
Off-Policy Exploitability-Evaluation and Equilibrium-Learning in Two-Player Zero-Sum Markov Games

Kenshi Abe
CyberAgent, Inc.
Shibuya, Tokyo
abe_kenshi@cyberagent.co.jp

Yusuke Kaneko
CyberAgent, Inc.
Shibuya, Tokyo
kaneko_yusuke@cyberagent.co.jp

Abstract

Off-policy evaluation (OPE) is the problem of evaluating new policies using historical data obtained from a different policy. Off-policy learning (OPL), on the other hand, is the problem of finding an optimal policy using historical data. In recent OPE and OPL contexts, most of the studies have focused on one-player cases, and not on more than two-player cases. In this study, we propose methods for OPE and OPL in two-player zero-sum Markov games. For OPE, we estimate exploitability that is often used as a metric for determining how close a strategy profile is to a Nash equilibrium in two-player zero-sum games. For OPL, we calculate maximin policies as Nash equilibrium strategies over the historical data. We prove the exploitability estimation error bounds for OPE and regret bounds for OPL based on the doubly robust and double reinforcement learning estimators. Finally, we demonstrate the effectiveness and performance of the proposed methods through experiments.

1 Introduction

Off-policy evaluation (OPE) is the problem of evaluating new policies using historical data obtained from a different policy. Off-policy learning (OPL), on the other hand, is the problem of finding an optimal policy using historical data. Because online policy evaluation and learning are usually expensive or risky in various applications of reinforcement learning (RL), such as medicine [22] and education [21], OPE and OPL are attracting considerable interest [1, 14, 15, 19, 31, 32, 36]. In recent OPE and OPL contexts, most of the studies have focused on one-player cases, and not on more than two-player cases.

Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (MARL) is a generalization of single-agent RL for multi-agent environments. It is widely applicable to situations where there are multi-agent interactions, such as security games, auctions, and negotiations. In recent years, MARL has achieved many successes in Go [28, 29] and poker [3, 4]. MARL is a field with potential applications in society, such as automated driving [27].

In this study, we propose methods for OPE and OPL in two-player zero-sum Markov games (TZMG), which is one of the problems dealt with in MARL. In general, existing OPE methods in RL estimate the discounted value of a new policy. Unlike these methods, for OPE in MARL, we evaluate a strategy profile by estimating exploitability, which is a metric for determining how close a strategy profile is to a Nash equilibrium in TZMG because estimating the discounted value is ineffective when the policy of the other player is unknown. For OPL, we estimate equilibrium policies as optimal policies by computing the maximin policies over the historical data. We prove exploitability estimation error bounds for OPE and exploitability bounds for the estimated strategy profiles for OPL based on the

following representative estimators: importance sampling (IS), marginalized importance sampling (MIS), doubly robust (DR), and double reinforcement learning (DRL) estimators. All the proofs are shown in Appendix B. To demonstrate the effectiveness of our methods, we experiment using these methods on benchmark problems. In both OPE and OPL, the results show that the methods based on DRL generally outperform the other estimator-based methods.

Related work: In the context of OPE, there are many previous focusing on the theoretical properties of estimators, such as IS [9], MIS [35], DR [5–7, 11, 20, 25, 32], and DRL [12, 13] estimators. In particular, DRL has the crucial advantage of using Markov properties to avoid the curse of horizon. The main difference between these studies and this study is that we propose a method for OPE in MARL. There are several studies on OPL in bandit problems or RL [1, 15, 31, 36]. This study proposes the OPL method in multi-agent settings. Nash-Q learning [10] and Minimax-Q learning [17, 18] are learning algorithms, with a proven convergence, that can calculate equilibrium even in offline environments. Unlike these studies, we derive the bounds of the exploitability of learned strategy profiles, depending on the number of trajectories. Some studies assume situations in which the historical data is obtained in multi-agent environments [16, 24, 34]. However, these studies focus on inverse RL.

2 Preliminary

2.1 Two-player zero-sum Markov game

A two-player zero-sum Markov game (TZMG) is defined as a tuple $\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, P_I, P_T, P_R, \gamma \rangle$, where \mathcal{S} represents a finite state space, \mathcal{A}_i represents an action space for player i ($i \in \{1, 2\}$), $P_I : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ represents an initial state distribution, $P_T : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ represents a transition probability function, P_R represents a reward distribution with $R : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ being a mean reward function, and $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ represents a discount factor. We define $r \sim P_R(s, a^1, a^2)$ as a player 1's reward for taking actions a^1 and a^2 at state s , and define $-r$ as a player 2's reward. Let $\pi_i : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_i \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a stationary policy for player i and let $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2)$ be a strategy profile or a *policy profile*. The T -step discounted value of the policy profile (π_1, π_2) for each player is represented as follows:

$$v_1(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_1, \pi_2} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} r_t \right], \quad v_2(\pi_1, \pi_2) = -v_1(\pi_1, \pi_2).$$

We further define the state value function of state s_t at step t ($1 \leq t \leq T$) as follows:

$$V_{1,t}(s_t) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_1, \pi_2} \left[\sum_{k=t}^T \gamma^{k-t} r_k | s_t \right], \quad V_{2,t}(s_t) = -V_{1,t}(s_t).$$

Based on the state value function, we define the state-action value function of taking actions a_t^1 and a_t^2 at state s_t as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{1,t}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2) &= R(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2) + \mathbb{E}_{P_T} [\gamma V_{1,t+1}(s_{t+1}) | s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2], \\ Q_{2,t}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2) &= -Q_{1,t}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2). \end{aligned}$$

2.2 Nash equilibrium and exploitability

In this study, we define optimal policies as *Nash equilibria* [23]. In TZMGs, a Nash equilibrium $\pi^* = (\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*)$ ensures the following condition:

$$\forall \pi_1 \in \Omega_1, \forall \pi_2 \in \Omega_2, v_1(\pi_1^*, \pi_2) \geq v_1(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*) \geq v_1(\pi_1, \pi_2^*), \quad (1)$$

where Ω_1 and Ω_2 are the *whole policy sets*, i.e., the sets of all possible policies for players 1 and 2, respectively. The best response is a policy for player i that is optimal against π_{-i} , where π_{-i} is a policy for a player other than i . Here, we introduce the value known as *exploitability*, which is a metric for measuring how close a policy profile π is to a Nash equilibrium $\pi^* = (\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*)$ in two-player zero-sum games. Formally, the exploitability of π_1, π_2 is represented as follows:

$$v^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) = (v_1(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*) - \min_{\pi_2' \in \Omega_2} v_1(\pi_1, \pi_2')) + (v_2(\pi_2^*, \pi_2^*) - \min_{\pi_1' \in \Omega_1} v_2(\pi_1', \pi_2))$$

$$= \max_{\pi'_1 \in \Omega_1} v_1(\pi'_1, \pi_2) + \max_{\pi'_2 \in \Omega_2} v_2(\pi_1, \pi'_2).$$

Note that when we calculate the exploitability $v^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1, \pi_2)$, we only need to calculate the best response values $\max_{\pi_1 \in \Omega_1} v_1(\pi_1, \pi_2^e)$, $\max_{\pi_2 \in \Omega_2} v_2(\pi_1^e, \pi_2)$ without calculating the discounted values of the Nash equilibrium $v_1(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*)$, $v_2(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*)$.

3 Off-policy evaluation and learning in two-player zero-sum Markov games

3.1 Data generating process

In this study, we assume that we can observe the *historical data*

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(s_{i,1}, a_{i,1}^1, a_{i,1}^2, r_{i,1}, \dots, s_{i,T}, a_{i,T}^1, a_{i,T}^2, r_{i,T}, s_{i,T+1})\}_{i=1}^n,$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the number of sampled trajectories. The data is sampled using a fixed policy profile $\pi^b = (\pi_1^b, \pi_2^b)$. We refer to this policy profile as a *behavior policy profile*. The data generating process is then defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{D} \sim P_I(s_1) \prod_{t=1}^T \pi_1^b(a_t^1 | s_t) \pi_2^b(a_t^2 | s_t) P_R(r_t | s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2) P_T(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2).$$

In most of the studies related to OPE, the goal is to estimate the discounted value of a given *target policy* from the historical data. However, this goal is not appropriate for multi-agent environments because, in general, in TZMGs, the policy of the opponent player is unknown, and one may play a game against a different policy than the target policy. In this case, the discounted value of the target policy depends critically on the opponent player's policy. Therefore, when the opponent policy is unknown, it is not worth estimating the discounted value against a specific policy. In this study, for OPE in TZMGs, we estimate the exploitability of a given *target policy profile* $\pi^e = (\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)$ from the historical data instead of estimating the discounted value. In other words, we estimate the value against the worst opponent policy. For the same reason as in OPE, maximizing the discounted value against a specific policy is not an appropriate goal for OPL in TZMGs. For OPL in TZMGs, we estimate maximin policies as follows:

$$\pi_1^* = \arg \max_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} \min_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} v_1(\pi_1, \pi_2), \quad \pi_2^* = \arg \max_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} \min_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} v_2(\pi_1, \pi_2),$$

where $\Pi_1 \subset \Omega_1, \Pi_2 \subset \Omega_2$ are the policy classes for players 1 and 2, respectively. According to Equation (1), when $\Pi_1 = \Omega_1$ and $\Pi_2 = \Omega_2$, the policy profile (π_1^*, π_2^*) is a Nash equilibrium. We also define $\Pi = \Pi_1 \times \Pi_2$ and $v_{\Pi}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \max_{\pi'_1 \in \Pi_1} v_1(\pi'_1, \pi_2) + \max_{\pi'_2 \in \Pi_2} v_2(\pi_1, \pi'_2)$.

Notation: We abbreviate terms like $V_1(s_t)$ as $V_{1,t}$. For $\pi \in \Pi$, we recursively define the marginal state-action distribution $p_t^\pi(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2)$ at step t as follows:

$$p_t^\pi(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2) = \pi_1(a_t^1 | s_t) \pi_2(a_t^2 | s_t) \sum_{s_{t-1} \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{a_{t-1}^1 \in \mathcal{A}_1} \sum_{a_{t-1}^2 \in \mathcal{A}_2} P_T(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}^1, a_{t-1}^2) p_{t-1}^\pi(s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}^1, a_{t-1}^2),$$

where $p_1^\pi(s_1, a_1^1, a_1^2) = \pi_1(a_1^1 | s_1) \pi_2(a_1^2 | s_1) P_I(s_1)$. We define the density ratio as $\eta_k = \frac{\pi_1^e(a_k^1 | s_k) \pi_2^e(a_k^2 | s_k)}{\pi_1^b(a_k^1 | s_k) \pi_2^b(a_k^2 | s_k)}$, cumulative density ratio as $\rho_t = \prod_{k=1}^t \eta_k$, and marginal density ratio as $\mu_t = \frac{p_t^{\pi^e}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2)}{p_t^{\pi^b}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2)}$. We denote the estimators of π_1^b , π_2^b , μ_t , and $Q_{1,t}$ as $\hat{\pi}_1^b$, $\hat{\pi}_2^b$, $\hat{\mu}_t$ and $\hat{Q}_{1,t}$,

respectively. By using $\hat{\pi}_1^b$ and $\hat{\pi}_2^b$, we define $\hat{\rho}_t = \prod_{k=1}^t \frac{\pi_1^e(a_k^1 | s_k) \pi_2^e(a_k^2 | s_k)}{\hat{\pi}_1^b(a_k^1 | s_k) \hat{\pi}_2^b(a_k^2 | s_k)}$. Finally, we use the notation $\mathbb{E}_n[f(X)] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i)$ as an empirical average. In the proofs presented in this study, we make the following assumptions regarding the overlaps of the policies and bounds of rewards and estimators:

Assumption 1. $0 \leq \eta_t \leq C$, $|r_t| \leq R_{\max}$ for all $1 \leq t \leq T$.

Assumption 2. $0 \leq \hat{\rho}_t \leq C^t$, $0 \leq \hat{\mu}_t \leq C^t$, $0 \leq |\hat{Q}_{1,t}| \leq (T+1-t)R_{\max}$ for all $1 \leq t \leq T$.

3.2 Efficiency bound in two-player zero-sum Markov games

In this subsection, we discuss the (semiparametric) efficiency bound, which is the lower bound of the asymptotic mean squared error (MSE) of OPE, among regular \sqrt{n} -consistent estimators. Following the general literature [33], we discuss the efficiency bound of OPE in TZMGs. An efficiency bound is defined for estimators under several conjectured models of the data generating process. If the conjectured model is parametric, the efficiency bound is equal to the Cramér-Rao lower bound. Even if the conjectured model is non-parametric or semi-parametric, we can still define a corresponding Cramér-Rao lower bound. Here, we introduce the following theorem from [12].

Theorem 1 (Efficiency bound in TZMGs). *The efficiency bound of $v_1(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)$ in TZMGs is*

$$\Upsilon_{\text{EB}} = \mathbb{V}[V_{1,1}] + \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\gamma^{2(t-1)} \mu_t^2 \mathbb{V}[r_t + \gamma V_{1,t+1} | s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2]],$$

where $V_{1,T+1} = 0$.

3.3 Representative off-policy value estimators and properties

In this study, we propose methods for OPE and OPL based on the IS, MIS, DM, DR, and DRL estimators. For simplicity, we refer to these estimators as *off-policy value* estimators. In this subsection, we summarize each estimator and the asymptotic properties of the DR and DRL estimators.

Importance sampling estimator: An IS estimator is represented as follows:

$$\hat{v}_1^{\text{IS}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = \mathbb{E}_n \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \hat{\rho}_t r_t \right], \hat{v}_2^{\text{IS}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = -\hat{v}_1^{\text{IS}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e).$$

When the behavior policy profile is known, i.e., $\hat{\rho}_t = \rho_t$, the IS estimator is an unbiased and consistent estimator of $v_1(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)$ and $v_2(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)$. However, in general, the variance of the IS estimator grows exponentially with respect to the horizon T [11].

