

# Learning the Linear Quadratic Regulator from Nonlinear Observations

Zakaria Mhammedi  
zak.mhammedi@anu.edu.au

Dylan J. Foster  
dylanf@mit.edu

Max Simchowitz  
msimchow@berkeley.edu

Dipendra Misra  
dimisra@microsoft.com

Wen Sun  
sun.wen@microsoft.com

Akshay Krishnamurthy  
akshaykr@microsoft.com

Alexander Rakhlin  
rakhlin@mit.edu

John Langford  
jcl@microsoft.com

## Abstract

We introduce a new problem setting for continuous control called the LQR with Rich Observations, or **RichLQR**. In our setting, the environment is summarized by a low-dimensional continuous latent state with linear dynamics and quadratic costs, but the agent operates on high-dimensional, nonlinear observations such as images from a camera. To enable sample-efficient learning, we assume that the learner has access to a class of *decoder functions* (e.g., neural networks) that is flexible enough to capture the mapping from observations to latent states. We introduce a new algorithm, **RichID**, which learns a near-optimal policy for the **RichLQR** with sample complexity scaling only with the dimension of the latent state space and the capacity of the decoder function class. **RichID** is oracle-efficient and accesses the decoder class only through calls to a least-squares regression oracle. Our results constitute the first provable sample complexity guarantee for continuous control with an *unknown* nonlinearity in the system model and general function approximation.

## 1 Introduction

In reinforcement learning and control, an agent must learn to minimize its overall cost in a dynamic environment that responds to its actions. In recent years, the field has developed a comprehensive understanding of the non-asymptotic sample complexity of *linear control*, where the dynamics of the environment are determined by a noisy linear system of equations. While studying linear models has led to a number of new theoretical insights, most practical control tasks are nonlinear. In this paper, we develop efficient algorithms with provable sample complexity guarantees for nonlinear control with rich, flexible function approximation.

For some control applications, the dynamics themselves are truly nonlinear, but another case—which is particularly relevant to real-world systems—is where there are (unknown-before-learning) latent linear dynamics which are identifiable through a nonlinear observation process. For example, cameras watching a robot may capture enough information to control its actuators, but the optimal control law is unlikely to be a simple linear function of the pixels. More broadly, with the decrease in costs of sensing hardware, it is now common to instrument complex control tasks with high-throughput measurement apparatus such as cameras, lidar, contact sensors, or other alternatives. These measurements often constitute *rich observations* which capture relevant information about the system state. However, deriving a control policy from these complex, high-dimensional sources remains a significant challenge in both theory and practice.

**The RichLQR setting.** We propose a learning-theoretic framework for rich observation continuous control in which the environment is summarized by a low dimensional continuous latent state (such as joint angles), while the agent operates on high-dimensional observations (such as images from a camera). While this setup is more general, we focus our technical developments on perhaps the simplest instantiation: the *rich observation linear quadratic regulator* (RichLQR). The RichLQR posits that latent states evolve according to noisy linear equations and that each observation can be associated with a latent state by an unknown nonlinear mapping.

We assume that every possible high-dimensional observation of the system corresponds to a particular latent system state, a property we term *decodability*. This assumption is natural in applications where the observations contain significantly more information than needed to control the system. However, decoding the latent state may require a highly nonlinear mapping, in which case linear control on the raw observations will perform poorly. Our aim is to learn such a mapping from data and use it for optimal control in the latent space.

## 1.1 LQR with Rich Observations

RichLQR is a continuous control problem described by the following dynamics:

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = A\mathbf{x}_t + B\mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{w}_t, \quad \mathbf{y}_t \sim q(\cdot | \mathbf{x}_t). \quad (1)$$

Starting from  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , the system state  $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  evolves as a linear combination of the previous state, a control input  $\mathbf{u}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u}$  selected by the learner, and zero-mean i.i.d. process noise  $\mathbf{w}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ . The learner does not directly observe the state, and instead sees an *observation*  $\mathbf{y}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  drawn from the observation distribution  $q(\cdot | \mathbf{x}_t)$ .<sup>1</sup> Here  $d_y \gg d_x$ —for example,  $\mathbf{x}_t$  might represent the state of a robot’s joints, while  $\mathbf{y}_t$  might represent an image of the robot in a scene. Given a policy  $\pi_t(\mathbf{y}_0, \dots, \mathbf{y}_t)$  that selects control inputs  $\mathbf{u}_t$  based on past and current observations, we measure performance as

$$J_T(\pi) := \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_t^\top Q \mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{u}_t^\top R \mathbf{u}_t \right], \quad (2)$$

where  $Q, R \succ 0$  are quadratic state and control cost matrices and  $\mathbb{E}_\pi$  denotes the expectation when the system’s dynamics (1) evolve under  $\mathbf{u}_t = \pi_t(\mathbf{y}_0, \dots, \mathbf{y}_t)$ .

In our model, the dynamics matrices  $(A, B)$  and the observation distribution  $q(\cdot | \mathbf{x})$  are unknown to the learner. We assume that the control cost matrix  $R \succ 0$  is known, but the state cost matrix  $Q \succ 0$  is unknown (so as not to tie the cost matrices to the system representation). We also assume the instantaneous costs  $\mathbf{c}_t := \mathbf{x}_t^\top Q \mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{u}_t^\top R \mathbf{u}_t$ , are revealed on each trajectory at time  $t$  (this facilitates learning  $Q$ , but not  $A, B$ ). The learner’s goal is to PAC-learn an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy: given access to  $n$  trajectories from the dynamics (1), produce a policy  $\hat{\pi}$  such that  $J_T(\hat{\pi}) - J_T(\pi_\infty) \leq \varepsilon$ , where  $\pi_\infty$  is the optimal infinite-horizon policy. If the dynamics matrices  $(A, B)$  were known and the state  $\mathbf{x}_t$  were directly observed, the RichLQR would reduce to the classical LQR problem (Kalman, 1960), and we could compute an optimal policy for (2) using dynamic programming. In particular, the optimal policy has the form  $\pi_\infty(\mathbf{x}_t) = K_\infty \mathbf{x}_t$ , where  $K_\infty$  is the optimal infinite-horizon state-feedback matrix given by the Discrete Algebraic Riccati Equation (Eq. (5) in the sequel). To facilitate the use of optimal control tools in our nonlinear observation model, we make the following assumption, which asserts the state  $\mathbf{x}_t$  can be uniquely recovered from the observation  $\mathbf{y}_t$ .

**Assumption 1** (Perfect decodability). There exists a *decoder function*  $f_\star : \mathbb{R}^{d_y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  such that  $f_\star(y) = x$  for all  $y \in \text{supp } q(\cdot | x)$ .<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Our results do not depend on  $d_y$ , and in fact do not even require that  $\mathbf{y}$  belongs to a vector space.

<sup>2</sup>We remark that  $f_\star$  is typically referred to as an *encoder* rather than a decoder in the autoencoding literature.

While a perfect decoder  $f_*$  is guaranteed to exist under [Assumption 1](#) (and thus the optimal LQR policy can be executed from observations),  $f_*$  is *not known* to the learner in advance. Instead, we assume that the learner has access to a class of functions  $\mathcal{F}$  (e.g., neural networks) that is rich enough to express the perfect decoder. Our statistical rates depend on the capacity of this class.

**Assumption 2** (Realizability). The learner’s decoder class  $\mathcal{F}$  contains the true decoder  $f_*$ .

While these assumptions—especially decodability—may seem strong at first glance, we show that without strong assumptions on the observation distribution, the problem quickly becomes statistically intractable. Consider the following variant of the model [\(1\)](#):

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = A\mathbf{x}_t + B\mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{w}_t, \quad \mathbf{y}_t = f_*^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_t) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \quad (3)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$  is an independent *output noise* variable with  $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t] = 0$ . In the absence of the noise  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ , the system [\(3\)](#) is a special case of [\(1\)](#) for which  $f_*$  is the true decoder, but in general the noise breaks perfect decodability. Unfortunately, our first theorem shows that output noise can lead to exponential sample complexity for learning nonlinear decoders, even under very benign conditions.

**Theorem (informal).** Consider the dynamics [\(3\)](#) with  $d_{\mathbf{x}} = d_{\mathbf{y}} = d_{\mathbf{u}} = T = 1$  and unit Gaussian noise. For every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists an  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ -Lipschitz decoder  $f_*$  and realizable function class  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $|\mathcal{F}| = 2$  such that any algorithm requires  $\Omega(2^{(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{2/3}})$  trajectories to learn an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal decoder.

A full statement and proof for this lower bound is deferred to [Appendix A](#) for space.

**Our Algorithm: RichID.** Our main contribution is a new algorithmic principle, *Rich Iterative Decoding*, or RichID, which solves the RichLQR problem with sample complexity scaling polynomially in the latent dimension  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$  and  $\ln|\mathcal{F}|$ . We analyze an algorithm based on this principle called RichID-CE (“RichID with Certainty Equivalence”), which solves the RichLQR by learning an off-policy estimator for the decoder, using the off-policy decoder to approximately recover the dynamics  $(A, B)$ , and then using these estimates to iteratively learn a sequence of on-policy decoders along the trajectory of a near-optimal policy. Our main theorem is as follows.

**Theorem 1.1** (Main theorem). Under appropriate regularity conditions on the system parameters and noise process ([Assumptions 1-9](#)), RichID-CE learns an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy for horizon  $T$  using  $C \cdot \frac{(d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^{16} T^4 \ln|\mathcal{F}|}{\varepsilon^6}$  trajectories, where  $C$  is a problem-dependent constant.<sup>3</sup>

[Theorem 1.1](#) shows that it is possible to learn the RichLQR with complexity polynomial in the the latent dimension and decoder class capacity  $\ln|\mathcal{F}|$ , and independent of the observation space. To our knowledge, this is the first polynomial-in-dimension sample complexity guarantee for continuous control with an unknown system nonlinearity and general function classes. We present our main theorem for finite classes  $\mathcal{F}$  for simplicity, but this quantity arises only through standard generalization bounds for least squares, and can trivially be replaced by learning-theoretic complexity measures such as Rademacher complexity (in fact, local Rademacher complexity). For example, if  $\mathcal{F}$  has pseudodimension  $d$ , one can replace  $\ln|\mathcal{F}|$  with  $d$  in [Theorem 1.1](#).

[Theorem 1.1](#) requires relatively strong assumptions on the dynamical system—in particular, we require that the system matrix  $A$  is stable, and that the process noise is Gaussian. Nonetheless, we believe that our results represent an important first step toward developing provable and practical sample-efficient algorithms for continuous control beyond the linear setting, and we are excited to see technical improvements addressing these issues in future research.

---

<sup>3</sup>See [Theorem 1.1a](#) in [Appendix G](#) for the full theorem statement.

## 1.2 Our approach

Our algorithm is broken into three phases. In the first phase, we excite the system with Gaussian inputs, then solve a carefully designed regression problem which recovers a decoder  $\hat{f}$  whose performance is near-optimal under the steady state distribution. The choice of *what* regression problem to solve is rather subtle, and we show (Section 2.1) that many naive approaches (e.g., predicting observations from inputs) fail. Our first key contribution is to show that an approach based on predicting *inputs from observations* succeeds under appropriate assumptions.

The second phase of our algorithm estimates the dynamics matrices  $(A, B)$  and certain other system parameters using our learned decoder’s prediction  $\hat{f}(\mathbf{y}_t)$  as a plug-in estimate for the system state  $\mathbf{x}_t$ . We then use these estimates to synthesize a near-optimal linear controller  $\hat{K}$ . The analysis here is rather straightforward, albeit somewhat technical due to the misspecification error caused by the inexact state estimates.

**Key challenge: Trajectory mismatch.** The third phase of our algorithm solves a major issue we call *trajectory mismatch*. Suppose for simplicity that  $\hat{K} = K_\infty$ , i.e. we exactly recover the optimal controller in the second phase (in reality, we must account for approximation error). A tempting approach is to select  $\mathbf{u}_t = K_\infty \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_t)$ , where  $\hat{f}$  is the decoder learned in the first phase. Unfortunately, this decoder is only guaranteed to be accurate on the steady state distribution induced by the Gaussian inputs we use for the first phase. There is no guarantee that this decoder will be accurate on the state distribution induced by the policy above. Indeed, this is an instance of a common technical issue in statistical learning: In general, given a function  $\hat{f}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}_P \|\hat{f}(x) - f^*(x)\|^2 \leq \varepsilon$  for a distribution  $P$ , we have no guarantee that  $\mathbb{E}_Q \|\hat{f}(x) - f^*(x)\|^2 \leq \varepsilon$  for a different distribution  $Q$  unless we put strong structural assumptions on either  $P/Q$  or the function class  $\mathcal{F}$ . Since we do not make such assumptions, we solve this problem by learning a new decoder. This is where our work departs from recent efforts such as Dean and Recht (2020), who—by working with nonparametric classes which incur exponential sample complexity—learn a decoder which *uniformly* approximates  $f_*$ ; such an approach does not succeed in the general setting we consider here.

At this point, the challenge we face is how to learn a new decoder  $\hat{f}$  that approximates  $f_*$  on trajectories induced by playing  $\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_t) = K_\infty \hat{f}(\mathbf{y}_t)$ . In particular, the foundational performance difference lemma (Kakade, 2003) implies that it suffices to ensure that

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\|\hat{f}(\mathbf{y}_t) - f_*(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2] \leq \varepsilon. \quad (4)$$

This presents a clear chicken-and-egg problem: how do we ensure that  $\hat{f}$  enjoys (4) on its *own* induced policy  $\hat{\pi}$ ?

**Our solution: Iterative decoding.** We address this issue by iteratively learning a sequence of time-dependent decoders  $\{\hat{f}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ . For each iteration  $1 \leq t \leq T$  we predict  $\mathbf{x}_t$  with  $\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_t)$ , where  $\hat{f}_t$  is a decoder learned at the previous iteration, and follow the induced policy  $\hat{\pi}_t(\mathbf{y}_t) = K_\infty \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_t)$ . We then estimate  $\hat{f}_{t+1}$  by learning to predict  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$  under the trajectory induced by playing  $\mathbf{u}_1 = \hat{\pi}_1(\mathbf{y}_1), \dots, \mathbf{u}_t = \hat{\pi}_t(\mathbf{y}_t)$ . The key idea here is that the induced distribution for  $\mathbf{x}_t$  does not depend on  $\hat{f}_t$ , only on  $\hat{f}_1, \dots, \hat{f}_{t-1}$ , thereby solving the chicken-and-egg problem.

A major technical challenge is ensuring that this iterative decoding procedure does not lead to errors which compound exponentially in the horizon  $T$ ; this is a serious issue which can easily arise if the misspecification error for the regression problem we solve to learn  $\hat{f}_t$  depends on the quality

of the previous decoders  $\hat{f}_1, \dots, \hat{f}_{t-1}$ . To solve this issue, we work with another carefully designed regression problem. The key idea is to roll in with the policies  $\hat{\pi}_1, \dots, \hat{\pi}_{t-1}$ , but roll out with purely Gaussian inputs for steps  $\tau = t, t+1, \dots$ . This allows us to set up a regression problem which is *well-specified* and enjoys the advantages of Gaussianity, while remaining valid under the trajectory induced by  $\{\hat{\pi}_t\}$ . The analysis for this phase is quite technical due to the inexact estimates from the first two phases, and showing that the indirect regression problems we solve eventually lead to a good predictor for the state requires substantial effort.

### 1.3 Technical Preliminaries

The main assumptions used by RichID are as follows.

**Assumption 3** (Gaussian initial state and process noise). The initial state satisfies  $\mathbf{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$ , and process noise is i.i.d.  $\mathbf{w}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_w)$ . Here,  $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_w$  are *unknown* to the learner, with  $\Sigma_w \succ 0$ .

**Assumption 4** (Controllability). For each  $k \geq 1$ , define  $\mathcal{C}_k := [A^{k-1}B \mid \dots \mid B] \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times kd_u}$ . We assume that  $(A, B)$  is *controllable*, meaning that  $\mathcal{C}_{\kappa_*}$  has full column rank for some  $\kappa_* \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Note that **Assumption 4** imposes the constraint  $d_{\mathbf{u}}\kappa_* \geq d_{\mathbf{x}}$ , which we use to simplify various expressions.

**Assumption 5** (Growth Condition). There exists  $L \geq 1$  such that  $\|f(y)\| \leq L \max\{1, \|f_*(y)\|\}$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  and  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ .

**Assumption 6** (Stability).  $A$  is stable; that is,  $\rho(A) < 1$ , where  $\rho(\cdot)$  denotes the spectral radius.

Our algorithms and analysis make heavy use of the Gaussian process noise assumption, which we use to calculate closed-form expressions for certain conditional expectations that arise under the dynamics model (1). We view relaxing this assumption as an important direction for future work. Controllability is somewhat more standard (Mania et al., 2019), and the growth condition ensures predictions do not behave too erratically. Stability ensures the state remains bounded without an initial stabilizing controller. While assuming access to an initial stabilizing controller is fairly standard in the recent literature on linear control, this issue is more subtle in our nonlinear observation setting. These assumptions can be relaxed somewhat; see [Section 3](#).

**Policies, interaction model, and sample complexity.** Formally, a policy  $\pi$  for the setup (1) is a sequence of mappings  $(\pi_t)_{t=0}^T$ , where  $\pi_t$  maps the observations  $\mathbf{y}_0, \dots, \mathbf{y}_t$  to an output control signal  $\mathbf{u}_t$ . In each round of interaction, the learner proposes a policy  $\pi$  and observes a trajectory  $\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{y}_0, \dots, \mathbf{u}_T, \mathbf{y}_T$  where  $\mathbf{u}_t = \pi_t(\mathbf{y}_0, \dots, \mathbf{y}_t)$ . We measure the sample complexity to learn an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy for  $J_T$  in terms of the number of trajectories observed in this model. However, to simplify the description of our algorithm, we allow the learner to execute trajectories of length  $2T + \mathcal{O}_*(\ln \ln(n))$  during the learning process, even though the objective is  $J_T$ . To avoid trivial issues caused by unidentifiability of the initial state  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , we define  $J_T$  to measure cost on times  $1, \dots, T$ . On the other hand, our rollouts begin at time 0: the initial state is  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , and the first control input executed is  $\mathbf{u}_0$ .

**Cost functions.** We assume that the control cost matrix  $R \succ 0$  is known but, to avoid tying costs to the unknown latent representation  $\mathbf{x}$ , we assume that the state cost matrix  $Q \succ 0$  is unknown. Instead, we assume that the learner has access to an additional *cost oracle* which on each trajectory at time  $t$  reveals  $\mathbf{c}_t := \mathbf{x}_t^\top Q \mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{u}_t^\top R \mathbf{u}_t$ . For simplicity, we place the following mild regularity conditions on the cost matrices.

**Assumption 7.** The cost matrices  $Q$  and  $R$  satisfy  $\lambda_{\min}(Q), \lambda_{\min}(R) \geq 1$ .

This assumption can be made to hold without loss of generality whenever  $Q, R \succ 0$  via rescaling.

**The DARE and infinite-horizon optimal control.** Controllability (and more generally stabilizability) implies that there is a unique positive definite solution  $P_\infty \succ 0$  to the *discrete algebraic Riccati equation* (DARE),

$$P = A^\top P A + Q - A^\top P B (R + B^\top P B)^{-1} B^\top P A, \quad (\text{DARE})$$

which characterizes the optimal cost function for the LQR problem in the infinite-horizon setting. Our analysis uses  $P_\infty$ , and our algorithms use the optimal infinite-horizon state feedback controller

$$K_\infty := -(R + B^\top P_\infty B)^{-1} B^\top P_\infty A. \quad (5)$$

When the state  $\mathbf{x}_t$  is directly observed, the optimal infinite-horizon controller is the time-invariant feedback policy  $u = K_\infty x$ . Thus, the optimal infinite-horizon policy for RichLQR, given the exact decoder, is  $\pi_\infty(y) = K_\infty f_\star(y)$ . We use this controller as our benchmark. Our analysis also uses the infinite-horizon covariance matrix

$$\Sigma_\infty := R + B^\top P_\infty B.$$

Our algorithm relies on *certainty equivalence*, in which we estimate  $K_\infty$  by solving the DARE with plug-in estimates  $\widehat{A}, \widehat{B}$  of  $(A, B)$  to obtain a matrix  $\widehat{P}$ , and take  $\widehat{K} := -(R + \widehat{B}^\top \widehat{P} \widehat{B})^{-1} \widehat{B}^\top \widehat{P} \widehat{A}$ .

**Definition 1** (DARE operator). *We define the DARE operator as the operator which takes in matrices  $(A_0, B_0, R_0, Q_0)$  with  $R_0, Q_0 \succeq 0$ , and returns  $(P, K)$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} P &= A_0^\top P A_0 + Q - A_0^\top P B_0 (R + B_0^\top P B_0)^{-1} B_0^\top P A_0, \\ K &= -(R + B_0^\top P B_0)^{-1} B_0^\top P A_0. \end{aligned}$$

**Strong stability.** We quantify stability of various matrices that arise in our analysis via *strong stability* (Cohen et al., 2018). Intuitively, a matrix  $X$  is *strongly stable* if its powers  $X^n$  decay geometrically in a quantitative sense.

**Definition 2** (Strong stability). *A matrix  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times d_x}$  is said to be  $(\alpha, \gamma)$ -strongly stable if there exists  $S \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times d_x}$  such that  $\|S\|_{\text{op}} \|S^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \alpha$  and  $\|S^{-1} X S\|_{\text{op}} \leq \gamma < 1$ .*

We make frequent use of the fact that if  $X$  is  $(\alpha, \gamma)$ -strongly stable, then

$$\|X^n\|_{\text{op}} = \|S(S^{-1} X S)^n S^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|S^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \|S\|_{\text{op}} \|S^{-1} X S\|_{\text{op}}^n \leq \alpha \gamma^n.$$

We let  $(\alpha_A, \gamma_A)$  and  $(\alpha_\infty, \gamma_\infty)$  be the strong stability parameters for  $A$  and  $A_{\text{cl}, \infty} := A + B K_\infty$ , respectively. Under Assumption 4 and Assumption 6, we are guaranteed that  $\gamma_A, \gamma_\infty < 1$  (see Proposition C.1 and Proposition C.2 for quantitative bounds).

Finally, we assume access to upper bounds on various system parameters.

**Assumption 8.** We assume that the learner has access to parameter upper bounds  $\Psi_\star \geq 1$ ,  $\alpha_\star \geq 1$ ,  $\gamma_\star \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$  such that (I)  $\kappa \geq \kappa_\star$ , (II)  $A$  and  $(A + B K_\infty)$  are both  $(\alpha_\star, \gamma_\star)$ -strongly stable, and (III)  $\Psi_\star$  is an upper bound on the operator norms of  $A, B, Q, R, \Sigma_w, \Sigma_w^{-1}, \Sigma_0, K_\infty$ , and  $P_\infty$ .<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup>Here,  $P_\infty$  solves the DARE (DARE), and  $K_\infty$  is the optimal infinite horizon controller.

**Asymptotic notation.** Lastly, we adopt standard non-asymptotic big-oh notation. For functions  $f, g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , we write  $f = \mathcal{O}(g)$  if there exists some universal constant  $C > 0$ , which doesn't depend on problem parameters, such that  $f(x) \leq Cg(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Our proofs also use the shorthand  $f(x) \lesssim g(x)$  to denote  $f = \mathcal{O}(g)$ . We use  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\cdot)$  to suppress logarithmic dependence on system parameters, time horizon, and dimension. We use  $\mathcal{O}_*(\cdot)$  to suppress polynomial factors in  $\alpha_*, \gamma_*^{-1}, (1 - \gamma_*)^{-1}, \Psi_*, L$ , and  $\sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)$ , and all logarithmic factors except for  $\ln|\mathcal{F}|$  and  $\ln(1/\delta)$ . We write  $f = \Omega_*(g)$  if  $f(x) \geq Cg(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , where  $C$  is a *sufficiently large* constant whose value is polynomial in the same parameters. Lastly, we write  $f = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(g)$  if  $f(x) \leq cg(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , where  $c = \text{poly}(\gamma_*(1 - \gamma_*), \alpha_*^{-1}, \Psi_*^{-1}, L^{-1}, \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa))$  is a *sufficiently small* constant.

**General notation.** For a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we let  $\|x\|$  denote the euclidean norm and  $\|x\|_\infty$  denote the element-wise  $\ell_\infty$  norm. We let  $\|x\|_A = \sqrt{x^\top Ax}$  for  $A \succeq 0$ . For a matrix  $A$ , we let  $\|A\|_{\text{op}}$  denote the operator norm. If  $A$  is symmetric, we let  $\lambda_{\min}(A)$  denote the minimum eigenvalue. For a potentially asymmetric matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , we let  $\rho(A) := \max\{|\lambda_1(A)|, \dots, |\lambda_d(A)|\}$  denote the spectral radius. For a symmetric matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $(M)_+$  denotes the result of thresholding all negative eigenvalues to zero, and we let  $\lambda_1(M), \dots, \lambda_d(M)$  denote the eigenvalues of  $M$ , sorted in decreasing order. Similarly, for a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ , we let  $\sigma_1(A), \dots, \sigma_{d_1 \wedge d_2}(A)$  denote the singular values of  $A$ , sorted in decreasing order, and use the shorthand  $\sigma_{\min}(A) = \sigma_{d_1 \wedge d_2}(A)$ . We let  $\text{vec}(A) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 d_2}$  be the vectorization of  $A$ . For matrices  $A$  and  $B$ , we use  $[A \mid B]$  or  $[A; B]$  to denote their horizontal concatenation.

## 1.4 Related Work

Our model and approach are related to the literature on Embedding to Control (E2C), and related techniques (Watter et al., 2015; Banijamali et al., 2018; Hafner et al., 2019; Levine et al., 2020; Shu et al., 2020; Dean et al., 2020) (see also Levine et al. (2016)). At a high level, these approaches learn a decoder that maps images down to a latent space, then performs simple control techniques such as iterative LQR (iLQR) in the latent space (Watter et al. (2015) is a canonical example). These approaches are based on heuristics, and do not offer provable sample complexity guarantees to learn the decoder in our setting.

Our work is also related to recent results on rich observation reinforcement learning with discrete actions (Jiang et al., 2017). We view our model as the control-theoretic analog of the block MDP model studied by Du et al. (2019); Misra et al. (2020), in which a latent state space associated with a discrete Markov Decision Process is decodable from rich observations. However, our setting is considerably different, in part because of the continuous nature of the RichLQR, and so the results and techniques are incomparable. In particular, discretization approaches immediately face a curse-of-dimensionality phenomenon and do not yield tractable algorithms. Interestingly, even ignoring the issue of continuous actions, our setting does not appear to have low Bellman rank in the sense of Jiang et al. (2017).

A recent line of work (Oymak, 2019; Sattar and Oymak, 2020; Foster et al., 2020) gives non-asymptotic system identification guarantees for a simple class of ‘‘generalized linear’’ dynamical systems. These results address a non-linear dynamic system, but are incomparable to our own as the non-linearity is known and the state is directly observed. Our results also are related to the LQG problem, which is a special case of (3) with linear observations; recent work provides non-asymptotic guarantees (Mania et al., 2019; Simchowitz et al., 2020; Lale et al., 2020). These results show that linear classes do not encounter the sample complexity barrier exhibited by Theorem A.1.

Finally, we mention two concurrent works which consider similar settings. First, Frandsen and Ge (2020) give guarantees for a simpler setting in which we observe a linear combination of the

latent state and a nonlinear nuisance parameter, and where there is no noise. Second, [Dean and Recht \(2020\)](#) (see also [Dean et al. \(2020\)](#)) give sample complexity guarantees for a variant of the our setting in which there is no system noise, and where  $\mathbf{y}_t = g_*(C\mathbf{y}_t)$ , where  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d_x}$  and  $g_* : \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$  is a smooth function. They provide a nonparametric approach which scales exponentially in the dimension  $p$ . Compared to this result, the main advantage of our approach is that it allows for general function approximation; that is, we allow for arbitrary function classes  $\mathcal{F}$ , and our results depend only on the capacity of the class under consideration. In terms of assumptions, the addition of the  $C$  matrix allows for maps that (weakly) violate the perfect decodability assumption; we suspect that our results can be generalized in this fashion. Likewise, we believe that our assumption concerning the stability of  $A$  can be removed in the absence of system noise (indeed, system noise is one of the primary technical challenges overcome by our approach).

## 2 An Algorithm for LQR with Rich Observations

---

### Algorithm 1 RichID-CE

---

1: **Inputs:**

$\varepsilon$  (suboptimality),  $T$  (horizon),  $\mathcal{F}$  (decoder class),  $d_x, d_u$  (latent dimensions),  
 $\Psi_*, \kappa, \alpha_*, \gamma_*$  (system parameter upper bounds),  $R$  (control cost).

2: **Parameters:** // see [Appendix G](#) for values.

$n_{\text{id}}, n_{\text{op}}$  // sample size for Phase/Phase II and Phase III, respectively.

$\kappa_0$  // burn-in time index.

$r_{\text{id}}, r_{\text{op}}$  // radius for sets  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$ .

$\sigma^2$  // exploration variance.

$\bar{b}$  // clipping parameter for decoders.

3: **Phase I** // learn a coarse decoder (see [Section 2.2](#))

4: Set  $\hat{f}_{\text{id}} \leftarrow \text{GETCOARSEDECODER}(n_{\text{id}}, \kappa_0, \kappa, r_{\text{id}})$ . // [Algorithm 2](#)

5: **Phase II** // learn system's dynamics and cost (see [Section 2.3](#))

6: Set  $(\hat{A}_{\text{id}}, \hat{B}_{\text{id}}, \hat{\Sigma}_{w,\text{id}}, \hat{Q}_{\text{id}}) \leftarrow \text{SYSID}(\hat{f}_{\text{id}}, n_{\text{id}}, \kappa_0, \kappa)$ . // [Algorithm 3](#)

7: **Phase III** // compute optimal policy (see [Section 2.4](#))

8: Set  $\hat{\pi} \leftarrow \text{COMPUTEPOLICY}(\hat{A}_{\text{id}}, \hat{B}_{\text{id}}, \hat{\Sigma}_{w,\text{id}}, \hat{Q}_{\text{id}}, R, n_{\text{op}}, \kappa, \sigma^2, T, \bar{b}, r_{\text{op}})$ . // [Algorithm 4](#)

9: **Return:**  $\hat{\pi}$ .

---

We now present our main algorithm, RichID-CE ([Algorithm 1](#)), which attains a polynomial sample complexity guarantee for the RichLQR.

**Algorithm overview.** [Algorithm 1](#) consists of three phases. In Phase I ([Algorithm 2](#)), we roll in with Gaussian control inputs and learn a good decoder under this roll-in distribution by solving a certain regression problem involving our decoder class  $\mathcal{F}$ . In Phase II ([Algorithm 3](#)), we leverage this decoder to learn a *model*  $(\hat{A}, \hat{B})$  for the system dynamics (up to a similarity transform). Due to linearity of the dynamics, this model is valid on any trajectory. Moreover, we can synthesize a controller  $\hat{K}$  so that the feedback controller  $\mathbf{u}_t = \hat{K}\mathbf{x}_t$  is optimal for  $(\hat{A}, \hat{B})$ , and thus near-optimal for  $(A, B)$ .

To actually implement this feedback controller, we still need a good decoder for the state. Unfortunately, our decoder from Phase I may be inaccurate along the optimal (or near-optimal) trajectory. Thus, in Phase III (Algorithm 4) we inductively solve a sequence of regression problems—one for each time  $t = 0, \dots, T$ —to learn a sequence of state decoders  $(\hat{f}_t)$ , such that for each  $t$ ,  $\hat{f}_t \approx f_\star$  under the roll-in distribution induced by playing  $\widehat{K}\hat{f}_s(\mathbf{y}_s)$  for  $s < t$ . We do this by rolling in with this near-optimal policy until  $t$ , but rolling out with purely Gaussian inputs. The former ensures that the decoder is accurate along the desired trajectory. The latter ensures that the regression at time  $t$  is essentially “independent” of approximation errors incurred by steps  $0, \dots, t - 1$ , avoiding an accumulation of errors which would otherwise compound exponentially in the horizon  $T$ .

In what follows, we walk through each phase in detail and explain the motivation, the technical assumptions required, and the key performance guarantees.

## 2.1 Predicting Inputs from Outputs: The Bayes Regression Function

At the core of our algorithm is a simple but indispensable identity for the Bayes predictor that arises when we aim to predict control inputs  $\mathbf{u}$  from observations  $\mathbf{y}$  in the RichLQR model. As a motivating example, let a time  $\tau \geq 1$  be fixed, suppose we take Gaussian inputs  $\mathbf{u}_{1:\tau} := (\mathbf{u}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbf{u}_\tau^\top)^\top \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{\tau d_u})$ , and consider the resulting state  $\mathbf{x}_{\tau+1}$ . Suppose that our goal is to estimate  $f_\star$  with expected  $L_2$  error under the marginal distribution of  $\mathbf{x}_{\tau+1}$ . That is, we wish to ensure

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{\tau+1}) - f_\star(\mathbf{x}_{\tau+1})\|^2 \right] \leq (\text{something small}), \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  denotes the expectation under the Gaussian inputs above.

**Attempt 1.** The natural strategy to attain (6) is to regress  $\mathbf{y}_{\tau+1}$  to  $\mathbf{u}_{1:\tau}$ . For example, note that linearity of the dynamics ensures that there exists a matrix  $M_\star \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times \tau d_u}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{\tau+1} | \mathbf{u}_{1:\tau}] = M_\star \mathbf{u}_{1:\tau}$ . Thus, one could attempt the regression

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}, M \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times \tau d_u}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|M \mathbf{u}_{1:\tau} - f(\mathbf{y}_{\tau+1})\|^2 \right].$$

Unfortunately, there are too many degrees of freedom in this minimization problem: if  $0 \in \mathcal{F}$ , then the above is minimized with  $f = 0$  and  $M = 0$ .

