

Smoothed Online Learning for Prediction in Piecewise Affine Systems

Adam Block *
MIT

Max Simchowitz†
MIT

Russ Tedrake‡
MIT

Abstract

The problem of piecewise affine (PWA) regression and planning is of foundational importance to the study of online learning, control, and robotics, where it provides a theoretically and empirically tractable setting to study systems undergoing sharp changes in the dynamics. Unfortunately, due to the discontinuities that arise when crossing into different “pieces,” learning in general sequential settings is impossible and practical algorithms are forced to resort to heuristic approaches. This paper builds on the recently developed *smoothed online learning* framework and provides the first algorithms for prediction and simulation in PWA systems whose regret is polynomial in all relevant problem parameters under a weak smoothness assumption; moreover, our algorithms are efficient in the number of calls to an optimization oracle. We further apply our results to the problems of one-step prediction and multi-step simulation regret in piecewise affine dynamical systems, where the learner is tasked with simulating trajectories and regret is measured in terms of the Wasserstein distance between simulated and true data. Along the way, we develop several technical tools of more general interest.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Related Work	5
2	Setting	6
3	Results	7
3.1	Regret for One-Step Prediction in PWA Systems	8
3.2	Guarantees for Simulation Regret	9
4	Analysis	10
4.1	Parameter Recovery	10
4.2	Mode Prediction	11
5	Discussion	13
I	General Tools	17
A	Notation	17
B	Lower Bounds	17
B.1	Proof of Proposition 1	17
B.2	A Lower Bound for Identification	18

*ablock@mit.edu

†msimchow@csail.mit.edu

‡russt@mit.edu

C	Properties of Smoothness	19
C.1	Directional Smoothness of Gaussians and Uniform Distributions	19
C.2	Directional Smoothness Equivalent to Lebesgue Density	20
C.3	Concatenation Preserves Directional Smoothness	20
C.4	Smoothness of Parameters Induces Separation	21
II	Supporting Proofs	22
D	Parameter Recovery	22
D.1	Disagreement Covers	23
D.2	Lower Bounding the Covariance	25
D.3	Small Ball Inequality	28
D.4	Upper Bounding the Empirical Error	31
D.5	Proof of Theorem 12	37
E	Modifying the Classifier and Mode Prediction	39
E.1	Look-ahead Classification Error	41
E.2	Bounding Permutation Disagreement and Term_1	44
F	Proving Theorem 3	45
G	Application to PWA Dynamical Systems	48
G.1	Proof of Lemma 3.1	48
G.2	Formal Simulation Regret Setup	48
G.3	Algorithm Modifications	48
G.4	Formal Guarantees for Simulation Regret	49
G.5	Extensions	52

1 Introduction

A central problem in the fields of online learning, control, and robotics is how to efficiently plan through piecewise-affine (PWA) systems. Such systems are described by a finite set of disjoint regions in state-space, within which the dynamics are affine. In this paper, we consider the related problem of learning to make predictions in PWA systems when the dynamics are unknown. While recent years have seen considerable progress around our understanding of linear control systems, the vast majority of dynamics encountered in practical settings involve nonlinearities. Learning and predicting in nonlinear systems is typically far more challenging because, unlike their linear counterparts, the dynamics in a local region of a nonlinear system do not determine its global dynamics.

PWA systems allow for discontinuities across the separate regions (“pieces”), and are thus a simplified way of modeling rich phenomena that arise in numerous robotic manipulation and locomotion tasks [Mason, 2001, Van Der Schaft and Schumacher, 2007, Marcucci and Tedrake, 2019], with one example among many being the modeling of dynamics involving contact. In addition, deep neural networks with ReLU activation [Goodfellow et al., 2016] are PWA systems, providing further motivation for their study. Already, there is a computational challenge simply in optimizing an objective over these systems, which is the subject of much of the previous literature. Here, we take a statistical perspective, assuming that we have access to effective heuristic algorithms for this optimization task. Uniformly accurate learning of the dynamics across all pieces may be impossible because some regions of space may require onerous exploration to locate (see Proposition 10); thus, we instead consider an iterative prediction setting, where at times $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, the learner predicts the subsequent system state. From this, we extend to prediction of entire trajectories: over episodes $t = 1, \dots, T$, a learner suggests a policy π_t , and the learner attempts to learn the dynamics so as to minimize prediction error along the trajectory π_t induces. This is motivated by iterative learning control, where our notion of error is an upper bound on the discrepancy between the planner’s estimate of policy performance and the ground truth.

Our iterative formulation of the learning problem is equivalent to the regret metric favored by the online learning community, and which has seen application to online/adaptive control and filtering problems in recent work. Importantly, our sense of regret does not require uniform identification of system parameters, as we observe that it may actually be impossible in certain settings. The key pathology here is that policies can oscillate across the boundary of two regions, accruing significant prediction error due to sharp discontinuities of the dynamics between said regions, a problem well-known to the online learning community [Littlestone, 1988]. Moreover, this pathology is not merely a theoretical artifact: discontinuities and non-smoothness pose significant challenges to planning and modeling contact-rich dynamics such as those encountered in robotic manipulation [Suh et al., 2022a,b, Posa et al., 2014].

Our solution takes inspiration from, and establishes a connection between, two rather different fields. Recent work in the robotics and control communities has relied on *randomized smoothing* to improve planning across discontinuous and non-smooth dynamics [Suh et al., 2022a,b, Lidec et al., 2022, Pang et al., 2022]. Additionally, in recent years, the online learning community has studied the *smoothed online learning setting* [Rakhlin et al., 2011, Haghtalab et al., 2021, 2022, Block et al., 2022, Block and Simchowitz, 2022], which circumvents the threshold-effect pathologies like the one described above. We show that, if the dynamics and the control inputs are subject to randomized smoothing, it is indeed possible to achieve low regret. More importantly, our proposed no-regret algorithm is *efficient* in terms of the number of calls to an optimization oracle, a popular notion of computational efficiency in the online learning community [Hazan and Koren, 2016, Kalai and Vempala, 2005, Block et al., 2022, Haghtalab et al., 2022]. In our setting, the optimization oracle required finds the *best-fit* PWA system to a batch of given data. Though this problem is, in general, computationally infeasible [Amaldi and Mattavelli, 2002], there is a rich literature of popular heuristics [Garulli et al., 2012, Paoletti et al., 2007, Ferrari-Trecate et al., 2003]. Unlike those works, this paper examines the *statistical challenges* of generalization to novel data given such an algorithm. We note that the randomized smoothing approach is, in some sense, canonical in mitigating the aforementioned pathology of policies that oscillate across the boundaries of two regions; smoothing prohibits precisely this pathology by ensuring that the system state is mostly far from these boundaries.

Contributions. A formal description of our setting is deferred to Section 2. Informally, we consider the problem of prediction in a PWA system over a horizon of T steps, where the regions are determined by intersections of halfspaces; we obtain prediction in PWA dynamical systems as a special case. We aim to achieve sublinear-in- T excess square-loss error (*regret*) of $O(T^{1-\alpha})$ with respect to the optimal predictor which knows the system dynamics, where $\alpha > 0$ is constant and the prefactor on the regret is at most polynomial in all of the problem parameters. Our result is derived from a general guarantee for online piecewise affine regression, which subsumes the online PWA identification setting.

We show that, when the dynamics and the control inputs are subject to randomized smoothing satisfying the σ_{dir} -directional smoothness condition introduced by Block and Simchowitz [2022], our regret bound is polynomial in σ_{dir} , dimension, and other natural problem parameters. We emphasize that we have made no effort to optimize either the polynomial dependence on the parameters or the exponent on the horizon; the goal of this work is to demonstrate that smoothness allows for oracle-efficient algorithms that achieve this polynomial dependence in the difficult setting of PWA systems. We further note that if we care only about low regret without regard to oracle efficiency, a simple discretization scheme coupled with a standard learning from experts algorithm [Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006] can achieve low-regret; because we wish for an oracle-efficient algorithm, the problem is significantly more challenging.

As a further application, we adapt our algorithm to make predictions, at each time t , of the trajectory comprising the next H steps in the evolution of the dynamical system. We bound the *simulation regret*, the cumulative error in Wasserstein distance between the distribution of our proposed trajectory and that of the actual trajectory. Assuming a Lyapunov condition, we demonstrate that our modified algorithm achieves simulation regret $O(\text{poly}(H) \cdot T^{1-\alpha})$, which allows for efficient simulation.

Key challenges. As noted above, vanishing regret in our setting is impossible without directional smoothness due to discontinuity in the regressors between different regions. The key challenge is to leverage smoothness to mitigate the effect of these discontinuities. Note that, if the learner were to observe the region in addition to the state, regression would be easy by decomposing the problem into K separate affine regression instances; the difficulty is in mimicking this approach *without explicit labels indicating which points are in which regions*. As described below, we adopt a natural, epoch-based approach by calling the optimization oracle between epochs, estimating the underlying system, and using this estimate to assign points to regions in the subsequent epoch. This introduces three new challenges. First, we need to control the performance of our oracle on the regression task, which we term *parameter recovery* below. Second, we must enforce consistency between regions learned in different epochs, so that we can predict the correct regions for subsequent covariates; doing this necessitates an intricate analysis of how the estimated parameters evolve between epochs. Finally, we need to modify the output of our oracle to enforce low regret with respect to the classification problem of correctly predicting which mode we are in on as yet unseen data. Each of these challenges requires substantial technical effort to overcome, as summarized below.

Our techniques. Our algorithm proceeds in epochs, at the end of each of which we compute a best-fitting piecewise affine approximation to available data by calling the Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM) oracle (defined in Assumption 1). The analysis of this best-fit shows that we recover the parameters and decision boundaries of the associated regions (“pieces”) frequently visited during that epoch. By the pigeonhole principle, this ultimately covers all regions visited at a non-negligible number of times t over the horizon T . Here, we leverage a careful analysis based on two modern martingale-least squares techniques: the self-normalized concentration bound [Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2011] for establishing recovery in a norm induced by within-region empirical covariance matrices, and the block-martingale small-ball method [Simchowitz et al., 2018] to lower-bound the smallest eigenvalues of empirical covariances with high probability. In addition, we introduce and bound a new complexity parameter, the *disagreement cover*, in order to make our statements uniform over the set of possible decision boundaries.

After the estimation phase, each epoch uses this estimate to make predictions on new data as it arrives. The key challenge is classifying the region to which each newly observed data point belongs. Without smoothing, this can be particularly treacherous, as points on or near to the boundary of regions can be easily be misclassified, and the correct predictions are discontinuous. To leverage smoothing, we propose a reduction to online convex optimization on the hinge loss with lazy updates and show, through a careful decomposition of the loss, that our classification error can be controlled in terms of the assumed directional smoothness. Combining this bound on the classification error with the parameter recovery described in the preceding paragraph yields our sublinear regret guarantee.

We instantiate one-step prediction as a special case of the more general online linear regression problem, showing that the approach described above immediately applies to the first problem under consideration. Finally, in order to simulate trajectories, we use the learned parameters in the epoch to predict the next H steps of the evolution. We then use the fact that our main algorithm recovers the parameters defining the PWA system to show that simulation regret is bounded, which solves the second main problem and allows for simulation in such systems.

1.1 Related Work

System Identification. System-identification refers to the estimation of the governing equations of a dynamical system. The special case of linear dynamical systems has been studied for decades [Ljung, 1999, Ljung and Wahlberg, 1992, Deistler et al., 1995], and more recent work has provided finite-sample statistical analyses in various regimes of interest [Simchowitz et al., 2018, Dean et al., 2020, Oymak and Ozay, 2019, Tsiamis and Pappas, 2019, Tsiamis et al., 2022]. Estimation for non-linear systems has proven more challenging, and has been studied most in the setting where the dynamics involve a known and smooth nonlinearity [Mania et al., 2020, Sattar and Oymak, 2022, Foster et al., 2020], or where only the observation model is nonlinear [Dean and Recht, 2021, Mhammedi et al., 2020]. Sattar et al. [2021] study *Markov jump systems*, where the system dynamics alternate between one of a finite number of linear systems (“modes”), and switches between modes are governed by a (discrete) Markov chain. PWA systems are thus an attractive intermediate step between the too simple linear setting and the intractably complex general case. To our knowledge, we are the first work to tackle piecewise affine dynamics in full generality, where the system mode is determined by the system state.

Heuristics for PWA System Identification. Despite its worst-case computational intractability [Amaldi and Mattavelli, 2002], there is a rich literature of heuristic algorithms for computing the best-fit PWA system to data; see the surveys Garulli et al. [2012] and Paoletti et al. [2007], which compare various approaches, notably the clustering method due to Ferrari-Trecate et al. [2003]. These references focus strictly on the *algorithmic* facets of computing a best-fit given an existing data set. We instead abstract the computation of a best-fit into an ERM oracle in order to focus on the *statistical* considerations.

Online Learning and Smoothing. The study of online learning is now classical, with a small sample of early works including Littlestone [1988], Freund and Schapire [1999b,a]. More recently, a general theory of online learning matching that which we have in the statistical learning setting was built up in Rakhlin et al. [2011], Rakhlin and Sridharan [2013], Rakhlin et al. [2015], Block et al. [2021], with Rakhlin and Sridharan [2014] characterizing the minimax regret of online regression. Due to the robustness and generality of this adversarial model, many problems that are trivial to learn in the statistical setting become impossible in the adversarial regime. Thus, some work [Rakhlin et al., 2011, Haghtalab et al., 2021, 2022, Block et al., 2022] has sought to constrain the adversary to be *smooth*, in the sense that the adversary is unable to concentrate its actions on worst-case points. Of these, most relevant to the current work is Block and Simchowitz [2022], which introduces the notion of directional smoothness to control the regret in a realizable, online classification problem.

Online Learning for Control. In addition to the recent advances in finite-sample system identification, a vast body of work has studied control tasks from the perspective of regret [see, e.g. Abbasi-Yadkori and Szepesvári [2011], Agarwal et al. [2019], Simchowitz et al. [2020], Simchowitz and Foster [2020], Cohen et al. [2018]]. While we do not consider a control objective in this work, we share with these works the performance metric of regret. Our work is more similar in spirit to online prediction in control settings [Hazan et al., 2017, Tsiamis et al., 2020], in that we also consider the task of next-step predictions under a system subject to control inputs.

Smoothing in RL and Control. One interpretation of the online smooth learning setting is that well-conditioned random noise is injected into the adversary’s decisions. Thus, one’s predictions (or in the control setting, estimates) converge attain zero regret under these noise-smoothed dynamics. It is well known that such noise injection can be viewed as a form of regularization [Duchi et al., 2012], and recent recent work in the robotics literature has shown that randomized smoothing improves the landscape in various robotic planning and control tasks [Suh et al., 2022a,b, Lidec et al., 2022, Pang et al., 2022]. More broadly, randomization has been popular for computation of zeroth-order estimates of gradients, notably via the acclaimed policy-gradient computation Williams [1992].

2 Setting

In this section, we formally describe the problem setting of online PWA regression. We suppose there is a ground truth classifier $g_\star : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [K]$ and matrices $\{\Theta_i^\star \mid i \in [K]\}$ and $\Theta_i^\star \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (d+1)}$ such that

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \Theta_{i_t}^\star \cdot \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t + \mathbf{e}_t + \boldsymbol{\delta}_t, \quad i_t = g^\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t), \quad \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t = [\mathbf{x}_t^\top | 1]^\top, \quad \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_t\| \leq \varepsilon_{\text{crp}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are covariates, $\mathbf{y}_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are responses, $\mathbf{e}_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are zero-mean noise vectors in \mathbb{R}^m , $\boldsymbol{\delta}_t$ are (small) non-stochastic corruptions with norm at most $\varepsilon_{\text{crp}} \ll 1$, and $i_t \in [K]$ are the regression modes, which depend on the covariates \mathbf{x}_t . The extension to $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$ accomodates affine regressors. We suppose that the learner has access to pairs $(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{y}_t)$ but, critically, does not know the regression modes i_t . We do however suppose that g_\star is an *affine classifier*; that is

$$g^\star \in \mathcal{G} = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \mapsto \arg \max_{1 \leq i \leq K} \langle \mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle + b_i \mid \mathbf{w}_i \in S^{d-1}, b_i \in [-C, C] \right\}, \quad (2.2)$$

where S^{d-1} is the unit sphere. It can be shown that many natural physical systems are indeed modeled as PWA with affine boundaries [Marcucci and Tedrake, 2019], and the closed loop dynamics for model-predictive control (MPC) in these cases is also a PWA system [Borrelli et al., 2017]. We will assume throughout access to an empirical risk minimization oracle, ERMORACLE, which satisfies the following guarantee:

Assumption 1 (ERMORACLE guarantee). *Given data $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{1:s}, \mathbf{y}_{1:s})$, ERMORACLE returns $\{\hat{\Theta}_i \mid i \in [K]\}$, \hat{g} satisfying*

$$\sum_{t=1}^s \left\| \hat{\Theta}_{\hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\|^2 - \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}, \{\Theta_i \mid i \in [K]\}} \sum_{t=1}^s \left\| \Theta_{g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\|^2 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{orac}}. \quad (2.3)$$

As noted, while such an oracle is necessarily not computationally efficient in the worst case [Amaldi and Mattavelli, 2002], there are many popular heuristics that are used in practical situations (see e.g. Ferrari-Trecate et al. [2003], or [Garulli et al., 2012] and references therein). The learner aims to construct an algorithm, efficient with respect to the above oracle, that at each time step t produces $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_t$ such that

$$\text{Reg}_T := \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \hat{\mathbf{y}}_t - \Theta_{g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)}^\star \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2 = o(T). \quad (2.4)$$

This notion of regret is standard in the online learning community and, as we shall see, immediately leads to bounds on prediction error.

Directional Smoothness. As previously mentioned, without further restriction, sublinear regret is infeasible, as formalized in the following proposition:

Proposition 1. *In the above setting, there exists an adversary with $m = d = 1$, $K=2$, that chooses Θ^\star and g_\star , as well as $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_T$ such that any learner experiences*

$$\mathbb{E} [\text{Reg}_T] \geq \frac{T}{2}.$$

Proposition 1 follows from a construction of a system where there is a discontinuity across a linear boundary, across which the states \mathbf{x}_t oscillate. The bound is then a consequence of the classical fact that online classification with linear thresholds suffers linear regret; see Appendix B.1 for a formal proof, included for the sake of completeness. Crucially, a discontinuity in the dynamics necessitates an $\Omega(1)$ contribution to regret each time the decision boundary is incorrectly determined. To avoid this pathology, we suppose that the contexts are smooth; however, because standard smoothness [Haghtalab et al., 2020] leads to regret that is exponential in dimension [Block and Simchowitz, 2022], we instead consider a related condition, “directional smoothness,” proposed by Block and Simchowitz [2022].

Definition 2 (Definition 52 from Block and Simchowitz [2022]). *Given a scalar $\sigma_{\text{dir}} > 0$, a random vector \mathbf{x} is called σ_{dir} -directionally smooth if for all $\mathbf{w} \in S^{d-1} := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|w\| = 1\}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\delta > 0$, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P} (|\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x} \rangle - c| \leq \delta) \leq \frac{\delta}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}. \quad (2.5)$$

Algorithm 1 Main Algorithm

- 1: **Initialize** Epoch length E , Classifiers $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^0 = (\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0})$, margin parameter $\gamma > 0$, learning rate $\eta > 0$
 - 2: **for** $\tau = 1, 2, \dots, T/E$ **do** (% iterate over epochs)
 - 3: $\left\{ (\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i})_{1 \leq i \leq K}, \hat{g}_\tau \right\} \leftarrow \text{ERMORACLE}((\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{1:\tau E}, \mathbf{y}_{1:\tau E}))$
 - 4: $\hat{g}_\tau \leftarrow \text{Reorder} \left(\hat{g}_\tau, \left(\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq K}, \left(\hat{\Theta}_{\tau-1,i} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq K} \right)$
 - 5: $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^{\tau E} \leftarrow \text{OGD}(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^{(\tau-1)E}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{(\tau-1)E:\tau E}; \hat{g}_\tau, \gamma, \eta)$
 - 6: Let $\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \arg \max_{1 \leq i \leq K} \langle \mathbf{w}_i^{\tau E}, \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle$ denote classifier induced by $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^{\tau E}$.
 - 7: **for** $t = \tau E, \dots, (\tau + 1)E - 1$ **do**
 - 8: **Receive** $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$, and **predict** $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_t = \hat{\Theta}_{\tau, \tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$
 - 9: **Receive** \mathbf{y}_t
-

For a comparison between directional and standard smoothness, consult [Block and Simchowitz \[2022\]](#). As an example, for any vector \mathbf{z}_t , if $\mathbf{w}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \mathbf{I})$, then $\mathbf{z}_t + \mathbf{w}_t$ is $\frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$ -directionally smooth; see [Appendix C.1](#) for a proof and examples of directional smoothness for other noise distributions. Crucially, directional smoothness is *dimension-independent*, in contradistinction to standard smoothness, where we would only have $\Theta(\sigma_{\text{dir}}^d)$ -smoothness (in the standard sense) in the previous example. Like prior work on smoothed online learning, we require our smoothness condition to hold conditionally:

Assumption 2. Let \mathcal{F}_t denote the filtration generated by $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_t$. For all times t , \mathbf{x}_t conditional on \mathcal{F}_{t-1} is σ_{dir} -directionally smooth.

Further Assumptions. Next, we make two standard assumption for sequential regression, one controlling the tail of the noise and the other the magnitude of the parameters.

Assumption 3. Let \mathcal{F}_t^y denote the filtration generated by \mathcal{F}_t and $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{t-1}$ (equivalently, by \mathcal{F}_t and $\mathbf{y}_t, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{t-1}$). For all t , it holds that \mathbf{e}_t is ν^2 -sub-Gaussian conditioned on \mathcal{F}_t^y ; in particular, \mathbf{e}_t is conditionally zero mean.

Assumption 4. We suppose that for all $1 \leq t \leq T$, $\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t\| \leq B$ and, furthermore, $\|\Theta_i^*\|_{\text{F}} \leq R$ for all i . We will further assume that [ERMORACLE](#) always returns $\hat{\Theta}_i$ such that $\|\hat{\Theta}_i\|_{\text{F}} \leq R$.

