

Corruption Robust Offline Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback

Debmalya Mandal

Dept. of Computer Science
University of Warwick, UK

Debmalya.Mandal@warwick.ac.uk

Andi Nika

Max-Planck Institute for
Software Systems, Germany

andinika@mpi-sws.org

Parameswaran Kamalaruban

Independent Researcher
London, UK

pkamalaruban@gmail.com

Adish Singla

Max-Planck Institute for
Software Systems, Germany

adishs@mpi-sws.org

Goran Radanović

Max-Planck Institute for
Software Systems, Germany

gradanovic@mpi-sws.org

February 13, 2024

Abstract

We study data corruption robustness for reinforcement learning with human feedback (RLHF) in an offline setting. Given an offline dataset of pairs of trajectories along with feedback about human preferences, an ε -fraction of the pairs is corrupted (e.g., feedback flipped or trajectory features manipulated), capturing an adversarial attack or noisy human preferences. We aim to design algorithms that identify a near-optimal policy from the corrupted data, with provable guarantees. Existing theoretical works have separately studied the settings of corruption robust RL (learning from scalar rewards directly under corruption) and offline RLHF (learning from human feedback without corruption); however, they are inapplicable to our problem of dealing with corrupted data in offline RLHF setting. To this end, we design novel corruption robust offline RLHF methods under various assumptions on the coverage of the data-generating distributions. At a high level, our methodology robustifies an offline RLHF framework by first learning a reward model along with confidence sets and then learning a pessimistic optimal policy over the confidence set. Our key insight is that learning optimal policy can be done by leveraging an offline corruption-robust RL oracle in different ways (e.g., zero-order oracle or first-order oracle), depending on the data coverage assumptions. To our knowledge, ours is the first work that provides provable corruption robust offline RLHF methods.

1 Introduction

Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) has emerged as a powerful paradigm for addressing complex tasks across diverse domains, ranging from large language models (LLMs) to robotics and game-playing [CL+17; Zie+19; SO+20; OW+22; BJ+22; SDB23]. At the core of RLHF is its unique ability to

Type of Coverage	Suboptimality Gap	Robust RL Oracle	# Oracle Calls
Uniform (ξ)	$O\left(\frac{H^3 + \sqrt{Hd}}{\xi} \varepsilon^{1-o(1)}\right)$	R-LSVI [Zha+22], zero-order access	1
Relative Condition Number (α)	$\tilde{O}\left(H^2 d \kappa \sqrt{\alpha \varepsilon}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(H^{5/4} d^{3/4} (\alpha \varepsilon)^{1/4}\right)$	R-LSVI [Zha+22], zero-order access	$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{H^{3/2} d^5}{\varepsilon^3}\right)$
Generalized Coverage Ratio (ν)	$O\left(\nu \kappa \sqrt{\varepsilon} H^2 d^{3/2}\right)$	Algorithm 7 (Our method), first-order access	$O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon \nu}\right)$

Table 1: We design *corruption robust RLHF* through reduction to *corruption robust offline RL* problem. Under uniform coverage and low relative condition number, we use R-LSVI [Zha+22] as an oracle, and obtain suboptimality gap of $O(\varepsilon^{1-o(1)})$ and $O(\varepsilon^{1/4})$ respectively, in terms of ε (fraction of corrupted data). Calls to R-LSVI are zero-order i.e. we only obtain a robust policy and an estimate of the value function. Under bounded generalized coverage ratio, we design a new robust offline RL method (algorithm (7)) that also returns an estimate of the sub-gradient (first order access). Using algorithm (7), we can improve the dependence on ε to $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ and also significantly reduce the number of oracle calls.

model reward functions solely from preference data, making it particularly well-suited for scenarios where explicit reward signals are challenging to define. Following reward model estimation, traditional RLHF approaches employ online reinforcement learning algorithms for subsequent policy optimization. However, the integration of offline RL within the RLHF pipeline holds promise for alleviating limitations inherent to online RL, notably in terms of sample efficiency and safety concerns [Lev+20; Kid+20]. By incorporating offline RL algorithms, RLHF becomes more adaptable to scenarios where online data collection proves prohibitive, facilitating the reuse of valuable pre-existing datasets [SDB23].

The real-world deployment of RLHF faces substantial challenges rooted in the reliability of the preference data, which is integral to its effectiveness. These challenges primarily arise from two sources: adversarial corruption and inherent noise [Cas+23; Xue+23; CNL24]. Adversarial entities, acting with malicious intent, may deliberately manipulate feedback labels or trajectory features, introducing potential biases in the reward model. Simultaneously, inherent human subjectivity within crowd-sourced preference data can contribute substantial noise, impeding accurate reward estimation. In light of these challenges, a pivotal research question emerges: *Can we devise a robust variant of RLHF that efficiently learns from adversarially corrupted or noisy preference data, exhibiting graceful scalability amidst increasing corruption levels?*

In this paper, we initiate the study of *corruption-robust offline reinforcement learning from human feedback*. Although there are several works on corruption robust offline reinforcement learning [Zha+22; Ye+23b], and provable preference based reinforcement learning [Zha+23; ZJJ23], ours is the first work to combine these two threads and provide provable corruption robust offline RLHF methods. We design corruption robust offline RLHF methods through reduction to corruption robust offline RL methods. In particular, we modify the existing RLHF framework through three steps – (1) Robustly learn a reward model by solving a robust logistic regression problem, (2) Construct a confidence set around the learned model, and (3) learn a pessimistic optimal policy over the confidence set through reduction to offline RL. We instantiate this general framework for datasets with various types of coverage assumptions, and as is often the case in offline RL, different coverage assumptions require different algorithms. For example, under *uniform coverage*, the solution to the robust logistic regression (step 1) gives a reward estimate that is $O(\varepsilon^{1-o(1)})$ close to the true parameter. In this case, just one call to a robust offline RL method is sufficient to obtain an $O(\varepsilon^{1-o(1)})$ -optimal policy.

However, the problem is significantly harder under weaker coverage assumptions e.g. *low relative con-*

dition number. In this case, the reward estimate might not be close to the true parameter. However, we show that their difference in likelihood is bounded, and this observation lets us construct a confidence set around the estimate. We then perform projected subgradient descent over this set to learn an approximately optimal reward parameter $\bar{\theta}$. At each iteration, we utilize corruption robust offline RL method [Zha+22] as a biased, and zero-order oracle, and use the technique of *Gaussian approximation* [NS17] to construct an approximate sub-gradient. We upper bound the error of projected sub-gradient descent with biased zero-order oracle and prove a final sub-optimality bound of $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{1/4})$ in terms of ε .

Finally, we show that we can improve the dependence on ε from $\varepsilon^{1/4}$ to $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ if the offline data satisfies the assumption of bounded generalized coverage ratio, an assumption recently considered by Gabbianelli et al. [Gab+23] (see also [JYW21] for a similar coverage ratio). In this case, we construct a new corruption robust offline RL that is *first-order* i.e. not only returns an approximately optimal policy but also an approximate sub-gradient of the optimal value function.

Our Contributions: Consider the standard *Huber contamination* model where ε -fraction of the data (human feedback, features of the trajectories or both) are corrupted. Moreover, consider a linear Markov decision process [Jin+20] with horizon length H , and feature dimension d . Then we prove the following set of results.

1. When the offline data has *uniform coverage*, we show that it is possible to learn a policy with sub-optimality gap at most $O(H^3\sqrt{d}\varepsilon^{1-o(1)})$.¹
2. When the offline data satisfies the condition of *low relative condition number*, a condition substantially weaker than the uniform coverage, we bound the sub-optimality gap by at most $\tilde{O}(H^2d\varepsilon^{1/4})$. In order to achieve this bound, we reduce our problem to standard corruption robust offline RL, and use an existing corruption-robust method [Zha+22] as a zero-order oracle. Along the way, we also develop a method of convex optimization with biased zero-order oracle that might be of independent interest.
3. Finally, when the offline data satisfies both low relative condition number, and *bounded coverage ratio* we bound the sub-optimality gap by at most $\tilde{O}(H^2d^{3/2}\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. The assumption of bounded coverage ratio is generally not comparable to low relative condition number, but is substantially weaker than the assumption of uniform coverage. We obtain the improved dependence of $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ by designing a new corruption-robust offline RL method, that we believe will be of interest to researchers working on offline RL.

1.1 Related Work

Preference-based RL: Our work is related to preference-based reinforcement learning (PbRL) [Wir+17; Lee+21]. Although the field of PbRL is not new, there have been significant recent interests in designing provably optimal RL methods from preferences [Zha+23; ZJJ23; WLJ23]. In particular, Zhu et al. [ZJJ23] proposed a pessimistic maximum likelihood estimation for provable PbRL under clean data. Our algorithm, in particular the reward confidence set construction, is related to the method proposed by Zhan et al. [Zha+23]. However, unlike [Zha+23] we don't build a confidence set around the probability transition function, but rather use reduction to offline RL. Finally, there are several works on PbRL in online setting [PSL21; Cha+21; Che+22] which are complementary to the work on offline setting.

Corruption robust RL: Our work is closely aligned with the research on corruption robust RL, where the challenge lies in designing agents that can effectively learn in the presence of adversarial corruption on

¹The term $\varepsilon^{1-o(1)}$ approaches ε as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We actually show a dependence of $\varepsilon \cdot \exp(\sqrt{\log(1/\varepsilon)})$ which is $\varepsilon^{1-o(1)}$.

both rewards and transitions [Rak+20]. Zhang et al. [Zha+22] has considered linear MDP, and have designed corruption robust offline RL by robustifying the least squares value iteration method. On the other hand, [Ye+23b] has considered corruption robustness in general MDPs by adopting uncertainty weighting to nonlinear function approximation [Ye+23a]. In the online RL setting, Lykouris et al.; Chen et al. [Lyk+21; CDJ21] proposed robust RL methods capable of accommodating up to $\epsilon \leq O(1/\sqrt{T})$ fraction of corruptions. Zhang et al. [Zha+21] developed an online policy gradient method that is resilient against a constant fraction of adaptive corruption.

2 Preliminaries

Markov Decision Process: Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P^*, r^*, H, \rho)$ be an episodic Markov Decision Process (MDP) where \mathcal{S} denotes the state space and \mathcal{A} denotes the action space. The initial state is sampled from the distribution ρ . $P^* = (P_1^*, \dots, P_H^*)$ denote the transition kernels where for each $h \in [H]$, $P_h^*(\cdot | s, a) \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ denotes the distribution over states given that the system is in state s at step h and action a is taken. Let $r^* : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ be the reward function where $r_h^*(s, a)$ is the reward obtained from taking action a from state s at time-step h . We can also extend the reward function to reward over trajectories by taking the sum of the rewards over the H steps. Specifically, given a trajectory $\tau = (s_1, a_1, s_2, \dots, s_{H+1})$, we define $r^*(\tau) = \sum_{h=1}^H r_h^*(s_h, a_h)$.

Policy: Policies denote mappings from histories of traversed state-action pairs to distributions over actions. Formally, a non-stationary history-dependent policy $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_H)$ is a sequence of mappings where, for each $h \in [H]$, $\pi_h : \mathcal{H}_h \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$, with $\mathcal{H}_h = \mathcal{S} \times (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})^{H-1} \times \mathcal{S}$ denoting the history space up to time-step h . The space of such policies is denoted by Π_{his} . We further denote by $q_h^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{P}(s_h = s, a_h = a | \pi, P^*)$ the state-action occupancy measure for every time-step $h \in [H]$. The expected performance of a given policy π with respect to the true transitions P^* and true reward r^* is denoted by

$$V^\pi(P^*, r^*) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{h=1}^H r^*(s_h, a_h) \middle| s_h \sim P_h^*, a_h \sim \pi_h \forall h \right].$$

2.1 Offline RLHF

We have an offline dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(\tau^{n,0}, \tau^{n,1}, o^n)\}_{n=1}^N$ of N pairs of trajectories, where each pair $(\tau^{n,0}, \tau^{n,1})$ is associated with feedback $o^n \in \{+1, -1\}$ representing the human preference, coming from a latent model assumed to satisfy the following assumption.

Assumption 2.1 (Preference-based model). Given a pair of trajectories (τ^0, τ^1) , and a preference $o \in \{+1, -1\}$, the probability that τ^1 is preferred over τ^0 satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}(o = 1 | \tau^0, \tau^1) = \sigma(r^*(\tau^1) - r^*(\tau^0)),$$

where $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a monotonically increasing link function.

In this paper, we will utilize the sigmoid link function $\sigma(x) = 1/(1 + \exp(-x))$, commonly used in the literature on RLHF [CL+17]. For our setting, the rewards are bounded and the range of the function is bounded away from 0 and 1. This also implies that there exists a constant κ such that $\sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{d\sigma^{-1}(p)}{dp} \right| \leq \kappa$.

The performance of a given policy π is measured by the notion of suboptimality gap with respect to a target policy π^* . Formally, we want to minimize the following quantity

$$\text{SubOpt}(\pi, \pi^*) = V^{\pi^*}(r^*, P^*) - V^\pi(r^*, P^*).$$

We will write $\Sigma_{\mu_0, \mu_1}^{\text{diff}}$ to denote the difference feature covariance matrix, which is defined as

$$\Sigma_{\mu_0, \mu_1}^{\text{diff}} = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\tau^0 \sim \mu_0, \\ \tau^1 \sim \mu_1}} \left[(\phi(\tau^0) - \phi(\tau^1)) (\phi(\tau^0) - \phi(\tau^1))^\top \right].$$

Similarly, we will write $\Sigma_{\mu_0, \mu_1}^{\text{avg}}$ to denote the average feature covariance matrix, which is defined as

$$\Sigma_{\mu_0, \mu_1}^{\text{avg}} = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\tau^0 \sim \mu_0, \\ \tau^1 \sim \mu_1}} \left[(\phi(\tau^0) + \phi(\tau^1)) (\phi(\tau^0) + \phi(\tau^1))^\top \right].$$

2.2 Contamination Model

In this paper, we study the problem of corruption robustness in offline RLHF. We assume that the collected data contains an ϵ -fraction of contaminated samples, i.e. an attacker, who is given access to the data beforehand, is allowed to arbitrarily modify up to an ϵ -fraction of the data samples (both the trajectory features, and the human feedback). Motivated by the sample corruption model in robust statistics and robust offline RL [Zha+22], we propose the *Huber contamination of human preferences* for RLHF as follows.

Assumption 2.2 (ϵ -corruption in Offline RLHF). Let $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ denote the contamination parameter and $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = \{(\widetilde{\tau}^{n,0}, \widetilde{\tau}^{n,1}, \widetilde{o}^n)\}_{n=1}^N$ be a dataset of N pairs of trajectories and human preferences. An attacker inspects $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and arbitrarily modifies any up to ϵN tuples from $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. We denote the corrupted dataset by $\mathcal{D} = \{(\tau^{n,0}, \tau^{n,1}, o^n)\}_{n=1}^N$. In other words, there are at most ϵN indices n , for which we have $\widetilde{o}^n \neq o^n$, or $\widetilde{\tau}^{n,1} \neq \tau^{n,1}$, or $\widetilde{\tau}^{n,0} \neq \tau^{n,0}$.

2.3 Parametric Markov Decision Processes

It is generally impossible to design provable offline RL algorithms without making any parametric assumptions on the underlying MDP. Therefore, throughout this paper, we will assume that the MDP is linear i.e. the reward and the transition are linear functions of by d -dimensional features.

Definition 2.3 (Linear MDP [Jin+20]). We assume access to known feature map $\phi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, and that there exist $\{\theta_h\}_{h \in [H]}$ and signed measures $\mu_h = (\mu_h^1, \dots, \mu_h^d)$ over the state space so that

$$r_h(s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \theta_h \text{ and } P_h(s' | s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \mu_h(s').$$

We also assume $\|\phi(s, a)\|_2 \leq 1$ for any s, a , $\max\{\|\theta_h\|_2, \|\mu_h(\mathcal{S})\|_2\} \leq \sqrt{d}$ for any $h \in [H]$.

Given a trajectory $\tau = (s_1, a_1, s_2, \dots, s_{H+1})$ we will often write $\phi(\tau) = [\phi(s_1, a_1); \phi(s_2, a_2); \dots; \phi(s_H, a_H)]$ to denote the feature of the trajectory τ . Note that $\phi(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{Hd}$ and $\|\phi(\tau)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\sum_{h=1}^H \|\phi(s_h, a_h)\|_2^2} \leq \sqrt{H}$.

Algorithm 1 Robust RLHF (with Uniform Coverage)

Require: (a) Corrupted dataset \mathcal{D} , (b) corruption parameter ϵ , (c) corruption robust offline RL algorithm RobRL.

- 1: Partition dataset \mathcal{D} uniformly at random into two datasets \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 of equal size.
- 2: \triangleright Estimate reward parameter of linear MDP $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\theta}_1, \dots, \hat{\theta}_H)$.
- 3: Let $x^n = \phi(\tau^{n,1}) - \phi(\tau^{n,0})$ and solve the following trimmed maximum likelihood estimation problem using algorithm (4).

$$\hat{\theta} \leftarrow \arg \max_{\theta} \max_{\substack{\hat{S} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_1 \\ |\hat{S}| = (1-\epsilon)N/2}} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta}(o^n | x^n) \quad (2)$$

- 4: Let $\tilde{\pi}$ be the policy returned by RobRL with reward function $r_h(s, a) = \phi(s, a)^{\top} \hat{\theta}_h$ and dataset \mathcal{D}_2 .
 - 5: Return $\tilde{\pi}$.
-

3 Robust RLHF with Uniform Coverage

We now provide our first algorithm for corruption robust reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF). Standard RLHF framework estimates the reward parameter by solving a maximum likelihood estimation problem. We essentially robustify this step and replace it with a robust version of logistic regression. Let $\mathbb{P}_{\theta}(o | \phi(\tau^1) - \phi(\tau^0))$ be the probability of observing feedback o from a comparison of trajectory τ^1 and τ^0 . Then algorithm (1) solves a trimmed maximum likelihood estimation problem,

$$\hat{\theta} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} \max_{S \subseteq \mathcal{D}: |S| = (1-\epsilon)N} \sum_{n \in S} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta}(o^n | x^n) \quad (1)$$

where $x^n = \phi(\tau^{n,1}) - \phi(\tau^{n,0})$. Therefore, the estimate $\hat{\theta}$ is chosen to maximize the likelihood over best subset containing $(1 - \epsilon)$ -fraction of the points.

With an estimate $\hat{\theta}$ of the reward parameter, algorithm (1) uses a robust offline RL method (input RobRL) to compute an approximately optimal policy $\tilde{\pi}$. For this step, algorithm (1) uses the features from the dataset $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ but the reward is defined according to the estimated model $\hat{\theta}$ i.e. $r_h(s, a) = \hat{\theta}_h^{\top} \phi(s, a)$. Finally, note that we want the two steps – reward estimation, and policy optimization to use separate datasets, so algorithm (1) partitions the dataset \mathcal{D} , uniformly at random into two datasets of equal size at the beginning. Before providing the performance guarantees of algorithm (1), we discuss how to solve the trimmed maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) problem (1).

