

# Double Pessimism is Provably Efficient for Distributionally Robust Offline Reinforcement Learning: Generic Algorithm and Robust Partial Coverage

Jose Blanchet\*<sup>†</sup>   Miao Lu\*<sup>†</sup>   Tong Zhang\*<sup>‡</sup>   Han Zhong\*<sup>§</sup>

May 17, 2023;   Revised: August 23, 2023

## Abstract

In this paper, we study distributionally robust offline reinforcement learning (robust offline RL), which seeks to find an optimal policy purely from an offline dataset that can perform well in perturbed environments. In specific, we propose a generic algorithm framework called Doubly Pessimistic Model-based Policy Optimization ( $P^2MPO$ ), which features a novel combination of a flexible model estimation subroutine and a doubly pessimistic policy optimization step. Notably, the *double pessimism* principle is crucial to overcome the distributional shifts incurred by (i) the mismatch between the behavior policy and the family of target policies; and (ii) the perturbation of the nominal model. Under certain accuracy conditions on the model estimation subroutine, we prove that  $P^2MPO$  is sample-efficient with *robust partial coverage data*, which only requires the offline data to have good coverage of the distributions induced by the optimal robust policy and the perturbed models around the nominal model. Our assumption on data is relatively mild compared with previous full-coverage-style assumptions which need a uniformly lower bounded data distribution.

Our algorithm and theory can be applied to a vast body of robust Markov decision processes (RMDPs) in the regime of large state spaces. By tailoring specific model estimation subroutines for concrete examples of RMDPs, including tabular RMDPs, factored RMDPs, kernel and neural RMDPs, we prove that for all these examples  $P^2MPO$  enjoys a  $\tilde{O}(n^{-1/2})$  convergence rate, where  $n$  is the number of trajectories in data. We highlight that all these RMDP examples, except tabular RMDPs, are first identified and proven tractable by this work. Furthermore, as an extension to multi-agent decision-making, we continue our study of robust offline RL in the multi-player robust Markov games (RMGs). By extending the double pessimism principle identified for single-agent RMDPs, we propose another doubly-pessimistic-type algorithm framework that can efficiently find the *robust Nash equilibria* among players using only robust unilateral (partial) coverage data. To our best knowledge, this work proposes the first general learning principle — double pessimism — for robust offline RL and shows that it is provably efficient in the context of general function approximation.

**Keywords:** distributionally robust offline reinforcement learning, double pessimism, robust partial coverage, function approximation

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Our Contributions . . . . .	3
1.2	Related Works . . . . .	4
1.3	Notations . . . . .	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries on Robust Markov Decision Processes</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	A Unified Framework of Robust Markov Decision Processes . . . . .	6
2.2	Robust Offline RL in Robust Markov Decision Processes . . . . .	7

\*Alphabetical order. Email to [miaolu@stanford.edu](mailto:miaolu@stanford.edu)

<sup>†</sup>Department of Management Science and Engineering, Stanford University.

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Mathematics, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

<sup>§</sup>Center for Data Science, Peking University.

<b>3</b>	<b>Offline RL in RMDPs: Generic Algorithm Framework and Unified Theory</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Algorithm Framework: P <sup>2</sup> MPO . . . . .	8
3.2	Unified Theoretical Analysis . . . . .	9
3.2.1	Conditions on Model Estimation Subroutine . . . . .	9
3.2.2	Suboptimality Analysis under Robust Partial Coverage . . . . .	10
<b>4</b>	<b>Implementations of P<sup>2</sup>MPO for Examples of RMDPs</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Examples of Robust Markov Decision Processes . . . . .	11
4.2	Model Estimation for General RMDPs with $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular Robust Sets . . . . .	13
4.3	Model Estimation for $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular Robust Factored MDP (Example 4.5) . . . . .	16
<b>5</b>	<b>Multi-Agent Extensions: Offline Reinforcement Learning in Robust Markov Games</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1	A Unified Framework of Robust Markov Games . . . . .	17
5.2	Robust Solution Concept: Robust Nash Equilibrium . . . . .	18
5.3	Robust Offline RL in Robust Markov Games . . . . .	19
5.4	Generic Algorithm Framework and Unified Theory . . . . .	19
5.4.1	Algorithm Framework: P <sup>2</sup> M <sup>2</sup> PO . . . . .	19
5.4.2	Unified Theoretical Analysis . . . . .	20
<b>6</b>	<b>Discussions</b>	<b>22</b>
6.1	$d$ -rectangular robust linear MDPs . . . . .	22
6.2	RMDPs with $\mathcal{S}$ -rectangular robust sets . . . . .	24
<b>A</b>	<b>Proof of Robust Bellman Equation</b>	<b>29</b>
A.1	Proof of Proposition 2.3 . . . . .	29
A.2	Proof of Theorem 5.5 . . . . .	31
<b>B</b>	<b>Proof of Main Results for RMDP (Theorem 3.4)</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Proof of Main Results for RMG (Theorem 5.11)</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Proofs for General RMDPs with <math>\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}</math>-rectangular Robust Sets</b>	<b>37</b>
D.1	Proof of Proposition 4.8 . . . . .	37
D.2	Proofs for $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular Robust Tabular MDP (Equation (4.9)) . . . . .	39
D.3	Proofs for $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular Robust MDPs with Kernel Function Approximations . . . . .	39
D.3.1	A Basic Review of Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space . . . . .	39
D.3.2	Proof of Equation (4.10) . . . . .	40
D.4	Proofs for $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular Robust MDPs with Neural Function Approximations . . . . .	40
D.4.1	Neural Tangent Kernel and Implicit Linearization . . . . .	40
D.4.2	Proof of Equation (4.14) . . . . .	40
<b>E</b>	<b>Proofs for <math>\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}</math>-rectangular Robust Factored MDPs</b>	<b>41</b>
E.1	Proof of Proposition 4.13 . . . . .	41
<b>F</b>	<b>Proofs for <math>d</math>-rectangular Robust Linear MDP</b>	<b>44</b>
F.1	Proof of Lemma F.2 and Lemma F.3 . . . . .	51
F.2	Other Lemmas . . . . .	53
<b>G</b>	<b>Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimator</b>	<b>54</b>
G.1	Proof of Lemma G.1 . . . . .	54
G.2	Proof of Lemma G.2 . . . . .	56
<b>H</b>	<b>Technical Lemmas</b>	<b>56</b>
H.1	Lemmas for Maximum Likelihood Estimator . . . . .	56
H.2	Lemmas for Concentration Inequalities and Bracket Numbers . . . . .	57
H.3	Lemmas for Dual Variables . . . . .	60

# 1 Introduction

Reinforcement learning (RL) (Sutton and Barto, 2018) aims to find an optimal policy that can maximize the expected cumulative rewards obtained from an unknown environment. Typically, modern deep RL algorithms learn such a policy in an online trial-and-error fashion, collecting millions to billions of data. However, online data collection could be costly and risky in many practical applications, such as healthcare (Wang et al., 2018) and autonomous driving (Pan et al., 2017), prohibiting the use of RL in these critical domains. To tackle this challenge, offline RL (Levine et al., 2020) (also known as batch RL (Lange et al., 2012)) proposes to learn a near-optimal policy purely from a dataset collected a priori without further interactions with the environment.

Recent years have witnessed great progresses in offline RL for both practice and theory (Yu et al., 2020; Kumar et al., 2020; Jin et al., 2021; Uehara and Sun, 2021; Xie et al., 2021a; Cheng et al., 2022). Nevertheless, these works implicitly require that the offline data are generated by the real-world environment, which may fail in practice. Taking robotics (Kober et al., 2013; OpenAI et al., 2018) as an example, the experimenter trains the agents in a simulated physical environment and then deploys them in real-world environments. Since the experimenter does not have access to the true physical environments, there would be a mismatch between the simulated environment to generate the offline dataset and the real-world environments to deploy the trained agents. Such a mismatch is commonly referred to as the *sim-to-real gap* (Peng et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2020). Since in RL the optimal policy is sensitive to the model (Mannor et al., 2004; El Ghaoui and Nilim, 2005), the potential sim-to-real gap may lead to the poor performance of RL algorithms.

A promising solution to remedy this issue is robust RL (Iyengar, 2005; El Ghaoui and Nilim, 2005; Morimoto and Doya, 2005) — learning a robust policy that can perform well in a bad or even adversarial environment. A line of works on deep robust RL (Pinto et al., 2017a,b; Pattanaik et al., 2017; Mandlekar et al., 2017; Tessler et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020; Kuang et al., 2022) demonstrates the superiority of the trained robust policy in the real world environments. Furthermore, the recent work of Hu et al. (2022) theoretically proves that the ideal robust policy does attain near optimality for problems with the sim-to-real gap. However, this work does not suggest how to learn an optimal robust policy efficiently from a theoretical perspective.

To understand robust RL from theoretical sides, robust Markov decision process (RMDP) (Iyengar, 2005; El Ghaoui and Nilim, 2005) has been proposed and extensively studied, and many recent works (Zhou et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2021; Shi and Chi, 2022; Ma et al., 2022) design sample-efficient algorithms for offline RL in RMDPs. But these works mainly focus on the tabular case, i.e., finite state space, and thus are not capable of tackling large or even infinite state spaces which usually appear in modern RL applications. Meanwhile, in the non-robust offline RL setting, a line of works (Jin et al., 2021; Uehara and Sun, 2021; Xie et al., 2021a; Zanette et al., 2021; Rashidinejad et al., 2021) has shown that “*pessimism*” is the general learning principle for designing sample-efficient algorithms that can overcome the key difficulty in offline RL, that is, the distributional shift problem caused by finite fixed data. In particular, in the context of function approximation, Xie et al. (2021a) and Uehara and Sun (2021) leverage the pessimism principle and propose generic algorithms in the model-free and model-based fashion, respectively. Hence, it is natural to ask the following questions:

**Q1:** *What is the general learning principle for robust offline RL?*

**Q2:** *Based on this learning principle, can we design a generic algorithm for robust offline RL in the context of function approximation?*

To answer these two questions, we need to handle two intertwined challenges — *distributional shifts* and *large state space*. In general, the distributional shift is caused by the mismatch between the offline data distribution and the distributions induced by the target policies *and* the target environments. Here in robust offline RL, the distributional shifts have two sources: (i) the mismatch between the behavior policy and the target policies to be learned; (ii) the mismatch between the nominal environment and the perturbed environment. The latter is a unique challenge that is not presented in non-robust offline RL. Besides, regarding the state space, existing works mainly focus on the tabular case, and it still remains elusive how to add reasonable structural conditions to make RMDPs with large state spaces tractable. Despite all these challenges, in this paper, we answer the aforementioned two questions affirmatively. Our contributions are summarized below.

## 1.1 Our Contributions

Our work contributes to the theoretical understanding of robust offline (multi-agent) RL in large state spaces. More concretely, our contributions are three-fold.

- **General learning principle and algorithmic design.** We first study robust offline single-agent RL within a general framework, which not only includes existing known tractable  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular tabular RMDPs, but also subsumes several newly proposed models:  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular factored RMDPs,  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular kernel RMDPs, and  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular neural RMDPs. Under this framework, we propose a generic model-based algorithm, dubbed as Doubly Pessimistic Model-based Policy Optimization (P<sup>2</sup>MP0), which consists of a model estimation subroutine and a policy optimization step based on *doubly pessimistic* value estimators. The algorithm is based on a *double pessimism* principle, which requires being pessimism in the face of *model estimation uncertainty* and *environment uncertainty* simultaneously. This plays a key role in overcoming the distributional shift problem in robust offline RL. Notably, the model estimation subroutine can be flexibly chosen according to the structural conditions of specific RMDP examples.
- **Theoretical guarantees based on a robust partial coverage assumption.** From the theoretical perspective, we characterize the optimality of P<sup>2</sup>MP0 via the notion of *robust partial coverage coefficient* and *robust model estimation error*. The robust partial coverage assumption only requires that the offline dataset has good coverage of distributions induced by the optimal robust policy and the perturbed models around the nominal model. In specific, we prove that the suboptimality of P<sup>2</sup>MP0 is bounded by the *robust model estimation error* (Condition 3.2) and the *robust partial coverage coefficient* (Assumption 3.3). For concrete examples of RMDPs, by customizing specific model estimation mechanisms and plugging them into P<sup>2</sup>MP0, we show that P<sup>2</sup>MP0 enjoys a  $\tilde{O}(n^{-1/2})$  convergence rate with robust partial coverage data, where  $n$  is the number of trajectories in the offline dataset.
- **Extension to robust offline multi-agent RL.** As a natural extension of single-agent RMDPs, we also make the first attempt to study offline RL in robust Markov games (RMGs) (Kardes, 2005), wherein the goal is to learn a *robust Nash equilibrium* (RNE). For this multi-agent setting, we extend the double pessimism principle identified for single-agent RMDPs, based on which we propose the Doubly Pessimistic Model-based Multi-agent Policy Optimization (P<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>PO) algorithm. Similar to P<sup>2</sup>MP0 for the single-agent setting, P<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>PO comprises a model estimation step and a surrogate objective minimization step, where the latter adopts a generalization of the double pessimism principle. We further demonstrate that the suboptimality of P<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>PO is controlled by the *robust unilateral (partial) coverage coefficient* (Assumption 5.8) and the *robust model estimation error* (Condition 5.10). Here the newly proposed robust unilateral coverage condition can be regarded as the robust counterpart of the unilateral coverage condition for offline non-robust Markov games (MGs) (Zhong et al., 2022; Cui and Du, 2022b). Finally, as in the single-agent setting, by specifying the robust model estimation error for concrete RMG examples, we can generally prove that P<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>PO converges to a robust Nash equilibrium at a rate of  $\tilde{O}(n^{-1/2})$  with robust unilateral coverage data, where  $n$  is the number of trajectories in the offline dataset.

In summary, our work identifies the first general learning principle, which we call *double pessimism*, for robust offline RL. Based on this general principle, we can perform sample-efficient robust offline RL with robust partial coverage data in the context of general function approximation.

## 1.2 Related Works

Our work is related to a line of previous theoretical works on robust RL in RMDPs, offline RL with pessimism principle, and robust Markov games, which we compare respectively in the following. Also, please see Table 1 for a summary of our results and a comparison with mostly related works on robust offline RL.

**Robust reinforcement learning in robust Markov decision processes.** Robust RL is usually modeled as a robust MDP (RMDP) (Iyengar, 2005; El Ghaoui and Nilim, 2005), and its planning has been well studied (Iyengar, 2005; El Ghaoui and Nilim, 2005; Xu and Mannor, 2010; Wang and Zou, 2022; Wang et al., 2022). Recently, robust RL in RMDPs has attracted considerable attention, and a growing body of works studies this problem in the generative model (Yang et al., 2021; Panaganti and Kalathil, 2022; Si et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2023; Clavier et al., 2023), online setting (Wang and Zou, 2021; Badrinath and Kalathil, 2021; Dong et al., 2022), and offline setting (Zhou et al., 2021; Panaganti et al., 2022; Shi and Chi, 2022; Ma et al., 2022). Our work focuses on robust offline RL, and we provide a more in-depth comparison with Zhou et al. (2021); Shi and Chi (2022); Ma et al. (2022) as follows. Under the full coverage

	Zhou et al. (2021)	Shi and Chi (2022)	Ma et al. (2022)	This Work
$\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular tabular RMDP	✓!	✓	✗	✓
$d$ -rectangular linear RMDP	✗	✗	✓	✓
$\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular factored RMDP	✗	✗	✗	✓
$\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular kernel RMDP	✗	✗	✗	✓
$\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular neural RMDP	✗	✗	✗	✓
$\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular general RMG	NA	NA	NA	✓

Table 1: A comparison with the most related works on robust offline RL. ✓ means that the work can tackle this model with robust partial coverage data, ✓! means that the work requires full coverage data to solve the model, and ✗ means that the work cannot tackle the model. The light green color denotes the models that are first proposed or proved tractable in this work.

condition (a uniformly lower bounded data distribution), Zhou et al. (2021) provide the first sample-efficient algorithm for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular tabular RMDPs. After, Shi and Chi (2022) leverage the pessimism principle and design a sample-efficient offline algorithm that only requires robust partial coverage data for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular tabular RMDPs. Ma et al. (2022) propose a new  $d$ -rectangular RMDP and develop a pessimistic style algorithm that can find a near-optimal robust policy with partial coverage data. In comparison, we provide a generic algorithm that can not only solve the models in Zhou et al. (2021); Shi and Chi (2022); Ma et al. (2022), but can also tackle various newly proposed RMDP models such as  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular factored RMDP,  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular kernel RMDP, and  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular neural RMDP. See Table 1 for a summary. Moreover, we propose a new pessimistic type learning principle “double pessimism” for robust offline RL. Although Shi et al. (2022) and Ma et al. (2022) adopt the similar algorithmic idea in tabular or linear settings, neither of them have identified a general learning principle for robust offline RL in the regime of large state spaces.

**Non-robust offline RL and pessimism principle.** The line of works on offline RL aims to design efficient learning algorithms that find an optimal policy given an offline dataset collected a priori. Prior works (Munos, 2005; Antos et al., 2008; Chen and Jiang, 2019) typically require a dataset of full coverage, which assumes that the offline data have good coverage of all state-action pairs. In order to avoid such a strong coverage condition on data, the *pessimism* principle – being conservative in policy or value estimation of those state-action pairs that are not sufficiently covered by data – has been proposed. Based on this principle, a long line of works (see e.g., Jin et al., 2021; Uehara and Sun, 2021; Xie et al., 2021a,b; Rashidinejad et al., 2021; Zanette et al., 2021; Yin and Wang, 2021; Xiong et al., 2022; Shi et al., 2022; Li et al., 2022b; Zhan et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2022; Rashidinejad et al., 2022) propose algorithms that can learn the optimal policy only with *partial coverage data*. The partial coverage data only need to cover the state-action pairs visited by the optimal policy. Among these works, our work is mostly related to Uehara and Sun (2021), which proposes a generic model-based algorithm for non-robust offline RL. Our algorithm for robust offline RL is also in a model-based fashion, and our study covers some models such as  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular kernel and neural RMDPs whose non-robust counterparts are not studied by Uehara and Sun (2021). More importantly, our algorithm is based on a newly proposed *double pessimism* principle, which is tailored for robust offline RL and is in parallel with the pessimism principle used in non-robust offline RL. Also, we show that the performance of our proposed algorithm depends on the notion of *robust partial coverage coefficient*, which is also different from the notions of partial coverage coefficient in previous non-robust offline RL works (Jin et al., 2021; Xie et al., 2021a; Uehara and Sun, 2021).

As an extension of offline RL in single-agent MDPs, another line of works (Zhong et al., 2022; Cui and Du, 2022a,b; Xiong et al., 2022; Yan et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023) studies offline RL in Markov games (MGs) and demonstrates that the *unilateral coverage* condition is the necessary and sufficient coverage condition for sample-efficient non-robust offline RL in MGs. In comparison, our work focuses on robust offline RL in RMGs and designs a generic algorithm framework that can efficiently learn a robust Nash equilibrium with only robust unilateral coverage data, which can be regarded as a robust counterpart of unilateral coverage data.

**Robust reinforcement learning in robust Markov games.** Robust RL has also been previously considered in a multi-agent setting, and the decision process is modeled as a robust Markov game (RMG) (Kardes, 2005; Kardeş et al., 2011), wherein the goal is to learn a *robust Nash equilibrium* (RNE) among players. The concept of RNE takes transition (and reward) uncertainty into consideration, thus rendering it more stable in

the face of perturbed environments. Recently, Zhang et al. (2020) study policy gradient and actor-critic style algorithms for solving the RNE. But the sample complexity and the convergence property of their algorithm are unknown. Ma et al. (2023) study online RL in RMGs and design a decentralized-style algorithm to learn the RNE. However, robust offline RL in RMGs and its sample-efficiency still remain open (to our best knowledge), which is the focus of our work.

### 1.3 Notations

For any set  $A$ , we use  $2^A$  to denote the collection of all the subsets of  $A$ . We use  $A^c$  to denote the complementary set of  $A$ . For any measurable space  $\mathcal{X}$ , we use  $\Delta(\mathcal{X})$  to denote the collection of all the probability measures over  $\mathcal{X}$ . For any integer  $n$ , we use  $[n]$  to denote the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . Throughout the paper, we use  $D(\cdot\|\cdot)$  to denote a (pseudo-)distance between two probability measures (or densities). In specific, we define the KL-divergence  $D_{\text{KL}}(p\|q)$  between two probability densities  $p$  and  $q$  over  $\mathcal{X}$  as

$$D_{\text{KL}}(p\|q) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} p(x) \log \left( \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} \right) dx,$$

and we define the TV-distance  $D_{\text{TV}}(p\|q)$  between two probability densities  $p$  and  $q$  over  $\mathcal{X}$  as

$$D_{\text{TV}}(p\|q) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |q(x) - p(x)| dx.$$

Given a function class  $\mathcal{F}$  equipped with some norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}})$  the  $\epsilon$ -bracket number of  $\mathcal{F}$ , and  $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}})$  the  $\epsilon$ -covering number of  $\mathcal{F}$ . We denote  $\mathcal{P} = \{P(\cdot|\cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \mapsto \Delta(\mathcal{S})\}$  as the space of transition kernels. We use  $\Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S}, H)$  to denote the collection  $\{\pi = \{\pi_h\}_{h=1}^H | \pi_h(\cdot|\cdot) : \mathcal{S} \mapsto \Delta(\mathcal{A})\}$ .

## 2 Preliminaries on Robust Markov Decision Processes

In this section, we introduce robust Markov decision processes (RMDPs) and formulate the offline RL problem. In Section 2.1, we introduce a unified framework for studying RMDPs in the episodic setting. In Section 2.2 we formulate the problem of offline RL in the proposed framework of RMDPs.

### 2.1 A Unified Framework of Robust Markov Decision Processes

We first introduce a unified framework of episodic RMDPs, denote by a tuple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, P^*, R, \mathcal{P}_M, \Phi)$ . The set  $\mathcal{S}$  is the state space with possibly *infinite* cardinality. The set  $\mathcal{A}$  is the action space with finite cardinality. The integer  $H$  is the length of each episode. The set  $P^* = \{P_h^*\}_{h=1}^H$  is the collection of *nominal* transition kernels where  $P_h^* : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \mapsto \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ . The set  $R = \{R_h\}_{h=1}^H$  is the collection of reward functions where  $R_h : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \mapsto [0, 1]$ . The space  $\mathcal{P}_M \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  is a realizable model space which contains the nominal transition kernel  $P^*$ , i.e.,  $P_h^* \in \mathcal{P}_M$  for each step  $h \in [H]$ .

Most importantly and different from standard MDPs, the RMDP is equipped with a mapping  $\Phi : \mathcal{P}_M \mapsto 2^{\mathcal{P}}$  that characterizes the *robust set* of any transition kernel in  $\mathcal{P}_M$ . Formally, for any transition kernel  $P \in \mathcal{P}_M$ , we call  $\Phi(P)$  the *robust set* of  $P$ . One can interpret the nominal transition kernel  $P_h^*$  as the transition of the training environment, while  $\Phi(P_h^*)$  contains all possible transitions of the test environment.

**Remark 2.1.** *The mapping  $\Phi$  is defined on the realizable model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$ , while for generality we allow the image of  $\Phi$  to be outside of  $\mathcal{P}_M$ . That is, a  $\tilde{P} \in \Phi(P)$  for some  $P \in \mathcal{P}_M$  might be in  $\mathcal{P}_M^c$ .*

**Policy and robust value function.** Given an RMDP  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, P^*, R, \mathcal{P}_M, \Phi)$ , we consider using a Markovian policy to make decisions. A Markovian policy  $\pi$  is defined as  $\pi = \{\pi_h\}_{h=1}^H$  with  $\pi_h : \mathcal{S} \mapsto \Delta(\mathcal{A})$  for each step  $h \in [H]$ . For simplicity, we use *policy* to refer to a Markovian policy in the sequel.

Given any policy  $\pi$ , we define the *robust value function* of  $\pi$  with respect to any set of transition kernels  $P = \{P_h\}_{h=1}^H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$  as the following, for each step  $h \in [H]$ ,

$$V_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi}(s) := \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h), 1 \leq h \leq H} V_h^{\pi}(s; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (2.1)$$

$$Q_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi}(s, a) := \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h), 1 \leq h \leq H} Q_h^{\pi}(s, a; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H), \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}. \quad (2.2)$$

Here  $V_h^\pi(\cdot; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H)$  and  $Q_h^\pi(\cdot; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H)$  are the *state-value function* and the *action-value function* (Sutton and Barto, 2018) of policy  $\pi$  in the standard episodic MDP  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H, R)$ , defined as

$$V_h^\pi(s; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H) := \mathbb{E}_{\{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \mid s_h = s \right], \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (2.3)$$

$$Q_h^\pi(s, a; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H) := \mathbb{E}_{\{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \mid s_h = s, a_h = a \right], \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \quad (2.4)$$

where the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H, \pi}[\cdot]$  is taken with respect to the trajectories induced by the transition kernels  $\{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H$  and the policy  $\pi$ . Intuitively, the robust value functions (2.1) and (2.2) of a policy  $\pi$  given transition kernel  $P$  are defined as the least expected cumulative reward achieved by  $\pi$  when the transition kernel varies in the robust set of  $P$ . This is how an RMDP takes the perturbed models into consideration.

**$\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust set and robust Bellman equation.** Ideally, we would like to consider robust value functions that have recursive expressions, just like the Bellman equations satisfied by (2.3) and (2.4) in a standard episodic MDP (Sutton and Barto, 2018). To achieve this, we impose a generally adopted *rectangular* assumption on the robust sets, which is called the  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -*rectangular* assumption (Iyengar, 2005).

**Assumption 2.2** ( $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust set). *We assume that the mapping  $\Phi$  induces  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust sets. More specifically, the mapping  $\Phi$  satisfies, for any  $P \in \mathcal{P}_M$ ,*

$$\Phi(P) = \bigotimes_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{P}(s, a; P), \quad \text{where } \mathcal{P}(s, a; P) \subseteq \Delta(\mathcal{S}).$$

Intuitively, the  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular assumption requires that the mapping  $\Phi(P)$  gives decoupled robust sets for any  $P(\cdot | s, a)$  across different  $(s, a)$ -pairs. We give specific forms of  $\mathcal{P}(\cdot, \cdot; P)$  in Section 4.1. Commonly, one chooses  $\mathcal{P}(s, a; P)$  as the set of distributions centered at  $P(\cdot | s, a)$ .

Now thanks to the  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular assumption, the robust value functions (2.1) and (2.2) of any policy  $\pi$  satisfy a recursive expression, called robust Bellman equations (Iyengar, 2005; Nilim and El Ghaoui, 2005).

**Proposition 2.3** (Robust Bellman equation). *Under Assumption 2.2, for any  $P = \{P_h\}_{h=1}^H$  where  $P_h \in \mathcal{P}_M$  and any  $\pi = \{\pi_h\}_{h=1}^H$  with  $\pi_h : \mathcal{S} \mapsto \Delta(\mathcal{A})$ , the following robust Bellman equations hold,*

$$V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_h(\cdot | s)} [Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s, a)], \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (2.5)$$

$$Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s, a) = R_h(s, a) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s, a)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^\pi(s')], \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}. \quad (2.6)$$

*Proof of Proposition 2.3.* Iyengar (2005) first showed that  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular-style robust sets allow for recursive expressions of robust value functions. To be self-contained, in Appendix A.1 we provide a detailed proof of the robust Bellman equation in our framework of RMDPs under Assumption 2.2.  $\square$

Equations (2.5) and (2.6) actually says that the infimum over all the transition kernels (recall the definition of  $V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi$  in (2.1)) can be decomposed into a “one-step” infimum over the transition kernels at step  $h$ , i.e.,  $\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)}$ , and an infimum over the transition kernels at steps larger than  $h$ , i.e.,  $V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^\pi$ . Such a property is crucial to the algorithmic design and theoretical analysis for solving RMDPs.

We note that besides the  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular assumption, there are other types of rectangular assumptions considered by robust RL literatures, including  $\mathcal{S}$ -rectangular (Wiesemann et al., 2013) and  $d$ -rectangular (Ma et al., 2022) assumptions. The above framework can also represent RMDPs with these kinds of robust set. We refer to Section 6 for more discussions about solving RMDPs with these two types of robust sets.

## 2.2 Robust Offline RL in Robust Markov Decision Processes

In this subsection, we define the offline RL protocol in an RMDP  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, P^*, R, \mathcal{P}_M, \Phi)$ . The learner is given the realizable model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$  and the robust mapping  $\Phi$ , but the learner doesn’t know the nominal transition kernel  $P^*$ . For simplicity, we assume that the learner knows the reward function  $R^1$ .