Marginalized importance sampling estimator: A MIS estimator is represented as follows:

$$\hat{v}_1^{\text{MIS}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = \mathbb{E}_n \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \hat{\mu}_t r_t \right], \hat{v}_2^{\text{MIS}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = -\hat{v}_1^{\text{MIS}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e).$$

The MIS estimator can be regarded as one of the IS-type estimators. Although the MIS estimator addresses the curse of horizon by exploiting the Markov decision process (MDP) structure, it is inefficient [12, 35].

Direct method estimator: A DM estimator is represented as follows:

$$\hat{v}_1^{\text{DM}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = \mathbb{E}_n \left[\mathbb{E}_{\pi^e} [\hat{Q}_{1,1}(s_1, a_1^1, a_1^2) | s_1] \right], \hat{v}_2^{\text{DM}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = -\hat{v}_1^{\text{DM}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e).$$

The DM estimator is not consistent if $\hat{Q}_{1,1}$ is not consistent, and it is not unbiased if $\hat{Q}_{1,1}$ is not correct.

Doubly robust estimator: In this study, we extend a DR estimator for the MDPs proposed by [11] to one for TZMGs. For the theoretical guarantees, we consider the *cross-fitting* version of the DR estimator. We split the historical data into K evenly-sized folds. Next, for each fold k , we construct estimators $\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}$ and $\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}$ based on all the data except fold k . We define the DR estimator as follows:

$$\hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = \mathbb{E}_n \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left(\hat{\rho}_t^{-k(i)} \left(r_t - \hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2) \right) + \hat{\rho}_{t-1}^{-k(i)} \hat{V}_t^{-k(i)}(s_t) \right) \right],$$

$$\hat{v}_2^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = -\hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e),$$

where $\hat{V}_t^{-k(i)}(s_t) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi^e} [\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2) | s_t]$ and $k(i)$ denotes the fold that contains the i -th data. By extending the proof of Theorem 4 in [12] to the TZMG case, we can easily show the asymptotic property of the DR estimator.

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic property of the DR estimator). *Suppose $1 \leq t \leq T, 1 \leq k \leq K, \|\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k} - Q_{1,t}\|_2 = o_p(n^{-\alpha_1}), \|\hat{\rho}_t^{-k} - \rho_t\|_2 = o_p(n^{-\alpha_2})$, where $\alpha_1 > 0, \alpha_2 > 0, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \geq 1/2$. Then, $\sqrt{n}(\hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - v_1(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Upsilon^{\text{DR}})$ and $\sqrt{n}(\hat{v}_2^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - v_2(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Upsilon^{\text{DR}})$, where $\Upsilon^{\text{DR}} = \mathbb{V}[V_{1,1}] + \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\gamma^{2(t-1)} \rho_t^2 \mathbb{V}[r_t + \gamma V_{1,t+1} | s_1, a_1^1, a_1^2, \dots, s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2]]$ and $V_{1,T+1} = 0$.*

Double reinforcement learning estimator: In addition to the DR estimator, we extend a DRL estimator with cross-fitting for MDPs proposed by [12] to one for TZMGs. The DRL estimator is defined as follows:

$$\hat{v}_1^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = \mathbb{E}_n \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left(\hat{\mu}_t^{-k(i)} \left(r_t - \hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2) \right) + \hat{\mu}_{t-1}^{-k(i)} \hat{V}_{1,t}^{-k(i)}(s_t) \right) \right],$$

$$\hat{v}_2^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = -\hat{v}_1^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e).$$

By extending the proof of Theorem 10 in [12] to the TZMG case, we can again show the asymptotic property of the DRL estimator.

Theorem 3 (Efficiency of the DRL estimator). *Suppose $1 \leq t \leq T, 1 \leq k \leq K, \|\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k} - Q_{1,t}\|_2 = o_p(n^{-\alpha_1}), \|\hat{\mu}_t^{-k} - \mu_t\|_2 = o_p(n^{-\alpha_2})$, where $\alpha_1 > 0, \alpha_2 > 0, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \geq 1/2$. Then, $\sqrt{n}(\hat{v}_1^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - v_1(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Upsilon_{\text{EB}})$ and $\sqrt{n}(\hat{v}_2^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - v_2(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Upsilon_{\text{EB}})$ where Υ_{EB} is an efficiency bound in Theorem 1.*

According to this result, the DRL estimator is efficient under mild assumptions, whereas the IS, MIS, DM, and DR estimators may be inefficient.

4 Exploitability evaluation

For OPE in TZMGs, by applying the DRL off-policy value estimator, we define the following estimator of the exploitability of π^e :

$$\hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = \max_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} \hat{v}_1^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1, \pi_2^e) + \max_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} \hat{v}_2^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2).$$

Similarly, we define $\hat{v}_{\text{IS}}^{\text{exp}}, \hat{v}_{\text{MIS}}^{\text{exp}}, \hat{v}_{\text{DM}}^{\text{exp}}$, and $\hat{v}_{\text{DR}}^{\text{exp}}$ as the estimators based on the IS, MIS, DM, and DR off-policy value estimators, respectively. In this section, we demonstrate the exploitability estimation error bounds of $\hat{v}_{\text{DR}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)$ and $\hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)$. To obtain theoretical implications, we define the ϵ -Hamming covering number $N_H(\epsilon, \Pi)$ under the Hamming distance $H_n(\pi^a, \pi^b) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\{\bigvee_{t=1}^T \pi_1^a(s_{i,t}) \neq \pi_1^b(s_{i,t})\} \vee \{\bigvee_{t=1}^T \pi_2^a(s_{i,t}) \neq \pi_2^b(s_{i,t})\})$ and its entropy integral $\kappa(\Pi) = \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log N_H(\epsilon^2, \Pi)}$. To establish uniform error bounds on $\hat{Q}_{1,t}$ and $\hat{\mu}_t$, in the remaining theorems, we assume that $\hat{Q}_{1,t}$ and $\hat{\mu}_t$ are computed using the estimated MDP model \hat{R}, \hat{P}_T , and \hat{p}_t^b . The estimation error bounds of $\hat{v}_{\text{DR}}^{\text{exp}}$ and $\hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}$ are then obtained as follows:

Theorem 4 (Estimation error bound of $\hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)$). *Assume that (4a) for any $0 < \epsilon < 1, N_H(\epsilon, \Pi) \leq D_1 \exp(D_2(\frac{1}{\epsilon})^\omega)$ for some constants $D_1, D_2 > 0, 0 \leq \omega < 0.5$, (4b) $\kappa(\Pi) < \infty$, (4c) $1 \leq t \leq T$ and $t \leq t' \leq T$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{R}^{-k}(s_{t'}, a_{t'}^1, a_{t'}^2) \prod_{l=t}^{t'-1} \hat{P}_T^{-k}(s_{l+1} | s_l, a_l^1, a_l^2) - R(s_{t'}, a_{t'}^1, a_{t'}^2) \prod_{l=t}^{t'-1} P_T(s_{l+1} | s_l, a_l^1, a_l^2) \right)^2 \right] = o(n^{-2\alpha_1}),$$

and (4d) $1 \leq t \leq T, \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{l=1}^t \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}_1^{b,-k}(a_l^1 | s_l) \hat{\pi}_2^{b,-k}(a_l^2 | s_l)} - \prod_{l=1}^t \frac{1}{\pi_1^b(a_l^1 | s_l) \pi_2^b(a_l^2 | s_l)} \right)^2 \right] = o_p(n^{-2\alpha_2})$, where $\alpha_1 > 0, \alpha_2 > 0$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \geq 1/2$. Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0, N_\delta > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ and for all $n \geq N_\delta$:

$$|v_{\Pi}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)| \leq C \left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right) \sqrt{\Upsilon_{\text{DR}}^*/n},$$

where $\Upsilon_{\text{DR}}^* = \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} (\rho_t(r_t - Q_{1,t}) + \rho_{t-1} V_{1,t}) \right)^2 \right]$.

Theorem 5 (Estimation error bound of $\hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)$). Assume (4a)-(4c) and (5a) $1 \leq t \leq T$, $\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\prod_{t'=1}^t \hat{P}_T^{-k}(s_{t'}|s_{t'-1}, a_{t'-1}^1, a_{t'-1}^2)}{\hat{p}_{b,t}^{-k}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2)} - \frac{\prod_{t'=1}^t P_T(s_{t'}|s_{t'-1}, a_{t'-1}^1, a_{t'-1}^2)}{p_{b,t}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2)} \right)^2 \right] = o_p(n^{-2\alpha_2})$, where $\alpha_1 > 0, \alpha_2 > 0$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \geq 1/2$. Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0, N_\delta > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ and for all $n \geq N_\delta$:

$$|v_{\Pi}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)| \leq C \left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right) \sqrt{\Upsilon_{\text{DRL}}^*/n},$$

$$\text{where } \Upsilon_{\text{DRL}}^* = \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} (\mu_t(r_t - Q_{1,t}) + \mu_{t-1}V_{1,t}) \right)^2 \right].$$

In the proofs of these theorems, we mainly show the regret bounds of the estimated best responses to π_1^e and π_2^e . We show these regret bounds following the proof of [36]. Note that we do not assume that the behavior policy profile is known. Because $\Upsilon_{\text{DR}}^* = \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} (\Upsilon_{\text{DR}} + v_1^2(\pi_1, \pi_2))$ and

$\Upsilon_{\text{DRL}}^* = \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} (\Upsilon_{\text{EB}} + v_1^2(\pi_1, \pi_2))$, it is necessary to use the off-policy value estimator with a

small variance in order to reduce the exploitability estimation error. the exploitability estimation error would be small by using the off-policy value estimator with a small variance. Therefore, $\hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}$ using the efficient off-policy value estimator would result in a small error. Note that when $\Pi \neq \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, the error between the estimated exploitability and the true exploitability $v^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)$ may not converge to 0. This is because the policy profile class may not contain the true best response.

5 Equilibrium learning

In this section, we propose an algorithm for OPL based on each off-policy value estimator to calculate maximin policies as Nash equilibrium policies over the historical data. By applying the DR off-policy value estimator, we define the following estimator for the maximin policies:

$$\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DRL}} = \arg \max_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} \min_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} \hat{v}_1^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1, \pi_2), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DRL}} = \arg \max_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} \min_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} \hat{v}_2^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1, \pi_2).$$

Similarly, we define $\hat{\pi}^{\text{IS}}, \hat{\pi}^{\text{MIS}}, \hat{\pi}^{\text{DM}}$, and $\hat{\pi}^{\text{DR}}$ as the estimators based on the IS, MIS, DM, and DR off-policy value estimators, respectively. We can derive the exploitability bounds of $\hat{\pi}^{\text{DR}}$ and $\hat{\pi}^{\text{DRL}}$ similarly as in the proofs of Theorems 4 and 5.

Theorem 6 (Exploitability bound of $\hat{\pi}^{\text{DR}}$). Assume (4a)-(4d). Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0, N_\delta > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ and for all $n \geq N_\delta$:

$$v^{\text{exp}}(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}) - v^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*) \leq C \left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right) \sqrt{\Upsilon_{\text{DR}}^*/n},$$

where $\pi_1^* = \arg \max_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} \min_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} v_1(\pi_1, \pi_2)$ and $\pi_2^* = \arg \max_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} \min_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} v_2(\pi_1, \pi_2)$.

Theorem 7 (Exploitability bound of $\hat{\pi}^{\text{DRL}}$). Assume (4a)-(4c) and (5a). Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0, N_\delta > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ and for all $n \geq N_\delta$:

$$v^{\text{exp}}(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DRL}}, \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DRL}}) - v^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*) \leq C \left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right) \sqrt{\Upsilon_{\text{DRL}}^*/n},$$

where $\pi_1^* = \arg \max_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} \min_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} v_1(\pi_1, \pi_2)$ and $\pi_2^* = \arg \max_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} \min_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} v_2(\pi_1, \pi_2)$.

According to the minimax theorem, if $\Pi_1 = \Omega_1$ and $\Pi_2 = \Omega_2$, then $v^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*) = 0$. Therefore, in this case, the exploitability of the estimated policy profile asymptotically converges to 0. This means that the estimated policy profile asymptotically converges to a Nash equilibrium when $\Pi_1 = \Omega_1$ and $\Pi_2 = \Omega_2$.

6 Experiments

In this section, we conduct experiments to analyze and evaluate the proposed exploitability estimators and the equilibrium learning methods. We conduct our experiments in two environments: Repeated biased rock-paper-scissors (RBRPS) and Markov soccer [17].




Figure 1: (a) Payoff matrices and a state transition graph in repeated biased rock-paper-scissors. When the result at the first step is a draw, the payoff matrix at the second step will be the gray one. When either player wins by rock/paper/scissors, the payoff matrix at the next step will be the blue/red/green one. (b) An initial board in Markov soccer.

In all the experiments, we first prepare a policy profile π_d as a Nash equilibrium using Minimax-Q learning [17], after which we construct the behavior and target policy profiles using π_d . We use an off-policy temporal difference learning [30] to construct a Q-function model, and we use a histogram estimator for μ , as in Section 5.2 in [12]. In our experiments, we assume that the behavior policy profile is known and fixed.

6.1 Environments

RBRPS is a simple TZMG where two players play a one-shot biased rock-paper-scissors game [26] multiple times. We refer to a game that is repeated once as RBRPS1 and a game that is repeated two times as RBRPS2. Note that RBRPS1 is precisely the same as the conventional rock-paper-scissors game. Figure 1 (a) shows the payoff matrices and the state transition graph of RBRPS2. In the first step, the payoff matrix is the same as in the conventional rock-paper-scissors game. Depending on the result of the one-shot game, the next state and the payoff matrix transition. Thus, there are five states in RBRPS2.

Markov soccer is a 1 vs 1 soccer game on a 4×5 grid, as shown in Figure 1 (b). A and B denote players 1 and 2, respectively, and the circle in the figure represents the ball. In each turn, each player can move to one of the neighboring cells or stay in place, and the actions of the two players are executed in random order. When a player tries to move to the cell occupied by the other player, the possession of the ball goes to the stationary player, and the positions of both players remain unchanged. When the player with the ball reaches the goal (right of cell 10 or 15 for A, left of cell 6 or 11 for B), the player receives a reward of +1 and the opponent receives a reward of -1, and the game is over. The positions of the players and the possession of the ball are initialized as shown in Figure 1 (b).