Solving Trimmed MLE: In general, the optimization problem in eq. (1) is hard to solve. But for the setting of generalized linear models, [Awa+22] proposed an alternating optimization method that converges to a stationary point under certain assumptions on the link function. At each iteration t , the alternating optimization updates \hat{S} and $\hat{\theta}$ as

1. $\hat{S}_t \leftarrow \arg \max_{\substack{S \subseteq [N] \\ |S| = (1-\epsilon)N}} \sum_{n \in S} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}_t}(o^n | x^n)$.
2. $\hat{\theta}_{t+1} \leftarrow \arg \max_{\theta: \|\theta\|_2 \leq \sqrt{Hd}} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}_t} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta}(o^n | x^n)$,

where $x^n = \phi(\tau^{1,n}) - \phi(\tau^{0,n})$. The method stop when the improvement in the likelihood is less than a threshold η .

Given an estimate $\hat{\theta}$ generated by algorithm (4), let the set \hat{S} contain $(1-\varepsilon)N$ data-points with the largest log-likelihood under $\hat{\theta}$. Then we say that $\hat{\theta}$ is a γ -stationary point if the following condition is satisfied.

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \nabla_{\theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | x_n)^\top \frac{(\theta_N^* - \hat{\theta})}{\|\theta_N^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2} \leq \gamma \quad (3)$$

Lemma (A.1) (in the appendix) provides a bound of $\max \left\{ O(\varepsilon), \varepsilon^2 / \|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2 \right\}$ on the constant γ . With this guarantee, we are now ready to provide a bound on the sub-optimality of the policy $\tilde{\pi}$ returned by algorithm (1). We will make the following assumption regarding the pair of policies μ_0, μ_1 that generate the offline data.

Assumption 3.1 (Uniform Coverage). Suppose $\|\phi(\tau)\|_2 \leq L$ for any trajectory τ . Then there exists a constant $\xi > 0$ such that

$$\Sigma_{\mu_0, \mu_1}^{\text{diff}} \succcurlyeq \xi L \cdot \text{Id}_d.$$

Since the feature norm of a trajectory is bounded by $L (= \sqrt{H})$, compared to [Zha+22] we use ξL as the lower bound constant, instead of just ξ . The next lemma shows that under uniform coverage, the reward estimate returned by algorithm (4) is $O(\varepsilon^{1-o(1)})$ close to the true reward parameter in terms of L_2 -norm.

Lemma 3.2. Suppose assumption (3.1) holds with $\xi \geq 5\varepsilon$ and $N \geq \Omega\left(\frac{H^{3/2}}{\varepsilon^2} (d + \log(1/\delta))\right)$. Then algorithm (4) returns $\hat{\theta}$, so that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \leq C_1 \frac{\varepsilon}{\xi} \exp\left(\sqrt{\log(1/2\delta\varepsilon)}\right)$$

The proof of the result above is given in the appendix. The main idea is that $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in \hat{S} \cap T} \nabla_{\theta} \log P_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | x_n)$ is a strongly concave function of θ under assumption (3.1). The next theorem provides a bound on the sub-optimality gap of algorithm (1), assuming access to a $f(\varepsilon)$ -robust offline RL method.

Theorem 3.3. Suppose RobRL returns a $f(\varepsilon)$ -robust estimate of the optimal value function, and assumption (3.1) holds with $\xi \geq 5\varepsilon$ and $N \geq \Omega\left(\frac{H^{3/2}}{\varepsilon^2} (d + \log(1/\delta))\right)$. Then the policy $\tilde{\pi}$ returned by algorithm (1) satisfies,

$$V^*(\theta^*) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) \leq f(\varepsilon) + 2\sqrt{Hd} C_1 \frac{\varepsilon}{\xi} \cdot e^{\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon}\right)}}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

We now instantiate theorem (3.3) for the setting of linear MDP. For corruption robust offline RL, we use algorithm R-LSVI from [Zha+22] as an oracle. It requires a coverage assumption similar to assumption (3.1).

Assumption 3.4 (Uniform Coverage: V2). Suppose, $\|\phi(\tau)\|_2 \leq L$ for any trajectory τ . Then there exists a constant $\xi > 0$ such that

$$\Sigma_{\mu_0, \mu_1}^{\text{avg}} \succcurlyeq \xi L \cdot \text{Id}_d.$$

Under assumption (3.4) R-LSVI returns a policy $\tilde{\pi}$ so that

$$V^{\tilde{\pi}}(s_0) \geq V^*(s_0) - \underbrace{\tilde{O}\left(\frac{H^{5/2}}{\xi\sqrt{N}} \text{poly}(d) + \frac{H^3}{\xi} \varepsilon\right)}_{:=f(\varepsilon)}.$$

Note that if $N \geq \tilde{\Omega} \left(\frac{\text{poly}(d)}{\varepsilon^2} \right)$, we have $f(\varepsilon) = \frac{H^3}{\xi} \varepsilon$. Substituting this value of $f(\varepsilon)$ in the bound of theorem (3.3) gives us the following bound on the suboptimality gap.

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose assumptions (3.1) and (3.4) hold. Then for the setting of linear MDP and $N \geq \tilde{\Omega} \left(\frac{\text{poly}(d) \log(1/\delta)}{\varepsilon^2} \right)$, algorithm (1) returns a policy $\tilde{\pi}$ so that,*

$$V^*(\theta^*) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) \leq O \left(\frac{H^3 + \sqrt{Hd}}{\xi} \varepsilon \cdot e^{\sqrt{\log(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon})}} \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

4 Low Relative Condition Number

Although the assumption of uniform coverage allows us to design $O(\varepsilon^{1-o(1)})$ -optimal policy, it is a strong assumption since the features generated by the offline policy might not cover the entire d -dimensional space. In this section, we relax this assumption to a new assumption named *Low Relative Condition number*, which is significantly weaker.

Assumption 4.1 (Relative Condition Number). Given a pairwise target distributions π_0, π_1 , there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that the following holds.

$$\sup_w \frac{w^\top \sum_{\pi_0, \pi_1}^{\text{diff}} w}{w^\top \sum_{\mu_0, \mu_1}^{\text{diff}} w} = \alpha < \infty$$

Although the above assumption is stated for a pair of distributions π_0, π_1 , given a target distribution π^\dagger one can choose $\pi_0 = \pi^\dagger$ and $\pi_1 = \mu_1$.

Algorithm (2) provides our new corruption robust RLHF method under the assumption of low relative condition number. The algorithm begins similarly to algorithm (1) by solving the trimmed maximum likelihood estimation to obtain a robust estimate $\hat{\theta}$ of the reward parameter θ^* . However, in the absence of uniform coverage, $\hat{\theta}$ might not be close to θ^* in terms of L_2 distance. So the following lemma provides a bound in terms of the likelihood at $\hat{\theta}$ and θ^* .

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mathbb{P}_\theta(y | x) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-y \cdot \theta^\top x}}$ and for any $n \in [N]$ define $\mathbf{x}_n = \phi(\tau^{1,n}) - \phi(\tau^{0,n})$. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) \leq 6\varepsilon H \sqrt{d} + c \cdot \frac{d}{N} \log \left(\frac{HN}{\delta} \right)$$

The above result is a generalization of Lemma 1 from [Zha+23], and allows us to build a confidence set around the estimate $\hat{\theta}$ even when a ε -fraction of the data has been corrupted (line 3 of algorithm (2)). Now we leverage two important observations.

1. The above approach requires the set $\Theta(\mathcal{D}_1)$ is a convex set. It can be easily checked this is true if the function $\log \mathbb{P}_\theta(\cdot)$ is concave. Moreover, for the case of sigmoid link function $\nabla_\theta^2 \log \sigma(\theta^\top x) \preceq 0$ i.e. $\Theta(\mathcal{D}_1)$ is a convex set.

Algorithm 2 Robust RLHF with Condition Number

Require: (a) Corrupted dataset \mathcal{D} , (b) corruption parameter ϵ , (c) corruption robust offline RL algorithm RobRL, (d) reference distribution μ_{ref} .

- 1: Partition dataset \mathcal{D} uniformly at random into \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 of equal size.
- 2: \triangleright Estimate an estimate $\hat{\theta}$ of the reward parameter, as in Algorithm (1).
- 3: Set $\zeta = 6\epsilon H\sqrt{d} + 2\frac{d}{N}\log\left(\frac{HN}{\delta}\right)$ and construct confidence set

$$\Theta(\mathcal{D}_1) = \left\{ \theta : \|\theta\|_2 \leq \sqrt{Hd} \text{ and } \frac{2}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N/2} \log \sigma\left(\theta^\top x^n\right) - \log \sigma\left(\hat{\theta}^\top x^n\right) \geq -\zeta \right\}$$

- 4: \triangleright Run Projected Sub-gradient Descent with Biased Oracle
- 5: Initialize $\theta_0 \in \Theta(\mathcal{D}_1)$.
- 6: **for** $t = 0, \dots, T - 1$ **do**
- 7: \triangleright Sub-Gradient Construction
- 8: Generate u_1, \dots, u_K uniformly at random from the standard normal distribution (restricted to $\Theta(\mathcal{D}_1)$).
- 9: Let g_t be the approximate subgradient,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\widehat{V}(\theta_t + \mu u_k) - \widehat{V}(\theta) - \mu \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} [\phi(\tau)^\top u_k]}{\mu} u_k$$

where $\widehat{V}(\theta)$ is the value estimate returned by RobRL with reward function $r_h(s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \theta_{t,h}$ and dataset \mathcal{D}_2 .

- 10: $\theta_{t+1} = \text{Proj}_{\Theta(\mathcal{D}_1)}(\theta_t - \eta g_t)$
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: Set $\bar{\theta} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \theta_k$ and let $\tilde{\pi}$ be the policy returned by running RobRL with reward function $r_h(s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \bar{\theta}_h$.
 - 13: Return $\tilde{\pi}$.
-

2. For the setting of linear MDP, the optimal value function $V^*(\theta) = \max_{\pi} V^{\pi}(\theta)$ is a convex function in the reward parameter θ . This follows from the occupancy measure based representation of MDP. Indeed, $V^*(\theta) = \max_{q^1, \dots, q^H \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{h=1}^H q_h^\top \Phi \theta$, where \mathcal{C} is the set of valid occupancy measures, and Φ is the feature matrix. Since for any θ , $V^*(\theta)$ is a maximum over linear functions, $V^*(\cdot)$ is convex.

Therefore, we run a projected subgradient descent over the set $\Theta(\mathcal{D}_1)$. At each iteration t , algorithm (2) selects a reward parameter θ_t . Although the corruption robust offline RL method RobRL can return an approximately optimal policy with reward parameter θ , we need a subgradient i.e. $g_t \in \delta_{\theta} V^*(\theta_t) = \{v : V^*(\theta') \geq V^*(\theta_t) + v^\top (\theta' - \theta_t) \forall \theta'\}$. So we treat RobRL as a biased, zero-order oracle and explicitly build an estimator of a subgradient (lines 8-9) [NS17; Duc+15; FKM04]. In particular, we use the *Gaussian approximation* technique introduced by [NS17]. Given a convex function $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, let f_{μ} be

its smoothed Gaussian approximation, defined as

$$f_\mu(\theta) = \frac{1}{\kappa} \int_E f(\theta + \mu \cdot u) e^{-1/2\|u\|_2^2} du,$$

where $\kappa = \int_E e^{-1/2\|u\|_2^2} du$. The Gaussian approximation method performs a gradient descent of the smoothed function f_μ , with the gradient

$$\nabla f_\mu(\theta) = \frac{1}{\kappa} \int_E \frac{f(\theta + \mu \cdot u) - f(\theta)}{\mu} e^{-1/2\|u\|_2^2} du.$$

It can be easily verified that the estimator constructed in lines 8-9 of algorithm (2) is an estimator of $\nabla f_\mu(\theta)$ for $f(\theta) = V^*(\theta) - \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} [\phi(\tau)^\top \theta]^2$. The algorithm finally computes the average reward parameter $\bar{\theta} = 1/T \cdot \sum_{k=1}^T \theta_k$ and returns a robust policy $\tilde{\pi}$ with respect to the parameter $\bar{\theta}$. Algorithm (2) provides our full implementation of the reduction to corruption robust RL. The next theorem provides a bound on the sub-optimality gap of algorithm (2), assuming access to a $f(\varepsilon)$ -robust offline RL method.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose assumption (4.1) holds, $\sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{d\sigma^{-1}(p)}{dp} \right| \leq \kappa$, and RobRL returns a $f(\varepsilon)$ -robust estimate of the optimal value function. If $N \geq \tilde{\Omega} \left(\frac{H^{3/2} d^5}{\varepsilon^3} \right)$, then for a target policy π^\dagger , the policy $\tilde{\pi}$ output by algorithm (2) satisfies the following w.p. at least $1 - \delta$.*

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi^\dagger}(\theta^*) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) &\leq f(\varepsilon) + 8\sqrt{f(\varepsilon)}(Hd)^{1/4} \\ &\quad + c\kappa\sqrt{\alpha} \left(\sqrt{\varepsilon Hd}^{1/4} + \sqrt{d/N} \cdot \log(HdN/\delta) \right) \end{aligned}$$

We now instantiate Theorem (4.3) for the setting of linear MDP. For corruption robust offline RL, we use algorithm (R-LSVI from [Zha+22]) as an oracle. It requires a coverage assumption similar to assumption (4.1).

Assumption 4.4 (Relative Condition Number: V2). For a target distribution π , there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that the following condition holds.

$$\sup_w \frac{w^\top \Sigma_\pi w}{w^\top \Sigma_{\mu_0, \mu_1}^{\text{avg}} w} = \alpha < \infty$$

Under assumption (4.4), R-LSVI returns a policy $\tilde{\pi}$ so that

$$V^{\tilde{\pi}}(s_0) \geq V^*(s_0) - \underbrace{\tilde{O} \left(\frac{H^{5/2}}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\alpha} \text{poly}(d) + H^2 d \sqrt{\alpha \varepsilon} \right)}_{:=f(\varepsilon)}.$$

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose assumptions (4.1) and (4.4) hold. Moreover, suppose $\sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{d\sigma^{-1}(p)}{dp} \right| \leq \kappa$. Then for the setting of linear MDP and $N \geq \tilde{\Omega} \left(\frac{H^{3/2}}{\varepsilon^3} \cdot \text{poly}(d, 1/\delta) \right)$, algorithm (2) returns a policy $\tilde{\pi}$ so that,*

$$V^*(\theta^*) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) \leq \tilde{O}(H^2 d \kappa \sqrt{\alpha \varepsilon}) + \tilde{O} \left(H^{5/4} d^{3/4} (\alpha \varepsilon)^{1/4} \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

²We subtract rewards according to a reference policy μ_{ref} since we only have preference data over rewards.

Note that proposition (4.5) provides an upper bound of $O(\varepsilon^{1/4})$ when other parameters are constant. The reason we obtain sub-optimal dependence on ε is because we assume a zero-order access to the offline robust RL oracle. We next show that we can improve the dependence on ε if we have access to a first-order oracle.

5 Bounded Generalized Coverage Ratio

Algorithm 3 Robust FreeHand with First-Order Oracle

Require: (a) Corrupted dataset \mathcal{D} , (b) corruption parameter ϵ , (c) corruption robust offline RL algorithm RobRL, (d) reference distribution μ_{ref} .

- 1: \triangleright Estimate reward parameter $\hat{\theta}$ and build confidence interval $\Theta(\mathcal{D}_1)$ as in algorithm (2).
 - 2: Initialize $\theta_0 \in \Theta(\mathcal{D}_1)$.
 - 3: **for** $t = 0, \dots, T - 1$ **do**
 - 4: Let g_t be the sub-gradient returned by running RobRL with reward parameter $r_h(s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \theta_{t,h}$ and dataset \mathcal{D}_2 .
 - 5: $\theta_{t+1} = \text{Proj}_{\Theta(\mathcal{D}_1)}(\theta_t - \eta(g_t + \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}}[\phi(\tau)]))$
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: Set $\bar{\theta} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \theta_k$ and let $\tilde{\pi}$ be the policy returned by running RobRL with reward function $r_h(s, a) = \phi(s, a)^\top \bar{\theta}_h$ and dataset \mathcal{D}_2 .
 - 8: Return $\tilde{\pi}$.
-

Algorithm (3) assumes access to a robust offline RL oracle RobRL, that given any reward parameter θ , returns an approximate sub-gradient of the optimal value function $V^*(\theta) = \max_{\pi} V^{\pi}(\theta)$. Given such a first order oracle, it essentially performs a projected subgradient descent to determine an approximately optimal reward parameter $\bar{\theta}$, and the corresponding policy $\tilde{\pi}$.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose assumption (4.1) holds, $\sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{d\sigma^{-1}(p)}{dp} \right| \leq \kappa$, and RobRL returns a $f(\varepsilon)$ -robust estimate of the optimal value function, and $f(\varepsilon)$ -approximate subgradient with norm at most G . If $N \geq \Omega\left(\frac{H^{3/2}dG}{f(\varepsilon)^2}\right)$, then for any target policy π^\dagger , the policy $\tilde{\pi}$ output by algorithm (2) satisfies the following with probability at least $1 - \delta$.*

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi^\dagger}(\theta^*) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) &\leq 2f(\varepsilon) \\ &\quad + c\kappa\sqrt{\alpha} \left(\sqrt{\varepsilon Hd^{1/4}} + \sqrt{d/N \cdot \log(HdN/\delta)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

We now construct a corruption robust sub-gradient estimator of the function $V^*(\theta) = \max_{\pi} V^{\pi}(\theta)$. Given a reward parameter $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_H)$, the optimal value function can be expressed as follows.

$$V^*(\theta) = \max_{q=(q_1, \dots, q_H) \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{h=1}^H q_h^\top \Phi \theta_h.$$

Here q_h is the state, action occupancy measure at time step h , and the constraint set \mathcal{C} ensures the Bellman flow constraints. Now from the definition of sub-gradient of a convex function which is expressed as a

maximum of affine function ([Nes18], chapter 3) we can write down the following expression of the sub-differential.

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\theta V^*(\theta) = \text{co} \left\{ (\Phi^\top q_1, \dots, \Phi^\top q_H) : \right. \\ \left. (q_1, \dots, q_H) \in \arg \max_{q=(q_1, \dots, q_H) \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{h=1}^H q_h^\top \Phi \theta_h \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Here $\text{co}(S)$ is the convex-hull of a set S . Since q_h is the state, action occupancy measure at time-step h , $\Phi^\top q_h$ is the average feature observed at time-step h , and the above result states that the subdifferential set is the convex hull of reward-maximizing average features. Therefore, we will construct a corruption robust offline RL method, that not only returns an approximately optimal policy but also the average feature under that policy. We will make the following assumption regarding the data generating policy.

Assumption 5.2 (Bounded Generalized Coverage Ratio). Given a target distribution π^* , there exists a constant $\nu > 0$ such that the following holds.

