

# Predicting Long Term Sequential Policy Value Using Softer Surrogates

Hyunji Nam, Allen Nie, Ge Gao, Vasilis Syrgkanis, Emma Brunskill

Stanford University

## Abstract

Performing policy evaluation in education, healthcare and online commerce can be challenging, because it can require waiting substantial amounts of time to observe outcomes over the desired horizon of interest. While offline evaluation methods can be used to estimate the performance of a new decision policy from historical data in some cases, such methods struggle when the new policy involves novel actions or is being run in a new decision process with potentially different dynamics. Here we consider how to estimate the full-horizon value of a new decision policy using only short-horizon data from the new policy, and historical full-horizon data from a different behavior policy. We introduce two new estimators for this setting, including a doubly robust estimator, and provide formal analysis of their properties. Our empirical results on two realistic simulators, of HIV treatment and sepsis treatment, show that our methods can often provide informative estimates of a new decision policy ten times faster than waiting for the full horizon, highlighting that it may be possible to quickly identify if a new decision policy, involving new actions, is better or worse than existing past policies.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Reinforcement learning has had many successes and offers the compelling framework of explicitly evaluating and optimizing decision policies to optimize for long-term outcomes. However, in many important settings – such as education, healthcare and online commerce – the horizon for the reward values of interest is very long. For example, it is common to consider how the use of an intelligent tutoring system over a school year impacts end-of-year external assessment results (Zheng et al., 2019), the impact of medical treatments on 5-year survival rates, and the impact of ads or promotions over a multi-month customer churn or engagement (Zhang et al., 2023). Performing policy optimization or evaluation in such settings can require substantial amounts of real time, and is a significant barrier to testing, deploying and iterating on adap-

tive sequential decision policies for such settings. This has motivated several recent works that consider how to estimate long-horizon outcomes of decision policies using short-horizon data (Saito et al., 2024; Cheng et al., 2021; Tang et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023; Tran et al., 2024).

Our aim is to estimate the long-term value of a new target policy that involves previously unexplored actions, using only short-horizon data from this new policy and full-horizon historical data from a behavioral policy. Without further assumptions, this task will generally be impossible to solve – the short-term data may not include all reachable states and rewards, and the historical policy and process may be entirely different than the target policy and the decision process of interest. To tackle this, surrogate indices have been proposed (Athey et al., 2019), which assumes a set of observed features that are made available from a short horizon, and renders the long-term delayed outcome independent of the decision policy.

Unfortunately surrogacy given short-horizon observations is a strong assumption when it comes to sequential decision making settings, where the decision policy will continue to take actions through the full horizon. The natural application of surrogacy indices to our setting would be if observation of the short-term state trajectory made the future expected sum of rewards independent of the decision policy deployed during the remaining time steps. While there are settings where that will be true (such as if no reward occurs after the short horizon sequence), in general surrogacy is unlikely to hold.

However, the “dynamic invariance” assumption of Battocchi et al. (2021) relaxes the standard surrogacy assumption by only requiring that the behavioral policy’s estimand and the new target policy’s estimand have the same relationship with the surrogates. For example, if the rewards and both the target and the behavioral policies are only functions of states, then even though a binary indicator for intervention  $D$  changes the policy from  $\pi_b$  to  $\pi_2$ , and therefore, the standard surrogacy assumption does not hold since the future trajectory of states due to the intervention  $D$  are not independent given the surrogates, identification is still




Figure 1: Suppose policies in  $\Pi$  induce state trajectories that cluster into two different regions, where similar regions correspond to similar rewards. Different policies may still have very different probabilities over the state trajectories, but conditioned on the initial  $s_{0:h}$  short-horizon trajectory, the resulting returns are similar. Note that there may exist other policies from  $\bar{\Pi}$  which do not exhibit this distribution.

possible if the dynamic invariance condition holds.

In this paper we will make a similar assumption to Battocchi et al. (2021), but focus on a different objective: the task of estimating the full multi-step horizon value of a target decision policy with new actions, given short-term trajectories from a target policy, coupled with historical data. We will introduce two new policy evaluation estimators, one based on doubly robust formulation. Our methods estimate the full-horizon value of a target policy only from its short-term trajectories, under the assumption that conditioned on the short  $h$ -step observations, the expected future returns of the target policy is the same as the expected future returns under the behavior policy. While we will shortly discuss this in greater depth, we briefly give some motivating scenarios where this is plausible, which are visualized in Figure 1.

Consider a setting where young students use an AI intelligent tutoring system that teaches mathematics. Each school day the student can log in and complete activities and at the end of the year is a national assessment. In this setting, some students thrive, regularly logging in and completing activities, and later doing well on the assessment, but other students struggle. Recent work has proposed new hybrid human-AI approach in which all students are additionally supported by human tutors (Thomas et al., 2024; Abdelshihed et al., 2024). Now consider such a hybrid human-AI approach as a new target policy, where tutors spend the first week ensuring that all kids log in and complete the assignments, and in later weeks, spend time with each student twice weekly. Under this new policy, all students now regularly log in and complete the ac-

tivities, similar to the thriving students from the first scenario. Then in later weeks, even though the students’ exact patterns of activities and log in frequencies may fluctuate depending on whether they receive a tutor’s support, they still continue to progress through the curriculum in a way that averages to that of the thriving students in the first scenario, ultimately leading to the same high final test scores. The thriving students under the first policy, and all students under the second policy would correspond to the top set of trajectories in Figure 1, and the struggling students from the first policy would follow the lower half of the trajectories. Note that the initial short-horizon data may not render the long horizon returns independent of the subsequent policy: though for these two policies the returns overlap conditioned on the short horizon data, other teaching strategies (such as employing human tutors for only 1 week to help with initial technical login problems) may have very different outcomes given the same initial short-horizon observation.

In general, even our weaker assumption may not hold, and our estimators may have some bias. Promisingly, we will demonstrate empirically using the popular simulators of HIV treatment (Ernst et al., 2006) and sepsis treatment (Oberst and Sontag, 2019) that our methods produced informative long-term value estimates for a target policy. While we might expect this to only hold when the initial state trajectory is long, our empirical results show that even given only short-term trajectories that cover 10% of the full horizon, our proposed estimators are sufficiently accurate for identifying whether the new decision policy will have better or worse performance than the behavior policy, which may be particularly important for AI safety applications. We also provide a theoretical analysis of our estimators. Promisingly, these findings suggest that it is possible to sometimes obtain useful estimates of the long-horizon value of a new target policy, after only observing its performance for a much shorter number of time steps, which could be extremely useful in many domains where experimentation is costly and involves substantial real time.

## 2 RELATED WORK

Policy evaluation of long-term outcomes in sequential decision making processes using historical data is well studied in offline reinforcement learning (Dudík et al., 2011; Thomas and Brunskill, 2016; Levine et al., 2020). Offline policy evaluation estimators rely on coverage between the actions taken by a behavior decision policy and a new target policy of interest, and assume the dynamics process is identical between the historical data generation process and the target policy environment. Such approaches do not provide informative

estimates<sup>1</sup> for our settings of interest: when novel actions, such as a new treatment, are part of a new decision policy, or when the action dynamics may change.

When the short horizon data from the new policy covers all reachable states and actions under the target policy, and the decision process is Markov, prior work has shown how to use the data to estimate the long-horizon policy value (Tran et al., 2024; Shi et al., 2023). For example, Tran et al. (2024) developed a double machine learning method to estimate the long-term effect of a T-duration single treatment policy versus control and Shi et al. (2023) developed a statistical test for detecting if the long-horizon value of a new policy would be higher than another decision policy.

A powerful approach to predicting the long-term outcomes of novel interventions comes from seminal work on surrogacy (Prentice, 1989; Athey et al., 2019; Saito et al., 2024). The surrogacy assumption (or surrogate index) is when one or more intermediate observed variables renders a past intervention independent of the delayed outcome of interest. In such work, historical data is used to learn estimators for predicting the long-term outcome of the target intervention given the short-term surrogate observations, and these estimators are then applied to new short-term observations given a new intervention. These ideas have been more recently used with machine learning methods (Cheng et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2023). Other papers have improved the surrogate methods to be more robust even when surrogacy does not strictly hold (Saito et al., 2024; Kallus and Mao, 2024), and some work has leveraged surrogates while actively exploring in a delayed multi-armed bandit setting (Grover et al., 2018; McDonald et al., 2023). Almost all such work has focused on when there is a single intervention, followed by surrogate measures, and then a delayed outcome. In contrast, our aim is to estimate the value of a decision policy that will continue to influence later states and rewards after the short-term observed trajectory.

To our knowledge, there has been very little work on the setting we consider. Attia et al. (2020) showed exciting results from learning a regressor that used domain-specific feature engineering to predict battery lifetime given short-term data, and used this with Bayesian optimization to quickly learn good charging protocols though their work does not consider policy estimation with new actions. Likely most similar to our work is Battocchi et al. (2021) which used surrogate indices from short-term data to estimate the impact of a novel action. Their focus is on estimating the long-term performance of taking single action followed by no addi-

<sup>1</sup>When all rewards are positive, certain importance sampling estimators have been proved to provide a valid lower bound even when coverage is not satisfied (Thomas et al., 2015) but this bound may be very loose when coverage is limited.

tional interventions, even though the data may have contained other actions. In contrast, we are interested in the full multi-step horizon value of a decision policy with new actions that persist over the long horizons.

Ultimately, we show that the problem that we are faced with can be framed as inference on a linear functional of a regression function under a co-variate shift. From this perspective it falls in the general setting analyzed in Chernozhukov et al. (2023). We show how the techniques in Chernozhukov et al. (2023) can be utilized to provide unbiased and doubly robust estimators that allow for the construction of asymptotically valid confidence intervals, under assumptions on the achievable estimation rates for nuisance components (e.g. value function, density ratio). One technical contribution of our work is to provide finite sample high-probability analogues of the asymptotic results given by Chernozhukov et al. (2023). Our results provide estimation rates with exponential tails and for any estimation rate regime of the nuisance components, which can be of independent interest.

### 3 PROBLEM SETTING

We consider sequential decision processes. We assume there is a  $H$ -horizon episodic decision process  $\mathcal{M}_b$  consisting of a set of states  $\mathcal{S}$ , actions  $\mathcal{A}_b$ , a dynamics model  $P(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t, s_1, a_1, \dots, s_t, a_t)$  and reward model  $R(s)$ . We assume the reward model depends only on the current or the full history of states but not on actions. We assume access to a historical dataset  $\mathcal{D}_b$  which consists of a set of  $N_b$  state and reward trajectories  $\tau_i = (s_{0i}, r_{0i}, s_{1i}, r_{1i}, \dots, s_{Hi}, r_{Hi})$  where each trajectory was collected by following a fixed behavior policy  $\pi_b$  in decision process  $\mathcal{M}_b$ , which is a function mapping either the current state  $s_t$  or a history of  $s_0, s_1, \dots, s_t$  to action  $a_t$ . Importantly, we do not assume the decision process is Markov, the dataset contains the taken actions, knowledge of  $\pi_b$  nor that the behavior policy is Markov. We use  $G_i = \sum_{j=1}^H r_{ji}$  to denote the total sum of rewards in a particular trajectory<sup>2</sup>. The value of a policy  $\pi$  in a particular episodic decision process  $\mathcal{M}$  is defined as the expected sum of  $H$ -step rewards in that process: overloading notation and writing  $E_{s \sim \pi}$  to denote the expectation over the distribution of trajectories induced by policy  $\pi$ , we can express the value as  $V_{H, \mathcal{M}}^\pi = E_{\tau(s_0, r_0, \dots, s_H, r_H) \sim \pi, \mathcal{M}} \sum_{j=1}^H r_j$ . Let  $\tau_h = (s_0, r_0, \dots, s_h, r_h)$ .

