
The Sample Complexity of Online Reinforcement Learning: A Multi-model Perspective

Michael Muehlebach¹ Zhiyu He¹ Michael I. Jordan²

Abstract

We study the sample complexity of online reinforcement learning for nonlinear dynamical systems with continuous state and action spaces. Our analysis accommodates a large class of dynamical systems ranging from a finite set of nonlinear candidate models to models with bounded and Lipschitz continuous dynamics, to systems that are parametrized by a compact and real-valued set of parameters. In the most general setting, our algorithm achieves a policy regret of $\mathcal{O}(N\epsilon^2 + \ln(m(\epsilon))/\epsilon^2)$, where N is the time horizon, ϵ is a user-specified discretization width, and $m(\epsilon)$ measures the complexity of the function class under consideration via its packing number. In the special case where the dynamics are parametrized by a compact and real-valued set of parameters (such as neural networks, transformers, etc.), we prove a policy regret of $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{Np})$, where p denotes the number of parameters, recovering earlier sample-complexity results that were derived for *linear time-invariant* dynamical systems. While this article focuses on characterizing sample complexity, the proposed algorithms are likely to be useful in practice, due to their simplicity, the ability to incorporate prior knowledge, and their benign transient behavior.

is required to learn continuously and is unable to reset the state of the dynamical system. This further introduces the challenge that the information received by the learner is correlated over time and hence, standard statistical tools cannot be applied directly. Despite these important challenges, we provide a suite of online reinforcement learning algorithms that are relatively straightforward to analyze, while being both practically and theoretically relevant. The algorithms sample from a posterior over the different potential model candidates (or an approximation thereof), apply the corresponding “certainty-equivalent” policies, while carefully introducing enough excitation to ensure that the posterior distribution over models converges sufficiently rapidly.

We consider three different settings. In the first setting, the decision-maker has access to a finite set of nonlinear candidate models that potentially describe the system dynamics (continuous state and action spaces). This setting is relevant for many practical engineering applications, where the choice of candidate models provides a natural way to incorporate prior knowledge. In this setting our online algorithm achieves a sample complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\ln(N) + \ln(m))$ in terms of policy regret, where N denotes the time-horizon and m the number of candidate models. In the second setting, we allow for any class of dynamical system, where the dynamics are given by a bounded set in a normed vector space. This includes, for example, all bounded Lipschitz continuous functions with the supremum norm, or a bounded set of square integrable functions. By applying packing and covering arguments, we can relate the second setting to the first one and derive corresponding policy-regret guarantees that take the form $\mathcal{O}(N\epsilon^2 + \ln(m(\epsilon))/\epsilon^2)$, where ϵ describes the discretization width and $m(\epsilon)$ the packing number, which measures the complexity of the function class (Wainwright, 2019). In the third setting, we consider systems that are parametrized by a compact and real-valued set of parameters. This includes the situation where the dynamics are parametrized by neural networks, transformers, or other parametric function approximators, and we obtain a policy regret of $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{Np})$, where p describes the number of parameters. We further note that in the common situation where our function class is given by a linear combination of nonlinear feature vectors, which also encompasses linear dynamics as a special case, our algo-

1. Introduction

Reinforcement learning describes the situation where a decision-maker chooses actions to control a dynamical system, which is unknown a priori, to optimize a performance measure. At the core of reinforcement learning is the fundamental dilemma between choosing actions that reveal information about the dynamics and choosing actions that optimize performance. These are typically conflicting goals. We consider an online setting, where the decision-maker

¹Max Planck Institute for Intelligent Systems, Tuebingen, Germany ²Department of Computer Science, University of California, Berkeley, USA. Correspondence to: Michael Muehlebach <michaelm@tue.mpg.de>.

rithm is straightforward to implement, as it only requires sampling from a Gaussian distribution at every iteration.

Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We provide a suite of algorithms with nonasymptotic regret guarantees for online reinforcement learning over continuous state and action spaces with nonlinear dynamics. Numerical results highlight that transients are benign and that our algorithms are likely to be useful in practice.
- Compared to earlier works in the machine learning community (see, e.g., Dean et al., 2018; Simchowitz & Foster, 2020), which mainly focused on linear dynamical systems and relied on two-step learning strategies that alternate between least-squares estimation and optimal control design, our work accommodates a much broader class of systems and results in a single-step procedure that unifies control design and identification. Moreover, our analysis is straightforward and recovers the results from earlier works as simple corollaries in the setting of linear dynamics.
- Compared to earlier works in the adaptive control community (see, e.g. Anderson et al., 2000; Hespanha et al., 2001), which has a focus on asymptotic stability, boundedness, and deterministic dynamical systems, we consider stochastic dynamical systems and characterize *nonasymptotic performance*. While boundedness (almost surely) cannot be guaranteed in our stochastic setting, where the process noise, for example, has unbounded support, we provide a nonasymptotic bound on the second moment of state trajectories and show that our estimation converges in finite time almost surely. This can be viewed as the stochastic analogue of boundedness and asymptotic convergence.
- Our analysis sheds light on the difference in sample complexity between model-based and model-free reinforcement learning.¹ In the model-based setting, as considered herein, a single iteration provides information about the accuracy of each candidate model, resulting in a regret that scales with $\mathcal{O}(\ln(m))$ in the presence of a finite set of models. In contrast, in the model-free setting, a single iteration provides only information about the feedback policy that is currently applied, resulting in a regret that scales with $\mathcal{O}(m)$ or worse (see, e.g., Lattimore & Szepesvári, 2020).
- The work provides a powerful *separation* principle that applies to nonlinear dynamics. Indeed, as, we will see (e.g., in the proof of Thm. 3.4), our algorithms are based on identifying the best model in the given class and applying a *certainty-equivalent* policy, sepa-

rating the model identification and the optimal control task. In particular, our algorithms combine optimal certainty-equivalent control with optimal model identification based on the posterior distribution over models.

The decision-making problem considered herein is central to machine learning and related disciplines, and there has been an incredible wealth of prior works. We provide a short review of recent prior work that is closely related to our approach in the following paragraph; a more detailed review of the literature can be found in App. A.

Online optimal control is an important benchmark problem of reinforcement learning with continuous states and actions. Built on the fruitful contributions of online learning for control in the linear world (Hazan & Singh, 2022; Tsiamis et al., 2023), the frontier now becomes online control with nonlinear dynamics. Prior work (see, e.g., Kakade et al., 2020; Boffi et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2024) has shown that sublinear $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$ regret can be achieved under structural assumptions on the dynamics, e.g., contraction or linear representations of nonlinear features, which are stronger than what is assumed herein. In applications, we may access multiple candidate models through learning or information aggregation, a situation also considered by *multi-model adaptive control* for asymptotic stabilization (Anderson & Dehghani, 2008). In contrast, we tackle online reinforcement learning and provide nonasymptotic policy-regret characterizations. Compared to recent works in online switching control (Li et al., 2023; Kim & Lavaei, 2024), we handle a broad class of nonlinear dynamics and achieve a favorable logarithmic regret with respect to the number of models.

The article is structured as follows: Sec. 2 discusses the problem formulation and presents the main results. Sec. 3 illustrates our analysis, where we focus on the first setting—the other two settings will follow analogously. Sec. 4 presents numerical results that illustrate the performance of our algorithms while Sec. 5 provides a short conclusion.

2. Problem formulation and summary

We consider a reinforcement learning problem where a decision-maker chooses actions $u_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u}$ to control a dynamical system $x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k) + n_k$, where $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ denotes the state, $f : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_u} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ the dynamics (unknown to the decision-maker), and $n_k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$ the process noise. The random variables $n_k, k = 1, \dots$ represent a sequence of independent and identically distributed random variables, and, for simplicity, $x_1 = 0$. We further denote the Lipschitz constant of f in (x, u) by L and assume, without loss of generality, that the origin is an equilibrium, that is, $f(0, 0) = 0$.

¹By model-free reinforcement learning we mean a setting where the decision maker has only access to a set of feedback policies. The terminology is arguably ill-defined.

The decision-maker aims at minimizing the expected loss, $E[\sum_{k=1}^N l(x_k, u_k)]$, where l captures the stage cost, by learning and applying an appropriate and possibly random feedback policy $u_k = \mu_k(x_k)$.

We consider three different settings. In the first setting (S1) the decision maker has access to m potential (non-linear) candidate models $F := \{f^1, \dots, f^m\}$, $f^i : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_u} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ that describe potential system dynamics. Each f^i is L -Lipschitz in (x, u) and satisfies $f^i(0, 0) = 0$. In the second setting (S2), we allow for any class of functions F that is given by a bounded set in a normed vector space, which is therefore much broader and includes, for example, all bounded L -Lipschitz functions with the usual supremum norm or a bounded set of square integrable functions. In the third setting (S3), the dynamics are parametrized by the parameter θ , i.e., $F = \{f_\theta(x, u) \mid \theta \in \Omega\}$, where Ω is a compact real-valued set. Without loss of generality, we assume that Ω is contained in a unit ball by scaling the parameters accordingly. This captures the setting where the functions f_θ are represented by neural or transformer architectures, or when f_θ are given by linear combinations of (nonlinear) feature vectors $f_\theta(x, u) = \theta^\top \phi(x, u)$. This also encompasses linear dynamics as a special case. We further assume that the system dynamics f are contained in the set of candidate models, that is, $f \in F$ for each setting.

Algorithm 1 Online reinforcement learning (S1)

Require: $F := \{f^1, \dots, f^m\}$, η , M , $\{\sigma_{u_k}^2\}_{k=1}^\infty$
 compute $\{\mu^1, \dots, \mu^m\}$ // e.g. by dynamic programming
for $k = 1, \dots$ **do**
 // every M th step
 if $\text{mod}(k - 1, M) = 0$ **then**
 $s_k^i \leftarrow \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{|x_{j+1} - f^i(x_j, u_j)|^2}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2}$ //one-step pred. error
 $i_k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \exp(-\eta s_k^i)$ //sample from $e^{-\eta s_k^i}$ /norm
 else
 $i_k = i_{k-1}$ //stay with i_{k-1}
 end if
 //follow policy i_k and add excitation
 $u_k = \mu^{i_k}(x_k) + n_{u_k}$, $n_{u_k} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{u_k}^2 I)$
end for

This article is concerned with analyzing the decision-making strategy listed in Alg. 1, which can be easily adapted to the settings S2/S3 (see Alg. 2 and Alg. 3). The algorithm keeps track of the one-step prediction error, that is,

$$s_k^i = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{|x_{j+1} - f^i(x_j, u_j)|^2}{1 + |(x_j, u_j)|^2/b^2}, \quad f^i \in F,$$

where $b > 0$ is a sufficiently large constant. The normalization with $1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2$ ensures that the variables s_k^i

remain bounded even when x_k, u_k become arbitrarily large, while for small x_k, u_k the normalization is close to the identity. This will simplify the subsequent analysis and the resulting statement of the policy-regret bounds. Our analysis also carries over to $b \rightarrow \infty$ and the same regret bounds apply, as is discussed in App. E; however, the constants in the resulting regret guarantees and algorithm parameters become more complex. The sum of squared distances $|x_{j+1} - f^i(x_j, u_j)|^2$ can be interpreted as the negative log-likelihood of model i given the past trajectory $\{x_j, u_j\}_{j=1}^k$, due to the fact that the process noise is Gaussian. Hence, from a Bayesian perspective, the distribution $\exp(-s_k^i)$ represents the probability that model f^i corresponds to f given the past trajectory. The scaling with η implements a softmax (for η large we greedily pick the model that maximizes the posterior, for $\eta \approx 1$ we directly sample from the posterior). Our analysis also applies when n_k is non-zero-mean, since this can be captured by modifying f accordingly, and generalizes to sub-Gaussian process noise.

