

Logarithmic Regret for Nonlinear Control

James Wang
Bruce D. Lee
Ingvar Ziemann
Nikolai Matni

JWANG541@SEAS.UPENN.EDU
BRUCELE@SEAS.UPENN.EDU
INGVARZ@SEAS.UPENN.EDU
NMATNI@SEAS.UPENN.EDU

All authors are with the Department of Electrical and System Engineering at the University of Pennsylvania.

Abstract

We address the problem of learning to control an unknown nonlinear dynamical system through sequential interactions. Motivated by high-stakes applications in which mistakes can be catastrophic, such as robotics and healthcare, we study situations where it is possible for fast sequential learning to occur. Fast sequential learning is characterized by the ability of the learning agent to incur logarithmic regret relative to a fully-informed baseline. We demonstrate that fast sequential learning is achievable in a diverse class of continuous control problems where the system dynamics depend smoothly on unknown parameters, provided the optimal control policy is persistently exciting. Additionally, we derive a regret bound which grows with the square root of the number of interactions for cases where the optimal policy is not persistently exciting. Our results provide the first regret bounds for controlling nonlinear dynamical systems depending nonlinearly on unknown parameters. We validate the trends our theory predicts in simulation on a simple dynamical system.

1. Introduction

Controlling an unknown nonlinear system through repeated sequential interaction is a fundamental problem in controls and reinforcement learning. Recent years have seen considerable impact of this paradigm in application areas ranging from walking robots (Yang et al., 2020), mastering games such as go and StarCraft (Silver et al., 2017) and even fine-tuning large language models (Ouyang et al., 2022). Problems of this form are often analyzed through the lens of Markov Decision Processes (MDP). Indeed, there is a wealth of literature on analyzing interactive sequential decision making in tabular MDPs (Burnetas and Katehakis, 1997; Dann and Brunskill, 2015). Extensions to this framework, typically motivated by studying large state and action spaces together with function approximation, are also abundant in the literature (Jiang et al., 2017; Zhou et al., 2021).

However, many problems, including certain robotics and healthcare tasks, are more naturally cast through the framework of continuous control. Such problems can be converted to tabular MDPs through discretization of the state and action spaces; however, doing so often results in intractable reinforcement learning problems. Conversely, the continuous control problem can be solved efficiently in special cases, such as the linear quadratic regulator (LQR) (Dean et al., 2020). Of the above motivating examples, robotic tasks in particular are plagued by costly data-collection (Kober et al., 2013). A similar situation arises in healthcare: giving the wrong treatment doses of a medicine repeatedly can have dire consequences. Consequently in these applications one would hope to find *fast learning algorithms* that require as few interactions as possible with the unknown system to meet the desired performance criteria.

In the sequel, we measure the performance of an interactive sequential decision-maker by its regret—its performance as compared to the best policy (in a certain class), in hindsight. A fast learning algorithm in such sequential decision making tasks is characterized as one that attains *regret scaling logarithmically in the number of interactions with the unknown environment*. There has been a wealth of literature in characterizing when such rates are achievable in the setting of bandits (Lai and Robbins, 1985; Garivier et al., 2019) and analogs for tabular reinforcement learning (Burnetas and Katehakis, 1997; Ok et al., 2018; Xu et al., 2021). However, to date there has been no general characterization of when this is achievable in continuous control for nonlinear systems with nonlinear dependence on the unknown parameters. We thus ask: **are there conditions under which such fast learning algorithms exist for continuous control of nonlinear systems with nonlinear parameter dependencies?**

1.1. Contribution

Our main result answers the question of achievability of logarithmic regret in the affirmative.

Theorem 1 (Informal version of the main result) *If the optimal policy solving a given continuous control task is identifiable from an experiment running the optimal policy, polylogarithmic regret is attained by our Algorithm 1.*

The crux of our contribution is thus to establish a natural condition for logarithmic regret in nonlinear control problems and to provide a novel algorithm leveraging this condition which achieves logarithmic regret. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first algorithm achieving (poly-)logarithmic regret in general nonlinear control problems.

The intuition behind our result is as follows. If the data collected by running the optimal policy is sufficiently informative about the unknown parameters, then it is unnecessary to inject exploratory noise to perform online control. In particular, a policy which is near optimal will enjoy similarly informative data collection, allowing the learner to gradually approach the optimal policy by playing certainty equivalent controllers synthesized with estimates of the dynamics parameters. We formalize this intuition with a persistence of excitation condition, asking that the Fisher information matrix of the optimal policy is positive definite.

Finally, for completeness, we also provide an algorithm attaining sublinear regret in the absence of our identifiability condition. This result can be found in Appendix A along with all proofs.

1.2. Related Work

Logarithmic Regret in Bandits and RL The question of whether logarithmic regret is attainable or not is intimately connected with the exploration exploitation trade-off. Beginning with Lai and Robbins (1985) in the tabular bandit setting, *gap-dependent* regret bounds have been established showing that logarithmic regret is possible whenever there is a strict separation between the reward of the optimal action and that of a second best, or worse, action. Similar gap sufficient conditions for logarithmic regret also exist in tabular reinforcement learning (Burnetas and Katehakis, 1997; Ok et al., 2018; Xu et al., 2021). In the worst case, or for instance in linear bandits where there is no gap, logarithmic regret is impossible and instead regret scales with the square root of the number of interactions with unknown environment (cf. e.g., Garivier et al., 2019).

Closed-Loop Identifiability and Adaptive Control Within the system identification community, the exploration-exploitation trade-off is often referred to as the *dual nature of control* (Feldbaum, 1960a,b) and is related to issues of *closed-loop identifiability* (Ljung, 1999). Roughly speaking,

closed-loop identifiability issues arise because a fixed control law might not sufficiently excite the system under consideration in the necessary directions in state space (or feature space more generally). Indeed, in the Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) setting, Polderman (1986) gives an elegant geometric argument showing that the true parameters need to be identified in order to ascertain the optimal control law. It is also interesting to note that, precisely because the minimum variance controller is closed-loop identifiable (Lin et al., 1985) (in contrast to the more general LQR controller), logarithmic regret can be achieved in this setting (Lai, 1986). Reiterating the point above: the reason for the impossibility of pure exploitation is precisely a lack of closed-loop identifiability. This insight is leveraged in Simchowitz and Foster (2020) and Ziemann and Sandberg (2024) to show logarithmic regret is impossible in general in the linear quadratic Gaussian control problem. However, given some prior information about the system (e.g. if the way the input impacts the state transitions is known), then closed-loop identifiability may hold, making logarithmic regret achievable for LQR (Cassel et al., 2020; Jedra and Proutiere, 2022; Lee et al., 2024a). Alternatively, if the policy choice is restricted to a set in which all possible candidate provide closed-loop identifiability of the system parameters, then Lale et al. (2020) demonstrate logarithmic regret for the Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG).

Closed-loop identifiability issues similarly hinder the achievability of logarithmic regret in the online control of nonlinear systems. In the setting of nonlinear dynamical systems which depend linearly on some unknown parameters, Kakade et al. (2020); Boffi et al. (2021) propose algorithms that achieve regret scaling with the square root of the number of interactions. Lale et al. (2024) consider linear function approximators for smooth systems, and provide an algorithm achieving regret scaling with the square root of the number of interactions in general, and logarithmic regret if the system is sufficiently smooth. Critically, as with Lale et al. (2020), Lale et al. (2024) assume that all policies in the policy class provide closed-loop identifiability of the parameters. By contrast, we do not assume a priori access to a policy yielding such identifiability; we show that it suffices that the *unknown* optimal policy yields easy identification and our algorithm then adapts to this property. Moreover, we consider dynamical systems which depend nonlinearly on an unknown parameter, and propose an algorithm that incurs logarithmic regret as long as the optimal policy enables closed-loop identification.

Learning in Dynamical Systems Our contribution also draws on a recent line of work on learning in dynamical systems beginning with Simchowitz et al. (2018); Faradonbeh et al. (2018). The authors therein show that non-asymptotic parameter recovery from a single trajectory is possible in certain marginally stable, or unstable, linear dynamical systems. Mania et al. (2022) leverage the parameter recovery bounds to enable efficient exploration. Non-asymptotic identification of more general nonlinear systems is studied by Sattar and Oymak (2022); Foster et al. (2020); Ziemann and Tu (2022). Treven et al. (2023); Wagenmaker et al. (2024); Lee et al. (2024b) study control-oriented experiment design in an episodic setting for nonlinear systems.

1.3. Notation

The Jacobian of a vector-valued function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is denoted Dg , and follows the convention for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the rows of $Dg(x)$ are the transposed gradients of $g_i(x)$. The p^{th} order derivative of g is denoted by $D^{(p)}g$. Note that for $p \geq 2$, $D^{(p)}g(x)$ is a tensor for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The operator norm of such a tensor is denoted by $\|D^{(p)}g(x)\|_{\text{op}}$. For a function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$, we define $\|f\|_{\infty} \triangleq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|f(x)\|$. A Euclidean norm ball of radius r centered at x is denoted $\mathcal{B}(x, r)$.

2. Problem Formulation

We consider a nonlinear dynamical system given by the dynamics

$$x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, \phi^*) + w_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (1)$$

where the state $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$; the input $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u}$; and the additive noise $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$, with $w_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2 I)$. Let $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ be arbitrary. Here, f is the dynamics function and depends on a parameter $\phi^* \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\Phi}$. We assume that there exists some positive B such that $\|\phi^*\| \leq B$ and $\|f(\cdot, \cdot, \phi)\|_\infty \leq B$ for all $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\Phi}$ satisfying $\|\phi\| \leq B$.

We study an online learning problem under these dynamics. We consider a learner who has knowledge of the dynamics f , but not the parameter ϕ^* . In each episode $n = 1, \dots, N$, the learner executes a policy π_n from the set of policies $\{\pi_0\} \cup \Pi$, where π_0 is an initial (possibly randomized) exploration policy, while Π is a class of deterministic controllers which take as input a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ and return a control input $u \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u}$. Then, the learner observes a trajectory $(x_1, u_1), \dots, (x_T, u_T)$ (generated by unrolling (1) with $u_t \sim \pi_n(x_t)$); and incurs the cost $J(\pi_n, \phi^*)$, where

$$J(\pi, \phi) := \mathbb{E}_\pi^\phi \left[\sum_{t=1}^T c_t(x_t, u_t) \right] \quad (2)$$

for some cost functions $\{c_t\}_{t=1, \dots, T}$ which are fixed across episodes. The subscript on the expectation denotes that the policy π is played, while the superscript denotes that the dynamics (1) are rolled out under ϕ . The expectation is taken over the noise w_t and the policy π_n . We suppose that the policy class Π is parametric: $\Pi = \{\pi_\theta : \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}\}$.

