

---

# Confident Natural Policy Gradient for Local Planning in $q_\pi$ -realizable Constrained MDPs

---

**Tian Tian**

University of Alberta, Edmonton  
ttian@ualberta.ca

**Lin F. Yang**

University of California, Los Angeles  
linyang@ee.ucla.edu

**Csaba Szepesvári**

University of Alberta, Google DeepMind, Edmonton  
szepesva@ualberta.ca

## Abstract

The constrained Markov decision process (CMDP) framework emerges as an important reinforcement learning approach for imposing safety or other critical objectives while maximizing cumulative reward. However, the current understanding of how to learn efficiently in a CMDP environment with a potentially infinite number of states remains under investigation, particularly when function approximation is applied to the value functions. In this paper, we address the learning problem given linear function approximation with  $q_\pi$ -realizability, where the value functions of all policies are linearly representable with a known feature map, a setting known to be more general and challenging than other linear settings. Utilizing a local-access model, we propose a novel primal-dual algorithm that, after  $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(d)\epsilon^{-3})^1$  queries, outputs with high probability a policy that strictly satisfies the constraints while nearly optimizing the value with respect to a reward function. Here,  $d$  is the feature dimension and  $\epsilon > 0$  is a given error. The algorithm relies on a carefully crafted off-policy evaluation procedure to evaluate the policy using historical data, which informs policy updates through policy gradients and conserves samples. To our knowledge, this is the first result achieving polynomial sample complexity for CMDP in the  $q_\pi$ -realizable setting.

## 1 Introduction

In the classical reinforcement learning (RL) framework, optimizing a single objective above all else can be challenging for safety-critical applications like autonomous driving, robotics, and Large Language Models (LLMs). For example, it may be difficult for an LLM agent to optimize a single reward that fulfills the objective of generating helpful responses while ensuring that the messages are harmless (Dai et al., 2024). In autonomous driving, designing a single reward often requires reliance on complex parameters and hard-coded knowledge, making the agent less efficient and adaptive (Kamran et al., 2022). Optimizing a single objective in motion planning involves combining heterogeneous quantities like path length and risks, which depend on conversion factors that are not necessarily straightforward to determine (Feyzabadi and Carpin, 2014).

The constrained Markov decision process (CMDP) framework (Altman, 2021) emerges as an important RL approach for imposing safety or other critical objectives while maximizing cumulative reward (Wachi and Sui, 2020; Dai et al., 2024; Kamran et al., 2022; Wen et al., 2020;

---

<sup>1</sup>Here  $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$  hides log factors.

Girard and Reza Emami, 2015; Feyzabadi and Carpin, 2014). In addition to the single reward function optimized under a standard Markov decision process (MDP), CMDP considers multiple reward functions, with one designated as the primary reward function. The goal of a CMDP is to find a policy that maximizes the primary reward function while satisfying constraints defined by the other reward functions. Although the results of this paper can be applied to multiple constraint functions, for simplicity of presentation, we consider the CMDP problem with only one constraint function.

Our current understanding of how to learn efficiently in a CMDP environment with a potentially infinite number of states remains limited, particularly when function approximation is applied to the value functions. Most works studying the sample efficiency of a learner have focused on the tabular or simple linear CMDP setting (see related works for more details). However, there has been little work in the more general settings such as the  $q_\pi$ -realizability, which assumes the value function of all policies can be approximated by a linear combination of a feature map with unknown parameters. Unlike Linear MDPs (Yang and Wang, 2019; Jin et al., 2020), where the transition model is assumed to be linearly representable by a feature map,  $q_\pi$ -realizability only imposes the assumption on the existence of a feature map to represent value functions of policies.

Nevertheless, the generality of  $q_\pi$ -realizability comes with a price, as it becomes considerably more challenging to design effective learning algorithms, even for the unconstrained settings. For the general online setting, we are only aware of one sample-efficient MDP learning algorithm (Weisz et al., 2023), which, however, is computationally inefficient. To tackle this issue, a line of research (Kearns et al., 2002; Yin et al., 2022; Hao et al., 2022; Weisz et al., 2022) applies the *local-access model*, where the RL algorithm can restart the environment from any visited states - a setting that is also practically motivated, especially when a simulator is provided. The local-access model is more general than the generative model (Kakade, 2003; Sidford et al., 2018; Yang and Wang, 2019; Lattimore et al., 2020; Vaswani et al., 2022), which allows visitation to arbitrary states in an MDP. The local-access model provides the ability to unlock both the sample and computational efficiency of learning with  $q_\pi$ -realizability for the unconstrained MDP settings. However, it remains unclear whether we can harness the power of local-access for CMDP learning.

In this paper, we present a systematic study of CMDP for large state spaces, given  $q_\pi$ -realizable function approximation in the local-access model. We summarize our contributions as follows:

- We design novel, computationally efficient primal-dual algorithms to learn CMDP near-optimal policies with the local-access model and  $q_\pi$ -realizable function classes. The algorithms can return policies with small constraint violations or even no constraint violations and can handle model misspecification.
- We provide theoretical guarantees for the algorithms, showing that they can compute an  $\epsilon$ -optimal policy with high probability, making no more than  $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(d)\epsilon^{-3})$  queries to the local-access model. The returned policies can strictly satisfy the constraint.
- Under the misspecification setting with a misspecification error  $\omega$ , we show that our algorithms achieve an  $\tilde{O}(\omega) + \epsilon$  sub-optimality with high probability, maintaining the same sample efficiency of  $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(d)\epsilon^{-3})$ .

## 2 Related works

Most provably efficient algorithms developed for CMDP are in the tabular and linear MDP settings. In the tabular setting, most notably are the works by (Efroni et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2021; Zheng and Ratliff, 2020; Vaswani et al., 2022; Kalagarla et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021; Gattami et al., 2021; HasanzadeZonuzuy et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Kitamura et al., 2024). Work by Vaswani et al. (2022) have showed their algorithm uses no more than  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)^3\epsilon^2}\right)$  samples to achieve relaxed feasibility and  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)^5\zeta^2\epsilon^2}\right)$  samples to achieve strict feasibility. Here, the  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  is the discount factor and  $\zeta \in (0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]$  is the Slater’s constant, which characterizes the size of the feasible region and hence the hardness of the CMDP. In their work, they have also provided a lower bound of  $\Omega\left(\frac{SA}{(1-\gamma)^5\zeta^2\epsilon^2}\right)$  on the sample complexity under strict feasibility. However, all the aforementioned results all scale polynomially with the cardinality of the state space.

For problems with large or possibly infinite state spaces, works by (Jain et al., 2022; Ding et al., 2021; Miryoosefi and Jin, 2022; Ghosh et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2022) have used linear function approximations to address the curse of dimensionality. All these works, except Jain et al. (2022); Liu et al. (2022), make the linear MDP assumption, where the transition function is linearly representable.

Under the generative model, for the infinite horizon discounted case, the online algorithm proposed in Jain et al. (2022) achieves a regret of  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d}/\sqrt{K})$  with  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d}/\sqrt{K})$  constraint violation, where  $K$  is the number of iterations. Work by Liu et al. (2022) is able to achieve a faster  $O(\ln(K)/K)$  convergence rate for both the reward suboptimality and constraint violation. For the online access setting under linear MDP assumption, Ding et al. (2021); Ghosh et al. (2024) achieve a regret of  $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(d)\text{poly}(H)\sqrt{T})$  with  $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(d)\text{poly}(H)\sqrt{T})$  violations, where  $T$  is the number of episodes and  $H$  is the horizon term.

Miryoosefi and Jin (2022) presented an algorithm that achieves a sample complexity of  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{d^3 H^6}{\epsilon^2}\right)$ , where  $d$  is the dimension of the feature space and  $H$  is the horizon term in the finite horizon CMDP setting. In the more general setting under  $q_\pi$ -realizability, the best-known upper bounds are in the unconstrained MDP setting.

In the unconstrained MDP setting with access to a local-access model, early work by Kearns et al. (2002) have developed a tree-search style algorithms under this model, albeit in the tabular setting. Under  $v^*$ -realizability, Weisz et al. (2021) presented a planner that returns an  $\epsilon$ -optimal policy using  $O((dH/\epsilon)^{|\mathcal{A}|})$  queries to the simulator. More works by (Yin et al., 2022; Hao et al., 2022; Weisz et al., 2022) have considered the local-access model with  $q_\pi$ -realizability assumption. Recent work by Weisz et al. (2022) have shown their algorithm can return a near-optimal policy that achieves a sample complexity of  $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{d}{(1-\gamma)^4 \epsilon^2}\right)$ .

### 3 Problem formulation

#### Constrained MDP

We consider an infinite-horizon discounted CMDP  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, \gamma, r, c, b, s_0)$  consisting a possibly infinite state space  $\mathcal{S}$  with finite actions  $\mathcal{A}$ , a transition probability function  $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$ , a discount factor  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ , a reward function  $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , a constraint function  $c : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , a constraint threshold  $b$ , and a fixed initial state  $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ . Given any stationary randomized policy  $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$  and the reward function, we define the action-value function with respect to a state-action pair  $(s, a)$  as  $q_\pi^r(s, a) \doteq \mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(S_t, A_t) | S_0 = s, A_0 = a]$ . The expectation is taken over randomness of the trajectory induced by the interaction between policy  $\pi$  and transition function  $P$ . The action-value function of the constraint function  $q_\pi^c$  is defined similarly to the reward function. For the state-value function of a state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , we have  $v_\pi^r(s) \doteq \langle \pi(\cdot | s), q_\pi^r(s, \cdot) \rangle$ . Likewise, the value function of the constraint function  $v_\pi^c$  is defined similarly to the reward function.

The objective of the CMDP is to find a policy  $\pi$  that maximizes the state-value function  $v_\pi^r$  starting from a given state  $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ , while ensuring that the constraint  $v_\pi^c(s_0) \geq b$  is satisfied:

$$\max_{\pi \in \Pi_{rand}} v_\pi^r(s_0) \quad s.t. \quad v_\pi^c(s_0) \geq b, \quad (1)$$

where  $\Pi_{rand}$  is the set of stationary randomized policies of the CMDP. We assume the existence of a feasible solution to eq. (1) and let  $\pi^*$  denote the solution to eq. (1). A quantity unique to CMDP is the Slater's constant, which is denoted as  $\zeta \doteq \max_{\pi} v_\pi^c(s_0) - b$ . Slater's constant characterizes the size of the feasibility region, and hence the hardness of the problem.

Because the state space can be large or possibly infinite, we use linear function approximation to approximate the values of stationary randomized policies. Let  $\phi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a feature map, we make the following assumption:

**Definition 1** ( $q_\pi$ -realizability) *There exists  $B > 0$  and a misspecification error  $\omega \geq 0$  such that for every  $\pi \in \Pi_{rand}$ , there exists a weight vector  $w_\pi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\|w_\pi\|_2 \leq B$ , and ensures  $|q_\pi(s, a) - \langle w_\pi, \phi(s, a) \rangle| \leq \omega$  for all  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ .*

We assume to have access to a local access model, where the agent can only query simulator for states that have been encountered in previous simulations. Then, our goal is to design an algorithm that returns a near-optimal mixture policy  $\bar{\pi}$ , whose performance can be characterised in two ways. For a given target error  $\epsilon > 0$ , the

**relaxed feasibility** requires the returned policy  $\bar{\pi}$  whose sub-optimality gap  $v_{\bar{\pi}^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}}^r(s_0)$  is bounded by  $\epsilon$ , while allowing for a small constraint violation. Formally, we require  $\bar{\pi}$  such that

$$v_{\bar{\pi}^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}}^r(s_0) \leq \epsilon \quad \text{s.t.} \quad v_{\bar{\pi}}^c(s_0) \geq b - \epsilon. \quad (2)$$

On the other hand, **strict-feasibility** requires the returned policy  $\bar{\pi}$  whose sub-optimality gap  $v_{\bar{\pi}^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}}^r(s_0)$  is bounded by  $\epsilon$  while not allowing any constraint violation. Formally, we require  $\bar{\pi}$  such that

$$v_{\bar{\pi}^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}}^r(s_0) \leq \epsilon \quad \text{s.t.} \quad v_{\bar{\pi}}^c(s_0) \geq b. \quad (3)$$

## Notations

For any integer  $i$ , we let  $[i] = \{1, \dots, i\}$  and  $[0, i] = \{0, 1, \dots, i\}$ . For any integers  $i_1, i_2$ , let  $[i_1, \dots, i_2]$  to mean  $\{i_1, i_1 + 1, \dots, i_2\}$ . For any real number  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we let  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  to denote the smallest integer  $i$  such that  $i \leq x$ . For a vector of values  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we use  $\|x\|_1 = \sum_i |x_i|$ ,  $\|x\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_i x_i^2}$ , and  $\|x\|_\infty = \max_i |x_i|$ . We let  $\text{proj}_{[a_1, a_2]}(\lambda) \doteq \arg \min_{p \in [a_1, a_2]} |\lambda - p|$ , and  $\text{trunc}_{[a_1, a_2]}(y) \doteq \min\{\max\{y, a_1\}, a_2\}$ . For any two positive numbers  $a, b$ , we write  $a = O(b)$  if there exists an absolute constant  $c > 0$  such that  $a \leq cb$ . We use the  $\tilde{O}$  to hide any polylogarithmic terms.

## 4 Confident-NPG-CMDP, a local-access algorithm for CMDP

### 4.1 A primal-dual approach

We approach solving the CMDP problem by framing it as an equivalent saddle-point problem:

$$\max_{\pi} \min_{\lambda \geq 0} L(\pi, \lambda),$$

where  $L : \Pi_{rand} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the Lagrange function. For a policy  $\pi \in \Pi_{rand}$  and a Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , we have

$$L(\pi, \lambda) \doteq v_{\pi}^r(s_0) + \lambda(v_{\pi}^c(s_0) - b).$$

Let  $(\pi^*, \lambda^*)$  be the solution to this saddle-point problem. By an equivalence to a LP formulation and strong duality (Altman, 2021),  $\pi^*$  is the policy that achieves the optimal value in the CMDP as defined in eq. (1). The optimal Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda^* \doteq \arg \min_{\lambda \geq 0} L(\pi^*, \lambda)$ . Therefore, solving eq. (1) is equivalent to finding the saddle-point of the Lagrange function.

A typical primal dual algorithm that finds the saddle-point will proceed in an iterative fashion alternating between a policy update using policy gradient and a dual variable update using mirror descent. The policy gradient is computed with respect to the primal value  $q_{\pi_k, \lambda_k}^p = q_{\pi_k}^r + \lambda_k q_{\pi_k}^c$  and the mirror descent is computed with respect to the constraint value  $v_{\pi_{k+1}}^c(s_0) = \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s_0), q_{\pi_{k+1}}^c(s_0, \cdot) \rangle$ . Given that we do not have access to an oracle for exact policy evaluations, we must collect data to estimate the primal and constraint values.

If we have the least-squares estimates of  $q_{\pi_k}^r$  and  $q_{\pi_k}^c$ , denoted by  $Q_k^r$  and  $Q_k^c$ , respectively, then we can compute the least-squares estimate  $Q_k^p = Q_k^r + \lambda_k Q_k^c$  to be the estimate of the primal value  $q_{\pi_k}^p$ . Additionally, we can compute  $V_{k+1}^c(s_0) = \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s_0), Q_k^c(s_0, \cdot) \rangle$  to be the least-squares estimate of the constraint value  $v_{\pi_{k+1}}^c(s_0)$ . Then, for any given  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , our algorithm makes a policy update of the following form:

$$\pi_{k+1}(a|s) \propto \pi_k(a|s) \exp(\eta_1 Q_k^p(s, a)), \quad (4)$$

followed by a dual variable update of the following form:

$$\lambda_{k+1} \leftarrow \lambda_k - \eta_2 (V_{k+1}^c(s_0) - b),$$

where the  $\eta_1$  and  $\eta_2$  are the step-sizes.