The algorithm chooses control actions u_k as

$$u_k = \mu^{i_k}(x_k) + n_{u_k},$$

where $n_{u_k} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{u_k}^2 I)$, and i_k is a random variable that is defined in the following way: If $\text{mod}(k - 1, M) = 0$, i_k takes the value $i_k = i$ with probability density $p_k^i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \exp(-\eta s_k^i)$ (conditional on the past). If $\text{mod}(k - 1, M) \neq 0$, i_k remains fixed, i.e., $i_k = i_{k-1}$. The random variable switches only every M th step, which ensures that the excitation with n_{u_k} is rich enough, as specified precisely in Ass. 3.2 below. The feedback policy μ^i describes any policy associated with candidate model f^i , i.e., a policy that achieves the performance

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} E\left[\sum_{k=1}^N l(x_k^i, \mu^i(x_k^i))\right] = \gamma^i, \quad (1)$$

on the candidate model f^i , where $x_{k+1}^i := f^i(x_k^i, \mu^i(x_k^i)) + n_k$ with $x_1^i = 0$. The policy μ^i can be optimal for model f^i , but this does not necessarily need to be the case. We will consider policy regret as our performance objective, where the policy μ corresponding to the dynamics f represents the benchmark performance.

The reinforcement learning strategy has a very natural interpretation: The strategy selects, at each M th iteration, the feedback policy μ^{i_k} , whereby the distribution of i_k follows a softmax function of s_k^i . The system is further excited by adding the random perturbation n_{u_k} to the feedback policy. If persistence of excitation is guaranteed, the estimation will converge at a rate at least $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$, which yields a policy regret (compared to the strategy μ corresponding to the dynamics f) that scales logarithmically in the horizon N and the number of candidates m .

We emphasize that our analysis technique translates in straightforward ways to more general situations than the ones described herein. For example, while this article focuses on time-invariant policies, it would be straightforward to also incorporate time-varying policies μ_k^i (although the computational burden would increase). More precisely, we focus on steady-state performance, where the benchmark is given by the steady-state performance of policy μ (corresponding to f). However, finite-horizon objectives can be easily accommodated by measuring regret with respect to the optimal finite-horizon policy μ_k ; the same nonasymptotic regret bounds would apply. The article also focuses on “naive” excitation signals n_{uk} , sampled from a normal distribution. However, our analysis principle is flexible enough to also incorporate more general type of excitation strategies (e.g., relying on domain-specific knowledge), as long as the excitation has finite second moments and guarantees a persistence condition similar to Ass. 3.2.

Our results are summarized as follows:

Theorem 2.1. (S1) *Let the cost-to-go function corresponding to f and the stage cost l be smooth (see Ass. 3.1), the feedback policies μ^i be Lipschitz continuous, and let a persistence of excitation condition be satisfied (see Ass. 3.2). Then, for a constant learning rate η and $\sigma_{uk}^2 \sim 1/(d_u k) + \ln(m)/(d_u k^2)$ the policy regret of Alg. 1 is bounded by*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^N l(x_k, u_k)\right] - N\gamma \leq c_{r1}\ln(N) + c_{r2}\ln(m) + c_{r3}\sigma^2 d_x,$$

for all $N \geq 2M$, where c_{r1}, c_{r2}, c_{r3} are constant, and γ corresponds to the \mathcal{H}_2 gain associated with the dynamics f (see (1)). The precise constants are listed in Thm. 3.4.

Theorem 2.2. (S2) *Let the set of candidate models F be a bounded set in a normed vector space. Let the cost-to-go function corresponding to f and the stage cost l be smooth (see Ass. 3.1 and C.2), the feedback policies $\mu^{\bar{f}}$ corresponding to an $\bar{f} \in F$ be Lipschitz continuous, and let a persistence of excitation condition be satisfied (see Ass. C.1). Then, for all $N \geq 2M$, any $\epsilon > 0$, for a constant learning rate η , and $\sigma_{uk}^2 \sim 1/(\epsilon^2 d_u k) + \ln(m(\epsilon))/(\epsilon^2 d_u k^2)$, the policy regret of Alg. 2 is bounded by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^N l(x_k, u_k)\right] - N\gamma &\leq c_{r0}N\epsilon^2 + c_{r1}\ln(N)/\epsilon^2 \\ &+ c_{r2}\ln(m(\epsilon))/\epsilon^2 + c_{r3}\sigma^2 d_x, \end{aligned}$$

where $m(\epsilon)$ denotes the packing number of the set F . The precise constants are listed in Thm. C.3.

Theorem 2.3. (S3) *Let the set of candidate models F be parametrized by θ , i.e., $F = \{f_\theta(x, u) \mid \theta \in \Omega\}$, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ is contained in a unit ball. Let the cost-to-go function corresponding to f and the stage cost l be smooth (see*

Ass. 3.1 and Ass. D.2), the feedback policies μ^θ corresponding to each $f_\theta \in F$ be Lipschitz continuous, and let a persistence of excitation condition be satisfied (see Ass. D.1). Then, for all $N \geq 2M$, for a constant learning rate η , and $\sigma_{uk}^2 \sim 1/(d_u k) + p/(d_u k^2)$, the policy regret of Alg. 3 is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] - N\gamma &\leq \sqrt{(c_{r1}\ln(N) + c_{r2}p)N} \\ &+ c_{r3}\sigma^2 d_x. \end{aligned}$$

The precise constants are listed in Thm. D.3.

The results characterize relative precisely how the policy regret scales with the dimension d_x, d_u and the time horizon N . In the setting of Thm. 2.1, we have a finite class of models, and the policy regret scales with $\ln(m)$, which is in line with the literature on online learning (Cesa-Bianchi & Lugosi, 2006; Lattimore & Szepesvári, 2020). Thm. 2.2 relies on a packing argument, whereby the set F is successively approximated by a finite number of candidate models. The result is stated in full generality; for a specific function class F and packing number $m(\epsilon)$ the right-hand side can be minimized over ϵ (the discretization width). For instance if F consists of the space of bounded L -Lipschitz functions, the packing number $m(\epsilon)$ scales with $d_x \exp((L/\epsilon)^{d_x+d_u})$, which means that the policy regret grows roughly with $T^{(d_x+d_u)/(d_x+d_u+2)} = o(T)$, and proves no-regret learning for a very large class of functions. In the special case where $d_x = d_u = 1$, the right-hand side grows with \sqrt{T} . Thm. 2.3 is of direct practical importance, since it provides an algorithm and corresponding regret bound that applies to the typical scenario where the functions F are parametrized, for example by neural networks. In the simplest setting, F consists of linear dynamical systems, which directly recovers well-known results from the literature (e.g., Simchowitz & Foster, 2020; Dean et al., 2018). More precisely, if F consists of linear dynamical systems, the number of parameters is given by $d_x^2 + d_x d_u$, which means that the resulting regret bound scales with $\sqrt{(d_x^2 + d_x d_u)T}$.

We conclude the summary by commenting on boundedness of states. In control-theoretic applications (and in the related community) boundedness of solutions and benign transients are a primary concern. We will see that in all our results we can ensure boundedness provided that the stage cost satisfies $l(x, u) \geq \underline{L}_1|x|^2/2$ for a constant $\underline{L}_1 > 0$. More precisely, we can guarantee that

$$\underline{L}_1 \mathbb{E}[|x_k|^2] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[V(x_k)] \leq c_b \quad (2)$$

for all $k = 1, \dots$, along the trajectories of our reinforcement learning algorithm, where V refers to the cost-to-go function corresponding to the dynamics f and policy μ , and

$c_b > 0$ is an explicit constant. Due to the fact that the dynamics are Lipschitz continuous and n_k, n_{u_k} are Gaussian, x_k, u_k are in fact sub-Gaussian with mean and second moment bounded by $\sqrt{c_b/\underline{L}_1}$ and c_b/\underline{L}_1 , respectively, and we can therefore relatively precisely characterize tail probabilities for finite k , as well as for arbitrarily large values of k under ergodicity assumptions on the dynamics arising from μ .

3. Summary of the analysis

This section discusses the technical details and insights that lead to the results presented in Thm. 2.1-2.3. The presentation focuses on the setting S1, since, as we will see, the results in setting S2 and S3 follow analogously.

3.1. Finite model set-up

This section considers the set-up where F is finite, i.e., $F = \{f^1, \dots, f^m\}$ and $f \in F$. We further denote the cost-to-go function related to the dynamics f by $V : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where V satisfies the following Bellman-type inequality

$$V(x) \geq \mathbb{E}[l(x, u) + V(f(x, u) + n)] - \gamma - d_u L_u \sigma_u^2, \quad (3)$$

for a constant L_u and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, where $u = \mu(x) + n_u$, $n \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$, $n_u \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2 I)$, and the expectation is taken over n and n_u . The inequality ensures that the policy μ has a bounded \mathcal{H}_2 gain in terms of the process noise n (denoted by γ , see (1)) and the excitation n_u (denoted by L_u).

We further make the following two assumptions:

Assumption 3.1. The cost-to-go function V (corresponding to f) is smooth with smoothness constant \bar{L}_V . In addition, the cost-to-go V and the stage cost l satisfy

$$\frac{\bar{L}_V}{2}|x|^2 \leq V(x) \leq \bar{L}_V|x|^2, \quad l(x, u) \leq \frac{\bar{L}_1}{2}(|x|^2 + |u|^2).$$

The feedback policies $\mu^i, i = 1, \dots, m$ are Lipschitz continuous.

