \leq \frac{1}{T} \gamma_T(\lambda),$$

where we use the short-hand notation  $\psi_t = \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} \|\phi(x_t, \pi_t^1) - \phi(x_t, \pi_t^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}$ . It is equivalent to

$$\psi_{t_0}^2 \leq \exp\left(\frac{\gamma_T(\lambda)}{T}\right) - 1.$$

We now consider the suboptimality at iteration  $t_0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_{t_0}^1) &= \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} \left[ \langle \theta^{t_0} - \theta^*, \phi(x_{t_0}, \pi_{t_0}^1) - \phi(x_{t_0}, \pi^*) \rangle \right] - \eta \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{t_0}^1(\cdot|x_{t_0}) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_{t_0}))] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} \left[ \|\phi(x_{t_0}, \pi_{t_0}^1) - \phi(x_{t_0}, \pi^*)\|_{\Sigma_{t_0, m}^{-1}} \cdot \|\theta^{t_0} - \theta^*\|_{\Sigma_{t_0, m}} - \eta \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{t_0}^1(\cdot|x_{t_0}) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_{t_0}))] \right], \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where the inequality uses the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Then, since the samples  $\{x_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^m$  are i.i.d and for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$

$$\|\phi(x, \pi_{t_0}^1) - \phi(x, \pi^*)\|_{\Sigma_{t_0, m}^{-1}} \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\lambda}},$$

we can use Chernoff bound (Theorem 2.16 of Zhang (2023)) to obtain that with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} \left[ \|\phi(x_{t_0}, \pi_{t_0}^1) - \phi(x_{t_0}, \pi^*)\|_{\Sigma_{t_0, m}^{-1}} \right] \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\phi(x_{t_0, i}, \pi_{t_0}^1) - \phi(x_{t_0, i}, \pi^*)\|_{\Sigma_{t_0, m}^{-1}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{2m}}.$$

Similarly, we also get with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ ,

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\phi(x_{t_0, i}, \pi_{t_0}^1) - \phi(x_{t_0, i}, \pi^*)\|_{\Sigma_{t_0}^{-1}} \leq \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} \left[ \|\phi(x_{t_0}, \pi_{t_0}^1) - \phi(x_{t_0}, \pi^*)\|_{\Sigma_{t_0}^{-1}} \right] + \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{2m}}$$

We take the two inequalities above back into Equation (21) to derive with that probability at least  $1 - 3\delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_{t_0}^1) \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[ \|\phi(x_{t_0, i}, \pi_{t_0}^1) - \phi(x_{t_0, i}, \pi^*)\|_{\Sigma_{t_0, m}^{-1}} \right] + \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{2m}} \right) \cdot \|\theta^{t_0} - \theta^*\|_{\Sigma_{t_0, m}} - \eta \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{t_0}^1(\cdot|x_{t_0}) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_{t_0}))] \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[ \|\phi(x_{t_0, i}, \pi_{t_0}^1) - \phi(x_{t_0, i}, \pi_{t_0}^2)\|_{\Sigma_{t_0, m}^{-1}} \right] + \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{2m}} \right) \cdot \|\theta^{t_0} - \theta^*\|_{\Sigma_{t_0, m}} - \eta \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{t_0}^1(\cdot|x_{t_0}) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_{t_0}))] \\ &\leq \left( \frac{\sqrt{3}}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[ \|\phi(x_{t_0, i}, \pi_{t_0}^1) - \phi(x_{t_0, i}, \pi_{t_0}^2)\|_{\Sigma_{t_0}^{-1}} \right] + \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{2m}} \right) \cdot \|\theta^{t_0} - \theta^*\|_{\Sigma_{t_0, m}} - \eta \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{t_0}^1(\cdot|x_{t_0}) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_{t_0}))] \\ &\leq \left( \sqrt{3} \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} \left[ \|\phi(x_{t_0}, \pi_{t_0}^1) - \phi(x_{t_0}, \pi^*)\|_{\Sigma_{t_0}^{-1}} \right] + 2\sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{2m}} \right) \cdot \|\theta^{t_0} - \theta^*\|_{\Sigma_{t_0, m}} - \eta \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{t_0}^1(\cdot|x_{t_0}) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_{t_0}))] \\ &\leq \left( \sqrt{\exp\left(\frac{\gamma_T(\lambda)}{T}\right) - 1} + 2\sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{2m}} \right) \cdot C \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(T/\delta)}{\gamma^2 m}} + \lambda B^2 - \eta \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{t_0}^1(\cdot|x_{t_0}) \| \pi^*(\cdot|x_{t_0}))], \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality applies Lemma 7 with  $\lambda = \Omega(d \log(T/\delta)/m)$ , and the last inequality uses Equation (20). By choosing  $T$  satisfying that  $T \geq d \log(T)$  and  $\lambda = \Theta(d \log(T/\delta)/mB^2)$ , we have

