

Taming “data-hungry” reinforcement learning? Stability in continuous state-action spaces

Yaqi Duan[◊] Martin J. Wainwright[†]

Laboratory for Information & Decision Systems
Statistics and Data Science Center
EECS & Mathematics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology[†]

Stern School of Business, New York University[◊]

January 11, 2024

Abstract

We introduce a novel framework for analyzing reinforcement learning (RL) in continuous state-action spaces, and use it to prove fast rates of convergence in both off-line and on-line settings. Our analysis highlights two key stability properties, relating to how changes in value functions and/or policies affect the Bellman operator and occupation measures. We argue that these properties are satisfied in many continuous state-action Markov decision processes, and demonstrate how they arise naturally when using linear function approximation methods. Our analysis offers fresh perspectives on the roles of pessimism and optimism in off-line and on-line RL, and highlights the connection between off-line RL and transfer learning.

1 Introduction

Many domains of science and engineering involve making a sequence of decisions over time, with previous decisions influencing the future in uncertain ways. The central challenge is choosing a *decision-making policy* that leads to desirable outcomes over a longer period. For example, in the treatment of chronic diseases such as diabetes [42], a clinician can choose from a range of treatments depending on the patient’s history, and any such policy can have uncertain effects on the patient’s status at future times. In a rather different domain, the design of tokamak systems for nuclear fusion requires learning policies for plasma control and shaping [7]; here the actions or decisions are effected via coils that are magnetically coupled to the plasma. Other applications include inventory and pricing systems for businesses [15]; navigation systems in robotics and autonomous driving [37, 24]; resource deployment for wildfire prevention and management [1]; and optimization and control of industrial processes [35].

Markov decision processes provide a flexible framework for describing such sequential problems, and reinforcement learning (RL) refers to a broad class of data-driven methods for estimating policies. Some applications are data-rich, meaning that it is relatively inexpensive to collect samples of states, actions and rewards from the underlying process. When given access to large sample sizes, RL methods have proven to be very successful, with especially prominent examples in competitive game-playing (e.g., AlphaGo and its extensions [34]). However, many applications have far more limited sample sizes—sometimes referred to as the “small data” setting—which renders deployment of RL more challenging. For example, in healthcare applications, there is limited data available for certain types of disease, or certain types of patients [42]. Similarly, for portfolio optimization in finance (e.g., [31]), effective data sizes are often very limited due to lack of history, or underlying

non-stationarity. With limited data, characterizing and improving the *sample complexity* of RL methods—meaning the amount of data required to learn near-optimal policies—becomes critical.

Considerable research effort has been devoted to studying RL sample complexity in many settings, including generative models/simulators, off-line observational studies, and on-line interactive learning. Existing studies for either the generative or the off-line settings (e.g., [23, 43, 41]) give procedures that, when applied to an dataset of size n , yield a value gap that decays at the rate $1/\sqrt{n}$. In the on-line setting, there are various procedures that yield cumulative regret that grows at the rate \sqrt{T} (e.g., [20, 22, 21, 8]). In contrast, the main result of this paper is to formalize conditions, suitable for RL in continuous domains, under which *much faster rates can be obtained using the same dataset*. In particular, in either the generative or off-line settings, our theory provides conditions under which the value gap decays as quickly as $1/n$. So as a concrete example, obtaining a policy with value gap at most $\epsilon = 1/100$ requires on the order of $n = 100$ samples, as opposed to the much larger sample size $n = (100)^2 = 10^4$ required by the classical “slow rate”. Similarly, in the regret setting, we reduce the classical \sqrt{T} growth to a much better $\log T$ rate.

As revealed by our analysis, these accelerated rates depend on certain *stability properties*, ones that—as we argue—are naturally satisfied in many control problems with continuous state-action spaces. Roughly speaking, these conditions ensure that perturbing the policy changes future outcomes by at most a quantity proportional to the magnitude of the perturbation. In other words, the evolution of the dynamic system depends in a “smooth” way on the influence of decision policy. Such notions of stability should be expected in various controlled systems with continuous state-action spaces. In robotics, for example, a minor torque or motion perturbation that occurs during a single step should not cause a notable deviation from the intended trajectory. Similarly, in clinical treatment, slight deviations in medication dosage should not significantly compromise effectiveness or safety. In inventory management, a properly designed supply chain should be able to handle minor variations due to supplier delays or demand changes while approximately maintaining expected inventory levels in the future.

1.1 A simple illustrative example: Mountain Car

The acceleration phenomenon—as well as the underlying stability—can be observed in a simple instance of a continuous control problem. The so-called “Mountain Car” problem is a benchmark example of a continuous control task. As illustrated in Figure 1(a), it involves a car positioned between two hills, where the ultimate goal is to maneuver the car so as to reach the top of the right-side hill by adjusting its acceleration. Due to limited force, the car must learn a decision policy that causes it to oscillate back and forth, using the potential energy to overcome the hill. In our study, we employ offline reinforcement learning using observations collected from the mountain car system. The physical system itself is continuous and subject to noise, with nonlinear dynamics governing the transitions. The control variable, acceleration or force, is represented as a real number within interval $[-1, 1]$.

In order to investigate the acceleration phenomenon, we learned near-optimal policies for this problem in the off-line setting, using linear methods with well-chosen basis functions to approximate the value. (See Appendix F for the full details of experiments that produce the numerical results shown here.) As demonstrated in Figure 1(b), the value sub-optimality behaves in an interesting way as a function of the sample size n . Instead of decaying at the classical $1/\sqrt{n}$ rate, we see that its rate is very well-approximated¹ by the $1/n$ rate, corresponding to a slope of -1 on the log-log

¹The approximation holds when disregarding transient behavior for small sample sizes.

scale. To the best of our knowledge, this phenomenon has not been addressed in past work, possibly due to the following two properties: (i) the continuous state-action space that renders inapplicable fast-rate analysis that depends on gaps or margins (e.g., [19, 29]); and (ii) the nonlinear dynamics, as contrasted with related work [27] on the linear quadratic regulator (LQR).

The theoretical analysis given in this paper sheds light on this intriguing phenomenon. In the specific setting of the “Mountain Car” problem, we observe that small perturbations in the driving policy $\hat{\pi}$ results in only a modest deviation in future trajectories of the car, with the magnitude of the deviation being proportional to the perturbation size. Our theory shows that fast rates can be guaranteed in the off-line setting whenever this property holds, and we exhibit a broad family of continuous control tasks for which it holds.




Figure 1. Illustration of the “fast rate” phenomenon for fitted Q -iteration (FQI) applied to the Mountain Car problem. (a) The Mountain Car problem is a canonical continuous state-action space control problem, in which the goal is to drive the car to the flag. See Appendix F for further details. (b) We used off-line FQI with linear function approximation to learn approximately optimal policies $\hat{\pi}_n$ over a range of sample sizes n . Log-log plot of the value sub-optimality $J(\pi^*) - J(\hat{\pi}_n)$ over sample sizes $n \in \{ \lfloor e^k \rfloor \mid k = 10.5, 10.75, 11, \dots, 13 \} = \{36315, 46630, 59874, \dots, 442413\}$. In the plot, each **red point** represents the average value sub-optimality $J(\pi^*) - J(\hat{\pi}_n)$ estimated from $T = 80$ Monte Carlo trials. The shaded area represents twice the standard errors. The **blue dashed line** represents the least-squares fit to the last 6 data points. This regression leads to the 95% confidence interval $(-1.084, -0.905)$ for the underlying slope, indicative of a decay rate much faster than the typical -0.5 “slow rate”.

1.2 Contributions of this paper

With this high-level perspective in mind, let us summarize the key contributions of this paper, which can be divided into three parts.

Fast rate of convergence: We develop a framework for analyzing RL in continuous state-action spaces, and use it to prove a general result (Theorem 1) under which fast rates can be obtained. The key insight is that stability conditions lead to upper bounds on the value sub-optimality that are

proportional to the *squared* norm of Bellman residuals. This quadratic scaling results in accelerated convergence compared to the standard linear scaling obtained via arguments that isolate only a single copy of Bellman residuals. In the off-line setting, this framework improves convergence from a rate of $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ to n^{-1} , while in on-line learning, it enhances the regret bound from \sqrt{T} to $\log T$.

Reconsidering pessimism and optimism principles: Our framework provides a novel perspective on the roles of pessimism and optimism in off-line and on-line RL. In the off-line setting, a line of past work [23, 6] has established the utility of pessimistic or risk-averse approaches to policy evaluation and optimization. Pessimism serves to protect against uncertainty associated with a fixed off-line data set. On the other hand, in the on-line setting, optimism drives exploration and embraces uncertainty, making it fundamental in online RL [20, 22, 21, 8, 14], where learning occurs through trial and error.

Our theory reveals that there are settings in which *neither pessimism nor optimism* are required for effective policy optimization—in particular, they are not required as long as one has a sufficiently accurate pilot estimate $\hat{\pi}$. Thus, while the use of pessimism or optimism can be useful in obtaining such a pilot estimate, they are not needed in later stages of training. Moreover, our analysis shows that some procedures based on certainty equivalence can achieve fast-rate convergence, showing that the benefits gained from incorporating additional pessimism or optimism measures may be limited in this context.

Connecting off-line RL with transfer learning: Our theory relates value sub-optimality to the Bellman residual as measured under a problem-specific norm. For instance, in the case of linear function approximation (as discussed in Section 3), the norm is induced by the occupation measures of the optimal policy π^* . In other examples such as the linear quadratic regulator (LQR), the norms can take on a more complex form; in certain cases, it can even capture the Bellman variance² associated with the optimal policy π^* . We explore this phenomenon in a forthcoming paper [10]. In this regard, off-line RL can be seen as a form of transfer learning, where the goal is to minimize the loss under covariate shifts from the distribution of historical data to a distribution related to the optimal policy.

While the bulk of our theory is of a general nature, we explore in depth the special case of RL methods based on linear approximation to value functions. In this concrete setting, we can give an intuitive and geometric interpretation of the stability conditions that underlie our analysis, along with the connection to covariate shift. Stability is related to the curvature of the set of feature vectors achievable by varying the action (with the state fixed), and covariate shift is reflected through a comparison of covariance matrices.

1.3 Related work

In this section, we discuss related work having to do with fast rates in optimization and statistics.

Fast rates in stochastic optimization and risk minimization: Many statistical estimators (e.g., likelihood methods, empirical risk minimization) are based on minimizing a data-dependent objective function. It is now well-understood that the local geometry around the optimum determines whether fast rates can be obtained. For instance, when the loss function exhibits some form of strong convexity (such as exp-concave loss) or strict saddle properties, it can lead to significant

²See the papers [13, 11] for more details on Bellman variances.

reductions in additive regret from $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{T})$ to just $\mathcal{O}(\log T)$ in stochastic approximation (e.g., [17]), or a decrease in the error rate from $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ to n^{-1} in empirical risk minimization [25, 16]. The theory of localization is also instrumental in characterizing this phenomenon. To achieve the sharpest analysis, it is essential to determine an appropriate radius in the measurement of function class complexity that accurately reflects the curvature of the loss function near the optimum [2, 26]. These fast rate phenomena rely on a form of stability, one which relates the similarity of functions to the closeness of their optima.

Our work shares a similar spirit, in that we isolate certain stability conditions that ensure fast rate convergence in RL. To the best of our knowledge, there is currently no literature systematically discussing the relationship between our stability conditions and fast rate convergence in the context of RL, or how the inherent curvature affects the convergence rate. Our work, in making this connection explicit and rigorous, provides a framework for analysis of value-based RL methods, akin to the role played by stability analysis in statistical learning.

Fast rates in reinforcement learning: In the RL literature, there are various lines of work related to fast rates, but the underlying mechanisms are typically different from those considered here. For problems with discrete state-action spaces, there is a line of recent work [19, 18, 39, 29] that performs gap/marginal-dependent analyses of RL algorithms. These papers focus on action spaces with finite cardinality, for which it is reasonable to assume a strictly positive gap between the value of an optimal action relative to a sub-optimal one. However, such separation assumptions are not helpful for continuous action spaces, since (under mild Lipschitz conditions) we can find sub-optimal actions with values arbitrarily close to that of an optimal one. Other work for discrete state-action spaces [32] has shown convergence rates in off-line RL are influenced by data quality, with a nearly-expert dataset enabling faster rate. In contrast, our analysis reveals that for off-line RL in continuous domains, fast convergence can occur whether or not the dataset has good coverage properties.

An important sub-class of continuous state-action problems are those with linear dynamics and quadratic reward functions (LQR for short). For such problems, it has been shown [27, 33] that value sub-optimality can be connected with the squared error in system identification. Our general theory can also be used to derive guarantees for LQR problems, as we explore in more detail in a follow-up paper [10]. Stability also arises in the analysis of (deterministic) policy optimization and Newton-type algorithms [30, 4], where it is possible to show superlinear convergence in a local neighborhood. This accelerated rate stems from the smoothness of the on-policy transition operator \mathcal{P}^{π_f} with respect to changes in the value function f ; for instance, see condition (10) in Puterman and Brumelle [30]. Our framework exploits related notions of smoothness, but is tailored to the stochastic setting of reinforcement learning, in which understanding the effect of function approximation and finite sample sizes is essential.

2 Fast rates for value-based reinforcement learning

Let us now set up and state the main result of this paper. We begin in Section 2.1 with background on Markov decision processes (MDPs) and value-based methods, before turning to the statement of our main result in Section 2.2. In Section 2.3, we provide intuition for why stability leads to faster rates, and discuss consequences for both the off-line and on-line settings of RL.

2.1 Markov decision processes and value-based methods

Here we provide a brief description of Markov decision processes, along with the idea of a value-based method for approximating an optimal policy. We refer the reader to some standard references [5, 36] for more detailed background.

2.1.1 Basic set-up

We consider decision-making over H stages, as described by a Markov decision process (MDP) with state space \mathcal{S} and action space \mathcal{A} . The evolution of the state over time is specified by a family of transition kernels $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{P}_h\}_{h=1}^{H-1}$, where the transition kernel \mathcal{P}_h maps each state-action pair $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ to a distribution $\mathcal{P}_h(\cdot | s, a)$ over the state space \mathcal{S} . Given an initial state s_1 and a sequence of actions $(a_1, a_1, \dots, a_{H-1}, a_H)$, these transition dynamics generate a state sequence (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_H) via $s_{h+1} \sim \mathcal{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)$ for $h = 1, 2, \dots, H-1$. An additional ingredient is the family of reward functions $\{r_h\}_{h=1}^H$. At time h , the mapping $(s_h, a_h) \mapsto r_h(s_h, a_h) \in \mathbb{R}$ specifies the reward received when in state-action pair (s_h, a_h) . In this paper, we assume that the rewards $r_h : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are known; however, this condition can be relaxed.

A policy π_h at time h is a mapping from any state s to a distribution $\pi_h(\cdot | s)$ over the action space \mathcal{A} . If the support of $\pi_h(\cdot | s)$ is a singleton, we also let $\pi_h(s) \in \mathcal{A}$ denote the single action to be chosen at state s . Given an initial distribution ξ_1 over the states at time $h = 1$, the *expected reward* obtained by choosing actions according to a policy sequence $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_H)$ is given by

$$J(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \equiv J(\boldsymbol{\pi}; \xi_1) := \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}} \left[\sum_{h=1}^H r_h(S_h, A_h) \right], \quad (1)$$

where $S_1 \sim \xi_1$, $S_{h+1} \sim \mathcal{P}_h(\cdot | S_h, A_h)$ and $A_h \sim \pi_h(\cdot | S_h)$ for $h = 1, 2, \dots, H$. Our goal is to estimate an *optimal policy* $\boldsymbol{\pi}^* \in \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} J(\boldsymbol{\pi})$.

2.1.2 Value functions and Bellman operators

We now describe the connection between the expected return $J(\boldsymbol{\pi})$ and value functions. Starting from a given state-action pair (s, a) at stage h , the expected return over subsequent stages defines the *state-action value function*

$$f_h^\pi(s, a) := \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{h'=h}^H r(S_{h'}, A_{h'}) \mid S_h = s, A_h = a \right]. \quad (2)$$

Here the expectation is taken over a sequence $(S_h = s, A_h = a, S_{h+1}, A_{h+1}, S_{h+2}, A_{h+2}, \dots, S_H, A_H)$ governed by the transition kernels $\{\mathcal{P}_{h'}\}_{h'=h}^{H-1}$ and the decision policy $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_H)$. The sequence of functions $\mathbf{f}^\pi = (f_1^\pi, \dots, f_H^\pi)$ defined by equation (2) is known as the *Q-functions* associated with $\boldsymbol{\pi}$.

The *Q-functions* \mathbf{f}^π have an important connection with the *Bellman evaluation operator* for $\boldsymbol{\pi}$. For any policy $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and any function $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$, we introduce the shorthand

$$f(s, \pi(s)) := \int_{\mathcal{A}} f(s, a) \pi(da | s). \quad (3a)$$

At stage h , we extend the transition functions to a linear operator that maps a function f on the state-action space $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ to a new function on the state-action space as follows:

$$(\mathcal{P}_h^\pi f)(s, a) := \int_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} f(s', \pi_{h+1}(s')) \mathcal{P}_h(ds' | s, a) \quad \text{for any function } f \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}. \quad (3b)$$

With this notation, the *Bellman evaluation operator* at stage h takes the form

$$(\mathcal{T}_h^\pi f)(s, a) := r_h(s, a) + (\mathcal{P}_h^\pi f)(s, a). \quad (3c)$$

From classical dynamic programming, the Q -functions \mathbf{f}^π must satisfy the Bellman relations

$$f_h^\pi(s, a) = (\mathcal{T}_h^\pi f_{h+1}^\pi)(s, a) \quad \text{for } h = 1, \dots, H - 1. \quad (4)$$

Furthermore, these Q -value functions are connected to the expected returns J under π ; in particular, recalling the definition (1), for any initial distribution ξ_1 over the states, we can use the value function f_1^π to compute the expected return as $J(\pi; \xi_1) = \mathbb{E}_{S \sim \xi_1} [f_1^\pi(S, \pi_1(S))]$.

Bellman principle for optimal policies: Under mild regularity conditions, there is at least one policy π^* such that, for any other policy π , we have $f_h^{\pi^*}(s, a) \geq f_h^\pi(s, a)$, for any $h \in [H]$, and uniformly over all state-action pairs (s, a) . Any optimal policy π^* must be greedy with respect to the optimal Q -function \mathbf{f}^* . This function \mathbf{f}^* is determined by the Bellman optimality operator, defined as

$$(\mathcal{T}_h^* f)(s, a) := r_h(s, a) + \mathbb{E}_h \left[\max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} f(S', a') \mid s, a \right], \quad \text{where } S' \sim \mathcal{P}_h(\cdot | s, a). \quad (5)$$

By classical dynamic programming, the optimal Q -function \mathbf{f}^* is obtained by setting $f_H^* = r_H$, and then recursively computing $f_h^* = \mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1}^*$ for $h = H - 1, \dots, 2, 1$.

2.1.3 Value-based RL methods

The main result of this paper applies to a broad class of methods for reinforcement learning. They are known as *value-based*, due to their reliance on the following two step approach for approximating an optimal policy π^* :

- (1) Construct an estimate $\hat{\mathbf{f}} = (\hat{f}_1, \dots, \hat{f}_H)$ of the optimal value function $\mathbf{f}^* = (f_1^*, \dots, f_H^*)$.
- (2) Use $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ to compute the greedy-optimal policy

$$\hat{\pi}_h(s) \in \arg \max_a \hat{f}_h(s, a) \quad \text{for } h = 1, 2, \dots, H. \quad (6)$$

It should be noted that there is considerable freedom in the design of a value-based method, since different methods can be used to approximate value functions in Step 1. Rather than applying to a single method, our main result applies to a very broad class of these methods.

