

# Automatic Double Reinforcement Learning in Semiparametric Markov Decision Processes with Applications to Long-Term Causal Inference

Lars van der Laan<sup>\*1,2</sup>, David Hubbard<sup>2</sup>, Allen Tran<sup>2</sup>,  
Nathan Kallus<sup>2,3</sup>, and Aurélien Bibaut<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Washington

<sup>2</sup>Netflix Research

<sup>3</sup>Cornell Tech, Cornell University

January 14, 2025

## Abstract

Double reinforcement learning (DRL) (Kallus and Uehara, 2020, 2022) enables statistically efficient inference on the value of a policy in a nonparametric Markov Decision Process (MDP) given trajectories generated by another policy. However, this approach necessarily requires stringent overlap between the two policies' state distributions, which is often violated in practice. To relax this requirement and extend DRL, we study efficient inference on linear functionals of the  $Q$ -function (of which policy value is a special case) in infinite-horizon, time-invariant MDPs under semiparametric restrictions on the  $Q$ -function. These restrictions can alleviate the overlap requirement and lower the efficiency bound, yielding more precise estimates. As an important example, we study the evaluation of long-term value under domain adaptation, given a few short trajectories from the new domain and restrictions on the difference between the domains, which can be used for long-term causal inference combining short and scant experimental data and long and plentiful observational data. Our method combines flexible estimates of the  $Q$ -function and of the Riesz representer of the functional of interest (e.g., the stationary state density ratio for policy value) and is automatic in that we do not need to know the form of the latter — only the functional we care about. To address potential model misspecification bias, we extend the adaptive debiased machine learning (ADML) framework of van der Laan et al. (2023) to construct nonparametrically valid and superefficient estimators that adapt to the functional form of the  $Q$ -function. As a special case, we propose a novel adaptive debiased plug-in estimator that uses isotonic-calibrated fitted  $Q$ -iteration — a new calibration algorithm for MDPs — to circumvent the computational challenges of estimating debiasing nuisances from min-max objectives.

---

\*Corresponding author: [lvdlaan@uw.edu](mailto:lvdlaan@uw.edu)

# 1 Introduction


## 1.1 Motivation

Experimentation, including A/B testing and randomized controlled trials, is widely used across industries to assess the impact of interventions on outcomes such as user engagement, customer retention, and revenue. Due to practical constraints and the need for rapid innovation, randomized experiments are often conducted over short periods and focus on proxy metrics that can be feasibly measured within this timeframe, such as user engagement, click rate, and other immediate performance indicators. These short-term experiments are often used to guide decisions aimed at improving long-term outcomes, such as annual user retention and revenue. However, such tests are inherently limited, as they provide unbiased causal effect estimates only for short-term outcomes. In recent years, there has been growing interest in developing causal inference methods to infer long-term effects of potentially novel policies from short-term experiments.

Surrogate methods provide a framework for linking short-term experimental results to long-term outcomes by identifying intermediate variables, or “surrogates,” that can be measured during the experiment and predict long-term outcomes (Athey et al., 2019). For example, a streaming platform may use engagement metrics like viewing hours and click rate as surrogates for long-term outcomes such as annual membership retention. These methods typically require access to observational data with observed long-term outcomes, relying on strong, untestable causal assumptions: namely, that the surrogate fully mediates the treatment effect on the outcome and that no unmeasured confounders influence both the surrogate and the outcome. However, surrogate methods break down when the treatment involves long-term, continuous exposure to a novel intervention extending beyond the experiment’s duration. For instance, a digital experiment evaluating a personalized recommendation algorithm, unlike a one-time intervention, involves sustained deployment that adapts based on user interactions. The cumulative effect of such sustained exposure can influence long-term outcomes, making it impossible to identify a short-term surrogate that perfectly mediates the long-term treatment effect, thereby limiting the applicability of surrogate methods.

In many cases, an individual’s long-term outcomes in an experiment result from a sequence of evolving states and outcomes that change over time in response to ongoing treatment. For exam-

ple, on a digital streaming platform, annual user retention in response to a new recommendation algorithm depends on changes in daily engagement, content preferences, and monthly subscription renewals. Recognizing these complex dynamics, [Tran et al. \(2023\)](#) proposed a method for estimating long-term effects of sustained treatments from short-term experiments, assuming that short-term observations sufficiently capture the long-term trajectory, even if they do not fully mediate the effect. The core idea in [Tran et al. \(2023\)](#) is to model the experiment’s temporal dynamics as a time-invariant Markov Decision Process (MDP) ([Puterman, 1990](#)) (see [Figure 1](#)), which imposes Markov independence and stationarity on the state-action-outcome process. This allows extrapolation from short-term outcomes to infer long-term effects. By connecting long-term causal inference with policy evaluation in offline reinforcement learning ([Kaelbling et al., 1996](#)), the authors propose nonparametric, efficient estimators of long-term treatment effects using double reinforcement learning ([Kallus and Uehara, 2020, 2022](#)).



**Figure 1:** DAG for trajectory under Markov Decision Process. The outcome  $Y_1$ , state  $S_2$ , and the trajectory need not be observed in the experiment.

A key assumption in [Kallus and Uehara \(2022\)](#) and [Tran et al. \(2023\)](#) for nonparametric identification and efficient estimation of the policy value in time-invariant MDPs is the requirement of sufficient overlap between the initial state distribution and future state distributions. This ensures that all states relevant to the long-term trajectory are visited with some probability, enabling model-free extrapolation of unobserved outcomes from observed outcomes. However, this assumption is often violated in realistic settings with high-dimensional or unbounded state spaces ([Mehrabi and Wager, 2024](#)), especially when interventions introduce previously unvisited states. Meeting this assumption is further complicated by the complexity of modeling the state-outcome process, which

may involve high-dimensional states and exponentially increasing transitions when future states depend on multiple previous time points. Even when overlap holds, limited overlap can degrade estimator performance, increasing variability and necessitating large sample sizes for unbiased estimates and precise confidence intervals. This challenge is analogous to, but distinct from, the poor performance of inverse probability weighted estimators in cross-sectional studies with limited overlap, particularly in high-dimensional settings (D’Amour et al., 2021). Unlike treatment overlap, state overlap cannot be ensured by randomization, as future states are causally determined by initial states and treatments.

## 1.2 Contributions of this work

Double reinforcement learning (DRL) (Kallus and Uehara, 2020, 2022) enables statistically efficient inference on the value of a policy in a nonparametric Markov Decision Process (MDP) given trajectories generated by another policy. However, this approach necessarily requires stringent overlap between the state distributions, which is often violated in practice. To relax this requirement and extend DRL, we study efficient inference on linear functionals of the  $Q$ -function (of which policy value is a special case) in infinite-horizon, time-invariant MDPs under semiparametric restrictions on the  $Q$ -function. A notable application is the estimation of the causal effects of long-term treatments and policies from short-term experimental data (Tran et al., 2023).

Our key contributions are as follows:

1. We propose efficient estimators for linear functionals of the  $Q$ -function in time-invariant MDPs under a semiparametric model for the  $Q$ -function, which relax key identification conditions, such as the overlap condition, and lower the semiparametric efficiency bound, yielding less variable estimates and tighter confidence intervals.
2. We extend the adaptive debiased machine learning (ADML) framework of van der Laan et al. (2023) to construct nonparametrically valid and superefficient estimators that are adaptive to the functional form of the  $Q$ -function.
3. We introduce a novel adaptive debiased plug-in estimator, which leverages isotonic-calibrated fitted  $Q$ -iteration — a new calibration algorithm for MDPs — to circumvent the computational challenges associated with estimating debiasing nuisances from min-max objectives.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces Markov decision processes,  $Q$ -functions, and our estimand. In Section 3, we define a target parameter that imposes model structure on the  $Q$ -function, derive its efficient influence function, and present debiased machine learning estimators. Section 4 extends this approach to adaptive debiased machine learning with data-driven model selection and provides asymptotic theory. In Section 4.2, we propose a novel debiased plug-in estimator based on calibrated fitted  $Q$ -iteration.

## 2 Problem setup

### 2.1 Data-structure: Markov decision process

Consider a randomized experiment or an observational study, where participants are assigned to either a treatment group or a control group. In each study arm, participants are sequentially administered treatment over time according to a specified policy. At each time point, the current state of each participant, the treatment administered, and an intermediate outcome — interpreted as a reward (or cost) associated with the treatment — are recorded. Participants are monitored throughout the study over a short period, and we are interested in evaluating the long-term effect of each policy in each study arm.

We formulate this problem in the discrete-time setting, with time indexed by the set  $\mathbb{T} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ . Let  $Z \in \{0, 1\}$  denote the study arm assignment, where  $Z = 1$  represents the treatment arm and  $Z = 0$  represents the control arm. The assignment may depend on the initial state of the participants. The long-term trajectory of an individual can be described by the data structure  $(S_0, Z, A_0, Y_0, S_1, A_1, Y_1, S_2, A_2, \dots) \sim \mathbb{P}$ , where  $\{S_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is a sequence of state vectors in  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\{A_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is a sequence of treatments (or actions) in an action space  $\mathcal{A}$ , and  $\{Y_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is a sequence of discrete or continuous outcomes in  $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}$ . Our observed data consist of  $n$  *i.i.d.* records of a single state transition  $(S_0, Z, A_0, Y_0, S_1)$  generated from the trajectory:  $\mathcal{D}_n := \{(S_{0,i}, Z_i, A_i, Y_{0,i}, S_{1,i}) : i \in [n]\}$ , distributed according to a probability measure  $P_0$  belonging to a nonparametric statistical model  $\mathcal{M}$  dominated by some measure  $\mu$ . To simplify notation, we write  $f_0$  for any summary  $f_{P_0}$  of the true data-generating distribution  $P_0$ . Throughout, we let  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{P_0}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{P_0}$  denote the  $L^2(P_0)$  inner product and norm.

We assume that the distribution of short-term observations determines the distribution of the

long-term trajectory. Formally, we posit that the state-action-outcome process  $\{(Z, S_t, A_t, Y_t) : t \in \mathbb{T}\}$  follows a time-invariant Markov Decision Process (Puterman, 1990). Let the history at time  $t$  be denoted by  $\mathcal{H}_t := \{(Z, S_u, A_u, Y_u) : 0 \leq u \leq t-1\}$ , with  $\mathcal{H}_0 := \emptyset$ . Under this framework, we make the following assumptions:

- (i) *Markov property*:  $S_t \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{H}_t \mid (S_{t-1}, A_{t-1}, Y_{t-1}, Z)$ , for all  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .
- (ii) *Reward independence*:  $Y_t \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{H}_t \mid (S_t, A_t, Z)$ , for all  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .
- (iii) *Memoryless policy*:  $A_t \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{H}_t \mid (S_t, Z)$ , for all  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .
- (iv) *Stationarity*: conditional law of  $(S_t, A_t, Y_t) \mid (S_{t-1}, A_{t-1}, Y_{t-1}, Z)$  does not vary with  $t$ .

Condition (i) states that the current state  $S_t$  depends only on the study arm  $Z$ , previous state  $S_{t-1}$ , action  $A_{t-1}$ , and outcome  $Y_{t-1}$ , and (ii) specifies that the next outcome (or reward)  $Y_t$  depends only on the study arm  $Z$ , current state  $S_t$  and action  $A_t$ . Condition (iii) states that the action  $A_t$  is chosen based solely on the current state  $S_t$  and study arm  $Z$ . Additionally, (iv) ensures that the transition dynamics, policy, and reward structure are time-invariant, such that  $\mathbb{E}[Y_t \mid S_t = s, A_t = a, \mathcal{H}_t, Z] = E_0[Y_0 \mid S_0 = s, A_0 = a, Z]$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(A_t = a \mid S_t = s, \mathcal{H}_t) = P_0(A_0 = a \mid S_0 = s, Z)$ , and  $\mathbb{P}(S_t \in B \mid Y_{t-1} = y, A_{t-1} = a, S_{t-1} = s, \mathcal{H}_t) = P_0(S_1 \in B \mid Y_0 = y, A_0 = a, S_0 = s, Z)$  almost surely for all  $(a, s, y) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ , and each set  $B \subset \mathcal{S}$ . Our Markov independence assumptions are visually represented by a directed acyclic graph (DAG) in Figure 1.

To allow  $Y_t$  to depend on the previous outcome  $Y_{t-1}$ , we can redefine our state vector as  $\tilde{S}_t := (S_t, Y_{t-1})$ , allowing  $(Y_t : t \in \mathbb{T})$  to model a cumulative reward, counting, or reliability process (Andersen et al., 2012). To plausibly satisfy conditions (i)-(iii), one may need a sufficiently rich state space, which can be expanded by incorporating multiple time points into the state representation. For instance, one could redefine the state vector as a fixed time window into the past,  $\tilde{S}_t := (S_t, S_{t-1}, \dots, S_{t-k})$ , or, more generally, define the states as fixed, finite-dimensional summaries of past history (van der Laan and Malenica, 2018).

## 2.2 Objective: Inferring linear functionals of the $Q$ -function

We are interested in evaluating the long-term effects of a potentially novel policy or intervention, despite only observing a sequence of short-term outcomes. Let  $\pi$  denote the policy of interest, where

$\pi(a \mid s, z)$  specifies the conditional probability of taking action  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  given that an individual is in state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and study arm  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ . Here, we allow the policy to depend on the study arm  $Z$ , so that  $\pi(\cdot \mid \cdot, z = 1)$  and  $\pi(\cdot \mid \cdot, z = 0)$  are the respective policies in the treatment and control arms. This policy induces a counterfactual Markov decision process (MDP), which we formalize using the nonparametric structural equation model (NPSEM) framework (Pearl, 2012). Under this framework, we assume that the study assignment  $Z$  is generated from the initial state  $S_0$  as  $Z := f_Z(S_0, U_Z)$  for a deterministic function  $f_Z$  and unobserved random variable  $U_Z$ . Moreover, we assume the observed MDP is generated sequentially over time  $t \geq 0$  according to the following structural equations:

$$\begin{aligned} A_t &:= f_A(S_t, U_{A_t}, Z); \\ Y_t &:= f_Y(A_t, S_t, U_{Y_t}, Z); \\ S_{t+1} &:= f_S(Y_{t-1}, A_{t-1}, S_{t-1}, U_{S_{t+1}}, Z). \end{aligned}$$

where  $f_A$ ,  $f_Y$ , and  $f_S$  are unknown deterministic functions, and  $\{U_Z, U_{A_t}, U_{Y_t}, U_{S_{t+1}} : t \in \mathbb{T}\}$  are unobserved, mutually independent, and stationary random variables. The counterfactual MDP induced by applying policy  $\pi$  is the process that would be observed if, at each time  $t$ , the action  $A_t$  were drawn independently, conditional on  $S_t$  and  $Z$ , according to the distribution  $\pi(\cdot \mid S_t, Z)$ .