Assumption 3.2. There exists an integer $M > 0$ and two constants $c_e > 0$ and $b > 0$ such that for any $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, $\sigma_u > 0$, and $f^i \in F, f^i \neq f$,

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|f^i(x_k, u_k) - f(x_k, u_k)|^2}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2} \right] \geq d_u c_e \sigma_u^2$$

holds, where $x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k) + n_k$, $u_k = \mu^q(x_k) + n_{u_k}$ with $n_k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$, $n_{u_k} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2 I)$, and $q \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

The first assumption specifies that f , the corresponding cost-to-go function V , and the feedback policies μ^i are smooth and Lipschitz continuous, respectively. These

smoothness assumptions will be needed to analyze how the cost-to-go V evolves if the feedback policy $\mu^q \neq \mu$ is applied and prevent the state from diverging in finite time. The second assumption specifies persistence of excitation, which guarantees that the estimate i_k of the best candidate model will quickly converge to i^* , where $f^{i^*} = f$. Ass. 3.2 can be restated in the following equivalent way. For any $\sigma_u > 0$ and initial condition x_1 , the model $f \in F$ is the unique minimizer of the expected one-step prediction error $s_k^i, i \in F$, accumulated over M steps. The integer M corresponds to the time interval by which i_k is updated, see Alg. 1. Ass. 3.2 includes a normalization with the constant b , which may seem slightly strong compared to the literature (see, e.g., Ljung, 1999, Ch. 8.2), where $b \rightarrow \infty$ is usually considered. However, as discussed in App. E our analysis also encompasses the case $b \rightarrow \infty$; the resulting constants are more elaborate and we therefore focus our discussion on the situation where b is finite. We further note that in the situation where $f^i \in F$ are linear, that is $f^i(x, u) = A^i x + B^i u$, $\mu^i(x) = K^i x$, Ass. 3.2 for $b \rightarrow \infty$ is straightforward to verify and we obtain, for example, the following bound

$$\mathbb{E}[|f^i(x_k, u_k) - f(x_k, u_k)|^2] \geq \sigma^2 |(A^i - A)K^q|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \sigma_u^2 (|B^i - B|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + |A^i - A|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \underline{\sigma}(K^q W_{k-1}^c K^q{}^\top)),$$

where K^q represents the linear feedback controller corresponding to model $f^q \in F$, and W_k^c denotes the controllability Gramian (over k steps):

$$W_k^c = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (A + BK^q)^j{}^\top BB^\top (A + BK^q)^j,$$

where $\underline{\sigma}$ denotes the minimum singular value, and $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{F}}$ the Frobenius norm. Hence, Ass. 3.2 (for $b \rightarrow \infty$) is satisfied for linear systems except in degenerate situations, for example when $B^i = B$ for some candidate model and at the same time the closed-loop dynamics $A + BK^q$ are uncontrollable.

Our analysis of Alg. 1 starts by showing that the convergence to the best candidate model is fast, which leads to the logarithmic scaling of the regret with N and m . This is summarized with the following proposition:

Proposition 3.3. *Let Ass. 3.2 be satisfied and let the step size be $\eta \leq \min\{1/(4M\sigma^2), 1/(2ML^2b^2)\}$. Then, the following holds*

$$\Pr(i_k = i) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{d_u c_e \eta}{4} \sum_{j=1}^{k-M} \sigma_{u_j}^2 \right),$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Moreover, choose $\sigma_{u_k}^2$ as

$$\sigma_{u_k}^2 = \frac{4}{\eta d_u c_e M} \left(\frac{2}{\lceil k/M \rceil} + \frac{\ln(m)}{(\lceil k/M \rceil)^2} \right),$$

where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ denotes rounding to the next higher integer. Then, it holds that

$$\Pr(i_k \neq i^*) \leq \frac{M^2}{(k-M)^2},$$

for all $k \geq M+1$, where $f^{i^*} = f$.

Proof. (Sketch, details are in App. B.1) The key in the proof of Prop. 3.3 is to exploit the fact that $|x_{k+1} - f^i(x_k, u_k)|^2$ can be expressed as

$$|f_k - f_k^i + n_k|^2 = |f_k - f_k^i|^2 + 2n_k^\top (f_k - f_k^i) + n_k^\top n_k,$$

where f_k stands for $f(x_k, u_k)$ and f_k^i for $f^i(x_k, u_k)$. As a result, the difference in one-step prediction error $s_k^i - s_k^*$ (where s_k^* relates to the one-step prediction error associated with the model $f^{i^*} = f$) is given by

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{|f_j - f_j^i|^2 + 2n_j^\top (f_j - f_j^i)}{1 + |(x_j, u_j)|^2/b^2}.$$

Due to the fact that n_j is zero mean and independent of $(f_j - f_j^i)$, the sum over $n_j^\top (f_j - f_j^i)$ represents a martingale difference sequence. Therefore, $s_k^i - s_k^*$ concentrates around its mean, which is given by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{|f(x_j, u_j) - f^i(x_j, u_j)|^2}{1 + |(x_j, u_j)|^2/b^2} \right]$$

and, in view of Ass. 3.2, bounded below by $\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} d_u c_e \sigma_{u_j}^2$. Moreover, each summand in s_k^i is bounded (as a result of the normalization with $|x_k, u_k|^2/b^2$ and the fact that f^i and f are Lipschitz continuous), which means that for small η , $\mathbb{E}[p_k^i]$ is bounded above by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\eta(s_k^i - s_k^*)}}{\sum_{j=1}^m e^{-\eta(s_k^j - s_k^*)}} \right] \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta(s_k^i - s_k^*)}] \approx e^{-\eta \mathbb{E}[s_k^i - s_k^*]},$$

where the first inequality follows by construction of p_k^i and the second step follows from the concentration of $s_k^i - s_k^*$ and the assumption of a small enough learning rate η . The second step is formalized with Lemma B.2 in App. B.1. In addition, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(i_k = i) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{i_k=i}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{i_k=i} | x_1, \dots, x_k, u_k, n_k]] = \mathbb{E}[p_k^i], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ denotes the indicator function (see Lemma B.1), which yields, combined with the previous reasoning,

$$\Pr(i_k = i) \approx e^{-\eta \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} d_u c_e \sigma_{u_j}^2},$$

and establishes the first inequality of Prop. 3.3 (see App. B.1 for the formal steps). The second inequality follows from computing the sum over $\sigma_{u_k}^2$. \square

An immediate corollary of the fast convergence rate established with Prop. 3.3 is that the sequence i_k will converge to i^* in finite time (almost surely), where $f^{i^*} = f$. This is discussed in Cor. B.6. As a result of Prop. 3.3, we are now ready to state and prove our first main result that characterizes the policy regret in setting S1.

Theorem 3.4. *Let Ass. 3.1 and 3.2 be satisfied and choose $\eta \leq \min\{1/(4M\sigma^2), 1/(2ML^2b^2)\}$ and $\sigma_{u_k}^2$ as in Prop. 3.3. Then, the policy regret of Alg. 1 is bounded by*

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] - N\gamma \leq c_{r1} + c_{r2}M \ln(m) + c_{r2} \ln(N),$$

for all $N \geq 2M$, where the constants c_{r1} and c_{r2} are given by

$$\begin{aligned} c_{r1} &= 3c_\alpha d_x \sigma^2 \bar{L}_V M/2 + c_{r2}, \\ c_{r2} &= \frac{8c_\alpha (\bar{L}_V L^2 + \bar{L}_l/2 + L_u)}{\eta c_e}, \quad c_\alpha = e^{3c_2 M}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (Sketch, details are in App. B.2) The proof relies on using V as a Lyapunov function and performing the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1})] &= \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1}) | i_k \neq i^*] \Pr(i_k \neq i^*) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1}) | i_k = i^*] \Pr(i_k = i^*). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The first term describes the evolution of $V(x_{k+1})$ when choosing $i_k \neq i^*$, and in this (unfavorable) situation V may grow at most exponentially. This is captured by the following bound that relies on the continuity assumptions on V (see Lemma B.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1}) | i_k \neq i^*] &\leq c_2 \mathbb{E}[V(x_k)] + \mathcal{O}(\sigma^2 + \sigma_{u_k}^2) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[l(x, u_k) | i_k \neq i^*], \end{aligned}$$

where the notation \mathcal{O} hides continuity and dimension-related constants. The second term in (4), describes the favorable situation of choosing $i_k = i^*$, where $V(x_{k+1})$ is bounded as a result of the Bellman-type inequality (3). This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1}) | i_k = i^*] &\leq \mathbb{E}[V(x_k)] + \gamma + \mathcal{O}(\sigma_{u_k}^2) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k) | i_k = i^*], \end{aligned}$$

where continuity and dimension-related constants are again hidden. By combining the two inequalities we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[V(x_k)](c_2 \Pr(i_k \neq i^*) + 1) + \gamma \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] + \mathcal{O}(\sigma_{u_k}^2 + \Pr(i_k \neq i^*)\sigma^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

From Prop. 3.3, we know that $\Pr(i_k \neq i^*)$ decays at rate $1/k^2$. This means that, roughly speaking, the inequality (5)

gives rise to a telescoping sum (see Lemma B.4 for details), which yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] - \gamma N \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{k=1}^N (\sigma_{u_k}^2 + \Pr(i_k \neq i^*)\sigma^2)\right).$$

The fact that $\Pr(i_k \neq i^*)$ is summable, due to the decay at rate $1/k^2$, and that the sum over $\sigma_{u_k}^2$ evaluates to $\mathcal{O}(\ln(N) + \ln(m))$ establishes the desired result up to constants (these are computed in App. B.2). \square

The proof of Thm. 3.4 relies on using V as a Lyapunov function. Provided that the stage cost $l(x, u)$ is bounded below by a quadratic of the type $|x|^2$, we can modify the analysis in straightforward ways to obtain explicit bounds on $\mathbb{E}[V(x_k)]$ and hence on $\mathbb{E}[|x_k|^2]$, uniform over k , which is an important concern in the adaptive control community. Moreover, these bounds require persistence of excitation only over a finite number of steps, since $\Pr(i_k \neq i^*)$ is monotonically decreasing even when Ass. 3.2 is not satisfied. The details are presented in App. B.4.

3.2. Infinite cardinality

The ideas described in the previous section translate to the situation, where the set of candidate models F is a bounded subset of a metric vector space with norm $\|\cdot\|$. For example, F could represent the set of bounded, L -Lipschitz continuous functions that map from $\mathbb{R}^{d_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_u} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, with $\|\cdot\|$ the supremum norm. Alternatively, F could be a bounded subset of the set of square integrable functions. Our presentation focuses on the main ideas that enable us to apply the arguments from the previous section; the details and formal proofs can be found in App. C.

Algorithm 2 Online reinforcement learning (S2)

Require: $F, \eta, M, \{\sigma_{u_k}^2\}_{k=1}^\infty, \epsilon$
for $k = 1, \dots$ **do**
 // every M th step
 if $\text{mod}(k-1, M) = 0$ **then**
 $f^* \leftarrow \text{argmin}_{\bar{f} \in F} s_k(\bar{f})$
 $F^\epsilon \leftarrow \text{greedyCover}(F, f^*, \epsilon)$
 $i_k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \exp(-\eta s_k(f^i)), f^i \in F^\epsilon$
 compute μ^{i_k} corr. to $f^{i_k} \in F^\epsilon$ // e.g. by d. prog.
 else
 $i_k = i_{k-1}$ // stay with i_{k-1}
 end if
 // follow policy i_k and add excitation
 $u_k = \mu^{i_k}(x_k) + n_{u_k}, n_{u_k} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{u_k}^2 I)$
end for

The decision-making strategy for S2 is listed in Alg. 2 (the subroutine `greedyCover` is specified in Alg. 4 in App. C).

