

Efficient and Sharp Off-Policy Evaluation in Robust Markov Decision Processes

Andrew Bennett*

Morgan Stanley

ANDREW.BENNETT@MORGANSTANLEY.COM

Nathan Kallus*

Cornell University

KALLUS@CORNELL.EDU

Miruna Oprescu*

Cornell University

AMO78@CORNELL.EDU

Wen Sun*

Cornell University

WS455@CORNELL.EDU

Kaiwen Wang*

Cornell University

KW437@CORNELL.EDU

Abstract

We study evaluating a policy under best- and worst-case perturbations to a Markov decision process (MDP), given transition observations from the original MDP, whether under the same or different policy. This is an important problem when there is the possibility of a shift between historical and future environments, due to *e.g.* unmeasured confounding, distributional shift, or an adversarial environment. We propose a perturbation model that can modify transition kernel densities up to a given multiplicative factor or its reciprocal, which extends the classic marginal sensitivity model (MSM) for single time step decision making to infinite-horizon RL. We characterize the sharp bounds on policy value under this model, that is, the tightest possible bounds given by the transition observations from the original MDP, and we study the estimation of these bounds from such transition observations. We develop an estimator with several appealing guarantees: it is semi-parametrically efficient, and remains so even when certain necessary nuisance functions such as worst-case Q-functions are estimated at slow nonparametric rates. It is also asymptotically normal, enabling easy statistical inference using Wald confidence intervals. In addition, when certain nuisances are estimated inconsistently we still estimate a valid, albeit possibly not sharp bounds on the policy value. We validate these properties in numeric simulations. The combination of accounting for environment shifts from train to test (robustness), being insensitive to nuisance-function estimation (orthogonality), and accounting for having only finite samples to learn from (inference) together leads to credible and reliable policy evaluation.

Keywords: Sensitivity Analysis, Robust MDPs, Semiparametric Efficiency.

1. Introduction

Offline policy evaluation from historical data is crucial in domains where active, on-policy experimentation is costly, risky, unethical, or otherwise operationally infeasible. Relevant domains range from medicine, to finance, to recommendation systems. However, whenever historical data is used to study future behavior, there is a concern of non-stationarity – shift between the environment generating the data (training environment) and the environment in which a policy will be deployed (test environment). This may occur *e.g.* due to general distributional shifts in the environment over time, unobserved confounding in the observed historical data, or adversarial elements of the environment

* Alphabetical order.

(such as other agents) that may react when the agent is deployed. So, even as standard off-policy evaluation in offline reinforcement learning accounts for the change between the logging and evaluation policies, it may fail to account for the fact that the Markov decision process (MDP) too has changed. While this issue is particularly critical in high-stakes domains, it is broadly appealing to understand how value shifts across different environments in any application domain.

Robust MDPs [28, 46] model unknown environments by permitting an adversary free to choose from any one environment in a set. Therefore, they offer a natural model for unknown environment shifts by simply considering all environments to which we could possibly shift. A variety of work addresses questions such as planning in a known robust MDP [25, 42, 61] as well as online learning [4, 60]. Here we focus on a purely statistical estimation question: given transition data from a (possibly unknown) logging policy playing in an unknown MDP, we wish to estimate the worst-case (or best-case) value of a given evaluation policy in a robust MDP defined by a set of environments centered around the original MDP. Crucially, just as in offline reinforcement learning, we do not know the original MDP, and therefore neither do we know the robust MDP. And, in a notable departure from standard offline reinforcement learning, the problem can be difficult even if the logging and evaluation policies are the same (the usually easy on-policy setting), since the policy can induce very different visitation distributions in the original and perturbed MDPs. Such robust offline evaluation from transition data was considered in recent work [10, 48].

We build on this recent work by focusing the question of statistically *efficient* and *robust* estimation of the *sharp* bounds (i.e., the tightest possible given the data). Previous work focused on evaluation using only the Q-function under the worst-case environment (in some cases under a relaxation of the adversary, leading to loose bounds). Thus, any error in its estimation translates directly to error in evaluation, with multiple negative consequences. First, flexible nonparametric modeling of this function can mean slow rates for estimating bounds. Second, a lack of semiparametric efficiency even under \sqrt{n} rates. Third, a lack of understanding of statistical uncertainty around the target bounds, most crucially their possible under-estimation due to statistical noise.

We address these issues by developing an orthogonalized estimation method. Our approach combines several nuisance functions: the Q-function in the worst-case environment, the state-visitation frequency in the worst-case environment, and a threshold characterizing the worst-case multiplicative perturbation. Our first key result is that the first-order behavior of our estimator is as though we took a sample averaging with the true value of these functions exactly without having to estimate them at all, provided we just estimate them at certain slow nonparametric rates. This ensures we not only have a \sqrt{n} -rate of estimation even when nuisances are estimated more slowly, but also that we are asymptotically normal, permitting the easy construction of confidence intervals on top of the bounds so that we are assured an actual bound with high confidence. We further show that our asymptotic variance is in fact the minimum achievable (either by any sufficiently stable estimator or by any estimator at all in a local minimax sense), that is, we attain semiparametric efficiency. Our second key results show that even if we do not estimate some of the nuisance functions correctly, we are still consistent to sharp or valid bounds (depending on the case). That is, even when we are biased due to misestimation of nuisances, our bias (if any) only enlarges our bounds, so they remain valid, albeit possibly not sharp. We illustrate these guarantees numerically. Taken together, these guarantees provide considerable credibility to bounds produced by our method.

1.1. Related Works

Unobserved Confounding in Sequential Decision Making. Offline policy evaluation in robust MDPs is tightly linked to the problem of OPE in confounded MDPs, where both the behavior policy and the transition kernel are influenced by unobserved confounders. The constraint Eq. (1) defining our target robust MDP aligns with the Marginal Sensitivity Model (MSM) [54] employed in sensitivity analysis for causal inference. Yet, unlike the MSM, which limits the ratio of policy densities, our approach directly constrains the ratio of the transition kernels. Our formulation can be viewed as a generalization of the MSM from traditional two-action no-horizon causal effects (where the constraints coincide) to multi-action infinite-horizon discounted MDPs, where the next state is the “potential outcome.” In that sense, our model essentially serves as an outcome-based sensitivity model [8], diverging from a purely policy-based perspective. This distinction is crucial as it enables our model to subsume the policy-based MSM in cases where the policy is confounded. Nonetheless, the reverse does not hold, and the policy-based MSM does not imply a transition kernel-based MSM for $A > 2$. This point is further corroborated by [10], who explore the policy-based MSM within confounded MDPs and obtain *non-sharp* identification bounds when $A > 2$. In contrast, our approach yields a *sharp* identification in general regardless of the number of actions and without placing assumptions on the behavior policy, which may or may not be confounded.

[11] also considered an MSM-like model in the transition kernel but their formulation assumes $A = 2$. [33] operates under the setting of [10] and required tabular states. We note that all these works including ours considers *i.i.d.* confounders at each step, which translates to a robust MDP with (s, a) -rectangularity and ensures that the worst-case problem is still an MDP rather than a POMDP. The importance of this assumption was verified by [45], who showed that without it the non-memoryless confounder can create exponential-in-horizon changes in value.

Neyman Orthogonality and Semiparametric Efficient Estimation. We leverage a body of research focusing on learning with nuisances functions (e.g., Q-functions) that we need to estimate from data but are not the primary target (e.g., policy value). Much of this research [5, 14, 15, 24, 52, 58, among others] aims to identify Neyman-orthogonal estimators, which are first order orthogonal (insensitive) to nuisance errors. This literature is tightly linked to the semiparametric efficient estimation literature since Neyman-orthogonal scores can arise naturally from efficient influence functions [27, 51]. Going beyond the no-horizon causal inference setting, some explore such estimators in off-policy sequential-decisions contexts [17, 31, 34, 39, 41]. Notably, [32] derive efficient influence functions and orthogonal estimation in standard, non-robust OPE in infinite-horizon RL, which coincides with our unconfounded no-uncertainty case ($\Lambda = 1$).

Going beyond point-identified settings, some explore orthogonality and efficiency for partial identification and sensitivity analysis. In the causal inference literature, efficient/orthogonal estimation in the no-horizon setting has been studied extensively under several sensitivity models [8, 16, 19]. Closest to our work is [19] who provide an orthogonal estimator and convergence rates under the MSM [54], which coincides with our setting under $\gamma = 0$. In the sequential setting, [45] considers confounding at a single time step under the MSM, but their estimator is not orthogonal when the quantile function is unknown. [10] provide a fitted-Q-iteration learner with an orthogonalized loss function, but not orthogonal/efficient estimates of worst-case policy value.

2. Preliminaries

We consider a Markov Decision Process (MDP) with state space \mathcal{S} , action space \mathcal{A} , transition kernel $P(s' | s, a)$, known reward function $r(s, a) \in [0, 1]$ and known initial state distribution $d_1 \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$. While we assumed r to be known for simplicity, our analysis easily adapts to when r is stochastic and unknown. We are given a dataset \mathcal{D} of n *i.i.d.* tuples (s_i, a_i, r_i, s'_i) such that $(s_i, a_i) \sim \nu$, $r_i = r(s_i, a_i)$ and $s'_i \sim P(\cdot | s, a)$, where ν is the visitation distribution of the data generating process. For a discount factor γ , define the quality function as the discounted sum of returns under a policy $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, $Q_{\pi, P}(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi, P}[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t(s_t, a_t) | s_1 = s, a_1 = a]$. Similarly, define the value function as $V_{\pi, P}(s) = Q_{\pi, P}(s, \pi)$, where $f(s, \pi) := \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(s)}[f(s, a)]$.

Throughout the paper, fix an arbitrary target evaluation policy π_t . We are interested in estimating the value of π_t in an MDP with a perturbed and unobserved transition kernel U . We say U is a feasible perturbation of P if for all s, a, s' : we have

$$\Lambda^{-1}(s, a) \leq \frac{dU(s' | s, a)}{dP(s' | s, a)} \leq \Lambda(s, a) \quad (1)$$

where $\Lambda(s, a) \in [1, \infty)$ is a sensitivity parameter chosen by the practitioner. Let $\mathcal{U}(P)$ denote all feasible perturbations of P . Note that $\mathcal{U}(P)$ is an s, a -rectangular set, which is important as otherwise the problem may be computationally hard [42]. We define the best- and worst-case quality functions of π_t as

$$Q^+(s, a) = \sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(P)} Q_{\pi_t, U}(s, a); \quad Q^-(s, a) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}(P)} Q_{\pi_t, U}(s, a). \quad (2)$$

We focus on estimating the best- and worst-case initial-state value of π_t ,

$$V_{d_1}^{\pm} := (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{d_1}[V^{\pm}(s_1)]. \quad (3)$$

where $V^{\pm}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_t(s)}[Q^{\pm}(s, a)]$ and the \pm symbol signals that an equation should be read twice, once with $\pm = +$ and once with $\pm = -$. We highlight that the best- and worst-case transition kernels U^{\pm} are unobserved as our dataset \mathcal{D} is generated under the nominal MDP with transition kernel P , which adds an additional layer of complexity on-top of standard offline evaluation. For example, even if \mathcal{D} were generated by π_t , *i.e.*, the on-policy case, our problem is still “off-data” and non-trivial while standard offline evaluation is easy.

Discounted Visitation Distributions. For any transition kernel U , denote $d_{d_1, U}^{\pi_t, \infty}(s)$ as the γ -discounted average visitation distribution of π_t under U starting from d_1 . That is, if $d_{d_1, U}^{\pi_t, h}(s)$ is the probability of s in the Markov chain induced by π_t and U , starting from $d_1(\cdot)$, then $d_{d_1, U}^{\pi_t, \infty}(s) := (1 - \gamma) \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{h-1} d_{d_1, U}^{\pi_t, h}(s)$. We omit π_t if it is clear from the context. In Lemma 4, we derive a closed form expression for the best- and worst-case transition kernel in $\mathcal{U}(P)$, which we denote as U^{\pm} . We use $d^{\pm, \infty}$ as shorthand for $d_{d_1, U^{\pm}}^{\pi_t, \infty}$.

Bellman-type Operators. Fix any $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For a transition kernel U , the standard Bellman operator is defined as $\mathcal{T}_U f(s, a) := r(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_U[f(s', \pi_t) | s, a]$. We also define $\mathcal{J}_U f(s, a) := \gamma \mathbb{E}_U[f(s', \pi_t) | s, a] - f(s, a)$. We also define the best- and worst-case robust Bellman operator as $\mathcal{T}_{\text{rob}}^+ f(s, a) := r(s, a) + \gamma \sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(P)} \mathbb{E}_U[f(s', \pi_t) | s, a]$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{rob}}^- f(s, a) := r(s, a) + \gamma \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}(P)} \mathbb{E}_U[f(s', \pi_t) | s, a]$. For any linear operator \mathcal{T} , also let \mathcal{T}' denote its adjoint: that is, for all $f, g \in L_2(\nu)$, $\langle f, \mathcal{T}g \rangle = \langle \mathcal{T}'f, g \rangle$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the inner product in $L_2(\nu)$.

Conditional Value-at Risk (CVaR). The upper and lower CVaRs [50] at level $\tau \in [0, 1]$ of a random variable X are defined as follows:

$$\text{CVaR}_\tau^+(X) = \min_{b \in \text{supp}(X)} \{b + \tau^{-1} \mathbb{E}[(X - b)_+]\}, \quad \text{CVaR}_\tau^-(X) = \max_{b \in \text{supp}(X)} \{b + \tau^{-1} \mathbb{E}[(X - b)_-]\}.$$

Intuitively, $\text{CVaR}_\tau^\pm(X)$ is the average outcome of the upper/lower τ -fraction of cases. For a CDF F we define the lower α -quantile $\beta_{\alpha, F}^- = \inf\{\beta : F(\beta) \geq \alpha\}$ and the upper α -quantile $\beta_{\alpha, F}^+ = \beta_{1-\alpha, F}^-$. The max / min are attained at the upper/lower τ -th quantile of X which we denote as $\beta_\tau^+(X) / \beta_\tau^-(X)$, respectively. That is, $\text{CVaR}_\tau^\pm(X) = \beta_\tau^\pm(X) + \tau^{-1} \mathbb{E}[(X - \beta_\tau^\pm(X))_\pm]$. If the CDF of X is differentiable at $\beta_\tau^+(X)$, then we have $\text{CVaR}_\tau^+(X) = \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \geq \beta_\tau^+(X)]$. Similarly, if the CDF of X is differentiable at $\beta_\tau^-(X)$, then we have $\text{CVaR}_\tau^-(X) = \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \leq \beta_\tau^-(X)]$. In the paper, τ will often be set to $(\Lambda + 1)^{-1}$ which takes values in $[0, 0.5]$.

Notations. For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $x_+ = \max(0, x)$ and $x_- = \min(0, x)$ and we take $x \lesssim y$ to mean $x \leq Cy$ for a universal constant C and log factors. We let $\mathbb{I}[b]$ take value 1 if the statement b is true and 0 otherwise. We denote random variables by upper case letters (e.g. X) and scalar values by lower case letters (e.g. x). For a data sample of size n , we define the empirical mean as $\mathbb{E}_n[f(X)] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i)$. We let $\|f\|_p := (\mathbb{E}|f(X)|^p)^{1/p}$ denote the L^p norm of f provided it exists. We also define the empirical version $\|f\|_{p,n} := (\mathbb{E}_n|f(X)|^p)^{1/p}$. For a measure μ , also let $\|f\|_\mu := (\mathbb{E}_\mu|f(X)|^2)^{1/2}$. For a parameter f , we reserve f^* to represent its true value and \hat{f} a value learned from data. Moreover, we employ $+$ and $-$ to denote functions corresponding to best- and worst-case bounds, respectively. The \pm symbol signals that an equation should be read twice, once with $\pm = +$ and once with $\pm = -$. For example, $a_\pm + b_\pm = c_\pm$ is compact notation for two equations: $a_+ + b_+ = c_+$ and $a_- + b_- = c_-$. See Section A for a comprehensive notation index.

3. Direct Approach with Robust Fitted-Q

We first prove an identification result for Q^\pm in terms of the robust Bellman equation, and then derive convergence guarantees for iteratively minimizing the robust Bellman error. By s, a -rectangularity of \mathcal{U} , we have the robust Bellman equations

$$Q^\pm(s, a) = \mathcal{T}_{\text{rob}}^\pm Q^\pm(s, a). \quad (4)$$

However, the above equations are intractable due to the sup / inf in $\mathcal{T}_{\text{rob}}^\pm$ and the fact that we do not observe the perturbed kernels U . The following lemma from [11] shows that $\mathcal{T}_{\text{rob}}^\pm$ actually has a closed form solution in terms of CVaR under the *observed* kernel P .

