arXiv:2106.07203v2 [cs.LG] 18 Apr 2023

Online Sub-Sampling for Reinforcement Learning with General Function Approximation*

Dingwen Kong
Peking University
dingwenk@pku.edu.cn

Ruslan Salakhutdinov
Carnegie Mellon University
rsalakhu@cs.cmu.edu

Ruosong Wang
Carnegie Mellon University
ruosongw@andrew.cmu.edu

Lin F. Yang
University of California, Los Angles
linyang@ee.ucla.edu

April 19, 2023

Abstract

Most of the existing works for reinforcement learning (RL) with general function approximation (FA) focus on understanding the statistical complexity or regret bounds. However, the computation complexity of such approaches is far from being understood – indeed, a simple optimization problem over the function class might be as well intractable. In this paper, we tackle this problem by establishing an efficient online sub-sampling framework that measures the information gain of data points collected by an RL algorithm and uses the measurement to guide exploration. For a value-based method with complexity-bounded function class, we show that the policy only needs to be updated for $\propto \operatorname{poly}\log(K)$ times for running the RL algorithm for K episodes while still achieving a small near-optimal regret bound. In contrast to existing approaches that update the policy for at least $\Omega(K)$ times, our approach drastically reduces the number of optimization calls in solving for a policy. When applied to settings in Wang et al. [2020c] or Jin et al. [2021a], we improve the overall time complexity by at least a factor of K. Finally, we show the generality of our online sub-sampling technique by applying it to the reward-free RL setting and multi-agent RL setting.

1 Introduction

Function approximation (FA) is one of the key techniques in scaling up reinforcement learning (RL) in real-world applications. FA methods have achieved phenomenal empirical success in games or control tasks [Mnih et al., 2013, 2015, Silver et al., 2017, Vinyals et al., 2019, Akkaya et al., 2019], where in these applications, RL agents learn to control complex systems by approximating value functions using deep neural networks. In contrast, the theoretical understanding of RL with general FA is still rudimentary, e.g., reasonable theoretical understandings have only been established in the tabular setting or the linear setting (c.f., Azar et al. [2017], Jin et al. [2018], Yang and Wang [2020], Jin et al. [2020b], Zanette et al. [2020a], and references therein). Designing RL algorithms with general FA with provable efficiency becomes increasingly important as it helps understanding the limits of existing algorithms while inspiring designing better practical algorithms.

Recently, there is a line of works targeting the sample efficiency of FA methods, including Wang et al. [2020c], Jin et al. [2021a], Ayoub et al. [2020], Feng et al. [2021]. These papers assume the value, policy, or

*Authors ordered alphabetically.

transition models of an RL environment can be approximated by a function from a function class. For instance, Wang et al. [2020c] assumes that the function class captures the *value closedness*, which requires that the *Bellman projection* (defined formally in Section 2.2) of any value function lies in the target function class. Wang et al. [2020c] establish a provably correct algorithm that achieves a regret bound of $\widetilde{O}(\text{poly}(dH)\sqrt{K})$[1], where H is the planning horizon, K is the total number of episodes, and d depends on the eluder dimension [Russo and Roy, 2013] and log-covering numbers of the function class. Here the regret measures the difference between the expected rewards collected by the optimal policy and that of the RL algorithm. Whereas Jin et al. [2021a] study a more general setting that the function class captures only *value completeness*, which requires the Bellman projection of a value function *in the function class* is still in the class. The algorithm in Jin et al. [2021a] achieves a similar regret bound but requires solving a number of possibly computationally intractable optimization problems.

Compared to the regret bound or sample complexity of FA methods, the computation complexity of these methods is much less understood. For instance, for the simple regression problem, which is a core step in many RL algorithms, finding a solution in a general function class might be intractable. Indeed, the computation complexity is heavily determined by the structure of the function class. To still measure a meaningful complexity, many papers consider a type of oracle complexity – the number of calls of certain optimization oracle on the function class. For instance, the time complexity in Foster and Rakhlin [2020], Wang et al. [2020c] measures the number of calls to a regression oracle, which solves a regression problem with the function class. The time complexity in Jin et al. [2021a] measures the number of oracle calls to a nested optimization problem. Such an *oracle complexity* allows us to focus on the complexity introduced by the RL algorithm rather than the optimization structure of the function class and is the focus of this paper. Nevertheless, existing results with FA take at least $\text{poly}(K)$ number of optimization oracle calls regardless of the assumptions on the function class. We therefore ask: *is there a generic approach to design a time-efficient RL algorithm with the least number of optimization oracle calls?*

In this paper, we develop a novel online sub-sampling technique that drastically reduces the amount of computation of RL with FA, while achieving small regret bounds, hence being both *sample and time efficient*. The core idea is to establish a novel notion called *online sensitivity score* applied to each data point (i.e., a state-action pair) collected by an RL algorithm. This score measures the *information gain* of a new data point with respect to the function class. Using this score as a sampling probability, we maintain a small subsampled dataset. For each new data point arriving, the algorithm can quickly compute the score by solving an optimization problem with respect to the small subsampled dataset. We show that for many function classes, the number of data points in the subsampled dataset is only proprotional to $\text{poly}\log(K)$, for K episodes of learning. This sub-sampling technique enables a *low-switching-cost* RL framework that updates the learned policy only when the sub-sampling buffer has changed, reducing the expensive computation in obtaining a new policy. We show that under both the closedness assumption in Wang et al. [2020c] or the completeness assumption in Jin et al. [2021a], our framework reduces the computation complexity to $\text{poly}(dH\log(K))$ optimization oracle calls, while preserving the regret bounds. The sub-sampling procedure, on the other hand, only requires to solve a optimization problem over a $\widetilde{O}(d^2)$-sized dataset per timestep.

We remark that besides saving computation, the low-switching-cost property itself is also desired in many real-world RL applications. For example, in recommendation systems [Afsar et al., 2021] and healthcare [Yu et al., 2020], each new recommendation/new medical treatment must pass several internal tests to ensure safety before being deployed [Huang et al., 2022], which can be time-costly and requires additional human efforts. Furthermore, the low-switching-cost property enables concurrent RL [Guo and Brunskill, 2015], where several agents interact with the same MDP in parallel. See Section 1.1 for a brief discussion on related works on RL with low switching costs.

Finally, we apply our online sub-sampling technique to the reward-free setting, where the exploration does not require the guidance of a reward, and the multi-agent RL setting, where the agent plays against an adversarial opponent. We summarize our contributions below.

- We propose a generic subsampling framework to measure the information gain of the data points collected by an RL algorithm wrt. the target function class. This low-switching-cost framework allows

[1]Throughout the paper, we use $\widetilde{O}(\cdot)$ to suppress logarithm factors.

an RL algorithm to update policy for number of times logarithmically depending on the number of episodes played by the algorithm, while still having a small regret. Thus the framework serves as a general method for accelerating existing algorithms for RL with general FA.

- To give rigorous and meaningful results on computation complexity, we consider the oracle complexity: the number of calls of certain optimization oracle on the function class. As two representative examples, we apply the framework in the closedness setting (Wang et al. [2020c]) and completeness setting (Jin et al. [2021a]). We establish near-optimal-regret value-based algorithms with exponentially smaller oracle complexity.
- We show the generality of our online sub-sampling technique by applying it to reward-free RL and multi-agent RL, which may be of independent interests.

1.1 Closely Related Work

Here we briefly review some closely related works. More related works are deferred to the appendix.

RL with Low Switching Cost. Bai et al. [2019] is the first work that studies switching cost in tabular RL. Former works [Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011, Gao et al., 2021, Wang et al., 2021] also design algorithms with poly $\log(K)$-type switching cost in linear stochastic bandit or linear MDP settings. However, all their works rely on tracking the determinant of the feature covariance matrix and switching the policy (or updating the model parameter) when the determinant doubles. However, their method can not work in the general FA setting since a *feature extractor* may not be available. Our work is the *first* to design a provably low-switching-cost RL algorithm in the general FA setting.

RL with General Function Approximation. Besides Wang et al. [2020c] and Jin et al. [2021a], Feng et al. [2021] provides a policy-based algorithm whose sample complexity is bounded by the eluder dimension of the function approximation class. Jiang et al. [2017] design a provably efficient algorithm whose sample complexity can be upper bounded in terms of the Bellman rank (which measures the rank of the Bellman error matrix) of the function class. Ayoub et al. [2020] propose an algorithm for model-based RL based on value-targeted regression. They bound the complexity using eluder dimension as well. Du et al. [2021] propose an algorithm for Bilinear function classes. Foster et al. [2020] propose a LSVI-based algorithm whose regret bound depends on the notion of disagreement coefficient. We remark that all these algorithms take at least poly(K) number of optimization oracle calls. In this paper we demonstrate the efficacy of our approach for the algorithms in Wang et al. [2020c] and Jin et al. [2021a]. We will discuss the possibility of extending our framework to a broader scope in Section 7.2.

2 Preliminaries

Before we formally introduce our algorithmic framework, we first present the background of reinforcement learning and function classes.

2.1 Episodic Markov Decision Process

In this paper, we consider the finite-horizon Markov decision process (MDP) $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, H, s_1)$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is the state space, $\mathcal{A}$ is the action space, $P = \{P_h\}_{h=1}^H$ where $P_h : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to \triangle(\mathcal{S})$ are the transition operators, $r = \{r_h\}_{h=1}^H$ where $r_h : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to [0, 1]$ are the deterministic reward functions, and H is the planning horizon. Without loss of generality, we assume that the initial state s_1 is fixed.[2] In RL, an agent interacts with the environment episodically. Each episode consists of H time steps. A deterministic policy π chooses an action

[2]For a general initial distribution ρ, we can treat it as the first stage transition probability, P_1.

$a \in \mathcal{A}$ based on the current state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ at each time step $h \in [H]$. Formally, $\pi = \{\pi_h\}_{h=1}^H$ where for each $h \in [H]$, $\pi_h : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{A}$ maps a given state to an action. In each episode, the policy π induces a trajectory

$$s_1, a_1, r_1, s_2, a_2, r_2, ..., s_H, a_H, r_H, s_{H+1}$$

where s_1 is fixed, $a_1 = \pi_1(s_1)$, $r_1 = r_1(s_1, a_1)$, $s_2 \sim P_1(\cdot|s_1, a_1)$, $a_2 = \pi_2(s_2)$, etc.

We use Q-function and V-function to evaluate the long-term expected cumulative reward in terms of the current state (state-action pair) and the policy deployed. Concretely, the Q-function and V-function are defined as:

$$Q_h^\pi(s, a) := \mathbb{E}\big[\sum_{h'=h}^{H} r_{h'} | s_h = s, a_h = a, \pi\big]$$

and

$$V_h^\pi(s) := \mathbb{E}\big[\sum_{h'=h}^{H} r_{h'} | s_h = s, \pi\big].$$

The agent aims to gradually improve its performance during the interaction with the environment. Thus an important measurement of the effectiveness of the learning algorithm is the *regret*. More precisely, we assume that the agent interacts with the environment for $K > 0$ episodes. For $k \in [K]$, at the beginning of the k-th episode the agent chooses a policy π^k to collect a trajectory. Then the regret is defined as

$$\text{Regret}(K) := \sum_{k=1}^{K} \Big(V_1^*(s_1) - V_1^{\pi^k}(s_1)\Big)$$

where s_1 is the fixed initial state. We assume K is fixed and known to the agent[3]. Throughout the paper, we define $T := KH$ to be the total number of steps.

In this paper we consider the *global switching cost*, which counts the number of policy changes in the running of the algorithm in K episodes, namely:

$$N_{\text{switch}}^{\text{gl}} := \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{I}\{\pi_k \neq \pi_{k+1}\}.$$

Additional Notations. We define the infinity-norm of function $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $v : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$ as: $\|f\|_\infty := \sup_{(s,a)\in\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}} |f(s, a)|$ and $\|v\|_\infty := \sup_{s\in\mathcal{S}} |v(s)|$. Given a dataset $\mathcal{D} := \{(s_i, a_i, q_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}$, for a function $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$, we define $\|f\|_{\mathcal{D}} := \big(\sum_{i=1}^n (f(s_i, a_i) - q_i)^2\big)^{1/2}$. Furthermore, for a set of state-action pairs $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ and a function $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$, we define $\|f\|_{\mathcal{Z}} := \Big(\sum_{(s,a)\in\mathcal{Z}} f(s, a)^2\Big)^{1/2}$.

2.2 Function Class

In our setting, we assume that a function class $\mathcal{F} \subset \{f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to [0, H + 1]\}$ is given as a priori. In the algorithm we will use functions from $\mathcal{F}$ to approximate the optimal Q-function. For any $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $h \in [H]$, we define the *Bellman projection* of f as $\mathcal{T}_h f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$, such that for all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$,

$$\mathcal{T}_h f(s, a) := r_h(s, a) + \mathbb{E}_{s'\sim\mathbb{P}_h(\cdot|s,a)} \max_{a'\in\mathcal{A}} f(s', a').$$

For $v : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $h \in [H]$, we also define the Bellman projection of v as $\mathcal{T}_h v : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$, such that for all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$,

$$\mathcal{T}_h v(s, a) := r_h(s, a) + \mathbb{E}_{s'\sim\mathbb{P}_h(\cdot|s,a)} v(s').$$

We need to assume bounded covering numbers for both the function class and the state-action space to measure the complexity of the RL problem. This assumption is standard in the literature [Russo and Roy, 2013, Wang et al., 2020c, Jin et al., 2021a].

[3]There are standard techniques to extend the results to unknown K, e.g., [Besson and Kaufmann, 2018].

Assumption 1 (Covering Number). *The function class $\mathcal{F}$, and state-action space $\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}$ both have bounded covering numbers. Concretely, for any $\varepsilon>0$, there exists an ε-cover $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F},\varepsilon)\subseteq\mathcal{F}$ with size $|\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F},\varepsilon)|\leq\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F},\varepsilon)$, such that for any $f\in\mathcal{F}$, there exists $f'\in\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F},\varepsilon)$ with $\|f-f'\|_\infty\leq\varepsilon$. Also, there exists an ε-cover $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A},\varepsilon)$ with size $|\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A},\varepsilon)|\leq\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A},\varepsilon)$, such that for any $(s,a)\in\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}$, there exists $(s',a')\in\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A},\varepsilon)$ with $\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}|f(s,a)-f(s',a')|\leq\varepsilon$.*

3 Algorithmic Framework

3.1 Online Sub-Sampling Procedure

In standard online RL algorithms, the agent computes a new policy using newly collected data after each episode. Computing a new policy is usually time-costly. Our idea is that we only update the policy when we have collected enough new information. In order to achieve this goal, we need to develop an criterion to decide whether we have collected enough information or not. In addition, this criterion itself can not be time-costly.

A naïve idea is that when a new data point arrives, we compute the *information gain* of the new data point with respect to the previously collected dataset. And then we only update the policy when the information gain is high. However, when the size of the dataset grows, the computation of the information gain itself becomes expensive.

We modify the above idea via online sub-sampling. We maintain a small subsampled dataset $\{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k\}_{h=1}^H$, which is initialized to be an empty set for all $h\in[H]$. We hope this subsampled dataset always provides a good approximation to the original dataset, $\mathcal{Z}_h^k:=\{(s_h^\tau,a_h^\tau)\}_{\tau\in[k-1]}$. By good approximation we mean $\|f_1-f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}$ is always close to $\|f_1-f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}$ for all $f_1,f_2\in\mathcal{F}$. At the beginning of episode k, the algorithm receives $\{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{k-1}\}_{h=1}^H$ and $\{(s_h^{k-1},a_h^{k-1})\}_{h=1}^H$, i.e., the current sampling buffer and the trajectory obtained in the previous episode. For each $h\in[H]$, we compute the *online sensitivity score* to measure the information gain of (s_h^{k-1},a_h^{k-1}) with respect to $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{k-1}$ by setting $\mathcal{Z}=\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{k-1}$ and $z=(s_h^{k-1},a_h^{k-1})$ in (1).

$$\mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{F}}(z):=\min\left\{\sup_{f_1,f_2\in\mathcal{F}}\frac{(f_1(z)-f_2(z))^2}{\min\{\|f_1-f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2,T(H+1)^2\}+\beta},1\right\}. \tag{1}$$

Here β is a regularization parameter whose value will be specified in the appendix. For each $h\in[H]$, starting with $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k\leftarrow\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{k-1}$, our algorithm then adds (s_h^{k-1},a_h^{k-1}) into $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ with probability proportional to its online sensitivity score. We also set the weight (or equivalently, the number of copies added to the sub-sampled dataset) of (s_h^{k-1},a_h^{k-1}) to be the reciprocal of the sampling probability, if added. We need to round (s_h^{k-1},a_h^{k-1}) to a finite cover before adding it to $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$, which gives us the convenience of applying union bound in our analysis.

Then we can recompute and switch the policy only when the sub-sampling buffer has changed. Note that such change indicates large information gain, thus serves as a natural policy-switching criterion.

Algorithm 1 provides one-step sampling procedure. We run Algorithm 1 in the following manner to obtain $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ $(k=1,2,...,K)$:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^1\leftarrow\{\},\ \text{and for } k=2,3,...,K,\ \text{run:}$$
$$\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k\leftarrow\textbf{Online-Sample}(\mathcal{F},\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{k-1},(s_h^{k-1},a_h^{k-1}),\delta)$$

As will be shown shortly, the size of the sub-sampling buffer is bounded if the function class has bounded complexity. As a result, we rarely update the policy and avoid most of the computation-cost in computing the new policy. In addition, computing the online sensitivity score is also cheap due to the small size of the buffer, $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$.

We remark that the algorithm in Wang et al. [2020c] also contains a sampling framework to obtain small-sized approximation to the original dataset. The small-sized subsampled dataset is then used to compute the bonus function. However, their sampling framework deals with static data and more importantly, is very inefficient. Therefore their sampling framework is not suitable for the purpose of this paper.

Algorithm 1 Online-Sample($\mathcal{F}, \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}, z, \delta$)

Input: Function class $\mathcal{F}$, current sub-sampled dataset $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, new state-action pair z, failure probability $\delta \in (0,1)$

Let p_z to be the smallest real number such that $1/p_z$ is an integer and

$$p_z \geq \min\{1, C \cdot \mathsf{sensitivity}_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}},\mathcal{F}}(z) \cdot \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/64T^3})/\delta)\}$$

Let $\widehat{z} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, 1/(16\sqrt{64T^3/\delta}))$ such that $\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |f(z) - f(\widehat{z})| \leq 1/16\sqrt{64T^3/\delta}$

Add $1/p_z$ copies of $\widehat{z}$ into $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}$ (or equivalently, set the weight of $\widehat{z}$ to be $1/p_z$) with probability p_z

return $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}$

Algorithm 2 RL with Online Sub-Sampling (RLOSS)

Input: Failure probability $\delta \in (0,1)$ and number of episodes K.

$\widetilde{k} \leftarrow 1$, $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^1 \leftarrow \{\}$ $\quad \forall h \in [H]$.

for episode $k = 1, 2, ..., K$ **do**

  for $h = H, H-1, ..., 1$ **do**

    $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k \leftarrow$ **Online-Sample**$(\mathcal{F}, \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{k-1}, (s_h^{k-1}, a_h^{k-1}), \delta)$

    (if $k \geq 2$)

  if $k = 1$ **or** $\exists h \in [H]$ $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k \neq \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{k-1}$ **then**

    $\widetilde{k} \leftarrow k$, $\pi^k \leftarrow$ **Planner**$(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k, \mathcal{Z}_h^k)$ // $\widetilde{k}$: index of the latest policy

  Execute policy $\pi^{\widetilde{k}}$ to induce a trajectory $s_1^k, a_1^k, r_1^k, ..., s_H^k, a_H^k, r_H^k, s_{H+1}^k$

3.2 Algorithmic Framework with Online Sub-Sampling

In this section we build a *low-switching-cost* RL framework based on the online sub-sampling procedure. Our framework splits into three steps: **Sampling**, **Planning** and **Executing**. In Step **Sampling**, we apply online sub-sampling to the data collected so far to reduce the size of the dataset. In Step **Planning**, if we have already collected enough new information (the sub-sampling buffer changes), we call a planner to compute a new policy and then update the current policy to be the new policy. Otherwise, we keep using the old policy. In Step **Executing**, we use the current policy to interact with the environment to collect new data. The full algorithm is presented in Algorithm 2.

3.3 Theoretical Guarantee

In this section we provide the theoretical guarantee of Algorithm 1. We use the eluder dimension [Russo and Roy, 2013] to measure the complexity of the function class. We remark that our subsampling algorithm does not require a bounded eluder dimension. However, this condition serves as a sufficient condition for us to obtain an efficient sample bound. We believe there are other type of complexity measures, which may also provide a bound for the number of samples in the framework. We also remark that a wide range of function classes, including linear functions, generalized linear functions and bounded degree polynomials, have bounded eluder dimension.

Definition 1 (Eluder Dimension)**.** *Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{(s_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ be a sequence of state-action pairs.*

(1) A state-action pair $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ is ε-dependent *on $\mathcal{Z}$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ if any $f, f' \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\|f - f'\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq \varepsilon$ also satisfies $|f(s,a) - f'(s,a)| \leq \varepsilon$.*

(2) An (s,a) is ε-independent *of $\mathcal{Z}$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ if (s,a) is not ε-dependent on $\mathcal{Z}$.*

(3) The ε-eluder dimension $\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, \varepsilon)$ *of a function class $\mathcal{F}$ is the length of the longest sequence of elements in $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ such that, for some $\varepsilon' \geq \varepsilon$, every element is ε'-independent of its predecessors.*

In the sequel, we define $d = \max(\log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta/T^2)), \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T), \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \delta/T^2)))$ to be the complexity of the function class. We now present the guarantee of Algorithm 1.