As before, $s_k(\bar{f})$, for any $\bar{f} \in F$, denotes the one-step-prediction error, accumulated over $k-1$ steps. Alg. 2 computes a minimizer $\text{argmin}_{\bar{f} \in F} s_k(\bar{f})$, which will be denoted by f^* . We then construct an ϵ -packing of the set F , denoted by F_k^ϵ by greedily adding functions $f^i \in F$ as long as $\|f^i - \bar{f}\| > \epsilon$ for all $\bar{f} \in F_k^\epsilon$. As a result F_k^ϵ covers F by construction, i.e., for every $f \in F$ there exists $f^i \in F_k^\epsilon$ such that $\|f^i - f\| \leq \epsilon$. The cardinality of F_k^ϵ is bounded by the packing number of F , which is denoted by $m(\epsilon)$. The algorithm then randomly samples i_k as before and applies the feedback policy μ^{i_k} that corresponds to model $f^{i_k} \in F_k^\epsilon$. Clearly, these steps (minimization over $\bar{f} \in F$, constructing the packing, and solving a dynamic programming problem at every iteration) are computationally intractable in general and one would have to resort to approximations in practice. The purpose of Alg. 2 is to characterize policy regret in this very general setting and not to directly provide a practical algorithm. As before, the key step to our analysis is to ensure that $\Pr(i_k = i)$ decays rapidly for models $f^i \in F_k^\epsilon$ where $\|f^i - f\|$ is large. The fact that the dynamics f are not included in F_k^ϵ is of minor importance, since by construction F_k^ϵ contains f^* , the minimizer of $s_k(f)$. This means that the arguments used in deriving Prop. 3.3 apply in the same way (Ass. 3.2 is extended to ensure that $f \in F$ is the unique *non-degenerate* minimizer of the one-step prediction step $s_k(\bar{f}), \bar{f} \in F$, accumulated over M steps, see Ass. C.1) and concludes that $\Pr(i_k \neq I_k^*) \leq M^2/(k-M)^2$ as before, where I_k^* denotes the set of models $f^{i^*} \in F_k^\epsilon$ that satisfy $\|f^{i^*} - f\| \leq \epsilon$. As a result, the same arguments as in the proof of Thm. 3.4 apply, provided that the \mathcal{H}_2 gain γ satisfies a continuity requirement (see Ass. C.2), which yields the statement of Thm. 2.2. The details are presented in App. C.

3.3. Parametric models

The following section discusses the situation where the set of candidate models F is parametrized by a parameter $\theta \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, where Ω is contained in a unit ball, that is,

$$F = \{f_\theta : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_u} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \mid \theta \in \Omega\}.$$

The canonical example we have in mind is when f_θ is parametrized with a large neural network, where θ represents the parameters. As in the previous section, we assume that $f \in F$, and without loss of generality, we set $f = f_{\theta=0}$, i.e., the parameters are centered around f .

Alg. 3 has a particularly straightforward interpretation, which also facilitates its implementation in practice. At every, iteration, f_{θ_k} is sampled from the posterior distribution over models f_θ , scaled by η . In the special case where $f_\theta(x, u) = \phi(x, u)^\top \theta$ we note that the density $\exp(-\eta s_k(\theta))$ corresponding to the random variable θ_k is




Figure 1. The first panel shows the evolution of the parameter error, where the y axis is scaled by $\max_k |\theta_k - \theta^*|$. The panels in the center and on the right show the evolution of the two norm of states and inputs, where the blue dashed line indicates the optimal steady-state performance (on a independent realization of n_k). The performance of Alg. 1 is superior (see panel in the center), since Alg. 1 optimizes over a finite set of candidate models instead of the real-valued parameter space Ω . Alg. 1 roughly reaches optimal steady-state performance within ten steps, whereas Alg. 3 requires about 60 steps.

Algorithm 3 Online reinforcement learning (S3)

Require: $F = \{f_\theta \mid \theta \in \Omega\}$, η , M , $\{\sigma_{uk}^2\}_{k=1}^\infty$

for $k = 1, \dots$ **do**

// every M th step

if $\text{mod}(k-1, M) = 0$ **then**

$s_k(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{|x_{j+1} - f_\theta(x_j, u_j)|^2}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2}$ //one-step pred. err.

$\theta_k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \exp(-\eta s_k(\theta)) \mathbb{1}_{\theta \in \Omega}$ //sampling

compute μ_θ corr. to $f_\theta \in F$ // e.g. by d. prog.

else

$\theta_k = \theta_{k-1}$ //stay with i_{k-1}

end if

//follow policy θ_k and add excitation

$u_k = \mu^{\theta_k}(x_k) + n_{uk}, \quad n_{uk} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{uk}^2 I)$

end for

Gaussian, with mean

$$\underset{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{|x_{j+1} - \phi(x_j, u_j)^\top \theta|^2}{1 + |(x_j, u_j)|^2/b^2}.$$

The Gaussian mean and covariance can be efficiently computed by running a recursive least squares algorithm, resulting in a per-iteration complexity of only $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$. The corresponding computation of the policy μ_θ for the model f_θ is much more challenging, but can, in principle, be done offline with dynamic programming. A notable exception is when $\phi(x, u)$ is linear, in which case the corresponding (steady-state optimal) policy μ_θ is linear and can be computed by solving a Riccati equation in $\mathcal{O}(d_x^3)$ steps. In the situation when f_θ has a more general structure, the sampling can, for example, be implemented with Langevin Monte-Carlo (Vempala & Wibisono, 2019). The regret analysis follows the same steps as in Sec. 3.1 and is included in App. D.

4. Numerical example

We present results of a numerical simulation to illustrate our algorithms. To simplify the presentation we consider a

linear time-invariant dynamical system of dimension $d_x = 20$ and $d_u = 5$ and apply the two algorithms Alg. 1 and Alg. 3. The dynamics f (unknown to the decision-maker) consist of four five-dimensional leaky integrators of the type $x_{k+1}^i = 0.8x_k^i + x_k^{i+1}$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$. The dynamics are relatively challenging for control, as there is a lag of five steps until a change in the input affects x_k^1 . It is assumed that the elements of the matrices A and B that define the dynamics are unknown with respect to an absolute error of 0.1 and relative error of 20%. In the setting S1 we generate 100 candidate models by uniformly sampling the parameter space, in the setting S3, the parameter space has dimension $d_x^2 + d_x d_u = 500$. The resulting trajectories are shown in Fig. 1. The algorithm settings were chosen as specified in Thm. 3.4 and Thm. D.3, that is, for Alg. 1 $\eta = 10$, $\sigma_{uk}^2 = 10/(\eta d_u M)(2/\lceil k/M \rceil + \ln(2m))/(\lceil k/M \rceil)^2$, with $M = 2$ and for Alg. 2 $\eta = 10$, $\epsilon = p/T$, $\sigma_{uk}^2 = 10/(\eta d_u M \epsilon)(2/\lceil k/M \rceil + \ln(p))/(\lceil k/M \rceil)^2$, with $M = 5$. The posterior in Alg. 3 was updated by a recursive least squares algorithm and we set $b \rightarrow \infty$. The recursive implementation has the advantage that reasonable estimates of A and B are already provided in the first p steps, which is important for the initial transient behavior. We note that the space of parameters in Alg. 3 is uncountable compared to that of Alg. 1 and therefore it takes about six times as long to reach a near optimal steady-state performance (see panel in the center). In contrast Alg. 1 reaches optimal steady-state performance very quickly (in about ten steps). We therefore believe that Alg. 1 provides an algorithmic paradigm that is applicable to emerging real-world machine learning and engineering challenges, including the control of intelligent transportation systems or automated supply chains.

5. Conclusion

This article provides policy-regret guarantees for online reinforcement learning with *nonlinear* dynamical systems over continuous state and action spaces. We provide a suite of algorithms and prove that the resulting policy regret over

N steps scales as $\mathcal{O}(\ln(N) + \ln(m))$ in a setting where there is a finite class of m models and as $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{Np})$ in a setting where models are parametrized over a compact real-valued space of dimension p . The results require persistence of excitation, and rely on continuity assumptions on the dynamics, feedback policies, and a corresponding value function.

The results highlight important and fruitful connections between reinforcement learning and control theory. There are numerous exciting future research avenues, including the exploration of an \mathcal{H}_∞ or an output feedback setting, the application to emerging real-world and large-scale infrastructure systems, or the analysis of the model-agnostic case, where the dynamics do not belong to the class of systems known to the learner.

Acknowledgments

We thank the German Research Foundation and the Max Planck ETH Center for Learning Systems for the support.

References

- Abbasi-Yadkori, Y. and Szepesvári, C. Regret bounds for the adaptive control of linear quadratic systems. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 1–26, 2011.
- Agarwal, N., Bullins, B., Hazan, E., Kakade, S., and Singh, K. Online control with adversarial disturbances. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 111–119, 2019.
- Anderson, B. D. and Dehghani, A. Challenges of adaptive control—past, permanent and future. *Annual reviews in control*, 32(2):123–135, 2008.
- Anderson, B. D., Brinsmead, T. S., De Bruyne, F., Hespanha, J., Liberzon, D., and Morse, A. S. Multiple model adaptive control. Part 1: Finite controller coverings. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 10(11-12):909–929, 2000.
- Bertsekas, D. *Dynamic programming and optimal control: Volume I*. Athena Scientific, 2017. 4th edition.
- Boffi, N. M., Tu, S., and Slotine, J.-J. E. Regret bounds for adaptive nonlinear control. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, pp. 471–483, 2021.
- Borrelli, F., Bemporad, A., and Morari, M. *Predictive Control for Linear and Hybrid Systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Cesa-Bianchi, N. and Lugosi, G. *Prediction, Learning, and Games*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Chatzikiriakos, N. and Iannelli, A. Sample complexity bounds for linear system identification from a finite set. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 8:2751–2756, 2024.
- Chen, X. and Hazan, E. Black-box control for linear dynamical systems. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 1114–1143, 2021.
- Cohen, A., Hasidim, A., Koren, T., Lazic, N., Mansour, Y., and Talwar, K. Online linear quadratic control. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1029–1038, 2018.
- Cohen, A., Koren, T., and Mansour, Y. Learning linear-quadratic regulators efficiently with only \sqrt{T} regret. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1300–1309, 2019.
- Dean, S., Mania, H., Matni, N., Recht, B., and Tu, S. Regret bounds for robust adaptive control of the linear quadratic regulator. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- Fazel, M., Ge, R., Kakade, S., and Mesbahi, M. Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1467–1476, 2018.
- Hazan, E. and Singh, K. Introduction to online nonstochastic control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09619*, 2022.
- Hazan, E., Kakade, S., and Singh, K. The nonstochastic control problem. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pp. 408–421, 2020.
- Hespanha, J., Liberzon, D., Stephen Morse, A., Anderson, B. D., Brinsmead, T. S., and De Bruyne, F. Multiple model adaptive control. Part 2: switching. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 11(5):479–496, 2001.
- Hu, B., Zhang, K., Li, N., Mesbahi, M., Fazel, M., and Başar, T. Toward a theoretical foundation of policy optimization for learning control policies. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 6(1):123–158, 2023.
- Jin, C., Yang, Z., Wang, Z., and Jordan, M. I. Provably efficient reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 48(3):1496–1521, 2023.
- Kakade, S., Krishnamurthy, A., Lowrey, K., Ohnishi, M., and Sun, W. Information theoretic regret bounds for online nonlinear control. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15312–15325, 2020.