The learner's objective is to achieve a low sum of costs over episodes. A natural metric is therefore to minimize the regret, defined as

$$\text{Regret}(N) := \left(\sum_{n=1}^N J(\pi_n, \phi^*) \right) - N \min_{\pi \in \Pi} J(\pi, \phi^*). \quad (3)$$

We will explore no-regret learners for this setting, for which $\text{Regret}(N)/N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

2.1. Certainty Equivalent Control

Our learners leverage the principle of certainty equivalence. In particular, the learner uses the data collected from its interactions to pose an estimate $\hat{\phi}$ for the parameter ϕ^* . Using this estimate, the learner solves the policy optimization problem,

$$\theta^*(\hat{\phi}) \in \underset{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}}{\text{argmin}} J(\pi_\theta, \hat{\phi}). \quad (4)$$

The certainty equivalent policy may then be expressed as a function of the estimated dynamics parameters $\hat{\phi}$ as

$$\pi^*(\hat{\phi}) \triangleq \pi_{\theta^*(\hat{\phi})}. \quad (5)$$

2.2. Assumptions

In order to relate the excess cost achieved by a certainty equivalent controller synthesized under a dynamics estimate ϕ to the error in the estimate, $\|\phi - \phi^*\|$, we impose some smoothness assumptions on the dynamics and policy class.

Assumption 1 (*Smooth dynamics*). The dynamics are four times differentiable with respect to u and ϕ . Furthermore, for all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\phi}$, and $i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ such that $1 \leq i + j \leq 4$, the derivatives of f satisfy

$$\left\| D_\phi^{(i)} D_u^{(j)} f(x, u, \phi) \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq L_f.$$

Assumption 2 (*Smooth exploitation policy class*). For all policies $\pi \in \Pi$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the function $\pi_\theta(x)$ is four-times differentiable in θ . Furthermore $\left\| D_\theta^{(i)} \pi_\theta(x) \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq L_\theta$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 4$, all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, and all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

We additionally require that the costs are bounded for policies in the class $\{\pi_0\} \cup \Pi$ and all dynamics parameters in a neighborhood of the true parameter. Intuitively, this allows our learning algorithm to occasionally play bad policies without incurring too much excess cost.

Assumption 3 (*Bounded costs*). There exists $r_{\text{cost}}(\phi^*) > 0$ such that for all $\phi \in \mathcal{B}(\phi^*, r_{\text{cost}}(\phi^*))$, and all $\pi \in \{\pi_0\} \cup \Pi$, we have $\mathbb{E}_\pi^\phi \left[\left(c_{t+1}(x_{t+1}) + \sum_{t=1}^T c_t(x_t, u_t) \right)^2 \right] \leq L_{\text{cost}}$.

As the task is episodic, the above assumption holds if the stage costs are uniformly bounded for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u}$. Alternatively, if the stage costs are smooth, the above condition holds if the states and inputs are bounded with high probability. This is satisfied for Π by the smoothness of the dynamics (Assumption 1) and exploitation policy class (Assumption 2). A mild assumption that the initial policy π_0 plays bounded inputs suffices to guarantee the above condition also holds for π_0 .

We additionally suppose that the certainty equivalent controller parameters, as a function of the estimated dynamics ϕ , are locally smooth near the true dynamics ϕ^* .

Assumption 4 There exists some $r_{\text{CE}} > 0$ such that for all $\phi \in \mathcal{B}(\phi^*, r_{\text{CE}})$,

- $\nabla_\theta J(\pi_\theta, \phi) |_{\theta=\theta^*(\phi)} = 0$,
- $\theta^*(\phi)$ is three times differentiable and $\left\| D_\phi^{(i)} \theta^*(\phi) \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq L_{\text{CE}}$ for some $L_{\text{CE}} > 0$ and $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

It is shown in Proposition 6 of Wagenmaker et al. (2024) that this condition holds if the minimizer of $J(\pi_\theta, \phi_\star)$ is unique, and $\nabla_\theta^2 J(\pi_\theta, \phi_\star) \succ 0$.

In order to bound the parameter recovery error in terms of the prediction error, additional identifiability conditions are needed. Ziemann et al. (2024) show that a rather minimal Lojasiewicz condition (cf. Roulet and d'Aspremont, 2017) relating the sharpness of an objective to its manifold of minimizers is sufficient for learning from dependent data. The following definition of a Lojasiewicz policy is taken from Lee et al. (2024b) and extends the corresponding definition from Ziemann et al. (2024) to decision-making. In the setting of Lee et al. (2024b), the following definition of a Lojasiewicz policy bounds the estimation error $\|\phi - \phi^*\|$ as a function of the prediction error $\text{Err}_\pi^{\phi^*}(\phi)$ for all dynamics parameters ϕ .

Definition 2 For positive numbers C and α , say that a policy $\pi \in \Pi$ is (C, α) -Lojasiewicz if

$$\left\| \hat{\phi} - \phi^* \right\| \leq C \text{Err}_\pi^{\phi^*}(\hat{\phi})^\alpha \quad \text{for all } \hat{\phi} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\phi}.$$

Next, to ensure parameter recovery is possible for the learner, we make the following assumption regarding identifiability.

Assumption 5 (*Initial Lojasiewicz policy*). Fix some positive constant C_{Loja} and $\alpha \in (1/4, 1/2]$. The learner has access to a policy π_0 which is (C_{Loja}, α) -Lojasiewicz (here, we do not require that $\pi_0 \in \Pi$; furthermore, we allow π_0 to be randomized).

This is satisfied in linear systems with $\alpha = 1/2$ if the initial controller π_0 plays Gaussian noise as input, and both the controller noise and process noise have positive definite covariance matrices.

While Assumption 5 ensures that the learner can identify the true dynamics ϕ^* using only data collected under π_0 , the rate of recovery may be slow under only the assumptions listed previously. In order to obtain polylogarithmic regret bounds, we require the assumption that the optimal controller, defined by $\theta^* \triangleq \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta} J(\pi_{\theta}, \phi_*)$, is persistently exciting. Persistence of excitation for a nonlinear dynamical system involves the positive definiteness of the matrix

$$\Sigma^{\pi} \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\pi}^{\phi^*} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, u_t, \phi^*)^{\top} Df(x_t, u_t, \phi^*) \right] = D_{\Phi}^{(2)} \operatorname{Err}_{\pi}^{\phi^*}(\phi^*),$$

where $Df(x_t, u_t, \phi^*)$ denotes the Jacobian of f with respect to ϕ evaluated at ϕ^* . It can be shown that Σ^{π} is a positive scalar multiple of the Fisher Information matrix (when the system evolves according to ϕ^* and π) and hence this condition is equivalent to requiring the positive definiteness of the Fisher Information matrix when the system evolves according to ϕ^* and π .

Assumption 6 (*Persistency of excitation for the optimal controller*). The optimal policy under the true dynamics ϕ^* , denoted $\pi_{\theta^*} \triangleq \pi_{\theta^*(\phi^*)}$, is persistently exciting, i.e. for some $\lambda_{\min} > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta^*}}^{\phi^*} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, u_t, \phi^*)^{\top} Df(x_t, u_t, \phi^*) \right] \succeq \lambda_{\min} I_{d_{\Phi}}.$$

Note that the above assumption is not satisfied in LQR in general when both the A^* and B^* matrices are unknown. However, Lee et al. (2024a) show that a sufficient condition for Assumption 6 to hold in linear systems is that either 1) the A^* matrix is known and the optimal controller K^* has full row rank or 2) the B^* matrix is known.

Finally, we reiterate that in the event that Assumption 6 does not hold, we can obtain slower, but still sublinear regret rates under very general conditions. See Appendix A of the extended manuscript for details.

3. Fast Learning

Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, we give an algorithm (Algorithm 1) based on the aforementioned certainty equivalence principle which achieves polylogarithmic regret in our online nonlinear control setting. Given an initial Lojasiewicz policy π_0 , the exploitation policy class Π , the number of episodes N , the number of initial phase episodes $N_{\text{phase 1}}$ (where $0 \leq N_{\text{phase 1}} \leq N$), and a confidence radius r_{Φ} , the algorithm proceeds in two phases.

In the first phase, the learner collects a dataset $\{(x_t^k, u_t^k, x_{t+1}^k)\}_{t=1, \dots, T}^{k=1, \dots, N_{\text{phase 1}}}$ using π_0 , and finds an confidence ball Φ with a radius of r_{Φ} which contains the true dynamics ϕ^* with high probability.

The confidence ball is centered at ϕ_0 , which is the solution to a nonlinear least squares problem,

$$\phi_0 \in \underset{\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\Phi}, \|\phi\| \leq B}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| x_{t+1}^k - f(x_t^k, u_t^n, \phi) \right\|^2. \quad (6)$$

With a sufficiently small r_Φ , and conditioned on the event $\phi^* \in \Phi$, we show that policies synthesized using estimates that fall within this set enjoy a positive definite Fisher Information; equivalently, the prediction error $\operatorname{Err}_\pi^{\phi^*}(\phi)$ is strongly convex on Φ for all certainty equivalent controllers π synthesized with dynamics estimates $\phi \in \Phi$. This motivates an online convex optimization procedure in the second phase.

In the second phase, the learner interacts with the system by playing policies synthesized using parameter estimates from Φ . The learner produces successive estimates ϕ_1, ϕ_2, \dots of the true dynamics ϕ^* using observations of the prediction error, where the prediction error for a dynamics estimate ϕ under the policy π is defined as

$$\operatorname{Err}_\pi^{\phi^*}(\phi) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_\pi^{\phi^*} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \right]. \quad (7)$$

More specifically, the learner uses the certainty equivalent policy π corresponding to its current estimate of ϕ^* to collect a single trajectory $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_t, u_t, x_{t+1})\}_{t=1, \dots, T}$. The square loss of a dynamics estimate ϕ on the dataset \mathcal{D} is

$$l_D(\phi) \triangleq \sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \quad (8)$$

and the learner updates its estimate of ϕ^* using the gradient $\nabla l_D(\phi)$.