Theorem 1 (informal). *For any fixed $\beta \in [1, TH^2]$, with high probability, for any $h \in [H]$, the sub-sampled dataset $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ ($k = 1, 2, ..., K$) changes for at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2)$ times. Therefore the number of distinct elements in $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ is also bounded by $\widetilde{O}(d^2)$. And for all $(h, k) \in [H] \times [K]$ and $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$,*

$$\frac{1}{C}\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \leq \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} \leq C\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}$$

holds for some constant $C > 0$.

In words, the theorem guarantees that the distance of any two functions measured by the historical dataset is approximated by the subsamping dataset. Note that Theorem 1 directly implies the switching-cost of the framework is at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2H)$ since the size of the subsampled dataset is $\widetilde{O}(d^2H)$. Here we provide a proof sketch of Theorem 1 and defer the whole proof to the appendix.

In our proof, we first show that the summation of the online sensitivity scores is upper bounded by $\widetilde{O}(d^2)$ if we use $\mathcal{Z}_h^k$ (the original dataset) instead of $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ (the sub-sampled dataset) to calculate the online sensitivity scores. This is established by a combinatorial argument which draws a connection between the eluder dimension and the summation of the online sensitivity scores. However, in our algorithm, for efficiency considerations, we use $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ instead of $\mathcal{Z}_h^k$ to calculate the sensitivity scores. Fortunately, as we will show, $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ provides an accurate estimation to $\mathcal{Z}_h^k$. Moreover, thanks to the design of the online sensitivity scores, their summation is robust to perturbations on the datasets. Hence, the summation of the sensitivity scores can be bounded even if $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ is used in replace of $\mathcal{Z}_h^k$. Note that the summation of the sensitivity scores provides an upper bound on the expected size of the sub-sampled dataset, and a high probability bound can be easily obtained by using martingale concentration bounds.

In order to show that $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}$ is close to $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}$, we note that sub-sampling proportional to online sensitivity scores implies that the estimator is unbiased and has low variance, and thus the desired result follows by Bernstein-type martingale concentration bounds.

3.4 Computational Efficiency

In this section we discuss the computational efficiency of the online sub-sampling framework. We introduce the following Regression Oracle to rigorously measure the computation complexity. As will be shown in Appendix B, the online sensitivity score can be estimated with $\widetilde{O}(1)$ calls to the regression oracle. Since the size of the subsampled dataset is at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2)$, the sub-sampling procedure is oracle-efficient – in each episode, it only calls a $\widetilde{O}(d^2)$-sized regression oracle for $\widetilde{O}(H)$ times.

Regression Oracle. We assume access to a weighted least-squares regression oracle over the function class $\mathcal{G}$, which takes a set of weighted examples $\mathcal{D} = \{(v_i, s_i, a_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}$ as input, and outputs the function with the smallest weighted squared loss:

$$\text{ORACLE}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{G}) = \text{argmin}_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i \left(g(s_i, a_i) - y_i\right)^2.$$

Remark 1. *This oracle commonly appears in the literature [Foster et al., 2018, Foster and Rakhlin, 2020, Foster et al., 2020]. In the linear setting where $g(s, a) = w_g^{\mathrm{T}} \phi(s, a)$, the solution to the regression oracle is $w_g^* = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n v_i \phi(s_i, a_i) \phi(s_i, a_i)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n v_i y_i \phi(s_i, a_i)\right)$. In the general setting where $\mathcal{F}$ is a general differentiable/sub-differentiable function class like neural networks, this oracle can be solved efficiently using gradient-based algorithms.*

Algorithm 3 Planner-A($\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k, \mathcal{Z}_h^k$)

Input: Datasets $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k, \mathcal{Z}_h^k$
$Q_{H+1}^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow 0, V_{H+1}^k(\cdot) \leftarrow 0$
for $h = H, H-1, ..., 1$ **do**
  $\mathcal{D}_h^k \leftarrow \{(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau, r_h^\tau + V_{h+1}^k(s_{h+1}^\tau))\}_{\tau \in [k-1]}$
  $f_h^k \leftarrow \text{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_h^k}^2$
  $b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow \sup_{f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}, \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2 \le \beta} |(f_1(\cdot,\cdot) - f_2(\cdot,\cdot)|$
  $Q_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow \min\{f_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) + b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot), H\}$
  $V_h^k(\cdot) \leftarrow \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_h^k(\cdot, a)$
  $\pi_h^k(\cdot) \leftarrow \text{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_h^k(\cdot, a)$
Output: policy π^k

4 Efficient RL Algorithm with Value Closedness

In this section we demonstrate that our subsampling framework can be applied to achieve an efficient algorithm in the following closedness assumption.[4]

Assumption 2 (Value Closedness)**.** *For all* $h \in [H]$ *and* $V : \mathcal{S} \to [0, H]$, $\mathcal{T}_h V \in \mathcal{F}$

In words, the assumption requires that any function will be Bellman-projected to the function class. Under Assumption 2, Wang et al. [2020c] establish a provably correct algorithm that achieves a regret bound of $\widetilde{O}(\text{poly}(dH)\sqrt{K})$. However, their algorithm calls an optimization oracle for at least $\Omega(K)$ times and thus can be time inefficient. Yet, by leveraging the ideas from Wang et al. [2020c], we design our planner that can take advantage our subsampling framework and reduce the oracle complexity.

4.1 Algorithm Design

The core idea in this planner is to calculate the optimistic Q-functions using least-squares value iteration. For each $h = H, H-1, ..., 1$, we solve the following optimization problem:

$$f_h^k \leftarrow \arg\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{\tau=1}^{k-1} \left(f(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - \left(r_h^\tau + \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{h+1}^k(s_{h+1}^\tau, a) \right) \right)^2$$

and set the estimated Q-function to be $Q_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow \min\left\{f_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) + b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot), H\right\}$, where $b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)$ is an exploration bonus defined on the sub-sampled dataset to measure the length of the confidence interval,

$$b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow \sup_{f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}, \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2 \le \beta} |(f_1(\cdot,\cdot) - f_2(\cdot,\cdot)|.$$

The policy is then defined as the greedy policy with respect to Q_h^k.

We study the computation complexity of this planner in terms of the regression oracle introduced in Section 3.4. As will be shown in Appendix B, the computation of b_h^k can be reduced to $\widetilde{O}(1)$ calls to a regression oracle of size $\widetilde{O}(d^2)$, whereas f_h^k requires to call a regression oracle of size $\Omega(K)$. Fortunately, we only need to call this policy planner for $\widetilde{O}(d^2 H)$ times, thus the number of "big" oracle calls is bounded by $\widetilde{O}(d^2 H^2)$. To execute the policy $\pi^{\widetilde{k}}$ in episode k, we also need to compute $b_h^{\widetilde{k}}(s,\cdot)$ for all encountered state s, which requires $\widetilde{O}(A)$ calls to a regression oracle of size $\widetilde{O}(d^2)$ per time step.

[4] Our framework is robust to *model mis-specification*, i.e., similar results hold when the function class only satisfies Assumption 2 *approximately*. See Appendix E for details.

4.2 Theoretical Guarantee

Here we present the theoretical guarantee of Algorithm 2 equipped with Planner-A. The computation complexity is measure by the number of calls to regression oracle with size $\Omega(K)$.

Theorem 2. *Assume Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 hold and T is sufficiently large. Equipped with Planner-A, with probability $1-\delta$, Algorithm 2 achieves a regret bound*

$$\text{Regret}(K) = O(\sqrt{\iota_1 \cdot H^3 \cdot T})$$

where

$$\iota_1 = \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta/T^2)/\delta) \cdot \dim_E^2(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log^2 T \cdot \log\left(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}, \delta/T^2)\cdot T/\delta\right).$$

Furthermore, with probability $1-\delta$ the algorithm calls a $\Omega(K)$-sized regression oracle for at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2H^2)$ times.

Note that our regret bound is the same with that in Wang et al. [2020c] when applied to the same setting, whereas our number of oracle calls is much smaller.

Remark 2. *When specialized to the linear MDP setting, i.e., when $\mathcal{F}$ is the class of d_{lin}-dimensional linear functions, the global switching cost bound of our algorithm is $\widetilde{O}(d_{\text{lin}}^2 H)$, which is worse than the $\widetilde{O}(d_{\text{lin}}H)$ bound given in Gao et al. [2021]. However, for linear functions, our sampling procedure is equivalent to the online leverage score sampling [Cohen et al., 2016], and therefore, by using the analysis in [Cohen et al., 2016] which is specific to the linear setting, the switching cost bound can be improved to $\widetilde{O}(d_{\text{lin}}H)$, matching the bound given in Gao et al. [2021]. Using the same technique, our regret bound can be improved to $\widetilde{O}(\sqrt{d_{\text{lin}}^3 H^3 T})$ in the linear setting, matching the bound given in Jin et al. [2020b], Gao et al. [2021].*

Remark 3. *If we assume the time cost of the regression oracle scales linearly with its data size, we can show that the whole time-complexity of our algorithm is $\widetilde{O}(\text{poly}(dH)K)$. Under the same assumption the whole time-complexity of the algorithm proposed in Wang et al. [2020c] is at least $\Omega(K^2)$.*

4.2.1 Proof Sketch of Theorem 2

The first step of the proof is to show optimism, which requires that our exploration bonus upper bounds the estimation error. As our exploration bonus also has bounded complexity, optimism can be established using similar uniform convergence argument as in Jin et al. [2020b], Wang et al. [2020c].

We switch the policy only when the sub-sampled dataset is changed; this can also be understood from a regret decomposition perspective. We use $\widetilde{k}$ to denote the index of the policy used in the k-th episode. The algorithm design naturally guarantees that $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k = \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{\widetilde{k}}$. With optimism, the regret can be decomposed as:

$$\text{Regret}(K) \le \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(V_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1) - V_1^{\pi_{\widetilde{k}}}(s_1)\right) \le \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H-1}\xi_h^k + 2\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H} b_h^{\widetilde{k}}(s_h^k, a_h^k)$$

where $\{\xi_h^k\}$ is a sequence of martingale differences, and $b_h^{\widetilde{k}}$ is the bonus function in the $\widetilde{k}$-th episode. Note that our exploration bonus is defined on the sub-sampled dataset $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$, and therefore $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{\widetilde{k}} = \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ indicates $b_h^{\widetilde{k}} = b_h^k$. Then using ideas in Russo and Roy [2013], $\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H} b_h^k(s_h^k, a_h^k)$ can be upper bounded in terms of the eluder dimension.

5 Efficient RL Algorithm with Value Completeness

In this section we demonstrate the efficacy of our framework under the following value completeness assumptions. Note that this assumption is more general than the value closedness assumption and thus captures a larger set of function classes.

Algorithm 4 Planner-B($\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k, \mathcal{Z}_h^k$)

Input: Datasets $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k, \mathcal{Z}_h^k$
$\mathcal{D}_h^k(f) \leftarrow \{(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau, r_h^\tau + \max_{a\in\mathcal{A}} f(s_{h+1}^\tau, a))\}_{\tau\in[k-1]}$ for all $h \in [H]$
$\mathcal{B}^k \leftarrow \{\{f_h\}_{h=1}^{H+1} : \forall h \in [H], \|f_h\|_\infty \le H+1-h, \|f_h\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(f_{h+1})} \le \inf_{g\in\mathcal{F}} \|g\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(f_{h+1})} + \beta, f_{H+1} \equiv 0\}$
$(Q_1^k, Q_2^k, ..., Q_{H+1}^k) \leftarrow \text{argmax}_{Q^k\in\mathcal{B}^k}(\max_{a\in\mathcal{A}} Q_1^k(s_1, a))$
$\pi_h^k(\cdot) \leftarrow \text{argmax}_{a\in\mathcal{A}} Q_h^k(\cdot, a)$
Output: policy π^k

Assumption 3 (Value Completeness)**.** *For all $h \in [H]$, $\mathcal{T}_h\mathcal{F}_{[0,H-h]} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{F}_{[0,H-h]} := \{f \in \mathcal{F} : \|f\|_\infty \le H-h\}$ is the truncated function class in step h.*

In words, this assumption requires that the function class is closed under the Bellman projection. However, unlike value closedness, the projection of an arbitrary function might not lie in the function class. Moreover, this assumption does not guarantee that the optimal Q-function is captured by the function class. Hence, we also require the following standard realizability assumption.

Assumption 4 (Realizability)**.** *For all $h \in [H]$, $Q_h^* \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Under these two assumptions, Jin et al. [2021a] develop an algorithm, GOLF, whose regret scales with the *Bellman eluder dimension* of the function class $\mathcal{F}$, denoted as $\dim_{BE}(\mathcal{F}, \varepsilon)$. The definition and discussion of the Bellman eluder dimension is deferred to Appendix A.1.1.

5.1 Algorithm Design

In this section we use the planner in Jin et al. [2021a]. The main component of this planner is the construction of the confidence set $\mathcal{B}^k$. For each $h \in [H]$, the planner maintains a local regression constraint using the collected transition data. The constraint essentially requires low empirical bellman error. Then we solve a *global* optimization problem to ensure the optimism of the learned Q-function:

$$\max_{Q^k\in\mathcal{B}^k}(\max_{a\in\mathcal{A}} Q_1^k(s_1, a)). \tag{2}$$

The policy is defined as the greedy policy with respect to Q^k. The full algorithm is presented in Algorithm 4.

5.2 Theoretical Guarantee

Note that (2) is a multi-level optimization problem, where the constraint region of the upper-level problem is determined implicitly by the solution set of the lower level problem. Unfortunately for now we do not know how to solve this problem efficiently. We therefore assume a *nested optimization oracle* to solve this problem. Compared to the Algorithm GOLF proposed in Jin et al. [2021a], the number of oracle calls in our algorithm decreased from $\Omega(K)$ to $\widetilde{O}(d^2H)$, and the regret bound is the same when applied to the same setting. The theoretical guarantee is formally stated as:

Theorem 3. *Assume Assumption 1, Assumption 3 and Assumption 4 holds and T is sufficiently large. Equipped with Planner-B, with probability $1-\delta$ Algorithm 2 achieves a regret bound*

$$\text{Regret}(K) = O(\sqrt{\iota_1 \cdot H^3 \cdot T})$$

where

$$\iota_1 = \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/K)/\delta) \cdot \dim_{BE}(\mathcal{F}, 1/\sqrt{K}).$$

Here $\dim_{BE}(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the Bellman eluder dimension. Furthermore, with probability $1-\delta$ the algorithm calls the nested optimization oracle for at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2H)$ times.

We postpone the proof sketch to Appendix D.3. The key step is similar to the one of Theorem 2, i.e., decomposing the regret properly in the face of delayed policy updates.

6 Application to Other Settings

In this section, we show the generality of our online sub-sampling technique by applying it to different RL tasks.

6.1 Reward-Free RL

The reward-free RL contains two phases, the *exploration phase* and the *planning phase*. In the exploration phase, the agent interacts with the MDP in episodes as usual, but receives no reward signal. After the exploration phase, the agent is given a reward function in the planning phase. The reward-free RL aims to output a near-optimal policy with respect to the given reward function with no additional access to the environment. As mentioned in Jin et al. [2020a] and Wang et al. [2020b], this paradigm is particularly suitable for the batch RL setting and the setting where there are multiple reward functions of interest.

Our algorithm is based on the "exploration-driven reward" technique proposed in Wang et al. [2020b], which studies reward-free RL with linear function approximation. We further run the online sub-sampling algorithm to control policy updates in the exploration phase. We present an informal theoretical guarantee here, and the details are deferred to the appendix.

Theorem 4 (informal)**.** *Under standard assumptions, with high probability, our algorithm guarantees to output an ε-optimal policy for any given reward function after exploring the environment for $\widetilde{O}(d^4H^6\varepsilon^{-2})$ episodes, while only switches the policy for $\widetilde{O}(d^2H)$ times during the exploration phase. Furthermore, with high probability, our algorithm calls a $\Omega(K)$-sized regression oracle for at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2H^2)$ times. Here d depends on the eluder dimension of the target function class.*

6.2 Multi-Agent RL

We consider the task of learning two-player zero-sum Markov games with general function approximation. This setting is formerly studied in Jin et al. [2022], Huang et al. [2021]. We focus on the online setting, where the learner can only control the max-player, and an adversarial opponent controls the min-player.[5] The learning goal is to minimize the regret compared to the value of the Nash equilibrium.

Based on the algorithms proposed in Jin et al. [2022], Huang et al. [2021], we run the online subsampling algorithm to control policy updates for the max-player. Again, we present an informal theoretical guarantee here and defer the details to the appendix.

Theorem 5 (informal)**.** *Under standard assumptions, with high probability, the regret of the max-player is bounded by $\widetilde{O}(\sqrt{d^2 \cdot H^4 \cdot K})$. At the same time, the max-player only switches her policy for $\widetilde{O}(d^2H)$ times. Furthermore, with high probability, our algorithm calls the nested optimization oracle for at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2H)$ times. Here K is the number of episodes, and d depends on the online Bellman eluder dimension [Jin et al., 2022] of the target function class.*

7 Discussions

7.1 Practical Impacts

Though our work is of theoretical nature, here we discuss the potential practical impacts of our work. The most direct practical impact is the improvement over Wang et al. [2020c]. A notable drawback of applying the algorithm in Wang et al. [2020c] in practice is its bad computational efficiency. Equipped with our

[5] Similar results hold for the self-play setting using the technique of the "exploiter" introduced in Jin et al. [2022].

framework, the whole time complexity of the algorithm grows linear in K (under the time cost assumption of the regression oracle, see Remark 3), making it more suitable for practical use.

Another direction is to combine our framework with a heuristic optimizer to obtain more practical algorithms. For example, in DQN, the agent doesn't need to train after each step. Instead, it uses experience replay to train on small batches once every n steps, where n is a tuning parameter, but is fixed during the entire course of training. Our subsampling approach would introduce an efficient and adaptive approach to adjust n – the network is retrained whenever the policy needs a switch. Note that the bonus function defined in our paper can be implemented for DNN and has been implemented in Feng et al. [2021]. While this idea needs further experimental verification, we believe our methods can inspire more efficient practical algorithms.

7.2 Limitations and Future Works

Admittedly, our current theoretical guarantees rely heavily on the eluder dimension structures of the function class, i.e., the sub-sampled dataset size can be bounded by a function of the eluder dimension. Here we discuss future directions to extend our framework to a broader scope.

Information-Theoretic View Point. One can understand the structure of our framework more generally from an information-theoretic point of view: the algorithm switches the policy when there is sufficient information gained, and the data points causing the information change are important points to be stored. Hence, we believe such an algorithmic structure can be further summarized and abstracted to fit a broader range of settings. We remark that the idea of measuring information gain has been further studied in Lu and Van Roy [2019], which could be integrated with our techniques for sampling.

Along the direction of accelerating existing algorithms, it would also be interesting to see whether our techniques can be used to accelerate the algorithms in Foster et al. [2021], which is the most general framework for RL with general FA up to now, subsuming the frameworks of Jiang et al. [2017], Jin et al. [2021a], and Du et al. [2021].

References

Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori, Dávid Pál, and Csaba Szepesvári. Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.

M Mehdi Afsar, Trafford Crump, and Behrouz Far. Reinforcement learning based recommender systems: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 2021.

Alekh Agarwal, Sham Kakade, Akshay Krishnamurthy, and Wen Sun. Flambe: Structural complexity and representation learning of low rank mdps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10814*, 2020a.

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. PMLR, 2020b.

Ilge Akkaya, Marcin Andrychowicz, Maciek Chociej, Mateusz Litwin, Bob McGrew, Arthur Petron, Alex Paino, Matthias Plappert, Glenn Powell, Raphael Ribas, et al. Solving rubik's cube with a robot hand. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.07113*, 2019.

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, Rémi Munos, and Hilbert J Kappen. Minimax pac bounds on the sample complexity of reinforcement learning with a generative model. *Machine learning*, 91(3):325–349, 2013.

Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Ian Osband, and Rémi Munos. Minimax regret bounds for reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 263–272, 2017.

Yu Bai and Chi Jin. Provable self-play algorithms for competitive reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 551–560. PMLR, 2020.

Yu Bai, Tengyang Xie, Nan Jiang, and Yu-Xiang Wang. Provably efficient q-learning with low switching cost. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 8004–8013, 2019.

Lilian Besson and Emilie Kaufmann. What doubling tricks can and can't do for multi-armed bandits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.06971*, 2018.

Fan Chen, Song Mei, and Yu Bai. Unified algorithms for rl with decision-estimation coefficients: No-regret, pac, and reward-free learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.11745*, 2022a.

Jinglin Chen, Aditya Modi, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Nan Jiang, and Alekh Agarwal. On the statistical efficiency of reward-free exploration in non-linear rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.10770*, 2022b.

Xiaoyu Chen, Jiachen Hu, Chi Jin, Lihong Li, and Liwei Wang. Understanding domain randomization for sim-to-real transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.03239*, 2021.

Michael B Cohen, Cameron Musco, and Jakub Pachocki. Online row sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.05448*, 2016.