**Attempt 2.** A second attempt might be to hope that all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  are invertible, and try to solve a regression problem based on reconstructing the observations:

$$\min_{f^{-1}: f \in \mathcal{F}, M \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times \tau d_u}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|f^{-1}(M \mathbf{u}_{1:\tau}) - \mathbf{y}_{\tau+1}\|^2 \right],$$

Unfortunately, since  $\mathbf{x}_{\tau+1} = M_\star \mathbf{u}_{1:\tau} + (\text{noise})$ , passing through the nonlinearity  $f^{-1}$  obviates any clear guarantees. In particular, this setup does not satisfy the usual first-order condition for regression with a well-specified model. A secondary issue is that even in the absence of system noise, this approach would likely incur dependence on the *observation* dimension  $d_y$ .

**Our Approach.** Our approach is to flip the input and target and regress  $\mathbf{u}_{1:\tau}$  to  $\mathbf{y}_{\tau+1}$ . Specifically, we consider the regression:

$$\min_{g=Mf: f \in \mathcal{F}, M \in \mathbb{R}^{\tau d_u \times d_x}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|g(\mathbf{y}_{\tau+1}) - \mathbf{u}_{1:\tau}\|^2 \right]. \quad (7)$$

Let us motivate this approach and shed some light on the properties of the solution to this problem. Leveraging the perfect decodability assumption, one can show that  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_{1:\tau} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\tau+1}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_{1:\tau} \mid \mathbf{x}_{\tau+1} = f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{\tau+1})]$ . Moreover, since  $\mathbf{x}_{\tau+1}$  and  $\mathbf{u}_{1:\tau}$  are *jointly Gaussian* (due to linearity of the dynamics and Gaussianity of the process noise), a simple calculation reveals that there exists a matrix  $\widetilde{M}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_{1:\tau} \mid \mathbf{x}_{\tau+1} = x] = \widetilde{M}x$ . Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_{1:\tau} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\tau+1}] = \widetilde{M}f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{\tau+1}).$$

In particular, this implies that the unconstrained minimizer (i.e., over all measurable functions  $g$ ) in (7) lies in the set  $\{Mf : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . Hence, since conditional expectations minimize square loss, we find:

*Up to a set of measure zero, any minimizer of (7) must have the form  $g = \widetilde{M}f_\star$ . In other words, the population risk minimizer recovers  $f_\star$  up to a linear transformation.*

Note that this crucially relies on Gaussianity, because while  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{\tau+1} \mid \mathbf{u}_{1:\tau}]$  is linear in  $\mathbf{u}_{1:\tau}$  for any mean-zero process noise, the same is no longer true when considering  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_{1:\tau} \mid \mathbf{x}_{\tau+1}]$ . But with this strong assumption, we find that (7) allows us to recover  $f_\star$  up to a global linear transformation. Of course, there are numerous remaining subtleties including:

- Inverting  $\widetilde{M}$  to recover  $f_\star$ .
- Identifying  $\widetilde{M}$ , especially since the learner does not know the system dynamics or noise covariance at first.
- Passing from population risk to empirical risk from finite samples.

How we address the above issues varies in different phases of the RichID-CE, and the remainder of this section supplies these details. But the fundamental principle—that we can solve empirical versions of (7) to recover linear transformations of  $f_\star$ —remains the core workhorse of RichID-CE.

**Remark 1** (Oracle Efficiency). Consider the empirical version of (7) in which we gather  $n$  trajectories and solve

$$\min_{g=Mf, f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|g(\mathbf{y}_{\tau+1}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{u}_{1:\tau}^{(i)}\|_2^2,$$

where the superscript  $i$  denotes the  $i$ -th trajectory. Solving problems of this form is computationally efficient whenever we have a *regression oracle* for the induced class  $\{g = Mf \mid f \in \mathcal{F}, M \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u \tau \times d_x}\}$ . For many function classes of interest, such as linear functions and neural networks, solving regression over this class is no harder than regression over the original decoder class  $\mathcal{F}$ . We believe this is a reasonable and practical assumption.

## 2.2 Phase I: Learning a Coarse Decoder

In Phase I (Algorithm 2), we gather  $2n_{\text{id}}$  trajectories by selecting independent standard Gaussian inputs  $\mathbf{u}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{d_u})$  for each  $0 \leq t \leq \kappa_1 := \kappa_0 + \kappa$ , where we recall that  $\kappa$  is an upper-bound on the controllability index  $\kappa_\star$ , and where  $\kappa_0$  is a “burn-in” time used to ensure mixing to a near-stationary distribution, defined as follows:<sup>5</sup>

$$\kappa_0 := \lceil (1 - \gamma_\star)^{-1} \ln(84\Psi_\star^5 \alpha_\star^4 d_x (1 - \gamma_\star)^{-2} \ln(10^3 \cdot n_{\text{id}})) \rceil. \quad (8)$$

---

**Algorithm 2** GETCOARSEDECODER: Phase I of RichID-CE (Section 2.2).

---

1: **Inputs:**

$n_{\text{id}}$  // sample size.

$\kappa_0$  // ‘‘burn-in’’ time index.

$\kappa$  // upper bound on the controllability index  $\kappa_*$ .

$r_{\text{id}}$  // upper bound on the matrix  $M$  in the definition of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$ .

2: Set  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{id}} := \{Mf(\cdot) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}, M \in \mathbb{R}^{\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}} \times d_{\mathbf{x}}}, \|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq r_{\text{id}}\}$ .

3: Set  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_0 + \kappa$ .

4: Gather  $2n_{\text{id}}$  trajectories by sampling control inputs  $\mathbf{u}_0, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{d_{\mathbf{u}}})$ .

5: **Phase I: // Learn coarse decoder (see Section 2.2).**

6: Set  $\hat{h}_{\text{id}} = \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{id}}} \|h(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{v}^{(i)}\|_2^2$ , where  $\mathbf{v} := (\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_0}^\top, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1-1}^\top)^\top$ .

7: Set  $\hat{V}_{\kappa, \text{id}}$  to be an orthonormal basis for top  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$ -eigenvectors of  $\frac{1}{n_{\text{id}}} \sum_{i=n_{\text{id}}+1}^{2n_{\text{id}}} \hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) \hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^\top$

8: Set  $\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\cdot) := \hat{V}_{\kappa, \text{id}}^\top \hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\cdot)$ . // coarse decoder.

9: **Return:** coarse decoder  $\hat{f}_{\text{id}}$ .

---

Let  $(\mathbf{u}_0^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_0^{(i)}, \mathbf{c}_0^{(i)}), \dots, (\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{c}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})$  denote the  $i$ th trajectory gathered in this fashion. Following the template described in Section 2.1, we show that for the state distribution induced the control inputs above, the true decoder  $f_*$  can be recovered up to a linear transformation by solving a regression problem whose goal is to predict a sequence of control inputs from the observations at time  $\kappa_1$ . Define  $\mathbf{v} := (\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_0}^\top, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1-1}^\top)^\top$ . Our key lemma (Lemma D.3) shows that

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{y}}}, \quad h_*(y) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1} = y] = \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1}^{-1} f_*(y), \quad (9)$$

where we recall that  $\mathcal{C}_\kappa = [A^{\kappa-1}B \mid \dots \mid B]$  and define

$$\Sigma_{\kappa_1} := A^{\kappa_1} \Sigma_0 (A^{\kappa_1})^\top + \sum_{t=0}^{\kappa_1} A^{t-1} (\Sigma_w + BB^\top) (A^{t-1})^\top.$$

This lemma follows from the discussion in Section 2.1, and relies on perfect decodability and the fact that  $\mathbf{v}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}$  are jointly Gaussian. In particular, by verifying  $\|\mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sqrt{\Psi_*}$ , the expression (9) ensures that  $h_*$  belongs to the class  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{id}} := \{Mf(\cdot) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}, M \in \mathbb{R}^{\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}} \times d_{\mathbf{x}}}, \|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sqrt{\Psi_*}\}$ . (i.e., we can take  $r_{\text{id}} = \sqrt{\Psi_*}$ ). The main step of Phase I solves the well-specified regression problem:

$$\hat{h}_{\text{id}} \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{id}}} \|h(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{v}^{(i)}\|_2^2. \quad (10)$$

Phase I is computationally efficient whenever we have an appropriate regression oracle, as explained in Remark 1.

For  $n_{\text{id}}$  sufficiently large, a standard analysis for least squares shows that the regressor  $\hat{h}_{\text{id}}$  has low prediction error relative to  $h_*$  in (9). However, this representation is overparameterized and takes values in  $\mathbb{R}^{\kappa d_{\mathbf{x}}}$  even though the true state lies in only  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$  dimensions. For the second part of Phase I, we perform principle component analysis to reduce the dimension to  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$ .<sup>6</sup> Specifically, we

---

<sup>5</sup>This is useful for learning  $(A, B)$  in (13), ensuring  $\hat{f}_{\text{id}}$  is accurate at both times  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_1 + 1$ .

<sup>6</sup>This step is not strictly required, but leads to tighter statistical analysis and more intuitive presentation.

compute a dimension-reduced decoder via

$$\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(y) := \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^\top \cdot \hat{h}_{\text{id}}(y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{x}}}, \quad (11)$$

where  $\widehat{V}_{\text{id}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}} \times d_{\mathbf{x}}}$  is an arbitrary orthonormal basis for the top  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$  eigenvectors of the empirical second moment matrix  $\sum_{i=n_{\text{id}}+1}^{2n_{\text{id}}} \hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) \hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^\top / n_{\text{id}}$ . This approach exploits that the output of the Bayes regressor  $h_{\star}$ —being a linear function of the  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$ -dimensional system state—lies in a  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$ -dimensional subspace.

Having reviewed the two components of Phase I, we can now state the main guarantee for this phase. In light of (9), the result essentially follows from standard tools for least-squares regression with a well-specified model, plus an analysis for PCA with errors in variables.

**Theorem 2.1** (Guarantee for Phase I). *If  $n_{\text{id}} = \Omega_{\star}(d_{\mathbf{x}} d_{\mathbf{u}} \kappa (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \kappa))$ , then with probability at least  $1 - 3\delta$ , there exists an invertible matrix  $S_{\text{id}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{x}} \times d_{\mathbf{x}}}$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) - S_{\text{id}} f_{\star}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|_2^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_{\star} \left( \frac{d_{\mathbf{u}} \kappa (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \kappa) \ln^3(n_{\text{id}}/\delta)}{n_{\text{id}}} \right),$$

and for which  $\sigma_{\min}(S_{\text{id}}) \geq \sigma_{\min, \text{id}} := \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})(1 - \gamma_{\star})(4\Psi_{\star}^2 \alpha_{\star}^2)^{-1}$  and  $\|S_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sigma_{\max, \text{id}} := \sqrt{\Psi_{\star}}$ .

### 2.3 Phase II: System Identification

In Phase II, we use the decoder from Phase I to learn the system dynamics, state cost, and process noise covariance up to the basis induced by the transformation  $S_{\text{id}}$ . Our targets are:

$$A_{\text{id}} := S_{\text{id}} A S_{\text{id}}^{-1}, \quad B_{\text{id}} := S_{\text{id}} B, \quad \Sigma_{w, \text{id}} := S_{\text{id}} \Sigma_w S_{\text{id}}^\top, \quad Q_{\text{id}} := S_{\text{id}}^{-\top} Q S_{\text{id}}^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

The key technique we use is to pretend that the decoder's output  $\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})$  is the true state  $\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}$ , then perform regressions which mimic the dynamical equations (1):

$$(\widehat{A}_{\text{id}}, \widehat{B}_{\text{id}}) \in \arg \min_{(A, B)} \sum_{i=2n_{\text{id}}+1}^{3n_{\text{id}}} \|\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1+1}^{(i)}) - A \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) - B \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}\|^2, \quad \text{and} \quad (13)$$

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_{w, \text{id}} = \frac{1}{n_{\text{id}}} \sum_{i=2n_{\text{id}}+1}^{3n_{\text{id}}} (\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1+1}^{(i)}) - \widehat{A}_{\text{id}} \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) - \widehat{B}_{\text{id}} \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2}, \quad \text{where } v^{\otimes 2} := vv^\top. \quad (14)$$

Similarly, we recover the state cost  $Q$  by fitting a quadratic function to observed costs

$$\widetilde{Q}_{\text{id}} \in \arg \min_Q \sum_{i=2n_{\text{id}}+1}^{3n_{\text{id}}} \left( \mathbf{c}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)} - (\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^\top R \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)} - \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^\top Q \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) \right)^2, \quad (15)$$

and then setting  $\widehat{Q}_{\text{id}} = \left( \frac{1}{2} \widetilde{Q}_{\text{id}} + \frac{1}{2} \widetilde{Q}_{\text{id}}^\top \right)_+$  as the final estimator, where  $(\cdot)_+$  truncates non-positive eigenvalues to zero. This is the only place where the algorithm uses the cost oracle.

Since Theorem 2.1 ensures that  $\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})$  is not far from  $S_{\text{id}} \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}$ , the regression problems (13)–(15) are all nearly-well-specified, and we have the following guarantee.

**Theorem 2.2** (Guarantee for Phase II). *If  $n_{\text{id}} = \Omega_{\star}(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 d_{\mathbf{u}} \kappa (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \kappa) \max\{1, \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^{-4}\})$ , then with probability at least  $1 - 11\delta$  over Phases I and II,*

$$\|[\widehat{A}_{\text{id}}; \widehat{B}_{\text{id}}] - [A_{\text{id}}; B_{\text{id}}]\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|\widehat{Q}_{\text{id}} - Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|\widehat{\Sigma}_{w, \text{id}} - \Sigma_{w, \text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{id}}, \quad (16)$$

where  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\star} \left( n_{\text{id}}^{-1/2} \ln^2(n_{\text{id}}/\delta) \sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}} d_{\mathbf{u}} \kappa (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \kappa)} \right)$ .

---

**Algorithm 3** SysID: Phase II of RichID-CE (Section 2.3).

---

- 1: **Require:**
  - 2: Cost oracle to access the cost  $\mathbf{c}_t$  at time  $t \geq 1$ .
  - 3: **Inputs:**
    - $\hat{f}_{\text{id}}$  // coarse decoder.
    - $n_{\text{id}}$  // sample size.
    - $\kappa_0$  // burn-in time index.
    - $\kappa$  // upper bound on the controllability index  $\kappa_*$ .
  - 4: Set  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_0 + \kappa$ .
  - 5: Gather  $n_{\text{id}}$  trajectories by sampling control inputs  $\mathbf{u}_0, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{d_{\mathbf{u}}})$ .
  - 6: **Phase II: // Recover system dynamics and cost (see Section 2.3).**
  - 7: Set  $(\hat{A}_{\text{id}}, \hat{B}_{\text{id}}) \in \arg \min_{(A,B)} \sum_{i=2n_{\text{id}}+1}^{3n_{\text{id}}} \|\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1+1}^{(i)}) - A\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) - B\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}\|^2$ .
  - 8: Set  $\hat{\Sigma}_{w,\text{id}} = \frac{1}{n_{\text{id}}} \sum_{i=2n_{\text{id}}+1}^{3n_{\text{id}}} (\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1+1}^{(i)}) - \hat{A}_{\text{id}}\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) - \hat{B}_{\text{id}}\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2}$ , where  $v^{\otimes 2} := vv^\top$ .
  - 9: Set  $\tilde{Q}_{\text{id}} = \min_Q \sum_{i=2n_{\text{id}}+1}^{3n_{\text{id}}} \left( \mathbf{c}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)} - (\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^\top R \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)} - \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^\top Q \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) \right)^2$ .
  - 10: Set  $\hat{Q}_{\text{id}} = \left( \frac{1}{2}\tilde{Q}_{\text{id}} + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{Q}_{\text{id}}^\top \right)_+$ , where  $(\cdot)_+$  truncates all negative eigenvalues to zero.
  - 11: **Return:** system and cost matrices  $(\hat{A}_{\text{id}}, \hat{B}_{\text{id}}, \hat{\Sigma}_{w,\text{id}}, \hat{Q}_{\text{id}})$ .
- 

To simplify presentation, we assume going forward that  $S_{\text{id}} = I_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}$ , which is without loss of generality (at the cost of increasing parameters such as  $\Psi_*$  and  $\alpha_*$  by a factor of  $\|S_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|S_{\text{id}}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}$ ),<sup>7</sup> and drop the “id” subscript on the estimators  $\hat{A}_{\text{id}}, \hat{B}_{\text{id}}$ , and so forth to reflect this.<sup>8</sup>

## 2.4 Phase III: Decoding Observations Along the Optimal Path

Given the estimates  $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{Q})$  from [Theorem 2.2](#), we can use certainty equivalence to synthesize an optimal controller matrix  $\hat{K}$  for the estimated dynamics. As long as  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}}$  in [\(16\)](#) is sufficiently small, the policy  $\mathbf{u}_t = \hat{K}\mathbf{x}_t$  is stabilizing and near optimal.

To (approximately) implement this policy from rich observations, it remains to accurately estimate the latent state. The decoder learned in Phase I does not suffice; it only ensures low error on trajectories generated with random Gaussian inputs, and not on the trajectory induced by the near-optimal policy. Indeed, while it is tempting to imagine that the initial decoder  $\hat{f}$  might generalize across different trajectories, this is not the case unless we place strong structural assumptions on  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Instead, we iteratively learn a sequence of decoders  $\hat{f}_t$ —one per timestep  $t = 1, \dots, T$ . Assuming  $\hat{K} \approx K_\infty$  is near optimal, the suboptimality  $J_T(\pi) - J_T(\pi_\infty)$  of the policy  $\pi(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) := \hat{K}\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})$  is controlled by the sum  $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_\pi \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_*(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2^2$ .<sup>9</sup> Thus, to ensure low regret, we ensure that, for all  $t \geq 1$ , the decoder  $\hat{f}_t$  has low prediction error *on the distribution induced by running  $\pi$  with previous decoders  $(\hat{f}_\tau)_{1 \leq \tau < t}$  and  $\hat{K}$* . This motivates the following iterative decoding procedure, executed for each time step  $t = 1, \dots, T$ :

---

<sup>7</sup>The controller  $S_{\text{id}}K_\infty$  attains the same performance on  $(A_{\text{id}}, B_{\text{id}})$  as  $K_\infty$  on  $(A, B)$

<sup>8</sup>We make this reasoning precise in the proof of [Theorem 1.1](#).

<sup>9</sup>Note that regret does not take into account step 0.

**Step 1.** Collect  $2n_{\text{op}}$  trajectories by executing the randomized control input  $\mathbf{u}_\tau = \widehat{K}\widehat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) + \mathbf{v}_\tau$ , for  $0 \leq \tau \leq t$ , and  $\mathbf{u}_\tau = \mathbf{v}_\tau$ , for  $t < \tau < t + \kappa$ , where  $\mathbf{v}_\tau \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_{d_u})$ ; here,  $n_{\text{op}} \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\sigma^2 \leq 1$  are algorithm parameters to be specified later.

**Step 2.** Obtain a *residual decoder*  $\widehat{h}_t$  satisfying (17) by solving regressions (25) and (26) using a regression oracle.

**Step 3.** Form a state decoder  $\widehat{f}_{t+1}$  from  $\widehat{h}_t$  and  $\widehat{f}_t$  using the update equation (18).

Forming the decoder  $\widehat{f}_1$  requires additional regression steps (described in Section 2.5) which account for the uncertainty in the initial state  $\mathbf{x}_0$ . At each subsequent time  $t$ , the most important part of the procedure above is **Step 2**, which aims to produce a regressor  $\widehat{h}_t$  such that

$$\widehat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - A\widehat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_t) \approx B\mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{w}_t = \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - A\mathbf{x}_t. \quad (17)$$

As we shall see, enforcing accuracy on the *increments*  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - A\mathbf{x}_t$  allows us to set up regression problems which do not depend on, and thus *do not* propagate forward, the errors in  $\widehat{f}_t$ . In contrast, a naive regression—say,  $\arg \min_f \mathbb{E} \left[ \|f(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - (A + B\widehat{K})\widehat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_t) - B\mathbf{v}_t\|_2^2 \right]$ —could compound decoding errors exponentially in  $t$ .

Luckily, the increments in (17) are sufficient for recovery of the state by unfolding a recursion; this comprises **Step 3**. Let  $\bar{b} > 0$  be an algorithm parameter. Given a regressor  $\widehat{h}_t$  satisfying (17) and the current decoder  $\widehat{f}_t$ , we form next state decoder  $\widehat{f}_{t+1}$  via

$$\widehat{f}_{t+1}(\cdot) := \widetilde{f}_{t+1}(\cdot) \mathbb{I}\{\|\widetilde{f}_{t+1}(\cdot)\|_2 \leq \bar{b}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{f}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) := \left( \widehat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \widehat{A} \cdot \widehat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_t) \right) + \widehat{A} \cdot \widehat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}), \quad (18)$$

where we set  $\widetilde{f}_0 \equiv \widehat{f}_0 \equiv 0$ . By clipping  $\widetilde{f}_t$ , we ensure states remain bounded, which simplifies the analysis. Crucially, by building our decoders ( $\widehat{f}_\tau$ ) this way, we ensure that the decoding error grows at most linearly in  $t$ —as opposed to exponentially—as long as the system is stable (i.e.  $\rho(A) < 1$ ), as assumed.

It remains to describe how to obtain a regressor  $\widehat{h}_t$  satisfying (17). To this end, we use the added Gaussian noise  $\mathbf{v}_t$  to set up the regression.

**Warm-up: Invertible  $B$ .** As a warm-up, suppose that  $B$  is invertible. Then, for the matrix  $M_1 := B^\top (BB^\top + \sigma^{-2}\Sigma_w)^{-1}$ , one can compute

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v}_t \mid \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}] \stackrel{(*)}{=} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v}_t \mid \mathbf{w}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t] \stackrel{(**)}{=} M_1(\mathbf{w}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t) = M_1(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - A\mathbf{x}_t - B\widehat{K}\widehat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})). \quad (19)$$

Following the discussion in Section 2.1, the identity  $(*)$  uses the fact that conditioning on  $\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}$  is equivalent to conditioning on  $\mathbf{x}_{0:t+1}$ , due to perfect decodability. However, unlike in Section 2.1,  $\mathbf{x}_{0:t+1}$  are *not* jointly Gaussian, because errors in the decoder may yield non-Gaussian control input. Instead, we use that the conditional distribution of  $\mathbf{v}_t \mid \mathbf{x}_{0:t+1}$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{v}_t \mid \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ , since  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = A\mathbf{x}_t + B\mathbf{u}_t$ . The equality  $(**)$  uses a general formula for Gaussian conditional expectations, also described in Section 2.1.

Since conditional expectations minimize the square loss, learning a residual regressor  $\widehat{h}_t$  which approximately minimizes

$$h \mapsto \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\mathbf{v}_t - M_1(h(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - Ah(\mathbf{y}_t) - B\widehat{K}\widehat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}))\|_2^2 \right] \quad (20)$$

produces a decoder  $\hat{h}_{t+1}$  approximately satisfying (17):

$$M_1(\hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - A\hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_{t+1})) \approx M_1(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - A\mathbf{x}_{t+1}), \quad (21)$$

since

$$M_1(\hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - A\hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - B\hat{K}\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})) \approx M_1(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - A\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - B\hat{K}\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})).$$

For invertible  $B$ , the matrix  $M_1$  is invertible, and so from (21), our state decoder  $\hat{h}_{t+1}$  indeed satisfies (17):  $\hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - A\hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_t) \approx \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - A\mathbf{x}_t$ . We emphasize that regressing to purely Gaussian inputs  $\mathbf{v}_t$  is instrumental in ensuring the conditional expectation equality in (19) holds. The noise variance  $\sigma^2$  trades off between the conditioning of the regression, and the excess suboptimality caused by noise injection; we choose it so that the final suboptimality is  $\mathcal{O}_*(\epsilon)$ .

**Extension to general controllable systems.** For non-invertible  $B$ , we aggregate more regressions. For  $k \in [\kappa]$ , let

$$M_k := \mathcal{C}_k^\top \left( \mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^\top + \sigma^{-2} \sum_{i=0}^k A^{i-1} \Sigma_w (A^{i-1})^\top \right)^{-1},$$

where we recall  $\mathcal{C}_k$  from Assumption 4. Generalizing (19), we show (Lemma F.7 in Appendix E) that the outputs  $(\mathbf{y}_\tau)$  and the Gaussian perturbation vector  $\mathbf{v}_{t:t+k-1} := (\mathbf{v}_t^\top, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{t+k-1}^\top)^\top$  generated according to Step 1 above satisfy, for all  $k \in [\kappa]$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v}_{t:t+k-1} \mid \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+k}] = M_k(\mathbf{x}_{t+k} - A^k \mathbf{x}_t - A^{k-1} B \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})) =: \phi_{t,k}^*(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+k}). \quad (22)$$

Defining concatenations  $\Phi_t^* := (\phi_{t,1}^*, \dots, \phi_{t,\kappa}^*)$  and  $\mathcal{M} := [M_1^\top, (M_2 A)^\top, \dots, (M_\kappa A^{\kappa-1})^\top]^\top$  and stacking the conditional expectations gives:

$$\mathbb{E}[\Phi_t^*(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) \mid \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}] = \mathcal{M}(B\mathbf{v}_t + \mathbf{w}_t) = \mathcal{M}(f_*(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - Af_*(\mathbf{y}_t) - B\hat{K}\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})). \quad (23)$$

Hence, with infinite samples (and knowledge of  $B$ ), we are able to recover the residual quantity  $\mathcal{M}(f_*(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - Af_*(\mathbf{y}_t))$ . Again, the Gaussian inputs enable the conditional expectations (22) and (23). The crucial insight for the stacked regression is that by rolling in and switching to pure Gaussian noise only *after* time  $t$ , we maintain gaussianity, while still yielding decoders that are valid on-trajectory *up to* time  $t$ . To ensure that we accurately recover the increment  $f_*(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - Af_*(\mathbf{y}_t)$ , we require the overdetermined matrix  $\mathcal{M}$  to be invertible. To facilitate this, let  $\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2}$  denote the value of  $\mathcal{M}$  as a function of  $\sigma^2$ , and let

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}} = \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2} / \sigma^2 \quad (24)$$

be the (normalized) limiting matrix as noise tends to zero, which is an intrinsic problem parameter.

**Assumption 9.** The limiting matrix  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$  satisfies  $\lambda_{\mathcal{M}} := \lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(\bar{\mathcal{M}}^\top \bar{\mathcal{M}}) > 0$ .

This assumption is central to the analysis, and we believe it is reasonable: it holds whenever either  $A$  or  $B$  is full rank and the system is controllable. However, we are interested to understand if there are other more transparent conditions under which our recovery guarantees hold.

To approximate the conditional expectations (22), (23) from finite samples, we define another expanded function class

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}} := \{Mf(\cdot) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}, M \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{x}} \times d_{\mathbf{x}}}, \|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Psi_{\star}^3\},$$

and use  $(\widehat{M}_k)$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$  to denote plugin estimates of  $(M_k)$  and  $\mathcal{M}$ , respectively, constructed from  $\widehat{A}$  and  $\widehat{B}$ . Here, the subscript “op” subscript on  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  abbreviates “on-policy”.

Next, given a state decoder  $\hat{f}_t$  for time  $t$  and  $k \in [\kappa]$ , we define

$$\widehat{\phi}_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+k}) := \widehat{M}_k \left( h(\mathbf{y}_{t+k}) - \widehat{A}^k h(\mathbf{y}_t) - \widehat{A}^{k-1} \widehat{B} \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) \right) \quad \text{for } h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}.$$

With this and the  $2n_{\text{op}}$  trajectories  $\{(\mathbf{y}_{\tau}^{(i)}, \mathbf{v}_{\tau}^{(i)})\}_{1 \leq i \leq 2n_{\text{op}}}$  gathered in **Step 1** above, we obtain  $\hat{h}_t$  by solving the following two-step regression:

$$\hat{h}_{t,k} \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{op}}} \left\| \widehat{\phi}_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{t+k}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{v}_{t:t+k-1}^{(i)} \right\|_2^2, \quad \forall k \in [\kappa], \quad (25)$$

followed by

$$\hat{h}_t \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i=n_{\text{op}}+1}^{2n_{\text{op}}} \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{M}} \cdot \left( h(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}^{(i)}) - \widehat{A} \cdot h(\mathbf{y}_t^{(i)}) - \widehat{B} \widehat{K} \cdot \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}^{(i)}) \right) - \widehat{\Phi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}^{(i)}) \right\|_2^2, \quad (26)$$

where

$$\widehat{\Phi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) := [\widehat{\phi}_{t,1}(\hat{h}_{t,1}, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+1})^\top, \dots, \widehat{\phi}_{t,\kappa}(\hat{h}_{t,\kappa}, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+\kappa})^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(1+\kappa)\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}}/2}. \quad (27)$$

We see that the first regression approximates (22), while the second approximates (23). We can now state the guarantee for Phase III.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Suppose  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}}^2 \leq \check{\mathcal{O}}((\ln|\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}}^2)n_{\text{op}}^{-1})$ . If we set  $\bar{b}^2 = \Theta_{\star}((d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}}) \ln(n_{\text{op}}))$ ,  $r_{\text{op}} = \Psi_{\star}^3$ , and  $\sigma^2 = \check{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda_{\mathcal{M}})$ , we are guaranteed that for any  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ , with probability at least  $1 - \mathcal{O}(\kappa T \delta)$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_{\star}(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2^2 \right] \leq \mathcal{O}_{\star} \left( \frac{\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}^{-2}}{\sigma^4} \cdot T^3 \kappa^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^4 \cdot \frac{(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln|\mathcal{F}|) \ln^5(n_{\text{op}}/\delta)}{n_{\text{op}}} \right). \quad (28)$$

To obtain **Theorem 1.1**, we combine **Theorem 2.2** and **Theorem 2.3**, then appeal to **Theorem C.2** (**Appendix C**), which bounds the policy suboptimality in terms of regression errors. Finally, we set  $\sigma \propto \varepsilon$  so that the suboptimality due to adding the Gaussian noise  $(\mathbf{v}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is low. See **Appendix G** for details.

## 2.5 Learning the Initial State

We now overview how Phase III of RichID (**Algorithm 4**) learns a predictor for the initial state  $\mathbf{x}_0$ ; this is an edge case not discussed above, and comprises **Line 19** through **Line 25** in **Algorithm 4**.

If we ignore the clipping in (18), the state decoders  $(\hat{f}_{\tau})_{t \geq 2}$  are defined through the recursion:

$$\hat{f}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) = \hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \widehat{A} \hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_t) + \widehat{A} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_t), \quad \text{for } t \geq 1,$$

which means that all the decoding error for any  $t$  will depend on the error of the decoder  $\hat{f}_1$  for the state  $\mathbf{x}_1$ . To ensure that  $\hat{f}_1$  is accurate, we need to somehow learn to decode the initial state  $\mathbf{x}_0$ ,

which we recall is assumed to be distributed as  $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$ . The challenge here is that the covariance matrix  $\Sigma_0$  is unknown, and we need to estimate it in order to “back out” the initial state through the approach in [Section 2.1](#). This is achieved by [Line 19](#) through [Line 25](#) of [Algorithm 4](#), which we explain in detail below. Briefly, the idea is that since  $\mathbf{x}_1 = A\mathbf{x}_0 + B\mathbf{u}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0$ , to accurately predict  $\mathbf{x}_1$  it suffices to have good predictors for  $\mathbf{w}_0$  and  $A\mathbf{x}_0$ . We can learn a predictor for  $\mathbf{w}_0$  in the same fashion as for all the other timesteps, and most of the work in [Line 19](#) through [Line 25](#) is to learn a regression function  $\hat{f}_{A,0}$  that accurately predicts  $A\mathbf{x}_0$ .

To begin, in [Line 19](#) we execute Gaussian control inputs  $\mathbf{v}_\tau$  for  $0 \leq \tau < \kappa$ . We then proceed as follows.

**Line 21.** As we show in [Theorem E.1](#) ([Appendix E](#)),  $\hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \hat{A}\hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_t) - \hat{B}(\hat{K}\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) + \mathbf{v}_t)$  approximates the system’s noise  $\mathbf{w}_t$ , for  $t \geq 0$ . In particular, since  $\hat{f}_0 \equiv 0$  by definition ([Line 11](#)),  $\hat{h}_0(\mathbf{y}_1) - \hat{A}\hat{h}_0(\mathbf{y}_0) - \hat{B}\mathbf{v}_0$  approximates the noise  $\mathbf{w}_0$ . Since we have  $\mathbf{x}_1 = A\mathbf{x}_0 + B\mathbf{u}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0$ , it remains to get a good estimator for  $A\mathbf{x}_0$ . To this end, we observe that the predictor  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}$  in [Line 21](#) is (up to a generalization bound) equal to

$$\arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\|h(\mathbf{y}_1) - \mathbf{w}_0\|^2],$$

which we show—under the realizability assumption—is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{w}_0 \mid \mathbf{y}_1] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{w}_0 \mid \mathbf{x}_1] = \Sigma_w(\sigma^2 BB^\top + \Sigma_w + A\Sigma_0 A^\top)^{-1}(A\mathbf{x}_0 + B\mathbf{v}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0), \quad (29)$$

where the last equality—like the rest of our Bayes characterizations—follows by [Fact D.2](#).

**Line 22.** Now, given that  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1) \approx \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{w}_0 \mid \mathbf{y}_1]$ , one can recognize that the matrix  $\hat{\Sigma}$  in [Line 22](#) is an estimator for the matrix

$$\Sigma_w(\sigma^2 BB^\top + \Sigma_w + A\Sigma_0 A^\top)^{-1}\Sigma_w. \quad (30)$$

In particular, even though we cannot recover the covariance matrix  $\Sigma_0$ , the estimator  $\hat{\Sigma}$  gives a means to predict  $A\mathbf{x}_0$ , leading to an accurate decoder  $\hat{f}_1$ .