<sup>1</sup>This is a reasonable assumption since learning the reward function is easier than learning the transition kernel.

**Offline dataset.** We assume that the learner is given an offline dataset  $\mathbb{D}$  that consists of  $n$  i.i.d. trajectories generated from the standard episodic MDP  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, P^*, R)$  using some behavior policy  $\pi^b$ . For each  $\tau \in [n]$ , the trajectory has the form of  $\{(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau, r_h^\tau)\}_{h=1}^H$ , satisfying that  $a_h^\tau \sim \pi_h^b(\cdot | s_h^\tau)$ ,  $r_h^\tau = R_h(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)$ , and  $s_{h+1}^\tau \sim P_h^*(\cdot | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)$  for each step  $h \in [H]$ , starting from some  $s_1^\tau$ .

Given transition kernels  $P = \{P_h\}_{h=1}^H$  and a policy  $\pi$ , we use  $d_{P,h}^\pi(\cdot, \cdot)$  to denote the state-action visitation distribution at step  $h$  when following policy  $\pi$  and transition kernel  $P$ . With this notation, the distribution of  $(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)$  can be written as  $d_{P^*,h}^{\pi^b}$  or simply  $d_{P^*,h}^b$ , for each  $\tau \in [n]$  and  $h \in [H]$ . We also use  $d_{P^*,h}^{\pi^b}(\cdot)$  to denote the marginal distribution of states at step  $h$  when there is no confusion.

**Learning objective.** In robust offline RL, the goal is to learn the policy  $\pi^*$  from the offline dataset  $\mathbb{D}$  which maximizes the robust value function  $V_{1,P^*,\Phi}^\pi$ , that is,

$$\pi^* := \operatorname{argsup}_{\pi \in \Pi} V_{1,P^*,\Phi}^\pi(s_1), \quad s_1 \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (2.7)$$

where the set  $\Pi = \{\pi = \{\pi_h\}_{h=1}^H \mid \pi_h : \mathcal{S} \mapsto \Delta(\mathcal{A})\}$  denotes the collection of all Markovian policies. In view of (2.7), we call  $\pi^*$  the *optimal robust policy*. Equivalently, we want to learn a policy  $\hat{\pi} \in \Pi$  which minimizes the suboptimality gap between  $\hat{\pi}$  and  $\pi^*$ . Formally, the suboptimality gap between  $\hat{\pi}$  and  $\pi^*$  is defined as<sup>2</sup>

$$\text{SubOpt}_\Phi(\hat{\pi}; s_1) := V_{1,P^*,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) - V_{1,P^*,\Phi}^{\hat{\pi}}(s_1), \quad \forall s_1 \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (2.8)$$

In conclusion, the problem of offline RL in RMDPs is to learn a robust policy from an offline dataset generated in some training environment (the nominal transition), which we hope can perform well across all the perturbed test environments (transitions in the robust set of the nominal transition).

### 3 Offline RL in RMDPs: Generic Algorithm Framework and Unified Theory

In this section, we propose the Doubly Pessimistic Model-based Policy Optimization (P<sup>2</sup>MPO) algorithm framework to solve robust offline RL. Theoretically, we establish a unified suboptimality guarantee for P<sup>2</sup>MPO. Our proposed algorithm and theory show that *double pessimism* is a general principle for designing sample-efficient algorithms for robust offline RL. We highlight that the proposed algorithm features three key points: i) learning the optimal robust policy  $\pi^*$  approximately; ii) requiring only a partial coverage property of the offline dataset  $\mathbb{D}$ ; iii) being able to handle infinite state space via powerful function approximators.

We first introduce the algorithm framework P<sup>2</sup>MPO in Section 3.1. We establish a unified theoretical analysis for P<sup>2</sup>MPO in Section 3.2. We apply the generic algorithm and theory to concrete RMDP examples in Section 4.

#### 3.1 Algorithm Framework: P<sup>2</sup>MPO

The P<sup>2</sup>MPO algorithm framework (Algorithm 1) consists of a *model estimation step* and a *doubly pessimistic policy optimization step*, which we introduce in the following respectively.

**Model estimation step (Line 3).** P<sup>2</sup>MPO first constructs an estimation of the nominal transition kernels  $P^* = \{P_h^*\}_{h=1}^H$  from the offline dataset  $\mathbb{D}$ , i.e., estimating the dynamics of the training environment. In specific, P<sup>2</sup>MPO implements a sub-algorithm `ModelEst`( $\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P}_M$ ) that returns a confidence region  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$  for  $P^*$ , in the form of

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}} = \{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_h\}_{h=1}^H, \quad \text{with } \hat{\mathcal{P}}_h \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M \quad \text{for each step } h \in [H].$$

We note that the sub-algorithm `ModelEst` can be tailored to various concrete RMDP examples. See Section 4 for detailed implementations of `ModelEst` for different examples of RMDPs.

Ideally, to ensure sample-efficient robust offline RL, we need the confidence region to satisfy: i) the nominal transition kernel  $P_h^*$  is contained in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  for each step  $h \in [H]$ ; ii) each transition kernel  $P_h \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  enjoys a small “robust estimation error” which is derived from the robust Bellman equation (2.5). We later characterize these two conditions on  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$  in detail in Section 3.2.

<sup>2</sup>Without loss of generality, we assume that the initial state is fixed to some  $s_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ . Our algorithm and theory can be directly extended to the case when  $s_1 \sim \rho \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** Doubly Pessimistic Model-based Policy Optimization (P<sup>2</sup>MPO)

---

- 1: **Input:** model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$ , mapping  $\Phi$ , dataset  $\mathbb{D}$ , policy class  $\Pi$ , algorithm ModelEst.
  - 2: **Model estimation step:**
  - 3: Obtain a confidence region  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}} = \text{ModelEst}(\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P}_M)$ .
  - 4: **Doubly pessimistic policy optimization step:**
  - 5: Set policy  $\widehat{\pi}$  as  $\text{argsup}_{\pi \in \Pi} J_{\text{Pess}^2}(\pi)$ , where  $J_{\text{Pess}^2}(\pi)$  is defined in (3.1).
  - 6: **Output:**  $\widehat{\pi} = \{\widehat{\pi}_h\}_{h=1}^H$ .
- 

**Doubly pessimistic policy optimization step (Line 5).** After **model estimation step**, P<sup>2</sup>MPO performs policy optimization to learn the optimal robust policy  $\pi^*$ . In the face of *uncertainties*, P<sup>2</sup>MPO adopts a *double pessimism* principle. To explain, this general principle has two sources of pessimism: i) *pessimism* in the face of data uncertainty which originates from statistical estimation of the nominal transition kernels; ii) *pessimism* in the face of test environment transition uncertainty which comes from the target of finding a robust policy against the environment perturbation.

We combine these two sources of pessimism in an organic way through a *doubly pessimistic value estimator*. In specific, for each policy  $\pi$ , we define its value estimator  $J_{\text{Pess}^2}$  via an iterative infimum: i) an infimum over the confidence region constructed in the **model estimation step**, i.e.,  $P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$ ; ii) an infimum over the robust set of  $P_h$ , i.e.,  $\widetilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)$ . Putting together, we define the doubly pessimistic value estimator as

$$J_{\text{Pess}^2}(\pi) := \inf_{P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h, 1 \leq h \leq H} \inf_{\widetilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h), 1 \leq h \leq H} V_1^\pi(s_1; \{\widetilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H), \quad (3.1)$$

where  $V_1^\pi$  is the standard state-value function of policy  $\pi$  defined in (2.3). Then P<sup>2</sup>MPO outputs the policy  $\widehat{\pi}$  that maximizes the doubly pessimistic value estimator  $J_{\text{Pess}^2}(\pi)$  (3.1), i.e.,

$$\widehat{\pi} := \text{argsup}_{\pi \in \Pi} J_{\text{Pess}^2}(\pi). \quad (3.2)$$

By performing pessimism from two sources (in the face of data uncertainty and test environment transition uncertainty) in a neat and iterative way, the double pessimism value estimator  $J_{\text{Pess}^2}$  contrasts with all existing offline RL value estimators. Compared with existing works on standard offline RL in MDPs (Xie et al., 2021a; Uehara and Sun, 2021) and robust offline RL in RMDPs (Zhou et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2021; Panaganti et al., 2022), they only contain one source of pessimism in value estimation and algorithm design.

Besides, we note that a recent work of Shi and Chi (2022) also studies robust offline RL in tabular RMDPs using the principle of pessimism in the face of data uncertainty. Compared with the double pessimism principle, their algorithm performs pessimism in the face of data uncertainty i) depending on the tabular structure of the model since a point-wise pessimism penalty term based on state-count is needed and ii) depending on the specific form of the robust set  $\Phi(P)$ . This makes their algorithm and analysis difficult to adapt to the infinite state space case coped with general types of robust set  $\Phi(P)$  and general function approximations. In contrast, our double-pessimism-based algorithm is capable of handling general RMDPs. In the coming subsection, we show that with a proper model estimation subroutine implemented, the P<sup>2</sup>MPO algorithm can learn the optimal robust policy  $\pi^*$  in a statistically efficient manner.

## 3.2 Unified Theoretical Analysis

In this subsection, we establish a unified theoretical analysis for the P<sup>2</sup>MPO algorithm framework (Algorithm 1). We first specify two conditions that the **model estimation step** of P<sup>2</sup>MPO should satisfy in order for sample-efficient learning. Then we establish an upper bound of the suboptimality (2.8) of the policy obtained by P<sup>2</sup>MPO given that these two conditions are satisfied.

### 3.2.1 Conditions on Model Estimation Subroutine

To achieve sample-efficient robust offline RL, we require the following two conditions on the **model estimation step** of P<sup>2</sup>MPO. The first condition requires the confidence region to contain the nominal transition kernel.

**Condition 3.1** ( $\delta$ -accuracy). *With probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , it holds that  $P_h^* \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  for any  $h \in [H]$ .*

The second condition requires that each transition kernel in the confidence region has some small “robust estimation error”. To be specific, we for each transition kernel  $P_h \in \mathcal{P}$  and function  $V : \mathcal{S} \mapsto [0, H]$ , we define

$$\mathcal{E}_h^\Phi(s, a; P_h, V) := \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s, a)}[V(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s, a)}[V(s')], \quad (3.3)$$

where  $P_h^*$  is the nominal transition kernel. Intuitively,  $\mathcal{E}_h^\Phi$  characterizes the difference in distributionally robust prediction between  $P_h$  and  $P_h^*$ . The second condition goes as follows.

**Condition 3.2** ( $\delta$ -model estimation error). *For some function of the sample size  $n$  and failure probability  $\delta$  denoted by  $\text{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta) < +\infty$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s, a) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}} \left[ \left( \mathcal{E}_h^\Phi(s, a; P_h, V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}) \right)^2 \right] \leq \text{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta), \quad (3.4)$$

for any  $P = \{P_h\}_{h=1}^H$  with  $P_h \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  for each step  $h \in [H]$ .

A seemingly more natural but stronger version of Condition 3.2 is to ensure (3.4) holds for any function  $V$ , rather than only for  $V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}$ . But for a valid theoretical analysis it turns out that we only need (3.2) to hold for  $V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}$ . We remark that Condition 3.1 is relatively standard for the transition kernel estimation since it does not involve robust sets and thus is a normal statistical estimation property. Condition 3.2 turns out to be more problem-specific since one needs to ensure that the model estimation has an accurate robust prediction.

In Section 4, we give concrete model estimation subroutine implementations for specific RMDP examples and thus specify Conditions 3.1 and 3.2. We further prove that all the implementations result in an  $\text{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)$  scaling with  $\tilde{O}(n^{-1})$ .

### 3.2.2 Suboptimality Analysis under Robust Partial Coverage

Now we establish a suboptimality upper bound for the P<sup>2</sup>MPO algorithm framework, given that Conditions 3.1 and 3.2 hold. To make sample-efficient offline RL possible, it is crucial to make certain *coverage* assumptions on the offline dataset (Chen and Jiang, 2019; Jin et al., 2021). Such assumptions generally require the offline data to cover the trajectories induced by certain policies. Thanks to the double pessimism principle of P<sup>2</sup>MPO, we can prove a suboptimality bound while only making a *robust partial coverage assumption* on the dataset.

**Assumption 3.3** (Robust partial coverage). *We assume that the offline dataset satisfies that*

$$C_{P^*, \Phi}^* := \sup_{1 \leq h \leq H} \sup_{P = \{P_h\}_{h=1}^H, P_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{(s, a) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}} \left[ \left( \frac{d_{P, h}^{\pi^*}(s, a)}{d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}(s, a)} \right)^2 \right] < +\infty, \quad (3.5)$$

and we call  $C_{P^*, \Phi}^*$  the robust partial coverage coefficient.

To interpret, Assumption 3.3 only requires that the dataset covers the visitation distribution of the optimal robust policy  $\pi^*$ , but in a robust fashion since  $C_{P^*, \Phi}^*$  considers all possible transition kernels in the robust set  $\Phi(P^*)$ . The robust consideration in  $C_{P^*, \Phi}^*$  is because in RMDPs the policies are evaluated in a robust way. To connect to the literature in offline RL in standard MDPs, Assumption 3.3 corresponds to the *partial coverage* or *single-policy concentrability* assumption (Jin et al., 2021; Uehara and Sun, 2021; Xie et al., 2021a,b; Yin and Wang, 2021; Rashidinejad et al., 2021; Zanette et al., 2021; Xiong et al., 2022; Shi et al., 2022; Li et al., 2022b; Zhan et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2022; Rashidinejad et al., 2022), which requires the offline dataset to cover the trajectories of the optimal policy. When the robust set mapping  $\Phi(P) = \{P\}$ , Assumption 3.3 reduces to the partial coverage assumption for standard MDPs.

This partial-coverage-style assumption is weaker and more practical than the full-coverage-style assumptions for robust offline RL (Yang et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2021; Panaganti et al., 2022), for which they require either a uniformly lower bounded dataset distribution or covering the visitation distribution of any  $\pi \in \Pi$ .

For  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust tabular MDPs (Example 4.1), the robust partial coverage coefficient  $C_{P^*, \Phi}^*$  is similar to the *robust single-policy clipped coefficient*  $C_{\text{rob}}^*$  recently proposed by Shi and Chi (2022) who solve offline tabular RMDPs under partial-coverage-style assumptions. We highlight that beyond  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust tabular MDPs, our robust partial coverage assumption together with the double pessimism algorithm

can handle general RMDPs (including examples of RMDPs introduced in Section 4.1) under our unified theory. Besides, in the tabular setting, the robust partial coverage coefficient  $C_{P^*, \Phi}^*$  can be related to the robust single-policy clipped coefficient  $C_{\text{rob}}^*$  via the inequality  $C_{P^*, \Phi}^* \leq (C_{\text{rob}}^*)^2$ .

Our main result is the following theorem, which upper bounds the suboptimality of P<sup>2</sup>MPO.

**Theorem 3.4** (Suboptimality of P<sup>2</sup>MPO). *Under Assumptions 2.2 and 3.3, suppose that Algorithm 1 implements a sub-algorithm that satisfies Conditions 3.1 and 3.2, then with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,*

$$\text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^*} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^H \sqrt{\text{Err}_h^{\Phi}(n, \delta)}.$$

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.* See Appendix B for a detailed proof.  $\square$

Theorem 3.4 shows that the suboptimality of P<sup>2</sup>MPO is characterized by the robust partial coverage coefficient  $C_{P^*, \Phi}^*$  (Assumption 3.3) and the sum of model estimation error  $\text{Err}_h^{\Phi}$  (Condition 3.2).

When  $\text{Err}_h^{\Phi}(n, \delta)$  achieves a rate of  $\tilde{O}(n^{-1})$ , P<sup>2</sup>MPO enjoys a  $\tilde{O}(n^{-1/2})$ -suboptimality. In Section 4, we give implementations of the model estimation step of P<sup>2</sup>MPO for concrete examples of RMDPs in Section 4.1. The implementations will make Conditions 3.1 and 3.2 satisfied and thus specify the general result Theorem 3.4.

## 4 Implementations of P<sup>2</sup>MPO for Examples of RMDPs

In this section, we provide concrete examples for the unified RMDP framework, based on which we specify the implementation of the ModelEst algorithm in P<sup>2</sup>MPO (Algorithm 1) for different examples. Upon specifying the ModelEst algorithm for a concrete RMDP example, we can then specify the general theory (Theorem 3.4) to this specific case. Examples of RMDPs are introduced in Section 4.1. Implementations and analysis are in the following subsections.

### 4.1 Examples of Robust Markov Decision Processes

In this subsection, we give concrete examples for the unified RMDP framework introduced in Section 2.1 via specifying the realizable model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$  and the robust set mapping  $\Phi$ . Most existing works on RMDPs hinge on the finiteness assumption on the state space  $\mathcal{S}$ , which fails to deal with prohibitively large or even infinite state spaces. In our framework, RMDPs can be studied in the paradigm of infinite state spaces, for which we use function approximation tools for the realizable model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$ . For the robust set mapping  $\Phi$ , we mainly consider  $\Phi(P)$  as a distribution ball centered at  $P$  as adopted in most existing works.

**Example 4.1** ( $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust tabular MDP). *When the state space  $\mathcal{S}$  is a finite set, we call the corresponding model an  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust tabular MDP. Recently, there is a line of works on the  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust tabular MDP (Zhou et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2021; Panaganti and Kalathil, 2022; Liu et al., 2022a; Shi and Chi, 2022; Panaganti et al., 2022; Dong et al., 2022; Ho et al., 2022; Neufeld and Sester, 2022; Wang et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2023; Clavier et al., 2023). For  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust tabular MDPs, we choose the realizable model space  $\mathcal{P}_M = \mathcal{P}$  which contains all possible transition kernels. We also choose the robust set mapping  $\Phi$  as*

$$\Phi(P) = \bigotimes_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{P}(s, a; P), \quad \text{where } \mathcal{P}_\rho(s, a; P) = \left\{ \tilde{P}(\cdot) \in \Delta(\mathcal{S}) : D(\tilde{P}(\cdot) \| P(\cdot | s, a)) \leq \rho \right\}, \quad (4.1)$$

for some (pseudo-)distance  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  on  $\Delta(\mathcal{S})$  and some  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . The (pseudo-)distance  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  can be chosen as a general  $\phi$ -divergence (Yang et al., 2021) or a  $p$ -Wasserstein-distance (Neufeld and Sester, 2022).

**Remark 4.2.** *We highlight that our unified framework of RMDPs covers substantially more model than  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust tabular MDPs since our state space  $\mathcal{S}$  can be infinite. The model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$  can be adapted to function approximation methods to handle the infinite state space. Thus any efficient algorithm developed for our framework of RMDPs **can not** be covered by algorithms for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust tabular MDPs. Example 4.3 and 4.4 are infinite state space  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDPs with function approximations.*

**Example 4.3** ( $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with kernel function approximations). We consider an infinite state space  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP whose realizable model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$  is in a reproduced kernel Hilbert space (RKHS). Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an RKHS associated with a positive definite kernel  $\mathcal{K} : (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S}) \times (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S}) \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$  (See Appendix D.3.1 for a review of the basics of RKHS). We denote the feature mapping of  $\mathcal{H}$  by  $\psi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \mapsto \mathcal{H}$ . With  $\mathcal{H}$ , an  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with kernel function approximation is defined as an  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with  $\mathcal{P}_M$  given by

$$\mathcal{P}_M = \left\{ P(s'|s, a) = \langle \psi(s, a, s'), \mathbf{f} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{H}, \|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq B_K \right\}, \quad (4.2)$$

for some  $B_K > 0$ . In (4.2), we have implicitly identified  $P(\cdot|\cdot, \cdot)$  as the density of the corresponding distribution with respect to a proper base measure on  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S}$ . Regarding the robust set mapping  $\Phi$ , we apply the same choice as (4.1) in Example 4.1.

**Example 4.4** ( $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with neural function approximations). We consider an infinite state space  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP whose realizable model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$  is parameterized by an overparameterized neural network. We define a two-layer fully-connected neural network on some  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  as

$$\text{NN}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \sigma(\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{w}_j), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (4.3)$$

where  $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$  is the number of hidden units,  $(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a})$  is the parameters given by  $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times m}$ ,  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_m)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is the activation function. Now we assume that the state space  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_S}$  for some  $d_S \in \mathbb{N}_+$ . Also, we identify actions via one-hot vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$ , i.e., we represent  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  by  $(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$  with 1 in the  $a$ -th coordinate. Let  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S}$  with  $d_x = 2d_S + |\mathcal{A}|$ . Then an  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with neural function approximation is defined as an  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with  $\mathcal{P}_M$  given by

$$\mathcal{P}_M = \left\{ P(s'|s, a) = \text{NN}((s, a, s'); \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) : \|\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{W}^0\|_2 \leq B_N \right\}, \quad (4.4)$$

for some  $B_N > 0$  and some fixed  $(\mathbf{W}^0, \mathbf{a}^0)$  which can be interpreted as the initialization. See Appendix D.4.1 for more details about neural function approximations and analysis techniques. Regarding the robust set mapping  $\Phi$ , we apply the same choice as (4.1) in Example 4.1.

**Example 4.5** ( $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust factored MDP). We consider a factored MDP equipped with  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular factored robust set. A standard factored MDP (Kearns and Koller, 1999) is defined as follows. Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and  $\mathcal{O}$  be a finite set. The state space  $\mathcal{S}$  is factored as  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{O}^d$ . For each  $i \in [d]$ ,  $s[i]$  is the  $i$ -coordinate of  $s$  and it is only influenced by  $s[\text{pa}_i]$ , where  $\text{pa}_i \subseteq [d]$ . In other words, the transition of a factored MDP can be factorized as

$$P_h^*(s'|s, a) = \prod_{i=1}^d P_{h,i}^*(s'[i]|s[\text{pa}_i], a).$$

Here we let the realizable model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$  consist of all the factored transition kernels, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}_M = \left\{ P(s'|s, a) = \prod_{i=1}^d P_i(s'[i]|s[\text{pa}_i], a) : P_i : \mathcal{S}[\text{pa}_i] \times \mathcal{A} \mapsto \Delta(\mathcal{O}), \forall i \in [d] \right\}. \quad (4.5)$$

For an  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust factored MDP, we define the robust set mapping  $\Phi$  as, for each transition kernel  $P(s'|s, a) = \prod_{i=1}^d P_i(s'[i]|s[\text{pa}_i], a) \in \mathcal{P}_M$ ,

$$\Phi(P) = \bigotimes_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{P}_{\text{Fac}, \rho}(s, a; P), \quad \text{with}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{Fac}, \rho}(s, a; P) = \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^d \tilde{P}_i(\cdot) : \tilde{P}_i(\cdot) \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}), D(\tilde{P}_i(\cdot) \| P_i(\cdot | s[\text{pa}_i], a)) \leq \rho_i, \forall i \in [d] \right\}.$$

for some (pseudo-)distance  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  on  $\Delta(\mathcal{O})$  and  $d$  positive real numbers  $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^d$ .

**Remark 4.6.** The  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust factored MDP (Example 4.5) can also be considered in an infinite state space paradigm, but for ease of presentation, we only consider factored MDPs with finite states here.

**Remark 4.7.** Besides the  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust set (Assumption 2.2), we refer to Section 6 for discussions about RMDPs with  $\mathcal{S}$ -rectangular (Wiesemann et al., 2013) and  $d$ -rectangular (Ma et al., 2022) robust sets.

## 4.2 Model Estimation for General RMDPs with $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular Robust Sets

In this subsection, we implement the `ModelEst` algorithm and specify Theorem 3.4 for general  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular RMDPs with robust sets given by (4.1). The proposed implementation and analysis apply to all of the RMDP examples in Section 4.1 (Examples 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5). In the next subsection, we further give a customized implementation for robust factorized MDPs (Example 4.5) which utilizes the factorization property and results in a refined analysis.

**Implementations of the ModelEst algorithm.** Using the offline data  $\mathbb{D}$ , we first construct the *maximum likelihood estimator* (MLE) of the transition kernel  $P^*$ . Specifically, for each step  $h \in [H]$ , we define

$$\hat{P}_h = \arg \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}_M} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \log P(s_{h+1}^\tau | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau). \quad (4.6)$$

After, we construct a confidence region  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$  for the MLE estimator (4.6), which contains all the transition kernels having a small total variance distance from  $\hat{P}$ . In specific, for each step  $h \in [H]$ , we define

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_h = \left\{ P \in \mathcal{P}_M : \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \|\hat{P}_h(\cdot | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - P(\cdot | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)\|_1^2 \leq \xi \right\}, \quad (4.7)$$

where  $\xi > 0$  is a tuning parameter controlling the size of  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_h$ . Finally, we define that  $\text{ModelEst}(\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P}_M) = \hat{\mathcal{P}} = \{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_h\}_{h=1}^H$  with  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  given by (4.7).

**Analysis for general  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular RMDPs with robust sets (4.1).** In the following, we consider a general RMDP with  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust sets satisfying (4.1). We choose the distance  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  defining the robust set as *KL-divergence* and *TV-distance*. The following proposition shows that the above implementation (4.7) of `ModelEst` in  $\text{P}^2\text{MPO}$  satisfies Conditions 3.1 and 3.2 for both KL-divergence and TV-distance.

**Proposition 4.8** (Guarantees for model estimation). *Under Assumption 2.2 and (4.1), choosing the (pseudo) distance  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  as KL-divergence or TV-distance, setting the tuning parameter  $\xi$  as*

$$\xi = \frac{C_1 \log(C_2 H N_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n},$$

for some constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$ , then Conditions 3.1 and 3.2 are satisfied respectively by,

- ♠ when  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  is KL-divergence and Assumption D.2 (See Appendix D.1) holds with parameter  $\underline{\Delta}$ ,  $\text{Err}_h^{\Phi}(n, \delta)$  is given by

$$\sqrt{\text{Err}_{h,\text{KL}}^{\Phi}(n, \delta)} = \frac{H \exp(H/\underline{\Delta})}{\rho} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C'_1 \log(C'_2 H N_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n}}.$$

- ♣ when  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  is TV-distance,  $\text{Err}_h^{\Phi}(n, \delta)$  is given by

$$\sqrt{\text{Err}_{h,\text{TV}}^{\Phi}(n, \delta)} = H \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C'_1 \log(C'_2 H N_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n}}.$$

Here  $c, C'_1, C'_2 > 0$  stand for three universal constants.

*Proof of Proposition 4.8.* See Appendix D.1 for a detailed proof. □

In Proposition 4.8 for KL-divergence-based robust sets, we make a technical assumption (Assumption D.2 given in Appendix D.1). This assumption is actually a mild regularity condition for analyzing KL-divergence-based distributional robust optimization problems. Similar assumptions also appear in Ma et al. (2022).

Proposition 4.8 deals with the general realizable model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$ . For the special case of finite model space, the corresponding results basically replace bracket number  $\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\cdot)$  of model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$  by its cardinality  $|\mathcal{P}_M|$ . Now plugging the results of Proposition 4.8 in Theorem 3.4, we arrive at the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.9** (Suboptimality of  $\mathbf{P}^2\text{MPO}$ :  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular RMDP). *Under the same assumptions and parameter choice as Theorem 3.4 and Proposition 4.8,  $\mathbf{P}^2\text{MPO}$  with model estimation step (4.7) satisfies that*

♠ *when  $D(\|\cdot\|)$  is KL-divergence and Assumption D.2 holds with parameter  $\underline{\Delta}$ , then with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,*

$$\text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \frac{\sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^* H^2 \exp(H/\underline{\Delta})}}{\rho} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C_1' \log(C_2' H \mathcal{N}_{[]} (1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty}) / \delta)}{n}}.$$

♣ *when  $D(\|\cdot\|)$  is TV-divergence, then with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,*

$$\text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^* H^2} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C_1' \log(C_2' H \mathcal{N}_{[]} (1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty}) / \delta)}{n}}.$$

*Proof of Corollary 4.9.* This is a direct corollary of Theorem 3.4 and Proposition 4.8.  $\square$

**Analysis for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust tabular MDP (Example 4.1).** When the state space  $\mathcal{S}$  is finite as in Example 4.1, the MLE estimator (4.6) coincides the empirical estimator

$$\hat{P}_h(s'|s, a) = \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{s_h^\tau = s, a_h^\tau = a, s_{h+1}^\tau = s'\}}{1 \vee \sum_{\tau=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{s_h^\tau = s, a_h^\tau = a\}}, \quad (4.8)$$

which is adopted by Zhou et al. (2021); Yang et al. (2021); Panaganti and Kalathil (2022); Shi and Chi (2022); Panaganti et al. (2022). Furthermore, in Example 4.1, the realizable model space  $\mathcal{P}_M = \mathcal{P} = \{P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \mapsto \Delta(\mathcal{S})\}$ . Since both  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  are finite, we can bound the bracket number of  $\mathcal{P}_M$  as

$$\mathcal{N}_{[]} (1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty}) \leq n^{2|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}. \quad (4.9)$$

Combining (4.9) and Corollary 4.9, we can then conclude that: i) under TV-distance the suboptimality of  $\mathbf{P}^2\text{MPO}$  for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust tabular MDP is given by  $\mathcal{O}(H^2 \sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^* |\mathcal{S}|^2 |\mathcal{A}| \log(nH/\delta)/n})$ , and ii) under KL-divergence the suboptimality of  $\mathbf{P}^2\text{MPO}$  for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust tabular MDP is given by  $\mathcal{O}(H^2 \exp(H/\underline{\Delta})/\rho \cdot \sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^* |\mathcal{S}|^2 |\mathcal{A}| \log(nH/\delta)/n})$ . See Appendix D.2 for a proof of (4.9).