Algorithm 1 Continuous Refinement

Require: Exploration policy π_0 , exploitation policy class Π , number of episodes N , number of initial phase episodes $N_{\text{phase 1}}$, confidence radius r_Φ

- 1: Play π_0 for $N_{\text{phase 1}}$ episodes to collect the dataset $\mathcal{D}_0 := \{(x_{t,n}^{(0)}, u_{t,n}^{(0)}, x_{t+1,n}^{(0)})\}_{t=1, \dots, T}^{n=1, \dots, N_{\text{phase 1}}}$ ▷
First phase
 - 2: Set ϕ_0 via least squares (6) using \mathcal{D}_0
 - 3: $\Phi \leftarrow \mathcal{B}(\phi_0, r_\Phi)$
 - 4: **for** $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N - N_{\text{phase 1}}$ **do** ▷ Second phase
 - 5: Set $\pi_{i+1} \leftarrow \pi^*(\phi_i)$
 - 6: Play π_{i+1} to collect dataset $\mathcal{D}_{i+1} := \{(x_t^{(i+1)}, u_t^{(i+1)}, x_{t+1}^{(i+1)})\}_{t=1, \dots, T}$
 - 7: $\psi_{i+1} \leftarrow \phi_i - 8/(\lambda_{\min} \cdot i) \nabla l_{\mathcal{D}_{i+1}}(\phi_i)$, with l_D in (8)
 - 8: $\phi_{i+1} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{\phi \in \Phi} \|\phi - \psi_{i+1}\|$
-

In general, the nonlinear least squares problem (6) and policy optimization problem (4) may be computationally challenging. The focus of this work is to understand the statistical complexity of the problem rather than the computational complexity. However, it is worth noting that the online stochastic optimization procedure is computationally efficient and therefore the learner may often efficiently execute the second phase of the dynamics estimation procedure online. Additionally, for

particular systems (1) and objectives (2), the policy optimization problem (4) may be efficient. This is the case, for instance, if the optimal solution to the policy optimization problem can be achieved via feedback linearization (Charlet et al., 1989) by choosing the input to cancel out some portion of the dynamics. We consider such an example in Section 4.

Our main result bounds the regret incurred by Algorithm 1 in terms of N and $N_{\text{phase 1}}$ under the aforementioned smoothness and identifiability conditions.

Theorem 3 *Consider applying Algorithm 1 to the system (1) with initial policy π_0 satisfying Assumption 5, policy class Π satisfying Assumption 2, number of iterations N , number of initial phase episodes $N_{\text{phase 1}}$ and confidence radius r_Φ . Additionally suppose that the dynamics satisfy Assumption 1 and that the costs satisfy Assumption 3. Furthermore, suppose that the dynamics, objective, and policy class satisfy Assumption 4. Finally, suppose that the true optimal controller, π_{θ^*} , satisfies Assumption 6. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N)] \leq \text{poly}_\alpha(T, d_x, \sigma_w, L_f, L_{\text{cost}}, \lambda_{\min}^{-1}) \log N + N_{\text{phase 1}} L_{\text{cost}}$$

as long as the following both hold:

- $r_\Phi \leq \text{poly}\left(r_{\text{CE}}, r_{\text{cost}}, T^{-1}, d_x^{-1}, \sigma_w^{-1}, L_f^{-1}, L_\theta^{-1}, L_{\text{CE}}^{-1}, \lambda_{\min}\right)$,
- $N_{\text{phase 1}} \geq \text{poly}_\alpha(\log N, T, d_x, d_\Phi, \sigma_w, C_{\text{Loja}}, L_f, r_\Phi^{-1}, \lambda_{\min}^{-1}, \log B)$.

Theorem 3 states that if r_Φ is chosen small enough and the number of initial phase episodes $N_{\text{phase 1}}$ exceeds some burn-in which is polylogarithmic in N and polynomial in r_Φ^{-1} all other relevant system parameters, then the regret incurred by Algorithm 1 grows at most linearly with $\log N$ and $N_{\text{phase 1}}$. Plugging in specific choices for r_Φ and $N_{\text{phase 1}}$ yields the desired polylogarithmic regret bound for Algorithm 1.

Corollary 4 *Suppose we apply Algorithm 1 in the setting of Theorem 3 with the parameters:*

- $r_\Phi = \text{poly}\left(r_{\text{CE}}, r_{\text{cost}}, T^{-1}, d_x^{-1}, \sigma_w^{-1}, L_f^{-1}, L_\theta^{-1}, L_{\text{CE}}^{-1}, \lambda_{\min}\right)$,
- $N_{\text{phase 1}} = \text{poly}_\alpha(\log N, T, d_x, d_\Phi, \sigma_w, C_{\text{Loja}}, L_f, r_\Phi^{-1}, \lambda_{\min}^{-1}, \log B)$.

Then, Algorithm 1 achieves regret depending polylogarithmically on the number of episodes N , i.e.,

$$\text{Regret}(N) \leq \text{poly}_\alpha(\log N, T, d_x, d_\Phi, \sigma_w, C_{\text{Loja}}, L_f, L_{\text{cost}}, r_\Phi^{-1}, \lambda_{\min}^{-1}, \log B).$$

The full proof of Theorem 3 may be found in Appendix B; we provide a brief sketch below.

Proof [Proof Sketch] For $N_{\text{phase 1}}$ satisfying the given bound, the system identification results of Ziemann and Tu (2022); Lee et al. (2024b) ensure that the confidence set Φ is constructed such that $\phi_\star \in \Phi$ with probability at least $1 - 1/N$. The regret is decomposed into three parts: that of the initial exploration phase, that of the second phase under the failure event where $\phi_\star \notin \Phi$, and that of the second phase under the success event, where $\phi_\star \in \Phi$. Using the bound on the episode costs, the regret incurred from the first phase is bounded by $L_{\text{cost}} N_{\text{phase 1}}$ and the regret incurred during the second phase under the failure event $\phi_\star \notin \Phi$ is bounded by $L_{\text{cost}} (N - N_{\text{phase 1}}) \mathbb{P}[\phi_\star \notin \Phi] \leq L_{\text{cost}}$. The condition on the radius of the confidence set ensures that the prediction error is strongly convex

when the learner plays a certainty equivalent controller synthesized using any system estimate $\phi \in \Phi$. This in turn allows us to leverage the analysis of stochastic gradient descent (Robbins and Monro, 1951) to obtain a bound on the regret incurred during the second phase. Summing the contributions of the three components leads to the regret bound in Theorem 3. ■

Before proceeding, we note that while the regret of Algorithm 1 depends *polylogarithmically* on the number of episodes N , it depends *polynomially (superlinearly, even)* on the episode length T . Intuitively, one might expect a sublinear dependence on T since increasing T increases the number of interactions the learner has with the system. The polynomial dependence on T arises because we consider an episodic setting without mixing assumptions within episodes. Indeed, under such mixing assumptions, growing length of the episode does reduce the identification error (Ziemann and Tu, 2022). Therefore, by imposing stronger assumptions which lead to mixing, such as stability of the initial and optimal policies, one can likely achieve a sublinear dependence on T . We leave formalizing this to future work.

4. Numerical Validation

4.1. Toy Experiment

We provide an simple example to illustrate the fast regret rates attained by Algorithm 1. For more experiments, see section 4.2. Consider the two-dimensional nonlinear system

$$x_{t+1} = x_t + 5 \exp\left(-\|x_t - \phi^*\|^2\right) \frac{x_t - \phi^*}{\|x_t - \phi^*\|} + u_t + w_t \quad (9)$$

where $x_t, u_t, w_t, \phi^* \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and with $x_1 = [0 \ 0]^\top$. The noise w_t has a standard normal distribution. We choose the unknown parameter $\phi^* = [0.25 \ 0.25]^\top$.

In this experiment, we use the horizon $T = 10$ and the number of episodes $N = 3000$. We will consider the quadratic cost functions

$$\begin{aligned} c_t(x, u) &= \|x\|^2 \quad \text{for } t = 1, \dots, T, \\ c_{T+1}(x) &= \|x\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The policy class Π consists of controllers parameterized by the dynamics estimate $\hat{\phi}$, with

$$\pi_{\hat{\phi}}(x) = - \left(x + 5 \exp\left(-\|x_t - \hat{\phi}\|^2\right) \frac{x_t - \hat{\phi}}{\|x_t - \hat{\phi}\|} \right). \quad (10)$$

It can be shown that the dynamics (9) and policy class (10) satisfy Assumption 6. Our initial policy π_0 plays the controller π_{ϕ} corresponding to $\phi = [0 \ 0]^\top$, which can be shown to satisfy Assumption 5. In place of choosing $N_{\text{phase 1}}$ or r_{Φ} according to Theorem 1, we heuristically set $N_{\text{phase 1}} = 100$ and $r_{\Phi} = 0.2$. We note that the dynamics are not uniformly bounded globally, however they are uniformly bounded with high probability.

Under this choice of cost function and policy class, the learner's objective is to keep the system near the origin. Figure 1 illustrates the performance (measured in terms of regret) of Algorithm 1 on the toy dynamical system. The first plot shows that, after the initial $N_{\text{phase 1}}$ -episode initial phase, the excess cost incurred per round begins to decay quickly, leading to the regret growing

polylogarithmically with N . The second plot is included to better illustrate the regret attained by Algorithm 1; after the initial phase, the average regret appears to grow as a polynomial of the logarithm of the iteration. This toy example highlights the fast regret rates attained by Algorithm 1.




Figure 1: Average regret incurred by Algorithm 1 on the toy dynamical system (9), versus iterations and $\log(\text{iterations})$, respectively. The mean over 30 runs is shown, with the standard error shaded.

4.2. Cartpole Experiment

In this section, we complement our simple numerical example with an implementation of Algorithm 1 on a cartpole system defined by the dynamics:

$$(M + m)(\ddot{p} + b_p \dot{p}) + ml \cos(\theta)(\ddot{\theta} + b_\theta \dot{\theta}) = m l \dot{\theta}^2 \sin(\theta) + u, \quad (11)$$

$$m \cos(\theta)(\ddot{p} + b_p \dot{p}) + ml(\ddot{\theta} + b_\theta \dot{\theta}) = mg \sin(\theta). \quad (12)$$

Here, p is the position of the cart, θ is the angle of the pole from the upright position, u is the control force; the state vector is given by $x = [p \ \dot{p} \ \theta \ \dot{\theta}]^\top$ and the input is given by u . Also, M is the mass of the cart, m is the mass of the pole, l is the length of the pole, g is the acceleration due to gravity, b_x is the friction coefficient for the cart, and b_θ is the friction coefficient for the pole. We discretize the system using the Euler approach using a timestep of $dt = 0.2$. We also include additive zero mean Gaussian noise with covariance $0.05I_4$. The unknown parameters are $\phi^* = [M \ m \ l \ b_x \ b_\theta]^\top = [1 \ 0.1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1]^\top$. For every episode, the system starts from the upright position, given by the state $x_0 = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]^\top$. The desired behavior is to keep the pole upright with the cart positioned at the origin for a time horizon of $T = 20$ timesteps. This behavior is described by the quadratic cost functions $c_t(x, u) = \|x\|^2 + 0.1u^2$, $c_{T+1}(x) = \|x\|^2$.