**Line 23.** Since  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1)$  accurately predicts  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{w}_0 \mid \mathbf{y}_1]$  (whose closed form expression we recall is given by the RHS of [\(29\)](#)), the predictor  $\tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0}$  in [Line 23](#) can be seen to approximate

$$\arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \|h(\mathbf{y}_0) - \Sigma_w(\sigma^2 BB^\top + \Sigma_w + A\Sigma_0 A^\top)^{-1}(A\mathbf{x}_0 + B\mathbf{v}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0)\|^2 \right],$$

which (under realizability) is simply

$$\mathbb{E}[\Sigma_w(\sigma^2 BB^\top + \Sigma_w + A\Sigma_0 A^\top)^{-1}(A\mathbf{x}_0 + B\mathbf{v}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0) \mid \mathbf{x}_0] = \Sigma_w(\sigma^2 BB^\top + \Sigma_w + A\Sigma_0 A^\top)^{-1}A\mathbf{x}_0. \quad (31)$$

**Lines 24 and 25.** In light of [\(31\)](#) and the fact that  $\hat{\Sigma}$  is an estimator of the matrix in [\(30\)](#), we are guaranteed that  $\hat{\Sigma}_w \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0)$  accurately predicts  $A\mathbf{x}_0$ , which motivates the updates in [Lines 24](#) and [25](#).

---

**Algorithm 4** COMPUTEPOLICY: Phase III of RichID-CE
 

---

- 1: **Inputs:**  $(\widehat{A}, \widehat{B}, \widehat{\Sigma}_w, \widehat{Q}, R)$  // estimates for the system parameters and cost matrices.
  - 2: **Parameters:**
    - $n_{\text{op}}$  // proportional to the sample size.
    - $\kappa$  // upper-bound on the controllability index  $\kappa_*$ .
    - $\sigma^2$  // exploration parameter.
    - $\bar{b}$  // clipping parameter for the decoders.
    - $r_{\text{op}}$  // parameter to define the function class.
  - 3: Set  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}} = \{Mf(\cdot) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}, M \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times d_x}, \|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq r_{\text{op}}\}$ .
  - 4: Set  $n_{\text{init}} = n_{\text{op}}$ .
  - 5: **Phase III: // Learn on-policy decoders (see Section 2.4 and Section 2.5).**
  - 6: Set  $(\widehat{P}, \widehat{K}) := \text{DARE}(\widehat{A}, \widehat{B}, \widehat{Q}, R)$  (Definition 1).
  - 7: **for**  $k = 1, \dots, \kappa$  **do**
  - 8:   Set  $\widehat{C}_k = [\widehat{A}^{k-1}\widehat{B} \mid \dots \mid \widehat{B}]$ .
  - 9:   Set  $\widehat{M}_k := \widehat{C}_k^\top (\widehat{C}_k \widehat{C}_k^\top + \sigma^{-2} \sum_{i=0}^k \widehat{A}^{i-1} \widehat{\Sigma}_w (\widehat{A}^{i-1})^\top)^{-1}$ .
  - 10: Set  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}} = [\widehat{M}_1, \dots, (\widehat{M}_\kappa \widehat{A}^{\kappa-1})^\top]^\top$ .
  - 11: Define  $\hat{f}_0(y_0) = 0$  for all  $y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ .
  - 12: **for**  $t = 0, \dots, T-1$  **do**
  - 13:   Collect  $2n_{\text{op}}$  trajectories by executing the randomized control input  $\mathbf{u}_\tau = \widehat{K} \hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) + \mathbf{v}_\tau$ ,
  - 14:   for  $0 \leq \tau \leq t$ , and  $\mathbf{u}_\tau = \mathbf{v}_\tau$ , for  $t < \tau < t + \kappa$ , where  $\mathbf{v}_\tau \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_{d_u})$ .
  - 15:   **for**  $k = 1, \dots, \kappa$  **do**
  - 16:     Set  $\hat{h}_{t,k} \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{op}}} \left\| \widehat{\phi}_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{t+k}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{v}_{t:t+k-1}^{(i)} \right\|_2^2$ ,  
       where  $\widehat{\phi}_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+k}) := \widehat{M}_k \left( h(\mathbf{y}_{t+k}) - \widehat{A}^k h(\mathbf{y}_t) - \widehat{A}^{k-1} \widehat{B} \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) \right)$ .
  - 17:     Set  $\hat{h}_t \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i=n_{\text{op}}+1}^{2n_{\text{op}}} \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{M}} \left( h(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}^{(i)}) - \widehat{A} h(\mathbf{y}_t^{(i)}) - \widehat{B} \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}^{(i)}) \right) - \widehat{\Phi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}^{(i)}) \right\|_2^2$ ,  
       where  $\widehat{\Phi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) := [\widehat{\phi}_{t,1}(\hat{h}_{t,1}, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+1})^\top, \dots, \widehat{\phi}_{t,\kappa}(\hat{h}_{t,\kappa}, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+\kappa})^\top]^\top$ .
  - 18:   **if**  $t = 0$  **then** // Initial state learning phase (Section 2.5).
  - 19:     Collect  $2n_{\text{init}}$  trajectories by executing the control input  $\mathbf{u}_\tau = \mathbf{v}_\tau$ , for  $0 \leq \tau < \kappa$ ,
  - 20:     where  $\mathbf{v}_\tau \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_{d_u})$ .
  - 21:     Set  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1} \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{init}}} \left\| h(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}) - \left( \hat{h}_0(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}) - \widehat{A} \hat{h}_0(\mathbf{y}_0^{(i)}) - \widehat{B} \mathbf{v}_0^{(i)} \right) \right\|_2^2$ .
  - 22:     Set  $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}} := \frac{1}{n_{\text{init}}} \sum_{i=n_{\text{init}}+1}^{2n_{\text{init}}} \hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}) \hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)})^\top$ .
  - 23:     Set  $\tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0} \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i=n_{\text{init}}+1}^{2n_{\text{init}}} \left\| h(\mathbf{y}_0^{(i)}) - \hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}) \right\|_2^2$ .
  - 24:     Set  $\hat{f}_{A,0}(\mathbf{y}_0) = \widehat{\Sigma}_w \widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0)$ .
  - 25:     Set  $\tilde{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_{0:1}) = \hat{h}_0(\mathbf{y}_1) - \widehat{A} \hat{h}_0(\mathbf{y}_0) + \hat{f}_{A,0}(\mathbf{y}_0)$ .
  - 26:   **else**
  - 27:     Set  $\tilde{f}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) = \hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \widehat{A} \hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_t) + \widehat{A} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_t)$ .
  - 28:     Set  $\hat{f}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) = \tilde{f}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) \mathbb{I}\{\|\tilde{f}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})\|_2 \leq \bar{b}\}$ .
  - 29:     Set controller  $\hat{\pi}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) = \widehat{K} \hat{f}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) + \mathbf{v}_{t+1}$ , with  $\mathbf{v}_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_{d_u})$ .
  - 30: **Return:** Controller  $\hat{\pi} = (\hat{\pi}_t)_{t=1}^T$ .
-

### 3 Extensions

**Relaxing the stability assumption.** We believe that our algorithm can be extended to so-called *marginally stable* systems, where  $\rho(A)$  can be as large as 1 (rather than strictly less than 1). In such systems, there exist system-dependent constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  for which  $\|A^n\|_{\text{op}} \leq c_1 n^{c_2}$  for all  $n$ . In general, these constants may be large, and in the worst case  $c_2$  may be as large as  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$  (or, more generally, the largest Jordan block of  $A$ ); see, e.g., [Simchowit et al. \(2018\)](#) for discussion. Nevertheless, if  $c_1, c_2$  are treated as problem dependent constants, we can attain polynomial sample complexity. The majority of [Algorithm 1](#) can remain as-is, but the analysis will replace the geometric decay of  $A$  with the polynomial growth bound above. This will increase our sample complexity by a  $\text{poly}(c_1 T^{c_2})$  factor, where  $T$  is the time horizon.

The only difficulty is that we can no longer directly identify the matrices  $A$  and  $B$  in Phase II. This is because our current analysis uses the *mixing* property of  $A$ , which entails that if  $\rho(A) < 1$ , then for  $t$  sufficiently large, under purely Gaussian inputs  $\mathbf{x}_t$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$  have similar distributions. This ensures that predictors learned at time  $t$  are similar to those at time  $t + 1$ . However, this is no longer true if  $\rho(A) = 1$ . To remedy this, we observe that it is still possible to recover the controllability matrix  $[B; AB; A^2B; \dots; A^{k-1}B]$  from the regression problem in Phase I up to a change of basis (see, e.g., [Simchowit et al. \(2019\)](#) for guarantees for learning such a matrix in the marginally stable setting). We can then recover the matrices  $A$  and  $B$  from the controllability matrix up to orthogonal transformation using the Ho-Kalman procedure (see [Oymak and Ozay \(2019\)](#) or [Sarkar et al. \(2019\)](#) for refined guarantees).

**Relaxing the controllability assumption.** If the system is not controllable, then we may not be able to recover the state exactly. Instead, we can recover the state up to the limiting-column space of the matrices  $(C_k)$ , which is always attained for  $k \leq d_{\mathbf{x}}$ . We can then use this to run a weaker controller (e.g., an observer-feedback controller) based on observations of the projection of the state onto this subspace.

**Other extensions.** The assumption on the growth rate for  $\mathcal{F}$  can be replaced with the bound  $\|f(y)\| \leq L \max\{1, \|f_{\star}(y)\|^p\} \forall f \in \mathcal{F}$  for any  $p \geq 1$ , at the expense of degrading the final sample complexity.

### 4 Discussion

We introduced **RichID**, a new algorithm for sample-efficient continuous control with rich observations. We hope that our work will serve as a starting point for further research into sample-efficient continuous control with nonlinear observations, and we are excited to develop the techniques we have presented further, both in theory and practice. To this end, we list a few interesting directions and open questions for future work.

- While our results constitute the first polynomial sample complexity guarantee for the **RichLQR**, the sample complexity can certainly be improved. An important problem is to characterize the fundamental limits of learning in the **RichLQR** and design algorithms to achieve these limits, which may require new techniques. Of more practical importance, however, is to remove various technical assumptions used by **RichID**. We believe the most important assumptions to remove are (I) the assumption that the open-loop system is stable ([Assumption 6](#)), which is rarely satisfied in practice; and (II) the assumption that process noise is Gaussian, which

is currently used in a rather strong sense to characterize the Bayes optimal solutions to the regression problems solved in RichID.

- RichID-CE is a model-based reinforcement learning algorithm. We are excited at the prospect of expanding the family of algorithms for RichLQR to include provable model-free and direct policy search-based algorithms. It may also be interesting to develop algorithms with guarantees for more challenging variants of the RichLQR, including regret rather than PAC-RL, and learning from a single trajectory rather than multiple episodes.
- Can we extend our guarantees to more rich classes of latent dynamical systems? For example, in practice, rather than assuming the latent system is linear, it is common to assume that it is *locally linear*, and apply techniques such as iterative LQR (Watter et al., 2015).

**Appendix.** All of our proofs, as well as detailed versions of the theorems in the main body, are presented in the appendix (following the convention [Theorem 1.1](#)→[Theorem 1.1a](#)), with apologies for the exceptional length. On a first pass the reader may wish to focus on [Appendix D](#) and [Appendix E](#), which constitute the core proof of [Theorem 1.1](#).

## Acknowledgements

This work was done while ZM was an intern at Microsoft Research. DF acknowledges the support of NSF Tripods grant #1740751. MS was supported by an Open Philanthropy AI Fellowship. AR acknowledges the support of ONR awards #N00014-20-1-2336 and #N00014-20-1-2394

## References

- Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori, Dávid Pál, and Csaba Szepesvari. Online-to-confidence-set conversions and application to sparse stochastic bandits. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1–9, 2012.
- Ershad Banijamali, Rui Shu, Hung Bui, and Ali Ghodsi. Robust locally-linear controllable embedding. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1751–1759, 2018.
- Dimitri P. Bertsekas. *Dynamic Programming and Optimal Control, Vol. I*. Athena Scientific, 2005.
- Alon Cohen, Avinatan Hasidim, Tomer Koren, Nevena Lazic, Yishay Mansour, and Kunal Talwar. Online linear quadratic control. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1028–1037, 2018.
- Chandler Davis and William Morton Kahan. The rotation of eigenvectors by a perturbation. III. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 7(1):1–46, 1970.
- Sarah Dean and Benjamin Recht. Certainty equivalent perception-based control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.12332*, 2020.
- Sarah Dean, Nikolai Matni, Benjamin Recht, and Vickie Ye. Robust guarantees for perception-based control. *Learning for Dynamics and Control (L4DC)*, 2020.
- Simon S. Du, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Nan Jiang, Alekh Agarwal, Miroslav Dudík, and John Langford. Provably efficient RL with rich observations via latent state decoding. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019.

- Jianqing Fan. On the optimal rates of convergence for nonparametric deconvolution problems. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1257–1272, 1991.
- Jianqing Fan and Young K Truong. Nonparametric regression with errors in variables. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1900–1925, 1993.
- Dylan J Foster, Alexander Rakhlin, and Tuhin Sarkar. Learning nonlinear dynamical systems from a single trajectory. *Learning for Dynamics and Control (L4DC)*, 2020.
- Abraham Frandsen and Rong Ge. Extracting latent state representations with linear dynamics from rich observations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.16128*, 2020.
- Danijar Hafner, Timothy Lillicrap, Ian Fischer, Ruben Villegas, David Ha, Honglak Lee, and James Davidson. Learning latent dynamics for planning from pixels. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2555–2565, 2019.
- Roger A. Horn and Charles R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis, 2nd Ed.* Cambridge University Press, 2012. ISBN 9780521548236. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139020411.
- Daniel Hsu, Sham Kakade, and Tong Zhang. A tail inequality for quadratic forms of subgaussian random vectors. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 17, 2012.
- Nan Jiang, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Alekh Agarwal, John Langford, and Robert E Schapire. Contextual decision processes with low Bellman rank are PAC-learnable. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1704–1713, 2017.
- Sham M. Kakade. *On the sample complexity of reinforcement learning.* PhD thesis, University College London, 2003.
- Rudolf E. Kalman. Contributions to the theory of optimal control. *Bol. soc. mat. mexicana*, 5(2): 102–119, 1960.
- Sahin Lale, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Babak Hassibi, and Anima Anandkumar. Logarithmic regret bound in partially observable linear dynamical systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.11227*, 2020.
- Beatrice Laurent and Pascal Massart. Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1302–1338, 2000.
- Nir Levine, Yinlam Chow, Rui Shu, Ang Li, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, and Hung Bui. Prediction, consistency, curvature: Representation learning for locally-linear control. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020.
- Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, Trevor Darrell, and Pieter Abbeel. End-to-end training of deep visuomotor policies. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):1334–1373, 2016.
- Horia Mania, Stephen Tu, and Benjamin Recht. Certainty equivalence is efficient for linear quadratic control. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 10154–10164, 2019.
- Andreas Maurer and Massimiliano Pontil. Empirical Bernstein bounds and sample-variance penalization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, 2009.
- Alexander Meister. *Deconvolution Problems in Nonparametric Statistics.* Springer, 2009.

- Alexander Meister. Nonparametric Berkson regression under normal measurement error and bounded design. *Journal of multivariate analysis*, 101(5):1179–1189, 2010.
- Dipendra Misra, Mikael Henaff, Akshay Krishnamurthy, and John Langford. Kinematic state abstraction and provably efficient rich-observation reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- Samet Oymak. Stochastic gradient descent learns state equations with nonlinear activations. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2551–2579, 2019.
- Samet Oymak and Necmiye Ozay. Non-asymptotic identification of LTI systems from a single trajectory. In *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 5655–5661. IEEE, 2019.
- Phan Phien. Some quantitative results on lipschitz inverse and implicit function theorems. *East-West Journal of Mathematics*, 13(arXiv: 1204.4916):7–22, 2012.
- Tuhin Sarkar, Alexander Rakhlin, and Munther A Dahleh. Finite-time system identification for partially observed LTI systems of unknown order. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01848*, 2019.
- Yahya Sattar and Samet Oymak. Non-asymptotic and accurate learning of nonlinear dynamical systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08538*, 2020.
- Susanne M Schennach. Regressions with Berkson errors in covariates—a nonparametric approach. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(3):1642–1668, 2013.
- Susanne M. Schennach. Recent advances in the measurement error literature. *Annual Review of Economics*, 8:341–377, 2016.
- Rui Shu, Tung Nguyen, Yinlam Chow, Tuan Pham, Khoat Than, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, Stefano Ermon, and Hung H Bui. Predictive coding for locally-linear control. *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2020.
- Max Simchowitz, Horia Mania, Stephen Tu, Michael I Jordan, and Benjamin Recht. Learning without mixing: Towards a sharp analysis of linear system identification. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pages 439–473, 2018.
- Max Simchowitz, Ross Boczar, and Benjamin Recht. Learning linear dynamical systems with semi-parametric least squares. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2714–2802, 2019.
- Max Simchowitz, Karan Singh, and Elad Hazan. Improper learning for non-stochastic control. *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, 2020.
- Joel A Tropp. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices. *Foundations of computational mathematics*, 12(4):389–434, 2012.
- Roman Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.3027*, 2010.
- Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Manuel Watter, Jost Springenberg, Joschka Boedecker, and Martin Riedmiller. Embed to control: A locally linear latent dynamics model for control from raw images. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2746–2754, 2015.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	LQR with Rich Observations . . . . .	2
1.2	Our approach . . . . .	4
1.3	Technical Preliminaries . . . . .	5
1.4	Related Work . . . . .	7
<b>2</b>	<b>An Algorithm for LQR with Rich Observations</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1	Predicting Inputs from Outputs: The Bayes Regression Function . . . . .	9
2.2	Phase I: Learning a Coarse Decoder . . . . .	10
2.3	Phase II: System Identification . . . . .	12
2.4	Phase III: Decoding Observations Along the Optimal Path . . . . .	13
2.5	Learning the Initial State . . . . .	16
<b>3</b>	<b>Extensions</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Lower Bound for RichLQR Without Perfect Decodability</b>	<b>27</b>
A.1	Formal Statement of Lower Bound . . . . .	27
A.2	Additional Preliminaries . . . . .	27
A.3	Proof of <a href="#">Theorem A.1</a> . . . . .	28
A.4	Proofs for Supporting Lemmas . . . . .	30
<b>B</b>	<b>Learning Theory Tools</b>	<b>40</b>
B.1	Statement of Guarantees . . . . .	40
B.1.1	Generic Concentration . . . . .	40
B.1.2	Gaussian Concentration and Change of Measure . . . . .	41
B.1.3	Conditional Expectations for Decodable Markov Chains . . . . .	41
B.1.4	Covering Numbers . . . . .	42
B.1.5	Square Loss Regression . . . . .	42
B.1.6	Principal Component Analysis . . . . .	44
B.1.7	Linear Regression . . . . .	44
B.1.8	Regression with Matrix Measurements . . . . .	45
B.2	Proofs for Technical Tools . . . . .	45
B.2.1	Proof of <a href="#">Lemma B.1</a> . . . . .	45
B.2.2	Proof of <a href="#">Lemma B.2</a> . . . . .	46
B.2.3	Proof of <a href="#">Lemma B.3</a> . . . . .	47
B.2.4	Proof of <a href="#">Lemma B.4</a> . . . . .	49
B.2.5	Proof of <a href="#">Lemma B.5</a> . . . . .	49
B.2.6	Proof of <a href="#">Proposition B.1</a> . . . . .	49
B.2.7	Proof of <a href="#">Corollary B.1</a> . . . . .	52
B.2.8	Proof of <a href="#">Corollary B.2</a> . . . . .	53
B.2.9	Proof of <a href="#">Proposition B.2</a> . . . . .	56
B.2.10	Proof of <a href="#">Corollary B.3</a> . . . . .	57
B.2.11	Proof of <a href="#">Proposition B.3</a> . . . . .	58
B.2.12	Proof of <a href="#">Proposition B.4</a> . . . . .	60
B.2.13	Proof of <a href="#">Proposition B.5</a> . . . . .	63

<b>C</b>	<b>Linear Control Theory</b>	<b>66</b>
C.1	Basic Technical Results . . . . .	66
C.2	Value Functions . . . . .	66
C.3	Perturbation Bound for the Optimal Controller . . . . .	67
C.4	Regret Decomposition . . . . .	68
C.5	Proofs for Linear Control Theory Results . . . . .	68
<b>D</b>	<b>Proofs for RichID Phase I and II</b>	<b>73</b>
D.1	Preliminaries . . . . .	73
D.1.1	Marginals and Conditions . . . . .	73
D.1.2	Selecting the Burn-In Time . . . . .	74
D.1.3	Properties of the Class $\mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$ . . . . .	76
D.2	Proof of Decoder Recovery (Theorem 2.1) . . . . .	77
D.2.1	Prediction Error Guarantee for $\hat{h}_{\text{id}}$ . . . . .	78
D.2.2	Dimension Reduction . . . . .	79
D.3	Estimating Costs and Dynamics (Theorem 2.2) . . . . .	81
D.3.1	Preliminaries for Theorem 2.2 . . . . .	81
D.3.2	Estimation of $A_{\text{id}}$ , $B_{\text{id}}$ , and $\Sigma_{w,\text{id}}$ . . . . .	83
D.3.3	Recovering the Cost Matrix $Q_{\text{id}}$ . . . . .	87
D.3.4	Concluding the Proof of Theorem 2.2a . . . . .	89
<b>E</b>	<b>Proofs for RichID Phase III</b>	<b>90</b>
E.1	Preliminaries . . . . .	90
E.1.1	Approximation Error for Plug-In Estimators. . . . .	91
E.1.2	Conditioning for the $\mathcal{M}$ Matrix . . . . .	92
E.2	Learning State Decoders for Rounds $t \geq 1$ . . . . .	92
E.3	Learning the Initial State . . . . .	95
E.4	Master Theorem for Phase III . . . . .	97
<b>F</b>	<b>Supporting Proofs for Appendix E</b>	<b>99</b>
F.1	A Truncation Bound for the Iterates . . . . .	99
F.2	Proof of Lemma E.1 . . . . .	100
F.2.1	Supporting Results . . . . .	101
F.3	Proof of Lemma E.2 . . . . .	104
F.4	Proof of Theorem E.1 . . . . .	105
F.4.1	Regression Bound for $\phi_{t,k}$ . . . . .	105
F.4.2	Regression bound for $\phi$ . . . . .	108
F.4.3	Proof of Theorem E.1 . . . . .	111
F.5	Proof of Lemma E.3 . . . . .	113
F.6	Proof of Theorem E.2 . . . . .	115
F.7	Proof of Theorem E.3 . . . . .	117
F.8	Proof of Lemma E.4 . . . . .	118
F.9	Proof of Lemma E.5 . . . . .	119
F.10	Proof of Theorem E.4 . . . . .	120
F.11	Supporting Results . . . . .	122
<b>G</b>	<b>Main Theorem and Proof</b>	<b>124</b>
G.1	Proof of Theorem 1.1a . . . . .	125

# Organization and Notation

This appendix is organized as follows.

- [Appendix A](#) contains a formal statement and proof for the lower bound ([Theorem A.1](#)).
- [Appendix B](#) and [Appendix C](#) contain basic technical tools for learning theory and linear control theory, respectively, which are invoked within the proof of the main theorem.
- All subsequent sections are devoted to proving our main theorem ([Theorem 1.1](#)):
  - [Appendix D](#) contains statements and proofs for all results concerning Phases I and II of RichID-CE, including [Theorem 2.1](#) and [Theorem 2.2](#).
  - [Appendix E](#) contains statements and proofs for Phase III, including [Theorem 2.3](#).
  - [Appendix G](#) states the full version of the [Theorem 1.1](#) ([Theorem 1.1a](#)), and shows how to deduce the proof from the results of [Appendix D](#) and [Appendix E](#).

We remind the reader that each numbered theorem from the main body has an corresponding “full” version in the appendix, which we denote using the “a” suffix (e.g., the full version of [Theorem 1.1](#) is [Theorem 1.1a](#)).

Notation	Definition
<b>Basic Definitions</b>	
$(A, B)$	system matrices
$q(\cdot x)$	emissions model
$f_*$	true decoder
$\mathcal{F}$	function class
$\mathbf{w}_t$	process noise, which follows $\mathbf{w}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_w)$
$\mathbf{x}_t$	system state, which has initial state $\mathbf{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$
$\mathbf{u}_t$	control input
$\mathbf{y}_t$	observations
$\mathbf{c}_t$	observed cost, with $\mathbf{c}_t = \mathbf{x}_t^\top Q \mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{u}_t^\top R \mathbf{u}_t$
$R, Q$	control cost, state cost
$T$	horizon
$J_T$	cost functional
$\pi_\infty$	infinite horizon optimal policy
$\mathcal{C}_k$	controllability matrix $([A^{k-1}B \mid \dots \mid B])$
$K_\infty, P_\infty, \Sigma_\infty$	infinite-horizon optimal controller, Lyapunov matrix, covariance matrix ( <a href="#">DARE</a> )
<b>System Parameter Bounds</b>	
$\Psi_*$	upper bound on system parameter norms ( <a href="#">Assumption 8</a> )
$(\alpha_*, \gamma_*)$	upper bound on strong stability parameter ( <a href="#">Assumption 8</a> )
$\kappa$	controllability index upper bound ( <a href="#">Assumption 8</a> )
$L$	growth condition on $\mathcal{F}$ ( <a href="#">Assumption 5</a> )
$(\alpha_A, \gamma_A)$	strong stability parameters for $A$ ( <a href="#">Proposition C.2</a> )
$(\alpha_\infty, \gamma_\infty)$	strong stability parameters for $A + BK_\infty$ ( <a href="#">Proposition C.1</a> )

Table 1: Summary of notation.

# A Lower Bound for RichLQR Without Perfect Decodability

## A.1 Formal Statement of Lower Bound

In this section of the appendix we formally state and prove our sample complexity lower bound for RichLQR without perfect decodability. The protocol for the lower bound is as follows: The learning algorithm **A** accesses the system (3) through  $n$  trajectories on which it can play any (possibly adaptively chosen) sequence of control inputs  $\mathbf{u}_{0:T}$  and observe  $\mathbf{y}_{0:T}$ . At the end of this process, the algorithm outputs a decoder  $\hat{f}_A$ , and the prediction performance of the decoder (at time  $t = 1$ ) is measured under an arbitrary roll-in policy (chosen a-priori).

**Theorem A.1** (Lower bound for RichLQR without perfect decodability.). *Let  $\mathbf{w}_t, \varepsilon_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , let  $n \geq n_0$ , where  $n_0$  is an absolute constant, and suppose we require that inputs are bounded so that  $|\mathbf{u}_t| \leq 64 \ln^{1/2} n$ . For every such  $n$ , there exists a function class  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $|\mathcal{F}| = 2$  and system with  $d_{\mathbf{x}} = d_{\mathbf{u}} = d_{\mathbf{y}} = 1$  and  $T = 1$  such that for learning algorithm **A** using only  $n$  trajectories, and any roll-in policy  $\pi$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_A \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \left( \hat{f}_A(\mathbf{y}_1) - f_*(\mathbf{y}_1) \right)^2 \right] \geq \Omega(1) \cdot \frac{1}{\ln^{3/2} n}.$$

Moreover, each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  is  $\mathcal{O}(\ln^{1/2} n)$ -Lipschitz and invertible, with  $f'(y) \geq 1$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Theorem A.1 shows that to learn a  $\varepsilon$ -suboptimal decoder under output noise for a particular function class  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $|\mathcal{F}| = 2$ , any algorithm requires an exponential number of samples. We note however that since the Lipschitz parameter for the functions in the construction grows with  $n$  (as  $\ln^{1/2} n$ ), the construction does not rule out a sample complexity guarantee that is polynomial in  $1/n$  but exponential in the Lipschitz parameter. Nonetheless, the algorithms we develop in this paper under the perfect decodability assumption enjoy polynomial dependence on both  $1/n$  and the Lipschitz parameter, which the lower bound shows is impossible under unit output noise. We remark that the constraint that  $|\mathbf{u}_t| \leq 64 \ln^{1/2} n$  can be weakened to  $|\mathbf{u}_t| \leq C \ln^{1/2} n$  for any  $C \geq 64$  at the cost of weakening the final lower bound to  $\frac{1}{C \ln^{3/2} n}$ . Finally, we remark that the lower bound only rules out learning a  $\varepsilon$ -optimal decoder, not an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policy; such a lower bound may require a more sophisticated construction.

Beyond Theorem A.1, an additional challenge for solving RichLQR without perfect decodability is that the optimal controller is no longer reactive: since the problem is partially observable, the optimal controller will in general depend on the entire history, which makes it difficult to characterize its performance and analyze the suboptimality of data-driven algorithms. We believe that developing more tractable models for RichLQR under weaker decodability assumptions is an important direction for future research.

## A.2 Additional Preliminaries

For an  $L_2$ -integrable function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define the Fourier transform  $\hat{f}$  via

$$\hat{f}(\omega) = \int e^{-i2\pi\omega x} f(x) dx.$$

For functions  $f, g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we let  $f * g$  denote their convolution, which is given by

$$(f * g)(x) = \int f(x - y)g(y) dy.$$

For a pair of distributions  $P \ll Q$  with densities  $p$  and  $q$ , we define

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P \parallel Q) = \int p(x) \ln(p(x)/q(x)) dx$$

and

$$\chi^2(P \parallel Q) = \int \frac{(p(x) - q(x))^2}{q(x)} dx.$$

### A.3 Proof of Theorem A.1

Throughout this proof we use  $C$  to denote an absolute numerical constant whose value may change from line to line.

We begin the proof by instantiating the LQR parameters. We set  $T = 1$ ,  $d_{\mathbf{u}} = d_{\mathbf{x}} = d_{\mathbf{y}} = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{w}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and  $\varepsilon_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . We select  $a = \frac{1}{2}$  (this choice is arbitrary) and  $b = 1$ . We assume that  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is always initialized to the same value, and this value is known to the learner. The precise value will be specified shortly, but it will be chosen such that  $\mathbf{y}_0$  reveals no information about the underlying instance. With the parameters above, the observation  $\mathbf{y}_1$  follows the following data-generating process:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_1 &= f_{\star}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_1) + \varepsilon_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_1 &= \mathbf{u}_0 + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0. \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

Since  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is known to the learner, we reparameterize the control inputs for the sake of notational compactness via  $\mathbf{u}_0 := \mathbf{u}_0 - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}_0$ , so the data-generating process simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_1 &= f_{\star}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_1) + \varepsilon_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_1 &= \mathbf{u}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0. \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

The basic observation underlying our lower bound is that the data-generating process (A.2) is an instance of the classical *error-in-variable regression* problem in the *Berkson* error model (Meister, 2009, 2010; Schennach, 2013, 2016). To emphasize the similarity to the setting, we rebind the variables as  $Y = \mathbf{y}_1$ ,  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1$ ,  $Z = \mathbf{x}_1$ ,  $X = \mathbf{u}_0$ ,  $W = \mathbf{w}_0$ , and  $m_{\star} = f_{\star}^{-1}$ , so that Eq. (A.2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= m_{\star}(Z) + \varepsilon \\ Z &= X + W. \end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

We can interpret  $X$  (the control  $\mathbf{u}_0$ ) as a true covariate known to the learner, and  $Z$  (the state  $\mathbf{x}_1$ ) as an unobserved noisy version of this covariate obtained by adding the noise  $W$ . The noisy covariate is passed through the regression function  $m_{\star}$ , then the noise  $\varepsilon$  is added, leading to the target variable  $Y$  (the observation  $\mathbf{y}_1$ ).

Ultra-slow  $1/\ln n$ -type rates appear in many variants of the error-in-variable regression problem (Fan and Truong, 1993; Meister, 2009, 2010), as well as the closely related nonparametric deconvolution problem (Fan, 1991). Our lower bound is based on Theorem 2 of Meister (2010), but with two important changes that add additional complications to the analysis. First, we ensure that the regression functions in our construction are invertible, so that the perfect decodability assumption holds in absence of noise, and second, our lower bound holds even for actively chosen covariates, since these correspond to control inputs chosen by the learner in the RichLQR problem.

Rather than constructing a decoder class  $\mathcal{F}$  directly, it will be more convenient to construct a class of encoders  $\mathcal{M}$  (so that  $m_{\star} \in \mathcal{M}$ ), then take  $\mathcal{F} = \{m^{-1} \mid m \in \mathcal{M}\}$  to be the induced decoder class.

Let  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ ,  $\beta \geq 1$ , and  $\gamma > 0$  be parameters of the construction. We define the following functions:

$$\begin{aligned} r(z) &= \gamma z, \\ \phi(z) &= e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\beta^2}}, \\ \psi(z) &= \cos(4\pi\beta z), \\ h(z) &= \alpha\phi(z)\psi(z). \end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

We consider two alternate regression functions:  $m_0(z) := r(z) + h(z)$  and  $m_1(z) := r(z) - h(z)$ , and take  $\mathcal{M} = \{m_0, m_1\}$ . We define  $f_i = m_i^{-1}$ .

**Lemma A.1.** For  $m \in \{m_0, m_1\}$ , we have

$$m'(z) \in [\gamma - 14\alpha\beta, \gamma + 14\alpha\beta].$$

In light of this lemma, we will leave  $\beta \geq 1$  free for the time being, but choose

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{28\beta^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{\beta}, \tag{A.5}$$

which ensures that

$$0 < \frac{1}{2\beta} \leq m'(z) \leq \frac{3}{2\beta}. \tag{A.6}$$

In particular, this implies that  $m$  is  $\frac{3}{2}$ -Lipschitz and invertible (since  $\beta \geq 1$ ).

We now specify the starting state as  $\mathbf{x}_0 = \frac{1}{8\beta}$ . This ensures that  $\psi(\mathbf{x}_0) = \cos(\pi/2) = 0$ , so that  $m_0(\mathbf{x}_1) = m_1(\mathbf{x}_0)$ , and consequently the observation  $\mathbf{y}_0$  is statistically independent of the underlying instance.

Let  $\mathbf{x}_0^{(i)}, \mathbf{u}_0^{(i)}, \mathbf{x}_1^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}$ , and so forth denote the realizations of the system variables in the  $i$ th trajectory played by the learner, and let  $S = (\mathbf{y}_0^{(1)}, \mathbf{u}_0^{(1)}, \mathbf{y}_1^{(1)}, \mathbf{u}_1^{(1)}), \dots, (\mathbf{y}_0^{(n)}, \mathbf{u}_0^{(n)}, \mathbf{y}_1^{(n)}, \mathbf{u}_1^{(n)})$  denote the observables collected throughout the entire learning process. For  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , we let  $\mathbb{P}_{S;i}$  denote the law of  $S$  when  $m_i$  is the true encoding function, and let  $\mathbb{E}_i$  denote the expectation under  $\mathbb{P}_{S;i}$ . We also let  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;i}(\cdot | u)$  denote the law of  $\mathbf{y}_1$  given  $\mathbf{u}_0$  when  $m_\star = m_i$  and  $p_i(y | u)$  be the corresponding density (we suppress dependence on  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , which takes on the constant value  $\frac{1}{8\beta}$  in both instances). Lastly, we let  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi;i}$  denote the expectation over  $(\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{u}_1)$  when we roll in with  $\pi$  and  $m_i$  is the underlying encoder.