---

**Algorithm 1** Confident-NPG-CMDP

---

- 1: **Input:**  $s_0$  (initial state),  $\epsilon$  (target accuracy),  $\delta \in (0, 1]$  (failure probability);  $\gamma$  (discount factor)
  - 2: **Initialize:**
  - 3: Define  $K, \eta_1, m$  according to Theorem 1 for relaxed-feasibility and Theorem 2 for strict-feasibility,
  - 4: Set  $L \leftarrow \lfloor \lfloor K \rfloor / (\lfloor m \rfloor + 1) \rfloor$ .
  - 5: For each iteration  $k \in [0, K] : \pi_k \leftarrow \text{Unif}(\mathcal{A}), \tilde{Q}_k^p(\cdot, \cdot) \leftarrow 0, \tilde{Q}_k^c(\cdot, \cdot) \leftarrow 0,$  and  $\lambda_k \leftarrow 0$ .
  - 6: For each phase  $l \in [L + 1] : \mathcal{C}_l \leftarrow (), D_l \leftarrow \{\}$
  
  - 7: For  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ : if  $(s_0, a) \notin \text{ActionCov}(\mathcal{C}_0)$ , then append  $(s_0, a)$  to  $\mathcal{C}_0$  and set  $\perp$  to  $D_0[(s_0, a)] \triangleright$  see ActionCov defined in eq. (6)
  
  - 8: **while** True **do**  $\triangleright$  main loop
  - 9:   Let  $\ell$  be the smallest integer s.t.  $D_\ell[z'] = \perp$  for some  $z' \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$
  - 10:   Let  $z$  be the first state-action pair in  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  s.t.  $D_\ell[z] = \perp$
  
  - 11:   If  $\ell = L + 1$ , then return  $\frac{1}{\lfloor K \rfloor} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor K \rfloor - 1} \pi_k$
  
  - 12:    $k_\ell \leftarrow \ell \times (\lfloor m \rfloor + 1)$   $\triangleright$  iteration corresponding to phase  $\ell$
  - 13:    $(result, discovered) \leftarrow \text{Gather-data}(\pi_{k_\ell}, \mathcal{C}_\ell, \alpha, z)$
  - 14:   **if**  $discovered$  is True **then**
  - 15:     Append  $result$  to  $\mathcal{C}_0$  and set  $\perp$  to  $D_0[result]$   $\triangleright result$  is a state-action pair
  - 16:     Goto line 8
  
  - 17:    $D_\ell[z] \leftarrow result$
  
  - 18:   **if**  $\nexists z' \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$  s.t.  $D_\ell[z'] = \perp$  **then**
  - 19:      $k_{\ell+1} \leftarrow k_\ell + (\lfloor m \rfloor + 1)$  **if**  $k_\ell + (\lfloor m \rfloor + 1) \leq \lfloor K \rfloor$  **otherwise**  $\lfloor K \rfloor$
  
  - 20:     **for**  $k = k_\ell, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1$  **do**  $\triangleright$  off-policy iterations reusing  $\mathcal{C}_\ell, D_\ell$
  - 21:        $Q_k^r, Q_k^c \leftarrow \text{LSE}(\mathcal{C}_\ell, D_\ell, \pi_k, \pi_{k_\ell})$
  
  - 22:       For  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell) \setminus \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1})$ , and for  $a \in \mathcal{A}$
  - 23:          $\tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a) \leftarrow \text{trunc}_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} Q_k^r(s, a) + \lambda_k \text{trunc}_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} Q_k^c(s, a)$
  - 24:          $\tilde{Q}_k^c(s, a) \leftarrow Q_k^c(s, a)$
  
  - 25:        $\triangleright$  update policy
  - 26:       For  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ :
  - 27:         
$$\pi_{k+1}(a|s) \leftarrow \begin{cases} \pi_{k+1}(a|s) & \text{if } s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) \\ \pi_k(a|s) \frac{\exp(\eta_1 \tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a))}{\sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_k(a'|s) \exp(\eta_1 \tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a'))} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
  
  - 28:        $\triangleright$  update dual variable
  - 29:        $\tilde{V}_{k+1}^c(s_0) \leftarrow \text{trunc}_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} \langle \pi_{k+1}(\cdot | s_0), \tilde{Q}_k^c(s_0, \cdot) \rangle$
  - 30:       
$$\lambda_{k+1} \leftarrow \begin{cases} \lambda_{k+1} & \text{if } s_0 \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) \\ \text{proj}_{[0, U]} \left( \lambda_k - \eta_2 (\tilde{V}_{k+1}^c(s_0) - b) \right) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
  
  - 31:     For  $z \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$  s.t.  $z \notin \mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$ : append  $z$  to  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$  and set  $\perp$  to  $D_{\ell+1}[z]$
-

## 4.2 Core set and least square estimates

To construct the least-squares estimates, let us assume for now that we are given a set of state-action pairs, which we call the core set  $\mathcal{C}$ . By organizing the feature vector of each state-action pair in  $\mathcal{C}$  row-wise into a matrix  $\Phi_{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}| \times d}$ , we can write the covariance matrix as  $V(\mathcal{C}, \alpha) \doteq \Phi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\top} \Phi_{\mathcal{C}} + \alpha I$ . For each state-action pair in  $\mathcal{C}$ , suppose we have run Monte Carlo rollouts using the rollout policy  $\pi$  with the local access simulator to obtain an averaged Monte Carlo return denoted by  $\bar{q}$ . Then for any state-action pair  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , the least-square estimate of action-value  $q_{\pi}$  is defined to be

$$Q(s, a) \doteq \langle \phi(s, a), V(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)^{-1} \Phi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\top} \bar{q} \rangle. \quad (5)$$

Since the algorithm can only rely on estimates for policy improvement and constraint evaluation, it is imperative that these estimates closely approximate their true action values. In the local access setting, an algorithm may not be able to visit all state-action pairs, so we cannot guarantee that the estimates will closely approximate the true action values for all state-action pairs. However, we can ensure the accuracy of the estimates for a subset of states.

Given  $\mathcal{C}$ , let us define a set of state-action pairs whose features satisfies the condition  $\|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)^{-1}} \leq 1$ , then we call this set the action-cover of  $\mathcal{C}$ :

$$\text{ActionCov}(\mathcal{C}) \doteq \{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} : \|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)^{-1}} \leq 1\}. \quad (6)$$

Following from the action-cover, we have the cover of  $\mathcal{C}$ . For a state  $s$  to be in the cover of  $\mathcal{C}$ , all its actions  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , the pair  $(s, a)$  is in the action-cover of  $\mathcal{C}$ . In other words,

$$\text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}) \doteq \{s \in \mathcal{S} : \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, (s, a) \in \text{ActionCov}(\mathcal{C})\}.$$

For any  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C})$ , we can ensure the least square estimate  $Q(s, a)$  defined by eq. (5) closely approximates its true action value  $q_{\pi}(s, a)$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ . However, such a core set  $\mathcal{C}$  is not available before the algorithm is run. Therefore, we need an algorithm that will build a core set incrementally in the local-access setting while planning. To achieve this, we build our algorithm on CAPI-QPI-Plan (Weisz et al., 2022), using similar methodology for core set building and data gathering. For the pseudo-code of our algorithm Confident-NPG-CMDP, please see algorithm 1.

## 4.3 Core set building and data gathering to control the accuracy of the least-square estimates

Confident-NPG-CMDP does not collect data in every iteration but collects data in interval of  $m = O(\ln(1+c) \text{poly}(\epsilon^{-1}(1-\gamma)^{-1}))$ , where  $c \geq 0$  is set by the user. By setting  $c$  to a non-zero value places an upper bound of  $1+c$  on the per-trajectory importance sampling ratio used in the off-policy evaluation. The  $m$  is then set accordingly. The total number of data collection phases is  $L = \lfloor K \rfloor / (\lfloor m \rfloor + 1)$ . When  $c$  is set to 0, we have  $L = K$ , recovering a purely on-policy version of the algorithm. The importance sampling ratio is used in the LSE-subroutine (algorithm 4 in appendix A) for computing an unbiased  $\bar{q}$  used in eq. (5).

In the iteration that corresponds to a data collection phase, the algorithm performs on-policy evaluation. Between any two data collection phases, the algorithm performs  $(\lfloor m \rfloor + 1)$  number of off-policy evaluations reusing data collected during the on-policy iteration. By setting  $c$  to a non-zero value places an upper bound of  $1+c$  on the per-trajectory importance sampling ratio used in the off-policy evaluation. The  $m$  is then set accordingly. When  $c$  is set to 0, we have  $L = K$ , recovering a purely on-policy version of the algorithm. The importance sampling ratio is used in the LSE-subroutine (algorithm 4 in appendix A) for computing an unbiased  $\bar{q}$  used in eq. (5).

Similar to CAPI-QPI-Plan of Weisz et al. (2022), Confident-NPG-CMPD maintains a set of core sets  $(\mathcal{C}_l)_{l \in [L+1]}$  and a set of policies  $(\pi_k)_{k \in [K]}$ . Due to the off-policy evaluations, Confident-NPG-CMDP also maintains a set of data  $(D_l)_{l \in [L]}$ . Initially, all core sets are set to the empty set, all policies are set to the uniform policy, and all  $D_l$  are empty.

The program starts by adding any feature vector of  $s_0, a$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  that are not in the action-cover of  $\mathcal{C}_0$ . Those feature vectors are considered informative. For the informative state-action pairs, the algorithm adds an entry in  $D_0$  and set the value to the placeholder  $\perp$ . Then the problem finds an  $l \in [L]$  in line 9 of algorithm 1, such that the corresponding  $D_l$  has an entry that does not have any



roll-out data. If there are multiple phases with the placeholder value, then start with the lowest level phase  $l \in [L]$  such that  $D_l$  contains the placeholder value. When such a phase is found, a running phase starts, and is denoted by  $\ell$  in algorithm 1. We note that only during a running phase, will the next phase core set  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$  be extended by line 31, the policies be updated by line 27, and dual variable updated by line 30.

During the roll-out performed in Gather-data subroutine (algorithm 3 in appendix A), if any  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  is not in the action-cover of  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$ , it is added to  $\mathcal{C}_0$ . Once a state-action pair is added to a core set by line 7 and line 31, it remains in that core set for the duration of the algorithm. This means that any  $\mathcal{C}_l, l \in [L + 1]$  can grow in size and be extended multiple times during the execution of the algorithm. When any new state-action pair is added to  $\mathcal{C}_l$ , the least-square estimate should be recomputed with the newly added information. This would mean the policy need to be updated and data rerun. We can avoid restarting the data collection procedure by following a similar update strategy of CAPI-QPI-Plan (Weisz et al., 2022) for updating the policy and the dual variable.

When a new state-action pair is added to  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$ , for each corresponding iteration  $k \in [k_\ell, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$ , the least-squares estimate is recomputed by the LSE subroutine (algorithm 4 in appendix A) with the newly added information. However, the refreshed least-squares estimate  $Q_k^p$  is only used to update the policy of states that are newly covered by  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  (i.e.,  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell) \setminus \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1})$ ) using the update eq. (4). For any states that are already covered by  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  (i.e.,  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1})$ ), the policy remains unchanged as it was first updated by eq. (4) with the least-squares estimate  $Q^p$  at that time. The primal estimate  $\tilde{Q}_k^p$  in line 23 of algorithm 1 captures the value with which  $\pi_{k+1}$  is updated. We want the accuracy guarantee of  $\tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a)$  with respect to  $q_{\pi_k, \lambda_k}^p(s, a)$  not just for  $\pi_k$  but for an extended set of policies defined as follows:

**Definition 2** For any policy  $\pi$  from the set of randomized policies  $\Pi_{rand}$  and any subset  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ , the extended set of policies is defined as:

$$\Pi_{\pi, \mathcal{X}} = \{\pi' \in \Pi_{rand} \mid \pi(\cdot|s) = \pi'(\cdot|s) \text{ for all } s \in \mathcal{X}\}. \quad (7)$$

By maintaining a set of core sets, gathering data via the Gather-data subroutine (algorithm 3 in appendix A), making policy updates by line 27, and dual variable updates by line 30, we have:

**Lemma 1** Whenever the LSE-subroutine on line 21 of Confident-NPG-CMDP is executed, for all  $k \in [k_\ell, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$ , for all  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell)$  and  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , the least-square estimate  $\tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a)$  satisfies the following,

$$|\tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a) - q_{\pi'_k, \lambda_k}^p(s, a)| \leq \epsilon' \quad \text{for all } \pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell)}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\epsilon' = (1 + U)(\omega + \sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon)\sqrt{\tilde{d}})$  with  $\tilde{d} = \tilde{O}(d)$  and  $U$  is an upper bound on the optimal Lagrange multiplier. Likewise,

$$|\tilde{Q}_k^c(s, a) - q_{\pi'_k}^c(s, a)| \leq \omega + \sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon)\sqrt{\tilde{d}} \quad \text{for all } \pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell)}, \quad (9)$$

The accuracy guarantee of eq. (8) and eq. (9) are maintained throughout the execution of the algorithm. By lemma 4.5 of Weisz et al. (2022) (restated in lemma 6 in appendix A), for any  $\mathcal{C}_l^{past}$  to be a past version of  $\mathcal{C}_l$  and  $\pi_k^{past}$  be the corresponding policy associated with  $\mathcal{C}_l^{past}$ , then we have  $\Pi_{\pi_k, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l)} \subseteq \Pi_{\pi_k^{past}, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l^{past})}$ . If we have eq. (8) and eq. (9) being true for any policy from  $\Pi_{\pi_k^{past}, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l^{past})}$ , then it will also be true for any future  $\pi_k$ .

## 5 Confident-NPG-CMDP satisfies relaxed-feasibility

With the accuracy guarantee of the least-square estimates, we prove that at the termination of Confident-NPG-CMDP, the returned mixture policy  $\bar{\pi}_K$  satisfies relaxed-feasibility. We note that because of the execution of line 31 in algorithm 1, at termination, one can show using induction that all the  $\mathcal{C}_l$  for  $l \in [L + 1]$  will be the same. Therefore, the cover of  $\mathcal{C}_l$  for all  $l \in [L + 1]$  are also equal. Thus, it is sufficient to only consider  $\mathcal{C}_0$  at the termination of the algorithm. By line 7 of algorithm 1, we have ensured  $s_0 \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_0)$ .

By the primal-dual approach discussed in section 4, we have reduced the CMDP problem into an unconstrained problem with a single reward of the form  $r_\lambda = r + \lambda c$ . Therefore, we can apply the value-difference lemma (lemma 14) of Confident-NPG in the single reward setting (see appendix A) to Confident-NPG-CMDP. Then, we can show the value difference between  $\pi^*$  and  $\bar{\pi}_K$  can be bounded, which leads to:

**Lemma 2** *Let  $\delta \in (0, 1]$  be the failure probability,  $\epsilon > 0$  be the target accuracy, and  $s_0$  be the initial state. Assuming for all  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_0)$  and all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $|\tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a) - q_{\pi'_k, \lambda_k}^p(s, a)| \leq \epsilon'$  and  $|\tilde{Q}_k^c(s_0, a) - q_{\pi'_k}^c(s_0, a)| \leq (\omega + \sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon)\sqrt{\tilde{d}})$  for all  $\pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_0)}$ , then, with probability  $1 - \delta$ , Confident-NPG-CMDP returns a mixture policy  $\bar{\pi}_K$  that satisfies the following,*

$$v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^r(s_0) \leq \frac{5\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{(\sqrt{2\ln(A)} + 1)(1+U)}{(1-\gamma)^2\sqrt{K}},$$

$$b - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0) \leq [b - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0)]_+ \leq \frac{5\epsilon'}{(1-\gamma)(U-\lambda^*)} + \frac{(\sqrt{2\ln(A)} + 1)(1+U)}{(1-\gamma)^2(U-\lambda^*)\sqrt{K}},$$

where  $\epsilon' \doteq (1+U)(\omega + (\sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon)\sqrt{\tilde{d}}))$  with  $\tilde{d} = \tilde{O}(d)$ , and  $U$  is an upper bound on the optimal Lagrange multiplier.

By setting the parameters to appropriate values, it follows from lemma 2 that we obtain the following result:

**Theorem 1** *With probability  $1 - \delta$ , the mixture policy  $\bar{\pi}_K = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \pi_k$  returned by confident-NPG-CMDP ensures that*

$$v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^r(s_0) = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{d}(1-\gamma)^{-2}\zeta^{-1}\omega) + \epsilon,$$

$$v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0) \geq b - \left( \tilde{O}(\sqrt{d}(1-\gamma)^{-2}\zeta^{-1}\omega) + \epsilon \right).$$

if we choose  $n = \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-2}\zeta^{-2}(1-\gamma)^{-4}d)$ ,  $\alpha = O(\epsilon^2\zeta^2(1-\gamma)^4)$ ,  $K = \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-2}\zeta^{-2}(1-\gamma)^{-6})$ ,  $\eta_1 = \tilde{O}((1-\gamma)^2\zeta K^{-1/2})$ ,  $\eta_2 = \zeta^{-1}K^{-1/2}$ ,  $H = \tilde{O}((1-\gamma)^{-1})$ ,  $m = \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-1}\zeta^{-2}(1-\gamma)^{-2})$ , and  $L = \lfloor K/(\lfloor m \rfloor + 1) \rfloor = \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-1}(1-\gamma)^{-4})$  total number of data collection phases.

Furthermore, the algorithm utilizes at most  $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-3}\zeta^{-3}d^2(1-\gamma)^{-11})$  queries in the local-access setting.

**Remark 1:** In the presence of misspecification error  $\omega > 0$ , the reward suboptimality and constraint violation is  $\tilde{O}(\omega) + \epsilon$  with the same sample complexity.

**Remark 2:** Suppose the Slater's constant  $\zeta$  is much smaller than the suboptimality bound of  $\tilde{O}(\omega) + \epsilon$ , and it is reasonable to set  $\zeta = \epsilon$ . Then, the sample complexity is  $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-6}(1-\gamma)^{-11}d^2)$ , which is independent of  $\zeta$ .

**Remark 3:** We note that our algorithm requires the knowledge of the Slater's constant  $\zeta$ , which can be estimated by another algorithm.

## 6 Confident-NPG-CMDP satisfies strict-feasibility

In this section, we show that the returned mixture policy  $\bar{\pi}_K$  by Confident-NPG-CMDP satisfies the strict feasibility.

In order to obtain an  $\epsilon$ -optimal policy that satisfies constraint:  $v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c \geq b$ , we consider a more conservative CMDP that we call it the surrogate CMDP. The surrogate CMDP is defined by the tuple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, c, b', s_0, \gamma)$ , where  $b' \doteq b + \Delta$  for a  $\Delta \geq 0$ . We note that  $b' \geq b$  and the optimal policy of this surrogate CMDP is defined as follows:

$$\pi_\Delta^* \in \arg \max v_\pi^r(s_0) \quad s.t. \quad v_\pi^c(s_0) \geq b'. \quad (10)$$



Notice that  $\pi_{\Delta}^*$  is a more conservative policy than  $\pi^*$ , where  $\pi^*$  is the optimal policy of the original CMDP objective eq. (1). By solving this surrogate CMDP using Confident-NPG-CMDP and applying the result of theorem 1, we obtain a  $\bar{\pi}_K$  that would satisfy

$$v_{\bar{\pi}^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^r(s_0) \leq \bar{\epsilon} \quad s.t. \quad v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0) \geq b' - \bar{\epsilon},$$

where  $\bar{\epsilon} = \tilde{O}(\omega) + \epsilon$ . Expanding out  $b'$ , we have  $v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0) \geq b + \Delta - \bar{\epsilon}$ . If we can set  $\Delta$  such that  $\Delta - \bar{\epsilon} \geq 0$ , then  $v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0)\epsilon \geq b$ , which satisfies strict-feasibility. We show this formally in the next theorem, where  $\Delta = O(\epsilon(1 - \gamma)\zeta)$  and is incorporated into the algorithmic parameters for ease of presentation.

