

Optimal Uniform OPE and Model-based Offline Reinforcement Learning in Time-Homogeneous, Reward-Free and Task-Agnostic Settings

Ming Yin^{1,2} and Yu-Xiang Wang²

¹Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, UC Santa Barbara

²Department of Computer Science, UC Santa Barbara

ming_yin@ucsb.edu yuxiangw@cs.ucsb.edu

Abstract

This work studies the statistical limits of uniform convergence for offline policy evaluation (OPE) problems with model-based methods (for episodic MDP) and provides a unified framework towards optimal learning for several well-motivated offline tasks. Uniform OPE $\sup_{\Pi} |Q^{\pi} - \hat{Q}^{\pi}| < \epsilon$ is a stronger measure than the point-wise OPE and ensures offline learning when Π contains all policies (the global class). In this paper, we establish an $\Omega(H^2 S/d_m \epsilon^2)$ lower bound (over model-based family) for the global uniform OPE and our main result establishes an upper bound of $\tilde{O}(H^2/d_m \epsilon^2)$ for the *local* uniform convergence that applies to all *near-empirically optimal* policies for the MDPs with *stationary* transition. Here d_m is the minimal marginal state-action probability. Critically, the highlight in achieving the optimal rate $\tilde{O}(H^2/d_m \epsilon^2)$ is our design of *singleton absorbing MDP*, which is a new sharp analysis tool that works with the model-based approach. We generalize such a model-based framework to the new settings: offline task-agnostic and the offline reward-free with optimal complexity $\tilde{O}(H^2 \log(K)/d_m \epsilon^2)$ (K is the number of tasks) and $\tilde{O}(H^2 S/d_m \epsilon^2)$ respectively. These results provide a unified solution for simultaneously solving different offline RL problems.

1 Introduction

Offline reinforcement learning (offline RL) targets at learning a reward-maximizing policy in an unknown *Markov Decision Process* (MDP) using a static data generated by running a behavior policy [Lange et al., 2012, Levine et al., 2020]. This framework is widely applicable in applications where online exploration is demanding but historical data are plentiful. Examples include medicine [Liu et al., 2017] (safety concerns limit the applicability of unproven treatments but electronic records are abundant) and autonomous driving [Codevilla et al., 2018] (building infrastructure for testing new policy is expensive while collecting data

from current setting is almost free).

Parallel to its practical significance, recently there is a surge of theoretical investigations towards offline RL via two threads: *offline policy evaluation* (OPE), where the goal is to estimate the value of a target (fixed) policy V^π [Jiang and Li, 2016, Liu et al., 2018, Kallus and Uehara, 2020, 2019, Uehara and Jiang, 2019, Nachum et al., 2019, Xie et al., 2019, Yin and Wang, 2020, Duan et al., 2020, Wang et al., 2020b, Zhang et al., 2021] and *offline (policy) learning* which intends to output a near-optimal policy [Chen and Jiang, 2019, Le et al., 2019, Xie and Jiang, 2020a,b, Liu et al., 2020b, Hao et al., 2020, Zanette, 2020, Jin et al., 2020c, Hu et al., 2021, Yin et al., 2021b, Rashidinejad et al., 2021].

Yin et al. [2021a] initiates the studies for offline RL from the new perspective of *uniform convergence* in OPE (uniform OPE for short) which unifies OPE and offline learning tasks. Generally speaking, given a policy class Π and offline data with n episodes, uniform OPE seeks to coming up with OPE estimators \hat{V}_1^π and \hat{Q}_1^π satisfy $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \|\hat{Q}_1^\pi - Q_1^\pi\|_\infty < \epsilon$. The task is to achieve this with the optimal episode complexity: the “minimal” number of episodes n needed as a function of ϵ , failure probability δ , the parameters of the MDP as well as the behavior policy μ in the minimax sense.

To further motivate the readers why uniform OPE should be considered, we state its relation to offline learning. Indeed, uniform OPE to RL is analogous of uniform convergence of empirical risk in statistical learning [Vapnik, 2013]. In supervised learning, it has been proven that almost all learnable problems are learned by an (asymptotic) *empirical risk minimizer* (ERM) [Shalev-Shwartz et al., 2010]. In offline RL, the natural counterpart is the *empirical optimal policy* $\hat{\pi}^* := \operatorname{argmax}_\pi \hat{V}_1^\pi$ and with uniform OPE it further ensures $\hat{\pi}^*$ is a near-optimal policy for the offline learning via:

$$0 \leq Q_1^{\pi^*} - Q_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} = Q_1^{\pi^*} - \hat{Q}_1^{\pi^*} + \hat{Q}_1^{\pi^*} - \hat{Q}_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} + \hat{Q}_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} - Q_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} \leq 2 \sup_\pi |Q_1^\pi - \hat{Q}_1^\pi|. \quad (1)$$

On the *policy evaluation* side, there is often a need to evaluate the performance of a *data-dependent* policy. Uniform OPE suffices for this purpose since it will allow us to evaluate policies selected by safe-policy improvements, proximal policy optimization, UCB-style exploration-bonus as well as any heuristic exploration criteria (please refer to Yin et al. [2021a] and the references therein for further discussions). In this paper, we study the uniform OPE problem under the *finite horizon stationary MDPs* and focus on the model-based approaches. Specifically, we consider two representative class: global policy class Π_g (contains all (deterministic) policies) and local policy class Π_l (contains policies near the empirical optimal one, see Section 2.1). We ask the following question:

What is the statistical limit for uniform OPE and what is its connection to optimal offline learning?

We answer the first part by showing the global uniform OPE requires a lower bound of $\Omega(H^2 S / d_m \epsilon^2)$ ¹ for the family of model-based approach and the local uniform OPE can

¹Here d_m is the minimal marginal state-action occupancy, see Assumption 2.4.

achieve $\tilde{O}(H^2/d_m\epsilon^2)$ minimax rate by the model-based plug-in estimator and this implies optimal offline learning. Importantly, the procedure of the model-based approach via learning $\hat{\pi}^*$ through planning over the empirical MDP has a wider range of use in offline RL as it naturally adapts to the challenging tasks like *offline task-agnostic learning* and *offline reward-free learning*. See Section 1.2.

1.1 Related works

Offline reinforcement learning.² Information-theoretical considerations for offline RL are first proposed for *infinite horizon discounted setting* via Fitted Q-Iteration (FQI) type function approximation algorithms [Chen and Jiang, 2019, Le et al., 2019, Xie and Jiang, 2020a,b] which can be traced back to [Munos, 2003, Szepesvári and Munos, 2005, Antos et al., 2008a,b].

For the finite horizon case, Yin et al. [2021a] first achieves $\tilde{O}(H^3/d_m\epsilon^2)$ complexity under non-stationary transition but their results cannot further improve in the stationary setting. Recently, Yin et al. [2021b] designs the offline variance reduction algorithm for achieving the optimal $\tilde{O}(H^2/d_m\epsilon^2)$ rate. Their result is for a specific algorithm that uses data splitting while our results work for any algorithms that returns a nearly empirically optimal policy via uniform convergence. Our results on the offline task-agnostic and the reward-free settings are entirely new. Concurrently, Ren et al. [2021] considers the horizon-free setting but does not provide uniform convergence guarantee.

Model-based approaches with minimaxity. It is known model-based methods are minimax-optimal for online RL with regret $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{HSAT})$ (e.g. Azar et al. [2017], Efroni et al. [2019]). In the generative model setting, Agarwal et al. [2020] shows model-based approach is still minimax optimal $\tilde{O}((1-\gamma)^{-3}SA/\epsilon^2)$ by using a s -absorbing MDP construction and this model-based technique is later reused for other more general settings (e.g. Markov games [Zhang et al., 2020a] and linear MDPs [Cui and Yang, 2020]) and also for overcoming the sample size barrier [Li et al., 2020]. In offline RL, Yin et al. [2021a] uses the model-based methods to achieve $\tilde{O}(H^3/d_m\epsilon^2)$ complexity.

Task-agnostic and Reward-free problems. The reward-free problem is initiated in the online RL [Jin et al., 2020a] where the agent needs to efficiently explore an MDP environment *without* using any reward information. It requires high probability guarantee for learning optimal policy for *any* reward function. Later, Kaufmann et al. [2020], Menard et al. [2020] establish the $\tilde{O}(H^3S^2A/\epsilon^2)$ complexity and Zhang et al. [2020c] further tightens the dependence to $\tilde{O}(H^2S^2A/\epsilon^2)$. Recently, Zhang et al. [2020b] proposes the task-agnostic setting where one needs to use exploration data to simultaneously learn K tasks and proves an upper bound $\tilde{O}(H^5SA\log(K)/\epsilon^2)$. However, although these settings remain critical in

²We only provide a short discussion of the most related works due to the space constraint. A detailed discussion can be found in Appendix A.

the offline regime, no statistical result has been derived so far.

1.2 Our contribution

Optimal local uniform OPE. First and foremost, we derive the $\tilde{O}(H^2/d_m\epsilon^2)$ optimal episode complexity for local uniform OPE (Theorem 4.1) via the model-based method and this implies optimal offline learning with the same rate (Corollary 4.2); this result strictly improves upon Yin et al. [2021a] ($\tilde{O}(H^3/d_m\epsilon^2)$) non-trivially through our new *singleton-absorbing MDP* technique.

Information-theoretical characterization of the global uniform OPE. We characterize the statistical limit for the global uniform convergence by proving a minimax lower bound $\Omega(H^2S/d_m\epsilon^2)$ (over all model-based approaches) (Theorem 3.1). This result answers the question left by Yin et al. [2021a] that the global uniform OPE is generically harder than the local uniform OPE / offline learning by a factor of S , such a difference will dominate when the state space is exponentially large.

Generalize to the new offline settings. Critically, our model-based frameworks naturally generalize to the more challenging settings like task-agnostic and reward-free settings. In particular, we establish the $\tilde{O}(H^2\log(K)/d_m\epsilon^2)$ (Theorem 5.3) and $\tilde{O}(H^2S/d_m\epsilon^2)$ (Theorem 5.4) complexities for *offline task-agnostic learning* and *offline reward-free learning*. Both results are new and optimal.

Singleton-absorbing MDP: a sharp analysis tool for episodic stationary transition case. On the technical end, our major contribution is the novel design of *singleton-absorbing MDP* which handles the data-dependence hurdle encountered in the stationary MDPs. To decouple the data-dependence between $\hat{P}_{s,a}$ and \hat{V} , Agarwal et al. [2020] uses a s -absorbing MDP \hat{V}_s (in lieu of \hat{V}) of each state for the independence. To control the error propagation between \hat{V}_s and \hat{V} , they use the ϵ -net covering such that the value of \hat{V}_s traverse the evenly-spaced grids in $[0, (1-\gamma)^{-1}]$. However, when applied to finite horizon case, the complexity increases as there are H different quantities (V_1, \dots, V_H) and the ϵ -nets need to cover the H -dimensional space $[0, H]^H$. This result in a exponential- H covering number and the metric entropy blows up by a factor H , which yields suboptimal result. In contrast, the *singleton-absorbing MDP* technique designs a single absorbing MDP that can also control the error propagation sufficiently well. This sharp analysis tool negates the conjecture of Cui and Yang [2020] that absorbing MDP is not well suitable for finite horizon stationary MDP.

Significance: Unifying different offline settings Beyond the study of statistical limit in uniform OPE, this work solves the sample optimality problems for the local uniform OPE, offline task-agnostic and offline reward-free problems. If we take a deeper look, the algorithmic frameworks utilized are all based on the model-based empirical MDP construction and planning. Therefore, as long as we can analyze such framework sharply

(*e.g.* via novel absorbing-MDP technique), then it is hopeful that our techniques can be generalized to tackle more sophisticated settings. On the other hand, things could be more tricky for online RL since the exploration phases need to be specifically designed for each settings and there may not be one general algorithmic pattern that dominates. Our findings reveal the model-based framework is fundamental for offline RL as it subsumes settings like local uniform OPE, offline task-agnostic and offline reward-free learning into the identical learning pattern. Considering these tasks were originally proposed in the online regime under different contexts, such a unified view from the model-based perspective offers a new angle for understanding offline RL.

2 Problem setup

Episodic stationary reinforcement learning. A finite-horizon *Markov Decision Process* (MDP) is denoted by a tuple $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, H, d_1)$, where \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{A} are finite state action spaces with $S := |\mathcal{S}|, A := |\mathcal{A}|$. A stationary (time-invariant) transition kernel has the form $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \mapsto [0, 1]$ with $P(s'|s, a)$ representing the probability transition from state s , action a to next state s' . Besides, $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is the expected reward function and given (s, a) which satisfies $0 \leq r \leq 1$ and assumed known. d_1 is the initial state distribution and H is the horizon. At time t , a policy $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_H)$ assigns each state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ a probability distribution $\pi_t(s)$ over actions. For a policy π , a random trajectory $s_1, a_1, r_1, \dots, s_H, a_H, r_H, s_{H+1}$ is generated as follows: $s_1 \sim d_1, a_t \sim \pi(\cdot|s_t), r_t = r(s_t, a_t), s_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot|s_t, a_t), \forall t \in [H]$.

For any policy π and any $h \in [H]$, value function $V_h^\pi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^S$ and Q-value function $Q_h^\pi(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times A}$ are defined as: $V_h^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_\pi[\sum_{t=h}^H r_t | s_h = s]$, $Q_h^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_\pi[\sum_{t=h}^H r_t | s_h = s, a]$, $\forall s, a \in \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}$. The goal of RL is to find a policy π^* such that $v^\pi := \mathbb{E}_\pi[\sum_{t=1}^H r_t]$ is maximized, which is equivalent to simultaneously maximize $V_1^\pi(s)$ (or $Q_1^\pi(s, a)$) for all s (or s, a) [Sutton and Barto, 2018]. Therefore, for a targeted accuracy $\epsilon > 0$ it suffices to find a policy π_{alg} such that $\|Q_1^* - Q_1^{\pi_{\text{alg}}}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$. We denote V_h^π, Q_h^π as column vectors and $P_{s,a}$ as the row vector. In particular, we denote the average marginal state-action occupancy $d^\pi(s, a)$ as: $d^\pi(s, a) := \frac{1}{H} \sum_{t=1}^H \mathbb{P}[s_t = s | s_1 \sim d_1, \pi] \cdot \pi_t(a|s)$.

Offline setting. The offline RL assumes that episodes $\mathcal{D} = \{(s_t^{(i)}, a_t^{(i)}, r_t^{(i)}, s_{t+1}^{(i)})\}_{i \in [n]}^{t \in [H]}$ are rolling from some behavior policy μ a priori. In particular, we do not assume the knowledge of μ .

Model-based RL. We focus our attention on the model-based methods, which has witnessed numerous successes and is one of the most critical components of theoretical RL as a whole (as reviewed in Section 1.1). To make the presentation precise, we define the following:

Figure 1: Related comparisons of sample complexities for offline RL

Result/Method	Setting	Type	Complexity	Uniform guarantee?
Le et al. [2019]	∞ -horizon	FQI variants	$\tilde{O}((1-\gamma)^{-6}\beta_\mu/\epsilon^2)$	No
FQI [Chen and Jiang, 2019]	∞ -horizon	FQI variants	$\tilde{O}((1-\gamma)^{-6}C/\epsilon^2)$	No
MSBO/MABO [Xie and Jiang, 2020b]	∞ -horizon	FQI variants	$\tilde{O}((1-\gamma)^{-4}C_\mu/\epsilon^2)$	No
OPEMA [Yin et al., 2021a]	H -horizon	Non-splitting	$\tilde{O}(H^3/d_m\epsilon^2)$	\sqrt{H}/S -local uniform
OPDVR Yin et al. [2021b]	H -horizon	Data splitting	$\tilde{O}(H^2/d_m\epsilon^2)$	No
Model-based Plug-in (Corollary 4.2)	H -horizon	Non-splitting	$\tilde{O}(H^2/d_m\epsilon^2)$	\sqrt{H}/S -local uniform
Task-Agnostic (Theorem 5.3)	H -horizon	Non-splitting	$\tilde{O}(H^2 \log(K)/d_m\epsilon^2)$	—
Reward-Free (Theorem 5.4)	H -horizon	Non-splitting	$\tilde{O}(H^2 S/d_m\epsilon^2)$	—

* K is the number of tasks for Task-agnostic setting and β_μ , C and $1/d_m$ are data coverage parameters that measure the state-action dependence and are qualitative similar under their respective assumptions.

Definition 2.1. *Model-based RL: Solving RL problems (either learning or evaluation) through learning / modeling transition dynamic P .*

We emphasize that the model-based approaches in general (e.g. Jaksch et al. [2010], Ayoub et al. [2020], Kidambi et al. [2020]) follow the procedure of modeling the full MDP $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, H, d_1)$ instead of only the transition P . Nevertheless, we (by convention) assume the mean reward function is known and the initial state distribution d_1 will not affect the choice of optimal policy π^* . Thus, Definition 2.1 suffices for our purposes.

2.1 Uniform convergence in offline RL

We study offline RL from the uniform OPE perspective. Concretely, uniform OPE extends the point-wise (fixed target policy) OPE to a family of policies Π . The goal is to construct estimator \hat{Q}_1^π such that $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \|Q_1^\pi - \hat{Q}_1^\pi\| < \epsilon$, which automatically ensures point-wise OPE for any $\pi \in \Pi$. More importantly, uniform OPE directly implies offline learning when Π contains optimal policies. As explained in Section 1, let $\hat{\pi}^* := \operatorname{argmax}_\pi \hat{V}_1^\pi$ be the *empirical optimal policy* for some OPE estimator \hat{v}^π , then by (1) $\hat{\pi}^*$ is a near-optimal policy given uniform OPE guarantee. We consider the following two policy classes that are of the interests.

Definition 2.2 (The global (deterministic) policy class.). *The global policy class Π_g consists of all the non-stationary (deterministic) policies.*

It is well-known [Sutton and Barto, 2018] there exists at least one (deterministic) optimal policy, therefore Π_g is sufficiently rich for evaluating algorithms that aim at learning the optimal policy.

Definition 2.3 (The local policy class). *Given empirical MDP \hat{M} and \hat{V}_h^π is the value under \hat{M} . Let $\hat{\pi}^* := \operatorname{argmax}_\pi \hat{V}_1^\pi$ be the empirical optimal policy, then the local policy class Π_l is defined as:*

$$\Pi_l := \left\{ \pi : \text{ s.t. } \left\| \hat{V}_h^\pi - \hat{V}_h^{\hat{\pi}^*} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_{opt}, \forall h \in [H] \right\}$$

where $\epsilon_{opt} \geq 0$ is a parameter.

In above \widehat{M} uses \widehat{P} in lieu of P where $\widehat{P}(s'|s, a) = \frac{n_{s',s,a}}{n_{s,a}}$ if $n_{s,a} > 0$ and $1/S$ otherwise.³ This class characterizes policies in the neighborhood of empirical optimal policy. Given \widehat{P} , it is efficient to obtain $\widehat{\pi}^*$ using Value / Policy Iteration, therefore it is more practical to consider the neighborhood of $\widehat{\pi}^*$ (instead of π^*) since practitioners can use data \mathcal{D} to really check Π_l whenever needed. Next we present the regularity assumption required for uniform convergence OPE problem.

Assumption 2.4 (Exploration requirement). *Logging policy μ obeys that $\min_s d^\mu(s) > 0$, for any state s that is “accessible”. Moreover, we define the quantity $d_m := \min_{s,a} \{d^\mu(s, a) : d^\mu(s, a) > 0\}$ (recall $d^\mu(s, a)$ in Section 2) to be the minimal average marginal state-action probability.*

State s is “accessible” means there exists a policy π so that $d^\pi(s) > 0$. If for any policy π we always have $d^\pi(s) = 0$, then state s can never be visited in the given MDP. Note this is weaker than Yin et al. [2021a] since $d^\mu(s)$ is the average version of $d_t^\mu(s)$. Assumption 2.4 is the minimal assumption needed for the consistency of uniform OPE task and is qualitatively similar to the *concentrability* assumption [Munos, 2003]. This assumption can be potentially relaxed for pure offline learning problems, e.g. Liu et al. [2019], Rashidinejad et al. [2021], where they only require $d^\mu(s)(d^\mu(s, a)) > 0$ for any state s (s, a) satisfies $d^{\pi^*}(s)(d^{\pi^*}(s, a)) > 0$.

