

# Regret Bounds for Stochastic Shortest Path Problems with Linear Function Approximation

Daniel Vial\*, Advait Parulekar†, Sanjay Shakkottai‡, R. Srikant§

May 5, 2021

## Abstract

We propose two algorithms for episodic stochastic shortest path problems with linear function approximation. The first is computationally expensive but provably obtains  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{B_\star^3 d^3 K / c_{min}})$  regret, where  $B_\star$  is a (known) upper bound on the optimal cost-to-go function,  $d$  is the feature dimension,  $K$  is the number of episodes, and  $c_{min}$  is the minimal cost of non-goal state-action pairs (assumed to be positive). The second is computationally efficient in practice, and we conjecture that it obtains the same regret bound. Both algorithms are based on an optimistic least-squares version of value iteration analogous to the finite-horizon backward induction approach from Jin et al. [2020]. To the best of our knowledge, these are the first regret bounds for stochastic shortest path that are independent of the size of the state and action spaces.

## 1 Introduction

To cope with the massive state spaces of modern reinforcement learning (RL) applications, a plethora of recent papers have studied RL with function approximation (see Section 1.2). A particularly tractable case is linear function approximation (LFA). Here one assumes the transition kernel and cost vector are linear in known feature vectors  $\{\phi(s, a)\}_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  (see Assumption 2), where  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  are the state and action spaces and  $d \ll |\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}|$ . In the online version of the problem, an agent interacts with the Markov decision process (MDP) for  $K$  episodes. The goal is to devise algorithms whose regret and computational complexity are independent of  $|\mathcal{S}|$ . More precisely, regret bounds typically scale as  $poly(d)\sqrt{K}$  (which is independent of both  $|\mathcal{S}|$  and  $|\mathcal{A}|$ ), while complexity is typically polynomial in  $d$ ,  $K$ , and  $|\mathcal{A}|$  (and independent of  $|\mathcal{S}|$ ).

Most of the LFA literature has considered finite horizon MDPs, although the discounted and average cost problems have received some attention. However, RL applications like games are arguably better modeled as stochastic shortest path (SSP) problems, where the agent tries to minimize its cost paid before reaching an absorbing zero-cost goal state (after which point no further cost is incurred). In the online setting, one episode ends and a new one begins when the goal state is reached. This is a natural model of repeatedly playing a game, for example, when terminal states of the game are modeled as goal states. However, to the best of our knowledge, there are no provably efficient algorithms for SSP with function approximation (linear or otherwise).

\*University of Texas at Austin, dvial@utexas.edu

†University of Texas at Austin, advaitp@utexas.edu

‡University of Texas at Austin, sanjay.shakkottai@utexas.edu

§University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, rsrikant@illinois.edu

## 1.1 Our contributions

We make progress toward LFA for SSP by devising and analyzing two algorithms. The first is provably statistically efficient but computationally intractable. The second is computationally efficient in practice and provably statistically efficient in some special cases, though we conjecture that this holds more generally. More precisely, our contributions are as follows.

**Optimistic approximate fixed points (OAFPs):** In Section 3.1, we show that under the LFA assumption (and if the model is known) the optimal policy in an SSP can be computed from the fixed point of a  $d$ -dimensional version of the Bellman operator, denoted  $G_d$  below (see Proposition 1). This is a simple observation, but it leads to a nontrivial definition of *optimistic approximate fixed points* (OAFPs, see Definition 1). Roughly speaking, OAFPs are  $d$ -dimensional vectors that have small Bellman error with respect to a certain operator  $\hat{G}_t$  that we interpret as an optimistic approximation of  $G_d$ . The operator  $\hat{G}_t$  is fully data-driven, and in principle, OAFPs can be computed online after observing trajectories of the SSP.

**Reducing regret minimization to OAFP computation:** In Section 3.2, we define a regret minimization algorithm (Algorithm 2) that assumes access to an oracle which, given a set of SSP trajectories, returns an OAFP. Algorithm 2 occasionally (roughly  $K + \log K$  times in  $K$  episodes) calls the oracle for an OAFP, then updates its policy in terms of the OAFP. We show (see Theorem 1) that this algorithm incurs regret  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{B_\star^3 d^3 K / c_{min}})$  with high probability, where  $B_\star$  is an upper bound on the optimal cost-to-go function and  $c_{min}$  is the minimal cost for non-goal state-action pairs. In addition to linearity, this bound assumes  $B_\star$  is known,  $c_{min}$  is positive, and all stationary and deterministic policies are proper (see Assumption 1). Hence, under these assumptions, Section 3.2 reduces the problem of regret minimization in SSP to the problem of computing OAFPs.

**Computation of OAFPs:** In Section 3.3, we present two algorithms for computing OAFPs. The first (Algorithm 3) simply iterates the operator  $\hat{G}_t$  until it (approximately) converges, and we show that if this convergence occurs, then Algorithm 3 returns an OAFP (see Theorem 2). In some special cases, we can prove that this convergence occurs, including the tabular case, where we show that  $\hat{G}_t$  is contractive (see Proposition 2). Moreover, we find empirically that this convergence occurs more generally, though we lack a proof of this fact (see Section 4). Hence, for the general case, we also provide a naive brute force search method (Algorithm 4), which has exponential complexity but is guaranteed to return an OAFP in finite time (see Theorem 2).

**Summary of contributions:** In short, we devise two end-to-end algorithms. First, running Algorithm 2 for regret minimization with Algorithm 4 as the OAFP oracle, we obtain an end-to-end algorithm that provably incurs  $\sqrt{K}$  regret, albeit with high computational cost. On the other hand, using Algorithm 2 with Algorithm 3 as the oracle, we obtain a practically efficient algorithm that (if the operator  $\hat{G}_t$  approximately converges) also incurs  $\sqrt{K}$  regret.

## 1.2 Related work

As mentioned above, to the best of our knowledge, SSP has only been investigated in the tabular setting. We first describe the relevant papers and then discuss prior work on LFA in finite and infinite horizon settings, respectively.

**Tabular SSP:** Assuming  $c_{min} > 0$ , Tarbouriech et al. [2020] proposes an algorithm that attains  $\tilde{O}(D|\mathcal{S}|\sqrt{|\mathcal{A}|DK/c_{min}})$  regret, where  $D$  is a measure of the SSP’s diameter (see [Tarbouriech et al., 2020, Assumption 2]); when  $c_{min} = 0$ , the dependence on  $K$  balloons to  $K^{2/3}$ . Similarly assuming  $c_{min} > 0$ , Rosenberg et al. [2020] proves  $\tilde{O}(B_\star^{3/2}|\mathcal{S}|\sqrt{|\mathcal{A}|K/c_{min}})$  regret for an algorithm that uses

Hoeffding-style confidence bounds. In the case  $c_{min} = 0$ , [Rosenberg et al. \[2020\]](#) uses Bernstein-style bounds to obtain  $\tilde{O}(B_\star|\mathcal{S}|\sqrt{|\mathcal{A}|K})$  regret when  $B_\star$  is known, which nearly matches the authors’  $\tilde{\Omega}(B_\star\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|K})$  lower bound. [Cohen et al. \[2021\]](#) devises an algorithm that maps an SSP instance to a finite horizon instance and that attains the optimal regret  $\tilde{O}(B_\star\sqrt{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|K})$  assuming knowledge of  $B_\star$  and  $T_\star$  (the expected time to reach the goal state from any starting state when following the optimal policy). [Tarbouriech et al. \[2021\]](#) attains the same regret bound without knowledge of  $B_\star$  and  $T_\star$ ; when  $B_\star$  and/or  $T_\star$  is known, they also provide bounds with improved additive dependence on these parameters. We point the reader to [[Tarbouriech et al., 2021](#), Table 1] for a nice summary of these four papers. Other variants of tabular SSP have been investigated, including adversarial costs and multiple goal states; see, e.g., [[Tarbouriech et al., 2021](#), Section 1.3].

**Finite horizon LFA:** To our knowledge, the earliest papers to obtain  $poly(d)\sqrt{K}$  regret bounds for finite horizon LFA are [Jin et al. \[2020\]](#), [Yang and Wang \[2020\]](#), and [Zanette et al. \[2020a\]](#). Like ours, these papers assume the cost vector and transition kernel are linear in known feature vectors:  $c(s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \theta$  and  $P(s'|s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \mu(s')$  for some known  $\phi(s, a) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  (see Assumption 2). [Jin et al. \[2020\]](#) is essentially an optimistic least-squares-based backward induction; our algorithm, which is an optimistic least-squares version of value iteration, is the natural generalization to SSP. In contrast, [Zanette et al. \[2020a\]](#) analyzes the randomized least squares backward induction algorithm ([Osband et al. \[2019\]](#)), and [Yang and Wang \[2020\]](#) takes a model-based approach, so these algorithms are less related. Follow-up work for LFA is extensive; to name a few examples, [Zhang et al. \[2021\]](#) (exponentially) improves the dependence on the horizon using Bernstein-style confidence bounds, [He et al. \[2020\]](#) proves  $\log(K)/\Delta$  regret bounds assuming a positive suboptimality gap  $\Delta$ , and [Cai et al. \[2020\]](#) proposes a policy optimization algorithm that can cope with adversarial rewards. Beyond LFA, [Wang et al. \[2019\]](#), [Zanette et al. \[2020b\]](#), and [Wang et al. \[2020\]](#) consider the more general function approximation settings of generalized linear models, low inherent Bellman error, and bounded eluder dimension ([Russo and Van Roy \[2013\]](#)), respectively.

**Infinite horizon LFA:** Comparatively little is known for the discounted and average cost cases of the infinite horizon setting. In the discounted case, [Zhou et al. \[2020\]](#) proposes an algorithm based on extended value iteration (EVI, [Jaksch et al. \[2010\]](#)) that achieves  $\sqrt{K}$  regret. However, the linearity assumption differs<sup>1</sup>:  $P(s'|s, a) = \varphi(s'|s, a)^\top \vartheta$  instead of  $P(s'|s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \mu(s')$ . Also, their algorithm can only be implemented in some special cases, and only approximately in these cases (see [[Zhou et al., 2020](#), Appendix B] for details). [Wei et al. \[2021\]](#) and [Wu et al. \[2021\]](#) study the average cost case under the minimal assumption that the optimal policy’s long-term average reward is independent of the initial state (see references therein for prior work with more restrictive assumptions). [Wei et al. \[2021\]](#) analyzes two algorithms under our linearity assumption ( $P(s'|s, a) = \theta(s, a)^\top \mu(s')$ ). The first attains  $\sqrt{K}$  regret assuming access to an oracle that computes a certain fixed point (analogous to our Algorithm 2), while the second can be implemented efficiently but has  $K^{3/4}$  regret. Under the assumption of [Zhou et al. \[2020\]](#) ( $P(s'|s, a) = \varphi(s'|s, a)^\top \vartheta$ ), [Wu et al. \[2021\]](#) obtains  $\sqrt{K}$  regret for an EVI-based algorithm that has similar implementation problems to [Zhou et al. \[2020\]](#). In summary, the algorithms that attain  $\sqrt{K}$  regret in [Zhou et al. \[2020\]](#), [Wei et al. \[2021\]](#), and [Wu et al. \[2021\]](#) all have computational issues. This suggests that simultaneously achieving statistical and computational efficiency is more difficult in infinite horizon settings. At a high level, this partially explains the computational gap in our paper, since SSP is also an infinite horizon problem (or at least a non-fixed horizon problem when all policies are proper).

<sup>1</sup>Note that if  $\vartheta = [1 \ \dots \ 1]^\top$  and  $\varphi_i(s'|s, a) = \theta_i(s, a)\mu_i(s')$ , then  $\varphi(s'|s, a)^\top \vartheta = \phi(s, a)^\top \mu(s')$ , so this assumption appears to generalize ours. The distinction is that [Zhou et al. \[2020\]](#) assumes  $\varphi(s'|s, a)$  is known, while  $\mu(s')$  is unknown in our case. See [[Zhou et al., 2020](#), Section 3] for further comparison of these models.

### 1.3 Organization and notation

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we discuss technical preliminaries. Section 3 follows the outline described in Section 1.1. In Section 4, we address the aforementioned issues with Algorithm 3 and present empirical results. Section 5 contains proofs.

The following notation is used frequently. For any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $[m]$  denotes the set  $\{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $\Delta_{m-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : x_i \geq 0 \forall i \in [m], \sum_{i=1}^m x_i = 1\}$  the  $m$ -dimensional simplex. We write  $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$  for the indicator function. We let  $e_i$  denote the  $i$ -th elementary basis vector, i.e., the vector with  $j$ -th element  $e_i(j) = \mathbb{1}(i = j)$  (the dimension will be clear from context). For any positive definite matrix  $A$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_A$  is the norm defined by  $\|x\|_A = \sqrt{x^\top A x}$ .