**Theorem 2** *With probability  $1 - \delta$ , a target  $\epsilon > 0$ , the mixture policy  $\bar{\pi}_K$  returned by confident-NPG-CMDP ensures that  $v_{\bar{\pi}^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^r(s_0) \leq \epsilon$  and  $v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0) \geq b$ , if assuming the misspecification error  $\omega \leq \epsilon\zeta^2(1 - \gamma)^3(1 + \sqrt{d})^{-1}$ , and if we choose  $\alpha = O(\epsilon^2\zeta^3(1 - \gamma)^5)$ ,  $K = \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-2}\zeta^{-4}(1 - \gamma)^{-8})$ ,  $n = \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-2}\zeta^{-4}(1 - \gamma)^{-8}d)$ ,  $H = \tilde{O}((1 - \gamma)^{-1})$ ,  $m = \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-1}\zeta^{-2}(1 - \gamma)^{-3})$ , and  $L = \lfloor K/(\lfloor m \rfloor + 1) \rfloor = \tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-1}\zeta^{-2}(1 - \gamma)^{-5})$  total data collection phases.*

*Furthermore, the algorithm utilizes at most  $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-3}\zeta^{-6}(1 - \gamma)^{-14}d^2)$  queries in the local-access setting.*

## 7 Conclusion

We have presented a primal-dual algorithm for planning in CMDP with large state spaces, given  $q_\pi$ -realizable function approximation. The algorithm, with high probability, returns a policy that achieves both the relaxed and strict feasibility CMDP objectives, using no more than  $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-3}d^2 \text{poly}(\zeta^{-1}(1 - \gamma)^{-1}))$  queries to the local-access simulator.

Our algorithm does not query the simulator and collect data in every iteration. Instead, the algorithm queries the simulator only at fixed intervals. Between these data collection intervals, our algorithm improves the policy using off-policy optimization. This approach makes it possible to achieve the desired sample complexity in both feasibility settings.

## References

- Altman, E. (2021). *Constrained Markov decision processes*. Routledge.
- Chen, Y., Dong, J., and Wang, Z. (2021). A primal-dual approach to constrained markov decision processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.10895*.
- Dai, J., Pan, X., Sun, R., Ji, J., Xu, X., Liu, M., Wang, Y., and Yang, Y. (2024). Safe RLHF: Safe reinforcement learning from human feedback. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ding, D., Wei, X., Yang, Z., Wang, Z., and Jovanovic, M. (2021). Provably efficient safe exploration via primal-dual policy optimization. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3304–3312. PMLR.
- Efroni, Y., Mannor, S., and Pirodda, M. (2020). Exploration-exploitation in constrained mdps. *CoRR*, abs/2003.02189.
- Feyzabadi, S. and Carpin, S. (2014). Risk-aware path planning using hirerachical constrained markov decision processes. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Automation Science and Engineering (CASE)*, pages 297–303.
- Gattami, A., Bai, Q., and Aggarwal, V. (2021). Reinforcement learning for constrained markov decision processes. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2656–2664. PMLR.
- Ghosh, A., Zhou, X., and Shroff, N. (2024). Towards achieving sub-linear regret and hard constraint violation in model-free rl. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1054–1062. PMLR.

- Girard, J. and Reza Emami, M. (2015). Concurrent markov decision processes for robot team learning. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 39:223–234.
- Hao, B., Lazic, N., Yin, D., Abbasi-Yadkori, Y., and Szepesvari, C. (2022). Confident least square value iteration with local access to a simulator. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2420–2435. PMLR.
- HasanzadeZonuzi, A., Kalathil, D., and Shakkottai, S. (2021). Model-based reinforcement learning for infinite-horizon discounted constrained markov decision processes. *IJCAI 2021*.
- Jain, A., Vaswani, S., Babanezhad, R., Szepesvari, C., and Precup, D. (2022). Towards painless policy optimization for constrained mdps. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 895–905. PMLR.
- Jin, C., Yang, Z., Wang, Z., and Jordan, M. I. (2020). Provably efficient reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 2137–2143. PMLR.
- Kakade, S. M. (2003). *On the sample complexity of reinforcement learning*. University of London, University College London (United Kingdom).
- Kalagarla, K. C., Jain, R., and Nuzzo, P. (2021). A sample-efficient algorithm for episodic finite-horizon mdp with constraints. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 8030–8037.
- Kamran, D., Simão, T. D., Yang, Q., Ponnambalam, C. T., Fischer, J., Spaan, M. T., and Lauer, M. (2022). A modern perspective on safe automated driving for different traffic dynamics using constrained reinforcement learning. In *2022 IEEE 25th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, pages 4017–4023. IEEE.
- Kearns, M., Mansour, Y., and Ng, A. Y. (2002). A sparse sampling algorithm for near-optimal planning in large markov decision processes. *Machine learning*, 49:193–208.
- Kitamura, T., Kozuno, T., Kato, M., Ichihara, Y., Nishimori, S., Sannai, A., Sonoda, S., Kumagai, W., and Matsuo, Y. (2024). A policy gradient primal-dual algorithm for constrained mdps with uniform pac guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.17780*.
- Lattimore, T. and Szepesvári, C. (2020). *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lattimore, T., Szepesvari, C., and Weisz, G. (2020). Learning with good feature representations in bandits and in rl with a generative model. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5662–5670. PMLR.
- Liu, T., Zhou, R., Kalathil, D., Kumar, P. R., and Tian, C. (2021). Learning policies with zero or bounded constraint violation for constrained mdps. *CoRR*, abs/2106.02684.
- Liu, T., Zhou, R., Kalathil, D., Kumar, P. R., and Tian, C. (2022). Policy optimization for constrained mdps with provable fast global convergence.
- Miryoosefi, S. and Jin, C. (2022). A simple reward-free approach to constrained reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 15666–15698. PMLR.
- Paternain, S., Chamon, L., Calvo-Fullana, M., and Ribeiro, A. (2019). Constrained reinforcement learning has zero duality gap. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- Sidford, A., Wang, M., Wu, X., Yang, L., and Ye, Y. (2018). Near-optimal time and sample complexities for solving markov decision processes with a generative model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31.
- Vaswani, S., Yang, L., and Szepesvári, C. (2022). Near-optimal sample complexity bounds for constrained mdps. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:3110–3122.
- Wachi, A. and Sui, Y. (2020). Safe reinforcement learning in constrained markov decision processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9797–9806. PMLR.

- Weisz, G., Amortila, P., Janzer, B., Abbasi-Yadkori, Y., Jiang, N., and Szepesvári, C. (2021). On query-efficient planning in mdps under linear realizability of the optimal state-value function. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4355–4385. PMLR.
- Weisz, G., György, A., and Szepesvári, C. (2022). Confident approximate policy iteration for efficient local planning in  $q$  pi realizable mdps. *arXiv preprint arXiv*, 2210.
- Weisz, G., György, A., and Szepesvári, C. (2023). Online rl in linearly  $q^\pi$ -realizable mdps is as easy as in linear mdps if you learn what to ignore.
- Wen, L., Duan, J., Li, S. E., Xu, S., and Peng, H. (2020). Safe reinforcement learning for autonomous vehicles through parallel constrained policy optimization. In *2020 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, pages 1–7.
- Yang, L. and Wang, M. (2019). Sample-optimal parametric  $q$ -learning using linearly additive features. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6995–7004. PMLR.
- Yin, D., Hao, B., Abbasi-Yadkori, Y., Lazić, N., and Szepesvári, C. (2022). Efficient local planning with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 1165–1192. PMLR.
- Yu, T., Tian, Y., Zhang, J., and Sra, S. (2021). Provably efficient algorithms for multi-objective competitive rl. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12167–12176. PMLR.
- Zheng, L. and Ratliff, L. (2020). Constrained upper confidence reinforcement learning. In Bayen, A. M., Jadbabaie, A., Pappas, G., Parrilo, P. A., Recht, B., Tomlin, C., and Zeilinger, M., editors, *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Learning for Dynamics and Control*, volume 120 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 620–629. PMLR.

## A Confident-NPG in a single reward setting

The pseudo code of Confident-NPG with a single reward setting is the same as Confident-NPG-CMDP in algorithm 1, except that line 29 to line 30 will not appear in Confident-NPG. Additionally, the LSE subroutine returns just  $Q^r$ , and the policy update will be with respect to  $\tilde{Q}^r$ . For the complete pseudo code of Confident-NPG in the single reward setting, please see algorithm 2. In the following analysis, for convenience, we omit the superscript  $r$ .

---

### Algorithm 2 Confident-NPG

---

**Input:**  $s_0$  (initial state),  $\epsilon$  (target accuracy),  $\delta \in (0, 1]$  (failure probability),  $c \geq 0$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $K = \frac{2 \ln(|\mathcal{A}|)}{(1-\gamma)^4 \epsilon^2}$ ,

$$\eta_1 = (1-\gamma) \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln(|\mathcal{A}|)}{K}}, m = \frac{\ln(1+c)}{2\epsilon(1-\gamma) \ln\left(\frac{4}{\epsilon(1-\gamma)^2}\right)}, L = \lfloor \lfloor K \rfloor / (\lfloor m \rfloor + 1) \rfloor.$$

**Initialize:** for each iteration  $k \in [0, K]$ :  $\pi_k \leftarrow \text{Uniform}(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $\tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a) \leftarrow 0$ ,  $\tilde{Q}_k^c(s, a) \leftarrow 0$  for all  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , and  $\lambda_k \leftarrow 0$ . For each phase  $l \in [L + 1]$ :  $\mathcal{C}_l \leftarrow ()$ ,  $D_l \leftarrow \{\}$

```

1: for  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  do
2:   if  $(s_0, a) \notin \text{ActionCov}(\mathcal{C}_0)$  then
3:     Append  $(s_0, a)$  to  $\mathcal{C}_0$ ;  $D_0[(s_0, a)] \leftarrow \perp$ 

4: while True do ▷ main loop
5:   Get the smallest integer  $\ell$  s.t.  $D_\ell[z'] = \perp$  for some  $z' \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$ 
6:   Get the first state-action pair  $z$  in  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  s.t.  $D_\ell[z] = \perp$ 
7:   if  $\ell = L + 1$  then return  $\frac{1}{\lfloor K \rfloor} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor K \rfloor - 1} \pi_k$ 

8:    $k_\ell \leftarrow \ell \times (\lfloor m \rfloor + 1)$  ▷ iteration corresponding to phase  $\ell$ 
9:    $(\text{result}, \text{discovered}) \leftarrow \text{Gather-data}(\pi_{k_\ell}, \mathcal{C}_\ell, \alpha, z)$ 
10:  if  $\text{discovered}$  is True then
11:    ▷  $\text{result}$  is a state-action pair
12:    Append  $\text{result}$  to  $\mathcal{C}_0$ ;  $D_0[\text{result}] \leftarrow \perp$ 
13:    break

14:  ▷  $\text{result}$  is a set of  $n$   $H$ -horizon trajectories  $\sim \pi_{k_\ell}$  starting at  $z$ 
15:   $D_\ell[z] \leftarrow \text{result}$ 

16:  if  $\nexists z' \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$  s.t.  $D_\ell[z'] = \perp$  then
17:     $k_{\ell+1} \leftarrow k_\ell + (\lfloor m \rfloor + 1)$  if  $k_\ell + (\lfloor m \rfloor + 1) \leq \lfloor K \rfloor$  otherwise  $\lfloor K \rfloor$ 

18:    ▷ update policy for every  $k \in [k_\ell, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$  using  $\mathcal{C}_\ell, D_\ell$ 
19:    for  $k = k_\ell, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1$  do
20:       $Q_k^r, \_ \leftarrow \text{LSE}(\mathcal{C}_\ell, D_\ell, \pi_k, \pi_{k_\ell})$ 

21:    ▷ update variables and improve policy
22:    for all  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell) \setminus \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1})$ , and for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  do
23:       $\tilde{Q}_k^r(s, a) \leftarrow \text{Trunc}_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]}$   $Q_k^r(s, a)$ 
24:    for all  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  do
25:       $\pi_{k+1}(a|s) \leftarrow \begin{cases} \pi_{k+1}(a|s) & \text{if } s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) \\ \pi_k(a|s) \frac{\exp(\eta_1 \tilde{Q}_k^r(s, a))}{\sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_k(a'|s) \exp(\eta_1 \tilde{Q}_k^r(s, a'))} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ 
26:    for  $z \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$  s.t.  $z \notin \mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$  do
27:      Append  $z$  to  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$ ;  $D_{\ell+1}[z] \leftarrow \perp$ 

```

---

### A.1 The Gather-data subroutine

Given a core set  $\mathcal{C}$ , a behaviour policy  $\mu$ , a starting state-action pair  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  along with some algorithmic parameters, the Gather-data subroutine (algorithm 3) will either 1) return a newly discov-

---

**Algorithm 3** Gather-data
 

---

**Input:** policy  $\pi$ , core set  $\mathcal{C}$ , regression parameter  $\alpha = \frac{\epsilon^2(1-\gamma)^2}{25B^2(1+U)}$ ,  $H = \frac{\ln(4/(\epsilon(1-\gamma)^2))}{1-\gamma}$ ,  $n = \frac{(1+c)^2 \ln\left(\frac{\bar{s}\bar{L}}{\delta}\right)}{2\epsilon^2(1-\gamma)^2}$ , starting state and action  $(s, a)$

**Initialize:**  $Trajectories \leftarrow ()$

- 1: **if**  $s \notin Cov(\mathcal{C})$  **then**
- 2:     **for**  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  **do**
- 3:         **if**  $(s, a) \notin ActionCov(\mathcal{C})$  **then return**  $((s, a), True)$
- 4: **for**  $i \in [n]$  **do**
- 5:      $\tau_{s,a}^i \leftarrow ()$
- 6:      $S_0^i \leftarrow s, A_0^i \leftarrow a$
- 7:     append  $S_0^i, A_0^i$  to  $\tau_{s,a}^i$
  
- 8:     **for**  $h = 0, \dots, H - 1$  **do**
- 9:          $S_{h+1}^i, R_{h+1}^i, C_{h+1}^i \leftarrow \text{simulator}(S_h^i, A_h^i)$
  
- 10:         **if**  $S_{h+1}^i \notin Cov(\mathcal{C})$  **then**
- 11:             **for**  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  **do**
- 12:                 **if**  $(S_{h+1}^i, a) \notin ActionCov(\mathcal{C})$  **then return**  $((S_{h+1}^i, a), True)$
  
- 13:             ▷ no new informative features discovered
- 14:              $A_{h+1}^i \sim \pi(\cdot | S_{h+1}^i)$
- 15:             append  $R_{h+1}^i, C_{h+1}^i, S_{h+1}^i, A_{h+1}^i$  to  $\tau_{s,a}^i$
  
- 16:     append  $\tau_{s,a}^i$  to  $Trajectories$

**return**  $(Trajectories, False)$

---

ered state-action pair, or 2) return a set of  $n$  trajectories. Each trajectory is generated by running the behaviour policy  $\mu$  with the simulator for  $H$  consecutive steps. For  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , let  $\tau_{s,a}^i$  denote the  $i$ th trajectory starting from  $s, a$  to be  $\{S_0^i = s, A_0^i = a, R_1^i, C_1^i, \dots, S_{H-1}^i, A_{H-1}^i, R_H^i, C_H^i, S_H^i\}$ . Then the  $i$ -th discounted cumulative rewards  $G(\tau_{s,a}^i) = \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i$ . For a target policy  $\pi$ , then the empirical mean of the discounted sum of rewards

$$\bar{q}(s, a) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(\tau_{s,a}^i) G(\tau_{s,a}^i), \quad (11)$$

where  $\rho(\tau_{s,a}^i) = \prod_{h=1}^{H-1} \frac{\pi(A_h^i | S_h^i)}{\mu(A_h^i | S_h^i)}$  is the importance sampling ratio.

For some given  $\bar{s}$  and  $\bar{a}$ , we establish the following relationship between the target policy  $\pi$  and the behavior policy  $\mu$ :

$$\pi(\bar{a} | \bar{s}) \propto \mu(\bar{a} | \bar{s}) \exp(f(\bar{s}, \bar{a})) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sup_{\bar{s}, \bar{a}} |f(\bar{s}, \bar{a})| \leq \frac{\ln(1+c)}{2H}, \quad (12)$$

where  $f(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be a function and  $c \geq 0$  is given and a constant. By establishing the relationship in eq. (12), the importance sampling ratio  $\rho(\tau_{s,a}^i)$  can be bounded by  $1+c$  as it is proven in the following lemma:

**Lemma 3** Suppose the state-action pairs  $\{(S_h, A_h)\}_{h=1}^{H-1}$  extracted from a trajectory

$$\tau \doteq \{S_0, A_0, R_1, S_1, A_1, \dots, S_{H-1}, A_{H-1}, R_H\} \sim \mu,$$

have their behavior policy  $\mu$  related to a target policy  $\pi$  by the relation in eq. (12). In this case, the per-trajectory importance sampling ratio

$$\rho(\tau) = \prod_{h=1}^{H-1} \frac{\pi(A_h | S_h)}{\mu(A_h | S_h)} \leq 1+c. \quad (13)$$

**Proof:** Let  $l \doteq \sup_{s,a} |f(s,a)|$ , where  $f$  is defined in eq. (12). For any  $(s,a) \in \{(S_h, A_h)\}_{h=1}^{H-1}$ ,

$$\pi(a|s) = \mu(a|s) \frac{\exp(f(s,a))}{\sum_{a'} \mu(a'|s) \exp(f(s,a'))} \leq \mu(a|s) \frac{\exp(l)}{\sum_{a'} \mu(a'|s) \exp(-l)} \quad (14)$$

$$\leq \mu(a|s) \exp(2l). \quad (15)$$

By assumption,  $l \leq \frac{\ln(1+c)}{2H}$ , then  $\exp(2lH) \leq \exp\left(2H \frac{\ln(1+c)}{2H}\right) \leq 1+c$ .  $\blacksquare$

Then, we can show that for all  $(s,a) \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $|\bar{q}(s,a) - q_\pi(s,a)| \leq \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon > 0$  is a given target error. Additionally, the accuracy guarantee of  $|\bar{q}(s,a) - q_\pi(s,a)| \leq \epsilon$  continues to hold for the extended set of policies defined in definition 2. Formally, we state the main result of this section.