Finally, we assume that the true affine parameters are well-separated:

Assumption 5. There is some $\Delta_{\text{sep}} > 0$ such that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq K$, it holds that

$$\|\Theta_i^* - \Theta_j^*\|_{\text{F}} \geq \Delta_{\text{sep}}. \quad (2.6)$$

We remark that [Assumption 5](#) is, in some sense, generic. Indeed, in the original smoothed analysis of algorithms [[Spielman and Teng, 2004](#)], it was assumed that the parameter matrices were smoothed by Gaussian noise; if, in addition to smoothness in contexts \mathbf{x}_t we assume that the Θ_i^* are drawn from a directionally smooth distribution, then [Proposition 11](#) below implies that with probability at least $1 - T^{-1}$, it holds that $\Delta_{\text{sep}} \gtrsim md \left(\frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}{K^2 T} \right)^{\frac{1}{md}}$. Furthermore, one reason why removing the gap assumption is difficult in our framework is that, computationally speaking, agnostically learning halfspaces is hard [[Guruswami and Raghavendra, 2009](#)]. Without [Assumption 5](#), [ERMORACLE](#) cannot reliably separate modes and thus the postprocessing steps our main algorithm ([Algorithm 1](#)) used to stabilize the predictions must also agnostically learn the modes; together with the previous observation on the difficulty of learning halfspaces, this suggests that if [ERMORACLE](#) is unable to separate modes, there is significant technical difficulty in achieving an oracle-efficient, no-regret algorithm. We defer the formal setting of one-step prediction and simulation regret to [Sections 3.1](#) and [3.2](#).

3 Results

We propose [Algorithm 1](#), an oracle-efficient protocol with provably sublinear regret and polynomial dependence on all problem parameters. [Algorithm 1](#) runs in epochs: at the beginning of epoch τ , the learner calls [ERMORACLE](#) on

the past data to produce \hat{g}_τ and the set of matrices $\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i}$. A major challenge is identifying the same affine regions between epochs. To this end, the learner then adjusts \hat{g}_τ to preserve consistency in labels across epochs, as explained informally in Section 4.2 and in greater detail in Appendix E.

The learner then runs online gradient descent (Algorithm 2) on the hinge loss to produce a modified classifier \tilde{g}_τ ; finally, throughout the epoch, the learner uses $\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i}$ and \tilde{g}_τ to predict \hat{y}_t before repeating the process in the next epoch. The reason for using a secondary algorithm to transform \hat{g}_τ into \tilde{g}_τ is to enforce stability of the predictor across epochs, which is necessary to bound the regret. Again, we suppose that Assumption 1 holds throughout.

We have the following result:

Theorem 3 (Regret Bound). *Suppose we are in the setting of online PWA regression (2.1) and Assumptions 2-5 hold. Then, if the parameters E, γ, η are set as in (F.6), it holds that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\text{Reg}_T \leq \text{poly} \left(d, \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}, m, B, R, K, \nu, \frac{1}{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}, \log(1/\delta) \right) \cdot T^{1-\Omega(1)} + \varepsilon_{\text{orac}} \cdot T + K^2 \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T \|\delta_t\|, \quad (3.1)$$

where the polynomial dependence is given in (F.7).

Remark 1. While Theorem 3 requires that we are correctly setting the parameters of the algorithm, aggregation algorithms allow us to tune these parameters in an online fashion (see, e.g. Hazan and Seshadhri [2009]).

Remark 2. We observe that the misspecification errors δ_t could also be viewed as indicators corresponding to the $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$ being in small, rarely visited regions; thus, we could run an underspecified ERMORACLE, with $K' \ll K$ modes and recover a regret bound depending only on “large” modes.

Observe that in the simple setting where $\varepsilon_{\text{crp}} = \varepsilon_{\text{orac}} = 0$, we obtain exactly the polynomial, no-regret rates promised in the introduction. Along the way to proving our regret bound, we establish that ERMORACLE correctly recovers the linear parameters within the modes, assuming sufficiently many examples from that mode have been observed.

Theorem 4 (Parameter Recovery). *Suppose that Assumptions 2-4 hold and let $\{\hat{\Theta}_i | i \in [K]\}$, \hat{g} denote the output of ERMORACLE($\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{1:T}, \mathbf{y}_{1:T}$) and $I_{ij}(\hat{g})$ denote the set of times t such that $\hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i$ and $g_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = j$. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ such that*

$$|I_{ij}(\hat{g})| \geq \text{poly} \left(K, B, \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}, \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \cdot T^{1-\Omega(1)},$$

it holds that

$$\|\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*\|_{\text{F}}^2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{T}}{|I_{ij}(\hat{g})|} \cdot \text{poly} \left(K, B, \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}, R, d, m, \nu, \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right).$$

Above we have given the result with the assumption that $\varepsilon_{\text{crp}} = \varepsilon_{\text{orac}} = 0$ for the sake of presentation; in the formal statement, the fully general case is stated. Theorem 4 implies that directional smoothness is sufficient to guarantee parameter recovery at a parametric rate, in marked distinction to most adversarial learning regimes. Note that this recovery result also implies mode recovery up to a permutation, due to separation. Before providing more detail on the algorithm and its analysis in Section 4, we discuss our two main applications.

3.1 Regret for One-Step Prediction in PWA Systems

A direct application of our main result is online prediction in piecewise affine systems. Consider the following dynamical system with state $\mathbf{z}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ and input $\mathbf{u}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u}$:

$$\mathbf{z}_{t+1} = \mathbf{A}_{i_t}^* \mathbf{z}_t + \mathbf{B}_{i_t}^* \mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{m}_{i_t}^* + \mathbf{e}_t, \quad i_t = g^*(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{u}_t). \quad (3.2)$$

Substitute $\Theta_i^* := [\mathbf{A}_i \mid \mathbf{B}_i \mid \mathbf{m}_i]$ and define the concatenations $\mathbf{x}_t = [\mathbf{z}_t \mid \mathbf{u}_t]$ and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t = [\mathbf{x}_t \mid 1]$. The following lemma, proven in Appendix G.1, gives sufficient conditions on the system noise \mathbf{e}_t and structure of the control inputs \mathbf{u}_t under which \mathbf{x}_t is directionally smooth.

Lemma 3.1. Let \mathcal{F}_t denote the filtration generated by $\mathbf{x}_t = [\mathbf{z}_t \mid \mathbf{u}_t]$. Suppose that $\mathbf{e}_{t-1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ is σ_{dir} smooth, and that in addition, $\mathbf{u}_t = \bar{\mathbf{K}}_t \mathbf{x}_t + \bar{\mathbf{u}}_t + \bar{\mathbf{e}}_t$, where $\bar{\mathbf{K}}_t$ and $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_t$ are \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable¹, and $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \mathbf{e}_t$ is σ_{dir} -directionally smooth. Then, $\mathbf{x}_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ is $\sigma_{\text{dir}} / \sqrt{(1 + \|\bar{\mathbf{K}}_t\|_{\text{op}})^2 + 1}$ -directionally smooth.

Directionally smooth noise distributions, such as Gaussians, are common in the study of online control [Dean et al., 2020, Simchowitz et al., 2020], and the smoothing condition on the input can be achieved by adding fractionally small noise, as is common in many reinforcement learning domains, such as to compute gradients in policy learning [Sutton et al., 1999] or for Model Predictive Path Integral (MPPI) Control [Williams et al., 2015].

Throughout, we keep the notation for compactly representing our parameters by letting $\Theta_i^* = [\mathbf{A}_i^* \mid \mathbf{B}_i^* \mid \mathbf{m}_i^*]$, the estimate at time t be $\hat{\Theta}_{t,i} = [\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{t,i} \mid \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{t,i} \mid \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{t,i}]$, and covariates $\mathbf{x}_t = (\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{u}_t)$. We let \mathcal{F}_t denote the filtration generated by $\mathbf{x}_{1:t}$, and note that \mathbf{e}_t is \mathcal{F}_{t+1} -measurable.

Assumption 6 (Boundedness). *The covariates and parameters, as defined above, satisfy Assumption 4.*

Assumption 7 (SubGaussianity and Smoothness so as to satisfy Lemma 3.1). *We assume that*

- $\mathbf{e}_t \mid \mathcal{F}_t$ is σ_{dir} -directionally smooth
- $\mathbf{u}_t = \bar{\mathbf{K}}_t \mathbf{x}_t + \bar{\mathbf{u}}_t + \bar{\mathbf{e}}_t$, where $\bar{\mathbf{K}}_t$ and $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_t$ are \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable and $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \mathbf{e}_t$ is σ_{dir} -directionally smooth.

Further, we assume that $\mathbf{e}_t \mid \mathcal{F}_t$ is ν^2 -subGaussian.

Under these assumptions, we can apply our main result, Theorem 3, to bound the one-step prediction error in PWA systems. In particular, we have the following:

Theorem 5 (One-Step Regret in PWA Systems). *Suppose that $\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{u}_t$ evolve as in (3.2) with the attendant notation defined therein. Suppose further that Assumptions 5, 6, and 7 hold and that at each time t , the learner predicts $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{t+1}$ with the aim of minimizing the cumulative square loss with respect to the correct \mathbf{z}_{t+1} . If the learner applies Algorithm 1 to this setting, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the learner experiences regret at most*

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\mathbf{z}_{t+1} - \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{t+1}\|^2 \leq T\nu^2 + \text{poly} \left(d, \frac{\sqrt{1 + (1 + \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|\bar{\mathbf{K}}_t\|_{\text{op}})^2}}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}, m, B, R, K, \nu, \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \cdot T^{1-\Omega(1)}$$

where the exact polynomial dependence is given in Theorem 16.

Proof. The result follows from applying Lemma 3.1 to demonstrate directional smoothness and using Assumptions 7 and 6 and smoothness to apply Theorem 3. \blacksquare

3.2 Guarantees for Simulation Regret

We now describe an extension of the one-step prediction desideratum to a notion of H -step prediction; more formal description is detailed in Appendix G.2. The learning process occurs in *episodes* $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, consisting of steps $h = 1, 2, \dots, H$. In each episode, an external planner provides the learner a policy π_t . For simplicity, we assume that $\pi_t = (\mathbf{u}_{t,1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{t,H})$ is *open loop* (state-independent) and stochastic, mimicking situations such as model predictive control; extensions are mentioned in Appendix G.5. With each episode, the true dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_{t,h+1} &= \mathbf{A}_{i_{t,h}}^* \mathbf{z}_t + \mathbf{B}_{i_{t,h}}^* \mathbf{u}_{t,h} + \mathbf{m}_{i_{t,h}}^* + \mathbf{e}_{t,h} \\ i_{t,h} &= g^*(\mathbf{z}_{t,h}, \mathbf{u}_{t,h}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

We assume that the process noise $\mathbf{e}_{t,h}$ are independently drawn from a known distribution \mathcal{D} , and that $\mathbf{z}_{t,1}$ is sampled from an arbitrary σ_{dir} -smooth distribution. At the start of episode t , the learner then produces estimates $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{B}}_t, \hat{g}_t$ and simulates the plan π_t using the plug in estimate of the dynamics, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{t,h+1} &= \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{t,\hat{i}_{t,h}} \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{t,h} + \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{t,\hat{i}_{t,h}} \mathbf{u}_{t,h} + \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{t,\hat{i}_{t,h}} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{t,h}, \\ \hat{i}_{t,h} &= \hat{g}_t(\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{t,h}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{t,h}), \end{aligned}$$

¹This permits, for example, that $\bar{\mathbf{K}}_t$ is chosen based on the previous mode i_{t-1} , or any estimate thereof that does not use \mathbf{x}_t .

where $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{t,h} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{D}$, and $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{t,h}$ are an i.i.d. draw from the stochastic, open-loop policy π_t . Because the simulated and true processes use a different noise sequence, we consider the following notion of error, which measures the distance between the two *distributions* induced by the dynamics, as opposed to the regret, which measure the distance between the realizations thereof. We choose the Wasserstein metric \mathcal{W}_2 , as it upper bounds the difference in expected value of any Lipschitz reward function between the true and simulated trajectories (see Appendix G.2 for a formal definition and more explanation).

Definition 6 (Simulation Regret). Let $\mathcal{W}_2(\cdot, \cdot)$ denote the L_2 -Wasserstein distance, define the concatenations $\mathbf{x}_{t,h} = (\mathbf{z}_{t,h}, \mathbf{u}_{t,h})$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t,h} = (\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{t,h}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{t,h})$, and let $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ be the filtration generated by $\{\mathbf{x}_{s,h}\}_{1 \leq s \leq t, 1 \leq h \leq H}$. We define the T -episode, H -step simulation regret as

$$\text{SimReg}_{T,H} := \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x}_{t,1:H}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t,1:H} \mid \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1})^2.$$

Our goal is to achieve $\text{SimReg}_{T,H} \lesssim \text{poly}(H) \cdot T^{1-\Omega(1)}$, but polynomial-in- H dependence may be challenging for arbitrary open-loop policies and unstable dynamics of the pieces. Thus, in the interest of simplicity, we decouple the problems of linear stability from the challenge of error compounding due to discontinuity of the dynamics by adopting the following strong assumption.

Assumption 8. There exists a known, positive definite Lyapunov matrix $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z \times d_z}$ that satisfies $(\mathbf{A}_i^*)^\top \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{A}_i^*) \preceq \mathbf{P}$ for all modes $i \in [K]$.

Extensions are described in Appendix G.5. Using a minor modification of Algorithm 1, detailed in Algorithm 4, we show that we can get vanishing simulation regret, summarized in the following result:

Theorem 7. Suppose that we are in the setting of (3.3) and that Assumptions 2-5 and 8 hold. If we run a variant of Algorithm 1 (see Algorithm 4 in Appendix G.3), then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\text{SimReg}_{T,H} \leq \text{poly}\left(H, d, \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}, m, B, R, K, \nu, \frac{1}{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}\right) \cdot T^{1-\Omega(1)}.$$

The proof of Theorem 7 with the exact polynomial dependence on the parameters can be found in Appendix G.2 and rests on a lemma showing that under Assumption 8, simulation regret at a given time t can be bounded as $\text{poly}(H)$ multiplied by the maximum one-step prediction error for times $t, t+1, \dots, t+H$, which is bounded in Theorem 3.

4 Analysis

In this section, we present a sketch of the proof of Theorem 16 by breaking the analysis into two parts and stating informal versions of two key intermediate theorems. There are two primary sources of regret: that which is due to poorly estimating the linear parameters within a mode and that which is due to misclassification of the mode. The first of these sources can be controlled by our first theorem, which we term parameter recovery, while the second can be controlled by our second theorem on mode prediction.

4.1 Parameter Recovery

We now describe how we control the regret that arises due to error in estimating the linear parameter in each mode. In particular, we sketch a proof of Theorem 4, stated above, which says that if we have seen many examples of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$ such that $g_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i$ and $\hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = j$, then our estimated parameter $\hat{\Theta}_j$ for this mode is close to Θ_i^* . The theorem was stated in terms of a recovery guarantee given T observations, but we ultimately apply it only to times within a given epoch. The full proof is given in Appendix D.

Proof sketch of Theorem 4. We break the proof into three parts: first, we show that the regret of \hat{g} and the $\hat{\Theta}_i$, when restricted to times $t \in I_{ij}(\hat{g})$, is small; second, we relate the prediction error

$$\mathcal{Q}_{ij}(\hat{g}) = \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(\hat{g})} \left\| (\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2$$

to the regret on $I_{ij}(\hat{g})$; third, demonstrate that $\Sigma_{ij}(\hat{g}) = \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(\hat{g})} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t^T$ has minimal eigenvalue bounded below by some constant with high probability. If all three of these claims hold, then, noting that

$$\|\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq \|\Sigma_{ij}(\hat{g})^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \cdot \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(\hat{g})} \left\| (\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2,$$

we conclude. Each of these claims requires significant technical effort in its own right. We introduce the notion of *disagreement covers*, a stronger analogue of the traditional ε -net that is adapted to our problem and allows us to turn statements proven for a single $g \in \mathcal{G}$ into ones uniform over \mathcal{G} . The first step is to bound the size of disagreement covers for the class \mathcal{G} of interest; we then prove each of the three claims for some fixed $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and lift the result to apply to the data-dependent \hat{g} . This step is accomplished in Appendix D.1.

We now turn to our three claims². For the first, proved in Lemma D.15, we introduce the *excess risk* on each pair (i, j) ,

$$\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g, \Theta) = \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\Theta_t \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t\|^2 - \|\mathbf{e}_t + \delta_t\|^2$$

and note that the cumulative empirical excess risk $\sum_{i,j} \mathcal{R}_{ij}(\hat{g}, \hat{\Theta})$ of predicting using \hat{g} and $\hat{\Theta}$ returned by the ERM oracle is bounded by $\varepsilon_{\text{orac}}$, which can be checked by the fact that $\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g_*, \Theta_*) = 0$ due to Equation (2.1). Thus, showing that $\mathcal{R}_{ij}(\hat{g}, \hat{\Theta})$ is small can be done by showing that for no i', j' is $\mathcal{R}_{i'j'}(\hat{g}, \hat{\Theta}) \ll 0$. This can be accomplished by a concentration argument for a single g, Θ_0 , coupled with a covering argument using our notion of disagreement covers to boost the result to one uniform in \mathcal{G} , and thus applying to $\hat{g}, \hat{\Theta}$.

For the second claim, i.e., that $\mathcal{Q}_{ij}(\hat{g})$ is controlled by $\mathcal{R}_{ij}(\hat{g}, \hat{\Theta})$, we provide a proof in Lemma D.14. For a fixed $g \in \mathcal{G}$, we decompose $\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g, \hat{\Theta})$ into $\mathcal{Q}_{ij}(g)$ and an error term. We then use a generalization of the self-normalized martingale inequality from Abbasi-Yadkori et al. [2011] to control the error in terms of $\mathcal{Q}_{ij}(g)$, providing a self-bounded inequality. Finally, we rearrange this inequality and apply a union bound on a disagreement cover to boost the result to one uniform in \mathcal{G} and Θ .

To prove the third claim, that $\Sigma_{ij}(\hat{g})$ has singular values uniformly bounded from below, we split our argument into two parts. First, in Appendix D.2, we assume the following sliced-small ball condition on the data, i.e., for some $\zeta, \rho > 0$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 \geq c \cdot \zeta^2 | \mathcal{F}_t, t \in I_{ij}(\hat{g}) \right) \geq c \cdot \rho.$$

Given the above condition, we establish a high probability lower bound on $\Sigma_{ij}(g)$ for fixed g using a self-normalized martingale inequality, using analysis that may be of independent interest. We then again apply a union bound on a disagreement cover to lift this result to be uniform in \mathcal{G} . Finally, in Appendix D.3, we provide bounds on ζ, ρ using directional smoothness and Markov's inequality. ■

While we do not expand on this point here, we remark in passing that our method for bounding the size of a disagreement cover can be applied to significantly simplify the proofs of many of the results found in Block and Simchowitz [2022].

4.2 Mode Prediction

As mentioned earlier, there are two sources of regret; (1) misspecification of the parameters defining the linear functions on each mode and (2) error in estimating the modes i_t . The previous section described how we control this first source, while this section addresses the second source. Algorithm 1 proceeds in epochs, which allows us to apply our parameter recovery results per-epoch, thereby ensuring that, when we correctly classify our modes, we are incurring low regret. The primary challenge is that directional smoothness, as opposed to independence, is insufficiently strong an assumption to guarantee that a learned classifier \hat{g}_τ at each epoch τ generalizes well to unseen data in the next epoch. In order to ensure such generalization, we take inspiration from online learning and enforce stability of our algorithm across epochs by modifying the classifier \hat{g}_τ .

There are two problems to solve before we can ensure good performance of our online classifier. First, the dynamics described in (2.1) are only identifiable up to a permutation of the labels. Thus, in order to enforce stability across

²Note that the presentation in this sketch is not in the order of that in the section below due to the natural structure of certain logical dependencies in the proof structure.

Algorithm 2 Online Gradient Descent (Single Epoch)

- 1: **Initialize** Data $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{1:E}$, classifiers $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^0$, margin parameter $\gamma > 0$, learning rate $\eta > 0$, classifier $\hat{g} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [K]$
 - 2: **for** $s = 1, 2, \dots, E$ **do**
 - 3: **Receive** $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i$ and **update** $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^s \leftarrow \Pi_{(\mathcal{B}^{d-1}) \times K} \left(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^{s-1} - \eta \nabla \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma, i, \hat{g}}(\mathbf{w}^{s-1}) \right)$ (% Gradient step and project
 so $\|\mathbf{w}_i\| \leq 1$
 % $\tilde{\ell}_{\gamma, i, \hat{g}}$ defined in Equation (4.1))
 - 4: **Return** $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^m$
-

epochs, we need to ensure that we label the same modes in the same way. This task is made more difficult by the fact that different modes may be combined or split up across different epochs due to the black box nature of ERMORACLE. We solve this by appealing to a subroutine, Reorder, described in Algorithm 3 in Appendix E, which combines modes that are both sufficiently large and have sufficiently similar parameters and then relabels the modes so that similar nominal clusters persist across epochs.

The next issue is how to enforce stability of our online classifier. We do this by introducing a surrogate loss $\tilde{\ell}_{\gamma, t, \hat{g}}$, the multi-class hinge loss with parameter $\gamma > 0$. Formally, let $\mathbf{w}_{1:K} = (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_K)$ for $\mathbf{w}_i \in \mathcal{B}^{d-1}$, and for $g \in \mathcal{G}$, define the $(1/\gamma)$ -Lipschitz and convex surrogate loss:

$$\tilde{\ell}_{\gamma, t, g}(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) = \max \left(0, \max_{j \neq g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} \left(1 - \frac{\langle \mathbf{w}_{g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \mathbf{w}_j, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle}{\gamma} \right) \right). \quad (4.1)$$

In OGD (see Algorithm 2), we modify the output of ERMORACLE to construct a classifier \tilde{g}_τ by running lazy online gradient descent on this surrogate loss, using the reordered labels given by the output of ERMORACLE evaluated on the previous epoch. By invoking OGD, we show that our mode classifier is sufficiently stable to ensure low regret, as stated informally in the following result.