Underlying any value-based method is a class \mathcal{F} of functions $(s, a) \mapsto f(s, a)$ used to approximate the state-action value functions. In general, different function classes may be selected at each stage $h = 1, 2, \dots, H$; here, so as to reduce notational clutter, we assume that the same function

class \mathcal{F} is used for each stage. Moreover, we assume that the function class \mathcal{F} is rich enough—relative to the Bellman evaluation operators (3c)—to ensure that for any greedy policy π induced by some $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_H) \in \mathcal{F}^H$, we have the inclusion

$$\mathcal{T}_h^\pi \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \quad \text{for } h = 1, \dots, H-1. \quad (7)$$

From the definition (3c), we see that this condition depends on the structure of the transition distributions $\mathcal{P}_h(\cdot | s, a)$. In many practical examples, the reward function itself has some number of derivatives, and these transition distributions perform some type of smoothing, so that we expect that the output of the Bellman update, given a suitably differentiable function, will remain suitably differentiable.

2.2 Stable problems have fast rates

We now turn the central question in understanding the behavior of any value-based method: *how to translate “closeness” of the Q -function estimate $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ to a bound on the value gap $J(\pi^*) - J(\hat{\pi})$?* At a high level, existing theory provides guarantees of the following type: if the Q -function estimates are ε -accurate for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, then the value gap is bounded by a quantity proportional to ε . In contrast, our main result shows that when the MDP is stable in a suitable sense, the value gap can be upper bounded by a quantity proportional to ε^2 . This *quadratic as opposed to linear scaling* encapsulates the “fast rate” phenomenon of this paper.

Our analysis isolates two key stability properties required for faster rates; both are Lipschitz conditions with respect to a certain norm. Here we define them with respect to the L^2 -norm induced by the state-action occupation measure induced by the optimal policy—namely

$$\|f\|_h := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}[f^2(S_h, A_h)]} \quad \text{for any } f \in \partial\mathcal{F}^3, \quad (8)$$

and over a neighborhood \mathcal{N} of the optimal Q -value function \mathbf{f}^* . See Appendix A for the precise definition of the neighborhood \mathcal{N} , as well as more general definitions of stability that allow for different norms.

Bellman stability: The first condition measures the stability of the Bellman optimality operator (5): in particular, we require that there is a scalar κ_h^* such that

$$\|\mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1} - \mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1}^*\|_h \leq \kappa_h^* \|f_{h+1} - f_{h+1}^*\|_{h+1} \quad (\text{Stb}(\mathcal{T}))$$

for any $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{N}$. Moreover, for any pair (h, h') of indices such that $1 \leq h < h' \leq H-1$, we define

$$\kappa_{h,h'}(\mathcal{T}^*) := \kappa_h^* \kappa_{h+1}^* \dots \kappa_{h'-1}^*.$$

Condition $(\text{Stb}(\mathcal{T}))$ is directly linked to the stability of estimating the Q -function \mathbf{f}^* . In typical estimation procedures, such as approximate dynamic programming, the estimation is carried out iteratively in a backward manner, so that it is important to control the propagation of estimation errors across the iterations. Condition $(\text{Stb}(\mathcal{T}))$ captures this property, since it implies that

$$\|\mathcal{T}_h^* \mathcal{T}_{h+1}^* \dots \mathcal{T}_{h'-1}^* f_{h'} - \mathcal{T}_h^* \mathcal{T}_{h+1}^* \dots \mathcal{T}_{h'-1}^* f_{h'}^*\|_h \leq \kappa_{h,h'}(\mathcal{T}^*) \cdot \|f_{h'} - f_{h'}^*\|_{h'},$$

which shows how the estimation error $(f_{h'} - f_{h'}^*)$ at step h' can be controlled in terms of estimation error at an earlier time step $h \leq h'$.

³We let $\partial\mathcal{F}$ be the set of all difference functions of the form $g = f - \tilde{f}$ for some f, \tilde{f} in our base function class \mathcal{F} .

Occupation measure stability: Our second condition is more subtle, and is key in our argument. Let us begin with some intuition. Consider two sequences of policies

$$(\pi_1^*, \dots, \pi_{h-1}^*, \pi_h^*, \pi_{h+1}^*, \dots, \pi_{h'}^*) \quad \text{and} \quad (\pi_1^*, \dots, \pi_{h-1}^*, \pi_h, \pi_{h+1}^*, \dots, \pi_{h'}^*),$$

that only differ at the h -th step, where π_h^* has been replaced by π_h . These two policy sequences induce Markov chains whose distributions differ from stage h onwards, and our second condition controls this difference in terms of the difference $\|f_h - f_h^*\|_h$ between the two Q -functions f_h and f_h^* that induce π_h and π_h^* , respectively.

We adopt \mathcal{P}_h^* as a convenient shorthand for the transition operator $\mathcal{P}_h^{\pi^*}$, and define the multi-step transition operator $\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* := \mathcal{P}_h^* \mathcal{P}_{h+1}^* \cdots \mathcal{P}_{h'-1}^*$. Using this notation, for any $h' \geq h + 1$, we require that there is a scalar $\kappa_{h,h'}(\pi^*)$ such that

$$\sup_{\substack{g \in \partial \mathcal{F} \\ \|g\|_{h'} > 0}} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}[(\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* g)(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) - (\mathcal{P}_{h,h'} g)(S_h, \pi_h(S_h))]|}{\|g\|_{h'}} \leq \kappa_{h,h'}(\pi^*) \frac{\|f_h - f_h^*\|_h}{\|f_h^*\|_h} \quad (\text{Stb}(\xi))$$

for any $f \in \mathcal{N}$. The renormalization in this definition serves to enforce a natural scale invariance; we show how it arises naturally in Section 3.

With these notions of stability in hand, we are now equipped to state our main result. Taking as input a value function estimate \hat{f} , it relates the induced value gap to the *Bellman residuals* $\mathcal{T}_h^* \hat{f}_{h+1} - \hat{f}_h$. Note that these residuals are a way of quantifying proximity to the optimal value function f^* , which has Bellman residual zero by definition. We assume that \hat{f} has Bellman residuals bounded as

$$\|\mathcal{T}_h^* \hat{f}_{h+1} - \hat{f}_h\|_h \leq \varepsilon_h \quad \text{for } h = 1, 2, \dots, H-1 \quad (9a)$$

for some sequence $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{H-1}, \varepsilon_H = 0)$ that satisfies the constraint

$$\varepsilon_h \geq \frac{1}{H-h} \sum_{h'=h+1}^H \varepsilon_{h'} \quad \text{for } h = 1, 2, \dots, H-1. \quad (9b)$$

This last condition means that the Bellman residual ε_h is larger than or equal to the average of the bounds established after step $h + 1$. It is natural because estimating at step h is at least as challenging as a stage $h' > h$; indeed, any such state h' occurs earlier in the dynamic programming backward iteration process. As a special case, the bound (9b) holds when $\varepsilon_h = \varepsilon$ for all stages.

With this set-up, we have the following guarantee in terms of the stability coefficients $\kappa_{h,h'}(\pi^*)$ and $\kappa_{h,h'}(\mathcal{T}^*)$ from conditions (Stb(ξ)) and (Stb(\mathcal{T})).

Theorem 1. *There is a neighborhood of f^* such that for any value function estimate \hat{f} with ε -bounded Bellman residuals (9a), the induced greedy policy $\hat{\pi}$ has value gap bounded as*

$$J(\pi^*) - J(\hat{\pi}) \leq 2 \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \frac{1}{\|f_h^*\|_h} \left\{ \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \kappa_{h,h'}(\pi^*) \varepsilon_{h'} \right\} \left\{ \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \kappa_{h,h'}(\mathcal{T}^*) \varepsilon_{h'} \right\}. \quad (10)$$

See Section 4.1 for the proof.

Treating dependence on the stability coefficients as constant, the main take-away is that value sub-optimality is bounded above by a quantity proportional to the *squared* norm of the Bellman residuals. Concretely, if the Bellman residuals are uniformly upper bounded by some ε , then equation (10) leads to an upper bound of the form

$$J(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) - J(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}) \leq c H^3 \varepsilon^2, \quad (11)$$

where c is a universal constant. Due to the quadratic scaling in the Bellman residual error ε , this bound is substantially tighter than the linear in ε rates afforded by a conventional analysis. We discuss this difference in more detail in the sequel.

2.3 Intuition for fast rates

Why does “fast rate” phenomenon formalized in Theorem 1 arise? In order to provide intuition, we begin by stating a standard telescope inequality for the value gap between two policies, and then describe the novel part of our analysis that leads to the sharper ε^2 -bound (11). We also discuss connections to the pessimism principle (for the off-line setting of RL), as well as the optimism principle (for the on-line setting).

2.3.1 Smoothness and cancelling terms in the telescope bound

The fast rates proved in this paper are established by a novel argument, starting from a known telescope bound, which we begin by stating. It controls the value gap between a given policy, and an arbitrary comparator $\boldsymbol{\pi}$. In particular, given a Q -function estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{f}} = (\widehat{f}_1, \dots, \widehat{f}_H)$, let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ denote the induced greedy policy. Then the value gap of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ with respect to an arbitrary comparator policy $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is bounded as

$$J(\boldsymbol{\pi}) - J(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}) \leq \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} (\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} - \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}}) [(\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h)(S_h, A_h)]. \quad (12)$$

This result follows by a “telescope” relation induced by the structure of the Bellman updates. Results of this type are known; for example, analogous results can be found in past work (e.g., Theorem 2 of the paper [40]; or Lemma 3.2 in the paper [9]). For completeness, we provide a proof of the telescope bound in Appendix G.3.

A key feature of inequality (12) is the difference of two expectations $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} - \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}}$, corresponding to the occupation measures under $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ versus $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$. In standard uses of this inequality, an initial argument is used to guarantee that one of these expectations is negative, and so can be dropped. We describe two forms of this argument below, either based on pessimism (Section 2.3.2) or optimism (Section 2.3.3).

In contrast, the proof of our Theorem 1 exploits a more refined approach, one that handles the difference of expectations directly. Doing so can be beneficial—and lead to “fast rates”—because various terms in this difference can cancel each other out. Specifically, under the smoothness conditions that underlie Theorem 1, when applying the telescope inequality (12) with comparator

$\pi = \pi^*$, we show that the discrepancy between the occupation measures associated with π^* and $\hat{\pi}$ is of the *same order* as the Bellman residual associated with \hat{f} . Note that the Bellman residuals of \hat{f} already appear on the right-hand side of inequality (12), so that this fortuitous cancellation can be exploited—along with a number of auxiliary results laid out in the proof—so as to upper bound the value gap by a quantity proportional to the squared Bellman residual ε^2 .

It is worthwhile making an explicit comparison of our cancellation approach with the more standard uses of the telescope relation, which typically consider only one portion of the Bellman residuals (e.g., [20, 22, 23, 21, 8, 14, 41]). We do so in the following two subsections.

2.3.2 Pessimism for off-line RL

In the off-line instantiation of RL, the goal is to learn a “good” policy based on a pre-collected dataset \mathcal{D} . Note that no further interaction with the environment is permitted, hence the notion of the learning being off-line. More precisely, an *off-line dataset* \mathcal{D} of size n consists of quadruples

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ (s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}, s'_{h,i}, r_{h,i}) \right\}_{i=1}^n,$$

where $s_{h,i}$ and $a_{h,i}$ represent the i -th state and action at the h -th step in the MDP; $s'_{h,i}$ is the successive state; and $r_{h,i} = r_h(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i})$ denotes the scalar reward. Note that while the successive states are defined by transition dynamics, and the rewards by the reward function, there are no restrictions on how the state-action pairs $(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i})$ are collected. That is, they need not have been generated by any fixed policy, but may have collected from some ensemble of behavioral policies, or even adaptively by human experts. The goal of off-line reinforcement learning is to use the n -sample dataset \mathcal{D} so as to estimate a policy $\hat{\pi} \equiv \hat{\pi}_n$ that (approximately) maximizes the expected return $J(\hat{\pi}_n)$. We expect that—at least for a sensible method for estimating $\hat{\pi}_n$ —the value gap $J(\pi^*) - J(\hat{\pi}_n)$ should decay to zero as n increases to infinity, and we are interested in understanding this rate of decay.

The use of pessimism is standard in off-line RL algorithms. Its purpose is to mitigate risks associated with “poor coverage” of the off-line dataset. For instance, the naive approach of simply maximizing Q -function estimates based on an off-line dataset can behave poorly when certain portions of the state-action space are not well covered by the given dataset. The pessimism principle suggests to form a *conservative estimate* of the value function—say with

$$\hat{f}_h(s, a) \leq \mathcal{T}_h^* \hat{f}_{h+1}(s, a) \tag{13a}$$

with high probability over state-action pairs (s, a) . Thus, the estimated value $\hat{f}_h(s, a)$ is an underestimate of the Bellman update, a form of conservatism that protects against unrealistically high estimates due to poor coverage. Doing so in the appropriate way ensures that

$$-\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [(\mathcal{T}_h^* \hat{f}_{h+1} - \hat{f}_h)(S_h, A_h)] \leq 0. \tag{13b}$$

Applying this upper bound to the inequality (12) yields the sub-optimality bound

$$J(\pi) - J(\hat{\pi}) \leq \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [(\mathcal{T}_h^* \hat{f}_{h+1} - \hat{f}_h)(S_h, A_h)].$$

Upper bounds derived in this manner only contain one portion of the Bellman residual. When the value functions are approximated in a parametric way (e.g., tabular problems, linear function

approximation), this line of analysis leads to value sub-optimality decaying at a “slow” $1/\sqrt{n}$ rate in terms of the sample size n (e.g., [23]). In contrast, an application of Theorem 1 can lead to value gaps bounded by $1/n$; see Section 3.3 for details in the linear setting.

2.3.3 Optimism in on-line RL

In the setting of on-line RL, a learning agent interacts with the environment in a sequential manner, receiving feedback in the form of rewards based on its actions. At the beginning, the learner possesses no prior knowledge of the system’s dynamics. In the t -th episode, the agent learns an optimal policy $\widehat{\pi}^{(t)}$ using existing observations, implements the policy and collects data $\{(s_h^{(t)}, a_h^{(t)}, r_h^{(t)})\}_{h=1}^H$ from the new episode. In each round, the system starts at an initial state $s_1^{(t)}$ independently drawn from a fixed distribution ξ_1 .

In this on-line setting, it is common to measure the performance of an algorithm by comparing it, over the T rounds of learning, with an oracle that knows and implements an optimal policy. At each round t , we incur the *instantaneous regret* $J(\pi^*) - J(\widehat{\pi}^{(t)})$, where π^* is any optimal policy. Over T rounds, we measure performance in terms of the *cumulative regret*

$$\text{Regret}(\{\widehat{\pi}^{(t)}\}_{t=1}^T) := \max_{\text{policy } \pi} \sum_{t=1}^T \{J(\pi) - J(\widehat{\pi}^{(t)})\} = \sum_{t=1}^T \underbrace{\{J(\pi^*) - J(\widehat{\pi}^{(t)})\}}_{\text{Regret at round } t}. \quad (14)$$

In a realistic problem, the cumulative regret of any procedure grows with T , and our goal is to obtain algorithms whose regret grows as slowly as possible.

In contrast to off-line RL, the on-line setting allows for exploring state-action pairs that have been rarely encountered; doing so makes sense since they might be associated with high rewards. Principled exploration of this type can be effected via the *optimism principle*: one constructs function estimates such that

$$\widehat{f}_h(s, a) \geq \mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1}(s, a) \quad (15a)$$

with high probability over state-action pairs.⁴ Note that $\widehat{f}_h(s, a)$ is optimistic in the sense that it is an over-estimate of the Bellman update $\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1}(s, a)$. In this way, we can ensure that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi} [(\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h)(S_h, A_h)] \leq 0. \quad (15b)$$

Combining this inequality with the telescope bound (12) allows one to upper bound the regret as

$$\text{Regret}(\{\widehat{\pi}^{(t)}\}_{t=1}^T) = \sum_{t=1}^T \{J(\pi^*) - J(\widehat{\pi}^{(t)})\} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}^{(t)}} [(\widehat{f}_h - \mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1})(S_h, A_h)].$$

which only includes a single portion of the Bellman residual. In the case of tabular or linear representations of the Q -functions, it results in a regret rate of \sqrt{T} (e.g., see the papers [20, 22]). In contrast, an appropriate use of Theorem 1 leads to regret growing only as $\log(T)$, which corresponds to a much better guarantee. See Section 3.4 for details in the case of linear function approximation.

In summary, then, the fast rates obtained in this paper are based on a different approach than the standard pessimism or optimism principles. Since we deal directly with the difference of

⁴Please refer to, for example, Lemma B.3 in the paper [22] for further details.

expectations in the bound (12), there is no need to nullify either of them through the use of these principles. However, it should be noted that we are assuming smoothness conditions that allow us to control this difference. As we discuss in the sequel, such smoothness conditions rule out certain “hard instances” used in past work on lower bounds (e.g. [20, 22, 23, 43]).

3 Consequences for linear function approximation

In this section, we explore some consequences of our general theory when applied to value-based methods using (finite-dimensional) linear function approximation. Notably, the geometry of the problem—having to do with curvature conditions—plays a key role in verifying the general stability conditions in this particular setting.

We consider a method that approximates value functions based on a weighted linear combination of base features. More concretely, let $\phi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a given feature map on the state-action space, and consider linear expansions of the form

$$f_{\mathbf{w}}(s, a) = \langle \phi(s, a), \mathbf{w} \rangle \equiv \sum_{j=1}^d w_j \phi_j(s, a)$$

where $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a weight vector. We adopt the conventional assumption that the feature mapping ϕ is uniformly bounded, meaning that $\|\phi(s, a)\|_2 \leq 1$ for all state-action pairs. Defining the linear function class $\mathcal{F} := \{f_{\mathbf{w}} \mid \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$, we note that the Minkowski difference class $\partial\mathcal{F}$ is equal to \mathcal{F} , since we have not imposed any constraints on \mathbf{w} .

In our analysis of linear approximation, we make use of the norm $\|f\|_h := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} [f^2(S_h, A_h)]}$, corresponding to L^2 -norm under the occupation measure induced by the optimal policy π^* . Given the linear structure, this norm has the explicit representation

$$\|f_{\mathbf{w}}\|_h \equiv \|\mathbf{w}\|_{\Sigma_h} := \sqrt{\mathbf{w}^\top \Sigma_h \mathbf{w}} \quad (16)$$

where we have defined the covariance matrix $\Sigma_h := \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} [\phi(S_h, A_h) \phi(S_h, A_h)^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.

3.1 Curvature for linear approximation

In analyzing methods based on linear approximation, it is natural to consider curvature conditions of the following type. At a given stage h , let f_h and f_h^* be (respectively) a value function estimate, and the optimal value function. Letting π_h and π_h^* denote the corresponding greedy-optimal policies, our analysis is based on curvature conditions of the form

$$\|\phi(s, \pi_h(s)) - \phi(s, \pi_h^*(s))\|_{\Sigma_h^{-1}} \leq C_h(s) \sqrt{d} \cdot \frac{\|f_h - f_h^*\|_h}{\|f_h^*\|_h}, \quad (\text{Curv1})$$

$$f_h(s, \pi_h(s)) - f_h(s, \pi_h^*(s)) \leq C_h(s) \sqrt{d} \cdot \|f_h^*\|_h \cdot \left\{ \frac{\|f_h - f_h^*\|_h}{\|f_h^*\|_h} \right\}^2, \quad (\text{Curv2})$$

where $C_h(s)$ is a state-dependent *curvature parameter*. As shown in our analysis, by introducing the \sqrt{d} -factor on the right-hand side, the quantity $C_h(s)$ can typically be chosen independent of dimension.