Qiwen Cui and Lin F Yang. Minimax sample complexity for turn-based stochastic game. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.14267*, 2020a.

Qiwen Cui and Lin F Yang. Is plug-in solver sample-efficient for feature-based reinforcement learning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.05673*, 2020b.

Simon S Du, Sham M Kakade, Ruosong Wang, and Lin F Yang. Is a good representation sufficient for sample efficient reinforcement learning? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.

Simon S Du, Jason D Lee, Gaurav Mahajan, and Ruosong Wang. Agnostic q-learning with function approximation in deterministic systems: Near-optimal bounds on approximation error and sample complexity. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.

Simon S Du, Sham M Kakade, Jason D Lee, Shachar Lovett, Gaurav Mahajan, Wen Sun, and Ruosong Wang. Bilinear classes: A structural framework for provable generalization in rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10897*, 2021.

Dan Feldman and Michael Langberg. A unified framework for approximating and clustering data. In *Proceedings of the forty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 569–578, 2011.

Dan Feldman, Melanie Schmidt, and Christian Sohler. Turning big data into tiny data: constant-size coresets for k-means, pca and projective clustering. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 1434–1453, 2013.

Fei Feng, Wotao Yin, Alekh Agarwal, and Lin F Yang. Provably correct optimization and exploration with non-linear policies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.11559*, 2021.

Dylan Foster and Alexander Rakhlin. Beyond ucb: Optimal and efficient contextual bandits with regression oracles. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3199–3210. PMLR, 2020.

Dylan J Foster, Alekh Agarwal, Miroslav Dudik, Luo Haipeng, and Robert E Schapire. Practical contextual bandits with regression oracles. In *35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018*, pages 2482–2517. International Machine Learning Society (IMLS), 2018.

Dylan J Foster, Alexander Rakhlin, David Simchi-Levi, and Yunzong Xu. Instance-dependent complexity of contextual bandits and reinforcement learning: A disagreement-based perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03104*, 2020.

Dylan J Foster, Sham M Kakade, Jian Qian, and Alexander Rakhlin. The statistical complexity of interactive decision making. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.13487*, 2021.

David A Freedman. On tail probabilities for martingales. *the Annals of Probability*, pages 100–118, 1975.

Minbo Gao, Tianle Xie, Simon S Du, and Lin F Yang. A provably efficient algorithm for linear markov decision process with low switching cost. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00494*, 2021.

Zhaohan Guo and Emma Brunskill. Concurrent pac rl. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 29, 2015.

Pihe Hu, Yu Chen, and Longbo Huang. Nearly minimax optimal reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8971–9019. PMLR, 2022.

Baihe Huang, Jason D Lee, Zhaoran Wang, and Zhuoran Yang. Towards general function approximation in zero-sum markov games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.14702*, 2021.

Jiawei Huang, Jinglin Chen, Li Zhao, Tao Qin, Nan Jiang, and Tie-Yan Liu. Towards deployment-efficient reinforcement learning: Lower bound and optimality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06450*, 2022.

Thomas Jaksch, Ronald Ortner, and Peter Auer. Near-optimal regret bounds for reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(4), 2010.

Nan Jiang, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Alekh Agarwal, John Langford, and Robert E Schapire. Contextual decision processes with low bellman rank are pac-learnable. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1704–1713. PMLR, 2017.

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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.02794*, 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.

Chi Jin, Qinghua Liu, and Sobhan Miryoosefi. Bellman eluder dimension: New rich classes of rl problems, and sample-efficient algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.00815v2*, 2021a.

Chi Jin, Qinghua Liu, Yuanhao Wang, and Tiancheng Yu. V-learning–a simple, efficient, decentralized algorithm for multiagent rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14555*, 2021b.

Chi Jin, Qinghua Liu, and Tiancheng Yu. The power of exploiter: Provable multi-agent rl in large state spaces. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10251–10279. PMLR, 2022.

Sham Machandranath Kakade. *On the sample complexity of reinforcement learning*. PhD thesis, UCL (University College London), 2003.

Emilie Kaufmann, Pierre Ménard, Omar Darwiche Domingues, Anders Jonsson, Edouard Leurent, and Michal Valko. Adaptive reward-free exploration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.06294*, 2020.

Michael Kearns and Satinder Singh. Near-optimal reinforcement learning in polynomial time. *Machine learning*, 49(2):209–232, 2002.

Akshay Krishnamurthy, Alekh Agarwal, Tzu-Kuo Huang, Hal Daumé III, and John Langford. Active learning for cost-sensitive classification. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1915–1924. PMLR, 2017.

Michael Langberg and Leonard J Schulman. Universal ε-approximators for integrals. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 598–607. SIAM, 2010.

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.

Gen Li, Laixi Shi, Yuxin Chen, Yuantao Gu, and Yuejie Chi. Breaking the sample complexity barrier to regret-optimal model-free reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 17762–17776, 2021.

Qinghua Liu, Tiancheng Yu, Yu Bai, and Chi Jin. A sharp analysis of model-based reinforcement learning with self-play. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7001–7010. PMLR, 2021.

Xiuyuan Lu and Benjamin Van Roy. Information-theoretic confidence bounds for reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.

Pierre Ménard, Omar Darwiche Domingues, Xuedong Shang, and Michal Valko. Ucb momentum q-learning: Correcting the bias without forgetting. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7609–7618. PMLR, 2021.

Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Alex Graves, Ioannis Antonoglou, Daan Wierstra, and Martin Riedmiller. Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.5602*, 2013.

Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, et al. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.

Ian Osband and Benjamin Van Roy. On lower bounds for regret in reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.02732*, 2016.

Dan Qiao, Ming Yin, Ming Min, and Yu-Xiang Wang. Sample-efficient reinforcement learning with loglog (t) switching cost. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06385*, 2022.

Shuang Qiu, Jieping Ye, Zhaoran Wang, and Zhuoran Yang. On reward-free rl with kernel and neural function approximations: Single-agent mdp and markov game. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8737–8747. PMLR, 2021.

Daniel Russo and Benjamin Van Roy. Eluder dimension and the sample complexity of optimistic exploration. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems-Volume 2*, pages 2256–2264, 2013.

Aaron Sidford, Mengdi Wang, Xian Wu, Lin Yang, and Yinyu Ye. Near-optimal time and sample complexities for solving markov decision processes with a generative model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5186–5196, 2018.

Aaron Sidford, Mengdi Wang, Lin Yang, and Yinyu Ye. Solving discounted stochastic two-player games with near-optimal time and sample complexity. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2992–3002. PMLR, 2020.

David Silver, Julian Schrittwieser, Karen Simonyan, Ioannis Antonoglou, Aja Huang, Arthur Guez, Thomas Hubert, Lucas Baker, Matthew Lai, Adrian Bolton, et al. Mastering the game of go without human knowledge. *nature*, 550(7676):354–359, 2017.

Istvan Szita and Csaba Szepesvari. Model-based reinforcement learning with nearly tight exploration complexity bounds. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1031–1038, 2010.

Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M Czarnecki, Michaël Mathieu, Andrew Dudzik, Junyoung Chung, David H Choi, Richard Powell, Timo Ewalds, Petko Georgiev, et al. Grandmaster level in starcraft ii using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 575(7782):350–354, 2019.

Andrew J Wagenmaker, Yifang Chen, Max Simchowitz, Simon Du, and Kevin Jamieson. Reward-free rl is no harder than reward-aware rl in linear markov decision processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 22430–22456. PMLR, 2022.

Ruosong Wang, Simon S Du, Lin Yang, and Sham Kakade. Is long horizon rl more difficult than short horizon rl? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020a.

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*, 2020b.

Ruosong Wang, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Lin Yang. Reinforcement learning with general value function approximation: Provably efficient approach via bounded eluder dimension. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020c.

Tianhao Wang, Dongruo Zhou, and Quanquan Gu. Provably efficient reinforcement learning with linear function approximation under adaptivity constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.02195*, 2021.

Yining Wang, Ruosong Wang, Simon S Du, and Akshay Krishnamurthy. Optimism in reinforcement learning with generalized linear function approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04136*, 2019.

Qiaomin Xie, Yudong Chen, Zhaoran Wang, and Zhuoran Yang. Learning zero-sum simultaneous-move markov games using function approximation and correlated equilibrium. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 3674–3682. PMLR, 2020.

Zhihan Xiong, Ruoqi Shen, and Simon S Du. Randomized exploration is near-optimal for tabular mdp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.09703*, 2021.

Lin Yang and Mengdi Wang. Sample-optimal parametric q-learning using linearly additive features. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6995–7004, 2019.

Lin Yang and Mengdi Wang. Reinforcement learning in feature space: Matrix bandit, kernels, and regret bound. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10746–10756. PMLR, 2020.

Tianhe Yu, Garrett Thomas, Lantao Yu, Stefano Ermon, James Y Zou, Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, and Tengyu Ma. Mopo: Model-based offline policy optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:14129–14142, 2020.

Andrea Zanette and Emma Brunskill. Tighter problem-dependent regret bounds in reinforcement learning without domain knowledge using value function bounds. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7304–7312. PMLR, 2019.

Andrea Zanette, Alessandro Lazaric, Mykel Kochenderfer, and Emma Brunskill. Learning near optimal policies with low inherent bellman error. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10978–10989. PMLR, 2020a.

Andrea Zanette, Alessandro Lazaric, Mykel J Kochenderfer, and Emma Brunskill. Provably efficient reward-agnostic navigation with linear value iteration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.07737*, 2020b.

Kaiqing Zhang, Sham Kakade, Tamer Basar, and Lin Yang. Model-based multi-agent rl in zero-sum markov games with near-optimal sample complexity. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33: 1166–1178, 2020a.

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*, 2020b.

Zihan Zhang, Yuan Zhou, and Xiangyang Ji. Almost optimal model-free reinforcement learningvia reference-advantage decomposition. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020c.

Dongruo Zhou, Quanquan Gu, and Csaba Szepesvari. Nearly minimax optimal reinforcement learning for linear mixture markov decision processes. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4532–4576. PMLR, 2021.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**
- 1.1 Closely Related Work . . . 3

2 Preliminaries **3**
- 2.1 Episodic Markov Decision Process . . . 3
- 2.2 Function Class . . . 4

3 Algorithmic Framework **5**
- 3.1 Online Sub-Sampling Procedure . . . 5
- 3.2 Algorithmic Framework with Online Sub-Sampling . . . 6
- 3.3 Theoretical Guarantee . . . 6
- 3.4 Computational Efficiency . . . 7

4 Efficient RL Algorithm with Value Closedness **8**
- 4.1 Algorithm Design . . . 8
- 4.2 Theoretical Guarantee . . . 9
  - 4.2.1 Proof Sketch of Theorem 2 . . . 9

5 Efficient RL Algorithm with Value Completeness **9**
- 5.1 Algorithm Design . . . 10
- 5.2 Theoretical Guarantee . . . 10

6 Application to Other Settings **11**
- 6.1 Reward-Free RL . . . 11
- 6.2 Multi-Agent RL . . . 11

7 Discussions **11**
- 7.1 Practical Impacts . . . 11
- 7.2 Limitations and Future Works . . . 12

A Additional Notations, Parameter Setting, Additional Related Works **19**
- A.1 Additional Notations . . . 19
  - A.1.1 Bellman Eluder Dimension . . . 19
- A.2 Choice of the parameter β . . . 20
- A.3 Additional Related Works . . . 20

B Computing Bonus and Sensitivity via Regression Oracle **21**

C Application in other settings **22**
- C.1 Reward-Free RL Setting . . . 22
  - C.1.1 Reward-Free RL . . . 22
  - C.1.2 Function Class . . . 23
  - C.1.3 Algorithm . . . 23
  - C.1.4 Theoretical Guarantee . . . 24
- C.2 Multi-Agent RL Setting . . . 25
  - C.2.1 Two-Player Zero-Sum Game . . . 25
  - C.2.2 Function Class . . . 25
  - C.2.3 Algorithm . . . 26
  - C.2.4 Theoretical Guanrantee . . . 27

D Omitted Proofs **27**
D.1 Proof of Theorem 1 . . . 27
D.1.1 Analysis and Propositions . . . 28
D.1.2 Proof of Proposition 2 . . . 29
D.1.3 Proof of Proposition 3 . . . 33
D.2 Proof of Theorem 2 . . . 36
D.2.1 Analysis of the Optimistic Planning . . . 36
D.2.2 Regret decomposition . . . 40
D.3 Proof of Theorem 3 . . . 43
D.3.1 Proof Sketch . . . 43
D.3.2 Formal Proof . . . 43
D.4 Proof of Theorem 4 . . . 45
D.5 Proof of Theorem 5 . . . 50

E Model Misspecification **52**

A Additional Notations, Parameter Setting, Additional Related Works

In this section we provide additional notations used in the analysis, choice of the parameter β, and additional related works.

A.1 Additional Notations

For n events $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_n$, we write

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_1\mathcal{E}_2 \ldots \mathcal{E}_n) = \Pr(\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2 \cap \ldots \cap \mathcal{E}_n).$$

For a event $\mathcal{E}$, we use $\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}\}$ to denote the indicator function, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}\} = \begin{cases} 1 & \mathcal{E} \text{ holds} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

For a event $\mathcal{E}$, we use $\mathcal{E}^c$ to denote its complement. For a multiset $\mathcal{Z}$, we use $|\mathcal{Z}|$ to denote the cardinality of $\mathcal{Z}$, and $n_d(\mathcal{Z})$ the number of distinct elements in $\mathcal{Z}$.

A.1.1 Bellman Eluder Dimension

In this section, we define the Bellman eluder dimension. Please refer to Jin et al. [2021a] for more discussions on this concept.

Firstly, we introduce the distributional eluder dimension.

Definition 2 (Distributional Eluder Dimension)**.** *Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{\mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_n\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \Delta(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})$ be a sequence of probability measures over state-action space.*
(1) A probability measure $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})$ is ε-dependent *on $\mathcal{Z}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ if any $g \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfying $\sqrt{\sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{E}_\mu g(s,a)^2} \leq \varepsilon$ also satisfies $\mathbb{E}_\mu |g(s,a)| \leq \varepsilon$.*
(2) An μ is ε-independent *of $\mathcal{Z}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ if μ is not ε-dependent on $\mathcal{Z}$.*
(3) The ε-distributional eluder dimension $\dim_{DE}(\mathcal{G}, \Pi, \varepsilon)$ *of a function class $\mathcal{G}$ is the length of the longest sequence of elements which take values in Π such that, for some $\varepsilon' \geq \varepsilon$, every element is ε'-independent of its predecessors.*

Typically there are two choices for the distribution family Π:
(1) We use $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{F},h}$ to denote the collection of all probability measures over $\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}$ at the h^{th} step, which can be generated by excuting the greedy policy $\pi_{(f_1,f_2,\ldots,f_H)}$ induced by any $f_1,f_2,\ldots,f_h\in\mathcal{F}$, i.e., $\pi_{f,h}(\cdot)=\operatorname{argmax}_{a\in\mathcal{A}}f_h(\cdot,a)$.
(2) $\mathcal{D}_\Delta:=\{\delta_{(s,a)}(\cdot)|s\in\mathcal{S},a\in\mathcal{A}\}$, i.e., all single point distribution.
Then the Bellman eluder dimension is stated as:

Definition 3 (Bellman Eluder Dimension)**.** *Let $(I-\mathcal{T}_h)\mathcal{F}:=\{f-\mathcal{T}_hf':f,f'\in\mathcal{F}\}$ be the set of bellman residuals induced by $\mathcal{F}$ at step h. The ε-Bellman eluder dimension of $\mathcal{F}$ is defined as* $\dim_{BE}(\mathcal{F},\varepsilon):=\min_{\Pi\in\{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{F}},\mathcal{D}_\Delta\}}\max_{h\in[H]}\dim_{DE}((I-\mathcal{T}_h)\mathcal{F},\Pi_h,\varepsilon)$.

A.2 Choice of the parameter β

We elaborate the choice of β. When using Planner-A, we set β to be

$$\beta=CH^2\cdot\log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F},\delta/T^2)/\delta)\cdot\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T)\cdot\log^2T\cdot\log\left(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A},\delta/(T^2))\cdot T/\delta\right).$$

When using planner-B, we set β to be

$$\beta=CH^2\cdot\log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F},1/K)/\delta).$$

In the reward-free RL setting (Algorithm 6 and Algorithm 7, will be introduced later), we set β to be

$$\begin{aligned}\beta=CH^2\cdot(&\log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R},1/T))\cdot\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T)\\&+\log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F},\delta/T^2)/\delta)\cdot\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T)\cdot\log^2T\cdot\log\left(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A},\delta/(T^2))\cdot T/\delta\right)).\end{aligned}$$

A.3 Additional Related Works

Online Sub-Sampling. Our core technique, sub-sampling by online sensitivity score, is inspired by the sensitivity sampling technique introduced in Langberg and Schulman [2010], Feldman and Langberg [2011], Feldman et al. [2013] and the online leverage score sampling technique introduced in Cohen et al. [2016]. However, the algorithm and analysis in [Cohen et al., 2016] works only for linear functions, and the framework in Langberg and Schulman [2010], Feldman and Langberg [2011], Feldman et al. [2013] can only deal with static datasets. On the other hand, our techniques can deal with general function classes while operate in an online manner.

Tabular RL. There is a long line of theoretical work on the sample complexity and regret bound for RL in the tabular setting. See, e.g., [Kearns and Singh, 2002, Kakade, 2003, Szita and Szepesvari, 2010, Jaksch et al., 2010, Azar et al., 2013, Osband and Van Roy, 2016, Azar et al., 2017, Jin et al., 2018, Sidford et al., 2018, Zanette and Brunskill, 2019, Agarwal et al., 2020b, Wang et al., 2020a, Zhang et al., 2020b, Sidford et al., 2020, Cui and Yang, 2020a, Li et al., 2020, 2021, Ménard et al., 2021, Xiong et al., 2021] and references therein. However, as these results all depend polynomially on the size of the state space, they can not be directly applied to real-world problems with large state spaces.

RL with Linear Function Approximation. The former most basic and frequently studied setting is RL with linear function approximation. See, e.g., [Yang and Wang, 2019, 2020, Jin et al., 2020b, Du et al., 2019, Wang et al., 2019, Zanette et al., 2020a,b, Du et al., 2020, Cui and Yang, 2020b, Agarwal et al., 2020a, Zhou et al., 2021, Hu et al., 2022] for recent theoretical advances.

RL with Low Switching Cost. Bai et al. [2019] is the first work that studies switching cost in RL. This problem was later studied in Zhang et al. [2020c], Gao et al. [2021], Wang et al. [2021], Huang et al. [2022], Qiao et al. [2022]. Our work focus on the *global* switching cost studied in Gao et al. [2021].

Reward-Free RL. The reward-free RL setting is proposed in Jin et al. [2020a]. Kaufmann et al. [2020] refine the algorithm proposed in Jin et al. [2020a] with improved sample complexity. Wang et al. [2020b], Zanette et al. [2020b], Qiu et al. [2021], Wagenmaker et al. [2022], Chen et al. [2022b,a] further design provably efficient algorithms with function approximation in the reward-free setting.

Learning Two-Player Zero-Sum Games. Recently there is a line of theoretical works on efficiently learning two-player zero-sum games. See, e.g., Zhang et al. [2020a], Sidford et al. [2020], Bai and Jin [2020], Liu et al. [2021], Jin et al. [2021b] and references therein. Xie et al. [2020], Chen et al. [2021], Jin et al. [2022], Huang et al. [2021] further consider learning two-player zero-sum games with function approximation. Our work focuses on the general function approximation setting studied in Huang et al. [2021], Jin et al. [2022].

B Computing Bonus and Sensitivity via Regression Oracle

The first step is to show that the following constrained optimization problem can be solved within $\widetilde{O}(1)$ calls to the regression oracle:

$$\max f_1(s,a) - f_2(s,a) \text{ s.t. } \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 \leq \varepsilon,\ f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{3}$$

This can be accomplished using ideas from Foster et al. [2018]. The idea is solving the following regression problem to estimate the solution to the constrained optimization problem:

$$\min \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 + \frac{w}{2}(f_1(s,a) - f_2(s,a) - 2H)^2$$

we do binary search over w to find the proper value of w. The full algorithm is presented in Algorithm 5. The

Algorithm 5 Binary Search

Input: Dataset $\mathcal{Z}$, objective (s,a), tolerance β, precision α
$\mathcal{G} \leftarrow \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}$
$R(g,w) := \|g\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 + \frac{w}{2}(g(s,a) - 2(H+1))^2,\ \forall g \in \mathcal{G}$
$w_L \leftarrow 0$, $w_H \leftarrow \beta/(\alpha(H+1))$
$g_L \leftarrow 0$, $z_L \leftarrow 0$
$g_H \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{g\in\mathcal{G}} R(g, w_H)$, $z_H \leftarrow g_H(s,a)$
$\Delta \leftarrow \alpha\beta/(8(H+1)^3)$
while $|z_H - z_L| > \alpha$ and $|w_H - w_L| > \Delta$ **do**
  $\widetilde{w} \leftarrow (w_H + w_L)/2$
  $\widetilde{g} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{g\in\mathcal{G}} R(g, \widetilde{w})$, $\widetilde{z} \leftarrow \widetilde{g}(s,a)$
  if $\|\widetilde{g}\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 > \beta$ **then**
    $w_H \leftarrow \widetilde{w}$, $z_H \leftarrow \widetilde{z}$
  else
    $w_L \leftarrow \widetilde{w}$, $z_L \leftarrow \widetilde{z}$
Output: z_H

following theorem shows that when $\mathcal{F}$ is convex, algorithm 5 solves the constrained optimization problem up to a precision of α in $O(\log(1/\alpha))$ iterations, i.e., $O(\log(1/\alpha))$ oracle invocations. When $\mathcal{F}$ is not convex, the constrained optimization problem can be solved with $O(1/\alpha)$ oracle invocations using the techniques in Krishnamurthy et al. [2017].