6.2 Exploitability evaluation

In the first experiment, we compare the performance of $\hat{v}_{IS}^{\text{exp}}$, $\hat{v}_{MIS}^{\text{exp}}$, $\hat{v}_{DM}^{\text{exp}}$, $\hat{v}_{DR}^{\text{exp}}$, and $\hat{v}_{DRL}^{\text{exp}}$ in RBRPS1 and RBRPS2. We define the behavior policy profile as $\pi_1^b = 0.7\pi_1^d + 0.3\pi^r$ and $\pi_2^b = 0.7\pi_2^d + 0.3\pi^p$, where π^r is a deterministic policy that always chooses rock and π^p is one that always chooses paper. Similarly, we define the target policy profile as $\pi_1^b = 0.9\pi_1^d + 0.1\pi^r$ and $\pi_2^b = 0.5\pi_2^d + 0.5\pi^p$. We conduct ten trials using varying historical data sizes.

Tables 1 and 2 show the root-mean-squared error (RMSE) of each exploitability estimator in RBRPS1 and RBRPS2, where we highlight in bold the best estimator in each case. For further details on the results, see Appendix D. We find that $\hat{v}_{DR}^{\text{exp}}$ and $\hat{v}_{DRL}^{\text{exp}}$ generally outperform the other estimators. Note that $\hat{v}_{DRL}^{\text{exp}}$ has no advantage over $\hat{v}_{DR}^{\text{exp}}$ because a trajectory is uniquely determined by a current state. Because the exploitability evaluation requires the estimation of the best response value using the historical data, the estimation error of the discounted value must be small. Therefore, $\hat{v}_{DR}^{\text{exp}}$ and $\hat{v}_{DRL}^{\text{exp}}$ with a small estimation error of the discounted value would perform better than the other estimators.

Table 1: Off-policy exploitability evaluation in RBRPS1: RMSE.

N	$\hat{v}_{\text{IS}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{MIS}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{DM}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{DR}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}$
250	0.162	0.217	2.0×10^{-3}	1.0×10^{-3}	1.8×10^{-3}
500	0.057	0.225	1.1×10^{-4}	6.0×10^{-5}	9.7×10^{-5}
1000	0.053	0.222	1.2×10^{-8}	4.7×10^{-9}	9.9×10^{-9}

Table 2: Off-policy exploitability evaluation in RBRPS2: RMSE.

N	$\hat{v}_{\text{IS}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{MIS}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{DM}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{DR}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}$
250	48.2	9.80	7.39	10.8	6.02
500	16.0	10.6	6.00	5.23	5.20
1000	10.2	10.7	4.45	3.49	4.06

Table 3: Off-policy equilibrium learning in RBRPS: Exploitability (and standard errors).

	π^b	$\hat{\pi}^{\text{IS}}$	$\hat{\pi}^{\text{MIS}}$	$\hat{\pi}^{\text{DM}}$	$\hat{\pi}^{\text{DR}}$	$\hat{\pi}^{\text{DRL}}$
RBRPS1	1.00	0.236(0.04)	0.738(0.05)	0.058(0.01)	0.036(0.01)	0.054(0.01)
RBRPS2	39.6	29.2(5.12)	37.4(4.33)	22.5(2.49)	20.5(0.66)	19.4(0.45)

Table 4: Off-policy equilibrium learning in Markov soccer: Win rate $\times 100$ (and standard errors).

		Player 2					
		π_2^b	$\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{IS}}$	$\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{MIS}}$	$\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DM}}$	$\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}$	$\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DRL}}$
Player 1	π_1^b	48.9(0.52)	31.7(9.5)	54.2(10.7)	18.2(3.4)	22.6(3.6)	15.6(0.9)
	$\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{IS}}$	81.2(3.0)	54.9(7.9)	74.9(8.0)	46.8(6.0)	53.5(5.3)	44.7(4.7)
	$\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{MIS}}$	88.1(1.6)	65.5(6.2)	79.7(6.4)	57.8(3.7)	63.2(5.0)	55.5(3.0)
	$\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DM}}$	88.8(3.1)	65.5(6.7)	81.3(6.2)	58.3(6.0)	67.0(4.5)	56.7(4.9)
	$\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}$	89.0(3.0)	70.0(5.5)	82.0(5.6)	60.8(5.8)	66.2(6.0)	57.5(4.1)
	$\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DRL}}$	92.2(1.5)	69.8(5.9)	82.5(5.8)	63.6(4.5)	71.0(5.1)	62.4(3.2)

6.3 Equilibrium learning

In the second experiment, we analyze the performance of our OPL methods in RBRPS1, RBRPS2, and Markov soccer. We compare the five policy profiles $\hat{\pi}^{\text{IS}}$, $\hat{\pi}^{\text{MIS}}$, $\hat{\pi}^{\text{DM}}$, $\hat{\pi}^{\text{DR}}$, and $\hat{\pi}^{\text{DRL}}$.

In the experiments on RBRPS1 and RBRPS2, we define the behavior policy profile as $\pi_1^b = 0.5\pi_1^d + 0.5\pi^r$ and $\pi_2^b = 0.5\pi_2^d + 0.5\pi^p$. We define the policy classes as $\Pi_1 = \Omega_1$, $\Pi_2 = \Omega_2$ in RBRPS1, and set them to $\Pi_1 = \{\{\alpha_1(s)\pi_1^d(s) + (1 - \alpha_1(s))\pi^r(s)\}_{s \in S} | 0 \leq \alpha_1(s) \leq 1\}$ and $\Pi_2 = \{\{\alpha_2(s)\pi_2^d(s) + (1 - \alpha_2(s))\pi^p(s)\}_{s \in S} | 0 \leq \alpha_2(s) \leq 1\}$ in RBRPS2. Note that the number of policy parameters is reduced to simplify minimax optimization in RBRPS2. We conduct ten trials in each experiment with a historical data size of 250.

Table 3 shows the exploitability of each learned policy in RBRPS1 and RBRPS2. We find that all learned policies are better than the behavior policy profile, where we highlight in bold the best estimator in each case. Notably, $\hat{\pi}^{\text{DR}}$ and $\hat{\pi}^{\text{DRL}}$ outperform the policy profiles obtained by the other estimators.

In the experiment on Markov soccer, we define the behavior policy profile as $\pi_1^b = 0.3\pi_1^d + 0.7\pi^u$ and $\pi_2^b = 0.5\pi_2^d + 0.5\pi^u$, where π^u is an uniform random policy. We set the policy classes to $\Pi_1 = \{\alpha_1\pi_1^d + (1 - \alpha_1)\pi^u | 0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq 1\}$, $\Pi_2 = \{\alpha_2\pi_2^d + (1 - \alpha_2)\pi^u | 0 \leq \alpha_2 \leq 1\}$. We conduct ten trials in each experiment with a historical data size of 250. Because it is difficult to calculate the exploitability accurately in Markov soccer accurately, we compare the winning rates of the learned policy against other policies. Here, we approximate the winning rate using the rate of reaching the goal in 10,000 games. Note that player 1 has an advantage over player 2 because the possession of the ball always goes to player 1 at the initial state.

Table 4 shows the winning rates of each learned policy in Markov soccer. In this table, we show the winning rate of player 1. We find that the winning rates of $\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DRL}}$ and $\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DRL}}$ are generally higher than those of the other policies. Unlike the results in RBRPS, the policy profile obtained by using the

DRL estimator is more robust and better than that obtained using the DR estimator. These results suggest that we can learn a policy profile closest to the Nash equilibrium policies when using the DRL estimator.

7 Conclusion

In this study, we proposed the methods for OPE and OPL for TZMGs. We proved the exploitability estimation error bounds for OPE and the regret bounds for OPL. In future studies, we shall explore the application of our methods in more general settings, such as large extensive-form games.

References

- [1] Susan Athey and Stefan Wager. Efficient policy learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.02896*, 2017.
- [2] Peter L Bartlett and Shahar Mendelson. Rademacher and gaussian complexities: Risk bounds and structural results. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):463–482, 2002.
- [3] Noam Brown and Tuomas Sandholm. Superhuman ai for multiplayer poker. *Science*, 365(6456):885–890, 2019.
- [4] Noam Brown, Tuomas Sandholm, and Strategic Machine. Libratus: The superhuman ai for no-limit poker. In *IJCAI*, pages 5226–5228, 2017.
- [5] Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, Whitney Newey, and James Robins. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(1):C1–C68, 2018.
- [6] Miroslav Dudík, Dumitru Erhan, John Langford, Lihong Li, et al. Doubly robust policy evaluation and optimization. *Statistical Science*, 29(4):485–511, 2014.
- [7] Mehrdad Farajtabar, Yinlam Chow, and Mohammad Ghavamzadeh. More robust doubly robust off-policy evaluation. In *ICML*, pages 1447–1456, 2018.
- [8] Evarist Giné, Vladimir Koltchinskii, et al. Concentration inequalities and asymptotic results for ratio type empirical processes. *The Annals of Probability*, 34(3):1143–1216, 2006.
- [9] Keisuke Hirano, Guido W Imbens, and Geert Ridder. Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica*, 71(4):1161–1189, 2003.
- [10] Junling Hu and Michael P Wellman. Nash q-learning for general-sum stochastic games. *Journal of machine learning research*, 4(Nov):1039–1069, 2003.
- [11] Nan Jiang and Lihong Li. Doubly robust off-policy value evaluation for reinforcement learning. In *ICML*, pages 652–661, 2016.
- [12] Nathan Kallus and Masatoshi Uehara. Double reinforcement learning for efficient off-policy evaluation in markov decision processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08526*, 2019.
- [13] Nathan Kallus and Masatoshi Uehara. Efficiently breaking the curse of horizon: Double reinforcement learning in infinite-horizon processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05850*, 2019.
- [14] Nathan Kallus and Masatoshi Uehara. Intrinsically efficient, stable, and bounded off-policy evaluation for reinforcement learning. In *NeurIPS*, pages 3320–3329, 2019.
- [15] Toru Kitagawa and Aleksey Tetenov. Who should be treated? empirical welfare maximization methods for treatment choice. *Econometrica*, 86(2):591–616, 2018.
- [16] Xiaomin Lin, Peter A Beling, and Randy Cogill. Multiagent inverse reinforcement learning for two-person zero-sum games. *IEEE Transactions on Games*, 10(1):56–68, 2017.
- [17] Michael L Littman. Markov games as a framework for multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *ICML*, pages 157–163. 1994.
- [18] Michael L Littman and Csaba Szepesvári. A generalized reinforcement-learning model: Convergence and applications. In *ICML*, pages 310–318, 1996.

- [19] Qiang Liu, Lihong Li, Ziyang Tang, and Dengyong Zhou. Breaking the curse of horizon: Infinite-horizon off-policy estimation. In *NeurIPS*, pages 5356–5366, 2018.
- [20] Yao Liu, Omer Gottesman, Aniruddh Raghu, Matthieu Komorowski, Aldo A Faisal, Finale Doshi-Velez, and Emma Brunskill. Representation balancing mdps for off-policy policy evaluation. In *NuerIPS*, pages 2644–2653, 2018.
- [21] Travis Mandel, Yun-En Liu, Sergey Levine, Emma Brunskill, and Zoran Popovic. Offline policy evaluation across representations with applications to educational games. In *AAMAS*, pages 1077–1084, 2014.
- [22] Susan A Murphy. Optimal dynamic treatment regimes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 65(2):331–355, 2003.
- [23] John Nash. Non-cooperative games. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 286–295, 1951.
- [24] Tummalapalli Sudhamsh Reddy, Vamsikrishna Gopikrishna, Gergely Zaruba, and Manfred Huber. Inverse reinforcement learning for decentralized non-cooperative multiagent systems. In *SMC*, pages 1930–1935, 2012.
- [25] James M Robins, Andrea Rotnitzky, and Lue Ping Zhao. Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 89(427):846–866, 1994.
- [26] Mohammad Shafiei Nathan Sturtevant Jonathan Schaeffer, N Shafiei, et al. Comparing uct versus cfr in simultaneous games. In *IJCAI Workshop on General Game Playing*.
- [27] Shai Shalev-Shwartz, Shaked Shammah, and Amnon Shashua. Safe, multi-agent, reinforcement learning for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.03295*, 2016.
- [28] David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George Van Den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot, et al. Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 529(7587):484, 2016.
- [29] 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.
- [30] Richard S. Sutton and Andrew G. Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. MIT Press, 1998.
- [31] Adith Swaminathan and Thorsten Joachims. Batch learning from logged bandit feedback through counterfactual risk minimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(1):1731–1755, 2015.
- [32] Philip Thomas and Emma Brunskill. Data-efficient off-policy policy evaluation for reinforcement learning. In *ICML*, pages 2139–2148, 2016.
- [33] Anastasios Tsiatis. *Semiparametric theory and missing data*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [34] Xingyu Wang and Diego Klabjan. Competitive multi-agent inverse reinforcement learning with sub-optimal demonstrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.02124*, 2018.
- [35] Tengyang Xie, Yifei Ma, and Yu-Xiang Wang. Towards optimal off-policy evaluation for reinforcement learning with marginalized importance sampling. In *NeurIPS*, pages 9665–9675, 2019.
- [36] Zhengyuan Zhou, Susan Athey, and Stefan Wager. Offline multi-action policy learning: Generalization and optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04778*, 2018.

A Notations

In this section, we summarize the notation we use in Table 5. We abbreviate terms like $Q_{1,t}(s_{i,t}, a_{i,t}^1, a_{i,t}^2)$ as $Q_{1,i,t}$. For simplicity, in our proofs, we assume that $|\mathcal{A}_1| = |\mathcal{A}_2| = d$.