Theorem 8 (Mode Prediction, Informal Statement of Theorem 14). *Suppose that Assumptions 2-5 hold and let $\mathcal{E}_t^{\text{mode}}$ be the event that the learner, invoking Algorithm 1 with correctly tuned parameters, misclassifies the mode of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that*

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_t^{\text{mode}}\} \leq \text{poly} \left(K, B, \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}, R, d, m, \nu, \frac{1}{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}, \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \cdot T^{1-\Omega(1)}.$$

Proof Sketch. As mentioned above, the first problem that needs to be solved is the lack of identifiability of the modes. To address this, for the purposes of analysis, for each epoch τ , we introduce the function $\pi_\tau : [K] \rightarrow [K]$ such that

$$\pi_\tau(i) = \underset{1 \leq j \leq K}{\text{argmin}} \|\hat{\Theta}_{\tau, i} - \Theta_j^*\|_{\mathbb{F}}.$$

In words, $\pi_\tau(i)$ is the mode j according to the ground truth whose parameters are closest to those estimated by ERMORACLE. We let $\mathcal{E}_t^{\text{mode}}$ denote the event of misclassifying the mode, i.e. the event that $\pi_\tau(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)$. We can then decompose the misclassification as

$$\mathcal{E}_t^{\text{mode}} \subset \{\pi_{\tau+1}(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)\} \cup \{\pi_\tau(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq \pi_{\tau+1}(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t))\}.$$

We call the first event look-ahead classification error and the second permutation disagreement error. To bound the first of these, we further decompose the look-ahead classification error event:

$$\{\pi_{\tau+1}(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)\} \subset \{\pi_{\tau+1}(\hat{g}_{\tau+1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)\} \cup \{\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \neq \hat{g}_{\tau+1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)\}.$$

Controlling the first of these events is proved as a corollary of the bound on the permutation disagreement error and we defer its discussion for the sake of simplicity. To bound the indicator loss of the second event, we use the fact that indicator loss is upper bounded by $\tilde{\ell}_{\gamma, t, \hat{g}_{\tau+1}}$ and apply standard online learning techniques to show that the regret on the $(1/\gamma)$ -Lipschitz and convex surrogate loss can be controlled using online gradient descent. We then use smoothness to show that the optimal comparator with respect to the surrogate loss does not experience large regret with respect to

the indicator loss, which in turn has a comparator experiencing zero loss due to the well-specified nature of g_* . Thus, putting everything together, this provides bound on the look-ahead classification error, with full details presented in Appendix E.1.

Bounding the permutation disagreement error is what necessitates the gap assumption. We show that if there are sufficiently many data points that \hat{g}_τ assigns to a given mode, with the threshold defined in terms of Δ_{sep} and other parameters of the problem, then with high probability the cluster becomes stable in the sense that $\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i} \approx \hat{\Theta}_{\tau+1,i}$. This result is proved using the fact that if $|I_{i,j}(\hat{g}_\tau)|$ is large enough, then the parameter recovery results from the previous section tell us that $\|\hat{\Theta}_i - \hat{\Theta}_j\|_F$ is small. Using the triangle inequality and the fact that $\|\Theta_j^* - \Theta_{j'}^*\|_F > \Delta_{\text{sep}}$ for $j' \neq j$ ensures that j is unique in satisfying $\|\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i} - \Theta_j^*\|_F$ is small. A similar argument applies to epoch $\tau + 1$, and thus we can identify $\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i}$ with some $\hat{\Theta}_{\tau+1,i'}$ by these matrices being sufficiently close in Frobenius norm. Algorithm 3 takes advantage of exactly this property and permutes the labels across epochs in order to maintain consistency and control the permutation disagreement error; full details can be found in Appendix E.2. Combining this argument with the bound on the look-ahead classification error suffices to control the online classification component of the regret. ■

5 Discussion

We have given an efficient online learning algorithm for prediction in piecewise affine (PWA) systems. Our results are the first foray into the study of such systems, and a number of outstanding questions remain:

- Does directional smoothness facilitate low regret for planning and control, in addition to for simulation and prediction?
- If the systems are piecewise-affine but forced to be continuous on their boundaries, is there an oracle efficient algorithm which suffers low regret without assuming directional smoothness? Note that exponential weights on a suitable discretization suffices for an information-theoretic bound.
- Can learning in piecewise affine systems be obtained under *partial observation* of the system state?
- What guarantees are possible if the underlying system can be approximated by a PWA system with many pieces, even if it is not exactly described by one? Note that this may require algorithms which overcome the separation condition, Assumption 5.
- What other class of systems, like Linear Complementarity systems, studied in [Jin et al., 2022], are amenable to oracle-efficient online learning?

We hope that our work initiates investigation of the above as the field continues to expand its understanding beyond the linear regime.

Acknowledgements

AB acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. 1122374 as well as support from ONR under grant N00014-20-1-2336 and DOE under grant DE-SC0022199. MS acknowledges support from Amazon.com Services LLC grant; PO# 2D-06310236. We also acknowledge Zak Mhammedi, Terry H.J. Suh and Tao Pang for their helpful comments.

References

- Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori and Csaba Szepesvári. Regret bounds for the adaptive control of linear quadratic systems. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1–26. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.
- Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori, Dávid Pál, and Csaba Szepesvári. Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.

- Naman Agarwal, Brian Bullins, Elad Hazan, Sham Kakade, and Karan Singh. Online control with adversarial disturbances. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 111–119. PMLR, 2019.
- Edoardo Amaldi and Marco Mattavelli. The min pfs problem and piecewise linear model estimation. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 118(1-2):115–143, 2002.
- Adam Block and Max Simchowitz. Efficient and near-optimal smoothed online learning for generalized linear functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.13056*, 2022.
- Adam Block, Yuval Dagan, and Alexander Rakhlin. Majorizing measures, sequential complexities, and online learning. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 587–590. PMLR, 2021.
- Adam Block, Yuval Dagan, Noah Golowich, and Alexander Rakhlin. Smoothed online learning is as easy as statistical learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.04690*, 2022.
- Francesco Borrelli, Alberto Bemporad, and Manfred Morari. *Predictive control for linear and hybrid systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi and Gábor Lugosi. *Prediction, learning, and games*. Cambridge university press, 2006.
- Alon Cohen, Avinatan Hasidim, Tomer Koren, Nevena Lazic, Yishay Mansour, and Kunal Talwar. Online linear quadratic control. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1029–1038. PMLR, 2018.
- Sarah Dean and Benjamin Recht. Certainty equivalent perception-based control. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 399–411. PMLR, 2021.
- Sarah Dean, Horia Mania, Nikolai Matni, Benjamin Recht, and Stephen Tu. On the sample complexity of the linear quadratic regulator. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 20(4):633–679, 2020.
- Manfred Deistler, K Peterzell, and Wolfgang Scherrer. Consistency and relative efficiency of subspace methods. *Automatica*, 31(12):1865–1875, 1995.
- John C Duchi, Peter L Bartlett, and Martin J Wainwright. Randomized smoothing for stochastic optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(2):674–701, 2012.
- Herbert Federer. *Geometric measure theory*. Springer, 2014.
- Giancarlo Ferrari-Trecate, Marco Muselli, Diego Liberati, and Manfred Morari. A clustering technique for the identification of piecewise affine systems. *Automatica*, 39(2):205–217, 2003.
- Dylan Foster, Tuhin Sarkar, and Alexander Rakhlin. Learning nonlinear dynamical systems from a single trajectory. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 851–861. PMLR, 2020.
- Yoav Freund and Robert E Schapire. Adaptive game playing using multiplicative weights. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 29(1-2):79–103, 1999a.
- Yoav Freund and Robert E Schapire. Large margin classification using the perceptron algorithm. *Machine learning*, 37(3):277–296, 1999b.
- Andrea Garulli, Simone Paoletti, and Antonio Vicino. A survey on switched and piecewise affine system identification. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 45(16):344–355, 2012.
- Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep learning*. MIT press, 2016.
- Venkatesan Guruswami and Prasad Raghavendra. Hardness of learning halfspaces with noise. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(2):742–765, 2009.
- Nika Haghtalab, Tim Roughgarden, and Abhishek Shetty. Smoothed analysis of online and differentially private learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10129*, 2020.
- Nika Haghtalab, Tim Roughgarden, and Abhishek Shetty. Smoothed analysis with adaptive adversaries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.08446*, 2021.

- Nika Haghtalab, Yanjun Han, Abhishek Shetty, and Kunhe Yang. Oracle-efficient online learning for beyond worst-case adversaries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.08549*, 2022.
- Elad Hazan and Tomer Koren. The computational power of optimization in online learning. In *Proceedings of the forty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 128–141, 2016.
- Elad Hazan and Comandur Seshadhri. Efficient learning algorithms for changing environments. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pages 393–400, 2009.
- Elad Hazan, Karan Singh, and Cyril Zhang. Learning linear dynamical systems via spectral filtering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- Elad Hazan et al. Introduction to online convex optimization. *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, 2(3-4): 157–325, 2016.
- Wanxin Jin, Alp Aydinoglu, Mathew Halm, and Michael Posa. Learning linear complementarity systems. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, pages 1137–1149. PMLR, 2022.
- Colin N Jones and Manfred Morari. Approximate explicit mpc using bilevel optimization. In *2009 European control conference (ECC)*, pages 2396–2401. IEEE, 2009.
- Adam Kalai and Santosh Vempala. Efficient algorithms for online decision problems. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 71(3):291–307, 2005.
- Quentin Le Lidec, Louis Montaut, Cordelia Schmid, Ivan Laptev, and Justin Carpentier. Leveraging randomized smoothing for optimal control of nonsmooth dynamical systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03986*, 2022.
- Nick Littlestone. Learning quickly when irrelevant attributes abound: A new linear-threshold algorithm. *Machine learning*, 2(4):285–318, 1988.
- Lennart Ljung. System identification: Theory for the users," prentice hall, new jersey, 1999.
- Lennart Ljung and Bo Wahlberg. Asymptotic properties of the least-squares method for estimating transfer functions and disturbance spectra. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 24(2):412–440, 1992.
- Horia Mania, Michael I Jordan, and Benjamin Recht. Active learning for nonlinear system identification with guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10277*, 2020.
- Tobia Marcucci and Russ Tedrake. Mixed-integer formulations for optimal control of piecewise-affine systems. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, pages 230–239, 2019.
- Matthew T Mason. *Mechanics of robotic manipulation*. MIT press, 2001.
- Zakaria Mhammedi, Dylan J Foster, Max Simchowitz, Dipendra Misra, Wen Sun, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Alexander Rakhlin, and John Langford. Learning the linear quadratic regulator from nonlinear observations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:14532–14543, 2020.
- Samet Oymak and Necmiye Ozay. Non-asymptotic identification of lti systems from a single trajectory. In *2019 American control conference (ACC)*, pages 5655–5661. IEEE, 2019.
- Tao Pang, HJ Suh, Lujie Yang, and Russ Tedrake. Global planning for contact-rich manipulation via local smoothing of quasi-dynamic contact models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.10787*, 2022.
- Simone Paoletti, Aleksandar Lj Juloski, Giancarlo Ferrari-Trecate, and René Vidal. Identification of hybrid systems a tutorial. *European journal of control*, 13(2-3):242–260, 2007.
- Michael Posa, Cecilia Cantu, and Russ Tedrake. A direct method for trajectory optimization of rigid bodies through contact. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 33(1):69–81, 2014.
- Alexander Rakhlin and Karthik Sridharan. Online learning with predictable sequences. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 993–1019. PMLR, 2013.

- Alexander Rakhlin and Karthik Sridharan. Online non-parametric regression. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1232–1264. PMLR, 2014.
- Alexander Rakhlin, Karthik Sridharan, and Ambuj Tewari. Online learning: Stochastic, constrained, and smoothed adversaries. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24:1764–1772, 2011.
- Alexander Rakhlin, Karthik Sridharan, and Ambuj Tewari. Sequential complexities and uniform martingale laws of large numbers. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 161(1):111–153, 2015.
- Yahya Sattar and Samet Oymak. Non-asymptotic and accurate learning of nonlinear dynamical systems. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(140):1–49, 2022.
- Yahya Sattar, Zhe Du, Davoud Ataee Tarzanagh, Laura Balzano, Necmiye Ozay, and Samet Oymak. Identification and adaptive control of markov jump systems: Sample complexity and regret bounds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.07018*, 2021.
- Max Simchowitz and Dylan Foster. Naive exploration is optimal for online lqr. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8937–8948. PMLR, 2020.
- Max Simchowitz, Horia Mania, Stephen Tu, Michael I Jordan, and Benjamin Recht. Learning without mixing: Towards a sharp analysis of linear system identification. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pages 439–473. PMLR, 2018.
- Max Simchowitz, Ross Boczar, and Benjamin Recht. Learning linear dynamical systems with semi-parametric least squares. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2714–2802. PMLR, 2019.
- Max Simchowitz, Karan Singh, and Elad Hazan. Improper learning for non-stochastic control. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3320–3436. PMLR, 2020.
- Daniel A Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. Nearly-linear time algorithms for graph partitioning, graph sparsification, and solving linear systems. In *Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 81–90, 2004.
- Hyung Ju Suh, Max Simchowitz, Kaiqing Zhang, and Russ Tedrake. Do differentiable simulators give better policy gradients? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 20668–20696. PMLR, 2022a.
- Hyung Ju Terry Suh, Tao Pang, and Russ Tedrake. Bundled gradients through contact via randomized smoothing. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7(2):4000–4007, 2022b.
- Richard S Sutton, David McAllester, Satinder Singh, and Yishay Mansour. Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 12, 1999.
- Anastasios Tsiamis and George J Pappas. Finite sample analysis of stochastic system identification. In *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 3648–3654. IEEE, 2019.
- Anastasios Tsiamis, Nikolai Matni, and George Pappas. Sample complexity of kalman filtering for unknown systems. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 435–444. PMLR, 2020.
- Anastasios Tsiamis, Ingvar Ziemann, Nikolai Matni, and George J Pappas. Statistical learning theory for control: A finite sample perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.05423*, 2022.
- Arjan J Van Der Schaft and Hans Schumacher. *An introduction to hybrid dynamical systems*, volume 251. springer, 2007.
- Grady Williams, Andrew Aldrich, and Evangelos Theodorou. Model predictive path integral control using covariance variable importance sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.01149*, 2015.
- Ronald J Williams. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine learning*, 8(3):229–256, 1992.

Part I

General Tools

A Notation

Problem Parameter	Definition
T	total number of time steps
K	number of modes
d	dimension of \mathbf{x} (general PWA)
m	dimension of y
σ_{dir}	directional smoothness constant (Assumption 2)
ν	subGaussian constant of noise (Assumption 3)
B	magnitude bound on $\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t\ $ (Assumption 4)
R	magnitude bound on $\ \Theta^*\ _F$ (Assumption 4)
Δ_{sep}	separation parameter (optional for sharper rates, see Assumption 5)

Algorithm Parameters	Definition
E	epoch length
τ	current epoch
η	step size (Line 4 in Algorithm 2)
γ	hinge loss parameter
A	cluster size threshold (Line 11 in Algorithm 3)
ε_{crp}	distance from realizability (see (2.1))
Algorithm Objects	Definition
$\tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}}$	hinge loss on estimated labels (see (4.1))
π_τ	stabilizing permutation (see (E.2))
γ	hinge loss parameter
Analysis Parameters	Definition
δ	probability of error
ξ	scale of disagreement cover discretization (Theorem 12)
Ξ	minimum cluster size to ensure continuity (Condition 1)

B Lower Bounds

B.1 Proof of Proposition 1

We suppose that $d = m = 1$ and consider the unit interval. Thus, \mathcal{G} is just the set of thresholds on the unit interval, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{G} = \{\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbb{I}\{\mathbf{x} > \theta\} \mid \theta \in [0, 1]\}.$$

We suppose that

$$\Theta_0^* = [0 \quad | \quad 1] \quad \Theta_1^* = [0 \quad | \quad 0],$$

i.e., $y_t = g_*(\mathbf{x}_t)$. We are thus in the setting of adversarially learning thresholds with an oblivious adversary. It is well known that this is unlearnable, but we sketch a proof here. With T fixed, let the adversary sample $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_T$ as

independent Rademacher random variables and let

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \varepsilon_s 2^{-s-1}$$

and let $\theta^* = \mathbf{x}_{T+1}$. We observe that $\mathbf{y}_t = -\varepsilon_t$ for all t . To see this, note that if $\varepsilon_t = 1$, then $x_s > x_t$ for all $s > t$ and similarly if $\varepsilon_t = -1$ then $x_s < x_t$; as $\theta^* = \mathbf{x}_{T+1}$, the claim is clear. Note that due to the independence of the ε_t , any \hat{y}_t chosen by the learner is independent of ε_t and thus is independent of \mathbf{y}_t . Thus the expected number of mistakes the learner makes, independent of the learner's strategy, is $\frac{T}{2}$, concluding the proof.

B.2 A Lower Bound for Identification

Consider a setting where there are $K = 3$ modes with state and input dimension $d = 1$. For a parameters $\alpha, \beta > 0$, define the linear functions

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(x; \alpha, \beta) &= 0 \\ g_3(x; \alpha, \beta) &= x - (1 + \alpha) \\ g_2(x; \alpha, \beta) &= 2(x - (1 + \alpha)) - \beta \end{aligned}$$

For our lexicographic convention in the definition of the arg max operator³, we have

$$\arg \max_i g_i(x; \alpha, \beta) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq 1 + \alpha \\ 2 & x \geq 1 + \alpha + \beta \\ 3 & x \in (1 + \alpha, 1 + \alpha + \beta) \end{cases}$$

That is, $x \mapsto \arg \max_i g_i(x; \alpha, \beta)$ defines three modes, with the third mode a segment of length β between $1 + \alpha$ and $1 + \alpha + \beta$. We consider simple 3-piece PWA systems whose regions are defined by the above linear functions.

Definition 9. Let $\mathcal{J}(\alpha, \beta, m, \mathcal{D})$ denote the problem instance with $K = 3$ pieces where where the dynamics abide by

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{m}_{i_t} + \mathbf{w}_t \quad \mathbf{m}_i = \begin{cases} 0 & i = 1, 2 \\ m & i = 3 \end{cases}, \quad i_t = \arg \max_i g_i(\mathbf{x}_t; \alpha, \beta), \quad \mathbf{w}_t \sim \mathcal{D}.$$

The following proposition shows that, regardless of the noise distribution \mathcal{D} , learning the parameter \mathfrak{m}_3 can be made arbitrarily hard. This is because as the β parameter is made small, making locating region 3 (which is necessary to learn \mathfrak{m}_3) arbitrarily challenging.

Proposition 10. Fix any positive integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and any arbitrary distribution \mathcal{D} over \mathbb{R} . Then, any algorithm which adaptively selects inputs $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_T$ returns an estimate $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_T$ of \mathfrak{m}_3 must suffer

$$\sup_{\iota \in \{-1, 1\}} \sup_{j \in [2N]} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{J}(j/N, 1/N, \iota m, \mathcal{D})} [|\hat{\mathbf{m}}_T - \mathfrak{m}_3| \geq m] \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{T}{N}\right).$$

As N is arbitrary, this makes a constant-accuracy estimate of \mathfrak{m}_3 arbitrarily difficult.

Remark 3. The lower bound of Proposition 10 can be circumvented in two cases. First, if the dynamics are forced to be Lipschitz continuous, then deviations of the dynamics in small regions can only lead to small differences in parameter values. Second, if there is an assumption which stipulates that all linear regions have ‘‘large volume’’, then there is an upper bound on how large N can be in the above construction, obviating our lower bound. It turns out that there are practical circumstances under which PWA systems (a) are not Lipschitz, and (b) certain regions have vanishingly small volume [Jones and Morari, 2009]. Still, whether stronger guarantees are possible under such conditions is an interesting direction for future work.

³alternatively, we can make this unambiguous by omitting the points $\{1 + \tau, 1 + 2\tau\}$

Proof of Proposition 10. Introduce the shorthand $\mathbb{P}_{j,\ell}[\cdot] := \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{S}(j/N, 1/N, \nu m)}[\cdot]$. Consider the regions $\mathcal{R}_j := [1 + j/4N, 1 + (j+1)/4N]$, and define the event $\mathcal{E}_{j,t} := \{\mathbf{u}_j \notin \mathcal{R}_j\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_j := \bigcap_{t=1}^T \mathcal{E}_{j,t}$. As the learner has information about \mathbf{m}_3 on \mathcal{E}_j , then if $\ell \stackrel{\text{unif}}{\sim} \{-1, 1\}$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell \sim \{-1, 1\}} \mathbb{P}_{j,\ell}[|\hat{\mathbf{m}}_T - \mathbf{m}_3| \geq m \mid \mathcal{E}_j] \geq \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}_\ell[|\nu m - \mu| \geq m] = \frac{1}{2}$$

Thus,

$$\sup_{j,\ell} \mathbb{P}_{j,\ell}[|\hat{\mathbf{m}}_T - \mathbf{m}_3| \geq m] \geq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{j,\ell} \mathbb{P}_{j,\ell}[\mathcal{E}_j]$$

Introduce a new measure \mathbb{P}_0 where the dynamics are given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{w}_t, \quad \mathbf{w}_t \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{D}.$$

We observe that on $\mathbb{P}_{j,\ell}[\mathcal{E}_j] = \mathbb{P}_0[\mathcal{E}_j]$, because on \mathcal{E}_j the learner has never visited region $i = 3$ where $i_t \neq 0$. Hence,

$$\sup_{j,\ell} \mathbb{P}_{j,\ell}[|\hat{\mathbf{m}}_T - \mathbf{m}_3| \geq m] \geq \frac{1}{2} \sup_j \mathbb{P}_0[\mathcal{E}_j] = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \min_j \mathbb{P}_0[\mathcal{E}_j^c] \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \min_j \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{P}_0[\mathcal{E}_{j,t}^c] \right).$$

Observe that $\mathcal{E}_{j,t}^c := \{\mathbf{u}_t \in \mathcal{R}_j\}$. As $\mathcal{R}_{2\ell} \cap \mathcal{R}_{2(\ell+1)}$ are disjoint for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that $\mathcal{E}_{2\ell,t}^c$ are disjoint events for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Upper bound bounding minimum by average on any subset, we have

$$\min_j \mathbb{P}_0[\mathcal{E}_{j,t}^c] \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \mathbb{P}_0[\mathcal{E}_{2\ell+1,t}^c] \stackrel{(i)}{=} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{P}_0\left[\bigcup_{\ell=1}^N \mathcal{E}_{2\ell+1,t}^c\right] \leq 1/N,$$

where (i) uses disjointness of the events $\mathcal{E}_{2\ell,t}^c$ as argued above. Thus, continuing from the second-to-last display, we have

$$\sup_{j,\ell} \mathbb{P}_{j,\ell}[|\hat{\mathbf{m}}_T - \mathbf{m}_3| \geq m] \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{T}{N} \right).$$

■

C Properties of Smoothness

C.1 Directional Smoothness of Gaussians and Uniform Distributions

Lemma C.1. *Let \mathbf{w} be distributed as a centred Gaussian with covariance $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}$ in \mathbb{R}^d . Then for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, if \mathbf{w} is independent of \mathbf{z} , it holds that $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{w}$ is σ_{dir} -directionally smooth, with $\sigma_{\text{dir}} = \sqrt{2\pi}\sigma$.*

Proof. Fix some $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle - c| < \delta) &= \mathbb{P}(|\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{u} \rangle - (-\langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u} \rangle + c)| < \delta) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(|\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{u} \rangle - c'| < \delta) \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by the fact that $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{u} \rangle$ is distributed as a centred univariate Gaussian with variance σ^2 and the fact that such a distribution has density upper bounded by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma}$. The result follows. ■