The  $Q$ -function (Kaelbling et al., 1996) is a fundamental quantity for evaluating a given policy  $\pi$  in MDPs. In the context of long-term causal inference, the  $Q$ -function links the causal effects of long-term treatments to the distribution of the short-term data. For a discount factor  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ , the  $Q$ -function is defined as the map  $Q_{\mathbb{P}}^{\pi} : \mathcal{A} \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , given by:

$$Q_{\mathbb{P}}^{\pi}(a, z, s) := \mathbb{E}^{\pi} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Y_t \mid A_0 = a, S_0 = s, Z = z \right],$$

where  $\mathbb{E}^{\pi}$  denotes the expectation under the counterfactual distribution induced under policy  $\pi$ . Intuitively, the  $Q$ -function represents the expected cumulative reward that an individual can achieve, starting from a given state  $s$ , taking a specific action  $a$ , and then following a certain policy  $\pi$  thereafter. The discount factor  $\gamma$  determines the weight assigned to future rewards and controls how far ahead the evaluation extends in infinite-horizon settings. By convention,  $0^0 := 1$ , so that when

$\gamma = 0$ , the  $Q$ -function simplifies to the outcome regression  $(a, z, s) \mapsto \mathbb{E}_0[Y_0 \mid A_0 = a, Z = z, S_0 = s]$ .

Our objective is to obtain inference on  $E_0[m(S_0, A_0, Q_{\mathbb{P}}^{\pi})]$ , where  $q \mapsto m(S_0, A_0, q)$  is a linear functional of the  $Q$ -function. Notable causal estimands of this form include the expected cumulative reward of the policy  $\pi$ , given by  $\mathbb{E}^{\pi} [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Y_t]$ , which corresponds to the functional  $m : (s, Q) \mapsto \int Q(a', z, s) \pi(a' \mid z, s) da'$ . Under our causal and Markov assumptions, the  $Q$ -function  $Q_{\mathbb{P}}^{\pi}$  can be identified from the observed data-generating distribution  $P_0$  by the function  $q_0^{\pi}$ , where  $q_P^{\pi}$  is defined as the solution to the Bellman integral equation (Bellman, 1966):

$$E_P [q_P^{\pi}(A_0, Z, S_0) - \gamma V_P^{\pi}(Z, S_1) \mid A_0, Z, S_0] = \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) \quad P\text{-almost surely}, \quad (1)$$

where  $V_P^{\pi} : (s, z) \mapsto \int q_P^{\pi}(a, s, z) \pi(a \mid s, z) da$  is the *value function* or *V-function*, and  $\mu_P : (a, z, s) \mapsto E_P[Y_0 \mid A_0 = a, Z = z, S_0 = s]$  is the *outcome regression*. Consequently, the causal estimand  $E_0[m(S_0, A_0, Q_{\mathbb{P}}^{\pi})]$  can be identified by  $\Psi(P_0)$ , where the parameter  $\Psi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined pointwise as

$$\Psi(P) := E_P [m(S_0, A_0, q_P^{\pi})].$$

As a special case, the parameter  $\Psi$  represents the long-term causal effect of an A/B test, where participants are randomly assigned to either a treatment group, receiving a specific intervention, or a control group, receiving an alternative intervention or no intervention, following a policy  $\pi$ . Following Tran et al. (2023), the long-term causal effect is defined as the discounted sum  $\mathbb{E} [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t (Y_t(1) - Y_t(0))]$ , where  $\{Y_t(1), Y_t(0) : t \in \mathbb{T}\}$  are the potential outcomes under the treatment and control policies implied by  $\pi$ , respectively. This parameter is identified as  $E_0[V_P^{\pi}(Z_0 = 1, S_0) - V_P^{\pi}(Z_0 = 0, S_0)]$ , which corresponds to the linear functional  $m : (s, a, q) \mapsto \int \{q(a', 1, s) \pi(a' \mid z = 1, s) - q(a', 0, s) \pi(a' \mid z = 0, s)\} da'$ . More generally, our setting also encompasses linear functionals of the V-function of the behavioral policy that generated the observed data. Specifically, we could let  $A_t$  indicate the study assignment at time  $t$ , such that  $A_t = Z$  almost surely, and consider the behavioral policy  $\pi$  that sets the treatment  $A_t$  equal to  $Z$ . In this case, the  $Q$ -function  $q_P^{\pi}$  identifies the V-function  $(a, z, s) \mapsto \mathbb{E} [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t Y_t \mid S_0 = s, Z = z]$  and solves the Bellman equation:

$$E_P [q_P^{\pi}(A_0, Z, S_0) - \gamma q_P^{\pi}(A_0, Z, S_1) \mid A_0, Z, S_0] = \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) \quad P\text{-almost surely}.$$



Statistically efficient estimation of the value of a policy, a particular case of a linear functional, using double reinforcement learning (DRL) (Kallus and Uehara, 2020) under a nonparametric model was studied in Kallus and Uehara (2022) and Tran et al. (2023). A key assumption for nonparametric identification and efficient estimation of  $\Psi(P_0)$  is the presence of sufficient overlap between the initial state distribution and the distribution of future states. Formally, this requires that the state occupancy ratio  $w_{\mathbb{P}} : (a, z, s) \mapsto \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \frac{d\mathbb{P}(S_t=s|A_t=a)}{d\mathbb{P}(S_0=s|A_0=a)}$  exists and is bounded, which is implied by the state overlap condition that  $\frac{dP_0}{d\mu}(A_0 = a, S_0 = s) > 0$  for each  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  (assumption 3 in Tran et al. (2023)). However, in high-dimensional state spaces or when the process depends on multiple past time points, this assumption becomes difficult to satisfy due to the combinatorial growth of possible transitions. It is also inherently violated when the intervention induces states unlikely to occur without treatment. Even if nominally satisfied, practical violations of overlap can cause excessive variability and instability in estimator performance. The generalized Cramér-Rao lower bound for nonparametric estimation of  $\Psi(P_0)$ , and the limiting variance of the estimators in Kallus and Uehara (2022) and Tran et al. (2023), largely depend on the variance of the state occupation ratio  $w_{\mathbb{P}}$ , reflecting the degree of state overlap.

### 3 Semiparametric double reinforcement learning

#### 3.1 Projection-based parameter and statistical efficiency

Nonparametric inference on  $\Psi(P_0)$  is challenging because it requires strong conditions for identifiability and  $\sqrt{n}$ -rate estimability. A key requirement is sufficient overlap between the initial state distribution and future state distributions, ensuring that unobserved outcomes for future states can be imputed from observed outcomes of initial states. However, in this section, we will show that these stringent conditions can be relaxed by imposing semiparametric model constraints on the  $Q$ -function. Specifically, the  $Q$ -function  $q_0^\pi$  may exhibit low functional complexity, such as being additive, bi-additive, or depending only on a subset of the state vector’s components. For instance, one can assume that the  $Q$ -function  $q_0^\pi$  belongs to a partially linear model that constrains the functional form of the study treatment effect,  $(a, z, s) \mapsto q_0^\pi(a, 1, s) - q_0^\pi(a, 0, s)$ . Intuitively, overlap becomes unnecessary because such model constraints enable extrapolation of the  $Q$ -function from the support of the initial state  $S_0$  to the support of the future state  $S_1$ , such as through linear

extrapolation (Kallus et al., 2018). These constraints can also substantially reduce the semiparametric efficiency bound of the estimand, resulting in less variable estimates and tighter confidence intervals.

Suppose we have structural knowledge that the  $Q$ -function  $q_P^\pi$  is known to lie within, or be well approximated by, a potentially infinite-dimensional linear subspace  $H \subset L^2(\mu)$ , where  $\mu$  is a measure on the state-action space  $\mathcal{S} \times \{0,1\} \times \mathcal{A}$ . For now, we assume that the regression model  $H$  is known *a priori*; however, in the next section, we will allow this model to be learned directly from the data. To exploit the fact that  $q_P^\pi$  is well approximated by elements in the model  $H$ , we consider inference on the projection estimand  $\Psi_H(P) := E_0[m(S_0, A_0, q_{0,H}^\pi)]$ , where  $q_{0,H}^\pi$  denotes the Bellman projection of  $q_0^\pi$  onto  $H$ . Specifically, this estimand arises from the parameter  $\Psi_H : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , defined pointwise as

$$\Psi_H(P) := E_P[m(S_0, A_0, q_{P,H}^\pi)], \quad (2)$$

where the Bellman projection  $q_{P,H}^\pi$  is defined as

$$q_{P,H}^\pi \in \operatorname{argmin}_{q \in H} E_P \left[ \{Y_0 - T_P(q)(A_0, S_0, Z)\}^2 \right].$$

Here,  $T_P : H \rightarrow L^2(P_{S_0,A})$  denotes the Bellman operator, defined as  $T_P(h) : (a, z, s) \mapsto h(a, z, s) - \gamma E_P[V_h^\pi(Z, S_1) \mid A_0 = a, Z = z, S_0 = s]$ , and  $h \mapsto V_h^\pi$  denotes the value operator, defined as  $V_h^\pi : (s, z) \mapsto \int h(a, z, s) \pi(a \mid s, z) da$ . In words,  $q_{P,H}^\pi$  is the best approximation of  $q_P^\pi$  in  $H$  with respect to the Bellman norm  $\|T_P(\cdot)\|_P$ , such that  $T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)$  is the  $L^2(P)$  projection of the outcome regression  $\mu_P$  onto the range  $T_P(H) := \{T_P(h) : h \in H\}$ . Notably, the projection parameter  $\Psi_H$  agrees with the original parameter  $\Psi$  on the submodel  $\mathcal{M}_H := \{P \in \mathcal{M} : q_P^\pi \in H\}$ , which consists of all distributions with  $Q$ -function in  $H$ .

Let  $P \in \mathcal{M}$  be an arbitrary distribution to be specified later. For the identification of  $\Psi_H(P)$ , we make the following assumptions:

- (C1) (Existence of  $q_{P,H}^\pi$ ) The set  $\operatorname{argmin}_{\mu \in T_P(H)} E_P [\{Y_0 - \mu(A_0, Z, S_0)\}^2]$  is nonempty.
- (C2) (Uniqueness of  $q_{P,H}^\pi$ ) For each  $h \in H$ , if  $T_P(h)(A_0, Z, S_0) = 0$ , then  $h(A_0, Z, S_0) = 0$   $P$ -almost surely.

Condition **C2** relaxes the state overlap condition assumed in [Kallus and Uehara \(2022\)](#) and [Tran et al. \(2023\)](#) when  $H$  is a constrained submodel. In the unconstrained case where  $H = L^2(\mu)$ , **C2** is necessarily violated if the state overlap condition is not met. For instance, the condition is violated by the function  $\tilde{h} : (a, z, s) \mapsto 1(s \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}) - f(a, z, s)$ , where  $f$  is any function satisfying  $E_P[V_f^\pi(Z, S_1) \mid A_0, Z, S_0] = 0$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  satisfies  $P(S_1 \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}) > 0$  and  $P(S_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}) = 0$ . When  $H$  is a constrained space, **C2** may still hold even if there is a state overlap violation, due to the imposed constraints on elements in  $H$ . Intuitively, this is because the functional form of an element  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  in regions without overlap may be determined by its functional form in regions with overlap, such as through linear extrapolation when  $H$  consists of linear functions ([Kallus et al., 2018](#)).

Condition **C1** ensures that there exists at least one solution  $q_{P,H}^\pi \in \operatorname{argmin}_{q \in H} E_P[\{Y_0 - T_P(q)(A_0, Z, S_0)\}^2]$ , and the image  $T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)$  is unique for all such solutions. This condition holds at  $P_0$  when  $H$  is closed under the inner product  $\langle T_0(h_1), T_0(h_2) \rangle$ , ensuring that  $T_0(H)$  is a closed set. Condition **C2** further ensures that the Bellman projection  $q_{P,H}^\pi$  is uniquely defined on the support of  $S_0$ , thereby identifying  $\Psi_H(P)$ . In the case where  $q_{P,H}^\pi$  cannot be uniquely identified, **C2** can be relaxed to only require that  $E_P[m(S_0, A_0, h)] = 0$ , so that the estimand  $E_P[m(S_0, A_0, q_{P,H}^\pi)]$  is uniquely identified ([Bennett et al., 2022](#)).

While the parameters  $\Psi$  and  $\Psi_H$  agree on  $\mathcal{M}_H$ , the nonparametric efficiency bound for  $\Psi_H$  may be smaller than that of  $\Psi$ , allowing for the construction of more efficient estimators that leverage structure in the  $Q$ -function. The efficiency bound is determined by the variance of the efficient influence function (EIF), as provided in the following theorem. The existence of the EIF requires that the projection parameter  $\Psi_H$  is pathwise differentiable, which is ensured under the following boundedness condition on the linear functional  $h \mapsto E_P[m(S_0, A_0, h)]$ .

**(C3)** (Boundedness of linear functional) It holds that  $\sup_{h \in H} \frac{E_P[m(S_0, A_0, h)]}{\|T_P(h)\|_P} < \infty$ .

By the Riesz representation theorem, there exists a unique Riesz representer  $\alpha_{P,H} \in H$  such that  $\Psi_H(P) = \langle T_P(\alpha_{P,H}), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_P = \langle T_P(\alpha_{P,H}), \mu_P \rangle_P$ . Hence,  $\Psi_H(P)$  can be expressed as a weighted average of the outcome:  $\Psi_H(P) = E_P[T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0)Y_0]$ . Akin to automatic DML ([Chernozhukov et al., 2022](#)), the Riesz representer can be explicitly written as the minimizer of the

following objective:

$$\alpha_{P,H} = \underset{\alpha \in H}{\operatorname{argmin}} E_P \left[ \{T_P(\alpha)(A_0, Z, S_0)\}^2 - 2m(S_0, A_0, \alpha) \right]. \quad (3)$$

The Riesz representer  $\alpha_{P,H}$  appears in the efficient influence function of  $\Psi_H$  and plays a crucial role in the construction of  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent and efficient estimators of  $\Psi_H(P)$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that C1-C3 hold in a Hellinger ball around  $P \in \mathcal{M}$ . Then, the parameter  $\Psi_H : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is pathwise differentiable at  $P$  with efficient influence function  $\varphi_{P,H}$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} (s, z, a, y, s') &\mapsto T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(a, z, s) \{y - \mu_P(a, z, s)\} \\ &\quad + \{\alpha_{P,H}(a, z, s) - \gamma V_{\alpha_{P,H}}^\pi(z, s')\} \{\mu_P(a, z, s) - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)(a, z, s)\} \\ &\quad + T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(a, z, s) \left\{ T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)(a, z, s) + \gamma V_{q_{P,H}^\pi}^\pi(z, s') - q_{P,H}^\pi(a, z, s) \right\} \\ &\quad + m(s, a, q_{P,H}^\pi) - \Psi_H(P). \end{aligned}$$

If  $H$  is correctly specified such that  $q_P^\pi \in H$ , the influence function simplifies to:

$$\varphi_{P,H} : (s, z, a, y, s') \mapsto T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(a, z, s) \{y + \gamma V_{q_{P,H}^\pi}^\pi(z, s') - q_{P,H}^\pi(a, z, s)\} + m(s, a, q_{P,H}^\pi) - \Psi_H(P).$$

The generalized Cramér-Rao lower bound of  $\Psi_H$  at  $P$  is given by the variance of its efficient influence function,  $E_P[\{\varphi_P(S_0, Z, A_0, Y_0, S_1)\}^2]$  (Bickel et al., 1993). In the nonparametric case where  $H = L^2(P)$ , Kallus and Uehara (2022) showed that for the ATE estimand  $E_0[V_{q_0^\pi}^\pi(1, S_0) - V_{q_0^\pi}^\pi(0, S_0)]$ , the EIF term  $T_P(\alpha_{P,L^2(P)})$  depends on the state occupation ratio  $w_P : (a, z, s) \mapsto \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \frac{d\mathbb{P}(S_t=s|A_t=a, Z=z)}{d\mathbb{P}(S_0=s|A_0=a, Z=z)}$ . In this case, C3 typically requires that the state occupation ratio has finite variance and, thus, implies an overlap condition in the state distributions across time. In the constrained case,  $T_P(\alpha_{P,H})$  can be shown to be the  $L^2(P)$ -projection of its nonparametric counterpart  $T_P(\alpha_{P,L^2(P)})$  onto the range  $T_P(H)$ . Since the norm is contracted under a projection, it follows that the norm of  $T_P(\alpha_{P,H})$ , and therefore the variance of the efficient influence function  $\varphi_{P,H}$ , is driven by the size of the  $Q$ -function model  $H$  in the norm  $\|T_P(\cdot)\|_P$ . To illustrate these efficiency gains due to incorporating model constraints, we consider the following data-fusion example.