As our analysis shows, these two inequalities arise naturally from a sensitivity analysis of maximizing a linear objective function over a constraint set defined by the feature mapping. In particular, given a value function estimate of the form $f_h(s, a) = \langle \mathbf{w}_f, \phi(s, a) \rangle$, the induced greedy policy

$\pi_h(s)$ satisfies the relation

$$\langle \mathbf{w}_f, \phi(s, \pi_h(s)) \rangle = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \mathbf{w}_f, \phi(s, a) \rangle = \max_{u \in \Phi(s)} \langle \mathbf{w}_f, u \rangle, \quad (18)$$

where we have defined the constraint set $\Phi(s) = \{\phi(s, a) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\}$. When this constraint set exhibits sufficient curvature, as captured by the quantity $C_h(s)$, the change in optimizers grows linearly with the perturbation (inequality **(Curv1)**), while the corresponding function values grow quadratically (inequality **(Curv2)**). In Appendix E, we state and prove a general result (Proposition 2) that makes this intuition very precise.

Here let us consider a simple but concrete example that illustrates the linear-quadratic behavior.

Example 1 (*An illustration of curvature property*). Consider the state and action spaces

$$\mathcal{S} := \{(s_1, s_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid s_1^2 + s_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A} := \{(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid a_1^2 + a_2^2 \leq \varrho^2\} \text{ with } \varrho \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

along with the feature mapping $\phi(s, a) := s + a \in \mathbb{R}^2$. With these definitions, the constraint set $\Phi(s) = \{s + a \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ forms a disk in \mathbb{R}^2 centered at s with a radius of ϱ . Note that by definition of the feature mapping, we have

$$\|\phi(s, \pi(s)) - \phi(s, \pi^*(s))\|_2 = \|\pi(s) - \pi^*(s)\|_2 \quad (19)$$

for any pair of policies.




Figure 2. An example with feature mapping ϕ defined in \mathbb{R}^2 . **(a)** The relation between $\phi - \phi^*$ and $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*$. The feature vectors $\phi^* \equiv \phi(s, \pi^*(s))$ and $\phi \equiv \phi(s, \pi(s))$ at the greedy policies π^* and π are marked by stars. The figure shows that the Euclidean norm of the deviation $\phi - \phi^*$ is approximately $\varrho \angle(\mathbf{w}^*, \mathbf{w})$. Furthermore, when measured along the direction of \mathbf{w} , the deviation $\Pi_{\mathbf{w}}(\phi - \phi^*)$ is rather small and, in fact, is of second order with respect to the angle $\angle(\mathbf{w}^*, \mathbf{w})$. **(b)** The relation between the difference in vectors $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*$ and the angle $\angle(\mathbf{w}^*, \mathbf{w})$. A key observation is that $\angle(\mathbf{w}^*, \mathbf{w}) \leq \arcsin\{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_2 / \|\mathbf{w}^*\|_2\}$.

Suppose that the optimal Q -function is given by $f^*(s, a) = \langle \mathbf{w}^*, \phi(s, a) \rangle$ for some weight vector $\mathbf{w}^* \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Writing this weight vector as $\mathbf{w}^* = \|\mathbf{w}^*\|_2 (\cos \theta^*, \sin \theta^*)$ for some angle $\theta^* \in [0, 2\pi)$, the optimal policy takes the form $\pi^*(s) = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \mathbf{w}^*, s + a \rangle = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \mathbf{w}^*, a \rangle =$

$\varrho(\cos \theta^*, \sin \theta^*)$. Similarly, for a value function estimate f defined by the $\mathbf{w} = \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 (\cos \theta, \sin \theta)$, we can write $\pi(s) = \varrho(\cos \theta, \sin \theta)$. Combining with the representation (19), we find that

$$\|\phi(s, \pi(s)) - \phi(s, \pi^*(s))\|_2 = \varrho \|(\cos \theta - \cos \theta^*, \sin \theta - \sin \theta^*)\|_2 \leq \varrho \angle(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}^*), \quad (20a)$$

where the angle $\angle(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}^*)$ is defined as $\angle(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}^*) = |\theta - \theta^*|$. Furthermore, the difference in function values satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |f(s, \pi(s)) - f(s, \pi^*(s))| &= |\{\phi(s, \pi(s)) - \phi(s, \pi^*(s))\}^\top \mathbf{w}| \\ &= |\{\pi(s) - \pi^*(s)\}^\top \mathbf{w}| \\ &= \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \|\pi(s) - \Pi_{\mathbf{w}}(\pi^*(s))\|_2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \cdot \varrho \{1 - \cos \angle(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}^*)\} \leq \frac{1}{2} \varrho \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \{\angle(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}^*)\}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (20b)$$

See Figure 2(a) for an illustration of inequalities (20a) and (20b).

In order to establish curvature conditions, we need to relate the angle $\angle(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}^*)$ to the difference in vectors $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*$. As shown in Figure 2(b), when $\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{w}^*\|_2$, we have the bounds $\angle(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}^*) \leq \arcsin \frac{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_2}{\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_2} \leq \frac{2\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_2}{\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_2}$. These facts can be used to show that conditions **(Curv1)** and **(Curv2)** hold with parameter $C_h(s) := 16\sqrt{2} \varrho$. See Appendix G.2 for details. \triangle

Example 1 captures the geometric intuition that underlies a much broader class of examples for which the curvature conditions hold. In particular, suppose that the constraint set $\Phi(s) = \{\phi(s, a) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ can be defined by inequalities of the form

$$g_j(\phi(s, a)) \leq 0 \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, M$$

where each $g_j : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a strongly convex function. Note that Example 1 provides an instance of this set-up with a single constraint ($M = 1$), namely $g_1(\phi(s, a)) := \|\phi(s, a) - s\|_2^2 - \rho^2$. In general, the strong convexity conditions on the constraint functions $\{g_j\}_{j=1}^M$ allow one to prove that the curvature conditions **(Curv1)** and **(Curv2)** hold. We refer the reader to Proposition 2 in Appendix E.1 for a complete justification.

3.2 From curvature to fast rates

Thus far, we have defined some curvature properties, and argued that they are satisfied when the feature set has a suitable geometry. We now turn to the consequences of these curvature conditions for fast rates. Our result applies to a value function estimate $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$, based on d -dimensional linear approximation over H stages, whose residuals can be controlled in terms of a *regular* sequence $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{H-1}, \varepsilon_H = 0)$ such that

$$\varepsilon_h \leq \frac{\|f_{h+1}^*\|_{h+1}}{6\sqrt{d} \|C_{h+1}\| (H-h)^2 (1 + \log H)} \quad \text{for } h \in [H-1], \quad (21)$$

where $\|C_h\| := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1, \pi^*} [C_h^2(S_h)]}$.

Proposition 1. Consider a value function estimate $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ that has ε -bounded Bellman residuals (9a) for a regular sequence ε satisfying condition (21). Then the value sub-optimality is at most

$$J(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) - J(\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}) \leq 6\sqrt{d} \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \frac{\|C_h\|}{\|f_h^*\|_h} \left\{ \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \varepsilon_{h'} \right\}^2. \quad (22)$$

The proof of this result involves a number of steps. We provide all the details in Section 4.2, but let us isolate a key auxiliary result that underlies the argument.

We require the general set-up for stability given in Appendix A. It allows for a pseudo-metric d_h that is compatible with the norm $\|\cdot\|_h$ in the sense of definition (43). In the linear setting under consideration here, the nature of the curvature condition (**Curv1**) suggests a natural choice for this metric, namely

$$d_h(f, g) := \frac{\sqrt{d} \|C_h\|}{\|f_h^*\|_h} \cdot \|f - g\|_h \quad \text{for any } f, g \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (23)$$

As stated below in Lemma 1, this metric satisfies the condition (43) required in our analysis. Moreover, we can use it to connect the curvature properties to the stability conditions required for applying Theorem 1.

More precisely, the following auxiliary result plays a key role in the proof of Proposition 1:

Lemma 1. (a) The metric d_h given in equation (23) is well-defined and satisfies the bound (43).

(b) Consider any neighborhood (45) $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ with radius parameters bounded as

$$\rho_h \leq \frac{1}{2} (H - h + 1)^{-1} (1 + \log H)^{-1} \quad \text{for } h = 2, 3, \dots, H - 1.$$

Then the stability condition (**Stb**(\mathcal{T})) holds with $\kappa_{h,h'}(\mathcal{T}^*) \leq 3$ for all pairs $h \leq h'$.

(c) The stability condition (**Stb**(ξ)) holds with $\kappa_{h,h'}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) \leq \sqrt{d} \|C_h\|$ for all pairs $h \leq h'$.

See Appendix C for the proof of Lemma 1, and see Section 4.2 for the proof of Proposition 1.

3.3 Consequences for off-line RL

We now turn to some implications of Proposition 1 for off-line reinforcement learning. Let us recall the off-line setting: for each $h = 1, \dots, H - 1$, we are given a dataset $\mathcal{D}_h = \{(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}, s'_{h,i}, r_{h,i})\}_{i=1}^n$ of quadruples, from which we can compute estimates $\hat{\mathbf{f}} = (\hat{f}_h)_{h=1}^H$ with certain Bellman residuals $\{\varepsilon_h\}_{h=1}^{H-1}$, which then appear in the bound (22). The remaining factors on the right-hand side of inequality (22), including the term $\|C_h\| / \|f_h^*\|_h$ along with the dimension d , do not depend on the dataset itself (but rather on structural properties of the MDP). Consequently, in terms of statistical understanding, the main challenge is to establish high-probability bounds on the Bellman residuals $\{\varepsilon_h\}_{h=1}^{H-1}$ for a particular estimator.

3.3.1 Fitted Q-iteration (FQI)

As an illustration, let us analyze the use of *fitted Q-iteration* (FQI) for computing estimates of the Q -function. At a given stage $h = 1, \dots, H - 1$, we can use the associated data \mathcal{D}_h to define a regularized objective function

$$\mathcal{L}_h(f, g) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_h|} \left[\sum_{(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}, s'_{h,i}, r_{h,i}) \in \mathcal{D}_h} \{f(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}) - (r_{h,i} + \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} g(s'_{h,i}, a))\}^2 \right] + \Lambda_h^2(f). \quad (24)$$

Here g represents the target function from stage $h + 1$, and it defines the targeted responses $y_{h,i}(g) := r_{h,i} + \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} g(s'_{h,i}, a)$. For a given target g , we obtain a Q -function estimate for stage h by minimizing the functional $f \mapsto \mathcal{L}_h(f, g)$. Given that our objective is defined with a quadratic cost, doing so can be understood as a regression method for estimating the conditional expectation that underlies the Bellman update—viz.

$$\mathcal{T}_h^* g(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[y_{h,i}(g) \mid (s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}) = (s, a)]. \quad (25)$$

The additional quantity $\Lambda_h^2(f)$ in our definition (24) is a regularizer. Given this set-up, we can generate a Q -function estimate $\hat{f} = (\hat{f}_1, \dots, \hat{f}_H)$ by first initializing $\hat{f}_H = r_H$, and then recursively computing

$$\hat{f}_h = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{L}_h(f, \hat{f}_{h+1}), \quad \text{for } h = H - 1, H - 2, \dots, 2, 1. \quad (26)$$

Ridge penalty: It remains to define the choice of regularizer. For the linear functions $f = \langle \phi(\cdot), \mathbf{w} \rangle$ under consideration, a standard choice is the ridge penalty $\Lambda_h^2(f) := \lambda_h \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2$, where $\lambda_h \geq 0$ is the regularization weight. In the analysis here, we assume that the dataset consists of i.i.d. tuples (but this can be relaxed as needed). Concretely, the dataset \mathcal{D}_h at stage h consists of n quadruples $\{(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}, r_{h,i}, s'_{h,i})\}_{i=1}^n$, where the state-action pairs $\{(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i})\}_{i=1}^n$ are drawn i.i.d. from a behavioral distribution $\bar{\mu}_h$ over state-action pairs $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$. This data-generating distribution $\bar{\mu}_h$ may differ from the occupation measure associated with the optimal policy π^* —that is, $\mu_h^* = \mathbb{P}_{\xi_1, \pi^*}[(S_h, A_h) \in \cdot]$. This discrepancy leads to form of *covariate shift* in the regression steps that underlie the FQI procedure.

3.3.2 Fast rates for FQI-based estimates

We now state a corollary of Proposition 1, applicable to value function estimates based on FQI with ridge regression. Our result involves the d -dimensional empirical covariance matrices

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}} := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_h|} \sum_{\mathcal{D}_h} \phi(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}) \phi(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \quad (27)$$

which we assume to be well-conditioned, with a lower bound on the smallest eigenvalue $\hat{\mu}_{\min} \geq c_0 d^{-1}$. Additionally, we define the empirical conditional variances

$$\hat{\sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2(f) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_h|} \sum_{\mathcal{D}_h} \text{Var} \left[\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} f(S_{h+1}, a) \mid S_h = s_{h,i}, A_h = a_{h,i} \right] \quad \text{for any } f \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}. \quad (28)$$

Corollary 1 (Fast rates for ridge-based FQI). *For FQI based on ridge regression, with a sufficiently large sample size n and with suitable choices of the regularization parameters $\{\lambda_h\}_{h=1}^{H-1}$, the bound (22) from Proposition 1 holds with*

$$\varepsilon_h = c \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h^{\frac{1}{2}} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_2 \widehat{\sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}}(\widehat{f}_{h+1}) \sqrt{\frac{d \log(d/\delta)}{n}} \quad (29)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

See Appendix D.1 for the proof of this claim.

Fast rates and comparisons to past work: So as to be able to compare with results from past work, let us consider some consequences of the bound (29) under standard assumptions. Suppose that the rewards take values in the unit interval $[0, 1]$, and the covariate shift (discussed at more length below) is mild, in the sense that we view the term $\left\{ \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h^{\frac{1}{2}} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_2 \right\}_{h=1}^{H-1}$ as constant order. Furthermore, we treat the curvature terms $\{ \|C_h\| \}_{h=1}^{H-1}$ as constants. Under these conditions, it can be shown that the bound from Corollary 1 takes the form

$$J(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) - J(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}) \leq c \frac{d^{3/2} H^3}{n} \log(dH/\delta), \quad (30a)$$

and is valid for a sample size $n \geq cd^2 H^3$. See Appendix D.3.1 for the details of this calculation. Alternatively stated, Corollary 1 guarantees that for FQI using ridge regression with d -dimensional function approximation, the number of samples $n(\epsilon)$ required to obtain ϵ -optimal policy is at most

$$n_{\text{fast}}(\epsilon) \asymp \frac{d^{\frac{3}{2}} H^3}{\epsilon} + d^2 H^3, \quad (30b)$$

where we use \asymp to denote a scaling that ignores constants and logarithmic factors.

Let us compare this guarantee to related work by Zanette et al. [43], who analyzed the use of pessimistic actor-critic methods for linear function classes. When translated into the notation of our paper, their analysis established⁵ a sample complexity of the order

$$n_{\text{Zan}}(\epsilon) \asymp \frac{d^2 H^3}{\epsilon^2}. \quad (30c)$$

Consequently, we see that once the target error ϵ is relatively small— $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ —then stable MDPs can exhibit a much smaller $(1/\epsilon)$ sample complexity.

It should be noted that past work (e.g., [23, 43]) has established $(1/\epsilon^2)$ -lower bounds on the sample complexity of estimating ϵ policies in the off-line setting. However, these lower bounds *do not* contradict our fast rate guarantee (30b), because the “hard instances” used in these lower bound proofs violate the stability condition ($\mathbf{Stb}(\xi)$). In particular, even infinitesimally small perturbations in policy lead to occupation measures that are significantly different.

⁵See Appendix D.3.2 for the details of this calculation

Transfer learning and covariate shift: It is also worth noting that the bound (29) highlights an important connection to covariate shift. This phenomenon arises whenever the data is *not* collected under the occupation measure induced by the optimal policy. More precisely, while we measure the Bellman residual error using the L^2 -norm under this occupation measure μ_h^* , the data are drawn from the distribution $\bar{\mu}_h$, which might differ significantly from μ_h^* . This can be viewed as a form of covariate shift in the regression problems that underlie the FQI method.

For the linear function classes to which Corollary 1 applies, the effect of this covariate shift is measured by the term $\|\Sigma_h^{\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{\Sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2$ in equation (29). Here Σ_h is the covariance matrix under the occupation measure, whereas $\widehat{\Sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}}$ is the empirical covariance defined by the dataset. Such a condition is much milder than any assumption directly posed on density ratios. We note that related measures of covariate shift in off-line RL have appeared in past work (e.g., [12, 23, 43]), but without the connections to fast rates given here.

When is pessimism necessary? An interesting aspect of the guarantee from Corollary 1 is that it provides guarantees for off-policy RL (and with fast rates) using a method that does *not* incorporate any form of pessimism. This is a sharp contrast with many other methods for off-policy RL, such as pessimistic forms of Q -learning and actor-critic methods (e.g., [23, 43]).

To be clear, as noted following the bound (30a), the guarantee from Corollary 1 requires the sample size to be lower bounded as $n \geq cd^2H^3$. In contrast, pessimistic schemes only require a sample size sufficiently large to ensure validity of the Bellman residual upper bounds that underlie Corollary 1—meaning that $n \gtrsim d$ up to logarithmic factors. Thus, the pessimism principle can be useful for problems with smaller sample sizes.

3.4 Consequences for on-line RL

In this section, we explore some consequences of Proposition 1 for on-line reinforcement learning. We begin by describing a two-stage procedure⁶ that allows us to convert the risk bounds for FQI from off-line RL into regret in on-line RL:

Phase 1 (Exploration) In the initial T_0 episodes, the focus is purely on exploration, resulting in an estimate of Q -function denoted as $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}^{(T_0)}$. For instance, we may apply some fixed exploration policy in each episode, designed to ensure reasonable coverage of the data, and then use FQI to compute $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}^{(T_0)}$.

Phase 2 (Fine-tuning) For $k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$ with $K := \lceil \log_2(T/T_0) \rceil$, repeat the following process:

- In the t -th episode, for each $t = T_0 2^k + 1, \dots, T_0 2^{k+1}$, execute the greedy policy induced by function $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}^{(T_0 2^k)}$.
- Update the Q -function estimate $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}^{(T_0 2^{k+1})}$ using FQI based on observations collected from episodes $T_0 2^k + 1, T_0 2^k + 2, \dots, T_0 2^{k+1}$.

We assume the burn-in time T_0 is large enough so as to ensure the pilot Q -function estimate $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}^{(T_0)}$ obtained in Phase 1 falls within a certain “absorbing” region $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ around \mathbf{f}^* , characterized by the following properties:

- (*Absorbing property*) For any greedy policy $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ induced by a function $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, running it for at least T_0 episodes and applying FQI to the observed data yields an estimated function $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}$ that belongs to $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$.

⁶To be clear, the purpose of this scheme is primarily conceptual, rather than practical in nature.

- (*Bounded covariate shift*) For any function $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, the associated greedy policy $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is a sufficiently accurate approximation to $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ so as to ensure that the covariate shift term $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h^{\frac{1}{2}} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2$ is upper bounded by a constant. (Here $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h$ is the covariance matrix under $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$, whereas $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{h,\mathcal{D}}$ is the empirical covariance when collecting samples under the greedy policy $\boldsymbol{\pi}$.)