- Karapetyan, A., Balta, E. C., Iannelli, A., and Lygeros, J. Closed-loop finite-time analysis of suboptimal online control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05607*, 2023.
- Kargin, T., Lale, S., Azizzadenesheli, K., Anandkumar, A., and Hassibi, B. Thompson sampling achieves $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret in linear quadratic control. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 3235–3284, 2022.
- Kim, J. and Lavaei, J. Online bandit nonlinear control with dynamic batch length and adaptive learning rate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.03230*, 2024.
- Lattimore, T. and Szepesvári, C. *Bandit Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Li, Y., Das, S., and Li, N. Online optimal control with affine constraints. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pp. 8527–8537, 2021.
- Li, Y., Preiss, J. A., Li, N., Lin, Y., Wierman, A., and Shamma, J. S. Online switching control with stability and regret guarantees. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, pp. 1138–1151, 2023.
- Liberzon, D. *Switching in Systems and Control*, volume 190. Springer, 2003.
- Lin, Y., Preiss, J. A., Anand, E., Li, Y., Yue, Y., and Wierman, A. Online adaptive policy selection in time-varying systems: No-regret via contractive perturbations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Ljung, L. *System Identification*. Prentice Hall, second edition, 1999.
- Mania, H., Tu, S., and Recht, B. Certainty equivalence is efficient for linear quadratic control. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Muehlebach, M. Adaptive decision-making with constraints and dependent losses. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 56(2):5107–5114, 2023.
- Narendra, K. S. and Balakrishnan, J. Adaptive control using multiple models. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 42(2):171–187, 1997.
- Rawlings, J. B., Mayne, D. Q., Diehl, M., et al. *Model Predictive Control: Theory, Computation, and Design*. Nob Hill Publishing, 2017.
- Safonov, M. and Tsao, T.-C. The unfalsified control concept and learning. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 42(6):843–847, 1997.
- Simchowitz, M. and Foster, D. Naive exploration is optimal for online LQR. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 8937–8948, 2020.
- Simchowitz, M., Singh, K., and Hazan, E. Improper learning for non-stochastic control. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 3320–3436, 2020.
- Tsiamis, A., Ziemann, I., Matni, N., and Pappas, G. J. Statistical learning theory for control: A finite-sample perspective. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 43(6):67–97, 2023.
- Vempala, S. S. and Wibisono, A. Rapid convergence of the unadjusted langevin algorithm: Isoperimetry suffices. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- Wainwright, M. J. *High-Dimensional Statistics*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Yang, L. and Wang, M. Reinforcement learning in feature space: Matrix bandit, kernels, and regret bound. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 10746–10756, 2020.
- Zhao, P., Yan, Y.-H., Wang, Y.-X., and Zhou, Z.-H. Non-stationary online learning with memory and non-stochastic control. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(1):9831–9900, 2023.

A. Related work

This article revolves around online reinforcement learning with multiple nonlinear candidate models. We adopt a viewpoint at the intersection of online decision-making, reinforcement learning, and adaptive control. We review representative works along these lines as follows.

Online optimal control studies regulating a dynamical system while optimizing a cumulative cost. At each time step, the stage cost is a function of the state and the input, and the cost is revealed sequentially after the control input is applied. This online nature constitutes the main difference compared with classical optimal control (Bertsekas, 2017) and gives rise to nonasymptotic performance characterizations via regret, i.e., the cumulative performance gap relative to the optimal policy in hindsight. Online control hinges on specifying an appropriate policy class and leveraging effective mechanisms for searching control policies. For instance, the class of linear state feedback policies is often associated with problems involving linear dynamics and quadratic costs. Policies attaining sublinear regret can be found via iterative gradient-based schemes (Cohen et al., 2018; Fazel et al., 2018; Hu et al., 2023) or explore-then-commit pipelines based on the certainty-equivalent principle (Dean et al., 2018; Mania et al., 2019; Simchowitz & Foster, 2020), optimism in the face of uncertainty (Abbasi-Yadkori & Szepesvári, 2011; Cohen et al., 2019), or Thompson sampling (Kargin et al., 2022). For linear dynamics and convex stage costs, typical benchmarks are disturbance-action policies represented by linear combinations of states and past disturbances (Agarwal et al., 2019; Hazan et al., 2020; Simchowitz et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021; Chen & Hazan, 2021; Zhao et al., 2023). Growing attention is currently paid to online nonlinear control, for which additional structure (e.g., linear mapping of nonlinear features (Kakade et al., 2020) or matched uncertainty (Boffi et al., 2021)), properties (e.g., contractive perturbation (Lin et al., 2024) or incremental input-to-state stability (Karapetyan et al., 2023)), and parameterizations of nonlinear dynamics and policies are required. We refer the readers to Hazan & Singh (2022); Tsiamis et al. (2023) for comprehensive reviews.

Multi-model adaptive control emphasizes the versatility of a system to handle diverse operating conditions by switching among multiple candidate models and associated controllers (Narendra & Balakrishnan, 1997; Anderson et al., 2000; Hespanha et al., 2001; Muehlebach, 2023; Chatzikiriakos & Iannelli, 2024). There is a supervisory controller that tracks the performance of the running controller and, if necessary, applies another more appropriate controller based on switching logic. Oftentimes the switching criterion follows the model (and the correspond-

ing controller) with the smallest estimation error integral (Liberzon, 2003; Anderson & Dehghani, 2008) or implements performance-based falsification (Safonov & Tsao, 1997). The above works mainly focus on asymptotic stabilization, whereas this article explores online reinforcement learning characterized by nonasymptotic policy regret measures.

Online control with switching policies is closely related to adaptive control with multiple models. Nonetheless, instead of tackling asymptotic stabilization, online control addresses optimal control from a modern nonasymptotic finite-sample perspective. Specifically, Li et al. (2023); Kim & Lavaei (2024) consider regulating a nonlinear dynamical system by iteratively selecting a control input from a finite set of candidate control policies. The key principles are to use the system trajectory driven by the chosen controller as a performance criterion to filter out non-stabilizing controllers and to identify the best stabilizing controller in hindsight via Exp3, a classical multi-armed bandit algorithm. The regret bounds therein scale sublinearly with the time horizon, but grow exponentially with the number of non-stabilizing controllers. In contrast, in the setting with finite candidate models, our algorithm attains a favorable logarithmic regret in terms of both the time horizon and the number of models. Furthermore, we extend the design and analysis to handle a continuum of nonlinear candidate models lying in a bounded set of function spaces.

This article leverages a *separation principle*, whereby we dynamically identify the best model within a given class and apply a certainty-equivalent feedback policy. Along the lines of policy extraction, we mention two streams of related works, since these can be readily incorporated into our online reinforcement learning pipelines. One stream is reinforcement learning with *linear function approximation* (Yang & Wang, 2020; Jin et al., 2023), featuring efficient search for no-regret policies when the transition dynamics and stage costs are approximated by linear representations of feature mappings. Another stream is *model predictive control* (Rawlings et al., 2017; Borrelli et al., 2017), where receding-horizon policies are computed in a setting with parameterized dynamics and finite horizons. We envision fruitful advances in these directions will further consolidate our multi-model perspective on online decision-making.

All the aforementioned works provide a comprehensive ground for online decision-making. Nonetheless, it is still unclear how to achieve sublinear regrets in an online regime encompassing a broad class of nonlinear dynamics models. In this article, we adopt a multi-model perspective and provide a suite of algorithms that identify the best candidate model and apply a certainty-equivalent policy, all equipped with nonasymptotic policy-regret guarantees.

B. Details of Sec. 3.1

We first state and prove two intermediate lemmas that are used in the proof of Prop. 3.3. The two lemmas express the fact that the larger the expected model deviation $f^i - f$ (accumulated over the past steps), the smaller the corresponding probability of selecting model i .

Lemma B.1. *For any step size $\eta > 0$ it holds that*

$$\Pr(i_k = i) \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta(s_k^i - s_k^j)}],$$

for all s_k^j (and in particular for $s_k^j = s_k^*$ corresponding to f).

Proof. We note that p_k^i is given by

$$p_k^i = \frac{e^{-\eta s_k^i}}{\sum_{j=1}^m e^{-\eta s_k^j}} \leq e^{-\eta(s_k^i - \bar{s}_k)} \leq e^{-\eta(s_k^i - s_k^j)},$$

for all $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, where $\bar{s}_k = \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}} s_k^i$. In addition, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(i_k = i) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{i_k=i}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{i_k=i} | x_1, \dots, x_k, u_k, n_k]] = \mathbb{E}[p_k^i], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ denotes the indicator function, which yields the desired result. \square

Lemma B.2. *Let*

$$l_k^i := \frac{|x_{k+1} - f^i(x_k, u_k)|^2}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2},$$

where $b > 0$ is constant. Let \mathcal{F}_k denote the collection of random variables $x_j, u_j, i_j, n_{j-1}, n_{uj}$ up to time k . Then, the following bound holds for all $0 < \eta \leq \min\{1/(4\sigma^2), 1/(2L^2b^2)\}$ and for all $1 \leq q \leq k$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta(l_k^i - l_k^*)} | \mathcal{F}_q] &\leq \\ &\exp\left(-\frac{\eta}{4} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|f - f^i|^2}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2} \middle| \mathcal{F}_q\right]\right), \end{aligned}$$

where f stands for $f(x_k, u_k)$ and f^i for $f^i(x_k, u_k)$, and where l_k^* corresponds to the loss of the candidate f .

Proof. We note that $|x_{k+1} - f^i(x_k, u_k)|^2$ can be expressed as

$$|f - f^i + n_k|^2 = |f - f^i|^2 + 2n_k^\top(f - f^i) + n_k^\top n_k,$$

and, as a result, $l_k^i - l_k^*$ is given by

$$\frac{|f - f^i|^2 + 2n_k^\top(f - f^i)}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2}.$$

Hence, conditioned on x_k, u_k , the randomness in $l_k^i - l_k^*$ is solely due to $n_k^\top(f - f^i)$, which describes a sum of d_x independent Gaussian random variables, weighted by the components of $f - f^i$. As a result, we exploit the closed-form expression for the moment generating function of a Gaussian random variable, which yields

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta(l_k^i - l_k^*)} | x_k, u_k] = \exp\left(\frac{2\eta^2\sigma^2|f - f^i|^2}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2} - \eta \frac{|f - f^i|^2}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2}\right).$$

Thus, for $\eta \leq 1/(4\sigma^2)$, the following bound holds

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta(l_k^i - l_k^*)} | \mathcal{F}_q] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{\eta|f - f^i|^2/2}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2}\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_q\right].$$

As a result of the Lipschitz continuity of f and f^i , the term

$$0 \leq \frac{|f - f^i|^2}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2} \leq 4L^2b^2$$

is bounded. When deriving the previous inequality we used the fact that $|f^i(x_k, u_k) - f(x_k, u_k)| \leq |f^i(x_k, u_k) - f^i(0, 0)| + |f(x_k, u_k) - f(0, 0)| \leq 2L|(x_k, u_k)|$ by Lipschitz continuity of f and f^i . We can therefore apply a ‘‘Poissonian’’ inequality (see, e.g., Cesa-Bianchi & Lugosi, 2006, App. A), which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta(l_k^i - l_k^*)} | \mathcal{F}_q] &\leq \exp\left(\frac{(e^{-2\eta L^2 b^2} - 1)}{4L^2 b^2}\right) \\ &\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|f - f^i|^2}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2} \middle| \mathcal{F}_q\right], \end{aligned}$$

for all $\eta \leq 1/(4\sigma^2)$. The desired result follows from the fact that $(e^{-2\eta L^2 b^2} - 1)/(4L^2 b^2) \leq -\eta/4$ for all $\eta \leq \min\{1/(4\sigma^2), 1/(2L^2 b^2)\}$. \square