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Stochastic shortest path (SSP)

We briefly review the SSP problem and refer the reader to Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis [1991] for further details. An SSP instance is defined by the tuple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, c, s_{goal})$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a set of  $S \triangleq |\mathcal{S}| < \infty$  states,  $\mathcal{A}$  is a set of  $A \triangleq |\mathcal{A}| < \infty$  actions,  $P(s'|s, a)$  is the probability of transitioning from state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  to state  $s' \in \mathcal{S}$  when the agent takes action  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $c(s, a)$  is the cost incurred at  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  when  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  is taken, and  $s_{goal} \in \mathcal{S}$  is an absorbing zero-cost state, i.e.,  $P(s_{goal}|s_{goal}, a) = 1, c(s_{goal}, a) = 0 \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$ . Any (stationary and deterministic) policy  $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  induces a trajectory  $\{s_t^\pi\}_{t=1}^\infty$ , where  $s_1^\pi$  is some initial state and  $s_{t+1}^\pi \sim P(\cdot|s_t^\pi, \pi(s_t^\pi))$  for each  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . A policy is called *proper* if the goal state is reached with probability 1 from any starting state; formally,  $\mathbb{P}(\cup_{t=1}^\infty \{s_t^\pi = s_{goal}\} | s_1^\pi = s) = 1$  for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Under the forthcoming Assumption 1, all policies are proper, which implies that for any  $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ , the *cost-to-go* function  $J^\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$J^\pi(s) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^T c(s_t^\pi, \pi(s_t^\pi)) \middle| s_1^\pi = s \right] \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$$

is finite. All policies being proper also implies that the optimal policy  $\pi^*$  (i.e., the  $\pi$  that minimizes  $J^\pi(s)$  uniformly over  $s$ ) is stationary and deterministic, and that its cost-to-go function  $J^* = J^{\pi^*}$  satisfies the Bellman optimality equations

$$J^*(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a), \quad \pi^*(s) \in \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (1)$$

where we define the optimal state-action cost-to-go function  $Q^* : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$Q^*(s, a) = c(s, a) + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) J^*(s') \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}. \quad (2)$$

As alluded to above, we make the following assumptions on the SSP instance.

**Assumption 1** (Basic properties). *Every stationary, deterministic policy  $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is proper. Moreover,  $c(s, a) \in (0, 1] \forall (s, a) \in (\mathcal{S} \setminus \{s_{goal}\}) \times \mathcal{A}$ , and the agent knows an upper bound  $B_* \geq \max\{\max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} J^*(s), 1\}$  on the optimal cost-to-go function.*

Note that since  $|\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}| < \infty$ , Assumption 1 implies  $c_{min} \triangleq \min_{(s,a) \in (\mathcal{S} \setminus \{s_{goal}\}) \times \mathcal{A}} c(s, a) > 0$ .

**Remark 1** (On Assumption 1). *In the tabular case, the  $c_{min} > 0$  assumption is required for  $\sqrt{K}$  regret in Tarbouriech et al. [2020], and the known  $B_*$  assumption is needed for the sharpest bounds*

in [Rosenberg et al. \[2020\]](#), [Cohen et al. \[2021\]](#), and [Tarbouriech et al. \[2021\]](#) (see [Section 1.2](#)). The assumption that all policies are proper essentially reduces our setting to a frequentist version of the setting introduced in [\[Osband et al., 2019, Section 3\]](#). However, the analysis in [Osband et al. \[2019\]](#) restricts to the finite horizon case, so in this sense, our setting is more general.

## 2.2 Linear SSP

As discussed above, we make the following assumption to enable LFA.

**Assumption 2** (Linearity). *There exist feature vectors  $\{\phi(s, a)\}_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \subset \Delta_{d-1}$  (known to the agent), and a vector  $\theta \in [0, 1]^d$  and probability distributions  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d$  over  $\mathcal{S}$  (unknown to the agent), such that, for any  $(s, a, s') \in (\mathcal{S} \setminus \{s_{goal}\}) \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S}$ , we have*

$$c(s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \theta, \quad P(s'|s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \mu(s'), \quad (3)$$

where  $\mu(s') = [\mu_1(s') \cdots \mu_d(s')]^\top$  for each  $s' \in \mathcal{S}$ . Also,  $d \geq 2$ . Define  $\phi(s_{goal}, a) = 0 \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$ .

**Remark 2** (On Assumption 2). *As discussed in [Section 1.2](#), (3) is common in the LFA literature. Bounds on  $\phi(s, a)$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $\mu$  are also typically required; for example, [Jin et al. \[2020\]](#) requires  $\|\phi(s, a)\|_2, \|\theta\|_2, \|\mu(\mathcal{S})\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d}$  but allows  $\mu_i$  to be a signed measure. Our assumption that feature vectors belong to the simplex and  $\mu_i$  are probability distributions is a natural special case, where  $P(\cdot|s, a)$  is a mixture of  $d$  probability distributions. Under the simplex assumption,  $d \geq 2$  only eliminates the uninteresting case  $\phi(s, a) = 1 \forall s, a$ . Nonnegativity of the cost parameter  $\theta$  ensures that certain operators defined later are monotone, which simplifies the analysis (see [Lemma 6](#) in [Section 5.3](#)). The upper bound on  $\theta$  can be relaxed to  $\theta_i \leq \iota$  for some constant  $\iota > 0$ .*

**Remark 3** (Tabular case). *Note that any SSP satisfying  $c(s, a) \in [0, 1]$  (as in [Assumption 1](#)) satisfies [Assumption 2](#) with  $d = SA$ ,  $\phi(s, a) = e_{(s,a)}$ ,  $\theta = c$ , and  $\mu_{(s,a)} = P(\cdot|s, a)$ .*

## 2.3 Episodic protocol

We study an episodic formulation of the SSP containing  $K$  episodes. At episode  $k \in [K]$ , the agent begins at an initial state  $s_1^k$ , and the episode ends as soon as the goal state is reached (i.e., no action is taken at the goal state). Note that, under [Assumption 1](#), each episode is guaranteed to end in finite time. We assume  $s_1^k \neq s_{goal}$  without loss of generality<sup>2</sup>. We make no further assumptions on the sequence of initial states  $\{s_1^k\}_{k=1}^K$ ; they can be fixed across episodes  $k$ , generated *i.i.d.* by some initial state distribution, adversarially and adaptively chosen, etc.

We summarize the protocol in [Algorithm 1](#), which also introduces the following notation. For each episode  $k$ ,  $(s_h^k, a_h^k)$  denotes the  $h$ -th state-action pair visited in the  $k$ -th episode. Hence, at the first  $h$  for which  $s_{h+1}^k = s_{goal}$ , the episode ends (without taking action  $a_{h+1}^k$ ). We also use the notation  $(s_t, a_t, s'_t)$  to denote the  $t$ -th state-action-state triple observed across all episodes. Hence, for each  $t$ ,  $s'_t \sim P(\cdot|s_t, a_t)$ , and  $s'_t = s_{t+1}$  unless an episode ends at time  $t$  (in which case  $s'_t = s_{goal}$  and  $s_{t+1} = s_1^{k+1}$ , where  $k$  is the episode that ended at  $t$ ).

Note that in [Algorithm 1](#), we define  $T$  to be the current time step when the  $K$ -th episode ends, i.e.,  $T$  is the (random) total number of steps taken across all episodes. We thus define

$$\text{Regret}(K) = \sum_{t=1}^T c(s_t, a_t) - \sum_{k=1}^K J^*(s_1^k).$$

<sup>2</sup>If  $s_1^k = s_{goal}$  for some episodes  $k$  – say,  $K'$  of them – we have an episodic SSP instance with  $K - K'$  episodes.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Episodic stochastic shortest path protocol

---

```
1 Set  $t = 1$  (current time step)
2 for episode  $k = 1, \dots, K$  do
3   Set  $h = 1$  (current step of episode), observe initial state  $s_h^k \neq s_{goal}$ 
4   while  $s_h^k \neq s_{goal}$  do
5     Take action  $a_h^k$ , observe cost  $c(s_h^k, a_h^k)$  and next state  $s_{h+1}^k \sim P(\cdot | s_h^k, a_h^k)$ 
6     Define  $(s_t, a_t, s'_t) = (s_h^k, a_h^k, s_{h+1}^k)$ 
7     if  $k = K$  and  $s_{h+1}^k = s_{goal}$  then
8       | Define  $T = t$  (total number of steps taken)
9     end
10    Increment  $h \leftarrow h + 1$  and  $t \leftarrow t + 1$ 
11  end
12 end
```

---

which is the difference between the total cost incurred by the agent and the expected total cost incurred by a “genie” who knows the optimal policy *a priori* and runs it for  $K$  episodes against the same sequence of initial states  $s_1^1, \dots, s_1^K$ .

### 3 Results

We next proceed to our algorithms and results. We begin in Section 3.1 by defining the OAFPs discussed above. In Section 3.2, we present a regret minimization algorithm (Algorithm 2) that assumes access to an oracle for computing OAFPs, and we derive a regret bound for this algorithm. In Section 3.3, we describe two such oracles. The first is Algorithm 3, which is efficient in practice; however, we lack a proof that it terminates in finite time. The second is Algorithm 4, which is inefficient but guaranteed to terminate. Hence, using Algorithm 4 as the oracle in Algorithm 2 yields a statistically efficient (i.e.,  $\sqrt{K}$  regret) but computationally inefficient algorithm. On the other hand, Algorithm 3 is computationally efficient in practice and is provably statistically efficient, *if* it terminates each time it is invoked. See Section 3.3 for further details.

#### 3.1 Optimistic approximate fixed point (OAFP)

To motivate the definition of OAFPs, we begin with the simple observation that for linear MDPs, the optimal policy can be computed from a feature space version of the Bellman operator.

**Proposition 1** (Feature space fixed point). *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Define the feature space Bellman operator  $G_d : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  by*

$$G_d w = \theta + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu(s) \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top w \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

*Then  $w_d^* = \theta + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu(s) J^*(s)$  is a fixed point of  $G_d$ , and*

$$\pi^*(s) \in \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top w_d^* \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (4)$$



*Proof.* By Assumption 2 and definition of  $Q^*$  (2), we have, for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\phi(s, a)^\top w_d^* = \phi(s, a)^\top \left( \theta + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mu(s') J^*(s') \right) = c(s, a) + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) J^*(s') = Q^*(s, a). \quad (5)$$

Hence, by the Bellman optimality equations (1),

$$J^*(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top w_d^*, \quad \pi^*(s) \in \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a) = \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top w_d^*. \quad (6)$$

The first equality in (6) also implies that  $w_d^*$  is a fixed point of  $G_d$ :

$$G_d w_d^* = \theta + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu(s) \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top w_d^* = \theta + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu(s) J^*(s) = w_d^*. \quad \square$$

**Remark 4** (Linearity vs. realizability). *As shown in (5), Assumption 2 implies that  $Q^*$  is linear in the feature vectors. Ideally, we would only assume (5) (called the realizability assumption), but recent work in the finite horizon setting (a special case of SSP) has shown this problem is fundamentally harder; see Du et al. [2020], Weisz et al. [2021], and Wang et al. [2021].*

From Proposition 1, we see that when the model (namely,  $\theta$  and  $\mu$ ) is known, computing the optimal policy amounts to computing the fixed point  $w_d^*$  of the operator  $G_d$ . When the model is unknown, a natural approach is to estimate this operator from data and compute a fixed point of the estimated operator. Formally, suppose we wish to compute a policy at the end of the  $t$ -th time step. As in Algorithm 1, let  $\{s_\tau, a_\tau, s'_\tau\}_{\tau=1}^t$  denote the state-action-state triples observed so far (i.e.,  $s'_\tau \sim P(\cdot|s_\tau, a_\tau)$  for each  $\tau$ ). Define  $\tilde{\Lambda}_t = \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau) \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top$ , assume  $\tilde{\Lambda}_t^{-1}$  exists, and define the empirical operator  $\hat{H}_t : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  by

$$\hat{H}_t w = \tilde{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau) \left( c(s_\tau, a_\tau) + \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s'_\tau, a)^\top w \right) \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We later show<sup>3</sup> that  $\min_a \phi(s'_\tau, a)^\top w$  concentrates near its conditional expectation, roughly,

$$\hat{H}_t w \approx \tilde{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau) \left( c(s_\tau, a_\tau) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P(s|s_\tau, a_\tau) \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top w \right).$$

Hence, by Assumption 2, we see that

$$\hat{H}_t w \approx \tilde{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau) \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top \left( \theta + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu(s) \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top w \right) = \tilde{\Lambda}_t^{-1} \tilde{\Lambda}_t G_d w = G_d w.$$

In summary, the operator  $\hat{H}_t$  (which can be computed from data at time  $t$ ) concentrates near the unknown operator  $G_d$ , whose fixed point yields the optimal policy. Hence, it seems reasonable to define policies in terms of fixed points of  $\hat{H}_t$ , analogous to (4).

This is roughly our approach, although we will define an operator  $\hat{G}_t$  that differs from  $\hat{H}_t$  in two ways. First, we will add a regularizer  $\lambda I$  to  $\tilde{\Lambda}_t$  to ensure invertibility. Second, we will replace the terms  $\phi(s'_\tau, a)^\top w$  in the definition of  $\hat{H}_t w$  by<sup>4</sup>

$$\phi(s'_\tau, a)^\top w - \alpha \|\phi(s'_\tau, a)\|_{(\lambda I + \tilde{\Lambda}_t)^{-1}},$$

<sup>3</sup>Actually, we show this for the related operator  $\hat{G}_t$  from Definition 1; see Lemma 1 in Section 5.1.

<sup>4</sup>We additionally need to “clip” this quantity for technical reasons; see Footnote 6.

for some  $\alpha > 0$ . In words, we subtract a linear bandit style bonus term (Abbasi-Yadkori et al. [2011]), which is large if  $\phi(s, a)$  is far from the observed feature vectors  $\{\phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)\}_{\tau=1}^t$ , thereby encouraging exploration of rarely-observed feature vectors.