Table 5: Notation

d	Number of possible actions $ \mathcal{A}_1 $ and $ \mathcal{A}_2 $ for each player
a_t	Tuple of actions (a_t^1, a_t^2) at step t
$\pi(a_t s_t)$	Instantaneous density $\pi_1(a_t^1 s_t)\pi_2(a_t^2 s_t)$
$R(s_t, a_t)$	Mean reward function $R(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2)$
$Q_{1,t}(s_t, a_t)$	Q-function $Q_{1,t}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2)$ at step t
$P(s_{t+1} s_t, a_t)$	Transition probability $P(s_{t+1} s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2)$
$p_t^{\pi^b}(s_t, a_t), p_{b,t}(s_t, a_t)$	Marginal state-action density $p_t^{\pi^b}(s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2)$
\mathcal{D}	Historical data
\mathcal{D}_k	Historical data in fold k
$A \otimes B$	Kronecker product $\begin{pmatrix} a_{11}B & \cdots & a_{1n}B \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{m1}B & \cdots & a_{mn}B \end{pmatrix}$, where A is a $m \times n$ matrix and B is a $p \times q$ matrix.
A_t^1	d -dimensional vectors $A_t^1 = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)^T$ where 1 appears and only appears in the $a_{i,t}^1$ -th component and the rest are all zeros
A_t^2	d -dimensional vectors $A_t^2 = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)^T$ where 1 appears and only appears in the $a_{i,t}^2$ -th component and the rest are all zeros
A_t	$A_t^1 \otimes A_t^2$
$Q_{1,t}(s_t)$	Q-function vector at step t $Q_{1,t}(s_t, a_1^1, a_1^2) = (Q_{1,t}(s_t, a_1^1, a_1^2), Q_{1,t}(s_t, a_1^1, a_2^2), \dots, Q_{1,t}(s_t, a_1^1, a_d^2))^T$
$\pi(s_t)$	Policy vector $\pi(s_t) = (\pi_1(a_1^1 s_t)\pi_2(a_1^2 s_t), \pi_1(a_1^1 s_t)\pi_2(a_2^2 s_t), \dots, \pi_1(a_d^1 s_t)\pi_2(a_d^2 s_t))^T$
$\pi(s_{t':t})$	$\pi(s_{t':t}) = \pi(s_{t'}) \otimes \pi(s_{t'+1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi(s_t)$
$\mathbb{1}_\alpha$	α -dimensional vector $(1, \dots, 1)^T$ where all components are 1
$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f(X)]$	Empirical average $\frac{1}{ \mathcal{D} } \sum_{X \in \mathcal{D}} f(X)$
$\mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{D}}[f(X)]$	Empirical process $\sqrt{ \mathcal{D} }(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[f(X)] - \mathbb{E}[f(X)])$
$\bigvee_{t=1}^T e_t$	Logical disjunction $e_1 \vee e_2 \vee \cdots \vee e_t$.

B Main Proofs

B.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. We omit the proof since it is almost the same as Theorem 2 in [12]. □

B.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. We prove the statement following in [12]. We define

$$\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}\}) = \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} (\hat{\rho}_t r_t - \hat{\rho}_t \hat{Q}_{1,t} + \hat{\rho}_{t-1} \hat{V}_t).$$

Then, $\hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)$ is given by

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\})],$$

where $n_k = |\mathcal{D}_k|$.

Then, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\})] - v_1(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)) = \sqrt{n/n_k} \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{D}_k}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\})]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sqrt{n/n_k} \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{D}_k} [\psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\})] \\
& + \sqrt{n} (\mathbb{E}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) | \{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}] - v_1(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)).
\end{aligned}$$

We analyze each term. First, we prove that $\sqrt{n/n_k} \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{D}_k} [\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\})] = o_p(1)$. If for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n_k \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n_k} P[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k} [\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\})] \\
& \quad - \mathbb{E}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\}) | \{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}] > \epsilon | \mathcal{D}_{-k}] = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Then, from bounded convergence theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n_k \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n_k} P[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k} [\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\})] \\
& \quad - \mathbb{E}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\}) | \{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}] > \epsilon] = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

To show Equation (2), we show that this conditional mean is 0 and conditional variance is $o_p(1)$. The conditional mean part is

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k} [\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\})] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\}) | \{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}] | \mathcal{D}_{-k}] = 0,$$

because $\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}$ only depend on \mathcal{D}_{-k} and \mathcal{D}_k , \mathcal{D}_{-k} are independent. The conditional variance part is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{V}[\sqrt{n_k} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k} [\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\}) | \mathcal{D}_{-k}] = \mathbb{V}[\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_k}} \sum_{\mathcal{D}_k} \psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\}) | \mathcal{D}_{-k}] \\
& = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{\mathcal{D}_k} \mathbb{V}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\}) | \mathcal{D}_{-k}] = \mathbb{V}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\}) | \mathcal{D}_{-k}] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}[D_1^2 + D_2^2 + D_3^2 + 2D_1D_2 + 2D_1D_3 + 2D_2D_3 | \mathcal{D}_{-k}] = T^2 \max\{o_p(n^{-2\alpha_1}), o_p(n^{-2\alpha_2}), o_p(n^{-\alpha_1 - \alpha_2})\} \\
& = o_p(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
D_1 & = \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left((\hat{\rho}_t^{-k} - \rho_t)(-\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k} + Q_{1,t}) + (\hat{\rho}_{t-1}^{-k} - \rho_{t-1})(\hat{V}_t^{-k} - V_{1,t}) \right), \\
D_2 & = \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left(\rho_t(-\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k} + Q_{1,t}) + \rho_{t-1}(\hat{V}_t^{-k} - V_{1,t}) \right), \\
D_3 & = \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left((\hat{\rho}_t^{-k} - \rho_t)(r_t - Q_{1,t} + \gamma V_{1,t+1}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we used the convergence rate assumption. Then, from Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{n_k} P[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k} [\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\})] \\
& \quad - \mathbb{E}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\}) | \{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}] > \epsilon | \mathcal{D}_{-k}] \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{V}[\sqrt{n_k} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k} [\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) - \psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\})] | \mathcal{D}_{-k}] = o_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, We prove that $\sqrt{n} (\mathbb{E}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) | \{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}] - v_1(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e))$ is $o_p(1)$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{n} (\mathbb{E}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}) | \{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\}) | \{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\}]) \\
& = \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left((\hat{\rho}_t^{-k} - \rho_t)(-\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k} + Q_{1,t}) + (\hat{\rho}_{t-1}^{-k} - \rho_{t-1})(\hat{V}_t^{-k} - V_{1,t}) \right) | \{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\} \right] \\
& \quad + \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left(\rho_t(-\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k} + Q_{1,t}) + \rho_{t-1}(\hat{V}_t^{-k} - V_{1,t}) \right) | \{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\} \right] \\
& \quad + \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left((\hat{\rho}_t^{-k} - \rho_t)(r_t - Q_{1,t} + \gamma V_{1,t+1}) \right) | \{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\} \right] \\
& = \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left((\hat{\rho}_t^{-k} - \rho_t)(-\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k} + Q_{1,t}) + (\hat{\rho}_{t-1}^{-k} - \rho_{t-1})(\hat{V}_t^{-k} - V_{1,t}) \right) | \{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \sqrt{n} \sum_{t=1}^T O\left(\|\hat{\rho}_t^{-k} - \rho_t\|_2 \|\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k} - Q_{1,t}\|_2\right) = \sqrt{n} \sum_{t=1}^T o_p(n^{-\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}) = o_p(1).$$

From above results, for $1 \leq k \leq K$,

$$\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\})] - v_1(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)) = \sqrt{n/n_k} \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{D}_k}[\psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\})] + o_p(1).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{n}(\hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - v_1(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{n} \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k}[\psi(\{\hat{\rho}_t^{-k}\}, \{\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}\})] - v_1(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)) = \sum_{k=1}^K \sqrt{\frac{n_k}{n}} \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{D}_k}[\psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\})] + o_p(1) \\ &\leq \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{D}}[\psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\})] + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Here, we can easily show that

$$\mathbb{V}[\psi(\{\rho_t\}, \{Q_{1,t}\})] = \mathbb{V}[V_{1,1}] + \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\gamma^{2(t-1)} \rho_t^2 \mathbb{V}[r_t + \gamma V_{1,t+1} | s_1, a_1^1, a_1^2, \dots, s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2]].$$

Then, from Assumption 1 and central limit theorem, this statement is concluded. \square

B.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2. \square

B.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. Let define

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) &= v_1(\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha) - v_1(\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta), \\ \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) &= \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta), \\ \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) &= v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha) - v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1^\dagger &= \arg \max_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} v_1(\pi_1, \pi_2^e), \quad \pi_2^\dagger = \arg \max_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} v_2(\pi_1^e, \pi_2), \\ \hat{\pi}_1^\dagger &= \arg \max_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2^e), \quad \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger = \arg \max_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} \hat{v}_2^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2). \end{aligned}$$

We have:

$$\begin{aligned} & v_{\Pi}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_{\text{DR}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = v_1(\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e) + v_2(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger) - \hat{v}_2^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger) \\ &= \Delta((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e)) + v_1(\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e) + \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e)) \\ &\quad - \Delta((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) + \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) - v_1(\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger) + \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) \\ &\leq \Delta((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e)) + v_1(\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e) \\ &\quad - \Delta((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) + \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) - v_1(\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger) + \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger) \\ &\leq \Delta((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e)) + \Delta((\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) - \Delta^{\text{DR}}((\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) \\ &\quad - \Delta((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) + \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) \\ &\leq 3 \sup_{\pi^\alpha \in \Pi, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |\Delta((\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha), (\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha), (\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta))|, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & v_{\Pi}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_{\text{DR}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = v_1(\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e) + v_2(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger) - \hat{v}_2^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger) \\ &= -\Delta((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e)) + \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e)) + v_1(\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e) + \Delta((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^e)) \\ &\quad + \Delta((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) - v_1(\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger) + \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger) - \Delta((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq -\Delta((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^\dagger), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^\dagger)) + \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^\dagger), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^\dagger)) + v_1(\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^\dagger) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^\dagger) \\
&+ \Delta((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) - v_1(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger) + \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger) \\
&\geq -\Delta((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^\dagger), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^\dagger)) + \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^\dagger), (\hat{\pi}_1^\dagger, \pi_2^\dagger)) + \Delta((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^\dagger, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger)) \\
&+ \Delta((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^e, \pi_2^\dagger), (\pi_1^e, \hat{\pi}_2^\dagger)) \\
&\geq -3 \sup_{\pi^\alpha \in \Pi, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |\Delta((\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha), (\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha), (\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta))|.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have:

$$|v_{\Pi}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_{\text{DR}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)| \leq 3 \sup_{\pi^\alpha \in \Pi, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |\Delta((\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha), (\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha), (\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta))|.$$

Here, we introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Assume Assumptions 1 and (4a)-(4b). Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0$, $N_\delta > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ and for all $n \geq N_\delta$:*

$$\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right| \leq C \left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right) \sqrt{\Upsilon_{\text{DR}}^*/n}.$$

The proof of this lemma is shown in Section C.1. Based on Lemma 1, for $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0$, $N_\delta > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ and for all $n \geq N_\delta$:

$$|v_{\Pi}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_{\text{DR}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)| \leq C \left(\left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_{\text{DR}}^*}{n}} \right).$$

□

B.5 Proof of Theorem 5

Proof. Let define

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) &= v_1(\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha) - v_1(\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta), \\
\hat{\Delta}^{\text{DRL}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) &= \hat{v}_1^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta), \\
\tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DRL}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) &= v_1^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha) - v_1^{\text{DRL}}(\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta).
\end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Theorem 4, we have:

$$|v_{\Pi}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)| \leq 3 \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |\Delta((\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha), (\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DRL}}((\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha), (\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta))|.$$

Here, we introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *Assume Assumptions 1 and (4a)-(4b). Then, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0$, $N_\delta > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ and for all $n \geq N_\delta$:*

$$\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DRL}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right| \leq C \left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right) \sqrt{\Upsilon_{\text{DRL}}^*/n}.$$

The proof of this lemma is shown in Section C.2. Based on Lemma 2, for $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0$, $N_\delta > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ and for all $n \geq N_\delta$:

$$|v_{\Pi}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) - \hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)| \leq C \left(\left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_{\text{DRL}}^*}{n}} \right).$$

□

B.6 Proof of Theorem 6

Proof. We have:

$$v^{\text{exp}}(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}) - v^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*) = v_1(BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}) + v_2(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}})) - v_1(BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*) - v_2(\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \Delta((BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), (\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}))) - \Delta((BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*), (\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*))) \\
&= \Delta((BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), (\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}))) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), (\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}))) \\
&\quad - \Delta((BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*), (\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*))) + \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*), (\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*))) \\
&\quad + \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}})) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*) + \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*)),
\end{aligned}$$

where $BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}) = \arg \max_{\pi_2 \in \Omega_2} v_2(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, \pi_2^e)$ and $BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}) = \arg \max_{\pi_1 \in \Omega_1} v_1(\pi_1, \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}})$. Let define $\hat{B}R(\pi_1) = \arg \max_{\pi_2 \in \Pi_2} \hat{v}_2^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2)$ and $\hat{B}R(\pi_2) = \arg \max_{\pi_1 \in \Pi_1} \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2)$. Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}) &\leq \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\hat{B}R(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}) \leq \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\hat{B}R(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*) \\
\hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}})) &\geq \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, \hat{B}R(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}})) \geq \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^*, \hat{B}R(\pi_1^*))
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&v^{\text{exp}}(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}) - v^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*) \\
&\leq \Delta((BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), (\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}))) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), (\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}))) \\
&\quad - \Delta((BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*), (\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*))) + \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*), (\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*))) \\
&\quad + \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\hat{B}R(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^*, \hat{B}R(\pi_1^*)) + \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*)), \\
&\leq \Delta((BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), (\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}))) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), (\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}))) \\
&\quad - \Delta((BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*), (\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*))) + \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*), (\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*))) \\
&\quad + \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\hat{B}R(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*) - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*) - v_1(\hat{B}R(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*) + v_1(BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*) \\
&\quad - \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^*, \hat{B}R(\pi_1^*)) + \hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*)) + v_1(\pi_1^*, \hat{B}R(\pi_1^*)) - v_1(\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*)) \\
&= \Delta((BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), (\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}))) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((BR(\hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}), (\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, BR(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}))) \\
&\quad - \Delta((BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*), (\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*))) + \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*), (\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*))) \\
&\quad + \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\hat{B}R(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*), (BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*)) - \Delta((\hat{B}R(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*), (BR(\pi_2^*), \pi_2^*)) \\
&\quad - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^*, \hat{B}R(\pi_1^*)), (\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*))) + \Delta((\pi_1^*, \hat{B}R(\pi_1^*)), (\pi_1^*, BR(\pi_1^*))) \\
&\leq 4 \sup_{\pi^\alpha \in \Pi, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |\Delta((\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha), (\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}((\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha), (\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta))|,
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, based on Lemma 1, for $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0$, $N_\delta > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ and for all $n \geq N_\delta$:

$$v^{\text{exp}}(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DR}}, \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DR}}) - v^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*) \leq C \left(\left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_{\text{DR}}^*}{n}} \right).$$