Lemma 1 (Identification of Q^\pm) *Set $\tau(s, a) = (\Lambda(s, a) + 1)^{-1}$. Then, for any $q : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{rob}}^\pm q(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \Lambda^{-1}(s, a) \mathbb{E}[v(s') \mid s, a] + \gamma(1 - \Lambda^{-1}(s, a)) \text{CVaR}_{\tau(s, a)}^\pm[v(s') \mid s, a],$$

where $v(s') = q(s', \pi_t)$, and $\mathbb{E}, \text{CVaR}_\tau$ are conditional on the observed nominal kernel $P(\cdot \mid s, a)$.

This identifies Q^\pm as a fixed point to an equation under observables. Lemma 1 is proved using the primal form of CVaR_τ as in [2]. Under no confounding, *i.e.*, $\Lambda = 1$, we recover the standard Bellman equation. Under maximal confounding, *i.e.*, $\Lambda = \infty$, then we recover the best- and worst-path Bellman equation [20], *i.e.*, the CVaR_τ^\pm with $\tau(s, a) = 0$ becomes min or max over possible next states.

Algorithm 1 Robust FQE for Estimating Q^\pm and β_τ^\pm .

- 1: **Input:** Num iterations K , Dataset \mathcal{D} of size n , Q-class \mathcal{Q} , quantile regressor QR
- 2: Init $\hat{q}_0(s, a) = 0, \hat{v}_0(s') = 0, \hat{\beta}_1^\pm(s, a) = 0$
- 3: **for** $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ **do**
- 4: Create a sub-dataset $\mathcal{D}_k = \mathcal{D}[nk/K : n(k+1)/K]$
- 5: Using the second half of \mathcal{D}_k , perform least-squares regression on the pseudo-outcome:

$$y^\pm(s, a, s') = r(s, a) + \gamma \Lambda^{-1}(s, a) \hat{v}_{k-1}(s') \\ + \gamma(1 - \Lambda^{-1}(s, a))(\hat{\beta}_k^\pm(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(s, a)(\hat{v}_{k-1}(s') - \hat{\beta}_k^\pm(s, a))_\pm),$$

that is, $\hat{q}_k = \arg \min_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k[|\mathcal{D}_k|/2+1:]}[(y^\pm(s, a, s') - q(s, a))^2]$, and set $\hat{v}_k(s') = \hat{q}_k(s, \pi_t)$

- 6: Invoke the quantile regression oracle $\hat{\beta}_{k+1}^\pm = \text{QR}(\hat{q}_k, \mathcal{D}_k[:|\mathcal{D}_k|/2])$.
 - 7: **Output:** $\hat{v}_K, \hat{\beta}_{K+1}$
-

3.1. Estimating Q^\pm with Robust FQE

Equipped with a tractable identification for $\mathcal{T}_{\text{rob}}^\pm$, we can estimate Q^\pm by performing a robust variant of fitted Q-evaluation (FQE) [44]. As described in [Algorithm 1](#), the algorithm proceeds for K iterates where each iterate first estimates the upper- and lower-quantile of \hat{v}_{k-1} and then fits the robust equation of [Lemma 1](#) via least squares with a function class $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, (1 - \gamma)^{-1}]$. In the second regression step ([Line 5](#)), we use the orthogonal estimating equation for CVaR [47] which allows for second-order errors in the first quantile estimation step ([Line 6](#)). The algorithm takes any quantile regression estimator as the oracle QR. Nonparametric quantile regression has been extensively studied and many algorithms exist which can be plugged in [7, 12, 22, 23, 43, 47, 49, 53]. For any $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ let $\beta_\tau^q(s, a)$ denote the true $\tau(s, a)$ -quantile of $q(s', \pi_t), s' \sim P(s, a)$. Given a dataset \mathcal{D}_{QR} of size n , we assume $\hat{\beta}_q = \text{QR}(q, \mathcal{D}_{\text{QR}})$ has bounded ℓ_∞ error: for any δ , w.p. $1 - \delta$, $\|\hat{\beta}_q - \beta_\tau^q\|_\infty < \text{err}_{\text{QR}}(n, \delta)$, which can, for example, be guaranteed under smoothness conditions.

Assumption 2 (Completeness) For all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$, we have $\mathcal{T}_{\text{rob}}^\pm q \in \mathcal{Q}$.

We assume completeness under the robust Bellman operator $\mathcal{T}_{\text{rob}}^\pm$. Completeness is a standard assumption in model-free RL; without it, fitted-Q can diverge or converge to bad fixed points [36, 56]. We also note that our completeness is weaker than required by the current proofs of [10, 48], which require $\mathcal{T}_\beta q \in \mathcal{B}$ for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ (\mathcal{B} is the quantile class). On the other hand, we only need $\mathcal{T}_{\beta_\tau^q} q \in \mathcal{B}$ for the correct quantile β_τ^q where $\mathcal{T}_{\beta_\tau^q}$ coincides with \mathcal{T}_{rob} . We circumvent the need for the stronger ‘‘all- β ’’ completeness by bounding model misspecification of least squares regression with second order error in the quantile regression.

Theorem 3 (Robust FQE) Let $\varepsilon_n^\mathcal{Q}$ denote the critical radius of \mathcal{Q} . Under [Assumption 2](#) and coverage $C_\mu^\pm := \|\text{dd}_\mu^{\pm, \infty}/\text{d}\nu\|_\infty$, then for any state distribution μ , for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, w.p. $1 - \delta$,

$$\|\hat{q}_K^\pm - Q^\pm\|_\mu \lesssim (1 - \gamma)^{-2} (\sqrt{C_\mu^\pm} \cdot \varepsilon_n^\mathcal{Q} + \text{err}_{\text{QR}}^2(n/2K, \delta/2K)).$$

Moreover, we have,

$$\left| V_{d_1}^\pm - (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{d_1}[\hat{q}_K^\pm(s_1, \pi_t)] \right| \lesssim \gamma^K + (1 - \gamma)^{-1} (\sqrt{C_{d_1}^\pm} \cdot \varepsilon_n^\mathcal{Q} + \text{err}_{\text{QR}}^2(n/2K, \delta/2K)).$$

The critical radius is a standard tool for deriving fast rates of squared loss [59]; see [Appendix D](#) for a summary. Note that we have a second-order (squared) dependence on the ℓ_∞ -rate of β . However, the error of this direct approach is bottlenecked by the rate of robust Q -regression, which may converge slower than parametric $n^{-1/2}$ -rates when working with milder assumptions. In [Section 5](#), we present an orthogonal estimator that is both robust to slower rates of Q and semi-parametrically efficient.

4. Robust kernel and visitations

In this section, we first identify the best- and worst-case feasible transition kernel in our uncertainty set. Then, we present a penalized minimax estimator with guarantees for estimating the best- and worst-case visitation density w.r.t. the data generating measure. This density will play an important role in the next section as we introduce our orthogonal estimator.

The following lemma identifies the best- and worst-case transition kernel U under the assumption that the next-state value is continuously distributed around its τ -th quantile.

Lemma 4 (Identification of U^\pm) *Fix any $v : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and define the pushforward $F_v(y | s, a) = P(v(s') \leq y | s, a)$. If $F_v(\beta_{\tau, F_v(\cdot|s,a)}^\pm(s, a) | s, a) = \frac{1}{2} \pm (\frac{1}{2} - \tau)$, then we have $\sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(P)} \mathbb{E}_U[v(s') | s, a] = \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim U_v^+(s,a)}[v(s')]$ and $\inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}(P)} \mathbb{E}_U[v(s') | s, a] = \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim U_v^-(s,a)}[v(s')]$, where*

$$U_v^\pm(s' | s, a) / P(s' | s, a) = \Lambda^{-1}(s, a) + (1 - \Lambda^{-1})\tau(s, a)^{-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\pm \left(v(s') - \beta_{\tau, F_v(\cdot|s,a)}^\pm(s, a) \right) \geq 0 \right].$$

The proof is to use the optimizer of the primal form of CVaR $_\tau$ as in [2]. This result is consistent with [Lemma 1](#) by recalling that, under the unique quantile assumption imposed, CVaR is simply the conditional expectation above/below the upper/lower τ -th quantile. Under no confounding, *i.e.*, $\Lambda = 1$, then we have $U_v^\pm = P$, which recovers the nominal transition kernel. Under maximal confounding, *i.e.*, $\Lambda = \infty$, then U_v^+ places all weight on s' that maximizes $v(s')$, and U_v^- places all weight on s' that minimizes $v(s')$. We are interested in the case when $v = V^\pm$; hence we define

$$U^\pm(s' | s, a) / P(s' | s, a) := \Lambda^{-1}(s, a) + (1 - \Lambda^{-1})\tau(s, a)^{-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\pm (V^\pm(s') - \beta_\tau^\pm(s, a)) \geq 0 \right], \quad (5)$$

where $\beta^\pm(s, a)$ is the upper/lower $\tau(s, a)$ -quantile of $V^\pm(s')$, $s' \sim P(s, a)$.

4.1. Estimating w^\pm with Robust Minimax Indirect Learning

Let $d^{\pm, \infty}(s)$ denote the γ -discounted average visitation of π_1 under U^\pm . That is, $d^{\pm, \infty}(s) := (1 - \gamma) \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{h-1} d_h^\pm(s)$, where d_h^\pm denotes the h -th step visitation of π_1 with the kernel U^\pm starting from d_1 . Then, the best- and worst-case visitation density w.r.t. the data generating measure is denoted by $w^\pm(s) := dd^{\pm, \infty}(s) / d\nu(s)$, which generalizes the visitation ratio in the efficient influence function of standard offline RL [32]. As with standard offline RL, the density w^\pm is an important nuisance function for our orthogonal and efficient estimator (in [Section 5](#)).

We now propose a penalized minimax algorithm for learning w^\pm based on the robust Bellman flow. Since $d^{\pm, \infty}(s)$ is the γ -discounted visitation in the best-/worst-case MDP with kernel U^\pm , it satisfies the Bellman flow under said MDP [57]:

$$d^{\pm, \infty}(s) = (1 - \gamma)d_1(s) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d^{\pm, \infty}, \tilde{a} \sim \pi_1(\tilde{s})} U^\pm(s | \tilde{s}, \tilde{a}). \quad (\text{Bellman Flow})$$

Define $\omega(s, a) = \pi_1(a|s) / \nu(a|s)$. Then, w^\pm solves the following moment: for all $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[w^\pm(s)f(s)] = (1 - \gamma)\mathbb{E}_{d_1}[f(s_1)] + \gamma \mathbb{E}[w^\pm(s)\omega(s, a)\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim U^\pm(s,a)}[f(s')]], \quad (w^\pm \text{ moment eq.})$$

Algorithm 2 Minimax Estimation of w^\pm with a Stabilizer

- 1: **Input:** Dataset \mathcal{D} , prior stage estimate $\tilde{\zeta}$, function classes \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{F} , stabilizer weight $\lambda > 0$.
- 2: Define weights $\xi^\pm(s, a, s') := \Lambda^{-1}(s, a) + (1 - \Lambda^{-1}(s, a))\tau^{-1}(s, a)\mathbb{I}[\pm\tilde{\zeta}(s, a, s') \geq 0]$.
- 3: **Output:**

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{w}^\pm = \arg \min_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_n [w(s, a)(\gamma\xi^\pm(s, a, s')f(s', \pi_t) - f(s, a)) + (1 - \gamma)\mathbb{E}_{d_1}f(s_1, \pi_t)] \\ - \lambda \|\gamma\xi^\pm(s, a, s'; \tilde{\zeta})f(s', \pi_t) - f(s, a)\|_{2, n}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where \mathbb{E} is over the data distribution ν . We also abuse notation and let $w(s, a) := w(s)\omega(s, a)$. While we do not know U^\pm *a priori*, we can estimate it using the identification of Lemma 4. In particular, given the true best-/worst-case threshold $\zeta^\pm(s, a, s') := V^\pm(s') - \beta_\tau^\pm(s, a)$, solving the equation in Lemma 4 indeed yields $U^\pm(\cdot | s, a)$, which can be used to deduce $d^{\pm, \infty}$ via the Bellman flow minimax estimator as in [57]. Thus, in Algorithm 2, we propose to approximate this minimax objective with an estimated $\tilde{\zeta}$, which can be derived from the output of robust FQE (Algorithm 1). Similar to the standard non-robust minimax algorithm of [57], our algorithm also takes as input two function classes: a \mathcal{W} class for learning w^\pm and an adversary class \mathcal{F} that is rich enough to ensure the moment is sufficiently solved. In our minimax objective (Eq. (6)), we also penalize the adversary function's norm which is necessary for obtaining fast projected L_2 rates, as we prove in the following theorem.

Assumption 5 (Regularity) (i) $\sup_{w \in \mathcal{W} \cup \{w^\pm\}} \|w\|_\infty < \infty$; (ii) the marginal CDF of $V^\pm(s') - \beta_\tau^\pm(s, a)$, i.e., $F(y) = P(V^\pm(s') - \beta_\tau^\pm(s, a) \leq y)$, is boundedly differentiable around 0.

Under coverage, we have $\|w^\pm\|_\infty \leq C_{d_1}^\pm$ so (i) is a standard assumption in offline RL. The Lipschitz assumption of the CDF is also expected since identifying the quantile (needed for identifying U^\pm) relies on the CDF to be Lipschitz in a neighborhood around the quantile. For any kernel U , we define the linear operator $\mathcal{J}_U f(s, a) := \gamma \mathbb{E}_U[f(s', \pi_t) | s, a] - f(s, a)$ and \mathcal{J}'_U denotes its adjoint.

Theorem 6 Let $\varepsilon_n^{\mathcal{W}}$ denote the max critical radii of the following two classes:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_1 &= \{(s, a, s') \mapsto (f(s, a) - \gamma f(s', \pi_t)), f \in \mathcal{F}\}, \\ \mathcal{G}_2 &= \{(s, a, s') \mapsto (w(s, a) - w^\pm(s, a))(\gamma f(s', \pi_t) - f(s, a)), f \in \mathcal{F}, w \in \mathcal{W}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose \mathcal{F} is star-shaped and symmetric, and satisfies $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\| / \|\mathcal{T}_{U^\pm} f\| < \infty$. Under (A) realizability, i.e., $w^\pm \in \mathcal{W}$, (B) w -completeness in the best- and worst-case MDP, i.e., $\mathcal{J}'_{U^\pm}(\mathcal{W} - w^\pm) \subset \mathcal{F}$, and regularity conditions in Assumption 5, then for any δ , w.p. $1 - \delta$,

$$\|\mathcal{J}'_{U^\pm}(\hat{w} - w^\pm)\|_2 \lesssim \varepsilon_n^{\mathcal{W}} + \|\tilde{\zeta}^\pm - \zeta^\pm\|_\infty + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)/n}.$$

Our assumptions are analogous to those needed for minimax learning to succeed in standard OPE [57, Theorem 6.1], except our w -completeness is under the best/worst-case MDP. Like [57], our algorithm is agnostic to these assumptions and the bound degrades gracefully w.r.t. violations of these assumptions, which we detail in Appendix I. Crucially, our algorithm also degrades linearly w.r.t. the ℓ_∞ error in $\tilde{\zeta}^\pm$ for estimating ζ^\pm . For example, if $\zeta(s, a, s') = \hat{v}(s') - \hat{\beta}(s, a)$ where $\hat{v}, \hat{\beta}$ are estimated with robust FQE, then the ζ -error can be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\|\hat{v} - v^\pm\|_\infty + \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^\pm\|_\infty)$. As we show in the next section, our orthogonal estimator is robust to this error from $\tilde{\zeta}$.

Algorithm 3 Orthogonal Estimation of $V_{d_1}^\pm$

-
- 1: **Input:** Dataset \mathcal{D} , Q-class \mathcal{Q} , W-class \mathcal{W} .
 - 2: **for** $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ **do**
 - 3: Use data $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_k$ to learn $q^{\pm, [k]}$ and $\beta^{\pm, [k]}$ with [Algorithm 1](#) and $w^{\pm, [k]}$ with [Algorithm 2](#)
 - 4: **for** $i = \lfloor (k-1)n/K \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor kn/K \rfloor - 1$ **do** $\psi_i^\pm = \psi(s_i, a_i, s'_i, \hat{\eta}^\pm)$
 - 5: **Output:** $\hat{V}_{d_1}^\pm = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i^\pm$.
-

5. Orthogonal and Efficient Estimator for Robust Policy Value

The direct approach presented in [Section 3.1](#) may yield an estimator that suffers from excessive bias due to model misspecification. Moreover, the convergence of the parameter of interest $\hat{V}_{d_1}^\pm$ to the true parameter $V_{d_1}^\pm$ is dominated by the convergence rate of the estimated $\hat{Q}^\pm(s, a)$. That is, $\hat{V}_{d_1}^\pm$ will inherit the slow estimation rates of $\hat{Q}^\pm(s, a)$ and its stochastic deviations (imperiling inference). In this section, we propose an *orthogonal* estimator that is designed to be robust against errors in the nuisances, exhibiting sensitivity only at the second-order level. Our estimator is based on the efficient influence function (EIF) of $V_{d_1}^\pm$, which serves as the canonical gradient of a statistical estimand and plays a central role in building semiparametrically efficient estimators [\[55\]](#). The adoption of EIFs for the development of efficient estimators is a broadly employed technique in machine learning, especially in causal inference [\[14, 35\]](#) and reinforcement learning [\[29, 32\]](#).