More precisely, we define  $\hat{G}_t$ , and the associated notion of OAFPs, as follows. Here  $B_\star$  is the known upper bound on the cost-to-go function from Assumption 1.

**Definition 1** (OAFP). *For any  $\alpha, \lambda > 0$ , we say that  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is an  $(\alpha, \lambda)$ -optimistic approximate fixed point ( $(\alpha, \lambda)$ -OAFP) at time  $t$  if*

$$f_t(s_{t+1}, w) \leq J^\star(s_{t+1}), \quad \|\hat{G}_t w - w\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \alpha, \quad \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} f_t(s, w) \leq B_\star + 1, \quad \|w\|_\infty \leq (B_\star + 2)\sqrt{dt}, \quad (7)$$

where we define  $\Lambda_t = \lambda I + \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)\phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top$  and

$$f_t(s, w) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left( \phi(s, a)^\top w - \alpha \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \right), \quad g_t(s, w) = \begin{cases} B_\star + 1, & f_t(s, w) > B_\star + 1 \\ f_t(s, w), & f_t(s, w) \in [0, B_\star + 1] \\ 0, & f_t(s, w) = 0 \end{cases}$$

$$\hat{G}_t w = \Lambda_t^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau) (c(s_\tau, a_\tau) + g_t(s'_\tau, w)).$$

**Remark 5** (On Definition 1). *In words, the first inequality in (7) says that OAFPs yield optimistic estimates of the cost-to-go function of the next state  $s_{t+1}$ . The second inequality says that OAFPs are approximate fixed points of the operator  $\hat{G}_t$ , which (as described above) adds a regularizer to  $\tilde{\Lambda}_t$ , and subtracts a bonus term from  $\phi(s, a)^\top w$  and “clips” the resulting quantity. The remaining inequalities in (7) are simple boundedness conditions that aid in the analysis. We also recall from Assumption 2 that we use the convention  $\phi(s_{goal}, a) = 0$ . This clearly implies that  $f_t(s_{goal}, w) = g_t(s_{goal}, w) = 0 \forall w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Also, recall from the same assumption that  $\phi(s, a) \in \Delta_{d-1}$  when  $s \neq s_{goal}$ . This implies that the feature vectors  $\phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)$  appearing in the definitions of  $\Lambda_t$  and  $\hat{G}_t$  all belong to the simplex (since  $s_\tau \neq s_{goal} \forall \tau \in [t]$  in Algorithm 1).*

### 3.2 Regret minimization with OAFP oracle

We next describe Algorithm 2.

- In Lines 1-3, we choose an arbitrary initial policy  $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  and initialize four variables: a counter for the number of policies used so far, denoted  $l$  and initialized to  $l = 1$ ;  $M_l$ , which represents the time the  $l$ -th policy was computed (so  $M_1 = 0$ ); a counter for the number of steps so far, denoted  $t$  and initialized to  $t = 1$  (as in Algorithm 1); and  $\Lambda_{t-1} = \lambda I$  (in general,  $\Lambda_t$  will be defined as in Definition 1, and it will be iteratively updated).
- Lines 4-10 and 15 are identical to the protocol from Algorithm 1, except for two changes. First, in Line 8, we iteratively update  $\Lambda_t$ . Second, in Line 10 – which is reached just before the process terminates – we record the total number of policies used  $L$ .
- In Line 11, we check if  $t = 1$ ,  $s_{h+1}^k = s_{goal}$ , or  $\det(\Lambda_t) \geq 2\det(\Lambda_{M_l})$ ; if any (in)equality holds, we will soon update the policy. In words, the first two conditions simply mean we update the arbitrary initial policy after the first observation  $(s_1, a_1, s'_1)$ , and at the end of each episode, respectively. The third condition, taken from [Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011, Section 5.1] means we also update if the determinant of  $\Lambda_t$  has doubled since the most recent policy update. The



idea is that, *before* this doubling occurs, i.e., for any  $t$  such that  $\det(\Lambda_t) \leq 2\det(\Lambda_{M_l})$ , we are guaranteed that

$$\|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \leq \sqrt{2}\|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}} \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \quad (8)$$

(see (29) in the proof of Lemma 5). In words, (8) says none of the bonuses have grown too much since we last updated the policy at time  $M_l$ , and thus (intuitively) the policy roughly reflects our current knowledge of the SSP. We note this condition is only used in Abbasi-Yadkori et al. [2011] to reduce computation; in this work, it also has consequences in terms of regret (see Remark 7).

- Line 12 is the actual policy update. First, we call the oracle for an  $(\alpha_t, \lambda)$ -OAFP<sup>5</sup>  $w_t$ , where we specify  $\alpha_t$  and  $\lambda$  in Theorem 1 below. For each  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , we then update  $\pi(s)$  to be the  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  that minimizes  $\phi(s, a)^\top w_t$ , less the bonus term (breaking ties arbitrarily). Here minimizing  $\phi(s, a)^\top w_t$  mimics the optimal policy computation in (4), and subtracting the bonus encourages exploration. Finally, in Line 13, we increment the number of policies used  $l$  and record the time of the  $l$ -th policy update  $M_l$ .

---

**Algorithm 2:** Regret minimization with OAFP oracle

---

```

1 Choose arbitrary policy  $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ 
2 Set  $l = 1$  (number of policies used so far) and  $M_l = 0$  (time  $l$ -th policy was computed)
3 Set  $t = 1$  (current time step) and  $\Lambda_{t-1} = \lambda I$ 
4 for episode  $k = 1, \dots, K$  do
5   Set  $h = 1$  (current step of episode), observe initial state  $s_h^k \neq s_{goal}$ 
6   while  $s_h^k \neq s_{goal}$  do
7     Take action  $a_h^k = \pi(s_h^k)$ , observe cost  $c(s_h^k, a_h^k)$  and next state  $s_{h+1}^k \sim P(\cdot | s_h^k, a_h^k)$ 
8     Set  $(s_t, a_t, s'_t) = (s_h^k, a_h^k, s_{h+1}^k)$  and  $\Lambda_t = \Lambda_{t-1} + \phi(s_t, a_t)\phi(s_t, a_t)^\top$ 
9     if  $k = K$  and  $s_{h+1}^k = s_{goal}$  then
10      | Let  $L = l$  (total number of policies used) and  $T = t$  (total number of steps taken)
11      else if  $t = 1$  or  $s_{h+1}^k = s_{goal}$  or  $\det(\Lambda_t) \geq 2\det(\Lambda_{M_l})$  then
12        | Call oracle for an  $(\alpha_t, \lambda)$ -OAFP  $w_t$  (see Definition 1) and update policy as follows:
13          | 
$$\pi(\cdot) \leftarrow \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left( \phi(\cdot, a)^\top w_t - \alpha_t \|\phi(\cdot, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \right)$$

14          | Increment  $l \leftarrow l + 1$  and set  $M_l = t$ 
15        end
16      | Increment  $h \leftarrow h + 1$  and  $t \leftarrow t + 1$ 
17    end

```

---

Having described our algorithm, we provide a  $\sqrt{K}$  regret bound.

**Theorem 1 (Regret).** *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and further assume the regularizer satisfies  $\lambda \geq 1$ . Then there exists a constant  $\iota > 0$  depending only on  $\lambda$  such that, for any  $\delta > 0$ , if we set*

<sup>5</sup>The OAFP definition involves  $s_{t+1}$ , which has not yet been defined in Algorithm 2 when Line 12 is reached. Thus, to be precise, the initial state of the next episode  $s_1^{k+1}$  should be revealed as soon as  $s_{goal}$  is reached in episode  $k$ . In this case, upon reaching Line 12, we know that  $s_{t+1} = s_1^k$  if  $s_{goal}$  was just reached and  $s_{t+1} = s'_t$  otherwise.

$\alpha_t = \iota B_\star d \sqrt{\log(B_\star dt/\delta)}$ , then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\text{Regret}(K) = \tilde{O} \left( \sqrt{\frac{B_\star^3 d^3 K \log(1/\delta)}{c_{\min}}} + \frac{B_\star^3 d^3 \log(1/\delta)}{c_{\min}} \right),$$

where  $\tilde{O}$  hides  $\lambda$  and  $o(\log(1/\delta))$  terms, and logarithmic dependence on other quantities.

**Remark 6** (Tabular case). In the tabular case (see Remark 3), the dominant term in our regret bound is  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{B_\star^3 S^3 A^3 K/c_{\min}})$  when  $K$  is large. Interestingly, the dependencies on  $B_\star$ ,  $K$ , and  $c_{\min}$  are identical to bound  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{B_\star^3 S^2 A K/c_{\min}})$  derived in the  $c_{\min} > 0$  case in Rosenberg et al. [2020] (see Section 1.2). Our dependence on  $SA$  is worse, though by treating the tabular and general cases separately, this be improved from  $(SA)^{3/2}$  to  $SA$  (see Remark 9 in Section 5.2). We suspect the remaining gap arises in part from the determinant doubling condition in Line 11, which is well-motivated in the general linear case but makes less sense in the tabular case.

*Proof sketch.* The proof contains three steps, which comprise Lemma 1 in Section 5.1, Lemma 2 in Section 5.2, and Lemmas 3-4 in Section 5.2, respectively. We sketch each step here.

**Step 1 (operator concentration):** In Lemma 1, we define  $U_t w_t = \theta + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu(s) g_t(s, w_t)$ , where  $w_t$  is an OAFP at time  $t$ . Multiplying by  $\Lambda_t^{-1} \Lambda_t$ , ignoring the regularizer, and using Assumption 2,

$$U_t w_t \approx \Lambda_t^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau) \left( c(s_\tau, a_\tau) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P(s|s_\tau, a_\tau) g_t(s, w_t) \right).$$

Hence, defining the “error operator”  $E_t = \hat{G}_t - U_t$ , we obtain

$$E_t w = \Lambda_t^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau) \left( g_t(s'_\tau, w_t) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P(s|s_\tau, a_\tau) g_t(s, w_t) \right).$$

This resembles a self-normalized multivariate martingale that arises in the linear bandits literature, but  $g_t(\cdot, w_t)$  is a random function that depends on  $\{s_\tau, a_\tau, s'_\tau\}_{\tau=1}^t$ , so the bounds on  $E_t w_t$  from Abbasi-Yadkori et al. [2011] do not directly apply. Hence, borrowing an idea from Jin et al. [2020], we use  $\varepsilon$ -nets<sup>6</sup> to take a union bound over  $g_t(\cdot, w_t)$ , after which we can apply such bounds.

**Step 2 (regret decomposition):** Recall that  $\{M_l\}_{l=1}^L$  are the times we update the policy in Algorithm 2. We thus rewrite the cost incurred on a per-policy update basis, namely,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T c(s_t, a_t) = \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t),$$

where  $M_{L+1} = T$  by convention. On the other hand, the expected cost of the genie is

$$\sum_{k=1}^K J^\star(s_1^k) = \sum_{k=1}^K J^\star(s_1^k) = \sum_{l=1}^L J^\star(s_{1+M_l}) + \left( \sum_{k=1}^K J^\star(s_1^k) - \sum_{l=1}^L J^\star(s_{1+M_l}) \right).$$

<sup>6</sup>The clipping in  $g_t$  and the  $\ell_\infty$  bound on  $w_t$  (see Definition 1) ensure this  $\varepsilon$ -net is sufficiently small.

For the term in parentheses, since we update the policy at the end of each episode, all but  $L - K$  terms cancel. Combining the above, and by definition of  $B_*$ , we can bound regret by

$$\text{Regret}(K) \leq \sum_{l=1}^L \left( \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t) - J^*(s_{1+M_l}) \right) + O(B_*(L - K)) \quad (9)$$

Here  $L - K$  is the number of policy updates that occur during episodes, i.e., the number of times  $\det(\Lambda_t)$  doubles, which (in terms of  $T$ ) can only occur order  $\log T$  times. In the next step, we show  $T = O(K)$ , so the second term in (9) is  $O(\log K)$  and contributes negligible regret.