**Example 1** (EIF in data-fusion setting). *Suppose that  $A_t := Z$  indicates the time-invariant study*

assignment. Consider the ATE estimand  $E_0[q_0^{\pi_0}(1, 1, S_0) - q_0^{\pi_0}(0, 0, S_0)]$ , under a randomized study assignment with  $P_0(Z = 1 | S_0) = 0.5$ , where  $\pi_0(a | z, s) := 1(a = z)$  is the behavioral policy generating the data. We focus on a data-fusion setting where experimental data ( $Z = 1$ ) is augmented with historical control data ( $Z = 0$ ), adapting the framework of [Kallus et al. \(2018\)](#) and [van der Laan et al. \(2024b\)](#) to Markov decision processes. Suppose the historical control data is much larger than the experimental data, allowing us to treat the historical control  $Q$ -function  $q_{hist}^\pi : (s, a) \mapsto q_0^\pi(a, 0, s)$  as effectively known. Consider the offset model  $H := \{q : (a, z, s) \mapsto q_{hist}^\pi(a, s) + \kappa + \beta z : \kappa, \beta \in \mathbb{R}\}$ , which models the data combination bias  $q_0^\pi(A, Z, S_0) - q_0^\pi(A, Z = 0, S_0)$  as a function of the study assignment  $Z$ . Although  $H$  is an affine space, [Theorem 1](#) remains valid with  $\alpha_{P,H}$  replaced by  $\alpha_{P,T_P(H)}$ , where  $T_P(H) := H - \{q_{hist}^\pi\}$  is the tangent space to  $H$  at  $P$ . In this case, under the MDP conditions, the nuisance function  $T_P(\alpha_{P,T_P(H)})$  appearing in the EIF is given by  $(a, z, s) \mapsto (4z - 1) \cdot E_P[w_P(A_0, Z, S_0) | Z = z]$ , where  $w_P$  denotes the state occupation ratio. Noting that  $(1 - \gamma)E_P[w_P(A_0, Z, S_0) | Z = z] = (1 - \gamma) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \int \mathbb{P}(S_t = ds | Z = z) = 1$  almost surely, we can show that the EIF, and hence the efficiency bound for  $\Psi_H$ , does not depend on the degree of state overlap over time.

### 3.2 Automatic debiased machine learning

In this section, we propose an efficient, debiased machine learning estimator of  $\Psi_H(P_0)$  based on the efficient influence function from [Theorem 1](#). To achieve this, we establish a functional von Mises expansion ([Von Mises, 1947](#)) for the parameter  $\Psi_H$ , showing that the efficient influence function  $\phi_{0,H}$  characterizes the first-order bias in the plug-in estimation of  $\Psi_H(P_0)$ .

Let  $q_{n,H}^\pi$  denote an estimator of the projected  $Q$ -function  $q_{0,H}^\pi$ , obtained using methods such as fitted  $Q$ -iteration (FQI) ([Munos and Szepesvári, 2008](#)), which will be described later. Given the estimator  $q_{n,H}^\pi$ , a natural estimator of  $\Psi_H(P_0)$  is the plug-in estimator  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m(S_{0,i}, q_{n,H}^\pi)$ . However, when  $q_{n,H}^\pi$  is obtained using flexible statistical learning tools, this estimator typically lacks both  $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -consistency and asymptotic normality due to excessive bias arising from the first-order dependence on the nuisance estimation error  $q_{n,H}^\pi - q_{0,H}^\pi$  ([Van der Laan et al., 2011](#); [Chernozhukov et al., 2018](#)). To overcome this sensitivity, debiasing methods must typically be used to eliminate the first-order bias of the plug-in estimator.

A bias correction for the plug-in estimator can be derived from the following functional von

Mises expansion (Von Mises, 1947), which establishes that, for an estimator  $\widehat{P}_n$  of  $P_0$ , the plug-in estimation error  $\Psi_H(\widehat{P}_n) - \Psi_H(P_0)$  is determined in leading order by the EIF.

**Theorem 2** (Functional von Mises expansion). *For all  $P, \bar{P} \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have the following bias expansion:  $\Psi_H(\bar{P}) - \Psi_H(P) = -P\varphi_{\bar{P},H} + R_H(P, \bar{P})$ , where:*

$$\begin{aligned} R_H(P, \bar{P}) := & P \left[ \left\{ \mathcal{T}_{\bar{P}}(\alpha_{\bar{P},H}) - T_P(\alpha_{\bar{P},H}) \right\} (\mu_P - \mu_{\bar{P}}) \right] \\ & + P \left[ \left\{ T_P(\alpha_{\bar{P},H}) - T_P(\alpha_{P,H}) \right\} (T_P(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi) - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)) \right] \\ & + P \left[ \left\{ T_P(\alpha_{\bar{P},H}) - \mathcal{T}_{\bar{P}}(\alpha_{\bar{P},H}) \right\} (T_P(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi) - \mathcal{T}_{\bar{P}}(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If  $P, \bar{P} \in \mathcal{M}_H$ ,  $R_H(P, \bar{P})$  simplifies to  $P[\{\mathcal{T}_{\bar{P}}(\alpha_{\bar{P},H}) - T_P(\alpha_{P,H})\}(T_P(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi) - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi))]$ .

The above theorem establishes that the plug-in error  $\Psi_H(\widehat{P}_n) - \Psi_H(P_0)$  is dominated by  $-P_0\varphi_{\widehat{P}_n,H}$ , with the remainder being second-order in the estimation error of the nuisance components  $T_0$ ,  $\alpha_{0,H}$ ,  $\mu_0$ , and  $q_{0,H}^\pi$ . Given the estimator  $q_{n,H}^\pi$  of  $q_{0,H}^\pi$ , a debiased machine learning estimator of  $\Psi_H(P_0)$  is given by the one-step estimator,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m(S_{0,i}, q_{n,H}^\pi) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_{n,H}(S_{0,i}, Z_i, A_{0,i}, Y_{0,i}, S_{1,i}),$$

where  $\varphi_{n,H}$  is an estimate of the efficient influence function  $\varphi_{0,H}$ , and the empirical mean of  $\varphi_{n,H}$  serves as a bias correction. In this work, we focus on a special case of the one-step estimator, denoted by  $\psi_{n,H}$ , given by:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ m(S_{0,i}, q_{n,H}^\pi) + T_n(\alpha_{n,H})(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i}) \{ Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{n,H}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i}) - q_{n,H}^\pi(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i}) \} \right], \quad (4)$$

where  $\alpha_{n,H} \in H$  is an estimate of  $\alpha_{0,H}$ ,  $V_{n,H}^\pi := V_{q_{n,H}^\pi}^\pi$  is an estimate of the value function, and  $T_n(\alpha_{n,H})$  is an estimator of  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H})$ . In general, this particular one-step estimator,  $\psi_{n,H}$ , is debiased only when the model  $H$  is correctly specified for the true  $Q$ -function  $q_0^\pi$ . In the next section, we introduce an adaptive variant of this estimator that uses data-driven model selection to learn the model  $H$ , ensuring asymptotically vanishing misspecification error. We will study the asymptotic properties of the one-step estimator, including its asymptotic linearity, efficiency, and validity when  $H$  is learned from data.

### 3.3 Estimation of $Q$ -function and Riesz representer

In this section, we describe the estimation of the  $Q$ -function  $q_{0,H}^\pi$  and the Riesz representer  $\alpha_{0,H}$  required to construct the one-step estimator  $\psi_{n,H}$ .

To estimate  $q_{n,H}^\pi$  for  $q_{0,H}^\pi$ , we use fitted Q-iteration (FQI) (Munos and Szepesvári, 2008), an iterative method for solving the Bellman integral equation (1) in offline reinforcement learning. FQI is based on the observation that if  $q_{0,H}^\pi$  were known, it could be estimated by regressing  $Y_0 + \gamma V_{q_{0,H}^\pi}^\pi(A_0, Z, S_1)$  on  $(A_0, Z, S_0)$ , since rearranging (1) yields  $E_0[Y_0 + \gamma V_{q_{0,H}^\pi}^\pi(A_0, Z, S_1) \mid A_0, Z, S_0] = q_{0,H}^\pi(A_0, Z, S_0)$  almost surely. Since  $q_{0,H}^\pi$  is unknown, FQI initializes  $q_{n,H}^{\pi,(0)} := 0$  and iteratively updates it by regressing the Bellman outcome  $Y_0 + \gamma V_{q_{n,H}^{\pi,(k)}}^\pi(A_0, Z, S_1)$  on  $(A_0, Z, S_0)$  over the model class  $H$  at each iteration  $k + 1 \in \mathbb{N}$ . Iteration stops when the  $\ell^2$  norm between consecutive updates is sufficiently small or when out-of-sample or cross-validated risk ceases to improve. Algorithm 1 details the procedure. Theoretical guarantees on validity and convergence rates of FQI using generic function approximation methods, such as neural networks (Bishop, 1994), random forests (Breiman, 2001), and gradient boosted trees (Friedman, 2001), are provided in Munos and Szepesvári (2008) and Agarwal et al. (2019).

---

#### Algorithm 1 Fitted Q-Iteration

---

**Require:** Function class  $H$ , number of iterations  $K$ ;

- 1: Initialize  $q_{n,H}^{\pi,(0)} := 0$ ;
- 2: **for**  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$  **do**
- 3:   Set value function  $V_{n,H}^{\pi,(k)} : (z, s) \mapsto \int q_{n,H}^{\pi,(k)}(a', z, s) \pi(a' \mid z, s) da'$ ;
- 4:   Update  $q_{n,H}^{\pi,(k+1)} \in H$  by estimating:

$$\arg \min_{q \in H} \mathbb{E}_P \left[ \{Y_0 + \gamma V_{n,H}^{\pi,(k)}(Z, S_1) - q(A_0, Z, S_0)\}^2 \right];$$

- 5: **end for**
  - 6: Set  $q_{n,H}^\pi := q_{n,H}^{\pi,(K)}$ ;
  - 7: **return**  $q_{n,H}^\pi$ ;
- 

Estimators for the debiasing nuisance functions  $\alpha_{0,H}$  and  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H})$  remain to be obtained. Given an estimator  $\alpha_{n,H}$  of  $\alpha_{0,H}$ ,  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H})$  can be estimated by regressing  $V_{\alpha_{n,H}}^\pi(A_0, Z, S_1)$  on  $(A_0, Z, S_0)$ . To obtain  $\alpha_{n,H}$ , we recast the minimization objective in (3) as the following convex-concave min-max optimization problem:

$$\alpha_{0,H} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha \in H} \max_{f \in L^2(P_{S_0,A})} L_0(\alpha, f), \quad (5)$$

where the objective function  $L_0(\alpha, f)$  is given by:

$$E_0 \left[ \{\alpha(A_0, Z, S_0)\}^2 - 2\gamma\alpha(A_0, Z, S_0)V_\alpha^\pi(Z, S_1) - 2m(S_0, A_0, \alpha) - \frac{\gamma^2}{2} [\{f(A_0, Z, S_0)\}^2 - 2V_\alpha^\pi(Z, S_1)f(A_0, Z, S_0)] \right]$$

In the context of minimax instrumental variable regression, [Bennett et al. \(2023\)](#) studied empirical risk minimization techniques for approximating solutions to min-max optimization problems and analyzed their theoretical properties. An alternative approach involves directly estimating the conditional distribution  $S_1 | (A_0, Z, S_0)$ , enabling a closed-form estimation of the Bellman operator  $T_P$ . The representer  $\alpha_{0,H}$  can then be obtained by minimizing the objective in (3), as in [Li et al. \(2024\)](#) for instrumental variable regression. However, this requires estimating a potentially high-dimensional multivariate conditional density, which is challenging in practice.

To mitigate the computational challenges of min-max optimization, one approach is to replace the inner unconstrained maximization with a constrained maximization over an expressive linear model or reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS)  $\mathcal{F}$ , enabling efficient closed-form solutions via methods like kernel ridge regression. The outer minimization can then be performed using standard loss-based techniques on the profiled loss, thereby reducing the min-max problem to a standard minimization ([Murphy and Van der Vaart, 2000](#)). When implemented using neural network gradient descent or gradient boosting, the inner maximization only needs to be solved once per gradient update, making the procedure computationally feasible, especially since penalized linear regression can be performed efficiently at scale ([Pedregosa et al., 2011](#)). To enhance the expressivity of  $\mathcal{F}$ , a data-dependent kernel can be learned, such as a random forest kernel derived from a random forest FQI model ([Scornet, 2016](#); [Feng and Baumgartner, 2020](#)), or one based on an embedding of the state-action space learned from data. In Section 4.2, we propose a debiased plug-in estimator based on a data-dependent embedding that avoids direct estimation of the Riesz representer.

## 4 Model selection with adaptive debiased machine learning

### 4.1 General approach

Adaptive Debiased Machine Learning (ADML) ([van der Laan et al., 2023](#)) combines debiased machine learning with data-driven model selection to produce superefficient estimators of smooth



functionals, which are adaptive to the functional forms of the nuisance components. In this section, we extend ADML to the MDP setting to construct estimators that adapt to the functional form of the  $Q$ -function  $q_0^\pi$ . In the next section, we use this framework to develop a novel ADML estimator that leverages the estimated  $Q$ -function itself as a scalar embedding (or dimension reduction) of the state space.