Lemma C.2. *Let \mathbf{w} be uniform on a centred Euclidean ball of radius σ . Then for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, if \mathbf{w} is independent of \mathbf{z} , it holds that $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{w}$ is σ_{dir} -directionally smooth, with $\sigma_{\text{dir}} \geq \frac{\sigma}{2}$.*

Proof. Let \mathbf{v} denote a point sampled uniformly from the unit Euclidean ball and note that $\mathbf{w} \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma \mathbf{v}$. We then have for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{u} \rangle - c'| < \delta) = \mathbb{P}\left(|\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \rangle - c| < \frac{\delta}{\sigma}\right).$$

Let $A = (c - \frac{\delta}{\sigma}, c + \frac{\delta}{\sigma})$ and let $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined so that $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \rangle$. We note that $D\phi = \mathbf{u}^T$ and thus $\det(D\phi D\phi^T) = 1$ uniformly. Using the co-area formula [Federer, 2014], we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \rangle - c| < \frac{\delta}{\sigma}\right) &= \int_{\phi^{-1}(A)} d \text{vol}_d(\mathbf{v}) \\ &= \int_{\phi^{-1}(A)} \sqrt{\det(D\phi(\mathbf{v})D\phi(\mathbf{v})^T)} d \text{vol}_d(\mathbf{v}) \\ &= \int_A \text{vol}_{d-1}(\phi^{-1}(y)) dy \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{y \in A} \text{vol}_{d-1}(\phi^{-1}(y))\right) \int_{c-\frac{\delta}{\sigma}}^{c+\frac{\delta}{\sigma}} dy \\ &\leq \frac{2\delta}{\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. ■

C.2 Directional Smoothness Equivalent to Lebesgue Density

Lemma C.3. *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a (Borel-measurable) random vector. Then, \mathbf{x} is σ_{dir} -smooth if and only if, for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$ admits a density $p(\cdot)$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} with $\text{ess sup}_{v \in \mathbb{R}} p(v) \leq 2/\sigma_{\text{dir}}$.*

Proof. The ‘‘if’’ direction is immediate. For the converse, let $\mu(B)$ denote the Lebesgue measure of a Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{R}$. We observe that σ_{dir} -smoothness proves that for any interval $I = (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{P}[\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \in I] \leq \sigma_{\text{dir}} \mu(I)/2$ (consider $c = (a + b)/2$ and $\delta = |b - a|/2$). Since the Borel sigma-algebra is the generated by open intervals, this implies that for any Borel subset B of \mathbb{R} , $\mathbb{P}[\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \in B] \leq 2\mu(B)/\sigma_{\text{dir}}$, where $\mu(\cdot)$ denotes the Lebesgue measure. Thus we see that the law of $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and, by definition of the Radon-Nikodym derivative, there exists some p such that for all Borel B , it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}(\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \in B) = \int_B p(a) da.$$

Now, let

$$B = \left\{ a \mid p(a) > \frac{2}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}} \right\}$$

and note that

$$\mathbb{P}(\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \in B) = \int_B p(a) da > \frac{2}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}} \cdot \mu(B).$$

Combining this with the fact that $\mathbb{P}(\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \in B) \leq \frac{2\mu(B)}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}$, we see that $\mu(B) = 0$ and the result holds. ■

C.3 Concatenation Preserves Directional Smoothness

Lemma C.4. *Let $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ be two random vectors such that $\mathbf{x}_1 \perp \mathbf{x}_2$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 \perp \mathbf{x}_1$ are both σ_{dir} -directionally smooth. Then, the concatenated vector $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$ is $\frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}{\sqrt{2}}$ -directionally smooth.*

Proof. Fix $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1+d_2}$ with $\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}\| = 1$. Set $\alpha_1 := \|\mathbf{w}_1\|$ and $\alpha_2 = \|\mathbf{w}_2\|$. Assume without loss of generality that $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2$, so then necessarily $\alpha_1 \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[|\langle \tilde{\mathbf{w}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \rangle - c| < \delta] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_2} \mathbb{P}[|\langle \tilde{\mathbf{w}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \rangle - c| < \delta \mid \mathbf{w}_2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_2} \mathbb{P}[|\langle \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{x}_1 \rangle - (c - \langle \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{x}_2 \rangle)| < \delta \mid \mathbf{w}_2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_2} \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\left\langle \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{x}_1 \right\rangle - \frac{1}{\alpha_1} (c - \langle \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{x}_2 \rangle)\right| < \frac{\delta}{\alpha_1} \mid \mathbf{w}_2\right] \leq \frac{\delta}{\sigma_{\text{dir}} \alpha_1} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \delta}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}. \end{aligned}$$

The bound follows. \blacksquare

Lemma C.5. *Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ and $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ be random vectors such that $\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{v}$ is σ_{dir} -directionally smooth, $\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{z}$ is σ_{dir} -directionally smooth, and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{v}$. Then, the concatenated vector $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u})$ is $\sigma_{\text{dir}}/\sqrt{(1 + \|\mathbf{K}\|_{\text{op}})^2 + 1}$ -smooth.*

Proof. Fix $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1+d_2}$ such that $\|\bar{\mathbf{w}}\| = 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \bar{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{x} \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{z} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{K}\mathbf{z} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{v} \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{z} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{v} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Define $\alpha_1 := \|\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{w}_2\|$, $\alpha_2 := \|\mathbf{w}_2\|$, and $X_1 := \langle \mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{z} \rangle$ and $X_2 := \langle \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{v} \rangle$. X_1 depends only on z and X_2 only on v . Hence, $X_1 \mid X_2$ is $\alpha_1 \sigma_{\text{dir}}$ smooth and $X_2 \mid X_1$ is $\alpha_2 \sigma_{\text{dir}}$ smooth. It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}[|X_1 + X_2 - c| \leq \delta] = \mathbb{E}_{X_1} \mathbb{P}[|X_1 + X_2 - c| \leq \delta \mid X_1] \leq \frac{\delta}{\sigma_{\text{dir}} \alpha_2},$$

and so my symmetry under labels $i = 1, 2$,

$$\mathbb{P}[|\langle \bar{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{x} \rangle - c| \leq \delta] = \mathbb{P}[|X_1 + X_2 - c| \leq \delta] \leq \min\left\{\frac{1}{\alpha_1}, \frac{1}{\alpha_2}\right\} \frac{\delta}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}} = \frac{1}{\max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}} \cdot \frac{\delta}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}.$$

We continue by bounding

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\} &= \max\{\|\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{w}_2\|, \|\mathbf{w}_2\|\} \\ &\geq \max\{\|\mathbf{w}\|_1 - \|\mathbf{K}\|_{\text{op}} \|\mathbf{w}_2\|, \|\mathbf{w}_2\|\} \\ &= \min_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \max\{\sqrt{1 - \alpha^2} - \|\mathbf{K}\|_{\text{op}} \alpha, \alpha\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\|\mathbf{w}_1\|^2 + \|\mathbf{w}_2\|^2 = 1)$$

The above is minimized when $\sqrt{1 - \alpha^2} - \|\mathbf{K}\|_{\text{op}} \alpha = \alpha$, so that $\alpha^2(1 + \|\mathbf{K}\|_{\text{op}})^2 = 1 - \alpha^2$, yielding $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{(1 + \|\mathbf{K}\|_{\text{op}})^2 + 1}$. Hence, $\max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\} \geq 1/\sqrt{(1 + \|\mathbf{K}\|_{\text{op}})^2 + 1}$. The bound follows. \blacksquare

C.4 Smoothness of Parameters Induces Separation

In this section, we show that if the true parameters Θ_i^* are taken from a smooth distribution, then with high probability Assumption 5 is satisfied with Δ_{sep} not too small. In particular, we have the following result:

Proposition 11. *Suppose that $(\Theta_1^*, \dots, \Theta_K^*)$ are sampled from a joint distribution on the K -fold product of the Frobenius-norm ball of radius R in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$. Suppose that the distribution of $(\Theta_1^*, \dots, \Theta_K^*)$ is such that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq K$, the distribution of Θ_j^* conditioned on the value of Θ_i^* is σ_{dir} -directionally smooth. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, Assumption 5 is satisfied with*

$$\Delta_{\text{sep}} \geq \frac{md}{4\sqrt{\pi}} \cdot \left(\frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}} \delta}{K^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{md}}.$$

Proof. By a union bound, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1 \leq i < j \leq K} \|\Theta_i^* - \Theta_j^*\|_{\text{F}} < \Delta_{\text{sep}}\right) &\leq K^2 \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq K} \mathbb{P}\left(\|\Theta_i^* - \Theta_j^*\|_{\text{F}} < \Delta_{\text{sep}}\right) \\
&= K^2 \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq K} \mathbb{E}_{\Theta_i^*} \left[\mathbb{P}\left(\|\widehat{\Theta}_i - \widehat{\Theta}_j\|_{\text{F}} < \Delta_{\text{sep}} \mid \Theta_i^*\right) \right] \\
&\leq K^2 \sup_{\Theta_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}} \mathbb{P}\left(\|\Theta_j^* - \Theta_i^*\|_{\text{F}} < \Delta_{\text{sep}} \mid \Theta_i^*\right) \\
&\leq K^2 \cdot \frac{\text{vol}\left(\mathcal{B}_{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}^{md}\right)}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}^{md}$ denotes the Euclidean ball in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ of radius Δ_{sep} and the last inequality follows by the smoothness assumption. Note that

$$\text{vol}\left(\mathcal{B}_{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}^{md}\right) = \frac{\pi^{\frac{md}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{md}{2} + 1\right)} \cdot \Delta_{\text{sep}}^{md}$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{1 \leq i < j \leq K} \|\Theta_i^* - \Theta_j^*\|_{\text{F}} < \Delta_{\text{sep}}\right) \leq \frac{K^2 \pi^{\frac{md}{2}} \Delta_{\text{sep}}^{md}}{\sigma_{\text{dir}} \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{md}{2} + 1\right)}.$$

Noting that $\Gamma\left(\frac{md}{2} + 1\right)^{\frac{1}{md}} \geq \frac{md}{4}$ concludes the proof. ■

Part II

Supporting Proofs

D Parameter Recovery

In this section, we fix τ and let $\{\widehat{\Theta}_i \mid i \in [K]\}$, \widehat{g} denote the output of $\text{ERMORACLE}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{1:\tau E}, \mathbf{y}_{1:\tau E})$. For any $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $i, j \in [K]$, we denote

$$I_{ij}(g) = \{1 \leq t \leq \tau E \mid g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i \text{ and } g_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = j\}. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

We will show the following result:

Theorem 12 (Parameter Recovery). *Suppose that Assumptions 2-4 hold. Then there is a universal constant C such that for any tunable parameter $\xi \in (0, 1)$ (which appears in the analysis but not in the algorithm), with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds for all $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ satisfying*

$$|I_{ij}(\widehat{g})| \geq CK^2 T \xi + C \frac{B^8 K d}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^8 \xi^8} \log\left(\frac{BKT}{\sigma_{\text{dir}} \xi \delta}\right),$$

it holds that

$$\|\widehat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*\|_{\text{F}}^2 \leq C \frac{B^2}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \xi^2 |I_{ij}(\widehat{g})|} \left(\varepsilon_{\text{orac}} + 1 + K^3 B^2 R^2 d^2 m \nu^2 \sqrt{T} \log\left(\frac{TRBmdK}{\delta}\right) \right) + 4BRK^2 \frac{1}{|I_{ij}(g)|} \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\delta_t\|$$

We refer the reader to the notation table in Appendix A for a reminder about the parameters. We begin by defining for any $i, j \in [K]$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$\Sigma_{ij}(g) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq t \leq \tau E \\ t \in I_{ij}(g)}} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t^T,$$

the empirical covariance matrix on those $t \in I_{ij}(g)$. We will first show that for a fixed g , $\Sigma_{ij}(g) \succeq cI$ for a sufficiently small c depending on problem parameters. We will then introduce a complexity notion we call a disagreement cover that will allow us to lift this statement to one uniform in \mathcal{G} , which will imply that $\Sigma_{ij}(\hat{g}) \succeq cI$. We will then use the definition of ERMORACLE to show that $\sum_t \|(\hat{\Theta}_{\hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \Theta_{g^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)}^*)\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2$ is small and the theorem will follow.

For the entirety of the proof and without loss of generality, we will assume that $T/E \in \mathbb{Z}$. Indeed, if T is not a multiple of E then we suffer regret at most $O(E)$ on the last episode, which we will see does not adversely affect our rates.

D.1 Disagreement Covers

We begin by introducing a notion of complexity we call a disagreement cover; in contrast to standard ε -nets, we show below that the disagreement cover provides more uniform notion of coverage. Moreover, we then show that the size of a disagreement cover of \mathcal{G} can be controlled under the assumption of directional smoothness.

Definition 13. Let $\mathcal{D} = \{(g_i, \mathcal{D}_i) \mid g_i \in \mathcal{G} \text{ and } \mathcal{D}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^d\}$. We say that \mathcal{D} is an ε -disagreement cover if the following two properties hold:

1. For every $g \in \mathcal{G}$, there exists some i such that $(g_i, \mathcal{D}_i) \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid g_i(\mathbf{x}) \neq g(\mathbf{x})\} \subset \mathcal{D}_i$.
2. For all i and t , it holds that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{D}_i \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \leq \varepsilon$

We will denote by $\text{DN}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ (or $\text{DN}(\varepsilon)$ when \mathcal{G} is clear from context) the minimal size of an ε -disagreement cover of \mathcal{G} .

We remark that a disagreement cover is stronger than the more classical notion of an ε -net because the sets of points where multiple different functions g disagree with a single element of the cover g_i has to be contained in a single set. With an ε -net, there is nothing stopping the existence of an i such that the set of points on which at least one g satisfying $\mathbb{P}(g_i \neq g) \leq \varepsilon$ is the entire space. The reason that this uniformity is necessary is to provide the following bound:

Lemma D.1. Let \mathcal{D} be an ε -disagreement cover for \mathcal{G} . Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{(g_i, \mathcal{D}_i) \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[g(\mathbf{x}_t) \neq g_i(\mathbf{x}_t)] \leq 2T\varepsilon + 6 \log \left(\frac{|\mathcal{D}|}{\delta} \right).$$

Proof. Note that by the definition of a disagreement cover, it holds that

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{(g_i, \mathcal{D}_i) \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[g(\mathbf{x}_t) \neq g_i(\mathbf{x}_t)] \leq \max_{(g_i, \mathcal{D}_i) \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{D}_i].$$

Note that for any fixed i , it holds that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{D}_i \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \leq \varepsilon$, also by construction. Applying a Chernoff bound (Lemma D.2), we see that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{D}_i] \geq 2T\varepsilon + 6 \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \leq \delta.$$

Taking a union bound over $\mathcal{D}_i \in \mathcal{D}$ concludes the proof. ■

For the sake of completeness, we state and prove the standard Chernoff Bound with dependent data used in the previous argument:

Lemma D.2 (Chernoff Bound). Suppose that X_1, \dots, X_T are random variables such that $X_t \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $1 \leq t \leq T$. Suppose that there exist p_t such that $\mathbb{P}(X_t = 1 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \leq p_t$ almost surely, where \mathcal{F}_{t-1} is the σ -algebra generated by X_1, \dots, X_{t-1} . Then

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T X_t > 2 \sum_{t=1}^T p_t + \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \leq \delta$$

Proof. We use the standard Laplace transform trick:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{t=1}^T X_t > 2\sum_{t=1}^T p_t + u\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(e^{\lambda\sum_{t=1}^T X_t} > e^{2\lambda u + 2\lambda\sum_{t=1}^T p_t}\right) \\
&\leq e^{-2\lambda u - 2\lambda\sum_{t=1}^T p_t} \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{t=1}^T e^{\lambda X_t}\right] \\
&= e^{-2\lambda u - 2\lambda\sum_{t=1}^T p_t} \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda X_t} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]\right] \\
&\leq e^{-2\lambda u - 2\lambda\sum_{t=1}^T p_t} \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{t=1}^T e^{\lambda\mathbb{P}(X_t = 1 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) + (1 - \mathbb{P}(X_t = 1 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}))}\right] \\
&\leq e^{-2\lambda u - 2\lambda\sum_{t=1}^T p_t} \cdot \prod_{t=1}^T e^{(e^\lambda - 1)p_t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we see that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{t=1}^T X_t > 2\sum_{t=1}^T p_t + u\right) \leq e^{-2\lambda u + (e^\lambda - 1 - 2\lambda)\sum_{t=1}^T p_t}.$$

Setting $\lambda = 1$ and noting that $\sum_{t=1}^T p_t > 0$ tells us that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{t=1}^T X_t > 2\sum_{t=1}^T p_t + u\right) \leq e^{-2u}$$

and the result follows. ■

Returning to the main thread, we see that Lemma D.1 allows us to uniformly bound the approximation error of considering a disagreement cover. Before we can apply the result, however, we need to show that this complexity notion is small for the relevant class, \mathcal{G} . We have the following result:

Lemma D.3. *Let \mathcal{G} be the set of classifiers considered above. Then it holds that*

$$\log(\text{DN}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)) \leq K(d+1) \log\left(\frac{3BK}{\varepsilon}\right)$$

We prove the result in two parts. For the first part, we show that any function class that is constructed by aggregating K simpler classes has a disagreement cover whose size is controlled by that of the K classes:

Lemma D.4. *Let $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_K$ be function classes mapping $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. Let $h : \mathcal{Y}^{\times K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be some aggregating function and define*

$$\mathcal{G} = \{\mathbf{x} \mapsto h(g_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, g_K(\mathbf{x})) \mid g_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1, \dots, g_K \in \mathcal{G}_K\}$$

Let $\text{DN}(\mathcal{G}_i, \varepsilon)$ be the minimal size of an ε -disagreement cover of \mathcal{G}_i . Then

$$\text{DN}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon) \leq \prod_{i=1}^K \text{DN}\left(\mathcal{G}_i, \frac{\varepsilon}{K}\right)$$

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{D}_i are $(\frac{\varepsilon}{K})$ -disagreement covers for \mathcal{G}_i and for any $g_i \in \mathcal{G}_i$ denote by $(\pi(g_i), \mathcal{D}_i(g_i))$ the pair of functions and disagreement sets satisfying the definition of a disagreement cover. Then we claim that

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ \left(h(g_1, \dots, g_K), \bigcup_i \mathcal{D}_i \right) \mid (g_i, \mathcal{D}_i) \in \mathcal{D}_i \right\}$$

is an ε -disagreement cover for \mathcal{G} . Note that $|\mathcal{D}|$ is clearly bounded by the desired quantity so this claim suffices to prove the result.

To prove the claim, we first note that a union bound ensures that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_t \in \bigcup_i \mathcal{D}_i \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \leq \varepsilon$. We further note that if $g = h(g_1, \dots, g_K)$ then

$$\{\mathbf{x} \mid g(\mathbf{x}) \neq h(\pi(g_1(\mathbf{x})), \dots, \pi(g_K(\mathbf{x})))\} \subset \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq K} \{\mathbf{x} \mid g_i(\mathbf{x}) \neq \pi(g_i(\mathbf{x}))\} \subset \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq K} \mathcal{D}_i(g_i).$$

The result follows. ■

We now prove that the class of linear threshold functions has bounded disagreement cover:

Lemma D.5. *Let $\mathcal{H} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ be the class of affine thresholds given by $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \text{sign}(\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x} \rangle + b)$ for some $\mathbf{w} \in B^d$ and some $b \in [-B, B]$. Then*

$$\log \text{DN}(\mathcal{H}, \varepsilon) \leq (d+1) \log \left(\frac{3B}{\varepsilon} \right).$$

Proof. We first let $\mathcal{N} := \{(\mathbf{w}_i, b_i)\}$ denote an ε -net on $B^d \times [-B, B]$. Associate each (\mathbf{w}_i, b_i) to its corresponding classifier $h_i(\mathbf{x}) = \text{sign}(\langle \mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle + b_i)$. We claim that for each h_i , there is a region $\mathcal{D}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\{(h_i, \mathcal{D}_i)\}$ is an ε -disagreement cover. To see this, consider some h with parameters (\mathbf{w}, b) , and let h_i with parameters (\mathbf{w}_i, b_i) ensure $\|\mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{w}\| + |b_i - b| \leq \sigma_{\text{dir}} \varepsilon / B$. Consider any \mathbf{x} such that

$$\text{sign}(\langle \mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle + b_i) \neq \text{sign}(\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x} \rangle + b)$$

By the continuity of affine functions, there is some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that if $\mathbf{w}_\lambda = (1-\lambda)\mathbf{w}_i + \lambda\mathbf{w}$ and $b_\lambda = (1-\lambda)b_i + \lambda b$ then

$$\langle \mathbf{w}_\lambda, \mathbf{x} \rangle + b_\lambda = 0$$

Note however that

$$|\langle \mathbf{w}_\lambda, \mathbf{x} \rangle + b_\lambda - \langle \mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle - b_i| \leq \lambda |\langle \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle| + \lambda |b_i - b| \leq B \left(\frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}} \varepsilon}{B} \right) \leq \sigma_{\text{dir}} \varepsilon$$

by the definition of our ε -net. Thus, let

$$\mathcal{D}_i = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \mid |\langle \mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle + b_i| \leq \frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}} \varepsilon}{B} \right\}$$

and note that the above computation tells us that if $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathcal{D}_i$ then h_i must agree with $h = (\mathbf{w}, b)$ for all h that are mapped to h_i by the projection onto the ε -net. Thus for all such h , it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}(h(\mathbf{x}_t) \neq h_i(\mathbf{x}_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(|\langle \mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x}_t \rangle + b_i| \leq \frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}} \varepsilon}{B} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Thus the claim holds and we have constructed an ε -disagreement cover. By noting that there are at most $\left(\frac{3}{\varepsilon}\right)^d \cdot \frac{B}{\varepsilon}$ members of this cover by a volume argument we conclude the proof. ■

By combining Lemma D.4 and Lemma D.5, we prove Lemma D.3. In the next section, we will apply Lemma D.3 and Lemma D.1 to lower bound $\Sigma_{ij}(\hat{g})$.