3 Statistical Hardness for Model-based Global Uniform OPE

From (1) and Definition 2.2, it is clear the global uniform OPE implies offline RL, therefore it is natural to wonder whether they just are “the same task” (their sample complexities have the same minimax rates). If this conjecture is true, then deriving sample efficient global OPE method is just as important as deriving efficient offline learning algorithm (plus the additional benefit of evaluating data-dependent algorithms)! Yin et al. [2021a] proves the $\tilde{O}(H^3 S / d_m \epsilon^2)$ upper bound and $\Omega(H^3 / d_m \epsilon^2)$ lower bound for global uniform OPE, but it is unclear whether the additional S is essential. We answer the question affirmatively by providing a tight lower bound result with a concise proof to show no model-based algorithm can surpass $\Omega(S / d_m \epsilon^2)$ information-theoretical limit.

Theorem 3.1 (Minimax lower bound for global uniform OPE). *Let d_m be a parameter such that $0 < d_m \leq \frac{1}{SA}$. Let the problem class be $\mathcal{M}_{d_m} := \{(\mu, M) \mid \min_{t,s,a} d_t^\mu(s, a) \geq d_m\}$.*

³Here $n_{s,a}$ is the number of pair (s, a) being visited among n episodes. $n_{s',s,a}$ is defined similarly.

Then there exists universal constants $c, C, p > 0$ such that: for any $n \geq cS/d_m \cdot \log(SAp)$,

$$\inf_{\hat{Q}_{1,mb}} \sup_{\mathcal{M}_{d_m}} \mathbb{P}_{\mu,M} \left(\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left\| \hat{Q}_{1,mb}^\pi - Q_1^\pi \right\|_\infty \geq C \sqrt{\frac{H^2 S}{nd_m}} \right) \geq p,$$

where $\hat{Q}_{1,mb}$ is the output of any model-based algorithm and Π_g is defined in Definition 2.2.

By setting $\epsilon := \sqrt{\frac{H^2 S}{nd_m}}$, Theorem 3.1 establishes the global uniform convergence lower bound of $\Omega(H^2 S/d_m \epsilon^2)$ over model-based methods, which builds the hard statistical threshold between the global uniform OPE and the local uniform OPE tasks by a factor of S since the local case has achievable $\tilde{O}(1/d_m \epsilon^2)$ rate on the dependence for state-actions. This result also reveals the global uniform convergence bound in Yin et al. [2021a] ($\tilde{O}(H^3 S/d_m \epsilon^2)$) is essentially minimax rate-optimal for their *non-stationary setting*⁴ and complements the story on the optimality behavior for global uniform OPE. Moreover, from the generative model view the lower bound degenerates to $S/d_m \epsilon^2 \approx \Theta(S^2 A/\epsilon^2)$ which is linear in the model size $S^2 A$. This means in order to achieve global uniform convergence any algorithm needs to estimate each coordinate of transition kernel $P(s'|s, a)$ accurately. We now provide the proof sketch and full proof is deferred to Appendix C.

Proof Sketch. We only explain the case where $H = 2$ in this proof sketch. Our proof relies on the following novel reduction to l_1 density estimation

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left\| \hat{Q}_1^\pi - Q_1^\pi \right\|_\infty \geq \sup_{s,a} \frac{1}{2} \left\| \hat{P}(\cdot|s, a) - P(\cdot|s, a) \right\|_1$$

and leverages the Minimax rate for estimating discrete distribution under l_1 loss is $O(\sqrt{S/n_{s,a}})$ [Han et al., 2015]. Concretely, by Definition 2.1, let \hat{P} be the learned transition by any arbitrary model-based method. Since we assume r is known and by convention $Q_{H+1}^\pi = 0$ for any π , then by Bellman equation

$$\hat{Q}_h^\pi = r_h + \hat{P}^{\pi_{h+1}} \hat{Q}_{h+1}^\pi, \forall h \in [H].$$

In particular, $\hat{Q}_{H+1}^\pi = Q_{H+1}^\pi = 0$, and this implies $\hat{Q}_H^\pi = Q_H^\pi = r_H$. Now, again by definition of Bellman equation $\hat{Q}_{H-1}^\pi = r_{H-1} + \hat{P}^{\pi_H} \hat{Q}_H^\pi = r_{H-1} + \hat{P}^{\pi_H} r_H$ and $Q_{H-1}^\pi = r_{H-1} + P^{\pi_H} r_H$,

⁴To be rigorous, we remark that it is rate-optimal since for the non-stationary setting the dependence for horizon is higher by a factor H .

therefore (recall $H = 2$ and note $r_H \in \mathbb{R}^{S \cdot A}, r_H^{\pi_H} \in \mathbb{R}^S$)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left\| \hat{Q}_{H-1}^\pi - Q_{H-1}^\pi \right\|_\infty = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left\| \left(\hat{P}^{\pi_H} - P^{\pi_H} \right) r_H \right\|_\infty \\
& = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left\| \left(\hat{P} - P \right) r_H^{\pi_H} \right\|_\infty \approx \sup_{r \in \{0,1\}^S} \left\| \left(\hat{P} - P \right) r \right\|_\infty \\
& \geq \sup_{s,a} \frac{1}{2} \left\| \hat{P}(\cdot|s,a) - P(\cdot|s,a) \right\|_1 \geq O(\sqrt{S/n_{s,a}});
\end{aligned}$$

Lastly, using exponential tail bound to obtain $O(\sqrt{S/n_{s,a}}) \gtrsim O(\sqrt{S/nd_m})$ with high probability. See Appendix C for how to prove the result for the general H . \blacksquare

4 Optimal local uniform OPE via model-based plug-in method

Global uniform OPE is intrinsically harder than the offline learning problem due to the additional state-space dependence and such a gap will amplify when S is (exponentially) large. This motivates us to switch to the local uniform convergence regime that enables optimal learning but also has sub-linear state-action size $\tilde{O}(1/d_m)$ in the policy evaluation. Yin et al. [2021a] Theorem 3.7 first obtains the $\tilde{O}(H^3/d_m\epsilon^2)$ local uniform convergence for Π_l (recall Definition 2.3) and also obtains the same rate for the learning task. Unfortunately, their technique cannot further reduces the dependence of H for stationary transition case. In this section we show the model-based plug-in approach ensures optimal local uniform OPE and further implies optimal offline learning with episode complexity $\tilde{O}(H^2/d_m\epsilon^2)$. To this end, we design the new *singleton-absorbing MDP* to handle the challenge in the stationary transition setting, which uses the absorbing MDP with one single H -dimensional reference point and is our major technical contribution. The *singleton-absorbing MDP* technique avoids the exponential H cover used in Cui and Yang [2020] and answers their conjecture that absorbing MDP is not well suitable for finite horizon stationary MDP.⁵

4.1 Model-based Offline Plug-in Estimator

Recall $n_{s,a} := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbf{1}[s_h^{(i)}, a_h^{(i)} = s, a]$ be the total counts that visit (s, a) pair, then the model-based offline plug-in estimator constructs estimator \hat{P} as:

$$\hat{P}(s'|s, a) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbf{1}[(s_{h+1}^{(i)}, a_h^{(i)}, s_h^{(i)}) = (s', s, a)]}{n_{s,a}},$$

if $n_{s,a} > 0$ and $\hat{P}(s'|s, a) = \frac{1}{S}$ if $n_{s,a} = 0$. As a consequence, the estimators $\hat{Q}_h^\pi, \hat{V}_h^\pi$ are computed as:

$$\hat{Q}_h^\pi = r + \hat{P}^{\pi_{h+1}} \hat{Q}_{h+1}^\pi = r + \hat{P} \hat{V}_{h+1}^\pi,$$

⁵See their Section 7, first bullet point for a discussion.

with the initial distribution $\hat{d}_1(s) = n_s/n$. Under the above setting, we can define the empirical Bellman optimality equations (as well as the population version for completeness) as $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, h \in [H]$:

$$\begin{aligned} V_h^*(s) &= \max_a \{r(s, a) + P(\cdot|s, a)V_{h+1}^*\}, \\ \hat{V}_h^*(s) &= \max_a \{r(s, a) + \hat{P}(\cdot|s, a)\hat{V}_{h+1}^*\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can state our local uniform OPE result with this construction.

4.2 Main results for local uniform OPE and offline learning

Recall $\hat{\pi}^* := \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi} \hat{V}_1^{\pi}$ is the empirical optimal policy and the local policy class $\Pi_l := \{\pi : \text{s.t. } \|\hat{V}_h^{\pi} - \hat{V}_h^{\hat{\pi}^*}\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon_{\text{opt}}, \forall h \in [H]\}$.

Theorem 4.1 (optimal local uniform OPE). *Let $\epsilon_{\text{opt}} \leq \sqrt{H/S}$ and denote $\iota = \log(HSA/\delta)$. For any $\delta \in [0, 1]$, there exists universal constants c, C such that when $n > cH \cdot \log(HSA/\delta)/d_m$, with probability $1 - \delta$,*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_l} \|\hat{Q}_1^{\pi} - Q_1^{\pi}\|_{\infty} \leq C \left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2 \iota}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^{2.5} S^{0.5} \iota}{nd_m} \right].$$

Theorem 4.1 establishes the $\tilde{O}(H^2/d_m \epsilon^2)$ complexity bound and directly implies the upper bound for $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_l} \|\hat{V}_1^{\pi} - V_1^{\pi}\|_{\infty}$ with the same rate. This result improves the local uniform convergence rate $\tilde{O}(H^3/d_m \epsilon^2)$ in [Yin et al. \[2021a\]](#) (Theorem 3.7) by a factor of H and is near-minimax optimal (up to the logarithmic factor). Such result is first achieved by our novel *singleton absorbing MDP* technique. We explain this technique in detail in the next section.

On the other hand, characterizing policy class through the distance in value (like Π_l) is more flexible than characterizing the distance between policies themselves (*e.g.* via total variation). This is because: if two policies are “close”, then their values are also similar; but the reverse may not be true since two very different policies could possibly generate similar values. Therefore the consideration of Π_l is generic and conceptually reflects the fundamental principle of RL: as long as two policies yield the same value, they are considered “equally good”, no matter how different they are.⁶

Most importantly, Theorem 4.1 guarantees near-minimax optimal offline learning:

⁶We recognize that in the specific settings (*e.g.* safe policy improvement) some of the policies that yield high values are not feasible. These considerations are beyond the scope of this paper.

Corollary 4.2 (optimal offline learning). *If $\epsilon_{\text{opt}} \leq \sqrt{H/S}$ and that $\sup_t \|\widehat{V}_t^{\widehat{\pi}} - \widehat{V}_t^{\widehat{\pi}^*}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_{\text{opt}}$, when $n > O(H \cdot \iota/d_m)$, then with probability $1 - \delta$, element-wisely,*

$$V_1^* - V_1^{\widehat{\pi}} \leq C \left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2 \iota}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^{2.5} S^{0.5} \iota}{nd_m} \right] \mathbf{1} + \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \mathbf{1}.$$

Corollary 4.2 first establishes the minimax rate for offline learning for any policy $\widehat{\pi}$ with the measurable gap $\epsilon_{\text{opt}} \leq \sqrt{H/S}$. This extends the standard concept of offline learning by allowing any empirical planning algorithm (e.g. VI/PI) to find an *inexact* $\widehat{\pi}$ as an $(\tilde{O}(\sqrt{H^2/nd_m} + \epsilon_{\text{opt}}))$ -optimal policy (instead of finding exact $\widehat{\pi}^*$). The use of *inexact* $\widehat{\pi}$ could encourage early stopping (e.g. for VI/PI) therefore saves computational iterations. Besides, we leverage full data to construct empirical MDP for planning and, on the contrary, Yin et al. [2021b] uses data-splitting (split data into mini-batches and only apply each mini-batch at each specific iteration) to enable Variance Reduction technique, which could cause inefficient data use for the practical purpose. By the following lower bound result from Yin et al. [2021b], our Corollary 4.2 is near minimax optimal.

Theorem 4.3 (Theorem 4.2. Yin et al. [2021b]). *Let \mathcal{M}_{d_m} be the same as Theorem 3.1. There exists universal constants c_1, c_2, c, p (with $H, S, A \geq c_1$ and $0 < \epsilon < c_2$) such that when $n \leq cH^2/d_m\epsilon^2$,⁷*

$$\inf_{V_1^{\pi_{\text{alg}}}} \sup_{(\mu, M) \in \mathcal{M}_{d_m}} \mathbb{P}_{\mu, M} (\|V_1^* - V_1^{\pi_{\text{alg}}}\|_\infty \geq \epsilon) \geq p.$$

For the rest of the section, we explain the proving ideas by introducing the *singleton-absorbing MDP* technique and the full proofs of Theorem 4.1, Corollary 4.2 can be found in Appendix B, D.

4.3 Singleton absorbing MDP for finite horizon MDP

For the ease of illustration, we explain our idea via bounding $\|\widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}^*}\|_\infty$ (instead of $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_t} \|\widehat{Q}_1^\pi - Q_1^\pi\|_\infty$) and choose related quantity $\widehat{\pi}^*$ (instead of $\widehat{\pi}$) and \widehat{V}_h^* (instead of $\widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}}$) to discuss. Essentially, the key challenge in obtaining the optimal dependence in stationary setting is the need to decouple the dependence between $P - \widehat{P}$ and \widehat{V}_h^* as we aggregate all data for constructing both \widehat{P} and \widehat{V}_h^* . This issue is not encountered in the non-stationary setting in general due to the flexibility to estimate different transition P_t at each time [Yin et al., 2021a] and \widehat{P}_t and \widehat{V}_{t+1}^* preserve conditional independence. However, when confined to stationary case, their complex $\tilde{O}(H^3/d_m\epsilon^2)$ becomes suboptimal. Moreover, the direct use of *s*-absorbing MDP in Agarwal et al. [2020] does not yield tight bounds for the finite horizon

⁷The original Theorem uses v^* but we use V_1^* here. It does not matter since we can manually add a default state at the beginning of the MDP and obtain the result for our version.

stationary setting, as it requires s -absorbing MDPs with H -dimensional fine-grid cover to make sure \widehat{V}_h^\star is close to one of the elements in the cover (which has size $\approx H^H$ and it is not optimal Cui and Yang [2020]). We overcome this hurdle by choosing *only one* delicate absorbing MDP to approximate \widehat{V}_h^\star which will not incur additional dependence on horizon H caused by the union bound. We begin with the general definition of absorbing MDP initialized in Agarwal et al. [2020] and then introduce the *singleton absorbing MDP*.

Standard s -absorbing MDP in the finite horizon setting. The general s -absorbing MDP is defined as follows: for a fixed state s and a sequence $\{u_t\}_{t=1}^H$, MDP $M_{s,\{u_t\}_{t=1}^H}$ is identical to M for all states except s , and state s is absorbing in the sense $P_{M_{s,\{u_t\}_{t=1}^H}}(s|s, a) = 1$ for all a , and the instantaneous reward at time t is $r_t(s, a) = u_t$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}, t \in [H]$. For convenience, we use the shorthand notation $V_{\{s, u_t\}}^\pi$ to denote $V_{s, M_{s,\{u_t\}_{t=1}^H}}^\pi$ and similarly for Q_t, r and transition P . Also, $V_{\{s, u_t\}}^\star$ ($Q_{\{s, u_t\}}^\star$) is the optimal value under $M_{s,\{u_t\}_{t=1}^H}$.

Before defining singleton absorbing MDP, we first present the following Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5 which support the our design.

Lemma 4.4. $V_t^\star(s) - V_{t+1}^\star(s) \geq 0, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, t \in [H]$.

Lemma 4.5. Fix a state s . If we choose $u_t^\star := V_t^\star(s) - V_{t+1}^\star(s)$, then we have the following vector form equation

$$V_{h,\{s, u_t^\star\}}^\star = V_{h,M}^\star \quad \forall h \in [H].$$

Similarly, if we choose $\hat{u}_t^\star := \widehat{V}_t^\star(s) - \widehat{V}_{t+1}^\star(s)$, then $\widehat{V}_{h,\{s, \hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star = \widehat{V}_{h,M}^\star, \forall h \in [H]$.

The proofs are deferred to Appendix B. Note by Lemma 4.4 the assignment of $u_t^\star (:= r_{t,\{s, u_t^\star\}})$ is well-defined. Lemma 4.5 is crucial since, under the specification of u_t^\star , the optimal value in $M_{s,\{u_t^\star\}_{t=1}^H}$ is identical to the optimal value in original M . Based on these, we can define the following:

Definition 4.6 (Singleton-absorbing MDP). For each state s , the singleton-absorbing MDP is chosen to be $M_{s,\{u_t^\star\}_{t=1}^H}$, where $u_t^\star := V_t^\star(s) - V_{t+1}^\star(s)$ for all $t \in [H]$.

Using Definition 4.6, for each (s, a) row the term $(\widehat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a})\widehat{V}_h^\star$ can be substituted by $(\widehat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a})\widehat{V}_{h,\{s, u_t^\star\}}^\star$, where $\widehat{P}_{s,a}$ and $\widehat{V}_{h,\{s, u_t^\star\}}^\star$ are independent by construction and Bernstein concentration applies. Furthermore, by the selection of u_t^\star , we can control the error of $\|\widehat{V}_h^\star - \widehat{V}_{h,\{s, u_t^\star\}}^\star\|_\infty$ to have rate $O(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}})$ which forces the term $(\widehat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a})(\widehat{V}_h^\star - \widehat{V}_{h,\{s, u_t^\star\}}^\star)$ to have higher order error. These are the critical building blocks for bounding $\|\widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}^\star} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}^\star}\|_\infty$.

Indeed, by Bellman equations we have the decomposition:

$$\widehat{Q}_h^{\pi^*} - Q_h^{\pi^*} = \dots = \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\pi^*} (\widehat{P} - P) \widehat{V}_{t+1}^*,$$

where $\Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\pi} = \prod_{i=h+1}^t P^{\pi_i}$ is multi-step state-action transition and $\Gamma_{h+1:h} := I$. Then for each (s, a) row

$$\begin{aligned} & (\widehat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}) \widehat{V}_h^* \\ &= (\widehat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}) (\widehat{V}_h^* - \widehat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*) + (\widehat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}) \widehat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^* \\ &\lesssim \|\widehat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1 \|\widehat{V}_h^* - \widehat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*\|_{\infty} + \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\widehat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*)}{n_{s,a}}} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{S}{n_{s,a}}} \|\widehat{V}_h^* - \widehat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*\|_{\infty} + \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\widehat{V}_h^*)}{n_{s,a}}} \quad (\star) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where (\star) is the place where the traditional technique uses the union bound over their *exponential large* ϵ -net and we do not have it! Next, by Lemma 4.5 and Lemma B.2 in Appendix

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\widehat{V}_h^* - \widehat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*\|_{\infty} = \|\widehat{V}_{h,\{s,\hat{u}_t^*\}}^* - \widehat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq H \max_t |\hat{u}_t^* - u_t^*| \leq 2H \max_t |\widehat{V}_t^* - V_t^*|, \end{aligned}$$

by a crude bound (Lemma J.10), $\max_t |\widehat{V}_t^* - V_t^*| \lesssim H^2 \sqrt{\frac{S}{n_{s,a}}}$ which makes $\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_{s,a}}} \|\widehat{V}_h^* - \widehat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*\|_{\infty}$ have order $1/n_{s,a}$. Finally, to reduce the horizon dependence we apply $\sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\pi} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{s,a}(V_{t+1}^{\pi})} \leq \sqrt{(H-h)^3}$ for any π . This (informally) bounds $\widehat{Q}_h^{\pi^*} - Q_h^{\pi^*}$ by

$$\|\widehat{Q}_h^{\pi^*} - Q_h^{\pi^*}\|_{\infty} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{H^3}{n_{s,a}}} + \frac{\text{Poly}(H, S)}{n_{s,a}}.$$

Lastly, use $\min_{s,a} n_{s,a} \gtrsim H \cdot d_m$ to finish the proof.