Let  $H_n \subseteq H$  be a data-dependent working model for the  $Q$ -function  $q_P^\pi$ , learned via data-driven model selection. Given the selected model  $H_n$ , our proposed ADML estimator of  $\Psi(P_0)$  is the debiased machine learning estimator  $\psi_{n,H_n}$  of the data-adaptive parameter  $\Psi_{H_n}$ , as defined in (4). The estimator  $\psi_{n,H_n}$  requires estimators  $q_{n,H_n}^\pi \in H_n$  and  $\alpha_{n,H_n} \in H_n$  for  $q_{0,H_n}^\pi$  and  $\alpha_{0,H_n}$ , respectively. The key idea behind ADML is to posit the existence of a fixed, unknown oracle submodel  $H_0 \subseteq H$ , depending on the true  $Q$ -function  $q_0^\pi$ , such that the model approximation error between  $H_n$  and  $H_0$  asymptotically vanishes. By leveraging a novel expansion of the parameter approximation error  $\Psi_{H_n}(P_0) - \Psi_{H_0}(P_0)$ , we show that  $\psi_{n,H_n}$  retains  $\sqrt{n}$ -convergence, asymptotic normality, and efficiency for the oracle parameter  $\Psi_{H_0}$ . This oracle parameter coincides with the target parameter  $\Psi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  over  $Q$ -functions in  $H_0$ , yielding the same estimand  $\Psi_{H_0}(P_0) = \Psi(P_0)$ . Notably,  $\Psi_{H_0}$  may have a substantially smaller efficiency bound than  $\Psi$  at  $P_0$ , resulting in less variable estimates and narrower confidence intervals while preserving unbiasedness.

For example, the working model  $H_n$  could be selected via cross-validated FQI over a sieve of models, a sequence of increasingly complex models  $H_1 \subset H_2 \subset H_3 \subset \dots \subset H_\infty := H$ , where  $H$  is a correctly specified model containing  $q_0^\pi$ . A plausible oracle submodel  $H_0$  could be the smallest correctly specified submodel in the sieve that contains  $q_0^\pi$ , which can feasibly be learned using cross-validation. Alternatively,  $H_n$  could result from a variable selection procedure or a feature embedding learned from data, with  $H_0$  as a limiting oracle embedding (e.g., the set of variables asymptotically selected by the model selection procedure). Data-adaptive methods for learning feature embeddings of the state-action space were proposed in [Pritz et al. \(2021\)](#) and [Pavse and Hanna \(2024\)](#). Feature embeddings could also be derived directly from the FQI model  $q_{n,H_n}^\pi$ , for instance, by one-hot encoding the leaves of trees in a random forest or gradient-boosted tree model (Section 3.1 of [He et al. \(2014\)](#)).

The following theorem is key to establishing the validity of our ADML estimator, showing that the parameter approximation bias  $\Psi_{H_n}(P_0) - \Psi(P_0)$  is second-order in the model approximation

error and thus asymptotically negligible under certain conditions.

**Theorem 3** (Decomposition of approximation bias). *Suppose that  $q_0^\pi \in H_0$  for some oracle sub-model  $H_0 \subseteq H$ , depending on  $P_0$ . Assume C3 holds for both  $H := H_n$  and  $H := H_0$ . Then, the oracle approximation error of the working model  $H_n$  satisfies:*

$$\Psi_{H_n}(P_0) - \Psi(P_0) = -\langle T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0,H_{n,0}}), T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_0^\pi) \rangle_{P_0}$$

where  $H_{n,0} := H_n \oplus H_0$  is the union linear model.

For the approximation error  $\Psi_{H_n}(P_0) - \Psi(P_0)$  to approach zero,  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n})$  and  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H_{n,0}})$  must converge to one another in  $L^2(P_0)$ , and  $T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi)$  must similarly converge to  $T_0(q_0^\pi)$  in  $L^2(P_0)$ . This requires that the learned model  $H_n$  approximates the true  $Q$ -function  $q_0^\pi$  and the union model representer  $\alpha_{0,H_{n,0}}$  with vanishing error in the norm  $\|T_0(\cdot)\|$ . For model selection over a sieve of models, the event  $H_n \subseteq H_0$  typically occurs with probability tending to one, in which case  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H_{n,0}})$  simplifies to  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H_0})$ , and the condition requires that  $H_n$  grows sufficiently quickly. For general model selection procedures, convergence of  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n})$  and  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H_{n,0}})$  to one another requires that any directions (e.g., variables, basis functions) included in  $H_0$  but not in  $H_n$  must have asymptotically vanishing importance in the basis expansion of the union model representer  $\alpha_{0,H_{n,0}}$ .

To further elucidate these conditions, suppose the working model  $H_n := H_{\phi_n}$  and the oracle model  $H_0 := H_{\phi_0}$  are derived from feature embeddings. Here, for a feature embedding  $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ , we define  $H_\phi := \{f \circ \phi : f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$ . The combined model  $H_{n,0}$  is given by  $H_{(\phi_n, \phi_0)}$ , where  $(\phi_n, \phi_0)$  denotes the embedding obtained by stacking the features of  $\phi_n$  and  $\phi_0$ . Theorem 3 implies that the approximation bias vanishes if the nuisance functions derived from the embeddings  $\phi_n$  and  $(\phi_n, \phi_0)$  asymptotically converge to the oracle embedding  $\phi_0$ . Heuristically, this requires that conditioning on features from  $\phi_n$  or  $(\phi_n, \phi_0)$  asymptotically provides the same information as conditioning on  $\phi_0$  alone. Similar high-level conditions have been assumed in prior work on debiased machine learning with data-dependent features, including Benkeser et al. (2017), Benkeser et al. (2020), Wang et al. (2023), and Bonvini et al. (2024). Towards developing lower-level conditions in regression settings, we show in Lemma 9 of the Appendix that the  $L^2(P_0)$  estimation error of  $E_0[Y | \phi_n(X), \mathcal{D}_n]$  and  $E_0[Y | \phi_n(X), \phi_0(X), \mathcal{D}_n]$  for estimating  $E_0[Y | \phi_0(X)]$  can be bounded by

the embedding approximation error  $\sqrt{\int \|\phi_n(x) - \phi_0(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 P_{0,X}(dx)}$ . A sufficient condition for this bound is that the function  $(t_1, t_2) \mapsto E_0[Y \mid \phi_n(X) = t_1, \phi_0(X) = t_2, \mathcal{D}_n]$  is almost surely Lipschitz continuous, a condition that also appears in [Bonvini et al. \(2024\)](#) and [van der Laan et al. \(2024a\)](#) for  $m = 1$ .

We now present our main result on the asymptotic linearity and superefficiency of the ADML estimator  $\psi_{n,H_n}$  for  $\Psi(P_0)$ . This result is established under the following conditions.

**(C4)** *Consistency:*  $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(P_n - P_0)\{\varphi_{\hat{P}_{n,H_n}} - \varphi_{0,H_n}\} = o_p(1)$ .

**(C5)** *Nuisance estimation rate:*  $\|T_n(\alpha_{n,H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n})\|_{P_0} \|T_0(q_{n,H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi)\|_{P_0} = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ .

**(C6)** *Stabilization of selected model:*  $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(P_n - P_0)\{\varphi_{0,H_n} - \varphi_{0,H_0}\} = o_p(1)$ .

**(C7)** *Model approximation error:*  $\|T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0,H_{n,0}})\|_{P_0} \|T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_0^\pi)\|_{P_0} = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ .

**Theorem 4.** *Assume C1-C5 hold. Suppose that  $H_n$  converges to an oracle submodel  $H_0$  with  $q_0^\pi \in H_0$  in the sense that conditions C6-C7 hold. Then,  $\psi_{n,H_n} - \Psi(P_0) = (P_n - P_0)\varphi_{0,H_0} + o_p(n^{-1/2})$ , and  $\psi_{n,H_n}$  is a locally regular and efficient estimator for the oracle parameter  $\Psi_{H_0}$  under the nonparametric statistical model.*

Condition C4 is an empirical process condition that requires the nuisance estimators  $T_n(\alpha_{n,H_n})$  and  $q_{n,H_n}^\pi$  to be consistent for the working nuisance functions  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n})$  and  $q_{0,H_n}^\pi$  in  $L^2(P_0)$ . This condition holds if  $\|\varphi_{\hat{P}_{n,H_n}} - \varphi_{P_{0,H_n}}\|_{P_0} = o_p(1)$ , provided  $\varphi_{\hat{P}_{n,H_n}} - \varphi_{0,H_0}$  lies in a Donsker class, or if sample-splitting or cross-fitting techniques are used ([van der Laan et al., 2011](#); [Chernozhukov et al., 2018](#)). Condition C5 is a doubly robust rate condition requiring  $T_n(\alpha_{n,H_n})$  and  $q_{n,H_n}^\pi$  to converge sufficiently quickly to  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n})$  and  $q_{0,H_n}^\pi$ , respectively, in the norm  $\|T_0(\cdot)\|$ . This rate condition is standard in the literature on parameters defined via integral equations ([Kallus and Uehara, 2022](#); [Bennett et al., 2023](#); [Li et al., 2024](#)) and can be achieved under appropriate smoothness assumptions using machine learning algorithms such as neural networks, random forests, and gradient-boosted trees. Conditions C6 and C7, which ensures that data-driven model selection preserves the validity of the debiased machine learning estimator, appear in prior works on ADML ([van der Laan et al., 2023, 2024b](#)). Condition C6 is an asymptotic stability condition requiring the EIF for the learned model  $H_n$  to converge to the EIF for the oracle submodel  $H_0$ , which necessitates that  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n})$

and  $q_{0,H_n}^\pi$  are asymptotically consistent with their oracle counterparts. Condition C7 ensures the parameter approximation bias satisfies  $\Psi_n(P_0) - \Psi(P_0) = o_p(n^{-1/2})$  in view of Theorem 3.

## 4.2 Automatic debiased plug-in estimation via calibrated fitted Q-iteration

A key challenge in constructing adaptive debiased machine learning estimators of  $\Psi(P_0)$  is the estimation of the Riesz representer  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n})$ , which is determined as the solution to the min-max optimization problem in (5). While maximizing over a linear model or reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) makes the inner maximization computationally feasible, misspecification of the model or RKHS can introduce significant estimation bias for  $T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n})$  and the resulting estimator of  $\Psi(P_0)$ . In this section, we propose a novel adaptive debiased plug-in estimator of  $\Psi(P_0)$  using calibrated fitted Q-iteration, which eliminates the need to estimate the Riesz representer  $\alpha_{0,H_0}$  for debiasing.

Our estimator is motivated by the observation that the Q-function  $q_0 := q_0^\pi$  serves as a sufficient adjustment statistic for the Bellman equation, meaning the Q-function can be identified by:

$$E_0[q_0(A_0, Z, S_0) - \gamma V_0^\pi(Z, S_1) \mid q_0(A_0, Z, S_0)] = E_0[Y_0 \mid q_0(A_0, Z, S_0)],$$

where the Bellman equation conditions on the one-dimensional variable  $q_0(A_0, Z, S_0)$  rather than the high-dimensional tuple  $(A_0, Z, S_0)$ . Consequently, if  $q_0$  were known a priori, the estimand  $\Psi(P_0)$  could be identified by the oracle parameter  $\Psi_{q_0} : P \mapsto E_P[m(S_0, A_0, q_{P,q_0}^\pi)]$ , where for each  $q \in H$ , we define:

$$q_{P,q}^\pi := \operatorname{argmin}_{f \circ q; f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} E_P \left[ \{Y_0 - T_{P,q}(f \circ q)(A_0, Z, S_0)\}^2 \right],$$

with the dimension-reduced Bellman operator  $T_{P,q}(h) : (a, z, s) \mapsto E_P[h(A_0, Z, S_0) - \gamma V_h^\pi(Z, S_1) \mid q(A_0, Z, S_0) = q(a, z, s)]$ . Although the oracle parameter  $\Psi_{q_0}$  is unknown a priori, the following theorem shows that, given an estimator  $q_n$  of  $q_0$ , it can be approximated up to second-order terms by the data-adaptive parameter  $\Psi_{q_n} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

We introduce the following notation. For any embedding  $\phi : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ , let  $d_{P,\phi} = T_\phi(\alpha_{0,\phi})$ , where  $\alpha_{P,\phi} := \operatorname{argmin}_{f \circ \phi; f: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} E_P \left[ \{T_{P,\phi}(f \circ \phi)(A_0, Z, S_0)\}^2 - 2m(S_0, A_0, f \circ \phi) \right]$  is the Riesz

representer for the function class induced by  $\phi$ . Let  $\tilde{d}_{0,q_n} := \operatorname{argmin}_{f \circ q_n} \|d_{0,(q_n,q_0)} - f \circ q_n\|_{P_0}$  denote the  $L^2(P_0)$  projection of  $d_{0,(q_n,q_0)}$  onto functions of  $q_n$ .

- (D1) *Pathwise differentiability:*  $d_{0,q_0}$ ,  $d_{0,q_n}$ , and  $d_{0,(q_n,q_0)}$  uniquely exist and have finite variance under  $P_0$ .
- (D2) The bivariate function  $(t_1, t_2) \mapsto E_0[d_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(A_0, Z, S_0) \mid q_n(A_0, Z, S_0) = t_1, q_0(A_0, Z, S_0) = t_2, \mathcal{D}_n]$  is almost surely Lipschitz continuous with a fixed constant  $L < \infty$ .

**Theorem 5** (Parameter approximation bias when estimating  $q_0$ ). *Suppose that D1 holds. Then,*

$$\Psi_{q_n}(P_0) - \Psi(P_0) = \langle d_{0,(q_n,q_0)} - \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}, T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) - T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_0) \rangle_{P_0}.$$

*If, in addition, D2 holds then  $\Psi_{q_n}(P_0) - \Psi_{q_0}(P_0) = O_p(\|q_n - q_0\|_{P_0} \|T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) - T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_0)\|_{P_0})$ .*

As a consequence of Theorem 5, an estimator that is debiased for the data-dependent estimand  $\Psi_{q_n}(P_0)$  is also debiased for the true estimand  $\Psi_{q_0}(P_0) = \Psi(P_0)$ . The next result states that if  $q_n$  is a calibrated estimator of  $q_0$ , the corresponding plug-in estimator  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m(S_{0,i}, A_{0,i}, q_n)$  is automatically debiased for  $\Psi_{q_n}$ .

We say that  $q_n$  is empirically calibrated for  $q_0$  if, for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , the empirical Bellman equation holds:

$$q_n(a, z, s) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i}) = q_n(a, z, s)) \{Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{q_n}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i})\}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i}) = q_n(a, z, s))},$$

or, equivalently, that the Bellman residuals  $\{Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{q_n}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i}) - q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})\}_{i=1}^n$  satisfy the empirical orthogonality condition for each transformation  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f(q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})) \{Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{q_n}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i}) - q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})\} = 0.$$

**Theorem 6.** *Suppose that  $q_n$  is empirically calibrated for  $q_0$ . Then,*

$$0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i}) \{Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{q_n}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i}) - q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})\}.$$

By the theorem above, the plug-in estimator  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m(S_{0,i}, A_{0,i}, q_n)$  serves as a debiased machine learning estimator of  $\Psi_{q_n}(P_0)$  using the nuisance estimators  $q_n$  and  $\tilde{d}_{0,q_n}$ , provided  $q_n$  is empirically calibrated. Ensuring that the plug-in estimator is debiased thus reduces to guaranteeing the calibration of  $q_n$ . To this end, we propose a novel calibration algorithm, *isotonic-calibrated fitted Q-iteration*, outlined in Algorithm 2, where  $\mathcal{F}_{iso}$  denotes the space of all monotone non-decreasing (isotonic) functions. Isotonic-calibrated fitted Q-iteration combines isotonic regression — a distribution-free calibration method widely used in prediction (Niculescu-Mizil and Caruana, 2005; Van Der Laan et al., 2023) — with fitted Q-iteration (Munos and Szepesvári, 2008). Since isotonic regression solutions are typically nonunique, we follow Groeneboom and Lopuhaa (1993) and select the unique càdlàg piecewise constant solution with jumps only at observed values of  $q_n$ . When combined with fitted Q-iteration, isotonic regression acts as a data-driven histogram estimator that bins the 1D space  $\{q_n(a, z, s) : a \in \mathcal{A}, z \in \{0, 1\}, s \in \mathcal{S}\}$ . The evaluation of the isotonic-calibrated estimator  $q_n^*(a, z, s)$  equals the empirical mean of the Bellman outcome  $Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{q_n^*}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i})$  for observations where  $q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})$  falls in the same bin as  $q_n(a, z, s)$ . Consequently,  $q_n^*$  is empirically calibrated, and Theorem 6 applies.