Let  $\hat{f}_A(\cdot)$  be the decoder returned by  $\mathbf{A}$ , which we assume to be  $\sigma(S)$ -measurable. We first observe that since the roll-in policy has  $|\mathbf{u}_t| \leq \beta$  with probability 1, [Lemma A.6](#) implies that

$$\max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}_i \mathbb{E}_{\pi;i} \left[ (\hat{f}_A(\mathbf{y}_1) - f_i(\mathbf{y}_1))^2 \right] \geq c \cdot \max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}_i \left[ \int_{-1}^1 (\hat{f}_A(y) - f_i(y))^2 dy \right],$$

meaning that going forward we can dispense with the roll-in policy and lower bound the simpler quantity on the right-hand side above. Now, let  $P_i$  denote the density corresponding to the law

$\mathbb{P}_{S;i}$ . We can further lower bound the worst-case risk of  $\mathbf{A}$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}_i \left[ \int_{-1}^1 (\hat{f}_{\mathbf{A}}(y) - f_i(y))^2 dy \right] \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} \left[ \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \int_{-1}^1 (\hat{f}_{\mathbf{A}}(y) - f_0(y))^2 dy \right] + \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \int_{-1}^1 (\hat{f}_{\mathbf{A}}(y) - f_1(y))^2 dy \right] \right] \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^1 \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} \left[ (\hat{f}_{\mathbf{A}}(y) - f_0(y))^2 + (\hat{f}_{\mathbf{A}}(y) - f_1(y))^2 \right] \min\{P_0(S), P_1(S)\} dS \right] dy \\
& \geq \frac{1}{4} \int_{-1}^1 (f_0(y) - f_1(y))^2 dy \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} \min\{P_0(S), P_1(S)\} dS \\
& \geq \frac{1}{4} \int_{-1}^1 (f_0(y) - f_1(y))^2 dy \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \|P_0 - P_1\|_{L_1(\mathbb{R}^{4n})} \right) \\
& = \frac{1}{4} \int_{-1}^1 (f_0(y) - f_1(y))^2 dy \cdot (1 - D_{\text{TV}}(\mathbb{P}_{S;0} \| \mathbb{P}_{S;1})).
\end{aligned}$$

If we choose  $\beta = 64 \ln^{1/2} n$  then our key technical lemma, [Lemma A.2](#), implies that  $D_{\text{TV}}(\mathbb{P}_{S;0} \| \mathbb{P}_{S;1}) = o(1)$ . [Lemma A.7](#) further implies that  $\int_{-1}^1 (f_0(y) - f_1(y))^2 dy \geq \frac{1}{8} \alpha^2 \beta$ , so that when  $n$  is sufficiently large we have

$$\max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}_i \left[ \int_{-1}^1 (\hat{f}_{\mathbf{A}}(y) - f_i(y))^2 dx \right] \geq c \cdot \alpha^2 \beta = c \ln^{-3/2} n.$$

□

#### A.4 Proofs for Supporting Lemmas

**Proof of [Lemma A.1](#).** We calculate that for  $m \in \{m_0, m_1\}$ , we have

$$m'(z) = \gamma \pm \alpha \left( \frac{z}{\beta^2} e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\beta^2}} \cos(2\beta z) + 4\pi\beta e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\beta^2}} \sin(2\beta z) \right).$$

Observe that  $|\cos z|, |\sin z|, e^{-z^2} \leq 1$ , and

$$\left| \frac{z}{\beta^2} e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\beta^2}} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \sup_z \left| z e^{-\frac{z^2}{2}} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\beta e^{1/2}}.$$

It follows that

$$f'(z) \in \left[ \gamma - \alpha \left( \frac{1}{\beta e^{1/2}} + 4\pi\beta \right), \gamma + \alpha \left( \frac{1}{\beta e^{1/2}} + 4\pi\beta \right) \right] \subseteq [\gamma - 14\alpha\beta, \gamma + 14\alpha\beta],$$

where we have used that  $\beta \geq 1$ .

□

**Lemma A.2.** If we choose  $\beta = 64 \ln^{1/2} n$ , then for all  $n \geq 3$  we have

$$D_{\text{TV}}^2(\mathbb{P}_{S;0} \| \mathbb{P}_{S;1}) \leq Cn^{-4}.$$

**Proof of [Lemma A.2](#).** To begin, we apply Pinsker's inequality:

$$D_{\text{TV}}^2(\mathbb{P}_{S;0} \| \mathbb{P}_{S;1}) \leq \frac{1}{2} D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}_{S;0} \| \mathbb{P}_{S;1}).$$

Let  $o^{(j)} = (y_0^{(j)}, u_0^{(j)}, y_1^{(j)}, u_1^{(j)})$ . We observe that then density  $P_i(o^{(1)}, \dots, o^{(n)})$  factorizes as

$$P_i(o^{(1)}, \dots, o^{(n)}) = \prod_{j=1}^n p_{\mathbf{y}_{0;i}}(y_0^{(j)}) p_{\mathbf{u}_0^{(j)}}(u_0^{(j)} \mid o^{(1)}, \dots, o^{(j-1)}, y_0^{(j)}) p_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;i}(y_1^{(j)} \mid u_0^{(j)}) p_{\mathbf{u}_1^{(j)}}(u_1^{(j)} \mid o^{(1)}, \dots, o^{(j-1)}, y_0^{(j)}, u_0^{(j)}, y_1^{(j)}),$$

where  $p_{\mathbf{y}_{0;i}}$  is the density for  $\mathbf{y}_0$  under instance  $i$ ,  $p_{\mathbf{u}_0^{(j)}}$  and  $p_{\mathbf{u}_1^{(j)}}$  are the conditional densities for  $\mathbf{u}_0^{(j)}$  and  $\mathbf{u}_1^{(j)}$  given all preceding observations, and  $p_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;i}$  is the conditional density for  $\mathbf{y}_1$  given  $\mathbf{u}_0$  under instance  $i$ . The densities  $p_{\mathbf{u}_0^{(j)}}$  and  $p_{\mathbf{u}_1^{(j)}}$  do not depend on the instance  $i$ , nor does the density  $p_{\mathbf{y}_{0;i}}$  (recall that the choice of starting state  $\mathbf{x}_0 = \frac{1}{8\beta}$  guarantees  $m_0(\mathbf{x}_0) = m_1(\mathbf{x}_0)$ , so  $\mathbf{y}_0 = \varepsilon_0$  in law for both instances). We conclude that the KL divergence telescopes as

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}_{S;0} \parallel \mathbb{P}_{S;1}) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ D_{\text{KL}} \left( \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;0}(\cdot \mid \mathbf{u}_0^{(j)}) \parallel \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;1}(\cdot \mid \mathbf{u}_0^{(j)}) \right) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \chi^2 \left( \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;0}(\cdot \mid \mathbf{u}_0^{(j)}) \parallel \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;1}(\cdot \mid \mathbf{u}_0^{(j)}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since the algorithm satisfies  $|\mathbf{u}_0^{(j)}|, |\mathbf{u}_1^{(j)}| \leq \beta$  almost surely, we can apply [Lemma A.3](#) to each summand, which gives

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}_{S;0} \parallel \mathbb{P}_{S;1}) \leq Cn^{-9}. \quad \square$$

**Lemma A.3.** If we choose  $\beta = 64 \ln n$ , then for all  $n \geq 3$  and all  $|u| \leq \beta$ , we have

$$\chi^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;0}(\cdot \mid u) \parallel \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;1}(\cdot \mid u)) \leq Cn^{-10}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

**Proof of Lemma A.3.** Recall that we let  $p_i$  denote the conditional density for  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;i}(\cdot \mid u)$ . Let  $p_\varepsilon(\varepsilon) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2}$  denote the density of  $\varepsilon$  and  $p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}w^2}$  denote the density of  $\mathbf{w}$ . Observe that for each  $i$ , we have

$$p_i(y \mid u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int p_\varepsilon(y - f_i(u + w)) p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\chi^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;0}(\cdot \mid u) \parallel \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;1}(\cdot \mid u)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int p_1^{-1}(y \mid u) \cdot \left| \int [p_\varepsilon(y - f_0(u + w)) - p_\varepsilon(y - f_1(u + w))] p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw \right|^2 dy. \end{aligned}$$

By [Lemma A.4](#) (with  $\eta = 1/5$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_i^{-1}(y \mid u) &\leq 3^{1/2} \exp \left( \frac{(1 + 1/5)(y - \gamma u)^2}{2} + 5 \right) \\ &\leq 3^{1/2} \exp \left( \frac{(1 + 1/5)^2}{2} y^2 + \frac{5(1 + 1/5)}{2} \gamma^2 u^2 + 5 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|u| \leq \beta$ ,  $\gamma^2 u^2 \leq 1$ , so we can further simplify to

$$p_i^{-1}(y \mid u) \leq C \cdot \exp \left( \frac{3}{4} y^2 \right).$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \chi^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;0}(\cdot | u) \| \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;1}(\cdot | u)) \\ & \leq C \int e^{\frac{3}{4}y^2} \left| \int [p_\varepsilon(y - f_0(u + w)) - p_\varepsilon(y - f_1(u + w))] p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw \right|^2 dy. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Taylor series representation for  $p_\varepsilon$ , we have

$$p_\varepsilon(y - f_i(u + w)) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} p_\varepsilon^{(k)}(y) (-f_i(u + w))^k,$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} & \chi^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;0}(\cdot | u) \| \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;1}(\cdot | u)) \\ & \leq C \int e^{\frac{3}{4}y^2} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} p_\varepsilon^{(k)}(y) \int [(-f_0(u + w))^k - (-f_1(u + w))^k] p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw \right|^2 dy. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to the series, we can further upper bound by

$$\begin{aligned} & C \int e^{\frac{3}{4}y^2} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{-2k}}{k!} (p_\varepsilon^{(k)}(y))^2 \right) \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{2k}}{k!} \left( \int [(f_0(u + w))^k - (f_1(u + w))^k] p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw \right)^2 \right) dy \\ & = C \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{-2k}}{k!} \int e^{\frac{3}{4}y^2} (p_\varepsilon^{(k)}(y))^2 dy \right) \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{2k}}{k!} \left( \int [(f_0(u + w))^k - (f_1(u + w))^k] p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw \right)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We first bound the left term involving the density  $p_\varepsilon$ . Let  $H_k(y) = (-1)^k e^{\frac{y^2}{2}} \frac{d^k}{dy^k} e^{-\frac{y^2}{2}}$  denote the probabilist's  $k$ th Hermite polynomial, so that  $p_\varepsilon^{(k)}(y) = (-1)^k H_k(y) e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int e^{\frac{3}{4}y^2} |p_\varepsilon^{(k)}(y)|^2 dy &= \int e^{\frac{3}{4}y^2} \cdot H_k^2(y) e^{-y^2} dy \\ &= \int H_k^2(y) e^{-\frac{1}{4}y^2} dy \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} 2^k \int H_k^2(y/\sqrt{2}) e^{-\frac{1}{2}(y/\sqrt{2})^2} dy \\ &= \sqrt{2} \cdot 2^k \int H_k^2(y) e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2} dy \\ &\leq C \cdot 2^k k!, \end{aligned}$$

where (i) uses that  $H_k$  is a degree- $k$  polynomial. Applying this inequality for each  $k$ , we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{-2k}}{k!} \int e^{\frac{3}{4}y^2} (p_\varepsilon^{(k)}(y))^2 dy \leq C \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k} \leq C,$$

and so

$$\chi^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;0}(\cdot | u) \| \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1|\mathbf{u}_0;1}(\cdot | u)) \leq C \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{2k}}{k!} \left( \int [(f_0(u + w))^k - (f_1(u + w))^k] p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw \right)^2.$$

Next, using the binomial theorem, for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(f_0(x))^k - (f_1(x))^k &= (r(x) + h(x))^k - (r(x) - h(x))^k \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} r^{k-j}(x) h^j(x) (1 - (-1)^k) \\
&= 2 \sum_{j \leq k, \text{ odd}} \binom{k}{j} r^{k-j}(x) h^j(x),
\end{aligned}$$

leading to the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
&\chi^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{u}_0; 0}(\cdot | u) \| \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{u}_0; 1}(\cdot | u)) \\
&\leq C \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{2k}}{k!} \left( \sum_{j \leq k, \text{ odd}} \binom{k}{j} \int r^{k-j}(u+w) h^j(u+w) p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw \right)^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{2k} k}{k!} \sum_{j \leq k, \text{ odd}} \binom{k}{j} \left| \int r^{k-j}(u+w) h^j(u+w) p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw \right|^2 \\
&= C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{2k} k}{k!} \sum_{j \leq k, \text{ odd}} \binom{k}{j} \left| (r^{k-j} h^j * p_{\mathbf{w}})(u) \right|^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{2k} k}{k!} \sum_{j \leq k, \text{ odd}} \binom{k}{j} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \left| (r^{k-j} h^j * p_{\mathbf{w}})(u) \right|^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{3k} k}{k!} \max_{j \leq k, \text{ odd}} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \left| (r^{k-j} h^j * p_{\mathbf{w}})(u) \right|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the equality holds because  $p_w$  is symmetric. We now appeal to [Lemma A.5](#) for each term in the sum, which leads to an upper bound of

$$\begin{aligned}
&C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{3k} k}{k!} \max_{j \leq k, \text{ odd}} \left( \gamma^{k-j} \alpha^j \beta^{(k-j+1)/2} \cdot j \sqrt{(k-j)!} \cdot \exp\left(-2\pi^2 \left(\frac{\beta^2}{j} \wedge 1\right) \beta^2\right) \right)^2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{3k} k^3 \max_{j \leq k, \text{ odd}} \left( \gamma^{k-j} \alpha^j \beta^{(k-j+1)/2} \cdot \exp\left(-2\pi^2 \left(\frac{\beta^2}{j} \wedge 1\right) \beta^2\right) \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the choice  $\alpha = \frac{1}{12\beta^2}$  and  $\gamma = 1/\beta$ , we can upper bound

$$\gamma^{k-j} \alpha^j \beta^{(k-j+1)/2} \leq \beta^{-k/2}$$

for each term above, so we have

$$\leq C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{3k} k^3 \max_{j \leq k, \text{ odd}} \beta^{-k} \cdot \exp\left(-4\pi^2 \left(\frac{\beta^2}{j} \wedge 1\right) \beta^2\right).$$

Since  $\beta \geq 64$  for  $n \geq 3$ , we have  $\beta^{-k} \leq 2^{-6k}$ , so we can upper bound the sum above as

$$\leq C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-2k} k^3 \max_{j \leq k, \text{ odd}} 2^{-k} \cdot \exp\left(-4\pi^2 \left(\frac{\beta^2}{j} \wedge 1\right) \beta^2\right).$$

We now consider two cases for the term in the max above. First, if  $j \leq \beta^2$ , then we have  $\exp\left(-4\pi^2\left(\frac{\beta^2}{j} \wedge 1\right)\beta^2\right) \leq \exp(-4\pi^2\beta^2)$ . Otherwise, we have  $k \geq j \geq \beta^2$ , so  $2^{-k} \leq 2^{-\beta^2}$ . Putting the two cases together (using that  $\exp(-4\pi^2\beta^2) \leq 2^{-\beta^2}$ ), we get the following coarse upper bound:

$$C2^{-\beta^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k} k^3 \leq C2^{-\beta^2}.$$

The choice  $\beta = 64 \ln^{1/2} n$  implies that  $2^{-\beta^2} \leq n^{-10}$ . □

**Lemma A.4.** Let  $\eta \leq 1$  be given. Then for each  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , we have

$$p_i(y | u) \geq 3^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\left(\frac{(1+\eta)(y-\gamma u)^2}{2} + \frac{1}{\eta}\right)\right).$$

**Proof of Lemma A.4.** We have

$$\begin{aligned} p_i(y | u) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int p_\varepsilon(y - f_i(u+w)) p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(y - r(u+w) \pm h(u+w))^2\right) p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw. \end{aligned}$$

Using the AM-GM inequality, we have that for any  $\eta > 0$ , this is lower bounded by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{1+\eta}{2}(y - r(u+w))^2\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1+1/\eta}{2}h^2(u+w)\right) p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw.$$

We will restrict to  $\eta < 1$ . Since  $|h| \leq \alpha < 1$  everywhere, we can further lower bound by

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1+1/\eta}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{1+\eta}{2}(y - r(u+w))^2\right) p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw \\ &\geq \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{\eta}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{1+\eta}{2}(y - r(u+w))^2\right) p_{\mathbf{w}}(w) dw \\ &= \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{\eta}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{1+\eta}{2}(y - r(u+w))^2\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}w^2\right) dw. \end{aligned}$$

Define  $\mu = y - \gamma u$ ,  $\sigma^2 = (1 + (1 + \eta)\gamma^2)^{-1}$ , and  $\mu' = (1 + \eta)\gamma\sigma^2\mu$ . Then by completing the square, we have

$$\exp\left(-\frac{1+\eta}{2}(y - r(u+w))^2\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}w^2\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{(1+\eta)\mu^2}{2(1+(1+\eta)\gamma^2)}\right) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(w-\mu')^2}{2\sigma^2}\right).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int \exp\left(-\frac{1+\eta}{2}(y - r(u+w))^2\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}w^2\right) dw &= \exp\left(-\frac{(1+\eta)\mu^2}{2(1+(1+\eta)\gamma^2)}\right) \cdot \sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2} \\ &\geq \exp\left(-\frac{(1+\eta)\mu^2}{2}\right) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma A.5.** There is a universal constant  $C > 0$  such that for all  $k$  and  $j \leq k$  with  $j$  odd,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| (r^{k-j} h^j * p_{\mathbf{w}})(x) \right| \leq C \cdot \gamma^{k-j} \alpha^j \beta^{(k-j+1)/2} \cdot j \sqrt{(k-j)!} \cdot \exp\left(-2\pi^2 \left(\frac{\beta^2}{j} \wedge 1\right) \beta^2\right) \quad (\text{A.8})$$

**Proof of Lemma A.5.** Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  be fixed. Then, using the Fourier inversion formula (using that both  $r^{k-j} h^j$ ,  $p_{\mathbf{w}}$ , and their respective Fourier transforms are  $L_2$ -integrable), we have

$$\left| (r^{k-j} h^j * p_{\mathbf{w}})(x) \right| = \left| \int e^{i2\pi x \omega} (\widehat{r^{k-j} h^j})(\omega) \widehat{p_{\mathbf{w}}}(\omega) d\omega \right| \leq \int \left| (\widehat{r^{k-j} h^j})(\omega) \widehat{p_{\mathbf{w}}}(\omega) \right| d\omega.$$

We proceed to compute the Fourier transform for  $r^{k-j}(x)h^j(x) = \gamma^{k-j}\alpha^j x^{k-j}\phi^j(x)\psi^j(x)$ . We first observe that  $\phi^j(x) = \exp(-\frac{j}{\beta^2} \cdot \frac{z^2}{2})$ . Let  $b_1 = \frac{\beta^2}{j}$ . Then, using that the Fourier transform is self-dual for Gaussians (specifically, that the Fourier transform of  $e^{-cx^2}$  is  $\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{c}} e^{-\frac{\pi^2}{c}\omega^2}$ ), we have

$$\widehat{\phi^j}(\omega) = \sqrt{2\pi b_1} e^{-2\pi^2 b_1 \omega^2}.$$

Next, we recall that for any  $f$ , the Fourier transform of  $x^n f(x)$  is  $(\frac{i}{2\pi})^n \frac{d^n}{d\omega^n} \widehat{f}(\omega)$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{x^{k-j} \phi^j}(\omega) &= \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^{k-j} \sqrt{2\pi b_1} \cdot \frac{d^{k-j}}{d\omega^{k-j}} e^{-2\pi^2 b_1 \omega^2} \\ &= \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^{k-j} \sqrt{2\pi b_1} b_2^{k-j} \cdot H_{k-j}(b_2 \omega) e^{-\frac{(b_2 \omega)^2}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

where  $b_2 := 2\pi\sqrt{b_1}$ . Finally, we use that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^j(x) &= (\cos(4\pi\beta x))^j = \frac{1}{2^j} (e^{i4\pi\beta x} + e^{-i4\pi\beta x}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^j} \sum_{l=0}^j \binom{j}{l} e^{i4\pi\beta x \cdot (j-l)} \cdot e^{-i4\pi\beta x \cdot l} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^j} \sum_{l=0}^j \binom{j}{l} e^{i4\pi\beta x \cdot (j-2l)} \end{aligned}$$

We now use that the Fourier transform of  $e^{-icx} f(x)$  is  $\widehat{f}(\omega - \frac{c}{2\pi})$  to derive

$$\widehat{x^{k-j} \phi^j \psi^j}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2^j} \left(\frac{i}{2\pi}\right)^{k-j} \sqrt{2\pi b_1} b_2^{k-j} \sum_{l=0}^j \binom{j}{l} H_{k-j}(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l))) e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \left| (\widehat{r^{k-j} h^j})(\omega) \widehat{p_{\mathbf{w}}}(\omega) \right| d\omega \\ &\leq \gamma^{k-j} \alpha^j \frac{1}{2^j} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^{k-j} \sqrt{2\pi b_1} b_2^{k-j} \sum_{l=0}^j \binom{j}{l} \int \left| H_{k-j}(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l))) e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} \widehat{p_{\mathbf{w}}}(\omega) \right| d\omega \\ &\leq \gamma^{k-j} \alpha^j \frac{1}{2^j} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^{k-j} \sqrt{2\pi b_1} b_2^{k-j} \sum_{l=0}^j \binom{j}{l} \int |H_{k-j}(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l)))| e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} e^{-2\pi^2 \omega^2} d\omega \end{aligned}$$

Now, let  $0 \leq l \leq j$  be fixed. We bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \int |H_{k-j}(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l)))| e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} e^{-2\pi^2\omega^2} d\omega \\ & \leq \underbrace{\int_{(-\beta,\beta)} |H_{k-j}(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l)))| e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} e^{-2\pi^2\omega^2} d\omega}_{(\star)} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus (-\beta,\beta)} |H_{k-j}(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l)))| e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} e^{-2\pi^2\omega^2} d\omega}_{(\star\star)}. \end{aligned}$$

For the integral in the term  $(\star)$ , we drop the  $e^{-2\pi^2\omega^2}$  term (since it is at most one), and apply Cauchy-Schwarz to bound by

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{(-\beta,\beta)} |H_{k-j}(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l)))| e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} d\omega \\ & \leq \sqrt{\int_{(-\beta,\beta)} H_{k-j}^2(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l))) e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} d\omega} \cdot \sqrt{\int_{(-\beta,\beta)} e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} d\omega} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that since  $j$  is odd,  $j-2l$  is also odd, and hence  $|j-2l| \geq 1$ . It follows that for  $\omega \in (-\beta, \beta)$ ,  $\omega - 2\beta(j-2l) \notin (-\beta, \beta)$ , and so

$$\int_{(-\beta,\beta)} e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} d\omega \leq \int_{(-\beta,\beta)} e^{-\frac{b_2^2}{2}\beta^2} d\omega \leq 2\beta e^{-\frac{b_2^2}{2}\beta^2}.$$

Leaving the Hermite integral for a moment and moving to the second term  $(\star\star)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus (-\beta,\beta)} |H_{k-j}(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l)))| e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} e^{-2\pi^2\omega^2} d\omega \\ & \leq e^{-2\pi^2\beta^2} \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus (-\beta,\beta)} |H_{k-j}(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l)))| e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} d\omega \\ & \leq e^{-2\pi^2\beta^2} \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus (-\beta,\beta)} H_{k-j}^2(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l))) e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} d\omega} \cdot \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus (-\beta,\beta)} e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} d\omega} \\ & \leq e^{-2\pi^2\beta^2} \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus (-\beta,\beta)} H_{k-j}^2(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l))) e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} d\omega} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{b_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting both cases together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int |H_{k-j}(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l)))| e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} e^{-2\pi^2\omega^2} d\omega \\ & \leq C \cdot (\sqrt{\beta} \vee 1/\sqrt{b_2}) \exp(-2\pi^2(b_1^2 \wedge 1)\beta^2) \cdot \sqrt{\int H_{k-j}^2(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l))) e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} d\omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is a numerical constant. Using a change of variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\int H_{k-j}^2(b_2(\omega - 2\beta(j-2l))) e^{-\frac{(b_2(\omega-2\beta(j-2l)))^2}{2}} d\omega} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{b_2}} \sqrt{\int H_{k-j}^2(\omega) e^{-\frac{\omega^2}{2}} d\omega} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2\pi(k-j)!}{b_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since this bound holds uniformly for all  $l$  and  $\sum_{l=0}^j \binom{j}{l} = 2^j$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \left| (\widehat{r^{k-j}h^j})(\omega) \widehat{p_{\mathbf{w}}}(\omega) \right| d\omega \\
& \leq C \cdot \gamma^{k-j} \alpha^j \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^{k-j} \sqrt{2\pi b_1 b_2}^{k-j} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2\pi(k-j)!}{b_2}} \cdot (\sqrt{\beta} \vee 1 / \sqrt{b_2}) \exp(-2\pi^2(b_1^2 \wedge 1)\beta^2) \\
& \leq C' \cdot \gamma^{k-j} \alpha^j b_1^{(k-j)/2} \cdot (\sqrt{\beta} \vee 1 / \sqrt{b_1}) \cdot \sqrt{(k-j)!} \cdot \exp(-2\pi^2(b_1^2 \wedge 1)\beta^2) \\
& \leq C'' \cdot \gamma^{k-j} \alpha^j \beta^{(k-j+2)/2} j \cdot \sqrt{(k-j)!} \cdot \exp(-2\pi^2(b_1^2 \wedge 1)\beta^2).
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma A.6.** For any non-negative function  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and any roll-in policy  $\pi$  with  $|\mathbf{u}_0| \leq \beta$  almost surely,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi; i}[g(\mathbf{y}_1)] \geq c \cdot \int_{-1}^1 g(y) dy \quad \text{for all } i \in \{0, 1\},$$

where  $c$  is an absolute numerical constant.

**Proof of Lemma A.6.** Observe that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\pi; i}[g(\mathbf{y}_1)] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}_0; i} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(y) p_i(y | \mathbf{u}_0) dy \right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}_0; i} \left[ \int_{-1}^1 g(y) p_i(y | \mathbf{u}_0) dy \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.4 (with  $\eta = 1$ ) implies that for all  $y \in [-1, 1]$  and  $|u| \leq \beta$ ,

$$p_i(y | u) \geq 3^{-1/2} \exp(-((y - \gamma u)^2 + 1)) \geq c.$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}_0; i} \left[ \int_{-1}^1 g(y) p_i(y | \mathbf{u}_0) dy \right] \geq c \cdot \int_{-1}^1 g(y) dy.$$

□

**Lemma A.7.** If  $\beta \geq 1$  and  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  are chosen as in Eq. (A.5), we have

$$\int_{-1}^1 (f_0(y) - f_1(y))^2 dy \geq \frac{1}{8} \alpha^2 \beta.$$

**Proof of Lemma A.7.** Recall that  $m_0 = f_0^{-1}$  and  $m_1 = f_1^{-1}$ . Throughout the proof we will use that

$$\frac{1}{2\beta} \leq m'_i(z) \leq \frac{3}{2\beta}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{2\beta}{3} \leq f'_i(y) \leq 2\beta.$$

As a first step, we have

$$\int_{-1}^1 (f_0(y) - f_1(y))^2 dy = \int_{-1}^1 (f_0(y) - f_0(f_0^{-1}(f_1(y))))^2 dy \geq \frac{4\beta^2}{9} \int_{-1}^1 (y - f_0^{-1}(f_1(y)))^2 dy,$$

where we have used that  $f'(y) \geq \frac{2\beta^2}{3}$  everywhere. Next, using a change of variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-1}^1 (y - f_0^{-1}(f_1(y)))^2 dy &= \int_{f_1(-1)}^{f_1(1)} \frac{(f_1^{-1}(x) - f_0^{-1}(x))^2}{f_1'(f_1^{-1}(x))} dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2\beta} \int_{f_1(-1)}^{f_1(1)} (f_1^{-1}(x) - f_0^{-1}(x))^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality uses that  $f_1' \leq 2\beta$  everywhere. Next, we observe that  $f_1 = m_1^{-1}$ , and that

$$m_1(1) \leq \gamma + \alpha < 1, \quad \text{and} \quad m_1(-1) \geq -\gamma - \alpha > -1.$$

It follows that  $f_1(1) \geq 1$  and  $f_1(-1) \leq -1$ , and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{f_1(-1)}^{f_1(1)} (f_1^{-1}(x) - f_0^{-1}(x))^2 dx &\geq \int_{-1}^1 (f_1^{-1}(x) - f_0^{-1}(x))^2 dx \\ &= \int_{-1}^1 (m_1(x) - m_0(x))^2 dx \\ &= 4 \int_{-1}^1 h^2(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we appeal to [Lemma A.8](#), which implies that

$$\int_{-1}^1 h^2(x) dx \geq \frac{\alpha^2}{2e}.$$

□

**Lemma A.8.** If we choose  $\beta \geq 1$ , then the function  $h$  in [\(A.4\)](#) satisfies

$$\int_{-\beta}^{\beta} h^2(z) dz \geq \frac{\alpha^2 \beta}{2e}, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{-1}^1 h^2(z) dz \geq \frac{\alpha^2}{2e}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

**Proof of Lemma A.8.** First, since we integrate only over the range  $(-\beta, \beta)$ ,  $e^{-\frac{z^2}{\beta^2}} \geq e^{-1}$ , so we have

$$\int_{-\beta}^{\beta} h^2(z) dz = \alpha^2 \int_{-\beta}^{\beta} e^{-\frac{z^2}{\beta^2}} \cos^2(4\pi\beta z) dz \geq \frac{\alpha^2}{e} \int_{-\beta}^{\beta} \cos^2(4\pi\beta z) dz.$$

Next, we recall that for any  $a$ , the indefinite integral of  $\cos^2(ax)$  satisfies  $\int \cos^2(ax) = \frac{x}{2} + \frac{1}{2a} \sin(ax) \cos(ax)$ . Applying this above, we have

$$\int_{-\beta}^{\beta} \cos^2(4\pi\beta z) dz = \frac{x}{2} + \frac{1}{8\pi\beta} \sin(4\pi\beta x) \cos(4\pi\beta x) \Big|_{-\beta}^{\beta} \geq \beta - \frac{1}{4\pi\beta}.$$

For  $\beta > 1$ , this is at least  $\frac{\beta}{2}$ .

Similarly, since  $\beta \geq 1$ , we have

$$\int_{-1}^1 h^2(z) dz \geq \frac{\alpha^2}{e} \int_{-1}^1 \cos^2(4\pi\beta z) dz,$$

and

$$\int_{-1}^1 \cos^2(4\pi\beta z) dz = \frac{x}{2} + \frac{1}{8\pi\beta} \sin(4\pi\beta x) \cos(4\pi\beta x) \Big|_{-1}^1 \geq 1 - \frac{1}{4\pi\beta} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

□

## B Learning Theory Tools

In this section, we state and prove basic learning-theoretic tools used throughout the proofs for our main results. [Appendix B.1](#) gives the main statements and definitions for these results, and [Appendix B.2](#) proves the results in the order in which they appear. Our results are split into the following categories:

- [Appendix B.1.1](#) introduces a convention for subexponential random variables (“ $c$ -concentrated”) used throughout our proofs and establishes key properties of random variables satisfying this condition ([Lemma B.1](#))
- [Appendix B.1.2](#) gives a concentration properties for Gaussian vectors ([Lemma B.2](#)) and establishes a useful change-of-measure lemma ([Lemma B.3](#))
- [Appendix B.1.3](#) gives a generic template ([Lemma B.4](#)) for computing conditional expectations for random variables we call *decodable Markov chains* ([Definition 4](#)), which arise when analyzing the regression problems used in [Algorithm 1](#).
- [Appendix B.1.4](#) presents [Definition 5](#), which introduces the main notion of covering number used in our analysis, and provides bounds on covering numbers for these function classes used by [Algorithm 1](#).
- [Appendix B.1.5](#) gives prediction error bounds for square loss regression over a general function classes, subject to misspecification error. [Proposition B.1](#) provides guarantees based on a classical notion of misspecification error (which arises in Phase I of [Algorithm 1](#)), while [Corollary B.2](#) gives guarantees under a stronger notion of *function-dependent* misspecification error, which is used in the analysis of Phase III.
- [Appendix B.1.6](#) provides guarantees for a principal component analysis (PCA) setup which, in particular, subsumes the dimensionality reduction procedure used in Phase I of [Algorithm 1](#). It provides guarantees for estimating a covariance matrix under persistent error ([Proposition B.2](#)), and a corollary regarding overlap between eigenspaces ([Corollary B.3](#)).
- [Appendix B.1.7](#) considers linear regression. [Proposition B.3](#) gives bounds for parameter recovery under errors in variables, which is used to recover  $A_{\text{id}}$  and  $B_{\text{id}}$  in Phase II of [Algorithm 1](#). [Proposition B.4](#) gives a guarantee for covariance estimation, which are used to estimate  $\Sigma_{w,\text{id}}$  in Phase II.
- Finally, [Appendix B.1.8](#) gives a parameter recovery bound for regression with measurements which are rank-one outer products of near-Gaussian vectors. This is used to recover the cost matrix  $Q_{\text{id}}$  in Phase II.

### B.1 Statement of Guarantees

#### B.1.1 Generic Concentration

**Definition 3** ( $c$ -concentration). *We say that a non-negative random variable  $z$  is  $c$ -concentrated if  $\mathbb{P}[z \geq c \ln(1/\delta)] \leq \delta$  for all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ . For such random variables, we define  $c_{n,\delta} := c \ln(2n/\delta)$ .*

This is one of many equivalent (up to numerical constants) definitions for sub-exponential concentration (e.g., [Wainwright \(2019\)](#)). We opt for the term “ $c$ -concentrated” to make the dependence on the concentration parameter  $c$  precise.