Remark 4.7. We emphasize the appropriate selection of $M_{s,\{u_t^*\}_{t=1}^H}$ ($\widehat{M}_{s,\{u_t^*\}_{t=1}^H}$) is the key for achieving optimality. It guarantees two things: 1. $\widehat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*$ approximates \widehat{V}_h^* with sufficient accuracy (has rate $\sqrt{1/n_{s,a}}$); 2. it avoids the fine-grid design with exponential union bound in the dominate term ($\sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\widehat{V}_h^*) \log(|U_{s,a}|/\delta)}{N}}$ with $|U_{s,a}|$ to be at least H^H Cui and Yang [2020].)

5 New settings: offline Task-agnostic and offline Reward-free learning

From Corollary 4.2, our model-based offline learning algorithm has two steps: 1. constructing offline empirical MDP \widehat{M} using the offline dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(s_t^{(i)}, a_t^{(i)}, r(s_t^{(i)}, a_t^{(i)}), s_{t+1}^{(i)})\}_{i \in [n], t \in [H]}$; 2. performing any accurate black-box *planning* algorithm and returning $\hat{\pi}^*$ (or $\hat{\pi}$) as the final output. However, the only *effective* data (data that contains stochasticity) is $\mathcal{D}' = \{(s_t^{(i)}, a_t^{(i)})\}_{i \in [n], t \in [H]}$. This indicates we are essentially using the state-action space exploration data \mathcal{D}' to solve the task-specific problem with reward r . With this perspective in mind, it is natural to ask: given only the offline exploration data \mathcal{D}' , can we efficiently learn a set of potentially conflicting K tasks (K rewards) simultaneously? Even more, can we efficiently learn all tasks simultaneously? This brings up the following definitions.

Definition 5.1 (Offline Task-agnostic Learning). *Given a offline exploration dataset $\mathcal{D}' = \{(s_t^{(i)}, a_t^{(i)})\}_{i \in [n], t \in [H]}$ by μ with n episodes. Given K tasks with reward $\{r_k\}_{k=1}^K$ and the corresponding K MDPs $M_k = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r_k, H, d_1)$. Can we use \mathcal{D}' to output $\hat{\pi}_1, \dots, \hat{\pi}_K$ such that $\mathbb{P}[\forall r_k, k \in [K], \|V_{1,M_k}^* - V_{1,M_k}^{\hat{\pi}_k}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon] \geq 1 - \delta$?*

Definition 5.2 (Offline Reward-free Learning). *Given a offline exploration dataset $\mathcal{D}' = \{(s_t^{(i)}, a_t^{(i)})\}_{i \in [n], t \in [H]}$ by μ with n episodes. For any reward r and the corresponding MDP $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, H, d_1)$. Can we use \mathcal{D}' to output $\hat{\pi}$ such that $\mathbb{P}[\forall r, \|V_{1,M}^* - V_{1,M}^{\hat{\pi}}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon] \geq 1 - \delta$?*

Definition 5.1 and Definition 5.2 are the offline counterparts of Zhang et al. [2020b] and Jin et al. [2020a] in online RL. Those settings are of practical interests in the offline regime as well since in practice reward functions are often iteratively engineered to encourage desired behavior via trial and error and using one shot of offline exploration data \mathcal{D}' to tackle problems with different reward functions (different tasks) could help improve sample efficiency significantly.

Our singleton absorbing MDP technique adapts to those settings and we have the following two theorems. The proofs of Theorem 5.3, 5.4 can be found in Appendix E, F.

Theorem 5.3 (optimal offline task-agnostic learning). *Given $\mathcal{D}' = \{(s_t^{(i)}, a_t^{(i)})\}_{i \in [n], t \in [H]}$ by μ . Given K tasks with reward $\{r_k\}_{k=1}^K$ and the corresponding K MDPs $M_k = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r_k, H, d_1)$. Denote $\iota = \log(HSA/\delta)$. Let $\hat{\pi}_k^* := \arg\max_{\pi} \widehat{V}_{1,M_k}^{\pi} \forall k \in [K]$, when $n > O(H \cdot [\iota + \log(K)]/d_m)$, then with probability $1 - \delta$, $\|V_{1,M_k}^* - V_{1,M_k}^{\hat{\pi}_k^*}\|_\infty \leq O\left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2(\iota + \log(K))}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^{2.5}S^{0.5}(\iota + \log(K))}{nd_m}\right] \forall k \in [K]$.*

Theorem 5.4 (optimal offline reward-free learning). *Given $\mathcal{D}' = \{(s_t^{(i)}, a_t^{(i)})\}_{i \in [n], t \in [H]}$ by μ . For any reward r denote the corresponding MDP $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, H, d_1)$. Denote*

$\iota = \log(HSA/\delta)$. Let $\hat{\pi}_M^* := \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi} \hat{V}_{1,M}^{\pi} \forall r$, when $n > O(HS \cdot \iota/d_m)$, then with probability $1 - \delta$, $\|V_{1,M}^* - V_{1,M}^{\hat{\pi}_M^*}\|_{\infty} \leq O\left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2 S \iota}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^2 S \iota}{nd_m}\right]$, $\forall r, M$.

By a direct translation of both theorems, we have sample complexity of order $\tilde{O}(H^2 \log(K)/d_m \epsilon^2)$ and $\tilde{O}(H^2 S/d_m \epsilon^2)$. All the parameters have the optimal rates, see the lower bounds in Zhang et al. [2020b] and Jin et al. [2020a].⁸ The higher order dependence in Theorem 5.4 is also tight comparing to Theorem 5.3. Such statistically optimal results reveal the model-based methods generalize well to those seemingly challenging problems in the offline regime. Changing to these harder problems would not affect the optimal statistical efficiency of the model-based approach.

6 Further discussion: Extension to linear MDP with anchor representations

The principle of our *Singleton absorbing MDP* technique (with model-based construction) in decoupling the dependence between $\hat{P}_{s,a}$ and \hat{V}^* is not confined to tabular MDPs and therefore it is natural to generalize such idea for the episodic stationary transition setting for other problems. As an example, we further present a sharp result for the setting of finite horizon linear MDP with anchor points. We narrate by assuming a generative oracle (that allows sampling from $s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)$) for the ease of exposition.

Definition 6.1 (Linear MDP with anchor points [Yang and Wang, 2019, Cui and Yang, 2020]). Let \mathcal{S} be the exponential large space and \mathcal{A} be the infinite (or even continuous) spaces. Assume there is feature map $\phi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ (where $K \ll |\mathcal{S}|$), i.e. $\phi(s, a) = [\phi_1(s, a), \dots, \phi_K(s, a)]$. Transition P admits a linear representation:

$$P(s'|s, a) = \sum_{k \in [K]} \phi_k(s, a) \psi_k(s')$$

where $\psi_1(\cdot), \dots, \psi_K(\cdot)$ are unknowns. We further assume there exists a set of anchor state-action pairs \mathcal{K} such that any (s, a) can be represented as a convex combination of the anchors $\{(s_k, a_k) | k \in \mathcal{K}\}$:

$$\exists \{\lambda_k^{s,a}\} : \phi(s, a) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} \phi(s_k, a_k), \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} = 1, \lambda_k \geq 0, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, (s, a) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}).$$

Under the definition, denote N be the number of samples at each anchor pairs. Then we have the following (see Appendix H for the proof):

Theorem 6.2 (Optimal sample complexity). Under Definition 6.1, let $\hat{\pi}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi} \hat{V}_1^{\pi}$. Then if $N \geq cH^2|\mathcal{S}|\log(KH/\delta)$, we have with probability $1 - \delta$, $\|Q_1^* - Q_1^{\hat{\pi}^*}\|_{\infty} \leq \tilde{O}(\sqrt{H^3/N})$.

⁸We add a discussion in Appendix G to explain more clearly why our rates are optimal for these problems.

Comparing to Theorem 4 of Cui and Yang [2020], Theorem 6.2 removes the additional dependence $\min\{|S|, K, H\}$. In term of the total sample complexity, Theorem 6.2 gives $\tilde{O}(KH^3/\epsilon^2)$ while Cui and Yang [2020] has $\tilde{O}(KH^4/\epsilon^2)$ (see their Section 7, first bullet point). Our result again reveals the model-based method is statistically optimal for the current setting.

Remark 6.3. *The rate $\tilde{O}(KH^3/\epsilon^2)$ with anchor point assumption has the linear dependence on K and for the standard linear bandit [Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020] $\Omega(\sqrt{d^2T})$ or the linear (mixture) MDP [Jin et al., 2020b, Zhou et al., 2020] $\Omega(\sqrt{d^2H^2T})$ the lower bound dependence on the feature dimension d is quadratic. We believe one reason for this to happen is that anchor representations assumption is somewhat strong as it abstracts the whole state action space by only finite points (via convex combination).*

7 Conclusion and Future Works

This work studies the uniform convergence problems for offline policy evaluation (OPE) and provides complete answers for their optimality behaviors. We achieve the optimal sample complexity for stationary-transition case using a novel adaptation of the absorbing MDP trick, which is more generally applicable to the new offline task-agnostic and reward-free settings combining with the model-based approach and we hope it can be applied to a broader range of future problems. We end the section by two future directions.

On the higher order error term. Our main result (Theorem 4.1) has an additional \sqrt{HS} dependence in the higher order error term and we cannot further remove it based on our current technique. Nevertheless, this is already among the best higher order results to our knowledge. In fact, most state-of-the-art works (e.g. Azar et al. [2017], Dann et al. [2019], Zhang et al. [2020d]) have additional S dependence in the higher order and Jin et al. [2018] has only extra \sqrt{S} in the higher order term but it also has additional \sqrt{A} (see Table 1 of Zhang et al. [2020d] for a clear reference). How to obtain optimality not only for the main term but also for the higher order error terms remains elusive for the community.

Uniform OPE and beyond. The current study of uniform OPE derives results with expression using parameter dependence and deriving instance-dependent uniform convergence result will draw a clearer picture on the individual behaviors for each policy. Besides, this work concentrates on Tabular MDPs and generalizing uniform convergence to more practical settings like linear MDPs, game environments and multi-agent settings are promising future directions. Specifically, general complexity measure (mirroring VC-dimensions and Rademacher complexities for statistical learning problems) that precisely captures local and global uniform convergence would be of great interest.

Acknowledgment

The research is partially supported by NSF Awards #2007117 and #1934641. MY would like to thank Simon S. Du, Zihan Zhang for explaining a question in [Zhang et al. \[2020c\]](#); and Tongzheng Ren for the helpful discussions.

References

- Alekh Agarwal, Nan Jiang, and Sham M Kakade. Reinforcement learning: Theory and algorithms. *CS Dept., UW Seattle, Seattle, WA, USA, Tech. Rep*, 2019.
- Alekh Agarwal, Sham Kakade, and Lin F Yang. Model-based reinforcement learning with a generative model is minimax optimal. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 67–83, 2020.
- Andras Antos, Remi Munos, and Csaba Szepesvari. Fitted q-iteration in continuous action-space mdps. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 9–16, 2008a.
- András Antos, Csaba Szepesvári, and Rémi Munos. Learning near-optimal policies with bellman-residual minimization based fitted policy iteration and a single sample path. *Machine Learning*, 71(1):89–129, 2008b.
- Alex Ayoub, Zeyu Jia, Csaba Szepesvari, Mengdi Wang, and Lin Yang. Model-based reinforcement learning with value-targeted regression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 463–474. PMLR, 2020.
- Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Ian Osband, and Rémi Munos. Minimax regret bounds for reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 263–272. JMLR. org, 2017.
- Jinglin Chen and Nan Jiang. Information-theoretic considerations in batch reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1042–1051, 2019.
- Herman Chernoff et al. A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 23(4):493–507, 1952.
- Felipe Codevilla, Antonio M Lopez, Vladlen Koltun, and Alexey Dosovitskiy. On offline evaluation of vision-based driving models. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 236–251, 2018.
- Qiwen Cui and Lin F Yang. Is plug-in solver sample-efficient for feature-based reinforcement learning? In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2020.
- Christoph Dann, Lihong Li, Wei Wei, and Emma Brunskill. Policy certificates: Towards

- accountable reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1507–1516. PMLR, 2019.
- Dongsheng Ding, Xiaohan Wei, Zhuoran Yang, Zhaoran Wang, and Mihailo Jovanovic. Provably efficient safe exploration via primal-dual policy optimization. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3304–3312. PMLR, 2021.
- Yaqi Duan, Zeyu Jia, and Mengdi Wang. Minimax-optimal off-policy evaluation with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8334–8342, 2020.
- Yonathan Efroni, Nadav Merlis, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, and Shie Mannor. Tight regret bounds for model-based reinforcement learning with greedy policies. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- YanJun Han, Jiantao Jiao, and Tsachy Weissman. Minimax estimation of discrete distributions under l_1 loss. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(11):6343–6354, 2015.
- Botao Hao, Yaqi Duan, Tor Lattimore, Csaba Szepesvári, and Mengdi Wang. Sparse feature selection makes batch reinforcement learning more sample efficient. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.04019*, 2020.
- Yichun Hu, Nathan Kallus, and Masatoshi Uehara. Fast rates for the regret of offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.00479*, 2021.
- Thomas Jaksch, Ronald Ortner, and Peter Auer. Near-optimal regret bounds for reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(4), 2010.
- Nan Jiang. Notes on tabular methods. 2018.
- Nan Jiang and Lihong Li. Doubly robust off-policy value evaluation for reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 48*, pages 652–661. JMLR. org, 2016.
- Chi Jin, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Sebastien Bubeck, and Michael I Jordan. Is q-learning provably efficient? In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4863–4873, 2018.
- Chi Jin, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Max Simchowitz, and Tiancheng Yu. Reward-free exploration for reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4870–4879. PMLR, 2020a.
- Chi Jin, Zhuoran Yang, Zhaoran Wang, and Michael I Jordan. Provably efficient reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2137–2143. PMLR, 2020b.

- Ying Jin, Zhuoran Yang, and Zhaoran Wang. Is pessimism provably efficient for offline rl? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15085*, 2020c.
- Nathan Kallus and Masatoshi Uehara. Intrinsically efficient, stable, and bounded off-policy evaluation for reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3325–3334, 2019.
- Nathan Kallus and Masatoshi Uehara. Double reinforcement learning for efficient off-policy evaluation in markov decision processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1922–1931, 2020.
- Emilie Kaufmann, Pierre Ménard, Omar Darwiche Domingues, Anders Jonsson, Edouard Leurent, and Michal Valko. Adaptive reward-free exploration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.06294*, 2020.
- Rahul Kidambi, Aravind Rajeswaran, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Thorsten Joachims. Morel: Model-based offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.05951*, 2020.
- Sascha Lange, Thomas Gabel, and Martin Riedmiller. Batch reinforcement learning. In *Reinforcement learning*, pages 45–73. Springer, 2012.
- Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Hoang Le, Cameron Voloshin, and Yisong Yue. Batch policy learning under constraints. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3703–3712, 2019.
- Sergey Levine, Aviral Kumar, George Tucker, and Justin Fu. Offline reinforcement learning: Tutorial, review, and perspectives on open problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01643*, 2020.
- Gen Li, Yuting Wei, Yuejie Chi, Yuantao Gu, and Yuxin Chen. Breaking the sample size barrier in model-based reinforcement learning with a generative model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.
- Qiang Liu, Lihong Li, Ziyang Tang, and Dengyong Zhou. Breaking the curse of horizon: Infinite-horizon off-policy estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5361–5371, 2018.
- Qinghua Liu, Tiancheng Yu, Yu Bai, and Chi Jin. A sharp analysis of model-based reinforcement learning with self-play. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.01604*, 2020a.
- Yao Liu, Adith Swaminathan, Alekh Agarwal, and Emma Brunskill. Off-policy policy gradient with state distribution correction. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2019.
- Yao Liu, Adith Swaminathan, Alekh Agarwal, and Emma Brunskill. Provably good batch reinforcement learning without great exploration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.08202*, 2020b.

- Ying Liu, Brent Logan, Ning Liu, Zhiyuan Xu, Jian Tang, and Yangzhi Wang. Deep reinforcement learning for dynamic treatment regimes on medical registry data. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI)*, pages 380–385. IEEE, 2017.
- Shie Mannor and John N Tsitsiklis. The sample complexity of exploration in the multi-armed bandit problem. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 5(Jun):623–648, 2004.
- Pierre Menard, Omar Darwiche Domingues, Anders Jonsson, Emilie Kaufmann, Edouard Leurent, and Michal Valko. Fast active learning for pure exploration in reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.13442*, 2020.
- Rémi Munos. Error bounds for approximate policy iteration. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 560–567, 2003.
- Ofir Nachum, Yinlam Chow, Bo Dai, and Lihong Li. Dualdice: Behavior-agnostic estimation of discounted stationary distribution corrections. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.04733*, 2019.
- Paria Rashidinejad, Banghua Zhu, Cong Ma, Jiantao Jiao, and Stuart Russell. Bridging offline reinforcement learning and imitation learning: A tale of pessimism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.12021*, 2021.
- Tongzheng Ren, Jialian Li, Bo Dai, Simon S Du, and Sujay Sanghavi. Nearly horizon-free offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14077*, 2021.
- Shai Shalev-Shwartz, Ohad Shamir, Nathan Srebro, and Karthik Sridharan. Learnability, stability and uniform convergence. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11: 2635–2670, 2010.
- Karthik Sridharan. A gentle introduction to concentration inequalities. *Dept. Comput. Sci., Cornell Univ., Tech. Rep*, 2002.
- Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- Csaba Szepesvári and Rémi Munos. Finite time bounds for sampling based fitted value iteration. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 880–887, 2005.
- Joel Tropp et al. Freedman’s inequality for matrix martingales. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 16:262–270, 2011.
- Masatoshi Uehara and Nan Jiang. Minimax weight and q-function learning for off-policy evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.12809*, 2019.
- Vladimir Vapnik. *The nature of statistical learning theory*. Springer science & business media, 2013.

- Ruosong Wang, Simon S Du, Lin F Yang, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. On reward-free reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.11274*, 2020a.
- Ruosong Wang, Dean P Foster, and Sham M Kakade. What are the statistical limits of offline rl with linear function approximation? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11895*, 2020b.
- Tengyang Xie and Nan Jiang. Batch value-function approximation with only realizability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.04990*, 2020a.
- Tengyang Xie and Nan Jiang. Q^* approximation schemes for batch reinforcement learning: A theoretical comparison. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 550–559, 2020b.
- Tengyang Xie, Yifei Ma, and Yu-Xiang Wang. Towards optimal off-policy evaluation for reinforcement learning with marginalized importance sampling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 9668–9678, 2019.
- Lin Yang and Mengdi Wang. Sample-optimal parametric q-learning using linearly additive features. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6995–7004. PMLR, 2019.
- Ming Yin and Yu-Xiang Wang. Asymptotically efficient off-policy evaluation for tabular reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3948–3958. PMLR, 2020.
- Ming Yin, Yu Bai, and Yu-Xiang Wang. Near-optimal provable uniform convergence in offline policy evaluation for reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1567–1575. PMLR, 2021a.
- Ming Yin, Yu Bai, and Yu-Xiang Wang. Near-optimal offline reinforcement learning via double variance reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.01748*, 2021b.
- Tianhe Yu, Garrett Thomas, Lantao Yu, Stefano Ermon, James Zou, Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, and Tengyu Ma. Mopo: Model-based offline policy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.13239*, 2020.
- Andrea Zanette. Exponential lower bounds for batch reinforcement learning: Batch rl can be exponentially harder than online rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.08005*, 2020.
- Kaiqing Zhang, Sham M Kakade, Tamer Başar, and Lin F Yang. Model-based multi-agent rl in zero-sum markov games with near-optimal sample complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.07461*, 2020a.
- Shangdong Zhang, Yi Wan, Richard S Sutton, and Shimon Whiteson. Average-reward off-policy policy evaluation with function approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.02808*, 2021.