D.2 Lower Bounding the Covariance

We continue by lower bounding $\Sigma_{ij}(\hat{g})$. Before we begin, we introduce some notation. For any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, we will let

$$Z_{t;ij}(g) = \mathbb{I}[g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i \text{ and } g_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = j] \quad \bar{Z}_{t;ij}(g) = \mathbb{E}[Z_{t;ij}(g) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$$

or, in words, $Z_{t;ij}(g)$ is the indicator of the event that a classifier predicts label i when g_* predicts j and $\bar{Z}_{t;ij}(g)$ is probability of this event conditioned on the \mathbf{x} -history. We will work under the small-ball assumption that there exist constants c_0, c_1 as well as ζ_t, ρ_t such that for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{S}^d$, it holds for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 \geq c_0 \zeta_t^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t, Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1\right) \geq c_1 \rho_t \quad (\text{D.2})$$

We will show that (D.2) holds and defer control of the values of ζ_t, ρ_t to Appendix D.3, but, for the sake of clarity, we take these constants as given for now. We proceed to show that for a single function g , that for all i, j such that $I_{ij}(g)$ is big, it holds that $\Sigma_{ij}(g)$ is also large. We will then apply our results in the previous section to lift this statement to one uniform in \mathcal{G} . We have the following result:

Lemma D.6. *Let $\rho = \min_t \rho_t$ and let $\zeta = \min_t \zeta_t$, where ρ_t, ζ_t are from (D.2). Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ and all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that*

$$|I_{ij}(g)| \geq \max\left(\frac{2}{\rho^2} \left(\log\left(\frac{2T}{\delta}\right) + \frac{d}{2} \log\left(C \frac{B \zeta^2}{\rho}\right) + \log(K^2 \text{DN}(\varepsilon))\right), C \frac{B^2}{\zeta^2} \left(2T\varepsilon + 6 \log\left(\frac{\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\delta}\right)\right)\right)$$

it holds that

$$\Sigma_{ij}(g) \succeq \frac{c_0 \zeta^2}{8} |I_{ij}(g)|$$

We will prove Lemma D.6 by first fixing $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and showing the statement for the fixed g and then using the results of Appendix D.3 to make the statements uniform in \mathcal{G} . To prove the statement for a fixed g , we require the following self-normalized martingale inequality:

Lemma D.7. *Let \mathcal{F}_t be a filtration with $A_t \in \mathcal{F}_t$ and $B_t \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ for all t . Let*

$$p_{A_t} = \mathbb{P}(A_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, B_t) \quad p_{B_t} = \mathbb{P}(B_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1})$$

and suppose that $p_{A_t} \geq \rho$ for all t . Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[A_t] \mathbb{I}[B_t] \geq \rho \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[B_t] - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2 \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[B_t]\right) \log\left(\frac{2T}{\delta}\right)}$$

In particular with probability at least $1 - \delta$, if

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[B_t] \geq \frac{2}{\rho^2} \log\left(\frac{2T}{\delta}\right)$$

then

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[A_t] \mathbb{I}[B_t] \geq \frac{\rho}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[B_t]$$

In order to prove Lemma D.7, we will require the following general result:

Lemma D.8 (Theorem 1 from Abbasi-Yadkori et al. [2011]). *Let (u_t) be predictable with respect to a filtration (\mathcal{G}_t) , and let (e_t) be such that $e_t \mid \mathcal{G}_t$ is ν^2 -subGaussian. Then, for any fixed parameter $\lambda > 0$, with probability $1 - \delta$,*

$$\left(\sum_{t=1}^T u_t e_t\right)^2 \leq 2\nu^2 \left(\lambda + \sum_{t=1}^T u_t^2\right) \log \frac{(1 + \lambda^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T u_t^2)^{1/2}}{\delta}$$

We now present the proof of Lemma D.7:

Proof of Lemma D.7. We apply Lemma D.8 with $u_t = \mathbb{I}[B_t]$, $e_t = \mathbb{I}[A_t] - p_{A_t}$, and $\mathcal{G}_t = \mathcal{F}_t$. Noting that the latter is $\frac{1}{8}$ -subGaussian because it is conditionally mean zero and bounded in absolute value by 1, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left|\sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbb{I}[A_t] - p_{A_t}) \mathbb{I}[B_t]\right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left(\lambda + \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[B_t]\right) \log\left(\frac{\sqrt{1 + \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[B_t]}{\lambda}}}{\delta}\right)}$$

Taking a union bound over $\lambda \in [T]$ and noting that $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[B_t] \in [T]$ almost surely, we recover the result. \blacksquare

We now proceed to apply Lemma D.7 to prove a version of Lemma D.6 with the function $g \in \mathcal{G}$ fixed:

Lemma D.9. *Suppose that (D.2) holds and that $\rho = \min_t \rho_t$ as well as $\zeta = \min_t \zeta_t$. For fixed $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}$, it holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ that if*

$$|I_{ij}(g)| \geq \frac{2}{\rho^2} \log \left(\frac{2T}{\delta} \right) + \frac{d}{\rho^2} \log \left(C \frac{B\zeta^2}{\rho} \right)$$

then

$$\Sigma_{ij}(g) \succeq \frac{c_0 \zeta^2}{4} |I_{ij}(g)|$$

Proof. Note that for any fixed unit vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{S}^{d-1}$, the following holds:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\mathbf{u}^T \Sigma_{ij}(g) \mathbf{u} \leq \frac{c_0 \rho \zeta^2 |I_{ij}(g)|}{2} \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} [\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T \mathbf{u} \leq c_0 \zeta^2] Z_{t;ij} \leq \frac{\rho |I_{ij}(g)|}{2} \right)$$

Now let A_t denote the event that $(\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_t \rangle)^2 \geq c_0 \zeta^2$ and let B_t denote the event that $Z_{t;ij} = 1$. Noting that $\mathbb{P}(A_t | B_t) \geq \rho$ by (D.2), we may apply Lemma D.7 and note that $|I_{ij}(g)|$ is just the sum of the B_t to show that if $I_{ij}(g)$ satisfies the assumed lower bound, then

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} [\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T \mathbf{u} \leq c_0 \zeta^2] Z_{t;ij} \leq \frac{\rho |I_{ij}(g)|}{2} \right) \leq 1 - \delta \exp \left(-\frac{d}{2} \log \left(C \frac{R\zeta^2}{\rho} \right) \right).$$

Taking a union bound over an appropriately sized ε -net on \mathcal{S}^{d-1} to approximate \mathbf{u} , and applying Block and Simchowitz [2022, Lemma 45] concludes the proof. \blacksquare

We are now ready to prove the main result in this section, i.e., a lower bound on $\Sigma_{ij}(\hat{g})$:

Proof of Lemma D.6. Fix $\mathcal{D} = \{(g_i, \mathcal{D}_i)\}$ an ε -disagreement cover of \mathcal{G} of size $\text{DN}(\varepsilon)$. Taking a union bound over all g_i in \mathcal{D} and then applying Lemma D.9 tells us that with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$, it holds for all $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ and all $g_k \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$|I_{ij}(g)| \geq \frac{4}{\rho^2} \log \left(\frac{2TK\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\delta} \right) + \frac{d}{\rho^2} \log \left(C \frac{B\zeta^2}{\rho} \right)$$

we have

$$\Sigma_{ij}(g_k) \succeq \frac{c_0 \zeta^2}{4} |I_{ij}(g)|. \tag{D.3}$$

Applying Lemma D.1, we see that with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$,

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{g_k \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} [g(\mathbf{x}_t) \neq g_k(\mathbf{x}_t)] \leq 2T\varepsilon + 12 \log \left(\frac{\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\delta} \right).$$

Noting that by assumption, $\|\mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T\| \leq B^2$, we see that for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, there is some $g_k \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\Sigma_{ij}(g) \succeq \Sigma_{ij}(g_k) - B^2 \left(4T\varepsilon + 6 \log \left(\frac{\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\delta} \right) \right).$$

Thus, applying the above lower bound on $\Sigma_{ij}(g_k)$ concludes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma D.6 has provided a lower bound on the empirical covariance matrices under the assumption that (D.2) holds; in the next section we show that this assumption is valid.

D.3 Small Ball Inequality

Introduce the shorthand $\mathbb{P}_t(\cdot) := \mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1})$ and $\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$. Recall from the previous section that we assumed that there are constants c_0, c_1 and ζ_t, ρ_t such that for any $\bar{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{S}^d$, and any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}_t \left(\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{w}} \rangle^2 \geq c_0 \zeta_t^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right) \geq c_1 \rho_t. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

In this section, we will show that smoothness and an assumption on $Z_{t;ij}(g)$ suffice to guarantee that this holds. We will show the following result:

Lemma D.10. *Suppose that Assumptions 4 and 2 hold. Fix a $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ and suppose that*

$$\mathbb{P}_t(Z_{t;ij}(g)) \geq \xi.$$

For all $\bar{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{S}^d$, it holds that, for universal constants c_0 and c_1 ,

$$\mathbb{P}_t \left(\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{w}} \rangle^2 \geq c_0 \frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \xi^2}{B^2} \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right) \geq c_1 \frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^4 \xi^4}{B^4}.$$

We begin by defining some notation. First, we let $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t}$ denote variance with respect to \mathbf{x}_t , conditioned on the \mathbf{x} -history and $Z_{t;ij}(g)$. That is, for some function f of \mathbf{x}_t , we let

$$\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t}[f] = \mathbb{E}_t[f(\mathbf{x}_t)^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g)] - \mathbb{E}_t[f(\mathbf{x}_t) \mid Z_{t;ij}(g)]^2. \quad (\text{D.5})$$

For a fixed $\bar{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{S}^d$, denote by \mathbf{w} the first d coordinates. For fixed $g \in \mathcal{G}$, and $1 \leq i, j \leq K$, we will denote:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_t(g, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) &= \left(\frac{\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t}[\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle]}{\|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \vee \left(\mathbb{E}_t[\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1] \right)} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{32 \left(1 + \mathbb{E}_t[\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^4 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1] \right)} \\ \zeta_t^2(g, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) &= \frac{\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t}[\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle]}{\|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \vee \left(\mathbb{E}_t[\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1] \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

We will now show the following result:

Lemma D.11. *It holds for any fixed $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}$ that*

$$\mathbb{P}_t \left(\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{w}} \rangle^2 \geq c_0 \zeta_t^2(g, \bar{\mathbf{w}}) Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right) \geq c_1 \rho_t(g, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$$

After proving Lemma D.11, we will provide lower bounds on ζ_t and ρ_t under the assumptions of Lemma D.10, which will allow us to prove the main result. To begin the proof of Lemma D.11, we will begin by showing that $\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{w}} \rangle^2$ is lower bounded in expectation in the following result:

Lemma D.12. *Suppose that Assumptions refass:dirmsmooth and 4 hold. Then for any fixed $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}$, it holds for all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{S}^d$ that*

$$\mathbb{E}_t \left[\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{w}} \rangle^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) \right] \geq \zeta_t^2(g, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$$

Proof. We prove two distinct lower bounds and then combine them. Fix i, j, g , and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$. Recall that \mathbf{w} is $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$ without its last coordinate and let w_0 denote the last coordinate of $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$. We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{w}} \rangle^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_t \left[(w_0 + \langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle)^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [w_0 + \langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle] \end{aligned}$$

where the equality comes from noting that the last coordinate of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$ is 1 by construction, the inequality is trivial. This is our first lower bound. For our second lower bound, we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{w}} \rangle^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_t \left[(w_0 + \langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle)^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right] \\ &\geq \frac{w_0^2}{2} - \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from applying the numerical inequality $2(x + y)^2 \geq x^2 - 2y^2$. This is our second lower bound. To ease notation, denote

$$\alpha = \frac{\mathbb{E}_t \left[\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right]}{\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle]} \geq 1.$$

Combining the two previous lower bounds, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right] &\geq \max \left(\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle], \frac{w_0^2}{2} - 2\alpha \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle] \right) \\ &\geq \max_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} \left\{ (1 - \lambda) \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle] + \lambda \frac{w_0^2}{2} - 2\lambda \alpha \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle] \right\} \\ &= \max_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} \left\{ (1 - \lambda - 2\alpha \lambda) \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle] + \lambda \frac{w_0^2}{2} \right\} \\ &\geq \max_{0 \leq \alpha \leq 1} \left\{ (1 - 3\alpha \lambda) \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle] + \lambda \frac{w_0^2}{2} \right\} \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{3\alpha}{6\alpha} \right) \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle] + \frac{1}{12\alpha} w_0^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} \left[\left\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \frac{\mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \right\rangle \right] + \frac{w_0^2}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{6\alpha} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\mathbf{w}\|^2 + w_0^2 \right) \min \left(\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} \left[\left\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \frac{\mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \right\rangle \right], \frac{1}{6\alpha} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \min \left(\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} \left[\left\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \frac{\mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \right\rangle \right], \frac{\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle]}{6\mathbb{E}_t [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1]} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows because $\alpha \geq 1$ and the last equality follows because $1 = \|\bar{\mathbf{w}}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 + w_0^2$. The result follows. \blacksquare

We now are prepared to use the Paley-Zygmund inequality to prove the lower bound depending on ρ_t and ζ_t :

Proof of Lemma D.11. We apply the Paley-Zygmund inequality and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_t \left(\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{w}} \rangle^2 \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}_t [\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1]}{2} \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right) &\geq \frac{\mathbb{E}_t [\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1]^2}{4\mathbb{E}_t [\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{w}} \rangle^4 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1]} \\ &\geq \frac{\zeta_t(g, \bar{\mathbf{w}})^4}{4\mathbb{E}_t [\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{w}} \rangle^4 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1]} \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma D.12. Applying the bound in Claim D.2, proved in a computation below for clarity, it holds that the last line above is lower bounded by:

$$\left(\frac{\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle]}{\|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \vee \left(\mathbb{E}_t [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1] \right)} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{32 \left(1 + \mathbb{E}_t [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^4 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1] \right)}.$$

The result follows by the definition of $\rho_t(g, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$. \blacksquare

We defer the more technical computation to the end of this section. We now have our desired small ball result, modulo the fact that we need to lower bound ζ_t and ρ_t . To do this, we have the following key result that lower bounds the conditional variance:

Claim D.1. Suppose that Assumptions 2 and 4 holds and that

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_{t;ij}(g) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \geq \xi.$$

Then it holds for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{B}^d$ that

$$\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle] \geq \frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \xi^2 \|\mathbf{w}\|^2}{4}.$$

In particular, it holds that

$$\rho_t(g, \mathbf{w}) \geq \frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^4 \xi^4}{128B^4}, \quad \zeta_t(g, \mathbf{w})^2 \geq \frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \xi^2}{4B^2}.$$

Proof. We begin by noting that by Markov's inequality, for any $\lambda > 0$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}_t (|\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle - \mathbb{E} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1]| > \lambda \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1) \leq \frac{\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle]}{\lambda^2}.$$

Rearranging, we see that

$$\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle] \geq \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^2 \cdot \mathbb{P}_t (|\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle - \mathbb{E}_t [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1]| > \lambda \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1).$$

Now we compute by Bayes' theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_t (|\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle - \mathbb{E} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1]| \leq \lambda \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1) \\ \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}_t (|\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle - \mathbb{E}_t [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1]| \leq \lambda \mid)}{\xi} \end{aligned}$$

and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_t (|\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle - \mathbb{E}_t [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1]| \leq \lambda) \\ \leq \sup_{\mathbf{w}, c} \mathbb{P}_t (|\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle - c| \leq \lambda) \\ \leq \sup_{\mathbf{w}, c} \mathbb{P}_t \left(\left| \left\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \frac{\mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \right\rangle - c \right| \leq \frac{\lambda}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \right) \leq \frac{\lambda}{\|\mathbf{w}\| \sigma_{\text{dir}}}, \end{aligned}$$

by Assumption 2. Thus we have

$$\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{x}_t} [\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle] \geq \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^2 \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\xi \sigma_{\text{dir}} \|\mathbf{w}\|} \right).$$

Setting $\lambda = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \xi \sigma_{\text{dir}} \|\mathbf{w}\|$ concludes the proof of the first statement. The second statements follow by Assumption 4. \blacksquare

Combining the lower bound in Claim D.1 with the small ball estimate of Lemma D.11 concludes the proof of Lemma D.10. We now prove the technical results required in previous proofs above.

Claim D.2. Suppose we are in the situation of Lemma D.12. Then it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_t \left[\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^4 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right] \leq 8 + 8\mathbb{E}_t \left[\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^4 \mid Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right]$$

Proof. Continuing to use notation from the proof of Lemma D.12, we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t, \bar{\mathbf{w}} \rangle^4 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[(w_0 + \langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle)^4 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right] \\ &\leq 8w_0^4 + 8\mathbb{E} \left[\langle \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{w} \rangle^4 \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, Z_{t;ij}(g) = 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows by noting that $w_0^2 \leq w_0^2 + \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 = \|\bar{\mathbf{w}}\|^2 = 1$. \blacksquare

With the covariance matrices lower bounded, we proceed to upper bound the regret.

D.4 Upper Bounding the Empirical Error

In this section, we will show that for $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ such that $|I_{ij}(\hat{g})|$ is sufficiently large, the fact that $\hat{\Theta}$ is formed by minimizing the empirical risk will force

$$\mathcal{Q}_{ij}(\hat{g}) = \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(\hat{g})} \left\| \left(\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^* \right) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2$$

to be small. In the end, we will combine this bound with our lower bound on $\Sigma_{ij}(\hat{g})$ proved above to conclude the proof of the theorem. We will begin by introducing some notation. For fixed $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ and a fixed $g \in \mathcal{G}$, we define:

$$\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g) = \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\| \hat{\Theta}_i \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\|^2 - \left\| \Theta_j^* \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\|^2.$$

The main result of this section is as follows:

Lemma D.13. *Under Assumptions 2-4, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(\hat{g}) &\leq \varepsilon_{\text{orac}} + CK^2 BR d \sqrt{TmK \log \left(\frac{TRBRK}{\delta} \right)} + CK^3 d \left(4B^2 R^2 + \nu^2 \log \left(\frac{T}{\delta} \right) \right) \log \left(\frac{BKT}{\delta} \right) \\ &\quad + C\nu^2 d^2 Km \log \left(\frac{TRBmdK}{\delta} \right) + C\nu d \sqrt{Km \log \left(\frac{TRBmdK}{\delta} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove this result, we begin by fixing $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ and bounding $\mathcal{Q}_{ij}(g)$ by $\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g)$. We will then use the results of Appendix D.1 to make the statement uniform in \mathcal{G} . We proceed with the case of fixed g and prove the following result:

Lemma D.14. *Suppose that Assumptions 2-4 all hold. Fix $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ and some $g \in \mathcal{G}$. For any $\lambda > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{Q}_{ij}(g) \leq \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g) + C\nu^2 dm \log \left(\frac{TRBmd}{\lambda\delta} \right) + C\nu \sqrt{\lambda dm \log \left(\frac{TRBmd}{\lambda\delta} \right)} + 16BR \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\delta_t\|.$$

Proof. We begin by expanding

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g) &= \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\| \hat{\Theta}_i \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\|^2 - \left\| \Theta_j^* \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\| \left(\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^* \right) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{e}_t - \delta_t \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbf{e}_t + \delta_t \right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\| \left(\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^* \right) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2 - 2 \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\langle \mathbf{e}_t + \delta_t, \left(\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^* \right) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\rangle \\ &= \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(g) - 2 \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\langle \mathbf{e}_t + \delta_t, \left(\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^* \right) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it suffices to bound the second term. By linearity, and the assumption on δ_t , we have

$$2 \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\langle \mathbf{e}_t + \delta_t, \left(\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^* \right) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\rangle \leq 2 \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\langle \mathbf{e}_t, \left(\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^* \right) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\rangle + 4BR \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\delta_t\|.$$

We use a generalization of the self-normalized martingale inequality, Lemma D.8 to bound the first term above. To do this, fix some $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (d+1)}$ and define

$$E(\Delta) = \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\langle \mathbf{e}_t, \Delta \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\rangle \quad V(\Delta) = \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\Delta \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t\|^2.$$

Noting that $V(\widehat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*) = \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(g)$, we see from the above that

$$\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g) = V(\widehat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*) - 2E(\widehat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*) \quad (\text{D.6})$$

We will now bound $E(\Delta)$ for some fixed Δ and then apply a covering argument to lift the statement to apply to $\widehat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*$. By Assumption 4, we may take $\|\Delta\| \leq 2R$.