Under these conditions, we have the following bound on the regret (14), as previously defined.

Corollary 2. *For FQI based on ridge regression with rewards in $[0, 1]$, with a sufficiently large burn-in time T_0 and with suitable choices of the regularization parameters $\{\lambda_h\}_{h=1}^{H-1}$, the two-phase scheme achieves regret bounded as*

$$\text{Regret}(T) \leq c \{T_0 \cdot H + d\sqrt{d} H^4 \log T \cdot \log(dHK/\delta)\} \quad (31)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

See Appendix D.2 for the proof.

Sharper bound on regret: The leading term (as T grows) in the bound (31) grows as $\log T$, which is much smaller than the typical \sqrt{T} -rate found in past work [20, 22]. The \sqrt{T} rate has been shown to be unimprovable in general, but the worst-case instances [20, 22] that lead to \sqrt{T} -regret violate the stability conditions used in our analysis.

When is optimism needed? The use of optimism—by adding bonuses to the current value function estimates so as to encourage exploration—underlies many schemes in on-line RL. An interesting take-away from Corollary 2 is that under the stability conditions highlighted by our theory, it is possible to achieve excellent regret bounds without the use of optimism. In our two-phase scheme, the only exploration occurs in Phase 1. All other data is simply collected using the greedy policy induced by the current Q -function estimate. A well-designed exploration scheme—one that might incorporate the optimism principle—is necessary only during the burn-in Phase 1.

There are degenerate settings in which additional exploration might be required. For example, consider the degenerate situation in which the optimal policy $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ leads to a (nearly) rank-deficient covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h$. In such cases, executing greedy policies in a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ might fail to generate observations that sufficiently represent the underlying dynamics, thereby hindering efficient estimation. This observation has parallels with results on contextual bandits, where exploration-free algorithms are known to be efficient under a covariate diversity condition [3]. Exploration becomes necessary when this assumption is not satisfied.

4 Proofs

This section is devoted to the proofs of Theorem 1 and Proposition 1. In both cases, we break down the proofs into a number of auxiliary claims, and defer the proofs of these more technical results to the appendices, as indicated. All of our proofs make use of the more general stability framework described in Appendix A.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 1

We begin with the proof of Theorem 1, which consists of three main steps. These steps rely on two auxiliary lemmas whose proofs are fairly technical, so that they are deferred to in Appendices B.1 and B.2.

High-level outline: Let us outline the three steps of the proof. In Step 1, we use a one-step expansion of the difference in the occupation measures to reformulate the standard telescope inequality (12). Doing so results in a relation with structure similar to that of the left-hand side of inequality $(\mathbf{Stb}(\xi))$. In Step 2, we develop a constraint on the function estimation error $d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*)$ that ensures the occupation measure produced by policy $\widehat{\pi}$ remains stable and does not deviate too much from the occupation measure associated with the optimal policy π^* . In Step 3, we use Bellman stability $(\mathbf{Stb}(\mathcal{T}))$ to connect the Q -function error $\widehat{f}_h - f_h^*$ with Bellman residuals. With this high-level view in place, we now work through the three steps.

4.1.1 Step 1: Reformulation of the telescope inequality.

Recall the standard telescope inequality (12). Our proof makes use of an alternative form, which involves the functions

$$\Delta_h(\pi; s, a) = \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^{\pi} (\mathcal{T}_{h'}^* \widehat{f}_{h'+1} - \widehat{f}_{h'}) (s, a). \quad (32)$$

Lemma 2. *Given a Q -function estimate $\widehat{f} = (\widehat{f}_1, \dots, \widehat{f}_{H-1}, \widehat{f}_H = r_H)$ and the associated greedy policy $\widehat{\pi}$, we have the bound*

$$J(\pi) - J(\widehat{\pi}) \leq \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} [\Delta_h(\pi; s_h, \pi_h(s_h)) - \Delta_h(\pi; s_h, \widehat{\pi}_h(s_h))] \quad (33)$$

valid for any policy π .

See Appendix B.1 for the proof.

We apply the bound (33) with $\pi = \pi^*$. Following some algebra, we find that

$$J(\pi^*) - J(\widehat{\pi}) \leq \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \widehat{\beta}(h, h') \cdot \varepsilon_{h'},$$

where $\varepsilon_{h'}$ is an upper bound on the Bellman residual $\|\mathcal{T}_{h'}^* \widehat{f}_{h'+1} - \widehat{f}_{h'}\|_{h'}$ as given in equation (9a). The term $\widehat{\beta}(h, h')$ is given by

$$\widehat{\beta}(h, h') := \sup_{f \in \partial \mathcal{F}: \|f\|_{h'} > 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{\|f\|_{h'}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \left[(\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f)(s_h, \pi_h^*(s_h)) - (\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f)(s_h, \widehat{\pi}_h(s_h)) \right] \right| \right\}. \quad (34a)$$

We note that the left-hand side of inequality $(\mathbf{Stb}(\xi))$ has a similar form to the term $\widehat{\beta}(h, h')$, differing only in that the expectation is taken over the occupation measure of running the optimal policy π^* , rather than the estimated policy $\widehat{\pi}$.

4.1.2 Step 2: Constraint to ensure stability

Our next step is to establish an upper bound on the coefficient $\widehat{\beta}(h, h')$ defined by the estimated policy $\widehat{\pi}$ in terms of the analogous quantity defined by the optimal policy π^* —namely, the coefficient

$$\beta(h, h') := \sup_{f \in \partial \mathcal{F}: \|f\|_{h'} > 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{\|f\|_{h'}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} \left[(\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f)(s_h, \pi_h^*(s_h)) - (\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f)(s_h, \widehat{\pi}_h(s_h)) \right] \right| \right\}. \quad (34b)$$

In order to do so, we demonstrate that a sufficiently small function estimation error $d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*)$ ensures the inequality

$$\sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \widehat{\beta}(h, h') \cdot \varepsilon_{h'} \leq 2 \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \beta(h, h') \cdot \varepsilon_{h'}. \quad (35)$$

Once we have established this bound, we can replace the term $\beta(h, h')$ with $\kappa_{h,h'}(\pi^*) \cdot \|\widehat{f}_h - f_h^*\|_h / \|f_h^*\|_h$, using the inequality **(Stb(ξ))**.

We summarize the result in the following auxiliary lemma:

Lemma 3. *Suppose that the function estimation errors satisfy $d_h(f_h, f_h^*) \leq \frac{1}{2b_{\mathcal{F}}}(H-h+1)^{-1}$ for $h = 2, 3, \dots, H-1$ and the sequence $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{H-1}, \varepsilon_H = 0)$ satisfies the regularity condition (9b). Then we have*

$$J(\pi^*) - J(\widehat{\pi}) \leq 2 \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \frac{\|\widehat{f}_h - f_h^*\|_h}{\|f_h^*\|_h} \left\{ \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \kappa_{h,h'}(\pi^*) \varepsilon_{h'} \right\}. \quad (36)$$

See Appendix B.2 for the proof.

4.1.3 Step 3: Connecting Q -function error and Bellman residuals

The remaining piece of the proof is to connect the function difference $\widehat{f}_h - f_h^*$ with Bellman residuals $\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h$, using the stability condition **(Stb(\mathcal{T}))** on the Bellman operator \mathcal{T}^* . This is relatively straightforward: indeed, we claim that

$$\|\widehat{f}_h - f_h^*\|_h \leq \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \kappa_{h,h'}(\mathcal{T}^*) \cdot \|\mathcal{T}_{h'}^* \widehat{f}_{h'+1} - \widehat{f}_{h'}\|_{h'}. \quad (37)$$

Recall that $f_h^* = \mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1}^*$ for $h = 1, 2, \dots, H-1$. Therefore, we have

$$\widehat{f}_h - f_h^* = (\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1}^*) - (\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h).$$

By employing the triangle inequality and the Bellman stability given in equation **(Stb(\mathcal{T}))**, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{f}_h - f_h^*\|_h &\leq \|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_h + \|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1}^*\|_h \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_h + \kappa_h^* \|\widehat{f}_{h+1} - f_{h+1}^*\|_{h+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying this inequality recursively yields the claim (37).

With this piece in place, we can complete the proof of Theorem 1. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) - J(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2 \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \frac{\|\widehat{f}_h - f_h^*\|_h}{\|f_h^*\|_h} \left\{ \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{h,h'}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) \varepsilon_{h'} \right\} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2 \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \frac{1}{\|f_h^*\|_h} \left\{ \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{h,h'}(\mathcal{T}^*) \varepsilon_{h'} \right\} \left\{ \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{h,h'}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) \varepsilon_{h'} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here step (a) is a restatement of the bound (36) from Lemma 3, whereas step (b) follows from inequality (37). Thus, we have established the claim given in Theorem 1.

4.2 Proof of Proposition 1

We now turn to the proof of Proposition 1, which provides a guarantee for value-based methods using linear function approximation.

4.2.1 High-level overview

There are two main ingredients in the proof: (i) the auxiliary claims previously stated as Lemma 1 following the statement of the proposition; and (ii) verifying that the conditions of Lemma 1 hold, so that we may apply it, in conjunction with Theorem 1, so as to establish the claim. The proof of Lemma 1 is given in Appendix C, whereas we prove step (ii) in this section.

More precisely, our goal is to establish the following auxiliary claim. Consider any sequence $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{H-1}, \varepsilon_H = 0)$ satisfying the conditions of Proposition 1, and any estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{f}}$ such that $\|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_h \leq \varepsilon_h$ for $h \in [H-1]$. We then claim that

$$d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*) \leq \frac{1}{2(H-h+1)(1+\log H)} \quad \text{for indices } h = 1, 2, \dots, H-1, H. \quad (38)$$

In other words, the estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{f}}$ lies within a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ around Q -function \boldsymbol{f}^* with $\rho_h \leq \frac{1}{2}(H-h+1)^{-1}(1+\log H)^{-1}$. This auxiliary claim (38) allows us to invoke Lemma 1, thereby allowing us to prove the claimed bound (22) as a consequence of Theorem 1. Accordingly, the remainder of our effort is devoted to the proof of this auxiliary statement.

4.2.2 Proof of the claim (38)

We proceed by induction.

Base case: Let us first consider the base case with $h = H$. The relation $\widehat{f}_H = f_H^* = r_H$ implies $d_H(\widehat{f}_H, f_H^*) = 0$. Therefore, inequality (38) naturally holds for $h = H$.

Induction step: Suppose that inequality (38) is met for $h = h' + 1, h' + 2, \dots, H$. We now establish the inequality (38) for $h = h'$ based on this induction hypothesis.

We apply the triangle inequality and derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{f}_{h'} - f_{h'}^*\|_{h'} &\leq \|\mathcal{T}_{h'}^* \widehat{f}_{h'+1} - \widehat{f}_{h'}\|_{h'} + \|\mathcal{T}_{h'}^* \widehat{f}_{h'+1} - \mathcal{T}_{h'}^* f_{h'+1}^*\|_{h'} \\
&\leq \varepsilon_{h'} + \|\mathcal{T}_{h'}^* \widehat{f}_{h'+1} - \mathcal{T}_{h'}^* f_{h'+1}^*\|_{h'}.
\end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

As shown in inequality (56) in the proof of Lemma 1(b) in Appendix C.2, the bound (38) with $h = h' + 1$ implies

$$\|\mathcal{T}_{h'}^* \widehat{f}_{h'+1} - \mathcal{T}_{h'}^* f_{h'+1}^*\|_{h'} \leq \kappa_{h'}^* \cdot \|\widehat{f}_{h'+1} - f_{h'+1}^*\|_{h'+1}$$

for $\kappa_{h'}^* = 1 + \frac{1}{2}(H - h')^{-1}(1 + \log H)^{-1}$. Furthermore, inequality (37) in Section 4.1.3 (Step 3 in the proof of Theorem 1) ensures

$$\|\widehat{f}_{h'+1} - f_{h'+1}^*\|_{h'+1} \leq \sum_{j=h'+1}^{H-1} \kappa_{h'+1,j}(\mathcal{T}^*) \cdot \|\mathcal{T}_j^* \widehat{f}_{j+1} - \widehat{f}_j\|_j \leq \sum_{j=h'+1}^{H-1} \kappa_{h'+1,j}(\mathcal{T}^*) \cdot \varepsilon_j. \quad (40)$$

We use the relation $\kappa_{h'}^* \cdot \kappa_{h'+1,j}(\mathcal{T}^*) = \kappa_{h',j}(\mathcal{T}^*)$ and find that

$$\|\mathcal{T}_{h'}^* \widehat{f}_{h'+1} - \mathcal{T}_{h'}^* f_{h'+1}^*\|_{h'} \leq \sum_{j=h'+1}^{H-1} \kappa_{h',j}(\mathcal{T}^*) \cdot \varepsilon_j.$$

Under the induction hypothesis that inequality (38) holds for $h = h' + 1, h' + 2, \dots, H$, Lemma 1(b) guarantees $\kappa_{h',j}(\mathcal{T}^*) \leq 3$. It follows that

$$\|\mathcal{T}_{h'}^* \widehat{f}_{h'+1} - \mathcal{T}_{h'}^* f_{h'+1}^*\|_{h'} \leq 3 \sum_{j=h'+1}^{H-1} \varepsilon_j. \quad (41)$$

Combining the bound (41) with inequality (39) yields

$$\|\widehat{f}_{h'} - f_{h'}^*\|_{h'} \leq \varepsilon_{h'} + 3 \sum_{j=h'+1}^{H-1} \varepsilon_j \leq 3(H - h' + 1) \varepsilon_{h'-1},$$

where the second inequality follows from the regularity condition (9b).

We further apply the definition of metric d_h in equation (23) and obtain

$$d_{h'}(\widehat{f}_{h'}, f_{h'}^*) = \frac{\sqrt{d} \|C_{h'}\|}{\|f_{h'}^*\|_{h'}} \cdot \|\widehat{f}_{h'} - f_{h'}^*\|_{h'} \leq \frac{3\sqrt{d} \|C_{h'}\| (H - h' + 1)}{\|f_{h'}^*\|_{h'}} \cdot \varepsilon_{h'-1}.$$

Substituting $\varepsilon_{h'-1}$ with its upper bound in inequality (21) then leads to the validity of inequality (38) with $h = h'$, which completes the proof of Proposition 1.

5 Discussion

This paper introduces a novel approach for the analysis of value-based RL methods for continuous state-action spaces. Our analysis highlights two key stability properties of MDPs under which much sharper bounds on value sub-optimality can be guaranteed. Studying in some detail the case of linear approximations to value functions, we showed that these stability conditions hold for a broad class of problems. Our analysis offers fresh perspectives on the commonly used pessimism and optimism principles, in off-line and on-line settings respectively, and highlight connections between RL and transfer learning.

Our study leaves open various questions for future work. First, our main result (Theorem 1) has consequences for linear quadratic control, to be described in an upcoming paper [10]. It provides

insight into the role of covariate shift in linear quadratic control, as well as efficient exploration in the on-line setting. Second, our current statistical analysis focused on i.i.d. data with linear function approximation. It is interesting to consider the extensions to dependent data and non-parametric function approximation (e.g. kernels, boosting, and neural networks). Third, while this paper has provided upper bounds, it remains to address the complementary question of lower bounds for policy optimization over the classes of stable MDPs isolated here. Last, to better align our framework with real-world scenarios, we intend to go beyond the idealized completeness condition used in this paper, and treat the role of model mis-specification.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by NSF grant CCF-1955450, ONR grant N00014-21-1-2842, and NSF DMS-2311072 to MJW.

References

- [1] A. Altamimi, C. Lagoa, J. G. Borges, M. E. McDill, C. Andriotis, and K. Papakonstantinou. Large-scale wildfire mitigation through deep reinforcement learning. *Frontiers in Forests and Global Change*, 5:734330, 2022.
- [2] P. L. Bartlett, O. Bousquet, and S. Mendelson. Local Rademacher complexities. *Annals of Statistics*, 33(4):1497–1537, 2005.
- [3] H. Bastani, M. Bayati, and K. Khosravi. Mostly exploration-free algorithms for contextual bandits. *Management Science*, 67(3):1329–1349, 2021.
- [4] D. Bertsekas. *Lessons from AlphaZero for optimal, model predictive, and adaptive control*. Athena Scientific, 2022.
- [5] D. Bertsekas and J. N. Tsitsiklis. *Neuro-dynamic programming*. Athena Scientific, 1996.
- [6] S. Dean, H. Mania, N. Matni, B. Recht, and S. Tu. On the sample complexity of the linear quadratic regulator. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 20(4):633–679, 2020.
- [7] J. Degraeve, F. Felici, and J. B. et al. Magnetic control of tokamak plasmas through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 602:414–419, 2022.
- [8] S. Du, S. Kakade, J. Lee, S. Lovett, G. Mahajan, W. Sun, and R. Wang. Bilinear classes: A structural framework for provable generalization in RL. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2826–2836. PMLR, 2021.
- [9] Y. Duan, C. Jin, and Z. Li. Risk bounds and Rademacher complexity in batch reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2892–2902. PMLR, 2021.
- [10] Y. Duan and M. J. Wainwright. Covariate shift in linear quadratic control.
- [11] Y. Duan and M. J. Wainwright. Policy evaluation from a single path: Multi-step methods, mixing and mis-specification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.03899*, 2022.
- [12] Y. Duan and M. Wang. Minimax-optimal off-policy evaluation with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2701–2709. PMLR, 2020.

- [13] Y. Duan, M. Wang, and M. J. Wainwright. Optimal policy evaluation using kernel-based temporal difference methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.12002*, 2021.
- [14] D. J. Foster, S. M. Kakade, J. Qian, and A. Rakhlin. The statistical complexity of interactive decision making. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.13487*, 2021.
- [15] J. Gijsbrechts, R. N. Boute, J. A. Van Mieghem, and D. J. Zhang. Can deep reinforcement learning improve inventory management? Performance on lost sales, dual-sourcing, and multi-echelon problems. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 24(3):1349–1368, 2022.
- [16] A. Gonen and S. Shalev-Shwartz. Fast rates for empirical risk minimization of strict saddle problems. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1043–1063. PMLR, 2017.
- [17] E. Hazan, A. Agarwal, and S. Kale. Logarithmic regret algorithms for online convex optimization. *Machine Learning*, 69:169–192, 2007.
- [18] J. He, D. Zhou, and Q. Gu. Logarithmic regret for reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4171–4180. PMLR, 2021.
- [19] Y. Hu, N. Kallus, and M. Uehara. Fast rates for the regret of offline reinforcement learning. *Conference on Learning Theory*, 134:2462–2462, 2021.
- [20] C. Jin, Z. Allen-Zhu, S. Bubeck, and M. I. Jordan. Is Q-learning provably efficient? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [21] C. Jin, Q. Liu, and S. Miryoosefi. Bellman eluder dimension: New rich classes of RL problems, and sample-efficient algorithms. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:13406–13418, 2021.
- [22] C. Jin, Z. Yang, Z. Wang, and M. I. Jordan. Provably efficient reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2137–2143. PMLR, 2020.
- [23] Y. Jin, Z. Yang, and Z. Wang. Is pessimism provably efficient for offline RL? *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5084–5096, 2021.
- [24] B. R. Kiran, I. Sobh, V. Talpaert, P. Mannion, A. A. Al Sallab, S. Yogamani, and P. Pérez. Deep reinforcement learning for autonomous driving: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(6):4909–4926, 2021.
- [25] T. Koren and K. Levy. Fast rates for exp-concave empirical risk minimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.
- [26] T. Liang, A. Rakhlin, and K. Sridharan. Learning with square loss: Localization through offset Rademacher complexity. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1260–1285. PMLR, 2015.
- [27] H. Mania, S. Tu, and B. Recht. Certainty equivalence is efficient for linear quadratic control. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [28] Y. Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.