We assume there is a second episodic decision process  $\mathcal{M}_2$  which has the same state space  $\mathcal{S}$  and same reward model  $R(s)$  but may have a different transition dynamics as the previous historical process but whose

<sup>2</sup>For simplicity we do not include discounting but it is trivial to extend our framework to include a reward discount factor if present.

action set  $\mathcal{A}_2$  includes one or more new actions that are not in  $\mathcal{A}_b$ . We assume there is a set  $\mathcal{D}_2$  of  $N_2$  short-horizon  $h$  trajectories (where  $h$  is much less than the full horizon  $H$ ) consisting of  $\tau_i = (s_{0i}, r_{0i}, s_{1i}, r_{1i}, \dots, s_{hi}, r_{hi})$  where each trajectory was collected by following a target policy  $\pi_2$  in  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . We assume the target policy  $\pi_2$  selects a new action that was not available in the historical decision process in at least some visited states. As is standard in reinforcement learning, we assume the true underlying dynamics processes in both  $\mathcal{M}_b$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , and their shared reward model is unknown.

The objective is to estimate the full horizon value of the target policy  $\pi_2$ , i.e.,  $V_{H, \mathcal{M}_2}^{\pi_2}$ , using only the historical data and the short-horizon on-policy data.

## 4 ESTIMATORS

There are multiple challenges involved in obtaining a good estimate of  $V_{H, \mathcal{M}_2}^{\pi_2}$ : The action space differs, the dynamics models may be different, and we do not assume knowledge of the behavior policy nor the reward model nor the dynamics models. We only have access to the historical dataset  $\mathcal{D}_b$  collected from executing the fixed behavioral policy  $\pi_b$  in the process  $\mathcal{M}_b$ , and assume that the state spaces between  $\mathcal{M}_b$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are the same, and the reward model  $R(s)$  is defined over the states (or a history of states).

We now present a quantity that we can estimate, followed by describing conditions under which this quantity is the desired quantity of the long-term expected return of the target policy.

Define  $V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}$  as the expected sum of returns of following the target policy  $\pi_2$  for  $h$  steps in decision process  $\mathcal{M}_2$  to reach state  $s_h$  (denote this sub-trajectory by  $\tau_{h2}$ , and then following behavior policy  $\pi_b$  in decision process  $\mathcal{M}_b$  starting in state  $s_h$ , for the remaining  $h+1$  to  $H$  steps of the episode, conditioned on the initial trajectory  $(s_0, \dots, s_h)$  (call this latter sub-trajectory  $\tau_{2bH}$ ).

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi_2 \pi_b} &\equiv E_{(s_0, r_0, s_1, r_1, \dots, s_h, r_h) \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} \left( \sum_{j=1}^h r_j + \right. \\ &\left. E_{(s_{h+1}, r_{h+1}, \dots, s_H, r_H) \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b | (s_0, r_0, \dots, s_h, r_h)} \sum_{j'=h+1}^H r_{j'} \right) \\ &= E_{\tau_{h2}} \sum_{j=1}^h r_j + E_{\tau_{2bH}} \sum_{j'=h+1}^H r_{j'} \end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, this considers the expected return of following the new target policy over a short horizon in the new decision process, and then following the old behavior policy for the remaining time steps till the full horizon in the old decision process, conditioned on the observed initial trajectory in the new process.

While we have no actual trajectories generated from this process, some of our trajectories may essentially be equivalent to some trajectories generated in this manner. As an example, consider a particular  $i$ -th trajectory in the historical dataset:

$$\tau_{bi} = \tau_{bi}(s_0, r_0, \dots, s_h, r_h) \tau_{bi}(s_{h+1}, r_{h+1}, \dots, s_H, r_H)$$

, where we have subdivided it into the first  $h$  steps and the remaining  $h+1, \dots, H$  steps. If the short-horizon behavior's initial sub-trajectory  $\tau_{bi}(s_0, r_0, \dots, s_h, r_h)$  matches one of the short-horizon trajectories in the target policy dataset  $\tau_{h2i}$ , then the reward obtained from  $\tau_{bi}$  is equivalent to the reward that would have been obtained by first following  $\pi_2$  along those first  $h$  steps (assuming the observed states) followed by following  $\pi_b$  for the remaining time steps. Note this is true because the reward is only a function of the observed states, so if the observed state sequences are identical, the reward will be identical.

In general, perfect matches of the trajectories and sub-trajectories may be rare. We will shortly propose methods that leverage function approximation to estimate  $V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}$ .

### 4.1 Estimating the Target Value

Before describing our proposed policy estimators, we first consider how estimates of  $V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}$  relate to our primary goal of estimating  $V^{\pi_2}$ . Consider the following assumption:

**Assumption 1.** *The expected future return given an initial sequence  $s_{0:h}$  is the same under the behavior policy and the historical decision process, and the target policy and the new decision process:*

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{s_{h+1}, r_{h+1}, \dots, s_H, r_H | \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b, s_0, \dots, s_h, r_h} \sum_{i=h+1}^H r_i \\ &= E_{s_{h+1}, r_{h+1}, \dots, s_H, r_H | \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2, s_0, \dots, s_h, r_h} \sum_{i=h+1}^H r_i \quad (1) \end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 1  $V^{\pi_2 \pi_b} = V^{\pi_2}$  (see Supplement).

Note that the standard surrogacy assumption would require that these match for all possible decision policies and sequential data generation processes, so that the future return is independent of the decision process and policy conditioned on  $s_{0:h}$ . Assumption 1 is slightly weaker, only focusing on the historical decision policy and process, and the target policy and process.

We recognize this assumption is still quite strong. In practical settings, we will often be interested in evaluating if a new target policy is better or worse than

an alternate policy, such as a behavior policy. In such cases, it may be that  $V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}$  still offers a sufficiently informative estimate of  $V^{\pi_2}$  that it can be used to help decide if  $\pi_2$  offers benefit over the existing alternative. We will shortly demonstrate empirically this is possible in Section 6.

## 4.2 Short Long Regression Estimation

We first introduce a Short Long Regression Estimator, which builds a regression function that takes in a short-horizon trajectory over states and rewards, and uses this to predict the full-horizon reward if the remaining trajectory was generated by following the behavior policy in the historical decision process:

$$f(\tau_h) = \sum_{i=1}^H r_i + E_{(s_{h+1}, \dots, s_H, r_H) \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b | \tau_h} \sum_{j'=h+1}^H r_{j'} \quad (2)$$

$V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}$  is then computed by evaluating  $f$  over the short-horizon target policy dataset:

$$V_{slr}^{\pi_2 \pi_b} \equiv \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{k=1}^{N_2} f(\tau_h^k) \approx E_{\tau_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} f(\tau_h^k) \quad (3)$$

While  $f$  can be learned directly using the data available in the behavior dataset, when data is limited and the function approximator is powerful, it may be helpful to change the loss to prioritize accurate predictions over the short-horizon sub-sequences most likely to occur in the target policy. To accomplish this we can use distribution shift aware methods or inverse propensity weighting when fitting the regressor function.

$$f_w(\tau_h) = \frac{p(\tau_h | \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2)}{p(\tau_h | \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b)} \left( \sum_{i=1}^H r_i \right), \quad (4)$$

Note that the density ratios involve probability distributions over the  $h$ -step state trajectories, which may yield a high dimensional distribution. Since we only require estimating the ratio, we use the popular technique of reducing density ratio estimation to a classification problem Sugiyama et al. (2007), which allows us to invert the problem and build a classifier  $h(\tau_h)$  to predict if a sample came from the behavior or target policy using the short-horizon historical and target data.

In our experiments we will compare the weighted and unweighted functions (Equations 2 and 4) as an input to our regression estimate (Equation 42).

## 4.3 Doubly Robust Short Long Estimation

One of the limitations to the prior estimator is that it relies on the machine learning regression estimate to

predict the long-term returns of a particular trajectory. When the true model does not lie inside the considered regressor class, this can introduce asymptotic bias and error. In addition, the density ratio estimator may also have error and introduce additional errors.

A recent powerful approach is to instead use double machine learning (Chernozhukov et al., 2023) or debiased machine learning (Battocchi et al., 2021; Kallus and Mao, 2024) to construct an estimator that is more robust to error in the "nuisance" parameters that contribute to the estimate of interest. We now construct such a double machine learning estimator for our setting. Define  $Z = (\tau_{Hb}, G^{\pi_b}, \tau_{h2})$  where  $\tau_{Hb}$  is a  $H$ -step trajectory generated by  $\mathcal{M}_b$  using behavior policy  $\pi_b$ , and  $\tau_{h2}$  is a  $h$ -step trajectory from the target policy:

$$m((Z, f, a) \equiv a(s_{0:h})(G^{\pi_b} - f(\tau_{hb}) + f(\tau_{h2})) \quad (5)$$

where

$$a(s_{0:h}) = \frac{p(\tau_h | \pi_2, s_0)}{p(\tau_h | \pi_b, s_0)} \quad (6)$$

represents the learned density ratio estimates over the short-horizon returns, and  $f$  is the learned regressor defined in the prior subsection.

Note the expected value of  $m$  with the true function parameters  $f_0, a_0$  (the true regression function and the true density ratios) satisfies the following moment condition

$$\begin{aligned} M(f_0, a_0) &\equiv E_Z[m(Z, f_0, a_0)] \\ 0 &= M(f_0, a_0) - V^{\pi_2, \pi_b} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

In other words, the expected value of  $m$  is an unbiased estimator  $V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}$  given the (unknown) true regressor and density ratios.

Of course, we do not have access to the true unknown regressor function and density ratios. Instead we construct an estimate of  $V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}$  by using  $k$ -fold cross-fitting (Chernozhukov et al., 2023) using one fold of the data to estimate the nuisance parameters  $(\tilde{a}^{(k)}, \tilde{f}^{(k)})$  and the rest to evaluate the finite sample moment conditions given the estimated nuisance parameters, summed over the folds. The  $k$ -th cross fit estimate is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{M}^k(f^{-k}, a^{-k}) &= \frac{1}{N_b^k} \sum_{i=1}^{N_b^k} a^{-k}(\tau_i)(G_H(s_{i,0:h}) - f^{-k}(\tau_{hi})) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N_2^k} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2^k} \tilde{f}(\tau_{hj}), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the first sum is over a subset of the historical data gathered by  $\pi_b$  in decision process  $\mathcal{M}_b$ , and the second term is a sum over a subset of the short-horizon data sampled from the target policy  $\pi_2$  in decision process  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . The second term serves as a baseline and is a

slight departure from standard double machine learning, since here we have access to (limited) on-policy data: in the supplement we justify the chosen second term in terms of error convergence.

The final estimate is the average over all cross-fit folds:

$$V_{DR}^{\pi_2, \pi_b} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \hat{M}^k(f^{-k}, a^{-k}) \quad (9)$$

## 5 THEORY

Overlap is a standard assumption for off-policy reinforcement learning. Here we present an adaptation of that assumption, specifically only on the short-horizon state distribution (not action distribution). Note that all proofs, when omitted, are presented in the supplement.