B.1. Proof of Prop. 3.3

We first consider the iterations $k = k'M + 1$, for $k' = 0, 1, \dots$. These are the iterations k where the random variable i_k is updated according to the distribution p_k^i (conditional on x_k, u_k). It will be useful to introduce the variables $\bar{l}_{k'}^i$ as follows:

$$\bar{l}_{k'}^i = \sum_{j=1}^M l_{k'M+j}^i,$$

which corresponds to a sum of the variables l_k^i over M steps. Let $\mathcal{F}_{k'}$ denote the collection of all random variables $(x_k, u_k, i_k, n_{k-1}, n_{uk})$ up to time $k = k'M + 1$. We condi-

tion on $\mathcal{F}_{k'-1}$ and conclude from Lemma B.2

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta(\bar{l}_{k'}^i - \bar{l}_{k'}^*)} | \mathcal{F}_{k'-1}] &= \mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta \sum_{j=1}^M (l_{k'M+j}^i - l_{k'M+j}^*)} | \mathcal{F}_{k'-1}] \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^M (\mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta M (l_{k'M+j}^i - l_{k'M+j}^*)} | \mathcal{F}_{k'-1}])^{1/M} \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^M (e^{-\frac{\eta M}{4} \mathbb{E}[\frac{|f-f^i|^2}{1+(x_k, u_k)^2/b^2} | \mathcal{F}_{k'-1}]})^{1/M} \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{\eta M c_e d_u}{4} \sigma_{u(k-1)}^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where we have used Hölder's inequality for the first inequality, Lemma B.2 for the second inequality, and Ass. 3.2 for the third inequality. As a result, by unrolling the recursion for $k'-1, k'-2, \dots$, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta(s_k^i - s_k^*)}] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\eta M c_e d_u}{4} \sum_{j=1}^{k'} \sigma_{u(Mj)}^2\right).$$

By virtue of Lemma B.1, this implies

$$\Pr(i_k = i) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\eta M c_e d_u}{4} \sum_{j=1}^{k'} \sigma_{u(Mj)}^2\right).$$

The bound holds in fact also for $k+1, k+2$, until $k+(M-1)$, since, by definition, $i_k = i_{k+1} = \dots = i_{k+(M-1)}$. This proves the first bound of Prop. 3.3.

It remains to derive the second bound, which is done by approximating the sum over $\sigma_{u_k}^2$ from below. We find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\eta M c_e d_u}{4} \sum_{j=1}^{k'} \sigma_{u(Mj)}^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^{k'} \left(\frac{2}{j} + \frac{\ln(m)}{j^2}\right) \\ &\geq \int_1^{k'} \frac{2}{j} dj + \ln(m) \\ &\geq 2\ln(k') + \ln(m), \end{aligned}$$

for $k' \geq 1$. This concludes that $\Pr(i_k = i) \leq 1/(mk'^2)$, due to the fact that $m \geq 1$. We further note that $k' = (k-1)/M$ by our choice of k . However, i_k remains unchanged for the M next iterations, and therefore

$$\Pr(i_{k+M-1} = i) \leq \frac{M^2}{m(k-1)^2},$$

which holds for all $k \geq 2$. This implies $\Pr(i_k = i) \leq M^2/(m(k-M)^2)$ for all $k \geq M+1$ by a change of variables. Applying a union bound yields the second inequality of Prop. 3.3, i.e.,

$$\Pr(i_k \neq i^*) \leq \sum_{i \neq i^*} \Pr(i_k = i) \leq \frac{M^2}{(k-M)^2}.$$

B.2. Proof of Thm. 3.4

We will use V as a Lyapunov function and have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1})] &= \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1}) | i_k \neq i^*] \Pr(i_k \neq i^*) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1}) | i_k = i^*] \Pr(i_k = i^*). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The first term can be further simplified in view of Lemma B.3, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1}) | x_k, i_k \neq i^*] &\leq c_2 V(x_k) + \bar{L}_V d_x \sigma^2 / 2 \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[l(x, u_k) | x_k, i_k \neq i^*] + (\bar{L}_V L^2 + \frac{\bar{L}_1}{2}) d_u \sigma_{u_k}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The second term in (7) is bounded as a result of the Bellman-type inequality (3) for the policy μ (the policy that corresponds to V). It will be convenient to rewrite the bound (3) in the following way:

$$\mathbb{E}[V(f(x, u) + n)] \leq V(x) - \mathbb{E}[l(x, u)] + q(x) + d_u L_u \sigma_u^2,$$

where $u = \mu(x) + n_u$, (n_u, n) are independent with $n_u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2 I)$, $n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$, and $q(x)$ is chosen such that $q(x) \leq \gamma$ and $-\mathbb{E}[l(x, u)] + q(x) \leq 0$.² The function $q(x)$ is introduced to account for the fact that the policy μ might in principle also achieve a running cost $\mathbb{E}[l(x, u)] \leq \gamma$ in the short term, since γ captures only the steady-state performance. As a result, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1}) | i_k = i^*] &\leq -\mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k) | i_k = i^*] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[V(x_k)] + \gamma_k + d_u L_u \sigma_{u_k}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\gamma_k := \mathbb{E}[q(x_k)]$. By combining (8) and (9) with (7) we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[V(x_k)] (c_2 \Pr(i_k \neq i^*) + 1) + \gamma_k \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] + \bar{L}_u d_u \sigma_{u_k}^2 + \bar{L}_V d_x \Pr(i_k \neq i^*) \sigma^2 / 2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{L}_u := \bar{L}_V L^2 + \bar{L}_1 / 2 + L_u$. As a result of Prop. 3.3, we know that $\Pr(i_k \neq i^*) \leq M^2 / (k-M)^2$ for $k \geq M+1$. We further note that $\mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] \geq \gamma_k$ and $\gamma_k \leq \gamma$ (by our choice of γ_k). We now invoke Lemma B.4 and conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^N (\mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] - \gamma_k) &\leq c_\alpha \bar{L}_u d_u \sum_{k=1}^N \sigma_{u_k}^2 \\ &\quad + c_\alpha \bar{L}_V d_x \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^N \Pr(i_k \neq i^*) / 2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $V(x_1) = 0$ and the following calculation

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (c_2 \Pr(i_k \neq i^*) + 1) &\leq e^{c_2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Pr(i_k \neq i^*)} \\ &\leq e^{3M c_2} = c_\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

²This can be achieved by setting $q(x) = \mathbb{E}[V(f(x, \mu(x) + n_u) + n)] - V(x) + \mathbb{E}[l(x, \mu(x) + n_u)] - d_u \sigma_u^2 L_u$ for $\gamma \geq \mathbb{E}[l(x, \mu(x) + n_u)]$ and $q(x) = \gamma$ otherwise.

due to the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Pr(i_k \neq i^*) &\leq 2M - 1 + \sum_{k=2M}^{\infty} \frac{M^2}{(k-M)^2} \\ &\leq 2M + \int_{2M}^{\infty} \frac{M^2}{(k-M)^2} dk \leq 3M. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we bound the sum over σ_{uk}^2 as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^N \sigma_{uk}^2 &= \frac{4}{d_u \eta c_e} \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{2}{M \lceil k/M \rceil} + \frac{M \ln(m)}{(M \lceil k/M \rceil)^2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{d_u \eta c_e} \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{2}{k} + \frac{M \ln(m)}{k^2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{8}{d_u \eta c_e} (1 + \ln(N-1) + M \ln(m)). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous inequalities and taking advantage of the fact that $\gamma_k \leq \gamma$ yields the desired result.

B.3. Supporting lemmas in the proof of Thm. 3.4

This section contains two lemmas that support the proof of Thm. 3.4.

Lemma B.3. *Let Ass. 3.1 be satisfied. Then, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(f(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u) + n)] &\leq c_2 V(x) + \bar{L}_V d_x \sigma^2 / 2 \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[l(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u)] + (\bar{L}_V L^2 + \frac{\bar{L}_1}{2}) d_u \sigma_u^2, \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, $\sigma_u > 0$, and $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, where the constant c_2 is given by

$$c_2 = (1 + L_\mu^2)(2L^2 \bar{L}_V + \bar{L}_1) / \underline{L}_V.$$

The random variables n_u and n are independent and satisfy $n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$, $n_u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2 I)$.

Proof. We exploit smoothness of V to bound $\mathbb{E}[V(f(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u) + n)]$ by

$$\mathbb{E}[V(f(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u))] + \frac{\bar{L}_V}{2} d_x \sigma^2,$$

where we exploited the fact that the term linear in n vanishes in expectation. We further note that the term $V(f(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u))$ can be bounded in a similar way:

$$\begin{aligned} V(f(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u)) &\leq V(f(x, \mu^i(x))) \\ &\quad + \nabla V(f(x, \mu^i(x)))^\top \nabla_u f(\xi) n_u + \frac{\bar{L}_V}{2} |\nabla_u f(\xi) n_u|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we further applied the mean value theorem to rewrite $f(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u) - f(x, \mu^i(x))$ as $\nabla_u f(\xi) n_u$ for some ξ (dependent on n_u). By applying Young's inequality and

taking advantage of the fact that $\nabla_u f$ is bounded above we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(f(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u))] &\leq V(f(x, \mu^i(x))) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\bar{L}_V} |\nabla V(f(x, \mu^i(x)))|^2 + \bar{L}_V L^2 d_u \sigma_u^2. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, the smoothness of V further yields the following upper bound on the right-hand side of the previous inequality

$$\bar{L}_V |f(x, \mu^i(x))|^2 + \bar{L}_V L^2 d_u \sigma_u^2.$$

We further note that $|f(x, \mu^i(x))|^2 \leq L^2(1 + L_\mu^2)|x|^2 \leq 2V(x)L^2(1 + L_\mu^2)/\underline{L}_V$, where L_μ denotes the Lipschitz constant of μ^i , which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(f(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u))] &\leq \frac{2\bar{L}_V L^2(1 + L_\mu^2)}{\underline{L}_V} V(x) \\ &\quad + \bar{L}_V L^2 d_u \sigma_u^2. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, the term $\mathbb{E}[l(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u)]$ is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[l(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u)] \leq \frac{\bar{L}_1}{2} (1 + L_\mu^2) |x|^2 + \frac{\bar{L}_1}{2} d_u \sigma_u^2$$

in view of Ass. 3.1. Combining the previous inequalities and taking advantage of the fact that $|x|^2 \leq 2V(x)/\underline{L}_V$ yields the desired result. \square