We define the collection of nuisance parameters by $\eta^\pm = (w^\pm, q^\pm, \beta^\pm)$. The notation $\hat{\eta}$ indicates that these functions are estimated from data, while η or η^* represent their true values.

Theorem 7 ((Recentered) Efficient Influence Function) *The (R)EIF of $V_{d_1}^\pm$ is given by:*

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(s, a, s'; \eta^\pm) &= V_{d_1}^\pm + w^\pm(s, a)(r(s, a) + \gamma \rho^\pm(s, a, s'; v^\pm, \beta^\pm) - q^\pm(s, a)), \quad \text{where} \\ \rho^\pm(s, a, s'; v^\pm, \beta^\pm) &= \Lambda(s, a)^{-1} v^\pm(s') + (1 - \Lambda(s, a)^{-1})(\beta^\pm(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(v^\pm(s') - \beta^\pm(s, a))_\pm). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 8 *When $\Lambda = 1$, there is no shift in the target environment and the weight on the CVaR term is 0. Then, the (R)EIF reduces to the (R)EIF in [\[32\]](#) for regular OPE with infinite horizon, as expected. As $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$, the CVaR term becomes predominant (and the quantiles $\beta^\pm(s, a)$ assume extreme values), yielding the (novel) (R)EIF for the problem studied in [\[20\]](#), where the expected value term is substituted with solely a CVaR component in the Bellman equation.*

The (R)EIF forms the basis of our orthogonal estimator. First, we note that $\mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \eta^\pm)]$ is an unbiased estimator of $V_{d_1}^\pm$. Furthermore, the expression for $\psi(s, a, s'; \eta^\pm)$ depends only on quantities w^\pm, q^\pm, β^\pm which can be estimated from data. Thus, we can cast the expression $\mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \eta^\pm)]$ as a statistical estimand to be learned from the observed distribution. This suggests a natural two-stage estimator that we summarize in [Algorithm 3](#). In the first stage, we estimate the nuisance parameters $\hat{\eta}$ from the data with K -fold cross-fitting; in the second stage, these estimates are incorporated into the (R)EIF expression and we calculate the empirical average using the observed data. We summarize our procedure in [Algorithm 3](#).

The nuisance estimation is detailed in [Sections 3.1](#) and [4.1](#). The reliance on the EIF confers our estimator desirable statistical properties including a second order bias due to the nuisances, meaning the bias has a product structure with respect to the nuisance errors. Thus, this special

structure orthogonalizes away the dependency on \widehat{Q}^\pm errors which now only appear in second order. Furthermore, our estimator is semiparametrically efficient in the sense that under mild consistency assumptions, it achieves minimum variance among all regular and asymptotically linear (RAL) estimators. We provide theoretical justifications for these properties in the next section.

6. Theoretical Guarantees of the Orthogonal Estimator

We now characterize the theoretical properties of our orthogonal estimator. We consider the K -fold cross-fitted estimator in [Algorithm 3](#) given by

$$\widehat{V}_{d_1}^\pm = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{(s,a,s') \in \mathcal{D}^k} \psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{\eta}^{[k]}),$$

where nuisances $\widehat{\eta}^{[k]}$, $k \in [K]$ are trained on all data excluding the k^{th} fold \mathcal{D}^k . The following theorem outlines the theoretical guarantees of this estimator:

Theorem 9 (Efficiency of \widehat{V}^\pm) *Let $r_{n,p}^w, r_{n,p}^q, r_{n,p}^\beta$ be functions of $n = |\mathcal{D}|$ such that $\|\mathcal{J}'_{U^\pm}(\widehat{w}^{\pm,[k]} - w^*)\|_p \leq r_{n,p}^w$, $\|\widehat{q}^{\pm,[k]} - q^*\|_p \leq r_{n,p}^q$, and $\|\beta^{\pm,[k]} - \beta^*\|_p \leq r_{n,p}^\beta$ for any $k \in [K]$. Furthermore, assume that the regularity conditions in [Assumption 5](#) hold. Then:*

$$|\widehat{V}_{d_1} - V_{d_1}^*| \lesssim O_p(n^{-1/2}) + O_p(r_{n,2}^w r_{n,2}^q + (r_{n,\infty}^q)^2 + (r_{n,\infty}^\beta)^2) \quad (\text{Rates})$$

Furthermore, if $r_{n,2}^w \vee r_{n,2}^q = o_p(1)$, $r_{n,2}^w r_{n,2}^q = o_p(n^{-1/2})$, $r_{n,\infty}^q = o_p(n^{-1/4})$, and $r_{n,\infty}^\beta = o_p(n^{-1/4})$, then \widehat{V}_{d_1} satisfies:

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{V}_{d_1} - V_{d_1}^*) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma), \quad \Sigma = \text{Var}(\psi(s, a, s'; \eta)). \quad (\text{Normality \& Efficiency})$$

Moreover, Σ is the minimum achievable asymptotic variance among RAL estimators in the nonparametric model for (s, a, s') (the efficiency bound).

The first part of [Theorem 9](#) implies that as long as we estimate the nuisances at rates faster than $n^{-1/4}$, then we can learn $\widehat{V}_{d_1}^\pm$ at parametric rates. The second part of [Theorem 9](#) states that under mild consistency assumptions, our estimator attains the efficiency bound and is asymptotically normal. That means, for example, we can construct asymptotically valid lower 95%-confidence bound on $\widehat{V}_{d_1}^-$ by simply subtracting 1.64 times $\widehat{\text{se}} = \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{(s,a,s') \in \mathcal{D}^k} (\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{\eta}^{[k]}) - \widehat{V}_{d_1}^-)^2 \right)^{1/2}$. Then, in an important departure from previous work, we can be sure to have a bound on the worst-case RL policy value, accounting *both* for potential environment shift and finite data.

Putting everything together. We can instantiate [Theorem 9](#) with the previous sections' estimators as follows. First, use robust FQE to obtain estimates \widehat{q}^\pm and $\widehat{\beta}^\pm$. This ensures $\|\widehat{q}^\pm - Q^\pm\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_n^{\mathcal{Q}} + \text{err}_{\text{QR}}^2)$. Under smoothness conditions ([Lemma 15](#)), the L_2 guarantee for \widehat{q}^\pm implies an L_∞ guarantee for \widehat{q}^\pm , which also ensures an L_∞ guarantee for $\widehat{\beta}^\pm$. This ensures $\max(\|\widehat{q}^\pm - Q^\pm\|_\infty, \|\widehat{\beta}^\pm - \beta^\pm\|_\infty)$ is well-controlled. Then, we can set $\widetilde{\zeta}^\pm(s, a, s') = \widehat{q}^\pm(s', \pi_\dagger) - \widehat{\beta}^\pm(s, a)$ and run the minimax algorithm for estimating \widehat{w}^\pm . By [Theorem 6](#), its projected- L_2 error is $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_n^{\mathcal{W}} + \|\widehat{q}^\pm - Q^\pm\|_\infty + \|\widehat{\beta}^\pm - \beta^\pm\|_\infty)$. Therefore, the final rate via [Theorem 9](#) is $\mathcal{O}((\varepsilon_n^{\mathcal{Q}} + \text{err}_{\text{QR}}^2) \cdot \varepsilon_n^{\mathcal{W}} + \|\widehat{q}^\pm - Q^\pm\|_\infty^2 + \|\widehat{\beta}^\pm - \beta^\pm\|_\infty^2)$.

Lastly, we provide some intuition for the results in [Theorem 9](#). Consider the V^- bound and let us decouple the indicator $\mathbb{I}[v(s') - \beta(s, a) \leq 0]$ that appears implicitly in the $(v^-(s') - \beta^-(s, a))_-$

notation of [Theorem 7](#). We augment the set of nuisances with $\zeta(s, a, s') = v^-(s') - \beta^-(s, a)$ such that $(v^-(s') - \beta^-(s, a))_- = (v^-(s') - \beta^-(s, a))\mathbb{I}[\zeta(s, a, s') \leq 0]$. We state the following lemma (which we elaborate upon in [Theorems 18](#) and [19](#) in the [Appendix](#)):

Lemma 10 (Double sharpness with correct ζ^*) *Let $\mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; q, w, \beta, \zeta^*)]$ be the expectation of the (R)EIF with an arbitrary nuisance set $\eta = (w, q, \beta)$, but where the indicator $\mathbb{I}[v^-(s') \leq \beta^-(s, a)]$ has been replaced with the correct indicator $\mathbb{I}[\zeta^*(s, a, s') \leq 0]$. Then:*

$$V_{d_1}^- = \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; q, w^*, \beta^*, \zeta^*)] = \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; q^*, w, \beta^*, \zeta^*)]$$

This lemma implies that if $\beta^- = (\beta^*)^-$ and $\zeta = \zeta^*$, then the estimator $\widehat{V}_{d_1}^-$ has a property known as “double-robustness” [[35](#)] or “double-sharpness” [[19](#)] in q and w , meaning the bias vanishes when either q or w is consistent. Moreover, the convergence rate would be $O_p(r_{n,2}^w r_{n,2}^q)$. This condition holds provided that β and ζ are correctly specified. However, estimation errors in β introduce an additional $O_p((r_{n,\infty}^\beta)^2)$ term, reflecting that β is first-order optimal for the CVaR component. Additionally, discrepancies between ζ and ζ^* contribute an extra $O_p((r_{n,\infty}^q)^2)$ to the error. While this discussion gives some insight into how we achieve the results in [Theorem 9](#), we refer the reader to [Appendix E](#) for a rigorous analysis.

6.1. Validity Guarantees

Moreover, our estimator has additional desirable properties such as *validity* when some nuisances are misspecified. Specifically, the bounds returned by our orthogonal estimator will be asymptotically valid, though possibly loose, when some nuisances are inconsistent, *i.e.*, do not converge to their true values. Below, we detail conditions under which we achieve validity. To be concise, we focus on the $-$ case. Proofs are in [Appendix J](#).

Validity with correct Q^\pm . If $\widehat{Q} = Q^\pm$, we obtain valid bounds even if w, β are inconsistent.

Lemma 11 *For any w, β , we have $\mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; Q^-, \beta, w)] \leq V_{d_1}^-$ with equality when $\beta = \beta_\tau^-$.*

Validity with $Q = \mathcal{T}_\beta^\pm Q$. Even if \widehat{Q} is misspecified, we still have a valid bound if it solves a Bellman-type equation of the dual CVaR form. For a $\beta : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\beta^\pm f(s, a) &:= r(s, a) + \gamma \Lambda^{-1}(s, a) \mathbb{E}[f(s', \pi_t) \mid s, a] \\ &+ \gamma(1 - \Lambda^{-1}(s, a)) \mathbb{E}[\beta(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(s, a)(f(s', \pi_t) - \beta(s, a))_\pm \mid s, a]. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 12 *Fix any w, β . If $Q_\beta^\pm = \mathcal{T}_\beta^\pm Q_\beta^\pm$, then $\mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; Q_\beta^-, \beta, w)] \leq V_{d_1}^-$.*

Remark 13 [Theorems 11](#) and [12](#) are dual: in [Lemma 11](#), the plug-in is consistent while the debiasing correction errs in the valid direction (*i.e.*, ≥ 0 for $+$ and ≤ 0 for $-$). In [Lemma 12](#), the plug-in is valid while the debiasing correction has expectation zero.

7. Empirical Evaluation

We now provide a brief “proof of concept” empirical investigation of our theory. Here we experiment with our proposed methodology in a simple synthetic environment. We first discuss our environment, then we discuss our approach for solving the continuaa of moment equations defining the nuisances functions η^\pm , and finally we provide some empirical results of our corresponding Orthogonal estimator, and compare these to corresponding weighted or direct estimators using the Q^\pm or w^\pm nuisances only.




Figure 1: Results of our synthetic data experiments. We show results for our three estimators on all four values of Λ , over our 10 experiment replications. Horizontal red dashed lines show the true worst-case policy values $V_{d_1}^-$.

7.1. Experimental Setup

We consider a simple synthetic MDP with a one-dimensional state and two actions, which is based on a simple control problem. We consider the task of estimating the worst-case policy value $V_{d_1}^-$ of a fixed candidate policy π_t , for four different fixed sensitivity parameter values: $\Lambda(s, a) \in \{1, 2, 4, 8\}$.

We considered estimation using the following methods:

1. **Q**: Baseline direct-style method using the estimated robust quality function \hat{Q}^- only.
2. **W**: Baseline importance-sampling method using the estimated robust density ratio \hat{w}^- only.
3. **Orth**: Our orthogonal estimator as described in [Algorithm 3](#).

We performed 10 replications of our experimental procedure, in each case: (1) sampling a dataset 20,000 tuples using a different fixed logging policy π_b ; (2) fitting the nuisance functions Q^- , β^- , and w^- along the lines of [Algorithms 1](#) and [2](#) for each Λ ; and (3) for each Λ estimating the corresponding robust policy value $V_{d_1}^-$ for all estimators using our estimated nuisances. In each case, we ran nuisance estimation three times and for each estimator used the minimum of the three resultant estimates, in order to minimize variation and better ensure validity.

Full experimental details, including our MDP, target/logging policies, methodology for computing the true robust policy values $V_{d_1}^-$, and nuisance estimation, are provided in [Appendix K](#).

7.2. Results

We summarize our results in [Fig. 1](#). First, we note that the Orthogonal estimator is able to consistently estimate a policy value that is both accurate and valid. In some cases the importance sampling-style estimator using w^- alone is more accurate than the orthogonal estimator, however it is also sometimes invalid (*e.g.* with $\Lambda = 4$ or 8.) We note that this makes sense, since any errors in the estimation of Q^- and β^- will lead to an estimation of the importance sampling term $U^-(s' | s, a)/P(s' | s, a)$ in the estimation of w' that is not actually worst-case, and therefore the estimated policy value using w^- alone will be too large. In some cases (especially with small Λ) we found that the estimator using q^- alone had large errors. We believe this is because our estimator was less well optimized for this setting, and that it could be fixed with additional hyperparameter tuning. However, it is notable that this large error in q^- estimation does *not* translate into comparably large errors in our orthogonal estimator. This is consistent with our theory, and helps highlight the practical utility of our orthogonal estimator in providing robustness to nuisance estimation error.

8. Conclusion

We consider the problem of infinite-horizon OPE in RL settings when there can be unknown, but bounded, shifts in the transition distribution compared to the transition distribution generating the data. This can, for example, occur when there is unobserved confounding so the transitions we see do not reflect true causal ones, there is non-stationarity in the environment we encounter, or we encounter adversarial environments. We consider a sensitivity model for such transition kernel shifts analogous to the classic MSM for static decision making, and provide theory for identifying and estimating the sharp (i.e., tightest possible) bounds on the best/worst-case policy value, as well as the corresponding robust Q- and state density ratio functions. Our estimator for best/worst-case policy value is orthogonal, meaning insensitive to how we estimate the latter nuisance functions, as well as semiparametrically efficient, meaning achieving the best possible variance. It also enables inference so we can be sure to get a bound on policy value even given finite data.

References

- [1] Alekh Agarwal, Yuda Song, Wen Sun, Kaiwen Wang, Mengdi Wang, and Xuezhou Zhang. Provable benefits of representational transfer in reinforcement learning. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2114–2187. PMLR, 2023.
- [2] Marcus Ang, Jie Sun, and Qiang Yao. On the dual representation of coherent risk measures. *Annals of Operations Research*, 262:29–46, 2018.
- [3] Jean-Yves Audibert and Alexandre B Tsybakov. Fast learning rates for plug-in classifiers under the margin condition. *arXiv preprint math/0507180*, 2005.
- [4] Kishan Panaganti Badrinath and Dileep Kalathil. Robust reinforcement learning using least squares policy iteration with provable performance guarantees. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 511–520. PMLR, 2021.
- [5] Alexandre Belloni, Victor Chernozhukov, Ivan Fernandez-Val, and Christian Hansen. Program evaluation and causal inference with high-dimensional data. *Econometrica*, 85(1):233–298, 2017.
- [6] Andrew Bennett, Nathan Kallus, and Miruna Oprescu. Low-rank mdps with continuous action spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03564*, 2023.
- [7] Pallab K Bhattacharya and Ashis K Gangopadhyay. Kernel and nearest-neighbor estimation of a conditional quantile. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1400–1415, 1990.
- [8] Matteo Bonvini, Edward Kennedy, Valerie Ventura, and Larry Wasserman. Sensitivity analysis for marginal structural models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.04681*, 2022.
- [9] Haïm Brezis and Petru Mironescu. Where sobolev interacts with gagliardo–nirenberg. *Journal of functional analysis*, 277(8):2839–2864, 2019.
- [10] David Bruns-Smith and Angela Zhou. Robust fitted-q-evaluation and iteration under sequentially exogenous unobserved confounders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00662*, 2023.
- [11] David A Bruns-Smith. Model-free and model-based policy evaluation when causality is uncertain. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1116–1126. PMLR, 2021.
- [12] Domagoj Čevič, Loris Michel, Jeffrey Näf, Nicolai Meinshausen, and Peter Bühlmann. Distributional random forests: Heterogeneity adjustment and multivariate distributional regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14458*, 2020.
- [13] Jonathan Chang, Kaiwen Wang, Nathan Kallus, and Wen Sun. Learning bellman complete representations for offline policy evaluation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2938–2971. PMLR, 2022.
- [14] Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, Whitney Newey, and James Robins. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(1):C1–C68, 2018. doi: 10.1111/ectj.12097.