**Remark 4.10.** *We note that for KL-divergence-based robust sets, the dependence on  $\exp(H)$  is due to the usage of general function approximations, which also appears in a recent work (Ma et al., 2022) for RMDPs with linear function approximations. For the special case of robust tabular MDPs with KL-divergence-based robust sets, existing work (Shi and Chi, 2022) has derived sample complexities without  $\exp(H)$ , but with an additional dependence on  $1/d_{\min}^b$  and  $1/P_{\min}^*$ <sup>3</sup>. We remark that our analysis for  $\mathbf{P}^2\text{MPO}$  algorithm can be tailored to the tabular case and become  $\exp(H)$ -free using their techniques, with the cost of an additional dependence on  $1/d_{\min}^b$  and  $1/P_{\min}^*$ . But we note that in the infinite state space case, both the  $d_{\min}^b$ -dependence and the  $1/P_{\min}^*$ -dependence become problematic. So, it serves as an interesting future work to answer whether one can derive both  $\exp(H)$ -free and  $(1/d_{\min}^b, 1/P_{\min}^*)$ -free results for (general) function approximations under KL-divergence.*

**Analysis for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with kernel function approximations (Example 4.3).**

For kernel function approximations, our theoretical results rely on the following regularity assumptions on the RKHS involved in Example 4.3, which is commonly adopted by the literature on kernel function approximation (Yang et al., 2020; Cai et al., 2020; Li et al., 2022a). Specifically, the kernel  $\mathcal{K}$  can be decomposed as  $\mathcal{K}(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \lambda_j \psi_j(x) \psi_j(y)$  for some  $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{+\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $\{\psi_j : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}\}_{j=1}^{+\infty}$  with  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S}$  (See Appendix D.3 for details). Our assumption on  $\mathcal{K}$  is summarized in the following.

<sup>3</sup>Here  $d_{\min}^b = \min_{(s, a, h): d_{P^*, h}^b(s, a) > 0} d_{P^*, h}^b(s, a)$  and  $P_{\min}^* = \min_{(s, s', h): P_h(s'|s, \pi_h^*(s)) > 0} P_h^*(s'|s, \pi_h^*(s))$ .

**Assumption 4.11** (Regularity of RKHS). *We assume that the kernel  $\mathcal{K}$  of the RKHS satisfies that:*

1. (Boundedness) *It holds that  $|\mathcal{K}(x, y)| \leq 1$ ,  $|\psi_j(x)| \leq 1$ , and  $|\lambda_j| \leq 1$  for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}_+$ ,  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ .*
2. (Eigenvalue decay) *There exists some  $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  such that  $|\lambda_j| \leq C_1 \exp(-C_2 j^\gamma)$  for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}_+$ .*

Under Assumption 4.11, we can then upper bound the bracket number  $\mathcal{N}_{[]}^{\infty}$  for the realizable model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$  defined in (4.2) as (see Appendix D.3.2 for a proof),

$$\log(\mathcal{N}_{[]}^{\infty}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty})) \leq C_K \cdot 1/\gamma \cdot \log^2(1/\gamma) \cdot \log^{1+1/\gamma}(n \text{Vol}(\mathcal{S}) B_K), \quad (4.10)$$

where  $C_K > 0$  is an absolute constant,  $\text{Vol}(\mathcal{S})$  is the measure of the state space  $\mathcal{S}$ , and  $B_K$  is defined in Example 4.3. Combining (4.10) and Corollary 4.9, we can conclude that: i) under TV-distance the suboptimality of  $\text{P}^2\text{MPO}$  for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with kernel function approximations is,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \mathcal{O} \left( H^2 \log(1/\gamma) \cdot \sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^* / \gamma \cdot \log^{1+1/\gamma}(n H \text{Vol}(\mathcal{S}) / \delta) / n} \right), \quad (4.11)$$

and ii) under KL-divergence the suboptimality of  $\text{P}^2\text{MPO}$  for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with kernel function approximations is,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \mathcal{O} \left( H^2 \exp(H/\underline{\lambda}) \log(1/\gamma) / \rho \cdot \sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^* / \gamma \cdot \log^{1+1/\gamma}(n H \text{Vol}(\mathcal{S}) / \delta) / n} \right). \quad (4.12)$$

**Analysis for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with neural function approximations (Example 4.4).**

For neural function approximation analysis, we use the tool of neural tangent kernel (NTK (Jacot et al., 2018)), which relates overparameterized neural networks (4.3) to kernel function approximations. To this end, given the neural network (4.3), we define its NTK  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{NTK}} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{NTK}}(x, y) := \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} \text{NN}(x, \mathbf{W}^0, \mathbf{a}^0)^\top \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} \text{NN}(y, \mathbf{W}^0, \mathbf{a}^0), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (4.13)$$

**Assumption 4.12** (Regularity of Neural Tangent Kernel). *We assume that the neural tangent kernel  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{NTK}}$  defined in (4.13) satisfies Assumption 4.11 with constant  $\gamma_N \in (0, 1/2)$ .*

This assumption on the spectral perspective of NTK is justified by Yang and Salman (2019). As we prove in Appendix D.4.1, when the number of hidden units is large enough, i.e., overparameterized, the neural network is well approximated by its linear expansion at initialization (Lemma D.5), for which we can apply the tool of NTK. Under Assumption 4.12, for the number of hidden units  $m \geq d_{\mathcal{X}} n^4 B_N^4$ , the bracket number  $\mathcal{N}_{[]}^{\infty}$  of  $\mathcal{P}_M$  defined in (4.4) is bounded by (see Appendix D.4.2 for a proof),

$$\log(\mathcal{N}_{[]}^{\infty}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty})) \leq C_N \cdot 1/\gamma_N \cdot \log^2(1/\gamma_N) \cdot \log^{1+1/\gamma_N}(n \text{Vol}(\mathcal{S}) B_N), \quad (4.14)$$

where  $C_N > 0$  denotes an absolute constant,  $\gamma_N \in (0, 1/2)$  is specified in Assumption 4.12, and  $B_N$  is defined in Example 4.4. Combining (4.14) and Corollary 4.9, we can conclude that, in the overparameterized paradigm, i.e.,  $m \geq d_{\mathcal{X}} n^4 B_N^4$ : i) under TV-distance the suboptimality of  $\text{P}^2\text{MPO}$  for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with neural function approximations is,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \mathcal{O} \left( H^2 \log(1/\gamma_N) \cdot \sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^* / \gamma_N \cdot \log^{1+1/\gamma_N}(n H \text{Vol}(\mathcal{S}) / \delta) / n} \right), \quad (4.15)$$

and ii) under KL-divergence the suboptimality of  $\text{P}^2\text{MPO}$  for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with neural function approximations is,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \mathcal{O} \left( H^2 \exp(H/\underline{\lambda}) \log(1/\gamma_N) / \rho \cdot \sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^* / \gamma_N \cdot \log^{1+1/\gamma_N}(n H \text{Vol}(\mathcal{S}) / \delta) / n} \right). \quad (4.16)$$

### 4.3 Model Estimation for $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular Robust Factored MDP (Example 4.5)

In this subsection, we propose an customized implementation of the `ModelEst` algorithm for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust factored MDPs (Example 4.5), resulting in a refined theoretical analysis for this specific RMDP example.

We first construct MLE estimator for each factor  $P_{h,i}^*$  of the transition  $P_h^* = \prod_{i=1}^d P_{h,i}^*$ , that is,

$$\widehat{P}_{h,i} = \arg \max_{P_i: \mathcal{S}[\text{pa}_i] \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{O})} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \log P(s_{h+1}^\tau[i] | s_h^\tau[\text{pa}_i], a_h^\tau). \quad (4.17)$$

Then given  $\{\widehat{P}_{h,i}\}_{i=1}^d$  we construct a confidence region  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$  that is factored across  $i \in [d]$ . Specifically, we define  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  for each step  $h \in [H]$  as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h = \left\{ P(s'|s, a) = \prod_{i=1}^d P_i(s'[i] | s[\text{pa}_i], a) : \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|(P_i - \widehat{P}_{h,i})(\cdot | s_h^\tau[\text{pa}_i], a_h^\tau)\|_1^2 \leq \xi_i, \forall i \in [d] \right\}. \quad (4.18)$$

Finally, we set  $\text{ModelEst}(\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P}_M) = \widehat{\mathcal{P}} = \{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h\}_{h=1}^H$  with  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  given by (4.18).

**Proposition 4.13** (Guarantees for model estimation). *Suppose the RMDP is the  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust factored MDP in Example 4.5 with  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  being KL-divergence or TV-distance. By choosing the tuning parameter  $\xi_i$  defined in (4.18) as*

$$\xi_i = \frac{C_1 |\mathcal{O}|^{1+|\text{pa}_i|} |\mathcal{A}| \log(C_2 n d H / \delta)}{n}$$

for constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  and each  $i \in [d]$ , then Conditions 3.1 and 3.2 are satisfied respectively by,

- ♠ when  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  is KL-divergence and Assumption E.1 (given in Appendix E.1) holds with parameter  $\underline{\lambda}$ , then  $\text{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)$  is given by

$$\sqrt{\text{Err}_{h,\text{KL}}^\Phi(n, \delta)} = \frac{H \exp(H/\underline{\lambda})}{\rho_{\min}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d C'_1 \sum_{i=1}^d |\mathcal{O}|^{1+|\text{pa}_i|} |\mathcal{A}| \log(C'_2 n d / \delta)}{n}},$$

where  $\rho_{\min} = \min_{i \in [d]} \rho_i$ .

- ♣ when  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  is TV-distance, then  $\text{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)$  is given by

$$\sqrt{\text{Err}_{h,\text{KL}}^\Phi(n, \delta)} = H \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d C'_1 \sum_{i=1}^d |\mathcal{O}|^{1+|\text{pa}_i|} |\mathcal{A}| \log(C'_2 n d / \delta)}{n}}.$$

Here  $c, C'_1, C'_2 > 0$  stand for three universal constants.

*Proof of Proposition 4.13.* See Appendix E.1 for a detailed proof. □

**Corollary 4.14** (Suboptimality of  $\text{P}^2\text{MPO}$ :  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust factored MDP). *Supposing the RMDP is an  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust factored MDP, under the same Assumptions and parameter choice in Theorem 3.4 and Proposition 4.13,  $\text{P}^2\text{MPO}$  with model estimation step given by (4.18) satisfies*

- ♠ when  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  is KL-divergence and Assumption D.2 holds with parameter  $\underline{\lambda}$ , then with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\widehat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \frac{\sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^*} H^2 \exp(H/\underline{\lambda})}{\rho_{\min}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d C'_1 \sum_{i=1}^d |\mathcal{O}|^{1+|\text{pa}_i|} |\mathcal{A}| \log(C'_2 n d / \delta)}{n}}.$$

- ♣ when  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  is TV-divergence, then with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\widehat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^*} H^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d C'_1 \sum_{i=1}^d |\mathcal{O}|^{1+|\text{pa}_i|} |\mathcal{A}| \log(C'_2 n d / \delta)}{n}}.$$

*Proof of Corollary 4.14.* This is a direct corollary of Theorem 3.4 and Proposition 4.13. □

Compared with the suboptimality bounds for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDPs in Section 4.2, the suboptimality of  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust factored MDPs with `ModelEst` given in (4.18) only scales with  $\sum_{i=1}^d |\mathcal{O}|^{1+|\mathbf{p}_{a_i}|}$  instead of scaling with  $|\mathcal{S}| = \prod_{i=1}^d |\mathcal{O}|$  which is of order  $\exp(d)$ . This justifies the statistical benefits of considering  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust factored MDPs when the transition kernels of training and testing environments enjoy factored structures.

## 5 Multi-Agent Extensions: Offline Reinforcement Learning in Robust Markov Games

In this section, we extend the theory of offline RL in robust single-agent MDPs to the multi-agent setting, i.e., Markov games (MGs). To this end, we first introduce the robust counterpart of standard Markov games, known as robust Markov games (RMGs), which feature transition robustness. Following the notation in Section 2, we propose a unified framework of RMGs in Section 5.1. We define the learning objective and offline RL protocol in Sections 5.2 and 5.3, respectively. In Section 5.4, we extend the ‘‘double pessimism’’ principle identified in Section 3 for RMDPs to RMGs and design a generic algorithm framework to solve RMGs sample-efficiently.

### 5.1 A Unified Framework of Robust Markov Games

We propose a unified framework of episodic RMGs of  $N$  players, denoted as  $(\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^i\}_{i=1}^N, H, P^*, \{R^i\}_{i=1}^N, \mathcal{P}_M, \Phi)$ . The set  $\mathcal{S}$  is the state space shared by all players, with a possibly *infinite* cardinality. The set  $\mathcal{A}^i$  is the finite action space for player  $i$ . The integer  $H$  is the length of each episode. The set  $P^* = \{P_h^*\}_{h=1}^H$  is the collection of nominal transition kernels where  $P_h^* : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}^1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}^N \mapsto \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ . The set  $R^i = \{R_h^i\}_{h=1}^H$  is the collection of reward functions for player  $i$ , where each  $R_h^i : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}^1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}^N \mapsto [0, 1]$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}^N$ , and we use  $\mathbf{a} = (a^1, \dots, a^N) \in \mathcal{A}$  to denote the joint action of  $N$  players. The space  $\mathcal{P}_M \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  is a realizable model space which contains the nominal transition kernel  $P^*$ , i.e.,  $P_h^* \in \mathcal{P}_M$  for each step  $h \in [H]$ .

Similar to RMDPs, the robust Markov game features a robust set of the transition kernels, which is induced by a mapping  $\Phi : \mathcal{P}_M \mapsto 2^{\mathcal{P}}$ . For any transition kernel  $P \in \mathcal{P}_M$ , we call  $\Phi(P)$  the *robust set* of  $P$ . For RMGs, we also focus on robust sets that are  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular, which is the following assumption.

**Assumption 5.1** ( $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust set). *We assume that the mapping  $\Phi$  induces  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust sets. Specifically, the mapping  $\Phi$  satisfies, for any  $P \in \mathcal{P}_M$ ,*

$$\Phi(P) = \bigotimes_{(s, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{P}_\rho(s, \mathbf{a}; P), \quad \text{where } \mathcal{P}_\rho(s, \mathbf{a}; P) \subseteq \Delta(\mathcal{S}).$$

**Joint policy and robust value function.** Given an RMG  $(\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^i\}_{i=1}^N, H, P^*, \{R^i\}_{i=1}^N, \mathcal{P}_M, \Phi)$ , we consider all players using Markovian policies to play. We denote a Markovian policy of player  $i$  by  $\pi^i = \{\pi_h^i\}_{h=1}^H$  with  $\pi_h^i : \mathcal{S} \mapsto \Delta(\mathcal{A}^i)$  for each step  $h \in [H]$ . A *product* Markovian joint policy of the  $N$  players is denoted by  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi^1, \dots, \pi^N)$ . We use *joint policy* to refer to a product Markovian joint policy in the sequel. For each player  $i \in [N]$ , we use  $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{-i}$  to denote the joint policy of all players except player  $i$ , i.e.,  $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{-i} = (\pi^1, \dots, \pi^{i-1}, \pi^{i+1}, \dots, \pi^N)$ .

Given any joint policy  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ , we define the *robust value function* of  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  and player  $i \in [N]$  with respect to any set of transition kernels  $P = \{P_h\}_{h=1}^H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$  as the following, for each step  $h \in [H]$ ,

$$V_{h, P, \Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}, i}(s) := \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h), 1 \leq h \leq H} V_h^{\boldsymbol{\pi}, i}(s; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (5.1)$$

$$Q_{h, P, \Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}, i}(s, \mathbf{a}) := \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h), 1 \leq h \leq H} Q_h^{\boldsymbol{\pi}, i}(s, \mathbf{a}; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H), \quad \forall (s, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \quad (5.2)$$

where  $V_h^{\boldsymbol{\pi}, i}(\cdot; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H)$  and  $Q_h^{\boldsymbol{\pi}, i}(\cdot, \cdot; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H)$  are the *state-value function* and *state-action value function* of

policy  $\pi$  and player  $i$  in a standard episodic MG given by  $(\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^i\}_{i=1}^N, H, \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H, \{R^i\}_{i=1}^N)$ . More specifically,

$$V_h^{\pi,i}(s; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H) := \mathbb{E}_{\{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{h'=h}^H R_{h'}^i(s_{h'}, \mathbf{a}_{h'}) \mid s_h = s \right], \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (5.3)$$

$$Q_h^{\pi,i}(s, \mathbf{a}; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H) := \mathbb{E}_{\{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{h'=h}^H R_{h'}^i(s_{h'}, \mathbf{a}_{h'}) \mid s_h = s, \mathbf{a}_h = \mathbf{a} \right], \quad \forall (s, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \quad (5.4)$$

where the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H, \pi}[\cdot]$  is taken with respect to the trajectories induced by the transition kernel  $\{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H$  and the joint policy  $\pi$ . Parallel to the robust Bellman equation for single-agent RMDPs, we also have the following multi-agent robust Bellman equation.

**Proposition 5.2** (Multi-agent robust Bellman equation). *Under Assumption 5.1, for any transition kernels  $P = \{P_h\}_{h=1}^H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$  and any joint policy  $\pi = \{\pi_h\}_{h=1}^H$ , the following robust Bellman equations hold,*

$$V_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a} \sim \pi_h(\cdot|s)}[Q_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s, \mathbf{a})], \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (5.5)$$

$$Q_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s, \mathbf{a}) = R_h^i(s, \mathbf{a}) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s, \mathbf{a})}[V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s')], \quad \forall (s, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}. \quad (5.6)$$

for each player  $i \in [N]$ .

*Proof of Proposition 5.2.* The proof of this proposition is the same as that of Proposition 2.3, and we omit it here to avoid repetition.  $\square$

## 5.2 Robust Solution Concept: Robust Nash Equilibrium

In a standard MG, the players in the game seek to achieve the *Nash equilibrium policy*, which maximizes each player's own value function given other players' policies (Filar and Vrieze, 2012). To take transition robustness into consideration, in an RMG, the players want to maximize their own *robust* value functions (Kardes, 2005; Kardes et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2020; Ma et al., 2023), leading to *robust Nash equilibrium*. In the sequel, we give a formal definition of such a solution concept. To this end, we first define the *robust best response*.

**Definition 5.3** (Robust best response). *Given transition kernel  $P = \{P_h\}_{h \in [H]} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$  and joint policy  $\pi = (\pi^i, \pi^{-i})$ , we say policy  $\pi^i$  of player  $i \in [N]$  is a *robust best response policy with respect to  $P$  and  $\pi^{-i}$*  if for any state  $s_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ , it holds that*

$$V_{1,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s_1) = \sup_{\tilde{\pi}^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}^i | \mathcal{S}, H)} V_{1,P,\Phi}^{(\tilde{\pi}^i, \pi^{-i}),i}(s_1).$$

Correspondingly, we denote the *best response policy* as  $\text{br}_{P,\Phi}(\pi^{-i})$  and denote the *robust value functions of the joint policy  $\pi = (\text{br}_{P,\Phi}(\pi^{-i}), \pi^{-i})$*  as  $V_{h,P,\Phi}^{(\dagger, \pi^{-i}),i}$  and  $Q_{h,P,\Phi}^{(\dagger, \pi^{-i}),i}$ .

The robust best response policy extends the definition of *best response policy* in standard MGs in the sense that it requires maximizing the *robust* value function of player  $i$  given other players' policies, thus taking the transition robustness into consideration. For a joint policy  $\pi = (\pi^1, \dots, \pi^N)$ , when each player's policy  $\pi^i$  is a robust best response policy against  $\pi^{-i}$ , we call this joint policy a *robust Nash equilibrium*.

**Definition 5.4** (Robust Nash equilibrium (RNE)). *Given transition kernel  $P = \{P_h\}_{h \in [H]} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$ , we say a joint policy  $\pi = \{\pi_h\}_{h \in [H]}$  a *robust Nash equilibrium policy with respect to  $P$*  if for any state  $s_1 \in \mathcal{S}$  and player  $i \in [N]$  it holds that*

$$V_{1,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s_1) = V_{1,P,\Phi}^{(\dagger, \pi^{-i}),i}(s_1).$$

As a special case, when the robust set mapping satisfies  $\Phi(P) = \{P\}$ , then the RMG reduces to a standard episodic MG, and the definitions of robust best response and robust Nash equilibrium reduce to best response and Nash equilibrium in standard episode MGs, respectively.

The following Theorem shows that in an RMG, the robust Nash equilibrium always exists.

**Theorem 5.5** (Existence of robust Nash equilibrium). *i) Given an RMG  $(\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}^i\}_{i=1}^N, H, P, \{R^i\}_{i=1}^N, \mathcal{P}_M, \Phi)$ , under Assumption 5.1, the robust Nash equilibrium policy defined in Definition 5.4 always exists. ii) Consider a joint policy  $\pi = \{\pi_h\}_{h=1}^H$  defined as the following<sup>4</sup>,*

$$\pi_h(\cdot|s) = \mathbf{NE}\left(\{Q_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^N\right), \quad (5.7)$$

for step  $h = H, \dots, 1$ , where  $\mathbf{NE}(\cdot)$  denotes the Nash equilibrium of normal form games. Then  $\pi$  is a robust Nash equilibrium policy defined in Definition 5.4.

*Proof of Theorem 5.5.* See Appendix A.2 for a detailed proof.  $\square$

The conclusion i) of Theorem 5.5 is a take-away of the conclusion ii) which gives a concrete construction of the robust Nash equilibrium. By ii), given an RMG, to find its robust Nash equilibrium, it suffices to call a standard Nash equilibrium oracle iteratively, where we input the *robust* value functions to the oracle.

### 5.3 Robust Offline RL in Robust Markov Games

Now we study offline RL in RMGs which aims to learn the robust Nash equilibrium policy purely from an offline dataset. Specifically, we assume access to an offline dataset  $\mathbb{D}$ , which consists of  $n$  i.i.d. trajectories induced by the standard Markov game  $(\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}\}_{i=1}^N, H, P^*, \{R^i\})$  and some behavior policy  $\pi^b = \{\pi_h^b\}_{h=1}^H$ . In specific, for each  $\tau \in [n]$ , the trajectory  $\{(s_h^\tau, \mathbf{a}_h^\tau, \mathbf{r}_h^\tau)\}_{h=1}^H$  satisfies  $\mathbf{a}_h^\tau \sim \pi_h^b(\cdot | s_h)$ ,  $\mathbf{r}_h^\tau = \{R_h^i(s_h^\tau, \mathbf{a}_h^i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , and  $s_{h+1}^\tau \sim P_h^*(\cdot | s_h^\tau, \mathbf{a}_h^\tau)$  for each  $h \in [H]$ . We denote the distribution of  $(s_h^\tau, \mathbf{a}_h^\tau)$  by  $d_{P^*,h}^{\pi^b}$  (or simply  $d_{P^*,h}^b$ ) for each  $\tau \in [n]$  and  $h \in [H]$ .

We evaluate the performance of offline algorithms by the following notion of *RNE gap*. Suppose the learning algorithm outputs some policy  $\hat{\pi}$  based on the offline dataset  $\mathbb{D}$ , then the suboptimality of  $\hat{\pi}$  is defined as the violation of the equilibrium condition in Definition 5.4. See the following definition.

**Definition 5.6** (RNE Gap). *The suboptimality gap of  $\pi$  is defined by<sup>5</sup>*

$$\text{RNEGap}_\Phi(\pi; s_1) = \max_{i \in [N]} \left\{ V_{1,P^*,\Phi}^{(\dagger, \pi^{-i}),i}(s_1) - V_{1,P^*,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s_1) \right\}, \quad \forall s_1 \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (5.8)$$

According to Definition 5.6, the suboptimality of a joint policy  $\pi$  is the maximum suboptimality gap across each single player's policy  $\pi^i$  against its *robust* best response given of other players. For an RNE policy  $\pi_{\text{RNE}}$ , it satisfies  $\text{RNEGap}_\Phi(\pi_{\text{RNE}}; s_1) = 0$ . When  $N = 1$ , the notion of  $\text{RNEGap}_\Phi$  coincides with that of  $\text{SubOpt}_\Phi$  for single-agent RMDP (2.8). When the robust set mapping satisfies  $\Phi(P) = \{P\}$ , the condition  $\text{RNEGap}_\Phi < \epsilon$  coincides with the notion of  $\epsilon$ -approximate NE (Cui and Du, 2022b; Zhang et al., 2023) for standard MGs. In conclusion, the goal of offline RL in RMGs is to learn from  $\mathbb{D}$  a policy  $\hat{\pi}$  which minimizes the RNE gap.

### 5.4 Generic Algorithm Framework and Unified Theory

In this subsection, we generalize the idea of double pessimism of  $\text{P}^2\text{MPO}$  (Algorithm 1) for solving offline RL in RMDPs to solving offline RL in RMGs. Our result is a new algorithm framework which we call the Doubly Pessimistic Model-based Multi-agent Policy Optimization ( $\text{P}^2\text{M}^2\text{PO}$ , Algorithm 2). In addition to the principle of double pessimism for value estimators, another optimistic-then-pessimistic value estimator is introduced to the new algorithm to achieve the goal of minimizing the RNE gap (5.8). We introduce the algorithm framework in Section 5.4.1 and we establish its theoretical analysis in Section 5.4.2.

#### 5.4.1 Algorithm Framework: $\text{P}^2\text{M}^2\text{PO}$

We now present our proposed algorithm framework  $\text{P}^2\text{M}^2\text{PO}$  (Algorithm 2), which consists of a *model estimation step* and a *surrogate objective minimization step*.

<sup>4</sup>The definition is in a backward fashion. The policy  $\pi_h$  is defined via  $Q_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}$  which only depends on  $\{\pi_{h'}\}_{h'=h+1}^H$

<sup>5</sup>Without loss of generality, we also assume that the initial state is fixed to some  $s_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ . Our algorithm and theory can be directly extended to the case when  $s_1 \sim \rho \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** Doubly Pessimistic Model-based Multi-agent Policy Optimization (P<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>PO)

---

- 1: **Input:** model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$ , mapping  $\Phi$ , dataset  $\mathbb{D}$ , policy class  $\Pi$ , algorithm ModelEst.
  - 2: **Model estimation step:**
  - 3: Obtain a confidence region  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}} = \text{ModelEst}(\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P}_M)$ .
  - 4: **Surrogate objective minimization step:**
  - 5: Calculate  $J_{\text{Pess}^2}^i(\pi)$ ,  $J_{\text{Opt-Pess}}^i(\pi)$ , and  $J_{\text{Surrogate}}(\pi)$  as (5.9), (5.10), and (5.11).
  - 6: Set policy  $\widehat{\pi} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\pi} J_{\text{Surrogate}}(\pi)$ .
  - 7: **Output:**  $\widehat{\pi} = \{\widehat{\pi}_h\}_{h=1}^H$ .
- 

**Model estimation step (Line 3).** The model estimation step follows the same routine as the single-agent setting. Specifically, P<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>PO implements a sub-algorithm ModelEst( $\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P}_M$ ) to construct a confidence region  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$  for the nominal transition kernel  $P^*$ . The confidence region  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$  is in the form of  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}} = \{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h\}_{h=1}^H$ , with  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$  for each step  $h \in [H]$ . Similar to the RMDP case, the subroutine ModelEst can be flexibly chosen and should satisfy: (i)  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$  contains the true model  $P^*$ ; and (ii) any model in  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$  does not incur large “robust model estimation error”. We quantify these two conditions in Conditions 5.9 and 5.10 in the coming theory section, respectively.