---

**Algorithm 2** Isotonic-calibrated fitted Q-iteration

---

**Input:** Initial estimator  $q_n$  of  $q_0$ , error threshold  $\varepsilon$ ;

- 1: initialize  $q_n^{*(0)} := q_n$ ;
- 2: **for**  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  **do**
- 3:   compute  $f_n^{(k+1)}$  by solving:

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{iso}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{q_n^{*(k)}}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i}) - f(q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i}))\}^2;$$

- 4:   update  $q_n^{*(k+1)} := f_n^{(k+1)} \circ q_n$ ;
  - 5:   **if**  $\|q_n^{*(k+1)} - q_n^{*(k)}\|_{P_n} < \varepsilon$  **then**
  - 6:     set  $q_n^* := q_n^{*(k+1)}$ ;
  - 7:     **break**;
  - 8:   **end if**
  - 9: **end for**
  - 10: **return**  $q_n^*$ ;
- 

Given an isotonic-calibrated estimator  $q_n^*$  of  $q_0$ , obtained from Algorithm 2, our proposed debi-

ased plug-in estimator of  $\Psi(P_0)$  is given by

$$\psi_n^* := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m(S_{0,i}, A_{0,i}, q_n^*),$$

which, by Theorem 6, is a debiased machine learning estimator of  $\Psi_{q_n^*}(P_0)$  and, by Theorem 5, an adaptive debiased machine learning estimator of  $\Psi(P_0)$ . The following theorem establishes the asymptotic linearity of  $\psi_n^*$  for  $\Psi(P_0)$ .

We introduce the following additional notation and conditions. Let  $\varphi_{n,q_n^*}$  denote the influence function estimate  $(s, z, a, y, s') \mapsto m(s, a, q_n^*) + d_{0,q_n^*}(a, z, s)\{y + \gamma q_n^*(a, s') - q_n^*(a, z, s)\} - \psi_n^*$ , and let  $\varphi_{0,q_0}$  denote the efficient influence function  $(s, z, a, y, s') \mapsto m(s, a, q_0) + d_{0,q_0}(a, z, s)\{y + \gamma q_0(a, s') - q_0(a, z, s)\} - \Psi_{q_0}(P_0)$  of  $\Psi_{q_0}$ .

**(D3)** *Nuisance estimation rate:*  $\|q_n^* - q_0\|_{P_0} \|T_{0,(q_n^*,q_0)}(q_0^\pi) - T_{0,(q_n^*,q_0)}(q_0)\|_{P_0} = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ .

**(D4)** *Empirical process condition:*  $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(P_n - P_0)\{\varphi_{n,q_n^*} - \varphi_{0,q_0}\} = o_p(1)$ .

**Theorem 7.** *Suppose that  $q_n^*$  is obtained from Algorithm 2 with  $\varepsilon = 0$ . Assume D1 and D2 hold with  $q_n := q_n^*$ , and that D3-D4 also hold. Then,  $\psi_n^* - \Psi(P_0) = (P_n - P_0)\varphi_{0,q_0} + o_p(n^{-1/2})$ , and  $\psi_n^*$  is a locally regular and efficient estimator for the oracle parameter  $\Psi_{q_0}$  at  $P_0$  under the nonparametric statistical model.*

As a consequence of Theorem 7, the calibrated estimator  $\psi_n^*$  is an adaptive, superefficient estimator of  $\Psi(P_0)$ , with limiting variance determined by the efficiency bound of the oracle parameter  $\Psi_{q_0}$  under  $P_0$ . Condition D1 ensures pathwise differentiability of  $\Psi_{q_0}$ ,  $\Psi_{q_n^*}$ , and  $\Psi_{(q_n^*,q_0)}$ , only requires overlap between the lower-dimensional embedding of the states, and is consequently significantly weaker than the condition for nonparametric pathwise differentiability of  $\Psi$ . In addition, the efficiency bound for  $\Psi_{q_0}$  attained by  $\psi_n^*$  can be substantially smaller than the efficiency bound for  $\Psi$ . This superefficiency phenomenon comes at the cost of  $\psi_n^*$  being an irregular estimator for  $\Psi$ , as Theorem 7 in van der Laan et al. (2023) shows that it may exhibit non-vanishing asymptotic bias under sampling from an  $n^{-1/2}$ -local perturbation of  $P_0$  in a nonparametric statistical model. Nonetheless, Theorem 7 establishes that  $\psi_n^*$  remains a regular (and efficient) estimator for the oracle parameter  $\Psi_{q_0}$  at  $P_0$ .

Theorem 7 implies that  $\sqrt{n}(\psi_n^* - \Psi(P_0))$  converges in distribution to a mean-zero normal random variable with variance  $\text{var}_0(\varphi_{0,q_0})$ , enabling the construction of confidence intervals and hypothesis tests. Under regularity conditions and D4, the variance can be consistently estimated by the empirical variance  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\varphi_{n,q_n^*}(S_{0,i}, A_{0,i}, Y_{0,i}, S_{1,i})\}^2$ , enabling Wald-type confidence intervals for  $\Psi(P_0)$ . Since  $\varphi_{n,q_n^*}$  depends on the nuisance function  $d_{0,q_n^*}$ , which is unknown,  $d_{0,q_n^*}$  must be estimated. Although this appears problematic because  $\psi_n^*$  was designed to avoid estimating the Riesz representer, isotonic calibration simplifies the problem: the calibrated estimator  $q_n^*$  takes on finitely many values, making the dimension-reduced state-action space discrete. Consequently, both  $\alpha_{0,q_n^*}$  and  $d_{0,q_n^*}$  can be efficiently estimated in closed form using the matrix formulae for discrete Markov chains (see Appendix A.1).

Interestingly, when  $\gamma = 0$ , such that  $\Psi(P_0)$  represents the standard ATE, our estimator is asymptotically equivalent to the superefficient A-TMLE of the ATE proposed by Benkeser et al. (2020) and can be viewed as a generalization of their estimator to the MDP setting. However, even in this special case, our estimator differs from Benkeser et al. (2020), as we perform automatic debiasing via isotonic calibration rather than an explicit targeted minimum loss update. More generally, our A-TMLE estimator fits within the calibrated debiased machine learning (C-DML) framework of van der Laan et al. (2024a), which uses calibration to construct doubly robust asymptotically linear estimators that provide valid inference as long as at least one nuisance function is estimated at a sufficiently fast rate. Our approach leverages the doubly robust inference properties of C-DML to construct debiased plug-in estimators, avoiding the need to estimate the debiasing representer.

Condition D3 holds if the calibrated  $Q$ -function estimator  $q_n^*$  is faster than  $n^{-1/4}$ -consistent for  $q_0$  in  $L^2(P_0)$  and if  $q_{0,q_n^*}^\pi$  — the best approximation of  $q_0$  given  $q_n^*$  — is faster than  $n^{-1/4}$ -consistent in the norm  $\|T_{0,(q_n^*,q_0)}(\cdot)\|$ , such that both  $\|q_n^* - q_0\|_{P_0} = o_p(n^{-1/4})$  and  $\|T_{0,(q_n^*,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n^*}^\pi) - T_{0,(q_n^*,q_0)}(q_0)\|_{P_0} = o_p(n^{-1/4})$ . In contrast with Theorem 4, a rate condition is only imposed on the nuisance estimator  $q_n^*$  and, as a consequence, unlike C5, the estimator  $\psi_n^*$  does not exhibit any double robustness properties. Condition D4 is satisfied if (i)  $\|\varphi_{n,q_n^*} - \varphi_{0,q_0}\|_{P_0} = o_p(1)$  and (ii)  $\varphi_{n,q_n^*} - \varphi_{0,q_0}$  falls within a Donsker function class, or the uncalibrated estimator  $q_n$  is obtained using sample-splitting or cross-fitting techniques. Under boundedness conditions, the condition  $\|\varphi_{n,q_n^*} - \varphi_{0,q_0}\|_{P_0} = o_p(1)$  holds if  $\|q_n^* - q_0\|_{P_0} = o_p(1)$  and  $\|d_{0,q_n^*} - d_{0,q_0}\| = o_p(1)$ .



## 5 Conclusion

We developed debiased machine learning estimators for linear functionals in semiparametric MDPs with model constraints on the  $Q$ -function. Building on the ADML framework of [van der Laan et al. \(2024b\)](#), we introduced adaptive and superefficient DML estimators that learn model constraints directly from data, mitigating model misspecification bias. Using ADML, we proposed a novel adaptive debiased plug-in estimator based on calibrated fitted  $Q$ -iteration, which avoids the difficult task of estimating the Riesz representer — a debiasing nuisance identified via a min-max objective.

In this work, we leveraged  $Q$ -function calibration to develop debiased plug-in estimators. A promising direction for future research is to extend the calibrated debiased machine learning framework of [van der Laan et al. \(2024a\)](#) to linear functionals of solutions to integral equations. This extension could demonstrate that calibrating both the  $Q$ -function and the Riesz representer yields doubly robust asymptotically linear estimators ([Benkeser et al., 2017](#)), enabling valid inference, including confidence intervals and hypothesis tests, even if either component is estimated inconsistently or at a slow rate. We leave the development of such a doubly robust inference procedure for future work.

Our framework can be used to extend the ADML framework of [van der Laan et al. \(2024b\)](#) for nonparametric data fusion in cross-sectional studies to the MDP setting, where a randomized experiment is augmented with observational data to increase the effective sample size and improve estimator efficiency. Following the experimental grounding approach of [Kallus et al. \(2018\)](#), our method can model the difference between the  $Q$ -functions in the experiment ( $Z = 1$ ) and the observational study ( $Z = 0$ ), enabling information sharing across studies without introducing model misspecification bias.

## References

- A. Agarwal, N. Jiang, S. M. Kakade, and W. Sun. Reinforcement learning: Theory and algorithms. *CS Dept., UW Seattle, Seattle, WA, USA, Tech. Rep*, 32:96, 2019.
- P. K. Andersen, O. Borgan, R. D. Gill, and N. Keiding. *Statistical models based on counting processes*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- S. Athey, R. Chetty, G. W. Imbens, and H. Kang. The surrogate index: Combining short-term proxies to estimate long-term treatment effects more rapidly and precisely. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2019.
- R. Bellman. Dynamic programming. *science*, 153(3731):

- 34–37, 1966.
- D. Benkeser, M. Carone, M. V. D. Laan, and P. B. Gilbert. Doubly robust nonparametric inference on the average treatment effect. *Biometrika*, 104(4):863–880, 2017.
- D. Benkeser, W. Cai, and M. J. van der Laan. A nonparametric super-efficient estimator of the average treatment effect. 2020.
- A. Bennett, N. Kallus, X. Mao, W. Newey, V. Syrgkanis, and M. Uehara. Inference on strongly identified functionals of weakly identified functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.08291*, 2022.
- A. Bennett, N. Kallus, X. Mao, W. Newey, V. Syrgkanis, and M. Uehara. Minimax instrumental variable regression and  $l_2$  convergence guarantees without identification or closedness. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2291–2318. PMLR, 2023.
- P. J. Bickel, C. A. Klaassen, P. J. Bickel, Y. Ritov, J. Klaassen, J. A. Wellner, and Y. Ritov. *Efficient and adaptive estimation for semiparametric models*, volume 4. Springer, 1993.
- C. M. Bishop. Neural networks and their applications. *Review of scientific instruments*, 65(6):1803–1832, 1994.
- M. Bonvini, E. H. Kennedy, O. Dukes, and S. Balakrishnan. Doubly-robust inference and optimality in structure-agnostic models with smoothness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08525*, 2024.
- L. Breiman. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45:5–32, 2001.
- V. Chernozhukov, D. Chetverikov, M. Demirer, E. Duflo, C. Hansen, W. Newey, and J. Robins. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters, 2018.
- V. Chernozhukov, W. K. Newey, and R. Singh. Automatic debiased machine learning of causal and structural effects. *Econometrica*, 90(3):967–1027, 2022.
- A. D’Amour, P. Ding, A. Feller, L. Lei, and J. Sekhon. Overlap in observational studies with high-dimensional covariates. *Journal of Econometrics*, 221(2):644–654, 2021.
- D. Feng and R. Baumgartner. Random forest (rf) kernel for regression, classification and survival. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.00089*, 2020.
- J. H. Friedman. Greedy function approximation: a gradient boosting machine. *Annals of statistics*, pages 1189–1232, 2001.
- P. Groeneboom and H. Lopuhaa. Isotonic estimators of monotone densities and distribution functions: basic facts. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 47(3):175–183, 1993.
- X. He, J. Pan, O. Jin, T. Xu, B. Liu, T. Xu, Y. Shi, A. Atallah, R. Herbrich, S. Bowers, et al. Practical lessons from predicting clicks on ads at facebook. In *Proceedings of the eighth international workshop on data mining for online advertising*, pages 1–9, 2014.
- L. P. Kaelbling, M. L. Littman, and A. W. Moore. Reinforcement learning: A survey. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 4:237–285, 1996.
- N. Kallus and M. Uehara. Double reinforcement learning for efficient off-policy evaluation in markov decision processes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(167):1–63, 2020.
- N. Kallus and M. Uehara. Efficiently breaking the curse of horizon in off-policy evaluation with double reinforcement learning. *Operations Research*, 70(6):3282–3302, 2022.
- N. Kallus, A. M. Puli, and U. Shalit. Removing hidden confounding by experimental grounding. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Z. Li, H. Lan, V. Syrgkanis, M. Wang, and M. Uehara. Regularized deepiv with model selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04236*, 2024.