**Step 3 (per-policy update regret):** For each  $l \in [L]$ , the first inequality in (7) implies

$$\sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t) - J^*(s_{1+M_l}) \leq \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t) - f_t(s_{1+M_l}, w_t). \quad (10)$$

We next show the right side can recursively bounded (see Lemma 3). First, by definition of  $f_t$  and the policy update on Line 12, and the second inequality in (7), respectively, we obtain

$$f_t(s_{1+M_l}, w_t) \approx \phi(s_{1+M_l}, a_{1+M_l})^\top w_t \approx \phi(s_{1+M_l}, a_{1+M_l})^\top \hat{G}_t w_t,$$

where the approximate equalities hide the bonus  $\|\phi(s_{1+M_l}, a_{1+M_l})\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}}$ . Using  $\hat{G}_t w_t \approx U_t w_t$  from Step 1, the second inequality in (7), and Assumption 2, respectively, we can bound this by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(s_{1+M_l}, a_{1+M_l})^\top \hat{G}_t w_t &\approx \phi(s_{1+M_l}, a_{1+M_l})^\top U_t w_t \\ &\geq c(s_{1+M_l}, a_{1+M_l}) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P(s|s_{1+M_l}, a_{1+M_l}) f_t(s_{1+M_l}, w_t) \\ &\approx c(s_{1+M_l}, a_{1+M_l}) + f_t(s_{2+M_l}, w_t), \end{aligned}$$

where the second  $\approx$  hides a conditionally zero-mean term. Combining the previous two lines,

$$\sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t) - f_t(s_{1+M_l}, w_t) \approx \sum_{t=2+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t) - f_t(s_{2+M_l}, w_t).$$

Recall  $\approx$  hides a bonus and conditionally zero-mean term. Hence, we can recursively apply this argument to bound the right side of (10) by a sum of bonuses and a martingale difference sequence, both of which scale as  $\sqrt{T}$  by standard results (see Lemmas 4 and 5). Finally, the minimal cost assumption implies  $T = O(K)$  (see end of Section 5.2), which implies  $\sqrt{K}$  regret.  $\square$

**Remark 7** (Regret and number of policy updates). *As discussed above, we only update the policy at the end of each episode, plus an additional  $L - K$  times (those  $t$  when  $\det(\Lambda_t)$  doubles). If instead, for example, we updated at every step, we would have  $L - K = \Omega(K)$ , which by Step 2 of the proof sketch implies linear regret (at least using this proof approach). In contrast, in the linear bandit setting, updating at every step or only when  $\det(\Lambda_t)$  doubles has negligible impact on regret (see [Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011, Section 5.1]).*

### 3.3 Computing OAFPs

We next discuss computation of OAFPs. An immediate idea is to iterate the operator  $\hat{G}_t$  in hopes that it converges to an OAFP; see Algorithm 3. As will be discussed shortly, this indeed yields an OAFP, *if* the sequence  $\{\hat{G}_t^n 0\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is convergent. In practice, we find that this convergence occurs, but we lack a proof (see Section 4). Hence, we provide an alternative method in Algorithm 4. Here we define a particular  $\ell_\infty$  net  $\mathscr{W}$ , find all elements of  $\mathscr{W}$  that satisfy the second inequality in (7) (denoted  $\mathscr{W}_F$  in Algorithm 4), and return the  $w \in \mathscr{W}_F$  that minimizes  $f_t(s_{t+1}, w)$ , which allows us to prove the first inequality in (7) (if  $\mathscr{W}_F = \emptyset$ , we simply return the zero vector). Algorithm 4 is clearly inefficient, but it is guaranteed to terminate in finite time.

---

**Algorithm 3:** OAFP via iterating  $\hat{G}_t$  (efficient in practice but no proof of termination)

---

```

1 for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  do
2   Compute  $\hat{G}_t^n 0 = \hat{G}_t(\hat{G}_t^{n-1} 0)$  (where  $\hat{G}_t^0 = 0$  by convention)
3   if  $\|\hat{G}_t^n 0 - \hat{G}_t^{n-1} 0\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \alpha_t$  (i.e., if the second inequality in (7) holds) then
4     |   return  $w_t = \hat{G}_t^n 0$ 
5   end
6 end

```

---



---

**Algorithm 4:** OAFP via brute force (guaranteed to terminate but inefficient)

---

```

1 Let  $\varepsilon = \alpha_t / (4\sqrt{dt(\lambda d + t)})$  and  $\mathscr{W} = \{w = [i_j \varepsilon]_{j=1}^d : i_j \in \{0, \dots, \lceil (B_\star + 1)/\varepsilon \rceil\} \forall j\}$ 
2 Find  $w \in \mathscr{W}$  satisfying the second inequality in (7):  $\mathscr{W}_F = \{w \in \mathscr{W} : \|\hat{G}_t w - w\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \alpha_t\}$ 
3 if  $\mathscr{W}_F \neq \emptyset$  then return  $w_t \in \arg \min_{w \in \mathscr{W}_F} f_t(s_{t+1}, w)$ ;
4 else return  $w_t = 0$ ;

```

---

We close the section with aforementioned guarantees for Algorithms 3 and 4.

**Theorem 2** (Oracles). *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and further assume  $\lambda \geq 1$ . Then for any  $\delta > 0$ , if we set  $\alpha_t = \iota B_\star d \sqrt{\log(B_\star dt / \delta)}$  (where  $\iota$  is the constant from Theorem 1 that depends only on  $\lambda$ ), the following hold:*

- With probability at least  $1 - \frac{\delta}{2} - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}^c)$ , for any  $t \in [T]$ , Algorithm 4 computes an  $(\alpha_t, \lambda)$ -OAFP, where  $\mathcal{F} = \bigcap_{t=1}^T \{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\hat{G}_t^n 0 - \hat{G}_t^{n-1} 0\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \alpha_t\}$  (i.e., if Algorithm 3 terminates, it returns an OAFP).
- With probability at least  $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$ , for any  $t \in [T]$ , Algorithm 4 computes an  $(\alpha_t, \lambda)$ -OAFP.

*Proof sketch.* The key is to prove the first two inequalities in (7), which differs for each algorithm:

- For Algorithm 3, the first inequality follows from induction on the iteration  $n$  and the operator concentration lemma described in the Theorem 1 proof sketch. The second inequality holds trivially by the algorithm's termination criteria, which is guaranteed to occur on  $\mathcal{F}$ .
- For Algorithm 4, we first show  $\{U_t^n 0\}_{n=1}^\infty$  has a fixed point  $w_t^\star$  satisfying  $\phi(s, a)^\top w_t^\star \leq Q^\star(s, a)$  (see Lemma 6), where  $U_t$  is the operator that  $\hat{G}_t$  concentrates around (see Lemma 1). We then show  $w_t^\star \approx w_t'$  for some  $w_t' \in \mathscr{W}$  (the  $\varepsilon$ -net from Algorithm 4) and that  $w_t'$  is an approximate fixed point of  $\hat{G}_t$ , i.e.,  $w_t' \in \mathscr{W}_F$  in Algorithm 4 (see Lemma 7). In particular,

this means  $\mathcal{W}_F \neq \emptyset$ ; the second inequality in (7) follows immediately from Algorithm 4. The first inequality in (7) holds since, by Lemmas 6 and 7,

$$f_t(s_{t+1}, w'_t) \approx f_t(s_{t+1}, w_t^*) \leq \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s_{t+1}, a)^\top w_t^* \leq \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a) = J^*(s),$$

and since  $w'_t \in \mathcal{W}_F$  and Algorithm 2 returns the  $w \in \mathcal{W}$  that minimizes  $f_t(s_{t+1}, w)$ .

See Section 5.3 for proof details. □

## 4 Discussion

To summarize the previous section, we showed that if Algorithm 3 terminates quickly, we can use it as the OAFP oracle in Algorithm 2 to obtain a computationally efficient algorithm with  $\sqrt{K}$  regret. We next discuss some special cases where Algorithm 3 terminates quickly and present empirical results for the general case.

### 4.1 Convergence in special cases

The following proposition shows that if  $\{\phi(s, a)\}_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$  (viewed as a set, i.e., with duplicates removed) is orthogonal, then Algorithm 3 terminates, so Algorithms 2 and 3 yield an end-to-end algorithm. Moreover, when this set is orthonormal,  $\hat{G}_t$  is a contraction. Note the latter case includes the tabular setting, and thus we have a computationally efficient algorithm for that setting.

**Proposition 2** (Special cases). *Let  $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be an orthogonal set, and suppose that for any  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\phi(s, a) = q_i$  for some  $i \in [d]$ . Then  $\{\hat{G}_t^n 0\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is convergent for any  $t \in [T]$  a.s. Moreover, if  $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^d$  is an orthonormal set, then  $\hat{G}_t$  is a contraction for any  $t \in [T]$  a.s.*

*Proof sketch.* The orthogonality assumption implies that the eigenvectors of  $\Lambda_t$  are scaled versions of the feature vectors. This yields an expression for  $\Lambda_t^{-1}$  that allows us to derive a monotonicity property:  $\tilde{Q}^\top(\hat{G}_t w_1 - \hat{G}_t w_2) \geq 0$  whenever  $\tilde{Q}^\top(w_1 - w_2) \geq 0$ , where  $\tilde{Q}$  is the matrix with columns  $q_i/\|q_i\|_2$  and the inequalities are componentwise. This implies (via induction) that  $\{\tilde{Q}^\top \hat{G}_t^n 0\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is increasing; we also show this sequence is bounded, which implies convergence. In the orthonormal case, we can use the expression for  $\Lambda_t^{-1}$  to show that  $\hat{G}_t$  is a contraction with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  defined by  $\|x\| = \|\tilde{Q}^\top x\|_\infty$ . See Section 5.4.1 for details. □

### 4.2 Empirical results

To test the numerical performance of Algorithm 3, we randomly generated (in a manner to be described shortly)  $10^3$  SSP instances  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, c, s_{goal})$  satisfying Assumptions 1 and 2 but *not* the assumptions of Proposition 2. For each instance, we ran Algorithm 2 with Algorithm 3 as the OAFP oracle for  $10^3$  episodes. Thus, the Algorithm 3 oracle was called at least  $10^6$  times, and it terminated each time, suggesting that  $\{\hat{G}_t^n 0\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is convergent beyond the special cases of Proposition 2. Moreover, these experiments suggest that  $\|\hat{G}_t^n 0 - \hat{G}_t^{n-1} 0\|_{\Lambda_t}$  decays geometrically fast (see Figure 3). In short, the event  $\mathcal{F}$  defined in Theorem 2 – under which Algorithms 2 and 3 together yield a statistically efficient end-to-end regret minimization scheme – occurs in practice, and this scheme is practically efficient as well.

Despite this scheme being efficient for each problem instance, it is also crucial to investigate how its complexity scales with  $S$ . Recall the LFA literature strives for complexity independent of  $S$ ; in our case, the only (potential) dependence on  $S$  arises if Algorithm 3 requires more iterations  $n$  as




Figure 1: Normalized regret




Figure 2: Number of iterations

$S$  grows. We tested this empirically by setting  $d = A = 4$  and choosing  $S \in \{4, 8, 16, 32\}$ . For each choice of  $S$ , we generated 250 linear SSPs by sampling  $\{\phi(s, a)\}_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $\{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^d$  uniformly from  $\Delta_{d-1}$ ,  $[0, 1]^d$ , and the set of distributions over  $\mathcal{S} = [S]$ , respectively; defining  $c$  and  $P$  as in (3); and setting  $s_{goal} = S$ . For each problem instance, we ran Algorithm 2 with Algorithm 3 as the OAFP oracle for  $10^3$  episodes, with a uniformly random non-goal initial state (i.e.,  $s_1^k \sim [S - 1]$ ). This was enough episodes for the algorithm to enter a clear sublinear regret regime for each choice of  $S$ ; see Figure 1, where we plot regret normalized by the optimal expected cost  $\sum_{k=1}^K J^*(s_1^k)$  (we normalize to negate the effect of  $B_*$ , which, for these experiments, grew with  $S$  despite  $d$  being fixed). In Figure 2, we show the average (across problem instances) of the total (across  $10^3$  episodes) of the number of iterations of Algorithm 3 as  $S$  grows. Note the  $S$  axis is logarithmic and the growth in iteration count appears linear. This suggests that, at worst, iteration count is  $O(\log S)$ ; however, it does not necessarily mean iteration count is  $\Omega(\log S)$ , since the aforementioned growth in  $B_*$  may also play a role. Also, even if iteration count does grow slowly in  $S$ , this seems to correspond to better regret performance (see Figure 1). Finally, Figure 3 shows the (seemingly) geometric decay of the Algorithm 3 error term  $\|\hat{G}_t^{m+1}0 - \hat{G}_t^m 0\|_{\Lambda_t}$ .

## 5 Proofs

Throughout the proofs, for any  $t \in [T]$ , we let  $\mathbb{E}_t$  denote expectation conditioned on the first  $t - 1$  state-action-state triples and the  $t$ -th state action pair, namely,  $\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \{(s_\tau, a_\tau, s'_\tau)\}_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \cup (s_t, a_t)]$ .






Figure 3: Algorithm 3 error term

We also let  $\mathbb{E}_{s'_t}$  denote expectation with respect to the random state  $s'_t$ . Hence, for  $h : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_t[h(s'_t)] = \mathbb{E}_{s'_t}[h(s'_t)] = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} h(s)P(s|s_t, a_t). \quad (11)$$

However, we clarify that since  $g_t$  in Definition 1 is a random function that depends on the first  $t$  state-action pairs, if  $\tau < t$ , it may be the case that

$$\mathbb{E}_\tau[g_t(s'_\tau, w)] \neq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} g_t(s, w)P(s|s_\tau, a_\tau).$$

On the other hand, it is always true that

$$\mathbb{E}_{s'_\tau}[g_t(s'_\tau, w)] = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} g_t(s, w)P(s|s_\tau, a_\tau).$$

With this notation in place, we proceed to the proofs. We begin in Section 5.1 with our operator concentration result discussed in the proof sketches, which is used for the proofs of both theorems. We then prove Theorems 1 and 2 in Sections 5.2 and 5.3, respectively. Finally, in Section 5.4, we prove Proposition 2 and provide some simple inequalities used throughout the analysis.

## 5.1 The error operator

For each  $t \in [T]$ , define the operators  $U_t, E_t : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  by

$$U_t w = \theta + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu(s)g_t(s, w), \quad E_t = \hat{G}_t - U_t.$$

Here  $U_t$  can be roughly viewed as the expected value of  $\hat{G}_t$ , so  $E_t$  is (roughly) the error between  $\hat{G}_t$  and its mean. This error operator is small in the following sense.