**Surrogate objective minimization step (Line 5 to 6).** In order to minimize the RNE gap (5.8), our method is to construct a surrogate objective of the RNE gap and find the policy minimizing it. In specific, for any player  $i \in [N]$  and any policy  $\pi$ , we first define two functions of  $\pi$  and  $i$  as

$$J_{\text{Pess}^2}^i(\pi) := \inf_{P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h, 1 \leq h \leq H} \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h), 1 \leq h \leq H} V_1^{\pi, i}(s_1; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H), \quad (5.9)$$

$$J_{\text{Opt-Pess}}^i(\pi) := \sup_{P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h, 1 \leq h \leq H} \sup_{\tilde{\pi}^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}^i | S, H)} \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h), 1 \leq h \leq H} V_1^{(\tilde{\pi}^i, \pi^{-i}), i}(s_1; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H). \quad (5.10)$$

Here  $J_{\text{Pess}^2}^i(\pi)$  is the doubly pessimistic estimator for the robust value function  $V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi, i}$  in the RNE gap (5.8), which corresponds to the doubly pessimistic estimator (3.1) for RMDPs. Besides, since RNE compares each player’s policy against its best response, the RNE gap (5.8) involves a robust best response term  $V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{(\cdot, \pi^{-i}), i}$ , for which we define the function  $J_{\text{Opt-Pess}}^i(\pi)$ . It first performs optimism in the face of data uncertainty (supremum over confidence regions  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$ ) and then performs pessimism in the face of test environment uncertainty (infimum over robust sets  $\Phi(P_h)$ ). The reason for being optimism in the face of data uncertainty is that to minimize the RNE gap (5.8) we actually need to minimize the robust best response value  $V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{(\cdot, \pi^{-i}), i}$  (in contrast to maximizing the robust value function  $V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi, i}$  when minimizing (5.8), for which we perform pessimism). Finally, we define the surrogate objective of the RNE gap (5.8) as the difference between  $J_{\text{Opt-Pess}}^i(\pi)$  and  $J_{\text{Pess}^2}^i(\pi)$ ,

$$J_{\text{Surrogate}}(\pi) := \max_{i \in [N]} \{J_{\text{Opt-Pess}}^i(\pi) - J_{\text{Pess}^2}^i(\pi)\}, \quad (5.11)$$

and then P<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>PO outputs a policy  $\widehat{\pi}$  that minimizes the surrogate objective function in (5.11).

**Remark 5.7.** The idea of minimizing the surrogate objective function also appears in the works on non-robust offline MGs (Cui and Du, 2022a; Zhang et al., 2023), but their algorithms are either restricted in the tabular case (Cui and Du, 2022a) or in a model-free fashion (Zhang et al., 2023).

## 5.4.2 Unified Theoretical Analysis

In this subsection, we provide theoretical guarantees for Algorithm 2. Before stating our main theorem, we first identify a new *robust unilateral coverage* coefficient for offline RMGs, and then specify two accurate conditions for the model estimation sub-algorithm ModelEst, parallel to Section 3.2.1.

As the key role played by coverage conditions in single-agent offline RL, coverage conditions are also critical for RL in MGs. Parallel to the single-agent RL setting, previous works on multi-agent RL also aim to perform sample-efficient learning under certain minimal coverage conditions. Recent works (Cui and Du, 2022b; Zhong et al., 2022) have proposed the *unilateral coverage* assumption for non-robust MGs and show

that offline RL in non-robust MGs can be solved in a sample-efficient manner under such an assumption. For RMGs, we propose the following *robust unilateral coverage* assumption.

**Assumption 5.8** (Robust unilateral coverage). *Suppose that  $\pi_{\text{RNE}}$  is a robust Nash equilibrium. We assume that following robust unilateral coverage coefficient is finite,*

$$C_{P^*, \Phi}^{\text{RNE}} = \sup_{h \in [H], i \in [N]} \sup_{\pi^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}^i | \mathcal{S}, H)} \sup_{P = \{P_h\}_{h=1}^H, P_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^i}} \left[ \left( \frac{d_{P, h}^{(\pi^i, \pi_{\text{RNE}}^{-i})}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)}{d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^i}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} \right)^2 \right] < \infty.$$

where  $\pi_{\text{RNE}}$  is one of the robust Nash equilibrium (Definition 5.4).

Assumption 5.8 requires that the dataset distribution has good coverage of trajectories induced by

$$\{\pi = (\pi_i, (\pi_{\text{RNE}}^{-i})^{-i}) : \pi_i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}^i | \mathcal{S}, H), i \in [N]\}$$

and any transition kernel  $P$  in the robust set of the nominal transition kernel  $\Phi(P^*)$ . For degenerate non-robust MGs, i.e.,  $\Phi(P) = \{P\}$ , the robust unilateral coverage coefficient defined in Assumption 5.8 is consistent with the *unilateral coverage coefficient* adopted by a line of previous works on offline non-robust MGs (Zhong et al., 2022; Cui and Du, 2022a,b; Xiong et al., 2022; Yan et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023), and thus giving the name of *robust unilateral coverage coefficient*.

**Conditions on model estimation.** Now we specify the two accurate conditions of model estimation. Recall that  $\hat{\mathcal{P}} = \text{ModelEst}(\mathbb{D}, \mathcal{P}_M)$  where  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_h \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$  for all  $h \in [H]$ . The first condition ensures that confidence region  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$  contains the nominate model  $P^*$  with high probability,

**Condition 5.9** ( $\delta$ -accuracy). *With probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , it holds that  $P_h^* \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  for any  $h \in [H]$ .*

Besides Condition 5.9, the desired confidence region  $\mathcal{P}$  should satisfy that any transition kernel in it incurs a small ‘‘robust estimation error’’. To be specific, we define the following *robust Bellman error* with respect to some transition  $P_h$  and value function  $V : \mathcal{S} \mapsto [0, H]$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}_h^\Phi(s, \mathbf{a}; P_h, V) = \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s, \mathbf{a})} [V(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s, \mathbf{a})} [V(s')]. \quad (5.12)$$

**Condition 5.10** ( $\delta$ -model estimation error). *For some function of the sample size  $n$  and failure probability  $\delta$  denoted by  $\mathbf{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta) < +\infty$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , it holds that*

$$\max_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E}_{(s, \mathbf{a}) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^i}} \left[ \left( \mathcal{E}_h^\Phi(s, \mathbf{a}; P_h, V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{(\pi^i, \pi_{\text{RNE}}^{-i})}) \right)^2 \right] \leq \mathbf{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta). \quad (5.13)$$

for any policy  $\pi^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}^i | \mathcal{S}, H)$ , transition kernel  $P = \{P_h\}_{h=1}^H$  with  $P_h \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  for each step  $h \in [H]$ .

To interpret, Condition 3.2 requires that the robust Bellman error (5.12) incurred by any  $P_h \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  is upper bounded by  $\mathbf{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)$ . As in the case of single-agent RMDPs, the error  $\mathbf{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)$  generally diminishes at the rate of  $\tilde{O}(n^{-1})$ , where  $n$  is the size of dataset  $\mathbb{D}$ .

Now we present our main result in the following theorem, which characterizes the RNE gap of Algorithm 2.

**Theorem 5.11** (Suboptimality of  $\text{P}^2\text{M}^2\text{PO}$ ). *Suppose that Assumptions 5.1 and 5.8 hold, if the model estimation sub-algorithm satisfies Conditions 5.9 and 5.10, it holds with probability  $1 - 2\delta$  that*

$$\text{RNEGap}_\Phi(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq 2\sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^{\text{RNE}}} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^H \sqrt{\mathbf{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)}.$$

*Proof of Theorem 5.11.* See Appendix C for a detailed proof.  $\square$

As we did in Section 4 for RMDPs, we can use similar analysis to specify Theorem 5.11 to specific examples of RMGs, and can be coped with kernel and neural function approximations. To illustrate, we only present a specification result for RMGs with finite state spaces. More corollaries can be derived without much difficulty given the techniques we presented in Section 4.

**Corollary 5.12** (Suboptimality of  $\mathbf{P}^2\mathbf{M}^2\mathbf{P}0$ :  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust tabular MG). *Consider an RMG satisfying Assumption 5.1 with a finite state space  $\mathcal{S}$ . Moreover, its robust set mapping  $\Phi$  satisfy that*

$$\Phi(P) = \bigotimes_{(s, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{P}(s, \mathbf{a}; P), \quad \text{where } \mathcal{P}_\rho(s, \mathbf{a}; P) = \left\{ \tilde{P}(\cdot) \in \Delta(\mathcal{S}) : D(\tilde{P}(\cdot) \| P(\cdot | s, \mathbf{a})) \leq \rho \right\}, \quad (5.14)$$

where  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  is either KL-divergence or TV-distance. Then by choosing the confidence region  $\hat{\mathcal{P}} = \{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_h\}_{h=1}^H$  as

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_h = \left\{ P \in \mathcal{P}_M : \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \|\hat{P}_h(\cdot | s_h^\tau, \mathbf{a}_h^\tau) - P(\cdot | s_h^\tau, \mathbf{a}_h^\tau)\|_1^2 \leq \xi \right\}, \quad \hat{P}_h = \arg \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}_M} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \log P(s_{h+1}^\tau | s_h^\tau, \mathbf{a}_h^\tau), \quad (5.15)$$

with  $\xi = C_1 |\mathcal{S}|^2 |\mathcal{A}| \log(C_2 n H / \delta) / n$ , the  $\mathbf{P}^2\mathbf{M}^2\mathbf{P}0$  algorithm enjoys following results under Assumption 5.8,

- ♠ when  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  is KL-divergence and Assumption D.2 holds with parameter  $\underline{\Delta}$  (treating  $\mathcal{A}$  as the joint action space of the RMG), then with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\text{RNEGap}_\Phi(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \frac{\sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^{\text{RNE}}} \cdot H^2 \exp(H/\underline{\Delta})}{\rho} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C'_1 |\mathcal{S}|^2 |\mathcal{A}| \log(C'_2 n H / \delta)}{n}}.$$

- ♣ when  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  is TV-divergence, then with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\text{RNEGap}_\Phi(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^{\text{RNE}}} \cdot H^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C'_1 |\mathcal{S}|^2 |\mathcal{A}| \log(C'_2 n H / \delta)}{n}}.$$

Here  $C_1, C_2, C'_1, C'_2 > 0$  stand for universal constants.

## 6 Discussions

In this section, we discuss and analysis some other types of RMDPs appearing in existing works that do not satisfy Assumption 2.2 ( $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular), including  $d$ -rectangular robust linear MDPs (Ma et al., 2022) and RMDPs with  $\mathcal{S}$ -rectangular robust sets (Wiesemann et al., 2013), see Section 6.1 and 6.2 respectively.

### 6.1 $d$ -rectangular robust linear MDPs

Recently Ma et al. (2022) proposed the  $d$ -rectangular robust linear MDP to study offline robust RL with linear structures. We use the following example to show how a  $d$ -rectangular robust linear MDP is represented by our general framework of RMDP.

**Example 6.1** ( $d$ -rectangular robust linear MDP (Ma et al., 2022)). *A  $d$ -rectangular robust linear MDP is equipped with  $d$ -rectangular robust sets. Linear MDP is an MDP that enjoys a  $d$ -dimensional linear decomposition of its reward function and transition kernel (Jin et al., 2020). We define the model space  $\mathcal{P}_M$  as*

$$\mathcal{P}_M = \left\{ P(s' | s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}(s') : \mu_i(\cdot) \in \Delta(\mathcal{S}), \forall i \in [d] \right\},$$

where  $\phi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$  is a known feature mapping satisfying that

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s, a) = 1, \quad \phi_i(s, a) \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in [d].$$

We then assume that  $P_h^*(s' | s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}_h^*(s') \in \mathcal{P}_M$ , and  $R_h(s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_h$  for some  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_h \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_h\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d}$ . We define the mapping  $\Phi$  as

$$\Phi(P) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s, a) \tilde{\mu}_i(s') : \tilde{\mu}_i(\cdot) \in \Delta(\mathcal{S}), D(\tilde{\mu}(\cdot) \| \mu_i(\cdot)) \leq \rho, \forall i \in [d] \right\},$$

where  $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$  is some (pseudo-)distance such as KL-divergence or TV-distance. This is called a  $d$ -rectangular robust set and is first considered by Ma et al. (2022). As is argued in Ma et al. (2022),  $d$ -rectangular robust set is not so conservative as  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust set in certain cases, which is more natural for linear MDPs due to the special linear structure.

While not satisfying Assumption 2.2 ( $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust sets), it can still be proved that RMDP in Example 6.1 also satisfies the robust Bellman equation in Proposition 2.3 (similar to the proof in Appendix A.1 for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDPs). Our algorithm P<sup>2</sup>MPO (Algorithm 1) can also be applied to offline solve robust RL with RMDP in Example 6.1, under certain robust partial coverage assumption (see Assumption 6.2). In the following, we give a specific implementation of the model estimation step for  $d$ -rectangular RMDPs in Example 6.1, and we provide theoretical guarantees for this specification of our algorithm P<sup>2</sup>MPO.

**Model estimation.** Suppose we are given a function class  $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \{v : \mathcal{S} \mapsto \mathbb{R}\}$  which depends on the choice of distance  $D(\cdot\|\cdot)$  of the robust set. Then, we define that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h = \left\{ P \in \mathcal{P}_M : \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} P(ds' | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) v(s') - \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_v \right|^2 \leq \xi \right\}, \quad (6.1)$$

where  $\xi > 0$  is a tuning parameter that controls the size of the confidence region, and the vector  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{h,v}$  depends on the specific function  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ , given by

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{h,v} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n (\phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)^\top \boldsymbol{\theta} - v(s_{h+1}^\tau))^2 + \frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2^2 = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) v(s_{h+1}^\tau) \right), \quad (6.2)$$

for some tuning parameter  $\alpha > 0$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}$  is the regularized covariance matrix, defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)^\top + \frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \mathbf{I}_d.$$

Similar constructions for standard linear MDPs are also considered by Sun et al. (2019); Neu and Pike-Burke (2020); Uehara and Sun (2021). We will specify the choice of the function class  $\mathcal{V}$  in the theoretical guarantees of this implementation.

**Suboptimality analysis.** In the following, we provide suboptimality bounds for the above implementation of P<sup>2</sup>MPO for  $d$ -rectangular robust linear MDPs. Regarding the offline dataset, we impose the following robust partial coverage assumption.

**Assumption 6.2** (Robust partial coverage covariance matrix). *We assume that for some constant  $c^\dagger > 0$ ,*

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha} \succeq \frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \mathbf{I}_d + c^\dagger \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P_h}^*} [(\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i)(\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i)^\top] \quad (6.3)$$

for any  $i \in [d]$ ,  $h \in [H]$ , and  $P_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)$ .

**Theorem 6.3** (Suboptimality of P<sup>2</sup>MPO:  $d$ -rectangular robust linear MDP). *Suppose that the RMDP is  $d$ -rectangular robust linear MDP in Example 6.1 with  $D(\cdot\|\cdot)$  being KL-divergence or TV-distance and that Assumption 6.2 holds, choosing the tuning parameter  $\alpha = 1$  in (6.2).*

♠ *when  $D(\cdot\|\cdot)$  is KL-divergence and Assumption F.1 holds with parameter  $\underline{\lambda}$ , then by setting*

$$\mathcal{V} = \left\{ v(s) = \exp \left\{ - \left\{ \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \mathbf{w} / \lambda \right\}_+ \right\} : \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq H\sqrt{d}, \lambda \in [\underline{\lambda}, H/\rho] \right\},$$

and choosing

$$\xi = \frac{C_1 d^2 (\log(1 + C_2 n H / \delta) + \log(1 + C_3 n d H / (\rho \underline{\lambda}^2)))}{n},$$

for some constants  $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ , it holds with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$  that,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\widehat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \frac{d^2 H^2 \exp(H/\underline{\lambda})}{c^\dagger \rho} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C'_1 (\log(1 + C'_2 n H / \delta) + \log(1 + C'_3 n d H / (\rho \underline{\lambda}^2)))}{n}}.$$

♣ when  $D(\|\cdot\|)$  is TV-distance, then by setting

$$\mathcal{V} = \left\{ v(s) = \left\{ \lambda - \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \mathbf{w} \right\}_+ : \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq H\sqrt{d}, \lambda \in [0, H] \right\}, \quad \xi = \frac{C_1 d^2 H^2 \log(C_2 n d H / \delta)}{n},$$

for some constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$ , it holds with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$  that,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \frac{d^2 H^2}{c^\dagger} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C'_1 \log(C'_2 n d H / \delta)}{n}}.$$

Here  $\underline{c}$  is defined in Assumption 6.2 and  $C'_1, C'_2, C'_3 > 0$  are universal constants.

*Proof of Theorem 6.3.* See Appendix F for a detailed proof. □

## 6.2 RMDPs with $\mathcal{S}$ -rectangular robust sets

Besides  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular, there exists another type of generic rectangular assumption on robust sets called  $\mathcal{S}$ -rectangular (Wiesemann et al., 2013; Yang and Salman, 2019). See the following assumption.

**Assumption 6.4** ( $\mathcal{S}$ -rectangular robust sets (Wiesemann et al., 2013)). An  $\mathcal{S}$ -rectangular robust MDP is equipped with  $\mathcal{S}$ -rectangular robust sets. The mapping  $\Phi$  is defined as, for  $\forall P \in \mathcal{P}_M$ ,

$$\Phi(P) = \bigotimes_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{P}_\rho(s; P), \quad \mathcal{P}_\rho(s; P) = \left\{ \tilde{P}(\cdot|\cdot) : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \Delta(\mathcal{S}) : \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} D(\tilde{P}(\cdot|a) \| P(\cdot|s, a)) \leq \rho |\mathcal{A}| \right\},$$

for some (pseudo-)distance  $D(\|\cdot\|)$  on  $\Delta(\mathcal{S})$  and some real number  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .

RMDP with  $\mathcal{S}$ -rectangular robust sets (Assumption 6.4) also satisfies Proposition 2.3 (Wiesemann et al., 2013). Unfortunately, our algorithm framework is unable to deal with this kind of rectangular robust sets under partial coverage data due to some technical problems in applying the robust partial coverage coefficient  $C_{P^*, \Phi}^*$  (Assumption 3.3) under this kind of robust sets. To our best knowledge, how to design sample-efficient algorithms for  $\mathcal{S}$ -rectangular RMDP with robust partial coverage data is still unknown. It is an exciting future work to fill this gap for robust offline reinforcement learning with function approximations.

## References

- AGARWAL, A., JIANG, N., KAKADE, S. M. and SUN, W. (2019). Reinforcement learning: Theory and algorithms. *CS Dept., UW Seattle, Seattle, WA, USA, Tech. Rep* 10–4. [45](#), [51](#)
- ANTOS, A., SZEPESVÁRI, C. and MUNOS, R. (2008). Learning near-optimal policies with bellman-residual minimization based fitted policy iteration and a single sample path. *Machine Learning* **71** 89–129. [5](#)
- BADRINATH, K. P. and KALATHIL, D. (2021). Robust reinforcement learning using least squares policy iteration with provable performance guarantees. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. [4](#)
- CAI, Q., YANG, Z., SZEPESVARI, C. and WANG, Z. (2020). Optimistic policy optimization with general function approximations . [14](#), [40](#)
- CHEN, J. and JIANG, N. (2019). Information-theoretic considerations in batch reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. [5](#), [10](#)
- CHENG, C.-A., XIE, T., JIANG, N. and AGARWAL, A. (2022). Adversarially trained actor critic for offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.02446* . [3](#)
- CLAVIER, P., PENNEC, E. L. and GEIST, M. (2023). Towards minimax optimality of model-based robust reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05372* . [4](#), [11](#)

- CUI, Q. and DU, S. S. (2022a). Provably efficient offline multi-agent reinforcement learning via strategy-wise bonus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.00159* . 5, 20, 21
- CUI, Q. and DU, S. S. (2022b). When is offline two-player zero-sum markov game solvable? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.03522* . 4, 5, 19, 20, 21
- DONG, J., LI, J., WANG, B. and ZHANG, J. (2022). Online policy optimization for robust mdp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.13841* . 4, 11
- EL GHAOU, L. and NILIM, A. (2005). Robust solutions to markov decision problems with uncertain transition matrices. *Operations Research* **53** 780–798. 3, 4
- FILAR, J. and VRIEZE, K. (2012). *Competitive Markov decision processes*. Springer Science & Business Media. 18
- HO, C. P., PETRIK, M. and WIESEMANN, W. (2022). Robust  $\phi$ -divergence mdps . 11
- HU, J., ZHONG, H., JIN, C. and WANG, L. (2022). Provable sim-to-real transfer in continuous domain with partial observations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.15598* . 3
- HU, Z. and HONG, L. J. (2013). Kullback-leibler divergence constrained distributionally robust optimization. *Available at Optimization Online* 1695–1724. 37
- IYENGAR, G. N. (2005). Robust dynamic programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **30** 257–280. 3, 4, 7
- JACOT, A., GABRIEL, F. and HONGLER, C. (2018). Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **31**. 15
- JIN, C., YANG, Z., WANG, Z. and JORDAN, M. I. (2020). Provably efficient reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. In *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 22
- JIN, Y., YANG, Z. and WANG, Z. (2021). Is pessimism provably efficient for offline rl? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 3, 5, 10
- KARDES, E. (2005). Robust stochastic games and applications to counter-terrorism strategies. *CREATE report* . 4, 5, 18
- KARDEŞ, E., ORDÓÑEZ, F. and HALL, R. W. (2011). Discounted robust stochastic games and an application to queueing control. *Operations research* **59** 365–382. 5, 18
- KEARNS, M. and KOLLER, D. (1999). Efficient reinforcement learning in factored mdps. In *IJCAI*, vol. 16. 12
- KOBER, J., BAGNELL, J. A. and PETERS, J. (2013). Reinforcement learning in robotics: A survey. *The International Journal of Robotics Research* **32** 1238–1274. 3
- KUANG, Y., LU, M., WANG, J., ZHOU, Q., LI, B. and LI, H. (2022). Learning robust policy against disturbance in transition dynamics via state-conservative policy optimization. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 36. 3
- KUMAR, A., ZHOU, A., TUCKER, G. and LEVINE, S. (2020). Conservative q-learning for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33** 1179–1191. 3
- LANGE, S., GABEL, T. and RIEDMILLER, M. (2012). Batch reinforcement learning. In *Reinforcement learning*. Springer, 45–73. 3
- LEVINE, S., KUMAR, A., TUCKER, G. and FU, J. (2020). Offline reinforcement learning: Tutorial, review, and perspectives on open problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01643* . 3
- LI, C. J., ZHOU, D., GU, Q. and JORDAN, M. I. (2022a). Learning two-player mixture markov games: Kernel function approximation and correlated equilibrium. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.05363* . 14

- LI, G., SHI, L., CHEN, Y., CHI, Y. and WEI, Y. (2022b). Settling the sample complexity of model-based offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05275* . 5, 10
- LIU, Z., BAI, Q., BLANCHET, J., DONG, P., XU, W., ZHOU, Z. and ZHOU, Z. (2022a). Distributionally robust  $q$ -learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 11
- LIU, Z., LU, M., WANG, Z., JORDAN, M. and YANG, Z. (2022b). Welfare maximization in competitive equilibrium: Reinforcement learning for markov exchange economy. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 40, 54, 56, 57, 59
- LU, M., MIN, Y., WANG, Z. and YANG, Z. (2022). Pessimism in the face of confounders: Provably efficient offline reinforcement learning in partially observable markov decision processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.13589* . 5, 10
- MA, S., CHEN, Z., ZOU, S. and ZHOU, Y. (2023). Decentralized robust v-learning for solving markov games with model uncertainty. 6, 18
- MA, X., LIANG, Z., XIA, L., ZHANG, J., BLANCHET, J., LIU, M., ZHAO, Q. and ZHOU, Z. (2022). Distributionally robust offline reinforcement learning with linear function approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.06620* . 3, 4, 5, 7, 13, 14, 22, 47
- MANDLEKAR, A., ZHU, Y., GARG, A., FEI-FEI, L. and SAVARESE, S. (2017). Adversarially robust policy learning: Active construction of physically-plausible perturbations. In *2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE. 3
- MANNOR, S., SIMESTER, D., SUN, P. and TSITSIKLIS, J. N. (2004). Bias and variance in value function estimation. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first international conference on Machine learning*. 3
- MORIMOTO, J. and DOYA, K. (2005). Robust reinforcement learning. *Neural computation* 17 335–359. 3
- MUNOS, R. (2005). Error bounds for approximate value iteration. In *Proceedings of the National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 20. Menlo Park, CA; Cambridge, MA; London; AAAI Press; MIT Press; 1999. 5
- NEU, G. and PIKE-BURKE, C. (2020). A unifying view of optimism in episodic reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 1392–1403. 23
- NEUFELD, A. and SESTER, J. (2022). Robust  $q$ -learning algorithm for markov decision processes under wasserstein uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00898* . 11
- NILIM, A. and EL GHAOU, L. (2005). Robust control of markov decision processes with uncertain transition matrices. *Operations Research* 53 780–798. 7
- OPENAI, ANDRYCHOWICZ, M., BAKER, B., CHOCIEJ, M., JÓZEFOWICZ, R., MCGREW, B., PACHOCKI, J., PETRON, A., PLAPPERT, M., POWELL, G., RAY, A., SCHNEIDER, J., SIDOR, S., TOBIN, J., WELINDER, P., WENG, L. and ZAREMBA, W. (2018). Learning dexterous in-hand manipulation. *CoRR* . 3
- PAN, Y., CHENG, C.-A., SAIGOL, K., LEE, K., YAN, X., THEODOROU, E. and BOOTS, B. (2017). Agile autonomous driving using end-to-end deep imitation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.07174* . 3
- PANAGANTI, K. and KALATHIL, D. (2022). Sample complexity of robust reinforcement learning with a generative model. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR. 4, 11, 14
- PANAGANTI, K., XU, Z., KALATHIL, D. and GHAVAMZADEH, M. (2022). Robust reinforcement learning using offline data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.05129* . 4, 9, 10, 11, 14
- PATTANAİK, A., TANG, Z., LIU, S., BOMMANNAN, G. and CHOWDHARY, G. (2017). Robust deep reinforcement learning with adversarial attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.03632* . 3
- PENG, X. B., ANDRYCHOWICZ, M., ZAREMBA, W. and ABBEEL, P. (2018). Sim-to-real transfer of robotic control with dynamics randomization. In *2018 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE. 3

- PINTO, L., DAVIDSON, J. and GUPTA, A. (2017a). Supervision via competition: Robot adversaries for learning tasks. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE. [3](#)
- PINTO, L., DAVIDSON, J., SUKTHANKAR, R. and GUPTA, A. (2017b). Robust adversarial reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. [3](#)
- RASHIDINEJAD, P., ZHU, B., MA, C., JIAO, J. and RUSSELL, S. (2021). Bridging offline reinforcement learning and imitation learning: A tale of pessimism. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **34** 11702–11716. [3](#), [5](#), [10](#)
- RASHIDINEJAD, P., ZHU, H., YANG, K., RUSSELL, S. and JIAO, J. (2022). Optimal conservative offline rl with general function approximation via augmented lagrangian. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.00716* . [5](#), [10](#)
- SHI, L. and CHI, Y. (2022). Distributionally robust model-based offline reinforcement learning with near-optimal sample complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.05767* . [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [14](#)
- SHI, L., LI, G., WEI, Y., CHEN, Y. and CHI, Y. (2022). Pessimistic q-learning for offline reinforcement learning: Towards optimal sample complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.13890* . [5](#), [10](#)
- SI, N., ZHANG, F., ZHOU, Z. and BLANCHET, J. (2023). Distributionally robust batch contextual bandits. *Management Science* . [4](#)
- STEINWART, I. and CHRISTMANN, A. (2008). *Support vector machines*. Springer Science & Business Media. [39](#)
- SUN, W., JIANG, N., KRISHNAMURTHY, A., AGARWAL, A. and LANGFORD, J. (2019). Model-based rl in contextual decision processes: Pac bounds and exponential improvements over model-free approaches. In *Conference on learning theory*. PMLR. [23](#)
- SUTTON, R. S. and BARTO, A. G. (2018). *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press. [3](#), [7](#)
- TESSLER, C., EFRONI, Y. and MANNOR, S. (2019). Action robust reinforcement learning and applications in continuous control. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. [3](#)
- UEHARA, M. and SUN, W. (2021). Pessimistic model-based offline reinforcement learning under partial coverage. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06226* . [3](#), [5](#), [9](#), [10](#), [23](#), [45](#), [54](#), [56](#), [57](#)
- VAN DE GEER, S. A. (2000). *Empirical Processes in M-estimation*, vol. 6. Cambridge university press. [56](#)
- WANG, L., ZHANG, W., HE, X. and ZHA, H. (2018). Supervised reinforcement learning with recurrent neural network for dynamic treatment recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. [3](#)
- WANG, Q., HO, C. P. and PETRIK, M. (2022). On the convergence of policy gradient in robust mdps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10439* . [4](#)
- WANG, S., SI, N., BLANCHET, J. and ZHOU, Z. (2023). A finite sample complexity bound for distributionally robust q-learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR. [4](#), [11](#)
- WANG, Y. and ZOU, S. (2021). Online robust reinforcement learning with model uncertainty. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **34** 7193–7206. [4](#)
- WANG, Y. and ZOU, S. (2022). Policy gradient method for robust reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. [4](#)
- WIESEMANN, W., KUHN, D. and RUSTEM, B. (2013). Robust markov decision processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **38** 153–183. [7](#), [13](#), [22](#), [24](#)
- XIE, T., CHENG, C.-A., JIANG, N., MINEIRO, P. and AGARWAL, A. (2021a). Bellman-consistent pessimism for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **34** 6683–6694. [3](#), [5](#), [9](#), [10](#)