Proposition 1. *Assume that the optimal solution to the following constrained optimization problem is* $g^* = f_1^* - f_2^*$.

$$\textit{maximize } f_1(s,a) - f_2(s,a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 \le \beta, \quad f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$$

We run algorithm 5 to solve the above problem. If the function class $\mathcal{F}$ is convex and closed under pointwise convergence, then algorithm 5 terminate after $O(\log(1/\alpha))$ oracle invocations and the returned values satisfy

$$|z_H - g^*(s,a)| \le \alpha.$$

Proof. Note that if $\mathcal{F}$ is convex, then $\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}$ is also convex due to the following equation:

$$\lambda(f_1 - f_2) + (1-\lambda)(f_3 - f_4) = (\lambda f_1 + (1-\lambda) f_3) - (\lambda f_2 + (1-\lambda) f_4).$$

The rest of the proof is identical to Theorem 1 of Foster et al. [2018]. We omit it here for brevity. □

The second step is to show how to reduce the computation of the online sensitivity scores to the constrained optimization problem in (3). Indeed, estimation of the online sensitivity score can be reduced to the following optimization problems: $\max f_1(s,a) - f_2(s,a)$ s.t. $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 \le 2^\alpha$, $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ for $\alpha \in \{0, 1, ..., \log(T(H+1)^2), +\infty\}$. Indeed, assuming the solution of the above problem is f_1^α, f_2^α for some α, and let

$$\mathsf{sensitivity}^{\mathrm{est}}_{\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{F}}(z) = \max_\alpha \left\{ \min \left\{ \frac{(f_1^\alpha(z) - f_2^\alpha(z))^2}{\min\{\|f_1^\alpha - f_2^\alpha\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2, T(H+1)^2\} + \beta}, 1 \right\} \right\}.$$

We then have $1 \le \mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{F}}(z) / \mathsf{sensitivity}^{\mathrm{est}}_{\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{F}}(z) \le 2$. Note that a 2-approximation of the sensitivity score is sufficient for our analysis. Note that the exploration bonus naturally has the form of (3). Hence, both the exploration bonus and the sensitivity scores can be computed using $\widetilde{O}(1)$ regression oracle calls.

C Application in other settings

C.1 Reward-Free RL Setting

In this section we show that our results can be extended to the reward-free exploration setting, in which the agent explores the environment without the guidance of a reward, while achieving both sample efficiency and computation efficiency. We begin with some basics and notations of reward-free RL.

C.1.1 Reward-Free RL

The reward-free RL contains two phases, the *exploration phase* and the *planning phase*. In the exploration phase, the agent interacts with the MDP in episodes as usual, but receives no reward signal. After the exploration phase, the agent is given a reward function in the planning phase. The goal of the reward-free RL is to output a near-optimal policy with respect to the given reward function with no additional access to the environment. As mentioned in Jin et al. [2020a] and Wang et al. [2020b], this paradigm is particular suitable for the batch RL setting and the setting where there are multiple reward functions of interest.

Notations. Slightly changing the notation, we define the value (action-value) functions with respect to a given reward function $r = \{r_h\}_{h=1}^H$ as

$$V_h^\pi(s, r) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{h'=h}^H r_{h'}(s_{h'}, a_{h'}) \mid s_h = s, \pi \right]$$

and

$$Q_h^\pi(s, a, r) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{h'=h}^H r_{h'}(s_{h'}, a_{h'}) \mid s_h = s, a_h = a, \pi \right].$$

The optimal value (action-value) functions $V_h^*(s, r)$ and $Q_h^*(s, a, r)$ are defined similarly. We say a policy π is a ε-optimal policy with respect to r if $V_1^*(s_1, r) - V_1^\pi(s_1, r) \le \varepsilon$.

C.1.2 Function Class

The reward-free RL setting also requires a function class $\mathcal{F} \subset \{f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to [0, H+1]\}$ given as a priori. The following version of closedness assumption is needed

Assumption 5. *For any $h \in [H]$ and any $V : \mathcal{S} \to [0, H]$,*

$$\mathcal{T}_h V \in \mathcal{F}$$

Compared to Assumption 2, with no reward function, Assumption 5 can be regarded as a constrain on the transition core. Intuitively, this assumption guarantees that we can use function class $\mathcal{F}$ to effectively explore the transition operator.

In Linear MDPs, it is assumed that the reward function is linear in the feature extractor. Instead of making explicit assumption on the structure of the reward function, we assume the reward function given in the planning phase belongs to a function class with bounded covering number.

Assumption 6. *The reward function $r = \{r_h\}_{h=1}^H$ belongs to a function class $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to [0,1]\}$, i.e., $r_h \in \mathcal{R}$ for all $h \in [H]$. And for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an ε-cover $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{R}, \varepsilon)$ with size $|\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{R}, \varepsilon)| \leq \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R}, \varepsilon)$.*

C.1.3 Algorithm

The algorithm consists of two phases: an exploration phase and a planning phase. Here we use the planner in Wang et al. [2020c]. Below, we introduce our algorithm.

Algorithm 6 Exploration Phase

Input: Failure probability $\delta \in (0,1)$, number of episodes K, and function class $\mathcal{F}$.
$\widetilde{k} \leftarrow 1$
$\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^1 \leftarrow \{\}$ $\quad \forall h \in [H]$
for episode $k = 1, 2, ..., K$ **do**
  for $h = H, H-1, ..., 1$ **do**
    $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k \leftarrow$ **Online-Sample**$(\mathcal{F}, \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{k-1}, (s_h^{k-1}, a_h^{k-1}), \delta)$ (if $k \geq 2$)
  if $k = 1$ **or** $\exists h \in [H]$ $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k \neq \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{\widetilde{k}}$ **then**
    $\widetilde{k} \leftarrow k$
    $Q_{H+1}^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow 0, V_{H+1}^k(\cdot) \leftarrow 0$
    for $h = H, H-1, ..., 1$ **do**
      $\mathcal{D}_h^k \leftarrow \{(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau, V_{h+1}^k(s_{h+1}^\tau))\}_{\tau \in [k-1]}$
      $f_h^k \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_h^k}^2$
      $b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow \sup_{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2 \leq \beta} |(f_1(\cdot,\cdot) - f_2(\cdot,\cdot)|$
      $r_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow \min\{b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)/H, 1\}$
      $Q_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow \min\{f_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) + b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) + r_h^k(\cdot,\cdot), H\}$
      $V_h^k(\cdot) \leftarrow \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_h^k(\cdot, a)$
      $\pi_h^k(\cdot) \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_h^k(\cdot, a)$
  Execute policy $\pi^{\widetilde{k}}$ to induce a trajectory $s_1^k, a_1^k, r_1^k, ..., s_H^k, a_H^k, r_H^k, s_{H+1}^k$

Exploration Phase. Our algorithm for the exploration phase is quite similar to Algorithm 2[6]. The main difference is that without the guidance from the reward signal, we use the following *exploration-driven* reward function to encourage exploration:

$$r_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow \min\{b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)/H, 1\}.$$

The full algorithm used in the exploration phase is presented in Algorithm 6.

[6] We need to slightly change the choice of β in the reward-free setting. See Section A.2 for details.

Algorithm 7 Planning Phase

Input: Dataset $\mathcal{Z}_h^K, h \in [H]$, subsampled dataset $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^K, h \in [H]$, reward function $r = \{r_h\}_{h=1}^H$, and function class $\mathcal{F}$.
$Q_{H+1}(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow 0, V_{H+1}(\cdot) \leftarrow 0$
$\mathcal{Z}_h \leftarrow \mathcal{Z}_h^K, \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h \leftarrow \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^K$
for $h = H, H-1, ..., 1$ **do**
  $\mathcal{D}_h \leftarrow \{(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau, V_{h+1}(s_{h+1}^\tau))\}_{\tau \in [K-1]}$
  $f_h \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_h}^2$
  $b_h(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow \sup_{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h}^2 \le \beta} |(f_1(\cdot,\cdot) - f_2(\cdot,\cdot)|$
  $Q_h(\cdot,\cdot) \leftarrow \min\{f_h(\cdot,\cdot) + b_h(\cdot,\cdot) + r_h(\cdot,\cdot), H\}$
  $V_h(\cdot) \leftarrow \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_h(\cdot, a)$
  $\pi_h(\cdot) \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_h(\cdot, a)$
return $\pi = \{\pi_h\}_{h=1}^H$

Planning Phase. In the planning phase we do optimistic planning similar to Algorithm 2, but with real reward instead of exploration-driven reward. We still add the bonus function to guarantee optimism.

C.1.4 Theoretical Guarantee

Now we state our theoretical guarantee in the reward-free RL setting.

Theorem 4 (formal)**.** *Suppose Assumption 1, Assumption 5, and Assumption 6 holds and T is sufficiently large. For any given $\delta \in (0,1)$, after collecting K trajectories during the exploration phase (by Algorithm 6), with probability at least $1-\delta$, for any reward function $r = \{r_h\}_{h=1}^H$ satisfying Assumption 6, Algorithm 7 outputs an $O(H^3 \cdot \sqrt{\iota_1 / K})$-optimal policy for the MDP $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, H, s_1)$. Here,*

$$\iota_1 = \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R}, 1/T)) \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) + \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta/T^2)/\delta) \cdot \log^2 T \cdot \dim_E^2(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log\left(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \delta/T^2) \cdot T/\delta\right).$$

Furthermore, with probability $1-\delta$ the algorithm calls a $\Omega(K)$-sized regression oracle for at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2H^2)$ times.

Using ideas in the proof of Theorem 2, the proof of Theorem 4 follows rather straightforwardly from Wang et al. [2020b]. The high-level idea is to show that, after the exploration phase, for any reward function, the error of the planning policy is upper bounded by the expectation of the bonus functions, which is shown to be small enough using results proved in Theorem 2. The formal proof of Theorem 4 is presented in Section D.4.

Remark 4. *Let $d(T,\delta) := \max(\log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R}, 1/T)), \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta/T^2)), \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T), \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \delta/T^2)))$. Then the output policy is guaranteed to be $\widetilde{O}(H^3 \cdot d(T,\delta)^2/\sqrt{K})$-optimal with high probability. In the tabular case we have $d(T,\delta) = O(|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \cdot \operatorname{poly}\log(|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|T\delta^{-1})) = \widetilde{O}(|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|)$. When $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ are both the class of d-dimensional linear functions we have $d(T,\delta) = O(d \cdot \operatorname{poly}\log(dT\delta^{-1})) = \widetilde{O}(d)$. However, it is hard to rigorously show this kind of property when $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ are both general function classes. Generally speaking, if $d(T,\delta) = O(d^* \cdot \operatorname{poly}\log(d^*T\delta^{-1})) = \widetilde{O}(d^*)$ where d^* depends only on the complexity of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{R}$, then the output policy is guaranteed to be $\widetilde{O}(H^3 \cdot (d^*)^2/\sqrt{K})$-optimal with high probability. Thus for any $\varepsilon > 0$, by taking $K = C \cdot (d^*)^4 H^6 \cdot \varepsilon^{-2} \cdot \operatorname{polylog}(d^*T\delta^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1})$ where $C > 0$ is a sufficiently large constant, our algorithm guarantees to output an ε-optimal policy after exploring the environment for $\widetilde{O}((d^*)^4H^6\varepsilon^{-2})$ episodes. In this case, our sample complexity bound and switching cost bound become $\widetilde{O}((d^*)^4H^6\varepsilon^{-2})$ and $\widetilde{O}((d^*)^2H)$. In particular, when $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ are the class of d-dimensional linear functions, our sample complexity bound can be improved to $\widetilde{O}(d^3H^6\varepsilon^{-2})$ with refined analysis using the technique mentioned in Remark 2, matching the bound given in Wang et al. [2020b].*

C.2 Multi-Agent RL Setting

C.2.1 Two-Player Zero-Sum Game

We consider a two-player zero-sum episodic Markov game $\mathrm{MG}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, P, r, H, s_1)$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is the state space, $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are the action space for the max-player and the min-player respectively, $P = \{P_h\}_{h=1}^H$ where $P_h : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \to \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ are the transition operators, $r = \{r_h\}_{h=1}^H$ where $r_h : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \to [0, 1]$ are the deterministic reward functions, and H is the planning horizon.

In this game the two player interacts with the environment episodically. Each episode starts from the fixed initial state s_1 and consists of H time steps. A Markov policy of the max-player $\mu = \{\mu_h\}_{h=1}^H$, where for each $h \in [H]$, $\mu_h : \mathcal{S} \to \Delta(\mathcal{A})$ maps a state to a distribution in the probability simplex over $\mathcal{A}$. Similarly, we can define a Markov policy ν over $\mathcal{B}$ for the min-player. In the rest of the section we only consider Markov policy. In each episode, the two players choose their policies μ and ν, and induce a trajectory

$$s_1, a_1, b_1, r_1, s_2, \ldots, s_H, a_H, b_H, r_H, s_{H+1}$$

where s_1 is fixed, $a_1 \sim \mu_1(s_1)$, $b_1 \sim \nu_1(s_1)$ $r_1 = r_1(s_1, a_1, b_1)$, $s_2 \sim P_1(\cdot|s_1, a_1, b_1)$, etc. Note that the whole trajectory (including the actions of the opponent) is visible to the two players.

Similar to the single agent setting, we use the Q and V-function to evaluate the long-term expected cumulative reward. For two policies μ, ν, and time step $h \in [H]$, we define

$$Q_h^{\mu,\nu}(s, a, b) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{h'=h}^{H} r_{h'} \mid s_h = s, a_h = a, b_h = b\right],$$

and

$$V_h^{\mu,\nu}(s) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{h'=h}^{H} r_{h'} \mid s_h = s\right].$$

For a policy of the max-player μ, there exists a best response policy of the min-player $\nu^\dagger(\mu)$ satisfying $V_h^{\mu,\nu^\dagger(\mu)}(s) = \inf_\nu V_h^{\mu,\nu}(s)$ for all (s, h). We further denote $V_h^{\mu,\dagger}(s) := V_h^{\mu,\nu^\dagger(\mu)}(s)$. Similarly we can define $\mu^\dagger(\nu)$ and $V_h^{\dagger,\nu}$.

We denote (μ^*, ν^*) as the Nash equilibrium of the Markov game, which satisfies the following minimax equation

$$V_h^{\mu^*,\nu^*}(s) = V_h^{\dagger,\nu^*}(s) = V_h^{\mu^*,\dagger}(s) =: V_h^*(s).$$

We can see from the minimax equation that in a Nash equilibrium, no player can benefit by *unilaterally* deviating from her own policy.

Learning Objective. We consider the online setting where the learner can only control the max-player, and the min-player is controlled by a potentially adversarial opponent. In the beginning of the k-th episode, the learner chooses her policy μ^k, and the opponent chooses a policy ν^k based on μ^k. The learning goal is to minimize the following regret

$$\mathrm{NashRegret}(K) := \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left[V_1^*(s_1) - V_1^{\mu^k,\nu^k}(s_1)\right].$$

C.2.2 Function Class

Similar to the single-agent setting, we assume that a function class $\mathcal{F} \subset \{f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \to [0, H + 1]\}$ is given as a priori. For any $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}$, we denote the Nash policy of the max-player induced by f as

$$\mu_f(s) := \arg\max_{\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{A})} \min_{\nu \in \Delta(\mathcal{B})} \mu^\top f(s, \cdot, \cdot)\nu,$$

and the Nash value function induced by f as

$$V_f(s) := \max_{\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{A})} \min_{\nu \in \Delta(\mathcal{B})} \mu^\top f(s, \cdot, \cdot)\nu.$$

Furthermore, for any $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}$, we define the *Bellman projection* of f as $\mathcal{T}_h f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}$, such that for all $(s, a, b) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$,

$$\mathcal{T}_h f(s, a, b) := r_h(s, a, b) + \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathbb{P}_h(\cdot|s,a,b)} V_f(s').$$

We still need to assume bounded covering numbers of the function class. Similar to Assumption 1, we can define $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, \varepsilon), \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \varepsilon), \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}, \varepsilon), \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}, \varepsilon)$.

We assume the following multi-agent version of the realizability and completeness assumptions used in Jin et al. [2022], Huang et al. [2021].

Assumption 7 (Completeness). *For all $h \in [H]$, $\mathcal{T}_h \mathcal{F}_{[0,H-h]} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{F}_{[0,H-h]} := \{f \in \mathcal{F} : \|f\|_\infty \leq H - h\}$ is the truncated function class in step h.*

Assumption 8 (Realizability). *For all $h \in [H]$, $Q_h^* \in \mathcal{F}$.*

To measure the complexity of $\mathcal{F}$, we introduce the *Online Bellman Eluder Dimension* [Jin et al., 2022].

Definition 4 (Distributional Eluder Dimension). *Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{\mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_n\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \Delta(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B})$ be a sequence of probability measures over state-action space.*
(1) A probability measure $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B})$ is ε-dependent *on $\mathcal{Z}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ if any $g \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfying $\sqrt{\sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{E}_\mu g(s, a, b)^2} \leq \varepsilon$ also satisfies $\mathbb{E}_\mu |g(s, a, b)| \leq \varepsilon$.*
(2) An μ is ε-independent *of $\mathcal{Z}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ if μ is not ε-dependent on $\mathcal{Z}$.*
(3) The ε-distributional eluder dimension $\dim_{DE}(\mathcal{G}, \Pi, \varepsilon)$ *of a function class $\mathcal{G}$ is the length of the longest sequence of elements which take values in Π such that, for some $\varepsilon' \geq \varepsilon$, every element is ε'-independent of its predecessors.*

Here we only consider the single point distribution: $\mathcal{D}_\Delta := \{\delta_{(s,a,b)}(\cdot) | s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}, b \in \mathcal{B}\}$. Then the online Bellman eluder dimension is stated as:

Definition 5 (Online Bellman Eluder Dimension). *Let $(I - \mathcal{T}_h)\mathcal{F} := \{f - \mathcal{T}_h f' : f, f' \in \mathcal{F}\}$ be the set of bellman residuals induced by $\mathcal{F}$ at step h. The ε-online Bellman eluder dimension of $\mathcal{F}$ is defined as*

$$\dim_{OBE}(\mathcal{F}, \varepsilon) := \max_{h \in [H]} \dim_{DE}((I - \mathcal{T}_h)\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_\Delta, \varepsilon).$$

C.2.3 Algorithm

Here we introduce the algorithm. The algorithm is based on Algorithm 1 in jin, which can be seen as a multi-agent version of the GOLF algorithm [Jin et al., 2021a]. We use the online sub-sampling procedure to carefully control the policy update of the max-player. Here the online sub-sampling algorithm is exactly the one in Algorithm 1, but with triple data points $(s, a, b) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$. The full algorithm is presented in Algorithm 8. Here we choose β to be

$$\beta = C \cdot H^2 \cdot \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/K)/\delta).$$

Algorithm 8 GOLF with Online Sub-Sampling

Input: Failure probability $\delta \in (0,1)$, number of episodes K, and function class $\mathcal{F}$.
$\widetilde{k} \leftarrow 1$
$\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^1 \leftarrow \{\}$ $\quad \forall h \in [H]$
for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, K$ **do**
  for $h = H, H-1, ..., 1$ **do**
    $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k \leftarrow$ **Online-Sample**$(\mathcal{F}, \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{k-1}, (s_h^{k-1}, a_h^{k-1}, b_h^{k-1}), \delta)$(if $k \geq 2$)
  if $k = 1$ **or** $\exists h \in [H]$ $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k \neq \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{k-1}$ **then**
    $\widetilde{k} \leftarrow k$ // $\widetilde{k}$: index of the latest policy
    Define $\mathcal{D}_h^k(f) \leftarrow \{(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau, b_h^\tau, r_h^\tau + V_f(s_{h+1}^\tau))\}_{\tau \in [k-1]}$ for all $h \in [H]$
    Set

$$\mathcal{B}^k \leftarrow \{\{f_h\}_{h=1}^{H+1} : \forall h \in [H], \|f_h\|_\infty \leq H+1-h, \|f_h\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(f_{h+1})} \leq \inf_{g \in \mathcal{F}} \|g\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(f_{h+1})} + \beta, f_{H+1} \equiv 0\}$$

    Set

$$(Q_1^k, Q_2^k, ..., Q_{H+1}^k) \leftarrow \text{argmax}_{Q^k \in \mathcal{B}^k}(V_{Q_1^k}(s_1))$$

    For all $h \in [H]$, set $\mu_h^k \leftarrow \mu_{Q_h^k}$
  Let the min-player choose a policy ν^k
  Execute policy $(\mu^{\widetilde{k}}, \nu^k)$ to induce a trajectory $s_1^k, a_1^k, b_1^k, r_1^k, ..., s_H^k, a_H^k, b_H^k, r_H^k, s_{H+1}^k$

C.2.4 Theoretical Guanrantee

Theorem 5 (formal)**.** *Assume Assumption 1, Assumption 7, and Assumption 8 holds and T is sufficiently large. With probability at least $1-4\delta$, Algorithm 8 achieves a regret bound*

$$\text{NashRegret}(K) \leq O\left(\sqrt{\iota_1 \cdot H^3 \cdot T}\right),$$

where

$$\iota_1 = \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/K)/\delta) \cdot \dim_{OBE}(\mathcal{F}, 1/\sqrt{K}).$$

Furthermore, with probability at least $1-\delta$, the max-player switches her policy for at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2H)$ times, and the algorithm calls the nested optimization oracle for at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2H)$ times.