- [15] Victor Chernozhukov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, and Ivan Fernandez-Val. Generic machine learning inference on heterogeneous treatment effects in randomized experiments, with an application to immunization in india. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2018.
- [16] Victor Chernozhukov, Carlos Cinelli, Whitney Newey, Amit Sharma, and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Long story short: Omitted variable bias in causal machine learning. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2022.
- [17] Victor Chernozhukov, Whitney Newey, Rahul Singh, and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Automatic de-biased machine learning for dynamic treatment effects and general nested functionals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13887*, 2022.
- [18] Yinlam Chow, Aviv Tamar, Shie Mannor, and Marco Pavone. Risk-sensitive and robust decision-making: a cvar optimization approach. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- [19] Jacob Dorn, Kevin Guo, and Nathan Kallus. Doubly-valid/doubly-sharp sensitivity analysis for causal inference with unmeasured confounding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11449*, 2021.
- [20] Yihan Du, Siwei Wang, and Longbo Huang. Provably efficient risk-sensitive reinforcement learning: Iterated cvar and worst path. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [21] Yaqi Duan, Chi Jin, and Zhiyuan Li. Risk bounds and rademacher complexity in batch reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2892–2902. PMLR, 2021.
- [22] Anouar El Ghouch and Marc G Genton. Local polynomial quantile regression with parametric features. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104(488):1416–1429, 2009.
- [23] Kevin Elie-Dit-Cosaque and Véronique Maume-Deschamps. Random forest estimation of conditional distribution functions and conditional quantiles. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 16(2):6553–6583, 2022.
- [24] Dylan J Foster and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Orthogonal statistical learning. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(3):879–908, 2023.
- [25] Vineet Goyal and Julien Grand-Clement. Robust markov decision processes: Beyond rectangularity. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 48(1):203–226, 2023.
- [26] Oliver Hines, Oliver Dukes, Karla Diaz-Ordaz, and Stijn Vansteelandt. Demystifying statistical learning based on efficient influence functions. *The American Statistician*, 76(3):292–304, 2022.
- [27] Hidehiko Ichimura and Whitney K Newey. The influence function of semiparametric estimators. *Quantitative Economics*, 13(1):29–61, 2022.
- [28] Garud N Iyengar. Robust dynamic programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 30(2):257–280, 2005.

- [29] Nan Jiang and Lihong Li. Doubly robust off-policy value evaluation for reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 652–661. PMLR, 2016.
- [30] Nathan Kallus. What’s the harm? sharp bounds on the fraction negatively affected by treatment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:15996–16009, 2022.
- [31] Nathan Kallus and Masatoshi Uehara. Double reinforcement learning for efficient off-policy evaluation in markov decision processes. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1): 6742–6804, 2020.
- [32] Nathan Kallus and Masatoshi Uehara. Efficiently breaking the curse of horizon in off-policy evaluation with double reinforcement learning. *Operations Research*, 70(6):3282–3302, 2022.
- [33] Nathan Kallus and Angela Zhou. Confounding-robust policy evaluation in infinite-horizon reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:22293–22304, 2020.
- [34] Edward H Kennedy. Nonparametric causal effects based on incremental propensity score interventions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114(526):645–656, 2019.
- [35] Edward H Kennedy. Towards optimal doubly robust estimation of heterogeneous causal effects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14497*, 2020.
- [36] J Kolter. The fixed points of off-policy td. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 24, 2011.
- [37] Navdeep Kumar, Kfir Levy, Kaixin Wang, and Shie Mannor. Efficient policy iteration for robust markov decision processes via regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14327*, 2022.
- [38] Navdeep Kumar, Esther Derman, Matthieu Geist, Kfir Yehuda Levy, and Shie Mannor. Policy gradient for rectangular robust markov decision processes. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=NLpXRrjpa6>.
- [39] Mark J Laan and James M Robins. *Unified methods for censored longitudinal data and causality*. Springer, 2003.
- [40] Giovanni Leoni. *A first course in Sobolev spaces*. American Mathematical Soc., 2017.
- [41] Greg Lewis and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Double/debiased machine learning for dynamic treatment effects. In *NeurIPS*, pages 22695–22707, 2021.
- [42] Shie Mannor, Ofir Mebel, and Huan Xu. Robust mdps with k-rectangular uncertainty. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 41(4):1484–1509, 2016.
- [43] Nicolai Meinshausen and Greg Ridgeway. Quantile regression forests. *Journal of machine learning research*, 7(6), 2006.
- [44] Rémi Munos and Csaba Szepesvári. Finite-time bounds for fitted value iteration. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(5), 2008.

- [45] Hongseok Namkoong, Ramtin Keramati, Steve Yadlowsky, and Emma Brunskill. Off-policy policy evaluation for sequential decisions under unobserved confounding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:18819–18831, 2020.
- [46] Arnab Nilim and Laurent El Ghaoui. Robust control of markov decision processes with uncertain transition matrices. *Operations Research*, 53(5):780–798, 2005.
- [47] Tomasz Olma. Nonparametric estimation of truncated conditional expectation functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.06150*, 2021.
- [48] Kishan Panaganti, Zaiyan Xu, Dileep Kalathil, and Mohammad Ghavamzadeh. Robust reinforcement learning using offline data. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:32211–32224, 2022.
- [49] Jeffrey S Racine and Kevin Li. Nonparametric conditional quantile estimation: A locally weighted quantile kernel approach. *Journal of Econometrics*, 201(1):72–94, 2017.
- [50] R Tyrrell Rockafellar and Stanislav Uryasev. Conditional value-at-risk for general loss distributions. *Journal of banking & finance*, 26(7):1443–1471, 2002.
- [51] Anton Schick. On asymptotically efficient estimation in semiparametric models. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1139–1151, 1986.
- [52] Vira Semenova and Victor Chernozhukov. Debiased machine learning of conditional average treatment effects and other causal functions. *The Econometrics Journal*, 24(2):264–289, 2021.
- [53] Ichiro Takeuchi, Quoc Le, Timothy Sears, Alexander Smola, et al. Nonparametric quantile estimation. 2006.
- [54] Zhiqiang Tan. A distributional approach for causal inference using propensity scores. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(476):1619–1637, 2006.
- [55] Anastasios A Tsiatis. Semiparametric theory and missing data. 2006.
- [56] John Tsitsiklis and Benjamin Van Roy. Analysis of temporal-difference learning with function approximation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 9, 1996.
- [57] Masatoshi Uehara, Masaaki Imaizumi, Nan Jiang, Nathan Kallus, Wen Sun, and Tengyang Xie. Finite sample analysis of minimax offline reinforcement learning: Completeness, fast rates and first-order efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.02981*, 2021.
- [58] Mark J van der Laan, Sherri Rose, Wenjing Zheng, and Mark J van der Laan. Cross-validated targeted minimum-loss-based estimation. *Targeted learning: causal inference for observational and experimental data*, pages 459–474, 2011.
- [59] Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [60] Yue Wang and Shaofeng Zou. Online robust reinforcement learning with model uncertainty. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:7193–7206, 2021.

- [61] Wolfram Wiesemann, Daniel Kuhn, and Berç Rustem. Robust markov decision processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 38(1):153–183, 2013.
- [62] Wenhao Xu, Xuefeng Gao, and Xuedong He. Regret bounds for Markov decision processes with recursive optimized certainty equivalents. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 38400–38427. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/xu23d.html>.

Appendices

Appendix A. Notations

Table 1: List of Notations

$\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, A$	State and action spaces, and $A = \mathcal{A} $.
$\Delta(S)$	The set of distributions supported by set S .
$\Lambda(s, a)$	Tolerance parameter for kernel shift at (s, a) . Takes values $[1, \infty]$.
$\tau(s, a)$	$\tau(s, a) = \frac{1}{1+\Lambda(s, a)} \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.
V^\pm, Q^\pm	Robust value and quality functions of the target policy π_t .
$P(s' s, a)$	Nominal transition kernel.
$U^\pm(s' s, a)$	Robust transition kernel which attains the best- or worst-case value.
$\beta_\tau^\pm(s, a)$	The upper τ -th quantile of $V^+(s')$ and lower τ -th quantile of $V^-(s')$, $s' \sim P(s, a)$.
$d_{d_1, U}^{\pi_t, \infty}$	The γ -discounted average visitation of π_t under MDP with transition U starting from d_1 .
$d^{\pm, \infty}$	$d^{\pm, \infty} = d_{d_1, U^\pm}^{\pi_t, \infty}$.
$\nu(s), \nu(s, a)$	Data generating distribution. $\nu(s)$ marginalizes over actions.
w^\pm	$w^\pm = dd^{\pm, \infty}/d\nu$. This is valid both as a function of s or (s, a) .
$\omega(s, a)$	$\omega(s, a) = \frac{\pi_t(a s)}{\nu(a s)}$.
x_+, x_-	$\max(0, x), \min(0, x)$ respectively, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$.
$x \lesssim y$	$x \leq Cy$ for some constant C .
\mathbb{E}_n	Empirical average over n samples.
$\ f\ _p$	L^p norm, $(\mathbb{E} f(X) ^p)^{1/p}$.
f^*	True (oracle) value of a parameter or function f .
f, \bar{f}	Putative value of a parameter or function f .
\hat{f}	Estimated value of a parameter or function f .

Appendix B. Other Related Works

Other Robust MDPs. There is a rich literature on Robust MDPs [25, 28, 42, 61] with s, a -rectangular uncertainty sets, but these foundational works assumed knowledge of the transition kernel. Recently, learning-based robust MDP algorithms have been proposed for uncertainty sets under the total variation [38, 48] and more generally L_p balls [37]. These L_p uncertainty sets are additive in nature, *i.e.*, the adversary adds or subtracts a vector in the ℓ_p ball to $P(\cdot | s, a)$, whereas our uncertainty set is multiplicative in nature, *i.e.*, the adversary can multiply or divide a bounded factor and is more commonly used in causal inference to model unobserved confounding.

Risk-sensitive RL with Dynamic Risk. RL with dynamic risk measures (*a.k.a.* iterated risk measures) is tightly related and often equivalent to Robust MDPs [18]. In Lemma 1, we show that our MSM uncertainty set is indeed equivalent to iterated risk RL with the risk measure $\Lambda \mathbb{E} + (1 - \Lambda) \text{CVaR}_\tau$. Efficient online RL algorithms have been proposed for similar measures [20, 62]. However, our focus is on deriving the optimal OPE estimators for the problem, which involves a different set of challenges such as deriving the efficiency bound and ensuring sharpness guarantees even when nuisances are estimated slowly.

Appendix C. Higher Order Norms via Smoothness

For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, define $\lfloor x \rfloor$ as the greatest integer that is strictly less than x , and let x and $\{x\} = x - \lfloor x \rfloor$ represent the fractional part. Thus, we obtain the distinct decomposition $x = \lfloor x \rfloor + \{x\}$, where $\lfloor x \rfloor \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{x\} \in (0, 1]$.

Definition 14 (α -smooth functions) *Given $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an α -smooth function if (1) the mixed derivatives up to $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor$ -order exist and are bounded; and (2) all $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor$ -order derivatives are $\{\alpha\}$ -Hölder continuous [40].*

Lemma 15 (L^∞ Bound for α -Smooth Functions) *Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be an α -smooth function as in Definition 14. Then, if \mathcal{X} is \mathbb{R}^m , a half-space or a bounded Lipschitz domain in \mathbb{R}^m , there exists a constant C such the following inequality holds:*

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq C \|f\|_p^{\frac{p\alpha}{p\alpha+m}}.$$

Proof This lemma is a direct application of the fractional Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequality (Theorem 1 in [9]) from the functional analysis literature. For a more comprehensive exposition on this result, see Appendix A.1 in [6]. ■

Appendix D. Localized Rademacher Complexity and Critical Radius

In this section, we recap the localized Rademacher complexity and critical radius, which is a standard complexity measure for obtaining fast rates for squared loss [59]. Let \mathcal{G} be a class of functions $g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Given n datapoints z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n , the empirical localized Rademacher complexity is:

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}) := \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}: \|g\|_n \leq \varepsilon} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i g(z_i) \right],$$

where \mathbb{E}_σ is expectation over n independent Rademacher random variables $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n$, *i.e.*, $\mathbb{E}_\sigma[\cdot] = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^n} [\cdot]$. Note that when $\varepsilon = \infty$, there is no localization and $\mathcal{R}_n(\infty, \mathcal{G})$ reduces to the vanilla Rademacher complexity. Let $C := \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|g\|_\infty$ be the envelope of \mathcal{G} . Then, the critical radius of \mathcal{G} with n , called ε_n , is the smallest ε that satisfies $\mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}) \leq \varepsilon^2/C$.

Unless otherwise stated, we will posit that \mathcal{G} is star-shaped: there exists $g_0 \in \mathcal{G}$ such that for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, we have $\alpha g_0 + (1 - \alpha)g \in \mathcal{G}$. If not, we can replace \mathcal{G} by its star-hull, *i.e.*, the smallest star-shaped set containing \mathcal{G} . We will also posit that \mathcal{G} is symmetric for simplicity.

The critical radius is a well-studied quantity in statistics [59] and also recently in RL [21, 57]. For example if \mathcal{G} has d VC-subgraph dimension, then w.p. $1 - \delta$, $\varepsilon_n \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d \log n/n})$. For nonparametric models with metric entropy at most $1/t^\beta$, the critical radius can also be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/(\max(2+\beta, 2\beta))})$ [57], *e.g.*, is $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/4})$ if $\beta = 2$.

Appendix E. Proof of Theorem 9

For this proof, our focus will be on $\widehat{V}_{d_1}^-$. The argument for $\widehat{V}_{d_1}^+$ is analogous, following a symmetric approach. To improve the clarity of our exposition, we will omit the $-$ and τ indices, assuming their presence is clear from the context.

For simplicity, we assume that n is a multiple of K such that $n = Kn_K$, where n_K is the size of a fold. We let $\mathbb{E}_n, \mathbb{E}_k$ denote the empirical averages over the entire sample and the k^{th} fold, respectively. Recall that we use $\widehat{\eta} = (\widehat{w}, \widehat{q}, \widehat{\beta})$ and $\eta^* = (w^*, q^*, \beta^*)$ to denote the estimated and oracle nuisances, respectively.

We further suppress the dependency on s, a in Λ and τ and we write the ρ term in Theorem 7 as

$$\rho(s, a, s'; v, \beta) = (1 - \lambda)v(s') + \lambda(\beta(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(v(s') - \beta(s, a))_-). \quad (7)$$

We justify this by noting that the analysis holds regardless of whether λ and τ depend on s, a . Sometimes, it will be useful to decouple the indicator $\mathbb{I}[v(s') - \beta(s, a) \leq 0]$ implicit in the definition of ρ . In this case, we augment the set of nuisances with $\zeta(s, a, s') = v(s') - \beta(s, a)$ and write ρ as

$$\rho(s, a, s'; v, \beta, \zeta) = (1 - \lambda)v(s') + \lambda(\beta(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(v(s') - \beta(s, a))\mathbb{I}[\zeta(s, a, s') \leq 0]). \quad (8)$$

Similarly define $\psi(\cdot; w, q, \beta, \zeta)$ with the $\rho(\cdot; v, \beta, \zeta)$.

E.1. Auxiliary Lemmas

Definition 16 (Margin Condition) A function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of some random variable X is said to satisfy the margin condition with sharpness $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$ (or more succinctly, an α -margin) if there exist a fixed constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\forall t > 0 : P(0 < |f(X)| \leq t) \leq ct^\alpha.$$

If $f(X)$ is either zero or bounded away from zero almost surely, then f satisfies an infinite margin, i.e., $\alpha = \infty$ [30, Lemma 2]. If $f(X)$ is continuously distributed in a neighborhood around 0, i.e., its CDF is boundedly differentiable on $(-\varepsilon, 0) \cup (0, \varepsilon)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then f has a 1-margin [30, Lemma 3].

Lemma 17 (Margin Guarantees) For any $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying α -margin (Definition 16), $p \in [1, \infty]$, and any $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the following statements hold for some constant $C > 0$:

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{I}[g(X) \leq 0] - \mathbb{I}[f(X) \leq 0])f(X)] \leq C \|f - g\|_p^{\frac{p(1+\alpha)}{p+\alpha}}, \quad (9)$$

$$P[\mathbb{I}[g(X) \leq 0] \neq \mathbb{I}[f(X) \leq 0], f(X) \neq 0] \leq C \|f - g\|_p^{\frac{p\alpha}{p+\alpha}}, \quad (10)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_p$ is the L^p norm and we set $\infty t / \infty = t$ in the exponents.