**Lemma 4** *For any  $s,a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{S}$ , the Gather-data subroutine will either return with  $((s',a'), \text{True})$  for some  $s' \notin \mathcal{X}$ , or it will return with  $(D[(s,a)], \text{False})$ , where  $D[(s,a)]$  is a set of  $n$  independent trajectories generated by a behavior policy  $\mu$  starting from  $(s,a)$ . When Gather-data returns False for  $(s,a)$ , we assume 1) the behavior policy  $\mu$  and target policy  $\pi$  for all the states and actions encountered in the trajectories stored in  $D[(s,a)]$  satisfy eq. (12) and 2)  $\bar{q}(s,a)$  is an unbiased estimate of  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi',s,a}[\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}]$  for all  $\pi' \in \Pi_{\pi,\mathcal{X}}$ . Then, the importance-weighted return  $\bar{q}(s,a)$  constructed from  $D[(s,a)]$  according to eq. (11) will, with probability  $1 - \delta'$ ,*

$$|\bar{q}(s,a) - q_{\pi'}(s,a)| \leq \epsilon \quad \text{for all } \pi' \in \Pi_{\pi,\mathcal{X}}.$$

**Proof:** The proof follows similar logic to Lemma 4.2 Weisz et al. (2022).

Recall  $D[(s,a)]$  stores  $n$  number of trajectories indexed by  $i$ , where each trajectory  $\tau_{s,a}^i = (S_0^i = s, A_0^i = a, R_0^i, \dots, S_{H-1}^i) \sim \mu$ . The per-trajectory importance sampling ratio  $\rho(\tau_{s,a}^i) = \prod_{h=1}^{H-1} \frac{\pi(A_h^i|S_h^i)}{\mu(A_h^i|S_h^i)}$ , and the return is  $\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i$ . By the triangle inequality,

$$|\bar{q}(s,a) - q_\pi(s,a)| = \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \prod_{h=0}^{H-1} \frac{\pi(A_h^i|S_h^i)}{\mu(A_h^i|S_h^i)} \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_h^i - q_\pi(s,a) \right| \quad (16)$$

$$\leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(\tau_{s,a}^i) \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i - \mathbb{E}_{\pi,s,a} \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1} \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}_{\pi,s,a} \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_h - q_\pi(s,a) \right|. \quad (17)$$

The goal is to bound each of the two terms in eq. (17) by  $\frac{\epsilon}{4}$  so that the sum of the two is  $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ .

By assumption,  $\pi, \mu$  for all  $\{(S_h^i, A_h^i)\}_{h=1}^{H-1}$  extracted out of the  $i$ -trajectory  $\tau_{s,a}^i$  satisfies eq. (12). Second,  $\bar{q}(s,a)$  is assumed to be an unbiased estimate of  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi,s,a} \left[ \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1} \right]$ . Note that each  $\rho(\tau_{s,a}^i) \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  are independent random variables such that  $\rho(\tau_{s,a}^i) \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i \in \left[0, \frac{1+c}{1-\gamma}\right]$ . This is because 1)  $\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  since the rewards take values in the range of  $[0, 1]$ , and 2)  $\rho(\tau_{s,a}^i) \leq 1+c$  by lemma 3. We apply Hoeffding's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(\tau_{s,a}^i) \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i - \mathbb{E}_{\pi,s,a} \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1} \right| > \epsilon \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( - \frac{2n\epsilon^2}{\left(\frac{1+c}{1-\gamma}\right)^2} \right). \quad (18)$$

Then, we have with probability  $1 - \delta'/2$ , where  $\delta' = 2 \exp \left( - \frac{2n\left(\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1+c}{1-\gamma}\right)^2} \right)$ , the first term in eq. (17),

$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(\tau_{s,a}^i) \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i - \mathbb{E}_{\pi,s,a} \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1} \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ . For the second term in eq. (17),

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\pi,s,a} \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_h - q_\pi(s,a) \right| = \left| \mathbb{E}_{\pi,s,a} \sum_{h=H}^{\infty} \gamma^h R_h \right| \leq \frac{\gamma^H}{1-\gamma}. \quad (19)$$

By the choice of  $H$ , we have  $\frac{\gamma^H}{1-\gamma} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ . Putting everything together, we get  $|\bar{q}(s,a) - q_\pi(s,a)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ . To get the final result, we need to bound  $|q_\pi(s,a) - q_{\pi'}(s,a)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ , so that  $|\bar{q}(s,a) - q_{\pi'}(s,a)| \leq |\bar{q}(s,a) - q_\pi(s,a)| + |q_\pi(s,a) - q_{\pi'}(s,a)| \leq \epsilon$ .



Recall that  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$  differs in distributions over states that are not in  $\mathcal{X}$ . For a trajectory  $\{S_0 = s, A_0 = a, S_1, \dots\}$ , let  $T$  be the smallest positive integer such that state  $S_T \notin \mathcal{X}$ , then the distribution of the trajectory  $S_0 = s, A_0 = a, S_1, \dots, S_T$  are the same under  $P_{\pi, s, a}$  and  $P_{\pi', s, a}$  because  $\pi(\cdot|s) = \pi'(\cdot|s)$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then,

$$|q_\pi(s, a) - q_{\pi'}(s, a)| = \left| \mathbb{E}_{\pi, s, a} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^T v_\pi(S_T) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi', s, a} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t R_t + \gamma^T v_{\pi'}(S_T) \right] \right| \quad (20)$$

$$= \left| \mathbb{E}_{\pi, s, a} [\gamma^T v_\pi(S_T)] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi', s, a} [\gamma^T v_{\pi'}(S_T)] \right| \quad (21)$$

$$= \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a'} P_{\pi, s, a}(S_{T-1} = s', A_{T-1} = a') P(S_T | s', a') \gamma^T v_\pi(S_T) \quad (22)$$

$$- \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a'} P_{\pi', s, a}(S_{T-1} = s', A_{T-1} = a') P(S_T | s', a') \gamma^T v_{\pi'}(S_T) \quad (23)$$

$$= \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a'} P_{\pi, s, a}(S_{T-1} = s', A_{T-1} = a') P(S_T | s', a') \gamma^T (v_\pi(S_T) - v_{\pi'}(S_T)) \quad (24)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a'} P_{\pi, s, a}(S_{T-1} = s', A_{T-1} = a') P(S_T | s', a') \gamma^T \quad (25)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a'} \sum_{\bar{s} \notin \mathcal{X}} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} P_{\pi, s, a}(S_{t-1} = s', A_{t-1} = a') P(S_t = \bar{s} | s', a') \gamma^t \quad (26)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{t=1}^{H-1} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a'} \sum_{\bar{s} \notin \mathcal{X}} P_{\pi, s, a}(S_{t-1} = s', A_{t-1} = a') P(S_t = \bar{s} | s', a') \gamma^t \quad (27)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{t=H}^{\infty} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a'} \sum_{\bar{s} \notin \mathcal{X}} P_{\pi, s, a}(S_{t-1} = s', A_{t-1} = a') P(S_t = \bar{s} | s', a') \gamma^t \quad (28)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{t=1}^{H-1} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a'} \sum_{\bar{s} \notin \mathcal{X}} P_{\pi, s, a}(S_{t-1} = s', A_{t-1} = a') P(S_t = \bar{s} | s', a') \quad (29)$$

$$+ \frac{\gamma^H}{1-\gamma} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a'} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t P_{\pi, s, a}(S_{t+H-1} = s', A_{t+H-1} = a') \quad (30)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{t=1}^{H-1} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a'} \sum_{\bar{s} \notin \mathcal{X}} P_{\pi, s, a}(S_{t-1} = s', A_{t-1} = a') P(S_t = \bar{s} | s', a') \quad (31)$$

$$+ \frac{\gamma^H}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a'} (1-\gamma) d_{\pi, s, a}(s', a') \quad (32)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{t=1}^{H-1} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a'} \sum_{\bar{s} \notin \mathcal{X}} P_{\pi, s, a}(S_{t-1} = s', A_{t-1} = a') P(S_t = \bar{s} | s', a') \quad (33)$$

$$+ \frac{\gamma^H}{(1-\gamma)^2}. \quad (34)$$

By the law of total probability,

$$P_{\pi, s, a}(S_t = s', A_t = a') \quad (35)$$

$$= \sum_{s_1, \dots, s_t, a_1, \dots, a_t} \prod_{i=0}^t P(S_{i+1} | S_i = s_i, A_i = a_i) \prod_{i=1}^t \pi(A_i = a_i | S_i = s_i) \quad (36)$$

$$= \sum_{s_1, \dots, s_t, a_1, \dots, a_t} \prod_{i=0}^t P(S_{i+1} | S_i = s_i, A_i = a_i) \prod_{i=1}^t \frac{\pi(A_i = a_i | S_i = s_i)}{\mu(A_i = a_i | S_i = s_i)} \mu(A_i = a_i | S_i = s_i) \quad (37)$$

$$\leq \sum_{s_1, \dots, s_t, a_1, \dots, a_t} \prod_{i=0}^t P(S_{i+1} | S_i = s_i, A_i = a_i) \prod_{i=1}^t \exp(2l) \mu(A_i = a_i | S_i = s_i) \quad (38)$$

$$\leq \exp(2tl) \sum_{s_1, \dots, s_t, a_1, \dots, a_t} \prod_{i=0}^t P(S_i | S_i = s_i, A_i = a_i) \prod_{i=1}^t \mu(A_i = a_i | S_i = s_i) \quad (39)$$

$$\leq (1+c) \sum_{s_1, \dots, s_t, a_1, \dots, a_t} \prod_{i=1}^t P(S_i | S_{i-1} = s_i, A_{i-1} = a_i) \prod_{i=1}^t \mu(A_i = a_i | S_i = s_i) \quad (40)$$

$$= (1+c) P_{\mu, s, a}(S_t = s', A_t = a'). \quad (41)$$

To get from eq. (37) to eq. (38), recall from the proof of lemma 3, we have  $\frac{\pi(a|s)}{\mu(a|s)} \leq \exp(2l)$ , for  $l \doteq \sup_{s, a} f(s, a)$ . To go from eq. (39) to eq. (40), we note that  $\exp(2tl) \leq \exp(2Hl)$  since  $t \in [1, H)$ , and  $\exp(2Hl) \leq 1+c$  for any  $l$  that satisfies the constraint of eq. (12). In summary, we have

$$|q_{\pi}(s, a) - q_{\pi'}(s, a)| \quad (42)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \sum_{t=1}^{H-1} \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{X}, a' \notin \mathcal{X}} (1+c) P_{\mu, s, a}(S_{t-1} = s', A_{t-1} = a') P(S_t = \bar{s} | s', a') \quad (43)$$

$$+ \frac{\gamma^H}{(1-\gamma)^2} \quad (44)$$

$$\leq \frac{1+c}{1-\gamma} P_{\mu, s, a}(1 \leq T < H) + \frac{\epsilon}{4}. \quad (45)$$

To bound  $P_{\mu, s, a}(1 \leq T < H)$ , let us recall that during the execution of Gather-data subroutine (algorithm 3), everytime the simulator returns a state-action pair that is not in the action-cover (i.e., does not pass the certainty check), the subroutine stops. For each  $s, a \in \mathcal{X}$ , during any of the  $n$  rollouts, let  $I_i(s, a)$  denote the indicator event that during  $1 \leq T < H$ ,  $S_T \notin \mathcal{X}$  in rollout  $i$ . Then  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu, s, a}[I_i(s, a)] = P_{\mu, s, a}(1 \leq T < H)$ . We know that  $I_i(s, a) \in \{0, 1\}$  and then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , by another Hoeffdings inequality, with probability  $1 - \delta'/2$ ,

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mu, s, a}[I_i(s, a)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_i(s, a)| \leq \frac{\epsilon(1-\gamma)}{4(1+c)}, \quad (46)$$

When gather-data subroutine returns, all indicators  $I_i(s, a) = 0$  for all  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $i \in [n]$ , then we have

$$P_{\mu, s, a}(1 \leq T < H) \leq \frac{\epsilon(1-\gamma)}{4(1+c)}. \quad (47)$$

Putting everything together, we have the result. ■

## A.2 The LSE subroutine

Given a core set  $\mathcal{C}$ , a set of trajectories, a behaviour policy  $\mu$ , a target policy  $\pi$ , the LSE subroutine (algorithm 4) returns a least-square estimate  $Q$  of  $q_{\pi}$ .

If the core set  $\mathcal{C}$  is empty, we define  $Q(\cdot, \cdot)$  to be zero. Then, for a target accuracy  $\epsilon > 0$  and a uniform misspecification error  $\omega$  defined in definition 1, we have a bound on the accuracy of  $\bar{q}$  with respect to  $q_{\pi}$  as given by the next lemma.

---

**Algorithm 4** LSE
 

---

**Input:**  $\mathcal{C}, D, \pi_k, \pi'_k$ 

- 1: **for**  $s, a \in \mathcal{C}$  **do**
  - 2:   **for every**  $\tau_{s,a}^i \in D[(s, a)]$  **for every**  $i \in [n]$  **do**
  - 3:     extract  $\{S_0^i, A_0^i, R_1^i, C_1^i, S_1^i, A_1^i \dots S_H^i, A_H^i\}$  from  $\tau_{s,a}^i$
  - 4:     compute  $G_r^i(s, a) \leftarrow \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i$ ;  $G_c^i(s, a) \leftarrow \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h C_{h+1}^i$
  - 5:     compute  $\rho^i(s, a) \leftarrow \prod_{h=1}^{H-1} \frac{\pi_k(A_h^i | S_h^i)}{\pi'_k(A_h^i | S_h^i)}$
  - 6:      $\bar{q}^r(s, a) \leftarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i(s, a) G_r^i(s, a)$ ;  $\bar{q}^c(s, a) \leftarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i(s, a) G_c^i(s, a)$
  - 7:  $w^r \leftarrow (\Phi_C^\top \Phi_C + \alpha I)^{-1} \Phi_C^\top \bar{q}^r$ ;  $w^c \leftarrow (\Phi_C^\top \Phi_C + \alpha I)^{-1} \Phi_C^\top \bar{q}^c$
  - 8:  $Q^r(s, a) \leftarrow \langle w^r, \phi(s, a) \rangle$ ,  $Q^c(s, a) \leftarrow \langle w^c, \phi(s, a) \rangle$  **for all**  $s, a$
  - return**  $Q^r, Q^c$
- 

**Lemma 5** [Lemma 4.3 of Weisz et al. (2022)] Let  $\pi$  be a randomized policy. Let  $\mathcal{C} = \{(s_i, a_i)\}_{i \in [N]}$  be a set of state-action pairs of set size  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Assume for all  $i \in [N]$ ,  $|\bar{q}(s_i, a_i) - q_\pi(s_i, a_i)| \leq \epsilon$ . Then, for all  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$|Q(s, a) - q_\pi(s, a)| \leq \omega + \|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)^{-1}} \left( \sqrt{\alpha} B + (\omega + \epsilon) \sqrt{N} \right). \quad (48)$$

**Proof:** Let  $w^*$  be the parameter that satisfies

$$\inf_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|w\|_2 \leq B} \sup_{s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} |\phi(s, a)^\top w - q_\pi(s, a)| \leq \epsilon, \quad (49)$$

for all  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$  and an  $\epsilon > 0$ . Let  $\bar{w}^* = V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \sum_{\bar{s}, \bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}} \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a})^\top w^*$ . Note that  $\bar{w}^*$  is obtained w.r.t to state-action pairs in  $\mathcal{C}$ . For any  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$|Q(s, a) - q_\pi(s, a)| \leq |\phi(s, a)^\top (w - \bar{w}^*)| + |\phi(s, a)^\top (\bar{w}^* - w^*)| + |\phi(s, a)^\top w^* - q_\pi(s, a)|. \quad (50)$$

By applying  $q_\pi$ -realizability assumption (eq. (49)), we have  $|\phi(s, a)^\top w^* - q_\pi(s, a)| \leq \epsilon$ . To bound the second term in eq. (50), we have

$$|\phi(s, a)^\top (\bar{w}^* - w^*)| \leq \|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C})^{-1}} \|\bar{w}^* - w^*\|_{V(\mathcal{C})} \quad (51)$$

$$\leq \|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C})^{-1}} \|V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \sum_{\bar{s}, \bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}} ((\phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a})^\top + \alpha I) w^* - \alpha I w^*) - w^*\|_{V(\mathcal{C})} \quad (52)$$

$$= \|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C})^{-1}} \| -\alpha V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} w^* \|_{V(\mathcal{C})} \quad (53)$$

$$= \alpha \|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C})^{-1}} \|w^*\|_{V(\mathcal{C})^{-1}} \quad (54)$$

$$\leq \alpha \|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C})^{-1}} \|w^*\|_{\frac{1}{\alpha} I} \quad (55)$$

$$\leq \alpha \|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C})^{-1}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\alpha}} B = \sqrt{\alpha} B \|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C})^{-1}}. \quad (56)$$