D Omitted Proofs

D.1 Proof of Theorem 1

In this section we first state Theorem 1 formally, then give a complete proof of it.

Theorem 1 (formal)**.** With probability $1-\delta$, for all $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$, the number of distinct elements in $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ is bounded by

$$n_d(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k) \leq O(\log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/64T^3})/\delta) \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log^2 T),$$

and

$$\frac{1}{10000}\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \leq \min\{\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}, T(H+1)^2\} \leq 10000\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}, \quad \forall \|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} > 100\beta,$$

and

$$\min\{\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}, T(H+1)^2\} \leq 10000\beta, \quad \forall \|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \leq 100\beta.$$

D.1.1 Analysis and Propositions

We explain the intuition behind Theorem 1. As mentioned before, we need to show that the sub-sampled dataset $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$

- provides a good approximation to $\mathcal{Z}_h^k$; and
- has a much lower complexity than $\mathcal{Z}_h^k$ (in terms of number of distinct elements).

We define the following enlarged and shrunk confidence sets. For all $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$ and $\alpha \in [\beta, +\infty)$, define

$$\underline{\mathcal{B}}_h^k(\alpha) := \{(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} | \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \leq \alpha/100\},$$

$$\mathcal{B}_h^k(\alpha) := \{(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} | \min\{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2, T(H+1)^2\} \leq \alpha\},$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{B}}_h^k(\alpha) := \{(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} | \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \leq 100\alpha\}.$$

For each $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$, we use $\mathcal{E}_h^k(\alpha)$ to denote the event that

$$\underline{\mathcal{B}}_h^k(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_h^k(\alpha) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{B}}_h^k(\alpha).$$

Furthermore, we denote that

$$\mathcal{E}_h^k := \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}_h^k(100^n \beta).$$

Event $\mathcal{E}_h^k$ characterizes the meaning of "good approximation". In fact, if $\mathcal{E}_h^k$ happens, we can show that $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}$ is close to $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}$ up to a constant factor, thus the confidence set induced by $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ is accurate. The following proposition verifies that $\mathcal{E}_h^k$ happens with high probability.

Proposition 2.

$$\Pr\left(\bigcap_{h=1}^{H} \bigcap_{k=1}^{K} \mathcal{E}_h^k\right) \geq 1 - \delta/32.$$

As will be shown shortly, Proposition 2 directly implies the approximation part of Theorem 1. Moreover, we define the following bonus functions calculated by $\mathcal{Z}_h^k$ instead of $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$:

$$\underline{b}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) := \sup_{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \leq \beta/100} |(f_1(\cdot,\cdot) - f_2(\cdot,\cdot)|,$$

$$\overline{b}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) := \sup_{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \leq 100\beta} |(f_1(\cdot,\cdot) - f_2(\cdot,\cdot)|.$$

If $\mathcal{E}_h^k$ happens, by taking $\alpha = \beta$, we have that

$$\underline{b}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leq b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leq \overline{b}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)$$

which verifies the correctness of our bonus function b_h^k used in the algorithm.

Proposition 3 bounds the size of $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$.

Proposition 3. *With probability at least $1 - \delta/8$, the following statements hold:*

1. For any fixed $h \in [H]$, the subsampled dataset $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ $(k = 1, 2, ..., K)$ changes for at most

$$S_{\max} = C \cdot \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/64T^3})/\delta) \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log^2 T$$

times for some absolute constant $C > 0$.

As a result, for any pair $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$, $n_d(\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k) \leq S_{\max}$.

2. For any $(h,k) \in [H] \times [K]$,

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k| \leq 64T^3/\delta.$$

In the following two sections we prove Proposition 2 and Proposition 3. Throughout the proof, We use $\mathscr{F}_k$ to denote the filtration induced by the history up to episode k (include episode k) and use $\mathbb{E}_k$ to denote the expectation conditioned on $\mathscr{F}_k$.

D.1.2 Proof of Proposition 2

For completeness, we state a Bernstein-type martingale concentration inequality which will be frequently used in our proofs.

Lemma 1 ([Freedman, 1975]). *Consider a real-valued martingale $\{Y_k : k = 0, 1, 2...\}$ with difference sequence $\{X_k : k = 1, 2, ...\}$. Assume that the difference sequence is uniformly bounded:*

$$|X_k| \leq R \text{ almost surely for } k = 1, 2, 3, ...$$

For a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, assume that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_{k-1}(X_k^2) \leq \sigma^2$$

almost surely. Then for all $t \geq 0$,

$$P\{|Y_n - Y_0| \geq t\} \leq 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{t^2/2}{\sigma^2 + Rt/3}\right\}.$$

The next lemma upper bounds the size of $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$.

Lemma 2. *With probability at least $1 - \delta/64T$,*

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k| \leq 64T^3/\delta \quad \forall (k, h) \in [K] \times [H].$$

Proof. Consider a fixed pair $(k, h) \in [K] \times [H]$. By Markov's inequality we have that

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k| \leq 64T^2 |\mathcal{Z}_h^k|/\delta$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta/(64T^2)$. With a union bound for all $(k, h) \in [K] \times [H]$ we complete the proof. □

Now we start to analyze the events defined in Section D.1.1. Recall that in Section D.1.1 we mentioned that event $\mathcal{E}_h^k$ characterizes the meaning of "good approximation". Our next lemma formalizes this intuition.

Lemma 3. *If $\mathcal{E}_h^k$ happens, then*

$$\frac{1}{10000}\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \leq \min\{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2, T(H+1)^2\} \leq 10000\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2, \quad \forall \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 > 100\beta$$

and

$$\min\{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2, T(H+1)^2\} \leq 10000\beta, \quad \forall \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \leq 100\beta.$$

Proof. If $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \leq 100\beta$, we have $(f_1, f_2) \in \underline{\mathcal{B}}_h^k(10000\beta)$. From $\mathcal{E}_h^k$ we know $(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{B}_h^k(10000\beta)$, which implies the desired result.

If $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 > 100\beta$, assume that $100^n\beta < \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \leq 100^{n+1}\beta$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Then we have $(f_1, f_2) \notin \overline{\mathcal{B}}_h^k(100^{n-1}\beta)$ and also $(f_1, f_2) \notin \mathcal{B}_h^k(100^{n-1}\beta)$. This implies that $\min\{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2, T(H+1)^2\} \geq 100^{n-1}\beta \geq \frac{1}{10000}\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2$. Similarly, we have $(f_1, f_2) \in \underline{\mathcal{B}}_h^k(100^{n+2}\beta)$, then also $(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{B}_h^k(100^{n+2}\beta)$. Thus we have $\min\{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2, T(H+1)^2\} \leq 100^{n+2}\beta \leq 10000\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2$. □

Recall that Proposition 2 states that $\bigcap_{h=1}^{H}\bigcap_{k=1}^{K}\mathcal{E}_h^k$ happens with high probability. As will be shown in the proof of Proposition 2 later, to bound the probability of $\bigcap_{h=1}^{H}\bigcap_{k=1}^{K}\mathcal{E}_h^k$ we only need to bound $\Pr\left(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}(\mathcal{E}_h^k(100^n\beta))^c\right)$. Note that $\mathcal{E}_h^k(100^n\beta)$ always holds if $100^n\beta \geq T(H+1)^2$. We establish the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *For $\alpha \in [\beta, T(H+1)^2]$,*

$$\Pr\left(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}(\mathcal{E}_h^k(\alpha))^c\right) \leq \delta/(32T^2).$$

Proof. We use $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ to denote the dataset without rounding, i.e., we replace every element $\hat{z}$ with z in $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$. Denote $C_1 := C \cdot \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/64T^3})/\delta)$ to be the parameter used in Algorithm 1.

Consider a fixed pair $(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)}) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)})$.

For each $i \geq 2$, define

$$Z_i = \max\{\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^i}, \min\{\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{i-1}}, T(H+1)^2\}\}$$

and

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{p_{z_h^{i-1}}}(f_1(z_h^{i-1}) - f_2(z_h^{i-1}))^2 & z_h^{i-1} \text{ is added into } \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^i \text{ and } Z_i \leq 2000000\alpha \\ 0 & z_h^{i-1} \text{ is not added into } \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^i \text{ and } Z_i \leq 2000000\alpha \\ (f_1(z_h^{i-1}) - f_2(z_h^{i-1}))^2 & Z_i > 2000000\alpha \end{cases}.$$

Y_i's are used to characterize the sampling procedure. Note that Y_i is adapted to the filtration $\mathscr{F}_i$, and $\mathbb{E}_{i-1}[Y_i] = (f_1(z_h^{i-1}) - f_2(z_h^{i-1}))^2$. In order to use Freedman's inequality, we need to bound Y_i and its variance.

If $p_{z_h^{i-1}} = 1$ or $\min\{\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{i-1}}, T(H+1)^2\} > 2000000\alpha$, then $Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[Y_i] = \mathrm{Var}_{i-1}[Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[Y_i]] = 0$. Otherwise from the definition of p_z in Algorithm 1 we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[Y_i]| &\leq (\min\{\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{i-1}}, T(H+1)^2\} + \beta) \cdot 1/C_1 \\ &\leq 3000000\alpha/C_1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Var}_{i-1}[Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[Y_i]] &\leq \frac{1}{p_{z_h^{i-1}}}(f_1(z_h^{i-1}) - f_2(z_h^{i-1}))^4 \\ &\leq (f_1(z_h^{i-1}) - f_2(z_h^{i-1}))^2 \cdot 3000000\alpha/C_1. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to verify that

$$\sum_{i=2}^{k} \mathrm{Var}_{i-1}[Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[Y_i]] \leq (3000000\alpha)^2/C_1.$$

By Freedman's inequality (Lemma 1), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr\left\{\left|\sum_{i=2}^{k}(Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[Y_i])\right| \geq \alpha/100\right\} \\ &\leq 2\exp\left\{-\frac{(\alpha/100)^2/2}{(3000000\alpha)^2/C_1 + \alpha \cdot 3000000\alpha/3C_1}\right\} \\ &\leq (\delta/64T^2)/(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)}))^2. \end{aligned}$$

With a union bound, the above inequality implies that with probability at least $1-\delta/(64T^2)$, for any pair $(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)}) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)})$, the corresponding Y_i's satisfy

$$\left|\sum_{i=2}^{k} (Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[Y_i])\right| \leq \alpha/100.$$

Now we condition on the above event and the event defined in Lemma 2 for the rest of the proof.

Part 1: ($\underline{\mathcal{B}}_h^k(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_h^k(\alpha)$) Consider any pair $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \leq \alpha/100$. From the definition we know that there exist $(\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)}) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)})$ such that $\|\hat{f}_1 - f_1\|_\infty, \|\hat{f}_2 - f_2\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)}$. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 &\leq (\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} + \|f_1 - \hat{f}_1\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} + \|\hat{f}_2 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k})^2 \\
&\leq (\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} + 2 \cdot \sqrt{|\mathcal{Z}_h^k|} \cdot \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)})^2 \\
&\leq \alpha/50.
\end{aligned}$$

We consider the Y_i's which corrspond to $\hat{f}_1$ and $\hat{f}_2$. Because $\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \leq \alpha/50$, we also have that $\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^{k-1}}^2 \leq \alpha/50$. From $\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}$ we know that $\min\{\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{k-1}}^2, T(H+1)^2\} \leq 10000\alpha$. Then from the definition of Y_i we have

$$\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2 = \sum_{i=2}^{k} Y_i.$$

Then $\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2$ can be bounded in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2 &= \sum_{i=2}^{k} Y_i \\
&\leq \sum_{i=2}^{k} \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[Y_i] + \alpha/100 \\
&= \|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 + \alpha/100 \\
&\leq 3\alpha/100.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2$ can also be bounded:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2 &\leq (\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} + \|f_1 - \hat{f}_1\|_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} + \|\hat{f}_2 - f_2\|_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k})^2 \\
&\leq (\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} + 2 \cdot \sqrt{|\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k|} \cdot \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)})^2 \\
&\leq \alpha/25.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we could bound $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2 &\leq (\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} + \sqrt{64T^3/\delta}/(8\sqrt{64T^3/\delta}))^2 \\
&\leq \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that for any pair $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \leq \alpha/100$, it holds that $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2 \leq \alpha$. Thus we must have $\underline{\mathcal{B}}_h^k(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_h^k(\alpha)$.

Part 2: ($\mathcal{B}_h^k(\alpha) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{B}}_h^k(\alpha)$) Consider any pair $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} > 100\alpha$. From the definition we know that there exist $(\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)}) \times \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)})$ such that $\|\hat{f}_1 - f_1\|_\infty, \|\hat{f}_2 - f_2\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)}$. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} &\geq (\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} - \|f_1 - \hat{f}_1\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} - \|\hat{f}_2 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k})^2 \\ &\geq (\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} - 2 \cdot \sqrt{|\mathcal{Z}_h^k|} \cdot \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)})^2 \\ &> 50\alpha.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have $\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} > 50\alpha$. We consider the Y_i's which corrspond to $\hat{f}_1$ and $\hat{f}_2$. Here we want to prove that $\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} > 40\alpha$. For the sake of contradicition we assume that $\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} \leq 40\alpha$.

Case 1: $\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \leq 2000000\alpha$. From the definition of Y_i we have that

$$\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} = \sum_{i=2}^{k} Y_i.$$

Combined with the former result, we conclude that

$$\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} = \sum_{i=2}^{k} Y_i \geq \sum_{i=2}^{k} \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[Y_i] - \alpha/100 = \|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} - \alpha/100 > 50\alpha - \alpha/100 = 49\alpha.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} &\geq (\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} - \sqrt{64T^3/\delta}/(8\sqrt{64T^3/\delta}))^2 \\ &> 40\alpha.\end{aligned}$$

This leads to a contradiction.

Case 2: $\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^{k-1}} > 1000000\alpha$. From $\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}$ we deduce that $\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{k-1}} > 100\alpha$ which directly leads to a contradiction.

Case 3: $\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} > 2000000\alpha$ and $\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^{k-1}} \leq 1000000\alpha$. It is clear that $(\hat{f}_1(z_h^{k-1}) - \hat{f}_2(z_h^{k-1}))^2 > 1000000\alpha$. From the definition of sensitivity we know that z_h^{k-1} will be added into $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ almost surely. This clearly leads to a contradiction.

We conclude that $\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} > 40\alpha$.

Finally we could bound $\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} &\geq (\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} - \|f_1 - \hat{f}_1\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} - \|\hat{f}_2 - f_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k})^2 \\ &\geq (\|\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} - 2 \cdot \sqrt{|\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k|} \cdot \sqrt{\delta/(64T^3)})^2 \\ &> \alpha.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that for any pair $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} > 10000\beta$, it holds that $\|f_1 - f_2\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} > 100\beta$. This implies that $\mathcal{B}_h^k(\alpha) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{B}}_h^k(\alpha)$. □

Proof of Proposition 2. Note that for all $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}) - \Pr(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^k) \\
&= \Pr(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}(\mathcal{E}_h^k)^c) \\
&= \Pr\left(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}\left(\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty}\mathcal{E}_h^k(100^n\beta)\right)^c\right) \\
&= \Pr\left(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty}(\mathcal{E}_h^k(100^n\beta))^c\right) \\
&\le \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\Pr\left(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}(\mathcal{E}_h^k(100^n\beta))^c\right) \\
&= \sum_{n\ge 0, 100^n\beta \le T(H+1)^2}\Pr\left(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}(\mathcal{E}_h^k(100^n\beta))^c\right). \qquad (4)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining Equation (4) and Lemma 4, we have that for all $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$,

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}) - \Pr(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^k) \le \delta/(32T^2)\cdot(\log(T(H+1)^2/\beta)+2) \le \delta/32T.$$

Thus for all $h \in [H]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left(\bigcap_{k=1}^{K}\mathcal{E}_h^k\right) \\
&= 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{K}(\Pr(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}) - \Pr(\mathcal{E}_h^1\mathcal{E}_h^2...\mathcal{E}_h^k)) \\
&\ge 1 - K\cdot(\delta/32T) \\
&= 1 - \delta/32H.
\end{aligned}$$

By applying a union bound for all $h \in [H]$ we complete the proof. □

D.1.3 Proof of Proposition 3

We start our proof by showing that the summation of online sensitivity scores can be upper bounded if $\mathcal{Z}_h^k$, i.e, the dataset without sub-sampling, is used.

Lemma 5. *For all $h \in [H]$, we have*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K-1}\text{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) \le C\cdot\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T)\log((H+1)^2T)\log T$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$.

Proof. Note that $|\mathcal{Z}_h^k| \le T$, thus we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) &= \min\left\{\sup_{f_1,f_2\in\mathcal{F}}\frac{(f_1(z_h^k)-f_2(z_h^k))^2}{\min\{\|f_1-f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2, T(H+1)^2\}+\beta}, 1\right\} \\
&\le \min\left\{\sup_{f_1,f_2\in\mathcal{F}}\frac{(f_1(z_h^k)-f_2(z_h^k))^2}{\|f_1-f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2+1}, 1\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

For each $k \in [K-1]$, let $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ be an arbitrary pair of functions such that

$$\frac{(f_1(z_h^k) - f_2(z_h^k))^2}{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 + 1}$$

is maximized, and we define $L(z_h^k) = (f_1(z_h^k) - f_2(z_h^k))^2$ for such f_1 and f_2. Note that $0 \le L(z_h^k) \le (H+1)^2$. Let $\mathcal{Z}_h^K = \bigcup_{\alpha=0}^{\log((H+1)^2T)-1} \mathcal{Z}^\alpha \cup \mathcal{Z}^\infty$ be a dyadic decomposition with respect to $L(\cdot)$ (we assume $\log((H+1)^2T)$ is an integer for simplicity), where for each $0 \le \alpha < \log((H+1)^2T)$, define

$$\mathcal{Z}^\alpha = \{z_h^k \in \mathcal{Z}_h^K \mid L(z_h^k) \in ((H+1)^2 \cdot 2^{-\alpha-1}, (H+1)^2 \cdot 2^{-\alpha}]\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}^\infty = \{z_h^k \in \mathcal{Z}_h^K \mid L(z_h^k) \le 1/T\}.$$

Clearly, for any $z_h^k \in \mathcal{Z}^\infty$, $\mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) \le 1/T$ and thus

$$\sum_{z_h^k \in \mathcal{Z}^\infty} \mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) \le 1.$$

Now we bound $\sum_{z_h^k \in \mathcal{Z}^\alpha} \mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k)$ for each $0 \le \alpha < \log((H+1)^2T)$ separately. For each α, let

$$N_\alpha = |\mathcal{Z}^\alpha| / \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, (H+1)^2 \cdot 2^{-\alpha-1})$$

and we decompose $\mathcal{Z}^\alpha$ into $N_\alpha + 1$ disjoint subsets, i.e., $\mathcal{Z}^\alpha = \bigcup_{j=1}^{N_\alpha+1} \mathcal{Z}_j^\alpha$, by using the following procedure. We initialize $\mathcal{Z}_j^\alpha = \{\}$ for all j and consider each $z_h^k \in \mathcal{Z}^\alpha$ sequentially. For each $z_h^k \in \mathcal{Z}^\alpha$, we find the smallest $1 \le j \le N_\alpha$ such that z_h^k is $(H+1)^2 \cdot 2^{-\alpha-1}$-independent of $\mathcal{Z}_j^\alpha$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}$. We set $j = N_\alpha + 1$ if such j does not exist, and use $j(z_h^k) \in [N_\alpha + 1]$ to denote the choice of j for z_h^k. We then add z_h^k into $\mathcal{Z}_j^\alpha$. For each $z_h^k \in \mathcal{Z}^\alpha$, it is clear that z_h^k is dependent on each of $\mathcal{Z}_1^\alpha, \mathcal{Z}_2^\alpha, \ldots, \mathcal{Z}_{j(z_h^k)-1}^\alpha$.