$$J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_{t_0}^1) = \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{(d + \log(T/\delta))d \log T}{\gamma^2 m T}} - \eta \mathbb{E}_{x_{t_0} \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{t_0}^1(\cdot|x_{t_0}) \|\pi^*(\cdot|x_{t_0}))]\right),$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## C Proof of the Hybrid Setting

### C.1 Proof of Proposition 1

*Proof of Proposition 1.* First, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} &= \sqrt{(\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})])^\top \Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})]} \\ &= \sqrt{\text{tr}\left(\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})] (\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})])^\top \Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses the property of trace. To facilitate our analysis, we use the notation that  $\Sigma^\ddagger = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})] (\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})])^\top$ . Together with the assumption that

$$\Sigma_{\text{off}} \succeq \lambda I + c^\ddagger \cdot n_{\text{off}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})] (\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})])^\top,$$

we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} &\leq \sqrt{\text{tr}\left(\Sigma^\ddagger (B^2 I + c^\ddagger \cdot n_{\text{off}} \cdot \Sigma^\ddagger)^{-1}\right)} \\ &= \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\lambda_j}{B^2 + c^\ddagger \cdot n_{\text{off}} \cdot \lambda_j}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda_j$  denotes the  $j$ -th eigenvalue of  $\Sigma^\ddagger$ . It is not difficult to show that  $\lambda_j \in [0, B^2]$ , which further implies that

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{1 + c^\ddagger \cdot n_{\text{off}}}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{d}{c^\ddagger \cdot n_{\text{off}}}}.$$

If  $T^{\alpha^\ddagger}/n_{\text{off}} = c^\ddagger$ , we have

$$T^{1-\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}})} \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})]\|_{(\Sigma_{\text{off}})^{-1}} \leq C_{\text{cov}}.$$

with

$$\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}) = 1 - \frac{\alpha^\ddagger}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \log T} \log \left( \frac{c^\ddagger d}{c^\ddagger C_{\text{cov}}^2} \right),$$

which concludes the proof of Corollary 1.  $\square$

## C.2 Proof of Theorem 3

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Define the following covariance matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{\text{off}} &= \lambda I + \sum_{(x, a^1, a^2) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}} (\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2))(\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2))^\top, \\ \Sigma_t &= \Sigma_{\text{off}} + \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (\phi(x_i, a_i^1) - \phi(x_i, a_i^2))(\phi(x_i, a_i^1) - \phi(x_i, a_i^2))^\top, \\ \bar{\Sigma}_t &= \Sigma_{\text{off}} + \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0, a^1 \sim \pi_t, a^2 \sim \pi_{\text{ref}}} (\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2))(\phi(x, a^1) - \phi(x, a^2))^\top.\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proofs of the offline and online setting, we get the following decomposition: with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}& \sum_{t=1}^T [J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_t)] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} [r^*(x, a) - r^t(x, a)] + \mathbb{E}_{\pi_t} [r^t(x, a) - r^*(x, a)]] - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t(\cdot|x_t) \|\pi^*(\cdot|x_t))] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [\langle \theta^* - \theta^t, \phi(x_t, \pi^*) - \phi(x_t, \pi_{\text{ref}}) \rangle] + \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [\langle \theta^t - \theta^*, \phi(x_t, \pi_t) - \phi(x_t, \pi_{\text{ref}}) \rangle] \\ &\quad - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t(\cdot|x_t) \|\pi^*(\cdot|x_t))] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \|\theta^* - \theta_t\|_{\Sigma_t} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [\|\phi(x_t, \pi^*) - \phi(x_t, \pi_{\text{ref}})\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=1}^T \|\theta^* - \theta_t\|_{\Sigma_t} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [\min\{1, \|\phi(x_t, \pi_t) - \phi(x_t, \pi_{\text{ref}})\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}\}] - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^t(\cdot|x_t) \|\pi^*(\cdot|x_t))], \\ &\leq \underbrace{T\beta \cdot \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}}}_{P_1} + \underbrace{\beta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} \min\{1, \|\phi(x_t, \pi_t) - \phi(x_t, \pi_{\text{ref}})\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}\}}_{P_2} \\ &\quad - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_t^t(\cdot|x_t) \|\pi^*(\cdot|x_t))],\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds due to Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, the first inequality uses the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the last inequality holds due to Lemma 4 and  $\Sigma_t \succeq \Sigma_{\text{off}}$ . For the term  $P_1$ , according to Assumption 2, we get