**Lemma B.1** (Truncated concentration). Let  $\mathbf{z}$  be a non-negative  $c$ -concentrated random variable. Then,  $\mathbf{z}$  is  $c'$ -concentrated for all  $c' \geq c$ , and  $\alpha\mathbf{z} + \beta$  is  $\alpha c + \beta$ -concentrated for all  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ . Moreover, the the following bounds hold.

1. For any  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}\mathbb{I}\{\mathbf{z} \geq c \ln(1/\delta)\}] \leq c\delta$ , and in particular,  $\mathbb{E} \max\{c, \mathbf{z}\} \leq 2c$ . For any integer  $k \geq 1$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}^k] \leq 2k!c^k$ .
2. Let  $\varepsilon^2 \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}]$ , and let  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose  $n$  is large enough such that  $\psi(n, \delta) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{c}$ , where we define

$$\psi(n, \delta) := \frac{2 \ln(2n/\delta) \ln(2/\delta)}{n}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,  $\mathbf{z}^{(i)} \sim \mathbf{z}$  satisfy  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i \mathbf{z}^{(i)} \leq 2\varepsilon^2$ , where  $\mathbf{z}^{(i)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathbf{z}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

3. Consider the previous claim. Suppose we replace the hypothesis that  $\mathbf{z}$  is  $c$ -concentrated with the assumption that for a given  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\mathbf{z} \leq c \ln(2n/\delta)$  almost surely. Then with failure probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i \mathbf{z}^{(i)} \leq 2\varepsilon^2$ .

### B.1.2 Gaussian Concentration and Change of Measure

Our first lemma shows that norms of Gaussian vectors satisfy the  $c$ -concentration condition.

**Lemma B.2.** Let  $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ . Then,  $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2$  is  $c$ -concentrated for  $c = 5\text{tr}(\Sigma)$ .

Next, we provide a change of measure argument, which is used to establish that [Algorithm 1](#) accurately estimates the system state.

**Lemma B.3** (Gaussian change of measure). Let  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \succ 0$  be matrices in  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_1)$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_2)$ , and let  $\mathbf{y}_1 \sim q(\cdot | \mathbf{x}_1)$ ,  $\mathbf{y}_2 \sim q(\cdot | \mathbf{x}_1)$ . Let  $\hat{h}, h_\star : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be two functions such that  $\max\{\|\hat{h}(y)\|, \|h_\star(y)\|\} \leq L\|f_\star(y)\|$ . Suppose that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_1}[\|\hat{h}(\mathbf{y}_1) - h_\star(\mathbf{y}_1)\|^2] \leq \varepsilon^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \|I - \Sigma_1^{1/2} \Sigma_2^{-1} \Sigma_1^{1/2}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{14d \ln\left(\frac{80eL^2(1+\|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}})}{\varepsilon^2}\right)},$$

for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then the following error bound holds:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_2}[\|\hat{h}(\mathbf{y}_2) - h_\star(\mathbf{y}_2)\|^2] \leq 2\varepsilon^2.$$

### B.1.3 Conditional Expectations for Decodable Markov Chains

**Definition 4** (Decodable Markov chain). Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$  be random variables that form a Markov chain  $\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{y}$ . We say  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is a decodable Markov chain if there exists some function  $f_\star : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\mathbf{x} = f_\star(\mathbf{y})$  almost surely.

**Lemma B.4** (Characterization of square loss minimizer). Let  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  be a decodable Markov chain. Then,  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{y} = y] = h_\star(y)$ , where

$$h_\star(y) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{x} = f_\star(y)].$$

Moreover, for any class of functions  $\mathcal{H}$  with  $h_\star \in \mathcal{H}$ , for any  $h \in \arg \min_{h' \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}\|h'(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{u}\|^2$ , we have

$$h(\mathbf{y}) = h_\star(\mathbf{y}) \quad \text{almost surely in } \mathbf{y}.$$

### B.1.4 Covering Numbers

**Definition 5** (Covering numbers). Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \text{dist})$  be a metric space with pseudometric  $\text{dist}$ . The covering number  $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{X}, \text{dist})$  is defined as the minimal cardinality of any set  $\mathcal{X}' \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  such that

$$\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \min_{x' \in \mathcal{X}'} \text{dist}(x, x') \leq \epsilon.$$

We say that  $\mathcal{X}'$  is a minimal  $\epsilon$ -cover of  $\mathcal{X}$  if it witnesses the condition above and has  $|\mathcal{X}'| = \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{X}, \text{dist})$ .

**Lemma B.5.** Let  $\mathcal{M} := \{M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_{\mathbf{x}}} : \|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq b\}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{N}(b\epsilon, \mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}) \leq (1 + 2/\epsilon)^{dd_{\mathbf{x}}}$ .

### B.1.5 Square Loss Regression

**Proposition B.1** (Square loss regression with misspecification error). Let  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})$  be a pair of random variables with  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$ , and let  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{U}$  be an arbitrary “error” random variable. Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a function class that contains the function  $h_{\star}(y) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{y} = y]$ . Consider empirical risk minimizer

$$\hat{h}_n := \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|h(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) + \mathbf{e}^{(i)} - \mathbf{u}^{(i)}\|^2,$$

where  $(\mathbf{u}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}^{(i)}, \mathbf{e}^{(i)})$  are drawn i.i.d. from the law of  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{e})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Suppose that there exists a constant  $c > 0$  and function  $\varphi : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that the following properties hold:

- $\|h(y)\|^2 \leq \varphi(y)$  for all  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ .
- The random variables  $\varphi(\mathbf{y})$  and  $\|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2$  are  $c$ -concentrated.
- For all  $c' \geq c$  and all  $\epsilon \leq 1$ , the  $\sqrt{c'}\epsilon$ -covering number of  $\mathcal{H}$  in the pseudometric  $d_{c', \infty}(h, h') := \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \{\|h(y) - h'(y)\| : \varphi(y) \leq c'\}$  is bounded by a function  $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon)$ .

Then, with probability at least  $1 - \frac{3\delta}{2}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_{\star}(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq \frac{270c_{n,\delta}}{n} \ln(2\mathcal{N}(1/33n)\delta^{-1}) + 8\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2,$$

where we recall that  $c_{n,\delta} := c \ln(2n/\delta)$ .

We now state two corollaries of the above regression. First, a simple corollary for structured function classes of the form  $\{M \cdot f\}$ , where  $M$  are matrices of bounded operator norm, and  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  are elements of finite class which satisfy a growth condition like [Assumption 5](#).

**Corollary B.1** (Regression with Structured Function Class). Let  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})$  be a pair of random variables with  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{u}}}$ ,  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$ , and let  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{U}$  be an arbitrary “error” random variable. Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a function class that contains the function  $h_{\star}(y) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{y} = y]$ . Consider empirical risk minimizer

$$\hat{h}_n := \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|h(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) + \mathbf{e}^{(i)} - \mathbf{u}^{(i)}\|^2.$$

where  $(\mathbf{u}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}^{(i)}, \mathbf{e}^{(i)})$  are drawn i.i.d. from the law of  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{e})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Suppose  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  is a finite class of functions satisfying  $f(y) \leq L \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|_2\}$  for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , where  $L \geq 1$  without loss of generality. In addition, suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  takes the form

$$\mathcal{H} := \{h(y) = M \cdot f(y) : f \in \mathcal{F} \quad M \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u d_x}, \quad \|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq b\}.$$

Lastly, assume that the random variables  $\varphi(\mathbf{y})$  and  $\|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2$  are  $c$ -concentrated, where  $\varphi(y)^{1/2} := bL \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|_2\}$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \frac{3\delta}{2}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq \frac{c(d_u d_x + \ln |\mathcal{F}|) \cdot \text{logs}(n, \delta)}{n} + 8\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2,$$

where define  $\text{logs}(n, \delta) := 270 \ln(2n/\delta) \ln(330n/\delta) \lesssim \ln(n/\delta)^2$ .

Second, we state a regression bound tailored to the structured regression problems that arise in Phase III of our algorithm.

**Corollary B.2.** Let  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . Let  $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Z}$  be a pair of random variables, and let  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{V}$  be a arbitrary “error” random variable defined on the same probability space. Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a function class, and let  $\phi, \hat{\phi} : \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be measurable functions. Suppose that the set  $\mathcal{H}$  contains a function  $h_\star$  satisfying  $\phi(h_\star, \mathbf{z}) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}]$ . Let  $\{(\mathbf{z}^{(i)}, \mathbf{v}^{(i)}, \mathbf{e}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^n$  be i.i.d. copies of  $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{e})$ , and define

$$\hat{h} := \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{\phi}(h, \mathbf{z}^{(i)}) + \mathbf{e}^{(i)} - \mathbf{v}^{(i)}\|^2.$$

Introduce  $\delta_\phi(z, h) := \hat{\phi}(h, \mathbf{z}^{(i)}) - \phi(h, \mathbf{z}^{(i)})$ . Suppose that there exists a constant  $c > 0$  and a map  $\psi : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that the following properties hold:

1.  $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|\phi(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2 + \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|\delta_\phi(z, h)\|^2 \leq \psi(z)^2$ .
2. For all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}[\psi(\mathbf{z})^2 \vee \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}\|^2 \geq c \ln \delta^{-1}] \leq \delta$ .
3.  $\mathcal{H}$  takes the form  $\mathcal{H} = \{h(y) = M \cdot f(y) : f \in \mathcal{F} \quad M \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_x}, \quad \|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq b\}$  for some  $b > 0$ , where  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  is a finite class and  $\cdot$ . Furthermore, there exists  $L \geq 1$ , matrices  $X_1, X_2$  of appropriate dimension, and an arbitrary function  $\delta_0 : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  (which does not depend on  $h$ ) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad & \|f(y)\|_2 \leq L \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|\} \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathcal{Y} \\ \forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad & \hat{\phi}(h, \mathbf{z}) := X_1(h(y_1) - X_2 h(y_2)) + \delta_0(\mathbf{z}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{z} = (y_1, y_2, y_3). \end{aligned}$$

4. Finally,  $c_\psi \geq 1$  satisfies the following for all  $\mathbf{z} = (y_1, y_2, y_3)$

$$bL(\|X_1\|_{\text{op}} + \|X_1 \cdot X_2\|_{\text{op}})(2 + \|f_\star(y_1)\| + \|f_\star(y_2)\|) \leq 2c_\psi \psi(\mathbf{z}).$$

Then, with probability at least  $1 - \frac{3\delta}{2}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\phi(\hat{h}, \mathbf{z}) - \phi(h_\star, \mathbf{z})\|^2 \leq \frac{12c(\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_1 d_x) \text{logs}(c_\psi n, \delta)}{n} + 16\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 + 8 \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}\|\delta_\phi(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2,$$

where again we define  $\text{logs}(n, \delta) := 270 \ln(2n/\delta) \ln(330n/\delta)$ , so that  $\text{logs}(c_\psi n, \delta) \lesssim \ln^2(c_\psi n/\delta)$ .

### B.1.6 Principal Component Analysis

**Proposition B.2** (PCA with errors). Let  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq (\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d)$  be a function class, and let  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$  be a random variable. Suppose that there exists a function  $\varphi : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and constants  $c, L$  such that the following properties hold:

- $\|h(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq \max\{c, \varphi(\mathbf{y})\}$  for all  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ .
- $\varphi(\mathbf{y})$  is  $c$ -concentrated.

Let  $h_\star \in \mathcal{H}$  be given, and let  $\Lambda_\star := \mathbb{E}[h_\star(\mathbf{y})h_\star(\mathbf{y})^\top]$ . Next, let  $\hat{h} \in \mathcal{H}$  be given and define

$$\hat{\Lambda}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{h}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\hat{h}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top,$$

where  $\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathbf{y}$ . Then with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have  $\|\hat{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_\star\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{pca},n,\delta}$ , where

$$\varepsilon_{\text{pca},n,\delta} := 3\sqrt{c \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{h}(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2]} + 5cn^{-1/2} \ln(2dn/\delta)^{3/2}.$$

**Corollary B.3** (Significant basis overlap). Consider the setting of [Proposition B.2](#), and suppose that  $\Lambda_\star := \mathbb{E}[h_\star(\mathbf{y})h_\star(\mathbf{y})^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  has  $\text{rank}(\Lambda_\star) = d_\star$ , so that  $\lambda_{d_\star}(\Lambda_\star) > 0$ . Let  $V_\star \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_\star}$  denote be a matrix with orthonormal columns that span the column space the image of  $\Lambda_\star$ . Likewise, let  $\hat{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_\star}$  be a matrix with orthonormal columns span the eigenspace of the top  $d_\star$  eigenvectors of  $\hat{\Lambda}_n$ . Suppose  $\varepsilon_{\text{pca},n,\delta} \leq \frac{\lambda_{d_\star}(\Lambda_\star)}{4}$ . Then on the good event for [Proposition B.2](#), we have  $\sigma_{d_\star}(V_\star^\top \hat{V}_n) \geq 2/3$ .

### B.1.7 Linear Regression

**Proposition B.3** (Linear regression with errors in variables). Let  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{e}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$  be a collection of random variables defined over a shared probability space, and let  $\{(\mathbf{u}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}^{(i)}, \mathbf{w}^{(i)}, \mathbf{e}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^n$  be i.i.d. copies. Suppose the following conditions hold:

1.  $\mathbf{y} = M_\star \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{e}$  with probability 1, where  $M_\star \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times d_u}$ .
2.  $\mathbf{w} \mid \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\delta} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_w)$  and  $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_u)$ .
3. We have  $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 \leq \varepsilon_e^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|^2 \leq \varepsilon_\delta^2$ .
4.  $\mathbf{e}$  is  $c_e$ -concentrated and  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$  is  $c_\delta$ -concentrated for  $c_e \geq \varepsilon_e^2$  and  $c_\delta \geq \varepsilon_\delta^2$ .
5.  $\varepsilon_\delta^2 \leq \frac{1}{16} \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u)$ .

Let  $\delta \leq 1/e$ , and let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy

1.  $\psi(n, \delta) \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_e^2 \varepsilon_\delta^2}{c_e c_\delta} \right\}$ , where  $\psi(n, \delta) := \frac{2 \ln(2n/\delta) \ln(2/\delta)}{n}$ .
2.  $n \geq c_1(d_u + \ln(1/\delta))$ , for some universal constant  $c_1 > 0$ .

Then the solution to the least squares problem

$$\hat{M} = \min_M \sum_{i=1}^n \|M(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(i)}\|^2,$$

satisfies the following inequality with probability at least  $1 - 4\delta$ :

$$\|\hat{M} - M_\star\|_{\text{op}}^2 \lesssim \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u)^{-1} \left( \|M_\star\|_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_\delta^2 + \varepsilon_e^2 + \frac{\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}(d_y + d_u + \ln(1/\delta))}{n} \right). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

**Proposition B.4.** Consider the setting of [Proposition B.3](#), and suppose we additionally require that  $n \geq c_0(d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta))$  for some (possibly inflated) universal constant  $c_0$ . Furthermore, suppose we have  $\varepsilon_{\delta}^2 \|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2 \leq 2\lambda_+$  for some  $\lambda_+ \geq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_w)$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - 7\delta$ , [\(B.2\)](#) holds, and moreover

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{M}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2} - \Sigma_w \right\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \sqrt{\lambda_+ (\varepsilon_{\delta}^2 \|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2) + \frac{\lambda_+^2 (d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta))}{n}}.$$

### B.1.8 Regression with Matrix Measurements

**Proposition B.5** (Regression with matrix measurements). Let  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$  be a random variable, and let  $\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathbf{y}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Fix two regression functions  $\hat{g}, g_{\star} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , and suppose that  $\mathbf{z} := \max\{\|\hat{g}(\mathbf{y})\|^2, \|g_{\star}(\mathbf{y})\|^2\}$  is  $c$ -concentrated, and that  $\mathbf{x} := g_{\star}(\mathbf{y}) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_x)$ . Let  $Q^{\star} \succeq 0$  be a fixed matrix, and consider the regression.

$$\tilde{Q} \in \arg \min_M \sum_{i=1}^n \left( g_{\star}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^{\top} Q^{\star} g_{\star}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) - \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^{\top} M \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) \right)^2.$$

Set  $\widehat{Q} := (\frac{1}{2}\tilde{Q}^{\top} + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{Q})_+$ , where  $(\cdot)_+$  truncates all negative eigenvalues to zero. Then, there is a universal constant  $c_0 > 0$  such that if the following conditions hold:

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{g}(\mathbf{y}) - g_{\star}(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq \varepsilon^2, \quad \psi(n, \delta/2) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4c}, \quad n \geq c_0(d^2 + \ln(1/\delta)), \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon^2 \leq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)^2}{64c \ln(2n/\delta)},$$

then with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\|\widehat{Q} - Q^{\star}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \leq \|\tilde{Q} - Q^{\star}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \leq 64c\varepsilon^2 \ln(4n/\delta) \cdot \frac{\|Q^{\star}\|_{\text{op}}^2}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)^2}.$$

## B.2 Proofs for Technical Tools

### B.2.1 Proof of [Lemma B.1](#)

First observe that if  $\mathbf{z}$  is  $c$ -concentrated, then for  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ ,  $\ln(1/\delta) \geq 1$ , so that  $\mathbb{P}[\alpha\mathbf{z} + \beta \geq (\alpha c + \beta) \ln(1/\delta)] \leq \mathbb{P}[\alpha\mathbf{z} \geq \alpha c \ln(1/\delta)] = \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{z} \geq c \ln(1/\delta)]$ . This is at most  $\delta$  by the definition of the  $c$ -concentrated property. We now turn to the enumerated points.

**Point 1.** For  $\delta \leq 1/e$ ,  $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{z} \geq c \ln(1/\delta)] \leq \delta$ . Thus, for any  $\delta \in (0, 1/e)$ , and  $u \geq c\delta \geq c$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{z} \geq u] \leq e^{-u/c}$ . It follows that for any  $\delta \leq 1/e$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z} \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{z} \geq c \ln(1/\delta))] &= \int_{u=c \ln(1/\delta)}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{z} \geq u] du \\ &= \int_{u=c \ln(1/\delta)}^{\infty} e^{-u/c} du = ce^{-c \ln(1/\delta)/c} = c\delta. \end{aligned}$$

A similar calculation reveals that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}^k] &\leq c^k \int_{u=c^k}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{z}^k \geq u] du \\ &\leq c^k + \int_{u=c^k}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{u^{1/k}}{c}} du \\ &= c^k + kc^k \int_{u=1}^{\infty} e^{-u} u^{k-1} du \\ &= c^k(1 + k!). \end{aligned}$$

**Point 2.** Define the increments  $\Delta_i = \mathbf{z}^{(i)} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}^{(i)}]$ , and  $\Delta_{i,\delta} := \Delta_i \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{z}^{(i)} \leq c_{n,\delta})$ . By a union bound,  $\Delta_i = \Delta_{i,\delta}$  for all  $i \in [n]$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ . Moreover,  $-c \leq -\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}] \leq \Delta_{i,\delta} \leq c_{n,\delta}$ , so that by Bennett's inequality (Maurer and Pontil (2009), Theorem 3), it holds that with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \Delta_{i,\delta} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2\text{VAR}[\Delta_{i,\delta}] \ln(2/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{c_{n,\delta} \ln(2/\delta)}{3n} \\ &\leq \frac{\tau}{2c_{n,\delta}} \text{VAR}[\Delta_{i,\delta}] + \left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{\tau}\right) \frac{c_{n,\delta} \ln(2/\delta)}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\tau > 0$ . Moreover, we have  $\text{VAR}[\Delta_{i,\delta}] = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_{i,\delta}^2] \leq c_{n,\delta} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}^{(i)} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}^{(i)}]| \leq 2c_{n,\delta} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}^{(i)}| = 2c_{n,\delta} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}^{(i)}]$  by non-negativity of  $\mathbf{z}^{(i)}$ . Hence, with total probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_i \Delta_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \Delta_{i,\delta} \leq \tau \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}^{(i)}] + \left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{\tau}\right) \frac{c_{n,\delta} \ln(2/\delta)}{n}.$$

Recalling that  $\Delta_i \leq \mathbf{z}^{(i)} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}^{(i)}]$  and taking  $\tau = 1/2$ , we have that with total probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_i \mathbf{z}^{(i)} \leq \frac{3}{2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}^{(i)}] + \frac{5}{6} \frac{c_{n,\delta} \ln(1/\delta)}{n}.$$

By assumption,  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}^{(i)}] \leq \varepsilon^2$ . Hence, for

$$\frac{c_{n,\delta} \ln(2/\delta)}{n} \leq \frac{6}{5} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \leq \varepsilon^2/2,$$

we have that  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i \mathbf{z}^{(i)} \leq 2\varepsilon^2$ . In particular, since

$$\psi(n, \delta) = \frac{2 \ln(2n/\delta) \ln(2/\delta)}{n} = \frac{2c_{n,\delta} \ln(2/\delta)}{cn},$$

we have  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i \mathbf{z}^{(i)} \leq 2\varepsilon^2$  for  $\psi(n, \delta) \leq \varepsilon^2/c$ .

It is simple to verify that all the steps above go through if  $\mathbf{z} \leq c_{\delta,n} = c \ln(2n/\delta)$  almost surely and  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}] \leq c$ . Substituting in  $c_{n,\delta} := c \ln(2n/\delta)$  concludes.  $\square$

## B.2.2 Proof of Lemma B.2

First, observe that  $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}\|^2] = \text{tr}(\Sigma)$ . Next, from Hsu et al. (2012, Proposition 1), we have that

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 \geq \text{tr}(\Sigma) + 2\sqrt{t}\|\Sigma\|_{\text{F}} + 2t\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}}] \leq e^{-t}.$$

Setting  $t = \ln(1/\delta) \geq 1$  and bounding  $\text{tr}(\Sigma) + 2\sqrt{t}\|\Sigma\|_{\text{F}} + 2t\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}} \leq 5t \cdot \text{tr}(\Sigma) = 5\text{tr}(\Sigma) \ln(1/\delta)$  concludes.  $\square$

### B.2.3 Proof of Lemma B.3

Let  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  denote the law of  $\mathbf{y}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}_2$  the law of  $\mathbf{y}_2$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_1$  the law of  $\mathbf{x}_1$ , and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  the law of  $\mathbf{x}_2$ . Let  $q(y | x)$  denote the density of  $y$  given  $x$ . We then have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_2}[\|h_\star(\mathbf{y}_2) - \hat{h}(\mathbf{y}_2)\|^2] &= \int_y \|h_\star(y) - \hat{h}(y)\|^2 d\mathcal{Q}_2(y) \\ &= \int_{x,y} q(x | y) \|h_\star(y) - \hat{h}(y)\|^2 d\mathcal{P}_2(x) \\ &= \int_{x,y} q(x | y) \frac{d\mathcal{P}_2(x)}{d\mathcal{P}_1(x)} \|h_\star(y) - \hat{h}(y)\|^2 d\mathcal{P}_1(x). \end{aligned}$$

Using the standard expression for the density for the multivariate Gaussian distribution, we have the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathcal{P}_2(x)}{d\mathcal{P}_1(x)} &= \det(\Sigma_1 \Sigma_2^{-1})^{1/2} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} x^\top (\Sigma_1^{-1} - \Sigma_2^{-1}) x\right) \\ &= \det(I + (\Sigma_1^{1/2} \Sigma_2^{-1} \Sigma_1^{1/2} - I))^{1/2} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1/2} (I - \Sigma_1^{1/2} \Sigma_2^{-1} \Sigma_1^{1/2}) \Sigma_1^{-1/2} x\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if we set  $\eta = \|(\Sigma_1^{1/2} \Sigma_2^{-1} \Sigma_1^{1/2} - I)\|_{\text{op}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det(I + (\Sigma_1^{1/2} \Sigma_2^{-1} \Sigma_1^{1/2} - I)) &= \prod_{i=1}^d \lambda_i(I + (\Sigma_1^{1/2} \Sigma_2^{-1} \Sigma_1^{1/2} - I)) \\ &\leq \prod_{i=1}^d (1 + \eta)^d \leq \exp(d\eta). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we may bound

$$\exp\left(\frac{1}{2} x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1/2} (I - \Sigma_1^{1/2} \Sigma_2^{-1} \Sigma_1^{1/2}) \Sigma_1^{-1/2} x\right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{\eta}{2} x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} x\right).$$

Thus,

$$\frac{d\mathcal{P}_2(x)}{d\mathcal{P}_1(x)} \leq \exp\left(\frac{\eta}{2} (d + x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} x)\right).$$

In particular, for any  $B > 0$ , as long as

$$x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} x \leq B, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta \leq \frac{2 \ln(3/2)}{d + B}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

we have

$$\frac{d\mathcal{P}_2(x)}{d\mathcal{P}_1(x)} \leq 3/2.$$

Henceforth, fix a bound parameter  $B$  and assume  $\eta \leq \frac{2\ln(3/2)}{d+B} < 1$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_2}[\|h_\star(\mathbf{y}_2) - \hat{h}(\mathbf{y}_2)\|^2] &= \int_{x,y} q(x|y) \frac{d\mathcal{P}_2(x)}{d\mathcal{P}_1(x)} \|h_\star(y) - \hat{h}(y)\|^2 d\mathcal{P}_1(x) \\ &\leq \underbrace{\frac{3}{2} \int_{x,y} q(x|y) \|h_\star(y) - \hat{h}(y)\|^2 d\mathcal{P}_1(x) \mathbb{I}(x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} x \leq B)}_{:=\text{Term}_1} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\int_{x,y} q(x|y) \exp\left(\frac{\eta}{2}(d + x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} x)\right) \|h_\star(y) - \hat{h}(y)\|^2 d\mathcal{P}_1(x) \mathbb{I}(x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} x > B)}_{:=\text{Term}_2}. \end{aligned}$$

To handle the first term, we use the assumed error bound between  $h_\star$  and  $\hat{h}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term}_1 &:= \frac{3}{2} \int_{x,y} q(x|y) \|h_\star(y) - \hat{h}(y)\|^2 d\mathcal{P}_1(x) \mathbb{I}(x^\top \Sigma_1 x \leq B) \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \int_{x,y} q(x|y) \|h_\star(y) - \hat{h}(y)\|^2 d\mathcal{P}_1(x) = \frac{3}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_1} \|h_\star(\mathbf{y}_1) - \hat{h}(\mathbf{y}_1)\|^2 \leq \frac{3\varepsilon^2}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

For  $\text{Term}_2$ , we use the bound  $\|h_\star(y) - \hat{h}(y)\|^2 \leq 4L \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|^2\} = 4L^2 \max\{1, \|x\|^2\}$  to bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{x,y} q(x|y) \exp\left(\frac{\eta}{2}(d + x^\top \Sigma_1 x)\right) \|h_\star(y) - \hat{h}(y)\|^2 d\mathcal{P}_1(x) \mathbb{I}(x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} x > B) \\ &\leq 4L^2 e^{\frac{d\eta}{2}} \int_x \exp\left(\frac{\eta}{2} x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} x\right) (1 + \|x\|^2) d\mathcal{P}_1(x) \mathbb{I}(x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} x > B). \end{aligned}$$

Let us change variables to  $u = \Sigma^{-1/2}x$ , and let  $\mathcal{P}_0$  denote the density of  $u$ , which is precisely the density of a standard normal  $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$  random variable. Then, using the formula the standard normal density,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_x \exp\left(\frac{\eta}{2} x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} x\right) (1 + \|x\|^2) \mathbb{I}(x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} x > B) d\mathcal{P}_1(x) \\ &= \int_u \exp\left(\frac{\eta}{2} \|u\|^2\right) \cdot (1 + \|\Sigma^{1/2}u\|^2) \cdot \mathbb{I}(\|u\|^2 > B) d\mathcal{P}_0(u) \\ &= \int_u \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(1-\eta)}{2} \|u\|^2\right) \cdot (1 + \|\Sigma^{1/2}u\|^2) \cdot \mathbb{I}(\|u\|^2 > B) du \\ &\leq \int_u \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(1-\eta)}{2} \|u\|^2\right) (1 + \|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}} \|u\|^2) \mathbb{I}(\|u\|^2 > B) du. \end{aligned}$$

Again, let us rescale via  $z \leftarrow (1-\eta)^{-1/2}u$ . The determinant of the Jacobian of this transformation is  $(1-\eta)^{d/2}$ , so that for  $B \geq 1$ , this is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &(1-\eta)^{-d/2} \int_z \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|z\|^2\right) (1 + (1-\eta) \|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}} \|z\|^2) \mathbb{I}(\|z\|^2 > B(1-\eta)^{-1}) dz \\ &= (1-\eta)^{-d/2} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} [(1 + (1-\eta) \|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}} \|z\|^2) \mathbb{I}(\|z\|^2 \geq B(1-\eta)^{-1})] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} e^{\eta d} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} [(1 + \|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}} \|z\|^2) \mathbb{I}(\|z\|^2 \geq B(1-\eta)^{-1})] \\ &\leq (1 + \|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}}) e^{\eta d} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} [\|z\|^2 \mathbb{I}(\|z\|^2 \geq B(1-\eta)^{-1})], \end{aligned}$$

where in (i) we observe that  $(1-\eta)^{-1/\eta} \leq e^2$  for  $\eta \leq 1/2$ , and where the last inequality uses that  $B \geq 1$ . Now, from [Lemma B.2](#), we have that  $\|\mathbf{z}\|^2$  is  $5d$ -concentrated. Hence, for  $\eta \leq 1/2$ ,  $(1-\eta)^{-1}\|\mathbf{z}\|^2$  is  $10d$ -concentrated. Thus  $B = 10d \ln(1/\delta)$  gives  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} [\|\mathbf{z}\|^2 \mathbb{I}((1-\eta)^{-1}\|\mathbf{z}\|^2 \geq B)] \leq 10d\delta$  by [Lemma B.1.](#), and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term}_2 &= \int_{x,y} q(x|y) \exp\left(\frac{\eta}{2}(2d + x^\top \Sigma_1 x)\right) \|h_\star(y) - \hat{h}(y)\|^2 d\mathcal{P}_1(x) \mathbb{I}(x^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} x > B) \\ &\leq 4(1 + \|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}}) L^2 e^{\eta d} \cdot e^{\eta d/2} \cdot 10d\delta = \delta \cdot (1 + \|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}}) 40L^2 e^{3d\eta/2}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if  $\eta \leq 1/2d$  and  $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{80L^2 \|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}} e}$ , we have  $\text{Term}_2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}$ , and thus  $\text{Term}_1 + \text{Term}_2 \leq 2\varepsilon^2$ . Gathering our conditions, we require  $\eta \leq 1/\max\{2, d\}$ ,  $B = 10d \ln(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{80L^2(1+\|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}})e})$ , and—from [Eq. \(B.3\)](#)— $\eta \leq \frac{2 \ln(3/2)}{d+B}$ . Altogether, it suffices to select

$$\eta \leq \frac{2 \ln(3/2)}{11d \ln\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{80L^2(1+\|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}})e}\right)} \leq \frac{1}{14d \ln\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{80L^2(1+\|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}})e}\right)}.$$

□

#### B.2.4 Proof of [Lemma B.4](#)

By the tower rule and the fact that  $\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{y}$  is a Markov chain,  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{y} = y] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} = y] | \mathbf{y} = y] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{x}] | \mathbf{y} = y]$ . Moreover, from decodability,  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{x}] | \mathbf{y} = y] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{x} = f_\star(y)] | \mathbf{y} = y] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} | f_\star(y) = \mathbf{x}] = h_\star(y)$ .

For the second point, It is well know that any *unrestricted* minimizer of  $\|h(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{u}\|^2$  over all measurable  $h$  satisfies  $h = h_0$  almost surely, where  $h(y) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{y} = y]$ . We verify above that  $h_\star(y) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{y} = y]$ , proving the that any unrestricted minimizer  $h$  coincideds with  $h_\star$ . Since  $h_\star \in \mathcal{H}$ , the same holds for the function class constraint in the lemma statement. □

#### B.2.5 Proof of [Lemma B.5](#)

Our task is to bound  $\mathcal{N}(b\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{op}})$ , where we recall  $\mathcal{M} := \{M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : \|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq b\}$ . By rescaling, it suffices to bound  $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \frac{1}{b}\mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{op}})$ . We recognize  $\mathcal{M}$  as the operator norm ball in  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and appeal to the following standard lemma.

**Lemma B.6** ([Wainwright \(2019\)](#), Lemma 5.2). Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for an arbitrary norm. Then, if  $\text{dist}$  is the metric induced by the norm,  $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{B}, \text{dist}) \leq (1 + \frac{2}{\varepsilon})^d$ .

□

#### B.2.6 Proof of [Proposition B.1](#)

Before diving into the meat of the proof, we first establish some basic concentration properties and state a number of definitions. For each realization  $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{u})$ , define

$$\mathcal{E} := \{\|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 \vee \varphi(\mathbf{y}) \leq c_{n,\delta}\},$$

where we recall that  $c_{n,\delta} := c \ln(2n/\delta)$ . Let  $\ell(h) := \|h(\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2$ , and let  $\mathcal{L}(h) = \mathbb{E}[\ell(h)]$ . Furthermore, define  $\ell_\delta(h) = \ell(h) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E})$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\delta(h) = \mathbb{E}[\ell_\delta(h)]$ . We first establish the following useful claim.

**Claim B.1.** Then on  $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $|\ell(h) - \ell(h')| \leq 4\sqrt{c_{n,\delta}}\|h(\mathbf{y}) - h'(\mathbf{y})\|$ . Moreover, defining  $\mathbf{z} = \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 \vee \varphi(y)$ , we have that  $\ell(h) \leq 4\mathbf{z}$ . In particular, on  $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $\ell(h) \leq 4c_{n,\delta}$ .