Let  $\alpha$  be the smallest eigenvalue of  $V(\mathcal{C})$ , then by eigendecomposition,  $V(\mathcal{C}) = Q \Lambda Q^{-1} \geq Q(\alpha I) Q = \alpha Q Q^\top \geq \alpha I$  since  $Q Q^\top$  is orthonormal. This implies that  $V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} I$ , which leads to eq. (55). Finally, we bound the first term in eq. (50). By definition of least-square,  $\bar{q} = \Phi w^* + \xi$ , where  $\xi$  is the error. Recall that  $w = V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \sum_{\bar{s}, \bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}} \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) \bar{q}(\bar{s}, \bar{a})$ , and by assumption that for any  $\bar{s}, \bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $|\bar{q}(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) - q_\pi(\bar{s}, \bar{a})| \leq \epsilon$ , then

$$|\xi(\bar{s}, \bar{a})| = |\bar{q}(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) - \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a})^\top w^*| \leq |\bar{q}(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) - q_\pi(\bar{s}, \bar{a})| + |q_\pi(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) - \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a})^\top w^*| \quad (57)$$

$$\leq \epsilon + \omega. \quad (58)$$

It follows that for all  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$|\phi(s, a)^\top (w - \bar{w}^*)| = |\langle V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \sum_{\bar{s}, \bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}} \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) (\bar{q}(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) - \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a})^\top w^*), \phi(s, a) \rangle| \quad (59)$$

$$= |\langle V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \sum_{\bar{s}, \bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}} \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) \xi(\bar{s}, \bar{a}), \phi(s, a) \rangle| \quad (60)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\bar{s}, \bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}} |\langle V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) \xi(\bar{s}, \bar{a}), \phi(s, a) \rangle| \quad (61)$$

$$\leq (\omega + \epsilon) \sum_{\bar{s}, \bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}} |\langle V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a}), \phi(s, a) \rangle| \quad (62)$$

$$\leq (\omega + \epsilon) \sqrt{|\mathcal{C}|} \sqrt{\sum_{\bar{s}, \bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}} \langle V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a}), \phi(s, a) \rangle^2} \quad \text{by Holder's inequality} \quad (63)$$

$$\leq (\omega + \epsilon) \sqrt{|\mathcal{C}|} \sqrt{\phi(s, a)^\top V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \left( \sum_{\bar{s}, \bar{a} \in \mathcal{C}} \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a}) \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{a})^\top \right) V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \phi(s, a)} \quad (64)$$

$$\leq (\omega + \epsilon) \sqrt{|\mathcal{C}|} \sqrt{\phi(s, a)^\top (I - \alpha V(\mathcal{C})^{-1}) V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \phi(s, a)} \quad (65)$$

$$\leq (\omega + \epsilon) \sqrt{|\mathcal{C}|} \sqrt{\phi(s, a)^\top V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \phi(s, a)} \quad \text{because } V(\mathcal{C})^{-1} \leq (1/\alpha)I \quad (66)$$

$$= (\omega + \epsilon) \sqrt{|\mathcal{C}|} \|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C})^{-1}}. \quad (67)$$

Altogether, for any  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$|Q(s, a) - q_\pi(s, a)| \leq \omega + \|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C})^{-1}} \left( \sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon) \sqrt{|\mathcal{C}|} \right). \quad (68)$$

■

### A.3 The accuracy of least-square estimates

Given a core set  $\mathcal{C}$  and a target policy  $\pi$ , lemma 5 ensures that  $|Q(s, a) - q_\pi(s, a)| = O(\omega + \epsilon)$  for any  $s$  within  $Cov(\mathcal{C})$ . This accuracy comes from the fact that for all  $s \in Cov(\mathcal{C})$ , the feature vector  $\phi(s, a)$  satisfies  $\|\phi(s, a)\|_{V(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)^{-1}} \leq 1$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ . In this section, we verify whether this accuracy is maintained under the framework of our algorithm, which includes constructing the core set, updating action-values, and improving policy updates. All of which plays a role in maintaining the accuracy of the  $Q$  estimates.

We note that policy improvements can only occur during a running phase  $\ell$ . When all  $(s, a)$  pairs in  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  have their placeholder value  $\perp$  replaced by trajectories, algorithm 2 executes line 17 to line 27. During each iteration from  $k_\ell$  to  $k_{\ell+1} - 1$ , the LSE subroutine is executed. The accuracy of  $\bar{q}_k$  is used to bound the estimation error in lemma 5. Therefore, we will first verify that the accuracy guarantee of  $\bar{q}_k(s, a)$ , used in lemma 4, is indeed satisfied by the main algorithm and maintained throughout its execution.

Once a state-action pair is added to a core set, it remains in that core set for the duration of the algorithm. This means that any  $\mathcal{C}_l$  for  $l \in [L + 1]$  can grow in size. When a core set  $\mathcal{C}_l$  is extended during a running phase when  $\ell = l$ , the least-square estimates will need be updated based on the newly extended  $\mathcal{C}_l$  containing newly discovered informative features. However, the improved estimates will only be used to update the policy of states that are newly covered, which are states that are in  $Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell) \setminus Cov(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1})$ . We break down  $\tilde{Q}_k^p$  to reflect the value based on which  $\pi_{k+1}$  is updated,

$$\tilde{Q}_k(s, a) \leftarrow \begin{cases} \tilde{Q}_k(s, a) & \text{if } s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) \\ Q_k(s, a) & \text{if } s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell) \setminus Cov(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) \\ \text{initial value 0} & \text{if } s \notin Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell), \end{cases} \quad (69)$$

where  $Q_k(s, a) = \text{trunc}_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} Q_k^r(s, a)$ . Respective to  $\tilde{Q}_k$ , we have the corresponding policy update as follows,

$$\pi_{k+1}(a|s) \leftarrow \begin{cases} \pi_{k+1}(a|s) & \text{if } s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) \\ \propto \pi_k(\cdot|s) \exp\left(\eta_1 \text{trunc}_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} Q_k(s, a)\right) & \text{if } s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell) \setminus \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) \\ \pi_k(a|s) & \text{if } s \notin \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell). \end{cases} \quad (70)$$

For all  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell)$ , the  $\tilde{Q}_k(s, \cdot)$  will be the value of the least-square estimate at the time the policy makes an NPG update of the form:

$$\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) \propto \pi_k(\cdot|s) \exp\left(\eta_1 \text{trunc}_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} Q_k(s, a)\right). \quad (71)$$

This is because at the end of the loop after line 27 is run, the next phase core set  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1} = \mathcal{C}_\ell$ , which make any states that are covered by  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  also be covered by  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$ . A state that was once newly covered by  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  will no longer be newly covered again. If the algorithm was to make an NPG update for states that are newly covered in some loop, in any subsequent loop with the same value  $\ell$ , the policy will remain unchanged. By updating policies according to line 25 of algorithm 2 with respect to  $\tilde{Q}_k$ , we have:

**Lemma 6** [Lemma 4.5 of Weisz et al. (2022)] For any  $l \in [L]$ , let  $\mathcal{C}_l^{\text{past}}$  be any past version of  $\mathcal{C}_l$  and  $\pi_k^{\text{past}}$  for  $k \in [k_l, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$  be the corresponding policies associated with  $\mathcal{C}_l^{\text{past}}$ , then at any later point during the execution of the algorithm,  $\pi_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l)} \subseteq \Pi_{\pi_k^{\text{past}}, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l^{\text{past}})}$  for all  $k \in [k_l, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$ .

**Lemma 7** For any  $l \in [L]$ , for any states to have been covered by  $\mathcal{C}_l$ , they will continue to be covered by  $\mathcal{C}_l$  throughout the execution of the algorithm.

Proof: Let us consider a past version of  $\mathcal{C}_l$  and denote it as  $\mathcal{C}_l^{\text{past}}$ . For any states to have been covered by  $\mathcal{C}_l^{\text{past}}$ , it will continue to be covered by any future extensions of  $\mathcal{C}_l$ . This is because  $V(\mathcal{C}_l^{\text{past}}, \alpha) \succeq V(\mathcal{C}_l, \alpha)$  and therefore  $\text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l^{\text{past}}) \subseteq \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l)$ . ■

**Lemma 8** Whenever LSE-subroutine of Confident-NPG is executed, for all iterations  $k \in [k_\ell, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$ , for any  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$ , the importance weighted return  $\bar{q}_k(s, a)$  is an unbiased estimate of  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_k^i, s, a} \left[ \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} R_{h+1} \right]$  for all  $\pi_k^i \in \Pi_{\pi_k, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell)}$ .

Proof: When LSE-subroutine is executed with  $\ell = l$ , we consider two scenarios. Case 1: The trajectories for a  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$  are generated and stored in  $D_l[(s, a)]$  for the first time. Case 2: The trajectories for a  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$  were already generated and stored in  $D_l[(s, a)]$  during a previous iteration when  $\ell = l$ .

**Case 1:** We consider the case when LSE-subroutine is executed with  $\ell = l$ , where the trajectories of a  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{C}_l$  is generated and saved to  $D_l[(s, a)]$  for the first time. For any trajectories to have been saved to  $D_l$  would mean that the encountered states within the trajectories are in  $\text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l)$ . Otherwise, the Gather-data would have returned ‘discovered is True’, and a newly discovered state-action pair would be added to  $\mathcal{C}_0$ , interrupting the roll-out procedure. Consequently, no trajectories would have been saved to  $D_l[(s, a)]$ .

We let  $\tau_{s,a}^i$  denote the  $i$ -th trajectory  $\{S_0^i = s, A_0^i = a, R_1^i, S_1^i, \dots, S_{H-1}^i, A_{H-1}^i, R_H^i\}$  generated by  $\pi_{k_l}$  interacting with the simulator, and there are  $n$  such trajectories stored in  $D_l[(s, a)]$ . Then, for all  $k \in [k_l, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$ , the return

$$\bar{q}_k(s, a) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \prod_{h=1}^{H-1} \frac{\pi_k(A_h^i | S_h^i)}{\pi_{k_l}(A_h^i | S_h^i)} G(\tau_{s,a}^i). \quad (72)$$

The behavior policy  $\pi_{k_l}$  is updated in a previous loop through the algorithm when  $\ell = l - 1$ . By the time LSE-subroutine is executed,  $\pi_{k_l}$  will have been the most recent  $\pi_{k_l}$  to generate the data. For subsequent iterations, starting with  $k = k_l + 1$  up to  $k = k_{l+1} - 1$ , the policy  $\pi_k$  is updated based in iteration  $k - 1$ . Thus, by the time LSE-subroutine is executed for any  $k$  within  $[k_l + 1, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$ ,

both the most recent policy  $\pi_k$  and the behaviour policy  $\pi_{k_l}$  are available for the computation of the importance sampling ratio:  $\rho_k(\tau_{s,a}^i) = \prod_{h=1}^{H-1} \frac{\pi_k(A_h^i|S_h^i)}{\pi_{k_l}(A_h^i|S_h^i)}$ .

For  $k = k_l$ , the importance sampling ratio  $\rho_k(\tau_{s,a}^i) = 1$ . The importance weighted return  $\rho_k(\tau_{s,a}^i)G(\tau_{s,a}^i)$  is an unbiased estimate of  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_k, s, a}[G(\tau_{s,a}^i)]$ :

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{k_l}, s, a} \left[ \rho_k(\tau_{s,a}^i) \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i \right] \quad (73)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{k_l}, s, a} \left[ \frac{\delta(s, a) P(S_1|S_0 = s, A_0 = a) \pi_k(A_1|S_1) \dots \pi_k(A_{H-1}|S_{H-1})}{\delta(s, a) P(S_1|S_0 = s, A_0 = a) \pi_{k_l}(A_1|S_1) \dots \pi_{k_l}(A_{H-1}|S_{H-1})} \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i \right] \quad (74)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_k, s, a} \left[ \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i \right], \quad (75)$$

where  $\delta(s, a)$  is the dirac-delta function.

Because all of the states encountered in the trajectories are in  $Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)$ , the importance sampling ratio  $\rho_k(\tau_{s,a}^i)$  would have been produced by any policy  $\pi'_{k_l} \in \Pi_{\pi_{k_l}, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)}$  and  $\pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)}$  by definition 2. Thus, the return  $\rho_k(\tau_{s,a}^i)G(\tau_{s,a}^i)$  is an unbiased estimate of  $E_{\pi'_{k_l}, s, a}[G(\tau_{s,a}^i)]$  for all  $\pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)}$ , and this is true for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Consequently,  $\bar{q}_k(s, a)$  is an unbiased estimate of  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi'_{k_l}, s, a}[\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} R_{h+1}]$  for all for all  $\pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)}$ .

**Case 2:** We consider the case when LSE-subroutine is executed with  $\ell = l$ , where the trajectories of a  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{C}_l$  is generated in a previous loop through the algorithm with  $\ell = l$ . Let us denote  $\mathcal{C}_l$  at the time of this data acquisition as  $\mathcal{C}_l^{past}$ , and the stored data as  $D_l^{past}[(s, a)]$ . The trajectories stored in  $D_l^{past}[(s, a)]$  were generated from the past behaviour policy  $\pi_{k_l}^{past}$  interacting with the simulator. Likewise, we let  $\pi_k^{past}$  to denote the past target policies at the time after 26 was executed for each of the iterations in the range of  $[k_l + 1, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$ . Finally, we also have the corresponding  $\tau_{s,a}^{i,past}$  to denote the  $i$ -th trajectory that is stored in  $D_l^{past}[(s, a)]$ .

By the time LSE-subroutine is run with  $\ell = l$  again, by the same arguments made for Case 1, for any  $k \in [k_l, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$  and any  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , the importance weighted return  $\rho_k(\tau_{s,a}^{i,past})G(\tau_{s,a}^{i,past})$  is an unbiased estimate of  $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_k, s, a}[G(\tau_{s,a}^{i,past})]$  for all  $\tilde{\pi}_k^{past} \in \Pi_{\pi_k^{past}, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l^{past})}$ . By lemma 6, the most recent  $\pi_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k^{past}, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l^{past})}$ . Then,  $\rho_k(\tau_{s,a}^{i,past})G(\tau_{s,a}^{i,past})$  is an unbiased estimate of  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_k, s, a}[G(\tau_{s,a}^{i,past})]$ . By definition 2, any  $\pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \subseteq \Pi_{\pi_k^{past}, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l^{past})}$  and  $\pi'_{k_l} \in \Pi_{\pi_{k_l}, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \subseteq \Pi_{\pi_k^{past}, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l^{past})}$  would have produced the same importance sampling ratio, this implies that  $\rho_k(\tau_{s,a}^{i,past})G(\tau_{s,a}^{i,past})$  is an unbiased estimate of  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi'_{k_l}, s, a}[G(\tau_{s,a}^{i,past})]$  for all  $\pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)}$ .

Once  $D_l^{past}[(s, a)]$  is populated with trajectories,  $D_l^{past}[(s, a)]$  remain unchanged throughout the execution of the algorithm. Therefore,  $G(\tau_{s,a}^{i,past})$  will never change again. Thus,  $G(\tau_{s,a}^i) = G(\tau_{s,a}^{i,past})$ , and we have  $\rho_k(\tau_{s,a}^i)G(\tau_{s,a}^i)$  is an unbiased estimate of  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi'_{k_l}, s, a}[G(\tau_{s,a}^i)]$  for all  $\pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)}$ , and this is true for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Consequently,  $\bar{q}_k(s, a)$  is an unbiased estimate of  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi'_{k_l}, s, a}[\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} R_{h+1}]$  for all for all  $\pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)}$ . ■

**Lemma 9** *Whenever LSE-subroutine of Confident-NPG is executed, for any  $s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell)$ , the behaviour policy  $\pi_{k_\ell}(\cdot|s)$  and target policy  $\pi_k(\cdot|s)$  for  $k \in [k_\ell + 1, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$  satisfy eq. (12).*

**Proof:** Recall that the behavior policy  $\pi_{k_\ell}$  is updated in a previous loop through the algorithm when  $\ell = l - 1$ . By the time LSE-subroutine is executed,  $\pi_{k_\ell}$  will have been the most recent  $\pi_{k_\ell}$  to generate the data. For the on-policy iteration where  $k = k_\ell$ , the policy  $\pi_{k_\ell}$  serves as both the target and behavior policy, making eq. (12) trivially satisfied.

For subsequent iterations, starting with  $k = k_\ell + 1$  up to  $k = k_{\ell+1} - 1$ , in iteration  $k - 1$ , the policy  $\pi_k$  would have either undergone an NPG update in the form of eq. (71) for the first time or



remain unchanged in the form of eq. (71) with respect to some past  $\pi_k$  and  $\pi_{k_\ell}$ . Either way, for any  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell)$ , the target policy  $\pi_k$  and behaviour policy  $\pi_{k_\ell}$  would be related to each other in form of eq. (71). Since  $\tilde{Q}_t(s, a) \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$  for any  $t \in [k_\ell, k-1]$ , then it follows that

$$\eta_1 \sum_{t=k_\ell}^{k-1} \tilde{Q}_t(s, a) \leq \eta_1(k-k_\ell) \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \leq \frac{\eta_1((\lfloor m \rfloor + 1) - 1)}{1-\gamma}. \quad (76)$$

By choosing  $\eta_1 = (1-\gamma)\sqrt{\frac{2\ln(|\mathcal{A}|)}{K}}$ ,  $m = \frac{\ln(1+c)}{2(1-\gamma)\epsilon \ln\left(\frac{4}{\epsilon(1-\gamma)^2}\right)}$ , and  $K = \frac{2\ln(A)}{(1-\gamma)^4\epsilon^2}$ , we have  $\frac{\eta_1((\lfloor m \rfloor + 1) - 1)}{1-\gamma} \leq \frac{\eta_1 m}{1-\gamma} = \frac{\ln(1+c)}{2H}$ . By the time LSE-subroutine is executed for any  $k$  within  $[k_\ell + 1, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$ , the most recent target policy  $\pi_k$  and behaviour policy  $\pi_{k_\ell}$  will satisfy eq. (12) for all states in the cover of  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$ . ■

**Lemma 10** [*q-bar unchanged*] For any  $l \in [L]$ , once an entry  $(s, a)$  in  $\mathcal{C}_l$  is populated with trajectories and stored in  $D_l[(s, a)]$  and a  $\bar{q}_k(s, a)$  for a  $k \in [k_l, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$  is computed in the LSE subroutine in LSE-subroutine for the first time, the  $\bar{q}_k$  will maintain unchanged as that value for remainder of the algorithm's execution.