**Assumption 2.** (*Coverage*). *The behavior policy in the historical process strictly overlaps the distribution of short-horizon state sequences generated under the target policy in the target domain:*

$$\frac{p_0(\tau_h | \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2)}{p_0(\tau_h | \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b)} > 0 \quad \forall p_0(\tau_h | \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2) > 0$$

We also define

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_2(f^{(k)}) &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\tau_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} [(f^{(k)}(\tau_h) - f_0(\tau_h))^2]} \\ \epsilon_b(f^{(k)}) &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\tau_h \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b} [(f^{(k)}(\tau_h) - f_0(\tau_h))^2]} \\ \epsilon_b(\hat{a}^{(k)}) &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\tau_h \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b} [(\hat{a}(\tau_h) - a_0(\tau_h))^2]} \end{aligned}$$

as the  $L_2$  error between the estimated nuisance parameters and the true nuisance parameters. Note that we are defining these errors with respect to the two different data distributions: that induced by the data generation process from either the historical data process  $\mathcal{M}_b$  and policy  $\pi_b$ , and that induced by the target data process  $\mathcal{M}_2$  and policy  $\pi_2$ .

We now present a bound in the error of our DR estimator (Equation 9):

**Theorem 1** (Variance-Based Rate for DR). *Assume that  $|G_H|, |f^{(k)}(\tau_h)|, |f_0(\tau_h)|$  are a.s. bounded by  $C_1 H$  and  $\hat{a}^{(k)}(\tau_h), a_0(\tau_h)$  are a.s. bounded by  $C_2$ , where  $C_1$*

and  $C_2$  are constants. Then w.p. at least  $1 - \delta$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |V_{DR}^{\pi_2, \pi_b} - V^{\pi_2, \pi_b}| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \text{Var}_{\tau_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2}(f_0(\tau_h)) \log(4K/\delta)}{N_2}} \\ &+ \sqrt{\frac{2 \mathbb{E}_{\tau_h \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b} [a_0(\tau_h)^2 (G_H(\tau_h) - f_0(\tau_h))^2] \log(4K/\delta)}{N_b}} \\ &+ \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \epsilon_b(f^{(k)}) \cdot \epsilon_b(\hat{a}^{(k)}) + \frac{2HK \log(4K/\delta)}{N_2} \\ &+ \max_k \epsilon_2(f^{(k)}) \sqrt{\frac{2K \log(4K/\delta)}{N_2}} + \frac{4C_1 C_2 HK \log(4K/\delta)}{N_b} \\ &+ 3C_1 H \max_k \left\{ \epsilon_b(f^{(k)}) + \epsilon_b(\hat{a}^{(k)}) \right\} \sqrt{\frac{2K \log(4K/\delta)}{N_b}} \end{aligned}$$

We are interested in understanding when the first two terms (which depend on the variance under the true, unknown, nuisance parameters) will dominate the bound. Note that terms four and six are dominated by the first two terms, as the first two terms have a slower rate dependence on  $N_2$  and  $N_b$ , respectively. As long as  $f$  is consistent for the target policy and data distribution, the fifth term will be dominated by the first term. Similarly if the nuisance parameters are consistently estimated under the behavior policy distribution, seventh term will be dominated by the second term. Finally the third term is a product of the nuisance error bounds under the historical distribution, which implies for this to be lower order than the first two terms, it may be particularly important for  $f$  to well model the historical distribution. This further suggests that fitting  $f$  using unweighted regression on the historical dataset (Equation 2) may have beneficial properties. We will examine this further in our empirical simulations.

Theorem 5 immediately implies the following:

**Corollary 1.** *Given Assumption 2, if our estimates of the regression function  $f$  and propensity weights / density ratio  $a$  are asymptotically consistent, at any rate, then  $V_{DR}^{\pi_2, \pi_b}$  is a consistent estimator of  $V^{\pi_2, \pi_b}$ .*

We also now characterize the doubly robust property of our  $V_{DR}^{\pi_2, \pi_b}$  estimator.

**Theorem 2.** *Define the error in the predicted value as  $\Delta(\tau_h, f) = f(\tau_h) - f_0(\tau_h)$  and the density ratio relative to the true density ratio as  $\delta(\tau_h) = \frac{a(\tau_h)}{a_0(\tau_h)}$ . Under Assumptions 1 and 2, then the bias of  $V_{DR}$  is*

$$V_{DR}^{\pi_2, \pi_b} - V^{\pi_2, \pi_b} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K E_{\tau_{h2}} [\Delta(\tau_{h2}, f^{(k)}) (1 - \delta^{(k)}(\tau_{h2}))], \quad (10)$$

the average of the product-bias terms across the folds.

(See proof 7.)

**Corollary 2.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, if  $\forall \tau_h$  either  $f(\tau_h) = f_0(\tau_h)$  or  $a(\tau_h) = a_0(\tau_h)$ , then  $V_{DR}^{\pi_2, \pi_b}$  is unbiased.*

Finally the regression estimate (Equation 42) is also consistent under similar assumptions:

**Theorem 3.** *If the regression function  $f$  is asymptotically consistent, then  $V_{slr}^{\pi_2, \pi_b}$  is a consistent estimator of  $V^{\pi_2, \pi_b}$ .*

Though both the DR and regression are consistent under similar assumptions, the doubly robust estimate can provide some robustness against regression misspecification. More broadly, it is often the case that doubly robust estimators achieve semi-parametric efficiency, but the regression estimators do not.

## 6 EXPERIMENTS

We now investigate the performance of our proposed estimators – namely, i) Short Long Regression Estimator, ii) unweighted version of Short Long Regression Estimator, iii) Doubly Robust Short Long Estimator, and iv) DR Short Long Estimator with weighted regressor – as introduced in Section 4. Additionally we include results from a synthetic domain showing that the DR estimator is more robust to mis-specification in the regression and density modeling in Section 9.

One may ask how the new target policies are suggested as alternatives to the existing behavioral policies. We model two possible scenarios for proposing new policies with the HIV simulator by Ernst et al. (2006) and the sepsis treatment model by Oberst and Sontag (2019). In HIV we consider when new actions (i.e., dosages of drugs) substitute the old actions taken by the behavioral policy; in sepsis a new treatment method is introduced additionally to the existing interventions already available to the behavioral policy.

### 6.1 Clinical Simulator Experiments

Our goal in both settings is to estimate the long-term value of a target policy (i.e., returns from the full-horizon) using only the short-horizon data from this new policy and some historical data under a different behavioral policy.

#### 6.1.1 Domains

**HIV Treatment** Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) is a retrovirus that can lead to the lethal Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) devastating a person’s immune system. In the simulator designed by Ernst et al. (2006), the patient’s state is

represented by 6 features representing the number of healthy and HIV-infected cells in the range between  $(0, 10^8)$ . Treatments are based on two drugs: Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (RTI) and Protease Inhibitors (PI). The behavioral policy chooses actions from  $\mathcal{A}_b = \{\text{small RTI \& high PI, high RTI \& small PI, small RTI \& PI, and high RTI \& PI}\}$ ; while the target policy chooses actions from a different action space,  $\mathcal{A}_2 = \{\text{high RTI, high PI, high both, and no treatment}\}$ . Notably the small dosages from  $\mathcal{A}_b$  are replaced with zero. As a result 3 out of the 4 discrete actions possible under the new policy are not observed in the historical dataset by the behavioral policy. The reward is observed at every time step based on the number of free virus particles and the HIV-specific T cells. Thus, the return  $G$  is the sum of these rewards over 200 steps, and the policy value is the average return over the initial patient population. We include 2500 trajectories in the historical dataset,  $\mathcal{D}_b$ , and only 500 trajectories in the new dataset  $\mathcal{D}_2$  under  $\pi_2$ , considering that in real world scenarios, new policies are likely first tested on a smaller scale compared to the behavioral policies which have been in practice for a long time.

**Managing Sepsis for ICU Patients** Sepsis is a life-threatening organ dysfunction in response to infections and one of the leading causes of mortality in the United States (Liu et al., 2014). We use the sepsis treatment model for ICU patients by Oberst and Sontag (2019), following the settings in Namkoong et al. (2020). The patient’s state is represented by a binary indicator for diabetes, and four vital signs (i.e., heart rate, blood pressure, oxygen concentration, glucose level) that take values in a subset of  $\{\text{very\_high, high, normal, low, very\_low}\}$ , leading to the size of the state space = 1440. The behavioral policy chooses from the following two binary treatment options,  $\{\text{antibiotics, mechanical ventilation}\}$ , leading to  $|\mathcal{A}_b| = 4$ , modeled after Gao et al. (2024). The target policy has an additional option of vasopressors based on the original implementation by Oberst and Sontag (2019), thus making the action space larger,  $|\mathcal{A}_2| = 8$ . The full horizon length is 20 and at each time step, the reward is either 0, +1 (if the patient is successfully discharged from the hospital), or -1 (if the patient dies).  $\mathcal{D}_b$  has 5000, and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  has 500 trajectories. More details about both simulators are in the supplement due to space.

#### 6.1.2 Baselines

We compare to the following baselines. i) **Online model-based RL:** Prior work has used the online short-horizon data to estimate the target value  $V^{\pi_2}$  (Tran et al., 2024; Shi et al., 2023). Here we estimate the transition models to estimate the target policy’s

long-term returns<sup>3</sup>. ii) LOPE estimator by Saito et al. (2024), which takes the form

$$\hat{V}_{\text{LOPE}}(\pi_2, \mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|} \frac{p(\tau_{h,i}|\pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2)}{p(\tau_{h,i}|\pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b)} \left( G_{H,i} - \hat{f}(s_{0:h,i}, a_{h+1,i}) + \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \pi_2(\cdot|\tau_{h,i})} \hat{f}(s_{0:h,i}, a') \right)$$

, and  $\hat{f}$  is learned as the minimizer of

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|} \left( G_{H,i} - \hat{f}(\tau_{h,i}, a_{h+1,i}) \right)^2$$

, from the historical data collected under  $\pi_b$  where  $a_{h+1,i} \sim \pi_b(\cdot|s_{0:h,i})$ . iii) **Extrapolate mean short-term reward**: Multiply the average reward observed during the short horizon by the full horizon length (similar to the naive baseline in Tran et al. (2024)). iv) **Extrapolate final short-term reward**: Similarly multiply the last reward observed from the short horizon by the full horizon length. This may give reasonable estimates if the system enters an equilibrium. v) **Full-horizon Monte Carlo estimates**: While these would not be available in practice, since  $\pi_2$  is only executed for a short horizon, we included this to benchmark the performance of using a finite set of full trajectories to estimate the policy value.<sup>4</sup>

### 6.1.3 Results

We first specify how we define ground truth long-term policy value of the target policy. In HIV the decision process is deterministic, and we compute  $V^{\pi_2}$  by averaging over simulating  $\pi_2$  for the full horizon in each initial state. In Sepsis the decision process is stochastic, and we define the ground truth  $V^{\pi_2}$  as a Monte Carlo average of 5000 simulation rollouts.