**Proof of Claim B.1.**

$$\begin{aligned} |\ell(h) - \ell(h')| &= \left| \|h'(\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \|h(\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 \right| \\ &\leq 2|\langle h(\mathbf{y}) - h'(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u} \rangle| + (\|h(\mathbf{y})\| + \|h'(\mathbf{y})\|)(\|h(\mathbf{y})\| - \|h'(\mathbf{y})\|) \\ &\leq 4\sqrt{c_{n,\delta}}\|h(\mathbf{y}) - h'(\mathbf{y})\|. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first claim. The claim holds because  $\ell(h) \leq 2\|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 + 2\|h(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq 2\|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 + 2\max\{\varphi(y), c\} \leq 4\max\{\mathbf{z}, c\}$ .  $\square$

Next, Let  $\mathcal{E}^{(i)}$  denote the event that  $\mathcal{E}$  holds for the  $i$ th sample, and let  $\mathcal{E}_{1:n} = \bigcup_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{E}^{(i)}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{E}_{1:n}$  occurs with probability at least  $1 - 2 \cdot \delta/2 = 1 - \delta$  by the  $c$ -concentration property and a union bound. On this event, if we define

$$\mathcal{L}_{n,\delta}(h) := \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_{i,\delta}(h), \quad \text{where} \quad \ell_{i,\delta}(h) := \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}^{(i)})\|h(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) + \mathbf{e}^{(i)} - \mathbf{u}^{(i)}\|^2,$$

we have

$$\hat{h}_n := \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{L}_{n,\delta}(h).$$

Lastly, define the excess risk with respect to the Bayes function  $h_*(y) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{y} = y]$ :

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\delta}(h) = \mathcal{L}_{n,\delta}(h) - \mathcal{L}_{n,\delta}(h_*), \quad \mathcal{R}_\delta(h) = \mathcal{L}_\delta(h) - \mathcal{L}_\delta(h_*).$$

Finally, let  $\mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}$  denote a finite cover for  $\mathcal{H}$  such that, for some  $\epsilon > 0$  to be selected at the end of the proof,

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \inf_{h' \in \mathcal{H}_0} \sup_{y: \varphi(y) \leq c_{n,\delta}} \|h(y) - h'(y)\| \leq \sqrt{c_{n,\delta}}\epsilon, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and let  $\hat{h}_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0$  denote the element that witnesses the covering inequality above for  $\hat{h}_n$ . Note that by [Claim B.1](#) and [\(B.5\)](#), the differences on the truncated losses between  $\hat{h}_n$  and  $\hat{h}_0$  satisfy

$$|\mathcal{L}_{n,\delta}(\hat{h}_n) - \mathcal{L}_{n,\delta}(\hat{h}_0)| \vee |\mathcal{L}_\delta(\hat{h}_n) - \mathcal{L}_\delta(\hat{h}_0)| \leq 4\epsilon c_{n,\delta},$$

whenever  $\mathcal{E}_{1:n}$  holds. Thus, on  $\mathcal{E}_{1:n}$ , when  $\hat{h}_n \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}_{n,\delta}(h)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_\delta(\hat{h}_n) &= \mathcal{R}_\delta(\hat{h}_n) - \mathcal{R}_{n,\delta}(\hat{h}_n) + \mathcal{R}_{n,\delta}(\hat{h}_n) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \mathcal{R}_\delta(\hat{h}_n) - \mathcal{R}_{n,\delta}(\hat{h}_n) \\ &\leq \mathcal{R}_\delta(\hat{h}_0) - \mathcal{R}_{n,\delta}(\hat{h}_0) + 2 \max\{|\mathcal{L}_\delta(\hat{h}_0) - \mathcal{L}_\delta(\hat{h}_n)|, |\mathcal{L}_{n,\delta}(\hat{h}_0) - \mathcal{L}_{n,\delta}(\hat{h}_n)|\} \\ &\leq \mathcal{R}_\delta(\hat{h}_0) - \mathcal{R}_{n,\delta}(\hat{h}_0) + 8\epsilon c_{n,\delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where (i) uses that  $\mathcal{R}_{n,\delta}(\hat{h}_n)$  is non-positive for the empirical risk minimizer.

**Step 1: Bounding  $\mathcal{R}_\delta(n)$ .** From the bound  $\ell_{i,\delta}(h) \leq 4c_{n,\delta}$  (Claim B.1), along with Bennett's inequality (see e.g. Theorem 3 of Maurer and Pontil (2009)) and a union bound over  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , we have, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_\delta(\hat{h}_0) - \mathcal{R}_{n,\delta}(\hat{h}_0) &\leq \sqrt{2n^{-1} \text{VAR}[\ell_{i,\delta}(\hat{h}_0) - \ell_{i,\delta}(h_\star)] \cdot \ln(2|\mathcal{H}_0|\delta^{-1})} + \frac{4c_{n,\delta}}{3} \ln(2|\mathcal{H}_0|\delta^{-1}) \\ &\leq \frac{\tau}{2c_{n,\delta}} \text{VAR}[\ell_{i,\delta}(\hat{h}_0) - \ell_{i,\delta}(h_\star)] + \frac{c_{n,\delta}}{n} \left( \frac{4}{3} + \frac{1}{\tau} \right) \ln(2|\mathcal{H}_0|\delta^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where the last step uses AM-GM and holds for all  $\tau > 0$ . Again, by Claim B.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{VAR}[\ell_{i,\delta}(\hat{h}_0) - \ell_{i,\delta}(h_\star)] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}) \left( \ell(\hat{h}_0) - \ell(h_\star) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq 16c_{n,\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}) \|\hat{h}_0(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 32c_{n,\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}) \|\hat{h}_0(\mathbf{y}) - \hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \right] + 32c_{n,\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}) \|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

From Eq. (B.5), we have  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}) \|\hat{h}_0(\mathbf{y}) - \hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \right] \leq c_{n,\delta} \epsilon^2$ . Moreover, we can always upper bound  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}) \|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \right]$  by removing the indicator. This ultimately yields

$$\text{VAR}[\ell_{i,\delta}(\hat{h}_0) - \ell_{i,\delta}(h_\star)] \leq 32c_{n,\delta}^2 \epsilon^2 + 32c_{n,\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \right].$$

Thus, combining the above with Eqs. (B.6) and (B.7), we have

$$\mathcal{R}_\delta(\hat{h}_n) \leq 16\tau \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \right] + 16c_{n,\delta}(\epsilon + \tau\epsilon^2) + \frac{c_{n,\delta}}{n} \left( \frac{4}{3} + \frac{1}{\tau} \right) \ln(2|\mathcal{H}_0|\delta^{-1}). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

**Step 2: Relating  $\mathcal{R}_\delta(h)$  to error against  $h_\star$ .** Recall that  $\mathcal{L}_\delta(h) \leq \mathcal{L}(h)$  due to truncation, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_\delta(h) = \mathcal{L}_\delta(h) - \mathcal{L}_\delta(h_\star) &\geq \mathcal{L}_\delta(h) - \mathcal{L}(h_\star) \\ &\geq \mathcal{L}(h) - \mathcal{L}(h_\star) - |\mathcal{L}_\delta(h) - \mathcal{L}(h)|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

We further develop

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(h) - \mathcal{L}(h_\star) &= \mathbb{E}[\|h(\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \|h_\star(\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\|h(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \|h_\star(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{u}\|^2] + 2\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{e}, h(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y}) \rangle \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[\|h(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \|h_\star(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{u}\|^2] - 2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\|h(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line uses Cauchy-Schwartz and AM-GM. Moreover, since  $h_\star = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{u}]$ , we can see that  $\mathbb{E}[\|h(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{u}\|^2 - \|h_\star(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{u}\|^2] = \mathbb{E}\|h(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2$ . This yields

$$\mathcal{L}(h) - \mathcal{L}(h_\star) \geq -2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\|h(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2.$$

Hence, Eq. (B.9) yields that for all  $h$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\|h(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq 2\mathcal{R}_\delta(h) + 4\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 + 2|\mathcal{L}_\delta(h) - \mathcal{L}(h)|.$$

Finally, recalling  $\mathbf{z} = \varphi(\mathbf{y})^2 \vee \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} 2|\mathcal{L}_\delta(h) - \mathcal{L}(h)| &= \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} 2\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}^c)\ell(h)] \\ &\leq 8\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}^c) \max\{c, \mathbf{z}\}] && \text{(Claim B.1)} \\ &\leq \frac{8c\delta}{3n}. && \text{(Lemma B.1)} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the previous two displays give

$$\mathbb{E}\|h(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq 2\mathcal{R}_\delta(h) + 4\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 + \frac{8c\delta}{3n}.$$

Thus, choosing  $h = \hat{h}_n$  and combining with Eq. (B.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 &\leq 32\tau\mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2\right] + 32c_{n,\delta}(\epsilon + \tau\epsilon^2) \\ &\quad + 2\frac{c_{n,\delta}}{n}\left(\frac{4}{3} + \frac{1}{\tau}\right) + \frac{8c\delta}{3n} + 4\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Setting  $\tau = \frac{1}{64}$  and using  $\epsilon \leq 1$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2\right] \\ &\quad + 33c_{n,\delta}\epsilon + \frac{c_{n,\delta}}{n}\left(\frac{8}{3} + 128\right)\ln(2|\mathcal{H}_0|\delta^{-1}) + 4\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 + \frac{8c\delta}{3n} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2\right] + 33c_{n,\delta}\epsilon + \frac{c_{n,\delta}}{n}134\ln(2|\mathcal{H}_0|\delta^{-1}) + 4\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we folded the  $8c\delta/3n$  term into the term with the log, bounding  $8/3 + 8\delta/3n \leq 16/3 \leq 6$ . Rearranging the above yields

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq 66c_{n,\delta}\epsilon + \frac{268c_{n,\delta}}{n}\ln(2|\mathcal{H}_0|\delta^{-1}) + 8\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2.$$

Taking  $\epsilon = 1/33n$  concludes the proof. □

### B.2.7 Proof of Corollary B.1

We verify Conditions 1-3 of Proposition B.1 in succession:

1. Condition 1: By assumption 1 of the corollary,  $f(y) \leq L \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|_2\}$ , then  $h(y) \leq bL \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|_2\} := \varphi(y)$  for all  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ .
2. Condition 2: This is satisfied by assumption 2 of the corollary,  $\varphi(\mathbf{y})^{1/2}$  and  $\|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2$  are  $c$ -concentrated.
3. Condition 3: We bound the covering number. Let  $\mathcal{M} := \{M \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u d_x} : \|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq b\}$ . Then, for an  $\epsilon > 0$  to be chosen, let  $\mathcal{N}(b\epsilon, \mathcal{M}, \|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}) \leq (1 + 2/\epsilon)^{d_u d_x}$  from Lemma B.5, so we may take a  $b\epsilon$ -cover  $\mathcal{M}_\epsilon$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  to have cardinality  $(1 + 2/\epsilon)^{d_u d_x}$ . Define the induced cover

$\mathcal{H}_\epsilon := \{Mf : M \in \mathcal{M}_\epsilon, f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ , which has  $|\mathcal{H}_\epsilon| \leq |\mathcal{F}|(1 + 2/\epsilon)^{d_u d_x}$ . Given  $h = Mf \in \mathcal{H}$ , let  $h' : M'f$ , where  $M' \in \mathcal{M}_\epsilon$  satisfies  $\|M - M'\|_{\text{op}} \leq b\epsilon$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{c',\infty}(h, h') &:= \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \{\|h(y) - h'(y)\| : \varphi(y)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{c'}\} \\
&:= \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \{\|(M - M')f(y)\| : \varphi(y)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{c'}\} \\
&\leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \{b\epsilon \cdot \|f(y)\| : \varphi(y)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{c'}\} \quad (\|M - M'\|_{\text{op}} \leq b\epsilon) \\
&\leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \{b\epsilon \cdot L \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|\} : \varphi(y)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{c'}\} \quad (\text{Assumption 1 of Corollary}) \\
&\leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \{b\epsilon \cdot L \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|\} : bL \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|\} \leq \sqrt{c'}\} \quad (\text{Definition of } \varphi) \\
&= \epsilon \sqrt{c'}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the  $\sqrt{c'}\epsilon$  cover of  $\mathcal{H}$  in the metric  $d_{c',\infty}(h, h')$  is at most the cardinality of  $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon$ , which is at most  $|\mathcal{F}|(1 + 2/\epsilon)^{d_u d_x}$ . Thus, we can take  $\ln \mathcal{N}(\epsilon) = \ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_u d_x \ln(1 + 2/\epsilon)$  in Condition 3 of [Proposition B.1](#). For  $\epsilon \leq 1$ , this may be upper bounded by  $\ln \mathcal{N}(\epsilon) = \ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_u d_x \ln(5/\epsilon)$ .

Hence, the conclusion of [Proposition B.1](#) entails that, with probability at least  $1 - \frac{3\delta}{2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{270c \ln(2n/\delta)(\ln(2/\delta) + \ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_u d_x \ln(5 \cdot 33n))}{n} + 8\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that  $\text{logs}(n, \delta) := 270 \ln(2n/\delta) \ln(330n/\delta)$ , we simplify

$$\begin{aligned}
270 \cdot \ln(2n/\delta) \cdot (\ln(2/\delta) + \ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_1 d_x \ln(3 \cdot 55n)) &\leq 270 \ln(2n/\delta) (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_1 d_x \ln(330n/\delta)) \\
&\leq (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_1 d_x) 270 \ln(2n/\delta) \ln(330n/\delta) := (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_1 d_x) \text{logs}(n, \delta)
\end{aligned} \tag{B.10}$$

which yields our final bound of

$$\mathbb{E} \|\hat{h}_n(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq \frac{c(d_u d_x + \ln |\mathcal{F}|) \cdot \text{logs}(n, \delta)}{n} + 8\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2,$$

as needed. □

### B.2.8 Proof of [Corollary B.2](#)

We consider

$$\hat{h} := \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{\phi}(h, \mathbf{z}^{(i)}) + \mathbf{e}^{(i)} - \mathbf{v}^{(i)}\|^2.$$

Recall the assumption that, for some  $h_\star \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\phi(h_\star, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{z}]$ , and that  $\delta_\phi(h, \mathbf{z}) := \phi(h, \mathbf{z}) - \phi(h_\star, \mathbf{z})$ . Let us set up a correspondence with [Proposition B.1](#).

- $g_h(\mathbf{z}) := \hat{\phi}(h, \mathbf{z}) - \delta_\phi(h_\star, \mathbf{z})$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}$  denote the resulting class of functions  $\{g_h : h \in \mathcal{H}\}$ .

- $\tilde{\mathbf{e}} = \delta_\phi(h_\star, \mathbf{z}) + \mathbf{e}$ .

Then, we have

$$\widehat{\phi}(\hat{h}) - \delta_\phi(h_\star, \mathbf{z}) = g_{\hat{h}}(\mathbf{y}) := \arg \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|g(\mathbf{z}) + \tilde{\mathbf{e}}^{(i)} - \mathbf{v}^{(i)}\|^2.$$

Define  $g_\star := g_{h_\star} = \phi(h_\star, \mathbf{z})$  and  $\widehat{g} = g_{\hat{h}}$ . We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\widehat{\phi}(\hat{h}, \mathbf{z}) - \phi(h_\star, \mathbf{z})\|^2 &= \mathbb{E}\|\widehat{g}(\mathbf{z}) - g_\star(\mathbf{z}) + \delta_\phi(\hat{h}, \mathbf{z}) - \delta_\phi(h_\star, \mathbf{z})\|^2 \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{g}(\mathbf{z}) - g_\star(\mathbf{z})\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}\|\delta_\phi(\hat{h}, \mathbf{z}) - \delta_\phi(h_\star, \mathbf{z})\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{g}(\mathbf{z}) - g_\star(\mathbf{z})\|^2 + 8 \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}\|\delta_\phi(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

It remains to bound  $\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{g}(\mathbf{z}) - g_\star(\mathbf{z})\|^2$ .

Note that  $g_\star \in \mathcal{G}$ , and moreover  $g_\star(z) = \phi(h_\star, z)$ , which is equal to  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{z}]$  by assumption. Considering the function class  $\mathcal{G} = \{g_h : h \in \mathcal{H}\}$  as the function class,  $g_\star$  as the Bayes regressor,  $\mathbf{v}$  as the target, and  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}$  as the residual noise, let us verify with conditions of [Proposition B.1](#), albeit with slightly inflated constants. We have

1. Define  $\tilde{\varphi}(z) = 6\psi^2(z)$ . We bound  $\|g_h(z)\|^2 \leq \tilde{\varphi}(z)$  via

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_h(z)\|^2 &\leq (\|\phi(h, z)\| + \|\delta_\phi(h, z)\| + \|\delta_\phi(h_\star, z)\|)^2 \\ &\leq \left( \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|\phi(h, z)\| + 2 \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|\delta_\phi(h, z)\| \right)^2 \leq 2 \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|\phi(h, z)\|^2 + 6 \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|\delta_\phi(h, z)\|^2 \\ &\leq 6 \left( \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|\phi(h, z)\|^2 + \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|\delta_\phi(h, z)\|^2 \right) \leq 6\psi(z)^2 := \tilde{\varphi}(z), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by the first assumption of the lemma.

2. Next, we establish the concentration property for  $\tilde{\varphi}(\mathbf{z}) \vee \|\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_t - \mathbf{v}_t\|^2$  that, for  $\tilde{c} = 6c$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\tilde{\varphi}(\mathbf{z}) \vee \|\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_t - \mathbf{v}_t\|^2 \geq \tilde{c} \ln(1/\delta)] \leq 1/\delta. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\varphi}(z) \vee \|\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_t - \mathbf{v}_t\|^2 &= \tilde{\varphi}(z) \vee \|\delta_\phi(z, h_\star) + \mathbf{e}_t - \mathbf{v}_t\|^2 \\ &\leq \tilde{\varphi}(z) \vee (2\|\delta_\phi(h_\star, z)\|^2 + 2\|\mathbf{e}_t - \mathbf{v}_t\|^2) \\ &\leq (\tilde{\varphi}(z) \vee 2\|\delta_\phi(h_\star, z)\|^2) + 2\|\mathbf{e}_t - \mathbf{v}_t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by assumption, we have that  $2\|\delta_\phi(h_\star, z)\|^2 \leq \tilde{\varphi}(z) = 6\psi(z)^2$ , so we may drop the  $\delta_\phi$ -term. Substituting in the definition of  $\tilde{\varphi}(z)$  and bounding  $2 \leq 6$  gives

$$\tilde{\varphi}(z) \vee \|\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_t - \mathbf{v}_t\|^2 \leq 6 (\psi(z)^2 \vee (\|\mathbf{e}_t - \mathbf{v}_t\|^2)).$$

Hence, the desired inequality [Eq. \(B.12\)](#) follows from the second condition of our corollary.

3. Lastly, it remains to verify the covering property from [Proposition B.1](#). Let  $\mathcal{M} := \{M \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_x} : \|M_{\text{op}}\| \leq b\}$ , let  $\mathcal{M}_\epsilon$  denote a  $b\epsilon$ -cover of  $\mathcal{M}$  in  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon := \{M \cdot f : M \in \mathcal{M}_\epsilon, f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ , and finally set  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon := \{g_h : h \in \mathcal{H}_\epsilon\}$ . Our goal will be to show that, for  $\epsilon$  adequately chosen,  $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon$  is an adequate cover of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

Let  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ . Then,  $g = g_h$ , where  $h = M \cdot f$  for some  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $M \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\tilde{h}_\epsilon \in \mathcal{H}_\epsilon$  be selected by selecting  $M_\epsilon \in \mathcal{M}_\epsilon$  such that  $\|M - M_\epsilon\|_{\text{op}} \leq b\epsilon$ ,  $h_\epsilon := M_\epsilon \cdot f$ , and  $g_\epsilon := g_{h_\epsilon}$ . Then, for any  $z$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(z) - g_\epsilon(z) &= \widehat{\phi}(h, z) + \delta_\phi(h_\star, z) - (\widehat{\phi}(h_\epsilon, z) + \delta_\phi(h_\star, z)) \\ &= \widehat{\phi}(h, z) - \widehat{\phi}(h_\epsilon, z) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} X_1(h(y_1) - X_2h(y_2)) + \delta_0(z) - (X_1(h_\epsilon(y_1) - X_2h_\epsilon(y_2)) + \delta_0(z)) \\ &= X_1(h(y_1) - h_\epsilon(y_1)) - X_1X_2(h(y_2) - h_\epsilon(y_2)) \\ &= X_1(M - M_\epsilon)f(y_1) - X_1X_2(M - M_\epsilon)f(y_2), \end{aligned}$$

where in (i) we use the functional form of  $\widehat{\phi}$  assumed by the lemma. Since  $\|M - M_\epsilon\|_{\text{op}} \leq b\epsilon$ , and  $f(y) \leq L \max\{1, \|f_\star\|\}$

$$\begin{aligned} g(z) - g_\epsilon(z) &\leq b\epsilon(\|X_1\|_{\text{op}}\|f(y_1)\| + \|X_1X_2\|_{\text{op}}\|f(y_2)\|) \\ &\leq bL\epsilon(\|X_1\|_{\text{op}} + \|X_1 \cdot X_2\|_{\text{op}})(\max\{1, \|f_\star(y_1)\|\} + \max\{1, \|f_\star(y_2)\|\}) \\ &\leq bL\epsilon(\|X_1\|_{\text{op}} + \|X_1 \cdot X_2\|_{\text{op}})(2 \vee \|f_\star(y_1)\| + \|f_\star(y_2)\|). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by assumption, we have that  $bL(\|X_1\|_{\text{op}} + \|X_1 \cdot X_2\|_{\text{op}})(2 + \|f_\star(y_1)\| + \|f_\star(y_2)\|) \leq 2c_\psi\psi(z)$ . Thus, recalling  $\tilde{\varphi}(z) = 6\psi(z)^2$ , we have

$$g(z) - g_\epsilon(z) \leq c_\psi\epsilon\sqrt{(2\psi(z))^2} \leq c_\psi\epsilon\tilde{\varphi}(z)^{1/2}.$$

It therefore follows that, for all  $c'$ , and all  $\epsilon \leq 1$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_{\epsilon/c_\psi}$  is a  $\sqrt{c'}\epsilon$ -covering number of  $\mathcal{G}$  in the pseudometric  $d_{c', \infty}(h, h') := \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}\{\|g(z) - g'(z)\| : \varphi(z) \leq c'\}$ . Hence, we can take  $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon) = |\mathcal{G}_\epsilon|$  is applying [Proposition B.1](#).

Hence, [Proposition B.1](#) implies the bound

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{g} - g_\star\|^2 \leq \frac{270\tilde{c}_{n,\delta}}{n} \ln(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/33c_\psi n}|\delta^{-1}) + 8\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2,$$

where we have  $\tilde{c}_{n,\delta} = \tilde{c} \ln(2n/\delta) = 6c \ln(2n\delta)$ . Combining the above with [Eq. \(B.11\)](#)

$$\mathbb{E}\|\phi(\hat{g}, \mathbf{z}) - \phi(g_\star, \mathbf{z})\|^2 \leq \frac{12 \cdot 270 \ln(2n/\delta)}{n} \ln(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/33c_\psi n}|\delta^{-1}) + 16\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 + 8 \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}\|\delta_\phi(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2.$$

Finally, let us bound  $|\mathcal{G}_{1/33c_\psi n}|$ . From [Lemma B.5](#), we have

$$\ln |\mathcal{G}_\epsilon| = \ln |\mathcal{H}_\epsilon| = \ln(|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{M}_\epsilon|) \leq \ln(|\mathcal{F}|) + d_1 d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(5/\epsilon).$$

Thus, repeating the computation [Eq. \(B.10\)](#) in the proof of [Corollary B.1](#),

$$\begin{aligned} 270 \ln(2n/\delta) \ln(2|\mathcal{G}_{1/33c_\psi n}|\delta^{-1}) &\leq 270 \cdot \ln(2n/\delta) \cdot (\ln(2/\delta) + \ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_1 d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(3 \cdot 55c_\psi n)) \\ &\leq (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_1 d_{\mathbf{x}}) \text{logs}(c_\psi n, \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\phi(\hat{g}, \mathbf{z}) - \phi(g_\star, \mathbf{z})\|^2 \leq \frac{12c(\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_1 d_{\mathbf{x}}) \text{logs}(c_\psi n, \delta)}{n} + 16\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 + 8 \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}\|\delta_\phi(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2,$$

concluding the corollary.  $\square$

### B.2.9 Proof of Proposition B.2

Define the matrix  $\widehat{\Lambda} = \mathbb{E}[\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})^\top]$ . To begin, we have

$$\|\Lambda_\star - \widehat{\Lambda}_n\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\Lambda_\star - \widehat{\Lambda}\|_{\text{op}} + \|\widehat{\Lambda} - \widehat{\Lambda}_n\|_{\text{op}}.$$

We now bound the terms on the right-hand side one by one. First,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\Lambda_\star - \widehat{\Lambda}\|_{\text{op}} \\ &= \|\mathbb{E}[\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})^\top] - h_\star(\mathbf{y})h_\star(\mathbf{y})^\top\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})^\top - h_\star(\mathbf{y})h_\star(\mathbf{y})^\top\|_{\text{op}}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[(\|\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\| + \|h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|)\|h_\star(\mathbf{y}) - \widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\|] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[(\|\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\| + \|h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|)^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[\|h_\star(\mathbf{y}) - \widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\|^2]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,  $(\|\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\| + \|h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|)^2 \leq 4 \max\{c, \varphi(\mathbf{y})\}$  by assumption, so this is at most

$$\|\mathbb{E}[\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})^\top - h_\star(\mathbf{y})h_\star(\mathbf{y})^\top]\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2(\mathbb{E} \max\{c, \varphi(\mathbf{y})\})^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[\|h_\star(\mathbf{y}) - \widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\|^2]^{1/2}. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Finally, using Lemma B.1, one can bound  $\mathbb{E} \max\{c, \varphi(\mathbf{y})\} \leq 2c$ , so we can further bound by  $3\sqrt{c}\mathbb{E}[\|h_\star(\mathbf{y}) - \widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\|^2]^{1/2}$ .

For the second term, we appeal to truncation. Let  $\mathcal{E}$  denote the event  $\{\varphi(\mathbf{y}) \leq c \ln(2n/\delta)\}$ , and let  $\mathcal{E}^{(i)}$  denote the analogous event for  $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ . By construction  $\mathcal{E}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{E}^{(n)}$  occur simultaneously with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ , so that we may bound

$$\|\widehat{\Lambda} - \widehat{\Lambda}_n\|_{\text{op}} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})^\top] - \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}^{(i)})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \left\| \mathbb{E}[(1 - \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}))\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})^\top] \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\quad + \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})^\top \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E})] - \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}^{(i)})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top \right\|_{\text{op}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.15})$$

We bound the first term above by

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbb{E}[(1 - \mathcal{E})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})^\top] \right\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| (1 - \mathcal{E})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})^\top \right\|_{\text{op}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(1 - \mathcal{E})\|\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\|^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(\varphi(\mathbf{y}) > c \ln(2n/\delta)) \max\{c, \varphi(\mathbf{y})\}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(\varphi(\mathbf{y}) > c \ln(2n/\delta))\varphi(\mathbf{y})] \leq \frac{c\delta}{2n}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.16})$$

where the last line uses Lemma B.1.

To conclude, let us bound the last term in Eq. (B.15). Define the symmetric matrices  $\mathbf{M}^{(i)} := \mathbb{E}[\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y})^\top \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E})] - \widehat{h}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\widehat{h}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}^{(i)})$ . Then  $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{M}^{(i)} = 0$ , we can see that  $\|\mathbf{M}^{(i)}\| \leq c \ln(2n/\delta)$  almost surely (indeed, if  $X, Y \succeq 0$ , then  $\|X - Y\|_{\text{op}} \leq \max\{\|X\|_{\text{op}}, \|Y\|_{\text{op}}\}$ ), and thus

$$(\mathbf{M}^{(i)})^2 \preceq (c \ln(2n/\delta))^2 I.$$

Hence, by Theorem 1.3 of [Tropp \(2012\)](#),

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{M}^{(i)} \right\| \geq t \right] \leq 2de^{-t^2/8\sigma^2}, \quad \text{where } \sigma^2 := n(c \ln(2n/\delta))^2.$$

Rearranging, we have that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{M}^{(i)} \right\| \geq 2c \ln(2n/\delta) \sqrt{2 \ln(2d/\delta)/n} \right] \leq \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Simplifying  $2c \ln(2n/\delta) \sqrt{2 \ln(2d/\delta)/n} \leq 4cn^{-1/2} \ln(2dn/\delta)^{3/2}$ , we have that with probability  $1 - \delta/2$ ,  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\hat{h}(\mathbf{y})\hat{h}(\mathbf{y})^\top \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E})] - \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}) \hat{h}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\hat{h}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{M}^{(i)} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq 4cn^{-1/2} \ln(2dn/\delta)^{3/2}$ . Hence, combining with [Eqs. \(B.13\)](#) and [\(B.16\)](#), we conclude that with probability  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda_\star - \widehat{\Lambda}_n\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \|\Lambda_\star - \widehat{\Lambda}\|_{\text{op}} + \|\widehat{\Lambda} - \widehat{\Lambda}_n\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq 3\sqrt{c\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{h}(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2]} + 4cn^{-1/2} \ln(2dn/\delta)^{3/2} + \frac{\delta c}{2n} \\ &\leq 3\sqrt{c\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{h}(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2]} + 5cn^{-1/2} \ln(2dn/\delta)^{3/2} := \varepsilon_{\text{pca},n}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

### B.2.10 Proof of [Corollary B.3](#)

By assumption,  $\Lambda_\star$  is rank  $d_\star$  and  $\lambda_{d_\star}(\Lambda_\star) > 0$ . Let  $V_\star$  be an eigenbasis for the top  $d_\star$  eigenvalues of  $\Lambda_\star$ , and let  $\widehat{V}_n$  be an eigenbasis for the top  $d_\star$  eigenvalues of  $\widehat{\Lambda}_n$ . From the Davis-Kahan sine theorem ([Davis and Kahan, 1970](#)), we have that for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\|(I - V_\star V_\star^\top) \widehat{V}_n\|_{\text{op}} \leq (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \lambda_{d_\star}(\Lambda_\star)^{-1} \|\Lambda_\star - \widehat{\Lambda}_n\|_{\text{op}},$$

whenever

$$\|\Lambda_\star - \widehat{\Lambda}_n\|_{\text{op}} \leq \alpha \lambda_{d_\star}(\Lambda_\star). \tag{B.17}$$

In particular, if  $n$  is sufficiently large that for

$$\|\Lambda_\star - \widehat{\Lambda}_n\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{pca},n,\delta} \leq \frac{1}{4} \lambda_{d_\star}(\Lambda_\star),$$

then from [Eq. \(B.17\)](#),

$$\|(I - V_\star V_\star^\top) \widehat{V}_n\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{4\varepsilon_{\text{pca},n,\delta}}{3\lambda_{d_\star}(\Lambda_\star)^{-1}} \leq \frac{1}{3}.$$

And thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{d_\star}(V_\star^\top \widehat{V}_n) &\geq \sigma_{d_\star}(V_\star V_\star^\top \widehat{V}_n) \geq \sigma_{d_\star}(\widehat{V}_n) - \|(I - V_\star V_\star^\top) \widehat{V}_n\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\geq 1 - 1/3 = 2/3, \end{aligned}$$

where the previous display uses that  $\sigma_{d_\star}(\widehat{V}_n) = 1$  since  $\widehat{V}_n$  has orthonormal columns, and that  $\|(I - V_\star V_\star^\top) \widehat{V}_n\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1/3$ . □

### B.2.11 Proof of Proposition B.3

Let  $\mathbf{U}$  be the matrix with  $\{\mathbf{u}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^n$  as rows, and let  $\mathbf{\Delta}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{E}$  be defined analogously for  $\boldsymbol{\delta}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}$ , and  $\mathbf{e}$  respectively. Let us assume for now that  $(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})$  has full row rank; this will be justified momentarily in Claim B.3. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{M}^\top &= (\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})^\dagger \mathbf{Y} \\ &= (\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})^\dagger (\mathbf{U} M_\star^\top + \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{E}) \\ &= (\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})^\dagger (\mathbf{U} M_\star^\top + \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{E}) \\ &= M_\star^\top + (\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})^\dagger (-\mathbf{\Delta} M_\star^\top + \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{E}).\end{aligned}\tag{B.18}$$

Thus,

$$\|\widehat{M} - M_\star\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_{\text{op}} \|M_\star\|_{\text{op}} + \|\mathbf{E}\|_{\text{op}}}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})} + \|(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})^\dagger \mathbf{W}\|_{\text{op}}.\tag{B.19}$$

**Handling the Gaussian Noise.** We first handle the term  $\|(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})^\dagger \mathbf{W}\|_{\text{op}}$ . Observe that  $\mathbf{W}$  is Gaussian conditioned on  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{\Delta}$ . Fix a matrix  $U$  with  $U^\top U \succ 0$ . Fix a vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  with  $\|v\| = 1$ , and observe that  $\langle v, \mathbf{e}^{(i)} \rangle$  are  $\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}$ -subgaussian. Thus, for any matrix  $\Lambda \succ 0$ , we have from Abbasi-Yadkori et al. (2012, Theorem 3) that conditioned on  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{\Delta}$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\|U^\top \mathbf{W} v\|_{(\Lambda + U^\top U)^{-1}} \leq \sqrt{2\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}} \ln\left(\frac{\det(\Lambda + U^\top U)^{1/2} \det(\Lambda)^{-1/2}}{\delta}\right)}.$$

Since we are taking  $U$  to be fixed (conditioned on  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{\Delta}$ ), we can take  $\Lambda = U^\top U$ . This gives, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\|U^\top \mathbf{W} v\|_{(U^\top U)^{-1}} \leq 2\sqrt{2\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}} \ln\left(\frac{2^{d_u/2}}{\delta}\right)} \leq 2\sqrt{\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}(d_u + 2\ln(1/\delta))}.$$

It follows that

$$\|U^\dagger \mathbf{W} v\|_2 \leq \sigma_{\min}(U)^{-1} \|U^\top \mathbf{W} v\|_{(U^\top U)^{-1}} \leq 2\sigma_{\min}(U)^{-1} \sqrt{\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}(d_u + 2\ln(1/\delta))}.$$

By a standard covering argument (see, e.g., Vershynin (2018, Section 4.2)), we find that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\|U^\dagger \mathbf{W}\|_{\text{op}} = \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}: \|v\|=1} \|U^\dagger \mathbf{W} v\| \lesssim \sigma_{\min}(U)^{-1} \sqrt{\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}(d_u + d_y + \ln(1/\delta))},$$

Taking  $U = \mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta}$ , this implies that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\|(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})^\dagger \mathbf{W}\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})^{-1} \sqrt{\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}(d_u + d_y + \ln(1/\delta))},$$

**Error Terms.** We have

$$\|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_{\text{op}}\|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}} + \|\mathbf{E}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}\|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_F + \|\mathbf{E}\|_F = \left( \|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \|\delta^{(i)}\|^2} \right) + \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{e}^{(i)}\|^2}.$$

Recall that 1)  $\psi(n, \delta) := \frac{2\ln(2n/\delta)\ln(2/\delta)}{n}$ , 2)  $\|\delta^{(i)}\|^2$  is  $c_{\delta}$ -concentrated and  $\|\mathbf{e}^{(i)}\|^2$  are  $c_{\mathbf{e}}$  concentrated (Definition 3), and 3)  $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}^{(i)}\|^2 \leq \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}\|\delta^{(i)}\|^2 \leq \varepsilon_{\delta}^2$ . Lemma B.1 thus implies that for

$$\psi(n, \delta) \leq \min\left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2}{c_{\mathbf{e}}}, \frac{\varepsilon_{\delta}^2}{c_{\delta}} \right\},$$

the following event holds with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ :

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{ls},1} := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \|\delta^{(i)}\|^2 \leq 2n\varepsilon_{\delta}^2 \right\} \cap \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{e}^{(i)}\|^2 \leq 2n\varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2 \right\}. \quad (\text{B.20})$$

Clearly, on  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{ls},1}$  we have

$$\|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_{\text{op}}\|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}} + \|\mathbf{E}\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim n^{1/2}(\|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}\varepsilon_{\delta} + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}).$$

**Bounding the least eigenvalue.** Summarizing the development so far, we have for  $\psi(n, \delta) \leq \max\{\frac{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2}{c_{\mathbf{e}}}, \frac{\varepsilon_{\delta}^2}{c_{\delta}}\}$ , with probability at least  $1 - 3\delta$ ,

$$\|\widehat{M} - M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \frac{n^{1/2}(\|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}\varepsilon_{\delta} + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}) + \sqrt{\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}(d_{\mathbf{y}} + d_{\mathbf{u}} + \ln(1/\delta))}}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})}.$$

Finally, let us lower bound  $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})$ . We start with the following self-contained result.