Now we show that for each $z_h^k \in \mathcal{Z}^\alpha$,

$$\mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) \le \frac{4}{j(z_h^k)}.$$

For any $z_h^k \in \mathcal{Z}^\alpha$, we use $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ to denote the pair of functions in $\mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\frac{(f_1(z_h^k) - f_2(z_h^k))^2}{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 + 1}$$

is maximized. Since $z_h^k \in \mathcal{Z}^\alpha$, we must have $(f_1(z_h^k) - f_2(z_h^k))^2 > (H+1)^2 \cdot 2^{-\alpha-1}$. Since z_h^k is dependent on each of $\mathcal{Z}_1^\alpha, \mathcal{Z}_2^\alpha, \ldots, \mathcal{Z}_{j(z_h^k)-1}^\alpha$, and for each $1 \le t < j(z_h^k)$, we have

$$\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_t^\alpha} \ge (H+1)^2 \cdot 2^{-\alpha-1}.$$

It is important to note that $\mathcal{Z}_1^\alpha, \mathcal{Z}_2^\alpha, \ldots, \mathcal{Z}_{j(z_h^k)-1}^\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_h^k$ due to the design of the partition procedure. Thus the online sensitivity score can be bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) \le & \frac{(f_1(z_h^k) - f_2(z_h^k))^2}{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 + 1} \le \frac{(H+1)^2 \cdot 2^{-\alpha}}{\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2} \\
\le & \frac{(H+1)^2 \cdot 2^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{t=1}^{j(z_h^k)-1} \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_t^\alpha}} \le 2/(j(z_h^k) - 1).
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of online sensitivity score we have $\mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) \le 1$, thus we conclude that:

$$\mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) \le \min\{\frac{2}{j(z_h^k)-1}, 1\} \le \frac{4}{j(z_h^k)}.$$

Moreover, by the definition of $(H+1)^2\cdot 2^{-\alpha-1}$-independent, we have $|\mathcal{Z}_j^\alpha| \le \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, (H+1)^2\cdot 2^{-\alpha-1})$ for all $1 \le j \le N_\alpha$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{z_h^k\in\mathcal{Z}^\alpha} \mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) \le \sum_{1\le j\le N_\alpha} |\mathcal{Z}_j^\alpha|\cdot 4/j + \sum_{z\in\mathcal{Z}^\alpha_{N_\alpha+1}} 4/N_\alpha \\
\le& 4\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, (H+1)^2\cdot 2^{-\alpha-1})\ln(N_\alpha) + |\mathcal{Z}^\alpha|\cdot\frac{4\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, (H+1)^2\cdot 2^{-\alpha-1})}{|\mathcal{Z}^\alpha|} \\
\le& 8\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, (H+1)^2\cdot 2^{-\alpha-1})\log T.
\end{aligned}$$

By the monotonicity of eluder dimension, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathrm{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) \\
\le& \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\log((H+1)^2T)-1} \sum_{z_h^k\in\mathcal{Z}^\alpha} \mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) + \sum_{z_h^k\in\mathcal{Z}^\infty} \mathsf{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) \\
\le& 8\log((H+1)^2T)\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)\log T + 1 \\
\le& 9\log((H+1)^2T)\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)\log T
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

With Lemma 5, now we are ready to prove Proposition 3.

Proof of Proposition 3. Firstly, note that conditioned on $\mathcal{E}_h^k$, which means $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ is a good approximation to $\mathcal{Z}_h^k$, the online sensitivity score computed with $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ will be relatively accurate. Formally, this argument can be stated as

$$\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_h^k\}\cdot \mathrm{sensitivity}_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k) \le C\cdot \mathrm{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k)$$

for some absolute constant $C>0$. This property can be easily derived from Lemma 3.

Note that in Algorithm 1,[7]

$$p_z \lesssim \mathrm{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{F}}(z)\cdot\log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/64T^3})/\delta).$$

Thus from Lemma 5 we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_h^k\}\cdot p_{z_h^k} &\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_h^k\}\cdot \mathrm{sensitivity}_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k)\cdot\log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/64T^3})/\delta) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathrm{sensitivity}_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k,\mathcal{F}}(z_h^k)\cdot\log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/64T^3})/\delta) \\
&\lesssim \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/64T^3})/\delta)\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)\log^2 T.
\end{aligned}$$

As we can adjust the constant C in Proposition 3, we assume that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_h^k\}\cdot p_{z_h^k} \le S_{\max}/3.$$

[7] We use $f \lesssim g$ to donote that $f \le Cg$ for some absolute constant $C>0$.

For $2 \le k \le K$, let X_h^k be a random variable defined as:

$$X_h^k = \begin{cases} \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}\} & \hat{z}_h^{k-1} \text{ is added into } \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Then X_h^k is adapted to the filtration $\mathscr{F}_k$. We have that $\mathbb{E}_{k-1}[X_h^k] = p_{z_h^{k-1}} \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}\}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{k-1}[(X_h^k - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}[X_h^k])^2] = \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}\} \cdot p_{z_h^{k-1}}(1 - p_{z_h^{k-1}})$. Note that $X_h^k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}[X_h^k]$ is a martingale difference sequence with respect to $\mathscr{F}_k$ and

$$\sum_{k=2}^{K} \mathbb{E}_{k-1}[(X_h^k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}[X_h^k])^2] = \sum_{k=2}^{K} \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}\} p_{z_h^{k-1}}(1 - p_{z_h^{k-1}}) \le \sum_{k=2}^{K} \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}\} \cdot p_{z_h^{k-1}} \le S_{\max}/3,$$

$$\sum_{k=2}^{K} \mathbb{E}_{k-1}[X_h^k] = \sum_{k=2}^{K} p_{z_h^{k-1}} \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_h^{k-1}\} \le S_{\max}/3.$$

By Freedman's inequality (Lemma 1), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr\left\{\sum_{k=2}^{K} X_h^k \ge S_{\max}\right\} \\ \le &\Pr\left\{\left|\sum_{k=2}^{K}(X_h^k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}[X_h^k])\right| \ge 2S_{\max}/3\right\} \\ \le &2\exp\left\{-\frac{(2S_{\max}/3)^2/2}{S_{\max}/3 + 2S_{\max}/9}\right\} \\ \le &\delta/(32T). \end{aligned}$$

With a union bound we know that with probability at least $1 - \delta/32$,

$$\sum_{k=2}^{K} X_h^k < S_{\max} \quad \forall h \in [H].$$

We condition on the above event and $\bigcap_{h=1}^{H}\bigcap_{k=1}^{K} \mathcal{E}_h^k$. In this case, it is clear that for all $h \in [H]$, we add elements into $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ for at most $S_{\max}$ times. Combining the above result with Lemma 2 completes the proof. □

D.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Here we provide the complete proof of Theorem 2.

D.2.1 Analysis of the Optimistic Planning

Our next lemma bounds the complexity of the bonus function. This step is essential for showing optimism, as we need to establish a uniform convergence argument to deal with the dependency in the data sequence.

Lemma 6. *With probability at least $1 - \delta/8$, for all $(h,k) \in [H] \times [K]$, $b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}$.*
Here $\mathcal{M}$ is a prespecified function class with bounded size:

$$\begin{aligned} &\log|\mathcal{M}| \\ \le &C' \cdot \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{\delta/64T^3})/\delta) \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log^2 T \cdot \log\left(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}, 1/(16\sqrt{64T^3/\delta})) \cdot 64T^3/\delta\right) \\ \le &C \cdot \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta/T^2)/\delta) \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log^2 T \cdot \log\left(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}, \delta/T^2) \cdot T/\delta\right) \end{aligned}$$

for some absolute constant $C', C > 0$ if T is sufficiently large.

Proof. Define $\mathcal{M}$ to be the set of all functions with the form:

$$\left\{|f_1(\cdot,\cdot) - f_2(\cdot,\cdot)| \mid \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 \le \beta\right\}, \quad \mathcal{Z} \in \Omega$$

where Ω contains all set with bounded size:

$$\Omega := \{\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, 1/(16\sqrt{64T^3/\delta})) \mid |\mathcal{Z}| \le 64T^3/\delta, n_d(\mathcal{Z}) \le S_{\max}\}$$

where $S_{\max}$ is defined in Proposition 3.

Conditioned on the event defined in Proposition 3, $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k \in \Omega$, and $b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}$ for all $(h,k) \in [H] \times [K]$. ☐

The next lemma estimates the error of the one-step bellman backup.

Lemma 7. *Consider a fixed pair $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$. For any $V : \mathcal{S} \to [0,H]$, define*

$$\mathcal{D}_h^k(V) := \{(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau, r_h^\tau + V(s_{h+1}^\tau))\}_{\tau \in [k-1]}$$

and also

$$\widehat{f_V} := \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(V)}^2.$$

For any $V : \mathcal{S} \to [0,H]$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$, there is an event $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta}$ which holds with probability at least $1-\delta$, such that for any $V' : \mathcal{S} \to [0,H]$ with $\|V' - V\|_\infty \le 1/T$, we have

$$\left\|\widehat{f_{V'}}(\cdot,\cdot) - r_h(\cdot,\cdot) - \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot)V'(s')\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \le C \cdot (H\sqrt{\log(1/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)}).$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$.

Proof. The proof is almost identical to that of Lemma 5 in Wang et al. [2020c]. We provide a proof here for completeness.

In our proof, we consider a fixed $V : \mathcal{S} \to [0,H]$, and define

$$f_V(\cdot,\cdot) := r_h(\cdot,\cdot) + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P_h(s' \mid \cdot,\cdot)V(s').$$

By Assumption 2, we have that $f_V(\cdot,\cdot) \in \mathcal{F}$.

For any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we consider $\sum_{\tau=1}^{k-1} \xi_h^\tau(f)$ where

$$\xi_h^\tau(f) := 2(f(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - f_V(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)) \cdot (f_V(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - r_h^\tau - V(s_{h+1}^\tau)).$$

Then $\xi_h^\tau(f)$ is adapted to the filtration $\mathscr{F}_\tau$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\tau-1}[\xi_h^\tau(f)] = 0$. Moreover,

$$|\xi_h^\tau(f)| \le 2(H+1)\,|f(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - f_V(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)|.$$

By Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, we have

$$\Pr\left[\left|\sum_{\tau=1}^{k-1} \xi_h^\tau(f)\right| \ge \varepsilon\right] \le 2\exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{8(H+1)^2\|f - f_V\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2}\right).$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon &= \left(8(H+1)^2 \log\left(\frac{2\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)}{\delta}\right) \cdot \|f - f_V\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2\right)^{1/2} \\ &\le 4(H+1)\|f - f_V\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \cdot \sqrt{\log(2/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)}.\end{aligned}$$

We have, with probability at least $1-\delta$, for all $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)$,

$$\left|\sum_{\tau=1}^{k-1} \xi_h^\tau(f)\right| \le 4(H+1)\|f - f_V\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \cdot \sqrt{\log(2/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)}.$$

We define the above event to be $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta}$, and we condition on this event for the rest of the proof.

For all $f \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists $g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)$, such that $\|f-g\|_\infty \le 1/T$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\sum_{\tau=1}^{k-1} \xi_h^\tau(f)\right| &\le \left|\sum_{\tau=1}^{k-1} \xi_h^\tau(g)\right| + 2(H+1) \\
&\le 4(H+1)\|g - f_V\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \cdot \sqrt{\log(2/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)} + 2(H+1) \\
&\le 4(H+1)(\|f - f_V\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} + 1) \cdot \sqrt{\log(2/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)} + 2(H+1).
\end{aligned}$$

Consider $V' : \mathcal{S} \to [0, H]$ with $\|V' - V\|_\infty \le 1/T$. We have

$$\|f_{V'} - f_V\|_\infty \le \|V' - V\|_\infty \le 1/T.$$

For any $f \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\|f\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(V')} - \|f_{V'}\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(V')} = \|f - f_{V'}\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} + 2\sum_{\tau=1}^{k-1} (f(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - f_{V'}(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)) \cdot (f_{V'}(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - r_h^\tau - V'(s_{h+1}^\tau)).$$

For the second term, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\sum_{\tau=1}^{k-1} (f(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - f_{V'}(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)) \cdot (f_{V'}(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - r_h^\tau - V'(s_{h+1}^\tau)) \\
\ge& 2\sum_{\tau=1}^{k-1} (f(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - f_V(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)) \cdot (f_V(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - r_h^\tau - V(s_{h+1}^\tau)) - 4(H+1) \cdot \|V' - V\|_\infty \cdot k \\
=& \sum_{\tau=1}^{k-1} \xi_h^\tau(f) - 4(H+1) \cdot \|V' - V\|_\infty \cdot k \\
\ge& -4(H+1)(\|f - f_V\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} + 1) \cdot \sqrt{\log(2/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)} - 2(H+1) - 4(H+1) \cdot \|V' - V\|_\infty \cdot k \\
\ge& -4(H+1)(\|f - f_{V'}\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} + 2) \cdot \sqrt{\log(2/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)} - 6(H+1).
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\widehat{f}_{V'} = \arg\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(V')}$. We have $\|\widehat{f}_{V'}\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(V')} - \|f_{V'}\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(V')} \le 0$, which implies,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\ge \|\widehat{f}_{V'}\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(V')} - \|f_{V'}\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(V')} \\
&= \|\widehat{f}_{V'} - f_{V'}\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} + 2\sum_{\tau=1}^{k-1} (\widehat{f}_{V'}(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - f_{V'}(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)) \cdot (f_{V'}(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - r_h^\tau - V'(s_{h+1}^\tau)) \\
&\ge \|\widehat{f}_{V'} - f_{V'}\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} - 4(H+1)(\|\widehat{f}_{V'} - f_{V'}\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} + 2) \cdot \sqrt{\log(2/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)} - 6(H+1).
\end{aligned}$$

Solving the above inequality, we have,

$$\|\widehat{f}_{V'} - f_{V'}\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \le C \cdot \left(H \cdot \sqrt{\log(1/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)}\right)$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$. □

Our next lemma shows that f_h^k belongs to the desired confidence region.

Lemma 8. *Let $\mathcal{E}_2$ denote the event that for all $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$,*

$$\left\| f_h^k - \bar{f}_h^k \right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \leq \beta/100$$

where $\bar{f}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}'} P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot) V_{h+1}^k(s') + r_h(\cdot,\cdot)$.
Then $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_2] \geq 1 - \delta/4$ provided

$$\beta \geq C \cdot H^2 \cdot (\log(T/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) + \log |\mathcal{M}|)$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$.

Proof. Note that for all $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$,

$$Q_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) = \min\{f_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) + b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot), H\}, \text{and}$$

$$V_h^k(\cdot) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_h^k(\cdot, a).$$

We define

$$\mathcal{Q} := \{\min\{f(\cdot,\cdot) + m(\cdot,\cdot), H\} | f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T), m \in \mathcal{M}\} \cup \{0\}, \text{and}$$

$$\mathcal{V} := \{\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} q(\cdot, a) | q \in \mathcal{Q}\}.$$

Then $\log |\mathcal{V}| \leq \log |\mathcal{M}| + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) + 1$.

Conditioned on the event defined in Lemma 6, we have that $b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}$ for all $(h,k) \in [H] \times [K]$. Thus for all $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$, $\mathcal{V}$ is a $(1/T)$-cover of $V_h^k(\cdot)$.

For each $V \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta/(8|\mathcal{V}|T)}$ be the event defined in Lemma 7. Note that $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta/(8|\mathcal{V}|T)}$ also relates to a fixed pair (k,h). By applying Lemma 7 and a union bound, we have $\Pr\left[\bigcap_{(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]} \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{E}_{V,\delta/(8|\mathcal{V}|T)}\right] \geq 1 - \delta/8$. We also condition on this event for the rest of the proof.

For $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$, recall that f_h^k is the solution to the regression problem in Algorithm 2, i.e., $f_h^k = \arg\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_h^k}^2$. Let $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\|V - V_{h+1}^k\|_\infty \leq 1/T$. By the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta/(8|\mathcal{V}|T)}$ (the one relats to this (k,h) pair), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| f_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) - r_h(\cdot,\cdot) - \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot) V_{h+1}^k(s') \right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \\
\lesssim & H \sqrt{\log(8|\mathcal{V}|T/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)} \\
\lesssim & H \sqrt{\log(T/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) + \log |\mathcal{M}|}.
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. ∎

Finally, we use the above result to show optimism.

Lemma 9. *Let $\mathcal{E}_3$ denote the event that for all $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$, and all $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$,*

$$Q_h^*(s,a) \leq Q_h^k(s,a) \leq \bar{f}_h^k(s,a) + 2b_h^k(s,a)$$

where $\bar{f}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}'} P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot) V_{h+1}^k(s') + r_h(\cdot,\cdot)$.
Then $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_3] \geq 1 - \delta/2$.

Proof. We condition on the event defined in Proposition 2 and $\mathcal{E}_2$ defined in Lemma 8. Because $\left\| f_h^k - \bar{f}_h^k \right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \leq \beta/100$, from the definition of $\underline{b}_h^k$ we have that $\left| \bar{f}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) - f_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \right| \leq \underline{b}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)$. Moreover, by Proposition 2 we have $\underline{b}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leq b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)$.

Thus for all $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$, $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q_h^k(s,a) \\
=&\min\{f_h^k(s,a) + b_h^k(s,a), H\} \\
\leq&\min\left\{\bar{f}_h^k(s,a) + b_h^k(s,a) + \left|\bar{f}_h^k(s,a) - f_h^k(s,a)\right|, H\right\} \\
\leq&\min\left\{\bar{f}_h^k(s,a) + b_h^k(s,a) + \underline{b}_h^k(s,a), H\right\} \\
\leq&\min\left\{\bar{f}_h^k(s,a) + 2b_h^k(s,a), H\right\} \\
\leq&\bar{f}_h^k(s,a) + 2b_h^k(s,a).
\end{aligned}$$

Next we use induction on h to prove $Q_h^*(\cdot,\cdot) \leq Q_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)$. The inequality clearly holds when $h = H+1$. Now we assume $Q_{h+1}^*(\cdot,\cdot) \leq Q_{h+1}^k(\cdot,\cdot)$ for some $h \in [H]$. Then obviously we have $V_{h+1}^*(\cdot) \leq V_{h+1}^k(\cdot)$. Therefore for all $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q_h^*(s,a) \\
=&r_h(s,a) + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P_h(s'|s,a) V_{h+1}^*(s') \\
\leq&\min\left\{r_h(s,a) + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P_h(s'|s,a) V_{h+1}^k(s'), H\right\} \\
=&\min\left\{\bar{f}_h^k(s,a), H\right\} \\
\leq&\min\left\{f_h^k(s,a) + b_h^k(s,a), H\right\} \\
=&Q_h^k(s,a).
\end{aligned}$$

□

D.2.2 Regret decomposition

Now we are ready to bound the regret. For any $k \in [K]$, we let $\widetilde{k}$ represents the episode index we update the policy to the one used in the k-th episode.

Lemma 10. *With probability at least $1 - 5\delta/8$, we have*

$$\textit{Regret}(K) \leq 4H\sqrt{KH \cdot \log(16/\delta)} + 2\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H} b_h^k(s_h^k, a_h^k).$$

Proof. $\forall (k,h) \in [K] \times [H-1]$, define

$$\xi_h^k = \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P_h(s'|s_h^k, a_h^k)(V_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}(s') - V_{h+1}^{\pi_{\widetilde{k}}}(s')) - (V_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}(s_{h+1}^k) - V_{h+1}^{\pi_{\widetilde{k}}}(s_{h+1}^k)).$$

Note that $\{\xi_h^k\}$ is a martingale difference sequence and $|\xi_h^k| \leq 2H$. By Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, with probability at least $1 - \delta/8$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \xi_h^k \leq 4H\sqrt{KH \cdot \log(16/\delta)}.$$

Conditioned on the above event and $\mathcal{E}_3$ defined in Lemma 9, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\text{Regret}(K)\\
=&\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(V_1^*(s_1^k)-V_1^{\pi_{\tilde{k}}}(s_1^k)\right)\\
\le&\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(V_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1^k)-V_1^{\pi_{\tilde{k}}}(s_1^k)\right)\\
=&\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(Q_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1^k,a_1^k)-Q_1^{\pi_{\tilde{k}}}(s_1^k,a_1^k)\right)\quad\text{(note that we played } \pi_{\widetilde{k}} \text{ in epsiode } k)\\
=&\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}}P_1(s'|s_1^k,a_1^k)(V_2^{\widetilde{k}}(s')-V_2^{\pi_{\tilde{k}}}(s'))+2b_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1^k,a_1^k)\right)\\
=&\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left((V_2^{\widetilde{k}}(s_2^k)-V_2^{\pi_{\tilde{k}}}(s_2^k))+\xi_1^k+2b_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1^k,a_1^k)\right)\\
\le&\ldots\\
\le&\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H-1}\xi_h^k+2\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}b_h^{\widetilde{k}}(s_h^k,a_h^k)\\
=&\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H-1}\xi_h^k+2\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}b_h^k(s_h^k,a_h^k)\quad\text{(note that } b_h^{\widetilde{k}}(\cdot,\cdot)=b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot))\\
\le&4H\sqrt{KH\cdot\log(16/\delta)}+2\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}b_h^k(s_h^k,a_h^k)
\end{aligned}
$$

as desired. □

The next lemma bounds the summation of the exploration bonus in terms of the eluder dimension.

Lemma 11. *With probability at least* $1-\delta/32$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}b_h^k(s_h^k,a_h^k)\le H+H(H+1)\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T)+C\cdot\sqrt{\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T)\cdot TH\cdot\beta}$$

for some absolute constant $C>0$.

Proof. We condition on the event defined in Proposition 2 in the proof. Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
b_h^k(s_h^k,a_h^k)&\le\overline{b}_h^k(s_h^k,a_h^k)\\
&=\sup_{\|f_1-f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2\le 100\beta}|(f_1(s_h^k,a_h^k)-f_2(s_h^k,a_h^k)|.
\end{aligned}
$$

In the rest of the proof, we bound $\sum_{k=1}^{K}b_h^k(s_h^k,a_h^k)$ for each $h\in[H]$ separately.