- M. Mehrabi and S. Wager. Off-policy evaluation in markov decision processes under weak distributional overlap. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08201*, 2024.
- R. Munos and C. Szepesvári. Finite-time bounds for fitted value iteration. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(5), 2008.
- S. A. Murphy and A. W. Van der Vaart. On profile likelihood. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95(450):449–465, 2000.
- A. Niculescu-Mizil and R. Caruana. Predicting good probabilities with supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 625–632, 2005.
- B. Pavse and J. Hanna. State-action similarity-based representations for off-policy evaluation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- J. Pearl. The causal foundations of structural equation modeling. *Handbook of structural equation modeling*, pages 68–91, 2012.
- F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, et al. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in python. *the Journal of machine Learning research*, 12:2825–2830, 2011.
- P. J. Pritz, L. Ma, and K. K. Leung. Jointly-learned state-action embedding for efficient reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 1447–1456, 2021.
- M. L. Puterman. Markov decision processes. *Handbooks in operations research and management science*, 2:331–434, 1990.
- E. Scornet. Random forests and kernel methods. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(3):1485–1500, 2016.
- A. Tran, A. Bibaut, and N. Kallus. Inferring the long-term causal effects of long-term treatments from short-term experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08527*, 2023.
- L. van der Laan, M. Carone, A. Luedtke, and M. van der Laan. Adaptive debiased machine learning using data-driven model selection techniques. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.12544*, 2023.
- L. Van Der Laan, E. Ulloa-Pérez, M. Carone, and A. Luedtke. Causal isotonic calibration for heterogeneous treatment effects. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 34831–34854. PMLR, 2023.
- L. van der Laan, A. Luedtke, and M. Carone. Automatic doubly robust inference for linear functionals via calibrated debiased machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.02771*, 2024a.
- M. van der Laan, S. Qiu, and L. van der Laan. Adaptive-tmle for the average treatment effect based on randomized controlled trial augmented with real-world data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07186*, 2024b.
- M. J. van der Laan and I. Malenica. Robust estimation of data-dependent causal effects based on observing a single time-series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.00734*, 2018.
- M. J. van der Laan, S. Rose, W. Zheng, and M. J. van der Laan. Cross-validated targeted minimum-loss-based estimation. *Targeted learning: causal inference for observational and experimental data*, pages 459–474, 2011.
- M. J. Van der Laan, S. Rose, et al. *Targeted learning: causal inference for observational and experimental data*, volume 4. Springer, 2011.
- R. Von Mises. On the asymptotic distribution of differentiable statistical functions. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 18(3):309–348, 1947.
- Z. Wang, W. Zhang, and M. van der Laan. Super ensemble learning using the highly-adaptive-lasso. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16953*, 2023.

## A Additional details

### A.1 Estimation of Riesz representer for calibrated fitted Q-iteration

An empirical plug-in estimator  $d_n^*$  of  $d_{0,q_n^*}$  is given by  $T_{n,q_n^*}(\alpha_{n,q_n^*})$ , where

$$T_{n,q_n^*}(\alpha) = (a, z, s) \mapsto \alpha(a, z, s) - \gamma E_{P_n}[\alpha(A, S_1) \mid q_n^*(A_0, Z, S_0) = q_n^*(a, z, s)]$$

is the empirical Bellman operator induced by the empirical distribution  $P_n$  of  $\{(S_{0,i}, A_{0,i}, S_{1,i})\}_{i=1}^n$ , and  $\alpha_{n,q_n^*}$  is obtained by solving

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{f \circ q_n^*, f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\{T_{n,q_n^*}(f \circ q_n^*)(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})\}^2 - 2m(S_{0,i}, A_{0,i}, f \circ q_n^*)].$$

## B Proofs

### B.1 Proofs of Section 3

**Theorem 8.** *Suppose that  $P \in \mathcal{M}$  satisfies C1 and C2. Then,  $\Psi_H(P)$  is identified.*

*Proof of identification.* Under C1, we know there exists some  $\mu_{P,H} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\mu \in T_P(H)} E_P [\{Y_0 - \mu(A_0, Z, S_0)\}^2]$ , and that this set is nonempty. Since  $T_P$  is a bounded linear operator and  $H$  is a linear space,  $T_P(H)$  is a linear subspace of  $L^2(P)$ . Additionally, since the projection of  $\mu_P$  onto the  $L^2(P)$  closure of  $T_P(H)$  is unique,  $\mu_{P,H}$  must equal this projection and be the unique solution to  $\operatorname{argmin}_{\mu \in T_P(H)} E_P [\{Y_0 - \mu(A_0, Z, S_0)\}^2]$ . Since  $\mu_{P,H} \in T_P(H)$ , there must exist some  $q_{P,H}^\pi \in H$  such that  $\mu_{P,H} = T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)$ . We claim that C2 implies  $q_{P,H}^\pi$  is unique in  $L^2(P_{0,A_0,Z,S_0})$ . We prove this by contradiction. Suppose that  $q_{P,H}^{(1),\pi}$  and  $q_{P,H}^{(2),\pi}$  both satisfy  $\mu_{P,H} = T_P(q_{P,H}^{(1),\pi})$  and  $\mu_{P,H} = T_P(q_{P,H}^{(2),\pi})$ . Then, subtracting the two expressions, we find that

$$0 = T_P(q_{P,H}^{(1),\pi}) - T_P(q_{P,H}^{(2),\pi}) = T_P(q_{P,H}^{(1),\pi} - q_{P,H}^{(2),\pi}).$$

Thus,  $q_{P,H}^{(1),\pi} - q_{P,H}^{(2),\pi}$  is in the null space of  $T_P$ . However, by C2, it must be true that  $q_{P,H}^{(1),\pi}(A_0, Z, S_0) = q_{P,H}^{(2),\pi}(A_0, Z, S_0)$  almost surely. The claim then follows. Since  $q_{P,H}^\pi$  exists and is uniquely defined, the associated ATE  $\Psi_H(P)$  is identified. □

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Let  $P \in \mathcal{M}$  be arbitrary, and let  $(P_{\varepsilon, \phi} : \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R})$  denote a regular submodel satisfying: (i)  $\frac{dP_{\varepsilon, \phi}}{d\varepsilon}$  exists; (ii)  $P_{\varepsilon, \phi} = P$  at  $\varepsilon = 0$ ; and (iii) the score at  $\varepsilon = 0$  is  $\phi \in T_{\mathcal{M}}(P)$ . We now show that the parameter  $\Psi_H$  is pathwise differentiable along any such path and satisfies the inner product representation:

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Psi_H(P_{\varepsilon, \phi}) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \langle \varphi_P, \phi \rangle_P,$$

where  $\varphi_P$  denotes the efficient influence function (EIF) of  $\Psi_H$ . To compute the pathwise derivative of  $\Psi_H$ , we will use the representation  $\Psi_H(P) = \langle T_P(\alpha_{P,H}), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_P = \langle T_P(\alpha_{P,H}), \Pi_P(\mu_P) \rangle_P$ , which is guaranteed by C3.

We adopt the following notation. Let  $W = (S_0, Z, A_0, Y_0, S_1)$ , and let  $w = (s, z, a, y, s')$  denote a generic realization of  $W$ . For each function  $h$ , define the next-state value function  $\bar{V}_h^\pi$  as  $w \mapsto V_h^\pi(z, s')$ . Throughout, we will view  $\bar{V}_h^\pi$  as an element of  $L^2(P_{Z, S_1})$  and  $V_h^\pi$  as an element of  $L^2(P_{Z, S_0})$ . Define  $\Pi_P : L^2(P) \rightarrow H$  as the  $L^2(P)$  projection operator, given pointwise by  $\Pi_P f := \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in H} \|f - h\|_P$ .

For each  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ , we denote the pathwise derivative  $dT_P(h) : T_{\mathcal{M}}(P) \rightarrow L^2(P)$  of  $T_P(h)$  by the map  $\phi \mapsto \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon, \phi}}(h) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0}$ . We can compute this pathwise derivative as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon, \phi}}(h) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= -\gamma \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \int V_h^\pi(s', Z) P_{\varepsilon, \phi}(S_1 = ds' \mid A_0, Z, S_0) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= -\gamma E_P[V_h^\pi(Z, S_1) \{\phi(W) - E_P[\phi(W) \mid A_0, Z, S_0]\} \mid A_0, Z, S_0] \\ &= -\gamma E_P[\{V_h^\pi(Z, S_1) - E_P[V_h^\pi(Z, S_1) \mid A_0, Z, S_0]\} \phi(W) \mid A_0, Z, S_0] \\ &= -E_P[\{\gamma V_h^\pi(Z, S_1) + T_P(h)(A_0, Z, S_0) - h(A_0, Z, S_0) \mid A_0, Z, S_0\} \phi(W) \mid A_0, Z, S_0] \\ &= E_P[\{h(A_0, Z, S_0) - \gamma \bar{V}_h^\pi(Z, S_1) - T_P(h)(A_0, Z, S_0) \mid A_0, Z, S_0\} \phi(W) \mid A_0, Z, S_0]. \end{aligned}$$

In the final equality, we used the fact that  $V_h^\pi(Z, S_1) = \bar{V}_h^\pi(Z, S_1)$  by definition. We will make use of the following expression:

$$\langle f, dT_P(h)(\phi) \rangle_P = \langle f, \phi \{h - \gamma \bar{V}_h^\pi - T_P(h)\} \rangle_P \quad \text{for all } f \in L^2(P),$$

where  $\bar{V}_h^\pi$  is viewed as a function of  $Z$  and  $S_1$ .

The first-order conditions of the optimization problem defining  $q_{P,H}^\pi$  imply that  $q_{P,H}^\pi$  satisfies

the restricted moment equation:

$$\langle T_P(h), \mu_P - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_P = 0 \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

By the product rule of differentiation, we have

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Psi_H(P_{\varepsilon,\phi}) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle T_P(\alpha_{P,H}), \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(q_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}^\pi) \rangle_P \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} + \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(\alpha_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0}.$$

**First Term.** We know  $T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)$  is determined by:

$$\langle T_P(h), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_P = \langle T_P(h), Y_0 \rangle_P \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Hence, taking the pathwise derivative of both sides, we find, for all  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ , that

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(h), \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(q_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}^\pi) \rangle_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(h), Y_0 \rangle_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0}.$$

Thus, by the chain rule, we have

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle T_P(h), \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(q_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}^\pi) \rangle_P \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} + \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(h), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(h), Y_0 \rangle_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle T_P(h), \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(q_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}^\pi) \rangle_P \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(h), Y_0 \rangle_P \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} + \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle T_P(h), Y_0 \rangle_P \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &\quad - \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle T_P(h), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_P \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} - \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(h), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_P \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= \langle dT_P(h)(\phi), Y_0 \rangle_P + \langle \phi, T_P(h)Y_0 - E_P[T_P(h)Y_0] \rangle_P \\ &\quad - \langle \phi, T_P(h)T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) - E_P[T_P(h)T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)] \rangle_P - \langle dT_P(h)(\phi), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_P \\ &= \langle dT_P(h)(\phi), \mu_P - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_P + \langle \phi, T_P(h)\{Y_0 - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)\} \rangle_P \\ &\quad + \langle \phi, E_P[T_P(h)T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)] - E_P[T_P(h)Y_0] \rangle_P. \end{aligned}$$

Using that  $E_P[T_P(\alpha_{P,H})T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)] = E_P[T_P(\alpha_{P,H})Y_0]$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\langle \mathcal{T}_P(\alpha_{P,H}), \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(q_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}^\pi) \rangle_P \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \langle dT_P(\alpha_{P,H})(\phi), \mu_P - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_P + \langle \phi, T_P(\alpha_{P,H})\{Y_0 - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)\} \rangle_P \\
&\quad + \langle \phi, E_P[T_P(\alpha_{P,H})T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)] - E_P[T_P(\alpha_{P,H})Y_0] \rangle_P \\
&= \langle dT_P(\alpha_{P,H})(\phi), \mu_P - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_P + \langle \phi, T_P(\alpha_{P,H})\{Y_0 - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)\} \rangle_P \\
&= \langle \phi\{\alpha_{P,H} - \gamma\bar{V}_{\alpha_{P,H}}^\pi - T_P(\alpha_{P,H})\}, \mu_P - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_P \\
&\quad + \langle \phi, T_P(\alpha_{P,H})\{Y_0 - \mu_P\} \rangle_P.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, this derivative component can be expressed as the inner product  $\langle \varphi_{P,1}, \phi \rangle$  for the gradient component:

$$\varphi_{1,P} : w \mapsto \{\alpha_{P,H}(a, z, s) - \gamma V_{\alpha_{P,H}}^\pi(z, s')\} \{\mu_P(a, z, s) - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)(a, z, s)\} + T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(a, z, s) \{y - \mu_P(a, z, s)\}.$$

### Second Term.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(\alpha_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(\alpha_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_P \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\
&\quad + \frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\langle T_P(\alpha_{P,H}), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0}.
\end{aligned}$$

To compute this term, we use the Riesz representation property of  $\alpha_{P,H}$ , which implies:

$$\langle T_P(\alpha_{P,H}), T_P(h) \rangle_P = E_P[m(S_0, A_0, h)] \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Taking the pathwise derivative of both sides and applying the chain rule, we find:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(\alpha_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}), \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(h) \rangle_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \frac{d}{d\varepsilon}E_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}[m(S_0, A_0, h)] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0}; \\
\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(\alpha_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}), T_P(h) \rangle_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} + \langle T_P(\alpha_{P,H}), dT_P(h)(\phi) \rangle_P \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \frac{d}{d\varepsilon}E_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}[m(S_0, A_0, h)] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0}; \\
\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}(\alpha_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}), T_P(h) \rangle_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \frac{d}{d\varepsilon}E_{P_{\varepsilon,\phi}}[m(S_0, A_0, h)] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} - \langle T_P(\alpha_{P,H}), dT_P(h)(\phi) \rangle_P.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} E_{P_{\varepsilon, \phi}}[m(S_0, A_0, h)] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = E_P[\phi_{S_0}(S_0)m(S_0, A_0, h)] = \langle \phi, m(S_0, A_0, h) - E_P[m(S_0, A_0, h)] \rangle_P.$$

Thus, taking  $h = q_{P,H}^\pi$ , we find that:

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon, \phi}}(\alpha_{P_{\varepsilon, \phi}}), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_{P_{\varepsilon, \phi}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \langle \phi, m(S_0, A_0, q_{P,H}^\pi) - E_P[m(S_0, A_0, q_{P,H}^\pi)] \rangle_P - \langle T_P(\alpha_{P,H}), dT_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)(\phi) \rangle_P.$$

By the definition of  $dT_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)(\phi)$ , we have:

$$\langle T_P(\alpha_{P,H}), dT_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)(\phi) \rangle_P = -E_P \left[ T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, S_0) \left\{ \gamma V_{q_{P,H}^\pi}^\pi(A_0, Z, S_1) + T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) - q_{P,H}^\pi(A_0, S_0) \right\} \phi(Z) \right].$$

Thus,  $\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \langle \mathcal{T}_{P_{\varepsilon, \phi}}(\alpha_{P_{\varepsilon, \phi}}), T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) \rangle_{P_{\varepsilon, \phi}} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} := \langle \varphi_{P,2}, \phi \rangle_P$  for the gradient component:

$$\varphi_{P,2} : w \mapsto T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(a, z, s) \left\{ \gamma V_{q_{P,H}^\pi}^\pi(a, z, s') + T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)(a, z, s) - q_{P,H}^\pi(a, z, s) \right\} + m(s, a, q_{P,H}^\pi) - \Psi_H(P).$$