Recall that \mathcal{F}_t^y denotes the filtration generated by $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{t-1}$. Applying Simchowitz et al. [2019, Lemma E.1], a generalization of Lemma D.8, with $e_t \leftarrow \langle \mathbf{e}_t, \Delta \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle$, $u_t = \Delta \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$, and the filtration \mathcal{F}_t^y , tells us that for any $\lambda > 0$, it holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ that

$$E(\Delta)^2 \leq 2\nu^2(\lambda + V(\Delta)) \log \left(\frac{\sqrt{1 + \frac{V(\Delta)}{\lambda}}}{\delta} \right). \quad (\text{D.7})$$

We note by Assumption 4, it holds that

$$V(\Delta) \leq 4TR^2B^2$$

and thus the subadditivity of the square root tells us that

$$E(\Delta)^2 \leq 2\nu^2(\lambda + V(\Delta)) \log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Now let \mathcal{N} be an ε -net of the Frobenius ball in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times (d+1)}$ of radius $2R$. For small ε , we may take \mathcal{N} such that

$$\log(|\mathcal{N}|) \leq m(d+1) \log \left(\frac{6R}{\varepsilon} \right). \quad (\text{D.8})$$

For any Δ , denote by Δ' its projection into \mathcal{N} . Then we compute

$$\begin{aligned} E(\Delta)^2 &\leq E(\Delta')^2 + E(\Delta)^2 - E(\Delta')^2 \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\mathbf{e}_t\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right) 4RB^2T \sqrt{\|\Delta - \Delta'\|_{\mathbb{F}}} + 2\nu^2(\lambda + V(\Delta')) \log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} |\mathcal{N}| \right) \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2 \right) 4RB^2T \sqrt{\varepsilon} + 2\nu^2(\lambda + V(\Delta')) \log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} |\mathcal{N}| \right) \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2 \right) 4RB^2T \sqrt{\varepsilon} + 2\nu^2(\lambda + V(\Delta)) \log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} |\mathcal{N}| \right) \\ &\quad + (V(\Delta') - V(\Delta)) \log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Claim D.3 along with a union bound over \mathcal{N} applied to (D.7), the third inequality follows from the definition of an ε -net, and the last inequality follows from simply adding and subtracting the same term. Applying Claim D.3 once again, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} E(\Delta)^2 &\leq \left(\sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2 \right) 4RB^2T \sqrt{\varepsilon} + 2\nu^2(\lambda + V(\Delta)) \log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} |\mathcal{N}| \right) \\ &\quad + 4RB^2T \sqrt{\varepsilon} \log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} |\mathcal{N}| \right) \\ &\leq 2\nu^2(\lambda + V(\Delta)) \log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} |\mathcal{N}| \right) + 4RB^2T^2 m \nu^2 \sqrt{\varepsilon} \log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} |\mathcal{N}| \right) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly for all Δ in the Frobenius ball of radius $2R$. We now choose

$$\varepsilon = C \left(\frac{TRB^2md}{\lambda} \right)^{-c}$$

for some universal constants C, c to ensure that

$$4RB^2T^2m\nu^2\sqrt{\varepsilon} \log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} |\mathcal{N}| \right) \leq 2\nu^2\lambda$$

Thus with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds for all Δ that

$$E(\Delta)^2 \leq 2\nu^2(\lambda + V(\Delta)) \left(\log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} \right) + m(d+1) \log \left(\frac{TR^2B^2md}{\lambda} \right) \right)$$

where we applied (D.8) to bound the size of \mathcal{N} . In particular, this holds for $\Delta = \widehat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*$ and thus

$$E(\widehat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*)^2 \leq 2\nu^2(\lambda + Q_{ij}(g)) \left(\log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} \right) + m(d+1) \log \left(\frac{TR^2B^2md}{\lambda} \right) \right)$$

Plugging this back into (D.6), we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$4BR|I_{ij}(g)|\varepsilon_{\text{crp}} + \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g) \geq Q_{ij}(g) - \sqrt{C\nu \left(\lambda + Q_{ij}(g) \right) \left(\log \left(\frac{1 + 2RB\sqrt{\frac{T}{\lambda}}}{\delta} \right) + m(d+1) \log \left(\frac{TR^2B^2md}{\lambda} \right) \right)}.$$

Rearranging concludes the proof. ■

We defer proofs of the technical computations, Lemmas D.3 and D.4, used in the proof of Lemma D.14 until the end of the section. For now, we press on to lift our bound from a statement about a fixed $g \in \mathcal{G}$ to one uniform in \mathcal{G} . We require one last lemma before concluding this proof, however. We are aiming to bound $Q_{ij}(\widehat{g})$ by $\mathcal{R}_{ij}(\widehat{g})$, but we need to upper bound $\mathcal{R}_{ij}(\widehat{g})$. This is the content of the following lemma:

Lemma D.15. *With probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $1 \leq i, j \leq K$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{ij}(\widehat{g}) &\leq \varepsilon_{\text{orac}} + 4BRK^2 \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\delta_t\| + CK^2BR \sqrt{Tmd \log \left(\frac{TBRKDN(\varepsilon)}{\delta} \right)} \\ &\quad + K^2 \left(4B^2R^2 + \nu^2 \log \left(\frac{T}{\delta} \right) \right) \left(2T\varepsilon + 6 \log \left(\frac{DN(\varepsilon)}{\delta} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We begin by introducing some notation. For fixed $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (d+1)}$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}$, let

$$\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g, \Theta) = \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\Theta_t \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t\|^2 - \|\mathbf{e}_t + \delta_t\|^2$$

and note that $\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g) = \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g, \widehat{\Theta}_i)$. First, we note that by definition of `ERMORACLE`,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\text{orac}} &\geq \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \widehat{\Theta}_{\widehat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\|^2 - \inf_{g, \widehat{\Theta}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \widehat{\Theta}_{\widehat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\|^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \widehat{\Theta}_{\widehat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\|^2 - \left\| \Theta_{g^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)}^* \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq K} \mathcal{R}_{ij}(\widehat{g}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{ij}(\widehat{g}) \leq \varepsilon_{\text{orac}} - \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i', j' \leq K \\ (i, j) \neq (i', j')}} \mathcal{R}_{ij}(\widehat{g}). \quad (\text{D.9})$$

Thus it will suffice to provide a lower bound on $\mathcal{R}_{ij}(\widehat{g})$ that holds with high probability. To do this, note that for fixed $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and Θ_0 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g, \Theta_0) &= \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\| (\Theta_0 - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2 - 2 \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \langle \mathbf{e}_t + \delta_t, (\Theta_0 - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{e}_t - \delta_t \rangle \\ &\geq -2 \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \langle \mathbf{e}_t + \delta_t, (\Theta_0 - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle \\ &\geq -2 \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \langle \mathbf{e}_t, (\Theta_0 - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle - 4BR \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\delta_t\|. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that \mathbf{e}_t is subGaussian by Assumption 3 and by Assumption 4 we have control over $\left\| (\Theta_0 - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|$, we see that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g, \Theta_0) &\geq -2 \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \langle \mathbf{e}_t, (\Theta_0 - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle - 4BR \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\delta_t\| \\ &\geq -8BR \sqrt{|I_{ij}(g)| \cdot \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} - 4BR \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\delta_t\|. \end{aligned}$$

Now note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g, \Theta_0) - \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g, \Theta'_0) &= \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\| (\Theta_0 - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{e}_t - \delta_t \right\|^2 - \left\| (\Theta'_0 - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{e}_t - \delta_t \right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \langle (\Theta_0 + \Theta'_0 - 2\Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - 2\mathbf{e}_t - 2\delta_t, (\Theta_0 - \Theta'_0) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Applying Cauchy Schwarz and noting that with probability at least $1 - \delta$ it holds that

$$\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|\mathbf{e}_t\| \leq \nu \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right)},$$

we have that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g, \Theta_0) - \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g, \Theta'_0) \leq 4RB^2 |I_{ij}(g)| \|\Theta_0 - \Theta'_0\| + 4BR \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\delta_t\|.$$

Thus if we take a union bound over a $\frac{1}{TBR^2}$ -net of the Frobenius ball of radius R in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times (d+1)}$, we see that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g) = \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g, \widehat{\Theta}_i) \geq -CBR \sqrt{Tm(d+1) \log\left(\frac{TBR}{\delta}\right)} - 4BR \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\delta_t\|.$$

We now note that by Lemma D.1, if \mathcal{D} is an ε -disagreement cover of \mathcal{G} , then

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{g_k \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \neq g_k(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] \leq 2T\varepsilon + 6 \log\left(\frac{\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\delta}\right).$$

We now apply Claim D.5 and note that this implies that if g is the projection of \hat{g} onto the disagreement cover, then

$$\mathcal{R}_{ij}(\hat{g}) \geq \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g) - \left(4B^2R^2 + \nu^2 \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right)\right) \left(2T\varepsilon + 6 \log\left(\frac{\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\delta}\right)\right)$$

Taking a union bound over $g \in \mathcal{D}$ and all pairs (i, j) tells us that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\mathcal{R}_{ij}(\hat{g}) \geq -CBBR\sqrt{Tmd \log\left(\frac{TRBRK\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\delta}\right)} - 4BBR \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\delta_t\| - \left(4B^2R^2 + \nu^2 \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right)\right) \left(2T\varepsilon + 6 \log\left(\frac{\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\delta}\right)\right).$$

Combining this with (D.9) concludes the proof. \blacksquare

We are now finally ready to prove the main result of this section:

Proof of Lemma D.13. We begin by noting that Lemma D.1 tells us that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{g_k \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \neq g_k(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] \leq 2T\varepsilon + 6 \log\left(\frac{\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\delta}\right)$$

We observe that for $g, g' \in \mathcal{G}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(g) - \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(g') &= \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\| (\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2 - \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g')} \left\| (\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2 \\ &\leq 4R^2B^2 \sum_t |Z_{t;ij}(g) - Z_{t;ij}(g')| \\ &\leq 4R^2B^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \neq g'(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)]. \end{aligned}$$

By Claim D.5, it holds that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $g, g' \in \mathcal{G}$, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g) - \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g') \leq \left(4B^2R^2 + \nu^2 \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right)\right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \neq g'(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)]$$

Now, taking a union bound over a minimal disagreement cover at scale ε as well as all pairs $1 \leq i, j \leq K$, we see that Lemma D.14 implies that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that for all $g_k \in \mathcal{D}$ the disagreement cover,

$$\mathcal{Q}_{ij}(g_k) \leq \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g_k) + C\nu^2 dm \log\left(\frac{TRBmdK^2\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\lambda\delta}\right) + C\nu\sqrt{\lambda dm \log\left(\frac{TRBmdK^2\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\lambda\delta}\right)}.$$

Letting g denote the projection of \hat{g} into the disagreement cover, we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(\hat{g}) &= \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(\hat{g}) - \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(g) + \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(g) \\ &\leq 4R^2B^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \neq g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] + \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(g) \\ &\leq 4R^2B^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \neq g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] + \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g) + C\nu^2 dm \log\left(\frac{TRBmdK^2\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\lambda\delta}\right) + C\nu\sqrt{\lambda dm \log\left(\frac{TRBmdK^2\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\lambda\delta}\right)} \\ &\leq \left(8B^2R^2 + \nu^2 \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right)\right) \left(2T\varepsilon + 6 \log\left(\frac{\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\delta}\right)\right) + \mathcal{R}_{ij}(\hat{g}) \\ &\quad + C\nu^2 dm \log\left(\frac{TRBmdK^2\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\lambda\delta}\right) + C\nu\sqrt{\lambda dm \log\left(\frac{TRBmdK^2\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\lambda\delta}\right)} \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\lambda = 1$ and applying Lemma D.15 to bound $\mathcal{R}_{ij}(\hat{g})$ then tells us that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(\hat{g}) &\leq \varepsilon_{\text{orac}} + CK^2 BR \sqrt{Tmd \log \left(\frac{TBRKDN(\varepsilon)}{\delta} \right)} + K^2 \left(4B^2 R^2 + \nu^2 \log \left(\frac{T}{\delta} \right) \right) \left(2T\varepsilon + 6 \log \left(\frac{DN(\varepsilon)}{\delta} \right) \right) \\ &\quad + C\nu^2 dm \log \left(\frac{TRBmdK^2 DN(\varepsilon)}{\delta} \right) + C\nu \sqrt{dm \log \left(\frac{TRBmdK^2 DN(\varepsilon)}{\delta} \right)} + 4BRK^2 T \varepsilon_{\text{crp}}. \end{aligned}$$

We can now plug in our bound on $DN(\varepsilon)$ from Lemma D.3 which says that

$$\log(DN(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)) \leq 2Kd \log \left(\frac{3BK}{\varepsilon} \right)$$

and set $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{T}$ to conclude the proof. \blacksquare

With the proof of Lemma D.13 concluded, we now prove the technical lemmas:

Claim D.3. *Let $\Delta, \Delta' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (d+1)}$ have Frobenius norm at most R . Let E, V be defined as in the proof of Lemma D.14. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} E(\Delta)^2 - E(\Delta')^2 &\leq \left(\sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2 \right) 4RB^2 T \sqrt{\|\Delta - \Delta'\|_F} \\ V(\Delta') - V(\Delta) &\leq 4RB^2 T \sqrt{\Delta - \Delta'} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} E(\Delta)^2 - E(\Delta')^2 &= E(\Delta + \Delta') \cdot E(\Delta - \Delta') \\ &= \left(\sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \langle \mathbf{e}_t, (\Delta + \Delta') \mathbf{x}_t \rangle \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \langle \mathbf{e}_t, (\Delta - \Delta') \mathbf{x}_t \rangle \right) \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2 \right) \sqrt{V(\Delta + \Delta')} \cdot \sqrt{V(\Delta - \Delta')} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2 \right) \sqrt{16TR^2 B^2} \cdot \sqrt{V(\Delta - \Delta')}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from linearity, the first inequality follows by Cauchy-Schwartz, and the last follows by a Assumption 4. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} V(\Delta) - V(\Delta') &= \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} (\|\Delta \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t\| + \|\Delta' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t\|) (\|\Delta \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t\| - \|\Delta' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t\|) \\ &\leq \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} (4RB) \|(\Delta - \Delta') \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t\| \\ &\leq 4RB \sqrt{T} \cdot \sqrt{V(\Delta - \Delta')}. \end{aligned}$$

We now note that

$$\begin{aligned} V(\Delta - \Delta') &= \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|(\Delta - \Delta') \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t\|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \|\Delta - \Delta'\|_F^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t\|^2 \\ &\leq TB^2 \|\Delta - \Delta'\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. \blacksquare

Claim D.4. Suppose that Assumption 3 holds. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2 \leq 2\nu^2 \left(Tm \log(8) + \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right).$$

Proof. Denote by $\bar{\mathbf{e}} = (\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_T)$ the concatenation of all the \mathbf{e}_t and note that $\bar{\mathbf{e}}$ is subGaussian by Assumption 3. Let $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ denote a unit vector in \mathbb{R}^{Tm} and note that for any fixed $\bar{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{S}^{Tm-1}$, it holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ that $\langle \bar{\mathbf{e}}, \bar{\mathbf{u}} \rangle \leq \sqrt{2\nu^2 \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}$. Constructing a covering at scale $\frac{1}{4}$ of \mathcal{S}^{Tm-1} and applying the standard discretization argument, we see that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2 = \|\bar{\mathbf{e}}\|^2 = \left(\sup_{\bar{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{S}^{Tm-1}} \langle \bar{\mathbf{e}}, \bar{\mathbf{u}} \rangle \right)^2 \leq 2\nu^2 \left(Tm \log(8) + \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. ■

Claim D.5. Suppose that Assumptions 3 and 4 hold. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds for all g, g' ,

$$\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g) - \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g') \leq \left(4B^2 R^2 + \nu^2 \log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right) \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \neq g'(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)].$$

Proof. We compute:

$$\mathcal{R}_{ij}(g) - \mathcal{R}_{ij}(g') = \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g)} \left\| \hat{\Theta}_i \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\|^2 - \|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2 - \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(g')} \left\| \hat{\Theta}_i \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t - \mathbf{y}_t \right\|^2 - \|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2.$$

A union bound and Assumption 3 tell us that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|\mathbf{e}_t\| \leq \nu \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{T}{\delta}\right)}.$$

As $\|\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*\|_{\text{F}} \leq 2R$, the result follows. ■

D.5 Proof of Theorem 12

We are now ready to put everything together and conclude the proof of Theorem 12. We first need to prove the following bound by combining results from Appendices D.2 and D.3:

Lemma D.16. For any fixed $\xi < 1$, Define the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_1 &= C \frac{B^8}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^8 \xi^8} \left(\log\left(\frac{2T}{\delta}\right) + \frac{d}{2} \log\left(\frac{B}{\sigma_{\text{dir}} \xi}\right) + \log(K^2 \text{DN}(\varepsilon)) \right) \\ \Xi_2 &= C \frac{B^2}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \xi^2} \left(2T\varepsilon + 6 \log\left(\frac{\text{DN}(\varepsilon)}{\delta}\right) \right) \\ \Xi_3 &= 4K^2 T \xi + 12 \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \max(\Xi_1, \Xi_2) \end{aligned}$$

With probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that for all $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ such that

$$|I_{ij}(\hat{g})| \geq \Xi_3. \tag{D.10}$$

we have

$$\|\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*\|_{\text{F}}^2 \leq C \frac{B^2}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \xi^2 |I_{ij}(\hat{g})|} \cdot \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(\hat{g}). \tag{D.11}$$

Proof. We begin by applying a Chernoff bound (Lemma D.2) to bound the number of times t such that $Z_{t;ij}(\hat{g}) = 1$ and $\mathbb{P}_t(Z_{t;ij}(\hat{g}) = 1) \leq \xi$. In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} [\text{there exist } i, j \text{ such that } Z_{t;ij}(\hat{g}) = 1 \text{ and } \mathbb{P}_t(Z_{t;ij}(\hat{g})) \leq \xi] \geq 2TK^2\xi + 6 \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq K} \mathbb{I} [Z_{t;ij}(\hat{g}) = 1 \text{ and } \mathbb{P}_t(Z_{t;ij}(\hat{g})) \leq \xi] \geq 2TK^2\xi + 6 \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \delta \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows by Lemma D.2. Now, denote

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}_{ij}(\hat{g}) &= I_{ij}(\hat{g}) \cap \{t | \mathbb{P}_t(Z_{t;ij}(\hat{g})) \geq \xi\} \\ \tilde{\Sigma}_{ij}(\hat{g}) &= \sum_{t \in \tilde{I}_{ij}(\hat{g})} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t^T \end{aligned}$$

and note that $\Sigma_{ij}(\hat{g}) \succeq \tilde{\Sigma}_{ij}(\hat{g})$ by construction. Furthermore, by the Chernoff bound above, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, if

$$|I_{ij}(\hat{g})| \geq 4K^2T\xi + 12 \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \max(\Xi_1, \Xi_2),$$

it holds that

$$|\tilde{I}_{ij}(\hat{g})| \geq \max \left(\frac{1}{2} |I_{ij}(\hat{g})|, \max(\Xi_1, \Xi_2) \right).$$

Now, applying Lemmas D.6 and D.10, we see that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\Sigma_{ij}(\hat{g}) \succeq \tilde{\Sigma}_{ij}(\hat{g}) \succeq c \frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \xi^2}{B^2} |\tilde{I}_{ij}(\hat{g})| I \succeq c \frac{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \xi^2}{B^2} |I_{ij}(\hat{g})|.$$

We now compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(\hat{g}) &= \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(\hat{g})} \left\| (\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(\hat{g})} \text{Tr} \left(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t^T (\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*)^T (\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right) \\ &= \sum_{t \in I_{ij}(\hat{g})} \text{Tr} \left((\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*)^T (\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t^T \right) \\ &\geq \|\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*\|_{\text{F}}^2 \cdot \lambda_{\min} \left(\sum_{t \in I_{ij}(\hat{g})} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t^T \right) \\ &= \|\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*\|_{\text{F}}^2 \cdot \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{ij}(\hat{g})) \end{aligned}$$

where we have denoted by $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ the minimal eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix. Thus, under our assumptions, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\|\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*\|_{\text{F}} \leq C \frac{B^2}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \xi^2 |I_{ij}(\hat{g})|} \cdot \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(\hat{g})$$

for all i, j satisfying (D.10). The result follows. ■

We are now ready to combine Lemma D.16 with the results of Appendix D.4 to conclude the proof.

Algorithm 3 Combine and Permute Labels

```

1: Initialize Classifier  $\hat{g}$ , new parameters  $(\hat{\Theta}_{1,i})_{1 \leq i \leq K}$ , old parameters  $(\hat{\Theta}_{0,i})_{1 \leq i \leq K}$ , threshold  $A > 0$ , gap
    $\Delta_{\text{sep}} > 0$ 
2: for  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, K$  do           (% Combine large clusters with similar  $\hat{\Theta}_{1,i}$ )
3:   if  $i = j$  or  $\min(I_i(\hat{g}), I_j(\hat{g})) < A$  then           (% Continue if cluster is too small)
4:     Continue
5:   if  $\|\hat{\Theta}_{1,i} - \hat{\Theta}_{1,j}\| < \Delta_{\text{sep}}$  then           (% Combine Cluster if parameters closer than gap)
6:      $\hat{g} \leftarrow (j \mapsto i) \circ \hat{g}$ 
7:  $I \leftarrow [K]$ 
8: Empty permutation  $\tilde{\pi} : [K] \rightarrow [K]$ 
9: Reorder  $I$  so that if  $i < i'$  then  $|I_i(\hat{g})| > |I_{i'}(\hat{g})|$ 
10: for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, K$  do
11:   if  $|I_i(\hat{g})| > A$  then           (% Check if cluster is large enough)
12:      $j \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{j' \in I} \|\hat{\Theta}_{1,i} - \hat{\Theta}_{0,j'}\|$ 
13:      $\tilde{\pi}(i) = j$ 
14:      $I \leftarrow I \setminus \{j\}$ 
15: Return  $\tilde{\pi} \circ \hat{g}$ 

```

Proof of Theorem 12. By Lemma D.13, it holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_{ij}(\hat{g}) &\leq \varepsilon_{\text{orac}} + CK^2 BRd \sqrt{TmK \log \left(\frac{TB RK}{\delta} \right)} + CK^3 d \left(4B^2 R^2 + \nu^2 \log \left(\frac{T}{\delta} \right) \right) \log \left(\frac{BKT}{\delta} \right) \\
&\quad + C\nu^2 d^2 Km \log \left(\frac{TRBmdK}{\delta} \right) + C\nu d \sqrt{Km \log \left(\frac{TRBmdK}{\delta} \right)} + 4BRK^2 |I_{ij}(g)| \varepsilon_{\text{crp}} \\
&\leq \varepsilon_{\text{orac}} + 1 + CK^3 B^2 R^2 d^2 m \nu^2 \sqrt{T} \log \left(\frac{TRBmdK}{\delta} \right) + 4BRK^2 |I_{ij}(g)| \varepsilon_{\text{crp}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma D.16, it holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ that for all i, j satisfying $|I_{ij}(\hat{g})| \geq \Xi_3$, we have

$$\|\hat{\Theta}_i - \Theta_j^*\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq C \frac{B^2}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \xi^2 |I_{ij}(\hat{g})|} \mathcal{Q}_{ij}(\hat{g}).$$

It now suffices to note that, by Lemma D.3, it holds that

$$\log(\text{DN}(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)) \leq K(d+1) \log \left(\frac{3BK}{\varepsilon} \right)$$

and so, taking $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{T}$,

$$\Xi_3 \leq CK^2 T \xi + C \frac{B^8 K d}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^8 \xi^8} \log \left(\frac{BKT}{\sigma_{\text{dir}} \xi \delta} \right).$$

The result follows. ■

E Modifying the Classifier and Mode Prediction

In this section, analyze OGD (Algorithm 2), the algorithm that modifies the classifier \hat{g}_τ produced by *ermoracle* after epoch into a stabilized classifier \tilde{g}_τ suitable for online prediction. The problem with the former classifier \hat{g}_τ is that while it performs well on the past examples by construction, directional smoothness is not strong enough to imply generalization in the sense that \hat{g}_τ will continue to perform well on epoch $\tau + 1$.

Notation. We begin our analysis of OGD by defining some notation. For any $1 \leq t \leq T$, let $\tau(t)$ denote the epoch containing t , i.e., $\tau(t) = \max \{\tau' | \tau'E \leq t\}$. Further, recall the concatenated parameter notation $\mathbf{w}_{1:K} = (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_K)$ for $\mathbf{w}_i \in \mathcal{B}^{d-1}$.

For a given epoch τ , we let $\{\widehat{\Theta}_{\tau,i} | i \in [K]\}$, \widehat{g}_τ denote the output of $\text{ERMORACLE}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{1:\tau E}, \mathbf{y}_{1:\tau E})$. For any $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $i, j \in [K]$, we denote

$$I_{ij;\tau}(g) = \{1 \leq t \leq \tau E | g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i \text{ and } g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = j\}. \quad (\text{E.1})$$

Finally, for a fixed epoch τ , if ERMORACLE has returned parameters $\widehat{\Theta}_{\tau,i}$, define

$$\pi_\tau(i) = \underset{1 \leq j \leq K}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\widehat{\Theta}_{\tau,i} - \Theta_j^\star\|_F \quad (\text{E.2})$$

the function that takes a label i according to \widehat{g}_τ and sends it to the closest label according to g_\star as measured by difference in parameter matrices. The notation “ π ” signifies that π_τ represents a permutation when all the estimates $\widehat{\Theta}_{\tau,i}$ are sufficiently accurate.