$$\begin{aligned}P_1 &= T^\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}) \beta \cdot T^{1-\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}})} \|\mathbb{E}_{x \sim d_0} [\phi(x, \pi^*) - \phi(x, \pi_{\text{ref}})]\|_{\Sigma_{\text{off}}^{-1}} \\ &= T^\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{off}}) \beta \cdot C_{\text{cov}}.\end{aligned}$$

For the term  $P_2$ , we can apply Lemmas 6 and 7 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}P_2 &\leq \beta \sqrt{3T \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0, a^1 \sim \pi_t, a^2 \sim \pi_{\text{ref}}} \min(\|\phi(x_t, a^1) - \phi(x_t, a^2)\|_{\Sigma_t^{-1}}^2, 1)} \\ &\leq \beta \sqrt{3T \cdot 2d \log(1 + T/d\lambda)}.\end{aligned}$$

By taking the upper bound of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  back, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T [J(\pi^*) - J(\pi_t)] \leq T^{\alpha(T, \mathcal{D}_{\text{opt}})} \beta \cdot C_{\text{cov}} + \beta \sqrt{6Td \log(1 + T/d\lambda)} - \eta \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim d_0} [D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_1^t(\cdot|x_t) \|\pi^*(\cdot|x_t))].$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## D Technical Lemma Proofs

*Proof of Lemma 2.* Since  $\hat{\pi}$  is induced by calling Oracle 1 with  $\hat{r}$ , we know that for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\hat{\pi}(a|x) = \frac{1}{Z(x)} \pi_0(a|x) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \cdot \hat{r}(a|x)\right),$$

where  $Z(x) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_0(a|x) \exp(\frac{1}{\eta} \hat{r}(x, a))$  is the normalization constant. We can rewrite the reward function as

$$\hat{r}(x, a) = \eta \log \frac{\hat{\pi}(a|x)}{\pi_0(a|x)} + \eta \log Z(x).$$

Plugging this reward reparameterization into the policy optimization error under  $\hat{r}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\hat{r}(x, a)] - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}}[\hat{r}(x, a)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[ \eta \log \frac{\hat{\pi}(a|x)}{\pi_0(a|x)} \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \eta \log \frac{\hat{\pi}(a|x)}{\pi_0(a|x)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[ \eta \log \frac{\pi(a|x)}{\pi_0(a|x)} \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[ \eta \log \frac{\pi(a|x)}{\hat{\pi}(a|x)} \right] - \eta \cdot D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{\pi}(\cdot|x) \|\pi_0(\cdot|x)) \\ &= \eta \cdot D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) \|\pi_0(\cdot|x)) - \eta \cdot D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) \|\hat{\pi}(\cdot|x)) - \eta \cdot D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{\pi}(\cdot|x) \|\pi_0(\cdot|x)). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging the above equality into the LHS of the Lemma 2 completes the proof.  $\square$

## E Technical Lemmas

**Lemma 6** (Elliptical Potential Lemma (Dani et al., 2008; Rusmevichientong & Tsitsiklis, 2010; Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011)). *Let  $\{x_i\}_{i \in [T]}$  be a sequence of vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\|x_i\|_2 \leq L < \infty$  for all  $t \in [T]$ . Let  $\Lambda_0$  be a positive-definite matrix and  $\Lambda_t = \Lambda_0 + \sum_{i=1}^t x_i x_i^\top$ . It holds that*

$$\log \left( \frac{\det(\Lambda_t)}{\Lambda_0} \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^t \|x_i\|_{\Lambda_{i-1}^{-1}}^2.$$