Lemma B.4. *Let the sequence*

$$V_{k+1} \leq (1 + \alpha_k) V_k + g_k^+ - g_k^-, \quad V_k \geq 0,$$

be given, where $k = 1, 2, \dots$, $\alpha_k \geq 0$, $g_k^+ \geq 0$, and $g_k^- \geq 0$ are arbitrary sequences such that $c_\alpha := \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 + \alpha_k) < \infty$. Then, the following holds for all $N \geq 1$

$$\sum_{j=1}^N g_j^- \leq c_\alpha \left(\sum_{j=1}^N g_j^+ + V_1 \right).$$

Proof. By unrolling the linear difference equation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_{N+1} &\leq \prod_{k=1}^N (1 + \alpha_k) V_1 + \sum_{i=1}^N (g_i^+ - g_i^-) \prod_{j=i+1}^N (1 + \alpha_j) \\ &\leq c_\alpha \left(V_1 + \sum_{i=1}^N g_i^+ \right) - \sum_{i=1}^N g_i^-, \end{aligned}$$

where we exploited the fact that $\prod_{k=1}^N (1 + \alpha_k) < \infty$. \square

B.4. Finite second moment

Corollary B.5. *Let Ass. 3.1 be satisfied, let σ_{uk}^2 be as in Prop. 3.3, $\eta \leq \min\{1/(4M\sigma^2), 1/(2ML^2b^2)\}$, and let $l(x, u) \geq \underline{L}_1|x|^2/2$ for some constant $\underline{L}_1 > 0$. Let Ass. 3.2 be satisfied for at least the first*

$$k_0 := \left\lceil M \left(1 + \sqrt{2\bar{L}_V c_2 / \underline{L}_1} \right) \right\rceil$$

steps. Then, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[V(x_k)] \leq \max\{c_3, c_4\}, \quad \forall k \geq 1,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} c_3 &= c_2^{k_0} k_0 (\bar{L}_V L^2 d_x \sigma^2 + (\bar{L}_V L^2 + \bar{L}_1/2) d_u \sigma_{u1}^2), \\ c_4 &= \frac{2\bar{L}_V}{\underline{L}_1} (\gamma + (\bar{L}_V L^2 + \bar{L}_1/2 + L_u) d_u \sigma_{u1}^2 + \bar{L}_V L^2 d_x \sigma^2). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We conclude for Prop. 3.3 that $\Pr(i_k \neq i^*)$ is bounded by

$$\Pr(i_k \neq i^*) \leq \frac{M^2}{(k-M)^2} \leq \frac{\underline{L}_1}{2\bar{L}_V c_2}, \quad (10)$$

for all $k \geq k_0$. It is important to note that persistence of excitation is only required to hold for k_0 steps, as, by our choice of η , $\Pr(i_k \neq i^*)$ is monotonically decreasing (see proof of Prop. 3.3). By Lemma B.3 we conclude that over the first k_0 steps the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1})] &\leq c_2 \mathbb{E}[V(x_k)] + \bar{L}_V L^2 d_x \sigma^2 \\ &\quad + (\bar{L}_V L^2 + \frac{\bar{L}_1}{2}) d_u \sigma_{uk}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[V(x_k)] \leq c_2^{k_0} k_0 (\bar{L}_V L^2 d_x \sigma^2 + (\bar{L}_V L^2 + \frac{\bar{L}_1}{2}) d_u \sigma_{u1}^2),$$

for all $k \leq k_0 + 1$, where we have exploited that σ_{uk} is monotonically decreasing.

By following the same reasoning (case distinction between $i_k = i^*$ and $i_k \neq i^*$) as in the proof of Thm. 3.4 we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[V(x_k)] (\underline{L}_1 / (2\bar{L}_V) + 1) + \gamma \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] + \bar{L}_u d_u \sigma_{u1}^2 + \bar{L}_V L^2 d_x \sigma^2, \end{aligned}$$

for all $k \geq k_0$, where we have used inequality (10) to bound $\Pr(i_k \neq i^*)$, $\gamma_k \leq \gamma$, and the fact that σ_{uk} is decreasing. The constant \bar{L}_u is given by $\bar{L}_u = \bar{L}_V L^2 + \bar{L}_1/2 + L_u$. Due to the fact that l is bounded below by a quadratic we

conclude that $l(x, u) \geq \underline{L}_1 / \bar{L}_V V(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, which can be used to simplify the above inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(x_{k+1})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[V(x_k)] (1 - \underline{L}_1 / (2\bar{L}_V)) + \gamma \\ &\quad + \bar{L}_u d_u \sigma_{u1}^2 + \bar{L}_V L^2 d_x \sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

This readily implies

$$\mathbb{E}[V(x_k)] \leq 2 \frac{\bar{L}_V}{\underline{L}_1} (\gamma + \bar{L}_u d_u \sigma_{u1}^2 + \bar{L}_V L^2 d_x \sigma^2),$$

for all $k \geq k_0$, which yields the desired result. \square

B.5. Convergence in finite time

Corollary B.6. *(Finite time convergence) Let the assumptions of Prop. 3.3 be satisfied. Then, almost surely, $\{i_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converges to i^* in finite time, that is,*

$$\Pr(\sup_{i_k \neq i^*} k < \infty) = 1.$$

Proof. We conclude from Prop. 3.3 that $\Pr(i_k \neq i^*) \leq M^2 / (k-M)^2$ for all $k \geq M+1$. This implies for any $j \geq M+1$

$$\Pr(\sup_{i_k \neq i^*} k > j) \leq \sum_{k=j}^\infty \Pr(i_k \neq i^*),$$

where the right-hand side is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=j}^\infty \frac{M^2}{(k-M)^2} &\leq \frac{M^2}{(j-M)^2} + \int_j^\infty \frac{M^2}{(k-M)^2} dk \\ &\leq \frac{M^2}{j-M} \left(1 + \frac{1}{j-M} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the right-hand side converges to zero for large j , which yields the desired result. \square

C. Details of Sec. 3.2

The following algorithm specifies the packing routine that is used in Alg. 2.

Algorithm 4 greedyCover(F, f^*, ϵ)

```

 $F^\epsilon \leftarrow \{f^*\}$ 
 $S \leftarrow \{f \in F \mid \|\bar{f} - f^i\| > \epsilon, \forall f^i \in F^\epsilon\}$ 
while  $S \neq \{\}$  do
     $F^\epsilon \leftarrow F^\epsilon \cup \{\bar{f}\}, \bar{f} \in S$  // pick an element from  $S$ 
     $S \leftarrow \{\bar{f} \in F \mid \|\bar{f} - f^i\| > \epsilon, \forall f^i \in F^\epsilon\}$ 
end while
return  $F^\epsilon$ 
    
```

In order to provide regret guarantees we will slightly modify Ass. 3.2 from setting S_1 in the following way.

Assumption C.1. There exists an integer $M > 0$ and a constant $c_e > 0$ such that for all $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, $\sigma_u > 0$, and $f^1, f^2 \in F$,

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|f^1(x_k, u_k) - f^2(x_k, u_k)|^2}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2} \right] \geq d_u c_e \sigma_u^2 \|f^1 - f^2\|^2,$$

holds, where $x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k) + n_k$, $u_k = \hat{\mu}(x_k) + n_{uk}$ with $n_k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$ and $u_k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2 I)$, and where $\hat{\mu}$ is any policy corresponding to a model $f \in F$.

We will further assume that the steady-state performance of the policy μ continuously depends on small modifications of μ .

Assumption C.2. Let the policies μ^i corresponding to $f^i \in F$ with $\|f - f^i\| \leq \xi$ satisfy the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(f(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u) + n)] &\leq V(x) + \gamma + L_u d_u \sigma_u^2 \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[l(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u)] + L_\mu \|f - f^i\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

for a $\xi > 0$ small enough and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, where $L_\mu > 0$ is constant, $n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$, and $n_u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2 I)$.

We now prove the following:

Theorem C.3. Let Ass. C.1, Ass. 3.1, and Ass. C.2 be satisfied and choose $\eta = \min\{1/(4M\sigma^2), 1/(2ML^2b^2)\}$ and σ_{uk}^2 as

$$\sigma_{uk}^2 = \frac{4}{\eta c_e d_u M \epsilon^2} \left(\frac{2}{\lceil k/M \rceil} + \frac{\ln(m(\epsilon))}{(\lceil k/M \rceil)^2} \right).$$

Then, the policy regret of Alg. 2 is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] - N\gamma &\leq c_{r1} \frac{3\ln(N) + M\ln(m(\epsilon))}{\epsilon^2} \\ &\quad + L_\mu N \epsilon^2 + c_{r2} d_x \sigma^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all $N \geq 2M$, where $m(\epsilon)$ denotes the packing number of F for a packing of size ϵ and where the constants c_{r1} and c_{r2} are given by

$$\begin{aligned} c_{r1} &= \frac{8c_\alpha (\bar{L}_V L^2 + \bar{L}_1/2 + L_u)}{\eta c_e}, \quad c_\alpha = e^{3c_2 M}, \\ c_{r2} &= 3M c_\alpha \bar{L}_V/2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows Thm. 3.4. At every iteration k we denote by I_k^* the set of models $f^{i^*} \in F_k^\epsilon$ that satisfy $\|f^{i^*} - f\| \leq \epsilon$. We then conclude from the same reasoning as in Prop. 3.3 that

$$\Pr(i_k \notin I_k^*) \leq \frac{M^2}{(k - M)^2},$$

for all $k \geq M + 1$. We make therefore the case distinction $i_k \in I_k^*$ and $i_k \notin I_k^*$, which then yields by the same arguments (see (7))

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^N (\mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] - \gamma_k) &\leq N L_\mu \epsilon^2 + c_\alpha \bar{L}_u d_u \sum_{k=1}^N \sigma_{uk}^2 \\ &\quad + c_\alpha \bar{L}_V L^2 d_x \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^N \Pr(i_k \notin I_k^*), \end{aligned}$$

where there is an additional error term, due to the fact that f^{i^*} and f could be different (although $\|f^{i^*} - f\| \leq \epsilon$ for any $i^* \in I_k^*$, by construction of I_k^*). The desired result follows from the previous inequality. However, compared to Thm. 3.4 we used the slightly more conservative bound

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \sigma_{uk}^2 \leq \frac{8}{d_u \eta c_e \epsilon^2} (3\ln(N) + M\ln(m(\epsilon))),$$

which applies as long as $N \geq 2$, and simplifies the resulting constants. \square

D. Details of Sec. 3.3

For deriving the regret bound we will slightly modify the persistence of excitation condition.

Assumption D.1. There exists an integer $M > 0$ and a constant $c_e > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|f_\theta(x_k, u_k) - f(x_k, u_k)|^2}{1 + |(x_k, u_k)|^2/b^2} \right] \geq d_x c_e \sigma_u^2 |\theta|^2,$$

for all $\theta \in \Omega$ and all $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, where $x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k) + n_k$, $u_k = \mu^\theta(x_k) + n_{uk}$, and n_k, n_{uk} are independent random variables that satisfy $n_{uk} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2 I)$, $n_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$.

The second assumption, which will be important, concerns the fact that the steady-state performance of policy μ continuously depends on the parameters θ . This is formalized with the following assumption

Assumption D.2. Let the policies μ_θ corresponding to $f_\theta \in F$ with $|\theta| \leq \xi$ satisfy the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(f(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u) + n)] &\leq V(x) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[l(x, \mu^i(x) + n_u)] + \gamma + L_u d_u \sigma_u^2 + L_\mu |\theta|^2, \end{aligned}$$

for a $\xi > 0$ small enough and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, where $L_\mu > 0$ is constant, $n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$, and $n_u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2 I)$.