**Lemma 1** (Error operator tail bound). *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and further assume  $\lambda \geq 1$ . Then there exists  $c > 0$  depending only on  $\lambda$  such that, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , if we set  $\alpha_t = cB_*d\sqrt{\log(B_*dt/\delta)} \forall t \in [T]$ , then  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 1 - \delta/2$ , where*

$$\mathcal{E} = \left\{ \sup_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d: \|w\|_\infty \leq (B_*+2)\sqrt{td}} \|E_t w\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \forall t \in [T] \right\}.$$

The proof mostly involves bounding the probability of the following “bad event” at time  $t$ :

$$\mathcal{B}_t = \left\{ \sup_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d: \|w\|_\infty \leq (B_\star + 2)\sqrt{td}} \|E_t w\|_{\Lambda_t} > \frac{\alpha_t}{2} \right\}.$$

We first introduce some notation. We note these definitions depend on  $t$ , but we suppress this dependence for simplicity. First, for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $Y \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{d \times d}$  (the set  $d \times d$  positive definite matrices), we define functions  $f_{x,Y} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $g_{x,Y} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (parameterized by  $x$  and  $Y$ ) by

$$f_{x,Y}(s) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left( \phi(s, a)^\top x - \alpha_t \|\phi(s, a)\|_Y \right), \quad g_{x,Y}(s) = \begin{cases} B_\star + 1, & f_{x,Y}(s) > B_\star + 1 \\ f_{x,Y}(s), & f_{x,Y}(s) \in [0, B_\star + 1] \\ 0, & f_{x,Y}(s) < 0 \end{cases}.$$

Note that  $g_t(s, w) = g_{w, \Lambda_t^{-1}}(s)$  for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $g_t$  is from Definition 1. With slight abuse of notation, we set  $g_{w,t} = g_{w, \Lambda_t^{-1}}$ . Hence, we emphasize the following identity:

$$g_t(s, w) = g_{w,t}(s) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, w \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (12)$$

Finally, for any  $\tau \in [t]$ , we use the shorthand  $\phi_\tau = \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)$ . We then have the following.

**Claim 1.** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 1, for any  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the following holds almost surely:*

$$\|E_t w\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_\tau (g_{w,t}(s'_\tau) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_\tau} g_{w,t}(s'_\tau)) \right\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} + \sqrt{\lambda d} (B_\star + 2).$$

*Proof.* Fix  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then by definition of  $\hat{G}_t$  and (12), we have

$$\hat{G}_t w = \Lambda_t^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_\tau (c(s_\tau, a_\tau) + \mathbb{E}_{s'_\tau} g_t(s'_\tau, w)) + \Lambda_t^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_\tau (g_{w,t}(s'_\tau) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_\tau} g_{w,t}(s'_\tau)).$$

By Assumption 2 and definition of  $\mathbb{E}_{s'_\tau}$ ,  $\Lambda_t$ , and  $U_t$ , the first term satisfies

$$\Lambda_t^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_\tau (c(s_\tau, a_\tau) + \mathbb{E}_{s'_\tau} g_t(s'_\tau, w)) = \Lambda_t^{-1} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_\tau \phi_\tau^\top \left( \theta + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu(s) g_t(s, w) \right) = (I - \lambda \Lambda_t^{-1}) U_t w.$$

Hence, by definition of the error operator, we have

$$E_t w = \hat{G}_t w - U_t w = \Lambda_t^{-1} \left( \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_\tau (g_{w,t}(s'_\tau) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_\tau} g_{w,t}(s'_\tau)) - \lambda U_t w \right).$$

Thus, by the triangle inequality and definition of the induced norm,

$$\|E_t w\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_\tau (g_{w,t}(s'_\tau) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_\tau} g_{w,t}(s'_\tau)) \right\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} + \lambda \|U_t w\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}}. \quad (13)$$

Next, we note that for any  $i \in [d]$ , Assumption 2 and the definition of  $g_t$  imply

$$0 \leq (U_t w)_i = \theta_i + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu_i(s) g_t(s, w) \leq 1 + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu_i(s) (B_\star + 1) = B_\star + 2.$$

Combined with (42) in Section 5.4, we obtain

$$\lambda \|U_t w\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \leq \sqrt{\lambda} \|U_t w\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\lambda d} \|U_t w\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\lambda d} (B_\star + 2). \quad (14)$$

Finally, combining (13) and (14) completes the proof.  $\square$

Next, we let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\ell_\infty$   $(1/t)$ -net of  $\{w \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|w\|_\infty \leq (B_\star + 2)\sqrt{td}\}$ ; explicitly, we define

$$\mathcal{X} = \left\{ [i_j/t]_{j=1}^d : i_j \in \left\{ -\lceil (B_\star + 2)\sqrt{t^3 d} \rceil, \dots, \lceil (B_\star + 2)\sqrt{t^3 d} \rceil \right\} \forall j \right\}.$$

We also let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an  $\ell_\infty$   $1/(t\alpha_t)^2$ -net of  $\{Y \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{d \times d} : |Y(i, j)| \leq 1/\lambda \forall i, j\}$ , where we view the matrices as vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^{d^2}$ ; explicitly, let

$$\mathcal{Y} = \left\{ [i_{j_1, j_2}/(t\alpha_t)^2]_{j_1, j_2=1}^d : i_{j_1, j_2} \in \{0, \dots, \lceil (t\alpha_t)^2/\lambda \rceil\} \forall j_1, j_2 \right\} \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{d \times d}.$$

We then have the following.

**Claim 2.** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 1, for any  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\|w\|_\infty \leq (B_\star + 2)\sqrt{td}$ , there exists  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$  such that*

$$\left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_\tau(g_{w,t}(s'_\tau) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_\tau} g_{w,t}(s'_\tau)) \right\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \leq \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_\tau(g_{x,Y}(s'_\tau) - \mathbb{E}_\tau g_{x,Y}(s'_\tau)) \right\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} + 2.$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $g_{w,t} = g_{w, \Lambda_t^{-1}}$ . Also, by (41) in Section 5.4 and a standard inequality for the spectral norm,  $|\Lambda_t^{-1}(i, j)| \leq \|\Lambda_t^{-1}\|_2 \leq 1/\lambda \forall i, j$ . Hence, we can find  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$  such that

$$|Y(i, j) - \Lambda_t^{-1}(i, j)| \leq 1/(t\alpha_t)^2 \forall i, j.$$

For such  $Y$  and any  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , by Assumption 2, we then obtain

$$|\phi(s, a)^\top (Y - \Lambda_t^{-1}) \phi(s, a)| \leq \sum_{i, j \in [d]} |\phi_i(s, a)| |\phi_j(s, a)| |Y(i, j) - \Lambda_t^{-1}(i, j)| \leq 1/(t\alpha_t)^2,$$

which implies that

$$\|\phi(s, a)\|_Y \leq \sqrt{\phi(s, a)^\top \Lambda_t^{-1} \phi(s, a) + |\phi(s, a)^\top (Y - \Lambda_t^{-1}) \phi(s, a)|} \leq \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} + 1/(t\alpha_t).$$

Hence, by symmetry, we conclude that

$$\alpha_t \left| \|\phi(s, a)\|_Y - \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \right| \leq 1/t. \quad (15)$$

On the other hand, we can clearly find  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\|w - x\|_\infty \leq 1/t$ . Hence, for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{x,Y}(s) - g_{w,t}(s)| &\leq |f_{x,Y}(s) - f_{w,t}(s)| \\ &\leq \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left| \phi(s, a)^\top (x - w) - \alpha_t (\|\phi(s, a)\|_Y - \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}}) \right| \\ &\leq \|w - x\|_\infty + \max_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \alpha_t \left| \|\phi(s, a)\|_Y - \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \right| \leq 2/t, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the first two inequalities hold similar to (45) in Section 5.4, the third uses the triangle and Holder inequalities and Assumption 2, and the fourth is (15). Hence, defining  $\Delta(s) = g_{w,t}(s) - g_{x,Y}(s) \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_{\tau}(g_{w,t}(s'_{\tau}) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\tau}} g_{w,t}(s'_{\tau})) \right\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \\ & \leq \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_{\tau}(g_{x,Y}(s'_{\tau}) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\tau}} g_{x,Y}(s'_{\tau})) \right\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} + \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_{\tau}(\Delta(s'_{\tau}) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\tau}} \Delta(s'_{\tau})) \right\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We can bound the second term as follows:

$$\left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_{\tau}(\Delta(s'_{\tau}) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\tau}} \Delta(s'_{\tau})) \right\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \leq \sum_{\tau=1}^t \|\phi_{\tau}\|_2 |\Delta(s'_{\tau}) - \mathbb{E}_{s'_{\tau}} \Delta(s'_{\tau})| \leq 2,$$

where we used the triangle inequality and (42) from Section 5.4, and  $\|\phi_{\tau}\|_2 \leq 1$  by Assumption 2 and (16), respectively. Finally, since  $g_{x,Y}$  is a deterministic function (unlike  $g_{w,t}$ ), we can use (11) to replace  $\mathbb{E}_{s'_{\tau}}$  by  $\mathbb{E}_{\tau}$  in the first term in (17).  $\square$

Combining the almost-sure inequalities from Claims 1 and 2, and using the main concentration inequality from Abbasi-Yadkori et al. [2011], we can prove the following probabilistic result.

**Claim 3.** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 1, for any  $\delta > 0$ , if we choose  $\alpha_t \geq 2\beta_t(\delta)$ , where*

$$\beta_t(\delta) = \sqrt{2}(B_{\star} + 1) \sqrt{\log \left( \left( \frac{t + \lambda}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}} \frac{4t(1 + 2\lceil (B_{\star} + 2)\sqrt{t^3 d} \rceil)^d (1 + \lceil \frac{(t\alpha_t)^2}{\lambda} \rceil)^{d^2}}{\delta} \right)} + \sqrt{\lambda d}(B_{\star} + 4),$$

then  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_t) \leq \delta / (2(t + 1))^2$ .

*Proof.* First note that by Assumption 2 and  $\lambda \geq 1$ ,  $2 \leq 2\sqrt{2} \leq 2\sqrt{\lambda d}$ . Combined with the definition of  $\mathcal{B}_t$ , Claims 1 and 2, and the union bound, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_t) \leq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}, Y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_{\tau}(g_{x,Y}(s'_{\tau}) - \mathbb{E}_{\tau} g_{x,Y}(s'_{\tau})) \right\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} > \frac{\alpha_t}{2} - \sqrt{\lambda d}(B_{\star} + 4) \right). \quad (18)$$

We next use the assumption on  $\alpha_t$  to loosen the right side of the lower bound. First, we compute

$$|\mathcal{X}| \leq \left( 1 + 2\lceil (B_{\star} + 2)\sqrt{t^3 d} \rceil \right)^d, \quad |\mathcal{Y}| \leq \left( 1 + \lceil (t\alpha_t)^2 / \lambda \rceil \right)^{d^2}. \quad (19)$$

Consequently, we see that

$$\frac{4t(1 + 2\lceil (B_{\star} + 2)\sqrt{t^3 d} \rceil)^d (1 + \lceil \alpha_t^2 t^2 / \lambda \rceil)^{d^2}}{\delta} \geq \frac{4t|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta} \geq \frac{2(t + 1)|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta},$$

where the second inequality is simply  $t \geq 1$ . Also, by (41) in Section 5.4, we know the eigenvalues of  $\Lambda_t$  lie in the interval  $(0, \lambda + t]$ , so

$$(1 + t/\lambda)^{d/2} \geq \sqrt{\det(\Lambda_t) / \det(\lambda I)}.$$

Therefore, the assumed lower bound on  $\alpha_t$  implies that

$$\frac{\alpha_t}{2} - \sqrt{\lambda d}(B_\star + 4) \geq \sqrt{2}(B_\star + 1) \sqrt{\log \left( \sqrt{\frac{\det(\Lambda_t)}{\det(\lambda I)} \frac{2(t+1)|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{\delta}} \right)}$$

Hence, applying [Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011, Theorem 1] with subgaussian constant  $B_\star + 1$  (which holds since  $g_{x,Y}(s_{t+1}) - \mathbb{E}_t g_{x,Y}(s_{t+1})$  are conditionally zero-mean  $[-(B_\star + 1), B_\star + 1]$ -valued random variables by definition of  $g_{x,Y}$ ), we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi_\tau(g_{x,Y}(s'_\tau) - \mathbb{E}_\tau g_{x,Y}(s'_\tau)) \right\|_{\Lambda_\tau^{-1}} > \frac{\alpha_t}{2} - \sqrt{\lambda d}(B_\star + 4) \right) \leq \frac{\delta}{2(t+1)|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}.$$

Finally, substituting into (18) completes the proof.  $\square$

Assuming the lower bound on  $\alpha_t$  in Claim 3 holds for all  $t$ , we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^C) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_t) \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \int_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t^2} = \frac{\delta}{2},$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 1. Hence, it only remains to show that we can choose  $\alpha_t$  as in the lemma statement, such that the lower bound in Claim 3 is satisfied.