- Xuezhou Zhang, Adish Singla, et al. Task-agnostic exploration in reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020b.
- Zihan Zhang, Simon S Du, and Xiangyang Ji. Nearly minimax optimal reward-free reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.05901*, 2020c.
- Zihan Zhang, Xiangyang Ji, and Simon S Du. Is reinforcement learning more difficult than bandits? a near-optimal algorithm escaping the curse of horizon. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.13503*, 2020d.
- Dongruo Zhou, Quanquan Gu, and Csaba Szepesvari. Nearly minimax optimal reinforcement learning for linear mixture markov decision processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.08507*, 2020.

Appendix




Figure 2: Visualization of singleton absorbing MDP technique

We provide a visualization (Figure 2) for understanding the *singleton absorbing MDP* technique at the beginning of Appendix. 2(a), 2(c) demonstrate the infinite horizon case and 2(b), 2(d) demonstrate the finite horizon case. In particular, it should be a H -dimensional hypercube $[0, H]^H$ (that contains $\hat{V}_1^*, \dots, \hat{V}_h^*$) instead of only the square $[0, H] \times [0, H]$ (\hat{V}_1^*, \hat{V}_2^*). This is only for the ease of visualization.

The standard absorbing MDP technique Agarwal et al. [2020], Cui and Yang [2020] leverages a set of absorbing MDPs to cover the range of value functions (following the standard covering principle) to make sure \hat{V}^* is close to one of the element (absorbing MDP) in the set (Figure 2(a), 2(b)). The size of the covering set (*i.e.* the covering number) grows exponentially in H 2(b) in the finite horizon setting and this is due to the fact that there

are $\widehat{V}_1^*, \widehat{V}_2^*, \dots, \widehat{V}_H^*$ quantities to cover. This results in the metric entropy (the log of the covering number) to blow up by a factor of H and incurs suboptimality. On the other hand, by the nifty chosen singleton absorbing MDP \widehat{V}_{h,u^*}^* (Figure 2(c), 2(d)), we completely get rid of the covering issue (covering the H -dimensional space requires exponential in H size), maintain the independence and control the error propagation ($\|\widehat{V}^* - \widehat{V}_{u^*}^*\|_\infty$ is sufficiently small). See Section B for all the technical details.

A Discussion on Related works

Offline reinforcement learning. Information-theoretical considerations for offline RL are first proposed for *infinite horizon discounted setting* via Fitted Q-Iteration (FQI) type function approximation algorithms [Chen and Jiang, 2019, Le et al., 2019, Xie and Jiang, 2020a,b] which can be traced back to [Munos, 2003, Szepesvári and Munos, 2005, Antos et al., 2008a,b]. Later, Xie and Jiang [2020a] considers the offline RL under only the *realizability* assumption and Liu et al. [2020b] considers the offline RL *without good exploration*. Those are all challenging problems but with they only provide suboptimal polynomial complexity in terms of $(1 - \gamma)^{-1}$.

For the finite horizon case, Yin et al. [2021a] first achieves $\tilde{O}(H^3/d_m\epsilon^2)$ complexity under non-stationary transition but their results cannot be further improved in the stationary setting. Concurrent to our work, a recently released work Yin et al. [2021b] designs the offline variance reduction algorithm for achieving the optimal $\tilde{O}(H^2/d_m\epsilon^2)$ rate. Their result is for a specific algorithm that uses data splitting while our results work for any algorithms that returns a nearly empirically optimal policy via a uniform convergence guarantee. Our results on the offline task-agnostic and the reward-free settings are entirely new. Another concurrent work Ren et al. [2021] considers the horizon-free setting but does not provide uniform convergence guarantee. Even more recently, Rashidinejad et al. [2021] considers the single concentrability coefficient $C^* := \max_{s,a} \frac{d\pi^*(s,a)}{d\mu(s,a)}$ and obtains the sample complexity $\tilde{O}[(1 - \gamma)^{-5}SC^*/\epsilon^2]$.

In the linear MDP case, Jin et al. [2020c] studies the pessimism-based algorithms for offline policy optimization under the weak compliance assumption and Wang et al. [2020b], Zanette [2020] provide some negative results (exponential lower bound) for offline RL with linear MDP structure.

Model-based approaches with minimaxity. It is known model-based methods are minimax-optimal for online RL with regret $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{HSAT})$ (e.g. Azar et al. [2017], Efroni et al. [2019]). For linear MDP, In the generative model setting, Agarwal et al. [2020] shows model-based approach is still minimax optimal $\tilde{O}((1 - \gamma)^{-3}SA/\epsilon^2)$ by using a s -absorbing MDP construction and this model-based technique is later reused for other more general settings (e.g. Markov games [Zhang et al., 2020a] and linear MDPs [Cui and Yang, 2020]).

and also for improving the sample size barrier [Li et al., 2020]. In offline RL, Yu et al. [2020], Kidambi et al. [2020] use model-based approaches for continuous policy optimization and Yin et al. [2021a] uses the model-based methods to achieve $\tilde{O}(H^3/d_m\epsilon^2)$ complexity.

Task-agnostic and Reward-free problems. The reward-free problem is initiated in the online RL [Jin et al., 2020a] where the agent needs to efficiently explore an MDP environment *without* using any reward information. It requires high probability guarantee for learning optimal policy for *any* reward function, which is strictly stronger than the standard learning task that one only needs to learn to optimal policy for a fixed reward. Later, Kaufmann et al. [2020], Menard et al. [2020] establish the $\tilde{O}(H^3S^2A/\epsilon^2)$ complexity and Zhang et al. [2020c] further tightens the dependence to $\tilde{O}(H^2S^2A/\epsilon^2)$.⁹ Recently, Zhang et al. [2020b] proposes the task-agnostic setting where one needs to use exploration data to simultaneously learn K tasks and provides a upper bound with complexity $\tilde{O}(H^5SA\log(K)/\epsilon^2)$. For linear MDP setting, Wang et al. [2020a] achieves the sample complexity $\tilde{O}(d^3H^6/\epsilon^2)$ and Liu et al. [2020a] considers such problem in the online two-player Markov game. However, although these settings remain critical in the offline regime, no statistical result has been formally derived so far.

B Proof of optimal local uniform convergence

B.1 Model-based Offline Plug-in Estimator

Recall the model-based estimator uses empirical estimator \hat{P} for estimating P and the estimator is calculated accordingly:

$$\hat{Q}_h^\pi = r + \hat{P}^{\pi_{h+1}} Q_{h+1}^\pi = r + \hat{P} V_{H+1}^\pi,$$

where $\hat{P}(s'|s, a)$ can be expressed as:

$$\hat{P}(s'|s, a) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbf{1}[(s_{h+1}^{(i)}, a_h^{(i)}, s_h^{(i)}) = (s', s, a)]}{n_{s,a}}, \quad n_{s,a} = \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}[(s_h^{(i)}, a_h^{(i)}) = (s, a)].$$

and $\hat{P}(s'|s, a) = \frac{1}{S}$, if $n_{s,a} = 0$. The initial distribution is also constructed as $\hat{d}_1^\pi(s) = n_s/n$.

First of all, we have by definition the Bellman optimality equation

⁹We translate [Zhang et al., 2020c] their dimension-free result to $\tilde{O}(H^2S^2A/\epsilon^2)$ under the standard assumption $r \in [0, 1]$.

$$V_t^\star(s) = \max_a \left\{ r(s, a) + \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) V_{t+1}^\star(s') \right\}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (3)$$

and similarly the empirical version

$$\widehat{V}_t^\star(s) = \max_a \left\{ r(s, a) + \sum_{s'} \widehat{P}(s'|s, a) \widehat{V}_{t+1}^\star(s') \right\}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.$$

The key difficulty in obtaining the optimal dependence in stationary setting is decoupling the dependence of $P - \widehat{P}$ and \widehat{V}^\star . This issue is not encountered in the non-stationary setting due to the possibility to estimate different transition at each time [Yin et al., 2021a], but it cannot further reduce the sample complexity on H . Moreover, the direct use of s -absorbing MDP in Agarwal et al. [2020] is not sharp for finite horizon stationary setting, as it requires s -absorbing MDPs with H -dimensional cover (which has size $\approx e^H$ and it is not optimal). We design the *singleton-absorbing MDP* to get rid of the issue.

B.2 General absorbing MDP

The general absorbing MDP is defined as follows: for a fixed state s and a sequence $\{u_t\}_{t=1}^H$, MDP $M_{s, \{u_t\}_{t=1}^H}$ is identical to M for all states except s , and state s is absorbing in the sense $P_{M_{s, \{u_t\}_{t=1}^H}}(s|s, a) = 1$ for all a , and the instantaneous reward at time t is $r_t(s, a) = u_t$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Also, we use the shorthand notation $V_{\{s, u_t\}}^\pi$ for $V_{s, M_{s, \{u_t\}_{t=1}^H}}^\pi$ and similarly for $Q_{\{s, u_t\}}$ and transition $P_{\{s, u_t\}}$. Then the following properties hold:

Lemma B.1.

$$V_{h, \{s, u_t\}}^\star(s) = \sum_{t=h}^H u_t.$$

Proof. We prove by backward induction. For $h = H$, under $M_{s, \{u_t\}_{t=1}^H}$ state s is absorbing (and by convention $V_{H+1, \{s, u_t\}}^\star = 0$) therefore

$$V_{H, \{s, u_t\}}^\star(s) = \max_a \left\{ r_{H, \{s, u_t\}}(s, a) + \sum_{s'} P_{\{s, u_t\}}(s'|s, a) V_{H+1, \{s, u_t\}}^\star(s') \right\} = \max_a \{ r_{H, \{s, u_t\}}(s, a) \} = u_H$$

for general h , note $\sum_{s'} P_{\{s, u_t\}}(s'|s, a) V_{h+1, \{s, u_t\}}^\star(s') = 1 \cdot V_{h+1, \{s, u_t\}}^\star(s)$, therefore using induction property $V_{h+1, \{s, u_t\}}^\star(s) = \sum_{t=h+1}^H u_t$ we can similarly obtain $V_{h, \{s, u_t\}}^\star(s) = \sum_{t=h}^H u_t$. \blacksquare

Lemma B.2. Fix state s . For two different sequences $\{u_t\}_{t=1}^H$ and $\{u'_t\}_{t=1}^H$, we have

$$\max_h \left\| Q_{h,\{s,u_t\}}^* - Q_{h,\{s,u'_t\}}^* \right\|_\infty \leq H \cdot \max_{t \in [H]} |u_t - u'_t|.$$

Proof. Let $\pi_{\{s,u_t\}}^*$ be the optimal policy in $M_{\{s,u_t\}}$. Then (by convention $\prod_{a=h+1}^h P^{\pi_a} = I$)

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{h,\{s,u_t\}}^* - Q_{h,\{s,u'_t\}}^* &= Q_{h,\{s,u_t\}}^* - \max_\pi \sum_{i=h}^H \left(\prod_{a=h+1}^i P_{\{s,u'_t\}}^{\pi_a} \right) r_{i,\{s,u'_t\}} \\ &\leq Q_{h,\{s,u_t\}}^* - \sum_{i=h}^H \left(\prod_{a=h+1}^i P_{\{s,u'_t\}}^{\pi_{a,\{s,u_t\}}^*} \right) r_{i,\{s,u'_t\}} = \sum_{i=h}^H \left(\prod_{a=h+1}^i P_{\{s,u'_t\}}^{\pi_{a,\{s,u_t\}}^*} \right) (r_{i,\{s,u_t\}} - r_{i,\{s,u'_t\}}) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=h}^H \max_{s,a} \left\| \left(\prod_{a=h+1}^i P_{\{s,u'_t\}}^{\pi_{a,\{s,u_t\}}^*} \right) (\cdot | s, a) \right\|_1 \cdot \|r_{i,\{s,u_t\}} - r_{i,\{s,u'_t\}}\|_\infty \cdot \mathbf{1} = (H - h + 1) \cdot \max_t |u_t - u'_t| \cdot \mathbf{1} \end{aligned}$$

where the first equal sign uses the definition of Q^* , the second equal sign uses $P_{\{s,u_t\}}$ only depends s but not the specification of u_t 's and the last equal sign comes from $r_{i,\{s,u_t\}}(s, a) = u_i$ for any $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $r_{i,\{s,u_t\}}(\tilde{s}, a) = r_{i,\{s,u'_t\}}(\tilde{s}, a)$ for any $\tilde{s} \neq s$. Lastly by symmetry we finish the proof. \blacksquare

B.3 Singleton-absorbing MDP

The direct of transfer of absorbing technique created in Agarwal et al. [2020] will require each u_t to fill in the range of $[0, H]$ using evenly spaced elements. For finite horizon MDP there are H layers, therefore the total number of H -tuples (u_1, \dots, u_H) has order $|U_s| = \text{Poly}(H)^H$, therefore when apply the union bound, it will incur the additional H factor. We get rid of this issue by choosing one single point in H -dimensional space $[0, H]^H$. We first give the following two lemmas.

Lemma B.3. $V_t^*(s) - V_{t+1}^*(s) \geq 0$, for all state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and all $t \in [H]$.

Proof. Let the optimal policy for V_{t+1}^* be $\pi_{t+1:H}^*$, i.e. $V_{t+1}^* = V_{t+1}^{\pi_{t+1:H}^*}$, then artificially construct a policy $\pi_{t:H}$ such that $\pi_{t:H-1} = \pi_{t+1:H}^*$ and π_H is arbitrary, then by the definition

of optimal value

$$\begin{aligned}
V_t^*(s) &\geq V_t^{\pi_{t:H}}(s) = \mathbb{E}^{\pi_{t:H}} \left[\sum_{i=t}^H r(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_t = s \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\pi_{t:H-1}} \left[\sum_{i=t}^{H-1} r(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_t = s \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\pi_{t:H}} [r(s_H, a_H) | s_t = s] \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\pi_{t+1:H}^*} \left[\sum_{i=t+1}^H r(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_{t+1} = s \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\pi_{t:H}} [r(s_H, a_H) | s_t = s] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}^{\pi_{t+1:H}^*} \left[\sum_{i=t+1}^H r(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_{t+1} = s \right] + 0 = V_{t+1}^*(s),
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equal sign uses exactly that P is a *STATIONARY* transition and definition $\pi_{t:H-1} = \pi_{t+1:H}^*$. The last inequality uses assumption that reward is always non-negative. ■

Remark B.4. Lemma B.3 leverages P is stationary and above may not be true in the non-stationary setting. This enables us to establish the following lemma, which is the key for singleton-absorbing MDP.

Lemma B.5. Fix a state s . If we choose $u_t^* := V_t^*(s) - V_{t+1}^*(s) \forall t \in [H]$, then we have the following vector form equation

$$V_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^* = V_{h,M}^* \quad \forall h \in [H].$$

Similarly, if we choose $\hat{u}_t^* := \hat{V}_t^*(s) - \hat{V}_{t+1}^*(s)$, then $\hat{V}_{h,\{s,\hat{u}_t^*\}}^* = \hat{V}_{h,M}^*, \forall h \in [H]$.

Proof. We focus on the first claim. Note by Lemma B.3 the assignment of $u_t^* := r_{t,\{s,u_t^*\}}$ is well-defined. Next recall $V_{h,M}^*$ is the optimal value under true MDP M and $V_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*$ is the optimal value under the assimilating MDP $M_{s,\{u_t^*\}_{t=1}^H}$. We prove by backward induction.

For $h = H$, note by convention $V_{H+1}^* = 0$, therefore $u_H^* = V_H^*(s) - V_{H+1}^*(s) = V_H^*(s) - 0 = V_H^*(s)$ and Bellman optimality equation becomes

$$V_H^*(\tilde{s}) = \max_a \{r(\tilde{s}, a)\}, \quad \forall \tilde{s} \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Under $M_{s,\{u_t^*\}_{t=1}^H}$, for state s by Lemma B.1 we have $V_{H,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*(s) = u_H^* = V_H^*(s)$, for other states $\tilde{s} \neq s$, reward in $M_{s,\{u_t^*\}_{t=1}^H} = M$ so we also have $V_{H,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*(\tilde{s}) = V_H^*(\tilde{s})$ for all $\tilde{s} \neq s$.

Now for general h , for state s by Lemma B.1

$$V_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*(s) = \sum_{t=h}^H u_t^* = \sum_{t=h}^H (V_t^*(s) - V_{t+1}^*(s)) = V_h^*(s),$$

for state $\tilde{s} \neq s$, by Bellman optimality equation

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*(\tilde{s}) &= \max_a \left\{ r_{\{s,u_t^*\}}(\tilde{s}, a) + \sum_{s'} P_{\{s,u_t^*\}}(s'|\tilde{s}, a) V_{h+1,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*(s') \right\} \\
&= \max_a \left\{ r(\tilde{s}, a) + \sum_{s'} P(s'|\tilde{s}, a) V_{h+1,\{s,u_t^*\}}^*(s') \right\} \\
&= \max_a \left\{ r(\tilde{s}, a) + \sum_{s'} P(s'|\tilde{s}, a) V_{h+1}^*(s') \right\} = V_h^*(\tilde{s}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equal sign uses when $\tilde{s} \neq s$, $M_{s,\{u_t^*\}_{t=1}^H}$ is identical to M and the third equal sign uses induction assumption that element-wisely $V_{h+1,\{s,u_t^*\}}^* = V_{h+1}^*$. Similar result can be derived for \hat{u}^* version and this completes the proof. ■

The singleton MDP we used is exactly $M_{s,\{u_t^*\}_{t=1}^H}$ (or $\widehat{M}_{s,\{u_t^*\}_{t=1}^H}$).

B.4 Proof for local uniform convergence

Recall the local policy class

$$\Pi_l := \left\{ \pi : \text{s.t. } \left\| \widehat{V}_h^\pi - \widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_{\text{opt}}, \forall h \in [H] \right\}.$$

For ease of exposition, we denote $N := \min_{s,a} n_{s,a}$. Note N itself is a random variable, therefore for the rest of proof we first conditional on N . Later we shall remove the conditional on N (see Section B.7).

For any $\hat{\pi} \in \Pi_t$, by (empirical) Bellman equation we have element-wisely:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{Q}_h^{\hat{\pi}} - Q_h^{\hat{\pi}} &= r_h + \hat{P}^{\hat{\pi}_{h+1}} \hat{Q}_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}} - r_h - P^{\hat{\pi}_{h+1}} Q_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}} \\
&= \left(\hat{P}^{\hat{\pi}_{h+1}} - P^{\hat{\pi}_{h+1}} \right) \hat{Q}_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}} + P^{\hat{\pi}_{h+1}} \left(\hat{Q}_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}} - Q_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}} \right) \\
&= \left(\hat{P} - P \right) \hat{V}_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}} + P^{\hat{\pi}_{h+1}} \left(\hat{Q}_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}} - Q_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}} \right) \\
&= \dots = \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\hat{\pi}} \left(\hat{P} - P \right) \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}} \\
&\leq \underbrace{\sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\hat{\pi}} \left| \left(\hat{P} - P \right) \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} \right|}_{(\star)} + \underbrace{\sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\hat{\pi}} \left| \left(\hat{P} - P \right) \left(\hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}} - \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} \right) \right|}_{(\star\star)}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\pi} = \prod_{i=h+1}^t P^{\pi_i}$ is multi-step state-action transition and $\Gamma_{h+1:h} := I$.

B.5 Analyzing $(\star\star)$

Term $(\star\star)$ can be readily bounded using the following lemma.

Lemma B.6. *Fix $N > 0$, we have with probability $1 - \delta$, for all $t = 1, \dots, H - 1$*

$$\sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\hat{\pi}} \left| \left(\hat{P} - P \right) \left(\hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} - \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}} \right) \right| \leq C \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{H^2 S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \mathbf{1}$$

where C absorb the higher order term and absolute constants.