□

B.7 Proof of Theorem 7

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 6, we have:

$$v^{\text{exp}}(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DRL}}, \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DRL}}) - v^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*) \leq 4 \sup_{\pi^\alpha \in \Pi, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |\Delta((\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha), (\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta)) - \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DRL}}((\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha), (\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta))|,$$

Therefore, based on Lemma 2, for $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0$, $N_\delta > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ and for all $n \geq N_\delta$:

$$v^{\text{exp}}(\hat{\pi}_1^{\text{DRL}}, \hat{\pi}_2^{\text{DRL}}) - v^{\text{exp}}(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*) \leq C \left(\left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_{\text{DRL}}^*}{n}} \right).$$

□

C Additional Proofs

C.1 Proofs of Lemma 1

Proof. We can rewrite $v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\prod_{t'=1}^t \pi^e(a_{i,t'} | s_{i,t'})}{\prod_{t'=1}^t \pi^b(a_{i,t'} | s_{i,t'})} R_{i,t} \right. \\ &\quad - \frac{\prod_{t'=1}^t \pi^e(a_{i,t'} | s_{i,t'})}{\prod_{t'=1}^t \pi^b(a_{i,t'} | s_{i,t'})} \sum_{s_{t+1} \in \mathcal{S}} P_T(s_{t+1} | s_{i,t}, a_{i,t}) \sum_{t'=\tau_{t+1:t'}}^T \gamma^{t'-t} \sum_{\tau_{t+1:t'}} \left(\prod_{l=t+1}^{t'} \pi^e(a_l | s_l) \right) \left(R_{t'} \prod_{l=t+1}^{t'-1} P_T(s_{l+1} | s_l, a_l) \right) \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\prod_{t'=1}^{t-1} \pi^e(a_{i,t'} | s_{i,t'})}{\prod_{t'=1}^{t-1} \pi^b(a_{i,t'} | s_{i,t'})} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi^e(a | s_i) \sum_{s_{t+1} \in \mathcal{S}} P_T(s_{t+1} | s_{i,t}, a) \sum_{t'=\tau_{t+1:t'}}^T \gamma^{t'-t} \sum_{\tau_{t+1:t'}} \left(\prod_{l=t+1}^{t'} \pi^e(a_l | s_l) \right) \left(R_{t'} \prod_{l=t+1}^{t'-1} P_T(s_{l+1} | s_l, a_l) \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\tau_{t:t'} = (s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2, \dots, s_{t'}, a_{t'}^1, a_{t'}^2)$. Therefore, we can write

$$v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^e, \pi_2^e) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_{1:T}} \langle \pi^e(s_{1:T}), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \rangle$$

where $s_{1:T} = (s_1, \dots, s_T)$ and $\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}$ is a random variable that is independent of π^e . By using this form, we can write $v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha) - v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta)$ as

$$v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^\alpha, \pi_2^\alpha) - v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1^\beta, \pi_2^\beta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_{1:T}} \langle \pi^\alpha(s_{1:T}) - \pi^\beta(s_{1:T}), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \rangle,$$

because $\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}$ is independent of π^α and π^β .

Hereafter, we prove the statement following [36]. We extend the proofs of [36] to TZMG cases.

Step 1: First, we bound the Rademacher complexity. We introduce the following definitions of the Rademacher complexity.

Definition 1. Let $\Pi^D = \{\sum_{s_{1:T}} \langle \pi^\alpha(\cdot) - \pi^\beta(\cdot), \cdot \rangle\}$ and Z_i 's be **iid** Rademacher random variables: $P(Z_i = 1) = P(Z_i = -1) = \frac{1}{2}$.

1. The empirical Rademacher complexity $\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D)$ of the function class Π^D is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D; \{\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}\}_{i=1}^n) \\ = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \sum_{s_{1:T}} \langle \pi^\alpha(s_{1:T}) - \pi^\beta(s_{1:T}), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \rangle \right| \middle| \{\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}\}_{i=1}^n \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to Z_1, \dots, Z_n .

2. The Rademacher complexity $\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D)$ of the function class Π^D is the expected value (taken with respect to the sample $\{\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}\}_{i=1}^n$) of the empirical Rademacher complexity: $\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D; \{\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}\}_{i=1}^n)]$.

Using these definitions, we can derive the following Lemma.

Lemma 3. Let $\{\{\Gamma_{i,t}\}\}_{i=1}^n$ be **iid** set of weights with bounded support. Then under Assumption 1:

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D) = O \left(\kappa(\Pi) \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{s_{1:T}} \langle \pi^\alpha(s_{1:T}) - \pi^\beta(s_{1:T}), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \rangle \right)^2 \right]}{n}} \right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \quad (4)$$

Step 2: Next, we characterize the uniform concentration of the difference of influence functions.

Lemma 4. *Under Assumptions 1 and (4a)-(4b), the influence difference function concentrates uniformly around its mean: for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$,*

$$\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right| \leq O \left(\left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_{\text{DR}}^*}{n}} \right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right),$$

Step 3: Next, we prove that with high probability, $\tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ concentrates around $\hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ uniformly at a rate strictly faster than $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$.

Lemma 5. *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, (4a)-(4d):*

$$\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right| = o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

Step 4: Finally, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) + \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right| + \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, based on Lemmas 4 and 1, for $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0$, $N_\delta > 0$, such that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$ and for all $n \geq N_\delta$:

$$\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right| \leq C \left(\left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_{\text{DR}}^*}{n}} \right). \quad (5)$$

□

C.1.1 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. First, we introduce the following definitions:

Definition 2. *Given the state space \mathcal{S} , a policy profile class Π , a set of n state trajectories $\{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\}$, define:*

1. *Hamming distance between any two policy profiles π^α and π^β in Π : $H_n(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\{\bigvee_{t=1}^T \pi_1^\alpha(s_{i,t}) \neq \pi_1^\beta(s_{i,t})\} \vee \{\bigvee_{t=1}^T \pi_2^\alpha(s_{i,t}) \neq \pi_2^\beta(s_{i,t})\})$.*
2. *ϵ -Hamming covering number of the set $\{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\}$: $N_H(\epsilon, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\})$ is the smallest number K of policy profiles $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_K\}$ in Π , such that $\forall \pi \in \Pi, \exists \pi_i, H_n(\pi, \pi_i) \leq \epsilon$.*
3. *ϵ -Hamming covering number of Π : $N_H(\epsilon, \Pi) = \sup\{N_H(\epsilon, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{m,t}\}\}) \mid m \geq 1, \{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{m,t}\}\}$.*
4. *Entropy integral: $\kappa(\Pi) = \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log N_H(\epsilon^2, \Pi)} d\epsilon$.*

Definition 3. *Given a set of n state trajectories $\{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\}$, and a set of n weights $\Gamma = \{\{\Gamma_{1,t}\}_{t=1}^T, \dots, \{\Gamma_{n,t}\}_{t=1}^T\}$, we define the following distances $I_\Gamma(\pi_1, \pi_2)$ between two policy profiles π_1 and π_2 in Π and the corresponding covering number $N_{I_\Gamma}(\epsilon, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\})$ as follows:*

1. $I_\Gamma(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\sum_{s_{1:T}} (\pi_1(s_{1:T}) - \pi_2(s_{1:T}), \Gamma_{i, s_{1:T}})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \sum_{i=1}^n |\sum_{s_{1:T}} (\pi^\alpha(s_{1:T}) - \pi^\beta(s_{1:T}), \Gamma_{i, s_{1:T}})|^2}}$, where we set $0 \triangleq \frac{0}{0}$.
2. $N_{I_\Gamma}(\epsilon, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\})$: *the minimum number of policy profiles needed to ϵ -cover Π under I_Γ .*

Based on these definitions, we introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *For any n , any $\Gamma = \{\{\Gamma_{1,t}\}_t^T, \dots, \{\Gamma_{n,t}\}_t^T\}$ and any $\{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\}$:*

1. *Triangle inequality holds for sum of inner productdistance:* $I_\Gamma(\pi_1, \pi_2) \leq I_\Gamma(\pi_1, \pi_3) + I_\Gamma(\pi_3, \pi_2)$.
2. $N_{I_\Gamma}(\epsilon, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\}) \leq N_H(\epsilon^2, \Pi)$.

Here, we break the proof into four main components.

Step 1: Policy profile approximations. Set $\epsilon_j = \frac{1}{2^j}$ and let $S_0, S_1, S_2, \dots, S_J$ be a sequence of policy profile classes such that S_j ϵ_j -cover Π under the sum of inner product distance:

$$\forall \pi \in \Pi, \exists \pi' \in S_j, I_\Gamma(\pi, \pi') \leq \epsilon_j,$$

where $J = \lceil \log_2(n)(1 - \omega) \rceil$. Note that by definition of the covering number under the sum of inner productdistance, we can choose the j -th policy profile class S_j such that $|S_j| = N_{I_\Gamma}(2^{-j}, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\})$. Additionally, we define refining approximation operators $A_j : \Pi \rightarrow \Pi$ ($j = 0, \dots, J$) as follows:

$$A_j(\pi) = \begin{cases} \arg \min_{\pi' \in S_J} I_\Gamma(\pi, \pi') & (j = J) \\ \arg \min_{\pi' \in S_j} I_\Gamma(A_{j+1}(\pi), \pi') & (j \neq J) \end{cases}.$$

By these definitions, we can obtain the following properties:

1. $\max_{\pi \in \Pi} I_\Gamma(\pi, A_J(\pi)) \leq 2^{-J}$:
Pick any $\pi \in \Pi$. By the definition of S_J , $\exists \pi' \in S_J, I_\Gamma(\pi, \pi') \leq \epsilon_J$. By the definition of A_J , we have $I_\Gamma(\pi, A_J(\pi)) \leq I_\Gamma(\pi, \pi') \leq \epsilon_J = 2^{-J}$. Taking maximum over all $\pi \in \Pi$ verifies this property.
2. $|\{A_j(\pi) | \pi \in \Pi\}| \leq N_{I_\Gamma}(2^{-j}, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\})$, for every $j = 0, \dots, J$:
Since $A_j(\pi) = \arg \min_{\pi' \in S_j} I_\Gamma(A_{j+1}(\pi), \pi')$, $A_j(\pi) \in S_j$ for every $\pi \in \Pi$. Consequently, $|\{A_j(\pi) | \pi \in \Pi\}| \leq |S_j| = N_{I_\Gamma}(2^{-j}, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\})$.
3. $\max_{\pi \in \Pi} I_\Gamma(A_j(\pi), A_{j+1}(\pi)) \leq 2^{-(j-1)}$, for very $j = 0, \dots, J - 1$:
From Lemma 6, since I_Γ satisfies the triangle inequality, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\pi \in \Pi} I_\Gamma(A_j(\pi), A_{j+1}(\pi)) &\leq \max_{\pi \in \Pi} (I_\Gamma(A_j(\pi), \pi) + I_\Gamma(A_{j+1}(\pi), \pi)) \\ &\leq \max_{\pi \in \Pi} I_\Gamma(A_j(\pi), \pi) + \max_{\pi \in \Pi} I_\Gamma(A_{j+1}(\pi), \pi) \\ &\leq 2^{-j} + 2^{-(j+1)} \leq 2^{-(j-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

4. For any $J \geq j' \geq j \geq 0$, $|\{(A_j(\pi), A_{j'}(\pi)) | \pi \in \Pi\}| \leq N_{I_\Gamma}(2^{-j'}, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\})$:
If $A_{j'}(\pi) = A_{j'}(\tilde{\pi})$, then by the definition of A_j , we have:

$$A_{j'-1}(\pi) = \arg \min_{\pi' \in S_{j'}} I_\Gamma(A_{j'}(\pi), \pi') = \arg \min_{\pi' \in S_{j'}} I_\Gamma(A_{j'}(\tilde{\pi}), \pi') = A_{j'-1}(\tilde{\pi}).$$

Consequently, by backward induction, it then follows that $A_j(\pi) = A_j(\tilde{\pi})$. Therefore,

$$|\{(A_j(\pi), A_{j'}(\pi)) | \pi \in \Pi\}| = |\{A_{j'}(\pi) | \pi \in \Pi\}| \leq N_{I_\Gamma}(2^{-j'}, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\})$$