**Claim 4.** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 1, there exists  $\iota > 0$  depending only  $\lambda$  such that, for any  $\delta > 0$ , if we choose  $\alpha_t = \iota B_\star d \sqrt{\log(B_\star dt/\delta)} \forall t \in [T]$ , then  $2\beta_t(\delta) \leq \alpha_t \forall t \in [T]$ .*

*Proof.* First observe that since  $B_\star, \lambda \geq 1$  by assumption, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2}(B_\star + 1) &\leq 8B_\star, \quad \sqrt{\lambda d}(B_\star + 4) \leq 8B_\star \sqrt{\lambda d}, \quad (t + \lambda)/\lambda \leq t + 1 \leq 2t \\ 1 + \lceil (t\alpha_t)^2/\lambda \rceil &\leq 2 + (t\alpha_t)^2, \quad 1 + 2 \lceil (B_\star + 2)\sqrt{t^3 d} \rceil \leq 2 + 6B_\star \sqrt{t^3 d} \leq 8B_\star \sqrt{t^3 d}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$2\beta_t(\delta) \leq 16B_\star \left( \sqrt{\log(4t(2t)^{\frac{d}{2}}(8B_\star \sqrt{t^3 d})^d/\delta)} + d\sqrt{\log(2 + (t\alpha_t)^2)} + \sqrt{\lambda d} \right). \quad (20)$$

Since  $B_\star dt \geq 2$  by assumption, we can find an absolute constant  $\iota_1 \geq 1$  such that

$$4t(2t)^{\frac{d}{2}}(8B_\star \sqrt{t^3 d})^d/\delta = 4 \cdot 2^{d/2} 8^d B_\star^d d^{d/2} t^{1+2d}/\delta \leq 64^d (B_\star dt)^{3d}/\delta \leq (B_\star dt/\delta)^{\iota_1^2 d^2}. \quad (21)$$

Again using  $B_\star dt \geq 2$ , we can clearly find  $\iota_2 > 0$  depending only on  $\lambda$  such that

$$\sqrt{\lambda d} \leq \iota_2 d \sqrt{\log(B_\star dt/\delta)}. \quad (22)$$

Now let  $\iota$  be a constant depending only on  $\lambda$  and satisfying

$$\iota \geq 32(\iota_1 + \iota_2), \quad 2 + \iota^2 x^3 \leq x^{(\iota/32)^2} \forall x \geq 2 \quad (23)$$

(clearly such  $\iota$  exists). Then since  $B_\star dt/\delta \geq 2$ , using  $\log x \leq x$ , we obtain

$$2 + (t\alpha_t)^2 \leq 2 + \iota^2 (B_\star dt/\delta)^2 \log(B_\star dt/\delta) \leq 2 + \iota^2 (B_\star dt/\delta)^3 \leq (B_\star dt/\delta)^{(\iota/32)^2}. \quad (24)$$

Hence, combining (20), (21), (22), and (24), we have shown

$$2\beta_t(\delta) \leq \left( 16(\iota_1 + \iota_2) + \frac{\iota}{2} \right) B_\star d \sqrt{\log(B_\star dt/\delta)} \leq \alpha_t,$$

where the second inequality holds by (23) and choice of  $\alpha_t$ .  $\square$

**Remark 8** (Sharpening the tabular case). *In the tabular case,  $\Lambda_t^{-1}$  is diagonal, so we can prove Claim 2 with  $\mathcal{Y}$  replaced by  $\mathcal{Y}' = \{Y \in \mathcal{Y} : Y \text{ is diagonal}\}$ . Then in Claim 3, (19) can be replaced by  $|\mathcal{Y}'| \leq (1 + \lceil (t\alpha_t)^2/\lambda \rceil)^d$ , so we can define  $\beta_t(\delta)$  to have square root (instead of linear) dependence on  $d$ . We can then sharpen  $\alpha_t$ 's dependence in Claim 4 to  $\sqrt{d}$  as well.*

## 5.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Recall from Algorithm 2 that  $M_l$  is the time of the  $l$ -th policy update,  $L$  is the total number of policy updates, and  $T$  is the total number of time steps. We can decompose regret as follows.

**Lemma 2** (Regret decomposition). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$\text{Regret}(K) \leq \sum_{l=2}^L \left( \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t) - J^*(s_{1+M_l}) \right) + dB_* \log_2(2T) + 1,$$

where  $M_{L+1} = T$  by convention.

*Proof.* Since  $M_2 = 1$  in Algorithm 2 and  $c(s_1, a_1) \leq 1$ , we can bound the total cost incurred by

$$\sum_{t=1}^T c(s_t, a_t) \leq 1 + \sum_{l=2}^L \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t).$$

On the other hand, the expected cost for the optimal policy is

$$\sum_{k=1}^K J^*(s_1^k) = \sum_{l=2}^L J^*(s_{1+M_l}) + \left( \sum_{k=1}^K J^*(s_1^k) - \sum_{l=2}^L J^*(s_{1+M_l}) \right).$$

For the term in parentheses, note that for each  $k \in \{2, \dots, K\}$ , the  $k$ -th episode begins at time  $1 + M_l$  for some  $l \in \{2, \dots, L\}$ . Hence, because  $J^*(s_1^k) \geq 0$  and  $J^*(s) \leq B_* \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$ , we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^K J^*(s_1^k) - \sum_{l=2}^L J^*(s_{1+M_l}) \geq -(L - K)B_* \geq -dB_* \log_2(1 + T/\lambda),$$

where the final inequality holds because  $L - K$  is the number of policies that occur at times  $t$  for which  $\det(\Lambda_t) \geq 2\det(\Lambda_{M_l})$ . This can happen at most  $d \log_2(2T)$  times because, by (41) in Section 5.4, and since  $T, \lambda \geq 1$ ,

$$\det(\Lambda_T)/\det(\Lambda_0) = \det(\Lambda_T)/\lambda^d \leq (1 + T/\lambda)^d \leq (2T)^d. \quad \square$$

We bound the summand in Lemma 2 by a martingale difference sequences and sum of bonuses.

**Lemma 3** (Per-policy update regret bound). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, conditioned on the event  $\mathcal{E}$  defined in Lemma 1, for any  $l \in \{2, \dots, L\}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t) - J^*(s_{1+M_l}) &\leq \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} (g_{M_l}(s'_t, w_{M_l}) - \mathbb{E}_t[g_{M_l}(s'_t, w_{M_l})]) \\ &\quad + 3\alpha_{M_l} \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} \|\phi(s_t, a_t)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}}^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where  $M_{L+1} = T$  by convention.



*Proof.* Assume  $\mathcal{E}$  holds and fix  $l \in \{2, \dots, L\}$ . For each  $\tau \in \{1 + M_l, \dots, M_{l+1}\}$ , define

$$\gamma_\tau = \sum_{t=\tau}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t) - f_{M_l}(s_\tau, w_{M_l}).$$

We claim, and will return to prove, that

$$\gamma_\tau \leq \gamma_{\tau+1} + g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l}) - \mathbb{E}_\tau[g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l})] + 3\alpha_{M_l} \|\phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}}^{-1} \quad \forall \tau \in \{1 + M_l, \dots, M_{l+1}\}, \quad (26)$$

where  $\gamma_{M_{l+1}+1} = 0$  when  $\tau = M_{l+1}$  by convention. Assuming (26) holds, we prove the lemma. First, since  $w_{M_l}$  is an OAFP at time  $M_l$ , Definition 1 implies

$$f_{M_l}(s_{1+M_l}, w_{M_l}) \leq J^*(s_{1+M_l}), \quad \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} f_{M_l}(s_{1+M_l}, w_{M_l}) \leq B_\star, \quad \|\hat{G}_{M_l} w_{M_l} - w_{M_l}\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}} \leq \alpha_{M_l}. \quad (27)$$

Using the first inequality in (27), and recursively applying (26), we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t) - J^*(s_{1+M_l}) &\leq \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t) - f_{M_l}(s_{1+M_l}, w_{M_l}) = \gamma_{1+M_l} \leq \dots \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} (g_{M_l}(s'_t, w_{M_l}) - \mathbb{E}_t[g_{M_l}(s'_t, w_{M_l})]) \\ &\quad + 3\alpha_{M_l} \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} \|\phi(s_t, a_t)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}}^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. We return to prove (26). First, for any  $\tau \in \{1 + M_l, \dots, M_{l+1}\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{M_l}(s_\tau, w_{M_l}) &= \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top \hat{G}_{M_l} w_{M_l} + \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top (w_{M_l} - \hat{G}_{M_l} w_{M_l}) - \alpha_{M_l} \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}} \\ &\geq \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top \hat{G}_{M_l} w_{M_l} - 2\alpha_{M_l} \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}} \\ &= \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top U_{M_l} w_{M_l} + \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top E_{M_l} w_{M_l} - 2\alpha_{M_l} \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}} \\ &\geq \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top U_{M_l} w_{M_l} - 3\alpha_{M_l} \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds by the policy update in Algorithm 2, the first inequality holds by Cauchy-Schwarz and the third inequality in (27), the second equality is by definition, and the second inequality holds by Cauchy-Schwarz on  $\mathcal{E}$ . For the first term, by definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top U_{M_l} w_{M_l} &= c(s_\tau, a_\tau) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P(s|s_\tau, a_\tau) g_{M_l}(s, w_{M_l}) \\ &= c(s_\tau, a_\tau) + g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l}) + \mathbb{E}_\tau[g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l})] - g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous two inequalities and rearranging, we obtain

$$c(s_\tau, a_\tau) - f_{M_l}(s_\tau, w_{M_l}) \leq -g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l}) + g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l}) - \mathbb{E}_\tau[g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l})] + 3\alpha_{M_l} \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}}. \quad (28)$$

Now consider two cases:

- If  $\tau = M_{l+1}$ , the left side of (28) is  $\gamma_\tau$ , and since  $s'_\tau = s_{goal}$ ,  $g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l}) = 0$ . Hence, recalling that  $\gamma_{M_{l+1}+1} = 0$  by convention, (28) is equivalent to (26).

- If  $\tau < M_{l+1}$ , then  $s'_\tau = s_{\tau+1}$ . Moreover, by the second inequality in (27), we know that  $g_{M_l}(s, w_{M_l}) \geq f_{M_l}(s, w_{M_l})$  for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Taken together, we can rewrite (28) as

$$\begin{aligned} c(s_\tau, a_\tau) - f_{M_l}(s_\tau, w_{M_l}) &\leq -f_{M_l}(s_{\tau+1}, w_{M_l}) + g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l}) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_t[g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l})] + 3\alpha_{M_l} \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, recalling  $\tau < M_{l+1}$ , we can use the definition of  $\gamma_\tau$  and  $\gamma_{\tau+1}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\tau &= c(s_\tau, a_\tau) - f_{M_l}(s_\tau, w_{M_l}) + \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{M_{l+1}} c(s_t, a_t) - f_{M_l}(s_{\tau+1}, w_{M_l}) + g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l}) - \mathbb{E}_t[g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l})] + 3\alpha_{M_l} \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}} \\ &= \gamma_{\tau+1} + g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l}) - \mathbb{E}_t[g_{M_l}(s'_\tau, w_{M_l})] + 3\alpha_{M_l} \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (26) holds in both cases, which completes the proof.  $\square$

We next bound the martingale difference sequence from Lemma 3.

**Lemma 4** (Martingale difference sequence). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, for any  $\delta > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ ,*

$$\sum_{l=2}^L \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} (g_{M_l}(s'_t, w_{M_l}) - \mathbb{E}_t[g_{M_l}(s'_t, w_{M_l})]) \leq B_\star \sqrt{T \log \frac{8T}{\delta}}.$$

*Proof.* For  $t \in \{2, \dots, T\}$ , let  $l(t)$  be the unique  $l \in \{2, \dots, L\}$  such that  $1 + M_l \leq t \leq M_{l+1}$  and

$$X_t = g_{M_{l(t)}}(s'_t, w_{M_{l(t)}}) - \mathbb{E}_t[g_{M_{l(t)}}(s'_t, w_{M_{l(t)}})].$$

Then since  $M_2 = 1$  in Algorithm 2, we have

$$\sum_{l=2}^L \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} (g_{M_l}(s'_t, w_{M_l}) - \mathbb{E}_t[g_{M_l}(s'_t, w_{M_l})]) = \sum_{t=2}^T X_t.$$

Note  $X_t$  is a martingale difference sequence with  $|X_t| \leq B_\star$ , so by [Rosenberg et al., 2020, Theorem D.1] (an anytime version of Azuma's inequality), we have that  $\sum_{t=2}^T X_t \leq B_\star \sqrt{T \log(8T/\delta)}$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

Finally, we bound the sum of bonuses from Lemma 3.