Proof. First, by vector induced matrix norm¹⁰ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\hat{\pi}} \cdot \left| \left(\hat{P} - P \right) \left(\hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} - \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}} \right) \right| \right\|_{\infty} &\leq H \cdot \sup_t \left\| \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\hat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| \left(\hat{P} - P \right) \left(\hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} - \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}} \right) \right\|_{\infty} \\
&\leq H \cdot \sup_t \left\| \left(\hat{P} - P \right) \left(\hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} - \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}} \right) \right\|_{\infty} \\
&= H \cdot \sup_{t,s,a} \left| \left(\hat{P} - P \right) (\cdot | s, a) \left(\hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} - \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}} \right) \right| \\
&\leq H \cdot \sup_{t,s,a} \left\| \left(\hat{P} - P \right) (\cdot | s, a) \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} - \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} \cdot \mathbf{1}
\end{aligned}$$

¹⁰For A a matrix and x a vector we have $\|Ax\|_{\infty} \leq \|A\|_{\infty} \|x\|_{\infty}$.

where the second inequality uses multi-step transition $\Gamma_{t+1:h-1}^\pi$ is row-stochastic. Note given N , therefore by Lemma J.9 and a union bound we have with probability $1 - \delta$,

$$\sup_{s,a} \left\| (\hat{P} - P)(\cdot | s, a) \right\|_1 \leq C \left(\sqrt{\frac{S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}} \right),$$

(where C absorb the higher order term and absolute constants) and using definition of Π_l we have $\sup_t \left\| \hat{V}_t^{\hat{\pi}^*} - \hat{V}_t^{\hat{\pi}} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_{\text{opt}}$. This indicates

$$\sup_{t,s,a} \left\| (\hat{P} - P)(\cdot | s, a) \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} - \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}} \right\|_\infty \cdot \mathbf{1} \leq C(\epsilon_{\text{opt}} \sqrt{\frac{S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \mathbf{1}),$$

where $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^S$ is all-one vector. Then multiple by H to get the stated result. ■

B.6 Analyzing (\star)

Concentration on $(\hat{P} - P) \hat{V}_h^*$.¹¹ Since \hat{P} aggregates all data from different step so that \hat{P} and \hat{V}_h^* are on longer independent, Bernstein inequality cannot be directly applied. We use the singleton-absorbing MDP $M_{s, \{u_t^*\}_{t=1}^H}$ to handle the case (recall $u_t^* := V_t^*(s) - V_{t+1}^*(s) \forall t \in [H]$). Again, let us fix a state s and $a \in \mathcal{A}$ be any action. Also, we use $P_{s,a}$ to denote row vector to avoid long expression. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}) \hat{V}_h^* = (\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}) (\hat{V}_h^* - \hat{V}_{h, \{s, u_t^*\}}^* + \hat{V}_{h, \{s, u_t^*\}}^*) \\ &= (\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}) (\hat{V}_h^* - \hat{V}_{h, \{s, u_t^*\}}^*) + (\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}) \hat{V}_{h, \{s, u_t^*\}}^* \\ &\leq \left\| \hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right\|_1 \left\| \hat{V}_h^* - \hat{V}_{h, \{s, u_t^*\}}^* \right\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\hat{V}_{h, \{s, u_t^*\}}^*)} + \frac{2H \log(1/\delta)}{3N} \\ &\leq \left\| \hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right\|_1 \left\| \hat{V}_h^* - \hat{V}_{h, \{s, u_t^*\}}^* \right\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4/\delta)}{N}} \left(\sqrt{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\hat{V}_h^*)} + \sqrt{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\hat{V}_{h, \{s, u_t^*\}}^* - \hat{V}_h^*)} \right) + \frac{2H \log(1/\delta)}{3N} \\ &\leq \left\| \hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right\|_1 \left\| \hat{V}_h^* - \hat{V}_{h, \{s, u_t^*\}}^* \right\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4/\delta)}{N}} \left(\sqrt{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\hat{V}_h^*)} + \sqrt{\left\| \hat{V}_{h, \{s, u_t^*\}}^* - \hat{V}_h^* \right\|_\infty^2} \right) + \frac{2H \log(1/\delta)}{3N} \\ &= \left(\left\| \hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right\|_1 + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4/\delta)}{N}} \right) \left\| \hat{V}_h^* - \hat{V}_{h, \{s, u_t^*\}}^* \right\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\hat{V}_h^*)} + \frac{2H \log(1/\delta)}{3N} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

¹¹Here we use \hat{V}_h^* instead of \hat{V}_t^* since we later have $\hat{V}_{h, \{s, u_t^*\}}^*$. We avoid the same t twice in the expression to prevent confusion.

where the first inequality uses Bernstein inequality (Lemma J.3), the second inequality uses $\sqrt{\text{Var}(\cdot)}$ is norm (norm triangle inequality). Now we treat $\|\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1$ and $\|\hat{V}_h^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star\|_\infty$ separately.

For $\|\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1$. Indeed, by Lemma J.9 again $\|\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1 \leq \tilde{O}(\sqrt{\frac{S \log(S/\delta)}{N}})$ and by a union bound we obtain w.p., $1 - \delta$

$$\sup_{s,a} \|\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1 \leq C \sqrt{\frac{S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}}. \quad (5)$$

where C absorbs the higher order term and constants.

For $\|\hat{V}_h^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star\|_\infty$. Note if we set $\hat{u}_t^\star = \hat{V}_t^\star(s) - \hat{V}_{t+1}^\star(s)$, then by Lemma B.5

$$\hat{V}_h^\star = \hat{V}_{h,\{\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star$$

Next since $\hat{V}_{h,\{\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star(\tilde{s}) = \max_a \hat{Q}_{h,\{\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star(\tilde{s}, a) \forall \tilde{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, by generic inequality $|\max f - \max g| \leq \max |f - g|$, we have $|\hat{V}_{h,\{\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star(\tilde{s}) - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star(\tilde{s})| \leq \max_a |\hat{Q}_{h,\{\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star(\tilde{s}, a) - \hat{Q}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star(\tilde{s}, a)|$, taking $\max_{\tilde{s}}$ on both sides, we obtain exactly

$$\|\hat{V}_{h,\{\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star\|_\infty \leq \|\hat{Q}_{h,\{\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star - \hat{Q}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star\|_\infty$$

then by Lemma B.2,

$$\|\hat{V}_h^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star\|_\infty \leq \|\hat{Q}_{h,\{\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star - \hat{Q}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star\|_\infty \leq H \max_t |\hat{u}_t^\star - u_t^\star|, \quad (6)$$

Recall

$$\hat{u}_t^\star - u_t^\star = \hat{V}_t^\star(s) - \hat{V}_{t+1}^\star(s) - (V_t^\star(s) - V_{t+1}^\star(s)).$$

Now we denote

$$\Delta_s := \max_t |\hat{u}_t^\star - u_t^\star| = \max_t \left| \hat{V}_t^\star(s) - \hat{V}_{t+1}^\star(s) - (V_t^\star(s) - V_{t+1}^\star(s)) \right|,$$

then Δ_s itself is a scalar and a random variable.

To sum up, by (4), (5) and (6) and a union bound we have

Lemma B.7. Fix $N > 0$. With probability $1 - \delta$, element-wisely, for all $h \in [H]$,

$$\left| (\hat{P} - P) \hat{V}_h^\star \right| \leq C \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} \cdot H \max_s \Delta_s \cdot \mathbf{1} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\hat{V}_h^\star)} + \frac{2H \log(HSA/\delta)}{3N} \cdot \mathbf{1}$$

Now plug Lemma B.7 back into (\star) and combine Lemma B.6, we receive:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}} \right| \\
& \leq \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\widehat{\pi}} \left(C \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} \cdot H \max_s \Delta_s \cdot \mathbf{1} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_{t+1}^*)} + \frac{2H \log(HSA/\delta)}{3N} \cdot \mathbf{1} \right) \\
& + C \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{H^2 S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\
& \leq \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\widehat{\pi}} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_{t+1}^*)} + CH^2 \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \max_s \Delta_s \cdot \mathbf{1} + \frac{2H^2 \log(HSA/\delta)}{3N} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\
& + C \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{H^2 S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \mathbf{1}
\end{aligned}$$

Next note

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_h^*)} := \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}^*})} = \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - \widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} + \widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}})} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}})} + \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - \widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}})} \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}})} + \left\| \widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - \widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}})} + \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \cdot \mathbf{1} \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V_h^{\widehat{\pi}})} + \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} - V_h^{\widehat{\pi}})} + \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V_h^{\widehat{\pi}})} + \left\| \widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} - V_h^{\widehat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} + \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \cdot \mathbf{1} \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V_h^{\widehat{\pi}})} + \left\| \widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} + \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \cdot \mathbf{1}
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Plug (7) back to above we obtain $\forall h \in [H]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}} \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\widehat{\pi}} \left(\sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}})} + \left\| \widehat{Q}_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} + \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \cdot \mathbf{1} \right) \\
& + CH^2 \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \max_s \Delta_s \cdot \mathbf{1} + \frac{2H^2 \log(HSA/\delta)}{3N} \cdot \mathbf{1} + C \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{H^2 S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\widehat{\pi}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}})} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \sum_{t=h}^H \left\| \widehat{Q}_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} \\
& + CH^2 \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \max_s \Delta_s \cdot \mathbf{1} + \frac{2H^2 \log(HSA/\delta)}{3N} \cdot \mathbf{1} + C_1 \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{H^2 S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \mathbf{1}
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Apply Lemma J.5 and the coarse uniform bound (Lemma J.10) we obtain the following lemma:

Lemma B.8. *Given $N > 0$ and $\epsilon_{\text{opt}} \leq \sqrt{H/S}$. With probability $1 - \delta$, for all $h \in [H]$,*

$$\left\| \widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \sqrt{\frac{C_0 H^3 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \sum_{t=h}^H \left\| \widehat{Q}_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} + C' H^4 \frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}$$

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_s &:= \max_t |\hat{u}_t^* - u_t^*| = \max_t \left| \widehat{V}_t^*(s) - \widehat{V}_{t+1}^*(s) - (V_t^*(s) - V_{t+1}^*(s)) \right| \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \max_t \left| \widehat{V}_t^*(s) - V_t^*(s) \right| \\ &= 2 \cdot \max_t \left| \max_{\pi} \widehat{V}_t^{\pi}(s) - \max_{\pi} V_t^{\pi}(s) \right| \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \max_{\pi \in \Pi_g, t \in [H]} \left\| \widehat{V}_t^{\pi} - V_t^{\pi} \right\|_{\infty} \leq C \cdot H^2 \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the last inequality uses Lemma J.10. Then apply union bound w.p. $1 - \delta/2$, we obtain $\max_s \Delta_s \leq C \cdot H^2 \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}}$. Note (8) holds with probability $1 - \delta/2$, therefore plug above into (8) we obtain w.p. $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}} \right| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\widehat{\pi}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}})} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \sum_{t=h}^H \left\| \widehat{Q}_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} \\ &+ C' H^4 \frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \cdot \mathbf{1} + C_1 \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{H^2 S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\ &\leq \left[\sqrt{\frac{C_0 H^3 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \sum_{t=h}^H \left\| \widehat{Q}_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} + C' H^4 \frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \right] \cdot \mathbf{1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses Lemma J.5 and $\epsilon_{\text{opt}} \leq \sqrt{H/S}$ and renames $C' = C' + C_1$. Take $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ then obtain the result. \blacksquare

Lemma B.9. *Given $N > 0$. Define $C'' := 2 \cdot \max(\sqrt{C_0}, C')$ where C' is the universal constant in Lemma B.8. When $N \geq 8H^2 \log(4HSA/\delta)$, then with probability $1 - \delta$, $\forall h \in [H]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} &\leq C'' \sqrt{\frac{H^3 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} + C'' \frac{H^4 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}. \\ \left\| \widehat{Q}_h^{\pi^*} - Q_h^{\pi^*} \right\|_{\infty} &\leq C'' \sqrt{\frac{H^3 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} + C'' \frac{H^4 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Proof. We prove by backward induction. For $h = H$, by Lemma B.8

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{Q}_H^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_H^{\widehat{\pi}}\|_{\infty} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{C_0 H^3 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \|\widehat{Q}_{H+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_{H+1}^{\widehat{\pi}}\|_{\infty} + C' H^4 \frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{C_0 H^3 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} + 0 + C' H^4 \frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \\
&\leq C'' \sqrt{\frac{H^3 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} + C'' H^4 \frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N},
\end{aligned}$$

for general h , by condition we have $H \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \leq 1/2$, therefore by Lemma B.8

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}}\|_{\infty} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{C_0 H^3 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \sum_{t=h}^H \|\widehat{Q}_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}}\|_{\infty} + C' H^4 \frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{C_0 H^3 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} + H \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} \max_{t+1} \|\widehat{Q}_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}}\|_{\infty} + C' H^4 \frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{C_0 H^3 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} + C' H^4 \frac{S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(C'' \sqrt{\frac{H^3 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} + C'' \frac{H^4 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \right) \\
&\leq C'' \sqrt{\frac{H^3 \log(4HSA/\delta)}{N}} + C'' \frac{H^4 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of the second claim is even easier since π^* is no longer a random policy and it is really just a non-uniform point-wise OPE. There are multiple ways to prove it and we leave it as an exercise to avoid redundancy: 1. Follow the same proving pipeline as $\|\widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}}\|_{\infty}$ used; 2. Mimic the procedure of point-wise OPE result in Lemma 3.4. in [Yin et al. \[2021a\]](#). \blacksquare

Remark B.10. Note the higher order term has dependence $H^4 S$, which is somewhat unsatisfactory. We use the recursion-back trick to further reduce it to $H^{3.5} S^{0.5}$.

Lemma B.11. Given $N > 0$. There exists universal constants C_1, C_2 such that when $N \geq C_1 H^2 \log(HSA/\delta)$, then with probability $1 - \delta$, $\forall h \in [H]$,

$$\|\widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}}\|_{\infty} \leq C_2 \sqrt{\frac{H^3 \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} + C_2 \frac{H^3 \sqrt{HS} \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}. \quad (11)$$

and

$$\left\| \widehat{Q}_h^{\pi^*} - Q_h^{\pi^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq C_2 \sqrt{\frac{H^3 \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} + C_2 \frac{H^3 \sqrt{HS} \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}.$$

Proof. Note

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{V}_t^*(s) - V_t^*(s) &:= \widehat{V}_t^{\widehat{\pi}^*}(s) - V_t^{\pi^*}(s) \\ &= \widehat{V}_t^{\widehat{\pi}^*}(s) - V_t^{\widehat{\pi}^*}(s) + V_t^{\widehat{\pi}^*}(s) - V_t^{\pi^*}(s) \\ &\leq \widehat{V}_t^{\widehat{\pi}^*}(s) - V_t^{\widehat{\pi}^*}(s) \leq \left| \widehat{V}_t^{\widehat{\pi}^*}(s) - V_t^{\widehat{\pi}^*}(s) \right| \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

and similarly $V_t^*(s) - \widehat{V}_t^*(s) \leq \left| \widehat{V}_t^{\pi^*}(s) - V_t^{\pi^*}(s) \right|$, therefore by Lemma B.9 (and use $\|\widehat{V}_t^{\pi^*} - V_t^{\pi^*}\|_{\infty} \leq \|\widehat{Q}_t^{\pi^*} - Q_t^{\pi^*}\|_{\infty}$), with probability $1 - \delta$,

$$\Delta_s \leq 2 \cdot \sup_t \left\| V_t^* - \widehat{V}_t^* \right\| \leq 2 \max_{\widehat{\pi}^*, \pi^*} \sup_t \left\| \widehat{V}_t^{\pi^*} - V_t^{\pi^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq C_2 \sqrt{\frac{H^3 \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} + C_2 \frac{H^4 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N},$$

where the second inequality uses (12). This replaces the crude bound of $O(\sqrt{H^4 S \log(HSA/\delta)/N})$ for $\max_s \Delta_s$ (recall (9)) by $O(\sqrt{H^3 \log(HSA/\delta)/N})$.

Plug this back to (8) and repeat the similar analysis we end up with (11). The second result is similarly proved. ■

B.7 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Note $n_{s,a} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^H \mathbf{1}[s_t^{(i)} = s, a_t^{(i)} = a]$, which implies

$$\mathbb{E}[n_{s,a}] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^H \mathbf{1}[s_t^{(i)} = s, a_t^{(i)} = a] \right] = n \cdot \sum_{t=1}^H d_t^{\mu}(s, a).$$

Or equivalently, $n_{s,a}$ follows $\text{Binomial}(n, \sum_{t=1}^H d_t^{\mu}(s, a))$. Then apply the first result of Lemma J.1 by taking $\theta = 1/2$, we have when $n > 1/d_m \cdot \log(HSA/\delta)^{12}$, then with probability $1 - \delta$,

$$n_{s,a} \geq \frac{1}{2} n \cdot \sum_{t=1}^H d_t^{\mu}(s, a), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

¹²The exact sufficient condition for applying Lemma J.1 is $n > 1/\sum_{t=1}^H d_t(s, a) \cdot \log(HSA/\delta)$ for all s, a . However, since $\sum_{t=1}^H d_t(s, a) \geq H d_m \geq d_m$, our condition $n > 1/d_m \cdot \log(HSA/\delta)$ used here is a much stronger version thus Lemma J.1 apply.

This further implies w.p. $1 - \delta$, $n_{s,a} \geq \frac{1}{2}n \cdot \sum_{t=1}^H d_t^\mu(s, a) = \frac{1}{2}n \cdot H \cdot d^\mu(s, a) \geq \frac{1}{2}nH \cdot d_m$ and further ensures

$$N := \min_{s,a} n_{s,a} \geq \frac{1}{2}nH \cdot d_m.$$

Finally, apply above to Lemma B.11, we can get over with the condition on N and obtain the stated result. \blacksquare

C Proof of minimax lower bound for model-based global uniform OPE

Proof of Theorem 3.1. In particular, we first focus on the case where $H = 2$ and extend the result of $H = 2$ to the general $H \geq 3$ at the end.

First of all, by Definition 2.1 let \hat{P} be the learned transition by certain model-based method. Since we assume r_h is known and by convention $Q_{H+1}^\pi = 0$ for any π , then by Bellman equation

$$\hat{Q}_h^\pi = r_h + \hat{P}^{\pi_{h+1}} \hat{Q}_{h+1}^\pi, \quad \forall h \in [H].$$

In particular, $\hat{Q}_{H+1}^\pi = Q_{H+1}^\pi = 0$, and this implies

$$\hat{Q}_H^\pi = r_H + \hat{P}^{\pi_{H+1}} \hat{Q}_{H+1}^\pi = r_H; \quad Q_H^\pi = r_H + P^{\pi_{H+1}} Q_{H+1}^\pi = r_H + 0 = r_H$$

Now, again by definition of Bellman equation

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_{H-1}^\pi &= r_{H-1} + \hat{P}^{\pi_H} \hat{Q}_H^\pi = r_{H-1} + \hat{P}^{\pi_H} r_H \\ Q_{H-1}^\pi &= r_{H-1} + P^{\pi_H} Q_H^\pi = r_{H-1} + P^{\pi_H} r_H \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left\| \hat{Q}_{H-1}^\pi - Q_{H-1}^\pi \right\|_\infty &= \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left\| \left(\hat{P}^{\pi_H} - P^{\pi_H} \right) r_H \right\|_\infty \\ &= \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left\| \left(\hat{P} - P \right) r_H^{\pi_H} \right\|_\infty = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \sup_{s,a} \left| \left(\hat{P}(\cdot|s, a) - P(\cdot|s, a) \right) r_H^{\pi_H} \right| \\ &= \sup_{s,a} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left| \left(\hat{P}(\cdot|s, a) - P(\cdot|s, a) \right) r_H^{\pi_H} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where $P^{\pi_H} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \cdot A \times S \cdot A}$, $r_H \in \mathbb{R}^{S \cdot A}$, $P \in \mathbb{R}^{S \cdot A \times S}$ and $r_H^{\pi_H} \in \mathbb{R}^S$. Note $A \geq 2$, so we can choose an instance of r_H as (there are at least two actions since $A \geq 2$)

$$(r_H(s, a_1), r_H(s, a_2), \dots) := (1, 0, \dots) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Above implies: if $\pi_H(s) = a_1$, then $r_H^{\pi_H}(s) = 1$; if $\pi_H(s) = a_2$, then $r_H^{\pi_H}(s) = 0$; ...