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi^*} [\phi(\tau)]^\top (\Sigma_{\mu_0, \mu_1}^{\text{avg}})^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi^*} [\phi(\tau)] < \nu$$

We have stated the above assumption assuming Σ_{μ_0, μ_1} is invertible, but this is only for simplicity and consistency with prior literature. An alternate way to state this assumption would be that there exists a vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \pi^*} [\phi(s,a)] = \Sigma_{\mu_0, \mu_1} y$ and $\|y\|_2^2 < \nu$.

Our method is based on the primal-dual framework of linear MDP and builds upon the recent work by [Gab+23], who considered a similar assumption for discounted MDP. The dual linear program for a finite horizon linear MDP is the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\{q_h\}_{h=1}^H, \{\lambda_h\}_{h=1}^H} \sum_{h=1}^H \lambda_h^\top \theta_h \\ \text{s.t. } E q_1 = \rho \\ E q_{h+1} = \mu_h \lambda_h \quad \forall h \in [H-1] \\ q_h \geq 0 \quad \forall h \in [H] \\ \lambda_h = \Phi^\top q_h \quad \forall h \in [H] \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Here we have added the constraint $\lambda_h = \Phi^\top q_h$ to the standard LP formulation, and λ_h denotes the expected feature at time step h . Note that this substitution doesn't change the optimal value of the LP. The Lagrangian corresponding to the optimization problem above is given as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \rho^\top v_1 + \sum_{h=1}^H \langle q_h, -E^\top v_h + \Phi w_h \rangle \\ + \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \langle \theta_h + \mu_h^\top v_{h+1} - w_h, \lambda_h \rangle + \langle \theta_H - w_H, \lambda_H \rangle \end{aligned}$$

The main idea is to solve a saddle point of the above optimization problem i.e. $\max_{\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}} \min_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ through a gradient descent-ascent based algorithm. However, \mathbf{q} and \mathbf{v} are infinite dimensional parameters.

So we represent them symbolically in terms of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and \boldsymbol{w} , and perform gradient descent-ascent steps over the $H \cdot d$ dimensional parameters $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_H)$ and $\boldsymbol{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_H)$.

Note that, we don't exactly know the Lagrangian, and hence can only estimate the gradients through samples collected from the offline behavioral policy. As noted by [Gab+23], computing estimates of the gradients require explicit knowledge of the feature covariance matrix $\Lambda_h = \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^h} [\phi(s,a)\phi(s,a)^\top]$. It turns out that a substitution $\lambda_h = \Lambda_h \beta_h$ lets us compute an estimate of the gradient without knowledge of the covariance matrix Λ_h . Hence we compute the saddle point of the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_R(\boldsymbol{q}, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w}) = \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{q}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}; \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w}) |_{\{\lambda_h = \Lambda_h \beta_h\}_{h \in [H]}}$.

Once we obtain a solution $(\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \overline{\boldsymbol{w}})$, we choose policy $\overline{\pi}_h(a | s) \propto \exp(\phi(s,a)^\top \overline{\boldsymbol{w}}_h)$ and the feature covariance matrix as $\widehat{\Lambda}_h \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h$. Finally, recall that a ε -fraction of our data is corrupted. Hence we use robust mean to estimate the gradients from the data, and also use robust covariance estimation to obtain an approximate average features under $\overline{\pi}$. The full details of the algorithm is provided in the appendix (algorithm (7)), and here we state the guarantees provided by the new corruption robust offline RL algorithm.

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose assumption (5.2) holds, and $N \geq \Omega\left(\frac{H^2 d^4 \nu^4}{\varepsilon^2} (\log^2 d + \log^2 A)\right)$. Then there exists an algorithm that runs in time $\text{poly}(H, d)$ and returns policy $\overline{\pi}$ s.t.*

$$\max_{\pi} V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[V^{\overline{\pi}}(\theta)] \leq O(\nu \sqrt{\varepsilon} H^2 d^{3/2}),$$

and a vector $\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}} = (\widehat{v}_1, \dots, \widehat{v}_H)$ (with $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{H} d \nu$) s.t.

$$V^*(\theta') \geq V^*(\theta) + \sum_{h=1}^H \langle \widehat{v}_h, \theta_h \rangle - O(\nu \sqrt{\varepsilon} H^2 d^{3/2}) \quad \forall \theta'.$$

With such a first-order oracle, the next result states the improved guarantees given by algorithm (3).

Proposition 5.4. *Suppose assumptions (4.1) and (5.2) hold, and $\sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{d\sigma^{-1}(p)}{dp} \right| \leq \kappa$. If $N \geq \widetilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{H^2 d^4 \nu^4}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$, algorithm (3) returns a policy $\widetilde{\pi}$ so that the following holds with constant probability.*

$$V^*(\theta^*) - V^{\widetilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) \leq O(\nu \sqrt{\varepsilon} H^2 d^{3/2})$$

6 Discussion and Future Work

We have designed corruption robust offline RLHF algorithms under different types of coverage assumptions. Algorithm (1) provides an upper bound of $O(H^3 \sqrt{d} \varepsilon^{1-o(1)})$ which is almost optimal in terms of ε since there exists a lower bound of $\Omega(H d \varepsilon)$ even for standard corruption robust offline RL [Zha+22]. We have seen that it is possible to obtain an upper bound of $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} H^2 d^{3/2})$ under a substantially weaker assumption of bounded general coverage ratio. In the standard offline RL, the assumption of low relative condition number is sufficient to obtain a dependence of $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. As pointed out by [Gab+23], these two assumptions are not directly comparable. However, one can consider a slightly different assumption where the exponent 2 in 5.2 is replaced by 1 i.e. $\mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi^*} [\phi(\tau)]^\top \Sigma_{\mu_0, \mu_1}^{\text{avg}^{-1}} \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi^*} [\phi(\tau)] < \nu$. This assumption is similar to the feature coverage ratio considered in the literature [Jin+20], and can be bounded in terms of low relative condition number. We believe our offline primal-dual method can be adapted for this assumption by carefully integrating a robust estimation of the covariance matrix, but we leave this exercise as a future work.

There are also other interesting directions for future work. First, it would be interesting to generalize our results for RL with general function approximation. Our results (e.g. algorithm (7)) crucially depend

on min-max theorem which holds for linear MDPs, and doesn't hold in general. Therefore, we will have to consider new approaches for reduction to offline RL [Ye+23b]. Another interesting direction is to consider trajectory based rewards [Zha+23], which requires non-Markovian RL policies. In this case, the computation of optimal policy itself is a hard problem, and the design of corruption robust RLHF will require different approaches.

References

- [Awa+22] Pranjali Awasthi, Abhimanyu Das, Weihao Kong, and Rajat Sen. “Trimmed Maximum Likelihood Estimation for Robust Generalized Linear Model”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), pp. 862–873 (cit. on pp. 6, 18).
- [BJ+22] Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, et al. “Training a Helpful and Harmless Assistant with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback”. In: *CoRR* abs/2204.05862 (2022) (cit. on p. 1).
- [Cas+23] Stephen Casper, Xander Davies, Claudia Shi, Thomas Krendl Gilbert, Jérémy Scheurer, Javier Rando, Rachel Freedman, Tomasz Korbak, David Lindner, Pedro Freire, et al. “Open Problems and Fundamental Limitations of Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback”. In: *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2023) (cit. on p. 2).
- [CDJ21] Yifang Chen, Simon Du, and Kevin Jamieson. “Improved Corruption Robust Algorithms for Episodic Reinforcement Learning”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 1561–1570 (cit. on p. 4).
- [Cha+21] Niladri Chatterji, Aldo Pacchiano, Peter Bartlett, and Michael Jordan. “On the theory of reinforcement learning with once-per-episode feedback”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), pp. 3401–3412 (cit. on p. 3).
- [Che+22] Xiaoyu Chen, Han Zhong, Zhuoran Yang, Zhaoran Wang, and Liwei Wang. “Human-in-the-loop: Provably efficient preference-based reinforcement learning with general function approximation”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2022, pp. 3773–3793 (cit. on p. 3).
- [CL+17] Paul F. Christiano, Jan Leike, et al. “Deep Reinforcement Learning from Human Preferences”. In: *NeurIPS*. 2017 (cit. on pp. 1, 4).
- [CNL24] David Chhan, Ellen Novoseller, and Vernon J Lawhern. “Crowd-PrefRL: Preference-Based Reward Learning from Crowds”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10941* (2024) (cit. on p. 2).
- [Dia+17] Ilias Diakonikolas, Gautam Kamath, Daniel M Kane, Jerry Li, Ankur Moitra, and Alistair Stewart. “Being robust (in high dimensions) can be practical”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2017, pp. 999–1008 (cit. on p. 45).
- [DK19] Ilias Diakonikolas and Daniel M Kane. “Recent advances in algorithmic high-dimensional robust statistics”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.05911* (2019) (cit. on p. 45).
- [Duc+15] John C Duchi, Michael I Jordan, Martin J Wainwright, and Andre Wibisono. “Optimal rates for zero-order convex optimization: The power of two function evaluations”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 61.5 (2015), pp. 2788–2806 (cit. on p. 9).
- [FKM04] Abraham D Flaxman, Adam Tauman Kalai, and H Brendan McMahan. “Online convex optimization in the bandit setting: gradient descent without a gradient”. In: *arXiv preprint cs/0408007* (2004) (cit. on p. 9).

- [Gab+23] Germano Gabbianelli, Gergely Neu, Nneka Okolo, and Matteo Papini. “Offline Primal-Dual Reinforcement Learning for Linear MDPs”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12944* (2023) (cit. on pp. 3, 12, 13, 36, 37, 39, 45).
- [Jin+19] Chi Jin, Praneeth Netrapalli, Rong Ge, Sham M Kakade, and Michael I Jordan. “A short note on concentration inequalities for random vectors with subgaussian norm”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.03736* (2019) (cit. on pp. 34, 35).
- [Jin+20] Chi Jin, Zhuoran Yang, Zhaoran Wang, and Michael I Jordan. “Provably efficient reinforcement learning with linear function approximation”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2020, pp. 2137–2143 (cit. on pp. 3, 5, 13).
- [JYW21] Ying Jin, Zhuoran Yang, and Zhaoran Wang. “Is pessimism provably efficient for offline rl?” In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 5084–5096 (cit. on p. 3).
- [Kid+20] Rahul Kidambi, Aravind Rajeswaran, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Thorsten Joachims. “Morel: Model-based offline reinforcement learning”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), pp. 21810–21823 (cit. on p. 2).
- [Lee+21] Kimin Lee, Laura Smith, Anca Dragan, and Pieter Abbeel. “B-pref: Benchmarking preference-based reinforcement learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.03026* (2021) (cit. on p. 3).
- [Lev+20] Sergey Levine, Aviral Kumar, George Tucker, and Justin Fu. “Offline reinforcement learning: Tutorial, review, and perspectives on open problems”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01643* (2020) (cit. on p. 2).
- [Liu+22] Qinghua Liu, Alan Chung, Csaba Szepesvári, and Chi Jin. “When is partially observable reinforcement learning not scary?” In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2022, pp. 5175–5220 (cit. on p. 27).
- [Lyk+21] Thodoris Lykouris, Max Simchowitz, Alex Slivkins, and Wen Sun. “Corruption-robust exploration in episodic reinforcement learning”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 3242–3245 (cit. on p. 4).
- [Man60] Alan S Manne. “Linear programming and sequential decisions”. In: *Management Science* 6.3 (1960), pp. 259–267 (cit. on p. 35).
- [Nes18] Yurii Nesterov. *Lectures on convex optimization*. Vol. 137. Springer, 2018 (cit. on p. 12).
- [NS17] Yurii Nesterov and Vladimir Spokoiny. “Random gradient-free minimization of convex functions”. In: *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 17 (2017), pp. 527–566 (cit. on pp. 3, 9, 33).
- [OW+22] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, et al. “Training Language Models to Follow Instructions with Human Feedback”. In: *NeurIPS*. 2022 (cit. on p. 1).
- [PSL21] Aldo Pacchiano, Aadirupa Saha, and Jonathan Lee. “Dueling rl: reinforcement learning with trajectory preferences”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.04850* (2021) (cit. on p. 3).
- [Rak+20] Amin Rakhsha, Goran Radanovic, Rati Devidze, Xiaojin Zhu, and Adish Singla. “Policy Teaching via Environment Poisoning: Training-time Adversarial Attacks against Reinforcement Learning”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2020, pp. 7974–7984 (cit. on p. 4).

- [SDB23] Daniel Shin, Anca D. Dragan, and Daniel S. Brown. “Benchmarks and Algorithms for Offline Preference-Based Reward Learning”. In: *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.* 2023 (2023) (cit. on pp. 1, 2).
- [SO+20] Nisan Stiennon, Long Ouyang, et al. “Learning to Summarize with Human Feedback”. In: *NeurIPS*. 2020 (cit. on p. 1).
- [Ver18] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*. Vol. 47. Cambridge university press, 2018 (cit. on pp. 28, 34).
- [Wir+17] Christian Wirth, Riad Akrouf, Gerhard Neumann, Johannes Fürnkranz, et al. “A survey of preference-based reinforcement learning methods”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18.136 (2017), pp. 1–46 (cit. on p. 3).
- [WLJ23] Yuanhao Wang, Qinghua Liu, and Chi Jin. “Is RLHF More Difficult than Standard RL? A Theoretical Perspective”. In: *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2023 (cit. on p. 3).
- [Xue+23] Wanqi Xue, Bo An, Shuicheng Yan, and Zhongwen Xu. “Reinforcement Learning from Diverse Human Preferences”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11774* (2023) (cit. on p. 2).
- [Ye+23a] Chenlu Ye, Wei Xiong, Quanquan Gu, and Tong Zhang. “Corruption-robust algorithms with uncertainty weighting for nonlinear contextual bandits and markov decision processes”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2023, pp. 39834–39863 (cit. on p. 4).
- [Ye+23b] Chenlu Ye, Rui Yang, Quanquan Gu, and Tong Zhang. “Corruption-Robust Offline Reinforcement Learning with General Function Approximation”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14550* (2023) (cit. on pp. 2, 4, 14).
- [Zha+21] Xuezhou Zhang, Yiding Chen, Xiaojin Zhu, and Wen Sun. “Robust Policy Gradient against Strong Data Corruption”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 12391–12401 (cit. on p. 4).
- [Zha+22] Xuezhou Zhang, Yiding Chen, Xiaojin Zhu, and Wen Sun. “Corruption-robust offline reinforcement learning”. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR. 2022, pp. 5757–5773 (cit. on pp. 2–5, 7, 10, 13, 25).
- [Zha+23] Wenhao Zhan, Masatoshi Uehara, Nathan Kallus, Jason D Lee, and Wen Sun. “Provable Offline Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14816* (2023) (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 8, 14, 23, 26).
- [Zie+19] Daniel M Ziegler et al. “Fine-tuning Language Models from Human Preferences”. In: *CoRR* abs/1909.08593 (2019) (cit. on p. 1).
- [ZJJ23] Banghua Zhu, Jiantao Jiao, and Michael I Jordan. “Principled Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback from Pairwise or K -wise Comparisons”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11270* (2023) (cit. on pp. 2, 3).
- [ZJS22] Banghua Zhu, Jiantao Jiao, and Jacob Steinhardt. “Generalized resilience and robust statistics”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 50.4 (2022), pp. 2256–2283 (cit. on p. 19).

Appendix

Table of Contents

A Missing Proofs from Section (3)	17
A.1 Convergence of Alternating Optimization	17
A.2 Proof of Lemma (3.2)	19
A.3 Proof of Theorem (3.3)	22
B Missing Proofs from Section (4)	22
B.1 Proof of Theorem (4.3)	24
B.2 Proof of Proposition (4.5)	25
C Missing Proofs from Section (5)	30
C.1 Proof of Theorem (5.1)	30
C.2 Subgradient Descent with Biased First-Order Oracle	30
C.3 Proof of Proposition (5.4)	31
D Projected Subgradient Descent with Biased Zero-Order Oracle	31
D.1 Gradient Construction	33
E A New Corruption Robust Offline RL Method	35
E.1 Formal Statement and Proof of Theorem (5.3)	39

A Missing Proofs from Section (3)

A.1 Convergence of Alternating Optimization

Lemma A.1. Suppose $\|x_n\|_2 \leq L$ for all n and we set $\eta = \varepsilon^2$. Then algorithm 4 computes a $\max \left\{ 2L\varepsilon, \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2} \right\}$ -stationary point of the trimmed maximum likelihood estimation problem (1).

Proof. Let us write $H = \frac{1}{N\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2^2} (\theta^* - \hat{\theta})^\top \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \nabla_{\theta}^2 \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta}(o^n | x^n) (\theta^* - \hat{\theta})$ be the second order

derivative in the direction of $\theta^* - \hat{\theta}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
|H| &\leq \frac{1}{N \|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2^2} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \left| (\theta^* - \hat{\theta})^\top \frac{\exp(-o^n \cdot \theta^\top x_n)}{(1 + \exp(-o^n \cdot \theta^\top x_n))^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. x_n x_n^\top (\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N \|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2^2} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} |x_n^\top (\theta^* - \hat{\theta})| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \|x_n\|_2^2 \leq L^2
\end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is very similar to the proof of Lemma A.12 of [Awa+22]. Let $\Delta = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \nabla_\theta \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | x_n)^\top \frac{(\theta^* - \hat{\theta})}{\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2}$. Writing $F(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(o^n | x_n)$, we get that there exists θ' such that

$$F(\theta') \leq F(\hat{\theta}) - \frac{\Delta^2}{4L^2}$$

Suppose $\|\theta'\|$ is feasible. Then it must be that $\eta \geq \frac{\Delta^2}{4L^2}$ as it is impossible to make improvement more than η . This implies that $\Delta \leq 2L\sqrt{\eta}$. On the other hand, if θ' is not a feasible solution, then we use the fact that $F(\cdot)$ is a concave function and obtain the following bound.

$$F(\theta^*) \leq F(\hat{\theta}) + \nabla_\theta F(\hat{\theta})^\top (\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) = F(\hat{\theta}) + \Delta \|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2$$

Then it must be that $\eta \geq \Delta \|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2$ or $\Delta \leq \frac{\eta}{\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2}$. Combining the two results and after substituting $\eta = \varepsilon^2$ we get $\Delta \leq \max \left\{ 2L\varepsilon, \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2} \right\}$. \square

Algorithm 4 Alternating Optimization

Require: Corrupted dataset \mathcal{D} , corruption parameter ε , slackness parameter η , transition model P^* .

- 1: Let $x^n = \phi(\tau^{n,1}) - \phi(\tau^{n,0})$.
 - 2: Set $\hat{\theta}_1 = 0$.
 - 3: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 4: $\hat{S}_t \leftarrow \arg \max_{\substack{S \subseteq [N] \\ |S| = (1-\varepsilon)N}} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}_t}(o^n | x^n)$.
 - 5: $\hat{\theta}_{t+1} \leftarrow \arg \max_{\theta: \|\theta\|_2 \leq \sqrt{Hd}} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}_t} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(o^n | x^n)$.
 - 6: ▷ Check Progress
 - 7: **if** $\sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}_{t+1}}(o^n | x^n) \leq \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}_t}(o^n | x^n) + \eta$ **then**
 - 8: Return $\hat{\theta}_t$.
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: **end for**
-

A.2 Proof of Lemma (3.2)

Proof. From Lemma A.1 we know that algorithm (4) computes a $\gamma = \max \left\{ 2L\varepsilon, \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2} \right\}$ stationary point. We can assume that $2L\varepsilon \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2}$. Otherwise, $\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon/2L$ and we are done.