Putting it all together, the EIF  $\varphi_P := \varphi_{P,1} + \varphi_{P,2}$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} w \mapsto & T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(a, z, s) \{ y - \mu_P(a, z, s) \} + \{ \alpha_{P,H}(a, z, s) - \gamma V_{\alpha_{P,H}}^\pi(a, z, s') \} \{ \mu_P(a, z, s) - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)(a, z, s) \} \\ & + T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(a, z, s) \left\{ \gamma V_{q_{P,H}^\pi}^\pi(a, z, s') + T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)(a, z, s) - q_{P,H}^\pi(a, z, s) \right\} \\ & + m(s, a, q_{P,H}^\pi) - \Psi_H(P). \end{aligned}$$

Assuming a correct model ( $T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) = \mu_P$ ), it simplifies to:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_P : w \mapsto & T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(a, z, s) \{ y + \gamma V_{q_{P,H}^\pi}^\pi(a, z, s') - q_{P,H}^\pi(a, z, s) \} \\ & + m(s, a, q_{P,H}^\pi) - \Psi_H(P). \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 2.* By the law of iterated expectations, it holds that

$$R_H(P, \bar{P}) = \Psi_H(\bar{P}) - \Psi_H(P) + P\phi_{\bar{P},H}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&= E_P \left[ T_{\bar{P}}(\alpha_{\bar{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \{ \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) - \mu_{\bar{P}}(A_0, Z, S_0) \} \right] \\
&\quad + E_P \left[ \{ \alpha_{\bar{P},H}(A_0, S_0) - \gamma V_{\alpha_{\bar{P},H}}^\pi(Z, S_1) \} \{ \mu_{\bar{P}}(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_{\bar{P}}(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \} \right] \\
&\quad + E_P \left[ T_{\bar{P}}(\alpha_{\bar{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \left\{ \gamma V_{q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi}^\pi(A_0, Z, S_1) + T_{\bar{P}}(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi(A_0, S_0) \right\} \right] \\
&\quad + E_P \left[ m(S_0, A_0, q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi) - m(S_0, A_0, q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By Riesz representation theorem, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
E_P \left[ m(S_0, A_0, q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi) - m(S_0, A_0, q_{P,H}^\pi) \right] &= E_P \left[ T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \left\{ T_P(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right] \\
&= E_P \left[ T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \left\{ T_P(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $T_P(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)$  is the  $L^2(P)$  projection of  $\mu_P$  onto  $T_P(H)$ . In addition, applying the law of iterated expectations applied to the second and third terms, we find:

$$\begin{aligned}
R_H(P, \bar{P}) &= E_P \left[ T_{\bar{P}}(\alpha_{\bar{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \{ \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) - \mu_{\bar{P}}(A_0, Z, S_0) \} \right] \\
&\quad + E_P \left[ T_P(\alpha_{\bar{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \{ \mu_{\bar{P}}(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_{\bar{P}}(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \} \right] \\
&\quad + E_P \left[ T_{\bar{P}}(\alpha_{\bar{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \left\{ T_{\bar{P}}(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right] \\
&\quad + E_P \left[ T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \left\{ T_P(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Next, adding and subtracting, the first and third term can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
R_H(P, \bar{P}) &= E_P \left[ \left\{ T_{\bar{P}}(\alpha_{\bar{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(\alpha_{\bar{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \{ \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) - \mu_{\bar{P}}(A_0, Z, S_0) \} \right] \\
&\quad + E_P \left[ T_P(\alpha_{\bar{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \{ \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_{\bar{P}}(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \} \right] \\
&\quad + E_P \left[ T_{\bar{P}}(\alpha_{\bar{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \left\{ T_{\bar{P}}(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right] \\
&\quad + E_P \left[ T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \left\{ T_P(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Adding and subtracting again, the third and fourth terms can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
R_H(P, \bar{P}) &= E_P \left[ \left\{ T_{\bar{P}}(\alpha_{\bar{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(\alpha_{\bar{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \{ \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) - \mu_{\bar{P}}(A_0, Z, S_0) \} \right] \\
&\quad + E_P \left[ T_P(\alpha_{\bar{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \{ \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_{\bar{P}}(q_{\bar{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + E_P \left[ \left\{ T_{\overline{P}}(\alpha_{\overline{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \left\{ T_{\overline{P}}(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right] \\
& + E_P \left[ T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \left\{ T_{\overline{P}}(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the second and fourth term, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
R_H(P, \overline{P}) & = E_P \left[ \left\{ T_{\overline{P}}(\alpha_{\overline{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(\alpha_{\overline{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \left\{ \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) - \mu_{\overline{P}}(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right] \\
& + E_P \left[ \left\{ T_P(\alpha_{\overline{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \left\{ \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_{\overline{P}}(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right] \\
& + E_P \left[ \left\{ T_{\overline{P}}(\alpha_{\overline{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \left\{ T_{\overline{P}}(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Using that  $T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)$  is the  $L^2(P)$  projection of  $\mu_P$  onto  $T_P(H)$ , we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_P \left[ \left\{ T_P(\alpha_{\overline{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \left\{ \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_{\overline{P}}(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right] \\
& = E_P \left[ \left\{ T_P(\alpha_{\overline{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \left\{ T_P(q_{\overline{P}}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_{\overline{P}}(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting this expression, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
R_H(P, \overline{P}) & = E_P \left[ \left\{ T_{\overline{P}}(\alpha_{\overline{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(\alpha_{\overline{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \left\{ \mu_P(A_0, Z, S_0) - \mu_{\overline{P}}(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right] \\
& + E_P \left[ \left\{ T_P(\alpha_{\overline{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \left\{ T_P(q_{\overline{P}}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_{\overline{P}}(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right] \\
& + E_P \left[ \left\{ T_{\overline{P}}(\alpha_{\overline{P},H})(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(\alpha_{P,H})(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \left\{ T_{\overline{P}}(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) - T_P(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)(A_0, Z, S_0) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The first result then follows. In the case where  $P, \overline{P} \in \mathcal{M}_H$ , we have that  $\mu_P = T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi)$  and  $\mu_{\overline{P}} = T_{\overline{P}}(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)$ . In this case, the expression simplifies to:

$$R_H(P, \overline{P}) = E_P \left[ \left\{ T_{\overline{P}}(\alpha_{\overline{P},H}) - T_P(\alpha_{P,H}) \right\} (T_P(q_{P,H}^\pi) - T_{\overline{P}}(q_{\overline{P},H}^\pi)) \right].$$

□

## B.2 Proofs of Section 4

*Proof of Theorem 3.* By C3 applied with  $H := H_{n,0}$  and Riesz representation theorem, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{H_n}(P_0) - \Psi(P_0) &= \langle T_0(\alpha_{0,H_{n,0}}), T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi) \rangle_{P_0} - \langle T_0(\alpha_{0,H_{n,0}}), T_0(q_0^\pi) \rangle_{P_0} \\ &= \langle T_0(\alpha_{0,H_{n,0}}), T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_0^\pi) \rangle_{P_0}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi)$  is the orthogonal projection in  $L^2(P)$  of  $T_0(q_0^\pi)$  onto  $T_P(H_n)$ . The orthogonality conditions of the projection imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{H_n}(P_0) - \Psi(P_0) &= \langle T_0(\alpha_{0,H_{n,0}}) - T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n}), T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_0^\pi) \rangle_{P_0} \\ &= -\langle T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0,H_{n,0}}), T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_0^\pi) \rangle_{P_0}.\end{aligned}$$

In the event  $H_n \subseteq H_0$ , we have that  $H_{n,0} = H_0$  and, hence,

$$\Psi_{H_n}(P_0) - \Psi(P_0) = -\langle T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0,H_0}), T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_0^\pi) \rangle_{P_0},$$

as desired. □

*Proof of Theorem 4.* Note that

$$\psi_{n,H_n} - \Psi_{H_0}(P_0) = \psi_{n,H_n} - \Psi_{H_n}(P_0) + \Psi_{H_n}(P_0) - \Psi_{H_0}(P_0).$$

Observe that  $\psi_{n,H_n} = \Psi_{H_n}(\widehat{P}_n) + P_n \varphi_{\widehat{P}_n, H_n}$ , where  $\widehat{P}_n \in \mathcal{M}$  is any distribution such that  $q_{\widehat{P}_n, H_n}^\pi = q_{n, H_n}^\pi$ ,  $\mu_{\widehat{P}_n} = T_n(q_{n, H_n}^\pi)$ , and  $T_{\widehat{P}_n}(\alpha_{\widehat{P}_n, H_n}) = T_{\widehat{P}_n}(\alpha_{n, H_n})$ . Thus, it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{n,H_n} - \Psi_{H_n}(P_0) &= \Psi_{H_n}(\widehat{P}_n) + P_n \varphi_{\widehat{P}_n, H_n} - \Psi_{H_n}(P_0) \\ &= P_n \varphi_{0, H_n} + (P_n - P) \{ \varphi_{\widehat{P}_n, H_n} - \varphi_{0, H_n} \} + R_{H_n}(P_0, \widehat{P}_n),\end{aligned}$$

where  $R_{H_n}(P_0, \widehat{P}_n) = \Psi_{H_n}(\widehat{P}_n) - \Psi_{H_n}(P_0) + P_0 \varphi_{\widehat{P}_n, H_n}$ . By a direct application of C4, we have that

$(P_n - P)\{\varphi_{\widehat{P}_n, H_n} - \varphi_{0, H_n}\} = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ . Moreover, by application of [C6](#),

$$\begin{aligned} P_n \varphi_{0, H_n} &= (P_n - P_0) \varphi_{0, H_n} \\ &= (P_n - P_0) \varphi_{0, H_0} + (P_n - P_0) \{\varphi_{\widehat{P}_n, H_n} - \varphi_{0, H_n}\} \\ &= P_n \varphi_{0, H_0} + o_p(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $P_0 \varphi_{0, H_n} = 0$  and  $P_0 \varphi_{0, H_0} = 0$ . Thus,

$$\psi_{n, H_n} - \Psi_{H_n}(P_0) = P_n \varphi_{0, H_0} + R_{H_n}(P_0, \widehat{P}_n) + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Next, applying [Lemma 2](#), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} R_{H_n}(P_0, \widehat{P}_n) &= E_0 [\{\mathcal{T}_n(\alpha_{n, H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{n, H_n})\} (T_0(q_0^\pi) - T_n(q_{n, H_n}^\pi))] \\ &\quad + E_0 [\{T_0(\alpha_{n, H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0, H_n})\} (T_0(q_{0, H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_{n, H_n}^\pi))] \\ &\quad + E_0 [\{T_0(\alpha_{n, H_n}) - \mathcal{T}_n(\alpha_{n, H_n})\} (T_0(q_{n, H_n}^\pi) - \mathcal{T}_n(q_{n, H_n}^\pi))] \\ &= E_0 [\{\mathcal{T}_n(\alpha_{n, H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{n, H_n})\} (T_0(q_0^\pi) - T_0(q_{n, H_n}^\pi))] \\ &\quad + E_0 [\{T_0(\alpha_{n, H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0, H_n})\} (T_0(q_{0, H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_{n, H_n}^\pi))]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $T_0(q_{0, H_n}^\pi)$  is the  $L^2(P_0)$  projection of  $q_0^\pi$  onto  $T_0(H_n)$ , we have the orthogonality conditions:

$$E_0 [\{\mathcal{T}_0(\alpha)\} (T_0(q_0^\pi) - T_0(q_{0, H_n}^\pi))] = 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in H_n.$$

Hence, since  $\alpha_{n, H_n}, \alpha_{0, H_n} \in H_n$ , we have that

$$E_0 [\{T_0(\alpha_{n, H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0, H_n})\} (T_0(q_{0, H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_{n, H_n}^\pi))] = E_0 [\{T_0(\alpha_{n, H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0, H_n})\} (T_0(q_0^\pi) - T_0(q_{n, H_n}^\pi))].$$

Substituting the above expression, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} R_{H_n}(P_0, \widehat{P}_n) &= E_0 [\{\mathcal{T}_n(\alpha_{n, H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{n, H_n})\} (T_0(q_0^\pi) - T_0(q_{n, H_n}^\pi))] \\ &\quad + E_0 [\{T_0(\alpha_{n, H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0, H_n})\} (T_0(q_0^\pi) - T_0(q_{n, H_n}^\pi))] \\ &= E_0 [\{\mathcal{T}_n(\alpha_{n, H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0, H_n})\} (T_0(q_0^\pi) - T_0(q_{n, H_n}^\pi))] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= O_p \left( \|T_n(\alpha_{n,H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n})\|_{P_0} \|T_0(q_{n,H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi)\|_{P_0} \right) \\
&= o_p(n^{-1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the final two equalities follow from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and C5. Thus,

$$\psi_{n,H_n} - \Psi_{H_n}(P_0) = P_n \varphi_{0,H_0} + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Next we turn to the term  $\Psi_{H_n}(P_0) - \Psi_{H_0}(P_0)$ . Note, by Theorem 3 and C7, it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_{H_n}(P_0) - \Psi_{H_0}(P_0) &= -\langle T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n,0}), T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_0^\pi) \rangle_{P_0} \\
&= O_p(\|T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n}) - T_0(\alpha_{0,H_n,0})\|_{P_0} \|T_0(q_{0,H_n}^\pi) - T_0(q_0^\pi)\|_{P_0}) \\
&= o_p(n^{-1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the final two equalities follow from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and C7.

Putting it all together, we conclude that

$$\psi_{n,H_n} - \Psi_{H_0}(P_0) = P_n \varphi_{0,H_0} + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Since  $\varphi_{0,H_0}$  is the  $P_0$ -efficient influence function of  $\Psi_0$ , it follows that  $\psi_{n,H_n}$  is an asymptotically linear, locally regular, and efficient estimator for  $\Psi_0$  at  $P_0$ .

□

In the following lemma, let  $X$  be a covariate and  $Y \in \mathbb{R}$  be an outcome. For functions  $q_n^\pi, q_0^\pi$ , denote  $f_{(q_n^\pi, q_0^\pi)} : x \mapsto E_0[Y_0 \mid q_n^\pi(X) = q_n^\pi(x), q_0^\pi(X) = q_0^\pi(x)]$ ,  $f_{q_n^\pi} : x \mapsto E_0[Y_0 \mid q_n^\pi(X) = q_n^\pi(x)]$ , and  $f_{q_0^\pi} : x \mapsto E_0[Y_0 \mid q_0^\pi(X) = q_0^\pi(x)]$ .

**Lemma 9.** *Suppose that  $(t_1, t_2) \mapsto E_0[f_{(\varphi_n, \varphi_0)}(X) \mid \varphi_n(X) = t_1, \varphi_0(X) = t_2, \mathcal{D}_n]$  is almost surely  $L$ -Lipschitz continuous. Then,*

$$\|f_{\varphi_n} - f_{(\varphi_n, \varphi_0)}\|_{P_0} \lesssim \|\varphi_n - \varphi_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|P_0 \text{ and } \|f_{\varphi_n} - f_{\varphi_0}\|_{P_0} \lesssim \|\varphi_n - \varphi_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|P_0.$$

*Proof.* For any real-valued function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a vector-valued function  $v : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  with

$k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define the conditional expectation projection operator  $\Pi_v : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  pointwise as  $\Pi_v f := \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \|f - \theta \circ v\|$ , where  $\Theta$  consists of all functions from  $\mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Whenever  $v$  and  $f$  are nonrandom functions, we have that  $\Pi_v f : (a, w) \mapsto E_0[f(A, W) | v(A, W) = v(a, w)]$ .