- [29] T. Nguyen-Tang, M. Yin, S. Gupta, S. Venkatesh, and R. Arora. On instance-dependent bounds for offline reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. *Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence*, 2023.
- [30] M. L. Puterman and S. L. Brumelle. On the convergence of policy iteration in stationary dynamic programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 4(1):60–69, 1979.
- [31] A. Rao and T. Jelvis. *Foundations of Reinforcement Learning with Applications to Finance*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2022.
- [32] P. Rashidinejad, B. Zhu, C. Ma, J. Jiao, and S. Russell. Bridging offline reinforcement learning and imitation learning: A tale of pessimism. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:11702–11716, 2021.
- [33] B. Recht. A tour of reinforcement learning: The view from continuous control. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 2:253–279, 2019.
- [34] D. Silver, J. Schrittwieser, K. Simonyan, I. Antonoglou, A. Huang, et al. Mastering the game of Go without human knowledge. *Nature*, 550(7676):354, 2017.
- [35] S. Spielberg, A. Tulsyan, N. P. Lawrence, P. D. Loewen, and R. B. Gopaluni. Toward self-driving processes: A deep reinforcement learning approach to control. *Amer. Inst. Chem. Eng. Journal*, 65:e16689, 2022.
- [36] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [37] L. Tai, G. Paolo, and M. Liu. Virtual-to-real deep reinforcement learning: Continuous control of mobile robots for mapless navigation. In *2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 31–36. IEEE, 2017.
- [38] M. J. Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [39] X. Wang, Q. Cui, and S. S. Du. On gap-dependent bounds for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:14865–14877, 2022.
- [40] T. Xie and N. Jiang. Q^* approximation schemes for batch reinforcement learning: A theoretical comparison. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 550–559. PMLR, 2020.
- [41] M. Yin, Y. Duan, M. Wang, and Y.-X. Wang. Near-optimal offline reinforcement learning with linear representation: Leveraging variance information with pessimism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05804*, 2022.
- [42] C. Yu, J. Liu, S. Nematy, and G. Yin. Reinforcement learning in healthcare: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 55(1):1–36, 2021.
- [43] A. Zanette, M. J. Wainwright, and E. Brunskill. Provable benefits of actor-critic methods for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:13626–13640, 2021.

A General set-up for stability

In this appendix, we describe a general set-up for stability, along with a precise definition of the local neighborhood \mathcal{N} in our main theorem.

A.1 Stability via compatible semi/pseudo-norms

In the main text, we defined stability conditions in terms of the L^2 -norm induced by the occupation measure of the optimal policy. Here we generalize this definition by allowing for more general pairs of (semi/pseudo) norms. In doing so, it is convenient to define the *Minkowski difference*

$$\partial\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F} = \{f - g \mid f, g \in \mathcal{F}\}. \quad (42)$$

Given a value function estimate $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$, our more general framework involves two notions of its closeness to the optimal Q -function, as defined by pseudo-metrics $\{d_h\}_{h=1}^H$ and semi-norms $\{\|\cdot\|_h\}_{h=1}^H$ on the difference class $\partial\mathcal{F}$.

- Our stability conditions are defined on a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(\rho)$ of the optimal Q -function, as specified by pseudo-metrics $\{d_h\}_{h=1}^H$.
- The resulting error bounds are stated in terms of the Bellman residuals $\|\mathcal{T}_h^* \hat{f}_{h+1} - \hat{f}_h\|_h$, as measured in the semi-norm $\|\cdot\|_h$.

We require that this pair of pseudo-metric and semi-norm are *compatible* in the sense that

$$\sup_{g \in \partial\mathcal{F} : \|g\|_h > 0} \frac{\|(\mathcal{P}_{h-1}^\pi - \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^*)g\|_{h-1}}{\|g\|_h} \leq d_h(f_h, f_h^*), \quad (43)$$

where π denotes the greedy policy associated with function \mathbf{f} . We adopt \mathcal{P}_h^* as a convenient shorthand for the transition operator $\mathcal{P}_h^{\pi^*}$ defined by an optimal policy π^* .⁷

Defining the multi-step transition operator $\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* := \mathcal{P}_h^* \mathcal{P}_{h+1}^* \cdots \mathcal{P}_{h'-1}^*$, we require that the semi-norms satisfy the bound

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f\|_h \leq b_{\mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{h'} \quad \text{for any } f \in \partial\mathcal{F}, \quad (44)$$

uniformly over all pairs $h < h'$.

As one special case (discussed in the main text), suppose that $\|\cdot\|_h$ is the L^2 -norm induced by the state-action occupation measure induced by the optimal policy—that is

$$\|f\|_h := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}[f^2(S_h, A_h)]} \quad \text{for any } f \in \partial\mathcal{F}. \quad (8)$$

With this choice, it can be verified (see Appendix G.1 for details) that condition (44) holds with $b_{\mathcal{F}} = 1$.

For certain problems, this pair can be chosen to be equivalent, meaning that $d_h(f, g) = c\|f - g\|_h$ for some universal constant $c > 0$. For instance, this choice is valid when using linear function approximation, as discussed in detail in Section 3. However, it is useful to retain the flexibility of a general choice of these pseudo-metrics.

⁷We adopt a complementary definition that $\mathcal{P}_0^\pi = 0$ for any policy π .

A.2 Stability neighborhood

Let us now define the neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ over which the stability conditions are assumed to hold. It is specified by a sequence $\boldsymbol{\rho} = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_H)$ of positive reals that are small enough to satisfy the bound $\rho_h \leq \frac{1}{2b_{\mathcal{F}}} (H - h + 1)^{-1}$. Here $b_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the stability parameter given in the bound (44). Given any such sequence, we say that a Q -function $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_H)$ is a $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ -good approximation to the optimal Q -function $\mathbf{f}^* = (f_1^*, \dots, f_H^*)$ if

$$d_h(f_h, f_h^*) \leq \rho_h \quad \text{for } h \in [H]. \quad (45)$$

We use $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ as a shorthand for the set of all Q -functions that are $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ -good approximations to \mathbf{f}^* . In our statement of Theorem 1, the neighborhood \mathcal{N} is equivalent to $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ defined in this way.

B Proof of auxiliary lemmas for Theorem 1

We now turn to proofs of the two auxiliary results used to establish our main theorem, with Lemmas 2 and 3 treated in in Appendices B.1 and B.2, respectively.

B.1 Proof of Lemma 2

For any integrable vector function $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_H) \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times \mathcal{A} \times H}$, we define

$$D(\mathbf{g}) = \sum_{h=1}^H (\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} - \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}}) [g_h(S_h, A_h)]. \quad (46a)$$

We claim that this functional satisfies the recursive relation

$$D(\mathbf{g}) = \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}} [g_h(S_h, \pi_h(S_h)) - g_h(S_h, \widehat{\pi}_h(S_h))] + D(\mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \mathbf{g}), \quad (46b)$$

where we have introduced the shorthand $\mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \mathbf{g} := (\mathcal{P}_1^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} g_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{H-1}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} g_H, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times \mathcal{A} \times H}$.

Taking this claim as given for the moment, let us prove the bound (33) from Lemma 2. First, we set $\mathbf{g} := (\mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}})^h \mathbf{g} = (\mathcal{P}_{1,1+h}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} g_{1+h}, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{H-h,H}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} g_H, 0, \dots, 0)$ in equation (46b) for $h = 0, 1, \dots, H-1$, which yields

$$D((\mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}})^h \mathbf{g}) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq h' \leq j \leq H, \\ j-h'=h}} \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}} [\{\mathcal{P}_{h',j}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} g_j\}(S_{h'}, \pi_{h'}(S_{h'})) - \{\mathcal{P}_{h',j}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} g_j\}(S_{h'}, \widehat{\pi}_{h'}(S_{h'}))] + D((\mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}})^{h+1} \mathbf{g}).$$

Note that $(\mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}})^H \mathbf{g} = 0$, which implies $D((\mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}})^H \mathbf{g}) = 0$. We then sum the resulting bounds so as to obtain

$$D(\mathbf{g}) = \sum_{1 \leq h \leq h' \leq H} \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}} [\{\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} g_{h'}\}(S_h, \pi_h(S_h)) - \{\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} g_{h'}\}(S_h, \widehat{\pi}_h(S_h))]. \quad (47)$$

Setting $\mathbf{g} = \mathcal{T}^* \widehat{\mathbf{f}} - \widehat{\mathbf{f}}$, or equivalently $g_h = \mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h$, in equation (47), we find that

$$D(\mathcal{T}^* \widehat{\mathbf{f}} - \widehat{\mathbf{f}}) = \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}} [\Delta_h(\boldsymbol{\pi}; S_h, \pi_h(S_h)) - \Delta_h(\boldsymbol{\pi}; S_h, \widehat{\pi}_h(S_h))],$$

where we have used the fact (32) that $\Delta_h(\boldsymbol{\pi}; \cdot) = \sum_{h'=h}^H \mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^\pi (\mathcal{T}_{h'}^* \widehat{f}_{h'+1} - \widehat{f}_{h'})$. Thus, we have established the bound (33) stated in Lemma 2.

It remains to establish the auxiliary claim (46b). Note that the functional D can be decomposed as $D(\mathbf{g}) = D_1 + D_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &:= \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}} [g_h(S_h, \pi_h(S_h)) - g_h(S_h, \widehat{\pi}_h(S_h))] \quad \text{and} \\ D_2 &:= \sum_{h=1}^H (\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} - \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}}) [g_h(S_h, \pi_h(S_h))]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the tower property of conditional expectation, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} D_2 &= \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} (\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} - \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}}) [\mathbb{E}[g_{h+1}(S_{h+1}, \pi_{h+1}(S_{h+1})) \mid S_h, A_h]] \\ &= \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} (\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} - \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}}) [(\mathcal{P}_h^\pi g_{h+1})(S_h, A_h)] \\ &= D(\mathcal{P}^\pi \mathbf{g}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the expressions for D_1 and D_2 above yields the claim (46b).

B.2 Proof of Lemma 3

The key step in proving Lemma 3 is establishing that inequality (35) holds when the function estimation error $d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*)$ is sufficiently small. In order to do so, we need to establish upper bounds on the term $\widehat{\beta}(h, h')$ by using $\beta(h, h')$. In particular, we will show that for any $1 \leq h \leq h' \leq H-1$,

$$\widehat{\beta}(h, h') \leq \beta(h, h') + \sum_{j=1}^{h-1} \widehat{\beta}(j, h-1) \cdot b_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*). \quad (48)$$

The inequality (48) is derived based on the bounds (43) and (44) that define metric d_h and parameter $b_{\mathcal{F}}$. After a close examination of the right-hand side of this inequality, it becomes evident that as long as the function estimation error $d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*)$ is sufficiently small, the terms associated with $d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*)$ are negligible and are dominated by $\beta(h, h')$. Consequently, inequality (35) within the arguments in Section 4.1.2 is likely to hold true.

With claim (48) assumed to be valid at this point, we now establish a proper upper bound on the estimation error $d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*)$ under which inequality (35) is satisfied. By taking linear combinations of inequality (48) using weights $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{H-1}, \varepsilon_H = 0)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \widehat{\beta}(h, h') \cdot \varepsilon_{h'} &\leq \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \beta(h, h') \cdot \varepsilon_{h'} \\ &\quad + \sum_{h=2}^{H-1} \sum_{j=1}^{h-1} \widehat{\beta}(j, h-1) \cdot b_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*) \sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \varepsilon_{h'}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

When the sequence $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{H-1}, \varepsilon_H = 0)$ is regular in the sense that inequality (9b) holds, the bound (49) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq h \leq h' \leq H} \widehat{\beta}(h, h') \cdot \varepsilon_{h'} &\leq \sum_{1 \leq h \leq h' \leq H} \beta(h, h') \cdot \varepsilon_{h'} \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq h \leq h' \leq H-2} \widehat{\beta}(h, h') \cdot \varepsilon_{h'} \cdot b_{\mathcal{F}}(H-h') \cdot d_{h'+1}(\widehat{f}_{h'+1}, f_{h'+1}^*). \end{aligned}$$

Under the condition $d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*) \leq \frac{1}{2b_{\mathcal{F}}}(H-h+1)^{-1}$ for $2 \leq h \leq H-1$, the inequality above implies bound (35), which further establishes the bound (36), as stated in Lemma 3.

It remains to prove the relation between $\widehat{\beta}(h, h')$ and $\beta(h, h')$, as shown in inequality (48).

Proof of bound (48): It is evident that inequality (48) holds for $h = 1$, therefore, we focus on its validation for indices $2 \leq h \leq H-1$. Recall the definitions of functions $\widehat{\beta}(h, h')$ and $\beta(h, h')$, as given by equations (34a) and (34b). We apply the triangle inequality and derive that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\widehat{\beta}(h, h') - \beta(h, h')| \\ &\leq \sup_{f \in \partial \mathcal{F}: \|f\|_{h'} > 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{\|f\|_{h'}} \left| (\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} - \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}) \left[(\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f)(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) - (\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f)(S_h, \widehat{\pi}_h(S_h)) \right] \right| \right\} \\ &= \sup_{f \in \partial \mathcal{F}: \|f\|_{h'} > 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{\|f\|_{h'}} \left| (\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} - \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}) \left[\{(\mathcal{P}_{h-1}^* - \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^{\widehat{\pi}}) \mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f\}(S_{h-1}, A_{h-1}) \right] \right| \right\} =: \Delta\beta(h, h'). \end{aligned}$$

The term $\Delta\beta(h, h')$ involves differences from two sources: (i) the difference in transition kernels $\mathcal{P}_{h-1}^* - \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^{\widehat{\pi}}$ that captures the divergence between policies π_h^* and $\widehat{\pi}_h$; (ii) the discrepancy of occupation measures at the $(h-1)$ -th step reflected by the difference in expectations $\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} - \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}}$, which is determined by the policies $(\pi_1^*, \dots, \pi_{h-1}^*)$ and $(\widehat{\pi}_1, \dots, \widehat{\pi}_{h-1})$ until the $(h-1)$ -th step. We treat them separately and write

$$\Delta\beta(h, h') \leq \nu_1(h-1, h') \cdot \nu_2(h-1), \quad (50)$$

where the functionals ν_2 and ν_1 are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_1(h-1, h') &:= \sup_{f \in \partial \mathcal{F}: \|f\|_{h'} > 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{\|f\|_{h'}} \left\| (\mathcal{P}_{h-1}^* - \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^{\widehat{\pi}}) \mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f \right\|_{h-1} \right\}, \\ \nu_2(h-1) &:= \sup_{f \in \partial \mathcal{F}: \|f\|_{h-1} > 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{\|f\|_{h-1}} \left| (\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} - \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}) [f(S_{h-1}, A_{h-1})] \right| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We first consider the term ν_1 . According to the definitions of metric d_h and parameter $b_{\mathcal{F}}$ in inequalities (43) and (44), we find that

$$\left\| (\mathcal{P}_{h-1}^* - \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^{\widehat{\pi}}) \mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f \right\|_{h-1} \stackrel{(43)}{\leq} d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*) \cdot \left\| \mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f \right\|_h \stackrel{(44)}{\leq} d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*) \cdot b_{\mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{h'},$$

which in turn implies

$$\nu_1(h-1, h') \leq b_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot d_h(\widehat{f}_h, f_h^*). \quad (51a)$$

As for term ν_2 , we claim that

$$\nu_2(h-1) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{h-1} \widehat{\beta}(j, h-1). \quad (51b)$$

Combining the bound $\widehat{\beta}(h, h') \leq \beta(h, h') + \Delta\beta(h, h')$ with inequalities (50), (51a) and (51b), we establish the bound (48), as claimed. It remains to prove the claim (51b).

Proof of inequality (51b): This proof is analogous to that of Lemma 2. We begin by introducing an analogue of the functional $D(g)$ from equation (46a); in particular, for any index $h \in [H-1]$ and function $g \in \partial\mathcal{F}$, define

$$D_h^*(g) := (\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} - \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}})[g(S_h, A_h)].$$

Using the notation of D_h^* , we can rewrite the left-hand side of inequality (51b) as $\nu_2(h-1) = \sup_{f \in \partial\mathcal{F}: \|f\|_{h-1} > 0} \{|D_{h-1}^*(f)|/\|f\|_{h-1}\}$. Following the same arguments as in the proof of inequality (46b), we can show that

$$D_h^*(g) = \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}}[g(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) - g(S_h, \widehat{\pi}_h(S_h))] + D_{h-1}^*(\mathcal{P}_{h-1}^*g) \quad \text{for } h = 1, 2, \dots, H, \quad (52)$$

where we set $D_0^* \equiv 0$.

We consider function $g := \mathcal{P}_{j,h-1}^* f$ for $1 \leq j < h \leq H-1$. It follows from equation (52) that

$$D_j^*(\mathcal{P}_{j,h-1}^* f) = \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}}[(\mathcal{P}_{j,h-1}^* f)(S_j, \pi_j^*(S_j)) - (\mathcal{P}_{j,h-1}^* f)(S_j, \widehat{\pi}_j(S_j))] + D_{j-1}^*(\mathcal{P}_{j-1,h-1}^* f),$$

where we have used the relation $\mathcal{P}_{j-1}^* \mathcal{P}_{j,h-1}^* = \mathcal{P}_{j-1,h-1}^*$. Recalling the definition of $\widehat{\beta}(j, h-1)$ in equation (34a), applying the triangle inequality yields

$$|D_j^*(\mathcal{P}_{j,h-1}^* f)| \leq \widehat{\beta}(j, h-1) \cdot \|f\|_{h-1} + |D_{j-1}^*(\mathcal{P}_{j-1,h-1}^* f)|.$$

Summing this equation over indices $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, h-1$ yields

$$|D_{h-1}^*(f)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{h-1} \widehat{\beta}(j, h-1) \cdot \|f\|_{h-1},$$

which establishes inequality (51b).

C Proof of Lemma 1

In this section, we prove the main auxiliary result used in the proof of Proposition 1. We devote a subsection to each of the three claims in the lemma.