Table 1 shows the estimation errors  $V^{\pi_2 \pi_b} - V^{\pi_2}$  made by our proposed estimates and the baselines in the HIV and sepsis domains. Encouragingly, we find that at a short horizon of  $h = 20$  in HIV (versus the full horizon of  $H = 200$ ) and  $h = 2$  in sepsis (versus the full

<sup>3</sup>We could also use the double machine learning methods introduced previously Tran et al. (2024) but (a) these were developed for T-duration single treatment policy evaluation which does not match our general decision policies and (b) we do not expect this to significantly change the results since the main challenge is that many states and action transitions are not observed in the short horizon due to the action space changes.

<sup>4</sup>In stochastic settings, if surrogacy holds, it is known that using a surrogate index may provably lead to a lower variance estimate than a Monte Carlo estimate of the full-horizon returns (Athey et al., 2019). In sepsis, if the short-term outcomes are informative, but not necessarily surrogates, we may see benefits of using our proposed methods over the full-horizon Monte Carlo estimates. We do not include HIV for this comparison since the process is deterministic.

horizon of  $H = 20$ ), our proposed methods yield estimates that are substantially more accurate than the existing baselines. Note in both cases this corresponds to predicting the full horizon value after only one-tenth of the full horizon time steps. For example, this could mean a difference of 2 weeks for clinical trials versus 20 weeks to get an estimate of the result at 20 weeks. In Table 5 and 6, we consider different short horizon  $h$  lengths for HIV and Sepsis, and observe that the short long regression estimators give reasonably accurate predictions, compared to the baseline estimators, across all considered  $h$ s. We also evaluate different estimators across multiple target policies with varying policy values in 10.3.

In contrast, the baseline of the online model-based RL approach does very poorly in both domains, likely due to the limited sample size, which means many states may not be observed from the short horizon, and the accumulated errors from the future state and reward estimation. Extrapolating the final short-term reward performs poorly in HIV where the short-horizon rewards are much smaller in magnitude compared to the later rewards. It performs quite well in the sepsis domain because the true value of the target policy in sepsis is close to 0, and the reward of most patients is zero during short trajectories, so this happens to perform well. To understand the quality of these predictions, we also consider the trivial baseline of predicting the behavior policy value.

Decision-makers often want to understand if the new target policy is likely to significantly outperform or under-perform another policy, such as the behavioral policy. In our two simulations, the target policy’s value is higher than the behavioral policy’s. In HIV  $V^{\pi_b} = 337.01$ , while the target policy makes the improvement of  $V^{\pi_2} = 404.87$ ; similarly, in sepsis  $V^{\pi_b} = -0.178$ , but the target policy reduces the chance of mortality as  $V^{\pi_2} = -0.006$ . We are interested in testing if we can use short-horizon estimates to quickly identify that the new policy’s value is higher, without having to waiting for the full-horizon results. To do so we perform T-tests using the estimated values for the new policy versus the observed values from the behavioral policy. The p-value in Table 1 indicates whether the estimated difference between the policy value of  $\pi_2$  and  $\pi_b$  is statistically significant, i.e., whether  $V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}$  is meaningfully different than  $V^{\pi_b}$  to consider a new policy  $\pi_2$ . In both HIV and sepsis, our estimates can accurately identify that the new target policy’s value will be better than the behavior policy using only short-horizon data that is 10% of the full horizon. Note the other baselines are not always reliable. For example, sometimes they will confidently but erroneously predict that the new target policy has a worse value than the behavior, or predict correctly but have wildly in-



Table 1: Comparison of HIV and Sepsis estimation: MSE and p-value from T-test results. Mean and std (in parentheses) for Sepsis are from 5 seeds for bootstrapping.

Estimator	HIV		Sepsis	
	Error ( $h = 20$ )	p-value	Error ( $h = 2$ )	p-value
Short long regression estimator	53.21	$p \leq 410^{-6}$	0.03 (0.02)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Short long estimator with unweighted regressor	67.15	$p \geq 0.05$	0.04 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
DR short long estimator	64.86	$p \leq 0.01$	0.04 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
DR with weighted regressor	50.61	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.03 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Online model-based RL	402.49	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.62 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
LOPE estimator (based on Saito et al. (2024))	67.75	$p \geq 0.3$	0.14 (0.25)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Extrapolate final short-term reward	400.56	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.07 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Extrapolate average short-term reward	403.83	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.07 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Predict $V^{\pi_b}$	67.86	N/A	0.172	N/A

accurate estimates, with worse error than predicting the behavior policy value. These results suggest our approaches may be especially useful for quickly identifying if a new decision policy is much better or worse than another policy already in practice, which could be useful for AI safety and for quickly extending beneficial policies to a broader cohort.

## 7 DISCUSSION

When the short-horizon length is not necessarily bound by logistical constraints (e.g., clinical trials are only scheduled to run for one week, but there may be opportunities to continue them for longer duration), practitioners may consider different observation horizons to balance practical trade-offs between more signal versus increased observation cost. Other future direction would be to combine our proposed methods with active learning to guide the design of a behavioral policy such that the data collected using this behavioral policy can improve efficiency of evaluating the long-term value of an unknown target policy.

## 8 APPENDIX: THEORY

### 8.1 Under Assumption 1, $V^{\pi_2 \pi_b} = V^{\pi_2}$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
V^{\pi_2 \pi_b} &\equiv E_{(s_0, r_0, \dots, s_h, r_h) \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} \left( \sum_{j=1}^h r_j + E_{(s_{h+1}, \dots, r_H) \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b | (s_0, \dots, r_h)} \sum_{j'=h+1}^H r_{j'} \right) \\
&= E_{(s_0, \dots, r_h) \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} \left( \sum_{j=1}^h r_j + E_{(s_{h+1}, \dots, r_H) \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2 | (s_0, \dots, r_h)} \sum_{j'=h+1}^H r_{j'} \right) \\
&= V^{\pi_2}
\end{aligned}$$

□

### 8.2 Baseline Regression Estimator

The second term of the DR estimator represents the estimated value of  $V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}$  using the regression estimate, and leverages the on policy data samples from the target policy  $\pi_2$ . We note that in our setting there are several choices for this quantity, and below we briefly motivate our choice. Consider two possible options:

$$\frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} f(s_{0:h}^j) a(s_{0:h}^i) \approx E_{s_{0:h} \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_{\pi_b}} [f(s_{0:h}) a(s_{0:h})] \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} f(s_{0:h}^j) \approx E_{s_{0:h} \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_{\pi_2}} [f(s_{0:h}) a(s_{0:h})] \quad (12)$$

Note the top expression uses the historical data and the bottom expression uses the on-policy short horizon data. We first consider when the regressor  $f$  is accurate:  $f(s_{0:h}) = E_{s_{0:h} \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2, s_{h+1:H} \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b} [\sum_{i=1}^H r(s_i)]$ . Then the error in the estimate for Equation 12 is only due to the finite sample approximation of the expectation, and will generally decrease as  $O(\frac{1}{N_2})$ .

We now consider the estimate in Equation 11 which uses the density ratio (short-horizon trajectory propensity weights)  $a(s_{0:h})$ . Let  $a^*$  be the true (unknown) density ratio and  $a$  be the density ratio estimated using the historical data and on policy short horizon data:

$$\frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} f(s_{0:h}^j) a(s_{0:h}^i) = \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} (f(s_{0:h}^j) a(s_{0:h}^i) - (f(s_{0:h}^j) a^*(s_{0:h}^i) + (f(s_{0:h}^j) a^*(s_{0:h}^i)) \quad (13)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} (f(s_{0:h}^j) (a(s_{0:h}^i) - a^*(s_{0:h}^i)) + (f(s_{0:h}^j) a^*(s_{0:h}^i)) \quad (14)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= E_{s_{0:h} \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_{\pi_b}} [f(s_{0:h}) a^*(s_{0:h})] + \left( \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} (f(s_{0:h}^j) (a(s_{0:h}^i) - E_{s_{0:h} \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_{\pi_b}} [f(s_{0:h}) a^*(s_{0:h})]) \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} (f(s_{0:h}^j) (a(s_{0:h}^i) - a^*(s_{0:h}^i))), \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

The second term is (like above) due to using finite samples to approximate an expectation and will therefore generally scale with the size of the historical dataset,  $O(\frac{1}{N_b})$ . The third term involve the error in the density ratio. Estimating the density ratio  $a$  uses short-horizon on policy data, and so in general we expect the estimation error in  $a$  to at best scale with  $O(\frac{1}{N_2})$ , which implies we expect the overall error

$$\frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} f(s_{0:h}^j) a(s_{0:h}^i) - E_{s_{0:h} \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_{\pi_b}} [f(s_{0:h}) a^*(s_{0:h})] = O\left(\frac{1}{N_b} + \frac{1}{N_2}\right). \quad (16)$$

Therefore we expect the finite-sample error to be better by using the on-policy data estimator Equation 12. Note that in standard offline reinforcement learning, no online data from the target policy is available and this "baseline" term is quite different: it is typically a weighting over the target policy, aka  $V(s) = \sum_a p(a|s, \pi_2) Q^{\pi_2}(s, a)$  where  $Q^{\pi_2}$  is estimated on the offline data from  $\pi_b$ , and  $p(a|s, \pi_2)$  is known because that is simply the new target policy.

### 8.3 DR Estimator Consistency

We first recall some prior results. First note that in our setting we are interested in solving a moment of the following form

$$\theta_0 = \mathbb{E}_s[m(Z; f_0)] \qquad f_0(X) = \mathbb{E}_\ell[Y | X] \qquad (17)$$

where  $m(Z; f_0)$  is a linear functional of  $f_0$  and  $s, \ell$  denote two different distributions of the data (short and long-horizon data). Here the goal is to linear functional of a regression function  $f_0$  over the distribution of short-term data, but we trained  $f_0$  as a regression over long-term data.

Our example is a special case of this where:

$$\theta_0 = \mathbb{E}_s[f_0(X)] \qquad f_0(X) = \mathbb{E}_\ell[Y | X] \qquad (18)$$

where  $X$  is the vector of surrogates.

Any such linear functional has a doubly robust representation:

$$\theta_0 = \mathbb{E}_s[m(Z; f_0)] + \mathbb{E}_\ell[a_0(X) (Y - f_0(X))] \qquad (19)$$

where  $a_0(X)$  is the Riesz representer (the element in the Hilbert space, that represents the linear functional as an inner product; with respect to the  $L^2$  inner product over the distribution in  $\ell$ ). In other words, it is the function that has the property that:

$$\forall g : \mathbb{E}_s[g(X)] = \mathbb{E}_\ell[a_0(X) g(X)] \qquad (20)$$

In our case, this Riesz representer is the density ratio:

$$a_0(X) = \frac{p_s(X)}{p_\ell(X)} \qquad (21)$$

We now note that the error due to the nuisance parameters for the DR representation of such linear functionals can be bounded by the error in the two nuisance parameters:

**Theorem 4** (Doubly Robust Bias Bound). *Chernozhukov et al. (2023) Consider the population moment function*

$$M(g, a) = \mathbb{E}_s[m(Z; g)] + \mathbb{E}_\ell[a(X) (Y - g(X))]$$

Then we have that for all  $a$ :

$$M(g, a) - M(f_0, a_0) = \mathbb{E}_\ell[(a(X) - a_0(X)) (f_0(X) - g(X))] \qquad (22)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_\ell(a^{(k)} - a_0)^2 \mathbb{E}_\ell(f^{(k)} - f_0)^2 \qquad (23)$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} M(g, a) - M(f_0, a_0) &= \mathbb{E}_s[m(Z; g)] + \mathbb{E}_\ell[a(X) (Y - g(X))] - \mathbb{E}_s[m(Z; f_0)] - \mathbb{E}_\ell[a_0(X) (Y - f_0(X))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_s[m(Z; g)] + \mathbb{E}_\ell[a(X) (f_0(X) - g(X))] - \mathbb{E}_s[m(Z; f_0)] - \mathbb{E}_\ell[a_0(X) (f_0(X) - f_0(X))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_s[m(Z; g)] + \mathbb{E}_\ell[a(X) (f_0(X) - g(X))] - \mathbb{E}_s[m(Z; f_0)], \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from the definition of the moment  $M(g, a)$ , and the second equality uses the tower rule of expectation and the fact that  $f_0(X) = \mathbb{E}_\ell[Y | X]$ .