Proof: Recall the  $i$ -th trajectory  $\tau_{s,a}^i$  stored in  $D_l[(s, a)]$  forms the return  $G(\tau_{s,a}^i) = \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h R_{h+1}^i$ . By extracting out all of the state-action pairs  $\{(S_h^i, A_h^i)\}_{h=1}^{H-1}$  from  $\tau_{s,a}^i$ , we have the importance sampling ratio for trajectory  $i$ :  $\rho(\tau_{s,a}^i) = \prod_{h=1}^{H-1} \frac{\pi_k(A_h^i | S_h^i)}{\pi_{k_l}(A_h^i | S_h^i)}$ . Then,  $\bar{q}_k(s, a) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(\tau_{s,a}^i) G(\tau_{s,a}^i)$ . We see that the value of  $\bar{q}_k(s, a)$  is influenced by the importance sampling ratio and the returns.

The returns  $G(\tau_{s,a}^i)$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  are based on data  $D_l[(s, a)]$ . Once  $D_l[(s, a)]$  is populated with trajectories,  $D_l[(s, a)]$  remain unchanged for the rest of the algorithm's execution.

The only source that can change the value of  $\bar{q}_k$  throughout the execution of the algorithm is the importance sampling ratio. Thus, let us consider the running phase with  $\ell = l$  where  $\bar{q}_k(s, a)$  for any  $k \in [k_l, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$  is computed the first time in the LSE subroutine in LSE-subroutine. First of all, the behavior policy  $\pi_{k_l}$  would already have been updated in a previous loop through the algorithm with  $\ell = l - 1$ . For subsequent iterations, starting with  $k = k_l + 1$  up to  $k = k_{l+1} - 1$ , the policy  $\pi_k$  is updated in iteration  $k - 1$ . Thus, by the time LSE-subroutine is executed for any  $k$  within  $[k_l + 1, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$ , both the most recent policy  $\pi_k$  and the behaviour policy  $\pi_{k_l}$  would have been updated by line 26.

In line 26, for any  $s$  that are newly covered by  $\mathcal{C}_l$  (i.e.,  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l) \setminus \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{l+1})$ ), the policy  $\pi_k(\cdot | s)$  makes an update, which will remain unchanged in any subsequent loops through the algorithm when  $\ell = l$  again. This is because of line 30, the state  $s$  that is considered newly covered in one loop through the algorithm will be added to  $\mathcal{C}_{l+1}$  by the end of the loop, making the state no longer as a newly covered state. In summary,  $\pi_k(\cdot | s)$  would have been updated once and remain unchanged as that update for the remainder of the execution of the algorithm.

By the time LSE-subroutine is executed for any  $k$  within  $[k_l + 1, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$ , the most recent policy  $\pi_k$  and the behaviour policy  $\pi_{k_l}$  for all states in the cover of  $\mathcal{C}_l$  would have already been updated and remain unchanged throughout the execution of the algorithm. Since all of the states in the trajectories are in the cover of  $\mathcal{C}_l$ , the importance sampling ratio would also have been set once and remain as that value for rest of the algorithm's run. When LSE-subroutine is run,  $\bar{q}_k(s, a)$  for a  $k \in [k_l, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$  will also remain unchanged throughout the execution of the algorithm. ■

**Lemma 11** [*q-bar accuracy*] Whenever LSE-subroutine of Confident-NPG is executed, for a  $\delta' \in (0, 1]$ , for all  $k \in [k_\ell, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$ , the corresponding  $\bar{q}_k(s, a)$  for all  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$  has with probability  $1 - \delta'$ ,

$$|\bar{q}_k(s, a) - q_{\pi'_k}(s, a)| \leq \epsilon \quad \text{for all } \pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell)}. \quad (77)$$

Since  $\ell$  takes on a specific value  $l \in [L]$  in each loop through the algorithm, if eq. (77) holds for all  $k \in [k_l, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$ , then the condition continues to hold for the remainder of the algorithm's execution.

**Proof:** We aim to apply lemma 4 to each individual  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$ . To do this, we must confirm the two necessary conditions of the lemma for each  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$ , demonstrating that  $|\bar{q}_k(s, a) - q_{\pi_k}(s, a)|$  for all  $k \in [k_\ell, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$  is indeed bounded by  $\epsilon$  for all  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$ .

We note that by the time LSE subroutine is run in line 20, all of the  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$  would have trajectories generated successfully by Gather-data and be stored in  $D_\ell[(s, a)]$ . For any trajectory to be stored in  $D_\ell$ , it would mean that all of the states in the trajectories are in the cover of  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$ , and by lemma 7, these states will continue to be covered by  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  throughout the execution of the algorithm. By picking any  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$ , we apply lemma 9 to all of the states  $s$  in the trajectories stored in  $D_\ell[(s, a)]$ , then we have the behaviour policy  $\pi_{k_\ell}(\cdot|s)$  and target policy  $\pi_k(\cdot|s)$  for  $k \in [k_{\ell+1}, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$  satisfy eq. (12).

Second, by lemma 8, the importance weighted return  $\bar{q}_k(s, a)$  is unbiased estimate of any  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi'_{k_\ell}, s, a} \left[ \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} R_{h+1} \right]$  for all  $\pi'_{k_\ell} \in \Pi_{\pi_k, Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell)}$ . Altogether, by lemma 4, we can ensure eq. (77) holds.

Since  $\ell$  takes on a specific value  $l \in [L]$  in each loop through the algorithm, if eq. (77) holds for all  $k \in [k_l, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$ , then the condition continues to hold for the remainder of the algorithm's execution. For any  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{C}_l$ , by the time  $q_k(s, a)$  is calculated for the first time and used in LSE subroutine, by lemma 10, the  $q_k(s, a)$  will remain as that same value throughout the execution of the algorithm. So, if eq. (77) holds for  $\bar{q}_k(s, a)$ , then the condition will continue to hold for the remainder of the algorithm's execution. ■

**Lemma 12 (Weisz et al. (2022))** *At any time during the execution of the main algorithm, for all  $l \in [0, L]$ , the size of each  $\mathcal{C}_l$  is bounded:*

$$|\mathcal{C}_l| \leq 4d \ln \left( 1 + \frac{4}{\alpha} \right) \doteq \tilde{d} = \tilde{O}(d), \quad (78)$$

where the  $\alpha$  is the smallest eigenvalue of  $V(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$  and  $N$  is the radius of the Euclidean ball containing all the feature vectors.

**Lemma 13** *Whenever LSE-subroutine of Confident-NPG is executed, for all  $k \in [k_\ell, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$ , for all  $s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell)$  and  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , the least-square estimate  $\tilde{Q}_k^r(s, a)$  satisfies the following condition*

$$|\tilde{Q}_k^r(s, a) - q_{\pi'_k}(s, a)| \leq \epsilon' \quad \text{for all } \pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell)}, \quad (79)$$

where  $\epsilon' = \omega + \sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon)\sqrt{\tilde{d}}$ .

**Proof:** We prove the result by induction similar to Lemma F.1 of Weisz et al. (2022). We let  $\mathcal{C}_\ell^-, \pi_k^-, \tilde{Q}_k^-$  to denote the value of variable  $\mathcal{C}_\ell, \pi_k, \tilde{Q}_k$  at the time when lines 16 to 31 were most recently executed with  $\ell = l$  in a previous loop through the algorithm. If such time does not exist, we let their values be the initialization values. Only after the execution of line 30 will  $\mathcal{C}_\ell^-$  change and as well as  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$ , and this is the only time that  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$  can be changed. Therefore, at the start of a new loop, we see that  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1} = \mathcal{C}_\ell^-$ . This also holds at the initialization of the algorithm, we conclude that at the start of each loop,  $Cov(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) = Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell^-)$ .

At initialization,  $\tilde{Q}_k = 0$  for any  $k \in [0, K]$  and  $\mathcal{C}_l = ()$  for all  $l \in [L]$ . By applying lemma 5 (Lemma 4.3 of Weisz et al. (2022)), for any  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$|\tilde{Q}_k(s, a) - q_{\pi'}(s, a)| \leq \omega + \sqrt{\alpha}B \leq \epsilon', \quad (80)$$

which satisfies eq. (79) for all  $k$ .

Next, let us consider the start of a loop after  $\ell$  is set and assume that the inductive hypothesis holds for the previous time line 20 to line 25 were executed with the same value of  $\ell$ . For any  $s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_{\ell-1}^-)$ , policy  $\pi_{k_\ell}(\cdot|s)$  would have already been set in a previous loop with value  $\ell - 1$  and remains unchanged in the current loop. By lemma 5 and lemma 11, we have for any  $s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_{\ell-1}^-)$ ,

$$|\tilde{Q}_{k_\ell}^-(s, \cdot) - q_{\pi'_{k_\ell}}(s, \cdot)| \leq \omega + \sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon)\sqrt{\tilde{d}} \quad \text{for } \pi'_{k_\ell} \in \Pi_{\pi_{k_\ell}^-, Cov(\mathcal{C}_{\ell-1}^-)}, \quad (81)$$

where  $\|\phi(s, \cdot)\|_{V(\mathcal{C}_{\ell-1}^-, \alpha)^{-1}} \leq 1$  because  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell-1}^-)$  and  $|\mathcal{C}_{\ell-1}^-| \leq \tilde{d}$  by lemma 12. Recall by definition,  $\tilde{Q}_{k_\ell} = \tilde{Q}_{k_\ell}^-$ ,  $\pi_{k_\ell} = \pi_{k_\ell}^-$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_\ell = \mathcal{C}_{\ell-1}^-$ , and  $\text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell) = \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell-1}^-)$ . It follows that for any  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell)$ ,  $|\tilde{Q}_{k_\ell}(s, \cdot) - q_{\pi_{k_\ell}'}(s, \cdot)| \leq \epsilon'$  for  $\pi_{k_\ell}' \in \Pi_{\pi_{k_\ell}, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell)}$ .

For any  $s$  that is already covered by  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  (i.e.,  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell^-)$ ), and for any off-policy iteration  $k \in [k_\ell + 1, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$ ,  $\tilde{Q}_k(s, \cdot) = \tilde{Q}_k^-(s, \cdot)$ . Additionally, the policy  $\pi_k(\cdot|s)$  would already have been set in a previous loop with the same value of  $\ell$  and remains unchanged in the current loop. For  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell^-)$ , by lemma 5 and lemma 11,

$$|\tilde{Q}_k^-(s, \cdot) - q_{\pi_k'}(s, \cdot)| \leq \omega + \sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon)\sqrt{\tilde{d}} \quad \text{for } \pi_k' \in \Pi_{\pi_k^-, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell^-)}, \quad (82)$$

where  $\|\phi(s, \cdot)\|_{V(\mathcal{C}_\ell^-, \alpha)^{-1}} \leq 1$  because  $s \in \text{cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell^-)$  and  $|\mathcal{C}_\ell^-| \leq \sqrt{\tilde{d}}$  by lemma 12. By lemma 6,  $\Pi_{\pi_k, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell)} \subseteq \Pi_{\pi_k^-, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell^-)}$ . By definition,  $\tilde{Q}_k(s, \cdot) = \tilde{Q}_k^-(s, \cdot)$  for  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) = \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell^-)$ ,  $|\tilde{Q}_k(s, \cdot) - q_{\pi_k'}(s, \cdot)| \leq \epsilon'$  for any  $\pi_k' \in \Pi_{\pi_k, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1})}$ .

Finally, for any  $s$  that is newly covered by  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  (i.e.,  $s \notin \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1})$ ), and for all  $k \in [k_\ell, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$ ,  $\tilde{Q}_k(s, \cdot) = Q_k(s, \cdot)$ . By lemma 5 and lemma 11, we have

$$|Q_k(s, \cdot) - q_{\pi_k'}(s, \cdot)| \leq \omega + \sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon)\sqrt{\tilde{d}} \quad \text{for } \pi_k' \in \Pi_{\pi_k, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell)}, \quad (83)$$

where  $\|\phi(s, \cdot)\|_{V(\mathcal{C}_\ell, \alpha)^{-1}} \leq 1$  and  $|\mathcal{C}_\ell| \leq \tilde{d}$  by lemma 12.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 14** For any  $\delta' \in (0, 1]$ , a target accuracy  $\epsilon > 0$ , misspecification error  $\epsilon$ , and initial state  $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta'$ , the value difference between any  $\pi \in \Pi_{\text{rand}}$  and the mixture policy  $\bar{\pi}_K$  returned by Confident-NPG has the following value-difference error:

$$v_\pi(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}(s_0) \leq \frac{4\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_\pi(s_0), s' \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_0)} \left[ \langle \tilde{Q}_k(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k(\cdot|s') \rangle \right]. \quad (84)$$

Proof: By line 27 of algorithm 2, one can use induction to show that by the time Confident-NPG terminates, all the  $\mathcal{C}_l$  for  $l \in [L+1]$  will be equal. Therefore, the cover of  $\mathcal{C}_l$  for all  $l \in [L+1]$  are also equal. Thus, it is sufficient to only consider  $\mathcal{C}_0$  at the end of the algorithm. By line 3 of algorithm 2,  $s_0 \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_0)$ .

For any  $l \in [L]$ , define policy for  $k \in [k_l, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$  as follows,

$$\pi_k^+(\cdot|s) = \begin{cases} \pi_k(\cdot|s) & \text{if } s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l) \\ \pi(\cdot|s) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (85)$$

For any  $l \in [L]$ , and for any  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l)$ ,  $k \in [k_l, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$ ,

$$v_\pi(s) - v_{\pi_k}(s) = v_\pi(s) - v_{\pi_k^+}(s) + v_{\pi_k^+}(s) - v_{\pi_k}(s) \quad (86)$$

$$= \underbrace{\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_\pi(s)} \left[ \langle q_{\pi_k^+}(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k^+(\cdot|s') \rangle \right]}_I \quad \text{by performance difference lemma} \quad (87)$$

$$+ \underbrace{\langle q_{\pi_k^+}(s, \cdot), \pi_k^+(\cdot|s) \rangle - \langle q_{\pi_k}(s, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s) \rangle}_II, \quad (88)$$

where  $d_\pi(s)$  is the discounted state occupancy measure induced by following  $\pi$  from  $s$ .

To bound term II, we note that for any  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l)$ , we have  $\pi_k^+(\cdot|s) = \pi_k(\cdot|s)$  and both  $\pi_k, \pi_k^+(\cdot|s) \in \Pi_{\pi_k, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l)}$ . By lemma 13, we have for any  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l)$ ,  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $|\tilde{Q}_k(s, a) - q_{\pi_k'}(s, a)| \leq \epsilon'$  for any  $\pi_k' \in \Pi_{\pi_k, \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l)}$ . Then, for any  $s \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_l)$ ,  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$|q_{\pi_k^+}(s, a) - q_{\pi_k}(s, a)| \leq |q_{\pi_k^+}(s, a) - \tilde{Q}_k(s, a)| + |\tilde{Q}_k(s, a) - q_{\pi_k}(s, a)| \leq 2\epsilon'. \quad (89)$$

It follows that for any  $s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)$ ,

$$\langle q_{\pi_k^+}(s, \cdot), \pi_k^+(\cdot|s) \rangle - \langle q_{\pi_k}(s, \cdot), \pi_k(\cdot|s) \rangle = \langle \pi_k(\cdot|s), q_{\pi_k^+}(s, \cdot) - q_{\pi_k}(s, \cdot) \rangle \quad (90)$$

$$\leq \langle \pi_k(\cdot|s), |q_{\pi_k^+}(s, \cdot) - q_{\pi_k}(s, \cdot)| \rangle \quad (91)$$

$$\leq \|q_{\pi_k^+}(s, \cdot) - q_{\pi_k}(s, \cdot)\|_\infty \|\pi_k(\cdot|s)\|_1 \quad (92)$$

$$\leq 2\epsilon'. \quad (93)$$

To bound term  $I$ , we note that for any  $s \notin Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)$ ,  $\pi_k^+(\cdot|s) = \pi(\cdot|s)$  and  $\pi_k^+ \in \Pi_{\pi_k, Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)}$ , then

$$\frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s)}} \left[ \langle q_{\pi_k^+}(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k^+(\cdot|s') \rangle \right] \quad (94)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s)}, s' \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \left[ \langle q_{\pi_k^+}(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k^+(\cdot|s') \rangle \right] \quad (95)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s)}, s' \notin Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \left[ \langle q_{\pi_k^+}(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k^+(\cdot|s') \rangle \right] \quad (96)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s)}, s' \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \left[ \langle q_{\pi_k^+}(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k^+(\cdot|s') \rangle \right] \quad (97)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s)}, s' \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \left[ \langle q_{\pi_k^+}(s', \cdot) - \tilde{Q}_k(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k^+(\cdot|s') \rangle \right] \quad (98)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s)}, s' \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \left[ \langle \tilde{Q}_k(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k^+(\cdot|s') \rangle \right] \quad (99)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s)}, s' \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \left[ \|q_{\pi_k^+}(s', \cdot) - \tilde{Q}_k(s', \cdot)\|_\infty \|\pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k^+(\cdot|s')\|_1 \right] \quad \text{by Holder's inequality} \quad (100)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s)}, s' \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \left[ \langle \tilde{Q}_k(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k^+(\cdot|s') \rangle \right] \quad (101)$$

$$\leq \frac{2\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} \quad \text{by lemma 13 and } \|\pi^*(\cdot|s') - \pi_k^+(\cdot|s')\|_1 \leq 2 \quad (102)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s)}, s' \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \left[ \langle \tilde{Q}_k(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k(\cdot|s') \rangle \right] \quad (103)$$

$$= \frac{2\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s)}, s' \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \left[ \langle \tilde{Q}_k(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k(\cdot|s') \rangle \right] \quad (104)$$

In summary, for any  $l, k \in [k_l, k_{l+1} - 1]$ ,

$$v_\pi(s) - v_{\pi_k}(s) \leq \frac{4\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s)}, s' \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \left[ \langle \tilde{Q}_k(s', \cdot), \pi^*(\cdot|s') - \pi_k(\cdot|s') \rangle \right]. \quad (105)$$

Putting everything together, the value difference can be bounded as follows,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (v_\pi(s_0) - v_{\pi_k}(s_0)) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{l=0}^L \sum_{k=k_l}^{k_{l+1}-1} (v_\pi(s_0) - v_{\pi_k}(s_0)) \quad (106)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{l=0}^L \sum_{k=k_l}^{k_{l+1}-1} \frac{4\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} \quad (107)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)} \sum_{l=0}^L \sum_{k=k_l}^{k_{l+1}-1} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s_0)}, s' \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_l)} \left[ \langle \tilde{Q}_k(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k(\cdot|s') \rangle \right] \quad (108)$$

$$\leq \frac{4\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi(s_0)}, s' \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_0)} \left[ \langle \tilde{Q}_k(s', \cdot), \pi(\cdot|s') - \pi_k(\cdot|s') \rangle \right]. \quad (109)$$

Going from eq. (108) to eq. (109) is because when the algorithm terminates, all the  $\mathcal{C}_l$  are the same, and hence the  $Cov(\mathcal{C}_0) = Cov(\mathcal{C}_1) = \dots = Cov(\mathcal{C}_L)$ .  $\blacksquare$

## B Confident-NPG-CMDP

We include the proofs of lemmas that appear in prior works and supporting lemmas that are helpful proving the lemmas in the main sections. The lemmas that appear in the main section will have the same numbering here.