Let T be the set of uncorrupted samples and E be the set of corrupted samples. Then we can write down the stationarity condition (3) as follows.

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap E} \nabla_{\theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) \leq 2L\varepsilon \cdot \|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap T} \nabla_{\theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) \quad (5)$$

We first upper bound the term on the right.

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap T} \nabla_{\theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) &= \underbrace{-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap T} \nabla_{\theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)}_{:=T_1} \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap T} (\nabla_{\theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n) - \nabla_{\theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n))^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)}_{:=T_2} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Using the functional form of sigmoid link function i.e. $\mathbb{P}_{\theta}(o | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-o \cdot \theta^\top \mathbf{x})}$, we get the following expression for the term T_1 .

$$T_1 = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap T} \frac{o^n}{1 + \exp(o^n \cdot \langle \theta^*, \mathbf{x}_n \rangle)} \mathbf{x}_n^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)$$

In order to provide a high probability bound on T_1 , we first provide a bound on the k -th moment of the random vector $X = \frac{o}{1 + \exp(o \cdot \langle \theta^*, \mathbf{x} \rangle)} \mathbf{x}$. For any unit vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|v\|_2 = 1$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{o}{1 + \exp(o \cdot \langle \theta^*, \mathbf{x} \rangle)} \right)^k (\mathbf{x}^\top v)^k \right] &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{o^{2k}}{(1 + \exp(o \cdot \langle \theta^*, \mathbf{x} \rangle))^{2k}} \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} [(\mathbf{x}^\top v)^{2k}]} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{(1 + \exp(o \cdot \langle \theta^*, \mathbf{x} \rangle))^{2k}} \right]} L^k \leq L^k \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality uses the fact that $o \in \{-1, 1\}$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq L$. Since $\widehat{S} \cap T$ contains uncorrupted samples, and $|\widehat{S} \cap T| \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon)N$ we can use Corollary G.1 from [ZJS22] to obtain the following result with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

$$\left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{o}{1 + \exp(o \cdot \langle \theta^*, \mathbf{x} \rangle)} \mathbf{x} \right] - \frac{1}{|\widehat{S} \cap T|} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap T} \frac{o^n}{1 + \exp(o^n \cdot \langle \theta^*, \mathbf{x}_n \rangle)} \mathbf{x}_n \right\|_2 \leq \frac{CkL}{1 - 2\varepsilon} \left(\frac{(2\varepsilon)^{1-1/k}}{\delta^{1/k}} + \frac{1}{\delta} \sqrt{\frac{d}{N}} \right)$$

Now substituting $k = \sqrt{\log(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon})}$ and assuming $N \geq d/\varepsilon^2$ we obtain the following result.

$$\frac{1}{|\widehat{S} \cap T|} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap T} \frac{o^n}{1 + \exp(o^n \cdot \langle \theta^*, x_n \rangle)} x_n = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{o}{1 + \exp(o \cdot \langle \theta^*, x \rangle)} x \right] + \Delta$$

where

$$\|\Delta\|_2 \leq \frac{4\varepsilon CL}{1 - 2\varepsilon} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon}\right)} \left(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon}\right)^{1/\sqrt{\log(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon})}} \leq \frac{C_1 \varepsilon L}{1 - 2\varepsilon} e^{\sqrt{\log(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon})}}$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$. This lets us derive the following upper bound on T_1 .

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= -\frac{|\widehat{S} \cap T|}{N} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{o}{1 + \exp(o \cdot \langle \theta^*, x \rangle)} x \right] + \Delta \right)^\top (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) \\ &= -\frac{|\widehat{S} \cap T|}{N} (\mathbb{E}_{x,o} [\nabla_\theta \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(o | x)] + \Delta)^\top (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) \\ &= -\frac{|\widehat{S} \cap T|}{N} \Delta^\top (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) \\ &\leq C_1 \varepsilon L \exp\left(\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon}\right)}\right) \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

The second equality uses that the fact θ^* optimizes the population logistic loss and hence the derivative is zero. The last inequality uses that $|\widehat{S} \cap T| \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon)N$.

We now bound the term T_2 defined in eq. (6). We use assumption (3.1) to show that the function $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap T} \nabla_\theta \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(o^n | x_n)$ is strongly concave in θ . Indeed from the definition of $\mathbb{P}_\theta(o | x)$ we have the following result.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap T} \nabla_\theta^2 \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(o^n | x_n) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in \widehat{S} \cap T} -\frac{\exp(o^n \langle \theta, x \rangle)}{(1 + \exp(o^n \langle \theta, x \rangle))^2} x_n x_n^\top \\ &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in \widehat{S} \cap T} \frac{1}{(\exp(-o^n \langle \theta, x \rangle / 2) + \exp(o^n \langle \theta, x \rangle / 2))^2} x_n x_n^\top \\ &\preceq -\frac{1}{4N} \sum_{n \in \widehat{S} \cap T} x_n x_n^\top \\ &= -\frac{1}{4N} \left(\sum_{n=1}^N x_n x_n^\top - \sum_{n \notin \widehat{S} \cap T} x_n x_n^\top \right) \\ &\preceq -\frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} [xx^\top] + c_1 L^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{N}} \cdot \text{Id}_d + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{n \notin \widehat{S} \cap T} x_n x_n^\top \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from the observation that $e^u + e^{-u} \geq 2$. The last inequality uses the concentration bound of a sample covariance matrix (lemma B.4). For the third term in the last upper bound, note that

$|\widehat{S} \cap T| \leq \varepsilon N$ and the L_2 -norm of a feature is bounded by L . This implies that the last term is at most $\varepsilon L/2$. Now using assumption (3.1) and choosing $N \geq \frac{4c_1^2 L^3}{\varepsilon^2} (d + \log(1/\delta))$ we obtain the following upper bound.

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap T} \nabla_{\theta}^2 \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta}(o^n | x_n) \preceq - \left(\frac{\xi}{4} - \varepsilon \right) L$$

Therefore, we get the following upper bound.

$$T_2 := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap T} (\nabla_{\theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(o^n | x_n) - \nabla_{\theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{\theta}}(o^n | x_n))^\top (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) \leq - \left(\frac{\xi}{4} - \varepsilon \right) L \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2^2$$

This gives us the following upper bound on the right hand side of eq. (5).

$$- \left(\frac{\xi}{4} - \varepsilon \right) L \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2^2 + \left(2 + C_1 \exp \left(\sqrt{\log \left(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon} \right)} \right) \right) \varepsilon L \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \quad (7)$$

We now provide a lower bound on the left hand side of eq. (5). From the definition of $\mathbb{P}_{\theta}(o | x)$ we obtain the following identity.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap E} \nabla_{\theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{\theta}}(o^n | x_n)^\top (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap E} \frac{o^n}{1 + \exp(o^n \cdot \langle \widehat{\theta}, x_n \rangle)} x_n^\top (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap E} \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-o^n \cdot \langle \widehat{\theta}, x_n \rangle)} \right) o^n \cdot x_n^\top (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap E} (1 - \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{\theta}}(o^n | x_n)) o^n \cdot x_n^\top (\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*) \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \widehat{S} \cap E} \|x_n\|_2 \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \geq -\varepsilon L \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality uses $|\widehat{S} \cap E| \leq \varepsilon N$. Now combining this lower bound with the upper bound established in eq. (7) we can obtain a bound on $\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2$.

$$\begin{aligned} -\varepsilon L \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 &\leq - \left(\frac{\xi}{4} - \varepsilon \right) L \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2^2 + \left(2 + C_1 \exp \left(\sqrt{\log \left(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon} \right)} \right) \right) \varepsilon L \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \\ \Rightarrow \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 &\leq \frac{3 + C_1 \exp \left(\sqrt{\log \left(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon} \right)} \right)}{\xi/4 - \varepsilon} \cdot \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

□

A.3 Proof of Theorem (3.3)

Proof. By Lemma 3.2 the reward estimate $\hat{\theta}$ is $C_1 \frac{\varepsilon}{\xi} e^{\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon}\right)}}$ close to the true parameter θ^* . Since algorithm `RobRL` returns at least $f(\varepsilon)$ optimal policy in terms of value function we are guaranteed that $V^*(\hat{\theta}) \geq V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\hat{\theta}) \geq V^*(\hat{\theta}) - f(\varepsilon)$ for any θ . Using this result we can lower bound $V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*)$.

$$\begin{aligned} V^*(\theta^*) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) &= V^*(\theta^*) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\bar{\theta}) + V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\bar{\theta}) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) \\ &\leq f(\varepsilon) + V^*(\theta^*) - V^*(\hat{\theta}) + V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\bar{\theta}) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) \end{aligned}$$

For the first difference, we use the fact that the optimal value function $V^*(\cdot)$ is \sqrt{Hd} -Lipschitz in the reward parameter (lemma (B.3)) and obtain the following bound.

$$V^*(\theta^*) - V^*(\hat{\theta}) \leq \sqrt{Hd} \|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{Hd} C_1 \frac{\varepsilon}{\xi} \exp\left(\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon}\right)}\right)$$

Using lemma (3.2) the second difference can be bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\bar{\theta}) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) &= \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{s,a} \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\pi}}(s_h = s, a_h = a) \phi(s, a)^\top (\bar{\theta}_h - \theta_h^*) \\ &\leq \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{s,a} \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\pi}}(s_h = s, a_h = a) \|\phi(s, a)\|_2 \|\bar{\theta}_h - \theta_h^*\|_2 \\ &\leq \sum_{h=1}^H \|\bar{\theta}_h - \theta_h^*\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{H} \sqrt{\sum_{h=1}^H \|\bar{\theta}_h - \theta_h^*\|_2^2} \\ &= \sqrt{H} \|\bar{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{H} C_1 \frac{\varepsilon}{\xi} \cdot \exp\left(\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{2\delta\varepsilon}\right)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

□

B Missing Proofs from Section (4)

Here we state a more general version of Lemma 4.2. Let us write $\mathbb{P}_\theta(o | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-o \cdot \mathbf{x}^\top \theta)}$. We will also write θ_N^* to denote the parameter that maximizes empirical log-likelihood i.e.

$$\theta_N^* \in \arg \max_{\theta: \|\theta\|_2 \leq 1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_n \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(o^n | x_n)$$

Lemma B.1. Suppose that $\|\theta\|_2 \leq B$ for any $\theta \in \Theta_B$, $\|\phi(\tau)\|_2 \leq L$ for any trajectory $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, and $\log \mathbb{P}_\theta(\cdot)$ is a concave function of θ . Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) \leq 6\varepsilon LB + c \cdot \frac{d}{N} \log \left(\frac{LN}{\delta} \right)$$

for $\tilde{\theta} = \hat{\theta}$ or θ_N^* . Here $c > 0$ is a universal constant.

Proof. First note that we can express the difference in log-likelihood as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n) - \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_N^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_N^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

For linear reward functions, we can use Lemma 1 of [Zha+23] to bound the second term. Let $T \subseteq [N]$ be the set of corrupted data points. Then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_N^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in T} \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_N^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \notin T} \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_N^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \cdot \log \left(\frac{1 + e^{LB}}{1 - e^{-LB}} \right) + O \left(\frac{d}{(1 - \varepsilon)N} \log \left(\frac{LN}{\delta} \right) \right) \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon LB + O \left(\frac{d}{N} \log \left(\frac{LN}{\delta} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality uses Lemma 1 of [Zha+23] and $|T| \leq \varepsilon N$. Now, we consider bounding the first term in eq. (8).

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_N^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) \quad (9) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \notin \hat{S}} \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_N^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_N^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \cdot \log \left(\frac{1 + e^{LB}}{1 - e^{-LB}} \right) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_N^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon LB + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_N^*}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)} \right) \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon LB + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in \hat{S}} \nabla_{\theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}}(o^n | \mathbf{x}_n)^\top (\theta^* - \hat{\theta}) \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon LB + \gamma \left\| \theta_N^* - \hat{\theta} \right\|_2 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The first inequality uses that the size of \widehat{S} is $(1 - \varepsilon)N$ and the inner product between the parameter and the feature is bounded by LB . The second inequality uses that $\log \mathbb{P}_\theta(o^n | x_n)$ is a concave function in θ .

Lemma A.1 shows that $\gamma \leq \max \left\{ 2L\varepsilon, \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\|\theta_N^* - \widehat{\theta}\|_2} \right\}$. Substituting this upper bound in eq. (10) and using $\|\theta_N^*\|_2, \|\widehat{\theta}\|_2 \leq B$ we get the following result: $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_{\widehat{\theta}}(o^n | x_n)}{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_N^*}(o^n | x_n)} \right) \leq \max \{4\varepsilon LB, 2\varepsilon LB + \varepsilon^2\} \leq 4\varepsilon LB$. \square

B.1 Proof of Theorem (4.3)

Proof. Given a reward parameter θ let $V^*(\theta) = \max_{\pi} V^\pi(\theta)$ be the optimal value function with reward parameter θ . We claim that $V^*(\cdot)$ is a convex function. In order to see this, given a policy π let d be the corresponding occupancy measure i.e. $d_h(s, a) = \mathbb{P}_\pi(s_h = s, a_h = a)$. Then we can write the value function as $V^\pi(\theta) = \sum_{h,s,a} d_h(s, a) \phi(s, a)^\top \theta = d^\top \Phi \theta$. This observation implies the following inequality.

$$\max_{\pi} V^\pi(\theta) \leq \max_d d^\top \Phi \theta \quad (11)$$

On the other hand, given an occupancy measure d one can consider the following policy.

$$\pi_h^d(s, a) = \begin{cases} \frac{d_h(s, a)}{\sum_b d_h(s, b)} & \text{if } \sum_b d_h(s, b) > 0 \\ \frac{1}{A} & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, it is known that occupancy measure induced by $\pi^d = (\pi_1^d, \dots, \pi_H^d)$ is d . This implies the following inequality.

$$\max_{\pi} V^\pi(\theta) \geq \max_d d^\top \Phi \theta \quad (12)$$

Therefore, from equations (12) and (11) we conclude that

$$V^*(\theta) = \max_{\pi} V^\pi(\theta) = \max_d d^\top \Phi \theta$$

Since $V^*(\cdot)$ is a maximum of linear functions, it is a convex function. Moreover, by lemma (B.3) $V^*(\cdot)$ is \sqrt{Hd} -Lipschitz. By a similar argument the function $\mathcal{R}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} [\phi(\tau)^\top \theta]$ is \sqrt{Hd} -Lipschitz in θ . Therefore, $V^*(\cdot) - \mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ is $2\sqrt{Hd}$ -Lipschitz function.

Now observe that, algorithm (2) performs a projected sub-gradient descent of the function $V^*(\cdot) - \mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ with biased zero oracle calls. In particular, since RobRL returns a $f(\varepsilon)$ -robust estimate of the optimal value function, we are guaranteed that $|\widehat{V}(\theta) - V^*(\theta)| \leq f(\varepsilon)$. Therefore, we can apply the result of Theorem D.1 to obtain the following bound.

$$V^*(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) - \min_{\theta} (V^*(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)) \leq 5\sqrt{2f(\varepsilon)}(Hd)^{1/4}$$

Note that in order to apply theorem Theorem D.1, we need a lower bound on the number of iterations (T) and the number of calls to zero-order oracle (K) per iteration. For linear MDP we have the maximum norm of the parameter, $D \leq \sqrt{Hd}$ and maximum value of the function $M \leq H\sqrt{d}$. This implies the following lower bound on the number of samples.

$$N \geq T \cdot K \geq \tilde{\Omega} \left(\frac{MD}{\varepsilon} \frac{M^2 d^3}{\varepsilon^2} \right) = \tilde{\Omega} \left(\frac{H^3/2 d^5}{\varepsilon^3} \right)$$

Since $\tilde{\pi}$ is $f(\varepsilon)$ -approximately optimal with respect to the reward parameter $\bar{\theta}$ we are guaranteed that,

$$V^*(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) - f(\varepsilon) \leq V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) \leq V^*(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) + 8\sqrt{f(\varepsilon)}(Hd)^{1/4}. \quad (13)$$

Now using lemma (B.5) (i.e. $\min_{\theta} \max_{\pi} V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) = \max_{\pi} \min_{\theta} V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)$ for linear reward models) we obtain the following inequality.

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\pi} \min_{\theta} (V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)) - f(\varepsilon) &= \min_{\theta} \max_{\pi} (V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)) \leq V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\bar{\theta}) \leq V^*(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) - f(\varepsilon) \\ &\leq V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) - f(\varepsilon) \\ &\leq \max_{\pi} \min_{\theta} (V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)) + 8\sqrt{f(\varepsilon)}(Hd)^{1/4} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

We claim that this implies that $\tilde{\pi}$ approximately optimizes the objective $\max_{\pi} \min_{\theta} V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)$ i.e.

$$\min_{\theta} \left(V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \right) \geq \max_{\pi} \min_{\theta} (V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)) - f(\varepsilon) - 8\sqrt{f(\varepsilon)}(Hd)^{1/4} \quad (15)$$

Let (π^*, θ^*) be an optimal solution of the optimization problem $\max_{\pi} \min_{\theta} V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)$. Then the observation above follows from the following set of inequalities.

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\theta} \left(V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \right) - \max_{\pi} \min_{\theta} (V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)) \\ &= \min_{\theta} \left(V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \right) - \min_{\theta} \left(V^{\pi^*}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \right) \\ &\geq - \min_{\theta} \left| V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta) - V^{\pi^*}(\theta) \right| \\ &= - \min_{\theta} \left| \left(V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \right) - \left(V^{\pi^*}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \right) \right| \\ &\geq - \underbrace{\min_{\theta} \left| \left(V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \right) - \left(V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) \right) \right|}_{:=T_1} - \underbrace{\min_{\theta} \left| \left(V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) \right) - \left(V^{\pi^*}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \right) \right|}_{:=T_2} \\ &\geq - \left| \left(V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) \right) - \left(V^{\pi^*}(\theta^*) - \mathcal{R}(\theta^*) \right) \right| \\ &\geq -f(\varepsilon) - 8\sqrt{f(\varepsilon)}(Hd)^{1/4} \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows since $\min_{\theta} V^{\pi^*}(\theta) \leq \min_{\theta} |V^{\pi^*}(\theta) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta)| + V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta) \leq \min_{\theta} |V^{\pi^*}(\theta) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta)| + \min_{\theta} V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta)$. The third inequality follows by substituting $\theta = \bar{\theta}$ in the term T_1 and $\theta = \bar{\theta}$ in the term T_2 . Finally, the last inequality uses eq. (14). Now we can apply lemma (4.2) with $\eta = f(\varepsilon) + 8\sqrt{f(\varepsilon)}(Hd)^{1/4}$ to complete the proof. \square

B.2 Proof of Proposition (4.5)

Proof. For linear MDP, the parameter $\theta = [\theta_1; \theta_2; \dots; \theta_H]$ and the feature of a trajectory τ is constructed by concatenating the features of H state, action pairs. Therefore, $\|\theta\|_2 \leq \sqrt{Hd}$ and $\|\phi(\tau)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{H}$ for any trajectory τ . So we substitute $L = \sqrt{H}$, $B = \sqrt{Hd}$, and $M \leq LB = H\sqrt{d}$.