Note that  $a_0$  satisfies that for all  $g$ :

$$\mathbb{E}_s[m(Z; g)] = \mathbb{E}_\ell[a_0(X) g(X)] \quad (24)$$

we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} M(g, a) - M(f_0, a_0) &= \mathbb{E}_\ell[a_0(X)g(X)] + \mathbb{E}_\ell[a_0(X)(f_0(X) - f_0(X))] - \mathbb{E}_\ell[a_0(X)f_0(X)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\ell[a_0(X)(g(X) - f_0(X)) + a_0(X)(f_0(X) - g(X))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\ell[(a_0(X) - a_0(X))(f_0(X) - g(X))] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_\ell(a^{(k)} - a_0)^2 \mathbb{E}_\ell(f^{(k)} - f_0)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality.  $\square$

Recall

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_2(f^{(k)}) &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\tau_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2}[(f^{(k)}(\tau_h) - f_0(\tau_h))^2]} \\ \epsilon_b(f^{(k)}) &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\tau_h \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b}[(f^{(k)}(\tau_h) - f_0(\tau_h))^2]} \\ \epsilon_b(a^{(k)}) &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\tau_h \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b}[(a(\tau_h) - a_0(\tau_h))^2]} \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 5** (Variance-Based Rate for DR). *Assume that  $|G_H|, |f^{(k)}(\tau_h)|, |f_0(\tau_h)|$  are a.s. bounded by  $C_1 H$  and  $a^{(k)}(\tau_h), a_0(\tau_h)$  are a.s. bounded by  $C_2$ , where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are constants. Then w.p. at least  $1 - \delta$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} |V_{DR}^{\pi_2, \pi_b} - V^{\pi_2, \pi_b}| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \text{Var}_{\tau_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2}(f_0(\tau_h)) \log(4K/\delta)}{N_2}} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \mathbb{E}_{\tau_h \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b}[a_0(\tau_h)^2 (G_H(\tau_h) - f_0(\tau_h))^2] \log(4K/\delta)}{N_b}} \\ &+ \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \epsilon_b(f^{(k)}) \cdot \epsilon_b(a^{(k)}) + \frac{2HK \log(4K/\delta)}{N_2} + \max_k \epsilon_2(f^{(k)}) \sqrt{\frac{2K \log(4K/\delta)}{N_2}} \\ &+ \frac{4C_1 C_2 HK \log(4K/\delta)}{N_b} + 3C_1 H \max_k \left\{ \epsilon_b(f^{(k)}) + \epsilon_b(a^{(k)}) \right\} \sqrt{\frac{2K \log(4K/\delta)}{N_b}} \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We can write:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{DR}^{\pi_2, \pi_b} - V^{\pi_2, \pi_b} &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{1}{|I_s \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_s \cap I_k} (f^{(k)}(Z_i) - V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}) + \frac{1}{|I_\ell \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_\ell \cap I_k} \underbrace{a^{(k)}(Z_i) (G_H^i - f^{(k)}(Z_i))}_{B_i(f^{(k)}, a^{(k)})} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{1}{|I_s \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_s \cap I_k} (f_0(Z_i) - V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}) + \frac{1}{|I_\ell \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_\ell \cap I_k} B_i(f_0, a_0) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{1}{|I_s \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_s \cap I_k} (f^{(k)}(Z_i) - f_0(Z_i)) + \frac{1}{|I_\ell \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_\ell \cap I_k} (B_i(f^{(k)}, a^{(k)}) - B_i(f_0, a_0)) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in I_s} (f_0(Z_i) - V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}) + \frac{1}{n_\ell} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} B_i(f_0, a_0) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{1}{|I_s \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_s \cap I_k} (f^{(k)}(Z_i) - f_0(Z_i)) + \frac{1}{|I_\ell \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_\ell \cap I_k} (B_i(f^{(k)}, a^{(k)}) - B_i(f_0, a_0)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

The first term is a sum of  $n_s$  i.i.d. mean-zero random variables, since  $V^{\pi_2 \pi_b} = \mathcal{E}_s[f_0(X)]$ . Hence, by a Bernstein bound, we have that, w.p.  $1 - \delta$ :

$$\left| \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i \in I_s} (f_0(Z_i) - V^{\pi_2 \pi_b}) \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \text{Var}_s(f_0) \log(1/\delta)}{n_s}} + \frac{2H \log(1/\delta)}{n_s} := \mathcal{E}_1(\delta) \quad (25)$$

Similarly, the second term is the sum of  $n_\ell$  i.i.d. mean-zero random variables, since  $\mathcal{E}_\ell[G_H | Z] = f_0(Z)$ . Hence, by a Bernstein bound, we have that, w.p.  $1 - \delta$ :

$$\left| \frac{1}{n_\ell} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} B_i(f_0, a_0) \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_\ell(B(f_0, a_0)) \log(1/\delta)}{n_\ell}} + \frac{2H^2 \log(1/\delta)}{n_\ell} \quad (26)$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{2\mathcal{E}_\ell[a_0(Z)^2(G_H - f_0(Z))^2] \log(1/\delta)}{n_\ell}} + \frac{2H^2 \log(1/\delta)}{n_\ell} := \mathcal{E}_2(\delta) \quad (27)$$

For each fold  $k$ , let:

$$\hat{\Delta}_k(f) = \frac{1}{|I_s \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_s \cap I_k} (f(Z_i) - f_0(Z_i)) \quad \Delta(g) = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\Delta}_k(g)] = \mathbb{E}_s[f(X) - f_0(X)] \quad (28)$$

$$\hat{\Lambda}_k(f, a) = \frac{1}{|I_\ell \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_\ell \cap I_k} (B_i(f, a) - B_i(f_0, a_0)) \quad \Lambda(g) = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\Lambda}_k(f)] = \mathbb{E}_\ell[a(Z)(G_H - f(Z))] \quad (29)$$

Conditional on the folds  $(I_1, \dots, I_K)$ , and on  $I_s, I_\ell$  and on the estimates  $f^{(k)}, \hat{a}^{(k)}$ , we have that  $\hat{\Delta}_k(f^{(k)})$ , is an average of  $|I_k \cap I_s|$  i.i.d. random variables with mean  $\Delta(f^{(k)}) = \mathbb{E}_s[f^{(k)}(Z) - f_0(Z)]$ . Since, we assumed that  $|f^{(k)}(Z)|, |f_0(Z)| \leq HC_1$ , a.s., by a Bernstein bound we have that w.p.  $1 - \delta$ :

$$|\hat{\Delta}_k(f^{(k)}) - \Delta(f^{(k)})| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\mathbb{E}_s[(f^{(k)}(Z) - f_0(Z))^2] \log(1/\delta)}{|I_s \cap I_k|}} + \frac{2HC_1 \log(1/\delta)}{|I_s \cap I_k|} \quad (30)$$

$$= \epsilon_2(f^{(k)}) \sqrt{\frac{2K \log(1/\delta)}{n_s}} + \frac{2HC_1 K \log(1/\delta)}{n_s} \quad (31)$$

Similarly,  $\hat{\Lambda}_k(f^{(k)}, a^{(k)})$ , is an average of  $|I_k \cap I_\ell|$  i.i.d. random variables with mean  $\Lambda(f^{(k)}, a^{(k)}) = \mathbb{E}_s[a^{(k)}(Z)(G_H - f^{(k)}(Z))]$ .

Also recall we assumed that  $|G_H|, |f^{(k)}|, |f_0|$  are a.s. bounded by  $C_1H$  and  $\hat{a}^{(k)}, a_0$  are a.s. bounded by  $C_2$ , by a Bernstein bound we have that w.p.  $1 - \delta$ :

$$|\hat{\Lambda}_k(f^{(k)}, a^{(k)}) - \Lambda(f^{(k)}, a^{(k)})| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\mathbb{E}_\ell[(B_i(f^{(k)}, a^{(k)}) - B_i(f_0, a_0))^2] \log(1/\delta)}{|I_k \cap I_\ell|}} + \frac{4HC_1 C_2 \log(1/\delta)}{|I_k \cap I_\ell|} \quad (32)$$

Note that:

$$\begin{aligned} B_i(g, a) - B_i(f_0, a_0) &= a(Z)(G_H - f(X)) - a_0(Z)(G_H - f_0(X)) \\ &= a(Z)(G_H - g(X)) - a_0(Z)(G_H - f(X)) + a_0(Z)(f_0(X) - f(X)) \\ &= (a(Z) - a_0(Z))(G_H - f(X)) + a_0(Z)(f_0(X) - f(X)) \end{aligned}$$

Note  $(a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$ , and  $\sqrt{a + b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$  (for any  $a, b \geq 0$ ), and again using our assumption that  $|G_H|, |f^{(k)}|, |f_0|, \hat{a}^{(k)}, a_0$  are almost surely bounded, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\ell[(B_i(g, a) - B_i(f_0, a_0))^2]} &\leq \sqrt{2\mathbb{E}_\ell[4C_1^2 H^2 (a(Z) - a_0(Z))^2 + C_2^2 (f(X) - f_0(X))^2]} \\ &\leq \left( 3C_1 H \epsilon_b(a^{(k)}) + 2C_2 \epsilon_b(f^{(k)}) \right) \\ &\leq 3 \left( HC_1 \epsilon_b(a^{(k)}) + C_2 \epsilon_b(f^{(k)}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus we conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\Lambda}_k(f^{(k)}, a^{(k)}) - \Lambda(f^{(k)}, a^{(k)})| &\leq \left( HC_1 \epsilon_b(a^{(k)}) + C_2 \epsilon_b(f^{(k)}) \right) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(1/\delta)}{|I_k \cap I_\ell|}} + \frac{4HC_1 C_2 \log(1/\delta)}{|I_k \cap I_\ell|} \\ &\leq 3 \left( HC_1 \epsilon_b(a^{(k)}) + C_2 \epsilon_b(f^{(k)}) \right) \sqrt{\frac{2K \log(1/\delta)}{n_\ell}} + \frac{4HC_1 C_2 K \log(1/\delta)}{n_\ell} \end{aligned}$$