Let  $g : \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a Lipschitz continuous function with constant  $L > 0$ . By Lipschitz continuity, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |g(\varphi_n(x), \varphi_0(x)) - E[g(\varphi_n(X), \varphi_0(X)) | \varphi_n(X) = \varphi_n(x)]| &= |E[g(\varphi_n(x), \varphi_0(x)) - g(\varphi_n(x), \varphi_0(X)) | \varphi_n(X) = \varphi_n(x)]| \\ &\leq E[|g(\varphi_n(x), \varphi_0(x)) - g(\varphi_n(x), \varphi_0(X))| | \varphi_n(X) = \varphi_n(x)] \\ &\leq LE[\|\varphi_0(x) - \varphi_0(X)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} | \varphi_n(X) = \varphi_n(x)]. \end{aligned}$$

On the event  $\{\varphi_n(X) = \varphi_n(x)\}$ , we know

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_0(x) - \varphi_0(X)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} &\leq \|\varphi_0(x) - \varphi_n(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} + \|\varphi_n(x) - \varphi_n(X)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} + \|\varphi_0(X) - \varphi_n(X)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} \\ &\leq \|\varphi_0(x) - \varphi_n(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} + \|\varphi_0(X) - \varphi_n(X)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |g(\varphi_n(x), \varphi_0(x)) - E[g(\varphi_n(X), \varphi_0(X)) | \varphi_n(X) = \varphi_n(x)]| &\lesssim E[\|\varphi_0(x) - \varphi_0(X)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} | \varphi_n(X) = \varphi_n(x)] \\ &\lesssim E[\|\varphi_0(x) - \varphi_n(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}] + E[\|\varphi_0(X) - \varphi_n(X)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} | \varphi_n(X) = \varphi_n(x)] \end{aligned}$$

Now, for some function  $f$ , suppose that  $(\varphi_n(x), \varphi_0(x)) \mapsto (\Pi_{\varphi_n, \varphi_0} f)(x)$  is Lipschitz continuous. Then, defining  $g : (\hat{m}, m) \mapsto E_0[f(X) | \varphi_n(X) = \hat{m}, \varphi_0(X) = m, \mathcal{D}_n]$  and noting by the law of iterated expectation that  $\Pi_{\varphi_n} \Pi_{\varphi_n, \varphi_0} f = \Pi_{\varphi_n} f$ , we obtain the following pointwise error bound:

$$|\Pi_{\varphi_n, \varphi_0} f - \Pi_{\varphi_n} f| \lesssim \|\varphi_n - \varphi_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} + \Pi_{\varphi_n} (\|\varphi_n - \varphi_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}).$$

Since  $\|\Pi_{\varphi_n} (\|\varphi_n - \varphi_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^d})\|_{L^2(P_0)} \leq \|\|\varphi_n - \varphi_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|_{L^2(P_0)}$  by the properties of projections, it follows that

$$\|\Pi_{\varphi_n, \varphi_0} f - \Pi_{\varphi_n} f\|_{L^2(P)} \lesssim \|\|\varphi_n - \varphi_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|_{L^2(P)}.$$

Taking  $f := f_{(\varphi_n, \varphi_0)}$  and noting that  $\Pi_{\varphi_n, \varphi_0} f_{(\varphi_n, \varphi_0)} := f_{(\varphi_n, \varphi_0)}$  and that  $\Pi_{\varphi_n} f_{(\varphi_n, \varphi_0)} := f_{(\varphi_n)}$ ,

we conclude that

$$\|f_{(\varphi_n, \varphi_0)} - f_{\varphi_n}\|_{L^2(P)} \lesssim \|\varphi_n - \varphi_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|L^2(P).$$

By an symmetric argument, swapping  $\varphi_n$  with  $\varphi_0$ , we conclude that

$$\|f_{(\varphi_n, \varphi_0)} - f_{\varphi_0}\|_{L^2(P)} \lesssim \|\varphi_n - \varphi_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|L^2(P).$$

Hence, by the triangle inequality, we have that

$$\|f_{\varphi_n} - f_{\varphi_0}\|_{L^2(P)} \lesssim \|\varphi_n - \varphi_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|L^2(P).$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 5.* Denote  $\tilde{d}_{0, q_n} := \operatorname{argmin}_{f \circ q_n} \|d_{0, (q_n, q_0)} - f \circ q_n\|_{P_0}$ . By Riesz representation theorem, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_n(P_0) - \Psi(P_0) &= \langle d_{0, (q_n, q_0)}, T_{(q_n, q_0)}(q_{0, q_n}^\pi) - T_{(q_n, q_0)}(q_0) \rangle_{P_0} \\ &= \langle d_{0, (q_n, q_0)}, \mu_{0, q_n} - \mu_{0, (q_n, q_0)} \rangle_{P_0} \\ &\quad + \langle d_{0, (q_n, q_0)}, T_{0, (q_n, q_0)}(q_{0, q_n}^\pi) - T_{0, q_n}(q_{0, q_n}^\pi) \rangle_{P_0} \\ &= \langle d_{0, (q_n, q_0)} - \tilde{d}_{0, q_n}, \mu_{0, q_n} - \mu_{0, (q_n, q_0)} \rangle_{P_0} \\ &\quad + \langle d_{0, (q_n, q_0)}, T_{0, (q_n, q_0)}(q_{0, q_n}^\pi) - T_{0, q_n}(q_{0, q_n}^\pi) \rangle_{P_0}, \end{aligned}$$

where, by properties of projections, we used that,

$$\langle \tilde{d}_{0, q_n}, \mu_{0, q_n} - \mu_{0, (q_n, q_0)} \rangle_{P_0} = 0.$$

We know that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle d_{0, (q_n, q_0)}, T_{0, (q_n, q_0)}(q_{0, q_n}^\pi) - T_{0, q_n}(q_{0, q_n}^\pi) \rangle_{P_0} \\ &= \langle d_{0, (q_n, q_0)} - \tilde{d}_{0, q_n}, T_{0, (q_n, q_0)}(q_{0, q_n}^\pi) - T_{0, q_n}(q_{0, q_n}^\pi) \rangle_{P_0} \\ &\quad + \langle \tilde{d}_{0, q_n}, T_{0, (q_n, q_0)}(q_{0, q_n}^\pi) - T_{0, q_n}(q_{0, q_n}^\pi) \rangle_{P_0} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \langle d_{0,(q_n,q_0)} - \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}, T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) - T_{0,q_n}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) \rangle_{P_0} \\
&\quad + \langle \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}, T_{0,q_n}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) - T_{0,q_n}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) \rangle_{P_0} \\
&= \langle d_{0,(q_n,q_0)} - \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}, T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) - T_{0,q_n}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) \rangle_{P_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_n(P_0) - \Psi(P_0) &= \langle d_{0,(q_n,q_0)} - \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}, \mu_{0,q_n} - \mu_{0,(q_n,q_0)} \rangle_{P_0} \\
&\quad + \langle d_{0,(q_n,q_0)} - \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}, T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) - T_{0,q_n}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) \rangle_{P_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that  $T_{0,q_n}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) = \mu_{0,q_n}$  and  $\mu_{0,(q_n,q_0)} = T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_0)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_n(P_0) - \Psi(P_0) &= \langle d_{0,(q_n,q_0)} - \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}, T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) - T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_0) \rangle_{P_0} \\
&= \langle d_{0,(q_n,q_0)} - \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}, T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) - T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_0) \rangle_{P_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Cauchy-Schwarz, it holds that

$$|\Psi_n(P_0) - \Psi(P_0)| \leq \|d_{0,(q_n,q_0)} - \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}\|_{P_0} \|T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) - T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_0)\|_{P_0}.$$

Next, using the second part of [D2](#), we can apply [Lemma 9](#) with  $Y := d_{0,(q_n,q_0)}$ ,  $\varphi_n := q_n$ , and  $\varphi_0 := q_0$  to conclude that  $\|d_{0,(q_n,q_0)} - \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}\|_{P_0} \lesssim \|q_n - q_0\|_{P_0}$ . Thus,

$$|\Psi_n(P_0) - \Psi(P_0)| \leq \|q_n - q_0\|_{P_0} \|T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n}^\pi) - T_{0,(q_n,q_0)}(q_0)\|_{P_0},$$

as desired. □

*Proof of [Theorem 6](#).* By empirical calibration, for any transformation  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f(q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})) \{Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{q_n}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i}) - q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})\} = 0.$$



Taking  $f$  such that  $f \circ q_n = \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}$ , we find that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i}) \{Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{q_n}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i}) - q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})\} = 0.$$

Therefore, the plug-in estimator  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m(S_{0,i}, A_{0,i}, q_n)$  is equal to the DML estimator:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m(S_{0,i}, A_{0,i}, q_n) + \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{d}_{0,q_n}(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i}) \{Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{q_n}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i}) - q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})\}.$$

□

**Lemma 10.** *Suppose that  $f_n^*$  is the fixed point isotonic regression solution to the calibrated fitted  $Q$ -iteration algorithm in Alg. 2, such that:*

$$f_n^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{iso}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{f_n^* \circ q_n}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i}) - f(q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i}))\}^2.$$

Then,  $q_n^* := f_n^* \circ q_n$  satisfies, for each transformation  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the empirical orthogonality condition:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f(q_n^*(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})) \{Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{q_n^*}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i}) - q_n^*(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})\} = 0.$$

*Proof.* The proof follows from Lemma 4 in [Van Der Laan et al. \(2023\)](#) with minor notational changes. Recall that  $f_n^*$  is the unique càdlàg piecewise constant solution of the isotonic regression problem with jumps occurring only at observed values of  $q_n$ . For any transformation  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we claim that  $f_n^* + \varepsilon(h \circ f_n^*)$  is monotone nondecreasing for  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently close to zero. To see this, note that  $f_n^*$  is a step function with only finitely many jumps. As a consequence,  $h \circ f_n^*$  is also a step function with the same jump points as  $f_n^*$ . By taking  $\varepsilon$  close enough to zero, we can guarantee that the maximum jump size of  $\varepsilon(h \circ f_n^*)$  is smaller than the minimum jump size of  $f_n^*$ . For all  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently close to zero, it must then be the case that  $f_n^* + \varepsilon(h \circ f_n^*)$  is also monotone nondecreasing and, thus, an element of  $\mathcal{F}_{iso}$ . Since  $f_n^*$  is the empirical risk minimizer over  $\mathcal{F}_{iso}$ , we must have that

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{f_n^* \circ q_n}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i}) - (f_n^* + \varepsilon(h \circ f_n^*))(q_n(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})) \right\}^2 \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = 0,$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f(q_n^*(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i})) \left\{ Y_{0,i} + \gamma V_{q_n^*}^\pi(Z_i, S_{1,i}) - q_n^*(A_{0,i}, Z_i, S_{0,i}) \right\} = 0.$$

Since the transformation  $f$  was arbitrary, the result then follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 7.* By Lemma 10,  $q_n^*$  is empirically calibrated for  $q_0$ . Thus, by Theorem 6, it holds that  $P_n \varphi_{n,q_n^*} = 0$  and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_n^* - \Psi_{q_n^*}(P_0) &= \psi_n^* + P_n \varphi_{n,q_n^*} - \Psi_{q_n^*}(P_0) \\ &= P_n \varphi_{0,q_0} + (P_n - P_0) \{ \varphi_{n,q_n^*} - \varphi_{0,q_0} \} \\ &\quad + \psi_n^* - \Psi_{q_n^*}(P_0) + P_0 \varphi_{n,q_n^*}. \end{aligned}$$

We first inspect the term  $\psi_n^* - \Psi_{q_n^*}(P_0) + P_0 \varphi_{n,q_n^*}$ . Note,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_n^* - \Psi_{q_n^*}(P_0) + P_0 \varphi_{n,q_n^*} &= P_0 m(\cdot, q_n^*) - P_0 m(\cdot, q_{0,q_n^*}^\pi) \\ &\quad + \int d_{0,q_n^*}(a, z, s) \{ y + \gamma V_{q_n^*}^\pi(a, s') - q_n^*(a, z, s) \} dP_0(s, z, a, y, s') \\ &= \langle d_{0,q_n^*}, T_{0,q_n^*}(q_n^*) - T_{0,q_n^*}(q_{0,q_n^*}^\pi) \rangle_{P_0} \\ &\quad + \int d_{0,q_n^*}(a, z, s) \{ y + \gamma V_{q_n^*}^\pi(a, s') - q_n^*(a, z, s) \} dP_0(s, z, a, y, s'), \end{aligned}$$

where the final equality uses the Riesz representation property of  $d_{0,q_n^*}$  and that  $q_n^* \in H_{q_n^*}$  and  $q_{0,q_n^*}^\pi \in H_{q_n^*}$ . Next, note, by the law of iterated expectation, that

$$\int d_{0,q_n^*}(a, z, s) \{ y + \gamma V_{q_n^*}^\pi(a, s') - q_n^*(a, z, s) \} dP_0(s, z, a, y, s') = \langle d_{0,q_n^*}, T_{0,q_n^*}(q_{0,q_n^*}^\pi) - T_{0,q_n^*}(q_n^*) \rangle_{P_0}.$$

Putting it all together, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_n^* - \Psi_{q_n^*}(P_0) + P_0 \varphi_{n,q_n^*} &= \langle d_{0,q_n^*}, T_{0,(q_n^*,q_0)}(q_n^*) - T_{0,(q_n^*,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n^*}^\pi) \rangle_{P_0} \\ &\quad + \langle d_{0,q_n^*}, T_{0,(q_n^*,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n^*}^\pi) - T_{0,(q_n^*,q_0)}(q_n^*) \rangle_{P_0} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Using that  $\psi_n^* - \Psi_{q_n^*}(P_0) + P_0\varphi_{n,q_n^*} = 0$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_n^* - \Psi_{q_n^*}(P_0) &= P_n\varphi_{0,q_0} + (P_n - P_0)\{\varphi_{n,q_n^*} - \varphi_{0,q_0}\} \\ &= P_n\varphi_{0,q_0} + o_p(n^{-1/2}),\end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $(P_n - P_0)\{\varphi_{n,q_n^*} - \varphi_{0,q_0}\} = o_p(n^{-1/2})$  by [D4](#).

Finally, applying [Theorem 5](#) and [D3](#), we find that

$$\Psi_{q_n}(P_0) - \Psi(P_0) = O_p\left(\|q_n^* - q_0\|_{P_0} \|T_{0,(q_n^*,q_0)}(q_{0,q_n^*}^\pi) - T_{0,(q_n^*,q_0)}(q_0)\|_{P_0}\right) = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Consequently,

$$\psi_n^* - \Psi(P_0) = P_n\varphi_{0,q_0} + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Thus,  $\psi_n^*$  is an asymptotically linear estimator of  $\Psi(P_0) = \Psi_{q_0}(P_0)$  with influence function given by the  $P_0$ -efficient influence function of  $\Psi_{q_0}$ . It follows that  $\psi_n^*$  is a locally regular and efficient estimator for  $\Psi_{q_0}$  at  $P_0$ . The result then follows. □