- XIE, T., JIANG, N., WANG, H., XIONG, C. and BAI, Y. (2021b). Policy finetuning: Bridging sample-efficient offline and online reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **34** 27395–27407. [5](#), [10](#)
- XIONG, W., ZHONG, H., SHI, C., SHEN, C., WANG, L. and ZHANG, T. (2022). Nearly minimax optimal offline reinforcement learning with linear function approximation: Single-agent mdp and markov game. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15512* . [5](#), [10](#), [21](#)
- XU, H. and MANNOR, S. (2010). Distributionally robust markov decision processes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **23**. [4](#)
- XU, Z., PANAGANTI, K. and KALATHIL, D. (2023). Improved sample complexity bounds for distributionally robust reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR. [4](#), [11](#)
- YAN, Y., LI, G., CHEN, Y. and FAN, J. (2022). Model-based reinforcement learning is minimax-optimal for offline zero-sum markov games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04044* . [5](#), [21](#)
- YANG, G. and SALMAN, H. (2019). A fine-grained spectral perspective on neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.10599* . [15](#), [24](#)
- YANG, W., WANG, H., KOZUNO, T., JORDAN, S. M. and ZHANG, Z. (2023). Avoiding model estimation in robust markov decision processes with a generative model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01248* . [4](#), [11](#)
- YANG, W., ZHANG, L. and ZHANG, Z. (2021). Towards theoretical understandings of robust markov decision processes: Sample complexity and asymptotics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03863* . [3](#), [4](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [14](#), [37](#)
- YANG, Z., JIN, C., WANG, Z., WANG, M. and JORDAN, M. (2020). Provably efficient reinforcement learning with kernel and neural function approximations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33** 13903–13916. [14](#)
- YIN, M. and WANG, Y.-X. (2021). Towards instance-optimal offline reinforcement learning with pessimism. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **34** 4065–4078. [5](#), [10](#)
- YU, T., THOMAS, G., YU, L., ERMON, S., ZOU, J. Y., LEVINE, S., FINN, C. and MA, T. (2020). Mopo: Model-based offline policy optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33** 14129–14142. [3](#)
- ZANETTE, A., WAINWRIGHT, M. J. and BRUNSKILL, E. (2021). Provable benefits of actor-critic methods for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **34** 13626–13640. [3](#), [5](#), [10](#)
- ZHAN, W., HUANG, B., HUANG, A., JIANG, N. and LEE, J. (2022). Offline reinforcement learning with realizability and single-policy concentrability. In *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. [5](#), [10](#)
- ZHANG, H., CHEN, H., XIAO, C., LI, B., LIU, M., BONING, D. and HSIEH, C.-J. (2020). Robust deep reinforcement learning against adversarial perturbations on state observations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33** 21024–21037. [3](#), [6](#), [18](#)
- ZHANG, Y., BAI, Y. and JIANG, N. (2023). Offline learning in markov games with general function approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02571* . [5](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#)
- ZHAO, W., QUERALTA, J. P. and WESTERLUND, T. (2020). Sim-to-real transfer in deep reinforcement learning for robotics: a survey. In *2020 IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence (SSCI)*. IEEE. [3](#)
- ZHONG, H., XIONG, W., TAN, J., WANG, L., ZHANG, T., WANG, Z. and YANG, Z. (2022). Pessimistic minimax value iteration: Provably efficient equilibrium learning from offline datasets. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. [4](#), [5](#), [20](#), [21](#)
- ZHOU, Z., ZHOU, Z., BAI, Q., QIU, L., BLANCHET, J. and GLYNN, P. (2021). Finite-sample regret bound for distributionally robust offline tabular reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR. [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [14](#)

# A Proof of Robust Bellman Equation

## A.1 Proof of Proposition 2.3

*Proof of Proposition 2.3 for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP.* Instead of directly proving the robust Bellman equation (2.5), we prove the following stronger results via induction from step  $h = H$  to 1: *there exists a set of transition kernels  $P^{\pi, \dagger} = \{P_h^{\pi, \dagger}\}_{h=1}^H$  with  $P_h^{\pi, \dagger} \in \Phi(P_h)$  such that*

1. *Robust Bellman equation holds, i.e.,*

$$\begin{aligned} V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s) &= \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_h(\cdot|s)}[Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s, a)], \\ Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s, a) &= R_h(s, a) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s, a)}[V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^\pi(s')]. \end{aligned}$$

2. *The following expressions for robust value functions hold,*

$$\begin{aligned} V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s) &= V_h^\pi(s; \{P_i^{\pi, \dagger}\}_{i=h}^H), \\ Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s, a) &= Q_h^\pi(s, a; \{P_i^{\pi, \dagger}\}_{i=h}^H). \end{aligned}$$

Firstly, for step  $h = H$ , the conclusion 1. and 2. hold directly because no transitions are involved. Now supposing that the conclusion 1. and 2. hold for some step  $h + 1$ , which means that there exist transition kernels  $\{P_i^{\pi, \dagger}\}_{i=h+1}^H$  such that the following condition hold for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^\pi(s) = V_{h+1}^\pi(s; \{P_i^{\pi, \dagger}\}_{i=h+1}^H). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

By the definition of robust value function  $Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi$  in (2.2), we can derive that for any  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s, a) &= \inf_{\tilde{P}_i \in \Phi(P_i), h \leq i \leq H} \mathbb{E}_{\{\tilde{P}_i\}_{i=h}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_h = s, a_h = a \right] \\ &= R_h(s, a) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_i \in \Phi(P_i), h \leq i \leq H} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{P}_h(ds'|s, a) \mathbb{E}_{\{\tilde{P}_i\}_{i=h+1}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h+1}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_{h+1} = s' \right] \\ &\leq R_h(s, a) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{P}_h(ds'|s, a) \mathbb{E}_{\{P_i^{\pi, \dagger}\}_{i=h+1}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h+1}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_{h+1} = s' \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

On the one hand, for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP, the robust set  $\Phi(P_h)$  is decoupled for different  $(s, a)$  pairs, i.e.,

$$\Phi(P_h) = \bigotimes_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{P}_\rho(s, a; P_h),$$

and therefore we can find a *single* transition kernel  $P_h^{\pi, \dagger}$  such that for *any*  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$P_h^{\pi, \dagger}(\cdot|s, a) = \operatorname{arginf}_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{P}_h(ds'|s, a) \mathbb{E}_{\{P_i^{\pi, \dagger}\}_{i=h+1}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h+1}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_{h+1} = s' \right]. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

On the other hand, using condition (A.1) and the definition of (robust) value function  $V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi$  and  $V_h^\pi$  in (2.1) and (2.3), we can also deduce that,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s, a) &\leq R_h(s, a) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{P}_h(ds'|s, a) V_{h+1}^\pi(s'; \{P_i^{\pi, \dagger}\}_{i=h+1}^H) \\ &= R_h(s, a) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{P}_h(ds'|s, a) V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^\pi(s') \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= R_h(s, a) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{P}_h(ds'|s, a) \inf_{\tilde{P}_i \in \Phi(P_i), h+1 \leq i \leq H} V_{h+1}^\pi(s'; \{\tilde{P}_i\}_{i=h+1}^H) \\ &\leq R_h(s, a) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_i \in \Phi(P_i), h \leq i \leq H} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{P}_h(ds'|s, a) V_{h+1}^\pi(s'; \{\tilde{P}_i\}_{i=h+1}^H), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where the first inequality follows from inequality (A.2) and the definition of  $V_{h+1}^\pi$  in (2.3), the first equality follows from condition (A.1), and the second equality follows from the definition of  $V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^\pi$  in (2.1). Note that the right hand side of (A.5) equals to  $Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s,a)$ . Therefore, all the inequalities are actually equalities. On the one hand, from (A.4), we can know that,

$$Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s,a) = R_h(s,a) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{P}_h(ds'|s,a) V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^\pi(s').$$

This proves the  $Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi$  part of the conclusion 1. for step  $h$ . On the other hand, by combining (A.3) and (A.2), one can further obtain that,

$$Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s,a) = \mathbb{E}_{\{P_i^{\pi,\dagger}\}_{i=h}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_h = s, a_h = a \right] = Q_h^\pi(s, a; \{P_i^{\pi,\dagger}\}_{i=h}^H). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

This proves the existence of  $\{P_i^{\pi,\dagger}\}_{i=h}^H$  in the conclusion 2. for step  $h$  and  $Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi$ . The remaining of the proof is to prove the  $V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi$  part of the conclusion 1. and 2. for step  $h$  using  $\{P_i^{\pi,\dagger}\}_{i=h}^H$  found in the previous proof. Specifically, by the definition of  $V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi$  in (2.1), we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s) &= \inf_{\tilde{P}_i \in \Phi(P_i), h \leq i \leq H} \mathbb{E}_{\{\tilde{P}_i\}_{i=h}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_h = s \right] \\ &= \inf_{\tilde{P}_i \in \Phi(P_i), h \leq i \leq H} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_h(a|s) \mathbb{E}_{\{\tilde{P}_i\}_{i=h}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_h = s, a_h = a \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_h(a|s) \mathbb{E}_{\{P_i^{\pi,\dagger}\}_{i=h}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_h = s, a_h = a \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Now applying (A.6) to (A.7), we can further obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s) &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_h(a|s) Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s, a) \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_h(a|s) \inf_{\tilde{P}_i \in \Phi(P_i), h \leq i \leq H} \mathbb{E}_{\{\tilde{P}_i\}_{i=h}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_h = s, a_h = a \right] \\ &\leq \inf_{\tilde{P}_i \in \Phi(P_i), h \leq i \leq H} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_h(a|s) \mathbb{E}_{\{\tilde{P}_i\}_{i=h}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_h = s, a_h = a \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where the equality follows from the definition of  $Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi$  in (2.2). Now note that the right hand side of (A.9) equals to  $V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi$ . Therefore, all the inequalities are actually equalities. On the one hand, by (A.8), we know that,

$$V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_h(a|s) Q_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s, a). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

This proves the  $V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi$  part of the conclusion 1. for step  $h$ . On the other hand, by combining (A.10) with (A.6), we can further deduce that,

$$V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\{P_i^{\pi,\dagger}\}_{i=h}^H, \pi} \left[ \sum_{i=h}^H R_i(s_i, a_i) \middle| s_h = s \right].$$

This proves the  $V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi$  part of the conclusion 2. for step  $h$ . Finally, by using an induction argument, we can finish the proof of the conclusion 1. and 2.

Now according to the conclusion 1., we have that

$$V_{h,P,\Phi}^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_h(\cdot|s)} [R_h(s, a)] + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_h(\cdot|s)} \left[ \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s,a)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^\pi(s')] \right]. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

By the conclusion 2. and the definition of  $P_h^{\pi, \dagger}$  in (A.3), we can obtain from (A.11) that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi}(s) &= \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_h(\cdot|s)}[R_h(s, a)] + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_h(\cdot|s), s' \sim P_h^{\pi, \dagger}(\cdot|s, a)}[V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi}(s')] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_h(\cdot|s)}[R_h(s, a)] + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_h(\cdot|s), s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s, a)}[V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi}(s')]. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Proposition 2.3 under Assumption 2.2.  $\square$

## A.2 Proof of Theorem 5.5

*Proof of Theorem 5.5.* To show that  $\pi$  is a RNE policy, we prove the following stronger result:

$$V_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s_h) = \sup_{\tilde{\pi}^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S}, H)} V_{h,P,\Phi}^{(\tilde{\pi}^i, \pi^{-i}), i}(s_h), \quad \forall h \in [H], s_h \in \mathcal{S}, i \in [N]. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

We prove this result from step  $h = H$  to 1 by induction. For step  $h = H$ , according to (5.7),

$$\pi_H(\cdot|s) = \mathbf{NE}\left(\{R_H^i(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^N\right),$$

This directly implies that for any  $i \in [N]$  and  $s_H \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$V_{H,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s_H) = \mathbb{D}_{(\pi_H^i, \pi_H^{-i})}[R_H^i(s_H, \cdot)] = \sup_{\tilde{\pi}_H^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S})} \mathbb{D}_{(\tilde{\pi}_H^i, \pi_H^{-i})}[R_H^i(s_H, \cdot)] = \sup_{\tilde{\pi}^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S}, H)} V_{H,P,\Phi}^{(\tilde{\pi}^i, \pi^{-i}), i}(s_H).$$

This proves (A.12) for step  $H$ . Now suppose that (A.12) holds for step  $h+1, \dots, H$ . Then for step  $h$ , according to (5.7),

$$\pi_h(\cdot|s) = \mathbf{NE}\left(\{Q_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^N\right),$$

This means that for any  $i \in [N]$  and  $s_h \in \mathcal{S}$ , it holds that

$$V_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s_h) = \mathbb{D}_{(\pi_h^i, \pi_h^{-i})}[Q_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s_h, \cdot)] = \sup_{\tilde{\pi}_h^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S})} \mathbb{D}_{(\tilde{\pi}_h^i, \pi_h^{-i})}[Q_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s_h, \cdot)]. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Now applying the multi-agent Bellman equation (Proposition 2.3) to the right hand side of (A.13), we have the following sequence of inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s_h) &= \sup_{\tilde{\pi}_h^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S})} \mathbb{D}_{(\tilde{\pi}_h^i, \pi_h^{-i})} \left[ R_h^i(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s')] \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{\tilde{\pi}^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S}, H)} \mathbb{D}_{(\tilde{\pi}_h^i, \pi_h^{-i})} \left[ R_h^i(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{(\tilde{\pi}^i, \pi^{-i}), i}(s')] \right] \quad (\text{A.14}) \\ &= \sup_{\tilde{\pi}_h^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S})} \mathbb{D}_{(\tilde{\pi}_h^i, \pi_h^{-i})} \left[ R_h^i(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) + \sup_{\tilde{\pi}^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S}, H)} \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{(\tilde{\pi}^i, \pi^{-i}), i}(s')] \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{\tilde{\pi}_h^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S})} \mathbb{D}_{(\tilde{\pi}_h^i, \pi_h^{-i})} \left[ R_h^i(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} \left[ \sup_{\tilde{\pi}^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S}, H)} V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{(\tilde{\pi}^i, \pi^{-i}), i}(s') \right] \right] \\ &= \sup_{\tilde{\pi}_h^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S})} \mathbb{D}_{(\tilde{\pi}_h^i, \pi_h^{-i})} \left[ R_h^i(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) + \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s')] \right] \\ &= \sup_{\tilde{\pi}_h^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S})} \mathbb{D}_{(\tilde{\pi}_h^i, \pi_h^{-i})} [Q_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s_h, \cdot)] \\ &= V_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s_h), \quad (\text{A.15}) \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due the minimax inequality, the third equality uses the correctness of (A.12) at step  $h+1$ , and the last equality is due to (A.13). Therefore, we conclude that all the above inequalities are actually equalities. Especially, we have that

$$V_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi,i}(s_h) = (\text{A.14}) = \sup_{\tilde{\pi}^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{S}, H)} V_{h,P,\Phi}^{(\tilde{\pi}^i, \pi^{-i}), i}(s_h),$$

which proves (A.12) for step  $h$ . An induction finishes the proof of Theorem 5.5.  $\square$

## B Proof of Main Results for RMDP (Theorem 3.4)

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.4. Let  $\mathcal{E}^\dagger$  denote the event that both Condition 3.1 and 3.2 hold, which happens with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ . In the following, we always assume that  $\mathcal{E}^\dagger$  holds.

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.* By the definition of  $\text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s)$  in (2.8), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s_1) &= V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) - V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\hat{\pi}}(s_1) \\ &= V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) - \inf_{P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}} V_{1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) + \inf_{P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}} V_{1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) - V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\hat{\pi}}(s_1) \\ &\leq V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) - \inf_{P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}} V_{1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) + \inf_{P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}} V_{1, P, \Phi}^{\hat{\pi}}(s_1) - V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\hat{\pi}}(s_1) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$\leq V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) - \inf_{P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}} V_{1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$= \sup_{P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}} \left\{ V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) - V_{1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) \right\}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Here (B.1) follows from our choice of  $\hat{\pi}$  in (3.2), and (B.2) follows from Condition 3.1. In the sequel, we present the upper bound on the right hand side of (B.3). For notational simplicity, for any  $P$  in the confidence region  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$  and any step  $h \in [H]$ , we denote that

$$\Delta_{h, P, \Phi}(s_h, a_h) = Q_{h, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_h, a_h) - Q_{h, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_h, a_h). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Using the robust Bellman equation in Proposition 2.3, we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{h, P, \Phi}(s_h, a_h) &= \underbrace{\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')]}_{\text{Term (i)}} \\ &= \underbrace{\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')]}_{\text{Term (ii)}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')]}_{\text{Term (ii)}}. \end{aligned}$$

**Term (i).** For the term (i), considering denote that

$$P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger} = \underset{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)}{\text{arginf}} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s, a)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')], \quad \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

This notation is consistent with the notation of  $P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger}$  in (A.3) in the proof of Proposition 2.3 (robust Bellman equation). It is because Assumption 2.2 ( $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust set) that we can choose a *single* transition kernel  $P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger}$  that satisfies (B.5) for each  $(s, a)$ -pair. Using the definition of  $P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger}$ , we observe that the following two relationships hold for any state  $(s_h, a_h) \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger}(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')], \\ \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] &= \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger}(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')]. \end{aligned}$$

Using these two observations, we can upper bound the term (i) as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term (i)} &\leq \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger}(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P^*, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger}(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger}(\cdot | s_h, a_h), a' \sim \pi_{h+1}^*(\cdot | s')} [\Delta_{h+1, P, \Phi}(s', a')], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where in the equality we use the robust Bellman equation (Proposition 2.3).

**Term (ii).** For the term (ii), currently we simply denote this term by  $\Delta_{h,P,\Phi}^{(ii)}(s_h, a_h)$ . Combining this with (B.6), we can derive that,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{h,P,\Phi}(s_h, a_h) &= \text{Term (i)} + \text{Term (ii)} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger}(\cdot | s_h, a_h), a' \sim \pi_{h+1}^*(\cdot | s')} [\Delta_{h+1,P,\Phi}(s', a')] + \Delta_{h,P,\Phi}^{(ii)}(s_h, a_h). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

By recursively applying (B.7) and then plugging in the definition of  $\Delta_{h,P,\Phi}^{(ii)}$ , we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{a_1 \sim \pi_1^*(\cdot | s_1)} [\Delta_{1,P,\Phi}(s_1, a_1)] &\leq \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}^{\pi^*}} [\Delta_{h,P,\Phi}^{(ii)}(s_h, a_h)] \\ &= \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}^{\pi^*}} \left[ \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where  $d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}^{\pi^*}(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the state-action visitation distribution induced by the transition kernels  $P^{\pi^*, \dagger} = \{P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger}\}_{h=1}^H$  and the optimal policy  $\pi^*$ . Now we bound the right hand side of (B.8) using Condition 3.2. By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have that for each  $h \in [H]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}^{\pi^*}} \left[ \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}^{\pi^*}} \left[ \frac{d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}^{\pi^*}(s_h, a_h)}{d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^*}(s_h, a_h)} \cdot \left( \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^*}} \left[ \left( \frac{d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}^{\pi^*}(s_h, a_h)}{d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^*}(s_h, a_h)} \right)^2 \right]} \cdot \sqrt{\text{Err}_h^{\Phi}(n, \delta)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

where the last inequality follows from Condition 3.2. Furthermore, by Assumption 3.3, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^*}} \left[ \left( \frac{d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}^{\pi^*}(s_h, a_h)}{d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^*}(s_h, a_h)} \right)^2 \right] &\leq \sup_{P = \{P_h\}_{h=1}^H, P_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^*}} \left[ \left( \frac{d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}^{\pi^*}(s_h, a_h)}{d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^*}(s_h, a_h)} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq C_{P^*, \Phi}^*, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_{P^*, \Phi}^*$  is defined in Assumption 3.3. Applying this to (B.8) and (B.9), we can derive that

$$\sup_{P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}} \left\{ V_{1,P^*, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) - V_{1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s_1) \right\} = \sup_{P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{a_1 \sim \pi_1^*(\cdot | s_1)} [\Delta_{1,P,\Phi}(s_1, a_1)] \right\} \leq \sqrt{C_{P^*, \Phi}^*} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^H \sqrt{\text{Err}_h^{\Phi}(n, \delta)}.$$

Finally, by inequality (B.3), we finish the proof of Theorem 3.4.  $\square$

## C Proof of Main Results for RMG (Theorem 5.11)

*Proof of Theorem 5.11.* Under Condition 5.9, we have that for any policy  $\pi$  and player  $i$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\text{Pess}^2}^i(\pi) &= \inf_{P_h \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_h, 1 \leq h \leq H} \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h), 1 \leq h \leq H} V_1^{\pi, i}(s_1; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H) \\ &\leq \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*), 1 \leq h \leq H} V_1^{\pi, i}(s_1; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H) \\ &= V_{1,P^*, \Phi}^{\pi, i}(s_1), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{\text{Opt-Pess}}^i(\boldsymbol{\pi}) &= \sup_{P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h, 1 \leq h \leq H} \sup_{\tilde{\pi}^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}^i | \mathcal{S}, H)} \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h), 1 \leq h \leq H} V_1^{(\tilde{\pi}^i, \boldsymbol{\pi}^{-i}), i}(s_1; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H) \\
&\geq \sup_{\tilde{\pi}^i \in \Delta(\mathcal{A}^i | \mathcal{S}, H)} \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*), 1 \leq h \leq H} V_1^{(\tilde{\pi}^i, \boldsymbol{\pi}^{-i}), i}(s_1; \{\tilde{P}_h\}_{h=1}^H) \\
&= V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{(\dagger, \boldsymbol{\pi}^{-i}), i}(s_1),
\end{aligned} \tag{C.2}$$

which further implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{RNEGap}_{\Phi}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}; s_1) &= \max_{i \in [N]} \left\{ V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{(\dagger, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^{-i}), i}(s_1) - V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}, i}(s_1) \right\} \\
&\leq \max_{i \in [N]} \left\{ J_{\text{Opt-Pess}}^i(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}) - J_{\text{Pess}^2}^i(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}) \right\} \\
&\leq \max_{i \in [N]} \left\{ J_{\text{Opt-Pess}}^i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}) - J_{\text{Pess}^2}^i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}) \right\} \\
&= \max_{i \in [N]} \left\{ \underbrace{J_{\text{Opt-Pess}}^i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}) - V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}, i}(s_1)}_{\text{(I)}} + \underbrace{V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}, i}(s_1) - J_{\text{Pess}^2}^i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}})}_{\text{(II)}} \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{C.3}$$

where the first inequality uses (C.1) and (C.2), and the second inequality follows from the definition of  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$  that  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \max_{i \in [N]} \{ J_{\text{Opt-Pess}}^i(\boldsymbol{\pi}) - J_{\text{Pess}^2}^i(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \}$ . Here  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}$  is the RNE policy in Assumption 5.8.

**Term (I).** For Term (I) in (C.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(I)} &= J_{\text{Opt-Pess}}^i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}) - V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}, i}(s_1) \\
&= \sup_{P \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}} \sup_{\pi^i} V_{1, P, \Phi}^{(\pi^i, (\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}})^{-i}), i}(s_1) - V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}, i}(s_1) \\
&\leq \sup_{P \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}} \sup_{\pi^i} \left\{ V_{1, P, \Phi}^{(\pi^i, (\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}})^{-i}), i}(s_1) - V_{1, P^*, \Phi}^{(\pi^i, (\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}})^{-i}), i}(s_1) \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{C.4}$$

where the first equality follows from the definition of  $J_{\text{Opt-Pess}}^i$  in (5.10) and the second inequality uses the fact that  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}$  is an RNE. Fix  $(i, P, \pi^i)$ , we use the notation

$$\Delta_{h, \Phi}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) = Q_{h, P, \Phi}^{(\pi^i, (\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}})^{-i}), i}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) - Q_{h, P^*, \Phi}^{(\pi^i, (\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}})^{-i}), i}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h), \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\text{RNE}} = (\pi^i, (\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{RNE}})^{-i}). \tag{C.5}$$

By the multi-agent robust Bellman equation in (5.5) and (5.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta_{h, \Phi}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) \\
&= \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\text{RNE}}, i}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P^*, \Phi}^{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\text{RNE}}, i}(s')] \\
&= \underbrace{\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\text{RNE}}, i}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\text{RNE}}, i}(s')]}_{\Delta_{h, \Phi}^{(i)}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\text{RNE}}, i}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P^*, \Phi}^{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\text{RNE}}, i}(s')]}_{\Delta_{h, \Phi}^{(ii)}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.6}$$

To facilitate the following analysis, we define

$$P_h^{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\text{RNE}}, \dagger} = \arg \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P^*, \Phi}^{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\text{RNE}}, i}(s_h)], \tag{C.7}$$

which is well defined due to Assumption 5.1 ( $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular). With this notation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{h,\Phi}^{(ii)}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)}} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}, i}(s')}] - \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)}} [V_{h+1, P^*, \Phi}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}, i}(s')}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)}, \mathbf{a}' \sim \tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}, h+1}(\cdot | s')} [\Delta_{h+1, \Phi}(s', \mathbf{a}')], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

where the last equality uses the definition of  $\Delta_{h,\Phi}$  in (C.5). Plugging (C.8) into (C.6) yields that

$$\Delta_{h,\Phi}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) \leq \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)}, \mathbf{a}' \sim \tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}, h+1}(\cdot | s')} [\Delta_{h+1, \Phi}(s', \mathbf{a}')] + \Delta_{h,\Phi}^{(i)}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h). \quad (\text{C.9})$$

Recursively expanding (C.8) across  $h \in [H]$  gives that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a}_1 \sim \tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}, 1}(\cdot | s_1)} [\Delta_{1, \Phi}(s_1, \mathbf{a}_1)] \\ &\leq \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) \sim d_{P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}, h}}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}}} [\Delta_{h,\Phi}^{(i)}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)] \\ &= \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) \sim d_{P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}, h}}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}}} \left[ \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}, i}(s')}] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P^*, \Phi}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}, i}(s')}] \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.10})$$

where  $d_{P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}, h}}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}}$  denotes the state-action distribution induced by the joint policy  $\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}$  defined in (C.5) and  $P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}} = \{P_h^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}}\}_{h \in [H]}$  defined in (C.7). In the equality we apply the definition of  $\Delta_{h,\Phi}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)$  in (C.6). Furthermore, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) \sim d_{P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}, h}}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}}} \left[ \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}, i}(s')}] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P^*, \Phi}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}, i}(s')}] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) \sim d_{P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}, h}}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}}} \left[ \frac{d_{P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}, h}}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)}{d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} \cdot \left( \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}, i}(s')}] \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1, P^*, \Phi}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}, i}(s')}] \right) \right], \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) \sim d_{P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}, h}}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}}} \left[ \left( \frac{d_{P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}, h}}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)}{d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} \right)^2 \right]} \cdot \sqrt{\mathbf{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.11})$$

where the last inequality uses Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the definition of  $\mathbf{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)$  in Condition 5.10. Meanwhile, by Assumption 5.8, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) \sim d_{P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}, h}}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}}} \left[ \left( \frac{d_{P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}, h}}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)}{d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} \right)^2 \right] &\leq \sup_{P=\{P_h\}_{h=1}^H, P_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) \sim d_{P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}, h}}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}}} \left[ \left( \frac{d_{P^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE},\dagger}, h}}^{\tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}}}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)}{d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbf{C}_{P^*, \Phi}^{\text{RNE}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.12})$$

where  $\mathbf{C}_{P^*, \Phi}^{\text{RNE}}$  is the robust unilateral coverage coefficient defined in Assumption 5.8. By plugging (C.11) and (C.12) into (C.10) we obtain that,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a}_1 \sim \tilde{\pi}_{\text{RNE}, 1}(\cdot | s_1)} [\Delta_{1, \Phi}(s_1, \mathbf{a}_1)] \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{C}_{P^*, \Phi}^{\text{RNE}}} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^H \sqrt{\mathbf{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)}. \quad (\text{C.13})$$