We conduct the analysis under the following condition, which informally states that for all sufficiently large clusters I_{ij} considered in Algorithm 3 are sufficiently large, the associate parameters, Assumption 5

Condition 1. We say that $\Xi \geq 0$ is a δ -valid clusterability bound if it satisfies the following property. If Algorithm 3 is run with $A = 2K\Xi$ then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $1 \leq i \leq K$ such that

$$I_{i;\tau}(\widehat{g}_\tau) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq K} |I_{ij;\tau}(\widehat{g}_\tau)| > 2K\Xi \quad (\text{E.3})$$

the following hold:

1. There exists a unique $1 \leq j \leq K$ such that $|I_{ij;\tau}(\widehat{g}_\tau)| > \Xi$ and for that j , $|I_{ij;\tau}(\widehat{g}_\tau)| > K\Xi$.
2. For the j given by the previous statement, $\left\| \widehat{\Theta}_i^\tau - \Theta_j^\star \right\| \leq \frac{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}{4}$.
3. For the j in the previous statements, it holds that in epoch $\tau + 1$, the classifier $\widehat{g}_{\tau+1}$ after the reordering step in Algorithm 2, the estimated parameter satisfies $|I_{ij;\tau}(\widehat{g}_{\tau+1})| > \Xi$ and in particular, $\left\| \widehat{\Theta}_i^{\tau+1} - \Theta_j^\star \right\| \leq \frac{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}{4}$.

Recall that the the pseudocode for OGD is in Algorithm 2. In words, the algorithm runs projected online gradient descent on $\widetilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\widehat{g}}$. We have the following result.

Theorem 14. Suppose that we run Algorithm 1 in the setting described in Section 2. If we set $A = 2K\Xi$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} [\pi_\tau(\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}})] \leq \frac{2BET\eta}{\gamma} + 3 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) (KE + 2K^2\Xi) + \frac{4K}{\eta} + \frac{\eta T}{\gamma^2} + \frac{T\gamma}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}} + \sqrt{T \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)} \quad (\text{E.4})$$

where Ξ is a parameter depending on the gap and the problem, defined in Lemma E.2.

Proof Strategy. One challenge is that $\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}$ is that it is updated at the start of epoch $\tau + 1$, and is trained using labels corresponding to the permutation π_τ . Therefore, we decompose to the error indicator into the case where $\pi_{\tau+1}(\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) = \pi_\tau(\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t))$, so this difference is immaterial, and into the cases where $\pi_{\tau+1}$ and π_τ differ.

$$\mathbb{I} [\pi_\tau(\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}})] \leq \underbrace{\mathbb{I} [\pi_{\tau+1}(\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}})]}_{\text{(look-ahead classification error)}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{I} [\pi_\tau(\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq \pi_{\tau+1}(\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t))]}_{\text{(permutation disagreement error)}} \quad (\text{E.5})$$

We call the former term the “look-ahead classification error”, because it applies the permutation from the subsequent epoch $\tau + 1$; the name for the second term is self-explanatory. Our online update OGD(Algorithm 2) controls the cumulative sum of the look-ahead classification error (see Theorem 15 in the following section), while our labeling protocol (Algorithm 3) bounds the permutation disagreement error (see Lemma E.3 in the Appendix E.2).

E.1 Look-ahead Classification Error

In this section we prove that the first term of (E.5) is small with high probability, which is the content of the following result:

Theorem 15. *With probability at least $1 - \delta$, the look-ahead classification error is at most*

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} [\pi_{\tau(t)+1}(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] \leq \frac{2BET\eta}{\gamma} + 2(1 + \gamma^{-1})(KE + 2K^2\Xi) + \frac{4K}{\eta} + \frac{\eta T}{\gamma^2} + \frac{K^2 T \gamma}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}} + \sqrt{T \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}. \quad (\text{E.6})$$

Proof. In addition to the notation $\tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}}$ defined in Equation (4.1), we introduce the following notation:

$$i_t^* = g^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \quad \hat{i}_t = \arg \max_{1 \leq i \leq K} \langle \mathbf{w}_i^{\tau(t)}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle = \tilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \quad \bar{i}_t = \hat{g}_{\tau(t)+1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \quad (\text{E.7})$$

or, in words, i_t^* is the groundtruth correct label, \hat{i}_t is the class predicted by the current epoch's linear predictors, and \bar{i}_t is the class predicted by the ERM trained with the current epoch's data included. Additionally, let

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{1:K}^t = \Pi_{(\mathbb{B}^{d-1}) \times K} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{1:K}^{t-1} - \eta \nabla \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{k(t)+1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{1:K}^{t-1}) \right) \quad (\text{E.8})$$

i.e., the predicted weight if we were able to apply gradient descent with the labels predicted by the ERM trained on the current epoch's data and

$$\tilde{i}_t = \arg \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i^t, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle, \quad (\text{E.9})$$

the class predicted by $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{1:K}^t$. We also consider the following ‘‘losses’’ that we will use in the analysis:

$$\hat{\ell}_t(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) = \mathbb{I} [\hat{i}_t \neq \bar{i}_t] \quad \ell_t^*(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) = \mathbb{I} [\pi_{\tau(t)+1}(\hat{i}_t) \neq i_t^*] \quad (\text{E.10})$$

or, in words, $\hat{\ell}_t$ is the event that our prediction is not equal to that of $\hat{g}_{k(t)+1}$ and ℓ_t^* is the event that our prediction is not equal to the groundtruth.

Mistake Decomposition. We now compute:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t^*(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^{\tau(t)}) \leq \underbrace{\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} [\pi_{\tau+1}(\hat{g}_{\tau+1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] \right)}_{\text{Term}_1} + \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} [\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \neq \hat{g}_{\tau+1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] \right) \quad (\text{E.11})$$

Lemma E.4 in Appendix E.2 controls Term₁. To control the other term, we note that for any $t, \gamma, g, \mathbf{w}_{1:K}$,

$$\tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,g}(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) = \max \left(0, \max_{j \neq g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} \left(1 - \frac{\langle \mathbf{w}_g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) - \mathbf{w}_j, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle}{\gamma} \right) \right) \geq \mathbb{I} [g_{\mathbf{w}_{1:K}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \neq g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)],$$

where $g_{\mathbf{w}_{1:K}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)$ is the classifier induced by the parameters $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}$. As $\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)$ is the classifier induced by $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^\tau$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} [\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) \neq \hat{g}_{\tau+1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{\tau+1}}(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^\tau) \\ &\leq \underbrace{\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{\tau+1}}(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^\tau) - \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{\tau+1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{1:K}^t) \right)}_{\text{Term}_2} + \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{\tau+1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{1:K}^t) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Continuing, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t^*(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^{\tau(t)}) &\leq \text{Term}_1 + \text{Term}_2 + \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{\tau+1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{1:K}^t) \\
&\leq \text{Term}_1 + \text{Term}_2 + \underbrace{\sup_{\mathbf{w}_{1:K}} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{\tau+1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{1:K}^t) - \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{\tau+1}}(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) \right)}_{\text{Term}_3} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\inf_{\mathbf{w}_{1:K}} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{\tau+1}}(\mathbf{w}_{1:K})}_{\text{Term}_4}
\end{aligned}$$

Bounding the “delay” penalty: Term_2 . Term_2 corresponds to the error we may suffer from using delayed gradient updates. We now observe that

$$\left\| \nabla \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{\tau(t)+1}} \right\| \leq \frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t\|}{\gamma} \leq \frac{B}{\gamma} \tag{E.12}$$

and that projection onto a convex body is a contraction. Furthermore, the gradient update in Algorithm 2, Line 3 only affects at most two distinct i, j in the coordinates of $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}$ per update. Thus it holds that, for all t ,

$$\left\| \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{1:K}^t - \mathbf{w}_{1:K}^{\tau(t)} \right\| \leq 2E\eta.$$

Applying (E.12) tells us that

$$\text{Term}_2 := \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{\tau+1}}(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^{\tau(t)}) - \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{\tau+1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{1:K}^t) \leq \frac{2BET\eta}{\gamma}. \tag{E.13}$$

Bounding the regret term: Term_3 . We see that Term_3 is just the regret for Online Gradient Descent for losses with gradients bounded in norm by $\frac{1}{\gamma}$ on the K -fold product of unit balls, having diameter $2\sqrt{K}$. Thus it holds by classical results (c.f. Hazan et al. [2016, Theorem 3.1]) that

$$\text{Term}_3 = \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{k(t)}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_t) - \inf_{\mathbf{w}_{1:K}} \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{k(t)}}(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) \leq \frac{4K}{\eta} + \frac{\eta T}{\gamma^2}. \tag{E.14}$$

Bounding the comparator: Term_4 . To bound Term_4 , we aim to move from the losses with margin $\tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}_{\tau+1}}$ back to sum measure of cumulative classification error. The central object in this analysis is the following “ambiguous set”, defined for each parameter $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}$:

$$D_\gamma(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) = \{ \bar{\mathbf{x}} : |\langle \mathbf{w}_{i,1:d} - \mathbf{w}_{j,1:d}, \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle - w_{i,d+1} + w_{j,d+1}| \leq \gamma \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq K \}, \tag{E.15}$$

where we denote the first d coordinates of \mathbf{w}_i by $\mathbf{w}_{i,1:d}$ and its last coordinate by the scalar $w_{i,d+1}$. Then, by directional smoothness and a union bound, the following is true for any fixed $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \in D_\gamma(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) \mid \mathcal{F}_t) \leq K^2 \sup_{i,j} \mathbb{P}(|\langle \mathbf{w}_{i,1:d} - \mathbf{w}_{j,1:d}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle - w_{i,d+1} + w_{j,d+1}| \leq \gamma \mid \mathcal{F}_t) \leq \frac{K^2 \gamma}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}.$$

Let $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^*$ be the parameter associated with g^* . Then a consequence of the above display and Azuma’s inequality is that most $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$ ’s fall outside of $D_\gamma(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^*)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \in D_\gamma(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^*)] &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{P}_t(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \in D_\gamma(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^*)) + \sqrt{T \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \\
&\leq \frac{K^2 T \gamma}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}} + \sqrt{T \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)}. \tag{E.16}
\end{aligned}$$

We compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{\mathbf{w}_{1:K}} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\ell}_{\gamma, t, \hat{g}_{\tau+1}}(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) &\leq \inf_{\mathbf{w}_{1:K}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \in D_\gamma(\mathbf{w}_{1:K})] + \left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma}\right) \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\ell}_t(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) \\
&\leq \inf_{\mathbf{w}_{1:K}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \in D_\gamma(\mathbf{w}_{1:K})] + \left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma}\right) \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t^*(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) + \mathbb{I}[\pi_{\tau(t)+1}(\bar{i}_t) \neq i_t^*] \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma}\right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\pi_{\tau(t)+1}(\bar{i}_t) \neq i_t^*] + \inf_{\mathbf{w}_{1:K}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \in D_\gamma(\mathbf{w}_{1:K})] + \left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma}\right) \ell_t^*(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma}\right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\pi_{\tau(t)+1}(\bar{i}_t) \neq i_t^*] + \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \in D_\gamma(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^*)] \\
&\leq \underbrace{\left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma}\right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\pi_{\tau(t)+1}(\bar{i}_t) \neq i_t^*]}_{=\text{Term}_1} + \frac{K^2 T \gamma}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}} + \sqrt{T \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows by Lemma E.1, the second inequality is trivial, the third inequality follows because the final term does not depend on $\mathbf{w}_{1:K}$, the fourth inequality follows from the realizability assumption, i.e., that $\ell_t^*(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^*) = 0$ for all t , and the last from Equation (E.16) (recalling the definition of Term_1).

Thus it holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ that

$$\text{Term}_4 \leq \left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma}\right) \text{Term}_1 + \frac{K^2 T \gamma}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}} + \sqrt{T \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}.$$

Concluding the proof. To conclude, we see that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \ell_t^*(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}^{\tau(t)}) \leq \text{Term}_1 + \text{Term}_2 + \text{Term}_3 + \text{Term}_4 \quad (\text{E.17})$$

$$\leq \left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma}\right) \text{Term}_1 + \frac{2BET\eta}{\gamma} + \frac{4K}{\eta} + \frac{\eta T}{\gamma^2} + \frac{K^2 T \gamma}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}} + \sqrt{T \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}. \quad (\text{E.18})$$

By Lemma E.4 it holds that

$$\text{Term}_1 = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\pi_{\tau(t)+1}(\bar{i}_t) \neq i_t^*] := \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\pi_{\tau(t)+1}(\hat{g}_{\tau(t)+1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] \leq KE + 2K^2 \Xi, \quad (\text{E.19})$$

where Ξ is defined in Lemma E.2. This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma E.1 (Bound indicator by soft margin). *For any γ, t, \hat{g} , it holds that if each component of \mathbf{w} has unit norm, then*

$$\tilde{\ell}_{\gamma, t, \hat{g}}(\mathbf{w}) \leq \mathbb{I}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \in D_\gamma(\mathbf{w}_{1:K})] + \left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma}\right) \hat{\ell}_t(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}). \quad (\text{E.20})$$

Proof. We prove this by casework. Suppose that $\hat{\ell}_t(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) = 0$. Then it holds that

$$\hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = \arg \max_{1 \leq j \leq K} \langle \mathbf{w}_j, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle \quad (\text{E.21})$$

and in particular for all $j \neq \hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)$, it holds that $\langle \mathbf{w}_{\hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \mathbf{w}_j, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle \geq 0$. If $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \notin D_\gamma(\mathbf{w}_{1:K})$ then it holds by construction that

$$\max_{j \neq \hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} 1 - \frac{\langle \mathbf{w}_{\hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \mathbf{w}_j, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle}{\gamma} \leq 0 \quad (\text{E.22})$$

and the conclusion clearly holds. If it holds that

$$\max_{j \neq \hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} 1 - \frac{\langle \mathbf{w}_{\hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \mathbf{w}_j, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle}{\gamma} > 0 \quad (\text{E.23})$$

then either there is some j such that $\langle \mathbf{w}_{\hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \mathbf{w}_j, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle < 0$ or there is some j such that $\langle \mathbf{w}_{\hat{g}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \mathbf{w}_j, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \rangle < \gamma$ and so $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \in D_\gamma(\mathbf{w}_{1:K})$. We cannot have the former by the assumption that $\hat{\ell}_t(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) = 0$ so the latter holds and the inequality follows in this case.

Now suppose that $\hat{\ell}_t(\mathbf{w}_{1:K}) = 1$. Then we see that as $\|\mathbf{w}_i\| \leq 1$ for all i , $\tilde{\ell}_{\gamma,t,\hat{g}} \leq \left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma}\right)$ uniformly and the result holds. ■

E.2 Bounding Permutation Disagreement and Term_1

In this section, we provide a bound on the permutation disagreement error - the second term of (E.5) - as well as on Term_1 from the section above. We begin by noting that Algorithm 3 ensures that large clusters remain large across epochs, a statement formalized by the following result:

Lemma E.2. *Define the following terms:*

$$\Xi_1 = CK^2T\xi + C \frac{B^8 K d}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^8 \xi^8} \log \left(\frac{BKT}{\sigma_{\text{dir}} \xi \delta} \right) \quad (\text{E.24})$$

$$\Xi_2 = C \frac{B^2}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \xi^2 \Delta_{\text{sep}}^2} \left(\varepsilon_{\text{orac}} + 1 + K^3 B^2 R^2 d^2 m \nu^2 \sqrt{T} \log \left(\frac{TRBmdK}{\delta} \right) \right) + \sum_{t=1}^T \|\delta_t\|. \quad (\text{E.25})$$

Then $\Xi := \max(\Xi_1, \Xi_2)$ is a δ -valid clusterability parameter in the sense of Condition 1.

Proof. By the pigeonhole principle, if $I_i(\hat{g}_\tau) > 2K\Xi$ there must be at least one j such that $|I_{ij;\tau}(\hat{g}_\tau)| > \Xi$ and thus by Theorem 12, it holds that $\left\| \hat{\Theta}_i^\tau - \Theta_j^* \right\| \leq \frac{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}{4}$ and thus the second statement holds. If there is another j' such that $|I_{ij';\tau}(\hat{g}_\tau)| > \Xi$ then it would also hold that $\left\| \hat{\Theta}_i^\tau - \Theta_{j'}^* \right\| \leq \frac{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}{4}$ and the triangle inequality would then imply that $\left\| \Theta_j^* - \Theta_{j'}^* \right\| \leq \frac{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}{2} < \Delta_{\text{sep}}$, which ensures that $j = j'$ by Assumption 5. Applying pigeonhole again then shows that

$$|I_{ij;\tau}(\hat{g}_\tau)| = I_{i;\tau}(\hat{g}_\tau) - \sum_{j' \neq j} |I_{ij';\tau}(\hat{g}_\tau)| > 2K\Xi - (K-1)\Xi = (K+1)\Xi. \quad (\text{E.26})$$

Thus the first statement holds. For the last statement, note that as there are at least $K\Xi$ times $t < \tau E$ such that $g_*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = j$, there are at least Ξ times $t < (\tau+1)E$ such that $t \in I_{ij;\tau}(\hat{g}_{\tau+1})$. This implies, again by Theorem 12, that $\left\| \hat{\Theta}_{i'}^{\tau+1} - \Theta_j^* \right\| \leq \frac{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}{4}$ and thus $\left\| \hat{\Theta}_{i'}^{\tau+1} - \hat{\Theta}_i^\tau \right\| \leq \frac{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}{2}$. If $i' \neq i$ after running Algorithm 3 then there must be an i'' such that $I_{i'';\tau}(\hat{g}_{\tau+1}) > K\Xi$ and $\left\| \hat{\Theta}_{i''}^{\tau+1} - \hat{\Theta}_i^\tau \right\| \leq \frac{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}{2}$. But if this is the case then the triangle inequality implies that $\left\| \hat{\Theta}_{i''}^{\tau+1} - \hat{\Theta}_{i'}^{\tau+1} \right\| < \Delta_{\text{sep}}$ and as they both are sufficiently large, there were merged by the first half of Algorithm 3, implying that $i'' = i'$ and, in turn, that $i' = i$, by the second half of Algorithm 3. Thus the first half of the third statement holds. To conclude, simply apply Theorem 12. ■

We are now ready to prove the main bound:

Lemma E.3. *With probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that*

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} \left[\pi_\tau(\tilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq \pi_{\tau+1}(\tilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})) \right] \leq KE + 2K^2\Xi \quad (\text{E.27})$$

Proof. We begin by fixing some $1 \leq i \leq K$ and bounding the number of epochs τ such that $\pi_\tau(i) \neq \pi_{\tau+1}(i)$. We will restrict our focus to the probability $1 - \delta$ event such that the conclusion of Lemma E.2 holds. Suppose that there

is an i such that $I_{i;\tau}(\widehat{g}_\tau) > 2K\Xi$ and $\pi_\tau(i) = j \neq j' = \pi_{\tau+1}(i)$. Then by Assumption 5 and the triangle inequality, we have that

$$\left\| \widehat{\Theta}_i^\tau - \Theta_{j'}^* \right\| + \frac{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}{4} \leq \left\| \widehat{\Theta}_i^{\tau+1} - \Theta_{j'}^* \right\| \quad (\text{E.28})$$

$$\left\| \widehat{\Theta}_i^{\tau+1} - \Theta_{j'}^* \right\| + \frac{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}{4} \leq \left\| \widehat{\Theta}_i^\tau - \Theta_j^* \right\| \quad (\text{E.29})$$

Rearranging and again applying Assumption 5 tells us that

$$\frac{\Delta_{\text{sep}}}{2} < \left\| \widehat{\Theta}_i^\tau - \widehat{\Theta}_i^{\tau+1} \right\|. \quad (\text{E.30})$$

Applying the second and third statements of Lemma E.2, however, brings a contradiction. Thus we have, on the high probability event from Lemma E.2,

$$\mathbb{I} [\pi_\tau(\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq \pi_{\tau+1}(\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))] \leq \mathbb{I} [I_{i;\tau}(\widehat{g}_{\tau(t)}) \leq 2K\Xi]. \quad (\text{E.31})$$

Thus we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} [\pi_\tau(\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq \pi_{\tau+1}(\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}))] \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} [\widetilde{g}_{\tau(t)}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i] \mathbb{I} [I_{i;\tau}(\widehat{g}_{\tau(t)}) \leq 2K\Xi] \quad (\text{E.32})$$

$$\leq K(E + 2K\Xi). \quad (\text{E.33})$$

The result follows. \blacksquare

We may also apply Lemma E.2 to show that $\pi_{\tau+1}(\widehat{g}_{\tau+1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) = g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)$ most of the time. We formalize this statement in the following result:

Lemma E.4 (Wrong Labels Bound). *With probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that*

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I} [\pi_{\tau+1}(\widehat{g}_{\tau(t)+1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] \leq KE + 2K^2\Xi \quad (\text{E.34})$$

Proof. By Lemma E.2, it holds that

$$\mathbb{I} [\pi_{\tau+1}(\widehat{g}_{\tau(t)+1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{I} [\widehat{g}_{\tau(t)+1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i] \mathbb{I} [I_{i;\tau}(\widehat{g}_{\tau(t)+1}) \leq 2K\Xi]. \quad (\text{E.35})$$

Thus we may argue exactly as in Lemma E.3 to conclude the proof. \blacksquare

F Proving Theorem 3

In this section we formally state and prove our main result, i.e., that Algorithm 1 is an oracle-efficient algorithm for achieving expected regret polynomial in all the parameters and scaling as $T^{1-\Omega(1)}$ as the horizon tends to infinity. We have the following formal statement, which we first establish under the assumption of a strict separation between parameters (Assumption 5).

Theorem 16. *Suppose that Assumptions 2-5 hold. Then, for the correct choices of γ, η , and E , given in the proof below (found above (F.7)), Algorithm 1 experiences expected regret:*

$$\mathbb{E} [\text{Reg}_T] \leq CB^{10} R^2 m d \nu^2 K^4 \sigma_{\text{dir}}^{-4} \Delta_{\text{sep}}^{-1} T^{\frac{35}{36}} (\varepsilon_{\text{orac}} + \log(TRBmdK)) + CBRK^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \|\delta_t\|.$$

Note that the last term is $O(BRK^2 T \varepsilon_{\text{crp}})$ in the worst case.