Hence, if Π_g is the global deterministic policy class, then $r_H^{\pi_H}$ can traverse all the S -dimensional vectors with either 0 or 1 in each coordinate, which is exactly

$$\{r_H^{\pi_H} \in \mathbb{R}^S : \pi_H \in \Pi_g\} \supset \{0, 1\}^S.$$

Now let us first consider fixed s, a . Then with this choice of r , above implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left| \left(\hat{P}(\cdot|s, a) - P(\cdot|s, a) \right) r_H^{\pi_H} \right| \geq \sup_{r \in \{0, 1\}^S} \left| \left(\hat{P}(\cdot|s, a) - P(\cdot|s, a) \right) \cdot r \right| \\ & = \sup_{r \in \{0, 1\}^S} \left| \sum_{i: r_i=1} \left(\hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a) \right) \right| \end{aligned}$$

Let $I_+ := \{i \in [S] : \text{s.t. } \hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a) > 0\}$ be the set of indices where $\hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a)$ are positive and $I_- := \{i \in [S] : \text{s.t. } \hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a) < 0\}$ be the set of indices where $\hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a)$ are negative, then we further have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{r \in \{0, 1\}^S} \left| \sum_{i: r_i=1} \left(\hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a) \right) \right| \\ & \geq \max \left\{ \left| \sum_{i \in I_+} [\hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a)] \right|, \left| \sum_{i \in I_-} [\hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a)] \right| \right\} \\ & = \max \left\{ \sum_{i \in I_+} \left| \hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a) \right|, \sum_{i \in I_-} \left| \hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a) \right| \right\} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\sum_{i \in I_+} \left| \hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a) \right| + \sum_{i \in I_-} \left| \hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a) \right| = \left\| \hat{P}(\cdot|s, a) - P(\cdot|s, a) \right\|_1$$

since $\hat{P}(s_i|s, a) - P(s_i|s, a) = 0$ contributes nothing to the l_1 norm. Combine all the steps together, we obtain

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left\| \hat{Q}_{H-1}^\pi - Q_{H-1}^\pi \right\|_\infty \geq \sup_{s, a} \frac{1}{2} \left\| \hat{P}(\cdot|s, a) - P(\cdot|s, a) \right\|_1 \underset{\textcircled{1}}{\geq} c \cdot \sup_{s, a} \sqrt{\frac{S}{n_{s, a}}} \underset{\textcircled{2}}{\geq} c' \sqrt{\frac{S}{nd_m}} \quad (13)$$

holds with constant probability p . Here $n_{s, a} = \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}[s_h^{(i)} = s, a_h^{(i)} = a]$ is the number of data pieces visited (s, a) in n episodes. Now we explain how to obtain $\textcircled{1}$ and $\textcircled{2}$. In particular, we first explain $\textcircled{2}$.

Explain ②. Recall we consider the case $H = 2$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[n_{s,a}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}[s_h^{(i)} = s, a_h^{(i)} = a]\right] = n \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}[s_h^{(1)} = s, a_h^{(1)} = a]\right] = n \sum_{h=1}^2 d_h^\mu(s, a)$$

i.e. $n_{s,a}$ is a Binomial random variable with parameter n and $\sum_{h=1}^2 d_h^\mu(s, a)$. Then by Lemma J.1, choose $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$, apply the second result, we obtain when $n > (1/2d_m) \cdot \log(SA/\delta)$ ¹³, with probability $1 - \delta$

$$n_{s,a} \leq \frac{3}{2}n \cdot \sum_{h=1}^2 d_h^\mu(s, a), \quad \forall s, a$$

Next, similar to the lower bound proof (Theorem G.2.) of Yin et al. [2021a], we can choose μ and M (**near uniform** but not exact uniform) such that $d_h^\mu(s, a) \leq C \cdot d_m$, which further implies $n_{s,a} \leq C \cdot n \cdot d_m$, $\forall s, a$. Summarize above we end up with the following Lemma:

Lemma C.1. Suppose $n \geq (1/2d_m) \cdot \log(SA/\delta)$, then

$$\sup_{\mu, M} \mathbb{P}\left[\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_{s,a}}} \geq C \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{n \cdot d_m}}, \forall s, a\right] \geq 1 - \delta$$

Explain ①. To make the explanation rigorous, we first fix a pair (s, a) and conditional on $n_{s,a}$. Then by a direct translation of Lemma J.7, we have

$$\inf_{\hat{P}} \sup_{P(\cdot|s,a) \in \mathcal{M}_S} \mathbb{P}\left[\|\hat{P}(\cdot|s, a) - P(\cdot|s, a)\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{\frac{eS}{2n_{s,a}}} - o(\cdot) \mid n_{s,a} \geq \frac{e}{32}S\right] \geq p,$$

where $o(\cdot)$ is some exponentially small term in S, n . Now we consider everything under the condition $n \geq \frac{e}{32} \cdot S/d_m \log(SA/\delta)$. Next again take $\theta = 1/2$, then by the first result of Lemma J.1, with probability $1 - \delta$,

$$n_{s,a} \geq \frac{1}{2}n \cdot \sum_{h=1}^2 d_h^\mu(s, a) \geq n \cdot d_m \geq \frac{e}{32}S \log(SA/\delta).$$

¹³By Lemma J.1, the inequality holds as long as $n \geq 1/\sum_{h=1}^2 d_h^\mu(s, a) \log(SA/\delta)$, here $n > (1/2d_m) \cdot \log(SA/\delta)$ is a stronger sufficient condition.

where the last inequality uses the condition $n \geq \frac{e}{32} \cdot S/d_m \log(SA/\delta)$. Therefore this implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\hat{P}} \sup_{P(\cdot|s,a) \in \mathcal{M}_S} \mathbb{P} \left[\|\hat{P}(\cdot|s,a) - P(\cdot|s,a)\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{\frac{eS}{2n_{s,a}}} - o(\cdot) \right] \\
&= \inf_{\hat{P}} \sup_{P(\cdot|s,a) \in \mathcal{M}_S} \left(\mathbb{P} \left[\|\hat{P}(\cdot|s,a) - P(\cdot|s,a)\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{\frac{eS}{2n_{s,a}}} - o(\cdot) \middle| n_{s,a} \geq \frac{e}{32} S \right] \cdot \mathbb{P} \left[n_{s,a} \geq \frac{e}{32} S \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{P} \left[\|\hat{P}(\cdot|s,a) - P(\cdot|s,a)\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{\frac{eS}{2n_{s,a}}} - o(\cdot) \middle| n_{s,a} \leq \frac{e}{32} S \right] \cdot \mathbb{P} \left[n_{s,a} \leq \frac{e}{32} S \right] \right) \\
&\geq \inf_{\hat{P}} \sup_{P(\cdot|s,a) \in \mathcal{M}_S} \mathbb{P} \left[\|\hat{P}(\cdot|s,a) - P(\cdot|s,a)\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{\frac{eS}{2n_{s,a}}} - o(\cdot) \middle| n_{s,a} \geq \frac{e}{32} S \right] \cdot \mathbb{P} \left[n_{s,a} \geq \frac{e}{32} S \right] \\
&\geq p \cdot (1 - \delta),
\end{aligned}$$

To sum up, we have the following lemma:

Lemma C.2. *Let $n \geq \frac{e}{32} S/d_m \cdot \log(SA/\delta)$, then there exists a $0 < p < 1$,*

$$\inf_{\hat{P}} \sup_{P(\cdot|s,a) \in \mathcal{M}_S} \mathbb{P} \left[\|\hat{P}(\cdot|s,a) - P(\cdot|s,a)\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{\frac{eS}{2n_{s,a}}} - o(\cdot) \right] \geq p \cdot (1 - \delta).$$

Now we finish the proof for the case where $H = 2$. First note by (13),

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left\| \hat{Q}_{H-1}^\pi - Q_{H-1}^\pi \right\|_\infty \geq \sup_{s,a} \frac{1}{2} \left\| \hat{P}(\cdot|s,a) - P(\cdot|s,a) \right\|_1$$

with probability 1, therefore by (13), Lemma C.1, Lemma C.2 we have

$$\inf_{\hat{P}} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{M}_S} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left\| \hat{Q}_{H-1}^\pi - Q_{H-1}^\pi \right\|_\infty \geq C \cdot \sqrt{\frac{S}{nd_m}} \right] \geq p(1 - \delta) - \delta$$

when $n \geq c \cdot S/d_m \log(SA/\delta)$ for some $c \geq \frac{e}{32}$. Above holds for any δ .

It is easy to check $\frac{3}{2} \frac{p}{1+p} \leq 1$, therefore, in particular we set $\delta = \frac{3}{2} \frac{p}{1+p}$, direct calculation shows

$$p(1 - \delta) - \delta = \frac{p}{2},$$

which completes the proof for $H = 2$.

Extend to the general $H \geq 3$.

Step 1. Similar to the decomposition in section B.4, we also have:

$$\hat{Q}_t^\pi - Q_t^\pi = \sum_{h=t}^H \hat{\Gamma}_{t+1:h}^\pi (\hat{P} - P) V_{h+1}^\pi$$

Step 2. Now choosing rewards recursively from back (with $\|r_H\|_\infty = c$ sufficiently small) such that $1 \geq r_h \geq (\|r_{h+1}\|_\infty + \dots + \|r_H\|_\infty)$ element-wisely $\forall h$, and $\max_{s,a} r_h(s,a) = 3 \min_{s,a} r_h(s,a)$. We denote $r_{h,max} := \max_{s,a} r_h(s,a)$ and $r_{h,min} := \min_{s,a} r_h(s,a)$. This choice guarantees:

$$r_{h,min} := \min_{s,a} r_h(s,a) > \|P^{\pi_{h+1}} r_{h+1} + \dots + P^{\pi_{h+1:H}} r_H\|_\infty$$

since P^{π_h} is row-stochastic.

Step 3. Next note $V_h^\pi = r_h + P^{\pi_{h+1}} r_{h+1} + \dots + P^{\pi_{h+1:H}} r_H$, so set $(r_h(s, a_1), r_h(s, a_2), \dots) := (\max_{s,a} r_h(s,a), \min_{s,a} r_h(s,a), \dots)$, then choose π_h similar to the $H = 2$ case and use **Step 1** and **Step 2** we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}) V_h^\pi| &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1 \cdot (r_{h,max} - r_{h,min} - (P^{\pi_{h+1}} r_{h+1} + \dots + P^{\pi_{h+1:H}} r_H)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1 \cdot r_{h,min} \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1 \cdot c \end{aligned}$$

where the reasoning of the first inequality is similar to the case of $H = 2$. Next use $\hat{\Gamma}_{t+1:h}^\pi$ is row-stochastic then from **Step 1** and take the sum we have

$$\|\hat{Q}_1^\pi - Q_1^\pi\|_\infty \geq \frac{1}{2} c \cdot H \min_{s,a} \|\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1.$$

for such choice of rewards and π .

Step 4. However, in the above construction c actually depends on H due to the design $1 \geq r_h \geq (\|r_{h+1}\|_\infty + \dots + \|r_H\|_\infty)$. To get a universal constant c we could use the bound $\|\hat{Q}_1^\pi - Q_1^\pi\|_\infty \gtrsim r_{\frac{H}{2},min} \cdot \frac{H}{2} \min_{s,a} \|\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1$ instead, where $r_{\frac{H}{2},min}$ in Step 2 is universally lower bounded. Then we apply $\|\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1 \gtrsim \Omega(\sqrt{S/nd_m})$ to obtain the lower bound $\Omega(\sqrt{H^2 S/nd_m})$. ■

Remark C.3. We point out while our lower bound of $\Omega(H^2 S/d_m \epsilon^2)$ for uniform OPE appears to be qualitatively similar to the lower bound of $\Omega(H^2 S^2 A/\epsilon^2)$ derived for the online reward-free RL setting [Jin et al., 2020a], our result is not implied by theirs and cannot be proven by directly adapting their construction. Those two results are in principle different

since: the result in [Jin et al., 2020a] is learning-oriented where they define the problem class on $O(S)$ states and forcing $\Omega(SA/\epsilon^2)$ episodes in each state and end up with $O(S^2A/\epsilon^2)$ complexity; our result is evaluation-oriented where we need reduce the uniform evaluation problem to estimating probability distribution in ℓ_1 -error. The global uniform OPE and the reward-free setting are also different tasks (one cannot imply the other): the former deals with uniform convergence over all policies but with a fixed reward while the latter aims at learning simultaneously over all rewards.

D Proof for optimal offline learning (Corollary 4.2)

Proof. This is a corollary of Theorem 4.1. Indeed, by taking $\hat{\pi} = \hat{\pi}^*$, we first have

$$\left\| \hat{V}_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} - V_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \left\| \hat{Q}_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} - Q_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq C \left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2 \iota}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^{2.5} S^{0.5} \iota}{nd_m} \right].$$

Similar to the second result in Lemma B.11, we also have

$$\left\| \hat{V}_1^{\pi^*} - V_1^{\pi^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \left\| \hat{Q}_1^{\pi^*} - Q_1^{\pi^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq C \left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2 \iota}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^{2.5} S^{0.5} \iota}{nd_m} \right].$$

Next, recall the definition of $\hat{\pi} \in \Pi_l$ that

$$\left\| \hat{V}_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} - \hat{V}_1^{\hat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon_{\text{opt}},$$

and Theorem 4.1 again that

$$\left\| \hat{V}_1^{\hat{\pi}} - V_1^{\hat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \left\| \hat{Q}_1^{\hat{\pi}} - Q_1^{\hat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} \leq C \left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2 \iota}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^{2.5} S^{0.5} \iota}{nd_m} \right].$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
V_1^{\pi^*} - V_1^{\hat{\pi}} &= V_1^{\pi^*} - V_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} + V_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} - V_1^{\hat{\pi}} \\
&\leq \max_{\hat{\pi}^*, \pi^*} \left\| \hat{V}_1^{\pi^*} - V_1^{\pi^*} \right\|_{\infty} + V_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} - V_1^{\hat{\pi}} \\
&= \max_{\hat{\pi}^*, \pi^*} \left\| \hat{V}_1^{\pi^*} - V_1^{\pi^*} \right\|_{\infty} + \left(V_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} - \hat{V}_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} \right) + \left(\hat{V}_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} - \hat{V}_1^{\hat{\pi}} \right) + \left(\hat{V}_1^{\hat{\pi}} - V_1^{\hat{\pi}} \right) \\
&\leq 3C \left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2 \iota}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^{2.5} S^{0.5} \iota}{nd_m} \right] + \left\| \hat{V}_1^{\hat{\pi}^*} - \hat{V}_1^{\hat{\pi}} \right\|_{\infty} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\
&\leq 3C \left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2 \iota}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^{2.5} S^{0.5} \iota}{nd_m} \right] + \epsilon_{\text{opt}} \cdot \mathbf{1}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

E Proof for optimal offline Task-agnostic learning (Theorem 5.3)

Proof. Recall the definition of offline task-agnostic setting, where K tasks corresponds to K MDPs $M_k = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r_k, H, d_1)$ with different mean reward functions r_k 's. Since the incremental number of rewards do not incur randomness, therefore by Corollary 4.2, choose $\hat{\pi}_k = \hat{\pi}_k^*$ and apply a union bound we obtain with probability $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{k \in [K]} \|V_{1, M_k}^* - V_{1, M_k}^{\hat{\pi}_k^*}\|_{\infty} &\leq O \left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2 \log(HSAK/\delta)}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^{2.5} S^{0.5} \log(HSAK/\delta)}{nd_m} \right] \\
&= O \left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2 (\iota + \log(K))}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^{2.5} S^{0.5} (\iota + \log(K))}{nd_m} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. ■

Remark E.1. We stress that Section 3 of Zhang et al. [2020b] claims the definition of task-agnostic RL setting embraces one challenge that $r_k^{(i)}$'s are the observed random

realizations and the need to accurately estimate mean rewards r_k 's causes the additional $\log(K)$ dependence. However, for offline case, this is not essential since, by straightforward calculation, estimating $r_k^{(i)}$'s accurately only requires $\tilde{O}(\log(K)/d_m\epsilon^2)$ samples, which is of lower order comparing to $\tilde{O}(H^2 \log(K)/d_m\epsilon^2)$ learning bound. Therefore, in Definition 5.1 we do not incorporate the random version statement for reward r_k .

E.1 Offline Learning in the Constrained MDPs (CMDP)

Recently, there is a line of studies in the Constrained Markov Decision Processes (CMDP) (e.g. Ding et al. [2021]), where the MDP $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, H, d_1)$. When the reward is set to be r , it defines the objective function V_r^π and there is another utility function g that defines the constraint. To be concrete, the objective formulated as:

$$\underset{\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S}, H)}{\text{maximize}} V_{r,1}^\pi(x_1) \text{ subject to } V_{g,1}^\pi(x_1) \geq b \quad (14)$$

where $b \in (0, H]$ is some constraint threshold. In addition, the formulation needs a Slater condition that: there exists $\gamma > 0$ and $\bar{\pi} \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S}, H)$ such that $V_{g,1}^{\bar{\pi}}(x_1) \geq b + \gamma$.

Let π^* be the optimal solution that is compatible with the programming (14) (note this is **different** from the optimal policy that maximizes $V_{r,1}^\pi$ only), then by feasibility it satisfies $V_{g,1}^{\pi^*} \geq b$.

Now let $\hat{\pi}^*$ be the solution of the empirical program:

$$\underset{\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S}, H)}{\text{maximize}} \hat{V}_{r,1}^\pi(x_1) \text{ subject to } \hat{V}_{g,1}^\pi(x_1) \geq b \quad (15)$$

then we can show $\hat{\pi}^*$ is a near-optimal solution for (14) via the local uniform convergence guarantee (Theorem 4.1).

Indeed, define a surrogate program:

$$\underset{\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S}, H)}{\text{maximize}} \hat{V}_{r,1}^\pi(x_1) \text{ subject to } V_{g,1}^\pi(x_1) \geq b \quad (16)$$

and let $\bar{\pi}^*$ be the solution for (16). Then apparently $\bar{\pi}^*$ satisfies $V_{g,1}^{\bar{\pi}^*}(x_1) \geq b$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_{r,1}^{\pi^*} - V_{r,1}^{\bar{\pi}^*} &= V_{r,1}^{\pi^*} - \hat{V}_{r,1}^{\pi^*} + \hat{V}_{r,1}^{\pi^*} - \hat{V}_{r,1}^{\bar{\pi}^*} + \hat{V}_{r,1}^{\bar{\pi}^*} - V_{r,1}^{\bar{\pi}^*} \\ &\leq V_{r,1}^{\pi^*} - \hat{V}_{r,1}^{\pi^*} + 0 + \hat{V}_{r,1}^{\bar{\pi}^*} - V_{r,1}^{\bar{\pi}^*} \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{\pi} |V_{r,1}^\pi - \hat{V}_{r,1}^\pi| \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by local uniform convergence guarantee, $|V_{g,1}^\pi - \widehat{V}_{g,1}^\pi| \leq \tilde{O}(\sqrt{H^2/nd_m})$ for all π in the $\sqrt{H/S}$ -neighborhood of $\hat{\pi}^*$ (w.r.t g). This implies

$$V_{r,1}^{\pi^*} - V_{r,1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} \leq 2 \sup_{\pi} |V_{r,1}^\pi - \widehat{V}_{r,1}^\pi| + \tilde{O}(\sqrt{H^2/nd_m})$$

and the violation of the constraint is bounded by $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{H^2/nd_m})$. This means any approach that solves (15) is near-optimal for the original constrained MDP task given the uniform convergence guarantee.

F Proof for optimal offline Reward-free learning (Theorem 5.4)

Similar to before, recall $n_{s,a} = \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}[s_h^{(i)} = s, a_h^{(i)} = a]$. We first prove two lemmas which essentially provide a version of “Maximal Bernstein inequality”. We first fix a pair (s, a) and then conditional on $n_{s,a}$.