For any given $\varepsilon>0$ and $h\in[H]$, let $\mathcal{L}_h=\{(s_h^k,a_h^k)|k\in[K],b_h^k(s_h^k,a_h^k)>\varepsilon\}$ with $|\mathcal{L}_h|=L_h$. We will show that there exists $z_h^k:=(s_h^k,a_h^k)\in\mathcal{L}_h$ such that (s_h^k,a_h^k) is ε-dependent on at least $L_h/\dim_E(\mathcal{F},\varepsilon)-1$ disjoint subsequences in $\mathcal{Z}_h^k\cap\mathcal{L}_h$. Denote $N=L_h/\dim_E(\mathcal{F},\varepsilon)-1$.

We decompose $\mathcal{L}_h$ into $N+1$ disjoint subsets, $\mathcal{L}_h=\cup_{j=1}^{N+1}\mathcal{L}_h^j$ by the following procedure. We initialize $\mathcal{L}_h^j=\{\}$ for all j and consider each $z_h^k\in\mathcal{L}_h$ sequentially. For each $z_h^k\in\mathcal{L}_h$, we find the smallest $1\le j\le N$

such that z_h^k is ε-independent on $\mathcal{L}_h^j$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}$. We set $j = N+1$ if such j does not exist. We add z_h^k into $\mathcal{L}_h^j$ afterwards. When the decomposition of $\mathcal{L}_h$ is finished, $\mathcal{L}_h^{N+1}$ must be nonempty as $\mathcal{L}_h^j$ contains at most $\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, \varepsilon)$ elements for $j \in [N]$. For any $z_h^k \in \mathcal{L}_h^{N+1}$, z_h^k is ε-dependent on at least $L_h/\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, \varepsilon) - 1$ disjoint subsequences in $\mathcal{Z}_h^k \cap \mathcal{L}_h$.

On the other hand, there exist $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $|f_1(s_h^k, a_h^k) - f_2(s_h^k, a_h^k)| > \varepsilon$ and $\|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \le 100\beta$. By the definition of ε-dependent we have

$$(L_h/\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, \varepsilon) - 1)\varepsilon^2 \le \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \le 100\beta$$

which implies

$$L_h \le \left(\frac{100\beta}{\varepsilon^2} + 1\right) \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, \varepsilon).$$

Let $b_1 \ge b_2 \ge ... \ge b_K$ be a permutation of $\{b_h^k(s_h^k, a_h^k)\}_{k\in[K]}$. For any $b_k \ge 1/K$, we have

$$k \le \left(\frac{100\beta}{b_k^2} + 1\right) \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, b_k) \le \left(\frac{100\beta}{b_k^2} + 1\right) \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/K)$$

which implies

$$b_k \le \left(\frac{t}{\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/K)} - 1\right)^{-1/2} \cdot \sqrt{100\beta}.$$

Moreover, we have $b_k \le H + 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^K b_k \le& 1 + (H+1)\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/K) + \sum_{\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/K) < k \le K} \left(\frac{k}{\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/K)} - 1\right)^{-1/2} \cdot \sqrt{100\beta} \\ \le& 1 + (H+1)\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/K) + C \cdot \sqrt{\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/K) \cdot K \cdot \beta}.\end{aligned}$$

Summing up for all $h \in [H]$, we conclude that with probability at least $1 - \delta/8$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{h=1}^H b_h^k(s_h^k, a_h^k) &\le H + H(H+1)\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/K) + CH \cdot \sqrt{\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/K) \cdot K \cdot \beta} \\ &= H + H(H+1)\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/K) + C \cdot \sqrt{\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/K) \cdot TH \cdot \beta} \\ &= H + H(H+1)\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) + C \cdot \sqrt{\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot TH \cdot \beta}\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Proof of Theorem 2. By Lemma 10 and Lemma 11, with probability at least $1 - 3\delta/4$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{Regret}(K) \\ \le& 4H\sqrt{KH \cdot \log(16/\delta)} + 2\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{h=1}^H b_h^k(s_h^k, a_h^k) \\ =& 4H\sqrt{KH \cdot \log(16/\delta)} + 2\left(H + H(H+1)\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) + C \cdot \sqrt{\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot TH \cdot \beta}\right) \\ \lesssim& \sqrt{\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot T \cdot H^3 \cdot \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta/T^2)/\delta) \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log^2 T \cdot \log\left(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \delta/(T^2)) \cdot T/\delta\right)} \\ \lesssim& \sqrt{T \cdot H^3 \cdot \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta/T^2)/\delta) \cdot \dim_E^2(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log^2 T \cdot \log\left(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \delta/(T^2)) \cdot T/\delta\right)}.\end{aligned}$$

We also condition on the event defined in Proposition 3, in which case the global switching cost is bounded by $O(H \cdot \iota_2)$. At the same time, under the event defined in Proposition 3, the size of the sub-sampled dataset $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k$ is at most $\widetilde{O}(\text{poly}(dH))$. Thus by the analysis in Section B the algorithm calls a $\Omega(K)$-sized regression oracle for at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2H^2)$ times. □

D.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Here we first provide a proof sketch of Theorem 3. The full proof then follows.

D.3.1 Proof Sketch

For simplicity, we only discusses the case of choosing $\mathcal{D}_\Delta$ as the distribution family Π in the definition of Bellman eluder dimension. The proof for the case of choosing $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{F}$ as the distribution family is similar. Similar to Jin et al. [2021a] we can show optimism, i.e., $Q^* \in \mathcal{B}^k$ for all $k \in [K]$. Thus optimistic planning step guarantees that $V_1^*(s_1) \le \max_{a\in\mathcal{A}} Q_1^k(s_1, a)$. Thus the regret can be decomposed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Regret}(K) &\le \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\max_{a\in A} Q_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1,a) - V_1^{\pi^{\widetilde{k}}}(s_1)\right) = \sum_{h=1}^{H}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\mathbb{E}_{\pi^{\widetilde{k}}}[(Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}})(s_h,a_h)] \\ &\le \sum_{h=1}^{H}\sum_{k=1}^{K}(Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}})(s_h^k,a_h^k) + O(H\sqrt{HK\log(HK/\delta)})\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from standard martingale concentration. Here $(Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}})(s_h^k, a_h^k)$ plays similar role of "bonus". The next core step is to bound $\|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}$, i.e., we want to show that the estimated Q-value in the $\widetilde{k}$-th episode still has low empirical bellman error in the k-th episode. The constraints on the confidence set can only guarantee $\|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^{\widetilde{k}}} \le O(\beta)$, where β is the parameter in Algorithm 4. The sub-sampled dataset builds a bridge:

$$\|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \lesssim \|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} = \|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{\widetilde{k}}} \lesssim \|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^{\widetilde{k}}} \le O(\beta)$$

Here the first and the third inequality follows from Theorem 1. Then we can bound the sum of "bonuses" in terms of the Bellman eluder dimension using techniques in Jin et al. [2021a], Russo and Roy [2013].

D.3.2 Formal Proof

We first provide the concentration bound.

Lemma 12 (Lemma 24 in Jin et al. [2021a])**.** *With probability at least $1-\delta$, for all $(k,h) \in [K]\times[H]$,*

$$\|Q_h^k - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^k\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \le O(\beta)$$

We use $\widetilde{k}$ to denote the index of the policy used in the k-th episode. Our switching criteria naturally indicates that $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k = \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{\widetilde{k}}$. The next lemma shows that the estimated Q-value in the $\widetilde{k}$-th episode still has low empirical bellman error with respect to the data collected in the k-th episode.

Lemma 13. *With probability at least $1-\delta$, for all $(k,h) \in [K]\times[H]$,*

- *(a)* $\|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \le O(\beta)$
- *(b)* $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\mathbb{E}_{\pi^{\widetilde{i}}}[(Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}})(s_h,a_h)]^2 \le O(\beta)$

Proof. Condition on the event defined in theorem 1 and the event defined in Lemma 12. Then we have that

$$\|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \lesssim \|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k} = \|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|^2_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{\widetilde{k}}} \lesssim \|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|^2_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \le O(\beta).$$

Here the first and the third inequality follows from Theorem 1, and the last inequality follows the result of Lemma 12. (b) can be derived directly from (a) by standard martingale concentration. ∎

Lemma 14 (Optimism, lemma 25 in Jin et al. [2021a]). *With probability at least $1-\delta$, for all $k \in [K]$,*

$$(Q_1^*, Q_2^*, ..., Q_{H+1}^*) \in \mathcal{B}^k.$$

As a result, $V_1^*(s_1) \le \max_{a\in\mathcal{A}} Q_1^k(s_1, a)$ holds for all $k \in [K]$.

Lemma 15 (Regret Decomposition). *With probability at least $1-\delta$,*

$$\text{Regret}(K) \le \sum_{h=1}^{H}\sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^{\tilde{k}}}[(Q_h^{\tilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}})(s_h, a_h)],$$

and

$$\text{Regret}(K) \le \sum_{h=1}^{H}\sum_{k=1}^{K} (Q_h^{\tilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}})(s_h^k, a_h^k) + O(H\sqrt{HK\log(HK/\delta)}).$$

Proof. Condition on the event in Lemma 14. Then we have that

$$\text{Regret}(K) \le \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\max_{a\in A} Q_1^{\tilde{k}}(s_1, a) - V_1^{\pi^{\tilde{k}}}(s_1)\right) = \sum_{h=1}^{H}\sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbb{E}_{\pi^{\tilde{k}}}[(Q_h^{\tilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}})(s_h, a_h)].$$

The second inequality then follows from standard martingale concentration. □

Lemma 16 (Lemma 26 in Jin et al. [2021a]). *For a fixed $h \in [H]$, suppose that $\{(f_k, f_k')\}_{k=1}^K \subseteq \mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{F}$, and $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^K \subseteq \Pi_h$ satisfy that for all $k \in [K]$, $\sum_{t=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_t}[(f_k - \mathcal{T}_h f_k')^2] \le O(\beta)$. Then we have that*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} |\mathbb{E}_{\mu_k}[f_k - \mathcal{T}_h f_k']| \le O(\sqrt{\dim_{DE}((I-\mathcal{T}_h)\mathcal{F}, \Pi_h, 1/\sqrt{K})\beta K} + H\cdot\min\{K, \dim_{DE}((I-\mathcal{T}_h)\mathcal{F}, \Pi_h, 1/\sqrt{K})\})$$

Proof of Theorem 3. Condition on the event defined in Lemma 14.

Case 1: $\dim_{BE}(\mathcal{F}, \varepsilon) = \max_{h\in[H]} \dim_{DE}((I-\mathcal{T}_h)\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_\Delta, \varepsilon)$. We use Lemma 16 with

$$f_k = Q_h^{\tilde{k}}, \quad f_k' = Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}}, \quad \mu_k = \mathbf{1}\{\cdot = (s_h^k, a_h^k)\}.$$

Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{K}(Q_h^{\tilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}})(s_h^k, a_h^k) &\le O\left(\sqrt{\dim_{DE}((I-\mathcal{T}_h)\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_\Delta, 1/\sqrt{K})\beta K}\right)\\ &\le O\left(\sqrt{KH^2\cdot\log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/K)/\delta)\cdot\dim_{BE}(\mathcal{F}, 1/\sqrt{K})}\right)\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this result into Lemma 15 completes the proof.

Case 2: $\dim_{BE}(\mathcal{F}, \varepsilon) = \max_{h\in[H]} \dim_{DE}((I-\mathcal{T}_h)\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{F},h}, \varepsilon)$. We use Lemma 16 with

$$f_k = Q_h^{\tilde{k}}, \quad f_k' = Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}}, \quad \mu_k = \mathbb{P}^{\pi^{\tilde{k}}}\{s_h = \cdot, a_h = \cdot\}.$$

Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\mathbb{E}_{\pi^{\tilde{k}}}[(Q_h^{\tilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}})(s_h, a_h)] &\le O\left(\sqrt{\dim_{DE}((I-\mathcal{T}_h)\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{F},h}, 1/\sqrt{K})\beta K}\right)\\ &\le O\left(\sqrt{KH^2\cdot\log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/K)/\delta)\cdot\dim_{BE}(\mathcal{F}, 1/\sqrt{K})}\right)\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this result into Lemma 15 completes the proof. □

D.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Firstly, note that the online sub-sampling procedure used in Algorithm 6 is exactly the same with Algorithm 2. Thus the properties of online sub-sampling, i.e., Proposition 2 and Proposition 3 still hold. As a special case, Proposition 2 and Proposition 3 also imply the corresponding results for b_h and $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h$ used in Algorithm 7.

Lemma 17. *With probability at least $1-\delta/8$, for all $(h,k)\in[H]\times[K]$, $b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)\in\mathcal{M}$.*
Here $\mathcal{M}$ is a prespecified function class with bounded size:

$$\begin{aligned}&\log|\mathcal{M}|\\ \le& C'\cdot\log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F},\sqrt{\delta/64T^3})/\delta)\cdot\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T)\cdot\log^2 T\cdot\log\left(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A},1/(16\sqrt{64T^3/\delta}))\cdot 64T^3/\delta\right)\\ \le& C\cdot\log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F},\delta/T^2)/\delta)\cdot\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T)\cdot\log^2 T\cdot\log\left(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A},\delta/T^2)\cdot T/\delta\right).\end{aligned}$$

for some absolute constant $C',C>0$ if T is sufficiently large.
As a special case, $b_h(\cdot,\cdot)\in\mathcal{M}$ as well.

Proof. The proof is identical to Lemma 6. □

The next lemma estimate the error of the one-step bellman backup.

Lemma 18. *Consider a fixed pair $(k,h)\in[K]\times[H]$. For any $V:\mathcal{S}\to[0,H]$, define*

$$\mathcal{D}_h^k(V):=\{(s_h^\tau,a_h^\tau,V(s_{h+1}^\tau))\}_{\tau\in[k-1]}$$

and also

$$\widehat{f_V}:=\operatorname{argmin}_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\|f\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(V)}.$$

For any $V:\mathcal{S}\to[0,H]$ and $\delta\in(0,1)$, there is an event $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta}$ which holds with probability at least $1-\delta$, such that for any $V':\mathcal{S}\to[0,H]$ with $\|V'-V\|_\infty\le 2/T$, we have

$$\left\|\widehat{f_{V'}}(\cdot,\cdot)-\sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}}P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot)V'(s')\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}\le C\cdot(H\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)+\log\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F},1/T)}).$$

for some absolute constant $C>0$

Proof. A key observation is that $\sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}}P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot)V'(s')\in\mathcal{F}$ due to Assumption 5. The rest of the proof is identical to Lemma 7. □

The next lemma verifies the confidence region.

Lemma 19. *Let $\mathcal{E}_2$ denote the event that for all $(k,h)\in[K]\times[H]$,*

$$\left\|f_h^k-\bar{f}_h^k\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}\le\beta/100$$

where $\bar{f}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)=\sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}'}P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot)V_{h+1}^k(s')$.
For the planning phase, for all $h\in[H]$, all reward function r in the function class $\mathcal{R}$

$$\left\|f_h-\bar{f}_h\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h}\le\beta/100$$

where $\bar{f}_h=\sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}'}P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot)V_{h+1}(s')$.
Then we have $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_2]\ge 1-\delta/4$ provided

$$\beta\ge C\cdot H^2\cdot(\log(T/\delta)+\log\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F},1/T)+\log\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R},1/T)+\log|\mathcal{M}|).$$

for some absolute constant $C>0$.

Proof. We condition on the event defined in Lemma 17 in the whole proof.

Note that for all $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$,

$$Q_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) = \min\{f_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) + b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) + \Pi_{[0,1]}[b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)/H], H\}, \text{and}$$

$$V_h^k(\cdot) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_h^k(\cdot, a).$$

We define

$$\mathcal{Q} := \{\min\{f(\cdot,\cdot) + m(\cdot,\cdot) + \Pi_{[0,1]}[m(\cdot,\cdot)/H], H\} | f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T), m \in \mathcal{M}\} \cup \{0\}, \text{and}$$

$$\mathcal{V} := \{\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} q(\cdot, a) | q \in \mathcal{Q}\}.$$

Then $\log|\mathcal{V}| \le \log|\mathcal{M}| + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) + 1$.

Because $b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{V}$ is a $(1/T)$-cover of $V_h^k(\cdot)$ for all $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H+1]$. For each $V \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta/(16|\mathcal{V}|T)}$ be the event defined in Lemma 18. Note that $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta/(16|\mathcal{V}|T)}$ relates to a fixed pair (k,h). By Lemma 18 and a union bound, we have $\Pr\left[\bigcap_{(k,h)\in[K]\times[H]} \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{E}_{V,\delta/(16|\mathcal{V}|T)}\right] \ge 1 - \delta/16$. We also condition on this event.

For $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$, recall that f_h^k is the solution to the regression problem in Algorithm 6, i.e., $f_h^k = \arg\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_h^k}^2$. Let $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\|V - V_{h+1}^k\|_\infty \le 1/T$. By the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta/(16|\mathcal{V}|T)}$ (the one relates to this (k,h) pair), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| f_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) - \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot) V_{h+1}^k(s') \right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \\
\lesssim & H\sqrt{\log(16|\mathcal{V}|T/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)} \\
\lesssim & H\sqrt{\log(T/\delta) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) + \log|\mathcal{M}|}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the planning phase, we define a new function class:

$$\mathcal{F}^* := \{f(\cdot,\cdot) + r(\cdot,\cdot) | f \in \mathcal{F}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}.$$

Then from the definition of covering number we have that:

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}^*, 2/T) \le \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{R}, 1/T).$$

Thus for all $h \in [H]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_h(\cdot,\cdot) &= \min\{f_h(\cdot,\cdot) + b_h(\cdot,\cdot) + r_h(\cdot,\cdot), H\} \\
&= \min\{f^*(\cdot,\cdot) + b_h(\cdot,\cdot), H\} \quad (f^* \in \mathcal{F}^*), \text{and}
\end{aligned}$$

$$V_h(\cdot) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_h(\cdot, a).$$

We define

$$\mathcal{Q}^* := \{\min\{f^*(\cdot,\cdot) + m(\cdot,\cdot), H\} | f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}^*, 2/T), m \in \mathcal{M}\} \cup \{0\}, \text{and}$$

$$\mathcal{V}^* := \{\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} q(\cdot, a) | q \in \mathcal{Q}^*\}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\log|\mathcal{V}^*| &\le \log|\mathcal{M}| + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}^*, 2/T) + 1 \\
&\le \log|\mathcal{M}| + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) + \log \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R}, 1/T) + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Because $b_h(\cdot,\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{V}^*$ is a $(2/T)$-cover of $V_h(\cdot)$ for all $h \in [H+1]$. Similarly, for each $V \in \mathcal{V}^*$, let $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta/(16|\mathcal{V}^*|T)}$ be the event defined in Lemma 18. Note that $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta/(16|\mathcal{V}^*|T)}$ relates to a fixed pair $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$. We only consider those with $k = K$. By Lemma 18 and a union bound, we have $\Pr\left[\bigcap_{h\in[H],k=K} \bigcap_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \mathcal{E}_{V,\delta/(16|\mathcal{V}^*|T)}\right] \geq 1 - \delta/16K \geq 1 - \delta/16$. We also condition on this event.

For $h \in [H]$, recall that f_h is the solution to the regression problem in Algorithm 7, i.e., $f_h = \arg\min_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \|f\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h}$. Let $V \in \mathcal{V}^*$ such that $\|V - V_{h+1}\|_\infty \leq 1/T$. By the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta/(16|\mathcal{V}^*|T)}$ (the one relates to this h and $k = K$, note that $\mathcal{Z}_h^K = \mathcal{Z}_h$), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| f_h(\cdot,\cdot) - \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot)V_{h+1}(s') \right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h} \\
\lesssim & H\sqrt{\log(16|\mathcal{V}^*|T/\delta) + \log\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)} \\
\lesssim & H\sqrt{\log(T/\delta) + \log\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) + \log\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R}, 1/T) + \log|\mathcal{M}|}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two parts we complete the proof. □

Finally, we use the above result to show optimism, in both the exploration and planning phase.

Lemma 20. *Let $\mathcal{E}_3$ denote the event that for all $(k,h) \in [K]\times[H]$, and all $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}$,*

$$Q_h^*(s,a,r^k) \leq Q_h^k(s,a) \leq \bar{f}_h^k(s,a) + r_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) + 2b_h^k(s,a)$$

where $\bar{f}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) = \sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}'} P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot)V_{h+1}^k(s')$.
And for the planning phase, for all $h \in [H]$, all $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}$, and all reward function r in the function class $\mathcal{R}$,

$$Q_h^*(s,a,r) \leq Q_h(s,a) \leq \bar{f}_h(s,a) + r_h(\cdot,\cdot) + 2b_h(s,a)$$

where $\bar{f}_h(\cdot,\cdot) = \sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}'} P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot)V_{h+1}(s')$.
Then $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_3] \geq 1 - 3\delta/8$.