The proof of Eq. (9) for any $p \in [1, \infty]$ and of Eq. (10) for $p = \infty$ is given in [3, Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2]. The proof of Eq. (10) for $p < \infty$ is given in [30, Lemma 5].

Lemma 18 (Sharpness with correct q^* and β^*) $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{(s,a,s') \sim \mathcal{D}} \psi(s, a, s'; w, q, \beta)$ is an unbiased estimator of $V_{d_1}^*$ when $q = q^*, \beta = \beta^*$, i.e.,

$$(1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{d_1} v^*(s_1) = \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; w, q^*, \beta^*)].$$

Proof Since q^* and β^* are correct, the robust Bellman equation holds, and so for every s, a ,

$$\mathbb{E}[(1 - \lambda)v^*(s') + \lambda(\beta^*(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a))_-) \mid s, a] = 0.$$

Thus, multiplying by any w does not change the fact that the debiasing term in ψ has expectation zero. Since we have v^* , the first term in ψ is exactly the estimand, which concludes the proof. ■

Lemma 19 (Sharpness with correct w^* and ζ^*) $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{(s,a,s') \sim \mathcal{D}} \psi(s, a, s'; w, q, \beta, \zeta)$ is an unbiased estimator of $V_{d_1}^*$ when $w = w^*, \zeta = \zeta^*$, i.e.,

$$(1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{d_1} v^*(s_1) = \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; q, w^*, \beta, \zeta^*)]$$

Proof Let P^* denote the robust transition kernel and let d^* denote the robust visitation measure under π , which satisfies: for all functions f ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{d^*}[f(s, a)] = (1 - \gamma)\mathbb{E}_{d_1}f(s, \pi) + \gamma\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s}, \tilde{a} \sim d^*, s \sim P^*(s, a)}[f(s, \pi)].$$

Since ζ^* is correct, for any v, s, a , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(s, a)}[(1 - \lambda)v(s') + \lambda(\beta(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(v(s') - \beta(s, a))\mathbb{I}[\zeta^*(s, a, s') \leq 0])] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(s, a)}[(1 - \lambda)v(s') + \lambda\tau^{-1}v(s')\mathbb{I}[\zeta^*(s, a, s') \leq 0]] \quad (\star) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P^*(s, a)}[v(s')], \quad (\text{Lemma 4}) \end{aligned}$$

where in \star we used $\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(s, a)}[\beta(s, a)(1 - \tau^{-1}\mathbb{I}[\zeta^*(s, a, s') \leq 0])] = \beta(s, a)(1 - \tau^{-1}\tau) = 0$. That is, for all function f , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \gamma)\mathbb{E}_{d_1}v(s_1) + \mathbb{E}[w^*(s, a)(r(s, a) + \gamma\rho(s, a, s'; v, \beta, \zeta^*) - q(s, a))] \\ &= (1 - \gamma)\mathbb{E}_{d_1}v(s_1) + \mathbb{E}_{s, a \sim d^*}[r(s, a) + \gamma\rho(s, a, s'; v, \beta, \zeta^*) - q(s, a)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s, a \sim d^*}[r(s, a)] + (1 - \gamma)\mathbb{E}_{d_1}v(s_1) + \mathbb{E}_{s, a \sim d^*}[\gamma\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P^*(s, a)}[v(s')] - q(s, a)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s, a \sim d^*}[r(s, a)] \quad (\text{robust Bellman flow}) \\ &= (1 - \gamma)\mathbb{E}_{d_1}v^*(s_1). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

E.2. Proof of Rates

The estimation error is given by:

$$|\widehat{V}_{d_1} - V_{d_1}^*| = \left| \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_k[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{\eta}^{[k]})] - V_{d_1}^* \right| \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left| \mathbb{E}_k[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{\eta}^{[k]})] - V_{d_1}^* \right|$$

We wish need to bound $|\mathbb{E}_k[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{\eta}^{[k]})] - V_{d_1}^*|$. We have that:

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_k[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{\eta}^{[k]})] - V_{d_1}^* \right| \leq \left| \mathbb{E}_k[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{\eta}^{[k]})] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{\eta}^{[k]})] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{\eta}^{[k]})] - V_{d_1}^* \right|$$

The first term is $O_p(n^{-1/2})$ by the CLT. We are now interested in bounding the second term:

$$\varepsilon(\widehat{\eta}) := \left| \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{\eta})] - V_{d_1}^* \right|. \quad (11)$$

where we dropped the $[k]$ indicator without loss of generality. We further decompose $\varepsilon(\widehat{\eta})$ into two error terms, ε_A and ε_B , as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(\widehat{\eta}) &= \left| \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{q}, \widehat{w}, \widehat{\beta})] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{q}, w^*, \widehat{\beta}, \zeta^*)] \right| \quad (\text{Lemma 19}) \\ &\leq \left| \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{q}, \widehat{w}, \widehat{\beta})] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{q}, \widehat{w}, \widehat{\beta}, \zeta^*)] \right| \quad (\varepsilon^A) \\ &\quad + \left| \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{q}, \widehat{w}, \widehat{\beta}, \zeta^*)] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{q}, w^*, \widehat{\beta}, \zeta^*)] \right|. \quad (\varepsilon^B) \end{aligned}$$

Bounding ε^A : Error from the incorrect indicator ζ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varepsilon_A &= \gamma\lambda\tau^{-1}\mathbb{E}\widehat{w}(s, a)\left(\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a)\right)\left(\mathbb{I}\left[\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) \leq 0\right] - \mathbb{I}\left[v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a) \leq 0\right]\right) \\
 &\leq C\gamma\lambda\tau^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a)\right)\left(\mathbb{I}\left[\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) \leq 0\right] - \mathbb{I}\left[v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a) \leq 0\right]\right) \\
 &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a)\right)\left(\mathbb{I}\left[\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) \leq 0\right] - \mathbb{I}\left[v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a) \leq 0\right]\right)
 \end{aligned} \tag{Assumption 5}$$

We break these terms down as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a)\right)\left(\mathbb{I}\left[\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) \leq 0\right] - \mathbb{I}\left[v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a) \leq 0\right]\right) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}\left(v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a)\right)\left(\mathbb{I}\left[\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) \leq 0\right] - \mathbb{I}\left[v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a) \leq 0\right]\right) \tag{ ε_1^A } \\
 &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) - v^*(s') + \beta^*(s, a)\right)\left(\mathbb{I}\left[\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) \leq 0\right] - \mathbb{I}\left[v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a) \leq 0\right]\right). \tag{ ε_2^A }
 \end{aligned}$$

We first bound ε_1^A . [Assumption 5](#) implies

$$P(0 < |v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a)| \leq t) \leq c''t, \quad \forall t \in [0, c'], \quad P(|v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a)| = 0) = 0,$$

where $c' < 1$ is the min of 1 and the given neighborhood of zero and $c'' \geq 1$ is the max of 1 and the bound on the density in that neighborhood. This implies a margin condition with $\alpha = 1$ and $c = c''/c'$.

We can instantiate the first part of [Lemma 17](#) with $f(X) = v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a)$, $g(X) = \widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a)$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varepsilon_1^A &\lesssim \left\|v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a) - \widehat{v}(s') + \widehat{\beta}(s, a)\right\|_p^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} \\
 &\leq \left\|\widehat{v}(s') - v^*(s')\right\|_p^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} + \left\|\widehat{\beta}(s, a) - \beta^*(s, a)\right\|_p^{\frac{2p}{p+1}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

To bound ε_2^A , first write

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\left|\mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) - v^*(s') + \beta^*(s, a)\right)\left(\mathbb{I}\left[\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) \leq 0\right] - \mathbb{I}\left[v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a) \leq 0\right]\right)\right| \\
 &\leq \left\|\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) - v^*(s') + \beta^*(s, a)\right\|_p \\
 &\quad \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{I}\left[\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) \leq 0\right] \neq \mathbb{I}\left[v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a) \leq 0\right]\right)^{(p-1)/p}. \tag{Holder's inequality}
 \end{aligned}$$

We can bound $\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{I}\left[\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) \leq 0\right] \neq \mathbb{I}\left[v^*(s') - \beta^*(s, a) \leq 0\right]\right)$ using the second part of [Lemma 17](#) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varepsilon_2^A &\lesssim \left\|\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) - v^*(s') + \beta^*(s, a)\right\|_p \left\|\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) - v^*(s') + \beta^*(s, a)\right\|_p^{\frac{p-1}{p+1}} \\
 &= \left\|\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) - v^*(s') + \beta^*(s, a)\right\|_p^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} \\
 &\leq \left\|\widehat{v}(s') - v^*(s')\right\|_p^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} + \left\|\widehat{\beta}(s, a) - \beta^*(s, a)\right\|_p^{\frac{2p}{p+1}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Putting the ε_1^A and ε_2^A together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_A &\lesssim \left\| \widehat{v}(s') - v^*(s') \right\|_p^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} + \left\| \widehat{\beta}(s, a) - \beta^*(s, a) \right\|_p^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} && \text{(when } p \in [1, \infty)) \\ &\lesssim \left\| \widehat{v}(s') - v^*(s') \right\|_\infty^2 + \left\| \widehat{\beta}(s, a) - \beta^*(s, a) \right\|_\infty^2 && \text{(when } p = \infty)\end{aligned}$$

Bounding ε^B : Error with correct indicator but wrong nuisances. Now we focus on bounding ε^B .

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_B &= \mathbb{E} \left[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{q}, \widehat{w}, \widehat{\beta}, \zeta^*) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{q}, w^*, \widehat{\beta}, \zeta^*) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\widehat{w}(s, a) - w^*(s, a)) \left(r(s, a) + \gamma \rho(s, a, s'; \widehat{v}, \widehat{\beta}, \zeta^*) - \widehat{q}(s, a) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\widehat{w}(s, a) - w^*(s, a)) \left(r(s, a) + \gamma \rho(s, a, s'; \widehat{v}, \widehat{\beta}, \zeta^*) - \widehat{q}(s, a) \right) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}(\widehat{w}(s, a) - w^*(s, a)) \left(r(s, a) + \gamma \rho(s, a, s'; v^*, \beta^*) - q^*(s, a) \right) && \text{(Lemma 18)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\widehat{w}(s, a) - w^*(s, a)) \left(\widehat{q}(s, a) - q^*(s, a) + \gamma(\rho(s, a, s'; \widehat{v}, \widehat{\beta}, \zeta^*) - \rho(s, a, s'; v^*, \beta^*)) \right).\end{aligned}$$

In the [Lemma 18](#) step, we used

$$0 = (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{d_1} v^*(s_1) - \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; q^*, \widehat{w}, \beta^*)] = (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{d_1} v^*(s_1) - \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; q^*, w^*, \beta^*)].$$

Finally, note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\rho(s, a, s'; \widehat{v}, \widehat{\beta}, \zeta^*) - \rho(s, a, s'; v^*, \beta^*) \\ &= (1 - \lambda)(\widehat{v}(s') - v^*(s')) + \lambda \tau^{-1}(\widehat{v}(s') - v^*(s')) \mathbb{I}[\zeta^*(s, a, s') \leq 0] \\ &\quad + \lambda(\widehat{\beta}(s, a) - \beta^*(s, a))(1 - \tau^{-1} \mathbb{I}[\zeta^*(s, a, s') \leq 0]).\end{aligned}$$

Due to continuity of the CDF of $v^*(s')$ at $\beta^*(s, a)$ for all s, a , we have $\Pr(\zeta^*(s', s, a) \leq 0 \mid s, a) = \tau$ and so the last term vanishes. Thus, we're left with a quantity that is at most $\lesssim (\widehat{v}(s') - v^*(s'))$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_B &\lesssim \mathbb{E}(\widehat{w}(s, a) - w^*(s, a)) (\mathcal{J}_{U^\pm}(\widehat{q}(s, a) - q^*(s, a))) \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{J}'_{U^\pm}(\widehat{w} - w^*)\|_2 \|\widehat{q} - q^*\|_2 && \text{(Holder's inequality)}\end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together, we obtain the desired rates:

$$\begin{aligned}|\widehat{V}_{d_1} - V_{d_1}^*| &\lesssim O_p(n^{-1/2}) + \|\mathcal{J}'_{U^\pm}(\widehat{w} - w^*)\|_2 \|\widehat{q} - q^*\|_2 + \|\widehat{v} - v^*\|_p^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} + \left\| \widehat{\beta} - \beta^* \right\|_p^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} \\ &= O_p(n^{-1/2}) + O_p \left(r_n^w r_n^q + (r_{n,p}^q)^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} + (r_{n,p}^\beta)^{\frac{2p}{p+1}} \right) && \text{(when } p \in [1, \infty)) \\ &\lesssim O_p(n^{-1/2}) + \|\mathcal{J}'_{U^\pm}(\widehat{w} - w^*)\|_2 \|\widehat{q} - q^*\|_2 + \|\widehat{v} - v^*\|_\infty^2 + \left\| \widehat{\beta} - \beta^* \right\|_\infty^2 \\ &= O_p(n^{-1/2}) + O_p \left(r_n^w r_n^q + (r_{n,\infty}^q)^2 + (r_{n,\infty}^\beta)^2 \right). && \text{(when } p = \infty)\end{aligned}$$

E.3. Proof of Normality & Efficiency

In this part of the theorem, we let:

$$\tilde{V}_{d_1} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_k[\psi(s, a, s'; \eta^*)]$$

Then, we can write the following equality:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{V}_{d_1} - V_{d_1}^*) = \sqrt{n}(\hat{V}_{d_1} - \tilde{V}_{d_1}) + \underbrace{\sqrt{n}(\tilde{V}_{d_1} - V_{d_1}^*)}_{\xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)}$$

The second term converges in distribution to $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ from the CLT and the fact that ψ is the efficient influence function. Thus, it remains to show that the first term is $o_p(1)$. We decompose the first term as follows:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{V}_{d_1} - \tilde{V}_{d_1}) = \sqrt{n} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \hat{\eta}^{[k]})] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \eta^*)] \right) \quad (12)$$

$$+ \sqrt{n} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^n \underbrace{\left(\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E} \right) [\psi(s, a, s'; \hat{\eta}^{[k]}) - \psi(s, a, s'; \eta^*)]}_{\varepsilon_k} \quad (13)$$

In Eq. (12), we have that $|\mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \hat{\eta}^{[k]})] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \eta^*)]|$ is bounded as in Eq. (Rates). Given the theorem's assumption about the nuisance rates, this term is $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ and Eq. (12) is $o_p(1)$. We now seek to control the ε_k term in Eq. (13). Letting \mathcal{D}_k represent the samples in the k^{th} fold, we leverage sample splitting to show that the mean of $\varepsilon_k \mid \mathcal{D}_k$ is 0:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_k \mid \mathcal{D}_k] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_k[\psi(s, a, s'; \hat{\eta}^{[k]}) - \psi(s, a, s'; \eta^*)] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; \hat{\eta}^{[k]}) - \psi(s, a, s'; \eta^*)] \mid \mathcal{D}_k] \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

where we consider $\hat{\eta}^{[k]}$ fixed with respect to the second expectation. The result follows from the fact that $\hat{\eta}^{[k]}$ does not depend on \mathcal{D}_k . Then, we can invoke Chebyshev's inequality to obtain the following bound:

$$P \left(\frac{\varepsilon_k}{\text{Var}[\varepsilon_k \mid \mathcal{D}_k]^{1/2}} \geq \epsilon \mid \mathcal{D}_k \right) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}, \quad \forall \epsilon > 0$$