Figure 2: The first plot shows average cost incurred by Algorithm 1 on the cartpole system (11) - (12), versus iterations. The mean over 30 runs is shown in blue, with standard error shaded. The cost of a "best-in-class" controller is shown with the dashed black line. The second and third plots show average regret versus iterations and the logarithm of iterations, respectively.

Our exploitation policy class II is given by neural networks with layer sizes (4, 64, 64, 64, 1) and ReLU activation functions. For computational reasons, in place of directly solving for the certainty equivalent policy for each parameter estimate ϕ_i , we simultaneously update a dynamics estimate ϕ_i and train our control parameters θ_i as follows. At each iteration, we update our estimate of ϕ_i as in Algorithm 1 to get a new estimate ϕ_{i+1} ; we then use the Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2014) to train a new set of control parameters θ_{i+1} to minimize the cost functions using trajectories sampled with the dynamics ϕ_{i+1} (in place of ϕ^*), warm-starting the optimizer with the previous control parameters θ_i . The initial exploration policy π_0 is given by bounded random noise scaled to match a predefined energy budget over the time horizon T ; we choose a budget of $0.1T$. Finally, to illustrate the performance of our algorithm, we trained a "best-in-class" controller π^* using trajectories sampled with the true dynamics ϕ^* .

In this experiment, we use the horizon $T = 20$ and the number of episodes $N = 300$. Finally, we note that in place of choosing the number of initial phase episodes $N_{\text{phase 1}}$, the confidence radius r_Φ , and the step sizes η_i according to Theorem 4 and Algorithm 1, we heuristically set $N_{\text{phase 1}} = 1$, $r_\Phi = 1$, and $\eta_i = 100/(100 + i)$. The cost of each controller was evaluated by sampling 10000 trajectories and using the average cost; for computational reasons, we chose to only evaluate the cost every 10 iterations.

Figure 2 illustrates the cost incurred by Algorithm 1 on the cartpole system. The first plot shows that the cost of the controllers chosen by Algorithm 1 converges to the cost of π^* quickly, which in turn leads to sublinear regret as demonstrated in the second plot. We note that unlike the example in Section 4.1, the plot of regret versus logarithm of iteration does not show the same linear growth. This is due to two main reasons: first, we observed higher variance in estimating the costs of our cartpole controllers via sampling, leading to higher estimation error in both the average performance of Algorithm 1 as well as the optimal cost; second, due to the nonconvexity of optimizing neural network weights, our policy optimization steps were inexact, introducing additional discrepancies with our theory. However, the overall trend of fast convergence to the optimal control cost using a greedy algorithm is clear, and supports the behavior predicted by our theory. This cartpole experiment verifies that Algorithm 1 works on simple physical systems in practice.

5. Conclusion

We have introduced Algorithm 1 for online learning in a broad class of nonlinear dynamical systems. We have also proven a general sufficient condition for polylogarithmic regret under a natural curvature condition — when the Fisher information matrix at the optimal policy is positive definite (detailed in our Assumption 6) — and show that polylogarithmic regret is achieved by our Algorithm 1. Finally, we have verified the performance of Algorithm 1 on a toy dynamical system and show that it achieves a fast regret rate in practice. Future work could extend these results to the single-trajectory setting. In particular, it could be interesting to extend the $\log^2 N$ regret rates of Cassel et al. (2020) and Lee et al. (2024a) in the single-trajectory partially known linear setting to the setting with nonlinear dynamics. Another exciting avenue for future work is to design an online learning algorithm which deploys optimal experiment design techniques (Wagenmaker et al., 2024) to optimally balance exploration and exploitation. Doing so may result in algorithms which automatically determine whether Assumption 6 is satisfied. Such an algorithm could achieve logarithmic regret if possible, and otherwise achieve \sqrt{N} regret. Additionally, it may be possible to show improved dependence on the system-theoretic constants by using this approach.

Acknowledgements

BL and NM are supported by NSF Award SLES-2331880, NSF CAREER award ECCS-2045834 and AFOSR Award FA9550-24-1-0102. IZ is supported by a Swedish Research Council international postdoc grant.

References

- Nicholas M Boffi, Stephen Tu, and Jean-Jacques E Slotine. Regret bounds for adaptive nonlinear control. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 471–483. PMLR, 2021.
- Apostolos N Burnetas and Michael N Katehakis. Optimal adaptive policies for markov decision processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 22(1):222–255, 1997.
- Asaf Cassel, Alon Cohen, and Tomer Koren. Logarithmic regret for learning linear quadratic regulators efficiently. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1328–1337. PMLR, 2020.
- B Charlet, J Levine, and R Marino. On dynamic feedback linearization. *Systems & Control Letters*, 13(2):143–151, 1989.

- Christoph Dann and Emma Brunskill. Sample complexity of episodic fixed-horizon reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.
- Sarah Dean, Horia Mania, Nikolai Matni, Benjamin Recht, and Stephen Tu. On the sample complexity of the linear quadratic regulator. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 20(4): 633–679, 2020.
- Mohamad Kazem Shirani Faradonbeh, Ambuj Tewari, and George Michailidis. Finite time identification in unstable linear systems. *Automatica*, 96:342–353, 2018.
- AA Feldbaum. Dual Control Theory. I. *Avtomatika i Telemekhanika*, 21(9):1240–1249, 1960a.
- AA Feldbaum. Dual Control Theory. II. *Avtomatika i Telemekhanika*, 21(11):1453–1464, 1960b.
- Dylan Foster, Tuhin Sarkar, and Alexander Rakhlin. Learning nonlinear dynamical systems from a single trajectory. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 851–861. PMLR, 2020.
- Aurélien Garivier, Pierre Ménard, and Gilles Stoltz. Explore first, exploit next: The true shape of regret in bandit problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 44(2):377–399, 2019.
- Yassir Jedra and Alexandre Proutiere. Minimal expected regret in linear quadratic control. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 10234–10321. PMLR, 2022.
- Nan Jiang, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Alekh Agarwal, John Langford, and Robert E. Schapire. Contextual decision processes with low Bellman rank are PAC-learnable. In Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1704–1713. PMLR, 06–11 Aug 2017. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v70/jiang17c.html>.
- Sham Kakade, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Kendall Lowrey, Motoya Ohnishi, and Wen Sun. Information theoretic regret bounds for online nonlinear control. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15312–15325, 2020.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *CoRR*, abs/1412.6980, 2014. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:6628106>.
- Jens Kober, J Andrew Bagnell, and Jan Peters. Reinforcement learning in robotics: A survey. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 32(11):1238–1274, 2013.
- Tze Leung Lai. Asymptotically efficient adaptive control in stochastic regression models. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 7(1):23–45, 1986.
- Tze Leung Lai and Herbert Robbins. Asymptotically efficient adaptive allocation rules. *Advances in applied mathematics*, 6(1):4–22, 1985.
- Sahin Lale, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Babak Hassibi, and Anima Anandkumar. Logarithmic regret bound in partially observable linear dynamical systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:20876–20888, 2020.

- Sahin Lale, Peter I Renn, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Babak Hassibi, Morteza Gharib, and Anima Anandkumar. FALCON: Fourier adaptive learning and control for disturbance rejection under extreme turbulence. *npj Robot*, 2(1), September 2024.
- Bruce Lee, Anders Rantzer, and Nikolai Matni. Nonasymptotic regret analysis of adaptive linear quadratic control with model misspecification. In *6th Annual Learning for Dynamics & Control Conference*, pages 980–992. PMLR, 2024a.
- Bruce D Lee, Ingvar Ziemann, George J Pappas, and Nikolai Matni. Active learning for control-oriented identification of nonlinear systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09030*, 2024b.
- Woei Lin, PR Kumar, and TI Seidman. Will the self-tuning approach work for general cost criteria? *Systems & control letters*, 6(2):77–85, 1985.
- Lennart Ljung. *System identification: theory for the user*. PTR Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1999.
- Horia Mania, Michael I Jordan, and Benjamin Recht. Active learning for nonlinear system identification with guarantees. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(32):1–30, 2022.
- Jungseul Ok, Alexandre Proutiere, and Damianos Tranos. Exploration in structured reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 27730–27744, 2022.
- Jan Willem Polderman. On the necessity of identifying the true parameter in adaptive lq control. *Systems & control letters*, 8(2):87–91, 1986.
- Herbert Robbins and Sutton Monro. A Stochastic Approximation Method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22(3):400 – 407, 1951. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177729586. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729586>.
- Vincent Roulet and Alexandre d’Aspremont. Sharpness, restart and acceleration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- Yahya Sattar and Samet Oymak. Non-asymptotic and accurate learning of nonlinear dynamical systems. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(140):1–49, 2022.
- David Silver, Julian Schrittwieser, Karen Simonyan, Ioannis Antonoglou, Aja Huang, Arthur Guez, Thomas Hubert, Lucas Baker, Matthew Lai, Adrian Bolton, et al. Mastering the game of go without human knowledge. *nature*, 550(7676):354–359, 2017.
- Max Simchowitz and Dylan Foster. Naive exploration is optimal for online lqr. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8937–8948. PMLR, 2020.
- Max Simchowitz, Horia Mania, Stephen Tu, Michael I Jordan, and Benjamin Recht. Learning without mixing: Towards a sharp analysis of linear system identification. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pages 439–473. PMLR, 2018.