We will use R-LSVI from [Zha+22] as the corruption robust offline RL oracle RobRL . Note that if $N \geq \Omega(H \cdot \text{poly}(d)/\varepsilon)$ we have $f(\varepsilon) \leq \tilde{O}(H^2 d \sqrt{\alpha \varepsilon})$. Now using the upper bound provided in theorem (4.3) we obtain the following bound.

$$\begin{aligned}
& V^*(\theta^*) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) \\
& \leq O\left(\kappa\sqrt{\alpha}\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon Hd}^{1/4} + \sqrt{\frac{d}{N}\log\left(\frac{HdN}{\delta}\right)}\right)\right) \\
& \quad + \tilde{O}(H^2 d \kappa \sqrt{\alpha \varepsilon}) + \tilde{O}\left(H^{5/4} d^{3/4} (\alpha \varepsilon)^{1/4}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Now observe that if $N \geq \Omega(H \cdot \text{poly}(d)/\varepsilon)$ the term $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d/N})$ can be bounded by $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. Finally, we need a lower bound of $N \geq \tilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{H^{3/2} d^5}{\varepsilon^3}\right)$ in order to apply theorem (4.3). \square

Lemma B.2. *Suppose assumption (4.1) holds, and $\sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{d\Phi^{-1}(p)}{dp} \right| \leq \kappa$. Let π be a policy so that*

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta(\hat{\mathcal{D}}_1)} \left(V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta) - \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} \left[\phi(\tau)^\top \theta \right] \right) \geq \max_{\pi} \min_{\theta \in \Theta(\hat{\mathcal{D}}_1)} \left(V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} \left[\phi(\tau)^\top \theta \right] \right) - \eta$$

then for any target policy π^\dagger , with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$V^{\pi^\dagger}(\theta^*) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) \leq c\kappa\sqrt{\alpha} \left(\sqrt{\varepsilon Hd}^{1/4} + \sqrt{\frac{d}{N}\log\left(\frac{HdN}{\delta}\right)} \right) + \eta.$$

Proof. The proof follows a similar approach to the proof of theorem 1 in [Zha+23], except for the fact that we need to account for the approximation error η and corrupted dataset. We will write $\mathcal{R}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} [\phi(\tau)^\top \theta]$. Moreover, let $\theta^\dagger \in \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta(\hat{\mathcal{D}}_1)} V^{\pi^\dagger}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
V^{\pi^\dagger}(\theta^*) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) &= \left(V^{\pi^\dagger}(\theta^*) - \mathcal{R}(\theta^*) \right) - \left(V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) - \mathcal{R}(\theta^*) \right) \\
&\leq \left(V^{\pi^\dagger}(\theta^*) - \mathcal{R}(\theta^*) \right) - \left(V^{\pi^\dagger}(\theta^\dagger) - \mathcal{R}(\theta^\dagger) \right) + \eta \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\tau \sim \mu_{\pi^\dagger} \\ \tau_0 \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}}} \left[(\phi(\tau) - \phi(\tau_0))^\top (\theta^* - \theta^\dagger) \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\tau \sim \mu_{\pi^\dagger} \\ \tau_0 \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}}} \left[\left| (\phi(\tau) - \phi(\tau_0))^\top (\theta^* - \theta^\dagger) \right| \right] + \eta \\
&\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\tau \sim \mu_{\pi^\dagger} \\ \tau_0 \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}}} \left[(\theta^* - \theta^\dagger)^\top (\phi(\tau) - \phi(\tau_0)) (\phi(\tau) - \phi(\tau_0))^\top (\theta^* - \theta^\dagger) \right]} + \eta \\
&\leq \sqrt{\alpha} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\tau_0 \sim \mu_0 \\ \tau_1 \sim \mu_1}} \left[(\theta^* - \theta^\dagger)^\top (\phi(\tau_0) - \phi(\tau_1)) (\phi(\tau_0) - \phi(\tau_1))^\top (\theta^* - \theta^\dagger) \right]} + \eta \\
&= \sqrt{\alpha} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\tau_0 \sim \mu_0 \\ \tau_1 \sim \mu_1}} \left[|(\theta^* - \theta^\dagger)^\top (\phi(\tau_0) - \phi(\tau_1))|^2 \right]} + \eta \\
&= \sqrt{\alpha} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\tau_0 \sim \mu_0 \\ \tau_1 \sim \mu_1}} \left[|\Phi^{-1}(P_{\theta^*}(o=1 | \tau_1, \tau_0)) - \Phi^{-1}(P_{\theta^\dagger}(o=1 | \tau_1, \tau_0))|^2 \right]} + \eta \\
&\leq \sqrt{\alpha} \kappa \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\tau_0 \sim \mu_0 \\ \tau_1 \sim \mu_1}} \left[|P_{\theta^*}(o=1 | \tau_1, \tau_0) - P_{\theta^\dagger}(o=1 | \tau_1, \tau_0)|^2 \right]} + \eta \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{\alpha} \kappa}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\tau_0 \sim \mu_0 \\ \tau_1 \sim \mu_1}} \left[\|P_{\theta^*}(\cdot | \tau_1, \tau_0) - P_{\theta^\dagger}(\cdot | \tau_1, \tau_0)\|^2 \right]} + \eta
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from the following observation $-V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) - \mathcal{R}(\theta^*) \geq \min_{\theta \in \Theta(\hat{\mathcal{D}}_1)} V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \geq (V^{\pi^\dagger}(\theta^\dagger) - \mathcal{R}(\theta^\dagger)) - \eta$. The second inequality uses Jensen's inequality. The third inequality uses the assumption of finite relative condition number (4.1). Now we can proceed similar to the proof of proposition 14 in [Liu+22] to establish the following bound (with probability at least $1 - \delta$).

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\tau_0 \sim \mu_0 \\ \tau_1 \sim \mu_1}} \left[\|P_{\theta^*}(\cdot | \tau_0, \tau_1) - P_{\theta^\dagger}(\cdot | \tau_0, \tau_1)\|_1^2 \right] \leq \frac{c}{N} \left(\sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\frac{P_{\theta^\dagger}(o^n | \tilde{\tau}^{0,n}, \tilde{\tau}^{1,n})}{P_{\theta^*}(o^n | \tilde{\tau}^{0,n}, \tilde{\tau}^{1,n})} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{N}(\Theta, 1/N)}{\delta} \right) \right)$$

Here $\mathcal{N}(\Theta, 1/N)$ is the number of elements in an ε -net of the set Θ for $\varepsilon = 1/N$. Since $\|\theta\|_2 \leq H\sqrt{d}$ for each $\theta \in \Theta$ we are guaranteed that $|\mathcal{N}(\Theta, 1/N)| \leq (2H\sqrt{d}N)^d$. Additionally, observe that we are using the clean data $\{\tilde{\tau}^{0,n}, \tilde{\tau}^{1,n}\}_{n=1}^N$ in the bound on the ratio of the log-likelihood. Now, let S be the set of clean trajectories that have been corrupted by the adversary. Then we can bound the difference in log-likelihood as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\frac{P_{\theta^\dagger}(o^n | \tilde{\tau}^{0,n}, \tilde{\tau}^{1,n})}{P_{\theta^*}(o^n | \tilde{\tau}^{0,n}, \tilde{\tau}^{1,n})} \right) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \notin S} \log \left(\frac{P_{\theta^\dagger}(o^n | \tilde{\tau}^{0,n}, \tilde{\tau}^{1,n})}{P_{\theta^*}(o^n | \tilde{\tau}^{0,n}, \tilde{\tau}^{1,n})} \right) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in S} \log \left(\frac{P_{\theta^\dagger}(o^n | \tilde{\tau}^{0,n}, \tilde{\tau}^{1,n})}{P_{\theta^*}(o^n | \tilde{\tau}^{0,n}, \tilde{\tau}^{1,n})} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\frac{P_{\theta^\dagger}(o^n | \tau^{0,n}, \tau^{1,n})}{P_{\theta^*}(o^n | \tau^{0,n}, \tau^{1,n})} \right) + \varepsilon \cdot \log \left(\frac{1 + e^{Hd}}{1 + e^{-Hd}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\frac{P_{\theta_N^*}(o^n | \tau^{0,n}, \tau^{1,n})}{P_{\theta^*}(o^n | \tau^{0,n}, \tau^{1,n})} \right) + 2\varepsilon H\sqrt{d} \\ &\leq 8\varepsilon H\sqrt{d} + c \cdot \frac{d}{N} \log \left(\frac{Hd}{\delta} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality uses $|S| \leq \varepsilon N$ and $|\phi(\tau)^\top \theta| \leq H\sqrt{d}$. The second inequality uses the fact that θ_N^* maximizes the log-likelihood over the corrupted dataset, and the final inequality uses lemma 4.2. \square

Lemma B.3. *For linear MDP, the optimal value function i.e. $V^*(\theta) = \max_{\pi} V^\pi(\theta)$ is \sqrt{Hd} -Lipschitz in the reward parameter θ .*

Proof. We use the occupancy measure characterization of Markov decision process. Given a probability transition function P let \mathcal{C} be the set of all feasible occupancy measures with respect to P . Then $V^*(\theta) =$

$$\sup_{d \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{h=1}^H d_h^\top \Phi \theta_h.$$

$$\begin{aligned} V^*(\theta) - V^*(\theta') &= \sup_{d \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_h d_h^\top \Phi \theta_h - \sup_{d \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_h d_h^\top \Phi \theta'_h \\ &\leq \sup_{d \in \mathcal{C}} \left| \sum_{h=1}^H d_h^\top \Phi \theta_h - \sum_{h=1}^H d_h^\top \Phi \theta'_h \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{d \in \mathcal{C}} \left| \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{s,a} d_h(s,a) \phi(s,a)^\top (\theta_h - \theta'_h) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{d \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{s,a} d_h(s,a) \|\phi(s,a)\|_2 \|\theta_h - \theta'_h\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{d} \sum_{h=1}^H \|\theta - \theta'\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality uses $\|\phi(s,a)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d}$ and $\sum_{s,a} d_h(s,a) = 1$ for any h . Now the claim follows from the following observation $\sum_{h=1}^H \|\theta - \theta'\|_2 \leq \sqrt{H} \sqrt{\sum_{h=1}^H \|\theta - \theta'\|_2^2} = \sqrt{H} \|\theta - \theta'\|_2$. \square

Lemma B.4. *Suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are drawn i.i.d. from a d -dimensional distribution with covariance Σ and sub-Gaussian norm at most K . Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ we have,*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^\top - \Sigma \right\| \leq c_1 K^2 \|\Sigma\| \left(\sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{n} \right).$$

Proof. See [Ver18] for a proof. \square

Lemma B.5. *For linear models, $\min_\theta \max_\pi V^\pi(\theta) - \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} [\phi(\tau)^\top \theta] = \max_\pi \min_\theta V^\pi(\theta) - \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} [\phi(\tau)^\top \theta]$.*

Proof. We will write $\mathcal{R}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} [\phi(\tau)^\top \theta]$. There are two cases to consider.

Case 1: First, we consider the linear MDP setting. Given a policy π let d be the corresponding occupancy measure i.e. $d_h(s,a) = \mathbb{P}_\pi(s_h = s, a_h = a)$. Then we can write the value function as $V^\pi(\theta) = \sum_{h,s,a} d_h(s,a) \phi(s,a)^\top \theta = d^\top \Phi \theta$. This observation implies the following inequality.

$$\min_\theta \max_\pi V^\pi(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \leq \min_\theta \max_d d^\top \Phi \theta - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \quad (16)$$

On the other hand, given an occupancy measure d one can consider the following policy.

$$\pi_h^d(s,a) = \begin{cases} \frac{d_h(s,a)}{\sum_b d_h(s,b)} & \text{if } \sum_b d_h(s,b) > 0 \\ \frac{1}{A} & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, it is known that occupancy measure induced by $\pi^d = (\pi_1^d, \dots, \pi_H^d)$ is d . This implies the following inequality.

$$\min_\theta \max_\pi V^\pi(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \geq \min_\theta \max_d d^\top \Phi \theta - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \quad (17)$$

Therefore, from equations (17) and (16) we conclude that

$$\min_\theta \max_\pi V^\pi(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) = \min_\theta \max_d d^\top \Phi \theta - \mathcal{R}(\theta)$$

Now observe that the objective $d^\top \Phi \theta - \mathcal{R}(\theta)$ is linear in both d and θ . Therefore, strong duality holds and we can exchange the order of min and max.

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\pi} V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) = \min_{\theta} \max_d d^\top \Phi \theta - \mathcal{R}(\theta) = \max_d \min_{\theta} d^\top \Phi \theta - \mathcal{R}(\theta)$$

Finally, by an argument very similar to the first part of the proof (correspondence between policy and occupancy measure) we can prove the following identity.

$$\max_d \min_{\theta} d^\top \Phi \theta - \mathcal{R}(\theta) = \max_{\pi} \min_{\theta} V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)$$

Case 2: We now consider the case of trajectory based linear MDP. Let \mathcal{C} be the set of all valid probability distributions over the trajectories i.e. $\mathcal{C} = \{p : \sum_{\tau} p_{\tau} = 1, p_{\tau} \geq 0 \forall \tau\}$. Given any policy π , one can consider the probability distribution $p^{\pi} \in \mathcal{C}$ induced by π so that $V^{\pi}(\theta) = \sum_{\tau} p_{\tau}^{\pi} \phi(\tau)^\top \theta = p^{\pi \top} \Phi \theta$. This gives us the following inequality.

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\pi} V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \leq \min_{\theta} \max_{p \in \mathcal{C}} p^\top \Phi \theta - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \quad (18)$$

On the other hand, given any probability distribution $p \in \mathcal{C}$, one can consider the following non-Markovian policy.

$$\pi_h^p(a | h) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{\tau} p_{h,a,\tau}}{\sum_{b,\tau} p_{h,b,\tau}} & \text{if } \sum_{b,\tau} p_{h,b,\tau} > 0 \\ \frac{1}{A} & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

We will also write $P_M(\tau')$ to denote the marginal probability of a sub-trajectory τ' which is defined as $P_M(\tau') = \sum_{\tau''} p_{\tau',\tau''}$. Now given any trajectory $\tau = (s_0, a_0, s_1, a_1, s_2, \dots, s_{H-1}, a_{H-1}, s_H)$ the probability that the τ is generated under π^p is given as,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau) &= \mu(s_0) \pi_0^p(a_0 | s_0) \mathbb{P}(s_1 | s_0, a_0) \mu_1^p(a_1 | s_0, a_0, s_1) \\ &\quad \dots \mu_{H-1}^p(a_{H-1} | s_0, \dots, s_{H-1}) \mathbb{P}(s_H | s_{H-1}, a_{H-1}) \mu_H^p(a_H | s_0, \dots, s_H) \\ &= \mu(s_0) \frac{P_M(s_0, a_0)}{P_M(s_0)} \mathbb{P}(s_1 | s_0, a_0) \frac{P_M(s_0, a_0, s_1, a_1)}{P_M(s_0, a_0, s_1)} \\ &\quad \dots \frac{P_M(s_0, \dots, s_{H-1}, a_{H-1})}{P_M(s_0, \dots, s_{H-1})} \mathbb{P}(s_H | s_{H-1}, a_{H-1}) \frac{P_M(s_0, \dots, s_H, a_H)}{P_M(s_0, \dots, s_H)} \\ &= \mu(s_0) \frac{P_M(s_0, a_0, s_1)}{P_M(s_0)} \frac{P_M(s_0, a_0, s_1, a_1, s_2)}{P_M(s_0, a_0, s_1)} \dots \frac{P_M(s_0, \dots, s_{H-1}, a_{H-1}, s_H)}{P_M(s_0, \dots, s_{H-1})} \frac{P_M(s_0, \dots, s_H, a_H)}{P_M(s_0, \dots, s_H)} \\ &= P_M(\tau) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, policy π^p induces the same probability distribution over the trajectories as $p \in \mathcal{C}$. This implies the following inequality.

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\pi} V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \geq \min_{\theta} \max_{p \in \mathcal{C}} p^\top \Phi \theta - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \quad (19)$$

Inequalities (18) and (19) imply the following identity.

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\pi} V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) = \min_{\theta} \max_{p \in \mathcal{C}} p^\top \Phi \theta - \mathcal{R}(\theta)$$

The rest of the proof is very similar to case 1 as we can again use strong duality to exchange the order of min and max. \square

C Missing Proofs from Section (5)

C.1 Proof of Theorem (5.1)

Proof. As shown in the proof of Theorem 4.3, $V^*(\theta) = \max_{\pi} V^{\pi}(\theta)$ is a convex function in θ . Let $\mathcal{R}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} [\phi(\tau)^{\top} \theta]$. Then $V^*(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)$ is convex in θ .

Now observe that, algorithm (3) performs a projected sub-gradient descent of the function $V^*(\cdot) - \mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ with first order oracle calls. Since, `RobRL` returns a $f(\varepsilon)$ approximate subgradient of the optimal value function $V^*(\cdot)$, $g_t + \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} [\phi(\tau)]$ is also an $f(\varepsilon)$ approximate sub-gradient of $V^*(\theta_t) - \mathcal{R}(\theta_t)$. Moreover, $\|g_t + \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} [\phi(\tau)]\|_2 \leq \|g_t\|_2 + \|\mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} [\phi(\tau)]\|_2 \leq G + \sqrt{H}$, and for any $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_H)$ we have $\|\theta\|_2 \leq \sqrt{Hd}$. Therefore, we can apply theorem C.1 to obtain the following bound.

$$V^*(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) - \min_{\theta} (V^*(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)) \leq \frac{\sqrt{Hd(G + \sqrt{H})}}{\sqrt{T}} + f(\varepsilon)$$

If $T \geq \frac{Hd(G + \sqrt{H})}{f(\varepsilon)^2}$, we have

$$V^*(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) - \min_{\theta} (V^*(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)) \leq 2 \cdot f(\varepsilon).$$

Since $\tilde{\pi}$ is approximately optimal with respect to the reward parameter $\bar{\theta}$ we are guaranteed that,

$$V^*(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) - f(\varepsilon) \leq V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) \leq V^*(\bar{\theta}) - \mathcal{R}(\bar{\theta}) + 2f(\varepsilon)$$

We can now proceed similar to the proof of Theorem 4.3, and establish that $\tilde{\pi}$ approximately optimizes the objective $\max_{\pi} \min_{\theta} V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)$ i.e.

$$\min_{\theta} \left(V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta) \right) \geq \max_{\pi} \min_{\theta} (V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathcal{R}(\theta)) - 2f(\varepsilon)$$

Now we can apply Lemma B.2 to complete the proof. □

C.2 Subgradient Descent with Biased First-Order Oracle

Setting: Our goal is to minimize a L -Lipschitz convex function $f : S \rightarrow [-M, M]$ where S is a convex and bounded set. The function f might not be differentiable, and we have access to a (first-order) noisy oracle, that given a point $x \in S$ returns a sub-gradient vector g such that

$$f(y) \geq f(x) - \beta + \langle g, y - x \rangle \forall y \in E.$$

We will also write $g \in \delta_{\beta} f(x)$ to denote such a noisy subgradient vector. The next theorem is well-known, but we provide a short proof for completeness.