Lemma F.1. *We define $\epsilon_1 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{HS^2}}$. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{[i_1\epsilon_1, i_2\epsilon_1, \dots, i_S\epsilon_1]^\top | i_1, i_2, \dots, i_S \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cap [0, H]^S$ be the S -dimensional grid. Next define $\iota_1 = \log[(\sqrt{H^3S^2})^S/\delta]$. Then with probability $1 - \delta$,*

$$\left| (P_{s,a} - \widehat{P}_{s,a})w \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(w)\iota_1}{n_{s,a}}} + \frac{2H\iota_1}{3n_{s,a}}, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{G}.$$

This is by the direct application of Bernstein inequality with a union bound, where the cardinality of \mathcal{G} is

$$\left(\frac{H}{\epsilon_1}\right)^S = \left(\sqrt{H^3S^2}\right)^S.$$

Lemma F.2. *Let the S -dimensional grid be $\mathcal{G} = \{[i_1\epsilon_1, i_2\epsilon_1, \dots, i_S\epsilon_1]^\top | i_1, i_2, \dots, i_S \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cap [0, H]^S$ and define $\iota_1 = \log[(\sqrt{H^3S^2})^S/\delta]$. It holds with probability $1 - \delta$,*

$$\left| (P_{s,a} - \widehat{P}_{s,a})v \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(v)\iota_1}{n_{s,a}}} + C\sqrt{\frac{\iota_1}{n_{s,a}HS}} + \frac{2H\iota_1}{3n_{s,a}}, \quad \forall v \in [0, H]^S.$$

Proof. Let $z := \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{G}}(v)$. Then by design of \mathcal{G} we have

$$\|z - v\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_1 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{HS^2}}.$$

Therefore we obtain $\forall v \in [0, H]^S$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| (P_{s,a} - \widehat{P}_{s,a})v \right| &\leq \left| (P_{s,a} - \widehat{P}_{s,a})(v - z) \right| + \left| (P_{s,a} - \widehat{P}_{s,a})z \right| \\
&\leq \left\| P_{s,a} - \widehat{P}_{s,a} \right\|_1 \|z - v\|_\infty + \left| (P_{s,a} - \widehat{P}_{s,a})z \right| \\
&\leq c \sqrt{\frac{S}{n_{s,a}}} \|z - v\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(z)\iota_1}{n_{s,a}}} + \frac{2H\iota_1}{3n_{s,a}} \\
&\leq c \sqrt{\frac{S}{n_{s,a}}} \|z - v\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{2\|z - v\|_\infty^2 \iota_1}{n_{s,a}}} + \sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(v)\iota_1}{n_{s,a}}} + \frac{2H\iota_1}{3n_{s,a}} \\
&\leq C \sqrt{\frac{S\iota_1}{n_{s,a}}} \|z - v\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(v)\iota_1}{n_{s,a}}} + \frac{2H\iota_1}{3n_{s,a}} \\
&\leq C \sqrt{\frac{\iota_1}{n_{s,a}HS}} + \sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(v)\iota_1}{n_{s,a}}} + \frac{2H\iota_1}{3n_{s,a}}.
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality uses Lemma F.1 and Lemma J.9. ■

Then recall $N := \min_{s,a} n_{s,a}$, by Lemma F.2 and a union bound we obtain with probability $1 - \delta$, element-wisely,

$$\left| (P - \widehat{P})v \right| \leq C \cdot \left(\sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(v)\iota_2}{N}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{\iota_2}{N \cdot HS}} + \frac{2H\iota_2}{3N} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}, \quad \forall v \in [0, H]^S, \quad (17)$$

where $\iota_2 = S \log(HSA/\delta)$.

Remark F.3. Equation 17 is a form of maximal Bernstein inequality as it keeps validity for all $v \in [0, H]^S$. The price for this stronger result is the extra S factor (coming from ι_2) in the dominate term.

Now, for *any* reward r , by (empirical) Bellman equation we have element-wisely:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}^*} &= r_h + \widehat{P}^{\widehat{\pi}^*_{h+1}} \widehat{Q}_{h+1}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - r_h - P^{\widehat{\pi}^*_{h+1}} Q_{h+1}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \\
&= \left(\widehat{P}^{\widehat{\pi}^*_{h+1}} - P^{\widehat{\pi}^*_{h+1}} \right) \widehat{Q}_{h+1}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} + P^{\widehat{\pi}^*_{h+1}} \left(\widehat{Q}_{h+1}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - Q_{h+1}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \right) \\
&= \left(\widehat{P} - P \right) \widehat{V}_{h+1}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} + P^{\widehat{\pi}^*_{h+1}} \left(\widehat{Q}_{h+1}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} - Q_{h+1}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \right) \\
&= \dots = \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \left(\widehat{P} - P \right) \widehat{V}_{t+1}^{\widehat{\pi}^*}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_{h+1:t}^\pi = \prod_{i=h+1}^t P^{\pi_i}$ is multi-step state-action transition and $\Gamma_{h+1:h} := I$.

Concentration on $(\hat{P} - P) \hat{V}_h^\star$. Now by (17), we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}) \hat{V}_h^\star \\
& \leq C \cdot \left(\sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(\hat{V}_h^\star)\iota_2}{N}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{\iota_2}{N \cdot HS}} + \frac{2H\iota_2}{3N} \right) \\
& \leq C \cdot \left(\sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(V_h^{\hat{\pi}^\star})\iota_2}{N}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{\iota_2}{N \cdot HS}} + \sqrt{\frac{2\iota_2}{N}} \cdot \|\hat{V}_h^{\hat{\pi}^\star} - V_h^{\hat{\pi}^\star}\|_\infty + \frac{2H\iota_2}{3N} \right) \quad (18) \\
& \leq C \cdot \left(\sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(V_h^{\hat{\pi}^\star})\iota_2}{N}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{\iota_2}{N \cdot HS}} + \sqrt{\frac{2\iota_2}{N}} \cdot H^2 \sqrt{\frac{S}{N}} + \frac{2H\iota_2}{3N} \right) \\
& \leq C' \cdot \left(\sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(V_h^{\hat{\pi}^\star})\iota_2}{N}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{\iota_2}{N \cdot HS}} + \frac{2H^2 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality uses Lemma J.10¹⁴. Then above implies

¹⁴Note the use of Lemma J.10 also works for any rewards since the only high probability result they used is for $\|P - \hat{P}\|_1$. Therefore conditional on the concentration for $\|P - \hat{P}\|_1$, the argument follows for any arbitrary reward as well.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{Q}_h^{\hat{\pi}^*} - Q_h^{\hat{\pi}^*} \\
& \leq C' \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\hat{\pi}^*} \cdot \left(\sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(V_h^{\hat{\pi}^*})\iota_2}{N}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{\iota_2}{N \cdot HS}} + \frac{2H^2 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \right) \\
& \leq C' \left[\sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\hat{\pi}^*} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2\text{Var}_{s,a}(V_h^{\hat{\pi}^*})\iota_2}{N}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{H \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} + \frac{2H^3 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \right] \\
& \leq C' \left[\sqrt{\frac{2H^3 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{H \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} + \frac{2H^3 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \right] \\
& \leq C'' \left[\sqrt{\frac{H^3 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N}} + \frac{H^3 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{N} \right] \\
& \leq O \left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^2 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{nd_m} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality uses Lemma J.5 and the last one uses $N \geq \frac{1}{2}nd_m$ with high probability. Similar result holds for $\hat{Q}_h^{\pi^*} - Q_h^{\pi^*}$. Combing those results we have reward-free bound (for any reward simultaneously)

$$O \left[\sqrt{\frac{H^2 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{nd_m}} + \frac{H^2 S \log(HSA/\delta)}{nd_m} \right],$$

which finishes the proof of Theorem 5.4.

Remark F.4. Note above result is tight in both the dominate term AND the higher order term. Therefore this result cannot be further improved even in the higher order term.

G Discussion of Section 5

In this section we explain why Theorem 5.3 and Theorem 5.4 are optimal in the offline RL.

We begin with the offline task-agnostic setting. For the exquisite readers who check the proof of Theorem 5 of Zhang et al. [2020b], the proving procedure of their lower bound follows the standard reduction to best-arm identification in multi-armed bandit problems. More specifically, to incorporate the dependence of $\log(K)$, they rely on the Theorem 10 of Zhang

et al. [2020b] (which is originated from Mannor and Tsitsiklis [2004]) to show in order to be (ϵ, δ) -correct for a problem with A arms and with K tasks, it need at least $\Omega(\frac{A}{\epsilon^2} \log(\frac{K}{\delta}))$ samples. Such a result updates the Lemma G.1. in Yin et al. [2021b] by the extra factor $\log(K)$ for the bandit problem with K tasks. With no modification, the rest of the proof in Section E of Yin et al. [2021b] follows though and one can end up with the lower bound $\Omega(H^2 \log(K)/d_m \epsilon^2)$ over the problem class $\mathcal{M}_{d_m} := \{(\mu, M) \mid \min_{t, s_t, a_t} d_t^\mu(s_t, a_t) \geq d_m\}$. The case for the offline reward-free setting is also similar. Indeed, the $\Omega(SA/\epsilon^2)$ trajectories in Lemma 4.2 in Jin et al. [2020a] could be replaced by $\Omega(1/d_m \epsilon^2)$ by choosing some hard *near-uniform* behavior policy instances (see Section E.2 in Yin et al. [2021b]) and the rest follows since by forcing S such instances (Section 4.2 of Jin et al. [2020a]) to obtain $\Omega(S/d_m \epsilon^2)$ and create a chain of $\Omega(H)$ rewards for $\Omega(H^2 S/d_m \epsilon^2)$.

H Proof of the linear MDP with anchor representations (Section 6)

Recall that we assume a generative oracle here. Sometimes we abuse the notation \mathcal{K} for either anchor point set or the anchor point indices set. The meaning should be clear in each context.

H.1 Model-based Plug-in Estimator for Anchor Representations

Step 1: For each (s_k, a_k) where index $k \in \mathcal{K}$, collect N samples from $P(\cdot|s_k, a_k)$; compute

$$\hat{P}_{\mathcal{K}}(s'|s_k, a_k) = \frac{\text{count}(s, a, s')}{N};$$

Step 2: Compute the linear combination coefficients $\lambda_k^{s,a}$ satisfies $\phi(s, a) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} \phi(s_k, a_k)$;

Step 3: Estimate transition distribution

$$\hat{P}(s'|s, a) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} \cdot \hat{P}_{\mathcal{K}}(s'|s_k, a_k).$$

We need to check such $\hat{P}(s'|s, a)$ is a valid distribution. This is due to:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{s'} \lambda_k^{s,a} P(s'|s_k, a_k) = \sum_{s'} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} P(s'|s_k, a_k) \\ &= \sum_{s'} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} \langle \phi(s_k, a_k), \psi(s') \rangle = \sum_{s'} \langle \phi(s, a), \psi(s') \rangle = \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{s'} \hat{P}(s'|s, a) &= \sum_{s'} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} \hat{P}_{\mathcal{K}}(s' | s_k, a_k) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{s'} \lambda_k^{s,a} \hat{P}_{\mathcal{K}}(s' | s_k, a_k) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} \frac{N}{N} = 1.\end{aligned}$$

Step 4: construct empirical model $\widehat{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \widehat{P}, r, H)$ and output $\widehat{\pi}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi} \widehat{V}_1^{\pi}$.

Similarly, Bellman (optimality) equations hold¹⁵

$$\begin{aligned}V_t^*(s) &= \max_a \left\{ r(s, a) + \int_{s'} V_{t+1}^*(s') dP(s'|s, a) \right\}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}. \\ \widehat{V}_t^*(s) &= \max_a \left\{ r(s, a) + \int_{s'} \widehat{V}_{t+1}^*(s') d\widehat{P}(s'|s, a) \right\}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.\end{aligned}$$

H.2 General absorbing MDP

The definition of the general absorbing MDP remains the same: *i.e.* for a fixed state s and a sequence $\{u_t\}_{t=1}^H$, MDP $M_{s, \{u_t\}_{t=1}^H}$ is identical to M for all states except s , and state s is absorbing in the sense $P_{M_{s, \{u_t\}_{t=1}^H}}(s|s, a) = 1$ for all a , and the instantaneous reward at time t is $r_t(s, a) = u_t$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Also, we use the shorthand notation $V_{\{s, u_t\}}^{\pi}$ for $V_{s, M_{s, \{u_t\}_{t=1}^H}}^{\pi}$ and similarly for $Q_{\{s, u_t\}}$ and transition $P_{\{s, u_t\}}$. Then the following properties mirroring the Lemma B.1 and Lemma B.2 with nearly identical proof but for the integral version (which we skip):

Lemma H.1.

$$V_{h, \{s, u_t\}}^*(s) = \sum_{t=h}^H u_t.$$

Lemma H.2. Fix state s . For two different sequences $\{u_t\}_{t=1}^H$ and $\{u'_t\}_{t=1}^H$, we have

$$\max_h \left\| Q_{h, \{s, u_t\}}^* - Q_{h, \{s, u'_t\}}^* \right\|_{\infty} \leq H \cdot \max_{t \in [H]} |u_t - u'_t|.$$

¹⁵We use the integral only to denote \mathcal{S} could be exponentially large.

H.3 Singleton-absorbing MDP

The well-definedness of singleton-absorbing MDP for linear MDP with anchor points depends on the following two lemmas whose proofs are still nearly identical to Lemma B.3 and Lemma B.5 which we skip.

Lemma H.3. $V_t^*(s) - V_{t+1}^*(s) \geq 0$, for all state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and all $t \in [H]$.

Lemma H.4. Fix a state s . If we choose $u_t^* := V_t^*(s) - V_{t+1}^*(s) \forall t \in [H]$, then we have the following vector form equation

$$V_{h,\{s,u_t^*\}}^* = V_{h,M}^* \quad \forall h \in [H].$$

Similarly, if we choose $\hat{u}_t^* := \hat{V}_t^*(s) - \hat{V}_{t+1}^*(s)$, then $\hat{V}_{h,\{s,\hat{u}_t^*\}}^* = \hat{V}_{h,M}^*, \forall h \in [H]$.

The singleton MDP we used is exactly $M_{s,\{u_t^*\}_{t=1}^H}$ (or $\hat{M}_{s,\{\hat{u}_t^*\}_{t=1}^H}$).

H.4 Proof for the optimal sample complexity

For $\hat{\pi}^*$, by (empirical) Bellman equation we have element-wisely:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_h^{\hat{\pi}^*} - Q_h^{\hat{\pi}^*} &= r_h + \hat{P}^{\hat{\pi}^*}_{h+1} \hat{Q}_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} - r_h - P^{\hat{\pi}^*}_{h+1} Q_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} \\ &= \left(\hat{P}^{\hat{\pi}^*}_{h+1} - P^{\hat{\pi}^*}_{h+1} \right) \hat{Q}_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} + P^{\hat{\pi}^*}_{h+1} \left(\hat{Q}_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} - Q_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} \right) \\ &= \left(\hat{P} - P \right) \hat{V}_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} + P^{\hat{\pi}^*}_{h+1} \left(\hat{Q}_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} - Q_{h+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} \right) \\ &= \dots = \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\hat{\pi}^*} \left(\hat{P} - P \right) \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} \leq \underbrace{\sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\hat{\pi}^*} \left| \left(\hat{P} - P \right) \hat{V}_{t+1}^{\hat{\pi}^*} \right|}_{(\star)} \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\hat{\pi}^*} = \prod_{i=h+1}^t P^{\hat{\pi}^*}_i$ is multi-step state-action transition and $\Gamma_{h+1:h} := I$.

H.5 Analyzing (\star)

Concentration on $(\hat{P} - P) \hat{V}_h^*$. Since \hat{P} aggregates all data from different step so that \hat{P} and \hat{V}_h^* are on longer independent. We use the singleton-absorbing MDP $M_{s,\{u_t^*\}_{t=1}^H}$ to handle the case (recall $u_t^* := V_t^*(s) - V_{t+1}^*(s) \forall t \in [H]$). **Here, we fix the state action**

$(s, a) \in \mathcal{K}$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right) \hat{V}_h^\star = \left(\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right) \left(\hat{V}_h^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star + \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \right) \\
& = \left(\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right) \left(\hat{V}_h^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \right) + \left(\hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right) \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \\
& \leq \left\| \hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right\|_1 \left\| \hat{V}_h^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \right\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star)} + \frac{2H \log(1/\delta)}{3N} \\
& \leq \left\| \hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right\|_1 \left\| \hat{V}_h^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \right\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4/\delta)}{N}} \left(\sqrt{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\hat{V}_h^\star)} + \sqrt{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star - \hat{V}_h^\star)} \right) + \frac{2H \log(1/\delta)}{3N} \\
& \leq \left\| \hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right\|_1 \left\| \hat{V}_h^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \right\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4/\delta)}{N}} \left(\sqrt{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\hat{V}_h^\star)} + \sqrt{\left\| \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star - \hat{V}_h^\star \right\|_\infty^2} \right) + \frac{2H \log(1/\delta)}{3N} \\
& = \left(\left\| \hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right\|_1 + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4/\delta)}{N}} \right) \left\| \hat{V}_h^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \right\|_\infty + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{s,a}(\hat{V}_h^\star)} + \frac{2H \log(1/\delta)}{3N}
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where the first inequality uses Bernstein inequality (Lemma J.3) (**note here $P_{s,a}V = \int_{\mathcal{S}'} V(s') dP(s'|s, a)$ since \mathcal{S} could be continuous space, but this does not affect the availability of Bernstein inequality!**), the second inequality uses $\sqrt{\text{Var}(\cdot)}$ is norm (norm triangle inequality). Now we treat $\left\| \hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right\|_1$ and $\left\| \hat{V}_h^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \right\|_\infty$ separately.

For $\left\| \hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right\|_1$. Recall here $(s, a) \in \mathcal{K}$. By Lemma J.9 we obtain w.p. $1 - \delta$

$$\left\| \hat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right\|_1 \leq C \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{S}| \log(1/\delta)}{N}}. \tag{20}$$

where C absorbs the higher order term and constants.

For $\left\| \hat{V}_h^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \right\|_\infty$. Note if we set $\hat{u}_t^\star = \hat{V}_t^\star(s) - \hat{V}_{t+1}^\star(s)$, then by Lemma H.4

$$\hat{V}_h^\star = \hat{V}_{h,\{s,\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star$$

Next since $\hat{V}_{h,\{s,\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star(\tilde{s}) = \max_a \hat{Q}_{h,\{s,\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star(\tilde{s}, a) \ \forall \tilde{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, by generic inequality $|\max f - \max g| \leq \max |f - g|$, we have $|\hat{V}_{h,\{s,\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star(\tilde{s}) - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star(\tilde{s})| \leq \max_a |\hat{Q}_{h,\{s,\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star(\tilde{s}, a) - \hat{Q}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star(\tilde{s}, a)|$, taking $\max_{\tilde{s}}$ on both sides, we obtain exactly

$$\left\| \hat{V}_{h,\{s,\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \right\|_\infty \leq \left\| \hat{Q}_{h,\{s,\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star - \hat{Q}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \right\|_\infty$$

then by Lemma H.2,

$$\left\| \hat{V}_h^\star - \hat{V}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \right\|_\infty \leq \left\| \hat{Q}_{h,\{s,\hat{u}_t^\star\}}^\star - \hat{Q}_{h,\{s,u_t^\star\}}^\star \right\|_\infty \leq H \max_t |\hat{u}_t^\star - u_t^\star|, \tag{21}$$

Recall

$$\hat{u}_t^\star - u_t^\star = \hat{V}_t^\star(s) - \hat{V}_{t+1}^\star(s) - (V_t^\star(s) - V_{t+1}^\star(s)).$$

Now we denote

$$\Delta_s := \max_t |\hat{u}_t^\star - u_t^\star| = \max_t \left| \hat{V}_t^\star(s) - \hat{V}_{t+1}^\star(s) - (V_t^\star(s) - V_{t+1}^\star(s)) \right|,$$

then Δ_s itself is a scalar and a random variable.