- Lenart Treven, Cansu Sancaktar, Sebastian Blaes, Stelian Coros, and Andreas Krause. Optimistic active exploration of dynamical systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:38122–38153, 2023.
- Andrew Wagenmaker, Guanya Shi, and Kevin G Jamieson. Optimal exploration for model-based rl in nonlinear systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Haike Xu, Tengyu Ma, and Simon Du. Fine-grained gap-dependent bounds for tabular mdps via adaptive multi-step bootstrap. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4438–4472. PMLR, 2021.
- Yuxiang Yang, Ken Caluwaerts, Atil Iscen, Tingnan Zhang, Jie Tan, and Vikas Sindhwani. Data efficient reinforcement learning for legged robots. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1–10. PMLR, 2020.
- Dongruo Zhou, Quanquan Gu, and Csaba Szepesvari. Nearly minimax optimal reinforcement learning for linear mixture markov decision processes. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4532–4576. PMLR, 2021.
- Ingvar Ziemann and Henrik Sandberg. Regret lower bounds for learning linear quadratic gaussian systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024.
- Ingvar Ziemann and Stephen Tu. Learning with little mixing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:4626–4637, 2022.
- Ingvar Ziemann, Stephen Tu, George J Pappas, and Nikolai Matni. Sharp rates in dependent learning theory: Avoiding sample size deflation for the square loss. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.

Appendix A. Slow Learning

Here, we consider a more general setting where the assumption that the optimal policy has a positive definite Fisher Information (Assumption 6) does not necessarily hold. In this setting, the approach of Section 3 fails, because the prediction error is no longer necessarily locally strongly convex near the optimal solution. Consequently, the result of the previous section no longer applies to achieve polylogarithmic regret. Instead, we propose an algorithm for which the learner incurs regret scaling with the square root of the number of interactions.

A.1. Additional Assumptions

To present the result for the setting where Assumption 6 does not necessarily hold, we strengthen the condition on the initial policy from that in Assumption 5 to the following.

Assumption 7 (*Initial Lojasiewicz policy*). Fix some positive constant C_{Loja} . The learner has access to a policy $\pi_0 \in \Pi$ which is $(C_{Loja}, 1/2)$ -Lojasiewicz.

In particular, we restrict attention to settings where the Lojasiewicz condition holds with parameter $1/2$. This means that estimation error grows quadratically with the parameter error. The assumption is made for ease of exposition. It would instead suffice to keep Assumption 5 and additionally assume that there exists a policy in the policy class which has a positive definite Fisher Information¹. Then by using the optimal experiment design procedure of Lee et al. (2024b), one could find the policy with a positive definite Fisher information, which satisfies the Lojasiewicz condition with parameter $\alpha = 1/2$.

A.2. Algorithm and Regret Bound

Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7, we give an algorithm with $\text{Regret}(N) = O(\sqrt{N} \log N)$. This algorithm is based on an "explore then commit" procedure in which the algorithm explores for some number of episodes to collect an initial dataset to synthesize a control policy $\hat{\pi}$, then plays $\hat{\pi}$ for the remainder of the episodes.

Algorithm 2 Explore-Then-Commit

Require: Initial policy π_0 , policy class Π , number of episodes N

- 1: Play π_0 for \sqrt{N} episodes to collect the dataset $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \{(x_t, u_t, x_{t+1})\}_{t=1, n=1}^{T, \sqrt{N}}$.
 - 2: Set $\hat{\phi}$ as the least squares estimate (6) using the dataset \mathcal{D} .
 - 3: Set $\hat{\pi} \leftarrow \pi^*(\hat{\phi})$.
 - 4: Play $\hat{\pi}$ for the remaining $N - \sqrt{N}$ episodes.
-

Algorithm 2 is simpler than Algorithm 1, and just includes a single step of parameter estimation rather than continuously refining. We characterize the regret incurred by Algorithm 2 as follows.

Theorem 5 Consider applying Algorithm 2 to the system (1) with initial policy π_0 satisfying Assumption 7, policy class Π satisfying Assumption 2 for N episodes. Suppose that the dynamics satisfy Assumption 1 and that the costs satisfy Assumption 3. Furthermore, suppose that the dynamics, objective, and policy class satisfy Assumption 4. Then there exists polynomial function $\text{poly}_{\text{burn in}}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N)] \leq \text{poly}(L_{\pi^*}, L_f, \log B, L_\theta, L_{\text{cost}}, \sigma_w, \sigma_w^{-1}, T, d_x, d_\phi, \log N) \sqrt{N}.$$

1. Note that this is still substantially less restrictive than assuming that the optimal policy satisfies such a condition.

as long as $N \geq \text{poly}_{\text{burn in}}(\sigma_w, d_x, d_\phi, \log B, L_f, \log(\sigma_w^{-1}), \log N, C_{\text{Loja}}, r_{\text{CE}}^{-1}, r_{\text{cost}}(\phi^*)^{-1})$.

This result follows by noting that the exploration phase incurs a regret proportional to the number of exploration episodes, \sqrt{N} . For the exploitation phase, we leverage the smoothness of the cost functions, policy classes, and dynamics, to show that the excess cost incurred from a certainty equivalent policy scales quadratically with the estimation error $\|\hat{\phi} - \phi_\star\|$. Meanwhile, the system identification bounds of Lee et al. (2024b) demonstrate that the estimation error decays with $1/\sqrt{K}$ when K trajectories are used to fit $\hat{\phi}$ (neglecting system constants and log terms). By setting $K = \sqrt{N}$, we find that $\|\hat{\phi} - \phi_\star\|$ scales with $1/N^{1/4}$. Then the regret incurred in the exploration phase is $N \times \|\hat{\phi} - \phi_\star\|^2 \lesssim N \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} = \sqrt{N}$, where \lesssim hides logarithmic quantities and problem constants. Summing the regrets in the exploration phase with the exploitation phase then also results in a bound scaling with \sqrt{N} . See Appendix A.3 for a rigorous proof.

A.3. Proof of Theorem 5

To prove Theorem 5 we first state two lemmas from Lee et al. (2024b).

Lemma 1 (Lemma A.1 of Lee et al. (2024b)) *Suppose Assumption 1 holds, and let $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$. Let $\hat{\phi}$ be the least squares estimate from (6) using K episodes of data collected with a $(C_{\text{Loja}}, \alpha)$ policy. There exists a polynomial function poly_α which depends on α such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\|\hat{\phi} - \phi_\star\|^2 \leq \left(\frac{512\sigma_w^2}{TK} \left(d_x + d_\phi \log \left(\frac{4BL_fTK}{\sigma_w\delta} \right) \right) \right)^\alpha.$$

as long as $K \geq \tau_{\text{Err}}(\delta) = \text{poly}_\alpha(\sigma_w, d_x, d_\phi, \log(B), L_f, C_{\text{Loja}}, \log(K), \log \frac{1}{\delta})$.

Lemma 2 (Modified from Lemma 3.1 of Lee et al. (2024b)) *Suppose Assumptions 1-4 hold. Then for $\hat{\phi} \in \mathcal{B}(\phi^*, \min\{r_{\text{cost}}(\phi^*), r_{\text{CE}}\})$,*

$$\mathcal{J}(\pi^*(\hat{\phi}), \phi^*) - \mathcal{J}(\pi^*(\phi^*), \phi^*) \leq C_{\text{cost}} \|\hat{\phi} - \phi^*\|^2, \quad (13)$$

where $C_{\text{cost}} = \text{poly}(L_{\pi^*}, L_f, L_\theta, L_{\text{cost}}, \sigma_w^{-1}, T, d_x)$.

Proof The proof follows as in the proof of Lemma 3.1 of Lee et al. (2024b); however, the third order Taylor expansion is replaced with a second order expansion. \blacksquare

Armed with these results, we proceed to prove Theorem 5. To begin, decompose the regret into the event conditioned on the success event of Lemma 1 that holds with probability at least $1 - 1/N$, and the regret conditioned on the complement of that event. The condition to apply Lemma 1 is satisfied due to the burn-in condition on N . Denote the success event $\mathcal{E}_{\text{success}}$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N)] &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\text{success}}) \mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N) \mid \mathcal{E}_{\text{success}}] + (1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\text{success}})) \mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N) \mid \mathcal{E}_{\text{success}}^c] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N) \mid \mathcal{E}_{\text{success}}] + (1/N)NL_{\text{cost}} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n=1}^N (J(\pi_n, \phi^*) - \min_{\pi \in \Pi} J(\pi, \phi^*)) \mid \mathcal{E}_{\text{success}} \right] + L_{\text{cost}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the probability bound on the failure event, and the fact that the cost incurred during each episode is bounded by L_{cost} . We may further decompose the cost into the cost incurred during the exploration phase (episodes 1 to \sqrt{N}) and the cost incurred in the exploitation phase \sqrt{N} to N . Leveraging the fact that the costs are bounded, we may therefore bound the cost incurred during the exploration phase by $\sqrt{N}L_{\text{cost}}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N)] &\leq L_{\text{cost}} + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\sqrt{N}} (J(\pi_0, \phi^*) - \min_{\pi \in \Pi} J(\pi, \phi^*)) \mid \mathcal{E}_{\text{success}} \right] \\
 &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n=\sqrt{N}+1}^N (J(\pi^*(\hat{\phi}), \phi^*) - \min_{\pi \in \Pi} J(\pi, \phi^*)) \mid \mathcal{E}_{\text{success}} \right] \\
 &= L_{\text{cost}} + \sqrt{N} \mathbb{E} \left[(J(\pi_0, \phi^*) - \min_{\pi \in \Pi} J(\pi, \phi^*)) \mid \mathcal{E}_{\text{success}} \right] \\
 &\quad + (N - \sqrt{N}) \mathbb{E} \left[(J(\pi^*(\hat{\phi}), \phi^*) - \min_{\pi \in \Pi} J(\pi, \phi^*)) \mid \mathcal{E}_{\text{success}} \right] \\
 &\leq L_{\text{cost}} + \sqrt{N}L_{\text{cost}} + N \mathbb{E} \left[(J(\pi^*(\hat{\phi}), \phi^*) - \min_{\pi \in \Pi} J(\pi, \phi^*)) \mid \mathcal{E}_{\text{success}} \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\phi}$ is the parameter estimate from Algorithm 2 of Algorithm 2. To continue the proof, we need to bound the term:

$$N \mathbb{E} \left[J(\pi^*(\hat{\phi}), \phi^*) - \min_{\pi \in \Pi} J(\pi, \phi^*) \mid \mathcal{E}_{\text{success}} \right],$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{\text{success}}$ denotes the event where the estimation error $\|\hat{\phi} - \phi^*\|$ is small, as guaranteed by Lemma 1. Under the event $\mathcal{E}_{\text{success}}$, from Lemma 1, it holds that

$$\|\hat{\phi} - \phi^*\|^2 \leq \frac{512\sigma_w^2}{T\sqrt{N}} \left(d_x + d_\phi \log \left(\frac{4BL_f T \sqrt{N}}{\sigma_w \delta} \right) \right) \leq \frac{C_{\text{identification}}}{\sqrt{N}},$$

where $C_{\text{identification}} := \text{poly}(\sigma_w, d_x, d_\phi, \log(B), \log(L_f), \log(T), \log(N))$. From Lemma 2, it holds that for $\hat{\phi}$ within a neighborhood of ϕ^* ,

$$J(\pi^*(\hat{\phi}), \phi^*) - J(\pi^*(\phi^*), \phi^*) \leq C_{\text{cost}} \|\hat{\phi} - \phi^*\|^2.$$