By applying a union bound over all the aforementioned  $2K + 2 \leq 4K$  bad events, we get that with probability  $1 - \delta$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\theta} - V^{\pi_2, \pi_b}| &\leq \mathcal{E}_1(\delta/4K) + \mathcal{E}_2(\delta/4K) + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K (\Delta(f^{(k)}) + \Lambda(f^{(k)}, a^{(k)})) \\ &\quad + \max_{k=1}^K \epsilon_2(f^{(k)}) \sqrt{\frac{2K \log(4K/\delta)}{n_s}} + \frac{2HK \log(4K/\delta)}{n_s} \\ &\quad + 3 \max_{k=1}^K 3(HC_1 \epsilon_b(a^{(k)}) + C_2 \epsilon_b(f^{(k)})) \sqrt{\frac{2K \log(1/\delta)}{n_\ell}} + \frac{4HC_1 C_2 K \log(4K/\delta)}{n_\ell} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that:

$$\Delta(f) + \Lambda(f, a) = M(f, a) - M(f_0, a_0) \quad (33)$$

with  $M(f, a)$  as defined in Theorem 4. Then invoking Theorem 4, we also get that:

$$\Delta(f) + \Lambda(f, a) \leq \epsilon_b(a^{(k)}) \epsilon_b(f^{(k)}) \quad (34)$$

Combining all the above yields the theorem.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.** *Given Assumption 1, and under the the same assumptions as Theorem 5, if our estimates of the regression function  $f$  and propensity weights / density ratio  $a$  are asymptotically consistent, at any rate, then  $V_{DR}^{\pi_2, \pi_b}$  is a consistent estimator of  $V^{\pi_2, \pi_b}$ .*

*Proof.* The result immediately follows from Theorem 5. Given  $|G_H|, |f^{(k)}(\tau_h)|, |f_0(\tau_h)|, a^{(k)}(\tau_h)$ , and  $a_0(\tau_h)$  are a.s. bounded, terms 1,2,4 and 6 all go to zero as  $N_2$  and  $N_b$  go to infinity. Terms 3, 5 and 7 also all go to zero when the nuisance parameters  $f$  and  $a$  are asymptotically consistent.  $\square$

**Theorem 7.** *Define the error in the predicted value as  $\Delta(\tau_h, f) = f(\tau_h) - f_0(\tau_h)$  and the density ratio relative to the true density ratio as  $\delta(\tau_h) = \frac{a(\tau_h)}{a_0(\tau_h)}$ . Under Assumptions 1 and 2, then the bias of  $V^{DR}$  is*

$$V_{DR}^{\pi_2, \pi_b} - V^{\pi_2, \pi_b} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K E_{s_0, \dots, s_H, r_H \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} [\Delta(\tau_h, f^{(k)}) (1 - \delta^{(k)}(\tau_h))], \quad (35)$$

the average of the product-bias terms across the folds.

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} E[V_{DR}^{\pi_2, \pi_b}] &= E \left[ \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{1}{|I_s \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_s \cap I_k} (f^{(k)}(Z_i) + \frac{1}{|I_\ell \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_\ell \cap I_k} a^{(k)}(Z_i) (G_H^i - f^{(k)}(Z_i))) \right) \right] - \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K E \left[ \left( \frac{1}{|I_s \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_s \cap I_k} (f^{(k)}(Z_i) + \frac{1}{|I_\ell \cap I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_\ell \cap I_k} a^{(k)}(Z_i) (G_H^i - f^{(k)}(Z_i))) \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generalizability, we will now analyze this for a single fold  $k$ . Since each trajectory within a fold, is independent and identically distributed, we will analyze the expectation for a single term with a single fold. We also now make the expectation term explicit. We denote  $V_k^{\pi_2, \pi_b}$  as the value of the DR-estimator for the

$k$ -th fold.

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\tau_h \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}; \tau'_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} [V_k^{\pi_2, \pi_b}] &= E_{\tau'_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} [f^{(k)}(\tau'_h)] + E_{\tau_H \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}} [a^{(k)}(\tau_H) (G_H(\tau_H) - f^{(k)}(\tau_H))] \\
&= E_{\tau'_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} [f_0(\tau'_h) + \Delta(\tau_h, f^{(k)})] + E_{\tau_H \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}} [a^{(k)}(\tau_H) (G_H(\tau_H) - (f_0(\tau'_h) + \Delta(\tau_h, f^{(k)})))] \\
&= E_{\tau'_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} [f_0(\tau'_h) + \Delta(\tau_h, f^{(k)})] + E_{\tau_H \sim \pi_b, \mathcal{M}} [a_0(\tau_H) \delta^{(k)}(\tau_H) (G_H(\tau_H) - (f_0(\tau'_h) + \Delta(\tau_h, f^{(k)})))] \\
&= E_{\tau'_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} [f_0(\tau'_h) + \Delta(\tau_h, f^{(k)})] + E_{\tau_H \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_\infty} [\delta^{(k)}(\tau_H) (G_H(\tau_H) - (f_0(\tau'_h) + \Delta(\tau_h, f^{(k)})))] \\
&= E_{\tau'_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} [f_0(\tau'_h) + \Delta(\tau_h, f^{(k)})] + E_{\tau_H \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_\infty} [\delta^{(k)}(\tau_H) (f_0(\tau'_h) - (f_0(\tau'_h) + \Delta(\tau_h, f^{(k)})))] \\
&= E_{\tau'_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} [f_0(\tau'_h) + \Delta(\tau_h, f^{(k)})] + E_{\tau_H \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_\infty} [-\delta^{(k)}(\tau_H) \Delta(\tau_h, f^{(k)})] \tag{36} \\
&= E[V^{\pi_2, \pi_b}] + E_{\tau'_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} [\Delta(\tau_h, f^{(k)}) (1 - \delta^{(k)}(\tau_h))] \tag{37} \\
& \tag{38}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds because the first term depends only on trajectories from  $\pi_2$  and the second is a function of trajectories from  $\pi_b$ ; the second and third equalities use the definition of  $\delta$  and  $\Delta$ ; the fourth equality uses the definition of  $a_0$  to replace the expectation over  $\pi_b$  to an expectation over  $\pi_2$ ; the fifth equality, with slight abuse of notation, takes an expectation over the randomness in the observed reward for a given state trajectory,  $E_{\tau} G_H(\tau_h) = f_0(\tau_h)$ ; the sixth equality simplifies the prior expression; and the seventh equality uses that  $E_{\tau'_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2} [f_0(\tau'_h)] = E[V^{\pi_2, \pi_b}]$ . The theorem follows by averaging over each of the folds.  $\square$

**Theorem 8.** *If the regression function  $f$  is asymptotically consistent, then  $V_{slr}^{\pi_2, \pi_b}$  is a consistent estimator of  $V^{\pi_2, \pi_b}$ .*

*Proof.* Recall

$$|V_{slr}^{\pi_2, \pi_b} - V^{\pi_2, \pi_b}| = \left| \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} f(\tau_h^j) - V^{\pi_2, \pi_b} \right| \tag{39}$$

$$= \left| \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} f(\tau_h^j) - f_0(\tau_h^j) + f_0(\tau_h^j) - V^{\pi_2, \pi_b} \right| \tag{40}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} |f(\tau_h^j) - f_0(\tau_h^j)| + \left| \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} f_0(\tau_h^j) - V^{\pi_2, \pi_b} \right| \tag{41}$$

$$\rightarrow 0 \tag{42}$$

In the third line, the first term goes to zero if  $f$  is asymptotically consistent, and the second term is the error due to the finite sample approximation of the expectation  $E_{\tau_h \sim \pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2}$ , and also goes to zero asymptotically.  $\square$

## 9 APPENDIX: SYNTHETIC EXPERIMENT

We design a low signal-to-ratio environment with surrogates to evaluate the robustness of Short Long Regression estimators to model mis-specification of a density ratio estimator and a regressor. Similarly as before, our goal is to estimate the long-term returns under a new target policy  $\pi_2$  only using short-term state trajectories observed under  $\pi_2$  and a historical dataset of short-term state trajectories and their corresponding long-term returns under  $\pi_b$ . First we introduce the synthetic domain details: states, transitions, returns, and surrogacy.

**Domain** Initial states  $s_0$  are evenly spaced between  $[0, 1.5]$  with additive  $N(0, 0.1)$  noise. Under  $\pi_b$ , transitions to the next state are as follows:

$$s_1 = \begin{cases} s_0 & \text{w.p } 0.5 \\ (-0.6 + 0.1 * U[0, 1]) * s_0 & \text{w.p } 0.45 \\ 1.5 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

with additive noise from  $N(0, 0.1)$ . Under  $\pi_2$ , the next state is determined deterministically as:

$$s_1 = \begin{cases} 1.5 & \text{if } s_0 < 1.25 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

plus additive noise from  $N(0, 0.1)$ . The true long-term return  $V^{\pi_b} = V^{\pi_2} = f(s_0, s_1)$  with a quadratic function  $f(s_0, s_1) = 5s_0 + s_1 + s_1^2$ . The observed return under  $\pi_b$   $V_{MC}^{\pi_b} = V^{\pi_b} + N(0, \omega)$  where  $\omega$  determines the amount of noise in the delayed returns (i.e., the higher the  $\omega$ , the more reliable the regression estimates are compared to the Monte Carlo estimates, same amount of noise is applied to the returns under  $\pi_2$ ).  $|D_b| = 5000$ , and  $|D_2| = 100$ .

We fit an ordinary least squares regression model using ‘statsmodel’ packages. A correct regressor given  $(s_0, s_1)$  is fitted as:  $f_{\theta}(s_0, s_1) = \theta^{\top}[s_0, s_1, s_1^2]$ . The continuous states are discretized into 50 bins (thus making a total of 2500 bins for  $(s_0, s_1)$ ), and the number of occurrences per bin is counted to estimate the density ratio between  $p(s_0, s_1|\pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2)$  and  $p(s_0, s_1|\pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b)$ . We report the mean squared error of the true and the estimated rewards of the 100 target trajectories under  $\pi_2$ :  $\sqrt{\frac{1}{|D_2|} \sum_{i=1}^{100} (\hat{V}_i^{\pi_2} - V_i^{\pi_2})^2}$ . The code for Table 1 is available as “surrogate synthetic.py” and the remaining experiments with “surrogate.py” using `-Ntrain 5000 -Ntarget 100`.

Table 2: **We show the mean and standard deviation of Mean-Squared Error (MSE) with 200 datasets where the randomness comes from the stochastic transitions under  $\pi_b$  and gaussian noises.**

	Large noise ( $\omega = 10$ )	Small noise ( $\omega = 1$ )
Short long estimator with unweighted regressor	<b>0.251 (0.307)</b>	<b>0.002 (0.003)</b>
Monte Carlo full returns estimate	98.457 (13.355)	0.984 (0.133)

As discussed in the main text, Table 2 shows that our estimates using the short trajectory data provides give more accurate predictions of  $V^{\pi_2}$  than using a Monte Carlo estimates of the full return  $V_{MC}^{\pi_2}$ . Here the regressor is correctly specified, and the comparison is only between the surrogate-based regression estimates and the noisy Monte Carlo estimates.

**Model Mis-specification** Next we consider either regressor or density ratio estimator misspecification. A correct regressor is a quadratic function of  $s_0, s_1$ :  $f(s_0, s_1) = 5s_0 + s_1 + s_1^2$  as stated above, but we use a mis-specified regressor model, in particular a linear model,  $f_{\hat{\theta}}(s_0, s_1) = \hat{\theta}^{\top}[s_0, s_1]$ . Note that this linear model can still capture the distribution under  $\pi_2$  since  $s_1$  under  $\pi_2$  is either 0 or 1.5, but not under  $\pi_b$ . This is by design to show that even when the regression model is mis-specified, when the density ratio estimates are correct, the target estimates can still be accurate as long as the behavioral data supports the target data distribution. We expect the weighted regressor and the doubly robust estimator to be unaffected but the unweighted regressor to fit the target data poorly.