### B.1 The accuracy of least-square estimates

Once a state-action pair is added to a core set, it remains in that core set for the duration of the algorithm. This means that any  $\mathcal{C}_l$  for  $l \in [L+1]$  can grow in size. When a core set  $\mathcal{C}_l$  is extended during a running phase when  $\ell = l$ , the least-square estimates will need be updated based on the newly extended  $\mathcal{C}_l$  containing newly discovered informative features. However, the improved estimates will only be used to update the policy of states that are newly covered, which are states that are in  $Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell) \setminus Cov(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1})$ . Therefore, we break down  $\tilde{Q}_k^p$  to reflect the value based on which  $\pi_{k+1}$  is updated, that is for  $s, a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a) \leftarrow \begin{cases} \tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a) & \text{if } s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) \\ Q_k^p(s, a) & \text{if } s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell) \setminus Cov(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) \\ \text{initial value 0} & \text{if } s \notin Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell), \end{cases} \quad (110)$$

where  $Q_k^p(s, a) = \text{trunc}_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} Q_k^r(s, a) + \lambda_k \text{trunc}_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} Q_k^c(s, a)$ . Respective to  $\tilde{Q}_k^p$ , we have the corresponding policy update as follows,

$$\pi_{k+1}(a|s) \leftarrow \begin{cases} \pi_{k+1}(a|s) & \text{if } s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) \\ \propto \pi_k(\cdot|s) \exp\left(\eta_1 \text{trunc}_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} Q_k^p(s, a)\right) & \text{if } s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell) \setminus Cov(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) \\ \pi_k(a|s) & \text{if } s \notin Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell), \end{cases} \quad (111)$$

For all  $s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell)$ , the  $\tilde{Q}_k(s, \cdot)$  will be the value of the least-square estimate at the time the policy makes an NPG update of the form:

$$\pi_{k+1}(\cdot|s) \propto \pi_k(\cdot|s) \exp\left(\eta_1 \text{trunc}_{[0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]} Q_k(s, a)\right). \quad (112)$$

This is because at the end of the loop after line 31 of algorithm 1 is run, the next phase core set  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1} = \mathcal{C}_\ell$ , which make any states that are covered by  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  also be covered by  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$ . A state that was once newly covered by  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  will no longer be newly covered again. If the algorithm was to make an NPG update for states that are newly covered in some loop, in any subsequent loops with the same value  $\ell$ , the policy will remain unchanged.

**Lemma 1** *Whenever LSE-subroutine on line 21 of Confident-NPG-CMDP is executed, for all  $k \in [k_\ell, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$ , for all  $s \in Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell)$  and  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , the least-square estimate  $\tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a)$  satisfies the following,*

$$|\tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a) - q_{\pi'_k, \lambda_k}^p(s, a)| \leq \epsilon' \quad \text{for all } \pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell)}, \quad (113)$$

where  $\epsilon' = (1+U)(\omega + \sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon)\sqrt{\tilde{d}})$  with  $\tilde{d} = \tilde{O}(d)$ . Likewise,

$$|\tilde{Q}_k^c(s, a) - q_{\pi'_k}^c(s, a)| \leq \omega + \sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon)\sqrt{\tilde{d}} \quad \text{for all } \pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, Cov(\mathcal{C}_\ell)}, \quad (114)$$

**Proof:** By the primal-dual approach, we have reduced the CMDP problem into an unconstrained problem with a single reward of the form  $r_\lambda = r + \lambda c$ . The proof of this lemma is a direct application of lemma 13 in the single reward setting along with a few adjustments.

The result of lemma 13 depends on lemma 11 (q-bar accuracy). For lemma 11 to be true, one of the requirement is that the behaviour policy  $\pi_{k_\ell}$  and the target policy  $\pi_k$  must satisfy the eq. (12). The lemma that verifies this condition is lemma 9, and all of the modifications would need be made in lemma 9 for the CMDP setting.

The main modification to lemma 9 for the CMDP setting is to recognize that the value  $\tilde{Q}_k^p$  for all  $k \in [0, K]$  are in the range of 0 and  $\frac{1+U}{1-\gamma}$ . The upper bound value is the result of the primary reward

function taking values in the range of  $[0, 1]$  and the dual variable taking values in the range of  $[0, U]$ . The value  $U$  is defined in lemma 15 for relaxed-feasibility and in lemma 17 for strict-feasibility, and it is an upper bound on the optimal dual variable (i.e.,  $\lambda^* \leq U$ ). From this value modification, we have the step size  $\eta_1 = \frac{1-\gamma}{1+U} \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln(|\mathcal{A}|)}{K}}$ .

The next modification is the interval of data collection  $m$ . For the total number of iterations  $K = \frac{9(\sqrt{2 \ln(|\mathcal{A}|)+1})^2(1+U)^2}{(1-\gamma)^4 \epsilon^2}$  and  $H = \frac{\ln((90\sqrt{d}(1+U))/((1-\gamma)^3 \epsilon))}{1-\gamma}$ . Then, it follows that  $m = \frac{(1+U) \ln(1+c)}{2\epsilon(1-\gamma) \ln((90\sqrt{d}(1+U))/((1-\gamma)^3 \epsilon))}$ . With these changes, we apply lemma 9 to validate one of the conditions for lemma 11.

Unlike the single-reward setting, the primal estimate  $\tilde{Q}_k^p(s, a)$  also depends on the dual variable  $\lambda_k$ . By the time policy  $\pi_{k+1}$  is being updated with respect to  $\tilde{Q}_k^p$ , the  $\lambda_k$  would have been set. For the on-policy iteration  $k = k_\ell$ , the dual variable  $\lambda_k$  is set in a prior loop. For off-policy iterations  $k \in [k_\ell + 1, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$ , the dual variable  $\lambda_k$  would have been set in the  $k - 1$  iteration. Thus, in any iteration  $k \in [k_\ell, \dots, k_{\ell+1} - 1]$ , the most recent  $\lambda_k$  will be available for the construction of  $\bar{q}_k$ .

Due to the execution of line 7 and line 31, the initial state  $s_0$  would be guaranteed to be covered by  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$ . If  $s_0 \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_\ell)$  for the first time, then  $\lambda_k$  makes a mirror descent update in line 30 using  $V_k^c(s_0)$  at the time of the update and remains that value for the remainder execution of the algorithm. This is because at the end of the loop after line 31 is run, the next phase core set  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1} = \mathcal{C}_\ell$ , making any states that are covered by  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  also be covered by  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$ . By lemma 7, these states will remain covered by  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$  for the rest of the algorithm execution. If the algorithm was to set the dual variable to the mirror descent update, in any subsequent loops with the same  $\ell$  again, the dual variable  $\lambda_k$  remains unchanged. Therefore, by lemma 10,  $\bar{q}_k$  will also remain unchanged as the value when it is computed for the first time in line 20.

With all the conditions of lemma 13 satisfied, we can apply the result to  $\tilde{Q}^p$ . For  $\tilde{Q}_k^c$ , the result follows from lemma 13. ■

## C Relaxed-feasibility

**Lemma 15** [Lemma 4.1 of Jain et al. (2022)] Let  $\lambda^*$  be the optimal dual variable that satisfies  $\min_{\lambda \geq 0} \max_{\pi} v_{\pi}^r(\rho) + \lambda(v_{\pi}^c(\rho) - b)$ . If we choose

$$U = \frac{2}{\zeta(1-\gamma)}, \quad (115)$$

then  $\lambda^* \leq U$ .

Proof: Let  $\pi_c^*(\rho) \doteq \arg \max_{\pi} v_{\pi}^c(\rho)$ , and recall that  $\zeta \doteq v_{\pi_c^*}^c(\rho) - b > 0$ , then

$$v_{\pi^*}^r(\rho) = \max_{\pi} \min_{\lambda \geq 0} v_{\pi}^r(\rho) + \lambda(v_{\pi}^c(\rho) - b). \quad (116)$$

$$(117)$$

By Paternain et al. (2019),

$$v_{\pi^*}^r(\rho) = \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \max_{\pi} v_{\pi}^r(\rho) + \lambda(v_{\pi}^c(\rho) - b) \quad (118)$$

$$= \max_{\pi} v_{\pi}^r(\rho) + \lambda^*(v_{\pi}^c(\rho) - b) \quad (119)$$

$$\geq v_{\pi_c^*}^r(\rho) + \lambda^*(v_{\pi_c^*}^c(\rho) - b) \quad (120)$$

$$\geq v_{\pi_c^*}^r(\rho) + \lambda^* \zeta. \quad (121)$$

After rearranging terms, we have

$$\lambda^* \leq \frac{v_{\pi^*}^r(\rho) - v_{\pi_c^*}^r(\rho)}{\zeta} \leq \frac{1}{\zeta(1-\gamma)}. \quad (122)$$

By choosing  $U = \frac{2}{\zeta(1-\gamma)}$ , we have  $\lambda^* \leq U$ . ■



**Definition 3**

$$R^p(\pi^*, K) = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi^*}(s_0), s' \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_0)} \left[ \langle \pi^*(\cdot|s') - \pi_k(\cdot|s'), \tilde{Q}_k^r(s', \cdot) + \lambda_k \tilde{Q}_k^c(s', \cdot) \rangle \right], \quad (123)$$

$$R^d(\lambda, K) = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\lambda_k - \lambda) (\tilde{V}_k^c(s_0) - b). \quad (124)$$

**Lemma 2** For any failure probability  $\delta \in (0, 1]$ , target accuracy  $\epsilon > 0$ , and initial state  $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ , with probability  $1 - \delta$ , Confident-NPG-CMDP returns a mixture policy  $\bar{\pi}_K$  that satisfies the following,

$$v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^r(s_0) \leq \frac{5\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{(\sqrt{2 \ln(A)} + 1)(1+U)}{(1-\gamma)^2 \sqrt{K}}, \quad (125)$$

$$b - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0) \leq [b - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0)]_+ \leq \frac{5\epsilon'}{(1-\gamma)(U-\lambda^*)} + \frac{(\sqrt{2 \ln(A)} + 1)(1+U)}{(1-\gamma)^2 (U-\lambda^*) \sqrt{K}}, \quad (126)$$

where  $\epsilon' \doteq (1+U)(\omega + (\sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon)\sqrt{\tilde{d}}))$  with  $\tilde{d} = \tilde{O}(d)$ .

**Proof:**

We apply lemma 14 with  $\pi$  being the optimal policy  $\pi^*$  for CMDP,  $\tilde{Q}_k^p = \tilde{Q}_k^r + \lambda_k \tilde{Q}_k^c$  instead of  $\tilde{Q}_k$ , and lemma 1 instead of lemma 13 of the single reward setting, then we have

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} v_{\pi^*, \lambda_k}^p(s_0) - v_{\pi_k, \lambda_k}^p(s_0) \quad (127)$$

$$\leq \frac{4\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{1}{K(1-\gamma)} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim d_{\pi^*}(s_0), s' \in \text{Cov}(\mathcal{C}_0)} \left[ \langle \tilde{Q}_k^r(s', \cdot) + \lambda_k \tilde{Q}_k^c(s', \cdot), \pi^*(\cdot|s') - \pi_k(\cdot|s') \rangle \right] \quad (128)$$

$$= \frac{4\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{R^p(\pi^*, K)}{K(1-\gamma)}. \quad (129)$$

By Proposition 28.6 of Lattimore and Szepesvári (2020), the primal regret  $R^p(\pi^*, K) \leq \frac{1+U}{1-\gamma} \sqrt{2K \ln(|\mathcal{A}|)}$  with  $\eta_1 = \frac{1-\gamma}{1+U} \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln(|\mathcal{A}|)}{K}}$ . Expanding the left hand side of eq. (129) in terms of  $v^r, v^c$ ,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\pi_k}^r(s_0) + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \lambda_k (v_{\pi^*}^c(s_0) - v_{\pi_k}^c(s_0)) \quad (130)$$

$$\leq \frac{4\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{1+U}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln(A)}{K}}. \quad (131)$$

Furthermore,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \lambda_k (v_{\pi_k}^c(s_0) - v_{\pi^*}^c(s_0)) \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \lambda_k (v_{\pi_k}^c(s_0) - b) \quad (132)$$

$$= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \lambda_k (v_{\pi_k}^c(s_0) - \tilde{V}_k^c(s_0)) + \lambda_k (\tilde{V}_k^c(s_0) - b) \quad (133)$$

$$\leq \epsilon' + \frac{R^d(0, K)}{K} \quad (134)$$

$$\leq \epsilon' + \frac{U}{(1-\gamma)\sqrt{K}}. \quad (135)$$

Note that  $\lambda_k(v_{\pi_k}^c(s_0) - \tilde{V}_k^c(s_0)) \leq U(\omega + \sqrt{\alpha}B + \omega\sqrt{\tilde{d}} + \epsilon\sqrt{\tilde{d}}) \leq \epsilon'$ , with  $\tilde{d}$  defined in lemma 12. The update to the dual variable is a mirror descent algorithm. By Proposition 28.6 of [Lattimore and Szepesvári \(2020\)](#), the dual regret  $R^d(0, K) \leq \frac{U\sqrt{K}}{1-\gamma}$  with  $\eta_2 = \frac{U(1-\gamma)}{\sqrt{K}}$ . Altogether,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) \leq \frac{4\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{1+U}{(1-\gamma)^2} \sqrt{\frac{2\ln(A)}{K}} + \epsilon' + \frac{U}{(1-\gamma)\sqrt{K}} \quad (136)$$

$$\leq \frac{5\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{(\sqrt{2\ln(A)}+1)(1+U)}{(1-\gamma)^2\sqrt{K}} \quad (137)$$

For bounding the constraint violations, we first incorporate  $R^d(\lambda, K)$  into eq. (131) and rearrange terms to obtain:

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\pi_k}^r(s_0) + \frac{\lambda}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (b - v_{\pi_k}^c(s_0)) \quad (138)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\lambda_k - \lambda)(v_{\pi_k}^c(s_0) - b) + \frac{4\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{(1+U)\sqrt{2\ln(A)}}{(1-\gamma)^2\sqrt{K}} \quad (139)$$

$$= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\lambda_k - \lambda)(v_{\pi_k}^c(s_0) - \tilde{V}_k^c(s_0)) + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} (\lambda_k - \lambda)(\tilde{V}_k^c(s_0) - b) \quad (140)$$

$$+ \frac{4\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{(1+U)\sqrt{2\ln(A)}}{(1-\gamma)^2\sqrt{K}} \quad (141)$$

$$= \epsilon' + \frac{R^d(\lambda, K)}{K} + \frac{4\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{(1+U)\sqrt{2\ln(A)}}{(1-\gamma)^2\sqrt{K}} \quad (142)$$

$$\leq \frac{5\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{(1+U)(\sqrt{2\ln(|\mathcal{A}|)}+1)}{(1-\gamma)^2\sqrt{K}} \quad (143)$$

There are two constraint cases. Case one is  $b - v_{\pi^*}^c(s_0) \leq 0$  (no violation), for which case,  $\lambda = 0$ . Case two is  $b - v_{\pi^*}^c(s_0) > 0$  (violation), for which case,  $\lambda = U$ . With these choices,  $R^d(\lambda, L)$  is increasing in  $\lambda$ . Using notation  $[x]_+ = \max\{x, 0\}$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\pi_k}^r(s_0) + \frac{U}{K} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^K b - v_{\pi_k}^c(s_0) \right]_+ \quad (144)$$

$$\leq \frac{5\epsilon'}{1-\gamma} + \frac{(1+U)(\sqrt{2\ln(|\mathcal{A}|)}+1)}{(1-\gamma)^2\sqrt{K}}. \quad (145)$$

By Lemma B.2 of [Jain et al. \(2022\)](#), we have

$$[b - v_{\pi_K}^c(s_0)]_+ \leq \frac{5\epsilon'}{(1-\gamma)(U-\lambda^*)} + \frac{(\sqrt{2\ln(A)}+1)(1+U)}{(1-\gamma)^2(U-\lambda^*)\sqrt{K}}. \quad (146)$$

■

**Theorem 1** *With probability  $1 - \delta$ , the mixture policy  $\bar{\pi}_K = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \pi_k$  returned by confident-NPG-CMDP ensures that*

$$v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^r(s_0) = \frac{5(1+U)(1+\sqrt{\tilde{d}})}{1-\gamma} \omega + \epsilon, \quad (147)$$

$$v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0) \geq b - \left( \frac{5(1+U)(1+\sqrt{\tilde{d}})}{(1-\gamma)} \omega + \epsilon \right). \quad (148)$$

if we choose  $n = \frac{1013(1+c)^2(1+U)^2\tilde{d}}{\epsilon^2(1-\gamma)^4} \ln\left(\frac{4\tilde{d}(L+1)}{\delta}\right)$ ,  $\alpha = \frac{(1-\gamma)^2\epsilon^2}{225(1+U)^2B^2}$ ,  $K = \frac{9(\sqrt{2\ln(|\mathcal{A}|)+1})^2(1+U)^2}{(1-\gamma)^4\epsilon^2}$ ,  
 $\eta_1 = \frac{1-\gamma}{1+U} \sqrt{\frac{2\ln(|\mathcal{A}|)}{K}}$ ,  $\eta_2 = \frac{U(1-\gamma)}{\sqrt{K}}$ ,  $H = \frac{\ln((90\sqrt{\tilde{d}}(1+U))/((1-\gamma)^3\epsilon))}{1-\gamma}$ ,  $m = \frac{(1+U)^2 \ln(1+c)}{2\epsilon(1-\gamma) \ln((90\sqrt{\tilde{d}}(1+U))/((1-\gamma)^3\epsilon))}$ , and  $U = \frac{2}{\zeta(1-\gamma)}$ .