In particular, it suffices to use the bound on $\|\hat{\phi} - \phi^*\|$ along with the burn-in condition on N to ensure that $\|\hat{\phi} - \phi^*\|$ is small enough to instantiate Lemma 2. Substituting this bound into the overall regret bound, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N)] &\leq L_{\text{cost}}(1 + \sqrt{N}) + N \mathbb{E} \left[J(\pi^*(\hat{\phi}), \phi^*) - J(\pi^*(\phi^*), \phi^*) \mid \mathcal{E}_{\text{success}} \right] \\
 &\leq L_{\text{cost}}(1 + \sqrt{N}) + C_{\text{identification}} C_{\text{cost}} \sqrt{N}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude:

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N)] \leq \text{poly}(L_{\pi^*}, L_f, \log(B), L_\theta, L_{\text{cost}}, \sigma_w, \sigma_w^{-1}, T, d_x, d_\phi, \log(N)) \sqrt{N}.$$

Appendix B. Proofs for Fast Learning

B.1. Results for Persistently Exciting Systems

Before proving Theorem 3, we state and prove some useful results for systems for which the optimal controller is persistently exciting.

The following results show that if the optimal controller $\pi_{\theta^*}(\phi^*)$ is persistently exciting (Assumption 6), then all controllers π_θ , where θ is in an open ball centered around θ^* , are also persistently exciting.

Lemma 3 *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$,*

$$\left\| D_\theta \left(D_\Phi^{(2)} \text{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi^*) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2TL_f^2 L_\theta + \frac{T^2 L_f^3 L_\theta \sqrt{d_x}}{\sigma_w}.$$

Proof Since the dynamics are rolled out under π_θ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & D_\theta \left(D_\Phi^{(2)} \text{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi^*) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \\ &= D_\theta \left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*)^\top Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) \right] \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \\ &= D_\theta \left(\int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*)^\top Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) \right) p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Here $p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1})$ is the density of the trajectory $x_{1:T+1}$ under dynamics ϕ^* and controller π_θ and can be written as:

$$p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_w \sqrt{2\pi}} \right)^T \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_w^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \right) \quad (15)$$

By the dominated convergence theorem, followed by the product rule, we may rewrite (14) as:

$$\begin{aligned} & D_\theta \left(D_\Phi^{(2)} \text{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi^*) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \\ &= \int \left(D_\theta \left(\left(\sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*)^\top Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) \right) p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right) d(x_{1:T+1}) \\ &= \int \left(D_\theta \left(\sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*)^\top Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right) p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \\ &\quad + \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*)^\top Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) \right) \left(D_\theta \left(p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) I \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right) d(x_{1:T+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We proceed by bounding the operator norms of the two integrals in equation (16). To bound the operator norm of the first integral, we apply Jensen's inequality followed by Assumptions 1 and 2:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| \int \left(D_\theta \left(\sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*)^\top Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right) p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \right\|_{\text{op}} \\
 & \leq \int \left\| \left(D_\theta \left(\sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*)^\top Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right) \right\|_{\text{op}} p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \\
 & \leq 2TL_f^2 L_\theta
 \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

To bound the operator norm of the second integral, we first apply Jensen's inequality, followed by the submultiplicative property of operator norm, followed by the identity $\nabla g(x) = g(x) \nabla \log g(x)$ for $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*)^\top Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) \right) \left(D_\theta \left(p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) I \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right) d(x_{1:T+1}) \right\|_{\text{op}} \tag{18} \\
 & \leq \int \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*)^\top Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) \right\|_{\text{op}} \left\| D_\theta \left(p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) I \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right\|_{\text{op}} d(x_{1:T+1}) \\
 & = \int \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*)^\top Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) \right\|_{\text{op}} \left\| \nabla_\theta \left(p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right\| d(x_{1:T+1}) \\
 & = \int \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*)^\top Df(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) \right\|_{\text{op}} \left\| \nabla_\theta \left(\log p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right\| p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \\
 & \leq TL_f^2 \int \left\| \nabla_\theta \left(\log p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right\| p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1})
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, we substitute (15) for the density $p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1})$, then apply the triangular inequality, followed by Assumptions 1 and 2:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & TL_f^2 \int \left\| \nabla_\theta \left(\log p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right\| p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \tag{19} \\
 & = TL_f^2 \int \left\| \nabla_\theta \left(\log \left(\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_w \sqrt{2\pi}} \right)^T \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_w^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \right) \right) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right\| p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \\
 & = \frac{TL_f^2}{2\sigma_w^2} \int \left\| \nabla_\theta \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right\| p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \\
 & = \frac{TL_f^2}{\sigma_w^2} \int \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T (f(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) - x_{t+1})^\top (D_u f(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*)) (D_\theta \pi_\theta(x_t)) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right\| p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \\
 & \leq \frac{TL_f^3 L_\theta}{\sigma_w^2} \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) - x_{t+1}\| \right) p_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1})
 \end{aligned}$$

We can bound the remaining integral with the expected norm of a Gaussian random vector $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_w^2 I)$:

$$\frac{TL_f^3 L_\theta}{\sigma_w^2} \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, \pi_\theta(x_t), \phi^*) - x_{t+1}\| \right) p_{\pi_\theta^*}^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \leq \frac{T^2 L_f^3 L_\theta \sqrt{d_x}}{\sigma_w} \quad (20)$$

Combining our bounds for the first and second integrals in (16), we conclude:

$$\left\| D_\theta \left(D_\Phi^{(2)} \text{Err}_{\pi_\theta^*}^{\phi^*}(\phi^*) \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2TL_f^2 L_\theta + \frac{T^2 L_f^3 L_\theta \sqrt{d_x}}{\sigma_w} \quad (21)$$

■

The following results demonstrate that, for any persistent exciting controller π , the prediction error of dynamics ϕ (using trajectories collected with controller π) is locally strongly convex near the true dynamics ϕ^* . These results allow us to analyze the second phase of our algorithm through the lens of online convex optimization.

Lemma 4 *Assume that Assumption 1 holds. Then for any controller π , and all $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\Phi}$,*

$$\left\| D_\Phi^{(3)} \text{Err}_\pi^{\phi^*}(\phi) \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq 6TL_f^2 + 2TL_f^2 \|\phi - \phi^*\| + 2TL_f \sigma_w \sqrt{d_x}.$$

Proof By the dominated convergence theorem followed by the product rule, the second derivative of the prediction error for dynamics ϕ under controller π , evaluated at ϕ , is:

$$\begin{aligned} & D_\Phi^{(2)} \left(\mathbb{E}_\pi^{\phi^*} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \right] \right) \Big|_{\phi=\phi} \\ &= D_\Phi^{(2)} \left(\int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \right) p_{\pi, \phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \right) \Big|_{\phi=\phi} \\ &= \int \left(D_\Phi^{(2)} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \right) \Big|_{\phi=\phi} \right) p_{\pi, \phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \quad (22) \\ &= \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(2D_\Phi f(x_t, u_t, \phi)^\top D_\Phi f(x_t, u_t, \phi) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 2(f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1})^\top D_\Phi^{(2)} f(x_t, u_t, \phi) \right) \right) p_{\pi, \phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating this once more with respect to ϕ , we find:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & D_{\Phi}^{(3)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi}^{\phi^*} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \right] \right) \Big|_{\phi=\phi} \\
 &= D_{\Phi} \left(\int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(2D_{\Phi} f(x_t, u_t, \phi)^{\top} D_{\Phi} f(x_t, u_t, \phi) \right. \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. \left. + 2(f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1})^{\top} D_{\Phi}^{(2)} f(x_t, u_t, \phi) \right) \right) p_{\pi, \phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \right) \Big|_{\phi=\phi} \quad (23) \\
 &= \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(6D_{\Phi} f(x_t, u_t, \phi)^{\top} D_{\Phi}^{(2)} f(x_t, u_t, \phi) \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. + 2(f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1})^{\top} D_{\Phi}^{(3)} f(x_t, u_t, \phi) \right) \right) p_{\pi, \phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1})
 \end{aligned}$$

Splitting the integral, and using the triangular inequality, Assumption 1, and the submultiplicative property of the operator norm, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(6D_{\Phi} f(x_t, u_t, \phi)^{\top} D_{\Phi}^{(2)} f(x_t, u_t, \phi) \right. \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. \left. + 2(f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1})^{\top} D_{\Phi}^{(3)} f(x_t, u_t, \phi) \right) \right) p_{\pi, \phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \right\|_{\text{op}} \quad (24) \\
 &\leq 6TL_f^2 + 2L_f \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1}\| \right) p_{\pi, \phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1})
 \end{aligned}$$

Rewriting this, and applying the triangular inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & 6TL_f^2 + 2L_f \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1}\| \right) p_{\pi, \phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \\
 &= 6TL_f^2 + 2L_f \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left\| f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - f(x_t, u_t, \phi^*) \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. + f(x_t, u_t, \phi^*) - x_{t+1} \right\| \right) p_{\pi, \phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \quad (25) \\
 &\leq 6TL_f^2 + 2L_f \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - f(x_t, u_t, \phi^*)\| \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi^*) - x_{t+1}\| \right) p_{\pi, \phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1})
 \end{aligned}$$

Using Assumption 1 and the expected norm of a Gaussian random variable,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & 6TL_f^2 + 2L_f \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - f(x_t, u_t, \phi^*)\| \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi^*) - x_{t+1}\| \right) p_{\pi, \phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \\
 & \leq 6TL_f^2 + 2TL_f^2 \|\phi - \phi^*\| + 2L_f \int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi^*) - x_{t+1}\| \right) p_{\pi, \phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \\
 & \leq 6TL_f^2 + 2TL_f^2 \|\phi - \phi^*\| + 2TL_f \sigma_w \sqrt{d_x}
 \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

■

Lemma 5 Assume that Assumptions 1, 2, 6 hold. Let λ_{\min} be defined as in Assumption 6. Define

$$r_\theta \triangleq \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{4TL_f^2 L_\theta + \left(\frac{2T^2 L_f^3 L_\theta \sqrt{d_x}}{\sigma_w} \right)} \quad \text{and} \quad r_\Phi \triangleq \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{32TL_f^2 + 8TL_f \sigma_w \sqrt{d_x}} \right\}.$$

Suppose $\theta \in \mathcal{B}(\theta^*, r_\theta)$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{B}(\phi^*, r_\Phi)$. Then,

$$D_\Phi^{(2)} \text{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi) \triangleq D_\Phi^{(2)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, u_t, \phi) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \right] \right) \succeq \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{4} I_{d_\Phi}.$$

In other words, for all θ sufficiently close to the optimal controller parameters θ^* , the prediction error under π_θ is strongly convex on a neighborhood around ϕ^* .