C.1 Proof of Lemma 1(a)

Here we need to show that the bound (43) holds for the distance function that we have chosen. Consider any function $g(\cdot) = \langle \mathbf{w}_g, \boldsymbol{\phi}(\cdot) \rangle \in \partial\mathcal{F}$. For $h = 2, 3, \dots, H-1$, the difference between transition operators \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^π and \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^* takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} ((\mathcal{P}_{h-1}^\pi - \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^*)g)(s, a) &= \mathbb{E}[g(S_h, \pi_h(S_h)) - g(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) \mid S_{h-1} = s, A_{h-1} = a] \\ &= \left\langle \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\phi}(S_h, \pi_h(S_h)) - \boldsymbol{\phi}(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) \mid S_{h-1} = s, A_{h-1} = a], \mathbf{w}_g \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& ((\mathcal{P}_{h-1}^\pi - \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^*)g)^2(s, a) \\
& \leq \left\| \mathbb{E}[\phi(S_h, \pi_h(S_h)) - \phi(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) \mid S_{h-1} = s, A_{h-1} = a] \right\|_{\Sigma_h^{-1}}^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{w}_g\|_{\Sigma_h}^2 \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\phi(S_h, \pi_h(S_h)) - \phi(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h))\|_{\Sigma_h^{-1}}^2 \mid S_{h-1} = s, A_{h-1} = a \right] \cdot \|\mathbf{w}_g\|_{\Sigma_h}^2. \tag{53a}
\end{aligned}$$

The definition of the norm $\|\cdot\|_h$ ensures $\|\mathbf{w}_g\|_{\Sigma_h} = \|g\|_h$. By using the curvature property (**Curv1**), we find that

$$\|\phi(S_h, \pi_h(S_h)) - \phi(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h))\|_{\Sigma_h^{-1}}^2 \leq C_h^2(S_h) d \cdot \frac{\|f_h - f_h^*\|_h^2}{\|f_h^*\|_h^2}. \tag{53b}$$

The combination of inequalities (53a) and (53b) leads to the following bound:

$$((\mathcal{P}_{h-1}^\pi - \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^*)g)^2(s, a) \leq \mathbb{E}[C_h^2(S_h) \mid S_{h-1} = s, A_{h-1} = a] \cdot d \cdot \frac{\|f_h - f_h^*\|_h^2}{\|f_h^*\|_h^2} \cdot \|g\|_h^2.$$

Taking expectations over the state-action pairs under the occupation measure μ_{h-1}^* yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\mathcal{P}_{h-1}^\pi - \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^*)g\|_{h-1}^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} \left[((\mathcal{P}_{h-1}^\pi - \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^*)g)^2(S_{h-1}, A_{h-1}) \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} [C_h^2(S_h)] \cdot d \cdot \frac{\|f_h - f_h^*\|_h^2}{\|f_h^*\|_h^2} \cdot \|g\|_h^2,
\end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\frac{\|(\mathcal{P}_{h-1}^\pi - \mathcal{P}_{h-1}^*)g\|_{h-1}}{\|g\|_h} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} [C_h^2(S_h)]} \cdot d \cdot \frac{\|f_h - f_h^*\|_h}{\|f_h^*\|_h} = d_h(f_h, f_h^*),$$

where the metric d_h is given by equation (23). Consequently, the bound (43) holds, as claimed in Lemma 1(a).

C.2 Proof of Lemma 1(b)

We now show that the condition (**Stb**(\mathcal{T})) holds, as claimed in part (b) of the lemma. From the definition of the Bellman (optimal) operator \mathcal{T}^* , we have

$$\mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1} = r_h + \mathcal{P}_h^\pi f_{h+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1}^* = r_h + \mathcal{P}_h^* f_{h+1}^*,$$

where we have adopted the shorthand $\mathcal{P}_h^* = \mathcal{P}_h^{\pi^*}$, and exploited the greediness of the policies π and π^* with respect to the functions f and f^* , respectively. Subtracting these two equations yields

$$\mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1} - \mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1}^* = \mathcal{P}_h^* (f_{h+1} - f_{h+1}^*) + (\mathcal{P}_h^\pi - \mathcal{P}_h^*) f_{h+1},$$

from which an application of the triangle inequality yields

$$\|\mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1} - \mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1}^*\|_h \leq \underbrace{\|\mathcal{P}_h^* (f_{h+1} - f_{h+1}^*)\|_h}_{T_1} + \underbrace{\|(\mathcal{P}_h^\pi - \mathcal{P}_h^*) f_{h+1}\|_h}_{T_2}. \tag{54}$$

Consequently, we have reduced the problem to bounding the two terms T_1 and T_2 .

We first focus on term T_1 . As shown in Appendix G.1, the stability condition (44) holds with parameter $b_{\mathcal{F}} = 1$. As a consequence, the quantity T_1 can be bounded as

$$T_1 = \|\mathcal{P}_h^*(f_{h+1} - f_{h+1}^*)\|_h \leq \|f_{h+1} - f_{h+1}^*\|_{h+1}. \quad (55a)$$

As for the term T_2 , we can show that it is second-order with respect to the function difference $\|f_{h+1} - f_{h+1}^*\|_{h+1}$, and therefore is negligible when f_{h+1} is sufficiently close to f_{h+1}^* . Note that for any $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & |((\mathcal{P}_h^\pi - \mathcal{P}_h^*) f_{h+1})(s, a)| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}[f_{h+1}(S_{h+1}, \pi_{h+1}(S_{h+1})) - f_{h+1}(S_{h+1}, \pi_{h+1}^*(S_{h+1})) \mid S_h = s, A_h = a] \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[|f_{h+1}(S_{h+1}, \pi_{h+1}(S_{h+1})) - f_{h+1}(S_{h+1}, \pi_{h+1}^*(S_{h+1}))| \mid S_h = s, A_h = a \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The curvature property (**Curv2**) ensures that

$$|((\mathcal{P}_h^\pi - \mathcal{P}_h^*) f_{h+1})(s, a)| \leq \mathbb{E}[C_{h+1}(S_{h+1}) \mid S_h = s, A_h = a] \cdot \sqrt{d} \cdot \frac{\|f_{h+1} - f_{h+1}^*\|_{h+1}^2}{\|f_{h+1}^*\|_{h+1}}$$

for each state-action pair $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$. Applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &= \|(\mathcal{P}_h^\pi - \mathcal{P}_h^*) f_{h+1}\|_h \leq \sqrt{d} \|C_{h+1}\| \cdot \frac{\|f_{h+1} - f_{h+1}^*\|_{h+1}^2}{\|f_{h+1}^*\|_{h+1}} \\ &= d_{h+1}(f_{h+1}, f_{h+1}^*) \cdot \|f_{h+1} - f_{h+1}^*\|_{h+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the definition of metric $d_h(f_{h+1}, f_{h+1}^*)$ in equation (23). Under the condition $d_{h+1}(f_{h+1}, f_{h+1}^*) \leq \rho_{h+1} \leq \frac{1}{2}(H-h)^{-1}(1+\log H)^{-1}$, we have

$$T_2 \leq \frac{1}{2(H-h)(1+\log H)} \cdot \|f_{h+1} - f_{h+1}^*\|_{h+1}. \quad (55b)$$

Combining the bounds (55a) and (55b) with inequality (54) yields

$$\|\mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1} - \mathcal{T}_h^* f_{h+1}^*\|_h \leq \kappa_h^* \cdot \|f_{h+1} - f_{h+1}^*\|_{h+1} \quad (56)$$

where $\kappa_h^* = 1 + \frac{1}{2}(H-h)^{-1}(1+\log H)^{-1}$. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{h,h'}(\mathcal{T}^*) &= \kappa_h^* \kappa_{h+1}^* \cdots \kappa_{h'-1}^* = \prod_{j=h}^{h'-1} \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{2(H-j)(1+\log H)} \right\} \\ &\leq \exp \left\{ \sum_{j=h}^{h'-1} \frac{1}{2(H-j)(1+\log H)} \right\} \leq e \leq 3, \end{aligned}$$

which establishes claim (b) in Lemma 1.

C.3 Proof of Lemma 1(c)

Finally, we need to show that the smoothness condition **(Stb)(ξ)** holds, as claimed in part (c). In order to do so, we make use of the curvature property **(Curv1)**. Consider the left-hand side of inequality **(Stb)(ξ)**. It is sufficient to show that

$$\sup_{\substack{f \in \partial \mathcal{F} \\ \|f\|_{h'} > 0}} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}[(\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f)(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) - (\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f)(S_h, \pi_h(S_h))]|}{\|f\|_{h'}} \leq \nu_3(h) \cdot \nu_4(h, h'),$$

where $\nu_4(h, h') := \sup_{\substack{f \in \partial \mathcal{F} \\ \|f\|_{h'} > 0}} \{\|\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f\|_h / \|f\|_{h'}\}$, and

$$\nu_3(h) := \sup_{\substack{g \in \partial \mathcal{F} \\ \|g\|_h > 0}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\|g\|_h} |\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}[g(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) - g(S_h, \pi_h(S_h))]| \right\}.$$

Recall that the bound (44) holds with radius $b_{\mathcal{F}} = 1$, i.e. $\|\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f\|_h \leq \|f\|_{h'}$. Therefore, we have $\nu_4(h, h') \leq 1$. It remains to bound the term $\nu_3(h)$.

Any $g \in \partial \mathcal{F}$ has the representation $g(\cdot) = \langle \phi(\cdot), \mathbf{w}_g \rangle$ for some vector $\mathbf{w}_g \in \mathbb{R}^d$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}[g(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) - g(S_h, \pi_h(S_h))]| &= \left| \left\langle \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}[\phi(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) - \phi(S_h, \pi_h(S_h))], \mathbf{w}_g \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq \|\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}[\phi(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) - \phi(S_h, \pi_h(S_h))]\|_{\Sigma_h^{-1}} \cdot \|\mathbf{w}_g\|_{\Sigma_h}. \end{aligned}$$

From the relation $\|\mathbf{w}_g\|_{\Sigma_h} = \|g\|_h$, we have

$$\nu_3(h) \leq \|\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}[\phi(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) - \phi(S_h, \pi_h(S_h))]\|_{\Sigma_h^{-1}}.$$

The curvature property **(Curv1)** ensures that

$$\|\phi(S_h, \pi_h(S_h)) - \phi(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h))\|_{\Sigma_h^{-1}} \leq C_h(S_h) \sqrt{d} \cdot \frac{\|f_h - f_h^*\|_h}{\|f_h^*\|_h}.$$

Applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality yields

$$\nu_3(h) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} \left[\|\phi(S_h, \pi_h^*(S_h)) - \phi(S_h, \pi_h(S_h))\|_{\Sigma_h^{-1}}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{d \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*}[C_h^2(S_h)]} \cdot \frac{\|f_h - f_h^*\|_h}{\|f_h^*\|_h}.$$

Putting together the pieces, we conclude that the stability condition **(Stb)(ξ)** holds with parameter $\kappa_{h,h'}(\pi^*) \leq \sqrt{d} \|C_h\|$, as claimed in Lemma 1.

D Proof of corollaries

In this appendix, we prove our two corollaries about ridge-based FQI in both off-line (Corollary 1, proved in Appendix D.1) and on-line settings (Corollary 2 proved in Appendix D.2).

D.1 Proof of Corollary 1

We begin with our result on ridge-based FQI in the off-line setting.

D.1.1 Main argument

At a high-level, we prove Corollary 1 by specifying choices of regularization parameters $\{\lambda_h\}_{h=1}^{H-1}$, along with lower bounds on the sample size n at each stage h , such that the ridge regression estimates $(\hat{f}_1, \dots, \hat{f}_H)$ satisfy the bounds

$$\|\mathcal{T}_h^* \hat{f}_{h+1} - \hat{f}_h\|_h \leq \varepsilon_h$$

where ε_h was defined in equation (29).

Moving recursively backwards from the terminal stage H , we can define the radii

$$\hat{R}_h = \|\mathbf{w}_{r_h}\|_2 + \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{h+1}\|_2,$$

where the vectors \mathbf{w}_{r_h} and $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{h+1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represent the linear coefficients associated with the reward function $r_h(s) = \langle \phi(s), \mathbf{w}_{r_h} \rangle$ and stage $h+1$ value function estimate $\hat{f}_{h+1}(s) = \langle \phi(s), \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{h+1} \rangle$. We also recall the definition (28) of the conditional variances $\hat{\sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2(f)$. Throughout the following, we use c, c', C etc. to denote universal constants.

With this set-up, we claim that if, for some failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if the sample sizes satisfy the lower bounds

$$n \geq c \{ \hat{R}_h / \hat{\sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}}(\hat{f}_{h+1}) \}^2 \log(d/\delta), \quad (57a)$$

and we take the regularization parameters

$$\lambda_h = c' \{ \hat{\sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}}(\hat{f}_{h+1}) / \hat{R}_h \}^2 (d/n) \log(d/\delta), \quad (57b)$$

then the Bellman residuals satisfy the upper bounds

$$\|\mathcal{T}_h^* \hat{f}_{h+1} - \hat{f}_h\|_h \leq c \|\Sigma_h^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\Sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2 \hat{\sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}}(\hat{f}_{h+1}) \sqrt{\frac{d \log(d/\delta)}{n}}, \quad (58)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

We now turn to the proof of this claim. For notational convenience, we introduce the (squared) norm

$$\|f\|_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2 := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_h|} \sum_{\mathcal{D}_h} f^2(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}) + \lambda_h \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \quad \text{for any function } f = \langle \phi(\cdot), \mathbf{w} \rangle \in \mathcal{F}.$$

By construction, we have $\|f\|_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2 = \mathbf{w}^\top (\hat{\Sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{w}$, where the empirical covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}}$ was previously defined (27). Now consider the inequality

$$\sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{\hat{\mu}_{\min} + \nu^2}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{n} \hat{R}_h}{\sigma_{h,\mathcal{D}}(\hat{f}_{h+1})} \nu, \quad (\text{CI})$$

in terms of the scalar $\nu > 0$, where $\hat{\mu}_{\min}$ denotes the minimum eigenvalue of the empirical covariance matrix. We let $\nu_h > 0$ be the smallest positive solution to inequality (CI); as we discuss in the sequel, this solution always exists. With this set-up, let us state the key auxiliary result in our proof:

Lemma 4. *Given a sample size n satisfying the lower bound (57a), suppose that we implement FQI using ridge regression with penalties $\lambda_h \geq \nu_h^2$. Then we have the bound*

$$\|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_{h, \mathcal{D}}^2 \leq c \widehat{R}_h^2 \{\nu_h^2 + \lambda_h\} \quad (59)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Suppose that the smallest eigenvalue $\widehat{\mu}_{\min}$ is at least the order of d^{-1} . Then the critical radius ν_h satisfies an upper bound of the form

$$\nu_h \leq c \{\sigma_{h, \mathcal{D}}(\widehat{f}_{h+1}) / \widehat{R}_h\} \sqrt{(d/n) \log(d/\delta)} =: \widetilde{\nu}_h.$$

By properly tuning the regularization parameter λ_h so that $\lambda_h \asymp \widetilde{\nu}_h^2$, we can ensure that

$$\|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_{h, \mathcal{D}} \leq c' \sigma_{h, \mathcal{D}}(\widehat{f}_{h+1}) \sqrt{(d/n) \log(d/\delta)}.$$

Combining this bound with the relation

$$\|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_h \leq \|\Sigma_h^{\frac{1}{2}} (\widehat{\Sigma}_{h, \mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2 \cdot \|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_{h, \mathcal{D}},$$

yields the claimed inequality (58).

It remains to prove Lemma 4.

D.1.2 Proof of Lemma 4

Our proof is based on two auxiliary results, which we begin by stating.

Step 1: Define the random variable

$$Z_n(\lambda_h) := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F} : \|f\|_{h, \mathcal{D}} \leq 1} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_h|} \sum_{\mathcal{D}_h} f(s_{h, i}, a_{h, i}) \zeta_{h, i},$$

where $\zeta_{h, i} := r_{h, i} + \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \widehat{f}_{h+1}(s'_{h, i}, a) - (\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1})(s_{h, i}, a_{h, i})$. Our first step is to show that

$$\|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_{h, \mathcal{D}}^2 \leq 2 \|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_{h, \mathcal{D}} \cdot Z(\lambda_h) + \lambda_h \widehat{R}_h^2, \quad (60a)$$

Step 2: We then apply a matrix-form Bernstein inequality to derive a concentration bound on $Z_n(\lambda_h)$. In particular, we claim that

$$Z_n(\lambda_h) \leq c' \widehat{R}_h \nu_h \quad (60b)$$

with probability exceeding $1 - \delta$.

The bound (59) on Bellman residual then follows from combining inequalities (60a) and (60b) and solving the quadratic inequality with respect to $\|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_{h, \mathcal{D}}$.

Let us now turn to the proofs of inequalities (60a) and (60b).

Proof of inequality (60a): We can write $\widehat{f}_h(\cdot) = \langle \phi(\cdot), \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_h \rangle$ and $\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1}(\cdot) = \langle \phi(\cdot), \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1}} \rangle$ for vectors $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_h$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1}}$. Introducing the shorthand $\Delta \mathbf{w} := \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_h - \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1}}$, and using the definition (24) of the ridge estimate, we have

$$\Delta \mathbf{w} = (\widehat{\Sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_h|} \sum_{\mathcal{D}_h} \phi(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}) \zeta_{h,i} \right\} - \lambda_h (\widehat{\Sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1}}. \quad (61)$$

Multiplying both sides of equation (61) by $\Delta \mathbf{w}^\top (\widehat{\Sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})$ from the left yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2 &= \Delta \mathbf{w}^\top (\widehat{\Sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I}) \Delta \mathbf{w} \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_h|} \sum_{\mathcal{D}_h} (\widehat{f}_h - \mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1})(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}) \cdot \zeta_{h,i} - \lambda_h \langle \Delta \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1}} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Using the definition of random variable $Z_n(\lambda_h)$, equation (62) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2 &\leq \|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_{h,\mathcal{D}} \cdot Z_n(\lambda_h) + \frac{\lambda_h}{2} \left\{ \|\Delta \mathbf{w}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1}}\|_2^2 \right\} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_{h,\mathcal{D}} \cdot Z_n(\lambda_h) + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_h \widehat{R}_h^2. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

The last inequality follows from the bounds $\lambda_h \|\Delta \mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \leq \|\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1} - \widehat{f}_h\|_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2$ and $\|\mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{T}_h^* \widehat{f}_{h+1}}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{w}_{r_h}\|_2 + \|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{h+1}\|_2 \leq \widehat{R}_h$. Simplifying inequality (63) yields inequality (60a).

Proof of inequality (60b): We prove this claim via matrix-form Bernstein inequality. Introducing the shorthand $\boldsymbol{\psi}(s, a) := (\widehat{\Sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \phi(s, a)$, the property $\|\phi(s, a)\|_2 \leq 1$ then implies $\|\boldsymbol{\psi}(s, a)\|_2 \leq (\widehat{\mu}_{\min} + \lambda_h)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for any $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$. Notice that

$$Z_n(\lambda_h) = \left\| \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_h|} \sum_{\mathcal{D}_h} \boldsymbol{\psi}(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}) \zeta_{h,i} \right\|_2.$$

It then follows from the bound $|\zeta_{h,i}| \leq 2 \widehat{R}_h$ that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\psi}(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}) \zeta_{h,i}\|_2 \leq 2 \widehat{R}_h / \sqrt{\widehat{\mu}_{\min} + \lambda_h}.$$

Moreover, since $\mathbb{E}[\zeta_{h,i}^2 \mid s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}] = \text{Var}[\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \widehat{f}_{h+1}(s'_{h,i}, a) \mid s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}]$, we find that the second order moment satisfies

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_h|} \sum_{\mathcal{D}_h} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\boldsymbol{\psi}(s_{h,i}, a_{h,i}) \zeta_{h,i}\|_2^2 \mid s_{h,i}, a_{h,i} \right] \leq \frac{\sigma_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2(\widehat{f}_{h+1})}{\widehat{\mu}_{\min} + \lambda_h},$$

where the conditional variance $\sigma_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2(\widehat{f}_{h+1})$ is given by definition (28). A standard matrix Bernstein inequality (see Theorem 6.17 in the book [38]) then implies that

$$Z_n(\lambda_h) \leq c_1 \left\{ \sigma_{h,\mathcal{D}}(\widehat{f}_{h+1}) \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n(\widehat{\mu}_{\min} + \lambda_h)}} + \widehat{R}_h \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n\sqrt{\widehat{\mu}_{\min} + \lambda_h}} \right\} \leq c_2 \widehat{R}_h \nu_h$$

with probability exceeding $1 - \delta$, which establishes inequality (60b). Here the last inequality follows from the critical inequality (CI) and the sample size condition $n \geq c_2 \{\widehat{R}_h^2 / \sigma_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2(\widehat{f}_{h+1})\} \log(d/\delta)$.