Proof. We recall that Algorithm 1 proceeds in epochs of length E , a parameter to be specified. At the beginning of epoch τ , at time $(\tau - 1)E + 1$, ERMORACLE is called, producing $\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq K$ and \hat{g}_τ , for a total of $\frac{T}{E} \leq T$ calls to ERMORACLE. We then use Algorithm 2 to modify \hat{g}_τ to \tilde{g}_τ and predict $\hat{y}_t = \hat{\Theta}_{\tau,\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_T &= \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \hat{y}_t - \Theta_{g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)}^\star \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \left\| \left(\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \Theta_{g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)}^\star \right) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2 \\ &= \left(\sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \left\| \left(\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \Theta_{g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)}^\star \right) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2 \mathbb{I}[\pi_\tau(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \left\| \left(\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \Theta_{\pi_\tau(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t))}^\star \right) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \left\| \left(\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \Theta_{g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)}^\star \right) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2 \mathbb{I}[\pi_\tau(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] &\leq \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} 4B^2R^2 \mathbb{I}[\pi_\tau(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] \\ &\leq 4B^2R^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[\pi_\tau(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)) \neq g_\star(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)] \end{aligned}$$

and thus, applying Theorem 14, it holds that the above expression is bounded by

$$4B^2R^2 \left(\frac{2BET\eta}{\gamma} + 3 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) (KE + 2K^2\Xi) + \frac{4K}{\eta} + \frac{\eta T}{\gamma^2} + \frac{T\gamma}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}} + \sqrt{T \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \right). \quad (\text{F.1})$$

For the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \left\| \left(\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \Theta_{\pi_\tau(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t))}^\star \right) \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \right\|^2 &\leq B^2 \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \left\| \hat{\Theta}_{\tau,\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t)} - \Theta_{\pi_\tau(\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t))}^\star \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\ &= B^2 \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \left\| \hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i} - \Theta_{\pi_\tau(i)}^\star \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \mathbb{I}[\tilde{g}_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let

$$\Xi_1 = CK^2T\xi + C \frac{B^8Kd}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^8 \xi^8} \log \left(\frac{BKT}{\sigma_{\text{dir}} \xi \delta} \right) \quad (\text{F.2})$$

$$\Xi_2 = C \frac{B^2}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2 \xi^2 \alpha} \left(\varepsilon_{\text{orac}} + 1 + K^3 B^2 R^2 d^2 m \nu^2 \sqrt{T} \log \left(\frac{TRBmdK}{\delta} \right) \right) + \sum_{t=1}^T \|\delta_t\| \quad (\text{F.3})$$

$$\Xi' = \max(\Xi_1, \Xi_2). \quad (\text{F.4})$$

Note that as long as $\alpha < \Delta_{\text{sep}}^2$ then Lemma E.2 tells us that if we run Algorithm 1 with $A \geq 2K\Xi'$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ it holds for all $1 \leq i \leq K$ and all $\tau \leq \tau'$ that if

$$I_i(\hat{g}_\tau) > 2K\Xi'$$

then

$$|I_{i\pi_{\tau'}(i)}(\hat{g}_{\tau'})| > \Xi'$$

and

$$\|\widehat{\Theta}_i^{\tau'} - \Theta_{\pi_{\tau'}(i)}^*\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq \alpha.$$

Furthermore, under this condition, Lemma E.2 tells us that

$$I_i(\widehat{g}_{\tau'}) > 2K\Xi.$$

Fixing an i , then, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \|\widehat{\Theta}_{\tau,i} - \Theta_{\pi_{\tau}(i)}^*\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \mathbb{I}[\widetilde{g}_{\tau}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i] &= \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \|\widehat{\Theta}_{\tau,i} - \Theta_{\pi_{\tau}(i)}^*\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \mathbb{I}[\widetilde{g}_{\tau}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i \wedge I_i(\widehat{g}_{\tau}) \leq 2K\Xi'] \\ &+ \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \|\widehat{\Theta}_{\tau,i} - \Theta_{\pi_{\tau}(i)}^*\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \mathbb{I}[\widetilde{g}_{\tau}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i \wedge I_i(\widehat{g}_{\tau}) > 2K\Xi']. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \|\widehat{\Theta}_{\tau,i} - \Theta_{\pi_{\tau}(i)}^*\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \mathbb{I}[\widetilde{g}_{\tau}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i \wedge I_i(\widehat{g}_{\tau}) \leq 2K\Xi'] &\leq 4R^2 \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \mathbb{I}[\widetilde{g}_{\tau}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i \wedge I_i(\widehat{g}_{\tau}) \leq 2K\Xi'] \\ &\leq 4R^2 \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} 2K\Xi' \\ &\leq \frac{4R^2TK\Xi'}{E}. \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, we have with high probability that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \|\widehat{\Theta}_{\tau,i} - \Theta_{\pi_{\tau}(i)}^*\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \mathbb{I}[\widetilde{g}_{\tau}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i \wedge I_i(\widehat{g}_{\tau}) > 2K\Xi'] &\leq \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \alpha \\ &\leq \alpha T. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over all K , we see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{\tau=1}^{T/E} \sum_{t=(\tau-1)E+1}^{\tau E} \|\widehat{\Theta}_{\tau,i} - \Theta_{\pi_{\tau}(i)}^*\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \mathbb{I}[\widetilde{g}_{\tau}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t) = i] \leq B^2K \left(4R^2 \frac{T}{E} K\Xi' + \alpha T \right). \quad (\text{F.5})$$

Thus, combining (F.1) and (F.5) tells us that with probability at least $1 - \delta$ it holds that Reg_T is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} 4B^2R^2 \left(\frac{2BET\eta}{\gamma} + 3 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) (KE + 2K^2\Xi) + \frac{4K}{\eta} + \frac{\eta T}{\gamma^2} + \frac{T\gamma}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}} + \sqrt{T \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \right) \\ + B^2K \left(4R^2 \frac{T}{E} K\Xi' + \alpha T \right) \end{aligned}$$

where Ξ' is given in (F.4) and Ξ is given in Lemma E.2. Now, setting

$$E = T^{\frac{17}{18}}, \quad \gamma = T^{-\frac{1}{36}}, \quad \xi = T^{-\frac{1}{9}}, \quad \alpha = T^{-\frac{1}{6}}, \quad \eta = T^{-\frac{19}{36}}, \quad (\text{F.6})$$

gives, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\text{Reg}_T \leq CB^{10}R^2md\nu^2K^4\sigma_{\text{dir}}^{-4}\Delta_{\text{sep}}^{-1}T^{\frac{35}{36}}(\varepsilon_{\text{orac}} + \log(TRBmdK)) + CBRK^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \|\delta_t\|. \quad (\text{F.7})$$

This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

G Application to PWA Dynamical Systems

G.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1

We observe that this result follows directly from Lemma C.5. Indeed, note that by assumption, $\mathbf{z}_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, \mathbf{u}_t is σ_{dir} -directionally smooth by the assumption that $\mathbf{e}_{t-1} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ is thus. Similarly, $\mathbf{u}_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, \mathbf{z}_t is σ_{dir} -directionally smooth by the assumption that $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, \mathbf{e}_t is smooth. Therefore, the conclusion follows from Lemma C.5.

G.2 Formal Simulation Regret Setup

In this setting, let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$ denote the filtration generated by $(\mathbf{x}_{s,h})_{1 \leq s \leq t, 1 \leq h \leq H}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{t,h}$ denote the filtration generated by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1}$ and $(\mathbf{x}_{t,h'})_{1 \leq h' \leq h}$, with the convention $\mathcal{F}_{t,0} = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1}$. We require that our estimates $\hat{\Theta}_{t,i}$ be $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{t-1}$ -measurable. Further, we assume that our planner returns open-loop stochastic policies.

Assumption 9 (Smoothed, Open Loop Stochastic Policies). *We assume that our policy π_t is stochastic and does not depend on state. That is, we assume that for all $h \in [H]$ and $t \in [T]$, $\mathbf{u}_{t,h}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{t,H} \perp \mathbf{x}_{t,1:h} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$. We further assume that $\mathbf{u}_{t,h} | \mathbf{u}_{t,1:h-1}, \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ is σ_{dir} -smooth.*

Assumption 10 (Noise Distribution). *We assume that $\|\mathbf{e}_{t,h}\| \leq B_{\text{noise}}$ for all t, h . Further, we assume that there exists a zero-mean, σ_{dir} -directionally smooth distribution \mathcal{D} over \mathbb{R}^{d_z} such that $\mathbf{e}_{t,h} | \mathcal{F}_{t,h-1} \sim \mathcal{D}$.⁴ Furthermore, we also assume that $\mathbf{z}_{t,1} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ is σ_{dir} -smooth.*

Definition 17 (Wasserstein Distance). *Let (\mathcal{X}, d) be a Polish space with metric $d(\cdot, \cdot)$, and let μ, ν be two Borel measures on \mathcal{X} . Define the Wasserstein distance as*

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\Gamma} \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \Gamma} [d(X, Y)^2]$$

where the infimum is over all couplings Γ such that the marginal of X is distributed as μ and the marginal over Y is distributed as ν .

We will show that with minor modifications, outlined below, Algorithm 1 can be leveraged to produce H -step simulated predictions with laws that are close in Wasserstein distance. In particular, this allows us to control the error of the associated predictions in expected squared norm.

G.3 Algorithm Modifications

In order to produce good simulation regret, we run a variant of Algorithm 1 with two changes. First, we need to use Assumption 8 in some way to ensure that our estimated dynamics are contractive. Second, we need to iterate our predictions in order to generate a trajectory of length H for each time t . To address the first problem, suppose that we are in Line 3 of Algorithm 1, which applies ERMORACLE to the past data, resulting in $\{(\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i})_{1 \leq i \leq K}, \hat{g}_\tau\}$. For each i , we modify $\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i}$ to become $\tilde{\Theta}_{\tau,i}$ by projecting $\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i}$ onto the convex set

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{P}} = \{\Theta | \Theta^\top \mathbf{P} \Theta \preceq \mathbf{P}\}.$$

Formally, we define the projection to be

$$\text{Project}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{P}}}(\Theta) = \underset{\Theta' \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{P}}}{\text{argmin}} \|\Theta - \Theta'\|_{\mathbf{F}}. \quad (\text{G.1})$$

Because $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{P}}$ is convex, this step can be accomplished efficiently. As we shall observe in the sequel, this projection step never hurts our error guarantees due, again, to the convexity of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{P}}$.

Moving on to the second modification, at each epoch τ , we have a fixed set of parameters $\{(\tilde{\Theta}_{\tau,i})_{1 \leq i \leq K}, \tilde{g}_\tau\}$ where the \tilde{g}_τ are modified from \hat{g}_τ exactly as in Algorithm 1. Thus, at each time, we independently sample $\mathbf{e}'_{t,h} \sim \mathcal{D}$, the noise distribution, for $1 \leq h \leq H$ and predict $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{t,h} = \tilde{\Theta}_{\tau, \tilde{g}_\tau(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{t,h-1})} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{t,h-1} + \mathbf{e}'_{t,h}$. The entire modified algorithm is given in Algorithm 4 and we prove in the sequel that we experience low simulation regret.

⁴Results can be extended to $\mathcal{D}_{t,h}$ changing with the time step as long as these distributions are known to the learner.

Algorithm 4 Algorithm for achieving low Simulation Regret

```

1: Initialize Epoch length  $E$ , Classifiers  $\mathbf{w}^0 = (\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0})$ , margin parameter  $\gamma > 0$ , learning rate  $\eta > 0$ , noise
   distributions  $\mathcal{D}$ 
2: for  $\tau = 1, 2, \dots, T/E$  do
3:    $\left\{ (\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i})_{1 \leq i \leq K}, \hat{g}_\tau \right\} \leftarrow \text{ERMORACLE}((\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{1:\tau E}, \mathbf{y}_{1:\tau E}))$            (% self.modelUpdate)
4:    $\tilde{\Theta}_{\tau,i} \leftarrow \text{Project}_{\mathcal{C}_P}(\hat{\Theta}_{\tau,i})$                                      (% See (G.1))
5:    $\tilde{g}_\tau \leftarrow \text{Reorder} \left( \hat{g}_\tau, \left( \tilde{\Theta}_{\tau,i} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq K}, \left( \tilde{\Theta}_{\tau-1,i} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq K} \right)$    (% see Algorithm 3)
6:    $\tilde{g}_\tau \leftarrow \text{OGD}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{(\tau-1)E:\tau E}, \tilde{g}_\tau, \gamma, \eta)$                                (% see Algorithm 2)
7:   for  $t = \tau E, \dots, (\tau + 1)E - 1$  do
8:     Receive  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$  and set  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t,0} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$ 
9:     for  $h = 1, 2, \dots, H$  do
10:      Sample  $\mathbf{e}'_{t,h} \sim \mathcal{D}$ 
11:      Predict  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t,h} = \tilde{\Theta}_{\tau, \tilde{g}_\tau}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t,h-1}) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t,h-1} + \mathbf{e}'_{t,h}$ 
12:      Receive  $\mathbf{y}_t$ 

```

G.4 Formal Guarantees for Simulation Regret

In this section, we prove that Algorithm 4 attains low simulation regret under our stated assumptions. Noting that Algorithm 4 is oracle-efficient, this result provides the first efficient algorithm that provably attains low simulation regret in the PWA setting. The main result is as follows:

Theorem 18 (Simulation Regret Bound). *Suppose that we are in the setting of (3.3) and that Assumptions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 hold. Suppose that we run Algorithm 4. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that*

$$\text{SimReg}_{T,H} \leq \frac{9B^2H^8}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2} \cdot \left(CB^{10}R^2md\nu^2K^4\sigma_{\text{dir}}^{-4}\Delta_{\text{sep}}^{-1}T^{\frac{35}{36}}(\varepsilon_{\text{orac}} + \log(\text{TRBmdK})) + CBRK^2T\varepsilon_{\text{crp}} \right).$$

Before we prove Theorem 18, we must state the following key lemma, which says that if both the true and estimated dynamics are stable, and we are able to predict \mathbf{x}_{t+1} with high accuracy, then our simulation regret H steps into the future is also small.

Lemma G.1. *Let $\mathcal{G} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [K]$ denote the class of multi-class affine classifiers and let \hat{f}, f^* denote functions satisfying the following properties:*

1. *The function f^* can be decomposed as $f^*(\mathbf{x}) = f_{g^*(\mathbf{x})}^*(\mathbf{x})$ and similarly for \hat{f} it holds that $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{f}_{\hat{g}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{x})$ for some $g^*, \hat{g} \in \mathcal{G}$.*
2. *For all $i \in [K]$, it holds that both \hat{f}_i and f_i^* are contractions, i.e., $\|f_i^*(\mathbf{x}) - f_i^*(\mathbf{x}')\| \leq \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|$.*

Suppose that for $0 \leq h \leq H - 1$, we let

$$\mathbf{x}_{h+1} = f^*(\mathbf{x}_h) + \mathbf{e}_h \qquad \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{h+1} = \hat{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_h) + \mathbf{e}'_h$$

for $\mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{e}'_h$ identically distributed satisfying Assumption 10. Suppose that \mathbf{x}_0 is σ_{dir} -smooth and that, almost surely, $\mathbf{x}_h, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_h$ have norms bounded uniformly by B . If $\max_{1 \leq h < H} \|\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_h) - f^*(\mathbf{x}_h)\| \leq \varepsilon$ then it holds that

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mathbf{x}_H, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_H) \leq \frac{9B^2H^6}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2} \varepsilon^2 \varepsilon.$$

Proof. We begin by introducing intermediate random variables $\mathbf{x}_h^{(\ell)}$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq H$. We let $\mathbf{x}_h^{(\ell)} = \mathbf{x}_h$ for $h \leq \ell$ and let

$$\mathbf{x}_{h+1}^{(\ell)} = \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_h^{(\ell)}) + \mathbf{e}'_h$$

otherwise. Note that $\mathbf{x}_H^{(1)} = \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_H$ and that $\mathbf{x}_H^{(H)} = \mathbf{x}_H$. By the triangle inequality applied to Wasserstein distance, we observe that

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x}_H, \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_H) \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^H \mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x}_H^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{x}_H^{(\ell+1)}).$$

Consider a coupling where $\mathbf{e}_h = \mathbf{e}'_h$ for all h . Note that under this coupling, for any $h > \ell$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{x}_h^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{x}_h^{(\ell+1)} \right\| &= \left\| \widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) + \mathbf{e}_t - \widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) - \mathbf{e}'_t \right\| \\ &= \left\| \widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) - \widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)} \right\| + B \cdot \mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{x}_H^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{x}_H^{(\ell+1)} \right\| &\leq \left\| \mathbf{x}_{\ell+1}^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{x}_{\ell+1}^{(\ell+1)} \right\| + B \sum_{h=\ell}^{H-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \right] \\ &\leq \left\| \widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_\ell) - f^*(\mathbf{x}_\ell) \right\| + B \sum_{h=\ell}^{H-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \right] \\ &\leq \varepsilon + B \sum_{h=\ell}^{H-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \right] \end{aligned}$$

by the assumption that $\left\| \widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_h) - f^*(\mathbf{x}_h) \right\| \leq \varepsilon$. We now note that a union bound implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{h=\ell}^{H-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \right] &= \sum_{h=\ell}^{H-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ and } \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell)}) = g_*(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ for } h' \leq h \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{h=\ell}^{H-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ and there exists } h' \leq h \text{ such that } \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell)}) \neq g_*(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell+1)}) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{h=\ell}^{H-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ and } \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell)}) = g_*(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ for } h' \leq h \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{h=\ell}^{H-1} (H-1-\ell) \mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ and } \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell)}) = g_*(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ for } h' \leq h \right] \\ &\leq H \sum_{h=\ell}^{H-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ and } \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell)}) = g_*(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ for } h' \leq h \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now observe that

$$\mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ and } \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell)}) = g_*(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ for } h' \leq h \right] \leq \mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ and } \left\| \mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)} \right\| \leq \varepsilon \right]$$

By the fact that \mathcal{G} is given by multi-class affine thresholds, we see that

$$\mathbb{I} \left[\widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \widehat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ and } \left\| \mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)} \right\| \leq \varepsilon \right] \leq \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq K} \mathbb{I} \left[|\langle \mathbf{w}_{ij}, \mathbf{x}_{h-1} \rangle| \leq 2\varepsilon \right]$$

where the \mathbf{w}_{ij} are the unit vectors determining the decision boundaries induced by \hat{g} . By smoothness, then, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}_H^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{x}_H^{(\ell+1)}) &\leq \varepsilon + BH \cdot \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{h=\ell}^{H-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\hat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \hat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ and } \hat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell)}) = g_*(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ for } h' \leq h \right] > 1 \right) \\
&\leq \varepsilon + BH \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell)}) \neq \hat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h-1}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ and } \hat{g}(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell)}) = g_*(\mathbf{x}_{h'}^{(\ell+1)}) \text{ for } h' \leq h \right) \\
&\leq \varepsilon + BH \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq K} \mathbb{P} (|\langle \mathbf{w}_{ij}, \mathbf{x}_h \rangle| \leq 2\varepsilon) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{2BH^2}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}} \right) \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into our bound at the beginning and noting that $1 \leq \frac{BH^2}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}}$ concludes the proof. \blacksquare

We are now ready to prove Theorem 18. In particular, we use Lemma G.1 to reduce a bound on simulation regret to one of the distance between \hat{f} and f^* evaluated on the data sequence. We then apply Theorems 12 and 14 to control this distance. The details are below:

Proof of Theorem 18. We begin by applying Lemma G.1. Observe that in our setting, \mathcal{G} is the class of multi-class affine classifiers and f^* , \hat{f}_t can be decomposed as required by the theorem, where we let τ denote the epoch in which t is placed and let

$$\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\Theta}_{\tau, \tilde{g}_\tau(\mathbf{x})} \cdot \mathbf{x}.$$

By the fact that $\tilde{\Theta}_{\tau, i}, \Theta_i^* \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{P}}$, which follows from the construction of $\tilde{\Theta}_{\tau, i}$ and Assumption 8, the contractivity assumption required by Lemma G.1 holds. Furthermore, note that because $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{P}}$ is convex and $\Theta_i^* \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{P}}$, it holds that

$$\|\tilde{\Theta}_{\tau, i} - \Theta_{\pi_\tau(i)}^*\|_{\text{F}} \leq \|\tilde{\Theta}_{\tau, i} - \Theta_{\pi_\tau(i)}^*\|_{\text{F}}. \quad (\text{G.2})$$

Now, note that Algorithm 1 does not update the predicting functions within the epoch and thus for all t such that $\{t, t+1, \dots, t+H\}$ does not contain an integral multiple of E , it holds that our prediction function \hat{f}_t is constant on the interval. Let \mathcal{J} denote the set of times t such that the previous condition fails, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{J} = \{t \leq T \mid \tau E - t > H \text{ for all } \tau \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Then, we may apply Lemma G.1 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{SimReg}_{T, H} &= \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mathbf{x}_{t+h}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+h} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[t \in \mathcal{J}] \sum_{h=1}^H \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mathbf{x}_{t+h}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+h} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) + \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[t \notin \mathcal{J}] \sum_{h=1}^H \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mathbf{x}_{t+h}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+h} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \\
&\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[t \in \mathcal{J}] \sum_{h=1}^H \frac{9B^2 H^6}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2} \max_{1 \leq h \leq H} \left\| \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{t+h}) - f^*(\mathbf{x}_{t+h}) \right\|^2 + 4HB^2 R^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[t \notin \mathcal{J}] \\
&\leq \frac{9B^2 H^7}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[t \in \mathcal{J}] \sum_{h=1}^H \left\| \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{t+h}) - f^*(\mathbf{x}_{t+h}) \right\|^2 + 4B^2 R^2 H \cdot \frac{HT}{E} \\
&\leq \frac{9B^2 H^8}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{I}[t \in \mathcal{J}] \left\| \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_t) - f^*(\mathbf{x}_t) \right\|^2 + 4B^2 R^2 H^2 \cdot \frac{T}{E} \\
&\leq \frac{9B^2 H^8}{\sigma_{\text{dir}}^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_t - f^*(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2 + 4B^2 R^2 H^2 \cdot \frac{T}{E},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_t$ is the prediction of Algorithm 1. We may now apply Theorem 16 to bound this last quantity by applying (G.2). The result follows. \blacksquare

G.5 Extensions

For simplicity, we considered a setting where all linear dynamics were stable with a common Lyapunov function. Our results can be extended to the case where there are mode-dependent gains $(\mathbf{K}_i)_{i \in K}$, where $\mathbf{K}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z \times d_u}$, as well, because our proof demonstrates that as we achieve low-regret, our simulation accurately recovers the correct mode sequence. Thus, if we know gains which ensure mutual stability, we can apply these gains as well. More general closed-loop policies can also be accommodated, provided we maintain the requisite smoothness (as, for example, ensured by Lemma 3.1). Lastly, as our regret-guarantees ensure parameter recovery, we can envision settings where the gains are constructed, for example, by certainty-equivalent control synthesis, and analyze their suboptimality via perturbation bounds such as those in [Simchowitz and Foster \[2020\]](#).