Step 2: Chaining with concentration inequalities in the negligible regime. For each policy profile $\pi \in \Pi$, we can write it in term of the approximation policy profiles as: $\pi = A_0(\pi) + \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi) - A_{j-1}(\pi)) + (A_J(\pi) - A_{\underline{J}}(\pi)) + (\pi - A_J(\pi))$, where $\underline{J} = \lfloor \frac{1}{2}(1 - \omega) \log_2(n) \rfloor$. Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^\alpha - \pi^\beta &= \left(A_0(\pi^\alpha) + \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi^\alpha) - A_{j-1}(\pi^\alpha)) + (A_J(\pi^\alpha) - A_{\underline{J}}(\pi^\alpha)) + (\pi^\alpha - A_J(\pi^\alpha)) \right) \\ &\quad - \left(A_0(\pi^\beta) + \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi^\beta) - A_{j-1}(\pi^\beta)) + (A_J(\pi^\beta) - A_{\underline{J}}(\pi^\beta)) + (\pi^\beta - A_J(\pi^\beta)) \right) \\ &= \left((\pi^\alpha - A_J(\pi^\alpha)) - (\pi^\beta - A_J(\pi^\beta)) \right) + \left((A_J(\pi^\alpha) - A_{\underline{J}}(\pi^\alpha)) + (A_J(\pi^\beta) - A_{\underline{J}}(\pi^\beta)) \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi^\alpha) - A_{j-1}(\pi^\alpha)) - \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi^\beta) - A_{j-1}(\pi^\beta)) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where the second equality follows from that $\{A_0(\pi)\}$ is a singleton set. Hereafter, for simplicity, we define $\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) = \sum_{s_{1:T}} \langle \pi^\alpha(s_{1:T}) - \pi^\beta(s_{1:T}), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \rangle$. In this step, we establish two claims, for any $\pi \in \Pi$:

$$1. \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \sum_{s_{1:T}} \langle \pi(s_{1:T}) - A_J(\pi)(s_{1:T}), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \rangle \right| \right] = 0:$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and $I_\Gamma(\pi, A_J(\pi)) \leq 2^{-J}$, $\forall \pi \in \Pi$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(\pi, A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi, A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2 \right)} \\ & = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi, A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n}}} \\ & = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} I_\Gamma(\pi, A_J(\pi)) \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n}} \\ & \leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} I_\Gamma(\pi, A_J(\pi)) \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{s_{1:T}} |\langle \pi^\alpha(s_{1:T}) - \pi^\beta(s_{1:T}), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \rangle| \right)^2}{n}} \\ & \leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} I_\Gamma(\pi, A_J(\pi)) \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{s_{1:T}} \|\pi^\alpha(s_{1:T}) - \pi^\beta(s_{1:T})\|_2 \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_2 \right)^2}{n}} \\ & \leq \sqrt{2} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} I_\Gamma(\pi, A_J(\pi)) \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_2 \right)^2}{n}} \\ & \leq \sqrt{2} \left(|\mathcal{S}|^{2T} \max_{i,s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_\infty \right) \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} I_\Gamma(\pi, A_J(\pi)) \leq \sqrt{2} \left(|\mathcal{S}|^{2T} \max_{i,s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_\infty \right) 2^{-J} \\ & = \sqrt{2} \left(|\mathcal{S}|^{2T} \max_{i,s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_\infty \right) 2^{-\lceil \log_2(n) \rceil} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{n^{1-\omega}} \left(|\mathcal{S}|^{2T} \max_{i,s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_\infty \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have:

$$\sqrt{n} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(\pi, A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{n^{0.5-\omega}} \left(|\mathcal{S}|^{2T} \max_{i,s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_\infty \right).$$

Since $\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}$ is bounded, consequently, $\sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(\pi, A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \right] = O\left(\frac{1}{n^{0.5-\omega}}\right)$, which then immediately implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(\pi, A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \right] = 0$.

$$2. \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_J(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \right] = 0:$$

Conditioned on $\{\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}\}_{i=1}^n$, the random variables $Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_J(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})$ are independent and zero-mean (since Z_i 's are Rademacher random variables). Further, each $Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_J(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})$ is bounded between $a_i = -|\mathcal{M}(A_J(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|$ and $b_i = |\mathcal{M}(A_J(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|$.

By the definition, we have: $I_\Gamma(A_J(\pi), A_J(\pi)) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(A_J(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}}$. Therefore, we have:

$$I_\Gamma(A_J(\pi), A_J(\pi))^2 \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(A_J(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2.$$

By Hoeffding's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} P \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_J(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \geq t \right] & \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2} \right) \\ & = 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2 \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(A_J(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $t = a2^{3-J}\sqrt{n\left(|\mathcal{S}|^{2T} \max_{i,s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_\infty\right)^2}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \geq a2^{3-J}\sqrt{\left(|\mathcal{S}|^{2T} \max_{i,s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_\infty\right)^2} \right] \\
&= P \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \geq t \right] \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2 \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \right) \\
&= 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2 \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2 \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} 2 \left(|\mathcal{S}|^{2T} \max_{i,s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_\infty\right)^2 n} \right) \\
&= 2 \exp \left(-\frac{a^2 4^{3-J}}{4 \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}} \right) = 2 \exp \left(-\frac{a^2 4^{3-J}}{4 I_\Gamma(A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), A_J(\pi))^2} \right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{a^2 4^{3-J}}{4 \left(\sum_{j=\underline{J}}^{J-1} I_\Gamma(A_j(\pi), A_{j+1}(\pi)) \right)^2} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{a^2 4^{3-J}}{4 \left(\sum_{j=\underline{J}}^{J-1} 2^{-(j-1)} \right)^2} \right) \\
&= 2 \exp \left(-\frac{a^2 4^{3-J}}{4 \left(\frac{2^{-(\underline{J}-1)}(1-2^{-J+\underline{J}})}{1-2^{-1}} \right)^2} \right) = 2 \exp \left(-\frac{a^2 4^{3-J}}{4 (2^{-\underline{J}+2}(1-2^{-J+\underline{J}}))^2} \right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{a^2 4^{3-J}}{4 (2^{-\underline{J}+2})^2} \right) = 2 \exp \left(-\frac{a^2 4^{3-J}}{4^{3-\underline{J}}} \right) = 2 \exp(-a^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Since this equation holds for any $\pi \in \Pi$, by a union bound, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \geq a2^{3-J}\sqrt{\left(|\mathcal{S}|^{2T} \max_{i,s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_\infty\right)^2} \right] \\
&\leq 2 |\{A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), A_J(\pi) | \pi \in \Pi\}| \exp(-a^2) \leq 2N_{I_\Gamma}(2^{-J}, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\}) \exp(-a^2) \\
&\leq 2N_H(2^{-2J}, \Pi) \exp(-a^2) \leq 2C \exp(D2^{2J\omega}) \exp(-a^2) \leq 2C \exp(D2^{2\omega(1-\omega)\log_2(n)} - a^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Property 4 in Step 1, the third inequality follows from Lemma 6, the fourth inequality follows from Assumption (4a) and the last inequality follows from $J = \lceil (1-\omega)\log_2(n) \rceil \leq (1-\omega)\log_2(n) + 1$ (and the term $2^{2\omega}$ is absorbed into the constant D). Next, set $a = \frac{2^{\underline{J}}}{\sqrt{\log n \left(|\mathcal{S}|^{2T} \max_{i,s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_\infty\right)^2}}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \geq \frac{8}{\sqrt{\log n}} \right] \leq 2C \exp(D2^{2\omega(1-\omega)\log_2(n)} - a^2) \\
&= 2C \exp \left(D2^{2\omega(1-\omega)\log_2(n)} - \frac{2^{(1-\omega)\log_2(n)}}{\log n \left(|\mathcal{S}|^{2T} \max_{i,s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_\infty\right)^2} \right) \\
&= 2C \exp \left(D2^{2\omega(1-\omega)\log_2(n)} - \frac{2^{(1-2\omega+2\omega)(1-\omega)\log_2(n)}}{U^2 \log n} \right) \\
&= 2C \exp \left(2^{2\omega(1-\omega)\log_2(n)} \left(D - \frac{2^{(1-2\omega)(1-\omega)\log_2(n)}}{U^2 \log n} \right) \right) = 2C \exp \left(-n^{2\omega(1-\omega)} \left(\frac{n^{(1-2\omega)(1-\omega)}}{U^2 \log n} - D \right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $U = (|\mathcal{S}|^{2T} \max_{i,s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_\infty)$. Since $\omega < \frac{1}{2}$ by Assumption (4a), $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^{(1-2\omega)(1-\omega)}}{U^2 \log n} = \infty$. This mean for all large n , with probability at least $1 - 2C' \exp(-n^{2\omega(1-\omega)})$, $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \leq \frac{8}{\sqrt{\log n}}$, therefore immediately implying: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \right] = 0$.

Step 3: Chaining with concentration inequalities in the effective regime. By expanding the Rademacher complexity using the approximation policy profiles, we can show:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \right], \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(\pi, A_J(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_J(\pi), A_{\underline{J}}(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \right] \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \sum_{s_{1:T}} \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi)(s_{1:T}) - A_{j-1}(\pi)(s_{1:T})), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \right\rangle \right| \right] \\
&= 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \sum_{s_{1:T}} \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi)(s_{1:T}) - A_{j-1}(\pi)(s_{1:T})), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \right\rangle \right| \right] + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Consequently, it now remains to bound $\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \sum_{s_{1:T}} \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi)(s_{1:T}) - A_{j-1}(\pi)(s_{1:T})), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \right\rangle \right| \right]$. For each $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$, setting $t_j = a_j 2^{2-j} \sqrt{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}$ and applying Hoeffding's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
P \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_j(\pi), A_{j-1}(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \geq a_j 2^{2-j} \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n}} \right] \\
= P \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_j(\pi), A_{j-1}(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \geq t_j \right] \\
\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t_j^2}{2 \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(A_j(\pi), A_{j-1}(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \right) \\
= 2 \exp \left(-\frac{a_j^2 4^{2-j}}{2 \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(A_j(\pi), A_{j-1}(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}} \right) = 2 \exp \left(-\frac{a_j^2 4^{2-j}}{2 I_\Gamma(A_j(\pi), A_{j-1}(\pi))^2} \right) \\
\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{a_j^2 4^{2-j}}{2 \cdot 4^{-(j-2)}} \right) = 2 \exp \left(-\frac{a_j^2}{2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Property 3 in Step 1. For the rest of this step, we denote for notational convenience $M(\Pi) \triangleq \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2$, as this term will be repeatedly used. Setting $a_j^2 = 2 \log \left(\frac{2j^2}{\delta} N_H(4^{-j}, \Pi) \right)$, we then apply a union bound to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
P \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_j(\pi), A_{j-1}(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \geq a_j 2^{2-j} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} \right] \\
\leq 2 |\{(A_j(\pi), A_{j-1}(\pi)) | \pi \in \Pi\}| \exp \left(-\frac{a_j^2}{2} \right) \leq 2 N_{I_\Gamma}(2^{-j}, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\}) \exp \left(-\frac{a_j^2}{2} \right) \\
\leq 2 N_H(4^{-j}, \Pi) \exp \left(-\frac{a_j^2}{2} \right) = 2 N_H(4^{-j}, \Pi) \exp \left(-\log \left(\frac{2j^2}{\delta} N_H(4^{-j}, \Pi) \right) \right) = \frac{\delta}{j^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by a further union bound:

$$P \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \sum_{s_{1:T}} \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi)(s_{1:T}) - A_{j-1}(\pi)(s_{1:T})), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \right\rangle \right| \geq \sum_{j=1}^J a_j 2^{2-j} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq P \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_j(\pi), A_{j-1}(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \geq \sum_{j=1}^J a_j 2^{2-j} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^J P \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(A_j(\pi), A_{j-1}(\pi), \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \geq a_j 2^{2-j} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} \right] \leq \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\delta}{j^2} < \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta}{j^2} < 1.7\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Take $\delta_k = \frac{1}{2^k}$ and apply the above bound to each δ_k yields that with probability at least $1 - \frac{1.7}{2^k}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \sum_{s_{1:T}} \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi)(s_{1:T}) - A_{j-1}(\pi)(s_{1:T})), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \right\rangle \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^J a_j 2^{2-j} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} \\
&= 4\sqrt{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \sqrt{\log(2^{k+1}j^2 N_H(4^{-j}, \Pi))} 2^{-j} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} = 4\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} \sum_{j=1}^J 2^{-j} \sqrt{\log(2^{k+1}j^2 N_H(4^{-j}, \Pi))} \\
&\leq 4\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} \sum_{j=1}^J 2^{-j} \left(\sqrt{k+1} + \sqrt{2 \log j} + \sqrt{\log N_H(4^{-j}, \Pi)} \right) \\
&\leq 4\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} \left(\sqrt{k+1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j} (1 + \sqrt{2 \log j}) + \sum_{j=1}^J 2^{-j} \sqrt{\log N_H(4^{-j}, \Pi)} \right) \\
&\leq 4\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} \left(\sqrt{k+1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{2j}{2^j} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J 2^{-j} \sqrt{\log N_H(4^{-j}, \Pi)} \right) \\
&= 4\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} \left(\sqrt{k+1} \frac{2 \cdot 2^{-1}}{(1-2^{-1})^2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J 2^{-j} \left(\sqrt{\log N_H(4^{-j}, \Pi)} + \sqrt{\log N_H(1, \Pi)} \right) \right) \\
&= 4\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} \left(4\sqrt{k+1} + \sum_{j=0}^J 2^{-j-1} \sqrt{\log N_H(4^{-j}, \Pi)} \right) < 4\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{M(\Pi)}{n}} \left(4\sqrt{k+1} + \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log N_H(\epsilon^2, \Pi)} d\epsilon \right) \\
&= 4\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n}} \left(4\sqrt{k+1} + \kappa(\Pi) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from setting $\epsilon = 2^{-j}$ and upper bounding the sum using the integral. Consequently, for each $k = 0, 1, \dots$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&P \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \sum_{s_{1:T}} \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi)(s_{1:T}) - A_{j-1}(\pi)(s_{1:T})), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \right\rangle \right| \right. \\
&\quad \left. \geq 4\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n}} \left(4\sqrt{k+1} + \kappa(\Pi) \right) \right] \leq \frac{1.7}{2^k}
\end{aligned}$$

We next turn the probability bound given in this equation into a bound on its (conditional) expectation. Specifically, define the (non-negative) random variable $R = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \sum_{s_{1:T}} \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi)(s_{1:T}) - A_{j-1}(\pi)(s_{1:T})), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \right\rangle \right|$ and let $F_R(\cdot)$ be its cumulative distribution function (conditioned on $\{\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}\}_{i=1}^n$). Per its definition, we have:

$$1 - F_R \left(4\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n}} \left(4\sqrt{k+1} + \kappa(\Pi) \right) \right) \leq \frac{1.7}{2^k}.$$