D.2 Proof of Corollary 2

In Phase 1 of pure exploration, the cumulative regret is always bounded from above by $T_0 \cdot H$. During Phase 2 of fine-tuning, we let $\hat{\pi}^k$ be the policy employed in the rounds $T_0 2^k + 1, T_0 2^k + 2, \dots, T_0 2^{k+1}$, which is determined by the estimate $\hat{f}^{(T_0 2^k)}$ calculated at the end of the $(T_0 2^k)$ -th round. To estimate the regret, we consider the decomposition

$$\sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \{J(\pi^*) - J(\hat{\pi}^{(t)})\} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{t=T_0 2^k}^{T_0 2^{k+1}} \{J(\pi^*) - J(\hat{\pi}^{(t)})\} = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} T_0 2^k \{J(\pi^*) - J(\hat{\pi}^k)\}.$$

We leverage our bound (30a) for off-line RL in Section 3.3.2 to control the value sub-optimality $J(\pi^*) - J(\hat{\pi}^k)$. Recall that the policy $\hat{\pi}^k$ is derived from i.i.d. trajectories collected from the rounds $T_0 2^{k-1} + 1, T_0 2^{k-1} + 2, \dots, T_0 2^k$. We divide those $T_0 2^{k-1}$ trajectories into $H - 1$ equal shares and use each share to conduct estimation in one iteration of the FQI procedure. This subsampling technique ensures the independence of samples used in different iterations. It is primarily adopted for the sake of convenience (to keep the explanations concise) and is not essential in general. It follows from inequality (30a) that the bound

$$J(\pi^*) - J(\hat{\pi}^k) \leq c \frac{d\sqrt{d} H^4}{T_0 2^k} \log(dHK/\delta)$$

holds uniformly for indices $k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$ with a probability exceeding $1 - \delta$.

Putting together the pieces, we arrive at

$$\text{Regret}(T) \leq T_0 \cdot H + c d\sqrt{d} H^4 K \log(dHK/\delta).$$

We then derive the regret bound (31) by noticing that $K = \mathcal{O}(\log T)$.

D.3 Scaling of bounds in off-line and on-line RL

In this part, we provide detailed explanations regarding the scaling, in terms of dimension d and horizon H , of the bounds that arise in the discussion of off-line RL from Section 3.3.

D.3.1 Effect of mild covariate shift

In this section, we justify the bound (30a) stated following Corollary 1 in Section 3.3.2. For rewards taking values in $[0, 1]$, it is reasonable to assume that the Q -functions f_h^* satisfy the bounds $\|f_h^*\|_h \asymp H - h + 1$, and moreover that the conditional variance $\hat{\sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}}(\hat{f}_{h+1}) \asymp \sqrt{H - h}$. (We will provide a detailed justification for this argument later.) Furthermore, suppose the covariate shift is mild such that $\|\Sigma_h^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\Sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2 \leq c'$, and the curvature parameter $C_h(s)$ in inequalities **(Curv1)** and **(Curv2)** satisfies $\|C_h\| \leq c'$.

Provided with these conditions, we apply inequality (58) from our preceding analysis, and then set the Bellman residual parameter

$$\varepsilon_h := c'' \sqrt{\frac{d(H-h) \log(dH/\delta)}{n}} \quad (64)$$

for a suitably chosen constant $c'' > 0$. Then the sequence $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{H-1}, \varepsilon_H = 0)$ is regular since $\sqrt{x+1} \geq \frac{1}{x} \sum_{i=1}^x \sqrt{i}$ for any integer $x \geq 1$.

Given the Bellman residual ε_h defined in equation (64), the condition (21) from Proposition 1 becomes $n \geq c \cdot d^2 H^3 (1 + \log H)^2 \log(dH/\delta)$, and the bound (29) reduces to

$$J(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) - J(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}) \leq \frac{c d^{\frac{3}{2}} H^3 \log(dH/\delta)}{n},$$

as claimed.

Justification of the bound $\widehat{\sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}}(\widehat{f}_{h+1}) \asymp \sqrt{H-h}$: When the estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{f}}$ is relatively close to the optimal Q -function \boldsymbol{f}^* , the conditional variance $\sigma_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2(\widehat{f}_{h+1})$ can be bounded as follows:

$$\sigma_{h,\mathcal{D}}^2(\widehat{f}_{h+1}) \asymp \sigma_h^2 \quad \text{with } \sigma_h^2 := \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*} \left[\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} [f_{h+1}^*(S_{h+1}, a) \mid S_h, A_h] \right].$$

From the law of total variance, we have $\sum_{h'=h}^{H-1} \sigma_{h'}^2 \leq c (H-h)^2$. Therefore, it is reasonable to consider $\sigma_h \asymp \sqrt{H-h}$, which further leads to the scaling $\widehat{\sigma}_{h,\mathcal{D}}(\widehat{f}_{h+1}) \asymp \sqrt{H-h}$.

D.3.2 Comparing to known off-line bounds

In this section, we derive inequality (30c) based on the results of Zanette et al. [43]; it gives the conventional $1/\sqrt{n}$ slow rate to which we compare. Zanette et al. [43] proved upper bounds on a pessimistic actor-critic scheme based on d -dimensional linear function approximation. Using our notation, Theorem 1 in their paper [43] can be expressed as

$$J(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) - J(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}) \leq c \left\{ \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \sqrt{\overline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-1} \overline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h} \right\} \sqrt{\frac{dH^4}{n}}, \quad (65)$$

where the vector $\overline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h$ is given by $\overline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h := \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*} [\boldsymbol{\phi}(S_h, A_h)]$.

We now consider the explicit dependence of this upper bound on dimension d , horizon H and sample size n . The divergence term $\overline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-1} \overline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h$ measures the conditioning of the regularized covariance matrix $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})$ along a specific direction of $\overline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h$. When the feature mapping $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ operates within a d -dimensional space, it is reasonable to assume that

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{h,\mathcal{D}} + \lambda_h \mathbf{I})^{-1} \overline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h \leq c' d.$$

The bound (65) then reduces to $J(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) - J(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}) \leq cdH^2/\sqrt{n}$. Regarding the dependence on horizon H , we conjecture that by incorporating the law of total variance in a more refined manner, it may be possible to further reduce the dependence by a factor of \sqrt{H} . Under these conditions, the bound takes the form $J(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) - J(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}) \leq cd\sqrt{H^3/n}$.

E General guarantee for linear curvature

In this section, we state and prove a general result under which the curvature conditions (**Curv1**) and (**Curv2**) hold.

E.1 A general curvature guarantee

For any state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, suppose that the feature set $\Phi(s) = \{\phi(s, a) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ can be described in the form

$$\Phi(s) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \mathbf{g}_s(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mathbf{0}\}.$$

where $\mathbf{g}_s : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m_s}$ is an m_s -vector of constraints, with $m_s \leq d$.

Given any Q -function estimate $f_h : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the associated greedy policy π_h is characterized by

$$\pi_h(s) \in \arg \max \{f_h(s, a) \mid a \in \mathcal{A} \text{ with } \mathbf{g}_s(\phi(s, a)) \leq \mathbf{0}\}. \quad (66)$$

We assume all the constraint functions $g_{s,1}, \dots, g_{s,m}$ are strongly convex and twice differentiable⁸, so that the solution to the optimization problem is unique and the greedy policy $\pi_h(s)$ is well-defined and deterministic. For the sake of simplicity in our subsequent discussion, we omit the dependence on state s and time index h , and instead use Φ, \mathbf{g}, m in place of $\Phi(s), \mathbf{g}_s, m_s$ and use $f^*, \pi^*, f, \pi, \Sigma$ to represent $f_h^*, \pi_h^*, f_h, \pi_h, \Sigma_h$ when the context is clear.

It is worth noting that while the optimization formulation (66) is originally defined within the action space \mathcal{A} , we can transform it into a problem that operates in the vector space \mathbb{R}^d . Consider the vector representation $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of function $f(\cdot) = \phi(\cdot)^\top \mathbf{w}$. By introducing a feature vector $\phi := \phi(s, \pi(s)) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we can equivalently reformulate problem (66) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \phi \equiv \phi(s, \pi(s)) &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{w} \\ &\text{subject to } \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

We define the vector $\phi^* := \phi(s, \pi^*(s)) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as the optimizer corresponding to the optimal Q -function $f^*(\cdot) = \phi(\cdot)^\top \mathbf{w}^*$. For simplicity, we assume all the constraints are active, i.e. the maxima are achieved at the boundary of Φ so that $\mathbf{g}(\phi) = \mathbf{g}(\phi^*) = \mathbf{0}$.

In our framework, we capture the ‘‘curvature’’ by using the following two key ingredients: a local Hessian matrix $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and a tangent space at the point ϕ^* .

Local Hessian matrix: Defining the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) := \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}^* \rangle - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$, we let $(\phi^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m$ be the saddle point of the problem

$$\max_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mathbf{0}}} \min_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^m \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda} \geq \mathbf{0}}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}).$$

We use the Lagrange multiplier $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = (\lambda_1^*, \lambda_2^*, \dots, \lambda_m^*)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$ to define the weighted sum

$$\mathbf{H} := \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^* \nabla^2 g_i(\phi^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \quad (68)$$

which is a positive definite matrix whenever $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$ is non-zero, given our strong convexity conditions on the constraint functions.

⁸To be precise, strong convexity and twice differentiability are only required within a neighborhood around $\phi(s, \pi_h^*(s))$ for the following arguments to hold.

Normal vectors and tangent space: Let $\mathbb{G} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a linear subspace defined as

$$\mathbb{G} := \text{span}\left(\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\nabla g_1(\phi^*), \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\nabla g_2(\phi^*), \dots, \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\nabla g_m(\phi^*)\right).$$

The elements within the space \mathbb{G} can be interpreted as normal vectors that are perpendicular to the boundary (after a specific linear transformation). Let $\Pi_{\mathbb{G}}$ represent the projection onto space \mathbb{G} under the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_2$. More explicitly, we define $\Pi_{\mathbb{G}}$ as follows:

$$\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} = \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)^\top \left[\nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*) \mathbf{H}^{-1} \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)^\top \right]^{-1} \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We use the operator $(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}})$ to denote the projection onto the orthogonal complement of linear space \mathbb{G} , which can be viewed as the projection onto the *tangent space* of the boundary at point ϕ^* . Intuitively, the tangent space contains all possible directions in which one can tangentially pass through ϕ^* when moving along the boundary of the feature set Φ .

In addition to the Hessian and tangent space, we also need characterizations of the smoothness of the boundary as shown below, which are in general direct consequences of twice differentiability.

Smoothness condition of the boundary: We introduce a compact notation of the gradients

$$\nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*) := \left[\nabla g_1(\phi^*), \nabla g_2(\phi^*), \dots, \nabla g_m(\phi^*) \right]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}.$$

When the constraint functions $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are twice differentiable, it follows from the definition of the Hessian matrix \mathbf{H} that $\{\nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)\}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x} - \phi^*) + o(\|\mathbf{x} - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}})$. Therefore, there exists a neighborhood around the vector ϕ^* such that any point \mathbf{x} within it satisfies

$$\left\| \{\nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)\}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* - \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x} - \phi^*) \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \|\mathbf{x} - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}}. \quad (69a)$$

Furthermore, we use a parameter $L > 0$ to characterize the Lipschitz continuity of the gradient $\nabla \mathbf{g}$. This means that

$$\left\| \mathbf{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \{\nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)\} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_2 \leq L \cdot \|\mathbf{x} - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}}, \quad (69b)$$

where the matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is defined as $\mathbf{W} := \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*) \mathbf{H}^{-1} \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)^\top$. Note that the gradient Lipschitz property is in general less restrictive than being twice differentiable.

We are now ready to present the exact formulations of inequalities **(Curv1)** and **(Curv2)** within the specific context we have established earlier.

Proposition 2. Suppose that $\|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} \leq \frac{\|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2}{3L \|\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2}$ and $\|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{12L}$. Then the bounds **(Curv1)** and **(Curv2)** hold with parameter

$$C_h(s) := \frac{5}{\sqrt{d}} \|\mathbf{w}^*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \left\| (\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_2^2. \quad (70)$$

Equivalently, it means that

$$\|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}} \leq C_h(s) \sqrt{d} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}}{\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}} \quad \text{and} \quad (71a)$$

$$\mathbf{w}^\top (\phi - \phi^*) \leq C_h(s) \sqrt{d} \cdot \|\mathbf{w}^*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \cdot \left\{ \frac{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}}{\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}} \right\}^2. \quad (71b)$$

See Appendix E.2 for the proof.

Let us make some comments about Proposition 2. We first observe that the conditions under which the curvature conditions hold are relatively mild, requiring only: (i) strong convexity constraint functions $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^m$ around the point ϕ^* , and (ii) twice differentiability of the constraint function \mathbf{g} . Thus, the guarantee of Proposition 2 applies to a fairly broad class of problems.

Second, in stating our result, we have defined the parameter $C_h(s)$ from equation (70) such that it is independent of the scaling of vector \mathbf{w} , and typically independent of the dimension d .

- First, suppose that we rescale the parameter vector \mathbf{w} . We redefine the objective function in optimization problem (66) by doubling the vector \mathbf{w}^* and setting $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} := 2\mathbf{w}^*$. The new Lagrangian multiplier $\tilde{\lambda}$ then undergoes the rescaling $\tilde{\lambda} = 2\lambda^*$, and leads to the a new Hessian matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{H}} = 2\mathbf{H}$, as in equation (68). Overall, the parameter $C_h(s)$ remains unchanged, as claimed.
- Regarding the dependence of parameter $C_h(s)$ on the dimension d of feature vector ϕ , recall our boundedness condition $\sup_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \|\phi(s, a)\|_2 \leq 1$. Under this bound, the eigenvalues of the covariance matrix $\Sigma_h = \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} [\phi(S_h, A_h) \phi(S_h, A_h)^\top]$ are of the order of $1/d$, so that the norm $\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_{\Sigma} = \sqrt{(\mathbf{w}^*)^\top \Sigma \mathbf{w}^*}$ scales as $1/\sqrt{d}$, while the norm $\|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2$ scales as \sqrt{d} . After rescaling by the factor $1/\sqrt{d}$ in the definition (70), we see that the parameter $C_h(s)$ becomes dimension-free.

E.2 Proof of Proposition 2

This section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 2, with two subsections corresponding to each of the claims. Our proof relies on an auxiliary result derived from the smoothness conditions (69a) and (69b), and exploiting the twice differentiability of the constraint functions \mathbf{g} .

Lemma 5. *The perturbation terms $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*$, $\phi - \phi^*$ and $\lambda - \lambda^*$ satisfy*

$$\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^* = \mathbf{H}(\phi - \phi^*) + \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)^\top (\lambda - \lambda^*) + \Delta \quad (72a)$$

with $\|\Delta\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} + L \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} \|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{\mathbf{W}}$, and

$$\|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi - \phi^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{L}{2} \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}}^2. \quad (72b)$$

See Appendix E.2.3 for the proof.

E.2.1 Proof of the bound (71a)

Our proof consists of three steps: (i) We first provide an upper bound on the difference in Lagrangian multipliers $\lambda - \lambda^*$, and (ii) Then use this bound to control the difference in optimizers $\phi - \phi^*$; (iii) Finally, we perform a norm transformation to include the weighted norm $\|\cdot\|_{\Sigma}$, thereby establishing a connection with the $\|\cdot\|_h$ norm.

Step 1 (*Bounding $\lambda - \lambda^*$*): We first derive an upper bound on the difference in Lagrangian multipliers $\lambda - \lambda^*$. We multiply equation (72a) by $\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ from the left and find that

$$\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*) = \Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi - \phi^*) + \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)^\top (\lambda - \lambda^*) + \Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta. \quad (73)$$

Recall that the matrix \mathbf{W} is defined as $\mathbf{W} = \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*) \mathbf{H}^{-1} \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)^\top$. Therefore, we have $\|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{\mathbf{W}} = \|\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)^\top (\lambda - \lambda^*)\|_2$. By the triangle inequality, it follows from (73) that

$$\|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{\mathbf{W}} \leq \|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2 + \|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi - \phi^*)\|_2 + \|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta\|_2. \quad (74)$$

On the right-hand side of this inequality, the first term $\|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2$ is the one we consider dominant, as suggested by Lemma 5. Intuitively, we expect to show that $\|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{\mathbf{W}} \leq c \|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{c'}{L}$. In the following, we present a rigorous argument to validate this intuition.

We use the inequality $\|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta\|_2 \leq \|\Delta\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}$ and invoke the upper bounds for $\|\Delta\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}$ and $\|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi - \phi^*)\|_2$ in Lemma 5. By further leveraging the bound $\|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} \leq \frac{1}{3L}$, we can deduce from inequality (74) that

$$\|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{\mathbf{W}} \leq \|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2 + \frac{5}{12} \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} + \frac{1}{3} \|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{\mathbf{W}}.$$

We solve this inequality and apply the bound $\|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{12L}$. It follows that

$$\|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{\mathbf{W}} \leq \frac{1}{3L}. \quad (75)$$

Step 2 (*Bounding $\phi - \phi^*$*): We now turn to bound the difference in optimizers $\phi - \phi^*$ using the difference in vectors $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*$. Let us multiply equation (72a) by $\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ from the left, which yields

$$\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*) = \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi - \phi^*) + \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)^\top (\lambda - \lambda^*) + \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta. \quad (76)$$

Subtracting equations (73) and (76) yields

$$\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi - \phi^*) = (\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*) + \Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi - \phi^*) - (\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta. \quad (77)$$

In a manner similar to Step 1, we employ the triangle inequality and the bounds for $\|\Delta\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}$ and $\|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi - \phi^*)\|_2$ in Lemma 5. This enables us to show that, under the condition $\|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} \leq \frac{1}{3L}$, the following holds:

$$\|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} \leq \|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2 + \frac{5}{12} \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} + L \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} \|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{\mathbf{W}}.$$

We now substitute the term $\|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{\mathbf{W}}$ by its upper bound $\frac{1}{3L}$ in inequality (75) and solve the inequality. It follows that

$$\|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} \leq 4 \|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2. \quad (78)$$

Step 3 (*Norm transformation*): Finally, we perform a change of norm to transform inequality (78) into the format of bound (71a). We first decompose the deviation $\phi - \phi^*$ into two components: one along the linear space \mathbb{G} and the other within the tangent space. It follows from the triangle inequality and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\Sigma^{-1}} &\leq \|\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\phi - \phi^*)\|_2 + \|\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\phi - \phi^*)\|_2 \\ &\leq \|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2 \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} + \|\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2 \|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\phi - \phi^*)\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

As suggested by inequality (72b) in Lemma 5, the second term on the right-hand side is “high-order” and negligible. Specifically, under the condition $\|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} \leq \frac{\|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2}{3L \|\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2}$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2 \|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\phi - \phi^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{6} \|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2 \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}},$$

which further implies that

$$\|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\Sigma^{-1}} \leq \frac{7}{6} \|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2 \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}}.$$

We proceed by substituting $\|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}}$ with its bound from inequality (78), which yields

$$\|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\Sigma^{-1}} \leq 5 \|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2 \|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2.$$

Applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality yields

$$\|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\Sigma^{-1}} \leq 5 \|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_{\Sigma},$$

which establishes the bound (71a), as stated in Proposition 2.

E.2.2 Proof of the bound (71b)

We observe that the vector ϕ^* maximizes the linear function $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}^* \rangle$ over the constraint set Φ , whence $\langle \phi, \mathbf{w}^* \rangle \leq \langle \phi^*, \mathbf{w}^* \rangle$, or equivalently

$$\langle \mathbf{w}, \phi - \phi^* \rangle \leq \langle \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*, \phi - \phi^* \rangle. \quad (79)$$

Our next step is to upper the right-hand side.