Together with (C.4) and (C.5), we can establish the following upper bound for Term (I) in (C.4),

$$(\text{I}) \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{C}_{P^*, \Phi}^{\text{RNE}}} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^H \sqrt{\mathbf{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)}. \quad (\text{C.14})$$

**Term (II).** We can tackle Term (II) by a similar way of bounding Term (I) in (C.3). In specific,

$$(II) = V_{1,P^*,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s_1) - \inf_{P \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}} V_{1,P,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s_1) = \sup_{P \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \left\{ V_{1,P^*,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s_1) - V_{1,P,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s_1) \right\}, \quad (\text{C.15})$$

where the first equality follows from the definition of  $J_{\text{Pess}^2}^i(\cdot)$  in (5.9). Fix a model  $P$  and player  $i$ . Similar to (C.5), we denote

$$\bar{\Delta}_{h,\Phi}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) = Q_{h,P^*,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) - Q_{h,P,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h). \quad (\text{C.16})$$

By the multi-agent robust Bellman equation in (5.5) and (5.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\Delta}_{h,\Phi}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) \\ &= \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P^*,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s')] \\ &= \underbrace{\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P^*,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s')]}_{\bar{\Delta}_{h,\Phi}^{(i)}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} \\ &+ \underbrace{\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s')]}_{\bar{\Delta}_{h,\Phi}^{(ii)}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.17})$$

For ease of presentation, we define

$$P_h^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i, \dagger} = \underset{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)}{\text{arginf}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a}_h \sim \pi_h^*(\cdot | s_h), s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s')]. \quad (\text{C.18})$$

Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Delta}_{h,\Phi}^{(i)}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i, \dagger}(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P^*,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s')] - \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i, \dagger}(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}(s')] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i, \dagger}(\cdot | s_h, \mathbf{a}_h), \mathbf{a}' \sim \pi_{\text{RNE}, h+1}(\cdot | s')} [\bar{\Delta}_{h+1,\Phi}(s', \mathbf{a}')], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.19})$$

where the first inequality uses the definition of  $P_h^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i, \dagger}$  in (C.18) and the equality follows from the definition of  $\bar{\Delta}_{h+1,\Phi}(\cdot)$  in (C.16). Plugging (C.19) into (C.17) and recursively expanding across  $h \in [H]$  give that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a}_1 \sim \pi_{\text{RNE}, 1}(\cdot | s_1)} [\bar{\Delta}_{1,\Phi}(s_1, \mathbf{a}_1)] \leq \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i, \dagger}, h}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}} [\bar{\Delta}_{h,\Phi}^{(ii)}(s_h, \mathbf{a}_h)], \quad (\text{C.20})$$

where  $d_{P^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i, \dagger}, h}^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i}$  denotes the state-action distribution induced by the policy  $\pi_{\text{RNE}}$  and  $P^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i, \dagger} = \{P_h^{\pi_{\text{RNE}}^i, \dagger}\}_{h \in [H]}$  defined in (C.18). Following the derivation of (C.13), we can obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a}_1 \sim \pi_{\text{RNE}, 1}(\cdot | s_1)} [\bar{\Delta}_{1,\Phi}(s_1, \mathbf{a}_1)] \leq \sqrt{C_{P^*,\Phi}^{\text{RNE}}} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^H \sqrt{\mathbf{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)}, \quad (\text{C.21})$$

which further implies that

$$(II) \leq \sqrt{C_{P^*,\Phi}^{\text{RNE}}} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^H \sqrt{\mathbf{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)}. \quad (\text{C.22})$$

**Combining Term (I) and Term (II).** Plugging (C.14) and (C.22) into (C.3) yields that

$$\text{RNEGap}_\Phi(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq 2\sqrt{C_{P^*,\Phi}^{\text{RNE}}} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^H \sqrt{\mathbf{Err}_h^\Phi(n, \delta)},$$

which finishes the proof of Theorem 5.11.  $\square$

## D Proofs for General RMDPs with $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular Robust Sets

### D.1 Proof of Proposition 4.8

**Lemma D.1** (Duality for KL-robust set). *The following duality for KL-robust set holds,*

$$\inf_{Q(\cdot): D_{\text{KL}}(Q(\cdot) \| Q^*(\cdot)) \leq \sigma} \int f(x) Q(dx) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left\{ -\lambda \log \left( \int \exp \{-f(x)/\lambda\} Q^*(dx) \right) - \lambda \sigma \right\}.$$

*Proof of Lemma D.1.* See Hu and Hong (2013); Yang et al. (2021) for a detailed proof.  $\square$

**Assumption D.2** (Regularity of KL-divergence duality variable). *We assume that the optimal dual variable  $\lambda^*$  for the following optimization problem*

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left\{ -\lambda \log \left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, Q, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda \right\} \right] \right) - \lambda \rho \right\},$$

*is lower bounded by  $\underline{\lambda} > 0$  for any transition kernels  $P_h \in \mathcal{P}_M$ ,  $Q = \{Q_h\}_{h=1}^H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$ , and step  $h \in [H]$ .*

**Lemma D.3** (Duality for TV-robust set). *The following duality for TV-robust set holds,*

$$\inf_{Q(\cdot): D_{\text{TV}}(Q(\cdot) \| Q^*(\cdot)) \leq \sigma} \int f(x) Q(dx) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ -\int (\lambda - f(x))_+ Q^*(dx) - \frac{\sigma}{2} (\lambda - \inf_x f(x))_+ + \lambda \sigma \right\}.$$

*Proof of Lemma D.3.* See Yang et al. (2021) for a detailed proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.8 with KL-divergence.* Firstly, by invoking the first conclusion of Lemma G.1, we know that the Condition 3.1 holds. In the following, we prove the Condition 3.2. By applying the dual formulation of the KL-robust set (Lemma D.1), we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\ &= \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\{ -\lambda \log \left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^*(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda \right\} \right] \right) - \lambda \rho \right\} \\ & \quad - \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\{ -\lambda \log \left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda \right\} \right] \right) - \lambda \rho \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

By Assumption D.2 and Lemma H.7, we know that the optimal value of  $\lambda$  for both two optimization problems in (D.1) lies in  $[\underline{\lambda}, H/\rho]$  for some  $\underline{\lambda} > 0$ . Thus we can further upper bound the right hand side of (D.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{D.1}) &= \sup_{\underline{\lambda} \leq \lambda \leq H/\rho} \left\{ -\lambda \log \left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^*(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda \right\} \right] \right) - \lambda \rho \right\} \\ & \quad - \sup_{\underline{\lambda} \leq \lambda \leq H/\rho} \left\{ -\lambda \log \left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda \right\} \right] \right) - \lambda \rho \right\} \\ &\leq \sup_{\underline{\lambda} \leq \lambda \leq H/\rho} \left\{ \lambda \log \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda \right\} \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^*(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda \right\} \right]} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

where in the second inequality we use the basic fact that  $\sup_x f(x) - \sup_x g(x) \leq \sup_x \{f(x) - g(x)\}$ . Now we work on the right hand side of (D.2) and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{D.2}) &= \sup_{\underline{\lambda} \leq \lambda \leq H/\rho} \left\{ \lambda \log \left( 1 + \frac{\left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} - \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^*(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} \right) \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda \right\} \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^*(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda \right\} \right]} \right) \right\} \\ &\leq \sup_{\underline{\lambda} \leq \lambda \leq H/\rho} \left\{ \lambda \cdot \frac{\left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} - \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^*(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} \right) \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda \right\} \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^*(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda \right\} \right]} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

where we use the fact of  $\log(1+x) \leq x$  in the second inequality. Now we can further bound the right hand side of (D.3) by

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(D.3)} &\leq \frac{H \exp(H/\Delta)}{\rho} \cdot \left| \left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} - \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^*(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} \right) \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^\pi(s')/\lambda \right\} \right] \right| \\
&\leq \frac{H \exp(H/\Delta)}{\rho} \cdot \int_{\mathcal{S}} |P_h(ds'|s_h, a_h) - P_h^*(ds'|s_h, a_h)| \\
&= \frac{H \exp(H/\Delta)}{\rho} \cdot \|P_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h) - P_h^*(\cdot|s_h, a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.4}$$

Thus by combining (D.1), (D.2), (D.3), and (D.4) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\
&\leq \frac{H \exp(H/\Delta)}{\rho} \cdot \|P_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h) - P_h^*(\cdot|s_h, a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.5}$$

By using a same argument for deriving (D.5), we can also obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\
&\leq \frac{H \exp(H/\Delta)}{\rho} \cdot \|P_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h) - P_h^*(\cdot|s_h, a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.6}$$

Therefore, due to (D.5) and (D.6), we can finally arrive at the following upper bound,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}} \left[ \left( \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{H^2 \exp(2H/\Delta)}{\rho^2} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}} [\|P_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h) - P_h^*(\cdot|s_h, a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}^2].
\end{aligned} \tag{D.7}$$

By invoking the second conclusion of Lemma G.1, we have that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}} [\|P_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h) - P_h^*(\cdot|s_h, a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}^2] \leq \frac{C'_1 \log(C'_2 H N_{[]} (1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty}) / \delta)}{n}, \tag{D.8}$$

for some absolute constant  $C'_1, C'_2 > 0$ . Now combining (D.7) and (D.8), we have that

$$\sqrt{\text{Err}_{h, \text{KL}}^\Phi(n)} = \frac{H \exp(H/\Delta)}{\rho} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C'_1 \log(C'_2 H N_{[]} (1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty}) / \delta)}{n}}.$$

This finishes the proof of Proposition 4.8 under KL-divergence.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.8 with TV-distance.* Firstly, by invoking the first conclusion of Lemma G.1, we know that the Condition 3.1 holds. In the following, we prove the Condition 3.2. By applying the dual formulation of the TV-robust set (Lemma D.3), we can similarly derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right| \\
&= \left| \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ -\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^*(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} \left[ \left( \lambda - V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \right)_+ \right] - \frac{\rho}{2} \left( \lambda - \inf_{s'' \in \mathcal{S}} V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s'') \right) + \lambda \right\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ -\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} \left[ \left( \lambda - V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \right)_+ \right] - \frac{\rho}{2} \left( \lambda - \inf_{s'' \in \mathcal{S}} V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s'') \right) + \lambda \right\} \right|
\end{aligned} \tag{D.9}$$

$$\leq \left| \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h^*(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} - \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} \right) \left[ \left( \lambda - V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \right)_+ \right] \right\} \right| \tag{D.10}$$

As is shown in Lemma H.8, the optimal value of  $\lambda$  for both two optimization problems in (D.9) lies in  $[0, H]$ . Thus we can further upper bound the right hand side of (D.10) as

$$(D.10) \leq H \cdot \|P_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h) - P_h^*(\cdot|s_h, a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}. \quad (D.11)$$

By applying the second conclusion of Lemma G.1, we conclude that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}} \left[ \left( \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq H^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}} [\|P_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h) - P_h^*(\cdot|s_h, a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}^2] \\ & \leq \frac{C'_1 H^2 \log(C'_2 H N_{[]} (1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty}) / \delta)}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (D.12)$$

Therefore, it suffices to choose  $\text{Err}_{h, \text{TV}}^{\Phi}(n)$  as

$$\sqrt{\text{Err}_{h, \text{TV}}^{\Phi}(n)} = H \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C'_1 \log(C'_2 H N_{[]} (1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty}) / \delta)}{n}}.$$

This finishes the proof of Proposition 4.8 under TV-distance.  $\square$

## D.2 Proofs for $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular Robust Tabular MDP (Equation (4.9))

The model class  $\mathcal{P}_M$  can be considered as a subspace of  $\mathcal{F} = \{f(s, a, s') : \|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1\}$  with finite  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$ . Consider the collection of brackets  $\mathcal{B}$  containing brackets in the form of  $[g, g + 1/n^2]$ , where  $g(s, a, s') \in \{0, 1/n^2, 2/n^2, \dots, (n^2 - 1)/n^2\}$ . Then we can see that  $\mathcal{B}$  is actually a  $1/n^2$ -bracket of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Thus we know that the bracket number of  $\mathcal{P}_M$  is bounded by,

$$\mathcal{N}_{[]} (1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty}) \leq \mathcal{N}_{[]} (1/n^2, \mathcal{F}_M, \|\cdot\|_{\infty}) \leq |\mathcal{B}| \leq n^{2|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}|}.$$

This finishes the proof of (4.9).

## D.3 Proofs for $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular Robust MDPs with Kernel Function Approximations

### D.3.1 A Basic Review of Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space

We briefly review the basic knowledge of a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS). We say  $\mathcal{H}$  is a RKHS on a set  $\mathcal{Y}$  with the reproducing kernel  $\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  if its inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$  satisfies, for any  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , we have that  $f(y) = \langle f, \mathcal{K}(y, \cdot) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ . The mapping  $\mathcal{K}(y, \cdot) : \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathcal{H}$  is called the feature mapping of  $\mathcal{H}$ , denoted by  $\psi(y) : \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathcal{H}$ .

When the reproducing kernel  $\mathcal{K}$  is continuous, symmetric, and positive definite, Mercer's theorem (Steinwart and Christman 2008) says that  $\mathcal{K}$  has the following representation,

$$\mathcal{K}(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \psi_j(x) \psi_j(y), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{Y},$$

where  $\psi_j : \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  and  $\{\sqrt{\lambda_j} \cdot \psi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  forms an orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{H}$  with  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$ . Also, the feature mapping  $\psi(y)$  can be represented as

$$\psi(y) = \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \lambda_j \psi_j(y) \psi_j, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

### D.3.2 Proof of Equation (4.10)

We invoke the following lemma to bound the bracket number of  $\mathcal{P}_M$  in Example 4.3.

**Lemma D.4** (Bracket number of kernel function class (Liu et al., 2022b)). *Under Assumption 4.11, the bracket number of  $\mathcal{P}_M$  given by*

$$\mathcal{P}_M = \{P(s'|s, a) = \langle \boldsymbol{\psi}(s, a, s'), \mathbf{f} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{H}, \|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq B_K\}$$

is bounded by, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\log(\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty})) \leq C_K \cdot 1/\gamma \cdot \log^2(1/\gamma) \cdot \log^{1+1/\gamma}(\text{Vol}(\mathcal{S})B_K/\epsilon).$$

*Proof of Lemma D.4.* We refer to Lemma B.11 in Liu et al. (2022b) for a detailed proof.  $\square$

By taking  $\epsilon = 1/n^2$  in Lemma D.4, we can finish the proof of (4.10).

## D.4 Proofs for $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular Robust MDPs with Neural Function Approximations

### D.4.1 Neural Tangent Kernel and Implicit Linearization

We consider the overparameterized paradigm of the neural network (4.3) in the sense that the neural network is very wide, i.e., the number of hidden units  $m$  is very large. The following lemma shows that in this paradigm, neural networks in  $\mathcal{P}_M$  are well approximated by a linear expansion at initialization.

**Lemma D.5** (Implicit Linearization (Cai et al., 2020)). *Consider the two-layer neural network NN defined in (4.3). Assuming that the activation function  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is 1-Lipschitz continuous and the input space  $\mathcal{X}$  is normalized via  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq 1$  for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then it holds that*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \text{NN}(\cdot; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) \in \mathcal{P}_M} |\text{NN}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) - \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} \text{NN}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}^0, \mathbf{a}^0)^\top (\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{W}^0)| \leq d_{\mathcal{X}}^{1/2} B_N^2 m^{-1/2}.$$

*Proof of Lemma D.5.* See the proof of Lemma 4.5 in Cai et al. (2020) for a detailed proof.  $\square$

In view of Lemma D.5, we can study the linearization of the neural networks in  $\mathcal{P}_M$  as a surrogate. To this end, we introduce the neural tangent kernel  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{NTK}}$  of NN as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{NTK}}(x, y) := \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} \text{NN}(x, \mathbf{W}^0, \mathbf{a}^0)^\top \nabla_{\mathbf{W}} \text{NN}(y, \mathbf{W}^0, \mathbf{a}^0), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}.$$

The idea is to approximate the functions in  $\mathcal{P}_M$  via the RKHS induced by the kernel  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{NTK}}$ . According to Lemma D.5, when the width of the neural network is large enough, i.e.,  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , the approximation error is negligible. See the following Section D.4.2 for detailed proofs.

### D.4.2 Proof of Equation (4.14)

Now we use Lemma D.5 to bound the bracket number of  $\mathcal{P}_M$  in Example 4.4.

**Lemma D.6** (Bracket number of neural function class). *Under Assumption 4.12, for the number of hidden units  $m \geq d_{\mathcal{X}} B_N^4 / \epsilon^2$ , the bracket number of  $\mathcal{P}_M$  given by*

$$\mathcal{P}_M = \{P(s'|s, a) = \text{NN}((s, a, s'); \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) : \|\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{W}^0\|_2 \leq B_N\},$$

is bounded by, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\log(\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty})) \leq C_N \cdot 1/\gamma_N \cdot \log^2(1/\gamma_N) \cdot \log^{1+1/\gamma_N}(\text{Vol}(\mathcal{S})B_K/\epsilon).$$

*Proof of Lemma D.6.* We denote the RKHS induced by the neural tangent kernel  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{NTK}}$  as  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{NTK}}$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{NTK}} = \{ \bar{P}(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} \text{NN}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}^0, \mathbf{a}^0)^\top (\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{W}^0) : \|\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{W}^0\|_2 \leq B_N \}. \quad (\text{D.13})$$

For any  $\text{NN}(\cdot; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) \in \mathcal{P}_M$ , we denote its linear expansion at initialization as  $\overline{\text{NN}}(\cdot; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{NTK}}$ . Here we use the fact that for  $\text{NN}(\cdot; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) \in \mathcal{P}_M$ ,  $\|\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{W}^0\|_2 \leq B_N$ . Now according to Lemma D.4 and Assumption 4.12, we know that the bracket number of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{NTK}}$  is bounded by

$$\log(\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_{\text{NTK}}, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})) \leq C \cdot 1/\gamma_N \cdot \log^2(1/\gamma_N) \cdot \log^{1+1/\gamma_N}(\text{Vol}(\mathcal{S})B_N/\epsilon), \quad (\text{D.14})$$

for some constant  $C > 0$ . Therefore, we can find a collect of brackets  $\mathcal{B}_0 = \{[g_j^l, g_j^u]\}_{j \in [\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_{\text{NTK}}, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})]}$  such that for any  $\bar{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{NTK}}$ , there exists a bracket  $[g_j^l, g_j^u] \in \mathcal{B}_0$  such that  $g_j^l(\mathbf{x}) \leq \bar{P}(\mathbf{x}) \leq g_j^u(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\|g_j^l - g_j^u\|_{1,\infty} \leq \epsilon$ . Now for any  $P = \text{NN}(\cdot; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) \in \mathcal{P}_M$ , by Lemma D.5, we have that

$$\overline{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) - \epsilon_N \leq \text{NN}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) \leq \overline{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) + \epsilon_N,$$

where  $\epsilon_N = d_{\mathcal{X}}^{1/2} B_N^2 m^{-1/2}$ . By previous arguments, there exists a bracket  $[g_j^l, g_j^u] \in \mathcal{B}_0$  such that

$$g_j^l(\mathbf{x}) - \epsilon_N \leq \text{NN}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) \leq g_j^u(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon_N.$$

Now it suffices to define a new collect of brackets  $\mathcal{B} = \{[g_j^l - \epsilon_N, g_j^u + \epsilon_N]\}_{j \in [\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_{\text{NTK}}, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})]}$ . For any  $P = \text{NN}(\cdot; \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{a}^0) \in \mathcal{P}_M$ , there exists a bracket  $[\tilde{g}_j^l, \tilde{g}_j^u] \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\tilde{g}_j^l(\mathbf{x}) \leq P(\mathbf{x}) \leq \tilde{g}_j^u(\mathbf{x})$ , and

$$\|\tilde{g}_j^l(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{g}_j^u(\mathbf{x})\|_{1,\infty} \leq \|g_j^l(\mathbf{x}) - g_j^u(\mathbf{x})\|_{1,\infty} + 2\epsilon_N \leq \epsilon + 2\epsilon_N.$$

By taking  $m \geq d_{\mathcal{X}} B_N^4 / \epsilon^2$ , we obtain that  $\|\tilde{g}_j^l(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{g}_j^u(\mathbf{x})\|_{1,\infty} \leq 3\epsilon$ . Therefore, we can conclude that the bracket number of  $\mathcal{P}_M$  is bounded by,

$$\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}) = \mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon/3, \mathcal{P}_{\text{NTK}}, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}). \quad (\text{D.15})$$

Finally, by combining (D.14) and (D.15), we have that, for  $m \geq d_{\mathcal{X}} B_N^4 / \epsilon^2$ ,

$$\log(\mathcal{N}_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})) \leq C_N \cdot 1/\gamma_N \cdot \log^2(1/\gamma_N) \cdot \log^{1+1/\gamma_N}(\text{Vol}(\mathcal{S})B_N/\epsilon),$$

for some constant  $C_N > 0$ . This finishes the proof of Lemma D.6.  $\square$

Now by taking  $\epsilon = 1/n^2$ , i.e.,  $m \geq d_{\mathcal{X}} n^4 B_N^4$ , we can derive the desired result in (4.14).

## E Proofs for $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular Robust Factored MDPs

### E.1 Proof of Proposition 4.13

**Assumption E.1** (Regularity of KL-divergence duality variable). *We assume that the optimal dual variable  $\lambda^*$  for the following optimization problem*

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left\{ -\lambda \log \left( \mathbb{E}_{s'[j] \sim P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -v_{h,T,Q,\Phi}^j(s'[j]) / \lambda \right\} \right] \right) - \lambda \rho \right\},$$

is lower bounded by  $\underline{\lambda} > 0$  for any transition kernel  $P_h \in \mathcal{P}_M$ ,  $T = \{T_h\}_{h=1}^H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$ ,  $Q = \{Q_h\}_{h=1}^H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$ , step  $h \in [H]$ , and factor  $j \in [d]$ . Here the function  $v_{h,T,Q,\Phi}^j(s'[j])$  is defined as

$$v_{h,T,Q,\Phi}^j(s'[j]) = \int_{\mathcal{O}^{d-1}} \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^d T_{h,i}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1,Q,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s'[1], \dots, s'[j-1], s[j], s'[j+1], \dots, s'[d]).$$

*Proof of Proposition 4.13 with KL-divergence.* Firstly, by invoking the first conclusion of Lemma G.2, we know that the Condition 3.1 holds. In the following, we prove the Condition 3.2. By the definition of robust set in Example 4.5,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\
&= \inf_{\tilde{P}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| P_{h,i}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)) \leq \rho_i, i \in [d]} \int_{\mathcal{O}^d} \prod_{i=1}^d \tilde{P}_{h,i}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \\
&\quad - \inf_{\tilde{P}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| P_{h,i}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)) \leq \rho_i, i \in [d]} \int_{\mathcal{O}^d} \prod_{i=1}^d \tilde{P}_{h,i}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s'). \tag{E.1}
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the following decomposition of the right hand side of (E.1),

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(E.1)} &= \sum_{j=1}^d \inf_{\substack{\tilde{P}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| P_{h,i}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)) \leq \rho_i, 1 \leq i \leq j \\ \tilde{P}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| P_{h,i}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)) \leq \rho_i, j+1 \leq i \leq d}} \int_{\mathcal{O}^d} \prod_{i=1}^d \tilde{P}_{h,i}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \\
&\quad - \inf_{\substack{\tilde{P}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| P_{h,i}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)) \leq \rho_i, 1 \leq i \leq j-1 \\ \tilde{P}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| P_{h,i}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)) \leq \rho_i, j \leq i \leq d}} \int_{\mathcal{O}^d} \prod_{i=1}^d \tilde{P}_{h,i}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s').
\end{aligned}$$

For each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , we denote that

$$(\tilde{P}_{h,1}^{*,j}, \dots, \tilde{P}_{h,d}^{*,j}) = \underset{\substack{\tilde{P}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| P_{h,i}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)) \leq \rho_i, 1 \leq i \leq j-1 \\ \tilde{P}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| P_{h,i}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)) \leq \rho_i, j \leq i \leq d}}{\text{arginf}} \int_{\mathcal{O}^d} \prod_{i=1}^d \tilde{P}_{h,i}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')$$

By the definition of taking infimum over  $d$  variables, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\substack{\tilde{P}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| P_{h,i}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)) \leq \rho_i, 1 \leq i \leq j-1 \\ \tilde{P}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| P_{h,i}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)) \leq \rho_i, j \leq i \leq d}} \int_{\mathcal{O}^d} \prod_{i=1}^d \tilde{P}_{h,i}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \\
&= \inf_{\tilde{P}_{h,j} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,j}(\cdot) \| P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)) \leq \rho_j} \int_{\mathcal{O}^d} \tilde{P}_{h,j}(ds'[j]) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^d \tilde{P}_{h,i}^{*,j}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s'). \tag{E.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, it naturally holds that for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\substack{\tilde{P}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| P_{h,i}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)) \leq \rho_i, 1 \leq i \leq j \\ \tilde{P}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| P_{h,i}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)) \leq \rho_i, j+1 \leq i \leq d}} \int_{\mathcal{O}^d} \prod_{i=1}^d \tilde{P}_{h,i}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \\
&\leq \inf_{\tilde{P}_{h,j} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,j}(\cdot) \| P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)) \leq \rho_j} \int_{\mathcal{O}^d} \tilde{P}_{h,j}(ds'[j]) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^d \tilde{P}_{h,i}^{*,j}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s'). \tag{E.3}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus by combining (E.2) and (E.3), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(E.1)} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \inf_{\tilde{P}_{h,j} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,j}(\cdot) \| P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)) \leq \rho_j} \int_{\mathcal{O}^d} \tilde{P}_{h,j}(ds'[j]) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^d \tilde{P}_{h,i}^{*,j}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \\
&\quad - \inf_{\tilde{P}_{h,j} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}): D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,j}(\cdot) \| P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)) \leq \rho_j} \int_{\mathcal{O}^d} \tilde{P}_{h,j}(ds'[j]) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^d \tilde{P}_{h,i}^{*,j}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s'). \tag{E.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Now for simplicity, for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , we denote a function  $v_h^j(s'[j]) : \mathcal{O} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  as

$$v_h^j(s'[j]) = \int_{\mathcal{O}^{d-1}} \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^d \tilde{P}_{h,i}^{*,j}(ds'[i]) V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s'[1], \dots, s'[j-1], s[j], s'[j+1], \dots, s'[d]), \quad (\text{E.5})$$

which satisfies  $0 \leq v_h^j \leq H$ . For each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , we can then upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_h^j(s_h, a_h) &= \inf_{\tilde{P}_{h,j} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}) : D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,j}(\cdot) \| P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)) \leq \rho_j} \int_{\mathcal{O}} \tilde{P}_{h,j}(ds'[j]) v_h^j(s'[j]) \\ &\quad - \inf_{\tilde{P}_{h,j} \in \Delta(\mathcal{O}) : D_{\text{KL}}(\tilde{P}_{h,j}(\cdot) \| P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)) \leq \rho_j} \int_{\mathcal{O}} \tilde{P}_{h,j}(ds'[j]) v_h^j(s'[j]) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.6})$$

using the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 4.8 under KL-divergence in Appendix D.1, in which we apply Assumption E.1 and Lemma H.7. The corresponding result is given by

$$\Delta_h^j(s_h, a_h) \leq \frac{H \exp(H/\underline{\lambda})}{\rho_j} \cdot \|P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) - P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}. \quad (\text{E.7})$$

Thus plugging (E.7) into (E.4) and (E.1), we can arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{H \exp(H/\underline{\lambda})}{\rho_j} \cdot \|P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) - P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.8})$$

By using the same argument for deriving (E.8), we can also obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{H \exp(H/\underline{\lambda})}{\rho_j} \cdot \|P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) - P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.9})$$

Therefore, due to (E.8) and (E.9), we can finally arrive at the following upper bound,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^*,h}^{\pi^b}} \left[ \left( \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^*,h}^{\pi^b}} \left[ \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{H \exp(H/\underline{\lambda})}{\rho_j} \cdot \|P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) - P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{dH^2 \exp(2H/\underline{\lambda})}{\rho_{\min}} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{(s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) \sim d_{P^*,h}^{\pi^b}} [\|P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) - P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}^2], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.10})$$

where the last inequality is from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and  $\rho_{\min} = \min_{i \in [d]} \rho_i$ . Now invoking the second conclusion of Lemma G.2, we have that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) \sim d_{P^*,h}^{\pi^b}} [\|P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) - P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}^2] \leq \frac{C'_1 |\mathcal{O}|^{1+|\text{pa}_j|} |\mathcal{A}| \log(C'_2 ndH/\delta)}{n}, \quad (\text{E.11})$$

for some absolute constant  $C'_1, C'_2 > 0$  and each  $j \in [d]$ . Combining (E.10) and (E.11), we have that

$$\sqrt{\text{Err}_{h,\text{KL}}^{\Phi}(n)} = \frac{H \exp(H/\underline{\lambda})}{\rho_{\min}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{dC'_1 \sum_{i=1}^d |\mathcal{O}|^{1+|\text{pa}_i|} |\mathcal{A}| \log(C'_2 ndH/\delta)}{n}}.$$

This finishes the proof of Proposition 4.13 under KL-divergence.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.13 with TV-distance.* Firstly, by invoking the first conclusion of Lemma G.2, we know that the Condition 3.1 holds. In the following, we prove the Condition 3.2. Using the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 4.13 under KL-divergence, we can derive that

$$\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \Delta_h^j(s_h, a_h), \quad (\text{E.12})$$

where  $\Delta_h^j(s_h, a_h)$  is defined in (E.6). Now applying the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 4.8 under TV-divergence, we can derive that

$$\Delta_h^j(s_h, a_h) \leq H \cdot \|P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) - P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}, \quad (\text{E.13})$$

where we have applied Lemma H.8. Therefore, by combining (E.12) and (E.13), we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\ & \leq H \cdot \sum_{j=1}^d \|P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) - P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.14})$$

By the same argument as in deriving (E.14), we can also obtain that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\ & \leq H \cdot \sum_{j=1}^d \|P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) - P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.15})$$

Now by combining (E.14) and (E.15), we can derive the following upper bound,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}} \left[ \left( \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}} \left[ \left( H \cdot \sum_{j=1}^d \|P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) - P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}} \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq dH^2 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{(s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}} [\|P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) - P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}^2], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.16})$$

where the last inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Now invoking the second conclusion of Lemma G.2, we have that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) \sim d_{P^*, h}^{\pi^b}} [\|P_{h,j}(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h) - P_{h,j}^*(\cdot | s_h[\text{pa}_j], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}^2] \leq \frac{C'_1 |\mathcal{O}|^{1+|\text{pa}_j|} |\mathcal{A}| \log(C'_2 ndH/\delta)}{n}, \quad (\text{E.17})$$

for some absolute constant  $C'_1, C'_2 > 0$  and each  $j \in [d]$ . Combining (E.16) and (E.17), we have that

$$\sqrt{\text{Err}_{h, \text{KL}}^{\Phi}(n)} = H \cdot \sqrt{\frac{dC'_1 \sum_{i=1}^d |\mathcal{O}|^{1+|\text{pa}_i|} |\mathcal{A}| \log(C'_2 ndH/\delta)}{n}}.$$

This finishes the proof of Proposition 4.13 under TV-distance.  $\square$

## F Proofs for $d$ -rectangular Robust Linear MDP

**Assumption F.1** (Regularity of KL-divergence duality variable). *We assume that the optimal dual variable  $\lambda^*$  for the following optimization problem*

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left\{ -\lambda \log \left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mu(\cdot)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, Q, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda \right\} \right] \right) - \lambda \rho \right\},$$

is lower bounded by  $\underline{\lambda} > 0$  for any distribution  $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ , transition kernels  $Q = \{Q_h\}_{h=1}^H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$ , and step  $h \in [H]$ .