Consequently, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[R \mid \{\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}\}_{i=1}^n] &= \int_0^\infty (1 - F_R(r)) dr \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1.7}{2^k} 4\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n}} \left(4\sqrt{k+1} + \kappa(\Pi) \right) \\
&= 6.8\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} 4\sqrt{k+1} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \kappa(\Pi) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 6.8\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{4(k+1)}{2^k} + 2\kappa(\Pi) \right) \\
&= 6.8\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n}} (16 + 2\kappa(\Pi)).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation with respect to $\{\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}\}_{i=1}^n$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \sum_{s_{1:T}} \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi)(s_{1:T}) - A_{j-1}(\pi)(s_{1:T})), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \right\rangle \right| \right] \\
&\leq 6.8\sqrt{2} (16 + 2\kappa(\Pi)) \mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n}} \right] \tag{8} \\
&\leq 13.6\sqrt{2} (8 + \kappa(\Pi)) \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n} \right]}
\end{aligned}$$

Step 4: Refining the lower range bound using Talagrand's inequality. In this step, we obtain a bound on $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{n} \right]$ in terms of $\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2 \right]$. To this end, we use the following version of Talagrand's concentration inequality in [8, 36]:

Lemma 7. Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent \mathcal{X} -valued random variables and \mathcal{F} be a class of functions where $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f(x)| \leq U$ for some $U > 0$, and let Z_i be iid Rademacher random variables: $P(Z_i = 1) = P(Z_i = -1) = \frac{1}{2}$. We have:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{i=1}^n f^2(X_i) \right] \leq n \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}[f^2(X_i)] + 8U \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i f(X_i) \right| \right]$$

We apply Lemma 7 to the current context: we identify X_i in Lemma 7 with $(\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})$ here and $f(\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) = \mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})$. Since $\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}$ is bounded, $|f(\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})| \leq \sum_{s_{1:T}} \|\pi^\alpha(s_{1:T}) - \pi^\beta(s_{1:T})\|_2 \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2} \sum_{s_{1:T}} \|\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\|_2 \leq U$, $\forall \pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi$ for some constant U . Consequently, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq n \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right)^2 \right] + 8U \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| Z_i \left(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right) \right| \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by n then yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right)^2}{n} \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right)^2 \right] + 8U \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| Z_i \left(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right) \right| \right] \tag{9} \\
&= \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right)^2 \right] + 8U \mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by combining Equation (8) with Equation (9), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \sum_{s_{1:T}} \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi)(s_{1:T}) - A_{j-1}(\pi)(s_{1:T})), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \right\rangle \right| \right] \\
&\leq 13.6\sqrt{2} (8 + \kappa(\Pi)) \sqrt{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right)^2 \right] + 8U \mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, combining Equation (7), we have:

$$\sqrt{n} \mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) \right| \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \sum_{s_{1:T}} \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^J (A_j(\pi)(s_{1:T}) - A_{j-1}(\pi)(s_{1:T})), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}} \right\rangle \right| \right] + o(1) \\
&\leq 27.2\sqrt{2} (8 + \kappa(\Pi)) \sqrt{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2]} + 8U\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D) + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides of the above inequality by \sqrt{n} yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D) &\leq 27.2\sqrt{2} (8 + \kappa(\Pi)) \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2] + 8U\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D)}{n}} + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\
&\leq 27.2\sqrt{2} (8 + \kappa(\Pi)) \left(\sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2]}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{8U\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D)}{n}} \right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

The above equation immediately implies $\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi) = O(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}}) + O(\sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi)}{n}})$, which one can solve to obtain $\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi) = O(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}})$. Plugging it into Equation (10) then results:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D) &\leq 27.2\sqrt{2} (8 + \kappa(\Pi)) \left(\sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2]}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{O(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}})}{n}} \right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\
&\leq 27.2\sqrt{2} (8 + \kappa(\Pi)) \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2]}{n}} + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\
&\leq O\left(\kappa(\Pi) \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2]}{n}} \right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

□

C.1.2 Proof of Lemma 4

Proof. The proof divides into two main components.

Step 1: Expected uniform bound on maximum deviation. Since $v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2)$ is consistent, classical results on Rademacher complexity [2] give:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right| \right] \leq 2\mathcal{R}_n(\Pi^D).$$

Therefore, from Lemma 3, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right| \right] &\leq O\left(\kappa(\Pi) \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2]}{n}} \right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\
&\leq 4 \cdot O\left(\kappa(\Pi) \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_{\text{DR}}^*}{n}} \right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2: High probability bound on maximum deviation via Talagrand inequality. From the previous step, it remains to bound the difference between $\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right|$ and $\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \Delta(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right| \right]$. Here, we introduce the following version of Talagrand's concentration inequality in [8, 36]:

Lemma 8. *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent \mathcal{X} -valued random variables and \mathcal{F} be a class of functions where each $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in \mathcal{F} satisfies $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f(x)| \leq 1$. Then:*

$$P \left(\left| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) \right| - \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) \right| \right] \right| \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} t \log \left(1 + \frac{t}{V} \right) \right), \forall t > 0,$$

where V is any number satisfying $V \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{i=1}^n f^2(X_i) \right]$.

We apply Lemma 8 to the current context: we identify X_i in Lemma 8 with $(\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})$ here and $f(\{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) = \frac{\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})]}{2U}$, where U satisfies $|\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})| \leq U$. Consequently, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\left| \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})]}{2U} \right| \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})]}{2U} \right| \right] \right| \geq t \right) \\
& = P \left(\left| \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \frac{n}{2U} |\tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2)| - \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \frac{n}{2U} |\tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2)| \right] \right| \geq t \right) \\
& \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} t \log \left(1 + \frac{t}{V} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, let $t = 2\sqrt{2(\log \frac{1}{\delta})V} + 2\log \frac{1}{\delta}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} t \log \left(1 + \frac{t}{V} \right) \right) = \exp \left(-\frac{2\sqrt{2(\log \frac{1}{\delta})V} + 2\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{2\sqrt{2(\log \frac{1}{\delta})V} + 2\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{V} \right) \right) \\
& \leq \exp \left(-\frac{2\sqrt{2(\log \frac{1}{\delta})V} + 2\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{2} \frac{\frac{2\sqrt{2(\log \frac{1}{\delta})V} + 2\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{V}}{1 + \frac{2\sqrt{2(\log \frac{1}{\delta})V} + 2\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{V}} \right) = \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{(2\sqrt{2(\log \frac{1}{\delta})V} + 2\log \frac{1}{\delta})^2}{V + 2\sqrt{2(\log \frac{1}{\delta})V} + 2\log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \\
& = \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2\sqrt{2(\log \frac{1}{\delta})V} + 2\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{\sqrt{V} + \sqrt{2\log \frac{1}{\delta}}} \right)^2 \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{2\log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right)^2 \right) = \exp \left(-\log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) = \delta
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\left| \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \frac{n}{2U} |\tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2)| - \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \frac{n}{2U} |\tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2)| \right] \right| \geq 2\sqrt{2(\log \frac{1}{\delta})V} + 2\log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \\
& \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} t \log \left(1 + \frac{t}{V} \right) \right) \leq 2\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

This means that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$:

$$\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \frac{n}{2U} |\tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2)| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \frac{n}{2U} |\tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2)| \right] + 2\sqrt{2(\log \frac{1}{\delta})V} + 2\log \frac{1}{\delta}.$$

Now multiplying both sides by $2U$ and dividing both sides by n :

$$\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} |\tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2)| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} |\tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2)| \right] + \frac{4}{n} \sqrt{2U^2 (\log \frac{1}{\delta})V} + \frac{2U}{n} \log \frac{1}{\delta}. \quad (12)$$

Here, from Lemma 7, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})])^2 \right] \\
& \leq n \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{V}[(\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))] \\
& \quad + 8U \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})]) \right| \right] \\
& \leq n \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2] \\
& \quad + 8U \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})) \right| \right] + 8U \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})]) \right| \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq n \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2] \\
&+ 8U \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})) \right| \right] + 8U \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})) \right| \right] \\
&= n \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2] + 16U \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})) \right| \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Jensen by noting that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})]) \right| \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})) \right| \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})) \right| \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) - \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})]}{2U} \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{n}{4U^2} \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2] + \frac{8}{U} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})) \right| \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can plug the following V value into Equation (12):

$$V = \frac{n}{4U^2} \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2] + \frac{8}{U} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})) \right| \right],$$

it follows that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2) \right| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2) \right| \right] + \frac{4}{n} \sqrt{2U^2 \left(\log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) V} + \frac{2U}{n} \log \frac{1}{\delta} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2) \right| \right] + \frac{2U}{n} \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{4}{n} \sqrt{\left(\log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \frac{n}{2} \sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2]} \\
&+ \frac{4}{n} \sqrt{\left(\log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) 16U \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})) \right| \right]} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2) \right| \right] + \frac{2U}{n} \log \frac{1}{\delta} + 2\sqrt{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2]}{n}} \\
&+ 16\sqrt{\left(\log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \frac{U}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})) \right| \right]} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2) \right| \right] + 2\sqrt{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2]}{n}} \\
&+ \sqrt{\frac{O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})}{n}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2) \right| \right] + 2\sqrt{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2]}{n}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{0.75}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this observation with Equation (11), we have that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2) \right| \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \left| \tilde{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - \Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2) \right| \right] + 2\sqrt{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} [(\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2]}{n}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{0.75}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq O\left(\kappa(\Pi)\sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_{\text{DR}}^*}{n}}\right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + 2\sqrt{2\log\frac{1}{\delta}}\sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}))^2]}{n}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{0.75}}\right) \\
&= O\left(\left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log\frac{1}{\delta}}\right)\sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_{\text{DR}}^*}{n}}\right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

□

C.1.3 Proof of Lemma 5

Proof. First, we prove that $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k} - Q_{1,t})^2] = o(n^{-2\alpha_1})$ under Assumption (4c). Let define $\tau_{t:t'} = (s_t, a_t^1, a_t^2, \dots, s_{t'}, a_{t'}^1, a_{t'}^2)$ and $\rho_{t:t'}^\pi = \prod_{l=t}^{t'} \pi(a_l | s_l)$. From Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k} - Q_{1,t})^2] = \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} (\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k} - Q_{1,t})^2] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left(\sum_{t'=t}^T \gamma^{t'-t} \sum_{\tau_{t+1:t'}} \rho_{t+1:t'}^\pi \left(\hat{R}_{t'}^{-k} \prod_{l=t}^{t'-1} \hat{P}_T^{-k}(s_{l+1}|s_l, a_l) - R_{t'} \prod_{l=t}^{t'-1} P_T(s_{l+1}|s_l, a_l)\right)\right)^2\right] \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{t'=t}^T \gamma^{2(t'-t)}\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left(\sum_{t'=t}^T \left(\sum_{\tau_{t+1:t'}} \rho_{t+1:t'}^\pi \left(\hat{R}_{t'}^{-k} \prod_{l=t}^{t'-1} \hat{P}_T^{-k}(s_{l+1}|s_l, a_l) - R_{t'} \prod_{l=t}^{t'-1} P_T(s_{l+1}|s_l, a_l)\right)\right)\right)^2\right] \quad (13) \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{t'=t}^T \gamma^{2(t'-t)}\right) \sum_{t'=t}^T \left(\sum_{\tau_{t+1:t'}} 1\right) \sum_{\tau_{t+1:t'}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\hat{R}_{t'}^{-k} \prod_{l=t}^{t'-1} \hat{P}_T^{-k}(s_{l+1}|s_l, a_l) - R_{t'} \prod_{l=t}^{t'-1} P_T(s_{l+1}|s_l, a_l)\right)^2\right] \\
&= \left(\sum_{t'=t}^T \gamma^{2(t'-t)}\right) \sum_{t'=t}^T \sum_{\tau_{t+1:t'}} o(n^{-2\alpha_1}) = o(n^{-2\alpha_1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\sum_{\tau_{t+1:t}} \rho_{t+1:t}^\pi R_t \prod_{l=t}^{t-1} P_T(s_{l+1}|s_l, a_l) = R_t$ and $\sum_{\tau_{t+1:t}} \rho_{t+1:t}^\pi \hat{R}_t^{-k} \prod_{l=t}^{t-1} \hat{P}_T^{-k}(s_{l+1}|s_l, a_l) = \hat{R}_t^{-k}$.

Taking any policy profile $\pi \in \Pi$. We start by rewriting the DR value estimator as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left(\hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} (r_{i,t} - \hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)}) + \hat{\rho}_{i,t-1}^{-k(i)} \hat{V}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} (r_{i,t} - \hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + \gamma \hat{V}_{1,i,t+1}^{-k(i)})\right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{V}_{1,i,1}^{-k(i)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have the oracle double robust estimator as follows:

$$v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \rho_{i,t} (r_{i,t} - Q_{1,i,t} + \gamma V_{1,i,t+1})\right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_{1,i,1}.$$

Therefore, we can decompose the difference function $\hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{v}_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) - v_1^{\text{DR}}(\pi_1, \pi_2) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} (r_{i,t} - \hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + \gamma \hat{V}_{1,i,t+1}^{-k(i)})\right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{V}_{1,i,1}^{-k(i)} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \rho_{i,t} (r_{i,t} - Q_{1,i,t} + \gamma V_{1,i,t+1})\right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_{1,i,1} \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\rho_{i,t} (-\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + Q_{1,i,t}) + \rho_{i,t-1} (\hat{V}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} - V_{1,i,t}))\right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t}) (r_{i,t} - Q_{1,i,t} + \gamma V_{1,i,t+1})\right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t}) (-\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + Q_{1,i,t})\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\rho}_{i,t-1}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t-1}) (\hat{V}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} - V_{1,i,t}) \right).$$

For each of reference, denote:

1. $S_1^t(\pi) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\rho_{i,t} \left(-\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + Q_{1,i,t} \right) + \rho_{i,t-1} \left(\hat{V}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} - V_{1,i,t} \right) \right).$
2. $S_2^t(\pi) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t} \right) (r_{i,t} - Q_{1,i,t} + \gamma V_{1,i,t+1}).$
3. $S_3^t(\pi) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t} \right) \left(-\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + Q_{1,i,t} \right).$
4. $S_4^t(\pi) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{\rho}_{i,t-1}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t-1} \right) \left(\hat{V}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} - V_{1,i,t} \right).$

Hereafter, we bound $\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |S_1^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_1^t(\pi^\beta)|$, $\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |S_2^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_2^t(\pi^\beta)|$, $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_3^t(\pi)|$, and $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_4^t(\pi)|$ in turn. Define further:

1. $S_1^{t,k}(\pi) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\{i|k(i)=k\}} \left(\rho_{i,t} \left(-\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + Q_{1,i,t} \right) + \rho_{i,t-1} \left(\hat{V}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} - V_{1,i,t} \right) \right).$
2. $S_2^{t,k}(\pi) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\{i|k(i)=k\}} \left(\hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t} \right) (r_{i,t} - Q_{1,i,t} + \gamma V_{1,i,t+1}).$

Clearly, $S_1^t(\pi) = \sum_{k=1}^K S_1^{t,k}(\pi)$, $S_2^t(\pi) = \sum_{k=1}^K S_2^{t,k}(\pi)$.