To sum up, by (19), (5) and (21) and a union bound over all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{K}$ we have

Lemma H.5. *Fix $N > 0$. With probability $1 - \delta$, element-wisely, for all $h \in [H]$ and all $(s_k, a_k) \in \mathcal{K}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left(\hat{P}_{s_k, a_k} - P_{s_k, a_k} \right) \hat{V}_h^\star \right| &\leq C \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{S}| \log(HK/\delta)}{N}} \cdot H \max_{s_k} \Delta_{s_k} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{P_{s_k, a_k}}(\hat{V}_h^\star)} + \frac{2H \log(HK/\delta)}{3N} \end{aligned}$$

Now we extend Lemma H.5 to any arbitrary (s, a) by proving the following lemma:

Lemma H.6 (recover lemma). *For any function V and any state action (s, a) , we have*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s, a} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{P_{s_k, a_k}}(V)} \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}_{P_{s, a}}(V)}$$

Proof of Lemma H.6. Since $\lambda_k^{s, a}$ are probability distributions, by Jensen's inequality twice

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s, a} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{P_{s_k, a_k}}(V)} &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s, a} \text{Var}_{P_{s_k, a_k}}(V)} \\ &= \sqrt{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s, a} \text{Var}_{P_{s_k, a_k}}(V)} = \sqrt{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s, a} (P_{s_k, a_k} V^2 - (P_{s_k, a_k} V)^2)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s, a} \cdot P_{s_k, a_k} V^2 - \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s, a} P_{s_k, a_k} V \right)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{P_{s, a} V^2 - (P_{s, a} V)^2} = \sqrt{\text{Var}_{P_{s, a}}(V)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use $P_{s, a} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s, a} P_{s_k, a_k}$. ■

Therefore for all (s, a) , using Lemma H.5 and Lemma H.6 we obtain w.p. $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \left(\widehat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a} \right) \widehat{V}_h^\star \right| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} \left| \left(\widehat{P}_{s_k,a_k} - P_{s_k,a_k} \right) \widehat{V}_h^\star \right| \\
& \leq C \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HK/\delta)}{N}} \cdot H \max_{s_k} \Delta_{s_k} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{P_{s_k,a_k}}(\widehat{V}_h^\star)} \\
& + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} \frac{2H \log(HK/\delta)}{3N} \\
& = C \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HK/\delta)}{N}} \cdot H \max_{s_k} \Delta_{s_k} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_k^{s,a} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{P_{s_k,a_k}}(\widehat{V}_h^\star)} \\
& + \frac{2H \log(HK/\delta)}{3N} \\
& \leq C \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HK/\delta)}{N}} \cdot H \max_{s_k} \Delta_{s_k} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{P_{s,a}}(\widehat{V}_h^\star)} + \frac{2H \log(HK/\delta)}{3N}
\end{aligned}$$

Now plug above back into (\star) , we receive:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}^\star} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}^\star} \right| \\
& \leq \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\widehat{\pi}^\star} \left(C \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HK/\delta)}{N}} \cdot H \max_{s_k} \Delta_{s_k} \cdot \mathbf{1} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_{t+1}^\star)} + \frac{2H \log(HK/\delta)}{3N} \cdot \mathbf{1} \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\widehat{\pi}^\star} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_{t+1}^\star)} + CH^2 \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HK/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \max_s \Delta_s \cdot \mathbf{1} + \frac{2H^2 \log(HK/\delta)}{3N} \cdot \mathbf{1}
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to before, we get

$$\sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_h^\star)} := \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(\widehat{V}_h^{\widehat{\pi}^\star})} \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V_h^{\widehat{\pi}^\star})} + \left\| \widehat{Q}_h^{\widehat{\pi}^\star} - Q_h^{\widehat{\pi}^\star} \right\|_\infty \quad (22)$$

Plug (22) back to above we obtain $\forall h \in [H]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \widehat{Q}_h^{\pi^*} - Q_h^{\pi^*} \right| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\pi^*} \left(\sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V_{t+1}^{\pi^*})} + \left\| \widehat{Q}_{t+1}^{\pi^*} - Q_{t+1}^{\pi^*} \right\|_{\infty} \right) \\
&+ CH^2 \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HK/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \max_{s_k} \Delta_{s_k} \cdot \mathbf{1} + \frac{2H^2 \log(HK/\delta)}{3N} \cdot \mathbf{1} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^{\pi^*} \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V_{t+1}^{\pi^*})} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} \sum_{t=h}^H \left\| \widehat{Q}_{t+1}^{\pi^*} - Q_{t+1}^{\pi^*} \right\|_{\infty} \\
&+ CH^2 \sqrt{\frac{S \log(HK/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \max_{s_k} \Delta_{s_k} \cdot \mathbf{1} + \frac{2H^2 \log(HK/\delta)}{3N} \cdot \mathbf{1}
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Apply Lemma J.5 and the (anchor version using recover lemma H.6) coarse uniform bound (Lemma J.10) we obtain the following lemma:

Lemma H.7. *With probability $1 - \delta$, for all $h \in [H]$,*

$$\left\| \widehat{Q}_h^{\pi^*} - Q_h^{\pi^*} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \sqrt{\frac{C_0 H^3 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} \sum_{t=h}^H \left\| \widehat{Q}_{t+1}^{\pi^*} - Q_{t+1}^{\pi^*} \right\|_{\infty} + C' H^4 \frac{S \log(HK/\delta)}{N}$$

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{s_k} &:= \max_t |\hat{u}_t^* - u_t^*| = \max_t \left| \widehat{V}_t^*(s_k) - \widehat{V}_{t+1}^*(s_k) - (V_t^*(s_k) - V_{t+1}^*(s_k)) \right| \\
&\leq 2 \cdot \max_t \left| \widehat{V}_t^*(s_k) - V_t^*(s_k) \right| \\
&= 2 \cdot \max_t \left| \max_{\pi} \widehat{V}_t^{\pi}(s_k) - \max_{\pi} V_t^{\pi}(s_k) \right| \\
&\leq 2 \cdot \max_{\pi \in \Pi_g, t \in [H]} \left\| \widehat{V}_t^{\pi} - V_t^{\pi} \right\|_{\infty} \leq C \cdot H^2 \sqrt{\frac{|S| \log(HK/\delta)}{N}}
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where the last inequality uses (the anchor version) of Lemma J.10.¹⁶ Then apply union bound w.p. $1 - \delta/2$, we obtain $\max_{s_k} \Delta_{s_k} \leq C \cdot H^2 \sqrt{\frac{|S| \log(HK^2/\delta)}{N}}$. Note (23) holds with probability $1 - \delta/2$, therefore plug above into (23) and uses Lemma J.5 and take $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ we obtain w.p. $1 - \delta$, the result holds. \blacksquare

Lemma H.8. *Given $N > 0$. Define $C'' := 2 \cdot \max(\sqrt{C_0}, C')$ where C' is the universal constant in Lemma H.7. When $N \geq 8H^2 |S| \log(4HK/\delta)$, then with probability $1 - \delta$,*

¹⁶Here the anchor version means for any (s, a) we can apply $\|\widehat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1 = \|\sum_k \lambda_k^{s,a} (\widehat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a})\|_1 \leq \sum_k \lambda_k^{s,a} \|\widehat{P}_{s,a} - P_{s,a}\|_1$.

$\forall h \in [H]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\widehat{Q}_h^{\pi^*} - Q_h^{\pi^*}\right\|_{\infty} &\leq C'' \sqrt{\frac{H^3 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} + C'' \frac{H^4 S \log(HK/\delta)}{N}. \\ \left\|\widehat{Q}_h^{\pi^*} - Q_h^{\pi^*}\right\|_{\infty} &\leq C'' \sqrt{\frac{H^3 \log(4HK/\delta)}{N}} + C'' \frac{H^4 S \log(HK/\delta)}{N}.\end{aligned}\tag{25}$$

Proof. The proof is the same as Lemma B.9. \blacksquare

Remark H.9. Note the higher order term has dependence $H^4 S$. Use the same self-bounding trick, we can reduce it to $H^{3.5} S^{0.5}$.

Lemma H.10. Given $N > 0$. There exists universal constants C_1, C_2 such that when $N \geq C_1 H^2 |\mathcal{S}| \log(HK/\delta)$, then with probability $1 - \delta$, $\forall h \in [H]$,

$$\left\|\widehat{Q}_h^{\pi^*} - Q_h^{\pi^*}\right\|_{\infty} \leq C_2 \sqrt{\frac{H^3 \log(HK/\delta)}{N}} + C_2 \frac{H^3 \sqrt{HS} \log(HK/\delta)}{N}.\tag{26}$$

and

$$\left\|\widehat{Q}_h^{\pi^*} - Q_h^{\pi^*}\right\|_{\infty} \leq C_2 \sqrt{\frac{H^3 \log(HK/\delta)}{N}} + C_2 \frac{H^3 \sqrt{HS} \log(HK/\delta)}{N}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to Lemma B.11. \blacksquare

H.6 Proof of Theorem 6.2

Proof. By the direct computing of the suboptimality,

$$Q_1^* - Q_1^{\pi^*} = Q_1^* - \widehat{Q}_1^{\pi^*} + \widehat{Q}_1^{\pi^*} - \widehat{Q}_1^{\pi^*} + \widehat{Q}_1^{\pi^*} - Q_1^{\pi^*} \leq |Q_1^* - \widehat{Q}_1^{\pi^*}| + |\widehat{Q}_1^{\pi^*} - Q_1^{\pi^*}|,$$

then by Lemma H.10 we can finish the proof. \blacksquare

H.7 Take-away in the linear MDP with anchor setting.

Under the setting S could be exponential large, \mathcal{A} could be infinite (or even continuous space), with anchor representations ($K \ll |\mathcal{S}|$), our Theorem 6.2 has order $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{H^3/N})$ when N is sufficiently large. This translate to $N = \tilde{O}(H^3/\epsilon^2)$ and the total sample used is $KN = \tilde{O}(KH^3/\epsilon^2)$. This improves the total complexity $\tilde{O}(KH^4/\epsilon^2)$ in Cui and Yang [2020] and is optimal.

I The computational efficiency for the model-based offline plug-in estimators

For completeness, we discuss the computational and storage aspect of our model-based method. Its computational cost is $\tilde{O}(H^4/d_m\epsilon^2)$ for computing \hat{P} , the same as its sample complexity in steps (H steps is an episode), and running value iteration causes $O(HS^2A)$ time (here we assume the bit complexity $L(P, r, H) = 1$, see [Agarwal et al. \[2019\]](#) Section 1.3). The total computational complexity is $\tilde{O}(H^4/d_m\epsilon^2) + O(HS^2A)$. The memory cost is $O(HS^2A)$.

J Assisting lemmas

Lemma J.1 (Multiplicative Chernoff bound [Chernoff et al. \[1952\]](#)). *Let X be a Binomial random variable with parameter p, n . For any $1 \geq \theta > 0$, we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}[X < (1 - \theta)pn] < e^{-\frac{\theta^2 pn}{2}}. \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}[X \geq (1 + \theta)pn] < e^{-\frac{\theta^2 pn}{3}}$$

Lemma J.2 (Hoeffding's Inequality [Sridharan \[2002\]](#)). *Let x_1, \dots, x_n be independent bounded random variables such that $\mathbb{E}[x_i] = 0$ and $|x_i| \leq \xi_i$ with probability 1. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq \epsilon\right) \leq e^{-\frac{2n^2\epsilon^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^2}}.$$

Lemma J.3 (Bernstein's Inequality). *Let x_1, \dots, x_n be independent bounded random variables such that $\mathbb{E}[x_i] = 0$ and $|x_i| \leq \xi$ with probability 1. Let $\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}[x_i]$, then with probability $1 - \delta$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma^2 \cdot \log(1/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{2\xi}{3n} \log(1/\delta)$$

Lemma J.4 (Freedman's inequality [Tropp et al. \[2011\]](#)). *Let X be the martingale associated with a filter \mathcal{F} (i.e. $X_i = \mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{F}_i]$) satisfying $|X_i - X_{i-1}| \leq M$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Denote $W := \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(X_i|\mathcal{F}_{i-1})$ then we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq \epsilon, W \leq \sigma^2) \leq 2e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2(\sigma^2 + M\epsilon/3)}}.$$

Or in other words, with probability $1 - \delta$,

$$|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \leq \sqrt{8\sigma^2 \cdot \log(1/\delta)} + \frac{2M}{3} \cdot \log(1/\delta), \quad \text{Or} \quad W \geq \sigma^2.$$

Lemma J.5 (Sum of expectation of conditional variance of value; Lemma F.3 of [Yin et al. \[2021a\]](#)).

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var}_\pi \left[\sum_{t=h}^H r_t^{(1)} \mid s_h^{(1)} = s_h, a_h^{(1)} = a_h \right] \\ &= \sum_{t=h}^H \left(\mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\text{Var} \left[r_t^{(1)} + V_{t+1}^\pi(s_{t+1}^{(1)}) \mid s_t^{(1)}, a_t^{(1)} \right] \mid s_h^{(1)} = s_h, a_h^{(1)} = a_h \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[r_t^{(1)} + V_{t+1}^\pi(s_{t+1}^{(1)}) \mid s_t^{(1)}, a_t^{(1)} \right] \mid s_t^{(1)} \right] \mid s_h^{(1)} = s_h, a_h^{(1)} = a_h \right] \right) \end{aligned}$$

By apply above, one can show

$$\sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^\pi \sqrt{\text{Var}_P(V_{t+1}^\pi)} \leq \sqrt{(H-h)^3} \cdot \mathbf{1}.$$

Remark J.6. The infinite horizon discounted setting counterpart result is $(I - \gamma P^\pi)^{-1} \sigma_{V^\pi} \leq (1 - \gamma)^{-3/2}$.

J.1 Minimax rate of discrete distributions under l_1 loss.

This Section provides the minimax rate for $\|\hat{P} - P\|_1$ for any model-based algorithms and is based on [Han et al. \[2015\]](#). Let P be S dimensional distribution.

Lemma J.7 (Minimax lower bound for $\|\hat{P} - P\|_1$). *Let n be the number of data-points sampled from P . If $n > \frac{e}{32}S$, then there exists a constant $p > 0$, such that*

$$\inf_{\hat{P}} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{M}_S} \mathbb{P} \left[\|\hat{P} - P\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{\frac{eS}{2n}} - o(e^{-n}) - o(e^{-S}) \right] \geq p,$$

where \mathcal{M}_S denotes the set of distributions with support size S and the infimum is taken over **ALL** estimators.

Remark J.8. Note the \hat{P} in above carries over all estimators but not just empirical estimator. This provides the minimax result.

Proof. The proof comes from Theorem 2 of [Han et al. \[2015\]](#), where we pick $\zeta = 1$. Note they establish the minimax result for $\mathbb{E}_P \|\hat{P} - P\|_1$. However, by a simple contradiction we can get the above. Indeed, suppose

$$\inf_{\hat{P}} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{M}_S} \mathbb{P} \left[\|\hat{P} - P\|_1 < \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{\frac{eS}{2n}} - o(e^{-n}) - o(e^{-S}) \right] = 1,$$

then this implies $\inf_{\hat{P}} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{M}_S} \mathbb{E}_P \|\hat{P} - P\|_1 < \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{\frac{eS}{2n}} - o(e^{-n}) - o(e^{-S})$ which contradicts Theorem 2 of [Han et al. \[2015\]](#). ■

Lemma J.9 (Upper bound for $\|\hat{P} - P\|_1$). *Let n be the number of data-points sampled from P . Then with probability $1 - \delta$*

$$\|\hat{P} - P\|_1 \leq C \left(\sqrt{\frac{S \log(S/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{S \log(S/\delta)}{n} \right)$$

for any $P \in \mathcal{M}_S$. Here \hat{P} is the empirical (MLE) estimator.

Proof. First fix a state s . Let $X_i = \mathbf{1}[s_i = s]$, then $X_i \sim \text{Bern}(p_s(1 - p_s))$ and $X_s = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \sim \text{Binomial}(n, p_i)$. By Bernstein inequality,

$$\left| \frac{X_s}{n} - P_s \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2p_s(1 - p_s) \log(1/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{3}{n} \log(1/\delta)$$

Apply a union bound we obtain w.p. $1 - \delta$

$$\left| \frac{X_s}{n} - P_s \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2p_s(1 - p_s) \log(S/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{3}{n} \log(S/\delta) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{P} - P\|_1 &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{X_s}{n} - P_s \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sqrt{\frac{2p_s(1 - p_s) \log(S/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{3S}{n} \log(S/\delta) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{S} \cdot \sqrt{2S^2 p_s(1 - p_s) \log(S/\delta)} + \frac{3S}{n} \log(S/\delta) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}} \sqrt{2S^2 \cdot \frac{\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} p_s}{S} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} p_s}{S} \right) \log(S/\delta)} + \frac{3S}{n} \log(S/\delta) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2(S-1) \log(S/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{3S}{n} \log(S/\delta). \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses the concavity of $\sqrt{x(1-x)}$.

Finally, we can absorb the higher order term using the mild condition $n > c \cdot S \log(S/\delta)$. ■

J.2 A crude uniform convergence bound

Here we provide a crude bound for $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g} \left\| \widehat{V}_1^\pi - V_1^\pi \right\|_\infty$, which is the finite horizon counterpart of Section 2.2 of Jiang [2018] and is a form of simulation lemma.

Lemma J.10 (Crude bound by Simulation Lemma). *Fix $N > 0$ to be number of samples for each coordinates. Recall Π_g is the global policy class. Then w.p. $1 - \delta$,*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g, h \in [H]} \left\| \widehat{Q}_h^\pi - Q_h^\pi \right\|_\infty \leq C \cdot H^2 \sqrt{\frac{S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}},$$

which further implies

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g, h \in [H]} \left\| \widehat{V}_h^\pi - V_h^\pi \right\|_\infty \leq C \cdot H^2 \sqrt{\frac{S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}},$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Q}_h^\pi - Q_h^\pi &= r_h + \widehat{P}^{\pi_{h+1}} \widehat{Q}_{h+1}^\pi - r_h - P^{\pi_{h+1}} Q_{h+1}^\pi \\ &= \left(\widehat{P}^{\pi_{h+1}} - P^{\pi_{h+1}} \right) \widehat{Q}_{h+1}^\pi + P^{\pi_{h+1}} (Q_{h+1}^\pi - Q_{h+1}^\pi) \\ &= \left(\widehat{P} - P \right) \widehat{V}_{h+1}^\pi + P^{\pi_{h+1}} \left(\widehat{Q}_{h+1}^\pi - Q_{h+1}^\pi \right) \\ &= \dots = \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^\pi \left(\widehat{P} - P \right) \widehat{V}_{t+1}^\pi \\ &\leq \sum_{t=h}^H \Gamma_{h+1:t}^\pi \left| \left(\widehat{P} - P \right) \widehat{V}_{t+1}^\pi \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{t=h}^H 1 \cdot \max_{s,a} \left\| \left(\widehat{P} - P \right) (\cdot | s, a) \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \widehat{V}_{t+1}^\pi \right\|_\infty \cdot \mathbf{1} \\ &\leq H^2 \cdot \max_{s,a} \left\| \left(\widehat{P} - P \right) (\cdot | s, a) \right\|_1 \cdot \mathbf{1} \leq C \cdot H^2 \sqrt{\frac{S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}} \mathbf{1} \end{aligned}$$

with probability $1 - \delta$, where the last inequality is by Lemma J.9. By symmetry and taking the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, we obtain w.p. $1 - \delta$

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_g, h \in [H]} \left\| \widehat{Q}_h^\pi - Q_h^\pi \right\|_\infty \leq C \cdot H^2 \sqrt{\frac{S \log(SA/\delta)}{N}}.$$

The above holds for $\forall \pi \in \Pi_g$ since Lemma J.9 acts on $\left\| \widehat{P} - P \right\|_1$ and is irrelevant to π . ■