Theorem C.1. Consider the iterates of projected subgradient descent i.e. $\theta_{t+1} = \text{Proj}_S(\theta_t - \eta g_t)$ for $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$. Suppose $g_t \in \delta_{\beta} f(\theta_t)$ for all t , $\|g_t\|_2 \leq G$ for all t , and $\sup_{\theta \in S} \|\theta\|_2 \leq D$. Then

$$f(\bar{\theta}) - f(\theta^*) \leq \frac{D\sqrt{G}}{\sqrt{T}} + \beta$$

Proof.

$$\|\theta_{t+1} - \theta^*\|_2^2 \leq \|\theta_t - \eta g_t - \theta^*\|_2^2 = \|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_2^2 + \eta^2 \|g_t\|_2^2 - 2\eta \langle g_t, \theta_t - \theta^* \rangle$$

After rearranging and dividing by 2η , we obtain the following inequality.

$$\langle g_t, \theta_t - \theta^* \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2\eta} \left(\|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_2^2 - \|\theta_{t+1} - \theta^*\|_2^2 \right) + \frac{\eta}{2} \|g_t\|_2^2$$

Since $g_t \in \delta_\beta f(\theta_t)$ is a noisy subgradient, using convexity we obtain,

$$f(\theta_t) - f(\theta^*) \leq \langle \theta_t - \theta^*, g_t \rangle + \beta.$$

Now using $\bar{\theta} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \theta_t$ and convexity of the function $f(\cdot)$ we obtain the following upper bound.

$$\begin{aligned} f(\bar{\theta}) - f(\theta^*) &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f(\theta_t) - f(\theta^*) \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \langle \theta_t - \theta^*, g_t \rangle + \beta \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{2\eta} \left(\|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_2^2 - \|\theta_{t+1} - \theta^*\|_2^2 \right) + \frac{\eta}{2T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|g_t\|_2^2 + \beta \\ &\leq \frac{D^2}{2\eta T} + \frac{\eta G}{2} + \beta \end{aligned}$$

Now choosing $\eta = \frac{D}{\sqrt{GT}}$ we obtain the desired bound. \square

C.3 Proof of Proposition (5.4)

Proof. For linear MDP, the parameter $\theta = [\theta_1; \theta_2; \dots; \theta_H]$ and the feature of a trajectory τ is constructed by concatenating the features of H state, action pairs. Therefore, $\|\theta\|_2 \leq \sqrt{Hd}$ and $\|\phi(\tau)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{H}$ for any trajectory τ .

We will use robust offline RL oracle provided by theorem 5.3. Note that if $N \geq \tilde{\Omega}(H^2 d^4 \nu^4 / \varepsilon^2)$ we have $f(\varepsilon) \leq O(\nu \sqrt{\varepsilon} H^2 d^{3/2})$. Now using the upper bound provided in theorem (5.1) we obtain the following bound.

$$\begin{aligned} V^*(\theta^*) - V^{\tilde{\pi}}(\theta^*) &\leq O\left(\nu \sqrt{\varepsilon} H^2 d^{3/2}\right) \\ &\leq O\left(\kappa \sqrt{\alpha} \left(\sqrt{\varepsilon H} d^{1/4} + \sqrt{\frac{d}{N} \log\left(\frac{HdN}{\delta}\right)} \right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

Now observe that if $N \geq \Omega(H \cdot \text{poly}(d)/\varepsilon)$ the term $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d/N})$ can be bounded by $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. Finally, we need a lower bound of $N \geq \Omega\left(\frac{H^{3/2} d G}{f(\varepsilon)^2}\right) = \Omega(d/\varepsilon^2)$ in order to apply theorem (5.1). \square

D Projected Subgradient Descent with Biased Zero-Order Oracle

Setting: Our goal is to minimize a L -Lipschitz convex function $f : S \rightarrow [-M, M]$ where S is a convex and bounded set. The function f might not be differentiable, and we only have access to a noisy oracle \tilde{f} that guarantees $|\tilde{f}(x) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon$ for any $x \in S$. We consider a projected subgradient descent based algorithm where algorithm 6 is used to construct a biased subgradient.

Algorithm 5 Biased Subgradient Descent

Require: Stepsize η , $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, number of iterations T .

- 1: **for** $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$ **do**
 - 2: Construct subgradient $g_t = \tilde{\nabla} f_\mu(\theta_t)$ using algorithm (6).
 - 3: $\theta_{t+1} = \text{Proj}_S(\theta_t - \eta g_t)$.
 - 4: **end for**
 - 5: $\bar{\theta} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \theta_t$.
-

Theorem D.1. Suppose algorithm (5) is run for $T \geq \frac{4DM}{\varepsilon}$ iterations, and we set $K \geq \frac{256CM^2d^3}{\varepsilon^2} \ln\left(\frac{16DM}{\varepsilon\delta}\right)$ and $\mu = \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{8d}}$. Then the output $\bar{\theta}$ of algorithm (5) satisfies

$$f(\bar{\theta}) - f(\theta^*) \leq 5\sqrt{\varepsilon L}$$

Proof.

$$\|\theta_{t+1} - \theta^*\|_2^2 \leq \|\theta_t - \eta g_t - \theta^*\|_2^2 = \|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_2^2 + \eta^2 \|g_t\|_2^2 - 2\eta \langle g_t, \theta_t - \theta^* \rangle$$

After rearranging and dividing by 2η , we obtain the following inequality.

$$\langle g_t, \theta_t - \theta^* \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2\eta} \left(\|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_2^2 - \|\theta_{t+1} - \theta^*\|_2^2 \right) + \frac{\eta}{2} \|g_t\|_2^2$$

Since $g_t = \tilde{\nabla} f_\mu(\theta_t)$ is a noisy subgradient constructed by algorithm (6), using lemma (D.2) we get,

$$f(\theta_t) - f(\theta^*) \leq \langle \theta_t - \theta^*, g_t \rangle + b_t$$

where

$$b_t = \sqrt{\frac{C}{K} \frac{4M}{\mu}} \sqrt{2d \ln(2/\delta)} + \frac{2\varepsilon}{\mu} \text{diam}(E) + \mu L \sqrt{d}$$

Summing over $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$ we obtain the following upper bound.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} f(\theta_t) - f(\theta^*) &\leq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \langle \theta_t - \theta^*, g_t \rangle + \sum_{t=1}^T b_t \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\eta} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\|\theta_t - \theta^*\|_2^2 - \|\theta_{t+1} - \theta^*\|_2^2 \right) + \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|g_t\|_2^2 + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} b_t \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\eta} \left(\|\theta_0 - \theta^*\|_2^2 - \|\theta_T - \theta^*\|_2^2 \right) + \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|g_t\|_2^2 + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} b_t \end{aligned}$$

From the construction of subgradient in algorithm (6) it is clear that $\|g_t\|_2 \leq \frac{2M}{\mu} \text{diam}(E)$. Moreover, diameter of S is at most D . This gives us the following result.

$$f(\bar{\theta}) - f(\theta^*) \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} f(\theta_t) - f(\theta^*) \leq \frac{2D^2}{\eta T} + \eta \frac{2M^2}{\mu^2 T} \text{diam}^2(E) + \sqrt{\frac{C}{K} \frac{4M}{\mu}} \sqrt{2d \ln(2/\delta)} + \frac{2\varepsilon}{\mu} \text{diam}(E) + \mu L \sqrt{d}$$

We now substitute $\eta = \frac{D\mu}{M\text{diam}(E)}$.

$$f(\bar{\theta}) - f(\theta^*) \leq \frac{4DM}{\mu T} \text{diam}(E) + \sqrt{\frac{C}{K}} \frac{4M}{\mu} \sqrt{2d \ln(2/\delta)} + \frac{2\varepsilon}{\mu} \text{diam}(E) + \mu L \sqrt{d}$$

We further substitute $\mu = \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\text{diam}(E)\sqrt{L}}$ and choose $T \geq \frac{4DM}{\varepsilon}$ and $K \geq \frac{32CM^2 \text{diam}^2(E)}{\varepsilon^2} d \ln(2T/\delta)$.

$$f(\bar{\theta}) - f(\theta^*) \leq 4\sqrt{\varepsilon L} + \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon L d}}{\text{diam}(E)} \quad (20)$$

Now recall that lemma (D.2) requires that the set E be such that $\int_E \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\|u\|_2^2\right) du \geq \frac{1}{2}$. We choose a simple set $E = [-\ell, \ell]^d$ and show that one can pick $\ell = O(1)$. Then we have,

$$\int_E \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\|u\|_2^2\right) du = \left\{ \int_{-\ell}^{\ell} \exp(-1/4v^2) dv \right\}^d = \left\{ 2 \int_{\ell/2}^{\ell/2} \exp(-1/2t^2) dt \right\}^d = \{2(2\Phi(\ell/2) - 1)\}^d.$$

Here $\Phi(t) = \mathbb{P}(X \leq t)$ with X being a standard Gaussian random variable. Substituting $\Phi(t) \geq 1 - e^{-t^2/2}$ we get the following lower bound.

$$\int_E \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\|u\|_2^2\right) du \geq \left\{ 2(1 - 2e^{-\ell^2/8}) \right\}^d$$

It can be checked that picking $\ell > \sqrt{8 \ln 4}$ satisfies $\int_E \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\|u\|_2^2\right) du \geq 1/2$. Therefore, we choose $E = [-4, 4]^d$. This also implies that $\text{diam}(E) = \sqrt{8d}$ and substituting this bound in eq. (20) we obtain the following upper bound.

$$f(\bar{\theta}) - f(\theta^*) \leq 4\sqrt{\varepsilon L} + \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon L}}{\sqrt{8}}$$

□

D.1 Gradient Construction

Given a convex function $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, let f_μ be defined as its Gaussian approximation.

$$f_\mu(x) = \frac{1}{\kappa} \int_E f(x + \mu u) e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|u\|_2^2} du$$

where $\kappa = \int_E e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|u\|_2^2} du$. Suppose f is L -Lipschitz then the following results are well known [NS17].

1. For any $x \in E$, $|f_\mu(x) - f(x)| \leq \mu L \sqrt{d}$.
2. $\nabla f_\mu(x) = \frac{1}{\kappa} \int_E \frac{f(x + \mu u) - f(x)}{\mu} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|u\|_2^2} u du$.
3. $\nabla f_\mu(x) \in \delta_\alpha f(x)$ for $\alpha = \mu L \sqrt{d}$ i.e. $f(y) \geq f(x) - \mu L \sqrt{d} + \langle \nabla f_\mu(x), y - x \rangle$ for all $y \in E$.

Algorithm 6 Gradient Construction

Require: Noisy oracle \tilde{f} , number of iterations K , input x .

- 1: Generate u_1, \dots, u_K uniformly at random from the standard normal distribution (restricted to the set E).
 - 2: Let $\tilde{\nabla} f_\mu(x) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\tilde{f}(x + \mu u_k) - \tilde{f}(x)}{\mu} u_k$.
 - 3: $\tilde{\nabla} f_\mu(x)$.
-

Lemma D.2. *Suppose the set E is chosen so that $\int_E e^{-\frac{1}{4}\|u_k\|_2^2} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, and $|\tilde{f}(x) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon$ for any x . Then the gradient estimate returned by algorithm (6) satisfies*

$$\tilde{\nabla} f_\mu(x) \in \delta_\alpha f(x) \text{ for } \alpha = \sqrt{\frac{C}{K}} \frac{4M}{\mu} \sqrt{2d \ln(2/\delta)} + \frac{2\varepsilon}{\mu} \text{diam}(E) + \mu L \sqrt{d}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. Let $\hat{\nabla} f_\mu(x) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{f(x + \mu u_k) - f(x)}{\mu} u_k$. Then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{\nabla} f_\mu(x) - \tilde{\nabla} f_\mu(x) \right\|_2 &= \frac{1}{K} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\left(\tilde{f}(x + \mu u_k) - f(x + \mu u_k) \right) - \left(\tilde{f}(x) - f(x) \right)}{\mu} u_k \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{2\varepsilon}{\mu K} \sum_{k=1}^K \|u_k\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{2\varepsilon}{\mu} \text{diam}(E) \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

We now show that $\hat{\nabla} f_\mu(x)$ concentrates around $\nabla f_\mu(x)$. Let $V_k = \frac{f(x + \mu u_k) - f(x)}{\mu} u_k$. We claim that the sub-Gaussian norm of V_k is at most $\frac{4M}{\mu}$. This follows from two observations. First, $\left| \frac{f(x + \mu u_k) - f(x)}{\mu} \right| \leq \frac{2M}{\mu}$. Second, we show that the sub-Gaussian norm of the random vector u_k is at most 2. Since $\|u_k\|_{\psi_2} = \sup_{v \in S_{d-1}} \|u_k^\top v\|_{\psi_2}$, consider any $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|v\|_2 = 1$.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{(u_k^\top v)^2}{4}} \right] = \frac{1}{\kappa} \int_E e^{\frac{(u_k^\top v)^2}{4}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|u_k\|_2^2} du_k \leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \int_E e^{-\frac{1}{4}\|u_k\|_2^2} du_k = \frac{\int_E e^{-\frac{1}{4}\|u_k\|_2^2}}{\int_E e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|u_k\|_2^2}} \leq \frac{1}{\int_E e^{-\frac{1}{4}\|u_k\|_2^2}} \leq 2$$

The first inequality uses $\|v\|_2 = 1$, and the second inequality uses Jensen's inequality. We can now use proposition 2.6.1 from [Ver18] to bound the sub-Gaussian norm of the average vector.

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{f(x + \mu u_k) - f(x)}{\mu} u_k \right\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sqrt{C \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| \frac{f(x + \mu u_k) - f(x)}{\mu} u_k \right\|_{\psi_2}^2} \leq \sqrt{CK} \frac{4M}{\mu}$$

for some universal constant $C > 0$. Therefore, $\left\| \hat{\nabla} f_\mu(x) \right\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{C}{K}} \frac{4M}{\mu}$. This also means that $\left\| \hat{\nabla} f_\mu(x) \right\|_{\psi_2}$ is $\sqrt{\frac{C}{K}} \frac{4M}{\mu} \sqrt{d}$ norm sub-Gaussian [Jin+19] and from the definition of norm sub-Gaussian random vectors

(definition 3 from [Jin+19]) we have the following bound.

$$\Pr \left(\left\| \widehat{\nabla} f_\mu(x) - \nabla f_\mu(x) \right\|_2 \geq \sqrt{\frac{C}{K}} \frac{4M}{\mu} \sqrt{2d \ln(2/\delta)} \right) \leq \delta \quad (22)$$

Finally, we can combine eq. (21), and eq. (22) and use item 3 to obtain the desired bound. \square

E A New Corruption Robust Offline RL Method

We adopt the linear programming based formulation of reinforcement learning [Man60]. We will write $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{SA \times d}$ to write the feature matrix, and $P_h \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times SA}$ to be the transition probability matrix at time-step h , which is defined as $P_h(s, (s', b')) = P_h(s | s', b')$. Note that we can write $P_h = \Psi_h \Phi^\top$ where $\mu_h \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times d}$ is the μ_h is the d -dimensional measure matrix.

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_q \sum_{h=1}^H q_h^\top \Phi \theta_h \\ & \text{s.t.} \sum_a q_1(s, a) = \rho(s) \quad \forall s \\ & \quad E q_{h+1} = \mu_h \Phi^\top q_h \quad \forall h \in \{1, 2, \dots, H-1\} \\ & \quad q_h \geq 0 \quad \forall h \in [H] \end{aligned}$$

The matrix $E \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times SA}$ is defined as $E(s, (s', a')) = \mathbb{1}\{s = s'\}$. We make the following substitution $\lambda_h = \Phi^\top q_h$ to obtain the following equivalent LP.

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\{q_h\}_{h=1}^H, \{\lambda_h\}_{h=1}^H} \sum_{h=1}^H \lambda_h^\top \theta_h \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad E q_1 = \rho \\ & \quad E q_{h+1} = \mu_h \lambda_h \quad \forall h \in \{1, 2, \dots, H-1\} \\ & \quad q_h \geq 0 \quad \forall h \in [H] \\ & \quad \lambda_h = \Phi^\top q_h \quad \forall h \in [H] \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The dual problem of the above optimization problem is the following optimization problem.

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\{v_h\}_{h=1}^H, \{w_h\}_{h=1}^H} \rho^\top v_1 \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad E^\top v_h \geq \Phi w_h \quad \forall h \in [H] \\ & \quad w_h \geq \theta_h + \mu_h^\top v_{h+1} \quad \forall h \in [H-1] \\ & \quad w_H \geq \theta_H \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The corresponding Lagrangian is given as $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) &= \rho^\top v_1 + \sum_{h=1}^H \left\langle q_h, -E^\top v_h + \Phi w_h \right\rangle + \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \left\langle \theta_h + \boldsymbol{\mu}_h^\top v_{h+1} - w_h, \lambda_h \right\rangle + \langle \theta_H - w_H, \lambda_H \rangle \\ &= \sum_{h=1}^H \lambda_h^\top \theta_h + \langle v_1, -E q_1 + \rho \rangle + \sum_{h=2}^H \langle v_h, -E q_{h+1} + \boldsymbol{\mu}_h \lambda_h \rangle + \sum_{h=1}^H \left\langle w_h, \Phi^\top q_h - \lambda_h \right\rangle\end{aligned}$$

We aim to solve a saddle point of the Lagrangian through gradient descent-ascent method. Note that each of λ_h and w_h is d -dimensional. So we will only perform gradient steps over these variables, whereas we will represent high-dimensional (possibly infinite) v_h and q_h implicitly. The gradient with respect to λ_h is given through the following expression.

$$\nabla_{\lambda_h} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \begin{cases} \theta_h + \boldsymbol{\mu}_h^\top v_{h+1} - w_h & \text{if } h \in [H-1] \\ \theta_h - w_h & \text{if } h = H \end{cases}$$

Now we introduce a transformation of variables suggested by [Gab+23]. Let $\Lambda_h = \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^h} [\phi(s,a)\phi(s,a)^\top]$ be the covariance matrix under the reference policy μ_{ref} at time step h . Then we can rewrite the gradient as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\lambda_h} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) &= \Lambda_h^{-1} \Lambda_h \left(\theta_h + \boldsymbol{\mu}_h^\top v_{h+1} - w_h \right) = \Lambda_h^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\phi(s,a)\phi(s,a)^\top \left(\theta_h + \boldsymbol{\mu}_h^\top v_{h+1} - w_h \right) \right] \\ &= \Lambda_h^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^h, s' \sim P_h(\cdot|s,a)} \left[\phi(s,a) \left(r_h(s,a) + v_{h+1}(s') - w_h^\top \phi(s,a) \right) \right]\end{aligned}$$

We can build an estimator of the expectation from samples, however the covariance matrix Λ_h might be unknown. Therefore, as proposed by [Gab+23], we substitute $\beta_h = \Lambda_h^{-1} \lambda_h$ for any $h \in [H]$ in the Lagrangian.