Proof We begin by restating the contents of Assumption 6:

$$D_\Phi^{(2)} \text{Err}_{\pi_{\theta^*}}^{\phi^*}(\phi^*) \succeq \lambda_{\min} I_{d_\Phi} \tag{27}$$

We proceed by using the smoothness of the error function with respect to the policy parameter, and the operator norm bound proved in Lemma 3, and obtain:

$$D_\Phi^{(2)} \text{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi^*) \succeq \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{2} I_{d_\Phi} \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \mathcal{B}(\theta^*, r_\theta) \tag{28}$$

Next, note that $r_\Phi \leq 1$ implies that $\left\| D_\Phi^{(3)} \text{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi) \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq 8TL_f^2 + 2TL_f \sigma_w \sqrt{d_x}$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{B}(\phi^*, r_\Phi)$, by Lemma 4. We use this operator norm bound and the smoothness of the error function with respect to the dynamics parameter, and conclude:

$$D_\Phi^{(2)} \text{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi) \succeq \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{4} I_{d_\Phi} \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \mathcal{B}(\theta^*, r_\theta) \text{ and } \phi \in \mathcal{B}(\phi^*, r_\Phi) \tag{29}$$

■

Equipped with these results, we now prove that the estimates ϕ_1, ϕ_2, \dots produced during the online stochastic optimization procedure in the second phase of Algorithm 1 converge at a fast rate to the true dynamics ϕ^* . The following descent lemma shows that each gradient step reduces the expected distance between the dynamics estimate ϕ_i and the true dynamics ϕ^* .

Lemma 6 *Assume that Assumption 1 holds. Then, for any controller π and dynamics estimate ϕ ,*

- $\mathbb{E}_{D_\pi}[\nabla l_{D_\pi}(\phi)] = \nabla_{\Phi} \text{Err}_\pi^{\phi^*}(\phi),$
- $\mathbb{E}_{D_\pi}[\|\nabla l_{D_\pi}(\phi)\|^2] \leq 4T^2 L_f^4 \|\phi - \phi^*\|^2 + 8T^2 L_f^3 \sigma_w \sqrt{d_x} \|\phi - \phi^*\| + 4L_f^2 T^2 \sigma_w^2 d_x.$

Here, $D_\pi = \{(x_t, \pi(x_t), x_{t+1})\}_{t=1, \dots, T}$ is a random variable representing a single trajectory of data collected under the policy π . Additionally, define

$$G_6 \triangleq 4T^2 L_f^4 + 8T^2 L_f^3 \sigma_w \sqrt{d_x} + 4L_f^2 T^2 \sigma_w^2 d_x,$$

such that for all ϕ with $\|\phi - \phi^*\| \leq 1$, we have $\mathbb{E}_{D_\pi}[\|\nabla l_{D_\pi}(\phi)\|^2] \leq G_6.$

Proof To prove the first claim, we expand the expectation using (8), then exchange integral and derivative using the dominated convergence theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{D_\pi}[\nabla l_{D_\pi}(\phi)] &= \int \nabla_{\Phi} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \right) p_\pi^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \\ &= \nabla_{\Phi} \left(\int \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \right) p_\pi^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \right) \\ &= \nabla_{\Phi} \text{Err}_\pi^{\phi^*}(\phi) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

To prove the second claim, we first expand the expectation using (8):

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{D_\pi}[\|\nabla l_{D_\pi}(\phi)\|^2] \\ &= \int \left\| \nabla_{\Phi} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi) - x_{t+1}\|^2 \right) \right\|^2 p_\pi^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \\ &= 4 \int \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi)^\top (f(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi) - x_{t+1}) \right\|^2 p_\pi^{\phi^*}(x_{1:T+1}) d(x_{1:T+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Applying the triangular inequality, then Assumption 1, we may upper bound the integrand as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T Df(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi)^\top (f(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi) - x_{t+1}) \right\|^2 \\
 & \leq \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\left\| Df(x_s, \pi(x_s), \phi)^\top (f(x_s, \pi(x_s), \phi) - x_{s+1}) \right\| \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left\| Df(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi)^\top (f(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi) - x_{t+1}) \right\| \right) \\
 & \leq L_f^2 \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_s, \pi(x_s), \phi) - x_{s+1}\| \|f(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi) - x_{t+1}\|
 \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Next, by the triangular inequality and Assumption 1, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|f(x_s, \pi(x_s), \phi) - x_{s+1}\| & \leq \|f(x_s, \pi(x_s), \phi) - f(x_s, \pi(x_s), \phi^*)\| + \|f(x_s, \pi(x_s), \phi^*) - x_{s+1}\| \\
 & \leq L_f \|\phi - \phi^*\| + \|f(x_s, \pi(x_s), \phi^*) - x_{s+1}\|
 \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

(and likewise for the t index). Therefore, we can bound (32) as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & L_f^2 \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_s, \pi(x_s), \phi) - x_{s+1}\| \|f(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi) - x_{t+1}\| \\
 & \leq T^2 L_f^4 \|\phi - \phi^*\|^2 + T L_f^3 \|\phi - \phi^*\| \cdot \sum_{s=1}^T \|f(x_s, \pi(x_s), \phi^*) - x_{s+1}\| \\
 & \quad + T L_f^3 \|\phi - \phi^*\| \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi^*) - x_{t+1}\| \\
 & \quad + L_f^2 \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{t=1}^T \|f(x_s, \pi(x_s), \phi^*) - x_{s+1}\| \|f(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi^*) - x_{t+1}\|
 \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Since $f(x_t, \pi(x_t), \phi^*) - x_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_w^2 I)$, we may substitute (34) back into (31) to obtain the upper bound:

$$\mathbb{E}_D \left[\|\nabla l_D(\phi)\|^2 \right] \leq 4T^2 L_f^4 \|\phi - \phi^*\|^2 + 8T^2 L_f^3 \sigma_w \sqrt{d_x} \|\phi - \phi^*\| + 4L_f^2 T^2 \sigma_w^2 d_x \tag{35}$$

■

Lemma 7 Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2, and 6 hold. Let λ_{\min} be defined as in Assumption 6. Let r_θ and r_Φ be defined as in Lemma 5. Let $\theta \in B(\theta^*, r_\theta)$. Let $\Phi \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\phi^*, r_\Phi)$ be a convex set such that $\phi^* \in \Phi$, and fix some $\phi_i \in \Phi$. Finally, let $\eta_i > 0$ be some step size.

Next, define the random variables ψ_{i+1} and ϕ_{i+1} such that

- $\psi_{i+1} = \phi_i - \eta_i \nabla l_{D_\theta}(\phi_i)$, where $D_\theta \sim P_\theta$, where P_θ is the distribution of trajectories under π_θ ,
- $\phi_{i+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\phi \in \Phi} \|\phi - \psi_{i+1}\|$.

Then,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\phi_{i+1} - \phi^*\|^2 \right] \leq G_6 \eta_i^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{4} \eta_i \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\phi_i - \phi^*\|^2 \right]. \quad (36)$$

where G_6 is defined in Lemma 6. Here, the randomness is taken with respect to P_θ , the distribution of trajectories under π_θ .

Proof We begin by recalling Lemma 5, which states that $\operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi)$ is $\frac{\lambda_{\min}}{4}$ -strongly convex on $\mathcal{B}(\phi^*, r_\Phi)$ as long as $\theta \in \mathcal{B}(\theta^*, r_\theta)$. By the first-order condition for a $\frac{\lambda_{\min}}{4}$ -strongly convex function, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi_2) &\geq \operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi_1) + (\nabla_{\Phi} \operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi_1))^\top (\phi_2 - \phi_1) \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{8} \|\phi_2 - \phi_1\|^2 \quad \text{for all } \phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\phi^*, r_\Phi) \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Rearranging the first order strong convexity condition (37) with $\phi_1 = \phi_i$ and $\phi_2 = \phi^*$, and applying Lemma 6, we have that for any fixed values of ϕ_i , ψ_{i+1} , and ϕ_{i+1} :

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi_i) &\leq \operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi^*) - (\nabla_{\Phi} \operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi_i))^\top (\phi^* - \phi_i) - \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{8} \|\phi^* - \phi_i\|^2 \\ &= \operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi^*) - (\mathbb{E}[\nabla l_{D_\theta}(\phi_i)])^\top (\phi^* - \phi_i) - \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{8} \|\phi^* - \phi_i\|^2 \\ &= \operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi^*) - \frac{1}{\eta_i} (\mathbb{E}[\phi_i - \psi_{i+1}])^\top (\phi^* - \phi_i) - \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{8} \|\phi^* - \phi_i\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Applying the three-point identity $2(c-b)^\top(a-b) = \|b-a\|^2 - \|c-a\|^2 + \|c-b\|^2$ with $a = \phi^*$, $b = \phi_i$, and $c = \psi_{i+1}$, we rearrange (38) to obtain:

$$\operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi_i) \leq \operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi^*) + \frac{1}{2\eta_i} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\|\phi_i - \phi^*\|^2 - \|\psi_{i+1} - \phi^*\|^2 + \|\phi_i - \psi_{i+1}\|^2 \right] - \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{8} \|\phi^* - \phi_i\|^2. \quad (39)$$