**Lemma 5** (Sum of bonuses). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$\sum_{l=2}^L \alpha_{M_l} \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} \|\phi(s_t, a_t)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}} \leq 2\alpha_T \sqrt{Td \log(2T)}.$$

*Proof.* As in the proof of Lemma 4, let  $l(t)$  be the unique  $l \in \{2, \dots, L\}$  such that  $1 + M_l \leq t \leq M_{l+1}$ . Then since  $\alpha_t$  is an increasing sequence and  $M_l \leq T \forall l \in \{2, \dots, L\}$ , we have

$$\sum_{l=2}^L \alpha_{M_l} \sum_{t=1+M_l}^{M_{l+1}} \|\phi(s_t, a_t)\|_{\Lambda_{M_l}^{-1}} \leq \alpha_T \sum_{t=2}^T \|\phi(s_t, a_t)\|_{\Lambda_{M_{l(t)}}^{-1}}$$

Furthermore, since  $\det(\Lambda_{t-1})/\det(\Lambda_{M_{l(t)}}) \leq 2$  by definition of  $l(t)$ , [Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011, Lemma 12] implies that  $\Lambda_{M_{l(t)}} - \Lambda_{t-1}/2$  is positive semidefinite, so  $\Lambda_{M_{l(t)}}^{-1} - 2\Lambda_{t-1}^{-1}$  is negative semidefinite, which implies

$$\|\phi(s_t, a_t)\|_{\Lambda_{M_{l(t)}}^{-1}} = \sqrt{\phi(s_t, a_t)^\top \Lambda_{M_{l(t)}}^{-1} \phi(s_t, a_t)} \leq \sqrt{2\phi(s_t, a_t)^\top \Lambda_{t-1}^{-1} \phi(s_t, a_t)} = \sqrt{2} \|\phi(s_t, a_t)\|_{\Lambda_{t-1}^{-1}}. \quad (29)$$

Hence, we have that

$$\sum_{t=2}^T \|\phi(s_t, a_t)\|_{\Lambda_{M_{l(t)}}^{-1}} \leq \sqrt{2} \sum_{t=2}^T \|\phi(s_t, a_t)\|_{\Lambda_{t-1}^{-1}} \leq \sqrt{2T \sum_{t=2}^T \|\phi(s_t, a_t)\|_{\Lambda_{t-1}^{-1}}^2},$$

where the inequality is Cauchy-Schwarz. Finally, by [Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011, Lemma 11],

$$\sum_{t=2}^T \|\phi(s_t, a_t)\|_{\Lambda_{t-1}^{-1}}^2 \leq 2 \log \frac{\det(\Lambda_T)}{\det(\Lambda_0)} \leq 2d \log(2T),$$

where the final inequality is (25) from the proof of Lemma 2. Combining the previous four inequalities completes the proof.  $\square$

We now prove Theorem 1. Fix  $\delta > 0$ . Then by assumption on  $\alpha_t$  and  $\lambda, \mathcal{E}$  and the event in Lemma 4 both occur with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ . We bound regret on the intersection of these events. First, combining Lemmas 2, 3, 4, and 5, and using the definition of  $\alpha_T$ , we obtain

$$\text{Regret}(K) \leq B_\star \sqrt{T \log \frac{8T}{\delta}} + 2\alpha_T \sqrt{Td \log(2T)} + dB_\star \log_2(2T) + 1 \leq \tilde{\iota} \sqrt{B_\star^2 d^3 T \log(B_\star dT/\delta)}, \quad (30)$$

where  $\tilde{\iota} > 0$  is a constant. Next, observe that by the previous inequality and Assumption 2,

$$Tc_{\min} \leq \sum_{t=1}^T c(s_t, a_t) = \text{Regret}(K) + \sum_{k=1}^K J^\star(s_1^k) \leq \tilde{\iota} \sqrt{B_\star^2 d^3 T \log(B_\star dT/\delta)} + KB_\star.$$

Now consider two cases:

- If  $\tilde{\iota} \sqrt{B_\star^2 d^3 T \log(B_\star dT/\delta)} \leq Tc_{\min}/2$ , then by the previous bound,  $\sqrt{T} \leq \sqrt{2KB_\star/c_{\min}}$ .
- Otherwise,  $\sqrt{T} \leq 2\tilde{\iota} \sqrt{B_\star^2 d^3 \log(B_\star dT/\delta)}/c_{\min}$ .

Combining the cases, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T} &\leq \max \left\{ \sqrt{2KB_\star/c_{\min}}, 2\tilde{\iota} \sqrt{B_\star^2 d^3 \log(B_\star dT/\delta)}/c_{\min} \right\} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2KB_\star/c_{\min}} + 2\tilde{\iota} \sqrt{B_\star^2 d^3 \log(B_\star dT/\delta)}/c_{\min} \end{aligned}$$

Combining with the regret upper bound above, we obtain the desired regret bound:

$$\text{Regret}(K) = \tilde{O} \left( \sqrt{\frac{B_\star^3 d^3 K}{c_{\min}}} + \frac{B_\star^3 d^3}{c_{\min}} \right).$$

**Remark 9** (Sharpening the tabular case). From (30), we see that the  $d^{3/2}$  term in the Theorem 1 regret bound arises from the product of  $\alpha_T$  (which has linear dependence on  $d$ ) and  $\sqrt{d}$ . In the tabular case, we can sharpen  $\alpha_T$ 's dependence to  $\sqrt{d}$  (see Remark 8), so the regret bound's dependence becomes linear.

### 5.3 Proof of Theorem 2

We separately prove the results for the two algorithms.

#### 5.3.1 Algorithm 3

By the union bound and Lemma 1, it suffices to prove that on the event  $\mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F}$ , for any  $t \in [T]$ , Algorithm 3 returns on OAFP. The second inequality in (7) trivially holds by the termination criteria of Algorithm 3 (which is guaranteed to occur on  $\mathcal{F}$ ). Because the output of Algorithm 3 is  $\hat{G}_t^n 0$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the fourth inequality follows from (46) in Section 5.4. To prove the remaining inequalities, by definition of  $B_\star$  in Assumption 1, it suffices to show

$$f_t(s, \hat{G}_t^n 0) \leq J^\star(s) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (31)$$

We prove (31) using induction on  $n$ . For  $n = 1$ , by Assumption 2 and definition of  $U_t$  and  $E_t$ , Cauchy-Schwarz and the definition of  $\mathcal{E}$ , and the definition of  $Q^\star$  (2), respectively, we obtain

$$\phi(s, a)^\top \hat{G}_t 0 = \phi(s, a)^\top \theta + \phi(s, a)^\top E_t 0 \leq c(s, a) + \alpha_t \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \leq Q^\star(s, a) + \alpha_t \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}}. \quad (32)$$

Rearranging, taking min over  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , and using the Bellman equation (1) and definition of  $f$ ,

$$f_t(s, \hat{G}_t 0) \leq \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^\star(s, a) = J^\star(s). \quad (33)$$

Assume (31) holds for  $n$ . Then  $f_t(s, \hat{G}_t^n 0) \leq B_\star$  by definition of  $B_\star$ , so by definition and (31),

$$g_t(s, \hat{G}_t^n 0) = \max\{f_t(s, \hat{G}_t^n 0), 0\} \leq J^\star(s) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (34)$$

This implies that for any  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\phi(s, a)^\top U_t(\hat{G}_t^n 0) = c(s, a) + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) g_t(s, \hat{G}_t^n 0) \leq c(s, a) + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) J^\star(s') = Q^\star(s, a).$$

The remainder of the inductive step follows the logic of (32) and (33).

#### 5.3.2 Algorithm 4

By Lemma 1, it suffices to show that on the event  $\mathcal{E}$ , for any  $t \in [T]$ , Algorithm 4 returns on OAFP. Since  $w_t \in [0, B_\star + 1]^d$  in Algorithm 4, the fourth inequality in (7) is immediate, and the third is a consequence of Holder's inequality and Assumption 2:

$$\max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} f_t(s, w_t) \leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top w_t \leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \|\phi(s, a)\|_1 \|w_t\|_\infty \leq B_\star + 1.$$

For the first two inequalities in (7), we begin with a fixed point lemma for  $U_t$ .

**Lemma 6** ( $U_t$  fixed point). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2,  $U_t$  has a fixed point  $w_t^\star \in [0, B_\star + 1]^d$  satisfying*

$$\phi(s, a)^\top w_t^\star \leq Q^\star(s, a) \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}. \quad (35)$$

*Proof.* We first show by induction that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\phi(s, a)^\top U_t^n \mathbf{0} \leq Q^*(s, a) \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}. \quad (36)$$

For  $n = 1$ ,  $\phi(s, a)^\top U_t \mathbf{0} = c(s, a) \leq Q^*(s, a)$  by the definition of  $U_t$  and Assumption 2. Assuming (36) holds for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we obtain that for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$f_t(s, U_t^n \mathbf{0}) \leq \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top U_t^n \mathbf{0} \leq \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a) = J^*(s). \quad (37)$$

This implies (similar to (34)) that  $g_t(s, U_t^n \mathbf{0}) \leq J^*(s)$  as well. Combined with Assumption 2 and the Bellman equations (1), we obtain

$$\phi(s, a)^\top U_t^{n+1} \mathbf{0} = c(s, a) + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) g_t(s', U_t^n \mathbf{0}) \leq c(s, a) + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) J^*(s') = Q^*(s, a),$$

which completes the proof of (36). Next, observe that by Assumption 2,  $w_1 \geq w_2$  implies that  $U_t w_1 \geq U_t w_2$  (componentwise). This further implies (by induction on  $n$ ) that  $\{U_t^n \mathbf{0}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  increases componentwise, so since this sequence is bounded (by Assumption 2), it converges. Let  $w_t^* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_t^n \mathbf{0}$ . Then  $w_t^*$  is a fixed point of  $U_t$  (by continuity of  $U_t$ ) and, letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  on both sides of (36) yields (35). It remains to show that  $w_t^* \in [0, B_* + 1]^d$ . The lower bound holds since  $w_t^*$  is a fixed point and  $U_t$  is nonnegative. For the upper bound, similar to (37) and the logic immediately following,  $g_t(s, w_t^*) \leq J^*(s) \leq B_*$ , which implies

$$w_t^*(i) = (U_t w_t^*)(i) = \theta(i) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu_i(s) g_t(s, w_t^*) \leq 1 + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu_i(s) B_* \leq 1 + B_* \quad \forall i \in [d]. \quad \square$$

We next show that the fixed point from Lemma 6 is close to some element of the  $\varepsilon$ -net  $\mathcal{W}$  from Algorithm 4, and that this element is an approximate fixed point of  $\hat{G}_t$ .

**Lemma 7** ( $\hat{G}_t$  approximate fixed point). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2, on the event  $\mathcal{E}$ , there exists  $w'_t \in \mathcal{W}$  such that*

$$\max \left\{ \|w'_t - w_t^*\|_{\Lambda_t}, \|\hat{G}_t w'_t - w'_t\|_{\Lambda_t} \right\} \leq \alpha_t,$$

where  $w_t^*$  is the fixed point of  $U_t$  from Lemma 6.

*Proof.* Since  $w_t^* \in [0, B_* + 1]^d$  by Lemma 6 and by definition of  $\mathcal{W}$ , we can find  $w'_t \in \mathcal{W}$  such that  $\|w'_t - w_t^*\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ . Hence, by (44) from Section 5.4,

$$\|w'_t - w_t^*\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \sqrt{\lambda d + t} \|w'_t - w_t^*\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\lambda d + t} \varepsilon = \frac{\alpha_t}{4\sqrt{td}}.$$

Combined with (47) from Section 5.4,

$$\|\hat{G}_t w'_t - \hat{G}_t w_t^*\|_{\Lambda_t} + \|w'_t - w_t^*\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq (\sqrt{td} + 1) \|w'_t - w_t^*\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq 2\sqrt{td} \|w'_t - w_t^*\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \frac{\alpha_t}{2}.$$

On the other hand, since  $w_t^*$  is a fixed point of  $U_t$ , on the event  $\mathcal{E}$ , we have

$$\|\hat{G}_t w_t^* - w_t^*\|_{\Lambda_t} = \|\hat{G}_t w_t^* - U_t w_t^*\|_{\Lambda_t} = \|E_t w_t^*\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \frac{\alpha_t}{2}.$$

Combining the above and using the triangle inequality,

$$\|\hat{G}_t w'_t - w'_t\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \|\hat{G}_t w'_t - \hat{G}_t w_t^*\|_{\Lambda_t} + \|\hat{G}_t w_t^* - w_t^*\|_{\Lambda_t} + \|w_t^* - w'_t\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \alpha_t. \quad \square$$

Finally, using Lemma 7, we can prove the first two inequalities in (7). The second holds since  $\mathscr{W}_F \neq \emptyset$  in Algorithm 4 by Lemma 7. For the first, we observe that for any  $s \in S$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f_t(s, w'_t) &= \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left( \phi(s, a)^\top w_t^* + \phi(s, a)^\top (w'_t - w_t^*) - \alpha_t \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \right) \\ &\leq \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left( \phi(s, a)^\top w_t^* + \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \|w'_t - w_t^*\|_{\Lambda_t} - \alpha_t \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \right) \\ &\leq \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top w_t^* \leq \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s, a) = J^*(s), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Cauchy-Schwarz, Lemma 7, and Lemma 6. Hence, because  $w'_t \in \mathscr{W}_F$ ,

$$f_t(s_{t+1}, w_t) = \min_{w \in \mathscr{W}_F} f_t(s_{t+1}, w) \leq f_t(s_{t+1}, w'_t) \leq J^*(s_{t+1}).$$

## 5.4 Other proofs

### 5.4.1 Proof of Proposition 2

Fix  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . For each  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , let  $i(s, a)$  be the unique  $i \in [d]$  such that  $\phi(s, a) = q_i$ . For each  $i \in [d]$ , define  $d_i = |\{\tau \in [t] : i(s_\tau, a_\tau) = i\}|$  and  $\tilde{q}_i = q_i / \|q_i\|_2$ . Let  $D$  be the diagonal matrix with diagonal elements  $\{\lambda + \|q_i\|_2^2 d_i\}_{i=1}^d$ , and let  $\tilde{Q}$  be the orthogonal matrix with columns  $\{\tilde{q}_i\}_{i=1}^d$ . We then have

$$\sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau) \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top = \sum_{i=1}^d d_i q_i q_i^\top = \sum_{i=1}^d \|q_i\|_2^2 d_i \tilde{q}_i \tilde{q}_i^\top.$$