*Proof of Theorem 6.3 with KL-divergence.* Recall that we consider the following definition of  $\mathcal{V}$ ,

$$\mathcal{V} = \left\{ v(s) = \exp \left( - \left\{ \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \mathbf{w} / \lambda \right\}_+ \right) : \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq H\sqrt{d}, \lambda \in [\underline{\lambda}, H/\rho] \right\}. \quad (\text{F.1})$$

Following the Section 7 of [Uehara and Sun \(2021\)](#) as well as the Section 8 of [Agarwal et al. \(2019\)](#), we introduce the notion  $\widehat{P}_h$  that satisfies for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} \widehat{P}_h(ds'|s, a)v(s') = \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{h,v}, \quad (\text{F.2})$$

where  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{h,v}$  is defined in (6.2). Actually  $\widehat{P}_h$  takes the following closed form,

$$\widehat{P}_h(ds'|s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1} \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \delta_{s_{h+1}^\tau}(ds'), \quad (\text{F.3})$$

where  $\delta_s(\cdot)$  is the Dirac measure centering at  $s$ . Regarding the estimator  $\widehat{P}_h$ , we have the following.

**Lemma F.2.** *Setting  $\alpha = 1$  and choosing the function class  $\mathcal{V}$  as (F.1), then the estimator  $\widehat{P}_h$  defined in (F.3) satisfies that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (P_h^*(ds'|s, a) - \widehat{P}_h(ds'|s, a))v(s') \right|^2 \\ & \leq C_1 \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \frac{d(\log(1 + C_2nH/\delta) + \log(1 + C_3ndH/(\rho\lambda^2)))}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

for any step  $h \in [H]$ , where  $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$  are three constants.

*Proof of Lemma F.2.* See Appendix F.1 for a detailed proof. □

With Lemma F.2, we can further derive that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for any  $h \in [H]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (P_h^*(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - \widehat{P}_h(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau))v(s') \right|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \|\phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \frac{C_1 d(\log(1 + C_2nH/\delta) + \log(1 + C_3ndH/(\rho\lambda^2)))}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

In the right hand side of the above inequality, it holds that,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \|\phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)\|_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left( \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1} \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \right) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1} \right) \\ &\leq \text{Tr} \left( \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1} \right) = d. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.4})$$

Thus, we have that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for each step  $h \in [H]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (P_h^*(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - \widehat{P}_h(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau))v(s') \right|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{C_1 d^2 (\log(1 + C_2nH/\delta) + \log(1 + C_3ndH/(\rho\lambda^2)))}{n} = \xi. \end{aligned}$$

This proves Condition 3.1 in Section 3.2. In the following, we prove Theorem 6.3 given Condition 3.1 holds. Using the definition of robust set  $\Phi(\cdot)$  in Example 6.1, we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\
&= \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{\mu}_i(ds') V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s, a) \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{\mu}_i(ds') V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \inf_{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{S}): D(\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| \mu_{h,i}^*(\cdot)) \leq \rho} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}(ds') V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \inf_{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{S}): D(\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| \mu_{h,i}(\cdot)) \leq \rho} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}(ds') V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s'), \tag{F.5}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from  $\phi(s, a) \geq 0$  for any  $i \in [d]$ . Now invoking the dual formulation of KL-divergence in Lemma D.1, we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(F.5)} &= \sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \cdot \left[ \sup_{\lambda_i \geq 0} \left\{ -\lambda_i \log \left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mu_{h,i}^*(\cdot)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda_i \right\} \right] \right) - \lambda_i \rho \right\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sup_{\lambda_i \geq 0} \left\{ -\lambda_i \log \left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mu_{h,i}(\cdot)} \left[ \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda_i \right\} \right] \right) - \lambda_i \rho \right\} \right] \tag{F.6}
\end{aligned}$$

Following the same argument in the proof of Proposition 4.8 (derivation of (D.3)), during which we invoke Assumption F.1 and Lemma H.7 to bound the optimal dual variable  $\lambda$ , we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(F.6)} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \cdot \sup_{\Delta \leq \lambda_i \leq H/\rho} \left\{ g(\lambda_i, \mu_{h,i}^*) \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\mu_{h,i}^*(ds') - \mu_{h,i}(ds')) \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda_i \right\} \right\}, \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \sup_{\Delta \leq \lambda_i \leq H/\rho} \left\{ g(\lambda_i, \mu_{h,i}^*) \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\mu_{h,i}^*(ds') - \mu_{h,i}(ds')) \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda_i \right\} \right\}, \tag{F.7}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have defined  $g(\lambda_i, \mu_{h,i}) = \lambda_i / (\int_{\mathcal{S}} \mu_{h,i}(ds') \exp \{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda_i \})$  for simplicity, and in the equality we have used the fact that  $\phi_i(s, a) \geq 0$ . To go ahead, we rewrite the summand in (F.7) for each  $i \in [d]$ . To be specific, recall the regularized covariance matrix  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{h, \alpha}$  of the feature  $\phi$ ,

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{h, \alpha} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)^\top + \frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \mathbf{I}_d.$$

Then, by denoting  $\mathbf{1}_i = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$  where 1 is at the  $i$ -th coordinate, we have the following,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\mu_{h,i}^*(ds') - \mu_{h,i}(ds')) \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda_i \right\} \\
&= \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{h, \alpha}^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{h, \alpha}^{1/2} \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\mu_h^*(ds') - \mu_h(ds')) \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda_i \right\} \\
&\leq \underbrace{\|\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{h, \alpha}^{-1}}}_{\text{Term (i)}} \cdot \underbrace{\left\| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\mu_h^*(ds') - \mu_h(ds')) \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') / \lambda_i \right\} \right\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{h, \alpha}}}_{\text{Term (ii)}}. \tag{F.8}
\end{aligned}$$

For the term (ii) in (F.8), by the definition of  $\Lambda_{h,\alpha}$ , we have that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Term (ii)}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \left| \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)^\top \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_h^*(ds') - \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(ds')) \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')/\lambda_i \right\} \right|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \left\| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_h^*(ds') - \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(ds')) \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')/\lambda_i \right\} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (P_h^*(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - P_h(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)) \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')/\lambda_i \right\} \right|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \left\| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_h^*(ds') - \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(ds')) \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')/\lambda_i \right\} \right\|_2^2. \tag{F.9}
\end{aligned}$$

In the following, we upper bound the right hand side of (F.9). On the one hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (P_h^*(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - P_h(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)) \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')/\lambda_i \right\} \right|^2 \\
&\leq \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} \left( P_h^*(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - \widehat{P}_h(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \right) v(s') \right|^2 \\
&\quad + \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} \left( \widehat{P}_h(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - P_h(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \right) v(s') \right|^2 \\
&\leq 2\xi, \tag{F.10}
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , where the first inequality holds since  $\exp\{-V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')/\lambda_i\} \in \mathcal{V}^6$ , and the last inequality follows from the fact that Condition 3.1 holds and the fact that  $P_h \in \widehat{P}_h$ . On the other hand, by setting the regularization parameter  $\alpha = 1$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \left\| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_h^*(ds') - \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(ds')) \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')/\lambda_i \right\} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\mu_{h,i}^*(ds') - \mu_{h,i}(ds')) \exp \left\{ -V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')/\lambda_i \right\} \right|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d \|\mu_{h,i}^*(\cdot) - \mu_{h,i}(\cdot)\|_{\text{TV}}^2 \leq \frac{2d}{n}. \tag{F.11}
\end{aligned}$$

By combining (F.9), (F.10) and (F.11), we can conclude that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\text{Term (ii)}^2 \leq 2\xi + \frac{2d}{n} \leq 3\xi. \tag{F.12}$$

Now by combining (F.7), (F.8), (F.12), we can conclude that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \sup_{\Delta \leq \lambda_i \leq H/\rho} \left\{ \|\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}} \cdot g(\lambda_i, \mu_{h,i}^*) \cdot \sqrt{3\xi} \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{2\sqrt{\xi} \cdot H \exp(H/\Delta)}{\rho} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d \|\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}, \tag{F.13}
\end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>6</sup>This is because the robust action value function  $Q_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s, a)$  is linear in the feature  $\phi(s, a)$  (Lemma 4.2 of Ma et al. (2022)), and it is direct to see that  $V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s, a)$ .

for any step  $h \in [H]$ ,  $(s_h, a_h) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , and  $P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$ , where we apply the definition of  $g(\lambda_i, \mu_i)$ . Now using the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.4, using Condition 3.1, we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SubOpt}(\widehat{\pi}; s_1) &\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}} \left[ \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right] \\ &\leq \frac{2\sqrt{\xi} \cdot H \exp(H/\underline{\lambda})}{\rho} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}} \left[ \|\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i\|_{\Lambda_{h, \alpha}^{-1}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.14})$$

where we have used (F.13). Here  $P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger}$  is some transition kernel chosen from  $\Phi(P_h^*)$ . Now we upper bound the right hand side of (F.14) using Assumption 6.2. Consider that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}} \left[ \|\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i\|_{\Lambda_{h, \alpha}^{-1}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}} \left[ \sqrt{\text{Tr} \left( (\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i) (\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i)^\top \Lambda_{h, \alpha}^{-1} \right)} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\text{Tr} \left( \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}} \left[ (\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i) (\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i)^\top \right] \Lambda_{h, \alpha}^{-1} \right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.15})$$

For notational simplicity, in the sequel, we denote by

$$\Sigma_{P, h, i} = \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}} \left[ (\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i) (\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i)^\top \right]$$

Note that the matrix  $\Sigma_{P, h, i}$  has non-zero element only at  $(\Sigma_{P, h, i})_{(i, i)}$ , which equals to  $\phi_i(s, a)^2$ . Under Assumption 6.2 and the fact that  $P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger} \in \Phi(P_h^*)$ , we have that

$$\Lambda_{h, \alpha} \succeq \frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \mathbf{I}_d + c^\dagger \cdot \Sigma_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h, i}.$$

Thus, using (F.15) and under  $\alpha = 1$ , we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h}} \left[ \|\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i\|_{\Lambda_{h, \alpha}^{-1}} \right] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\text{Tr} \left( \Sigma_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h, i} \left( \frac{\alpha}{n} \cdot \mathbf{I}_d + c^\dagger \cdot \Sigma_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger}, h, i} \right)^{-1} \right)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\frac{\phi_i(s, a)^2}{n^{-1} + c^\dagger \cdot \phi_i(s, a)^2}} \leq \frac{d}{c^\dagger}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.16})$$

Therefore, by combining (F.14) and (F.16), we have that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\widehat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \frac{2\sqrt{\xi} \cdot H \exp(H/\underline{\lambda})}{\rho} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^H \frac{d}{c^\dagger} = \frac{2d\sqrt{\xi} \cdot H^2 \exp(H/\underline{\lambda})}{c^\dagger \rho}.$$

Using the definition of  $\xi$ , we can finally derive that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\widehat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \frac{d^2 H^2 \exp(H/\underline{\lambda})}{c^\dagger \rho} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C'_1 (\log(1 + C'_2 n H / \delta)) + \log(1 + C'_3 n d H / (\rho \underline{\lambda}^2))}{n}}.$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 6.3 under KL-divergence.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 6.3 with TV-divergence.* We use the same notation of  $\widehat{P}_h$  introduced in the proof of KL-divergence case, which satisfies (F.2) with  $\mathcal{V}$  defined as

$$\mathcal{V} = \left\{ v(s) = \left( \lambda - \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \mathbf{w} \right)_+ : \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq H\sqrt{d}, \lambda \in [0, H] \right\}. \quad (\text{F.17})$$

Regarding the estimator  $\widehat{P}_h$  with  $\mathcal{V}$  defined in (F.17), we have the following.

**Lemma F.3.** *Setting  $\alpha = 1$  and choosing the function class  $\mathcal{V}$  as (F.17), then the estimator  $\widehat{P}_h$  defined in (F.3) satisfies that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (P_h^*(ds'|s, a) - \widehat{P}_h(ds'|s, a)) v(s') \right|^2 \leq C_1 \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \frac{dH^2 \log(C_2 ndH/\delta)}{n},$$

for any step  $h \in [H]$ , where  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  are two constants.

*Proof of Lemma F.3.* See Appendix F.1 for a detailed proof.  $\square$

With Lemma F.3, we can further derive that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for any  $h \in [H]$ ,

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (P_h^*(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - \widehat{P}_h(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)) v(s') \right|^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \|\phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \frac{C_1 dH^2 \log(C_2 ndH/\delta)}{n}.$$

In the right hand side of the above inequality, it holds that,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \|\phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left( \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)^\top \Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1} \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \right) \leq \text{Tr} \left( \Lambda_{h,\alpha} \Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1} \right) = d. \quad (\text{F.18})$$

Thus, we have that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for each step  $h \in [H]$ ,

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (P_h^*(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) - \widehat{P}_h(ds'|s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau)) v(s') \right|^2 \leq \frac{C_1 d^2 H^2 \log(C_2 ndH/\delta)}{n} = \xi.$$

This proves Condition 3.1 in Section 3.2. In the following, we prove Theorem 6.3 given Condition 3.1 holds. Using the definition of robust set  $\Phi(\cdot)$  in Example 6.1, following the same argument as (F.5), we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\widehat{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \widehat{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\widehat{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \widehat{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \inf_{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{S}): D(\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| \mu_{h,i}^*(\cdot)) \leq \rho} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}(ds') V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \\ & \quad - \sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \inf_{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i} \in \Delta(\mathcal{S}): D(\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}(\cdot) \| \mu_{h,i}(\cdot)) \leq \rho} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}(ds') V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi}(s'). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.19})$$

Now invoking the dual formulation of TV-distance in Lemma D.3, we can further derive that

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{F.19}) &= \sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \cdot \left[ \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ -\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mu_{h,i}^*(\cdot)} \left[ \left( \lambda - V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \right)_+ \right] - \frac{\rho}{2} \left( \lambda - \inf_{s'' \in \mathcal{S}} V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi}(s'') \right) + \lambda \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ -\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mu_{h,i}(\cdot)} \left[ \left( \lambda - V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi}(s') \right)_+ \right] - \frac{\rho}{2} \left( \lambda - \inf_{s'' \in \mathcal{S}} V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi}(s'') \right) + \lambda \right\} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \cdot \sup_{\lambda \in [0, H]} \left\{ \left( \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mu_{h,i}^*(\cdot)} - \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mu_{h,i}(\cdot)} \right) \left[ \left( \lambda - V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \right)_+ \right] \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \sup_{\lambda \in [0, H]} \left\{ \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\mu_{h,i}^*(ds') - \mu_{h,i}(ds')) \left( \lambda - V_{h+1, P, \Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \right)_+ \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.20})$$

where in the first inequality we use Lemma H.8 to bound  $\lambda \in [0, H]$ . Now we consider each summand  $i \in [d]$  in the right hand side of (F.20). We rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\mu_{h,i}^*(ds') - \mu_{h,i}(ds')) \left( \lambda - V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \right)_+ \\
&= \phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{1/2} \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_h^*(ds') - \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(ds')) \left( \lambda - V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \right)_+ \\
&\leq \underbrace{\|\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}}_{\text{Term (i)}} \cdot \underbrace{\left\| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_h^*(ds') - \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(ds')) \left( \lambda - V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s') \right)_+ \right\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}}}_{\text{Term (ii)}}. \tag{F.21}
\end{aligned}$$

Following the same argument as (F.9), (F.10), and (F.11), using the fact that  $(\lambda - V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s'))_+ \in \mathcal{V}$  with  $\mathcal{V}$  in (F.17), we can derive that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\text{Term(ii)}^2 \leq 3\xi \tag{F.22}$$

Now by combining (F.19), (F.21), (F.22), we can conclude that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \sup_{0 \leq \lambda_i \leq H} \left\{ \|\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1}} \cdot \sqrt{3\xi} \right\} \leq 2\sqrt{\xi} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d \|\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}, \tag{F.23}
\end{aligned}$$

for any step  $h \in [H]$ ,  $(s_h, a_h) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ , and  $P_h \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_h$ . Now using the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.4, using Condition 3.1, we can derive that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s_1) &\leq \sup_{P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}} \sum_{h=1}^H \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger, h}}} \left[ \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h^*)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \inf_{\tilde{P}_h \in \Phi(P_h)} \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \tilde{P}_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)} [V_{h+1,P,\Phi}^{\pi^*}(s')] \right] \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{\xi} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger, h}}} \left[ \|\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1}} \right], \tag{F.24}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we apply (F.23). Here  $P_h^{\pi^*, \dagger}$  is some transition kernel chosen from  $\Phi(P_h^*)$ . Now we use the same argument as (F.15) and (F.16) to upper bound the right hand side of (F.24) using Assumption 6.2, which gives that,

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P^{\pi^*, \dagger, h}}} \left[ \|\phi_i(s_h, a_h) \mathbf{1}_i\|_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{h,\alpha}^{-1}} \right] \leq \frac{d}{c^\dagger}. \tag{F.25}$$

Therefore, by combining (F.24) and (F.25), we have that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq 2\sqrt{\xi} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^H \frac{d}{c^\dagger} = \frac{2d\sqrt{\xi} \cdot H}{c^\dagger}.$$

Using the definition of  $\xi$ , we can finally derive that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\text{SubOpt}(\hat{\pi}; s_1) \leq \frac{d^2 H^2}{c^\dagger} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C'_1 \log(C'_2 n d H / \delta)}{n}}.$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 6.3 under TV-distance.  $\square$

## F.1 Proof of Lemma F.2 and Lemma F.3

*Proof of Lemma F.2.* The proof of Lemma F.2 follows from the main proofs in Section 8 of Agarwal et al. (2019) and the covering number of the function class  $\mathcal{V}$  (Lemma F.4). Denote  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{V},\epsilon}$  as an  $\epsilon$ -cover of the function class  $\mathcal{V}$  under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ . Following the exact same argument of Lemma 8.7 in Agarwal et al. (2019), we can derive that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for any  $h$  and  $v \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{V},\epsilon}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}} P_h^*(ds' | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) v(s') - v(s_{h+1}^\tau) \right) \right\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \\ & \leq 9n \cdot (\log(H/\delta) + \log(|\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{V},\epsilon}|) + d \log(1 + N)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.26})$$

where we have taken  $\alpha = 1$ , which we will keep in the following. For any function  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ , take  $\widehat{v} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{V},\epsilon}$  such that  $\|v - \widehat{v}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ . Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}} P_h^*(ds' | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) v(s') - v(s_{h+1}^\tau) \right) \right\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \\ & \leq 2 \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}} P_h^*(ds' | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \widehat{v}(s') - \widehat{v}(s_{h+1}^\tau) \right) \right\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \\ & \quad + 2 \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}} P_h^*(ds' | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) (\widehat{v} - v)(s') - (\widehat{v} - v)(s_{h+1}^\tau) \right) \right\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \\ & \leq 18n \cdot (\log(H/\delta) + \log(|\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{V},\epsilon}|) + d \log(1 + n)) + 8\epsilon^2 n^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.27})$$

Now we apply the definition of  $\widehat{P}_h$  in (F.3) and we can then derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (P_h^*(ds' | s, a) - \widehat{P}_h(ds' | s, a)) v(s') \right|^2 \\ & = \left| \phi(s, a)^\top \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\mu}^*(ds') v(s') - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1} \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) v(s_{h+1}^\tau) \right) \right|^2 \\ & = \left| \phi(s, a)^\top \Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1} \left( \Lambda_{h,\alpha} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\mu}^*(ds') v(s') - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) v(s_{h+1}^\tau) \right) \right|^2 \\ & = \left| \phi(s, a)^\top \Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_h^*(ds') v(s') + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s, a) \int_{\mathcal{S}} P_h^*(ds' | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) v(s') - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) v(s_{h+1}^\tau) \right) \right|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2}{n^2} \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \left\| \int_{\mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\mu}^*(ds') v(s') \right\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{2}{n^2} \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}} P_h^*(ds' | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) v(s') - v(s_{h+1}^\tau) \right) \right\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.28})$$

On the one hand, the first term in the right hand side of (F.28) is bounded by

$$\frac{2}{n^2} \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \left\| \int_{\mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\mu}^*(ds') v(s') \right\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \leq \frac{2}{n} \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \left\| \int_{\mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\mu}^*(ds') v(s') \right\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2d}{n} \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2, \quad (\text{F.29})$$

where we use the fact that  $\Lambda_{h,\alpha} \succeq (1/n) \cdot \mathbf{I}_d$  and  $\|v(\cdot)\|_\infty \leq 1$  for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ . On the other hand, the second term in the right hand side of (F.28) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2}{n^2} \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}} P_h^*(ds' | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) v(s') - v(s_{h+1}^\tau) \right) \right\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \\ & \leq \left( \frac{36}{n} \cdot (\log(H/\delta) + \log(|\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{V},\epsilon}|) + d \log(1+n)) + 16\epsilon^2 \right) \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have applied (F.27). Now taking  $\epsilon = 1/\sqrt{n}$ , applying Lemma F.4 to bound the covering number of  $\mathcal{V}$ , we can further derive that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2}{n^2} \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}} P_h^*(ds' | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) v(s') - v(s_{h+1}^\tau) \right) \right\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{36}{n} \cdot (\log(H/\delta) + d \log(1 + 4\sqrt{n}Hd/(\Delta)) + \log(1 + 4\sqrt{n}Hd/(\Delta^2\rho)) + d \log(1+n)) \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{16}{n} \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2, \\ & \leq \frac{C_1 d (\log(1 + C_2 nH/\delta) + \log(1 + C_3 ndH/(\rho\Delta^2)))}{n} \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2, \end{aligned} \tag{F.30}$$

where  $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$  are three constants. Finally, by combining (F.28), (F.29), and (F.30), we can conclude that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for each step  $h \in [H]$ ,

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (P_h^*(ds' | s, a) - \hat{P}_h(ds' | s, a)) v(s') \right|^2 \leq C'_1 \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \frac{d (\log(1 + C_2 nH/\delta) + \log(1 + C_3 ndH/(\rho\Delta^2)))}{n}.$$

where  $C'_1$  is another constant. This finishes the proof of Lemma F.2.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma F.3.* The proof of Lemma F.3 follows the same argument as proof of Lemma F.2, except a different covering number of the function class  $\mathcal{V}$  which we show in the following. Using the same argument as the proof of Lemma F.2 (except that now  $\|v(\cdot)\|_\infty \leq H$ ), with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (P_h^*(ds' | s, a) - \hat{P}_h(ds' | s, a)) v(s') \right|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2H^2}{n^2} \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \left\| \int_{\mathcal{S}} \mu^*(ds') v(s') \right\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{2H^2}{n^2} \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \left\| \sum_{\tau=1}^n \phi(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) \left( \int_{\mathcal{S}} P_h^*(ds' | s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau) v(s') - v(s_{h+1}^\tau) \right) \right\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \\ & \leq H^2 \cdot \left( \frac{36}{n} \cdot (\log(H/\delta) + \log(|\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{V},\epsilon}|) + d \log(1+n)) + 16\epsilon^2 + \frac{2d}{n} \right) \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2, \end{aligned} \tag{F.31}$$

where  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{V},\epsilon}$  is an  $\epsilon$ -covering of the function class  $\mathcal{V}$  defined in (F.17). Now taking  $\epsilon = 1/\sqrt{n}$ , applying Lemma F.5 to bound the covering number of  $\mathcal{V}$ , we can further derive that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \left| \int_{\mathcal{S}} (P_h^*(ds' | s, a) - \hat{P}_h(ds' | s, a)) v(s') \right|^2 \\ & \leq H^2 \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \left( \frac{36}{n} \cdot (\log(H/\delta) + d \log(1 + 4\sqrt{n}Hd) + \log(1 + 4\sqrt{n}H) + d \log(1+n)) + \frac{16 + 2d}{n} \right) \\ & \leq C_1 \cdot \|\phi(s, a)\|_{\Lambda_{h,\alpha}^{-1}}^2 \cdot \frac{dH^2 \log(C_2 ndH/\delta)}{n}. \end{aligned} \tag{F.32}$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma F.3.  $\square$

## F.2 Other Lemmas

**Lemma F.4** (Covering number of  $\mathcal{V}$ : KL-divergence case). *The  $\epsilon$ -covering number of function class  $\mathcal{V}$  defined in (F.1) under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -norm is bounded by*

$$\log(\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)) \leq d \log(1 + 4Hd/(\underline{\lambda}\epsilon)) + \log(1 + 4H^2d/(\underline{\lambda}^2\rho\epsilon)).$$

*Proof of Lemma F.4.* Consider any two pairs of parameters  $(\mathbf{w}, \lambda)$  and  $(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}, \widehat{\lambda})$ , and denote the functions they induce as  $v$  and  $\widehat{v}$ . Then we have that

$$|v(s) - \widehat{v}(s)| = \left| \exp \left\{ - \left\{ \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \mathbf{w} / \lambda \right\}_+ \right\} - \exp \left\{ - \left\{ \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} / \widehat{\lambda} \right\}_+ \right\} \right|$$