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \rho^\top v_1 + \sum_{h=1}^H \left\langle q_h, -E^\top v_h + \Phi w_h \right\rangle + \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} \left\langle \Lambda_h \left(\theta_h + \boldsymbol{\mu}_h^\top v_{h+1} - w_h \right), \beta_h \right\rangle + \langle \Lambda_H (\theta_H - w_H), \beta_H \rangle \quad (25)$$

Gradient with respect to β_h is given as follows.

$$\nabla_{\beta_h} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^h, s' \sim P_h(\cdot|s,a)} \left[\phi(s,a) \left(r_h(s,a) + v_{h+1}(s') - w_h^\top \phi(s,a) \right) \right] & \text{if } h \in [H-1] \\ \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\phi(s,a) \left(r_h(s,a) - w_h^\top \phi(s,a) \right) \right] & \text{if } h = H \end{cases}$$

Therefore, given any data point (s_h, a_h, s'_h, r_h) we can define the following estimate of the gradient.

$$\tilde{g}_{\beta_h} = \widehat{\nabla}_{\beta_h} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \begin{cases} \phi(s_h, a_h) \left(r_h + v_{h+1}(s'_h) - w_h^\top \phi(s_h, a_h) \right) & \text{if } h \in [H-1] \\ \phi(s_h, a_h) \left(r_h - w_h^\top \phi(s_h, a_h) \right) & \text{if } h = H \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, the gradient with respect to w_h is the following.

$$\nabla_{w_h} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \Phi^\top q_h - \Lambda_h \beta_h = \Phi^\top q_h - \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}} \left[\phi(s,a) \cdot \beta_h^\top \phi(s,a) \right]$$

This leads to the following estimate of the gradient with respect to w_h .

$$\tilde{g}_{w_h} = \widehat{\nabla}_{w_h} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \Phi^\top q_h - \phi(s_h, a_h) \cdot \beta_h^\top \phi(s_h, a_h)$$

We will also use the following symbolic representation for policy, value, and occupancy measure.

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_h(a | s) &= \frac{\exp(\phi(s, a)^\top w_h)}{\sum_b \exp(\phi(s, b)^\top w_h)} \\ v_h(s) &= \sum_a \pi_h(a | s) \phi(s, a)^\top w_h\end{aligned}$$

and

$$q_1(s) = \rho(s) \text{ and } q_{h+1}(s') = \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(s')^\top \Lambda_h \beta_h = \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[P_h(s' | s, a) \phi(s, a)^\top \beta_h \right]$$

Given w_h, β_h we define policy π_h as

$$\pi_h(a | s) = \frac{\exp(\phi(s, a)^\top w_h)}{\sum_b \exp(\phi(s, b)^\top w_h)}.$$

We also define $q_h^{\pi, \beta}$ as

$$q_h^{\pi, \beta}(s, a) = \begin{cases} \pi_h(a | s) \cdot \rho(s) & \text{if } h = 1 \\ \pi_h(a | s) \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(s)^\top \Lambda_{h-1} \beta_{h-1} & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

After substituting $q_h = q_h^{\pi, \beta}$ we obtain the following form of the Lagrangian.

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = f(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{w}) = \sum_{h=1}^H \langle \Lambda_h \theta_h, \beta_h \rangle + \sum_{h=1}^H \langle w_h, \Phi^\top q_h^{\pi, \beta} - \Lambda_h \beta_h \rangle \quad (26)$$

This also gives us the following expression for derivative with respect to w_h .

$$\nabla_{w_h} f(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{w}) = \Phi^\top q_h^{\pi, \beta} - \Lambda_h \beta_h \quad (27)$$

Additionally, if we write $v_h^{\pi, w}(s) = \sum_a \pi_h(a | s) \cdot w_h^\top \phi(s, a)$ and $d_h^\beta = E q_h^{\pi, \beta}$ then we obtain the following form of the Lagrangian.

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = f(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{w}) = \sum_{h=1}^H \langle \Lambda_h (\theta_h - w_h), \beta_h \rangle + \sum_{h=1}^H \langle d_h^\beta, v_h^{\pi, w} \rangle \quad (28)$$

And, we can write down the derivative with respect to β_h for any $h > 1$ as

$$\nabla_{\beta_h} f(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{w}) = \Lambda_h (\theta_h - w_h) + \sum_{s'} v_{h+1}^{\pi, w}(s') \nabla_{\beta_h} d_{h+1}^\beta(s') = \Lambda_h (\theta_h - w_h) + \sum_{s'} v_{h+1}^{\pi, w}(s') \Lambda_h \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(s'). \quad (29)$$

And, for $h = 1$ we have,

$$\nabla_{\beta_h} f(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{w}) = \Lambda_h (\theta_h - w_h). \quad (30)$$

Following [Gab+23] we define the following notion of regret.

$$\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \boldsymbol{\pi}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:T}^*) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \boldsymbol{\pi}^*, \mathbf{w}_t) - f(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t, \boldsymbol{\pi}_t, \mathbf{w}_t^*) \quad (31)$$

Algorithm 7 Corruption Robust Offline Primal-Dual

Require: (a) Corrupted dataset \mathcal{D} , (b) corruption parameter ε , (c) Step sizes η_w, η_b , and α , and (d) Number of iterations T .

- 1: Partition dataset \mathcal{D} uniformly at random into two datasets \mathcal{D}_m and \mathcal{D}_c , where $\mathcal{D}_c = \Theta(H \cdot d^2 / \varepsilon^2 \log^2(d))$.
- 2: Partition dataset \mathcal{D}_m uniformly at random into $2HT$ groups $\{\mathcal{D}_1^{t,h}, \mathcal{D}_2^{t,h}\}_{h \in [H], t \in [T]}$.
- 3: Initialize $w^0 = \{w_h^0\}_{h=1}^H$ and $\beta^0 = \{\beta_h^0\}_{h=1}^H$.
- 4: **for** $t = 0, \dots, T - 1$ **do**
- 5: **for** $h = 1, \dots, H$ **do**
- 6: **▷ Take a gradient step for w_h**
- 7: Set $\pi_h^t(a | s) \propto \exp(\alpha \phi(s, a)^\top w_h^t)$.
- 8: For each $j \in [K]$, set (symbolically)

$$q_{h,j}^t(\tilde{s}, \tilde{b}) = \begin{cases} \pi_h^t(\tilde{b} | \tilde{s}) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{s'_j = \tilde{s}\} \phi(s_{h,j}, a_{h,j})^\top \beta_{h-1}^t & \text{if } h > 1 \\ \pi_h^t(\tilde{b} | \tilde{s}) \cdot \rho(\tilde{s}) & \text{if } h = 1 \end{cases}$$

- 9: Set $\tilde{g}_{w_h}^t = \text{RobMean} \left(\left\{ \Phi^\top q_{h,j}^t - \phi(s_{h,j}^2, a_{h,j}^2) \cdot \langle \beta_h^t, \phi(s_{h,j}^2, a_{h,j}^2) \rangle \right\}_{j=1}^K \right)$.
 - 10: $w_h^{t+1} \leftarrow \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{W}}(w_h^t - \eta_w \cdot \tilde{g}_{w_h}^t)$
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: **for** $h = 1, \dots, H$ **do**
 - 13: **▷ Take a gradient step for β_h**
 - 14: Set $\pi_h^t(a | s) \propto \exp(\alpha \phi(s, a)^\top w_h^t)$.
 - 15: Set $v_h^t(s) = \sum_a \pi_h^t(a | s) \cdot \phi(s, a)^\top w_h^t$.
 - 16: Set $\tilde{g}_{\beta_h}^t = \widehat{\nabla}_{\beta_h} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q}, \beta; \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ defined as
- $$\tilde{g}_{\beta_h}^t = \begin{cases} \text{RobMean} \left(\left\{ \phi(s_{h,j}, a_{h,j}) \left(r_{h,j} + v_{h+1}(s'_{h,j}) - \langle w_h^t, \phi(s_h, a_h) \rangle \right) \right\}_{j=1}^K \right) & \text{if } h \in [H - 1] \\ \text{RobMean} \left(\left\{ \phi(s_{h,j}, a_{h,j}) \left(r_{h,j} - \langle w_h^t, \phi(s_{h,j}, a_{h,j}) \rangle \right) \right\}_{j=1}^K \right) & \text{if } h = H \end{cases}$$
- 17: $\beta_h^{t+1} \leftarrow \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{B}}(\beta_h^t + \eta_b \cdot \tilde{g}_{\beta_h}^t)$
 - 18: **end for**
 - 19: **end for**
 - 20: Partition dataset \mathcal{D}_c uniformly at random into H groups $\{\mathcal{D}_c^h\}_{h \in [H]}$.
 - 21: **for** $h = 1, \dots, H$ **do**
 - 22: Set $\bar{w}_h = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T w_h^t$ and $\bar{\beta}_h = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \beta_h^t$.
 - 23: Set $\hat{v}_h = \text{RobCovariance}(\mathcal{D}_c^h) \cdot \bar{\beta}_h$
 - 24: **end for**
 - 25: Return $\bar{\pi} = (\bar{\pi}_1, \dots, \bar{\pi}_H)$ and $\hat{v} = (\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_H)$.
-

Lemma E.1. Suppose $\pi^* = (\pi_1^*, \dots, \pi_H^*)$ be a policy and q^{π^*} be its state, action occupancy measure. If we set $\beta_h^* = \Lambda_h^{-1} \Phi^\top q_h^*$ for each $h = 1, \dots, H$, and $w_{t,h}^* = w_h^*$ for each $t \in [T]$ and $h \in [H]$, the the policy $\bar{\pi}$

output by algorithm (7) satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(q^{\pi^*} - q^{\bar{\pi}})^\top r \right] \leq \mathcal{R}(\beta^*, \pi^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:T}^*)$$

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of lemma 4.1 of [Gab+23]. \square

Lemma E.2. *With the choice of the parameters as in Lemma E.1, we have the following regret decomposition.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\beta^*, \pi^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:T}^*) &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \langle w_{t,h} - w_h^*, \nabla_{w_h} f(\pi_t, \beta_t, \mathbf{w}_t) \rangle + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \langle \beta_h^* - \beta_{t,h}^*, \nabla_{\beta_h} f(\pi_t, \beta_t, \mathbf{w}_t) \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_s q_h^{\pi^*}(s) \sum_a (\pi_h^*(a | s) - \pi_{t,h}(a | s)) \langle w_{t,h}, \phi(s, a) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of lemma 4.2 of [Gab+23]. \square

E.1 Formal Statement and Proof of Theorem (5.3)

Theorem E.3. *Suppose assumptions (5.2) holds, and $N \geq \Omega \left(\frac{H^2 d^4 \nu^4}{\varepsilon^2} (\log^2 d + \log^2 A) \right)$. Then the policy $\bar{\pi}$ output by algorithm (7) is approximately optimal i.e.*

$$\max_{\pi} V^{\pi}(\theta) - \mathbb{E} [V^{\bar{\pi}}(\theta)] \leq O \left(\nu \sqrt{\varepsilon} H^2 d^{3/2} \right),$$

and the vector $\hat{v} = (\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_H)$ is an approximate sub-gradient to $V^*(\theta) = \max_{\pi} V^{\pi}(\theta)$ i.e.

$$V^*(\theta') \geq V^*(\theta) + \sum_{h=1}^H \langle \hat{v}_h, \theta_h \rangle - O \left(\nu \sqrt{\varepsilon} H^2 d^{3/2} \right) \quad \forall \theta'.$$

Proof. Let Λ_h be the feature covariance matrix under the offline policy π_{ref} at time step h . Moreover, let $d_h^* = \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \pi^*} [\phi(s, a)]$ and $\beta_h^* = d_h^* \Lambda_h^{-1}$. Then by assumption (5.2), $\|\beta^*\|_2 \leq \nu$. Therefore, it is sufficient to take diameter of the set \mathcal{B} to be ν . We now bound the diameter of the set \mathcal{W} from the feasibility condition in the optimization problem (24). It can be easily seen that given any optimal solution $(\{v_h\}_{h=1}^H, \{w_h\}_{h=1}^H)$, we can always choose $w_h = \theta_h + \mu_h^\top v_{h+1}$ for any $h \in [H-1]$, and $w_H = \theta_H$. Indeed, if this condition is not satisfied, then we can define the following new set of variables.

$$\tilde{w}_H = \theta_H \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{w}_h = \theta_h + \mu_h^\top \tilde{v}_{h+1}, \quad \tilde{v}_h(s) = \sum_a \phi(s, a)^\top \tilde{w}_h \quad \text{for } h = H-1, \dots, 1$$

This new set of variables is feasible to the optimization problem (24) and has objective value bounded above by $\rho^\top v_1$. For linear MDP, the reward at every step is at most \sqrt{d} , and hence the value function $v_h(s)$ is at most $H\sqrt{d}$. This implies that for any h , $\|w_h\|_2 \leq \|\theta_h\| + \|\mu_h^\top \tilde{v}_{h+1}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d} + H\sqrt{d} \|\mu_h\|_2 \leq 2Hd$. Therefore, $\|w\|_2^2 = \sum_{h=1}^H \|w_h\|_2^2 \leq 2H^2d$, and we can take the diameter of the set \mathcal{W} to be at most $2H\sqrt{d}$.

By lemma (E.1) and (E.2) we can express the suboptimality of value function as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
V^{\pi^*}(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[V^{\bar{\pi}}(\theta)] &\leq \underbrace{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \langle w_{t,h} - w_h^*, \nabla_{w_h} f(\pi_t, \beta_t, w_t) \rangle}_{:=\text{Reg}_1} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \langle \beta_h^* - \beta_{t,h}^*, \nabla_{\beta_h} f(\pi_t, \beta_t, w_t) \rangle}_{:=\text{Reg}_2} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_s q_h^{\pi^*}(s) \sum_a (\pi_h^*(a|s) - \pi_{t,h}(a|s)) \langle w_{t,h}, \phi(s, a) \rangle}_{:=\text{Reg}_3}
\end{aligned}$$

We now apply Lemma E.4 with $W = 2H\sqrt{d}$, $B = \nu$, and $\eta_w = \frac{W}{Bd} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} = \frac{H}{\nu\sqrt{dT}}$ to obtain the following bound on the term Reg_1 .

$$\text{Reg}_1 \leq O\left(\nu\sqrt{\varepsilon d}H \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2 + \frac{\nu H^2 d^{3/2}}{\sqrt{T}}\right) \quad (32)$$

We apply Lemma E.5 with $W = 2H\sqrt{d}$, $B = \nu$ and $\eta_b = \sqrt{\frac{HB^2}{2T}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d+W^2)Hd^2}} = \frac{\nu}{d^{3/2}\sqrt{2(H^2+1)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}$ to obtain the following bound on the term Reg_2 .

$$\text{Reg}_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon d}H \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2 + \frac{H^2 \nu d^{3/2}}{\sqrt{T}}\right) \quad (33)$$

For the third term, we apply Lemma E.7 separately for each $h \in [H]$. In particular, we set $q_t^h = \Phi_{w_{t,h}}$, and $D = \|q_t^h\|_\infty \leq W$.

$$\text{Reg}_3 \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{h=1}^H \frac{\mathcal{H}(\pi_h^* \|\pi_1^h)}{\alpha} + \frac{H\alpha W^2}{2}$$

We now substitute $W = H\sqrt{d}$, $\mathcal{H}(\pi_h^* \|\pi_1^h) \leq \log A$ and $\alpha = \frac{1}{H} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2\log A}{dT}}$ to obtain the following bound.

$$\text{Reg}_3 \leq O\left(H^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log A}{T}}\right) \quad (34)$$

Using the upper bounds on Reg_1 , Reg_2 , and Reg_3 , we obtain the following upper bound on the suboptimality gap.

$$V^{\pi^*}(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[V^{\bar{\pi}}(\theta)] \leq O\left(\nu\sqrt{\varepsilon d}H \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2 + \frac{\nu H^2 d^{3/2}}{\sqrt{T}} + H^2 \sqrt{\frac{d \log A}{T}}\right)$$

Now we substitute $\|\Lambda_h\|_2 \leq \text{Trace}(\Lambda_h) \leq d$, for any $h \in [H]$. Moreover, we must have $K \geq \Theta((d/\varepsilon) \log d)$ and $N \geq KTH$. If we use $T = \sqrt{N}$ then we need $N \geq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{H^2 d^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$. This substitution gives us the following upper bound.

$$V^{\pi^*}(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[V^{\bar{\pi}}(\theta)] \leq O\left(\nu\sqrt{\varepsilon}H^2 d^{3/2} + \frac{\nu H^2 d^{3/2} + H^2 \sqrt{d \log A}}{N^{1/4}}\right)$$

If $N \geq \frac{(vd + \sqrt{\log A})^4}{\nu^4 \varepsilon^2}$ then the second term dominates the first term and we get the following bound.

$$V^{\pi^*}(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[V^{\bar{\pi}}(\theta)] \leq O\left(\nu\sqrt{\varepsilon}H^2d^{3/2}\right)$$

For any $h \in [H]$, the average of the feature distribution at time-step h is $\mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \bar{\pi}_h}[\phi(s, a)] = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \pi_h^t}[\phi(s, a)] = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \Phi^\top q_h^{\pi^t} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \Lambda_h \beta_h^t = \Lambda_h \bar{\beta}_h$. Algorithm (7) performs a robust covariance estimation of Λ_h , and then multiplies this estimator to $\bar{\beta}_h$ to obtain the average feature distribution. Give any feature $\phi = \phi(s, a)$, let X be the flattened vector $\phi\phi^\top$. Then each entry of the matrix XX^\top can be expressed as $\phi_i\phi_j\phi_k\phi_\ell$ where $1 \leq i, j, k, \ell \leq m$. This means that $\|XX^\top\|_F^2 = \sum_{i,j,k,\ell} \phi_i^2\phi_j^2\phi_k^2\phi_\ell^2 = \|\phi\|_2^8 \leq 1$, and $\text{cov}(X) \leq 2 \cdot \text{Id}$. So we can apply Lemma E.9 and conclude that $\|\hat{\Lambda}_h - \Lambda_h\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ for any $h \in [H]$. Therefore, for any $h \in [H]$, $\|\hat{v}_h - \Lambda_h \bar{\beta}_h\|_2 \leq \|\hat{\Lambda}_h - \Lambda_h\|_2 \|\bar{\beta}_h\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}\nu)$. This bound also implies that $\|(\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_H) - (\Lambda_1 \bar{\beta}_1, \dots, \Lambda_H \bar{\beta}_H)\|_2 \leq O(\nu\sqrt{H\varepsilon})$.