Thus, $\varepsilon_k \mid \mathcal{D}_k = O_p(\text{Var}[\varepsilon_k \mid \mathcal{D}_k]^{1/2}) = O_p(n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}[(\psi(s, a, s'; \hat{\eta}^{[k]}) - \psi(s, a, s'; \eta^*))^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_k]^{1/2})$. Here, we leveraged the fact that $n_K = n/K$ where K is a fixed integer that doesn't grow with n and the fact that ε_k has 0 conditional mean. For the remainder of the analysis, we leave the conditioning on \mathcal{D}_k implicit for simplicity. To bound $\mathbb{E}[(\psi(s, a, s'; \hat{\eta}^{[k]}) - \psi(s, a, s'; \eta^*))^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_k]^{1/2} = \|\psi(s, a, s'; \hat{\eta}^{[k]}) - \psi(s, a, s'; \eta^*)\|_2$, we use similar notation and techniques as in Appendix E.2:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi(s, a, s'; \hat{\eta}^{[k]}) - \psi(s, a, s'; \eta^*)\|_2 &\leq \|\psi(s, a, s'; \hat{q}, \hat{w}, \hat{\beta}) - \psi(s, a, s'; \hat{q}, \hat{w}, \hat{\beta}, \zeta^*)\|_2 \quad (\sigma_1) \\ &\quad + \|\psi(s, a, s'; \hat{q}, \hat{w}, \hat{\beta}, \zeta^*) - \psi(s, a, s'; q^*, w^*, \beta^*, \zeta^*)\|_2 \quad (\sigma_2) \end{aligned}$$

where we invoked Cauchy-Schwarz for the L_2 norm. We bound σ_2 as follows:

$$\sigma_2 \leq \|\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{q}, \widehat{w}, \widehat{\beta}) - \psi(s, a, s'; q^*, \widehat{w}, \widehat{\beta}, \zeta^*)\|_2 \quad (\sigma_{2a})$$

$$+ \|\psi(s, a, s'; q^*, \widehat{w}, \widehat{\beta}, \zeta^*) - \psi(s, a, s'; q^*, \widehat{w}, \beta^*, \zeta^*)\|_2 \quad (\sigma_{2b})$$

$$+ \|\psi(s, a, s'; q^*, \widehat{w}, \beta^*, \zeta^*) - \psi(s, a, s'; q^*, w^*, \beta^*, \zeta^*)\|_2 \quad (\sigma_{2c})$$

$$\leq \|\widehat{v} - v^*\|_2 + \gamma(1 - \lambda)\|\widehat{w}\|_2\|\widehat{v} - v^*\|_2 + \gamma\lambda\tau^{-1}\|\widehat{w}\|_2\|\widehat{v} - v^*\|_2 + \|\widehat{w}\|_2\|\widehat{q} - q^*\|_2 \quad (\sigma_{2a})$$

$$+ \gamma\lambda\|\widehat{w}\|_2\|\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2 + \gamma\lambda\tau^{-1}\|\widehat{w}\|_2\|\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2 \quad (\sigma_{2b})$$

$$+ \|\widehat{w} - w^*\|_2 (\|r\|_2 + \gamma(1 - \lambda)\|v^*\|_2 + \gamma\lambda\|\beta^*\|_2 + \gamma\lambda\tau^{-1}\|v^* - \beta^*\|_2) \quad (\sigma_{2c})$$

Given our rate assumptions, our boundedness assumptions for \widehat{w} , the implicit boundedness of q^*, v^*, w^*, β^* , as well as the ordering of the L_2 and L_∞ norms, σ_2 is $o_p(1)$. We now bound the σ_1 term:

$$\sigma_2 = \gamma\lambda\tau^{-1} \left\| \widehat{w}(s, a)(\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a))(\mathbb{I}[\widehat{v}(s') \leq \widehat{\beta}(s, a)] - \mathbb{I}[v^*(s') \leq \beta^*(s, a)]) \right\|_2$$

There are two cases in which the difference of indicators is non-zero:

$$\begin{cases} \widehat{v}(s') \leq \widehat{\beta}(s, a) \text{ and } v^*(s') > \beta^*(s, a) \Rightarrow \mathbb{I}[\widehat{v}(s') \leq \widehat{\beta}(s, a)] - \mathbb{I}[v^*(s') \leq \beta^*(s, a)] = 1 \\ \widehat{v}(s') > \widehat{\beta}(s, a) \text{ and } v^*(s') \leq \beta^*(s, a) \Rightarrow \mathbb{I}[\widehat{v}(s') \leq \widehat{\beta}(s, a)] - \mathbb{I}[v^*(s') \leq \beta^*(s, a)] = -1 \end{cases}$$

In the first case, $\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) \leq 0, \beta^*(s, a) - v^*(s') < 0$ and thus

$$|(\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a))(\mathbb{I}[\widehat{v}(s') \leq \widehat{\beta}(s, a)] - \mathbb{I}[v^*(s') \leq \beta^*(s, a)])| \leq |\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) + \beta^*(s, a) - v^*(s')|.$$

In the second case, $\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) > 0, \beta^*(s, a) - v^*(s') \leq 0$ and

$$|(\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a))(\mathbb{I}[\widehat{v}(s') \leq \widehat{\beta}(s, a)] - \mathbb{I}[v^*(s') \leq \beta^*(s, a)])| \leq |\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) + \beta^*(s, a) - v^*(s')|.$$

Going back to σ_1 , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_2 &\leq \gamma\lambda\tau^{-1}\|\widehat{w}\|_2\|\widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{\beta}(s, a) + \beta^*(s, a) - v^*(s')\|_2 \\ &\leq \gamma\lambda\tau^{-1}\|\widehat{w}\|_2(\|\widehat{v} - v^*\|_2 + \|\widehat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2) \end{aligned}$$

By our theorem's assumptions, this term is also $o_p(1)$. Putting σ_1 and σ_2 together, we have that $\|\psi(s, a, s'; \widehat{\eta}^{[k]}) - \psi(s, a, s'; \eta^*)\|_2$ is $o_p(1)$ and $\varepsilon_k | \mathcal{D}_k$ is $o_p(n^{-1/2})$. By the bounded convergence theorem, this implies that ε_k is also $o_p(n^{-1/2})$. Then, the term in 13 is $o_p(1)$, which further means that $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{V}_{d_1} - \widetilde{V}_{d_1}) = o_p(1)$. Our proof is now complete.

Appendix F. Proofs for the Efficient Influence Function

We use the ε -contamination approach of [26] to derive an influence function (IF) for our estimand $V_{d_1}^-$. The proof for $V_{d_1}^+$ follows symmetrically. We note that since our tangent space is the whole space as it factorizes in the trivial way (as in [32, Page 54]), the IF we derive is actually the efficient influence function (EIF).

Let $P(s, a, s')$ denote the data distribution. Consider the ε -contamination $P_\varepsilon(s, a, s') = (1 - \varepsilon)P(s, a, s') + \varepsilon\delta(\bar{s}, \bar{a}, \bar{s}')$, where $\delta(\bar{z})$ is the dirac delta at \bar{z} , *i.e.*, $\delta(\bar{z})$ has infinite mass at \bar{z} and 0 mass elsewhere. Let V_ε^- denote the robust value function under the transition kernel $P_\varepsilon(s' | s, a)$. Omitting the ε subscript means $\varepsilon = 0$. The IF of $V_{d_1}^-$ is then given by

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}(1 - \gamma)\mathbb{E}_{d_1}V_\varepsilon^-(s_1)|_{\varepsilon=0}.$$

We dedicate the rest of this section towards this goal, which will be obtained in [Theorem 24](#).

Lemma 20

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}P_\varepsilon(s' | s, a)|_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{\delta(\bar{s}, \bar{a})}{P(s, a)}(\delta(\bar{s}') - P(s' | s, a)).$$

Proof Use the fact $P_\varepsilon(s' | s, a) = \frac{P_\varepsilon(s, a, s')}{P_\varepsilon(s, a)} = \frac{(1-\varepsilon)P(s, a, s') + \varepsilon\delta(\bar{s}, \bar{a}, \bar{s}')}{(1-\varepsilon)P(s, a) + \varepsilon\delta(\bar{s}, \bar{a})}$ and take derivative. ■

Lemma 21 (IF of conditional expectation) For any s, a and f_ε ,

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}_{P_\varepsilon}[f_\varepsilon(s') | s, a]|_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{\delta(\bar{s}, \bar{a})}{P(s, a)}(f(\bar{s}') - \mathbb{E}_P[f(s') | s, a]) + \mathbb{E}_P\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}f_\varepsilon(s')|_{\varepsilon=0} | s, a\right],$$

where $f = f_0$.

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}_{P_\varepsilon}[f_\varepsilon(s') | s, a]|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \sum_{s'} f(s') \frac{d}{d\varepsilon}P_\varepsilon(s' | s, a)|_{\varepsilon=0} + \sum_{s'} \frac{d}{d\varepsilon}f_\varepsilon(s')|_{\varepsilon=0}P(s' | s, a) \\ &= \frac{\delta(\bar{s}, \bar{a})}{P(s, a)}(f_0(\bar{s}') - \mathbb{E}_P[f_0(s') | s, a]) + \mathbb{E}_P\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon}f_\varepsilon(s')|_{\varepsilon=0} | s, a\right], \end{aligned}$$
■

Lemma 22 (IF of conditional CVaR) For any τ, s, a and f_ε ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\text{CVaR}_{\tau, P_\varepsilon}[f_\varepsilon(s') | s, a]|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \frac{\delta(\bar{s}, \bar{a})}{P(s, a)}(\beta_\tau(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(f(\bar{s}') - \beta_\tau(s, a))_- - \text{CVaR}_\tau(f(s') | s, a)) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_P\left[\tau^{-1}\mathbb{I}[f(s') \leq \beta_\tau(s, a)] \frac{d}{d\varepsilon}f_\varepsilon(s')|_{\varepsilon=0} | s, a\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $f = f_0$ and $\beta_\tau(s, a)$ be the $(1 - \tau)$ -th quantile of $f(s')$, $s' \sim P(s, a)$.

Proof

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \text{CVaR}_{P_\varepsilon}[f_\varepsilon(s') \mid s, a]_{\varepsilon=0} \quad (14)$$

$$= \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \min_b \mathbb{E}_{P_\varepsilon}[b + \tau^{-1}(f_\varepsilon(s') - b)_- \mid s, a]_{\varepsilon=0} \quad (15)$$

$$= \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_{P_\varepsilon}[\beta_\tau(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(f_\varepsilon(s') - \beta_\tau(s, a))_- \mid s, a]_{\varepsilon=0}, \quad (16)$$

where the last equality is due to Danskin's theorem and the fact that $\beta_\tau(s, a)$ is the maximizer of the CVaR dual form at $\varepsilon = 0$. Continuing, let $g_\varepsilon(s'; s, a) := \beta_\tau(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(f_\varepsilon(s') - \beta_\tau(s, a))_-$, so

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_{P_\varepsilon}[g_\varepsilon(s'; s, a) \mid s, a] \\ &= \frac{\delta(\bar{s}, \bar{a})}{P(s, a)} (g(\bar{s}'; s, a) - \mathbb{E}_P[g(s', s, a) \mid s, a]) + \mathbb{E}_P \left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} g_\varepsilon(s'; s, a)_{\varepsilon=0} \mid s, a \right] \quad (\text{Lemma 21}) \\ &= \frac{\delta(\bar{s}, \bar{a})}{P(s, a)} (g(\bar{s}'; s, a) - \text{CVaR}_\tau(f(s') \mid s, a)) + \mathbb{E}_P \left[\tau^{-1} \mathbb{I}[f(s') \leq \beta_\tau(s, a)] \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} f_\varepsilon(s')_{\varepsilon=0} \mid s, a \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. ■

We now prove the key ‘‘one-step forward’’ lemma.

Lemma 23 (One-Step Forward) *For any state distribution $\nu(s)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \nu} \left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^-(s)_{\varepsilon=0} \right] \\ &= \frac{\nu(\bar{s})\pi(\bar{a} \mid \bar{s})}{P(\bar{s}, \bar{a})} (r(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) + \gamma((1 - \lambda)V^-(\bar{s}') + \lambda(\beta_\tau(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) + \tau^{-1}(V^-(\bar{s}') - \beta_\tau(\bar{s}, \bar{a}))_-)) \\ & \quad - Q^-(\bar{s}, \bar{a})) \\ & \quad + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \nu} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\pi, P} \left[((1 - \lambda) + \lambda\tau^{-1} \mathbb{I}[V^-(s') \leq \beta_\tau(s, a)]) \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^-(s')_{\varepsilon=0} \mid s \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof For any s_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^-(s_1) \\
 &= \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_{a_1 \sim \pi(s_1)} \left[r(s_1, a_1) + \gamma \left((1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E}_{P_\varepsilon} [V_\varepsilon^-(s_2) \mid s_1, a_1] + \lambda \text{CVaR}_{\tau, P_\varepsilon} [V_\varepsilon^-(s_2) \mid s_1, a_1] \right) \right]_{\varepsilon=0} \\
 &= \gamma \mathbb{E}_{a_1 \sim \pi(s_1)} \left[(1 - \lambda) \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_{\tau, P_\varepsilon} [V_\varepsilon^-(s_2) \mid s_1, a_1] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} + \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \text{CVaR}_{\tau, P_\varepsilon} [V_\varepsilon^-(s_2) \mid s_1, a_1] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] \\
 &= \gamma (1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E}_{a_1 \sim \pi(s_1)} \left[\frac{\delta(\bar{s}, \bar{a})}{P(s_1, a_1)} (V^-(\bar{s}') - \mathbb{E}_P [V^-(s_2) \mid s_1, a_1]) \right] \\
 &\quad + \gamma (1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E}_{a_1 \sim \pi(s_1)} \mathbb{E}_P \left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^-(s_2) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \mid s_1, a_1 \right] \\
 &\quad + \gamma \lambda \mathbb{E}_{a_1 \sim \pi(s_1)} \left[\frac{\delta(\bar{s}, \bar{a})}{P(s_1, a_1)} (\beta_\tau(s_1, a_1) + \tau^{-1} (V^-(\bar{s}') - \beta_\tau(s_1, a_1))_- - \text{CVaR}_\tau (V^-(s_2) \mid s_1, a_1)) \right] \\
 &\quad + \gamma \lambda \mathbb{E}_{a_1 \sim \pi(s_1)} \mathbb{E}_P \left[\tau^{-1} \mathbb{I} [V^-(s_2) \leq \beta_\tau(s_1, a_1)] \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_{\pi, P_\varepsilon}^-(s_2) \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation over $s_1 \sim \nu$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \nu} \left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^-(s) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] &= \gamma \frac{\nu(\bar{s}) \pi(\bar{a} \mid \bar{s})}{P(\bar{s}, \bar{a})} \left((1 - \lambda) V^-(\bar{s}') + \lambda (\beta_\tau(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) + \tau^{-1} (V^-(\bar{s}') - \beta_\tau(\bar{s}, \bar{a}))_-) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - ((1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E} [V^-(s') \mid \bar{s}, \bar{a}] + \lambda \text{CVaR}_\tau (V^-(s') \mid \bar{s}, \bar{a})) \right) \\
 &\quad + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \nu} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\pi, P} \left[((1 - \lambda) + \lambda \tau^{-1} \mathbb{I} [V^-(s') \leq \beta_\tau(s, a)]) \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^-(s') \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \mid s \right] \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally recall that V^- satisfies the Bellman equation, so

$$(1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E} [V^-(s') \mid \bar{s}, \bar{a}] + \lambda \text{CVaR}_\tau (V^-(s') \mid \bar{s}, \bar{a}) = Q^-(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) - r(\bar{s}, \bar{a}).$$

This concludes the proof. ■

Equipped with our main one-step lemma, we can now unroll it an infinite number of steps to derive the IF of our estimand.

Theorem 24 (IF of Estimand) *Let us denote*

$$g(\bar{s}, \bar{a}, \bar{s}') := r(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) + \gamma \left((1 - \lambda) V^-(\bar{s}') + \lambda (\beta_\tau(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) + \tau^{-1} (V^-(\bar{s}') - \beta_\tau(\bar{s}, \bar{a}))_-) \right).$$

Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{d_1} \left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^-(s_1) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] = \frac{d_{rob}^{\pi, \infty}(\bar{s}, \bar{a})}{P(\bar{s}, \bar{a})} g(\bar{s}, \bar{a}, \bar{s}').$$

Proof Let d_h denote the h -th step visitation in the robust MDP, with transition P_{rob} satisfying $\frac{P_{\text{rob}}(s'|s,a)}{P(s'|s,a)} = (1 - \lambda) + \lambda\tau^{-1}\mathbb{I}[V^-(s') \leq \beta_\tau(s, a)]$. Then notice that the final term of [Lemma 23](#) is exactly $\mathbb{E}_{s \sim \nu} [\mathbb{E}_{\pi, P_{\text{rob}}} [\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^-(s')|_{\varepsilon=0} | s]]$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{d_1} \left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^-(s_1)|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] \\ &= \frac{d_1(\bar{s})\pi(\bar{a} | \bar{s})}{P(\bar{s}, \bar{a})} g(\bar{s}, \bar{a}, \bar{s}') + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s_2 \sim d_2} \left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^-(s_2)|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] \\ &= \frac{d_1(\bar{s})\pi(\bar{a} | \bar{s})}{P(\bar{s}, \bar{a})} g(\bar{s}, \bar{a}, \bar{s}') + \gamma \frac{d_2(\bar{s})\pi(\bar{a} | \bar{s})}{P(\bar{s}, \bar{a})} g(\bar{s}, \bar{a}, \bar{s}') + \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_{s_3 \sim d_3} \left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^-(s_3)|_{\varepsilon=0} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Iterating the process, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{d_1} \left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon^-(s_1)|_{\varepsilon=0} \right] = \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{h-1} \frac{d_h(\bar{s})\pi(\bar{a} | \bar{s})}{P(\bar{s}, \bar{a})} g(\bar{s}, \bar{a}, \bar{s}') = \frac{d_{\text{rob}}^{\pi, \infty}(\bar{s}, \bar{a})}{P(\bar{s}, \bar{a})} g(\bar{s}, \bar{a}, \bar{s}'),$$

as desired. \blacksquare

Finally, we can conclude that the IF in [Theorem 24](#) is in fact the efficient IF (EIF) because it is in the tangent space, as the tangent space contains all functions [\[32\]](#).