Now since $\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)}$ is computed using the rest $K-1$ folds, when we condition on the data in the rest $K-1$ folds, $\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)}$ is fixed estimator. Consequently, conditioned on $\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)}$, $S_1^{t,k}(\pi)$ is a sum of **iid** bounded random variables with zero mean, because:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\rho_{i,t} \left(-\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + Q_{1,i,t} \right) + \rho_{i,t-1} \left(\hat{V}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} - V_{1,i,t} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\rho_{i,t-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\eta_{i,t} \left(-\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + Q_{1,i,t} \right) + \left(\hat{V}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} - V_{1,i,t} \right) \mid s_1, a_1^1, a_1^2, \dots, s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}^1, a_{t-1}^2, s_t \right] \right) \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, as in Equation (13), we can decompose $\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k}$ into π and other terms that are independent of π . Therefore, defining $S_{1,i}^t(\pi) = \rho_{i,t} \left(-\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + Q_{1,i,t} \right) + \rho_{i,t-1} \left(\hat{V}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} - V_{1,i,t} \right)$, we can obtain the bound on $\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |S_1^{t,k}(\pi^\alpha) - S_1^{t,k}(\pi^\beta)|$ as in Lemma 4: $\forall \delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & K \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |S_1^{t,k}(\pi^\alpha) - S_1^{t,k}(\pi^\beta)| \\ & \leq O \left(\left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} \left[(S_{1,i}^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_{1,i}^t(\pi^\beta))^2 \mid \hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)} \right]}{\frac{n}{K}}} \right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ & \leq 4 \cdot O \left(\left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Gamma_i\|_2^2 \mid \hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)} \right]}{\frac{n}{K}}} \right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_i = \frac{-\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + Q_{1,i,t}}{\prod_{t'=1}^t \pi^b(a_{i,t'} \mid s_{i,t'})} A_{i,1:t} + \frac{A_{i,1:t-1} \otimes (\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)}(s_{i,t}) - Q_{1,t}(s_{i,t}))}{\prod_{t'=1}^{t-1} \pi^b(a_{i,t'} \mid s_{i,t'})}$, and the second inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwartz.

Thus, from Assumption 1, for any $a^1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$, $a^2 \in \mathcal{A}^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} & K \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |S_1^{t,k}(\pi^\alpha) - S_1^{t,k}(\pi^\beta)| \\ & \leq 8C^t \sqrt{d} \cdot O \left(\left(\kappa(\Pi) + \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{K \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)}(s_{i,t}, a^1, a^2) - Q_{1,t}(s_{i,t}, a^1, a^2)|^2 \mid \hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)} \right]}{n}} \right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

From Equation (13), it follows that $\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left(\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)}(s_{i,t}, a) - Q_{1,t}(s_{i,t}, a) \right)^2 \right] = o(n^{-2\alpha_1})$. Consequently, Markov's inequality immediately implies that $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)}(s_{i,t}, a) - Q_{1,t}(s_{i,t}, a) \right)^2 \mid \hat{Q}_{1,t}^{-k(i)} \right] = o_p(n^{-2\alpha_1})$. Therefore, from $\alpha_1 > 0$, we immediately have: $\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |S_1^{t,k}(\pi^\alpha) - S_1^{t,k}(\pi^\beta)| = o_p(n^{-0.5-\alpha_1}) + o_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}) = o_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |S_1^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_1^t(\pi^\beta)| &= \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \left(S_1^{t,k}(\pi^\alpha) - S_1^{t,k}(\pi^\beta) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |S_1^{t,k}(\pi^\alpha) - S_1^{t,k}(\pi^\beta)| = o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By exactly the same argument, we have $\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |S_2^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_2^t(\pi^\beta)| = o_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$.

Next, we bound the contribution from $S_3^t(\pi)$ as follow:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_3^t(\pi)| &= \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t} \right) \left(-\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + Q_{1,i,t} \right) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t} \right| \cdot \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} - Q_{1,i,t} \right| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left(\hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t} \right)^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left(\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} - Q_{1,i,t} \right)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwartz. Taking expectation of both sides yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_3^t(\pi)| \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left(\hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t} \right)^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left(\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} - Q_{1,i,t} \right)^2} \right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left(\hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t} \right)^2 \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left(-\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + Q_{1,i,t} \right)^2 \right]} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left(\hat{\rho}_{i,t}^{-k(i)} - \rho_{i,t} \right)^2 \right]} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left(-\hat{Q}_{1,i,t}^{-k(i)} + Q_{1,i,t} \right)^2 \right]} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{s(\frac{K-1}{K}n)}{(\frac{K-1}{K}n)^{2\alpha_2}}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{s(\frac{K-1}{K}n)}{(\frac{K-1}{K}n)^{2\alpha_1}}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{s(\frac{K-1}{K}n)}{(\frac{K-1}{K}n)^{2\alpha_2}}} \sqrt{\frac{s(\frac{K-1}{K}n)}{(\frac{K-1}{K}n)^{2\alpha_1}}} \leq \frac{s(\frac{K-1}{K}n)}{\sqrt{(\frac{K-1}{K}n)^{2(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)}}} = o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality again follows from Cauchy-Schwartz and the last equality follows from $s(n) = o(1)$. Consequently, by Markov's inequality, this equation immediately implies $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_3^t(\pi)| = o_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$. By exactly the same argument, we have $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_4^t(\pi)| = o_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$. Putting the above bound for $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_1^t(\pi)|$, $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_2^t(\pi)|$, $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_3^t(\pi)|$ and $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_4^t(\pi)|$ together, we therefore have the claim established:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \hat{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) - \bar{\Delta}^{\text{DR}}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta) \right| \\ &= \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left(S_1^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_1^t(\pi^\beta) + S_2^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_2^t(\pi^\beta) + S_3^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_3^t(\pi^\beta) + S_4^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_4^t(\pi^\beta) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} \left| S_1^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_1^t(\pi^\beta) + S_2^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_2^t(\pi^\beta) + S_3^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_3^t(\pi^\beta) + S_4^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_4^t(\pi^\beta) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^{t-1} \left(\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |S_1^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_1^t(\pi^\beta)| + \sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta \in \Pi} |S_2^t(\pi^\alpha) - S_2^t(\pi^\beta)| + 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_3^t(\pi)| + 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_4^t(\pi)| \right) \\ &= o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

C.1.4 Proof of Lemma 6

Proof. $\forall \pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3 \in \Pi$:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_\Gamma(\pi_1, \pi_2)^2 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\sum_{s_{1:T}} (\pi_1(s_{1:T}) - \pi_3(s_{1:T}) + \pi_3(s_{1:T}) - \pi_2(s_{1:T}), \Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_3, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\}) + \mathcal{M}(\pi_3, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \\
&\leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (|\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_3, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2 + |\mathcal{M}(\pi_3, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2)}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{2 \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_3, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})| |\mathcal{M}(\pi_3, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \\
&\leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (|\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_3, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2 + |\mathcal{M}(\pi_3, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2)}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{2 \sqrt{(\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_3, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2) (\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi_3, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2)}}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \\
&= \left(\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi_1, \pi_3, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}} + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi_3, \pi_2, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}} \right)^2 \\
&= (I_\Gamma(\pi_1, \pi_3) + I_\Gamma(\pi_3, \pi_2))^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get $I_\Gamma(\pi_1, \pi_2) \leq I_\Gamma(\pi_1, \pi_3) + I_\Gamma(\pi_3, \pi_2)$.

Next, to prove the second statement, let $K = N_H(\epsilon^2, \Pi)$. Without loss of generality, we can assume $K < \infty$, otherwise, the above inequality automatically holds. Fix any n state trajectories $\{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\}$. Denote by $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_K\}$ the set of K policy profiles that ϵ^2 -cover Π . This means that for any $\pi \in \Pi$, there exists π_j , such that:

$$\forall M > 0, \forall \{\{\tilde{s}_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{\tilde{s}_{M,t}\}\}, H_M(\pi, \pi_j) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{1}(\{\bigvee_{t=1}^T \pi_1(s_{i,t}) \neq \pi_{j,1}(s_{i,t})\} \vee \{\bigvee_{t=1}^T \pi_2(s_{i,t}) \neq \pi_{j,2}(s_{i,t})\}) \leq \epsilon^2.$$

Pick $M = m \sum_{i=1}^n \lceil \frac{m |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \rceil + \sum_{i=1}^n \lceil \frac{m |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \rceil$ (where m is some positive integer) and

$$\{\{\tilde{s}_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{\tilde{s}_{M,t}\}\} = \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{1,t}\}, \{s_{2,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{2,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}, \{s_{*,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{*,t}\}\},$$

where $\{s_{i,t}\}$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) appears $\lceil \frac{m |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \rceil$ times and $\{s_{*,t}\}$ appears $m \sum_{i=1}^n \lceil \frac{m |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \rceil$ times. Here, we pick $\{s_{*,t}\}$ such that $\mathbf{1}(\{\bigvee_{t=1}^T \pi_1(s_{*,t}) \neq \pi_{j,1}(s_{*,t})\} \vee \{\bigvee_{t=1}^T \pi_2(s_{*,t}) \neq \pi_{j,2}(s_{*,t})\}) = 1$. Per the definition of M , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= (m+1) \sum_{i=1}^n \lceil \frac{m |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \rceil \\
&\leq (m+1) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{m |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} + 1 \right) \\
&= (m+1) \frac{m \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} + n \leq (m+1)(m+n).
\end{aligned}$$

Further, since each $\{s_{i,t}\}$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) appears $\lceil \frac{m |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \rceil$ times and $\{s_{*,t}\}$ appears $m \sum_{i=1}^n \lceil \frac{m |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \rceil$ times, we have:

$$H_M(\pi, \pi_j) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{1}(\{\bigvee_{t=1}^T \pi_1(s_{i,t}) \neq \pi_{j,1}(s_{i,t})\} \vee \{\bigvee_{t=1}^T \pi_2(s_{i,t}) \neq \pi_{j,2}(s_{i,t})\})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{m |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \right] \mathbf{1}(\{\bigvee_{t=1}^T \pi_1(s_{i,t}) \neq \pi_{j,1}(s_{i,t})\} \vee \{\bigvee_{t=1}^T \pi_2(s_{i,t}) \neq \pi_{j,2}(s_{i,t})\}) \\
&+ \frac{m}{M} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{m |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \right] \\
&\geq \frac{m}{(m+1)(m+n)} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{m |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} \\
&= \frac{m^2}{(m+1)(m+n)} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi, \pi_j, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2}{\sup_{\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{M}(\pi^\alpha, \pi^\beta, \{s_{i,t}\}, \{\Gamma_{i,s_{1:T}}\})|^2} = \frac{m^2}{(m+1)(m+n)} I_\Gamma(\pi, \pi_j)^2
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ yields: $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} H_M(\pi, \pi_j) \geq I_\Gamma(\pi, \pi_j)^2$. Therefore, we have:

$$I_\Gamma(\pi, \pi_j) \leq \epsilon.$$

Consequently, the above argument establishes that for any $\pi \in \Pi$, there exists $\pi_j \in \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_K\}$, such that $I_\Gamma(\pi, \pi_j) \leq \epsilon$, and therefore $N_{I_\Gamma}(\epsilon, \Pi, \{\{s_{1,t}\}, \dots, \{s_{n,t}\}\}) \leq K = N_H(\epsilon^2, \Pi)$ \square

C.2 Proofs of Lemma 2

Proof. Since the proof of Lemma 2 is almost same as Lemma 1, we omit the proof. \square

D Additional results of Experiment

Tables 6, 7 show the results in the experiments in Section 6.2. We provide additional results from the experiment in Section

Table 6: Off-policy exploitability evaluation in RBRPS1: RMSE (and standard errors).

N	$\hat{v}_{\text{IS}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{MIS}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{DM}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{DR}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}$
250	0.162 (0.049)	0.217 (0.020)	2.0×10^{-3} (5.6×10^{-4})	1.0×10^{-3} (3.1×10^{-4})	1.8×10^{-3} (5.0×10^{-4})
500	0.057 (0.018)	0.225 (8.7×10^{-3})	1.1×10^{-4} (3.4×10^{-5})	6.0×10^{-5} (1.9×10^{-5})	9.7×10^{-5} (3.0×10^{-5})
1000	0.053 (0.016)	0.222 (6.9×10^{-3})	1.2×10^{-8} (3.6×10^{-9})	4.7×10^{-9} (1.5×10^{-9})	9.9×10^{-9} (3.1×10^{-9})

Table 7: Off-policy exploitability evaluation in RBRPS2: RMSE (and standard errors).

N	$\hat{v}_{\text{IS}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{MIS}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{DM}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{DR}}^{\text{exp}}$	$\hat{v}_{\text{DRL}}^{\text{exp}}$
250	48.2 (10.9)	9.80 (2.60)	7.39 (0.43)	10.8 (3.40)	6.02 (1.01)
500	16.0 (2.98)	10.6 (1.43)	6.00 (0.71)	5.23 (1.71)	5.20 (1.09)
1000	10.2 (1.97)	10.7 (1.36)	4.45 (1.04)	3.49 (1.15)	4.06 (1.12)