Now recall that we can write $V^{\bar{\pi}}(\theta) = \sum_{h=1}^H \langle \Lambda_h \bar{\beta}_h, \theta_h \rangle \geq \sum_{h=1}^H \langle \hat{v}_h, \theta_h \rangle - O(\nu\sqrt{H\varepsilon}) \|\theta_1, \dots, \theta_H\|_2 \geq \sum_{h=1}^H \langle \hat{v}_h, \theta_h \rangle - O(\nu H \sqrt{d\varepsilon})$. Since $\bar{\pi}$ is an approximate $O(\nu\sqrt{\varepsilon}H^2d^{3/2})$ optimal policy, and $\hat{v} = (\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_H)$ is an approximate $O(\nu\sqrt{\varepsilon}Hd^{1/2})$ subgradient of $V^{\bar{\pi}}(\theta)$, we can apply lemma (E.10) to conclude that $\hat{v} = (\hat{v}_1, \dots, \hat{v}_H)$ is also an approximate $O(\nu\sqrt{\varepsilon}H^2d^{3/2})$ of the optimal value function with respect to the reward parameter θ . \square

We now bound the three terms appearing in lemma (E.2).

Lemma E.4. *Assume $\text{diam}(\mathcal{B}) \leq B$, $\text{diam}(\mathcal{W}) \leq W$, and $K \geq \Theta((d/\varepsilon) \log d)$. Then we have,*

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \langle w_{t,h} - w_h^*, \nabla_{w_h} f(\pi^t, \beta^t, \mathbf{w}_t) \rangle \leq O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon}WB \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2 + \frac{HW^2}{\eta_w T} + \eta_w B^2 \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2^2\right)$$

with constant probability.

Proof. Let $\bar{g}_{w_h}^t = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \Phi^\top q_{h,j}^t - \phi(s_{h,j}^2, a_{h,j}^2) \cdot \langle \beta_h^t, \phi(s_{h,j}^2, a_{h,j}^2) \rangle$. From the definition of q_h^t in algorithm (7), we have for any $h > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[q_{h,j}^t(\tilde{s}, \tilde{b}) \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\pi_h^t(\tilde{b} \mid \tilde{s}) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{s'_{h,j} = \tilde{s}\} \phi(s_{h,j}, a_{h,j})^\top \beta_{h-1}^t \right] \\ &= \pi_h^t(\tilde{b} \mid \tilde{s}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[P_{h-1}(\tilde{s} \mid s, a) \phi(s, a)^\top \beta_{h-1}^t \right] \\ &= \pi_h^t(\tilde{b} \mid \tilde{s}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_{h-1}(\tilde{s})^\top \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^{h-1}} \left[\phi(s, a) \phi(s, a)^\top \beta_{h-1}^t \right] \\ &= \pi_h^t(\tilde{b} \mid \tilde{s}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_{h-1}(\tilde{s})^\top \Lambda_{h-1} \beta_{h-1}^t = q_h^{\pi^t, \beta^t}(\tilde{s}, \tilde{b}) \end{aligned}$$

Additionally $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[q_{h,j}^t(\tilde{s}, \tilde{b}) \right] = \pi_h^t(\tilde{b} \mid \tilde{s}) \cdot \rho(\tilde{s}) = q_h^{\pi^t, \beta^t}(\tilde{s}, \tilde{b})$. We now bound on the deviation of the

estimator $\tilde{g}_{w_h}^t$ from $\nabla_{w_h} f(\boldsymbol{\pi}_t, \boldsymbol{\beta}^t, \mathbf{w}_t)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h, \mathcal{D}^{t,h}} [\tilde{g}_{w_h}^t] &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h, \mathcal{D}^{t,h}} \left[\Phi^\top q_{h,j}^t - \phi(s_{h,j}, a_{h,j}) \cdot \langle \beta_h^t, \phi(s_{h,j}, a_{h,j}) \rangle \right] \\
&= \Phi^\top q_h^{\pi^t, \beta^t} - \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\phi(s, a) \phi(s, a)^\top \beta_h^t \right] \\
&= \Phi^\top q_h^{\pi^t, \beta^t} - \Lambda_h \beta_h^t \\
&= \nabla_{w_h} f(\boldsymbol{\pi}_t, \boldsymbol{\beta}^t, \mathbf{w}_t) \quad [\text{By eq. (27)}]
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\phi_{h,j} = \phi(s_{h,j}, a_{h,j})$. Then we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\left\| \Phi^\top q_{h,j}^t - \phi_{h,j} \cdot \langle \phi_{h,j}, \beta_h^t \rangle \right\|_2^2 \right] &\leq 2\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\left\| \Phi^\top q_{h,j}^t \right\|_2^2 \right] + 2\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\left\| \phi_{h,j} \cdot \langle \phi_{h,j}, \beta_h^t \rangle \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
&\leq 2 + 2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[(\beta_h^t)^\top \phi_{h,j} \phi_{h,j}^\top \beta_h^t \right] = 2 + 2 \cdot \|\beta_h^t\|_{\Lambda_h}^2 \leq 2 \cdot (1 + B^2 \|\Lambda_h\|_2^2)
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality uses the fact that the norm of the features is bounded by one, and exactly one entry of $q_{h,j}^t$ is set to one. The above bound also implies that $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\|\tilde{g}_{w_h}^t\|_2^2 \right] \leq 2 \cdot (1 + B^2 \|\Lambda_h\|_2^2)$. Now, observe that ε -fraction of the dataset $\mathcal{D}_1^{t,h}$ is corrupted, and we apply robust mean to obtain the estimator $\tilde{g}_{w_h}^t$. Therefore, we can apply lemma E.8 with $\sigma^2 = 4 \cdot (1 + B^2 \|\Lambda_h\|_2^2)$ to obtain the following bound (as long as $K \geq \Theta((d/\varepsilon) \log d)$).

$$\|\tilde{g}_{w_h}^t - \nabla_{w_h} f(\boldsymbol{\pi}^t, \boldsymbol{\beta}^t, \mathbf{w}_t)\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} B \|\Lambda_h\|_2) \quad (35)$$

The above bound also implies the following upper bound on the L_2 -norm $\tilde{g}_{w_h}^t$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{g}_{w_h}^t\|_2 &\leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} B \|\Lambda_h\|_2) + \|\nabla_{w_h} f(\boldsymbol{\pi}^t, \boldsymbol{\beta}^t, \mathbf{w}_t)\|_2 \\
&\leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} B \|\Lambda_h\|_2) + \left\| \Phi^\top q_h^{\pi^t, \beta^t} - \Lambda_h \beta_h^t \right\|_2 \\
&\leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} B \|\Lambda_h\|_2) + \left\| \Phi^\top q_h^{\pi^t, \beta^t} \right\|_2 + \|\Lambda_h \beta_h^t\|_2 \\
&\leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} B \|\Lambda_h\|_2) + \sum_{s,a} q_h^{\pi^t, \beta^t}(s, a) \|\phi(s, a)\|_2 + \|\Lambda_h\|_2 \|\beta_h^t\|_2 \\
&\leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} B \|\Lambda_h\|_2) + 1 + B \|\Lambda_h\|_2 = O(B \|\Lambda_h\|_2)
\end{aligned}$$

The penultimate inequality uses the fact that $q_h^{\pi^t, \beta^t}$ is a probability distribution over the state, action pairs and the feature norms are bounded by one.

Let us write $\tilde{g}_{\mathbf{w}}^t = (\tilde{g}_{w_1}^t, \dots, \tilde{g}_{w_H}^t)$. Then $\|\tilde{g}_{\mathbf{w}}^t\|_2^2 \leq O\left(B^2 \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2^2\right)$. Furthermore, for any t and

h , $\|w_h^t\|_2^2 \leq W^2$. Therefore, $\|\mathbf{w}^t\|_2^2 \leq HW^2$. So we can apply lemma (E.6) to obtain the following bound.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \langle w_{t,h} - w_h^*, \nabla_{w_h} f(\boldsymbol{\pi}^t, \boldsymbol{\beta}^t, \mathbf{w}_t) \rangle \\
& \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \langle w_{t,h} - w_h^*, \mathbb{E} [\tilde{g}_{w_h}^t] \rangle + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \|w_{t,h} - w_h^*\|_2 \cdot O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} B \|\Lambda_h\|_2) \\
& \leq O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon} W B \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2\right) + \frac{HW^2}{2\eta_w T} + O\left(\eta_w B^2 \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2^2\right)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma E.5. Assume $\text{diam}(\mathcal{B}) \leq B$, $\text{diam}(\mathcal{W}) \leq W$, and $K \geq \Theta((d/\varepsilon) \log d)$. Then we have,

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \langle \beta_h^* - \beta_{t,h}, \nabla_{\beta_h} f(\boldsymbol{\pi}^t, \boldsymbol{\beta}^t, \mathbf{w}_t) \rangle \leq O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon}(\sqrt{d} + W) \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2\right) + \frac{HB^2}{2\eta_b T} + O\left(\eta_b(d + W^2) \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2^2\right)$$

with constant probability.

Proof. Recall that algorithm (7) defines $v_h^t(s) = \sum_a \pi_h^t(a | s) \cdot \phi(s, a)^\top w_h^t$. Let us define the gradient $\bar{g}_{\beta_h}^t$ as follows.

$$\bar{g}_{\beta_h}^t = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \phi(s_{h,j}, a_{h,j}) \left(r_{h,j} + v_{h+1}^t(s'_{h,j}) - \langle w_h^t, \phi(s_h, a_h) \rangle \right) & \text{if } h \in [H-1] \\ \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \phi(s_{h,j}, a_{h,j}) \left(r_{h,j} - \langle w_h^t, \phi(s_{h,j}, a_{h,j}) \rangle \right) & \text{if } h = H \end{cases}$$

We will write $\phi_{h,j} = \phi(s_{h,j}, a_{h,j})$. Then for any $h \in [H-1]$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \phi_{h,j} \left(\theta_h^\top \phi_{h,j} + v_{h+1}^t(s'_{h,j}) - \langle w_h^t, \phi_{h,j} \rangle \right) \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\phi_{h,j} \left(\theta_h^\top \phi_{h,j} + v_{h+1}^t(s'_{h,j}) - \langle w_h^t, \phi_{h,j} \rangle \right) \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\phi(s, a) \phi(s, a)^\top \theta_h \right] + \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\sum_{s'} P_h(s' | s, a) v_{h+1}^t(s') \phi(s, a) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\phi(s, a) \phi(s, a)^\top w_h^t \right] \\
& = \Lambda_h(\theta_h - w_h^t) + \sum_{s'} \Lambda_h \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(s') v_{h+1}^t(s') \\
& = \nabla_{\beta_h} f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^t, \boldsymbol{\pi}^t, \mathbf{w}_t^*) \quad [\text{By eq. (29)}]
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\left\| \phi_{h,j} \left(\theta_h^\top \phi_{h,j} + v_{h+1}^t(s'_{h,j}) - \langle w_h^t, \phi_{h,j} \rangle \right) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
& \leq 2\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\left\| \phi_{h,j} \left(\theta_h^\top \phi_{h,j} + v_{h+1}^t(s'_{h,j}) \right) \right\|_2^2 \right] + 2\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\left\| \phi_{h,j} \langle w_h^t, \phi_{h,j} \rangle \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
& \leq 4\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\left\| \phi_{h,j} \cdot \theta_h^\top \phi_{h,j} \right\|_2^2 \right] + 4\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\left\| \phi_{h,j} \cdot v_{h+1}^t(s'_{h,j}) \right\|_2^2 \right] + 2\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\left\| \phi_{h,j} \langle w_h^t, \phi_{h,j} \rangle \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
& \leq 4\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\left\| \phi(s, a) \right\|_2^2 \theta_h^\top \phi(s, a) \phi(s, a)^\top \theta_h \right] + 4\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\left\| \sum_{s'} P_h(s' | s, a) v_{h+1}^t(s') \cdot \phi(s, a) \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
& \quad + 2\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[(w_h^t)^\top \phi(s, a) \phi(s, a)^\top w_h^t \right] \\
& \leq 4 \|\theta_h^t\|_{\Lambda_h}^2 + 2 \|w_h^t\|_{\Lambda_h}^2 + 4\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[(w_h^t)^\top \phi(s, a) \phi(s, a)^\top w_h^t \right] \\
& \leq 4 \|\theta_h^t\|_{\Lambda_h}^2 + 6 \|w_h^t\|_{\Lambda_h}^2 \leq (4d + 6W^2) \|\Lambda_h\|_2^2
\end{aligned}$$

The fourth inequality uses the definition of v_{h+1}^t and $\|\phi(s, a)\|_2 \leq 1$. The final inequality uses $\|\theta_h^t\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d}$ and $\|w_h^t\|_2 \leq W$. The above bound implies that for any $h \in [H]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\text{ref}}^h} \left[\left\| \tilde{g}_{\beta_h}^t \right\|_2^2 \right] \leq (4d + 6W^2) \|\Lambda_h\|_2^2$.

Now, observe that ε -fraction of the dataset $\mathcal{D}_2^{t,h}$ is corrupted, and we apply robust mean to obtain the estimator $\tilde{g}_{\beta_h}^t$. Therefore, we can apply Lemma (E.8) with $\sigma^2 = (4d + 6W^2) \|\Lambda_h\|_2^2$ to obtain the following bound (as long as $K \geq \Theta((d/\varepsilon) \log d)$).

$$\left\| \tilde{g}_{\beta_h}^t - \nabla_{\beta_h} f(\boldsymbol{\pi}^t, \boldsymbol{\beta}^t, \mathbf{w}_t) \right\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon(d + W^2)} \|\Lambda_h\|_2) \quad (36)$$

Furthermore, the above bound also implies the following upper bound on the L_2 -norm of $\tilde{g}_{\beta_h}^t$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \tilde{g}_{\beta_h}^t \right\|_2 & \leq O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon}(\sqrt{d} + W) \|\Lambda_h\|_2\right) + \left\| \nabla_{\beta_h} f(\boldsymbol{\pi}^t, \boldsymbol{\beta}^t, \mathbf{w}_t) \right\|_2 \\
& \leq O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon}(\sqrt{d} + W) \|\Lambda_h\|_2\right) + \left\| \Lambda_h(\theta_h - w_h) + \sum_{s'} v_{h+1}^{\pi, w}(s') \Lambda_h \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(s') \right\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

From the definition of value function we have $v_{h+1}^{\pi, w}(s') \leq \left| \sum_{b'} \pi_{h+1}^t(b' | s') \phi(s', b')^\top w_{h+1}^t \right| \leq \sum_{b'} \pi_{h+1}^t(b' | s') \|\phi(s', b')\|_2 \|w_{h+1}^t\|_2 \leq W$ as feature norms are bounded by one. This result gives us the following upper bound.

$$\left\| \tilde{g}_{\beta_h}^t \right\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon}(\sqrt{d} + W) \|\Lambda_h\|_2\right) + \|\Lambda_h(\theta_h - w_h)\|_2 + \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_h \Lambda_h\|_2 \leq O\left((\sqrt{d} + W) \|\Lambda_h\|_2\right)$$

Let us now write $\tilde{g}_{\beta}^t = (\tilde{g}_{w_1}^t, \dots, \tilde{g}_{w_H}^t)$. Then $\left\| \tilde{g}_{\beta}^t \right\|_2^2 \leq O\left((d + W^2) \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2^2\right)$. Furthermore, for any

t and h , $\|\beta_h\|_2 \leq B$. Therefore, $\|\beta\|_2^2 \leq HB^2$. So we can apply Lemma E.6 to obtain the following bound.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \langle \beta_h^* - \beta_{t,h}, \nabla_{\beta_h} f(\pi^t, \beta^t, \mathbf{w}_t) \rangle \\
& \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \langle \beta_h^* - \beta_{t,h}, \mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}_{\beta_h}^t] \rangle + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^H \|\beta_{t,h} - \beta_h^*\|_2 \cdot O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon}(\sqrt{d} + W) \|\Lambda_h\|_2\right) \\
& \leq O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon}(\sqrt{d} + W) \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2\right) + \frac{HB^2}{2\eta_b T} + O\left(\eta_b(d + W^2) \sum_{h=1}^H \|\Lambda_h\|_2^2\right)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma E.6 (Online Stochastic Gradient Descent). *Let $y_1 \in W$, and $\eta > 0$. Define the sequence y_2, \dots, y_{n+1} and h_1, \dots, h_n such that for $k = 1, \dots, n$*

$$y_{k+1} = \text{Proj}_W(y_k + \eta \hat{h}_k)$$

and \hat{h}_k satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\hat{h}_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] = h_k$ and $\mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{h}_k\|_2^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right] \leq G^2$. Then for any $y^* \in W$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^n \langle y^* - y_k, h_k \rangle\right] \leq \frac{\|y_1 - y^*\|_2^2}{2\eta} + \frac{\eta n G^2}{2}.$$

Lemma E.7 (Mirror Descent, Lemma D.2 of [Gab+23]). *Let q_1, q_2, \dots, q_T be a sequence of functions from $S \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that $\|q_t\|_\infty \leq D$. Given an initial policy π_1 , and a learning rate $\alpha > 0$, define a sequence of policies*

$$\pi_{t+1}(a | s) \propto \pi_t(a | s) e^{\alpha q_t(s,a)}$$

for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T-1$. Then for any comparator policy π^* ,

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s \in S} q^{\pi^*}(s) \langle \pi^*(\cdot | s) - \pi_t(\cdot | s), q_t(s, \cdot) \rangle \leq \frac{\mathcal{H}(\pi^* | \pi_1)}{T\alpha} + \frac{\alpha D^2}{2}$$

Lemma E.8 ([Dia+17], Theorem 3.2). *Let P be a distribution on \mathbb{R}^d with unknown mean vector μ and unknown covariance matrix $\Sigma \preceq \sigma^2 \cdot \text{Id}$. Let S be an ε -corrupted set of samples from P of size $\Theta((d/\varepsilon) \log d)$. There exists an efficient algorithm that, on input S and $\varepsilon > 0$, with probability 9/10 outputs $\hat{\mu}$ with $\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}\sigma)$.*

Lemma E.9. *Let P be a distribution on \mathbb{R}^d with unknown mean vector μ and unknown covariance matrix Σ . Suppose $\text{cov}_{X \sim P}(XX^\top) \preceq \sigma^4 \text{Id}$. Let S be an ε -corrupted set of samples from P of size $\Theta((d^2/\varepsilon^2) \log^2 d)$. There exists an efficient algorithm that, on input S and $\varepsilon > 0$, with probability 9/10 outputs $\hat{\mu}$ with $\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}\sigma^2)$.*

Proof. Apply robust mean estimation on the set of flattened vectors $\{xx^\top : x \in S\}$. See also [DK19], subsection 3.2. □

Lemma E.10 (Approximate Subgradient). *Let $f(x) = \max_{i \in [m]} f_i(x)$ where each f_i is closed and convex. Let $j \in [m]$ be a β_1 -approximate optimizer i.e. $f_j(x) \geq f(x) - \beta_1$. If v is a β_2 -approximate subgradient of f_j at x , then v is a $(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$ -approximate subgradient of f at x .*

Proof. Since v is a β_2 -approximate subgradient of f_j at x , for any y we have,

$$f(y) = \max_i f_i(y) \geq f_j(y) \geq f_j(x) - \beta_2 + \langle v, y - x \rangle \geq f(x) - (\beta_1 + \beta_2) + \langle v, y - x \rangle.$$

□