Furthermore, the algorithm utilizes at most  $\tilde{O}(d^2(1+U)^3\epsilon^{-3}(1-\gamma)^{-8})$  queries in the local-access setting.

**Proof:** From lemma 2, we have

$$v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\pi_K}^r(s_0) \leq \frac{5\epsilon'}{(1-\gamma)} + \frac{(\sqrt{2\ln(A)}+1)(1+U)}{(1-\gamma)^2\sqrt{K}}, \quad (149)$$

$$b - v_{\pi_K}^c(s_0) \leq \frac{5\epsilon'}{(1-\gamma)(U-\lambda^*)} + \frac{(\sqrt{2\ln(A)}+1)(1+U)}{(1-\gamma)^2(U-\lambda^*)\sqrt{K}}, \quad (150)$$

Let  $C \doteq \frac{1}{\zeta(1-\gamma)}$  for a  $\zeta \in (0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]$ . By lemma 15, we chose  $U = 2C$  and  $\lambda^* \leq C$ . It follows that  $\frac{1}{U-\lambda^*} \leq \frac{1}{C} = \zeta(1-\gamma) \leq 1$ , and thus the right hand side of eq. (150) is upper bounded by the right hand side of eq. (149). Recall  $\epsilon' \doteq (1+U) \left( \omega + \left( \sqrt{\alpha}B + (\omega + \epsilon)\sqrt{\tilde{d}} \right) \right)$ . Then, the goal is to set the parameters  $H, n, K$ , and  $\alpha$  appropriately so that the  $A, B$  and  $C$  of the following expression, when added together, is less than  $\epsilon$ :

$$\frac{5(1+U)(1+\sqrt{\tilde{d}})\omega}{1-\gamma} + \underbrace{\frac{5(1+U)\sqrt{\alpha}B}{1-\gamma}}_A + \underbrace{\frac{5(1+U)\epsilon\sqrt{\tilde{d}}}{1-\gamma}}_B + \underbrace{\frac{(\sqrt{2\ln(A)}+1)(1+U)}{(1-\gamma)^2\sqrt{K}}}_C. \quad (151)$$

First, we set  $n$  appropriately so that the failure probability is well controlled. The failure probability depends on the number of times Gather-data subroutine (algorithm 3) is executed. Gather-data is run in phase  $[0, L]$ . Each phase has at most  $\tilde{d}$  elements, and recall  $\tilde{d}$  is defined in lemma 12. Therefore, Gather-data would return success at most  $\tilde{d}$  times. Altogether, Gather-data can return success at most  $\tilde{d}(L+1)$  times, each with probability of at least  $1 - \delta' = 1 - \delta/(\tilde{d}(L+1))$ . By a union bound, Gather-data returns success in all occasions with probability  $1 - \delta$ . By setting  $H = \frac{\ln((90\sqrt{\tilde{d}}(1+U))/((1-\gamma)^3\epsilon))}{1-\gamma}$  and  $n = \frac{1013(1+c)^2(1+U)^2\tilde{d}}{\epsilon^2(1-\gamma)^4} \ln\left(\frac{4\tilde{d}(L+1)}{\delta}\right)$ , we have for all  $l \in [0, L]$ ,  $k \in [k_l, \dots, k_{l+1} - 1]$ , the  $|\bar{q}_k(s, a) - q_{\pi'_k}(s, a)| \leq \frac{(1-\gamma)\epsilon}{15(1+U)\sqrt{\tilde{d}}}$  hold for all  $\pi'_k \in \Pi_{\pi_k, C_{ov}(C_l)}$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ . Then, this is used in the accuracy guarantee of the least-square estimate (lemma 1) and finally in the suboptimality bound of lemma 2. Then, we can set  $B$  of eq. (151) to be less than  $\frac{\epsilon}{3}$ .

By setting  $K = \frac{9(\sqrt{2\ln(|\mathcal{A}|)+1})^2(1+U)^2}{(1-\gamma)^4\epsilon^2}$ , we have  $C$  of eq. (151) be less than  $\frac{\epsilon}{3}$ . Finally, we set  $\alpha = \frac{(1-\gamma)^2\epsilon^2}{225(1+U)^2B^2}$  and have  $A$  of eq. (151) to be less than  $\frac{\epsilon}{3}$ . Altogether, we have the reward suboptimality satisfying eq. (147) and constraint satisfying eq. (148).

For the query complexity, we note that our algorithm does not query the simulator in every iteration, but at fixed intervals, which we call phases. Each phase is  $m$  iterations in length. There are total of  $L = \lfloor K/(\lfloor m \rfloor + 1) \rfloor \leq K/m = \tilde{O}((1+U)(1-\gamma)^{-3}\epsilon^{-1})$  phases. In each phases, Gather-data subroutine (algorithm 3) can be run. Each time Gather-data returns success with trajectories, the subroutine would have made at most  $nH$  queries. Gather-data is run for each of the elements in  $C_l$ ,  $l \in [0, L]$ . By the time the algorithm terminates, all  $C_l$ 's are the same. Since there are at most  $\tilde{O}(d)$  elements in each  $C_l$ , the algorithm will make a total of  $nH(L+1)|C_0|$  number of queries to the simulator. Since we have  $H = \tilde{O}((1-\gamma)^{-1})$ ,  $n = \tilde{O}((1+U)^2d\epsilon^{-2}(1-\gamma)^{-4})$  and  $L = \tilde{O}((1+U)\epsilon^{-1}(1-\gamma)^{-3})$ , the sample complexity is  $\tilde{O}(d^2(1+U)^3(1-\gamma)^{-8}\epsilon^{-3})$ . ■

## D Strict-feasibility

**Lemma 16** Let  $\pi_\Delta^*$  be defined as in eq. (10) and  $\pi^*$  be the optimal policy of CMDP. Then, for a  $\Delta > 0$ ,

$$v_{\pi_\Delta^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) \leq \lambda^* \Delta, \quad (152)$$

where  $\lambda^*$  is the optimal dual variable that satisfies  $\min_{\lambda \geq 0} \max_{\pi} v_{\pi}^r(s_0) + \lambda(v_{\pi}^c(s_0) - b')$ .

Proof:

$$v_{\pi_\Delta^*}^r(s_0) = \max_{\pi} \min_{\lambda \geq 0} v_{\pi}^r(s_0) + \lambda(v_{\pi}^c(s_0) - b'). \quad (153)$$

By Paternain et al. (2019),

$$v_{\pi_\Delta^*}^r(s_0) = \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \max_{\pi} v_{\pi}^r(s_0) + \lambda(v_{\pi}^c(s_0) - b') \quad (154)$$

$$= \max_{\pi} v_{\pi}^r(s_0) + \lambda^*(v_{\pi}^c(s_0) - b') \quad (155)$$

$$\geq v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) + \lambda^*(v_{\pi^*}^c(s_0) - (b + \Delta)) \quad (156)$$

$$\geq v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) + \lambda^*(b - b - \Delta) \quad \text{because } v_{\pi^*}^c(s_0) \geq b \quad (157)$$

$$= v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - \lambda^* \Delta. \quad (158)$$

After rearranging the terms, we get the result.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 17** Let  $\lambda^*$  be the optimal dual variable that satisfies  $\min_{\lambda \geq 0} \max_{\pi} V_{\pi}^r(s_0) + \lambda(V_{\pi}^c(s_0) - b')$ . If we choose

$$U = \frac{4}{\zeta(1-\gamma)}, \quad (159)$$

then  $\lambda^* \leq U$  requiring that  $\Delta \in (0, \frac{\zeta}{2})$ .

Proof: Let  $\pi_c^*(s_0) \doteq \arg \max V_{\pi}^c(s_0)$ , and recall that  $\zeta \doteq V_{\pi_c^*}^c(s_0) - b > 0$ , then

$$v_{\pi_\Delta^*}^r(s_0) = \max_{\pi} \min_{\lambda \geq 0} v_{\pi}^r(s_0) + \lambda(v_{\pi}^c(s_0) - b') \quad (160)$$

By Paternain et al. (2019),

$$v_{\pi_\Delta^*}^r(s_0) = \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \max_{\pi} v_{\pi}^r(s_0) + \lambda(v_{\pi}^c(s_0) - b') \quad (161)$$

$$= \max_{\pi} v_{\pi}^r(s_0) + \lambda^*(V_{\pi}^c(s_0) - b') \quad (162)$$

$$\geq v_{\pi_c^*}^r(s_0) + \lambda^*(v_{\pi_c^*}^c(s_0) - (b + \Delta)) \quad (163)$$

$$= v_{\pi_c^*}^r(s_0) + \lambda^*(\zeta - \Delta). \quad (164)$$

If we require  $\Delta \in (0, \frac{\zeta}{2})$ , then we have

$$v_{\pi_\Delta^*}^r(s_0) \geq v_{\pi_c^*}^r(s_0) + \lambda^*(\zeta - \frac{\zeta}{2}) \quad (165)$$

$$= v_{\pi_c^*}^r(s_0) + \frac{\lambda^* \zeta}{2} \quad (166)$$

After rearranging terms in eq. (166), we have

$$\lambda^* \leq \frac{2(v_{\pi_\Delta^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\pi_c^*}^r(s_0))}{\zeta} \leq \frac{2}{\zeta(1-\gamma)}. \quad (167)$$

By choosing  $U = \frac{4}{\zeta(1-\gamma)}$ ,  $\lambda^* \leq U$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 2** With probability  $1 - \delta$ , a target  $\epsilon > 0$ , the mixture policy  $\bar{\pi}_K$  returned by confident-NPG-CMDP ensures that  $v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^r(s_0) \leq \epsilon$  and  $v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0) \geq b$ , if assuming the misspecification error  $\omega \leq \frac{\Delta(1-\gamma)}{40(1+U)(1+\sqrt{d})}$ , and if we choose  $\Delta = \frac{\epsilon(1-\gamma)\zeta}{8}$ ,  $\alpha = \frac{\Delta^2(1-\gamma)^2}{1600(1+U)^2B^2}$ ,  $K = \frac{64(\sqrt{2\ln(|\mathcal{A}|)+1})^2(1+U)^2}{(1-\gamma)^4\Delta^2}$ ,  $n = \frac{7200(1+c)^2\tilde{d}(1+U)^2}{\Delta^2(1-\gamma)^4} \ln\left(\frac{4\tilde{d}(L+1)}{\delta}\right)$ ,  $H = \frac{\ln\left(\frac{240(1+U)\sqrt{d}}{\Delta(1-\gamma)^3}\right)}{1-\gamma}$ ,  $m = \frac{4(1+U)\ln(1+c)}{\Delta(1-\gamma)\ln\left(\frac{240(1+U)\sqrt{d}}{\Delta(1-\gamma)^3}\right)}$ ,  $U = \frac{4}{\zeta(1-\gamma)}$ .

Furthermore, the algorithm utilizes at most  $\tilde{O}(d^2(1+U)^3(1-\gamma)^{-11}\epsilon^{-3}\zeta^{-3})$  queries in the local-access setting.

**Proof:** Let  $\lambda^*$  be the optimal dual variable that satisfies the Lagrangian primal-dual of the surrogate CMDP defined by eq. (10) (i.e.,  $\lambda^* = \arg \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \max_{\pi} v_{\pi}^r(s_0) + \lambda(v_{\pi}^c(s_0) - b')$ ).

$$v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^r(s_0) \tag{168}$$

$$= \underbrace{\left[ v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\pi_{\Delta}^*}^r(s_0) \right]}_{\text{surrogate suboptimality}} + \underbrace{\left[ v_{\pi_{\Delta}^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^r(s_0) \right]}_{\text{Confident-NPG-CMDP suboptimality}} \tag{169}$$

$$\leq \lambda^* \Delta + \bar{\epsilon}, \tag{170}$$

where  $\bar{\epsilon} = \frac{5(1+U)(1+\sqrt{d})\epsilon}{1-\gamma} + \frac{5(1+U)\sqrt{\alpha}B}{1-\gamma} + \frac{5(1+U)\epsilon\sqrt{d}}{1-\gamma} + \frac{(\sqrt{2\ln(|\mathcal{A}|)+1})(1+U)}{(1-\gamma)^2\sqrt{K}}$ . By lemma 16,  $v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\pi_{\Delta}^*}^r(s_0) \leq \lambda^* \Delta$ . We can further upper bound  $\lambda^*$  by  $U = \frac{4}{\zeta(1-\gamma)}$  using lemma 17 and requiring  $\Delta \in \left(0, \frac{\zeta}{2}\right)$ . Together with theorem 1, we have Confident-NPG return  $\bar{\pi}_K$  s.t.

$$v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^r(s_0) \leq \frac{4\Delta}{\zeta(1-\gamma)} + \bar{\epsilon} \quad \text{and} \tag{171}$$

$$b' - V_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0) \leq \bar{\epsilon}. \tag{172}$$

Now, we need to set  $\Delta$  such that 1)  $\Delta \in \left(0, \frac{\zeta}{2}\right)$  and 2)  $\Delta - \bar{\epsilon} \geq 0$  are satisfied. If we choose  $\Delta = \frac{\epsilon(1-\gamma)\zeta}{8}$ , then the first condition is satisfied. This is because  $\epsilon \in \left(0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right]$ , and thus  $\Delta \leq \frac{\zeta}{8} < \frac{\zeta}{2}$ .

Next, we check if our choice of  $\Delta = \frac{\epsilon(1-\gamma)\zeta}{8}$  satisfies  $\Delta - \bar{\epsilon} \geq 0$ . For the condition  $\Delta - \bar{\epsilon} \geq 0$  to be true, we make an assumption on the misspecification error  $\omega \leq \frac{\Delta(1-\gamma)}{40(1+U)(1+\sqrt{d})}$ , and pick  $n, \alpha, K, \eta_1, \eta_2, H, m$  to be the values outlined in this theorem. Consequently, we have  $\bar{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{2}\Delta$ . Then, we have ensured the condition  $\Delta - \bar{\epsilon} \geq 0$  is satisfied.

We note that because  $\zeta \in \left(0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right)$ , we have  $\bar{\epsilon} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{16} \leq \epsilon$ . following from eq. (171), we have  $v_{\pi^*}^r(s_0) - v_{\bar{\pi}_K}^r(s_0) \leq \epsilon$  and  $b' - V_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0) \leq \frac{\Delta}{2}$ . Then it follows that  $b + \frac{\Delta}{2} \leq V_{\bar{\pi}_K}^c(s_0)$ . Strict-feasibility is achieved.

For the query complexity, we note that our algorithm does not query the simulator in every iteration, but at fixed intervals, which we call phases. Each phase is  $m$  iterations in length. There are total of  $L = \lfloor K/(\lfloor m \rfloor + 1) \rfloor \leq K/m = \tilde{O}((1+U)(1-\gamma)^{-3}\Delta^{-1})$  phases. In each phase, Gather-data subroutine (algorithm 3) can be run. Each time Gather-data subroutine returns with trajectories, the subroutine would have made at most  $nH$  queries. Gather-data is run for each of the element in  $\mathcal{C}_l$ ,  $l \in [0, L]$ . By the time the algorithm terminates, all  $\mathcal{C}_l$ 's are the same. Since there are at most  $\tilde{O}(d)$  elements in each  $\mathcal{C}_l$ , the algorithm will make a total of  $nH(L+1)|\mathcal{C}_0|$  number of queries to the simulator. Since we have  $H = \tilde{O}((1-\gamma)^{-1})$ ,  $n = \tilde{O}((1+U)^2d(1-\gamma)^{-4}\Delta^{-2})$ ,  $L = \tilde{O}((1+U)(1-\gamma)^{-3}\Delta^{-1})$ , and  $\Delta = \frac{\epsilon\zeta(1-\gamma)}{8}$ , the sample complexity is  $\tilde{O}(d^2(1+U)^3(1-\gamma)^{-11}\epsilon^{-3}\zeta^{-3})$ . ■