Using the fact that, for any  $x, y > 0$ ,  $\exp(-x) - \exp(-y) = \exp(-\zeta(x, y)) \cdot (y - x)$  for some  $\zeta(x, y)$  between  $x$  and  $y$ , we know that

$$\begin{aligned} |v(s) - \widehat{v}(s)| &\leq \exp \left\{ -\zeta \left( \left\{ \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \mathbf{w} / \lambda \right\}_+, \left\{ \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} / \widehat{\lambda} \right\}_+ \right) \right\} \cdot \left| \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \mathbf{w} / \lambda - \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} / \widehat{\lambda} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \phi(s, a)^\top \mathbf{w} / \lambda - \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} / \widehat{\lambda} \right\} \right| \\ &= \left| \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \phi(s, a)^\top \mathbf{w} / \lambda - \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} / \lambda + \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} / \lambda - \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} / \widehat{\lambda} \right\} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that  $\|\phi(s, a)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d}$  (because  $\sum_{i=1}^d \phi_i(s, a) = 1$ ),  $\|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \leq H\sqrt{d}$ , and  $\lambda, \widehat{\lambda} \geq \underline{\lambda}$ , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \phi(s, a)^\top \mathbf{w} / \lambda - \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} / \lambda + \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} / \lambda - \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} / \widehat{\lambda} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \lambda^{-1} \phi(s, a)^\top (\mathbf{w} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}) \right| + \left| \lambda^{-1} \widehat{\lambda}^{-1} \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} (\lambda - \widehat{\lambda}) \right| \\ &\leq \underline{\lambda}^{-1} \sqrt{d} \cdot \|\mathbf{w} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}\|_2 + \underline{\lambda}^{-2} H d \cdot |\lambda - \widehat{\lambda}|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we conclude that to form an  $\epsilon$ -cover of  $\mathcal{V}$  under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -norm, it suffices to consider the product of an  $\underline{\lambda}\epsilon/(2\sqrt{d})$ -cover of  $\{\mathbf{w} : \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq H\sqrt{d}\}$  under  $\|\cdot\|_2$ -norm and an  $\underline{\lambda}^2\epsilon/(2Hd)$ -cover of the interval  $[\underline{\lambda}, H/\rho]$ . Therefore, we can derive that

$$\log(\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)) \leq d \log(1 + 4Hd/(\underline{\lambda}\epsilon)) + \log(1 + 4H^2d/(\underline{\lambda}^2\rho\epsilon)).$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma F.4.  $\square$

**Lemma F.5** (Covering number of  $\mathcal{V}$ : TV-distance case). *The  $\epsilon$ -covering number of function class  $\mathcal{V}$  defined in (F.17) under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -norm is bounded by*

$$\log(\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)) \leq d \log(1 + 4Hd/\epsilon) + \log(1 + 4H/\epsilon).$$

*Proof of Lemma F.5.* Consider any two pairs of parameters  $(\mathbf{w}, \lambda)$  and  $(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}, \widehat{\lambda})$ , and denote the functions they induce as  $v$  and  $\widehat{v}$ . Then we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} |v(s) - \widehat{v}(s)| &= \left| \left( \lambda - \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \mathbf{w} \right)_+ - \left( \widehat{\lambda} - \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} \right)_+ \right| \\ &\leq |\lambda - \widehat{\lambda}| + \left| \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \mathbf{w} - \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi(s, a)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} \right| \\ &\leq |\lambda - \widehat{\lambda}| + \sup_{(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \|\phi(s, a)\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{w} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \\ &\leq |\lambda - \widehat{\lambda}| + \sqrt{d} \cdot \|\mathbf{w} - \widehat{\mathbf{w}}\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

Thus we conclude that to form an  $\epsilon$ -cover of  $\mathcal{V}$  under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -norm, it suffices to consider the product of an  $\epsilon/(2\sqrt{d})$ -cover of  $\{\mathbf{w} : \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq H\sqrt{d}\}$  under  $\|\cdot\|_2$ -norm and an  $\epsilon/2$ -cover of the interval  $[0, H]$ . Therefore, we can derive that

$$\log(\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{V}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)) \leq d \log(1 + 4Hd/\epsilon) + \log(1 + 4H/\epsilon).$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma F.5.  $\square$

## G Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimator

**Lemma G.1** (MLE estimator guarantee: infinite model space). *The maximum likelihood estimator procedure given by (4.6) and (4.7) for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust MDP with tuning parameter  $\xi$  given by Proposition 4.8 satisfies that w.p. at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

1.  $P_h^* \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  for any step  $h \in [H]$ .
2. for any step  $h \in [H]$  and  $P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$ , it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s_h, a_h) \sim d_{P_h^*, h}^b} [\|P_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h) - P_h^*(\cdot|s_h, a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}^2] \leq \frac{C_1 \log(C_2 H N_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1, \infty})/\delta)}{n}.$$

for some absolute constant  $C_1, C_2 > 0$ . Here  $d_{P_h^*, h}^b$  is the state-action visitation measure induced by the behavior policy  $\pi^b$  and transition kernel  $P^*$ .

*Proof of Lemma G.1.* See Appendix G.1 for a detailed proof.  $\square$

**Lemma G.2** (MLE estimator guarantee: factored model space). *The maximum likelihood estimator procedure given by (4.17) and (4.18) for  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ -rectangular robust factored MDP with tuning parameter  $\xi_i$  given by Proposition 4.13 satisfies that w.p. at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

1.  $P_h^* \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  for any step  $h \in [H]$ .
2. for any step  $h \in [H]$ ,  $P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$ , and any factor  $i \in [d]$  it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h) \sim d_{P_h^*, h}^b} [\|P_{h,i}(\cdot|s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h) - P_{h,i}^*(\cdot|s_h[\text{pa}_i], a_h)\|_{\text{TV}}^2] \leq \frac{C_1 |\mathcal{O}|^{1+|\text{pa}_i|} |\mathcal{A}| \log(C_2 n d H / \delta)}{n}.$$

for some absolute constant  $C_1, C_2 > 0$ . Here  $d_{P_h^*, h}^b$  is the state-action visitation measure induced by the behavior policy  $\pi^b$  and transition kernel  $P^*$ .

*Proof of Lemma G.2.* See Appendix G.2 for a detailed proof.  $\square$

### G.1 Proof of Lemma G.1

In this section, we establish the proof of Lemma G.1. We firstly introduce several notations. For any function  $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ , we denote

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h}[f] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n f(s_h^\tau, a_h^\tau).$$

*Proof of Lemma G.1.* We follow the proof of similar MLE guarantees in Uehara and Sun (2021) and Liu et al. (2022b). We begin with proving the first conclusion of Lemma G.1, i.e.,  $P_h^* \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$  for each step  $h \in [H]$ . For notational simplicity, we define

$$g_h(P)(s, a) = \|P(\cdot|s, a) - P_h^*(\cdot|s, a)\|_1^2, \quad \forall P \in \mathcal{P}_M. \quad (\text{G.1})$$

To prove the first conclusion, it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h}[g_h(\widehat{P}_h)] \leq \xi, \quad \forall h \in [H]. \quad (\text{G.2})$$

where  $\widehat{P}_h$  is the MLE estimator given in (4.6) and the parameter  $\xi$  is given by Proposition 4.8. To this end, we first invoke Lemma H.1, which gives that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(\widehat{P}_h)] \leq c_1 (\zeta_h + \sqrt{\log(c_2/\delta)/n})^2, \quad (\text{G.3})$$

for some absolute constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$ . Here  $\zeta_h$  is a solution to the inequality  $\sqrt{n}\epsilon^2 \geq c_0 G_h(\epsilon)$  w.r.t  $\epsilon$ , with some carefully chosen function  $G_h$  which is specified in Lemma H.1. As proved in Lemma H.2, choosing  $G_h(\epsilon) = (\epsilon - \epsilon^2/2)\sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon^4/2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))}$  and  $\zeta_h = c_3\sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))/n}$  for some absolute constant  $c_3 > 0$  can satisfy the inequality and the requirements on  $G_h$ . Thus we can obtain from (G.3) that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(\widehat{P}_h)] &\leq c_1 \left( c_3 \sqrt{\frac{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(c_2/\delta)}{n}} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{c'_1 \log(c'_2 \mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.4})$$

for some absolute constants  $c'_1, c'_2 > 0$ . Now to prove (G.2), it suffices to relate the expectation w.r.t. dataset  $\mathbb{D}_h$  and the expectation w.r.t. visitation measure  $d_{P^*,h}^b$ . To bridge this gap, we invoke Lemma H.3, which is a Bernstein style concentration inequality and gives that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [g_h(\widehat{P}_h)] - \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(\widehat{P}_h)]| \leq \frac{c_4 \log(c_5 \mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n}, \quad (\text{G.5})$$

for some absolute constant  $c_4 > 0$ . Now combining (G.4) and (G.5), we can obtain that,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [g_h(\widehat{P}_h)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [g_h(\widehat{P}_h)] - \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(\widehat{P}_h)] + \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(\widehat{P}_h)] \leq \frac{c''_1 \log(c''_2 \mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n},$$

for some absolute constants  $c''_1, c''_2 > 0$ . Finally, taking a union bound over step  $h \in [H]$  and rescaling  $\delta$ , we obtain that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [g_h(\widehat{P}_h)] \leq \frac{\widetilde{C}_1 \log(\widetilde{C}_2 H \mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n} = \xi, \quad \forall h \in [H], \quad (\text{G.6})$$

for some absolute constants  $\widetilde{C}_1, \widetilde{C}_2 > 0$ . This finishes the proof of the first conclusion of Lemma G.1.

The following of the proof is to prove the second conclusion of Lemma G.1. With the notation of  $g_h$ , it suffices to prove that with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ ,

$$\sup_{h \in [H], P_h \in \widehat{P}_h} \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(P_h)] \leq \frac{C_1 \log(C_2 H \mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n},$$

for some absolute constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$ . To this end, for any step  $h \in [H]$  and  $P_h \in \widehat{P}_h$ , consider the following decomposition of  $\mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(P_h)]$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(P_h)] = \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(P_h)] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [g_h(P_h)] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [g_h(P_h)]. \quad (\text{G.7})$$

Note that the term  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [g_h(P_h)]$  in (G.7) satisfies, with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [g_h(P_h)] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [\|P_h(\cdot|s, a) - P_h^*(\cdot|s, a)\|_1^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [\|P_h(\cdot|s, a) - \widehat{P}_h(\cdot|s, a) + \widehat{P}_h(\cdot|s, a) - P_h^*(\cdot|s, a)\|_1^2] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [\|P_h(\cdot|s, a) - \widehat{P}_h(\cdot|s, a)\|_1^2] + 2\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [\|\widehat{P}_h(\cdot|s, a) - P_h^*(\cdot|s, a)\|_1^2] \\ &\leq 4\xi, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.8})$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of confidence region  $\widehat{P}_h$  and the first conclusion of Lemma G.1, i.e., (G.6). Thus by taking (G.8) back into (G.7), we obtain that,

$$\mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(P_h)] \leq 4\xi + \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(P_h)] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [g_h(P_h)]. \quad (\text{G.9})$$

Finally, invoking another Bernstein style concentration inequality (Lemma H.4), we have that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\sup_{P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h} [g_h(P_h)] - \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(P_h)]| \leq \frac{c_6 \log(c_7 \mathcal{N}_{[]} (1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}) / \delta)}{n} \quad (\text{G.10})$$

Thus by combining (G.9) and (G.10), taking a union bound over step  $h \in [H]$ , rescaling  $\delta$ , and using the definition of  $\xi$ , we can conclude that with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ ,

$$\sup_{h \in [H], P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h} \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [g_h(P_h)] \leq \frac{C_1 \log(C_2 H \mathcal{N}_{[]} (1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}) / \delta)}{n},$$

for some absolute constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$ . This finishes the proof of Lemma G.1.  $\square$

## G.2 Proof of Lemma G.2

*Proof of Lemma G.2.* This is a direct corollary of Lemma G.1 in the finite state space case: for each factor  $i \in [d]$ , consider  $\mathcal{O}$  as the finite state space and apply the upper bound of bracket number (4.9) for finite state space case proved in Appendix D.2. This proves Lemma G.2.  $\square$

# H Technical Lemmas

## H.1 Lemmas for Maximum Likelihood Estimator

In this section, we give technical lemmas for the maximum likelihood estimator. We firstly introduce several notations which are also considered by Uehara and Sun (2021) and Liu et al. (2022b), We define a localized model space  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon)$  as

$$\overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon) = \left\{ P \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}_{M,h} : \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [D_{\text{Hellinger}}^2(P(\cdot|s, a) \| P_h^*(\cdot|s, a))] \leq \epsilon^2 \right\},$$

where  $D_{\text{Hellinger}}(\cdot \| \cdot)$  is the Hellinger distance between two probability measures, and  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_{M,h}$  is called a modified space  $\mathcal{P}_M$ , defined as  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_{M,h} = \{(P + P_h^*)/2 : P \in \mathcal{P}_M\}$ . Also, we define the entropy integral of  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon)$  under the  $\|\cdot\|_{2, d_{P^*,h}^b}$ -norm as

$$J_B(\epsilon, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon), \|\cdot\|_{2, d_{P^*,h}^b}) = \max \left\{ \epsilon, \int_{\epsilon^2/2}^{\epsilon} \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{[]} (u, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon), \|\cdot\|_{2, d_{P^*,h}^b}))} du \right\}.$$

**Lemma H.1** (MLE Gaurantee, Van de Geer (2000)). *Take a function  $G_h(\epsilon) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  s.t.  $G_h(\epsilon) \geq J_B(\epsilon, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon), \|\cdot\|_{2, d_{P^*,h}^b})$  and  $G_h(\epsilon)/\epsilon^2$  non-increasing w.r.t  $\epsilon$ . Then, letting  $\zeta_h$  be a solution to  $\sqrt{n}\epsilon^2 \geq c_0 G_h(\epsilon)$  w.r.t  $\epsilon$ , where  $c_0$  is an absolute constant. With probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b} [\|\widehat{P}_h(\cdot|s, a) - P_h^*(\cdot|s, a)\|_1^2] \leq c_1 (\zeta_h + \sqrt{\log(c_2/\delta)/n})^2.$$

*Proof of Lemma H.1.* We refer to Theorem 7.4 in Van de Geer (2000) for a detailed proof.  $\square$

**Lemma H.2** (Choice of  $G_h(\epsilon)$  and  $\zeta_h$  in Lemma H.1). *In Lemma H.1, we can choose  $G_h(\epsilon)$  as*

$$G_h(\epsilon) = (\epsilon - \epsilon^2/2) \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{[]} (\epsilon^4/2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))},$$

*In this case,  $\zeta_h = c_0 \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{[]} (1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})) / n}$  solves the inequality  $\sqrt{n}\epsilon^2 \geq c_0 G_h(\epsilon)$  w.r.t  $\epsilon$ .*

*Proof of Lemma H.2.* We first check the conditions that  $G_h$  should satisfy. By the choice of  $G_h$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} G_h(\epsilon) &= (\epsilon - \epsilon^2/2) \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon^4/2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))} \\ &\geq (\epsilon - \epsilon^2/2) \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon^2/2, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon), \|\cdot\|_{2,d_{P^*,h}^b}))} \\ &\geq \max \left\{ \epsilon, \int_{\epsilon^2/2}^{\epsilon} \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(u, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon), \|\cdot\|_{2,d_{P^*,h}^b}))} du \right\} \\ &= J_B(\epsilon, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon), \|\cdot\|_{2,d_{P^*,h}^b}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma H.6, the second inequality follows from the fact that  $\mathcal{N}_{\square}(u_1, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon), \|\cdot\|_{2,d_{P^*,h}^b}) \geq \mathcal{N}_{\square}(u_2, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon), \|\cdot\|_{2,d_{P^*,h}^b})$  for  $u_1 \leq u_2$ . In the second inequality we assume without loss of generality that  $\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon^2/2, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon), \|\cdot\|_{2,d_{P^*,h}^b})) \geq 4$ . Besides, since

$$G_h(\epsilon)/\epsilon^2 = (1/\epsilon - 1/2) \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon^4/2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))}$$

is non-increasing w.r.t  $\epsilon$  for  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ , we can confirm that  $G_h$  satisfy the conditions in Lemma H.1. With this choice of  $G_h$ , the inequality  $\sqrt{n}\epsilon^2 \geq c_0 G_h(\epsilon)$  reduces to

$$\sqrt{n} \geq c_0(1/\epsilon - 1/2) \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon^4/2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))},$$

which equivalentents to

$$\epsilon \geq \frac{c_0 \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon^4/2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))}}{\sqrt{n} + \frac{c_0}{2} \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon^4/2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))}}. \quad (\text{H.1})$$

Taking  $\zeta_h = c_0 \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))}/n$ , when  $c_0 \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))} \geq 2^{1/4}$ , we can check that  $\zeta_h$  satisfies the inequality (H.1) by,

$$\zeta_h = \frac{c_0 \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))}}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \frac{c_0 \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\zeta_h^2/2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))}}{\sqrt{n} + \frac{c_0}{2} \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\zeta_h^2/2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}))}}.$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma H.2.  $\square$

## H.2 Lemmas for Concentration Inequalities and Bracket Numbers

**Lemma H.3** (Bernstein inequality I). *For any step  $h \in [H]$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h}[g_h(\widehat{P}_h)] - \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b}[g_h(\widehat{P}_h)]| \leq \frac{c_1 \log(c_2 \mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n}.$$

*Proof of Lemma H.3.* Motivated by Uehara and Sun (2021) and Liu et al. (2022b), to obtain a fast rate of convergence, we will utilize the localization technique in proving concentration. To this end, we first define the following localized realizable model space,

$$\mathcal{P}_{M,h}^{\text{Loc}} = \left\{ P \in \mathcal{P}_M : \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b}[g_h(P)] \leq \frac{c'_1 \log(c'_2 \mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n} \right\},$$

where absolute constants  $c'_1$  and  $c'_2$  are specified in (G.4). According to the proof of (G.4), we know that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the event  $E_1 = \{\widehat{P}_h \in \mathcal{P}_{M,h}^{\text{Loc}}\}$  holds. In the sequel, we will always condition on the event  $E_1$ . Now we define another function class as

$$\mathcal{F}_h = \{g_h(P) : P \in \mathcal{P}_{M,h}^{\text{Loc}}\}.$$

Then applying Bernstein inequality with union bound (Lemma H.5) on the function class  $\mathcal{F}_h$ , we can obtain that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for any  $P \in \mathcal{P}_{M,h}^{\text{Loc}}$ , (denote  $\mathcal{M}(\epsilon) = \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}_h, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ )

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h}[g_h(P)] - \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b}[g_h(P)]| \tag{H.2} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\mathbb{V}_{d_{P^*,h}^b}[g_h(P)] \log(\mathcal{M}(\epsilon)/\delta)}{n}} + 8\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon \log(\mathcal{M}(\epsilon)/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{8 \log(\mathcal{M}(\epsilon)/\delta)}{3n} + 2\epsilon \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{8\mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b}[g_h(P)] \log(\mathcal{M}(\epsilon)/\delta)}{n}} + 8\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon \log(\mathcal{M}(\epsilon)/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{8 \log(\mathcal{M}(\epsilon)/\delta)}{3n} + 2\epsilon \\
& \leq \frac{\sqrt{8c_1' \log(c_2' \mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta) \cdot \log(\mathcal{M}(\epsilon)/\delta)}}{n} + 8\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon \log(\mathcal{M}(\epsilon)/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{8 \log(\mathcal{M}(\epsilon)/\delta)}{3n} + 2\epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma H.5, both the first and the second inequality use the fact that  $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{M,h}^{\text{Loc}}} |g_h(P)| \leq 4$ , and the last inequality uses the definition of  $\mathcal{P}_{M,h}^{\text{Loc}}$ . If we denote

$$\mathcal{F}'_h = \{g_h(P) : P \in \mathcal{P}_M\}, \tag{H.3}$$

we can upper bound the covering number  $\mathcal{M}(\epsilon)$  via the following sequence of inequalities,

$$\mathcal{M}(\epsilon) = \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}_h, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \leq \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}'_h, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \leq \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}), \tag{H.4}$$

where the first inequality follows from  $\mathcal{F}_h \subseteq \mathcal{F}'_h$ , the second inequality can be easily derived from the relationship between  $\mathcal{F}'_h$  and  $\mathcal{P}_M$ , and the last inequality follows from the fact that covering number can be bounded by bracket number. Therefore, by combining (H.2) and (H.4), letting  $\epsilon = 1/n^2$ , we can derive that, conditioning on  $E_1 = \{\widehat{P}_h \in \mathcal{P}_{M,h}^{\text{Loc}}\}$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h}[g_h(\widehat{P}_h)] - \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b}[g_h(\widehat{P}_h)]| \leq \frac{c_1 \log(c_2 \mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n},$$

for some absolute constant  $c_1, c_2 > 0$ . Finally, since the event  $E_1$  holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , by rescaling  $\delta$ , we can finish the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma H.4** (Bernstein inequality II). *For any step  $h \in [H]$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h}[g_h(P_h)] - \mathbb{E}_{d_{P^*,h}^b}[g_h(P_h)]| \leq \frac{c_1 \log(c_2 \mathcal{N}_{\square}(1/n^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n}, \quad \forall P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h.$$

*Proof of Lemma H.4.* According to the proof of (G.8), we know that the event  $E_2$  defined as

$$E_2 = \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h}[g_h(P_h)] \leq 4\xi, \quad \forall P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h \right\}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ . In the sequel, we always condition on the event  $E_2$ . Now we define a function class  $\mathcal{G}_h$  as following,

$$\mathcal{G}_h = \left\{ g_h(P_h) : P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h \right\}.$$

Applying Bernstein inequality with union bound (Lemma H.5) on the function class  $\mathcal{G}_h$ , we can obtain that

with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for any  $P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$ , (denote  $\mathcal{M}'(\epsilon) = \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}_h, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ )

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h}[g_h(P_h)] - \mathbb{E}_{d_{\mathcal{P}^*,h}^b}[g_h(P_h)]| \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\mathbb{V}_{d_{\mathcal{P}^*,h}^b}[g_h(P_h)] \log(\mathcal{M}'(\epsilon)/\delta)}{n}} + 8\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon \log(\mathcal{M}'(\epsilon)/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{8 \log(\mathcal{M}'(\epsilon)/\delta)}{3n} + 2\epsilon \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{8\mathbb{E}_{d_{\mathcal{P}^*,h}^b}[g_h(P_h)] \log(\mathcal{M}'(\epsilon)/\delta)}{n}} + 8\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon \log(\mathcal{M}'(\epsilon)/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{8 \log(\mathcal{M}'(\epsilon)/\delta)}{3n} + 2\epsilon \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{8(|\mathbb{E}_{d_{\mathcal{P}^*,h}^b}[g_h(P_h)] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h}[g_h(P_h)]| + 4\xi) \log(\mathcal{M}'(\epsilon)/\delta)}{n}} \\
& \quad + 8\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon \log(\mathcal{M}'(\epsilon)/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{8 \log(\mathcal{M}'(\epsilon)/\delta)}{3n} + 2\epsilon, \tag{H.5}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma H.5, both the first and the second inequality use the fact that  $\sup_{P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h} |g_h(P_h)| \leq 4$ , and the last inequality uses the definition of event  $E_2$ . By using the fact that the function class  $\mathcal{G}_h \subseteq \mathcal{F}'_h$  where  $\mathcal{F}'_h$  is defined in (H.3) in the proof of Lemma H.3, we can apply the same argument as (H.4) to derive that  $\mathcal{M}'(\epsilon) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})$ . Thus taking  $\epsilon = 1/n^2$ , denoting  $\Delta_h(P_h) = |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{D}_h}[g_h(P_h)] - \mathbb{E}_{d_{\mathcal{P}^*,h}^b}[g_h(P_h)]|$ , we can derive from (H.5) that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_h(P_h) & \leq \sqrt{\frac{8(\Delta_h(P_h) + 4\xi) \log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n}} \\
& \quad + 8\sqrt{\frac{\log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n^3}} + \frac{8 \log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{3n} + \frac{2}{n^2} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{8(\Delta_h(P_h) + 4\xi) \log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{c'_1 \log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{8\Delta_h(P_h) \log(\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{c''_1 \log(c''_2 \mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n}, \tag{H.6}
\end{aligned}$$

for some absolute constants  $c'_1, c''_1, c''_2 > 0$ , where in the last inequality we have applied the definition of  $\xi$ . Now solving this quadratic inequality (H.6) w.r.t  $\Delta_h(P_h)$ , we can obtain that,

$$\Delta_h(P_h) \leq \frac{c_1 \log(c_2 \mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty})/\delta)}{n},$$

for some absolute constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$ . Thus we obtain that when conditioning on the event  $E_2$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for any  $P_h \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_h$ , the desired concentration inequality holds. Finally, since  $E_2$  holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ , by rescaling  $\delta$ , we can finish the proof of Lemma H.4.  $\square$

**Lemma H.5** (Bernstein inequality with union bound). *Consider a function class  $\mathcal{F} \subset \{f : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  is a probability space. If we assume that the  $\epsilon$ -covering number of  $\mathcal{F}$  under infinity-norm is finite, that is,  $M = \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty) < \infty$ , and we also assume that there exists an absolute constant  $R$  such that  $|f(X)| \leq R$ , then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  the following inequality holds for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ ,*

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=1}^n f(X_\tau) - \mathbb{E}[f(X)] \right| \leq 2\epsilon + \sqrt{\frac{2\mathbb{V}[f(X)] \log(M/\delta)}{n}} + 4\sqrt{\frac{R\epsilon \log(M/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{2R \log(M/\delta)}{3n},$$

where  $X, X_1, \dots, X_n$  are i.i.d. samples on the probability space  $\mathcal{X}$ .

*Proof of Lemma H.5.* We refer to Lemma F.1 in Liu et al. (2022b) for a detailed proof.  $\square$

**Lemma H.6** (Bracket number I). *It holds for any  $\epsilon \geq 0$  that*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\square}(\epsilon, \overline{\mathcal{P}}_h(\epsilon), \|\cdot\|_{2,d_{\mathcal{P}^*,h}^b}) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\square}(2\epsilon^2, \mathcal{P}_M, \|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}).$$

*Proof of Lemma H.6.* We refer to Lemma G.2 in Liu et al. (2022b) for a detailed proof.  $\square$

### H.3 Lemmas for Dual Variables

**Lemma H.7** (Dual variable for KL-divergence). *The optimal solution to the following optimization problem*

$$\lambda^* = \operatorname{argsup}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left\{ -\lambda \log \left( \int \exp \{ -f(x)/\lambda \} P(\mathrm{d}x) \right) - \lambda \sigma \right\},$$

with  $\|f\|_\infty \leq H$  and some probability measure  $P$  satisfies that  $\lambda^* \leq H/\sigma$ .

*Proof of Lemma H.7.* For simplicity, denote by  $g(\lambda) = -\lambda \log \left( \int \exp \{ -f(x)/\lambda \} P(\mathrm{d}x) \right) - \lambda \sigma$ . Notice that  $g(0) = 0$ , and for  $\lambda > H/\sigma$ , due to  $\|f\|_\infty \leq H$ , we have that

$$g(\lambda) < -\lambda \log(\exp\{-H/(H/\sigma)\}) - \lambda \sigma = \lambda \sigma - \lambda \sigma = 0.$$

Thus we can conclude that  $\lambda^* \leq H/\sigma$ . □

**Lemma H.8** (Dual variable for TV-distance). *The optimal solution to the following optimization problem*

$$\lambda^* = \operatorname{argsup}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ - \int (\lambda - f(x))_+ P(\mathrm{d}x) - \frac{\sigma}{2} (\lambda - \inf_x f(x))_+ + \lambda \right\}.$$

with  $\|f\|_\infty \leq H$  and some probability measure  $P$  satisfies that  $0 \leq \lambda^* \leq H$ .

*Proof of Lemma H.8.* For simplicity, denote  $g(\lambda) = - \int (\lambda - f(x))_+ P(\mathrm{d}x) - \frac{\sigma}{2} (\lambda - \inf_x f(x))_+ + \lambda$ . We can observe that  $g(0) = 0$ , and  $g(\lambda) \leq 0$  for  $\lambda \leq 0$ . Thus we have shown that  $\lambda^* \geq 0$ . Also, for  $\lambda \geq H$ , due to  $\|f\|_\infty \leq H$ , we can write  $g(\lambda)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} g(\lambda) &= - \int \lambda - f(x) P(\mathrm{d}x) - \frac{\sigma}{2} (\lambda - \inf_x f(x)) + \lambda \\ &= \int f(x) P(\mathrm{d}x) + \frac{\sigma}{2} \inf_x f(x) - \frac{\sigma}{2} \lambda, \end{aligned}$$

which is a monotonically decreasing function with respect to  $\lambda$ . Thus we prove that  $\lambda^* \leq H$ . □