Proof. We condition on the event defined in Proposition 2 and $\mathcal{E}_2$ defined in Lemma 19. Because $\left\|f_h^k - \bar{f}_h^k\right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \leq \beta/100$, from the definition of $\underline{b}_h^k$ we have that $\left|\bar{f}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) - f_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)\right| \leq \underline{b}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)$. Moreover, by Proposition 2 we have $\underline{b}_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \leq b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)$. Thus for all $(k,h) \in [K]\times[H]$, $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_h^k(s,a) &= \min\{f_h^k(s,a) + r_h^k(s,a) + b_h^k(s,a), H\} \\
&\leq \min\left\{\bar{f}_h^k(s,a) + r_h^k(s,a) + b_h^k(s,a) + \left|\bar{f}_h^k(s,a) - f_h^k(s,a)\right|, H\right\} \\
&\leq \min\left\{\bar{f}_h^k(s,a) + r_h^k(s,a) + b_h^k(s,a) + \underline{b}_h^k(s,a), H\right\} \\
&\leq \min\left\{\bar{f}_h^k(s,a) + r_h^k(s,a) + 2b_h^k(s,a), H\right\} \\
&\leq \bar{f}_h^k(s,a) + r_h^k(s,a) + 2b_h^k(s,a).
\end{aligned}$$

Next we use induction on h to prove $Q_h^*(\cdot,\cdot,r^k) \leq Q_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)$. The inequality clearly holds when $h = H+1$. Now we assume $Q_{h+1}^*(\cdot,\cdot,r^k) \leq Q_{h+1}^k(\cdot,\cdot)$ for some $h \in [H]$. Then obviously we have $V_{h+1}^*(\cdot,r^k) \leq V_{h+1}^k(\cdot)$. Therefore for all $(s,a) \in \mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_h^*(s,a,r^k) &= r_h^k(s,a) + \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} P_h(s'|s,a)V_{h+1}^*(s',r^k) \\
&\leq \min\left\{r_h^k(s,a) + \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} P_h(s'|s,a)V_{h+1}^k(s'), H\right\} \\
&= \min\left\{r_h^k(s,a) + \bar{f}_h^k(s,a), H\right\} \\
&\leq \min\left\{r_h^k(s,a) + f_h^k(s,a) + b_h^k(s,a), H\right\} \\
&= Q_h^k(s,a).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of the second inequality is identical. One only need to discard the superscript k in the above argument. □

Lemma 21. *With probability at least* $1-\delta/32$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H} b_h^k(s_h^k,a_h^k) \le H + H(H+1)\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T) + C\cdot\sqrt{\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T)\cdot TH\cdot\beta}$$

for some absolute constant $C>0$.

Proof. The proof is identical to Lemma 11. □

The next lemma bounds the summation of the optimistic value functions in the exploration phase. The techniques are similar to the standard regret decomposition for optimistic algorithms.

Lemma 22. *With probability at least* $1-\delta/2$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} V_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1) = O(\sqrt{T\cdot H^3\cdot\iota_1})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_1 &= \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R},1/T))\cdot\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T)\\ &+\log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F},\delta/T^2)/\delta)\cdot\dim_E^2(\mathcal{F},1/T)\cdot\log^2 T\cdot\log\left(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A},\delta/T^2)\cdot T/\delta\right).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For all $(k,h)\in[K]\times[H-1]$, denote

$$\xi_h^k = \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} P_h(s'|s_h^k,a_h^k)V_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}(s') - V_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}(s_{h+1}^k).$$

If $\mathcal{E}_3$ defined in Lemma 20 happens, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{K} V_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1) &= \sum_{k=1}^{K} V_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1^k)\\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{K} Q_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1^k,a_1^k)\\ &\le \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(r_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1^k,a_1^k) + \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} P_1(s'|s_1^k,a_1^k)V_2^{\widetilde{k}}(s') + 2b_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1^k,a_1^k)\right)\\ &\le \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} P_1(s'|s_1^k,a_1^k)V_2^{\widetilde{k}}(s') + (2+1/H)b_1^k(s_1^k,a_1^k)\right)\\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(V_2^{\widetilde{k}}(s_2^k) + \xi_1^k + (2+1/H)b_1^k(s_1^k,a_1^k)\right)\\ &\le \ldots\\ &\le \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H-1}\xi_h^k + \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}(2+1/H)b_h^k(s_h^k,a_h^k).\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\{\xi_h^k\}_{(k,h)\in[K]\times[H]}$ (arranged in lexicographical order) is a martingale difference sequence with $|\xi_h^k| \le H$. By Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, we have

$$\Pr\left\{\left|\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H-1}\xi_h^k\right| \le C'\cdot\sqrt{KH^3\log(1/\delta)}\right\} \ge 1-\delta/16.$$

for some absolute constant $C'>0$. Conditioned on the above event, the event defined in Lemma 21, and $\mathcal{E}_3$ defined in Lemma 20 we conclude that with probability at least $1-\delta/2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=1}^{K} V_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1)\\
\le&\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H-1}\xi_h^k + \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}(2+1/H)b_h^k(s_h^k,a_h^k)\\
=&C'\cdot\sqrt{KH^3\log(1/\delta)} + (2+1/H)\cdot\left(H + H(H+1)\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T) + C\cdot\sqrt{\dim_E(\mathcal{F},1/T)\cdot TH\cdot\beta}\right)\\
\lesssim&\sqrt{T\cdot H^3\cdot\iota_1}
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

The next lemma bounds the error of the planning policy in terms of the expectation of the bonus functions.

Lemma 23. *If $\mathcal{E}_3$ defined in Lemma 20 (optimism) happens, then for all reward function r in the function class $\mathcal{R}$,*

$$V_1^*(s_1,r) - V_1^{\pi}(s_1,r) \le 2HV_1^*(s_1,\Pi_{[0,1]}[b/H]).$$

Here b is the bonus function computed during the planning phase, and π is the output policy in the planning phase.

Proof. We generalize the lemma and use induction on h to prove that for any $h\in[H+1]$,

$$V_h(s) - V_h^{\pi}(s,r) - 2HV_h^{\pi}(s,\Pi_{[0,1]}[b/H]) \le 0 \quad \forall s\in\mathcal{S}.$$

The result is obvious for $h=H+1$. Suppose for some $h\in[H]$, it holds that

$$V_{h+1}(s) - V_{h+1}^{\pi}(s,r) - 2HV_{h+1}^{\pi}(s,\Pi_{[0,1]}[b/H]) \le 0 \quad \forall s\in\mathcal{S}.$$

Then for all $s\in\mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_h(s) - V_h^{\pi}(s,r) - 2HV_h^{\pi}(s,\Pi_{[0,1]}[b/H])\\
=&Q_h(s,\pi(s)) - Q_h^{\pi}(s,\pi(s),r) - 2HQ_h^{\pi}(s,\pi(s),\Pi_{[0,1]}[b/H])\\
\le&\left(r_h(s,\pi(s)) + \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}}P_h(s'|s,\pi(s))V_{h+1}(s') + 2\Pi_{[0,H]}[b_h(s,\pi(s))]\right)\\
&-\left(r_h(s,\pi(s)) + \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}}P_h(s'|s,\pi(s))V_{h+1}^{\pi}(s',r)\right)\\
&-2H\left(\Pi_{[0,1]}[b_h(s,\pi(s))/H] + \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}}P_h(s'|s,\pi(s))V_{h+1}(s',\Pi_{[0,1]}[b/H])\right)\\
=&\sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}}P_h(s'|s,\pi(s))\left(V_{h+1}(s') - V_{h+1}^{\pi}(s',r) - 2HV_{h+1}^{\pi}(s',\Pi_{[0,1]}[b/H])\right)\\
\le&0.
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

By taking $h = 1$ and $s = s_1$ as a special case, we have that

$$V_1(s_1) - V_1^{\pi}(s_1, r) - 2HV_1^{\pi}(s_1, \Pi_{[0,1]}[b/H]) \leq 0.$$

Then we conclude

$$V_1^*(s_1, r) - V_1^{\pi}(s_1, r) \leq V_1(s_1, r) - V_1^{\pi}(s_1, r) \leq 2HV_1^{\pi}(s_1, \Pi_{[0,1]}[b/H]) \leq 2HV_1^*(s_1, \Pi_{[0,1]}[b/H]).$$

□

Lemma 24. *With probability at least $1 - 7\delta/8$, for all reward function r in the function class $\mathcal{R}$,*

$$V_1^*(s_1, r) - V_1^{\pi}(s_1, r) = O(H^3 \cdot \sqrt{\iota_1/K})$$

where

$$\iota_1 = \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R}, 1/T)) \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)$$
$$+ \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta/T^2)/\delta) \cdot \dim_E^2(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log^2 T \cdot \log\left(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \delta/T^2) \cdot T/\delta\right).$$

Proof. We condition on $\mathcal{E}_3$ defined in Lemma 20 and the event defined in Lemma 22. By Lemma 23, we have

$$V_1^*(s_1, r) - V_1^{\pi}(s_1, r) \leq 2HV_1^*(s_1, \Pi_{[0,1]}[b/H]).$$

By the monotonicity of the bonus function, we have that

$$\Pi_{[0,1]}[b_h(\cdot,\cdot)/H] \leq \Pi_{[0,1]}[b_h^k(\cdot,\cdot)/H] = r_h^k(\cdot,\cdot) \quad \forall (k,h) \in [K] \times [H].$$

Then the right hand side can be bounded in the following manner:

$$2HV_1^*(s_1, \Pi_{[0,1]}[b/H]) \leq 2\frac{H}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K} V_1^*(s_1, r^{\widetilde{k}}) \leq 2\frac{H}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K} V_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1).$$

Substituting the bound for $\sum_{k=1}^{K} V_1^{\widetilde{k}}(s_1)$ completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 4. Simply combing Proposition 3 and Lemma 24 with a union bound completes the proof. □

D.5 Proof of Theorem 5

We first provide the concentration bound. Similar to the single-agent setting, we define the original dataset as

$$\mathcal{Z}_h^k := \{(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau, b_h^\tau)\}_{\tau \in [k-1]}$$

The proof of the following lemma is identical to that of Lemma 12

Lemma 25. *With probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $(k,h) \in [K] \times [H]$,*

$$\|Q_h^k - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^k\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \leq O(\beta)$$

Similar to the single-agent setting, we use $\widetilde{k}$ to denote the index of the policy used in the k-th episode. Our switching criteria indicates that $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k = \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{\widetilde{k}}$. The next lemma shows that the estimated Q-value in the $\widetilde{k}$-th episode still has low empirical bellman error with respect to the data collected in the k-th episode.

Lemma 26. *With probability at least $1-2\delta$, for all $(k,h)\in[K]\times[H]$,*

$$\|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \le O(\beta)$$

Proof. Condition on the event defined in Theorem 1 and the event defined in Lemma 25. Then we have that

$$\|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \lesssim \|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^k}^2 = \|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|_{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_h^{\widetilde{k}}}^2 \lesssim \|Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}_h Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}}\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k}^2 \le O(\beta).$$

Here the first and the third inequality follows from Theorem 1, and the last inequality follows the result of Lemma 12. □

The following lemma shows optimism.

Lemma 27. *With probability at least $1-\delta$, for all $k\in[K]$,*

$$(Q_1^*, Q_2^*, ..., Q_{H+1}^*) \in \mathcal{B}^k.$$

As a result, $V_1^*(s_1) \le V_{Q_1^k}(s_1)$ holds for all $k\in[K]$.

Proof. The proof of the first part is identical to that of Lemma 14. To see the second part, note that

$$V_1^*(s_1) = V_{Q_1^*}(s_1) \le V_{Q_1^k}(s_1)$$

□

The next lemma is a special case of Lemma 16.

Lemma 28. *For a fixed $h\in[H]$, suppose that $\{(f_k, f_k')\}_{k=1}^K \subseteq \mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{F}$, and $\{z_k\}_{k=1}^K \subseteq \mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{B}$ satisfy that for all $k\in[K]$, $\sum_{t=1}^{k-1}(f_k - \mathcal{T}_h f_k')(z_t)^2 \le O(\beta)$. Then we have that*

$$\sum_{k=1}^K |(f_k - \mathcal{T}_h f_k')(z_k)| \le O\left(\sqrt{\dim_{OBE}(\mathcal{F}, 1/\sqrt{K})\beta K} + H\cdot\min\{K, \dim_{OBE}(\mathcal{F}, 1/\sqrt{K})\}\right)$$

The next lemma decomposes the regret in this setting.

Lemma 29 (Regret Decomposition)**.** *With probability at least $1-2\delta$,*

$$\mathrm{NashRegret}(K) \le \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{h=1}^H (Q_h^{\widetilde{k}} - \mathcal{T} Q_{h+1}^{\widetilde{k}})(s_h^k, a_h^k, b_h^k) + O\left(H\sqrt{KH\log(KH/\delta)}\right).$$

Proof. We condition on the event defined in Lemma 27. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{NashRegret}(K) &= \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left[V_1^*(s_1) - V_1^{\mu^{\tilde{k}},\nu^k}(s_1)\right] \\
&\overset{(i)}{\leq} \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left[V_{Q_1^{\tilde{k}}}(s_1) - V_1^{\mu^{\tilde{k}},\nu^k}(s_1)\right] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\tilde{k}},\nu^k}\left[V_{Q_h^{\tilde{k}}}(s_h) - r_h(s_h,a_h,b_h) - V_{Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}}}(s_{h+1})\right] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\tilde{k}},\nu^k}\left[\max_{\mu}\min_{\nu}\mu^\top Q_h^{\tilde{k}}(s_h,\cdot,\cdot)\nu - r_h(s_h,a_h,b_h) - V_{Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}}}(s_{h+1})\right] \\
&\overset{(ii)}{=} \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\tilde{k}},\nu^k}\left[\min_{\nu}(\mu_h^{\tilde{k}})^\top Q_h^{\tilde{k}}(s_h,\cdot,\cdot)\nu - r_h(s_h,a_h,b_h) - V_{Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}}}(s_{h+1})\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\tilde{k}},\nu^k}\left[(\mu_h^{\tilde{k}})^\top Q_h^{\tilde{k}}(s_h,\cdot,\cdot)\nu_h^k - r_h(s_h,a_h,b_h) - V_{Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}}}(s_{h+1})\right] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\tilde{k}},\nu^k}\left[Q_h^{\tilde{k}}(s_h,a_h,b_h) - r_h(s_h,a_h,b_h) - V_{Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}}}(s_{h+1})\right] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\tilde{k}},\nu^k}\left[(Q_h^{\tilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}})(s_h,a_h,b_h)\right] \\
&\overset{(iii)}{\leq} \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}(Q_h^{\tilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}})(s_h^k,a_h^k,b_h^k) + O\left(H\sqrt{KH\log(KH/\delta)}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here (i) is due to Lemma 27, (ii) is due to $\mu_h^k = \mu_{Q_h^k}$, and (iii) is by Azuma-Hoeffding's inequality. □

Proof of Theorem 5. We condition on the event defined in Lemma 26 and Lemma 29. By Lemma 28 (with $f_k = Q_h^{\tilde{k}}$ and $f_k' = Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}}$), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{NashRegret}(K) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{h=1}^{H}(Q_h^{\tilde{k}} - \mathcal{T}Q_{h+1}^{\tilde{k}})(s_h^k,a_h^k,b_h^k) + O\left(H\sqrt{KH\log(KH/\delta)}\right) \\
&\leq H\cdot O\left(\sqrt{\dim_{OBE}(\mathcal{F},1/\sqrt{K})\beta K} + H\cdot\min\{K,\dim_{OBE}(\mathcal{F},1/\sqrt{K})\}\right) + O\left(H\sqrt{KH\log(KH/\delta)}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging the value of β completes the proof of the first part. The second part is a direct implication of Theorem 1. □

E Model Misspecification

In this section we study the case when there is a misspecification error in our model. We show that our algorithms are robust to the violation of the assumptions. We stick to the planner in Section 4.

In the standard RL setting, Assumption 2 with a misspecification error is stated as:

Assumption 9. *There exists a set of functions $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to [0, H+1]\}$ and a real number $\zeta > 0$, such that for any $V : \mathcal{S} \to [0, H]$ and all $h \in [H]$, there exists $f_V \in \mathcal{F}$ which satisfies*

$$\max_{(s,a)\in\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}} \left| f_V(s,a) - r_h(s,a) - \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} P_h(s' \mid s,a)V(s') \right| \le \zeta.$$

We call ζ the misspecification error.

In the reward-free RL setting, Assumption 5 with a misspecification error is stated as:

Assumption 10. *There exists a set of functions $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to [0, H+1]\}$ and a real number $\zeta > 0$, such that for any $V : \mathcal{S} \to [0, H]$ and all $h \in [H]$, there exists $f_V \in \mathcal{F}$ which satisfies*

$$\max_{(s,a)\in\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}} \left| f_V(s,a) - \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} P_h(s' \mid s,a)V(s') \right| \le \zeta.$$

We call ζ the misspecification error.

Our algorithms for the misspecification case are same with the original algorithms except for the change of the global parameter β.

In the standard RL setting (Algorithm 2), we set β to be:

$$\beta = C \cdot (H^2 \cdot \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta/T^2)/\delta) \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log^2 T \cdot \log\left(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}, \delta/T^2)\cdot T/\delta\right) + T\zeta).$$

In the reward-free RL setting (Algorithm 7 and Algorithm 6), we set β to be:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta = C \cdot (H^2 \cdot \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta/T^2)/\delta) \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log^2 T \cdot \log\left(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}, \delta/T^2)\cdot T/\delta\right) + T\zeta) \\ + C \cdot H^2 \cdot \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R}, 1/T)) \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T)\end{aligned}$$

In Lemma 30 and Lemma 31, we bound the single-step optimization error in the misspecified case. The proofs are identical to that of Lemma 11 in Wang et al. [2020c].

Lemma 30. *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies Assumption 9. Consider a fixed pair $(k,h) \in [K]\times[H]$. For any $V : \mathcal{S} \to [0,H]$, define*

$$\mathcal{D}_h^k(V) := \{(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau, r_h^\tau + V(s_{h+1}^\tau))\}_{\tau\in[k-1]}$$

and also

$$\widehat{f_V} := \operatorname{argmin}_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \|f\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(V)}.$$

For any $V : \mathcal{S} \to [0,H]$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$, there is an event $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta}$ which holds with probability at least $1-\delta$, such that for any $V' : \mathcal{S} \to [0,H]$ with $\|V' - V\|_\infty \le 1/T$, we have

$$\left\| \widehat{f_{V'}}(\cdot,\cdot) - r_h(\cdot,\cdot) - \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot)V'(s') \right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \le C\cdot(\sqrt{H^2(\log(1/\delta) + \log\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F},1/T)) + T\zeta}).$$

Lemma 31. *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies Assumption 10. Consider a fixed pair $(k,h) \in [K]\times[H]$. For any $V : \mathcal{S} \to [0,H]$, define*

$$\mathcal{D}_h^k(V) := \{(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau, V(s_{h+1}^\tau))\}_{\tau\in[k-1]}$$

and also

$$\widehat{f_V} := \operatorname{argmin}_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \|f\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_h^k(V)}.$$

For any $V : \mathcal{S} \to [0,H]$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$, there is an event $\mathcal{E}_{V,\delta}$ which holds with probability at least $1-\delta$, such that for any $V' : \mathcal{S} \to [0,H]$ with $\|V' - V\|_\infty \le 2/T$, we have

$$\left\| \widehat{f_{V'}}(\cdot,\cdot) - \sum_{s'\in\mathcal{S}} P_h(s'|\cdot,\cdot)V'(s') \right\|_{\mathcal{Z}_h^k} \le C\cdot(\sqrt{H^2(\log(1/\delta) + \log\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F},1/T)) + T\zeta}).$$

Then similar to Lemma 8 and Lemma 19 we can verifies that the new value of β can derive the desired confidence region.

With the new value of β, the new regret bound in the regular RL setting can be easily derived. In the reward-free setting the bound for $V_1^*(s_1, r) - V_1^\pi(s_1, r)$ will have an additional $O(\sqrt{H^5 \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \zeta})$ term. Therefore there will be an irreducible error in the error bound.

Formally, our results in the misspecification case is stated in Theorem 6 and Theorem 7.

Theorem 6. *Assume Assumption 9 holds, and T is sufficiently large.With probability at least $1 - \delta$, the algorithm achieves a regret bound,*

$$\textit{Regret}(K) = O(\sqrt{\iota_1 \cdot H^3 \cdot T} + \sqrt{\dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot H \cdot \zeta} \cdot T)$$

where

$$\iota_1 = \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta/T^2)/\delta) \cdot \dim_E^2(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log^2 T \cdot \log\left(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \delta/T^2) \cdot T/\delta\right)$$

Furthermore, with probability $1 - \delta$ the algorithm calls a $\Omega(K)$-sized regression oracle for at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2H^2)$ times.

Theorem 7. *Suppose Assumption 10 holds and T is sufficiently large. For any given $\delta \in (0, 1)$, after collecting K trajectories during the exploration phase (by Algorithm 6), with probability at least $1-\delta$, for any reward function $r = \{r_h\}_{h=1}^H$ satisfying Assumption 6, Algorithm 7 outputs an $O(H^3 \cdot \sqrt{\iota_1/K} + \varepsilon_i)$-optimial policy for the MDP $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, H, s_1)$. Here,*

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_1 &= \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R}, 1/T)) \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \\ &+ \log(T\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta/T^2)/\delta) \cdot \log^2 T \cdot \dim_E^2(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \log\left(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \delta/T^2) \cdot T/\delta\right)\end{aligned}$$

and ε_i is the irreducible error:

$$\varepsilon_i = \sqrt{H^5 \cdot \dim_E(\mathcal{F}, 1/T) \cdot \zeta}.$$

Furthermore, with probability $1 - \delta$ the algorithm calls a $\Omega(K)$-sized regression oracle for at most $\widetilde{O}(d^2H^2)$ times.