In order to estimate the density ratios, the continuous states are discretized into 50 bins (thus making a total of 2500 bins for  $(s_0, s_1)$ ), and the number of occurrences per bin is counted under  $\pi_2$  and under  $\pi_b$ . Then to bias the density ratio estimates, we add a non-zero gaussian noise from  $N(10, 10)$  to the denominator representing  $p(s_0, s_1|\pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b)$  in the density ratios between  $p(s_0, s_1|\pi_2, \mathcal{M}_2)$  and  $p(s_0, s_1|\pi_b, \mathcal{M}_b)$ . We expect the unweighted Short Long Regression estimator and the doubly robust estimator to be unaffected by the density ratio misspecification as the regressor model is still correct.

Table 3: **We show the MSE of estimators for synthetic example ( $\omega = 1$ ) when regression model or density ratio model may be mis-specified. Mean and std from 200 datasets where the randomness comes from the stochastic transitions under  $\pi_b$  and gaussian noises.**

	Realizable	Regressor Model Misspecified	Density Ratio Model Misspecified
Short long estimator with unweighted regressor	0.002 (0.003)	<b>0.914 (0.064)</b>	0.002 (0.003)
Short long regression estimator	0.079 (0.085)	0.080 (0.068)	<b>0.388 (0.728)</b>
DR short long estimator	0.008 (0.007)	0.008 (0.007)	0.006 (0.005)



**Results** Table 3 compares the performance of the 3 different regressors under different conditions. As expected, the doubly robust method does well in all three cases. The short long estimator with weighted regression continues to perform well when the density model is well specified, when fitting a (misspecified) linear regression model, because  $V^{\pi_2}$  can be well fit with a linear function. Note however that this method performs less well when the density ratio model is misspecified, since the incorrect weights impact the learned regression model. Note that we consider the use of a linear regression model as misspecification in this case because the linear model is only correct for the processes under  $\pi_2$  and not for the processes under  $\pi_b$ , which require a quadratic.

Even when the density ratio estimates are incorrect, unweighted and DR estimates perform well when the regressor is correctly specified. Since the regression model itself is still consistent, as the training data size increases, the effect due to the incorrect density ratio estimates is lessened for the weighted short long horizon regression estimate, as we show in in Table 4.

Our synthetic experiments demonstrate that the doubly robust estimator is robust to both regressor and density ratio estimator misspecification. The unweighted estimator has a higher error when the regression model is misspecified, and the weighted estimator has higher error when the density ratio model is misspecified (since this impacts the regression fit due to a limited training sample size).

Table 4: **MSE using different training data sizes of the short long regression estimator when the density ratio estimates are misspecified.**

Training data size	Error
500	2.123 (7.382)
1000	0.806 (1.281)
50000	0.259 (0.480)

## 10 APPENDIX: CLINICAL SIMULATOR EXPERIMENTS

### 10.1 HIV Treatment

**Domain** The 500 initial patients are sampled using the code by Ernst et al. (2005) with a perturbation rate of 0.05, and the same set of initial states is used for collecting trajectories under both  $\pi_b$  and  $\pi_2$ . The initial states are shared between the behavioral and the new target decision processes but the subsequent state trajectories differ due to the policies taking different actions.

**Policy** The behavioral policy is learned using Fitted Q Iteration (FQI). FQI is implemented with an extra-trees regressor from ‘sklearn’ packages with  $n$  estimators = 50 and  $\text{min samples split} = 2$ . An  $\epsilon$ -greedy policy ( $\epsilon = 0.15$ , except when the policy is first initialized,  $\epsilon = 1$ ) is used for collecting on-policy samples under the newly fitted policy, and the policy is rolled out 30 times between the policy improvement steps. 400 Bellman backups are done with a discount factor of 0.98, and the policy is improved for 10 iterations, each time using the augmented dataset from all previous roll-outs (dataset size =  $30 \times 200$  per iteration). We set  $\pi_b$  to be the optimal policy from the last policy improvement step. In order to collect samples for the historical dataset,  $\pi_b$  is executed with 0.95 fidelity for the full horizon of 200 time steps.

The target policy  $\pi_2$  replaces small dosages (i.e., 0.1 of RTI and 0.05 of PI) with zero dosages, and is executed with perfect fidelity. For example, for a given state, if  $\pi_b$  chooses high RTI and small PI (0.7 RTI and 0.05 PI), then  $\pi_2$  chooses high RTI only (0.7 RTI). The historical dataset has 2500 observations of the 500 patients each with five roll-outs, and the target dataset contains 500 trajectories, one per each patient. The reward is given at every time step based on the number of free virus particles and the HIV-specific cytotoxic T cells, and the return  $G$  is the undiscounted sum of per-step rewards over the full horizon of 200 steps. We use the short-horizon trajectories from  $\pi_2$ , along with the short-horizon trajectories and their associated long-term outcomes from  $\pi_b$  to estimate the long-term effects of the target policy.

Due to file size limits, the datasets for HIV and sepsis are unavailable for upload. These will be shared via a link following the anonymous review process.

**Short Long Regression Estimator details** Density ratio estimators are implemented with an MLP classifier from ‘sklearn’ packages. All short-horizon trajectories under  $\pi_b$  are labeled as 0, and all short-horizon trajectories

under  $\pi_2$  are labeled as 1. Hyperparameter selection with 5-fold cross validation is used to select the best model. The hyperparameter search is done over the following:

- MLP hidden layer sizes: (128), (128, 64), (128, 64, 64)
- MLP  $\alpha$  (l2 regularization): 0.001, 0.01, 0.1
- Learning rate: adaptive, constant

all implemented with the Adam optimizer and ReLU activation between the intermediate layers. The un/weighted regressor is implemented with Support Vector Regressor (SVR module from ‘sklearn’), and the best model is chosen from 5-fold cross validation. The hyperparameters considered are:

- C (regularization): 0.1, 1, 10
- Epsilon: 0.001, 0.01, 0.1

We use  $k = 2$  for the doubly robust estimator  $k$ -fold cross-fitting (Chernozhukov et al., 2018). The code is included as ‘code hiv.py’.

**Baseline training details** Among the baselines considered only the online model-based RL method requires training a model. The two reward extrapolation baselines only depend on the on-policy short-horizon rewards observed until  $h$ . The online model-based RL requires training a transition dynamics model using the on-policy data in  $\mathcal{D}_2$ . The transition model is implemented with Multi output regressor and Support Vector Regressor as a sub-module. Hyperparameter selection with 5-fold cross validation is done to select the best hyperparameters for the transition model. The hyperparameters considered are:

- C (regularization): 0.1, 1, 10
- Epsilon: 0.1, 0.2.

The baseline methods are included in ‘baseline hiv.py’.

## 10.2 Sepsis

**States & actions** The definition of states and actions are introduced in Section 6.1.1.

**Rewards** The simulation continues either until at most  $H = 20$  (horizon) time steps with 0 reward, or terminates early with either death (-1 if at least three vitals are out of the normal range), or discharge (+1 if all vital signs are in the normal range without treatment). Once the patient enters the terminal state, no further reward is given for any additional time steps until  $H = 20$ .

**Policy** Similar to Namkoong et al. (2020), we use policy iteration to learn the optimal policy, and create a soft-optimal policy as the behaviour policy by having the policy take a random action with probability 0.15, and the optimal action with probability 0.85. The value function is computed using value iteration. The discount factor  $\gamma = 0.99$ . Similar process is used to learn the target policy with  $\mathcal{A}_2$  which includes vasopressors in addition to {antibiotics, mechanical ventilation} already available in  $\mathcal{A}_b$ .

### 10.2.1 Detailed experimental setup

In sepsis, the decision process is stochastic, so we define the true policy mean  $V^{\pi_2}$  as a Monte Carlo average of 500 simulation roll-outs. In the target dataset  $\mathcal{D}_2$ , we only include 500 bootstrapped samples to compute the Monte Carlo estimates using those 500 samples as well as the regression estimates, and repeat this experiment 5 times to get the mean and the standard deviation of the prediction errors from these 5 runs (shown in Table 1 of the main text). The historical dataset  $\mathcal{D}_b$  always has 5000 trajectories.

**Regression model training** Hyperparameters considered for hyperparameter selection with 5-fold cross validation are:

- MLP hidden layer sizes: (128), (128, 64)
- Learning rate: 0.001, 0.01, 0.1

implemented with Pytorch MLP Regressor and ReLU activation between the intermediate layers. The code is included in ‘code sepsis.py’.

**Baseline training details** In the sepsis simulator, if the patient is dead or discharged by  $h$ , their return is fully known, so we consider online baselines where if the patient’s outcome is known by  $h$ , then there’s no error; and for those whose outcomes are still unknown, their long-term returns are projected to be 0. Note that in the sparse reward setting like sepsis, the two reward extrapolation methods – ‘final short-term reward’ and ‘average short-term reward’ – behave the same since any unobserved patient outcomes (both average and last rewards observed so far are 0) are predicted to be 0 even in the future.

We also build an online model-based estimator using short-term on-policy data. The dynamics model  $\hat{T}(s, a, s')$  is based on the online sample counts. For previously unseen  $(s, a)$  pairs whose next states are completely unknown, the next state transition probabilities are set to be uniform over the entire state space. All the baseline methods are included as ‘baseline sepsis.py’.

All computation for the experimental results was done on internal servers with GPUs, but they can be done without GPU with a reasonable wall clock time of less than 10 hours depending on the size of the hyperparameter search space.

### **Fast identification of policy improvement between the historical policy and the new target policy**

The p-values for comparing the target policy’s value with the behavioral policy’s value are calculated using paired T tests for HIV (implemented with ‘stats.ttest rel’ from ‘scipy stats’ packages) and independent T tests for Sepsis (implemented with ‘stats.ttest ind’). In HIV, the 500 estimated returns, one per starting patient state, under  $\pi_2$  are compared to the 500 averaged returns under  $\pi_b$  since the behavioral policy is rolled out with  $\epsilon = 0.05$  from each starting state 5 times. In Sepsis, 500 estimated returns under  $\pi_2$  are compared to the 5000 observed returns under  $\pi_b$  to evaluate whether the true mean under the target policy is likely to exceed the true mean under the behavioral policy. The experiment results are shown in Table 1 of the main text.

## **10.3 Additional Experimental Results**

In the main text we include the estimation results from the 10% of the full horizon ( $h = 20$  for HIV and  $h = 2$  for sepsis). Here we show the results from different short-horizon lengths. The full horizon length of HIV is 200 time steps, and in sepsis the full horizon is 20 steps.

Table 5 shows that, as expected, all baseline methods that use only the online on-policy data (online model-based RL, final short-term reward extrapolation, and average short-term reward extrapolation) have better accuracy as  $h$  increases. In particular the final short-term reward at  $h = 50$  achieves the lowest prediction error since in HIV the per-step rewards from the initial short-term horizon are much lower than the rewards at the later time steps, and the rewards after some period stay within a certain range. On the other hand, our short long regression estimator’s performance does not improve monotonically with larger  $h$ , which we suspect is due to the density ratio estimator variance and the distribution shift between the historical data and the target data. Naively predicting the target policy value to be the same as the behavioral policy value means no hypothesis testing can be done between the target return estimates and the observed returns under the behavioral policy, so a p-value is not available in for that baseline.