Multiplying inequality (77) by $(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)^\top \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ on the left yields that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)^\top (\phi - \phi^*) &= (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)^\top \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*) \\ &\quad + (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)^\top \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\phi - \phi^*) - (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)^\top \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)^\top (\phi - \phi^*) &\leq \|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2^2 + \underbrace{\|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2 \|\Pi_{\mathbb{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\phi - \phi^*)\|_2}_{T_3} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbb{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_{T_4} \|\Delta\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}}_{T_4}. \quad (80) \end{aligned}$$

On the right-hand side of inequality (80), the terms T_3 and T_4 that involve the factor $\|\Delta\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}$ or $\|\Pi_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi - \phi^*)\|_2$ are considered “high-order” according to Lemma 5. We upper bound term T_3 using inequalities (72b), (78) and the condition $\|\Pi_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{12L}$. Furthermore, we control term T_4 using the bound on $\|\Delta\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}$ in Lemma 5, along with inequalities (75) and (78). This leads to the following result

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)^\top (\phi - \phi^*) &\leq 4 \|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbf{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq 4 \|(\mathbf{I} - \Pi_{\mathbf{G}}) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_2^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_{\Sigma}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

Combining inequalities (79) and (81) yields inequality (71b) as claimed.

E.2.3 Proof of Lemma 5

Proof of equation (72a): From the KKT conditions of the optimization problem (67), there are Lagrange multipliers λ and $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$\mathbf{w} = \nabla g(\phi)^\top \lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{w}^* = \nabla g(\phi^*)^\top \lambda^*.$$

Subtracting these two equations yields

$$\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}^* + \mathbf{H}(\phi - \phi^*) + \nabla g(\phi^*)^\top (\lambda - \lambda^*) + \Delta,$$

where the vector $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is defined as

$$\Delta := \{\nabla g(\phi)^\top \lambda^* - \nabla g(\phi^*)^\top \lambda^* - \mathbf{H}(\phi - \phi^*)\} + \{\nabla g(\phi) - \nabla g(\phi^*)\}^\top (\lambda - \lambda^*). \quad (82)$$

We control the two terms on the right-hand side of (82) separately.

By using the smoothness condition (69a), we derive that

$$\left\| \nabla g(\phi)^\top \lambda^* - \nabla g(\phi^*)^\top \lambda^* - \mathbf{H}(\phi - \phi^*) \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}}.$$

Moreover, the smoothness condition (69b) implies that the second term satisfies

$$\left\| \{\nabla g(\phi) - \nabla g(\phi^*)\}^\top (\lambda - \lambda^*) \right\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} \leq L \cdot \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} \cdot \|\lambda - \lambda^*\|_{\mathbf{W}}.$$

By combining the components using the triangle inequality, we arrive at an upper bound for the norm $\|\Delta\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}}$ as stated in Lemma 5.

Proof of equation (72b): Recall that the linear space \mathbf{G} is defined as the span of the rows of matrix $\nabla g(\phi^*) \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Therefore, there exists a vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$\frac{\Pi_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi - \phi^*)}{\|\Pi_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi - \phi^*)\|_2} = \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla g(\phi^*)^\top \mathbf{y}. \quad (83)$$

Given the vector \mathbf{y} , we define a function $\tilde{g}(\cdot) := \mathbf{g}(\cdot)^\top \mathbf{y} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The function \tilde{g} exhibits some desired properties:

- By definition of the matrix $\mathbf{W} = \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*) \mathbf{H}^{-1} \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)^\top$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbf{W}} = \|\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)^\top \mathbf{y}\|_2 = 1. \quad (84a)$$

- Multiplying equation (83) by $(\phi - \phi^*)^\top \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ from the left, we find that

$$\|\Pi_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi - \phi^*)\|_2 = (\phi - \phi^*)^\top \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*)^\top \mathbf{y} = \nabla \tilde{g}(\phi^*)^\top (\phi - \phi^*). \quad (84b)$$

Furthermore, the smoothness condition (69b) guarantees the Lipschitz continuity of the gradient of function \tilde{g} . Specifically, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \tilde{g}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla \tilde{g}(\phi^*)\|_{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} &= \left\| \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \{ \nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla \mathbf{g}(\phi^*) \}^\top \mathbf{y} \right\|_2 \\ &\leq L \cdot \|\mathbf{x} - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}} \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbf{W}} \stackrel{(84a)}{=} L \cdot \|\mathbf{x} - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

The property of gradient Lipschitz (see e.g. Lemma 1.2.3 in textbook [28]) implies that

$$\left| \tilde{g}(\phi) - \tilde{g}(\phi^*) - \nabla \tilde{g}(\phi^*)^\top (\phi - \phi^*) \right| \leq \frac{L}{2} \|\phi - \phi^*\|_{\mathbf{H}}^2. \quad (85)$$

Applying the equality relation (84b) along with $\tilde{g}(\phi) = \tilde{g}(\phi^*) = 0$, we see that the claimed inequality (72b) follows from inequality (85).

F Details of the mountain car experiment

In this experiment, a car is situated in a valley between two hills. The car's objective is to overcome the gravitational pull and reach the top of the right hill by efficiently controlling its acceleration.

F.1 Structure of the Markov decision process

The Markov decision process underlying the mountain car problem has a state space $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and an action space $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}$. The state $s = (p, v)$ consists of the current position p and velocity v , whereas the scalar action $a = f$ corresponds to the applied input force. The state variables (p, v) and action f are restricted as

$$p \in [p_{\min}, p_{\max}] = [-1.2, 0.6], \quad v \in [v_{\min}, v_{\max}] = [-0.07, 0.07] \quad \text{and} \quad f \in [f_{\min}, f_{\max}] = [-1, 1].$$

The mountain is described by the function

$$m(p) = \frac{1}{3} \sin(3p) + \frac{0.025}{(p_{\max} - p)(p - p_{\min})},$$

over the interval $p \in [p_{\min}, p_{\max}]$.

Let m' be the derivative of the mountain shape function m , which represents the instantaneous slope, and let $(\sigma_v, \sigma_p) = (0.01, 0.0025)$ be a pair of standard deviations that dictate the amount of randomness in the updates. For an interval $[a, b]$, we define the truncation function

$$\Psi_{[a,b]}(u) := \begin{cases} u & \text{if } u \in [a, b], \\ b & \text{if } u > b, \\ a & \text{if } u < a. \end{cases}$$

With this notation, at each discrete time step $h = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, the position and velocity of the car evolve as

$$\begin{aligned} v_{h+1} &= \Psi_{[v_{\min}, v_{\max}]} \left(v_h + 0.0015 f_h - 0.0025 m'(p_h) + \sigma_v Z_h \right) \\ p_{h+1} &= \Psi_{[p_{\min}, p_{\max}]} \left(p_h + v_{h+1} + \sigma_p Z'_h \right) \end{aligned}$$

where (Z_h, Z'_h) are a pair of independent standard normal variables. Note that the system dynamics are non-linear due to both the presence of the derivative m' and the truncation function Ψ .

The objective of the car is to reach the peak of the mountain, designated by the position $p_{\text{goal}} = 0.45$. The reward at state-action pair (s, a) is given by

$$r(s, a) := -\frac{1}{10} f^2 + 100 [\max\{0, p - p_{\text{goal}}\}]^2.$$

For any policy π , we define the γ -discounted value function

$$J(\pi) := \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \gamma^h r(S_h, A_h) \right],$$

using $\gamma = 0.97$. The initial state $s_0 = (p_0, v_0)$ is generated with p_0 following a uniform distribution over the interval $[-0.6, -0.4]$, and we initialize with velocity $v_0 = 0$.

F.2 Fitted Q-iteration (FQI) with linear function approximation

Here we describe the use of fitted Q-iteration (FQI) with linear function approximation to estimate the optimal Q-function, along with the corresponding greedy policy $\hat{\pi}$.

Linear function approximation We approximate the the optimal Q-function $(s, a) \mapsto f^*(s, a)$ using a d -dimensional linear function class with $d = 3000$ features. We begin by defining the *base feature maps* $\phi_p : [p_{\min}, p_{\max}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{50}$ for position, and $\phi_v : [v_{\min}, v_{\max}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{15}$ for velocity, with components given by

$$\begin{cases} \phi_{p,2j+1}(p) := \cos(jp), & \text{for } j = 0, 1, \dots, 24, \text{ and} \\ \phi_{p,2j}(p) := \sin(jp), & \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, 25; \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \phi_{v,2j+1}(v) := \cos(jv), & \text{for } j = 0, 1, \dots, 7, \text{ and} \\ \phi_{v,2j}(v) := \sin(jv), & \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, 7. \end{cases}$$

To represent the action $a \equiv f$, we define the *base action feature map*

$$\phi_f(f) := (1, f, f^2, f^3) \in \mathbb{R}^4.$$

The overall feature map $\phi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3000}$ is constructed by taking the outer product of the three base feature maps ϕ_p , ϕ_v , and ϕ_f as follows:

$$\phi(s, a) := \text{vec}\{\phi_p(p) \otimes \phi_v(v) \otimes \phi_f(f)\} \in \mathbb{R}^{3000}. \quad (86)$$

Taking all possible triples of the three base features in the outer product leads to the overall dimension $d = 3000 = 50 \times 15 \times 4$. Given a weight vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{3000}$, we define the function $f_{\mathbf{w}}(s, a) := \langle \mathbf{w}, \phi(s, a) \rangle$, and we approximate the optimal Q-function using the function class $\mathcal{F} := \{f_{\mathbf{w}} \mid \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{3000}\}$.

Fitted Q-iteration (FQI) We employed fitted Q-iteration with the linear feature $\phi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3000}$ to estimate an optimal policy $\hat{\pi}$. The FQI process begins by initializing the weight vector as $\mathbf{w}_0 := \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{3000}$. In each iteration, we first use the dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(s_i, a_i, r_i, s'_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}$ to construct the pseudo-responses

$$y_i := r_i + \gamma \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{w}_t, \phi(s'_i, a) \rangle}_{f_{\mathbf{w}_t}(s'_i, a)} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (87)$$

corresponding to a stochastic estimate of the Bellman update applied to our current Q-function estimate $f_{\mathbf{w}_t}$. The polynomial form of the force feature ϕ_f allows for a closed-form solution to the maximum operation required in equation (87). Given these pseudo-responses, we then update the weight vector $\mathbf{w}_t \rightarrow \mathbf{w}_{t+1}$ via the ridge regression

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1} := \arg \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{3000}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{y_i - \langle \mathbf{w}, \phi(s_i, a_i)\rangle\}^2 + \lambda_n \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \right\}, \quad (88)$$

where $\lambda_n = \frac{0.01}{n}$ in all experiments reported here.

We terminate the procedure after at most 500 iterations, or when there have been 5 consecutive iterations with insignificant improvements in weights, where insignificant means that $\|\mathbf{w}_{t+1} - \mathbf{w}_t\|_2 / \sqrt{3000} < 0.005$. Letting $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ represent the weight vector obtained from this procedure, the resulting policy $\hat{\pi}$ is given by selecting the greedy action based on the Q-function estimate $\hat{f}(s, a) := \langle \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \phi(s, a) \rangle$.

F.3 Experimental configurations

Our experiments were based on an off-line dataset consisting of n i.i.d. tuples

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(s_i, a_i, r_i, s'_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S},$$

where the state-action pairs $\{(s_i, a_i) = (p_i, v_i, f_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ were generated from a uniform distribution over the cube $[p_{\min}, p_{\max}] \times [v_{\min}, v_{\max}] \times [f_{\min}, f_{\max}]$. We performed independent experiments with the sample size n varying over the range

$$\begin{aligned} n &\in \{ \lfloor e^k \rfloor \mid k = 10.5, 10.75, 11, \dots, 13 \} \\ &= \{36315, 46630, 59874, 76879, 98715, 126753, 162754, 208981, 268337, 344551, 442413\}. \end{aligned}$$

In each experiment, we generated a dataset \mathcal{D} , estimated an optimal policy $\hat{\pi}$ based on the data, and evaluated the return $J(\hat{\pi})$. For each sample size, we conducted 80 independent trials.

In order to evaluate the return $J(\hat{\pi})$, for each initial position $p_0 = -0.5 + 0.2j/1000$ with $j = -500, -499, -498, \dots, 499$, we simulated 30 independent 1000-step trajectories by executing the estimated policy $\hat{\pi}$. The average return over the 30×1000 trajectories is used as the estimate of $J(\hat{\pi})$.

In order to approximate the policy⁹ π^\dagger that represents ‘‘ground truth’’, we conducted a single experiment with sample size $n = 6.4 \times 10^6$ to obtain π^\dagger . We simulated 1000 trajectories for each initial position p_0 and calculated the average return, which serves as the reference value $J(\pi^\dagger)$. The value sub-optimality is then computed as the difference $J(\pi^\dagger) - J(\hat{\pi})$.

⁹In general, it is not guaranteed that π^\dagger is equal to the optimal policy π^* , due to approximation error that might arise from using the linear function class defined here.

G Verification of auxiliary claims

In this appendix, we collect the verification of various auxiliary claims made in the main text.

G.1 Condition (44) for occupation measures

In this appendix, we verify that condition (44) holds for the state-action occupation measures (8). By definition, we have

$$\|\mathcal{P}_h^* f\|_h^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} [(\mathcal{P}_h^* f)^2(S_h, A_h)] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} \left[\mathbb{E}_h [f(S_{h+1}, \pi_{h+1}^*(S_{h+1})) \mid S_h, A_h]^2 \right].$$

According to the property of variance, we can deduce

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} \left[\mathbb{E}_h [f(S_{h+1}, \pi_{h+1}^*(S_{h+1})) \mid S_h, A_h]^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} \left[f^2(S_{h+1}, \pi_{h+1}^*(S_{h+1})) \right] = \|f\|_{h+1}^2.$$

As a consequence, we find that $\|\mathcal{P}_h^* f\|_h \leq \|f\|_{h+1}$. Applying this inequality recursively leads to the conclusion that for any indices $1 \leq h \leq h' \leq H$, we have

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{h,h'}^* f\|_h = \|\mathcal{P}_h^* \mathcal{P}_{h+1,h'}^* f\|_h \leq \|\mathcal{P}_{h+1,h'}^* f\|_{h+1} \leq \|\mathcal{P}_{h+2,h'}^* f\|_{h+2} \leq \dots \leq \|f\|_{h'}.$$

This establishes the bound (44) with $b_{\mathcal{F}} = 1$.

G.2 Details of Example 1

In this appendix, we complete the argument outlined in Example 1. In particular, our goal is to show that conditions **(Curv1)** and **(Curv2)** hold with parameter $C_h(s) := 16\sqrt{2} \varrho$.

We begin by connecting the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_2$ with the $\|\cdot\|_h$ norm that is defined by the occupation measure.¹⁰ Let us assume that the occupation measure under the optimal policy is sufficiently exploratory so as to ensure that the covariance matrix $\Sigma_h = \mathbb{E}_{\pi^*} [\phi(S_h, A_h) \phi(S_h, A_h)^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is well-conditioned in the sense that $\frac{1}{2d} \mathbf{I} \preceq \Sigma_h \preceq \frac{2}{d} \mathbf{I}$. This sandwich relation implies that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2d}} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\Sigma_h} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{d}} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\Sigma_h^{-1}} \leq \sqrt{2d} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2. \quad (89)$$

For linear functions $f_h(s) = \langle \mathbf{w}, \phi(s) \rangle$ and $f_h^*(s) = \langle \mathbf{w}^*, \phi(s) \rangle$, we have $\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_{\Sigma_h} = \|f_h - f_h^*\|_h$ and $\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_{\Sigma_h} = \|f_h^*\|_h$. Using our inequalities (89), we find that

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_2}{\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2d} \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_{\Sigma_h}}{\sqrt{\frac{d}{2}} \|\mathbf{w}^*\|_{\Sigma_h}} = \frac{2 \|f_h - f_h^*\|_h}{\|f_h^*\|_h}. \quad (90)$$

Furthermore, when $\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{w}^*\|_2$, we have the bound

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq 2 \|\mathbf{w}^*\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{2d} \|\mathbf{w}^*\|_{\Sigma_h} = 2\sqrt{2d} \|f_h^*\|_h.$$

Now recall from the main text our two inequalities (20a) and (20b), as well as the inequality

$$\angle(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}^*) \leq \frac{2 \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_2}{\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_2}.$$

¹⁰In the argument given here, we consider a general dimension d so as to convey the general idea, but the example itself has $d = 2$.

Combining these bounds with the inequalities above, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi(s, \pi_h(s)) - \phi(s, \pi_h^*(s))\|_{\Sigma_h^{-1}} &\leq 4\sqrt{2d} \varrho \cdot \frac{\|f_h - f_h^*\|_h}{\|f_h^*\|_h}, \\ |f_h(s, \pi_h(s)) - f_h(s, \pi_h^*(s))| &\leq 16\sqrt{2d} \varrho \|f_h^*\|_h \left\{ \frac{\|f_h - f_h^*\|_h}{\|f_h^*\|_h} \right\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have established the claim—namely, that conditions **(Curv1)** and **(Curv2)** hold with parameter $C_h(s) := 16\sqrt{2} \varrho$.

G.3 Proof of the telescope inequality (12)

For completeness of this paper,¹¹ let us prove the telescope relation (12) stated in Section 2.3.1. For any policy $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_H)$ and sequence of functions $\boldsymbol{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_H)$ with $f_H = r_H$, we have the “telescope” relation

$$V_1^\pi(s) = f_1(s, \pi_1(s)) + \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \mathbb{E}_\pi[(\mathcal{T}_h^\pi f_{h+1} - f_h)(S_h, A_h) \mid S_1 = s] \quad \text{for any state } s \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (91)$$

Here the value function V_1^π is given by $V_1^\pi(s) := f_1^\pi(s, \pi_1(s))$ for the Q -function f_1^π defined in equation (2). Taking $\boldsymbol{f} = \hat{\boldsymbol{f}}$ in equation (91) yields

$$V_1^\pi(s) = \hat{f}_1(s, \pi_1(s)) + \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \mathbb{E}_\pi[(\mathcal{T}_h^\pi \hat{f}_{h+1} - \hat{f}_h)(S_h, A_h) \mid S_1 = s]. \quad (92a)$$

Letting $\boldsymbol{\pi} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ in equation (92a) yields

$$V_1^{\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}}(s) = \hat{f}_1(s, \hat{\pi}_1(s)) + \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}}[(\mathcal{T}_h^{\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}} \hat{f}_{h+1} - \hat{f}_h)(S_h, A_h) \mid S_1 = s]. \quad (92b)$$

Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ is a greedy policy with respect to function $\hat{\boldsymbol{f}}$, we have

$$\hat{f}_1(s, \hat{\pi}_1(s)) \geq \hat{f}_1(s, \pi_1(s)), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_h^{\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}} \hat{f}_{h+1} = \mathcal{T}_h^* \hat{f}_{h+1} \geq \mathcal{T}_h^\pi \hat{f}_{h+1} \quad \text{for any policy } \boldsymbol{\pi}.$$

Using this fact and subtracting equations (92a) and (92b), we obtain

$$V_1^\pi(s) - V_1^{\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}}(s) \leq \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} (\mathbb{E}_\pi - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}})[(\mathcal{T}_h^* \hat{f}_{h+1} - \hat{f}_h)(S_h, A_h) \mid S_1 = s].$$

Finally, taking the expectation over the initial distribution ξ_1 yields the claimed inequality (12).

¹¹We are not claiming novelty here; see Theorem 2 of the paper [40]; or Lemma 3.2 in the paper [9] for analogous results.