Hence, by orthogonality of  $\tilde{Q}$ , we obtain

$$\Lambda_t = \lambda I + \sum_{\tau=1}^t \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau) \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top = \lambda \sum_{i=1}^d \tilde{q}_i \tilde{q}_i^\top + \sum_{i=1}^d \|q_i\|_2^2 d_i \tilde{q}_i \tilde{q}_i^\top = \sum_{i=1}^d (\lambda + \|q_i\|_2^2 d_i) \tilde{q}_i \tilde{q}_i^\top = \tilde{Q} D \tilde{Q}^\top.$$

This implies that  $\tilde{Q} D \tilde{Q}^\top$  is the eigendecomposition of  $\Lambda_t$ . Since  $D$  is invertible, we obtain

$$\Lambda_t^{-1} = \tilde{Q} D^{-1} \tilde{Q}^\top.$$

Hence, for any  $i \in [d]$  and any  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , since  $\phi(s, a) = \tilde{q}_{i(s,a)} \|q_{i(s,a)}\|_2$ , we have that

$$e_i^\top \tilde{Q}^\top \Lambda_t^{-1} \phi(s, a) = \frac{\tilde{q}_i^\top \tilde{q}_{i(s,a)} \|q_{i(s,a)}\|_2}{\lambda + \|q_i\|_2^2 d_i} = \frac{\mathbb{1}(i(s, a) = i) \|q_{i(s,a)}\|_2}{\lambda + \|q_i\|_2^2 d_i} = \frac{\mathbb{1}(i(s, a) = i) \|q_i\|_2}{\lambda + \|q_i\|_2^2 d_i}.$$

Therefore, by definition of  $\hat{G}_t$ , we have, for any  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$e_i^\top \tilde{Q}^\top \hat{G}_t w = \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\mathbb{1}(i(s_\tau, a_\tau) = i) \|q_i\|_2}{\lambda + \|q_i\|_2^2 d_i} (c(s_\tau, a_\tau) + g_t(s'_\tau, w)). \quad (38)$$

Next, for any  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\tilde{Q}^\top w_1 \geq \tilde{Q}^\top w_2$  and any  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\phi(s, a)^\top w_1 = e_{i(s,a)}^\top \tilde{Q}^\top w_1 \geq e_{i(s,a)}^\top \tilde{Q}^\top w_2 = \phi(s, a)^\top w_2.$$

Subtracting  $\alpha \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}}$  from both sides and taking minimum over  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  implies  $f_t(s, w_1) \geq f_t(s, w_2)$ , so since  $g_t$  (viewed as a function of  $f_t$ ) is increasing, we conclude that

$$g_t(s, w_1) \geq g_t(s, w_2). \quad (39)$$



We next prove by induction that

$$\tilde{Q}^\top(\hat{G}_t^n 0 - \hat{G}_t^{n-1} 0) \geq 0 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (40)$$

For  $n = 1$ ,  $\tilde{Q}^\top \hat{G}_t^0 0 \geq 0$  by (38) and since  $c(s_\tau, a_\tau) \geq 0$  and  $g_t(s'_\tau, 0) = 0$ , so because  $\hat{G}_t^0 0 = 0$  by convention, (40) holds. Assuming (40) holds for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , combining (38) and (39) yields

$$e_i^\top \tilde{Q}^\top(\hat{G}_t^{n+1} 0 - \hat{G}_t^n 0) = \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\mathbb{1}(i(s_\tau, a_\tau) = i) \|q_i\|_2}{\lambda + \|q_i\|_2^2 d_i} \left( g_t(s'_\tau, \hat{G}_t^n 0) - g_t(s'_\tau, \hat{G}_t^{n-1} 0) \right) \geq 0,$$

which completes the proof of (40). Hence,  $\{\tilde{Q}^\top \hat{G}_t^n 0\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a componentwise increasing sequence. By (38) and since  $g_t(s, w) \in [0, B_\star + 1]$  for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and any  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , this sequence is also bounded. Taken together,  $\{\tilde{Q}^\top \hat{G}_t^n 0\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a convergent sequence. Hence, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\hat{G}_t^{n+1} 0 - \hat{G}_t^n 0) = \tilde{Q} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{Q}^\top (\hat{G}_t^{n+1} 0 - \hat{G}_t^n 0) = 0.$$

In the orthonormal case  $\|q_i\|_2 = 1$  (so  $\tilde{q}_i = q_i$ ), we have, for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and any  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|g_t(s, w_1) - g_t(s, w_2)| \leq \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |\phi(s, a)^\top (w_1 - w_2)| = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |e_{i(s,a)}^\top \tilde{Q}^\top (w_1 - w_2)| \leq \|\tilde{Q}^\top (w_1 - w_2)\|_\infty,$$

where we used (45) for the first inequality. Combined with (38), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{Q}^\top (\hat{G}_t w_1 - \hat{G}_t w_2)\|_\infty &= \max_{i \in [d]} \left| e_i^\top \tilde{Q}^\top (\hat{G}_t w_1 - \hat{G}_t w_2) \right| \\ &\leq \max_{i \in [d]} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\mathbb{1}(i(s_\tau, a_\tau) = i)}{\lambda + d_i} \|\tilde{Q}^\top (w_1 - w_2)\|_\infty \\ &= \max_{i \in [d]} \frac{d_i}{\lambda + d_i} \|\tilde{Q}^\top (w_1 - w_2)\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where second equality holds by definition of  $d_i$ . Hence, because  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $\hat{G}_t$  is a contraction with respect to the norm<sup>7</sup>  $\|\cdot\|$  defined by  $\|x\| = \|\tilde{Q}^\top x\|_\infty$ .

#### 5.4.2 Basic inequalities

Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the following hold for any  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , and any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ .

- (Eigenvalue bounds) Let  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$  and  $q_1, \dots, q_d$  be the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $\Lambda_t$ . Then since  $\|q_i\|_2 = 1$  and by Assumption 2 and Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\lambda = \lambda q_i^\top q_i \leq q_i^\top \Lambda_t q_i = \lambda q_i^\top q_i + \sum_{\tau=1}^t (\phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top q_i)^2 \leq \lambda + t \quad \forall i \in [d].$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\lambda_i = q_i^\top (\lambda_i q_i) = q_i^\top (\Lambda_t q_i) \in [\lambda, \lambda + t] \quad \forall i \in [d]. \quad (41)$$

- (Norm equivalences) Using (41), if  $\lambda \geq 1$ , we have

$$\|w\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{(q_i^\top w)^2}{\lambda_i} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d (q_i^\top w)^2}{\lambda} = \frac{\|Qw\|_2^2}{\lambda} = \frac{\|w\|_2^2}{\lambda} \Rightarrow \|w\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \leq \frac{\|w\|_2}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \leq \|w\|_2. \quad (42)$$

<sup>7</sup>While  $\|x\| = \|Ax\|_\infty$  is only a seminorm for general matrices  $A$ , it is a norm for full rank matrices like  $Q$ .

Also if  $\lambda \geq 1$ , by definition of  $\Lambda_t$ , we obviously have

$$\|w\|_2^2 \leq \lambda w^\top w \leq \|w\|_{\Lambda_t}^2. \quad (43)$$

Finally, by a standard norm equivalence, Holder's inequality, and Assumption 2,

$$\|w\|_{\Lambda_t}^2 = \lambda \|w\|_2^2 + \sum_{\tau=1}^t (\phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)^\top w)^2 \leq \lambda d \|w\|_\infty^2 + t \|\phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)\|_1^2 \|w\|_\infty^2 = (\lambda d + t) \|w\|_\infty^2. \quad (44)$$

- (Nonexpansiveness of  $g_t$ ) Let  $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{A}$  be any action attaining the minimum in  $f_t(s, w)$ , i.e.,

$$\bar{a} \in \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left( \phi(s, a)^\top w - \alpha_t \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \right).$$

Then clearly, for any  $w' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_t(s, w) - f_t(s, w') &\geq f_t(s, w) - \left( \phi(s, \bar{a})^\top w' - \alpha_t \|\phi(s, \bar{a})\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \right) \\ &= \phi(s, \bar{a})^\top (w - w') \geq -\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |\phi(s, a)^\top (w - w')|. \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, we also have  $f_t(s, w) - f_t(s, w') \leq \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |\phi(s, a)^\top (w - w')|$ . Hence,

$$|f_t(s, w) - f_t(s, w')| \leq \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |\phi(s, a)^\top (w - w')|.$$

Using this inequality, Holder's, and Assumption 2, and since  $g_t$  "clips"  $f_t$ ,

$$|g_t(s, w) - g_t(s, w')| \leq |f_t(s, w) - f_t(s, w')| \leq \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |\phi(s, a)^\top (w - w')| \leq \|w - w'\|_\infty. \quad (45)$$

- (Bounds on operator) If  $\lambda \geq 1$ , then

$$\sum_{\tau=1}^t \|\Lambda_t^{-1} \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)\|_\infty \leq \sum_{\tau=1}^t \|\Lambda_t^{-1} \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)\|_2 \leq \sum_{\tau=1}^t \|\phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} \leq \sqrt{td},$$

where we used a standard norm equivalence, (43), Cauchy-Schwarz, and [Jin et al., 2020, Lemma D.1]. Hence, by definition of  $g_t$ , the iterates of  $\hat{G}_t$  are uniformly bounded:

$$\|\hat{G}_t^n 0\|_\infty \leq \sum_{\tau=1}^t \|\Lambda_t^{-1} \phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)\|_\infty |c(s_\tau, a_\tau) + g_t(s'_\tau, \hat{G}_t^{n-1} 0)| \leq \sqrt{td}(B_* + 2) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (46)$$

Next, let  $w' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then by (45), a standard norm equivalence, and (43),

$$|g_t(s, w) - g_t(s, w')| \leq \|w - w'\|_\infty \leq \|w - w'\|_2 \leq \|w - w'\|_{\Lambda_t}.$$

Combined with (45), we obtain that  $\hat{G}_t$  is Lipschitz:

$$\|\hat{G}_t w - \hat{G}_t w'\|_{\Lambda_t} \leq \sum_{\tau=1}^t \|\phi(s_\tau, a_\tau)\|_{\Lambda_t^{-1}} |g_t(s'_\tau, w) - g_t(s'_\tau, w')| \leq \sqrt{td} \|w - w'\|_{\Lambda_t}. \quad (47)$$

## References

- Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori, Dávid Pál, and Csaba Szepesvári. Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits. In *NIPS*, volume 11, pages 2312–2320, 2011.
- Dimitri P Bertsekas and John N Tsitsiklis. An analysis of stochastic shortest path problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 16(3):580–595, 1991.
- Qi Cai, Zhuoran Yang, Chi Jin, and Zhaoran Wang. Provably efficient exploration in policy optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1283–1294. PMLR, 2020.
- Alon Cohen, Yonathan Efroni, Yishay Mansour, and Aviv Rosenberg. Minimax regret for stochastic shortest path. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.13056*, 2021.
- 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*, 2020.
- Jiafan He, Dongruo Zhou, and Quanquan Gu. Logarithmic regret for reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.11566*, 2020.
- Thomas Jaksch, Ronald Ortner, and Peter Auer. Near-optimal regret bounds for reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(4), 2010.
- 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, 2020.
- Ian Osband, Benjamin Van Roy, Daniel J Russo, and Zheng Wen. Deep exploration via randomized value functions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(124):1–62, 2019.
- Aviv Rosenberg, Alon Cohen, Yishay Mansour, and Haim Kaplan. Near-optimal regret bounds for stochastic shortest path. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8210–8219. PMLR, 2020.
- Daniel Russo and Benjamin Van Roy. Eluder dimension and the sample complexity of optimistic exploration. In *NIPS*, pages 2256–2264. Citeseer, 2013.
- Jean Tarbouriech, Evrard Garcelon, Michal Valko, Matteo Pirotta, and Alessandro Lazaric. No-regret exploration in goal-oriented reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9428–9437. PMLR, 2020.
- Jean Tarbouriech, Runlong Zhou, Simon S Du, Matteo Pirotta, Michal Valko, and Alessandro Lazaric. Stochastic shortest path: Minimax, parameter-free and towards horizon-free regret. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.11186*, 2021.
- 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, 2020.
- 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.
- Yuanhao Wang, Ruosong Wang, and Sham M Kakade. An exponential lower bound for linearly-realizable mdps with constant suboptimality gap. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.12690*, 2021.

- Chen-Yu Wei, Mehdi Jafarnia Jahromi, Haipeng Luo, and Rahul Jain. Learning infinite-horizon average-reward mdps with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3007–3015. PMLR, 2021.
- Gellert Weisz, Philip Amortila, and Csaba Szepesvári. Exponential lower bounds for planning in mdps with linearly-realizable optimal action-value functions. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 1237–1264. PMLR, 2021.
- Yue Wu, Dongruo Zhou, and Quanquan Gu. Nearly minimax optimal regret for learning infinite-horizon average-reward mdps with linear function approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.07301*, 2021.
- 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.
- Andrea Zanette, David Brandfonbrener, Emma Brunskill, Matteo Pirotta, and Alessandro Lazaric. Frequentist regret bounds for randomized least-squares value iteration. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1954–1964. PMLR, 2020a.
- 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, 2020b.
- Zihan Zhang, Jiaqi Yang, Xiangyang Ji, and Simon S Du. Variance-aware confidence set: Variance-dependent bound for linear bandits and horizon-free bound for linear mixture mdp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.12745*, 2021.
- Dongruo Zhou, Jiafan He, and Quanquan Gu. Provably efficient reinforcement learning for discounted mdps with feature mapping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.13165*, 2020.