If the feedback policy μ is optimal with respect to the dynamics f , it satisfies the corresponding Bellman equation

$$V(x) = \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^m} \mathbb{E}[l(x, u) + V(f(x, u + n_u) + n)] - \gamma - L_u d_u \sigma_u^2.$$

Ass. D.2 requires the above minimum to be a non-degenerate critical point. For simplifying the presentation of the results, we will assume that Ass. D.2 is satisfied globally.

Theorem D.3. *Let Ass. D.1, Ass. 3.1, and Ass. D.2 be satisfied and choose $\eta \leq \min\{1/(4M\sigma^2), 1/(2ML^2b^2)\}$ and σ_{uk}^2 as*

$$\sigma_{uk}^2 = \frac{4}{\eta c_e d_u M \epsilon^2} \left(\frac{2}{\lceil k/M \rceil} + \frac{p}{(\lceil k/M \rceil)^2} \right).$$

Then, for all $N \geq 2M$ there exists a large enough p , such that the policy regret of Alg. 3 is bounded by

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] - N\gamma \leq 2\sqrt{c_{r1}(3\ln(N) + Mp)N} + c_{r2}d_x\sigma^2,$$

where the constants c_{r1} and c_{r3} are given by

$$c_{r1} = \frac{8c_\alpha L_\mu (\bar{L}_V L^2 + \bar{L}_1/2 + L_u)}{\eta c_e}, \quad c_\alpha = e^{3c_2 M},$$

$$c_{r2} = 3M c_\alpha \bar{L}_V/2,$$

with

$$\epsilon^2 = \sqrt{\frac{c_{r1}(3\ln(N) + Mp)}{L_\mu^2 N}}.$$

Proof. We first argue that the reasoning in Lemma B.1 applies in a very similar way to setting S3. To that extent, we first define the random variable p_k as follows

$$p_k = \frac{\int_{\Omega \setminus \{\theta: |\theta| \leq \epsilon\}} e^{-\eta(s_k(\theta) - \bar{s}_k)} d\theta}{\int_{\Omega} e^{-\eta(s_k(\theta) - \bar{s}_k)} d\theta},$$

where $d\theta$ denotes the Lebesgue measure, and $\bar{s}_k = \min_{\theta \in \Omega} s_k(\theta)$. However, compared to the discrete setting, where the denominator was simply bounded below by unity, the situation is more delicate. More precisely, we bound the denominator from below by $|B_\delta|e^{-\eta h(\delta)}$, where $h(\delta) := \max_{\theta \in B_\delta} s_k(\theta) - \bar{s}_k$ and B_δ denotes a ball of radius δ with volume $|B_\delta|$ centered at a minimizer of $s_k(\theta)$. From the smoothness of $s_k(\theta)$ we conclude that $h(\delta) = O(\delta^2)$ for small δ . Due to our normalization, Ω is contained in a ball of unit radius and we have $|B_\delta|/|\Omega| \geq |B_\delta|/|B_1| \geq \delta^p$ where p refers to the dimension of Ω . Hence we arrive at the following lower bound

$$\int_{\Omega} e^{-\eta(s_k(\theta) - \bar{s}_k)} d\theta \geq |\Omega| \delta^p e^{-h(\delta)} \gtrsim |\Omega| e^{-p},$$

where the second inequality arises from carefully choosing δ in order to balance the the term δ^p and $e^{-h(\delta)}$. This yields

the following bound on p_k (which resembles the discrete setting)

$$p_k \leq \frac{e^p}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega \setminus \{\theta: |\theta| \leq \epsilon\}} e^{-\eta(s_k(\theta) - s_k^*)} d\theta,$$

where we have also replaced \bar{s}_k with s_k^* due to the fact that \bar{s}_k is a minimum. Following the same reasoning as in Lemma B.1 and Prop. 3.3 yields therefore

$$\Pr(|\theta_k| > \epsilon) \leq \frac{e^p}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega \setminus \{\theta: |\theta| \leq \epsilon\}} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta(s_k(\theta) - s_k^*)}] d\theta$$

$$\leq e^p \exp\left(-\frac{c_e d_u \eta}{4} |\theta|^2 \sum_{j=1}^{k-M} \sigma_{uj}^2\right),$$

where Fubini's theorem has been used in the first step to interchange expectation and integration. In addition, due to the modification of σ_{uk}^2 compared to Thm. C.3 (where now $m(\epsilon)$ is replaced by e^p), we find that

$$\Pr(|\theta_k| \geq \epsilon) \leq \frac{M^2}{(k-M)^2},$$

for all $k \geq M+1$. We apply the same reasoning as in the proof of Thm. 3.4, where we now have the case distinction $\Pr(|\theta_k| > \epsilon)$ and $\Pr(|\theta_k| \leq \epsilon)$ (corresponding to $\Pr(i_k \neq i^*)$ and $\Pr(i_k = i^*)$). This concludes that

$$\sum_{k=1}^N (\mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] - \gamma_k) \leq L_\mu N \epsilon^2 + c_\alpha \bar{L}_u d_u \sum_{k=1}^N \sigma_{uk}^2$$

$$+ c_\alpha \bar{L}_V L^2 d_x \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^N \Pr(|\theta_k| > \epsilon),$$

where, as before,

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \Pr(|\theta_k| > \epsilon) \leq 3M.$$

We further note that the sum over σ_{uk}^2 yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \sigma_{uk}^2 \leq \frac{8}{d_u \eta c_e \epsilon^2} (1 + \ln(N) + Mp)$$

$$\leq \frac{8}{d_u \eta c_e \epsilon^2} (3\ln(N) + Mp),$$

where $N \geq 2M \geq 2$ (and therefore $\ln(N) \geq 1/2$) has been used in the second step. Consequently the regret is bounded by

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[l(x_k, u_k)] - N\gamma \leq L_\mu N \epsilon^2 + c_{r1} \frac{3\ln(N) + Mp}{L_\mu \epsilon^2}$$

$$+ c_{r3} d_x \sigma^2.$$

The choice of ϵ achieves an optimal trade-off between the first two terms, which yields the desired result. \square

E. Relaxing persistence of excitation

This section discusses the situation when $b \rightarrow \infty$. We slightly modify Ass. 3.2 to the following:

Assumption E.1. There exists an integer $M > 0$ and two constants $c_e > 0$ and $b > 0$ such that for any $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, $\sigma_u > 0$, and $f^i \in F$, $f^i \neq f$,

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[|f^i(x_k, u_k) - f(x_k, u_k)|^2 \right] \geq c_e (d_u \sigma_u^2 + d_x \sigma^2)$$

holds, where $x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k) + n_k$, $u_k = \mu^q(x_k) + n_{uk}$ with $n_k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$, $n_{uk} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2 I)$, and $q \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

We now derive a variant of Lemma B.2 that relies on the fact that over finite time x_k and u_k are sub-Gaussian random variables. This is summarized as follows.

Lemma E.2. Let Ass. E.1 be satisfied and let

$$l_k^i = |x_{k+1} - f^i(x_k, u_k)|^2,$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$, where x_k, u_k denotes the trajectory resulting from Alg. 1, and σ_{uk}^2 is monotonically decreasing. Let $k' \geq 0$ be an integer and define $k = k'M + 1$ (i.e., k is a time instance where l_k switches). Then, the following bound holds for all $0 < \eta \leq \min\{1/(4\sigma^2), \eta_0\}$ and all $j = k, \dots, k + M - 1$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta \sum_{j=k}^{k+M-1} (l_j^i - l_j^*)} | x_k] \\ & \leq \exp \left(-\frac{\eta c_e}{4} \sum_{j=k}^{k+M-1} (d_u \sigma_{uj}^2 + d_x \sigma^2) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\eta_0 = \frac{1}{16(\sigma^2 d_x + \sigma_{u1}^2 d_u)} \cdot \frac{c_e}{128M^2 L^{2M} (1 + L_\mu)^{2M}},$$

and f_j, f_j^i is shorthand notation for $f(x_j, u_j)$ and $f^i(x_j, u_j)$, respectively.

Proof. Without loss of generality we set $k = 1$ and $k' = 0$ (the proof follows exactly the same steps for $k' > 0$). We first note that the random variables x_j and u_j for $j \geq k$ are Lipschitz continuous functions of the noise variables $\{n_q, n_{uq}\}_{q=1}^{M-1}$. We define the random variable $X_j := |f(x_j, u_j) - f^i(x_j, u_j)|/\sqrt{2}$ and note that X is sub-Gaussian with variance proxy

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2 := 2L^{2M} (1 + L_\mu)^{2M} M (\sigma_{u1}^2 d_u + \sigma^2 d_x),$$

due to the fact that there are at most M steps between x_1 and x_j . We will simplify the notation by introducing the following variables

$$\tilde{L} := 2L^{2M} (1 + L_\mu)^{2M}, \sigma_e^2 := M (\sigma_{u1}^2 d_u + \sigma^2 d_x),$$

such that $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \tilde{L} \sigma_e^2$ and $16\tilde{\sigma}^2 \eta_0 = c_e / (32\tilde{L}M)$. The previous result exploits the fact that a L_v -Lipschitz function of a set of p_v independent standard Gaussian random variables is sub-Gaussian with variance proxy $p_v L_v$ (see, e.g., Wainwright, 2019, Ch.2.3). By following the same argument as in Prop. 3.3 and Lemma. B.2 we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta \sum_{j=1}^M (l_j^i - l_j^*)}] & \leq \left(\prod_{j=1}^M \mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta M (l_j - l_j^*)}] \right)^{1/M} \\ & \leq \left(\prod_{j=1}^M \mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta M |f_j - f_j^i|^2 / 2}] \right)^{1/M} \\ & \leq \left(\prod_{j=1}^M \mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta M X_j^2}] \right)^{1/M}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the shorthand notation f_j, f_j^i as in the statement of the lemma and the fact $\eta \leq 1/(4M\sigma^2)$. The random variables X_j are sub-Gaussian with variance proxy $\tilde{\sigma}^2$ and therefore $X_j^2 - \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]$ are sub-Exponential with variance proxy $16\tilde{\sigma}^2$. As a result, we can simplify the previous inequality to

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta \sum_{j=1}^M (l_j^i - l_j^*)}] \leq \left(\prod_{j=1}^M e^{-\eta M \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] + \eta \tilde{\sigma}^2 c_e / (4\tilde{L})} \right)^{1/M},$$

since $M\eta(16\tilde{\sigma}^2) \leq c_e / (32M\tilde{L})$ by our choice of η_0 . As a result of Ass. E.1 we infer

$$\sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \geq M c_e (d_u \sigma_{u1}^2 + d_x \sigma^2) / 2 = c_e \sigma_e^2 / 2,$$

and therefore

$$\sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] - \frac{c_e \tilde{\sigma}^2}{4\tilde{L}} \geq \sigma_e^2 \left(\frac{c_e}{2} - \frac{c_e}{4} \right) = \frac{\sigma_e^2 c_e}{4}.$$

This establishes

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\eta \sum_{j=1}^M (l_j^i - l_j^*)}] \leq e^{-\eta c_e \sigma_e^2 / 4},$$

and yields the desired result. \square