Further, if  $\|x_i\|_2 \leq L$  for all  $i \in [T]$ , then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^T \min\{1, \|x_i\|_{\Lambda_{i-1}^{-1}}^2\} \leq 2 \log \left( \frac{\det(\Lambda_t)}{\Lambda_0} \right) \leq 2d \log \left( \frac{\text{trace}(\Lambda_0) + nL^2}{d \det(\Lambda_0)^{1/d}} \right).$$

Finally, if  $\lambda_{\min}(\Lambda_0) \geq \max(1, L^2)$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^T \|x_i\|_{\Lambda_{i-1}^{-1}}^2 \leq 2 \log \left( \frac{\det(\Lambda_t)}{\Lambda_0} \right).$$

**Lemma 7** (Concentration of Inverse Covariance (Zanette et al., 2021a)). *Let  $\mu_i$  be the conditional distribution of  $\phi$  given the sampled  $\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{i-1}\}$ . Assume  $\|\phi\|_2 \leq 1$ , for any realization of the vector. Define  $\Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\phi \sim \mu_i} [\phi \phi^\top]$ . If  $\lambda = \Omega(d \log(n/\delta))$ , then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for any  $n \geq 1$*

$$3(\Lambda + \lambda I)^{-1} \succeq \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i \phi_i^\top + \lambda I \right)^{-1} \succeq \frac{3}{5} (\Lambda + \lambda I)^{-1}.$$

**Lemma 8** (Solution of KL-regularized Optimization (Proposition 7.16 and Theorem 15.3 of Zhang (2023))).  
Given a loss functional with respect to  $\pi(\cdot|x)$ , written as

$$\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} \left[ -r(x, a) - \eta \log \frac{\pi_0(a|x)}{\pi(a|x)} \right] = \eta D_{\text{KL}} \left( \pi(a|x) \parallel \pi_0(a|x) \exp \left( \frac{1}{\eta} r(x, a) \right) \right),$$

the minimizer of the loss functional is  $\pi^*(a|x) \propto \pi_0(a|x) \exp \left( \frac{1}{\eta} r(x, a) \right)$ , also known as Gibbs distribution.

**Lemma 9** (Solution of Preference data). Given  $x, a^1, a^2$ , we consider the preference learning for

$$p^*(a^1 \succ a^2|x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp \left( \eta \log \frac{\pi^*(a^2|x)}{\pi_0(a^2|x)} - \eta \log \frac{\pi^*(a^1|x)}{\pi_0(a^1|x)} \right)} = \sigma \left( \eta \log \frac{\pi^*(a^1|x)}{\pi_0(a^1|x)} - \eta \log \frac{\pi^*(a^2|x)}{\pi_0(a^2|x)} \right),$$

by

$$p^\theta(a^1 \succ a^2|x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp \left( \eta \log \frac{\pi^\theta(a^2|x)}{\pi_0(a^2|x)} - \eta \log \frac{\pi^\theta(a^1|x)}{\pi_0(a^1|x)} \right)} = \sigma \left( \eta \log \frac{\pi^\theta(a^1|x)}{\pi_0(a^1|x)} - \eta \log \frac{\pi^\theta(a^2|x)}{\pi_0(a^2|x)} \right).$$

Consider the loss when we have sufficiently many samples,

$$p^*(a^1 \succ a^2|x) \log p^\theta(a^1 \succ a^2|x) + p^*(a^2 \succ a^1|x) \log p^\theta(a^2 \succ a^1|x).$$

The solution satisfies  $\pi_\theta(a^1|x)/\pi_\theta(a^2|x) = \pi^*(a^1|x)/\pi^*(a^2|x)$ .

*Proof.* The loss function can be reformulated as the KL divergence plus a constant term:

$$D_{\text{KL}}(p^* \parallel p^\theta) - [p^*(a^1 \succ a^2|x) \log p^*(a^1 \succ a^2|x) + p^*(a^2 \succ a^1|x) \log p^*(a^2 \succ a^1|x)].$$

This implies that  $p^* = p^\theta$  is the unique optimal solution for  $p^\theta$ .

Moreover, if the condition  $\pi_\theta(a^1|x)/\pi_\theta(a^2|x) = \pi^*(a^1|x)/\pi^*(a^2|x)$  is satisfied, the optimality of the solution is assured.  $\square$