We include the Monte Carlo (MC) estimation errors in Table 6 for sepsis. Since the sepsis simulator has stochastic decision processes, we compare the MC estimates of the returns (from  $\tilde{N}_2 = 500$  but observed after the full  $H = 20$  steps) with the ground truth returns (from  $N_2 = 5000$  and observed after the full  $H$  horizon). While the MC estimator would not be feasible if the long-term outcomes were not observed – so in most settings of interest, this would not be available – we still include this to compare with the short long regression estimators which are only based on the short-horizon trajectories. If the long-term outcomes are noisy, and the short-term data is predictive of the long-term outcomes, then using the short-term data with the regressor can give comparable, or even more accurate, predictions of the true value than directly using (or averaging) the delayed long-term outcomes.

Table 5: HIV estimation at different short-horizon lengths: MSE and p-value from T-test results.

Estimator	h = 5		h = 10		h = 50	
	Error	p-value	Error	p-value	Error	p-value
Short long regression estimator	61.84	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	71.51	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	53.85	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Short long estimator with unweighted regressor	68.16	$p \geq 0.5$	68.15	$p \geq 0.5$	57.96	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
DR short long estimator	67.99	$p \geq 0.7$	68.32	$p \geq 0.3$	58.15	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
DR with weighted regressor	57.80	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	70.90	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	55.26	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
LOPE estimator	73.84	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	69.95	$p \leq 10^{-5}$	71.91	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Online model-based RL	404.77	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	404.58	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	137.37	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Extrapolate final short-term reward	404.71	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	404.37	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	31.79	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Extrapolate average short-term reward	404.79	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	404.68	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	334.36	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Predict $V^{\pi_b}$	67.86	N/A	67.86	N/A	67.86	N/A

Table 6: Sepsis estimation at different short-horizon lengths: MSE and p-value from T-test results. Mean and std (in parentheses) are from 5 seeds for bootstrapping.

Estimator	h = 4		h = 5	
	Error	p-value	Error	p-value
Short long regression estimator	0.01 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.04 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Short long estimator with unweighted regressor	0.02 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.02 (0.02)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
DR short long estimator	0.01 (0.005)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.03 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
DR with weighted regressor	0.02 (0.004)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.01 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Online model-based RL	0.62 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.62 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
LOPE estimator	0.10 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.19 (0.13)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Extrapolate final short-term reward	0.07 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.07 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Extrapolate average short-term reward	0.07 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.07 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Monte Carlo estimator	0.02 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$	0.02 (0.01)	$p \leq 10^{-6}$
Predict $V^{\pi_b}$	0.172	N/A	0.172	N/A

Table 7: Each column represents a target policy, whose value is listed on the first row. The values in the table show the RMSE of the estimated versus true policy values of the 8 target policies in the HIV simulator.

Target policy value	350.55	417.37	419.94	404.87	342.49	411.18	407.44	401.89
Estimator	Error (h = 20)							
Short long regression estimator	0.61	66.78	68.57	53.21	8.68	62.16	56.07	51.6
Short long regression with unweighted estimator	12.83	79.66	82.22	67.15	6.41	73.84	69.73	64.7
DR short long estimator	10.49	77.19	79.83	64.86	8.93	66.94	67.38	65.53
DR with weighted estimator	2.35	69.14	71.07	50.61	2.63	64.41	57.87	51.69
LOPE estimator	13.43	80.26	82.83	67.75	5.38	74.06	70.33	64.78
Online model-based RL	348.19	415.15	417.68	402.49	340.15	408.98	405.18	399.52
Extrapolate final short-term reward	349.51	416.32	415.5	400.56	338.89	407.47	403	398.06
Extrapolate average short-term reward	346.28	413.07	418.86	403.83	341.59	410.23	406.36	400.88

We have run experiments with a number of target policies with different values to complement evaluation results in the main text.

In the HIV experiments, the original target policy replaces the behavioral policy’s small dosage with zero, executed at 100% fidelity. We have now also introduced target policies where the small dosage is reduced by 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100%, each executed with with  $\epsilon \in \{0, 0.1\}$  (with  $\epsilon$  probability, choose a random action from the action set instead of the one chosen by the policy). The resulting target policy values are: 350.55, 417.37, 419.94, 404.87, 342.49, 411.18, 407.44, 410.89. The behavioral policy value is 337.01. Estimator performance (RMSE) across these 8 target policies are shown in Table 7.

Table 8: **The policy values are listed on the first row, and the rest of the values in the table are the RMSE of the predicted versus true target policy values of the 8 target policies in the Sepsis domain.**

Target policy value	0.119	0.110	0.057	0.019	-0.006	-0.002	-0.053	-0.065
Estimator	Error ( $h = 2$ )							
Short long regression estimator	0.15	0.10	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.03
Short long regression with unweighted estimator	0.14	0.11	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.008	0.02
DR short long estimator	0.13	0.11	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.01
DR with weighted estimator	0.13	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.03
LOPE estimator	0.39	0.09	0.05	0.07	0.14	0.06	0.06	0.16
Online model-based RL	0.37	0.39	0.48	0.55	0.62	0.62	0.67	0.67
Extrapolate final short-term reward	0.002	0.005	0.05	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.1	0.06
Extrapolate average short-term reward	0.002	0.005	0.05	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.1	0.06

We observe that our estimators outperform the online model-based RL and short-term reward baselines at all considered values of  $h$ .

In the Sepsis domain, we introduced target policies with varying epsilon values (0.01, 0.02, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.25, 0.3). The original target policy, reported in the main text, is set at epsilon 0.15. These target policy values are: 0.119, 0.110, 0.057, 0.019, -0.006, -0.022, -0.053, -0.065, and the behavioral policy value is -0.178. Performance across these 8 policies is listed in Table 8.

We observe that in Sepsis the short-term reward baseline performs well on two out of the 8 target policies – these policies have small epsilon values of 0.01 and 0.02. When the epsilon is small, most of the patients who do not die nor recover within the short horizon of  $h = 2$  achieve a reward of 0, so predicting the unknown patient outcomes with 0, as done by the short-term reward baselines, seems to yield good estimates. However, with a higher epsilon, the outcomes of the remaining patients are further away from 0, i.e., more patients either survive (+1 reward) or die (-1 reward) instead of remaining in the same state (0 reward). Therefore the short-term reward baselines perform poorly when the policy’s epsilon increases.

## References

- Abdelshiheed, M., K. Jacobs, J., and K. D’Mello, S. (2024). Aligning tutor discourse supporting rigorous thinking with tutee content mastery for predicting math achievement. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*, pages 150–164. Springer.
- Athey, S., Chetty, R., Imbens, G. W., and Kang, H. (2019). The surrogate index: Combining short-term proxies to estimate long-term treatment effects more rapidly and precisely. Working Paper 26463, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Attia, P. M., Grover, A., Jin, N., Severson, K. A., Markov, T. M., Liao, Y.-H., Chen, M. H., Cheong, B., Perkins, N., Yang, Z., and et al. (2020). Closed-loop optimization of fast-charging protocols for batteries with machine learning. *Nature*.
- Battocchi, K., Dillon, E., Hei, M., Lewis, G., Oprescu, M., and Syrgkanis, V. (2021). Estimating the long-term effects of novel treatments. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:2925–2935.
- Cheng, L., Guo, R., and Liu, H. (2021). Long-term effect estimation with surrogate representation. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 274–282.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., Demirer, M., Duflo, E., Hansen, C., Newey, W., and Robins, J. (2018). Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(1):C1–C68.
- Chernozhukov, V., Newey, M., Newey, W. K., Singh, R., and Srygkanis, V. (2023). Automatic debiased machine learning for covariate shifts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04527*.
- Dudík, M., Langford, J., and Li, L. (2011). Doubly robust policy evaluation and learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR.
- Ernst, D., Geurts, P., and Wehenkel, L. (2005). Tree-based batch mode reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 6:503–556.
- Ernst, D., Stan, G.-B., Goncalves, J., and Wehenkel, L. (2006). Clinical data based optimal sti strategies for hiv: a reinforcement learning approach. In *Proceedings of the 45th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 667–672.
- Gao, G., Gao, Q., Yang, X., Ju, S., Pajic, M., and Chi, M. (2024). On trajectory augmentations for off-policy evaluation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Grover, A., Markov, T., Attia, P., Jin, N., Perkins, N., Cheong, B., Chen, M., Yang, Z., Harris, S., Chueh, W., et al. (2018). Best arm identification in multi-armed bandits with delayed feedback. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 833–842. PMLR.
- Kallus, N. and Mao, X. (2024). On the role of surrogates in the efficient estimation of treatment effects with limited outcome data.
- Levine, S., Kumar, A., Tucker, G., and Fu, J. (2020). Offline reinforcement learning: Tutorial, review, and perspectives on open problems.
- Liu, V., Escobar, G. J., Greene, J. D., Soule, J., Whippy, A., Angus, D. C., and Iwashyna, T. J. (2014). Hospital deaths in patients with sepsis from 2 independent cohorts. *Jama*, 312(1):90–92.
- McDonald, T. M., Maystre, L., Lalmas, M., Russo, D., and Ciosek, K. (2023). Impatient bandits: Optimizing recommendations for the long-term without delay. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1687–1697.
- Namkoong, H., Keramati, R., Yadlowsky, S., and Brunskill, E. (2020). Off-policy policy evaluation for sequential decisions under unobserved confounding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:18819–18831.
- Oberst, M. and Sontag, D. (2019). Counterfactual off-policy evaluation with gumbel-max structural causal models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4881–4890. PMLR.

- Prentice, R. L. (1989). Surrogate endpoints in clinical trials: definition and operational criteria. *Statistics in medicine*, 8(4):431–440.
- Saito, Y., Abdollahpouri, H., Anderton, J., Carterette, B., and Lalmas, M. (2024). Long-term off-policy evaluation and learning. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 3432–3443.
- Shi, C., Wang, X., Luo, S., Zhu, H., Ye, J., and Song, R. (2023). Dynamic causal effects evaluation in a/b testing with a reinforcement learning framework. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(543):2059–2071.
- Sugiyama, M., Krauledat, M., and Müller, K.-R. (2007). Covariate shift adaptation by importance weighted cross validation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*.
- Tang, Z., Duan, Y., Zhang, S., and Li, L. (2022). A reinforcement learning approach to estimating long-term treatment effects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07536*.
- Thomas, D. R., Lin, J., Gatz, E., Gurung, A., Gupta, S., Norberg, K., Fancsali, S. E., Aleven, V., Branstetter, L., Brunskill, E., et al. (2024). Improving student learning with hybrid human-ai tutoring: A three-study quasi-experimental investigation. In *Proceedings of the 14th Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference*, pages 404–415.
- Thomas, P. and Brunskill, E. (2016). Data-efficient off-policy policy evaluation for reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2139–2148. PMLR.
- Thomas, P., Theodorou, G., and Ghavamzadeh, M. (2015). High-confidence off-policy evaluation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 29.
- Tran, A., Bibaut, A., and Kallus, N. (2024). Inferring the long-term causal effects of long-term treatments from short-term experiments. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Zhang, V., Zhao, M., Le, A., and Kallus, N. (2023). Evaluating the surrogate index as a decision-making tool using 200 a/b tests at netflix. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11922*.
- Zheng, G., Fancsali, S. E., Ritter, S., and Berman, S. (2019). Using instruction-embedded formative assessment to predict state summative test scores and achievement levels in mathematics. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 6(2):153–174.