**Claim B.2.** Consider matrices  $U, \Delta$ , and suppose  $\|\Delta\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}\lambda_{\min}(U^{\top}U)$ . Then,

$$(U + \Delta)^{\top}(U + \Delta) \succeq \frac{1}{4}U^{\top}U.$$

**Proof.** By Cauchy-Schwarz and AM-GM, we have the elementary inequality that for two vectors  $v, w$  of the same dimension,  $\|v + w\|^2 = \|v\|^2 + \|w\|^2 + 2\langle v, w \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2}\|v\|^2 - \|w\|^2$ . This entails

$$\begin{aligned} (U + \Delta)^{\top}(U + \Delta) &\succeq \frac{1}{2}U^{\top}U - \Delta^{\top}\Delta \\ &\succeq \frac{1}{2}U^{\top}U - I\|\Delta\|_{\text{op}}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4}U^{\top}U + \left(\frac{1}{4}U^{\top}U - \|\Delta\|_{\text{op}}^2 I\right) \\ &\succeq \frac{1}{4}U^{\top}U, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line uses the that  $\frac{1}{4}U^{\top}U \succeq \frac{1}{4}\lambda_{\min}(U^{\top}U)$ , and the assumption  $\|\Delta\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}\lambda_{\min}(U^{\top}U)$ .  $\square$

**Claim B.3.** There is a universal constant  $c_1 > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_{\mathbf{u}}}$  be a matrix with rows drawn i.i.d. from  $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_u)$  where  $\Sigma_u \succeq 0$ , and let  $\mathbf{\Delta}$  be a matrix of the same dimension with  $\|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq \frac{n}{8}\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u)$ . Then, for  $n \geq c_1(d_{\mathbf{u}} + \ln(1/\delta))$ , the following holds with probability  $1 - \delta$ :

$$(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})^{\top}(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta}) \succeq \frac{n\Sigma_u}{8} \succeq \frac{n\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u)}{8}I. \quad (\text{B.21})$$

**Proof of Claim B.3.** From Claim B.2, we have that if  $\|\Delta\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U})$ , we have

$$(\mathbf{U} + \Delta)^\top (\mathbf{U} + \Delta) \succeq \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U}.$$

If this holds, we have

$$\frac{1}{4}\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} = \frac{1}{4}\Sigma_u^{1/2} \left( \Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} \Sigma_u^{-1/2} \right) \Sigma_u^{1/2} \succeq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u^{-1/2} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} \Sigma_u^{-1/2}) \Sigma_u.$$

Note that  $\mathbf{U} \Sigma_u^{-1/2}$  has standard Gaussian rows, and its number of rows exceeds its number of columns. Thus, from Theorem 5.39 of Vershynin (2010), we have that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u^{-1/2} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} \Sigma_u^{-1/2})^{1/2} \geq \sqrt{n} - \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{u}}} + \sqrt{\ln(1/\delta)}) \right] \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (\text{B.22})$$

In particular, for  $n \geq c_1(d_{\mathbf{u}} + \ln(1/\delta))$  for some universal  $c_1$ , we have that with probability  $1 - \delta$ ,  $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u^{-1/2} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} \Sigma_u^{-1/2})^{1/2} \geq \sqrt{n/2}$ , and thus when this occurs, and when  $\|\Delta\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq \frac{n\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u)}{8} \leq \frac{1}{4}\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U})$ , we have

$$(\mathbf{U} + \Delta)^\top (\mathbf{U} + \Delta) \succeq \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} \succeq \frac{n}{8}\Sigma_u \succeq \frac{n}{8}\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u)I.$$

□

Hence, for  $n \geq c_1(\ln(1/\delta) + d_{\mathbf{u}})$ ,  $\psi(n, \delta) \leq \max\{\frac{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2}{c_{\mathbf{e}}}, \frac{\varepsilon_{\delta}^2}{c_{\delta}}\}$ , and  $2\varepsilon_{\delta}^2 \leq \frac{n}{8}\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u)$  (or equivalently,  $\varepsilon_{\delta}^2 \leq \frac{n}{16}\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u)$ ), we find that with total failure probability at least  $1 - 4\delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{M} - M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}} &\lesssim \frac{n^{1/2}(\|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}\varepsilon_{\delta} + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}) + \sqrt{\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}(d_{\mathbf{y}} + d_{\mathbf{u}} + \ln(1/\delta))}}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{U} + \Delta)} \\ &\lesssim \frac{(\|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}\varepsilon_{\delta} + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}) + \sqrt{n^{-1/2}\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}(d_{\mathbf{y}} + d_{\mathbf{u}} + \ln(1/\delta))}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, under these conditions, with probability  $1 - 4\delta$ ,

$$\|\widehat{M} - M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \lesssim \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u)^{-1} \left( \|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\delta}^2 + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2 + \frac{\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}(d_{\mathbf{y}} + d_{\mathbf{u}} + \ln(1/\delta))}{n} \right).$$

□

### B.2.12 Proof of Proposition B.4

Assume that the events of the proof of Proposition B.2 above; this contributes a failure probability of  $4\delta$ . To begin, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{M}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \delta^{(i)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n ((\widehat{M} - M_{\star})(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \delta^{(i)}) - \mathbf{w}^{(i)} - \mathbf{e}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2} \\ &= \left( (\mathbf{U} + \Delta)(\widehat{M} - M_{\star})^\top + \Delta M_{\star}^\top - \mathbf{W} - \mathbf{E} \right)^\top \left( (\mathbf{U} + \Delta)(\widehat{M} - M_{\star})^\top + \Delta M_{\star}^\top - \mathbf{W} - \mathbf{E} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From Eq. (B.18), and the fact that  $\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta}$  has full rank under the high probability events of Proposition B.2, we have

$$\widehat{M}^\top = M_\star^\top + (\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})^\dagger (-\mathbf{\Delta} M_\star^\top + \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{E}).$$

This yields

$$(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})(\widehat{M}^\top - M_\star^\top) = P_{\mathbf{U}+\mathbf{\Delta}}(-\mathbf{\Delta} M_\star^\top + \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{E}),$$

where  $P_{\mathbf{U}+\mathbf{\Delta}} := (\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta})^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is the projection onto the row space of  $\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{\Delta}$ , which has dimension  $d_{\mathbf{u}}$ . Thus, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{M}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2} \\ &= \left( (I - P_{\mathbf{U}+\mathbf{\Delta}})(-\mathbf{\Delta} M_\star^\top + \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{E}) \right)^\top \left( (I - P_{\mathbf{U}+\mathbf{\Delta}})(-\mathbf{\Delta} M_\star^\top + \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{E}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging, and using that  $I - P_{\mathbf{U}+\mathbf{\Delta}}$  is a projection operator, we have that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{M}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{W}^\top (I - P_{\mathbf{U}+\mathbf{\Delta}}) \mathbf{W} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2 \|\mathbf{W}\|_{\text{op}} \|\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{\Delta} M_\star^\top\|_{\text{op}} + \|\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{\Delta} M_\star^\top\|_{\text{op}}^2.$$

We can now bound this quantity using the following claim.

**Claim B.4.** Suppose that  $\lambda_+ \geq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_w)$ , and  $\varepsilon_\delta^2 \|M_\star\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_e^2 \leq 2\lambda_+$ . Suppose the event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{ls},1}$  of Eq. (B.20) holds, and  $n \geq c' \sqrt{d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta)}$  for  $c'$  sufficiently large. Then,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{M}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{W}^\top (I - P_{\mathbf{U}+\mathbf{\Delta}}) \mathbf{W} \right\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_+ (\varepsilon_\delta^2 \|M_\star\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_e^2)}{n}}.$$

**Proof.** On the event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{ls},1}$  of Eq. (B.20), recall that

$$\|\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{\Delta} M_\star^\top\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon_\delta \|M_\star\|_{\text{op}} + \varepsilon_e.$$

In addition, for  $n \geq c'(d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta))$  for some sufficiently large numerical constant  $c'$ , a suitable analogue of Eq. (B.22) implies that with an additional probability  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{W}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_w)^{1/2} \|\Sigma_w^{-1/2} \mathbf{W}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\sqrt{n} \lambda_+^{1/2}.$$

Hence, for  $\varepsilon_\delta^2 \|M_\star\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_e^2 \leq \lambda_+$ , we have that with total probability at least  $1 - 5\delta$  (including events from the previous proposition),

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{M}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{W}^\top (I - P_{\mathbf{U}+\mathbf{\Delta}}) \mathbf{W} \right\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \sqrt{\lambda_+(\Sigma_w) (\varepsilon_\delta^2 \|M_\star\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_e^2)}.$$

□

To conclude the proof, we bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{M}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2} - \Sigma_w \right\|_{\text{op}} \\
& \leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{M}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{W}^\top (I - P_{\mathbf{U}+\Delta}) \mathbf{W} \right\|_{\text{op}} \\
& \quad + \left\| \Sigma_w - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{W}^\top (I - P_{\mathbf{U}+\Delta}) \mathbf{W} \right\|_{\text{op}}. \tag{B.23}
\end{aligned}$$

The following claim bounds the second term.

**Claim B.5.** Suppose  $n \geq c''(d_{\mathbf{u}} + \ln(1/\delta))$ , where  $c'' > 0$  is a suitably large numerical constant. For any upper bound  $\lambda_+ \geq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_w)$ , with probability  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\left\| \Sigma_w - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{W}^\top (I - P_{\mathbf{U}+\Delta}) \mathbf{W} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \lambda_+ \sqrt{\frac{d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta)}{n}}.$$

**Proof.** Define  $P_{\mathbf{U}+\Delta}^c := I - P_{\mathbf{U}+\Delta}$ . Then we have

$$\left\| \Sigma_w - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{W}^\top P_{\mathbf{U}+\Delta}^c \mathbf{W} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{n} \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_w) \left\| nI - \underbrace{(\mathbf{W}\Sigma_w^{-1/2})^\top P_{\mathbf{U}+\Delta}^c (\mathbf{W}\Sigma_w^{-1/2})}_{:=\mathbf{M}} \right\|_{\text{op}}.$$

Now, observe that since  $P_{\mathbf{U}+\Delta}^c \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a projection matrix with rank  $n - d_{\mathbf{u}}$ , and  $\mathbf{W}\Sigma_w^{-1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_{\mathbf{y}}}$ , the matrix  $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbf{W}\Sigma_w^{-1/2})^\top P_{\mathbf{U}+\Delta}^c (\mathbf{W}\Sigma_w^{-1/2})$  is identical in distribution to  $\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{G}$ , where  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-d_{\mathbf{u}}) \times d_{\mathbf{y}}}$  has i.i.d. unit Gaussian entries. Theorem 5.39 of Vershynin (2010) guarantees that with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\sqrt{n - d_{\mathbf{u}}} - \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta)}\right) \leq \sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{G}) \leq \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{G}) \leq \sqrt{n - d_{\mathbf{u}}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta)}\right).$$

This implies that for  $n \geq c''(d_{\mathbf{u}} + d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta))$  for some universal constant  $c''$ , we have that

$$(n - d_{\mathbf{u}}) - \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta)}\right) \sqrt{n - d_{\mathbf{u}}} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{M}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{M}) \leq (n - d_{\mathbf{u}}) + \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta)}\right) \sqrt{n - d_{\mathbf{u}}}.$$

Hence, on this event (and again for  $n \geq c''(d_{\mathbf{u}} + \ln(1/\delta))$  for  $c''$  suitably large),

$$\|nI - \mathbf{M}\|_{\text{op}} \leq d_{\mathbf{u}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta)}\right) \sqrt{n - d_{\mathbf{u}}} \lesssim \sqrt{n(d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta))}.$$

as needed.  $\square$

In total, combining Claims B.4 and B.5 and Eq. (B.23), we conclude that on the events of the previous proposition, and with an additional  $3\delta$  failure probability,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{M}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2} - \Sigma_w \right\|_{\text{op}} \\
& \lesssim \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_w) (\varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^2 \|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2) + \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_w)^2 (d + \ln(1/\delta))}{n}}, \tag{B.24}
\end{aligned}$$

provided that  $\varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^2 \|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2 \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_w)$ , and  $n \geq c(d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta))$  for some universal constant  $c$ .

### B.2.13 Proof of Proposition B.5

We observe that since  $Q^*$  lies in the convex PSD cone,  $\|\widehat{Q} - Q^*\|_F \leq \|(\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{Q}^\top + \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{Q}) - Q^*\|_F$  by the Pythagorean theorem. In more detail, we have the following result.

**Claim B.6.** Let  $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , and let  $B \succeq 0$ . Then  $\|A_+ - B\|_F \leq \|A - B\|_F$ .

**Proof.** Let  $A = A_+ + A_-$ , so that  $A_+ \succeq 0$  and  $A_- \preceq 0$ . Then we have

$$\|A - B\|_F^2 - \|A_+ - B\|_F^2 = \|A_+ + A_- - B\|_F^2 - \|A_+ - B\|_F^2 = \|A_-\|_F^2 + \langle A_-, A_+ - B \rangle.$$

Now, note that  $\langle A_-, A_+ - B \rangle = \langle -A_-, B \rangle \geq 0$ , since  $\langle X, Y \rangle \geq 0$  whenever  $X, Y \succeq 0$ .  $\square$

Moreover,  $Q^* = (Q^*)^\top$ , so  $\|(\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{Q}^\top + \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{Q}) - Q^*\|_F \leq \|\widetilde{Q} - Q^*\|_F$  by the triangle inequality. Thus, we conclude

$$\|\widehat{Q} - Q^*\|_F \leq \|\widetilde{Q} - Q^*\|_F.$$

Next, let us introduce  $\mathbf{v}_i := \text{vec}(g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_i := \text{vec}(\widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top)$ . Let  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d^2}$  denote the matrix whose rows are  $\mathbf{v}_i$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  analogously for  $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}$ . Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(\widehat{Q}) &= \widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\dagger \mathbf{V} \text{vec}(Q^*) \\ &= \widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\dagger \widehat{\mathbf{V}} \text{vec}(Q^*) + \widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\dagger (\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{V}}) \text{vec}(Q^*) \\ &= \text{vec}(Q^*) + \widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\dagger (\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{V}}) \text{vec}(Q^*), \end{aligned}$$

provided that  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  is full rank (which we ultimately verify), where we recall that  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\dagger = (\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{V}})^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top$  in this case. Next, we bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{vec}(\widehat{Q}) - \text{vec}(Q^*)\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}})^2} \|(\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{V}}) \text{vec}(Q^*)\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{V}})} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle \text{vec}(g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top) - \text{vec}(\widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top), \text{vec}(Q^*) \right\rangle^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{V}})} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top - \widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top, Q^* \right\rangle^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{V}})} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top - \widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top, Q^* \right\rangle^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\|Q^*\|_{\text{op}}^2}{\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{V}})} \sum_{i=1}^n \|g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top - \widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top\|_{\text{nuc}}^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{2\|Q^*\|_{\text{op}}^2}{\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{V}})} \sum_{i=1}^n \|g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top - \widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) uses Hölder's inequality ( $|\langle A, B \rangle| \leq \|A\|_{\text{op}} \|B\|_{\text{nuc}}$ ), and (b) uses that  $g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top - \widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top$  has rank 2, so its nuclear norm is at most  $\sqrt{2}$  times its Frobenius norm. Recognizing  $\sum_{i=1}^n \|g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top - \widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\widehat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top\|_F^2 = \|\widehat{\mathbf{V}} - \mathbf{V}\|_F^2$ , we obtain

$$\|\text{vec}(\widehat{Q}) - \text{vec}(Q^*)\|^2 \leq \frac{4\|\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{V}}\|_F^2 \|Q^*\|_{\text{op}}^2}{\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{V}})}. \quad (\text{B.25})$$

Next, we give the following bound.

**Claim B.7.** Suppose that  $\psi(n, \delta) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4c}$ . Then, with probability  $1 - \delta$ , we have the bound  $\|\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{V}}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq \|\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{V}}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \leq 8c_{n,\delta}\varepsilon^2$ , where  $c_{n,\delta} = c \ln(2n/\delta)$ .

**Proof.** To begin, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{V}}\|_{\text{op}}^2 &\leq \|\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{V}}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \|\text{vec}(g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top) - \text{vec}(\hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top - \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top\|_{\text{F}}^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left( (\|g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\| + \|\hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\|)^2 \|g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) - \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Introduce the event  $\mathcal{E} := \max\{\|g_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2, \|\hat{g}(\mathbf{y})\|^2\} \leq c_{n,\delta} := c \ln(2n/\delta)$ , and let  $\mathcal{E}^{(i)}$  denote the analogous event for  $\mathbf{y}^{(i)}$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}^{(1:n)} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}^{(i)}$ . Then  $\mathcal{E}^{(1:n)}$  holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ , and on this event the above display is at most

$$\|\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{V}}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq 4c_{n,\delta} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}^{(i)}) \|g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) - \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\|^2.$$

Next, define the random variable  $\delta_i := \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}^{(i)}) \|g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) - \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\|^2$ , and we observe that  $\delta_i \leq 4c \ln(2n/\delta)$  with probability 1. Thus, by applying [Lemma B.1](#) with  $c \leftarrow 4c$ , we have that for any  $\varepsilon^2 \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}^{(i)}) \|g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) - \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\|^2]$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta/2$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{E}^{(i)}) \|g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) - \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\|^2 \leq 2\varepsilon^2,$$

as soon as  $\psi(n, \delta) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4c}$ . In particular, since  $\|g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) - \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\|^2 \geq 0$ , it is valid to select  $\varepsilon^2 \geq \mathbb{E}[\|g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) - \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})\|^2]$ . Hence, for such  $\varepsilon^2$ , we conclude that with total probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{V} - \widehat{\mathbf{V}}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq 8c_{n,\delta}\varepsilon^2. \quad \square$$

Denote the event of [Claim B.7](#) by  $\mathcal{E}_1$ . Then on  $\mathcal{E}_1$ , [Eq. \(B.25\)](#) implies

$$\|\tilde{Q} - Q^\star\|_{\text{F}}^2 \leq \|Q^\star\|_{\text{F}}^2 \frac{8c_{n,\delta}\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{V}})}. \quad (\text{B.26})$$

Next, from [Claim B.2](#), we have that

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}} - \mathbf{V}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{V}) \quad \text{implies} \quad \lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{V}}) \geq \frac{1}{4} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{V}).$$

And thus, on  $\mathcal{E}_1$ , we have that

$$\varepsilon^2 \leq \frac{\lambda_0}{32c_{n,\delta}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{V}) \quad \text{implies} \quad \lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{V}}) \geq \frac{1}{4} \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{V}). \quad (\text{B.27})$$

Let us now lower bound  $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{V})$  with high probability. We observe that  $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{V}) \geq \lambda_0$  for some  $\lambda_0 > 0$  if and only if

$$\forall M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : \sum_{i=1}^n \langle g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top, M \rangle^2 \geq \lambda_0 \|M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2,$$

if and only if

$$\forall M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \mathbf{x}^{(i)} \mathbf{x}^{(i)\top}, M \rangle^2 \geq \lambda_0 \|M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2, \quad (\text{B.28})$$

where  $\mathbf{x}^{(i)} := g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_x)$  by assumption.

**Claim B.8.** Let  $\mathbf{x}^{(i)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_x)$ . Then, for  $n \geq c_1 d$ , the following holds with probability  $1 - e^{-c_2 n}$ :

$$\forall M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \mathbf{x}^{(i)} \mathbf{x}^{(i)\top}, M \rangle^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)^2 \|M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2,$$

where  $c_1$  is a numerical constant

**Proof.** Define  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} := \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ . Note that  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ . From [Wainwright \(2019, Theorem 10.12\)](#), we find that for any  $\alpha > 0$ , for all  $n \geq c_1 \alpha d$ , with probability  $1 - e^{-c_2 n}$ , the following holds simultaneously for all matrices  $M$  satisfies  $\|M\|_{\text{nu}}^2 \leq \alpha \|M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)\top}, M \rangle^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2, \quad (\text{B.29})$$

where  $\|M\|_{\text{nuc}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i(M)$  denotes the matrix nuclear norm. By Cauchy-Schwartz,  $\|M\|_{\text{nu}}^2 \leq d \|M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2$  for all matrices  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . This means that we capture *all* matrices  $M$  by setting  $\alpha = d$ , and thus, for  $n \geq c_1 d^2$ , then with probability  $1 - e^{-c_2 n}$ , [Eq. \(B.29\)](#) holds for all  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  simultaneously. When this holds, we have that for all such  $M$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \mathbf{x}^{(i)} \mathbf{x}^{(i)\top}, M \rangle^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(i)\top}, \Sigma_x^{1/2} M \Sigma_x^{1/2} \rangle^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\Sigma_x^{1/2} M \Sigma_x^{1/2}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2.$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Sigma_x^{1/2} M \Sigma_x^{1/2}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 &= \text{tr}(\Sigma_x^{1/2} M \Sigma_x M^\top \Sigma_x^{1/2}) \\ &\geq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x) \text{tr}(\Sigma_x^{1/2} M M^\top \Sigma_x^{1/2}) \\ &= \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x) \text{tr}(M^\top \Sigma_x M) \geq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)^2 \text{tr}(M^\top M) = \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)^2 \|M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Denote the event of [Claim B.8](#) by  $\mathcal{E}_2$ . Then, on  $\mathcal{E}_2$ , we can take  $\lambda_0 = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)^2$  in [Eq. \(B.28\)](#), and thus on  $\mathcal{E}_1$ , [Eq. \(B.27\)](#) yields that

$$\varepsilon^2 \leq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)^2}{64c_{n,\delta}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \lambda_0 \quad \text{implies} \quad \lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{V}}) \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)^2}{8}.$$

Thus, by [Eq. \(B.26\)](#), we have that on  $\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2$ ,

$$\|\tilde{Q} - Q^\star\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 = \|\text{vec}(\tilde{Q}) - q_\star\|^2 \leq 4 \cdot 16c_{n,\delta} \varepsilon^2 \cdot \frac{\|Q^\star\|_{\text{op}}^2}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)^2},$$

giving us the desired inequality. Since  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2) \geq 1 - \delta - e^{-c_2 n}$  for  $n \geq c_1 d^2$ , we have that if  $n \geq c(d^2 + \ln(1/\delta))$  for some universal constant  $c$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2) \geq 1 - 2\delta$ , yielding our desired failure probability. Recalling that  $c_{n,\delta} := c \ln(2/\delta)$  concludes. □

## C Linear Control Theory

In this section we recall some basic results for the classical LQR problem in the fully observed setting with known dynamics. The main result for this section is [Theorem C.2](#), which bounds the regret of any policy for the RichLQR in terms of decoding errors. Proofs are deferred to the end of the section.

### C.1 Basic Technical Results

**Lemma C.1.** Let  $X$  be any matrix with  $\rho(X) < 1$ . Then for any  $Y \succ 0$ , there exists a unique solution  $P \succ 0$  to the Lyapunov equation

$$P = X^\top P X + Y. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Moreover,  $X$  is  $(\alpha, \gamma)$ -strongly stable for  $\alpha = \|P^{1/2}\|_{\text{op}}\|P^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}}$  and  $\gamma = \|I - P^{-1/2}YP^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}}^{1/2}$ .

This lemma immediately implies the following strong stability guarantees for the closed-loop and open-loop dynamics for LQR.

**Proposition C.1.**  $A_{\text{cl},\infty} := A + BK_\infty$  is  $(\alpha_\infty, \gamma_\infty)$ -strongly stable, where  $\alpha_\infty := \|P_\infty^{1/2}\|_{\text{op}}\|P_\infty^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}}$  and  $\gamma_\infty := \|I - P_\infty^{-1/2}QP_\infty^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}}^{1/2} < 1$ .<sup>10</sup>

**Proposition C.2.** If we define  $\alpha_A := \|\Sigma_A^{1/2}\|_{\text{op}}\|\Sigma_A^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}}$  and  $\gamma_A := \|I_{d_x} - \Sigma_A^{-1}\|^{1/2} < 1$ , then  $A$  is  $(\alpha_A, \gamma_A)$ -strongly stable, where  $\Sigma_A$  is the unique solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$\Sigma = A\Sigma A^\top + I_{d_x}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

We also make use of the following bound on the operator norm for the infinite-horizon covariance matrix.

**Proposition C.3.** We have  $\|\Sigma_\infty\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|R\|_{\text{op}} + \|B\|_{\text{op}}^2\|P_\infty\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\Psi_\star^3$ .

### C.2 Value Functions

Toward proving our main regret decomposition, in this section we establish some basic technical results regarding the value functions and Q-functions for the fully observed LQR problem. Our first result concerns finite-horizon value functions for linear controller.

**Lemma C.2.** Consider the RichLQR setting (1) under [Assumption 1](#), and consider a state feedback controller  $\pi_K(y) = Kf_\star(y)$ , where  $f_\star$  is the true decoder. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}_{t:T}^K(x) &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_K} \left[ \sum_{s=t}^T \mathbf{x}_s^\top Q \mathbf{x}_s + \mathbf{u}_s^\top R \mathbf{u}_s \mid \mathbf{x}_t = x \right], \\ \mathbf{Q}_{t:T}^K(x, u) &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_K} \left[ \sum_{s=t}^T \mathbf{x}_s^\top Q \mathbf{x}_s + \mathbf{u}_s^\top R \mathbf{u}_s \mid \mathbf{x}_t = x, \mathbf{u}_t = u \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}_{t:T}^K(x) &= \sum_{s=t}^T \|(A + BK)^{s-t}x\|_{Q+K^\top RK}^2 + F_{t:T}(A, B, Q, R, K, \Sigma_w), \\ \mathbf{Q}_{t:T}^K(x, u) &= \|x\|_Q^2 + \|u\|_R^2 + \mathbf{V}_{t+1:T}^K(Ax + Bu) + G_{t:T}(A, B, Q, R, K, \Sigma_w), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

<sup>10</sup>[Proposition C.1](#) and [Proposition C.2](#) are immediate consequences of [Lemma C.1](#), proven in [Appendix C](#).

where  $F_{t:T}$  and  $G_{t:T}$  are functions that depend on the system parameters and time horizon, but not the state or control inputs.

In light of [Lemma C.2](#), it will be convenient to define

$$\bar{\mathbf{V}}_{t:T}^K(x) = \sum_{s=t}^T \|(A + BK)^{s-t}x\|_{Q+K^\top RK}^2, \quad (\text{C.5})$$

which is simply the value function in [Eq. \(C.4\)](#) in the absence of noise. Our next result concerns the infinite-horizon value functions that arise in the noiseless setting.

**Lemma C.3** ([Bertsekas \(2005\)](#)). Consider the optimal infinite horizon controller  $\pi_\infty(x) = K_\infty x$ , and define  $\mathbf{V}_\infty(x) = \|x\|_{P_\infty}^2$ . Then  $\mathbf{V}_\infty$  is the infinite-horizon cost for playing  $\pi_\infty$  starting from  $\mathbf{x}_1 = x$  under the noiseless dynamics

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = A\mathbf{x}_t + B\mathbf{u}_t.$$

Moreover, if we define  $\mathbf{Q}_\infty(x, u) = \|x\|_Q^2 + \|u\|_R^2 + \|Ax + Bu\|_{P_\infty}^2$ , we have

$$\pi_\infty(x) = \arg \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u}} \mathbf{Q}_\infty(x, u).$$

Finally, we have

$$P_\infty = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} ((A + BK_\infty)^\top)^k (Q + K_\infty^\top RK_\infty) (A + BK_\infty)^k$$

The following lemma shows that the infinite-horizon value functions are well-approximated by their finite-horizon counterparts.

**Lemma C.4.** For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  and all  $t \leq T$ , we have

$$\left| \bar{\mathbf{V}}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(x) - \mathbf{V}_\infty(x) \right| \leq \mathcal{O}(\alpha_\infty^2 (1 - \gamma_\infty^2)^{-1} \Psi_\star^3) \cdot \gamma_\infty^{2(T-t+1)} \|x\|_2^2$$

and

$$\left| \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(x, u) - \mathbf{Q}_\infty(x, u) \right| \leq \mathcal{O}(\alpha_\infty^2 (1 - \gamma_\infty^2)^{-1} \Psi_\star^5) \cdot \gamma_\infty^{2(T-t)} (\|x\|_2^2 + \|u\|_2^2).$$

Lastly, we establish a Lipschitz property for the finite-horizon  $Q$ -functions.

**Lemma C.5.** For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  and  $u, u' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u}$ ,

$$\left| \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(x, u) - \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(x, u') \right| \leq \mathcal{O}(\Psi_\star^3) \cdot (\|x\|_2 \vee \|u\|_2 \vee \|u'\|_2) \|u - u'\|_2.$$

### C.3 Perturbation Bound for the Optimal Controller

To analyze the quality of the certainty-equivalent controller used in [RichID-CE](#), we use the following perturbation bound.

**Theorem C.1** ([Mania et al. \(2019\)](#)). Suppose we have matrices  $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{Q})$  for which there exists an invertible transformation  $G$  such that

$$\left\| \hat{A} - GAG^{-1} \right\|_{\text{op}} \vee \left\| \hat{B} - GB \right\|_{\text{op}} \vee \left\| \hat{Q} - G^{-\top} QG^{-1} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Suppose that  $\|G\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|G^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq C_{\text{sim}}$ . Let  $\hat{K}$  be the optimal infinite-horizon controller for  $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{Q}, R)$ . Then once  $\varepsilon \leq c_{\text{stable}} \cdot \gamma_\infty \cdot C_{\text{sim}}^{-15} \alpha_\infty^{-4} (1 - \gamma_\infty^2)^{-2} \Psi_\star^{-11}$ , where  $c_{\text{stable}}$  is a sufficiently small numerical constant,

$$\left\| \hat{K} - K_\infty G^{-1} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}(C_{\text{sim}}^{11} \alpha_\infty^2 (1 - \gamma_\infty^2)^{-1} \Psi_\star^9) \cdot \varepsilon, \quad (\text{C.6})$$

and we are guaranteed that  $A + B\hat{K}$  is  $(\alpha_\infty, \bar{\gamma}_\infty)$ -strongly stable, where  $\bar{\gamma}_\infty = (1 + \gamma_\infty)/2$ .

## C.4 Regret Decomposition

The following theorem is the main result from this section, and shows that any policy of the form  $\hat{\pi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) = \hat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})$  (in particular, the policy returned by Phase III of **RichID-CE**), has low regret whenever  $\hat{K}$  accurately approximates  $K_\infty$  and  $\hat{f}_t$  has low prediction error on the state distribution induced by  $\hat{\pi}_{1:t-1}$ .

**Theorem C.2.** *Consider a randomized policy of the form  $\hat{\pi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) = \hat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) + \mathbf{v}_t$ , where  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v}_t | \mathbf{y}_{1:t}] = 0$ . Suppose we are guaranteed that*

$$\|\hat{K} - K_\infty\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon_K \leq \|K_\infty\|, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left\| \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t) \right\|_2^2 \leq \varepsilon_f^2 \quad \text{for all } t.$$

Suppose that  $\|\hat{f}_t\|_2 \leq \bar{b}$  almost surely, that  $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2^2 \leq \sigma_v^2$ , and that  $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \leq c_x^2$ , where  $\bar{b}, c_x \geq 1$ . Then for any  $0 \leq \tau \leq T$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & J_T(\hat{\pi}) - J_T(\pi_\infty) \\ & \leq C_1 \cdot (\varepsilon_f^2 + \varepsilon_K^2 + \sigma_v^2)(T - \tau)/T + C_2(\varepsilon_f + c_x \cdot \varepsilon_K + \sigma_v)\tau/T + C_3 \exp(-2 \ln(1/\gamma_\infty)\tau)(T - \tau)/T, \end{aligned} \tag{C.7}$$

where  $C_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\Psi_\star^5 c_x^2)$ ,  $C_2 \leq \mathcal{O}(\bar{b} \Psi_\star^5 c_x (1 \vee \sigma_v))$ , and  $C_3 \leq \mathcal{O}(\alpha_\infty^2 \Psi_\star^7 (c_x^2 \vee \sigma_v^2 \vee \bar{b}^2))$ .