Appendix G. Properties of the Robust MDP

G.1. Identification of robust Q

Lemma 25 (Identification of Q^\pm) Set $\tau(s, a) = (\Lambda(s, a) + 1)^{-1}$. Then, for any $q : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{rob}}^\pm q(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \Lambda^{-1}(s, a) \mathbb{E}[v(s') | s, a] + \gamma(1 - \Lambda^{-1}(s, a)) \text{CVaR}_{\tau(s, a)}^\pm[v(s') | s, a],$$

where $v(s') = q(s', \pi_t)$, and $\mathbb{E}, \text{CVaR}_\tau$ are conditional on the observed nominal kernel $P(\cdot | s, a)$.

Proof We rewrite [Eq. \(1\)](#) as:

$$0 \leq \frac{U(s' | s, a) - \Lambda^{-1}(s, a)P(s' | s, a)}{P(s' | s, a)} \leq \Lambda(s, a) - \Lambda^{-1}(s, a).$$

Note that $\Lambda - \Lambda^{-1} = (1 - \Lambda^{-1})(1 + \Lambda)$. Naming $G(s' | s, a) = \frac{U(s'|s,a) - \Lambda^{-1}(s,a)P(s'|s,a)}{1 - \Lambda^{-1}(s,a)}$, we have $G(\cdot | s, a) \ll P(\cdot | s, a)$ and $\|\frac{dG(s'|s,a)}{dP(s'|s,a)}\| \leq \Lambda(s, a) + 1$. Setting $\tau(s, a) = \frac{1}{\Lambda(s, a) + 1}$, we can apply the primal form of CVaR to obtain:

$$\sup_{G \ll P: \|\frac{dG(\cdot|s,a)}{dP(\cdot|s,a)}\|_\infty \leq \tau^{-1}(s, a)} = \text{CVaR}_{\tau(s, a)}^+[f(s') | s, a],$$

where the CVaR is over P [\[2\]](#). The other case, with inf and lower CVaR, is identical. \blacksquare

G.2. Identification of robust kernel and visitation

Lemma 26 (Identification of U^\pm) Fix any $v : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and define the pushforward $F_v(y | s, a) = P(v(s') \leq y | s, a)$. If $F_v(\beta_{\tau, F_v(\cdot | s, a)}^\pm(s, a) | s, a) = \frac{1}{2} \pm (\frac{1}{2} - \tau)$, then we have $\sup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(P)} \mathbb{E}_U[v(s') | s, a] = \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim U_v^+(s, a)}[v(s')]$ and $\inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}(P)} \mathbb{E}_U[v(s') | s, a] = \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim U_v^-(s, a)}[v(s')]$, where

$$U_v^\pm(s' | s, a) / P(s' | s, a) = \Lambda^{-1}(s, a) + (1 - \Lambda^{-1})\tau(s, a)^{-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\pm \left(v(s') - \beta_{\tau, F_v(\cdot | s, a)}^\pm(s, a) \right) \geq 0 \right].$$

Proof Recall that $\text{CVaR}_\tau^+(v(s') | s, a) = \mathbb{E}[v(s') | f(s') \geq \beta_\tau^+(s, a), s, a]$ under the assumption that the CDF of $v(s')$ is differentiable at $\beta_\tau^+(s, a)$. Then the result follows immediately from [Lemma 1](#) by noticing that the form of U^+ exactly recovers the convex combination of expectation and CVaR. Alternatively, one can use the closed form solution of the primal CVaR to obtain the result, as in [\[2\]](#). The proof for the other case, with inf and lower CVaR, is identical. \blacksquare

Appendix H. Proofs for Robust FQE

We prove a more general result with approximate completeness, which shows that [Theorem 3](#) is robust to approximate completeness.

Assumption 27 (Approximate Completeness) $\max_{g \in \mathcal{Q}} \min_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \|g - \mathcal{T}_{\text{CVaR}}^\pm q\|_\nu \leq \varepsilon_{\text{QComp}}$.

Theorem 28 Assume [Assumption 27](#). Under the same setup as [Theorem 3](#), we have

$$\|\widehat{q}_K^\pm - Q^\pm\|_\mu \lesssim \frac{1}{(1 - \gamma)^2} (\sqrt{C_\mu^\pm} \cdot (\varepsilon_n^\mathcal{Q} + \varepsilon_{\text{QComp}}) + \text{err}_{\text{QR}}^2(n/2K, \delta/2K)),$$

and

$$\left| V_{d_1}^\pm - (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{d_1}[\widehat{q}_K^\pm(s_1, \pi_t)] \right| \lesssim \gamma^K + \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} (\sqrt{C_\mu^\pm} \cdot (\varepsilon_n^\mathcal{Q} + \varepsilon_{\text{QComp}}) + \text{err}_{\text{QR}}^2(n/2K, \delta/2K)).$$

Proof Let U^\pm denote the worst-case kernel that satisfies $V_{d_1}^\pm = (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{d_1} V_{U^\pm}^{\pi_t}(s_1)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{d_1}^\pm - (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{d_1}[\widehat{q}_K^\pm(s_1, \pi_t)] &= (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{d_1} [V_{U^\pm}^{\pi_t}(s_1) - \widehat{q}_K(s_1, \pi_t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{d_{U^\pm}^{\pi_t, \infty}} [\mathcal{T}_{U^\pm}^{\pi_t} \widehat{q}_K(s, a) - \widehat{q}_K(s, a)] && \text{(Lemma 29)} \\ &\leq \frac{4}{1 - \gamma} \max_{k=1, 2, \dots} \|\widehat{q}_k - \mathcal{T}_{U^\pm}^{\pi_t} \widehat{q}_{k-1}\|_{d_{U^\pm}^{\pi_t, \infty}} + \gamma^{K/2}. && \text{(Lemma 30)} \end{aligned}$$

Consider any $k = 1, 2, \dots$. By definition of U^\pm , we have

$$\|\widehat{q}_k - \mathcal{T}_{U^\pm}^{\pi_t} \widehat{q}_{k-1}\|_{d_{U^\pm}^{\pi_t, \infty}} = \left\| \widehat{q}_k - \mathcal{T}_{\beta_k^\pm}^\pm \widehat{q}_{k-1} \right\|_{d_{\pm, \infty}}, \quad \text{(by def of } U^\pm \text{)}$$

where $\beta_k^*(s, a)$ is the true quantile of $\widehat{v}_{k-1}(s')$. Denote $q_k^* := \mathcal{T}_{\text{rob}}^\pm \widehat{q}_{k-1}$ and let β_k^* be the true upper/lower quantile of \widehat{q}_{k-1} . Recall the population loss function is

$$\begin{aligned} L_k(q, \beta) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(y_k^\beta(s, a, s') - q(s, a) \right)^2 \right] \\ y_k^\beta(s, a, s') &= r(s, a) + \gamma \Lambda^{-1}(s, a) \widehat{v}_{k-1}(s') \\ &\quad + \gamma (1 - \Lambda^{-1}(s, a)) \left(\beta(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(s, a) (\widehat{v}_{k-1}(s') - \beta(s, a))_\pm \right). \end{aligned}$$

The empirical loss $\widehat{L}_k(q, \beta)$ is if \mathbb{E} is replaced by \mathbb{E}_n . Note that $\widehat{q}_k = \arg \min_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \widehat{L}_k(q, \widehat{\beta}_k)$.

Nonparametric Least Squares with Model Misspecification. We will directly invoke [59, Theorem 13.13], which gives a fast rate for misspecified least squares with general nonparametric classes. We now bound the misspecification. Recall that at the k -th iteration, our regression Bayes-optimal is $\mathbb{E}[y_k^{\widehat{\beta}_k}(s, a, s') \mid s, a] = \mathcal{T}_{\widehat{\beta}_k} \widehat{q}_{k-1}(s, a)$. By Lemma 17, we know this is close to $\mathcal{T}_{\beta_k^*} \widehat{q}_{k-1}(s, a)$ with second order errors in β : for any μ , we have

$$\left\| \mathcal{T}_{\widehat{\beta}_k} \widehat{q}_{k-1} - \mathcal{T}_{\beta_k^*} \widehat{q}_{k-1} \right\|_{d_\mu^\pm, \infty} \lesssim \|\widehat{\beta}_k - \beta_k^*\|_\infty^2.$$

Finally, by approximate completeness (Assumption 27), there exists $g \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\|\mathcal{T}_{\beta_k^*} \widehat{q}_{k-1}(s, a) - g\| \leq \varepsilon_{\text{QComp}}$. Putting this together: for any k , there exists a $g \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|g - \mathcal{T}_{\widehat{\beta}_k} \widehat{q}_{k-1}(s, a)\|_{d_\mu^\pm, \infty} &\leq \|g - \mathcal{T}_{\beta_k^*} \widehat{q}_{k-1}(s, a)\|_{d_\mu^\pm, \infty} + \|\mathcal{T}_{\beta_k^*} \widehat{q}_{k-1}(s, a) - \mathcal{T}_{\widehat{\beta}_k} \widehat{q}_{k-1}(s, a)\|_{d_\mu^\pm, \infty} \\ &\leq \sqrt{C_\mu^\pm} \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{QComp}} + \|\widehat{\beta}_k - \beta_k^*\|_\infty^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, [59, Theorem 13.13] (and concentration of least squares) certifies that:

$$\left\| \widehat{q}_k - \mathcal{T}_{\widehat{\beta}_k} \widehat{q}_{k-1} \right\|_{d_\mu^\pm, \infty} \lesssim \sqrt{C_\mu^\pm} \cdot (\varepsilon_{\text{QComp}} + \varepsilon_n) + \|\widehat{\beta}_k - \beta_k^*\|_\infty^2.$$

Therefore, we have proven:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{q}_k - \mathcal{T}_{\beta_k^*} \widehat{q}_{k-1} \right\|_{d_\mu^\pm, \infty} &\leq \left\| \widehat{q}_k - \mathcal{T}_{\widehat{\beta}_k} \widehat{q}_{k-1} \right\|_{d_\mu^\pm, \infty} + \left\| \mathcal{T}_{\widehat{\beta}_k} \widehat{q}_{k-1} - \mathcal{T}_{\beta_k^*} \widehat{q}_{k-1} \right\|_{d_\mu^\pm, \infty} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{C_\mu^\pm} \cdot (\varepsilon_{\text{QComp}} + \varepsilon_n) + \|\widehat{\beta}_k - \beta_k^*\|_\infty^2. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. ■

Lemma 29 (Performance Difference) For any π , transition kernel P , and function $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$V_P^\pi - \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_1} [f(s, \pi)] = \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \mathbb{E}_{d_P^\pi, \infty} [\mathcal{T}_P^\pi f(s, a) - f(s, a)].$$

Proof See Lemma C.1 of [13]. ■

Lemma 30 (Unrolling) For any π , transition kernel P , and functions $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_K : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $f_0(s, a) = 0$, we have $\|f_K - \mathcal{T}_P^\pi f_K\|_{d_P^{\pi, \infty}} \leq \frac{4}{1-\gamma} \max_{k=1,2,\dots} \|f_k - \mathcal{T}_P^\pi f_{k-1}\|_{d_P^{\pi, \infty}} + \gamma^{K/2}$.

Proof See Lemma C.2 of [13]. ■

Appendix I. Proofs for Robust Minimax Algorithm

Assumption 31 (Approximate W -realizability and completeness) Assume the following hold for \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{F} :

(A) *Approximate realizability*: $\min_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \|\mathcal{J}_{U^\pm}(w^\pm - w)\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{WReal}}$;

(B) *Approximate completeness*: $\max_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f - \mathcal{J}'_{U^\pm}(w - w^\pm)\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{WComp}}$.

We prove a more general result with approximate realizability and completeness, which implies [Theorem 6](#) that is robust to misspecification in its assumptions.

Theorem 32 Under [Assumption 31](#) and the same setup as [Theorem 6](#), we have

$$\|\mathcal{J}'_{U^\pm}(\hat{w} - w^\pm)\|_2 \lesssim \varepsilon_n^{\mathcal{W}} + \|\tilde{\zeta}^\pm - \zeta^\pm\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}} + \varepsilon_{\text{WReal}} + \varepsilon_{\text{WComp}}.$$

Proof For this proof, we focus on the worst-case kernel P^* of the form $\frac{P^*(s'|s,a)}{P(s'|s,a)} = \tau^{-1}(s, a) \mathbb{I}[\zeta^*(s, a, s') \leq 0]$ where $\zeta^*(s, a, s') = V^-(s') - \beta^-(s, a)$. This corresponds to the pure CVaR case of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{rob}}^-$; the \mathbb{E} part is identical to standard non-robust RL so we omit it. The best-case kernel U^+ can be handled similarly. Let $\hat{P}(s' | s, a)$ denote our estimated robust kernel, which satisfies $\frac{\hat{P}(s'|s,a)}{P(s'|s,a)} = \tau^{-1}(s, a) \mathbb{I}[\hat{\zeta}(s, a, s') \leq 0]$, where $\hat{\zeta}(s, a, s')$ is the given prior stage estimate of $\zeta^*(s, a, s') = V^-(s') - \beta^-(s, a)$.

The key and only difference between our [Algorithm 2](#) and the MIL algorithm (\hat{w}_{mil}) of [57] is that our next-state samples are importance weighted with $\xi^\pm(s, a, s')$, which is the density ratio of the estimated robust kernel $\hat{P}(s' | s, a)$ and the nominal kernel $P(s' | s, a)$. Note also that $\xi^\pm(s, a, s') \leq \tau^{-1}(s, a) < \infty$, and hence $|\mathbb{E}_n[\zeta(s, a, s')f(s')] - \mathbb{E}_{s,a \sim \nu, s' \sim \hat{P}(s,a)}[f(s')]| \lesssim \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)/n}$ w.p. $1 - \delta$. Therefore, up to $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)/n})$ errors, our [Algorithm 2](#) can be viewed as MIL applied to the MDP with kernel \hat{P} .

To invoke the result of [57, Theorem 6.1] (in MDP with kernel \hat{P}), we need to show that its assumptions are met by bounding the model misspecification, *i.e.*, Eq. (6) and Appendix C of [57].

Note that these misspecifications are w.r.t. the MDP with kernel \widehat{P} , since this is the MDP in which we're applying Theorem 6.1 of [57]. Specifically, the two errors we need to bound are, (A) approximate realizability: $\varepsilon_A = \min_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \|\mathcal{J}'_{\widehat{P}}(w_{\widehat{P}} - w)\|_2$; and (B) approximate completeness: $\varepsilon_B = \max_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f - \mathcal{J}'_{\widehat{P}}(w - w_{\widehat{P}})\|_2$ where recall that \mathcal{J}_P is the linear operator defined as $\mathcal{J}_P f(s, a) := \gamma \mathbb{E}_P[f(s', \pi_t) \mid s, a] - f(s, a)$ and \mathcal{J}'_P is the adjoint.

Bounding misspecifications by $\|\widehat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty$. Since $\zeta^*(s, a, s')$ has a marginal CDF that's boundedly differentiable around 0 (i.e., (ii) of Assumption 5), [30, Lemma 3] implies that $\zeta^*(s, a, s')$ satisfies a 1-margin (Definition 16). Hence, Lemma 17 and the continuity of $\zeta^*(s, a, s')$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\left(\mathbb{I}[\widehat{\zeta}(s, a, s') \leq 0] \neq \mathbb{I}[\zeta^*(s, a, s') \leq 0]\right) \\ &= \Pr\left(\left(\mathbb{I}[\widehat{\zeta}(s, a, s') \leq 0] \neq \mathbb{I}[\zeta^*(s, a, s') \leq 0]\right), \zeta^*(s, a, s') \neq 0\right) \lesssim \|\widehat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $v : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left|(\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{P}} - \mathbb{E}_{P^*})[v(s') \mid s, a]\right| &\leq \mathbb{E}[\tau^{-1}(s, a)(\mathbb{I}[\widehat{\zeta}(s, a, s') \leq 0] \neq \mathbb{I}[\zeta^*(s, a, s') \leq 0]) \cdot |v(s')|] \\ &\lesssim \|v\|_\infty \cdot \Pr\left(\mathbb{I}[\widehat{\zeta}(s, a, s') \leq 0] \neq \mathbb{I}[\zeta^*(s, a, s') \leq 0]\right) \\ &\lesssim \|v\|_\infty \|\widehat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently

$$\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{P}(\cdot \mid s, a) - P^*(\cdot \mid s, a)\|_{\text{TV}} \lesssim \|\widehat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty. \quad (17)$$

Equipped with Eq. (17), we can now bound the following two types of errors: (i) $\langle f, (\mathcal{T}_{P^*} - \mathcal{T}_{\widehat{P}})g \rangle$, and (ii) $\langle w_{\widehat{P}} - w_{P^*}, h \rangle$, where $f, g : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $h : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and \mathcal{T}_P and w_P are the Bellman operator and visitation density of target policy π_t in the MDP with kernel P .