Next, observe that $\phi^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\Phi}} \operatorname{Err}_{\pi^*}^{\phi^*}(\phi)$ for all controllers π (this fact is a result of the bias-variance decomposition of the square loss). Using this to rearrange (39), we obtain an upper bound on $\mathbb{E} \left[\|\psi_{i+1} - \phi^*\|^2 \right]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\psi_{i+1} - \phi^*\|^2 \right] &\leq 2\eta_i \left(\operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi^*) - \operatorname{Err}_{\pi_\theta}^{\phi^*}(\phi_i) \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\|\phi_i - \phi^*\|^2 + \|\phi_i - \psi_{i+1}\|^2 \right] - \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{4} \eta_i \|\phi^* - \phi_i\|^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{4} \eta_i \right) \|\phi_i - \phi^*\|^2 + \|\phi_i - \psi_{i+1}\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Next, we write $\mathbb{E}\left[\|\phi_i - \psi_{i+1}\|^2\right]$ as the second moment of the gradient estimator, and bound with Lemma 6 (also using the fact that $r_\Phi \leq 1$ implies that $\|\phi - \phi^*\| \leq 1$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{B}(\phi^*, r_\Phi)$):

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\phi_i - \psi_{i+1}\|^2\right] = \eta_i^2 \mathbb{E}\left[\|\nabla l_{D_\theta}(\phi_i)\|^2\right] \leq G_6 \eta_i^2. \quad (41)$$

Combining (40) and (41), and using that ϕ_{i+1} is the projection of ψ_{i+1} onto a convex set Φ containing ϕ^* (which implies that $\|\phi_{i+1} - \phi^*\| \leq \|\psi_{i+1} - \phi^*\|$), we conclude:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\phi_{i+1} - \phi^*\|^2\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\|\psi_{i+1} - \phi^*\|^2\right] \leq G_6 \eta_i^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{4} \eta_i\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\|\phi_i - \phi^*\|^2\right] \quad (42)$$

■

B.2. Proof of Theorem 3

We will now proceed to prove our main result, the polylogarithmic regret bound for Algorithm 1.

Suppose the confidence radius r_Φ given to Algorithm 1 satisfies:

$$r_\Phi \leq \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ r_{\text{CE}}, r_{\text{cost}}, \frac{r_\theta}{L_{\text{CE}}}, r_\Phi \right\} \quad (43)$$

and that the number of initial phase episodes $N_{\text{phase 1}}$ given to Algorithm 1 satisfies:

$$N_{\text{phase 1}} \geq \max \left\{ \tau_{\text{Err}}(\delta), \frac{C_{\text{Err}} \sigma^2 \left(d_x + d_\Phi \log \left(\frac{L_f T N}{\delta} \right) \right)}{T r_\Phi^{1/\alpha}} \right\} \quad \text{for some } \delta > 0 \quad (44)$$

Inverting Lemma 1, we can show that with the above choices of $N_{\text{phase 1}}$ and Φ , we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following hold simultaneously:

- $\phi^* \in \Phi$;
- $\Phi \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\phi^*, \min\{r_{\text{CE}}, r_\Phi, \frac{r_\theta}{L_{\text{CE}}}\})$, which, together with Assumption 4, implies that the local strong convexity guarantees of Lemma 5 hold;
- $\Phi \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\phi^*, r_{\text{cost}})$, which implies that Φ only contains policies close enough to ϕ^* in order to bound the suboptimality $J(\pi_{\theta^*(\phi)}, \phi^*) - J(\pi_{\theta^*}, \phi^*)$ as a quadratic function of $\|\phi - \phi^*\|$.

Denote by $E_{\text{phase 1}}$ the event that the above are satisfied after the first phase of Algorithm 1.

Next, we will analyze the regret incurred by Algorithm 1 (denoted $\text{Regret}(N)$) under the events $E_{\text{phase 1}}^{\text{C}}$ and $E_{\text{phase 1}}$.

If the first phase fails. Conditioning on the event $E_{\text{phase 1}}^{\text{C}}$, we can apply Assumption 3 for a crude upper bound:

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N) \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}^{\text{C}}] \leq N L_{\text{cost}}. \quad (45)$$

If the first phase succeeds. Conditioning on the event $E_{\text{phase 1}}$, we can proceed to unroll Lemma 7 to show that the estimates $\phi_0, \phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_i, \dots$ converge at a fast $\frac{1}{i}$ rate to the true dynamics ϕ^* in the second phase (continuous refinement phase).

We will solve for η_i and a universal constant $A \geq 0$ such that for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$, it holds that if $\mathbb{E}\left[\|\phi_i - \phi^*\|^2 \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}\right] \leq \frac{A}{i}$ and we choose a step size of η_i for the i^{th} gradient step, then $\mathbb{E}\left[\|\phi_{i+1} - \phi^*\|^2 \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}\right] \leq \frac{A}{i+1}$. Here, the expectations are taken over the randomness of the gradient oracle and the system noise, and conditioned on the success of the first phase. The proof follows the standard analysis of stochastic gradient descent, with the standard descent lemma replaced by our Lemma 7. Applying Lemma 7:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\|\phi_{i+1} - \phi^*\|^2 \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}\right] &\leq G_6 \eta_i^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{4} \eta_i\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\|\phi_i - \phi^*\|^2 \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}\right] \\ &\leq G_6 \eta_i^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{4} \eta_i\right) \frac{A}{i}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

To show that $\mathbb{E}\left[\|\phi_{i+1} - \phi^*\|^2 \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}\right] \leq \frac{A}{i+1}$, it suffices to show $G_6 \eta_i^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{4} \eta_i\right) \frac{A}{i} \leq \frac{A}{i+1}$. Rearranging, it can be shown that the choices $\eta_i = \frac{8}{\lambda_{\min} i}$ and $A \geq \frac{64G_6}{\lambda_{\min}^2}$ suffices. To explicitly bound $\mathbb{E}\left[\|\phi_i - \phi^*\|^2 \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}\right]$, we note that the success of the first phase implies that $\|\phi_i - \phi^*\| \leq 2r_\Phi$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$; in particular, we use that $\|\phi_1 - \phi^*\| \leq 2r_\Phi$. Combining results yields the explicit upper bound:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\phi_i - \phi^*\|^2 \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}\right] \leq \frac{1}{i} \max\left\{\frac{64G_6}{\lambda_{\min}^2}, 4r_\Phi^2\right\}. \quad (47)$$

i.e., conditioning on the event $E_{\text{phase 1}}$, the dynamics estimation error $\mathbb{E}\left[\|\phi_i - \phi^*\|^2 \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}\right]$ decays as $O(\frac{1}{i})$ in the second phase of Algorithm 1.

Next, we show that an $O(\frac{1}{i})$ rate of dynamics estimation error translates to an $O(\log i)$ cumulative regret rate during the second phase of Algorithm 1. By the success of the first phase (in particular, that $\Phi = \mathcal{B}(\phi_0, r_\Phi) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\phi^*, \min\{r_{\text{cost}}, r_{\text{CE}}\})$), we may apply Lemma 2 to obtain:

$$J(\pi_{\theta^*}(\phi_i), \phi^*) - J(\pi_{\theta^*}, \phi^*) \leq C_{\text{cost}} \left\| \hat{\phi} - \phi^* \right\|^2 \quad (48)$$

Taking conditional expectations (with respect to $E_{\text{phase 1}}$) on both sides, and combining with (47), we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[J(\pi_{\theta^*}(\phi_i), \phi^*) - J(\pi_{\theta^*}, \phi^*) \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}\right] \leq \frac{C_{\text{cost}}}{i} \max\left\{\frac{64G_6}{\lambda_{\min}^2}, 4r_\Phi^2\right\} \quad (49)$$

We thus conclude:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N) \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}] &\leq N_{\text{phase 1}} L_{\text{cost}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-N_{\text{phase 1}}} \left(\frac{C_{\text{cost}}}{i} \max\left\{\frac{64G_6}{\lambda_{\min}^2}, 4r_\Phi^2\right\} \right) \\ &\leq N_{\text{phase 1}} L_{\text{cost}} + C_{\text{cost}} \max\left\{\frac{64G_6}{\lambda_{\min}^2}, 4r_\Phi^2\right\} \log N. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

In other words, conditioning on the success of the first phase, Algorithm 1 achieves logarithmic regret in our online nonlinear control setting.

Choosing δ to balance the regret. Finally, we find a specific choice of δ such that $\mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N)]$ is logarithmic in N . We begin by conditioning with respect to $E_{\text{phase 1}}$ and applying the upper bounds (45) and (50):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N)] &= (1 - \mathbb{P}(E_{\text{phase 1}}))\mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N) \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}^c] + \mathbb{P}(E_{\text{phase 1}})\mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N) \mid E_{\text{phase 1}}] \\ &\leq \delta N L_{\text{cost}} + N_{\text{phase 1}} L_{\text{cost}} + C_{\text{cost}} \max \left\{ \frac{64G_6}{\lambda_{\min}^2}, 4r_{\Phi}^2 \right\} \log N. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

We conclude by considering the choice $\delta = \frac{1}{N}$. Then, (51) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(N)] &\leq L_{\text{cost}} + N_{\text{phase 1}} L_{\text{cost}} + C_{\text{cost}} \max \left\{ \frac{64G_6}{\lambda_{\min}^2}, 4r_{\Phi}^2 \right\} \log N \\ &= \text{poly}_{\alpha}(T, d_x, \sigma_w, L_f, L_{\text{cost}}, \lambda_{\min}^{-1}) \log N + N_{\text{phase 1}} L_{\text{cost}} \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

as long as (43) and (44) hold with $\delta = \frac{1}{N}$, i.e.,

$$r_{\Phi} \leq \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ r_{\text{CE}}, r_{\text{cost}}, \frac{r_{\theta}}{L_{\text{CE}}}, r_{\Phi} \right\} = \text{poly} \left(r_{\text{CE}}, r_{\text{cost}}, T^{-1}, d_x^{-1}, \sigma_w^{-1}, L_f^{-1}, L_{\theta}^{-1}, L_{\text{CE}}^{-1}, \lambda_{\min} \right) \quad (53)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\text{phase 1}} &\geq \max \left\{ \tau_{\text{Err}} \left(\frac{1}{N} \right), \frac{C_{\text{Err}} \sigma^2 (d_x + 2d_{\Phi} \log(L_f T N))}{T r_{\Phi}^{1/\alpha}} \right\} \\ &= \text{poly}_{\alpha}(\log N, T, d_x, d_{\Phi}, \sigma_w, C_{\text{Loja}}, L_f, r_{\Phi}^{-1}, \lambda_{\min}^{-1}, \log B) \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$