For (i):

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f, (\mathcal{J}_{P^*} - \mathcal{J}_{\widehat{P}})g \rangle| &= |\mathbb{E}[f(s, a)(\gamma(\mathbb{E}_{P^*} - \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{P}})[g(s', \pi_t) \mid s, a])]| \\ &\leq \gamma \|f\|_\infty \mathbb{E}|(\mathbb{E}_{P^*} - \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{P}})[g(s', \pi_t) \mid s, a]| \\ &\lesssim \gamma \|f\|_\infty \|g(\cdot, \pi_t)\|_\infty \|\widehat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

For (ii):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w_{\widehat{P}} - w_{P^*}, h \rangle &= \mathbb{E}[(w_{\widehat{P}}(s) - w_{P^*}(s))h(s)] \\ &\leq \|h\|_\infty \|d_{\widehat{P}} - d_{P^*}\|_{\text{TV}} \\ &\leq \|h\|_\infty \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*}} \|\widehat{P}(\cdot \mid s, a) - P^*(\cdot \mid s, a)\|_{\text{TV}} \quad (\text{Eq. (19)}) \\ &\lesssim C \|h\|_\infty \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}\|\widehat{P}(\cdot \mid s, a) - P^*(\cdot \mid s, a)\|_{\text{TV}} \quad (\text{Assumption 5(i)}) \\ &\lesssim C \|h\|_\infty \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \|\widehat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where $C = \|\text{dd}^{P^*}/d\nu\|_\infty < \infty$.

For approximate realizability (ε_A): for any $w \in \mathcal{W}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{J}'_{\hat{P}}(w_{\hat{P}} - w)\|_2 \\ & \leq \|(\mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}} - \mathcal{J}_{P^*})'(w_{\hat{P}} - w)\|_2 + \|\mathcal{J}'_{P^*}(w_{\hat{P}} - w_{P^*})\|_2 + \|\mathcal{J}'_{P^*}(w^* - w)\|_2 \\ & = \langle w_{\hat{P}} - w, (\mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}} - \mathcal{J}_{P^*})g_1 \rangle + \langle w_{\hat{P}} - w_{P^*}, \mathcal{J}_{P^*}g_2 \rangle + \|\mathcal{J}'_{P^*}(w^* - w)\|_2 \\ & \lesssim \|\hat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty + \|\mathcal{J}'_{P^*}(w^* - w)\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

where $g_1 = ((\mathcal{J}_{P^*} - \mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}})'(w_{\hat{P}} - w))/\|(\mathcal{J}_{P^*} - \mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}})'(w_{\hat{P}} - w)\|_2$, $g_2 = (\mathcal{J}'_{P^*}(w_{\hat{P}} - w_{P^*}))/\|\mathcal{J}'_{P^*}(w_{\hat{P}} - w_{P^*})\|_2$. The last inequality uses (i) and (ii) with the fact that $\|g_1\|_\infty < \infty$ and $\|g_2\|_\infty < \infty$ as the w terms are bounded by our premise. Therefore, taking min over w and using [Assumption 31](#), we have $\varepsilon_A \lesssim \|\hat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty + \varepsilon_{\text{WReal}}$.

For approximate completeness (ε_B): for any $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|f - \mathcal{J}'_{\hat{P}}(w - w_{\hat{P}})\|_2 \\ & \leq \|f - \mathcal{J}'_{P^*}(w - w_{P^*})\|_2 + \|(\mathcal{J}_{P^*} - \mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}})'(w - w_{P^*})\|_2 + \|\mathcal{J}'_{P^*}(w_{\hat{P}} - w_{P^*})\|_2 \\ & \lesssim \|f - \mathcal{J}'_{P^*}(w - w_{P^*})\|_2 + \|\hat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

for the same reason as ε_A as the error terms are the same. Thus, $\varepsilon_B \lesssim \|\hat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty + \varepsilon_{\text{WComp}}$.

In sum, we have shown that the misspecification is at most $\mathcal{O}(\|\hat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty + \varepsilon_{\text{WReal}} + \varepsilon_{\text{WComp}})$. Therefore, [\[57, Theorem 6.1 and Appendix C\]](#) ensures that w.p. $1 - \delta$, our learned \hat{w} satisfies,

$$\left\| \mathcal{J}'_{\hat{P}}(\hat{w} - w_{\hat{P}}) \right\|_2 \lesssim \varepsilon_n^{\mathcal{W}} + \|\hat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty + \varepsilon_{\text{WReal}} + \varepsilon_{\text{WComp}} + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)/n}.$$

Concluding the proof. The final step is to translate the above guarantee to $\|\mathcal{J}'_{P^*}(\hat{w} - w_{P^*})\|_2$. The following shows that the switching cost is $\mathcal{O}(\|\hat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty)$ as before:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{J}'_{P^*}(\hat{w} - w_{P^*})\|_2 \\ & \leq \|(\mathcal{J}_{P^*} - \mathcal{J}_{\hat{P}})'(\hat{w} - w_{P^*})\|_2 + \|\mathcal{J}'_{\hat{P}}(\hat{w} - w_{\hat{P}})\|_2 + \|\mathcal{J}'_{\hat{P}}(w_{\hat{P}} - w_{P^*})\|_2 \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon_n^{\mathcal{W}} + \|\hat{\zeta} - \zeta^*\|_\infty + \varepsilon_{\text{WReal}} + \varepsilon_{\text{WComp}} + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)/n}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. ■

Lemma 33 (Visitation performance-difference) *Let $P, U : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be non-negative measures, which should be thought of as transitions in a discounted Markov chain. Assume U satisfies $\sum_{s'} U(s' | s) \leq 1$. Define $d_U = (1 - \gamma) \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{h-1} d_U^h$, where $d_U^h = \int_{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{h-1}} d_1(s_1) U(s_2 | s_1) \dots U(s | s_{h-1}) ds_{1:h-1}$. Assume the same for P .*

Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function class that satisfies $f \in \mathcal{F} \implies g(s) = \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(s)}[f(s')] \in \mathcal{F}$, i.e., closed under projection with P . Then, define the integral (probability) metric $\|P - U\|_{\mathcal{F}} := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |(\mathbb{E}_P - \mathbb{E}_U)[f(s)]|$. Then we have,

$$\|d_P - d_U\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{\gamma}{1 - \gamma} \mathbb{E}_{d_U} \|P(\cdot | s) - U(\cdot | s)\|_{\mathcal{F}}. \quad (18)$$

Proof Recall Bellman's flow, which is $d_P(s) = (1 - \gamma)d_1(s) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_P} P(s | \tilde{s})$. Fix any $f \in \mathcal{F}$. The initial state distributions cancel, so we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\mathbb{E}_{d_P} - \mathbb{E}_{d_U})[f(s)]| \\ &= |\gamma \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_P} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim P(\cdot | \tilde{s})}[f(s)] - \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_U} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim U(\cdot | \tilde{s})}[f(s)]| \\ &\leq |\gamma \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_P} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim P(\cdot | \tilde{s})}[f(s)] - \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_U} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim P(\cdot | \tilde{s})}[f(s)]| \\ &\quad + |\gamma \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_U} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim P(\cdot | \tilde{s})}[f(s)] - \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_U} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim U(\cdot | \tilde{s})}[f(s)]| \\ &\leq \gamma |(\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_P} - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_U})[\mathbb{E}_{s \sim P(\cdot | \tilde{s})} f(s)]| + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_U} |(\mathbb{E}_{s \sim P(\cdot | \tilde{s})} - \mathbb{E}_{s \sim U(\cdot | \tilde{s})})[f(s)]|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, taking supremum over \mathcal{F} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|d_P - d_U\|_{\mathcal{F}} \\ &\leq \gamma \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |(\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_P} - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_U})[\mathbb{E}_{s \sim P(\cdot | \tilde{s})} f(s)]| + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_U} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |(\mathbb{E}_{s \sim P(\cdot | \tilde{s})} - \mathbb{E}_{s \sim U(\cdot | \tilde{s})})[f(s)]| \\ &= \gamma \|d_P - d_U\|_{\mathcal{F}} + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim d_U} \|P(\cdot | \tilde{s}) - U(\cdot | \tilde{s})\|_{\mathcal{F}}. \quad (\mathcal{F} \text{ closed under } P\text{-projection}) \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms finishes the proof. \blacksquare

If \mathcal{F} is the class of functions with $\|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1$, then this recovers the TV distance, which gives,

$$\|d_P - d_U\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \frac{\gamma}{1 - \gamma} \mathbb{E}_{d_U} \|P(\cdot | s) - U(\cdot | s)\|_{\text{TV}}. \quad (19)$$

This generalizes Lemma E.3 of [1] to infinite horizon.

Appendix J. Proofs for Validity

J.1. Validity with correct Q

Lemma 34 For any w, β , we have $\mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; Q^-, \beta, w)] \leq V_{d_1}^-$ with equality when $\beta = \beta_{\tau}^-$.

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; Q^-, \beta, w)] &\leq (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{d_1}[V_{\beta}^-(s_1)] + \mathbb{E}[w(s, a)(Q^-(s, a) - \mathcal{T}_{\text{CVaR}}^- Q^-(s, a))] \\ &= V_{d_1}^- + 0 = V_{d_1}^-, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality comes from the fact that β is sub-optimal for $\mathbb{E}[\beta(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(V^-(s') - \beta(s, a))_-]$. The same proof applies for Q^+ . \blacksquare

J.2. Validity with $Q = \mathcal{T}_\beta^\pm Q$

First, we show that the \mathcal{T}_β perspective gives rise to a dual definition of Q^\pm (dual to Eq. (2)).

Lemma 35

$$Q^+(s, a) = \arg \min_{\beta: Q_\beta = \mathcal{T}_\beta^+ Q_\beta} Q_\beta(s, a), \quad Q^-(s, a) = \arg \max_{\beta: Q_\beta = \mathcal{T}_\beta^- Q_\beta} Q_\beta(s, a).$$

Proof Unroll $Q^-(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}(P)} \mathbb{E}_U[r(s', a') + \gamma \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}(P)} \mathbb{E}_U[\dots]]$, replacing each $\inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}(P)}$ with the convex combination of \mathbb{E} and CVaR from Lemma 1. Then, write each CVaR using the dual form, i.e., $\max_\beta \{\beta(s, a) + \tau^{-1}(s, a) \mathbb{E}[(\dots - \beta(s, a))_+]\}$. By s, a -rectangularity, the scalar \max_β separates per s, a , so we can pull all the maxes out front as a max over $\beta(s, a)$ functions. Note that not all $\beta(s, a)$ functions have a well-defined infinite sum in this manner, as \mathcal{T}_β is not always a contraction. The condition $Q_\beta = \mathcal{T}_\beta^- Q_\beta$ exactly characterizes when this unrolling is well-defined. Thus, Q^- is exactly the minimum Q_β whenever this procedure of unrolling with β is well-defined. This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma 36 Fix any w, β . If $Q_\beta^\pm = \mathcal{T}_\beta^\pm Q_\beta^\pm$, then $\mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; Q_\beta^-, \beta, w)] \leq V_{d_1}^-$.

Proof

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi(s, a, s'; Q_\beta^-, \beta, w)] = (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{d_1}[V_\beta^-(s_1)] + 0 \leq V_{d_1}^-.$$

The first equality is because the correction term is $\mathcal{T}_\beta^- Q_\beta^- - Q_\beta^-$, which is zero since Q_β^- is a fixed point. The inequality is due to Lemma 35. \blacksquare

Appendix K. Additional Experiment Details

K.1. Environment

We consider a simple MDP with a one-dimensional state space $\mathcal{S} = [0, 5]$, a binary action space $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$, reward function

$$r(s, a) = \frac{26 - s^2 - \mathbb{I}[a = 1]}{26},$$

which we note takes values in the range $[0, 1]$, and with transitions given by

$$\begin{aligned} P(\cdot \mid s, a = 0) &= \text{UnifClip}[s - 0.2, s + 1] \\ P(\cdot \mid s, a = 1) &= \text{UnifClip}[0.2s - 0.02, s + 0.5], \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{UnifClip}[a, b]$ denotes a uniform distribution between $\max(a, 0)$ and $\min(b, 5)$. In addition, the environment always starts in initial state $s_0 = 2$. Essentially, this is a simple control environment, where high rewards are obtained by maintaining state as close to zero as possible, the action $a = 1$ is a control action that (in expectation) moves the state closer to zero, and which occurs a small reward cost, and the action $a = 0$ is a passive action that allows the state to freely drift (with an overall drift away from zero).

K.2. Target Policy

We focus on estimating the worst-case policy value $V_{d_1}^-$ for the simple threshold-based target policy π_t which takes action $a = 1$ when $s \geq 2$, and $a = 0$ whenever $s < 2$.

K.3. Logging Policy and Data Sampling Procedure

We sample data using an evaluation policy π_b which is an ϵ -smoothed threshold policy similar to π_t . Specifically, π_b takes action $a = 1$ when $s \geq 1.5$ with probability 0.95, and takes action $a = 0$ when $s < 1.5$ with probability 0.95. We obtain a dataset $\{s_i, a_i, s'_i, r_i\}$ by first rolling out with π_b for 1000 burn-in time steps, and then sampling the tuple (s, a, s', r) every 10 time steps. For each replication of our experiment, we sample 10,000 tuples in total.

K.4. Calculation of True Worst-case Policy Values

A major challenge in studying robust policy value estimation is that, even with ground truth knowledge of the MDP and/or access to a simulator, it may be intractable to estimate the robust policy values $V_{d_1}^\pm$. Fortunately, the above environment has the desirable property that we can analytically compute the best/worst-case transition distributions allowed by our sensitivity model, since no matter what policy π_t the agent is acting with, it always strictly prefers transitions to smaller states. In detail, suppose that for some state, action pair (s, a) we have $P(\cdot \mid s, a) = \text{Unif}[x, y]$, for some $0 \leq x \leq y \leq 5$. Then, letting $\alpha = 1/(1 + \Lambda(s, a))$, it is easy to verify that the worst case transition kernel is given by

$$U^-(\cdot \mid s, a) = (1 - \Lambda^{-1}(s, a))\text{Unif}[y - \alpha(y - x), y] + \Lambda^{-1}(s, a)\text{Unif}[x, y].$$

That is, the worst case transition kernel is given by a mixture of two uniform distributions. Therefore, we can easily simulate rollouts with the best/worst case transition kernels, and accurately estimate the robust policy values. This allows us to validate our methodology in this synthetic environment. Specifically, for each $\Lambda(s, a)$ we experiment with, we can compute the corresponding ground truth $V_{d_1}^-$ up to arbitrary precision via Monte Carlo sampling, by rolling out trajectories with π_t in the adversarial MDP according to the above worst-case transition kernel.

Note as well that if one wanted to estimate the best-case policy value, analogous reasoning would give us

$$U^+(\cdot \mid s, a) = (1 - \Lambda^{-1}(s, a))\text{Unif}[x, x + \alpha(y - x)] + \Lambda^{-1}(s, a)\text{Unif}[x, y].$$

However, in our experiments we only concern ourselves with worst-case policy value estimation.

K.5. Nuisance Estimation

We instantiate slight variations of [Algorithms 1](#) and [2](#) using neural nets for the classes \mathcal{Q} , \mathcal{B} , and \mathcal{W} used for fitting Q^- , β^- , and w^- respectively, and linear sieves for the corresponding critic class \mathcal{Q} that we perform maximization over for the minimax estimation of w^- . Specifically, we grow the linear sieve for the critic class in a data-driven way, as follows: at each step k of the respective algorithm, we compute the best response $q_k \in \mathcal{Q}$ to the previous iterate solution $w_k \in \mathcal{W}$ by optimizing over a neural net class, and then we append this best-response function to the set of functions in our linear sieve for the corresponding critic class. We also note that our estimator for Q^- deviates slightly from that described in [Algorithm 1](#) in that we used a minimax loss, similar to that used for estimating w^- , rather than the fixed Q iteration loss, for computing \hat{q}_k at each step of the algorithm. Full exact nuisance estimation details necessary for reproducibility will be available with our code release on acceptance.

K.6. Estimators

We estimate the worst-case policy value using three different estimators:

- **Q:** Direct estimator given by:

$$\hat{V}_{d_1}^- = \hat{Q}^-(s_1, \pi_t(s_1)),$$

where s_1 is the deterministic initial state.

- **W:** Importance sampling-style estimator using \hat{w}^- , which is given by:

$$\hat{V}_{d_1}^- = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{w}^-(s_i, a_i) \hat{\xi}_i r_i,$$

where

$$\hat{\xi}_i = \Lambda^{-1} + (1 - \Lambda^{-1})(1 + \Lambda)\mathbb{I} \left[\hat{V}^-(s'_i) \leq \hat{\beta}^-(s_i, a_i) \right].$$

- **Orth:** Our orthogonal estimator using EIF, given by

$$\hat{V}_{d_1}^- = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(s_i, a_i, s'_i; \hat{Q}^-, \hat{\beta}^-, \hat{w}^-).$$

Note as well that we used a simpler data splitting procedure rather than the cross-fitting procedure described in [Algorithm 3](#). Specifically, we used the first 10,000 tuples for estimating nuisances, and the second 10,000 tuples for the final estimators. This was done for the sake of computational ease in running experiments with many replications, and was performed in the same way for all methods.