## C.5 Proofs for Linear Control Theory Results

**Proof of Lemma C.1.** Existence of a unique solution to the Lyapunov equation is a standard result ([Bertsekas, 2005](#)). Now, define  $L = P^{1/2} X P^{-1/2}$ . Then the Lyapunov equation (C.1) is equivalent to

$$L^\top L + P^{-1/2} Y P^{-1/2} = I.$$

This implies that

$$\|L\|_{\text{op}}^2 = \|L^\top L\|_{\text{op}} \leq \underbrace{\|I - P^{-1/2} Y P^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}}}_{=\gamma^2} < 1.$$

Moreover, since  $L = P^{1/2} Y P^{-1/2}$ , we may take  $\alpha = \|P^{1/2}\|_{\text{op}} \|P^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}}$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma C.2.** Since we have perfect decodability,  $\pi_K$  operates directly on the true state, and so we may overload  $\pi_K(x) = Kx$ . To begin, we observe that if we begin at  $\mathbf{x}_t = x$  and follow  $\pi_K$ , we have

$$\mathbf{x}_s = (A + BK)^{s-t} x + \sum_{i=t}^{s-1} (A + BK)^{s-i-1} \mathbf{w}_i.$$

It follows that

$$\mathbf{V}_{t:T}^K(x) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{s=t}^T \left\| (A + BK)^{s-t} x + \sum_{i=t}^{s-1} (A + BK)^{s-i-1} \mathbf{w}_i \right\|_{Q+K^\top R K}^2 \right].$$

However, since  $\mathbf{w}_t$  are zero-mean and independent, we can expand the norm and cancel the cross terms, which allows us to write this as

$$\mathbf{V}_{t:T}^K(x) = \sum_{s=t}^T \left\| (A + BK)^{s-t} x \right\|_{Q+K^\top R K}^2 + F_{t:T}(A, B, Q, R, K, \Sigma_w). \tag{C.8}$$

The expression for  $\mathbf{Q}_{t:T}^K$  immediately follows, since we have

$$\mathbf{Q}_{t:T}^K(x, u) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_K} \left[ \|x\|_Q^2 + \|u\|_R^2 + \mathbf{V}_{t+1:T}(Ax + Bu + \mathbf{w}_t) \right].$$

The fact that  $\mathbf{V}_{t+1:T}^K$  is quadratic and  $\mathbf{w}_t$  is zero-mean again allows us to factor out the noise.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma C.4.** Since  $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_{t:T}^K = \bar{\mathbf{V}}_{1:T-t+1}^K$ , we focus on the case  $t = 1$  without loss of generality. Observe that we have

$$\bar{\mathbf{V}}_{1:T}^{K_\infty}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \left\| (A + BK_\infty)^k x \right\|_{Q+K_\infty^\top RK_\infty}^2 = \left\langle x, \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} ((A + BK_\infty)^\top)^k (Q + K_\infty^\top RK_\infty) (A + BK_\infty)^k x \right\rangle.$$

Using the expression for  $P_\infty$  from Lemma C.3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bar{\mathbf{V}}_{1:T}^{K_\infty}(x) - \mathbf{V}_\infty(x) \right| &\leq \|x\|_2^2 \cdot \left\| \sum_{k=T}^{\infty} ((A + BK_\infty)^\top)^k (Q + K_\infty^\top RK_\infty) (A + BK_\infty)^k \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \|x\|_2^2 \cdot 2\Psi_\star^3 \sum_{k=T}^{\infty} \left\| (A + BK_\infty)^k \right\|_{\text{op}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using Proposition C.1, we are guaranteed that  $\left\| (A + BK_\infty)^k \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \alpha_\infty \gamma_\infty^k$ , so we have

$$\sum_{k=T}^{\infty} \left\| (A + BK_\infty)^k \right\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq \alpha_\infty^2 \sum_{k=T}^{\infty} \gamma_\infty^{2k} = \alpha_\infty^2 \gamma_\infty^{2T} (1 - \gamma_\infty^2)^{-1}.$$

This establishes the bound on the error to  $\mathbf{V}_\infty$ . The error bound for the  $Q$ -functions follows immediately, since

$$\left| \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(x, u) - \mathbf{Q}_\infty(x, u) \right| = \left| \bar{\mathbf{V}}_{t+1:T}^{K_\infty}(Ax + Bu) - \mathbf{V}_\infty(Ax + Bu) \right|.$$

$\square$

**Proof of Lemma C.5.** We first compute that for any  $x, x'$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bar{\mathbf{V}}_{t+1:T}^{K_\infty}(x) - \bar{\mathbf{V}}_{t+1:T}^{K_\infty}(x') \right| &\leq 2(\|x\|_2 \vee \|x'\|_2) \|x - x'\|_2 \left\| \sum_{s=t}^T ((A + BK_\infty)^\top)^{s-t} (Q + K_\infty^\top RK_\infty) (A + BK_\infty)^{s-t} \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq 2(\|x\|_2 \vee \|x'\|_2) \|x - x'\|_2 \left\| \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} ((A + BK_\infty)^\top)^{s-t} (Q + K_\infty^\top RK_\infty) (A + BK_\infty)^{s-t} \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &= 2(\|x\|_2 \vee \|x'\|_2) \|x - x'\|_2 \|P_\infty\|_{\text{op}}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, for all  $x$  and  $u, u'$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(x, u) - \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(x, u') \right| &\leq \left| \|u\|_R^2 - \|u'\|_R^2 \right| + \left| \bar{\mathbf{V}}_{t+1:T}^{K_\infty}(Ax + Bu) - \bar{\mathbf{V}}_{t+1:T}^{K_\infty}(Ax + Bu') \right| \\ &\leq 2\Psi_\star (\|u\|_2 \vee \|u'\|_2) \|u - u'\|_2 + \left| \bar{\mathbf{V}}_{t+1:T}^{K_\infty}(Ax + Bu) - \bar{\mathbf{V}}_{t+1:T}^{K_\infty}(Ax + Bu') \right| \\ &\leq 2\Psi_\star (\|u\|_2 \vee \|u'\|_2) \|u - u'\|_2 + 2\|P_\infty\| (\|Ax + Bu\|_2 \vee \|Ax + Bu'\|_2) \|B(u - u')\|_2 \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\Psi_\star^3) \cdot (\|x\|_2 \vee \|u\|_2 \vee \|u'\|_2) \|u - u'\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Proof of Theorem C.1.** We first consider the case where  $G$  is the identity matrix. We apply Proposition 2 of Mania et al. (2019), which implies that<sup>11</sup>

$$\left\| \widehat{P} - P_\infty \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}(\alpha_\infty^2 (1 - \gamma_\infty^2)^{-1} \Psi_\star^6) \cdot \varepsilon,$$

as long as  $\varepsilon \leq c \cdot (1 - \gamma_\infty^2)^2 \alpha_\infty^{-4} \Psi_\star^{-11}$ , where  $c$  is a sufficiently small numerical constant. Proposition 1 of Mania et al. (2019) now implies that

$$\left\| \widehat{K} - K_\infty \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}(\alpha_\infty^2 (1 - \gamma_\infty^2)^{-1} \Psi_\star^9) \cdot \varepsilon.$$

The strong stability result follows by observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| P_\infty^{1/2} (A + B\widehat{K}) P_\infty^{-1/2} \right\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \left\| P_\infty^{1/2} (A + BK_\infty) P_\infty^{-1/2} \right\|_{\text{op}} + \left\| P_\infty^{1/2} B (\widehat{K} - K_\infty) P_\infty^{-1/2} \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \gamma_\infty + \alpha_\infty \Psi_\star \left\| \widehat{K} - K_\infty \right\|_{\text{op}}. \end{aligned}$$

In the general case, we apply the reasoning above with  $A' = BAG^{-1}$ ,  $B' = GB$ , and  $Q' = G^{-T}QG^{-1}$ , and  $R$ , and observe that the optimal controller for this system is  $K_\infty G^{-1}$ . The same perturbation bound holds, but with  $\Psi_\star$  scaled up by at most  $C_{\text{sim}}^2$  and  $\alpha_\infty$  scaled up by at most  $C_{\text{sim}}$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem C.2.** Before beginning the proof, we collect some helpful norm bounds. We have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \leq c_{\mathbf{x}}^2, \quad (\text{C.9})$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \|\widehat{\pi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})\|_2^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \|\widehat{K} \widehat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})\|_2^2 + \sigma_{\mathbf{v}}^2 \leq 42 \Psi_\star^2 \bar{b}^2 + \sigma_{\mathbf{v}}^2, \quad (\text{C.10})$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \|\pi_t^\star(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2^2 \leq \|K_\infty\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \leq \Psi_\star^2 c_{\mathbf{x}}^2, \quad (\text{C.11})$$

where (C.10) follows because  $\|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\|K_\infty\|_{\text{op}}$ , so that  $\|\widehat{K} \widehat{f}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})\| \leq 2\|K_\infty\|_{\text{op}} \bar{b} \leq 2\Psi_\star \bar{b}$  almost surely.

As a first-step, using the standard performance difference lemma (Kakade, 2003), we have

$$J_T(\widehat{\pi}) - J_T(\pi_\infty) = \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(\mathbf{x}_t, \widehat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})) - \mathbf{Q}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(\mathbf{x}_t, \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)) \right],$$

where we have used Assumption 1, which implies that the Q-functions for  $\pi_\infty$  have the form in Eq. (C.4).

Let  $T_0 = T - \tau$ . We handle the timesteps before and after  $T_0$  separately. For the first case, where  $t \leq \tau$ , we apply Lemma C.4, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \mathbf{Q}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(\mathbf{x}_t, \widehat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})) - \mathbf{Q}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(\mathbf{x}_t, \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \mathbf{Q}_\infty(\mathbf{x}_t, \widehat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})) - \mathbf{Q}_\infty(\mathbf{x}_t, \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_\infty^2 (1 - \gamma_\infty^2)^{-1} \Psi_\star^5) \cdot \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \gamma_\infty^{2(T-t)} (\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})\|_2^2 + \mathbb{E} \|\pi^\star(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})\|_2^2) \end{aligned}$$

<sup>11</sup>To apply the proposition as stated in their paper, we use that  $\rho(A_{\text{cl},\infty}) \leq \gamma_\infty$  by Gelfand's formula, and that their parameter  $\tau(A_{\text{cl},\infty}, \gamma_\infty)$  is bounded by  $\alpha_\infty$ .

We simplify the error term above to

$$\gamma_\infty^{2\tau}(T - \tau) \cdot \mathcal{O}(\alpha_\infty^2 \Psi_\star^7 (c_\mathbf{x}^2 \vee \sigma_\mathbf{v}^2 \vee \bar{b}^2)).$$

To handle the summands, we observe that since  $\pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t) = \arg \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^{d_u}} \mathbf{Q}_\infty(\mathbf{x}, u)$ , and since  $\mathbf{Q}_\infty$  is a strongly convex quadratic with Hessian  $P_\infty + B^\top P_\infty B = \Sigma_\infty$ , the first-order conditions for optimality imply that

$$\mathbf{Q}_\infty(\mathbf{x}_t, \hat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})) - \mathbf{Q}_\infty(\mathbf{x}_t, \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)) = \|\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) - \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_{\Sigma_\infty}^2.$$

Thus, since  $\|\Sigma_\infty\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\Psi_\star^3$  (Proposition C.3), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \mathbf{Q}_\infty(\mathbf{x}_t, \hat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})) - \mathbf{Q}_\infty(\mathbf{x}_t, \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)) \right] \leq 2\Psi_\star^3 \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \|\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) - \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2^2.$$

Now, for each  $t$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \|\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) - \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left\| \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) + \mathbf{v}_t - K_\infty f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t) \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left\| \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) - K_\infty f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t) \right\|_2^2 + \sigma_\mathbf{v}^2 \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left\| \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) - \widehat{K} f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t) \right\|_2^2 + 2 \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left\| (\widehat{K} - K_\infty) f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t) \right\|_2^2 + 2\sigma_\mathbf{v}^2 \\ &\leq 8\Psi_\star^2 \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left\| \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t) \right\|_2^2 + 24c_\mathbf{x}^2 \left\| \widehat{K} - K_\infty \right\|_{\text{op}}^2 + 2\sigma_\mathbf{v}^2 \\ &\leq 8\Psi_\star^2 \varepsilon_f^2 + 24c_\mathbf{x}^2 \varepsilon_K^2 + 2\sigma_\mathbf{v}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{C.11}$$

Collecting terms, this gives a coarse bound of

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \mathbf{Q}_\infty(\mathbf{x}_t, \hat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})) - \mathbf{Q}_\infty(\mathbf{x}_t, \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)) \right] \leq \mathcal{O}(\Psi_\star^5 c_\mathbf{x}^2 (T - \tau) (\varepsilon_f^2 + \varepsilon_K^2 + \sigma_\mathbf{v}^2)).$$

We now bound the terms after time  $T_0$ . Using Lemma C.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \sum_{t=T_0}^T \mathbf{Q}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(\mathbf{x}_t, \hat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})) - \mathbf{Q}_{t:T}^{K_\infty}(\mathbf{x}_t, \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)) \right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\Psi_\star^3) \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \sum_{t=T_0}^T (\|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2 + \|\hat{\pi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{1:t})\|_2 + \|\pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2) \|\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) - \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\bar{b} \Psi_\star^4) \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \sum_{t=T_0}^T (\|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2 + \|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2) \|\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) - \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\bar{b} \Psi_\star^4) \sum_{t=T_0}^T \left( \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2^2} \right) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \|\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) - \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2^2} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\bar{b} \Psi_\star^4 (c_\mathbf{x} + \sigma_\mathbf{v})) \sum_{t=T_0}^T \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \|\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{1:t}) - \pi_\infty(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2^2} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\bar{b} \Psi_\star^4 (c_\mathbf{x} + \sigma_\mathbf{v})) (\Psi_\star \varepsilon_f + c_\mathbf{x} \varepsilon_K + \sigma_\mathbf{v}) \cdot \tau \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\bar{b} \Psi_\star^5 c_\mathbf{x} (1 \vee \sigma_\mathbf{v})) (\varepsilon_f + c_\mathbf{x} \varepsilon_K + \sigma_\mathbf{v}) \cdot \tau, \end{aligned}$$

where the second-to-last inequality uses [Eq. \(C.11\)](#).

□

## D Proofs for RichID Phase I and II

The section is organized as follows.

- [Appendix D.1](#) contains preliminaries. [Appendix D.1.1](#) establishes the relevant Gaussian marginals and conditionals, [Appendix D.1.2](#) specifies the burn-in parameter  $\kappa_0$ , and [Appendix D.1.3](#) addresses relevant properties of the function class  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$ .
- [Appendix D.2](#) provides proofs for Phase I, in particular [Theorem 2.1](#) and its more granular statement, [Theorem 2.1a](#).
- [Appendix D.3](#) provides proofs for Phase II, including [Theorem 2.2/Theorem 2.2a](#).

### D.1 Preliminaries

Recall that in the identification phase, for each  $t \geq 0$ , we take  $\mathbf{u}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{d_{\mathbf{u}}})$ . We recall that the controllability matrices are given by  $\mathcal{C}_k = [A^{k-1}B \mid \dots \mid B]$ , and define the following matrices:

$$\Sigma_{k,\text{id}} := A^k \Sigma_0 (A^k)^\top + \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} (A^s) (\Sigma_w + BB^\top) (A^s)^\top. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

$$\Sigma_{\infty,\text{id}} := \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} (A^s) (\Sigma_w + BB^\top) (A^s)^\top. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

We also recall the definition of  $\kappa_0$  and  $\kappa_1$ :

$$\kappa_0 := \left\lceil \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_\star} \ln \left( \frac{84 \Psi_\star^5 \alpha_\star^4 d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(1000 n_{\text{id}})}{(1 - \gamma_\star)^2} \right) \right\rceil. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

$$\kappa_1 := \kappa_0 + \kappa. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Finally, we define

$$\mathbf{v} := (\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_0}^\top, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1-1}^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}}},$$

and we recall the definition of the function class used in the regression problem for Phase I:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{id}} := \left\{ Mf(\cdot) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}, M \in \mathbb{R}^{\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}} \times d_{\mathbf{x}}}, \|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sqrt{\Psi_\star} \right\}, \quad (\text{D.5})$$

which corresponds to choosing  $r_{\text{id}} = \sqrt{\Psi_\star}$ .

#### D.1.1 Marginals and Conditions

To compute the Bayes regression function for Phase I we use the following results, which are readily verified.

**Fact D.1** (Marginals for Phase I). Fix  $\kappa, \kappa_0$  and define.  $\kappa_1 := \kappa_0 + \kappa$ . Then  $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}$  are jointly Gaussian and mean zero. Moreover,  $\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}})$ ,  $\mathbf{v} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}}})$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v} \mathbf{x}_k^\top] = \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top$ .

**Fact D.2** (Gaussian Expectation). Let  $(U, X)$  be jointly Gaussian random variables with distribution

$$(U, X) \sim \mathcal{N} \left( 0, \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{UU} & \Sigma_{UX} \\ \Sigma_{XU} & \Sigma_{XX} \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

Then we have  $\mathbb{E}[U \mid X = x] = \Sigma_{UX} \Sigma_{XX}^{-1} x$ .

### D.1.2 Selecting the Burn-In Time

**Lemma D.1.** Fix an integer  $n_{\text{id}} \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then as long as  $\kappa_0$  satisfies Eq. (D.3), we have that for any  $k, k' \geq \kappa_0$  (including  $k = \infty$ ), the following properties hold.

1. The following bounds hold with respect to the PSD ordering:

$$\frac{9}{10}\Sigma_\star \preceq \Sigma_{k,\text{id}} \preceq \frac{11}{10}\Sigma_\star \preceq \frac{11}{5}\Psi_\star^2\alpha_\star^2(1-\gamma_\star)^{-1} \cdot I.$$

2. Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . For any  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$  with  $\mathbb{E}\|h_1(\mathbf{y}_k) - h_2(\mathbf{y}_k)\|^2 \leq \varepsilon^2$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|h_1(\mathbf{y}_{k'}) - h_2(\mathbf{y}_{k'})\|^2 \leq 2 \max\{\varepsilon^2, \Psi_\star L^2/n_{\text{id}}\}.$$

3. The controllability matrices satisfy the following bounds:

$$1 \wedge \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_k^\top \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}^{-1/2}) \geq \sigma_{d_\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{C}_k) \sqrt{\frac{5(1-\gamma_\star)}{11\Psi_\star^2\alpha_\star^2}}, \quad (\text{D.6})$$

and

$$1 \wedge \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_k^\top \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}^{-1/2}) \cdot \sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_{k',\text{id}}^{-1/2}) \geq \frac{5(1-\gamma_\star)\sigma_{d_\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{C}_k)}{11\Psi_\star^2\alpha_\star^2}. \quad (\text{D.7})$$

4.  $\|\mathcal{C}_k^\top \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sqrt{\Psi_\star}$ , provided  $k \geq k'$  (but in fact, not requiring  $k \geq \kappa_0$ ).

**Proof.** Our proof starts with the following claim, which shows that the covariance matrices for  $k$  and  $k'$  are very close under the conditions of the lemma.

**Claim D.1.** Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ . For all  $k, k' \geq \frac{1}{1-\gamma_\star} \ln \frac{6\varepsilon^{-1}\Psi_\star^2\alpha_\star^2}{1-\gamma_\star}$ , we have that

$$\max\{\|I - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}}, \|I - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}^{-1} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{1/2}\|_{\text{op}}\} \leq \varepsilon.$$

**Proof of Claim D.1.** Since  $\Sigma_{k,\text{id}} \succeq \Sigma_w \succeq \Psi_\star^{-1}I$  by definition, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|I - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}} &= \|\Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2} (\Sigma_{k,\text{id}} - \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}) \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2}\| \\ &\leq \|\Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1}\| \|\Sigma_{k',\text{id}} - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}\| \leq \Psi_\star \|\Sigma_{k',\text{id}} - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}\|. \end{aligned}$$

By the same token,

$$\begin{aligned} \|I - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}^{-1} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{1/2}\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \varepsilon \\ \iff (1-\varepsilon)I &\preceq \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}^{-1} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{1/2} \preceq (1+\varepsilon)I \\ \iff (1-\varepsilon)\Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1} &\preceq \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}^{-1} \preceq (1+\varepsilon)\Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1} && (\text{conjugation}) \\ \iff (1+\varepsilon)^{-1}\Sigma_{k,\text{id}} &\preceq \Sigma_{k',\text{id}} \preceq (1-\varepsilon)^{-1}\Sigma_{k,\text{id}} && (\text{inversion}) \\ \iff (1+\varepsilon)^{-1}I &\preceq \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2} \preceq (1+\varepsilon)^{-1}\Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2} \\ \iff \|I - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \max\{1 - (1+\varepsilon)^{-1}, (1-\varepsilon)^{-1} - 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for  $\epsilon \leq 1/2$ ,  $\|I - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}^{-1} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{1/2}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \epsilon$  as long as  $\|I - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\epsilon$ . Combining with the above,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max\{\|I - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}}, \|I - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}}\} \leq \epsilon \\ & \text{if } \|\Sigma_{k,\text{id}} - \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2\Psi_\star} \leq \epsilon \leq 1/2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.8})$$

Next, for any  $k, k'$ , using strong stability implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Sigma_{k,\text{id}} - \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} & \leq \|A^k(\Sigma_0)(A^k)^\top - A^{k'}(\Sigma_0)(A^{k'})^\top\|_{\text{op}} + \left\| \sum_{i=\min\{k,k'\}+1}^{\max\{k,k'\}} (A^i) \Sigma_w (A^i)^\top \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ & \leq \Psi_\star \alpha_\star^2 \left( 2\gamma_\star^{2\min\{k,k'\}} + \sum_{i=\min\{k,k'\}+1}^{\max\{k,k'\}} \gamma_\star^{2s} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{3\Psi_\star \alpha_\star^2 \gamma_\star^{2\min\{k,k'\}}}{1 - \gamma_\star}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for a given  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\|\Sigma_{k,\text{id}} - \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \epsilon \text{ for } \min\{k, k'\} \geq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_\star} \ln \frac{3\epsilon^{-1} \Psi_\star \alpha_\star^2}{1 - \gamma_\star}.$$

The bound now follows by combining with Eq. (D.8), and shrinking  $\epsilon$  by a factor of 2.  $\square$

Next, we require a basic operator norm bound for  $\Sigma_{\infty,\text{id}}$ .

**Claim D.2.**  $\|\Sigma_{\infty,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)^{-1}$ .

**Proof of Claim D.2.**  $\|\Sigma_{\infty,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} = \|\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (A^i)(\Sigma_w + BB^\top)(A^i)^\top\|_{\text{op}} \leq (\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}} + \|B\|_{\text{op}}^2) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \|A^i\|_{\text{op}}^2$ . We can bound  $(\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}} + \|B\|_{\text{op}}^2) \leq 2\Psi_\star^2$  and  $\|A^i\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq \alpha_\star^2 \gamma_\star^{2i}$ , so that  $\|\Sigma_{\infty,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2 \sum_{i \geq 0} \gamma_\star^{2i} \leq \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)^{-1}$ .  $\square$

We now proceed with the proof of the lemma. We prove points 1 through 4 in order.

1. We have that  $\frac{9}{10}\Sigma_{\infty,\text{id}} \preceq \Sigma_{k,\text{id}} \preceq \frac{11}{10}\Sigma_{\infty,\text{id}}$  if and only if  $\|I - \Sigma_{\infty,\text{id}}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}} \Sigma_{\infty,\text{id}}^{-1/2}\| \leq 1/10$ . Hence, the bounds hold by selecting  $k \leftarrow \infty$ ,  $k' \leftarrow k$ , and invoking Claim D.1 for our choice of  $\kappa_0$ . Moreover, by Claim D.2,  $\Sigma_{\infty,\text{id}} \preceq 2I\Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)^{-1}$ , yielding the last inequality.
2. For point 2, every  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$  satisfies  $\|h(y)\| \leq L\sqrt{\Psi_\star} \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|\}$ ; see the definition of the class  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$  in Eq. (D.5). Hence, given two elements  $h, h' \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$  with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{k,\text{id}})} \|h(\mathbf{y}_k) - h'(\mathbf{y}_k)\| \leq \epsilon^2$ , Lemma B.3 ensures that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_{k'} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{k',\text{id}})} \|h(\mathbf{y}_{k'}) - h'(\mathbf{y}_{k'})\| \leq 2 \max\{\epsilon^2, \Psi_\star L^2/n_{\text{id}}\}, \\ & \text{provided that } \|I - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}^{-1} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{1/2}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{14d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(80en_{\text{id}}(1 + \|\Sigma_{k,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}}))}. \end{aligned}$$

Using that  $\Psi_\star, \alpha_\star \geq 1$  and the previous bound,  $(1 + \|\Sigma_{k,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}}) \leq \frac{22}{5} \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)^{-1}$ , we have that as long as

$$\|I - \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{1/2} \Sigma_{k',\text{id}}^{-1} \Sigma_{k,\text{id}}^{1/2}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{14d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(16 \cdot 22en_{\text{id}} \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)^{-1})}, \quad (\text{D.9})$$

we obtain the desired inequality:  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_{k'} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{k', \text{id}})} \|h(\mathbf{y}_{k'}) - h'(\mathbf{y}_{k'})\| \leq 2 \max\{\varepsilon^2, \Psi_\star L^2/n_{\text{id}}\}$ . Finally to obtain the guarantee in Eq. (D.9), we require

$$\min\{k, k'\} \geq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_\star} \ln \left( \frac{6 \cdot 14 \Psi_\star^3 \alpha_\star^2 d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(16 \cdot 22 e n_{\text{id}} \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)^{-1})}{1 - \gamma_\star} \right).$$

Simplifying constants, a sufficient condition is that

$$\min\{k, k'\} \geq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_\star} \ln \left( \frac{84 \Psi_\star^3 \alpha_\star^2 d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(1000 n_{\text{id}} \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)^{-1})}{1 - \gamma_\star} \right).$$

Finally, since  $\ln(xy) = \ln(x) + \ln(y) \leq y \ln(x)$  for  $x \geq e$  and  $y \geq 1$ , we can further simplify to the sufficient condition

$$\min\{k, k'\} \geq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_\star} \ln \left( \frac{84 \Psi_\star^5 \alpha_\star^4 d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(1000 n_{\text{id}})}{(1 - \gamma_\star)^2} \right) := \kappa_0.$$

which is precisely the condition in Eq. (D.3).

3. For the third point, we start with 1

$$\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{k', \text{id}}^{-1/2}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{k', \text{id}})}} \geq \sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_k) \sqrt{\frac{5(1 - \gamma)}{11 \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2}} \quad (\text{D.10})$$

To prove the first point of Eq. (D.7), we bound

$$\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_k^\top \Sigma_{k', \text{id}}^{-1/2}) \geq \sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_k) \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{k', \text{id}}^{-1/2}) \geq \sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_k) \sqrt{\frac{5(1 - \gamma)}{11 \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2}}, \quad (\text{D.11})$$

where we use the first point of the lemma in the last step (Eq. (D.10)). To see that this lower bound (the RHS of Eq. (D.11)) is less than 1 (accounting for the  $\wedge 1$  in the LHS of Eq. (D.7)), we observe  $\Sigma_{k', \text{id}} \succeq \mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^\top$  for  $k' \geq k$ , and thus  $\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_k^\top \Sigma_{k', \text{id}}^{-1/2}) \leq 1$ .

Proving the second part of Eq. (D.7) follows by combining Eqs. (D.10) and (D.11). The resultant lower bound is also less than 1, since the (RHS of Eq. (D.10))  $\leq 1$ , and  $\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_k^\top \Sigma_{k', \text{id}}^{-1/2}) \leq 1$  as well.

4. Finally,  $\|\mathcal{C}_k^\top \Sigma_{k', \text{id}}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\mathcal{C}_k^\top (\Sigma_{k', \text{id}}^{-1/2})\|_{\text{op}} \|\Sigma_{k', \text{id}}^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}}$ . Since  $\Sigma_{k', \text{id}} \succeq \mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^\top$  for  $k' \geq k$ ,  $\|\mathcal{C}_k^\top (\Sigma_{k', \text{id}}^{-1/2})\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$ . Moreover, since  $\Sigma_{k', \text{id}} \succeq \Sigma_w \succeq \Psi_\star^{-1} I$ ,  $\|\Sigma_{k', \text{id}}^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sqrt{\Psi_\star}$ , as needed.

□

### D.1.3 Properties of the Class $\mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$

**Lemma D.2.** Let  $\kappa_0$  satisfy Eq. (D.3), and define

$$c_{\text{conc, id}} := \frac{12 L^2 \Psi_\star^3 \alpha_\star^2}{1 - \gamma_\star}. \quad (\text{D.12})$$

Then, for all  $k \geq \kappa_0$ :

1.  $\max_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}} \|h(\mathbf{y}_k)\|^2 \leq L^2 \Psi_\star \max\{1, \|f_\star(\mathbf{y}_k)\|^2\}$ , and both are  $(d_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot c_{\text{conc, id}})$ -concentrated.

2. For any matrix  $V$  with  $\|V\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$  (e.g., any  $V$  with orthonormal columns) and any  $h, h' \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$ , the random variable  $\|V^\top h(\mathbf{y}_k)\|^2$  is  $(d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc},\text{id}})$  concentrated, and  $\|V^\top h(\mathbf{y}_k) - V^\top h'(\mathbf{y}_k)\|^2$  is  $(4d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc},\text{id}})$ -concentrated.

**Proof.** Let us first reason about the concentration of  $\|f_\star(\mathbf{y}_k)\|^2$ . Under perfect decodability,  $\|f_\star(\mathbf{y}_k)\|^2 = \|\mathbf{x}_k\|^2$ , which is  $5\text{tr}(\Sigma_{k,\text{id}}) \leq 5d_{\mathbf{x}}\|\Sigma_{k,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}}$ -concentrated by Lemma B.2. Moreover, from Lemma D.1, we have that  $5d_{\mathbf{x}}\|\Sigma_{k,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 11\Psi_\star^2\alpha_\star^2(1 - \gamma_\star)^{-1}$ .

To finish proving the first point, observe that  $\max_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}} \|h(y)\|^2 \leq L^2\Psi_\star \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|^2\}$  (Eq. (D.5)). From Lemma B.1, we recall that if a random variable  $\mathbf{z}$  is  $c$ -concentrated, then  $\alpha(\mathbf{z} + \beta)$  is  $\alpha(c + \beta)$  concentrated for  $\beta, \alpha > 0$ . Hence,  $\max_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}} \|h(y)\|^2$  is  $L^2\Psi_\star(1 + 11d_{\mathbf{x}}\Psi_\star^2\alpha_\star^2(1 - \gamma_\star)^{-1}) \leq d_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot 12L^2\Psi_\star^3\alpha_\star^2(1 - \gamma_\star)^{-1} = d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc},\text{id}}$ -concentrated, as needed.

The proof of the second point is analogous. First, we note that for  $\|V\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$ ,  $\|V^\top h(\mathbf{y}_k)\|^2 \leq \|h(\mathbf{y}_k)\|^2$  and  $\|V^\top(h(\mathbf{y}_k) - h'(\mathbf{y}_k))\|^2 \leq 4L^2\Psi_\star \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|^2\}$ . Combined with the concentration result for  $\|f_\star(\mathbf{y}_k)\|^2$  above, this yields the result.  $\square$

**Lemma D.3.** Let  $\kappa_0$  satisfy Eq. (D.3), let  $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$ , and define  $\kappa_1 := \kappa_0 + \kappa$ . Then for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{x}}}$  and  $y \in \text{supp} q(\cdot | x)$  we have:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1} = y] = \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1} x =: h_{\star, \text{id}}(y),$$

and  $h_{\star, \text{id}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$ .

**Proof.** Since  $\mathbf{v} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} \rightarrow \mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}$  forms a Markov chain, and  $\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} = f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})$  almost surely, we have that  $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}, \mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})$  is *decodable* in the sense of Definition 4. Thus, by Lemma B.4,  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1} = y] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} = f_\star(y)]$ . By Fact D.1,  $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1})$  are jointly Gaussian and mean zero, and  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}^\top] = \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v} \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}^\top] = \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} = x] = \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1} x$  (Fact D.2), giving that  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1} = y] = \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1} f_\star(y) = h_{\star, \text{id}}(y)$ , as needed.

To see that  $h_{\star, \text{id}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$ , we observe that  $h_{\star, \text{id}} = M f_\star$  for  $M = \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1}$ . By Lemma D.1 part 4, we have  $\|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Psi_\star^{1/2}$ . Thus, from the definition of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$  in Eq. (D.5) and the fact that  $f_\star \in \mathcal{F}$  by the realizability assumption, we conclude that  $h_{\star, \text{id}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$ .  $\square$

## D.2 Proof of Decoder Recovery (Theorem 2.1)

We first state the full version of Theorem 2.1, which asserts that Phase I recovers a decoder that accurately predicts the state under Gaussian roll-in, up to a well-conditioned similarity transformation.

**Theorem 2.1a.** For a universal constant  $\bar{c}_{\text{id},1} \geq 8$ , define

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}^2 = \bar{c}_{\text{id},1} \frac{\ln^2(\frac{n_{\text{id}}}{\delta})(d_{\mathbf{u}}\kappa + d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc},\text{id}})(\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}}d_{\mathbf{x}}\kappa)}{n_{\text{id}}}, \quad (\text{D.13})$$

and assume that  $n_{\text{id}}$  is sufficiently large such that

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc},\text{id}}} \leq \frac{(1 - \gamma_\star)\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2}{71\alpha_\star^2\Psi_\star^2}.$$

Then, with probability at least  $1 - 3\delta$ , there exists an invertible matrix  $S_{\text{id}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{x}}^2}$  satisfying

$$1 \wedge \sigma_{\min}(S_{\text{id}}) \geq \sigma_{\min, \text{id}} := \frac{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)(1 - \gamma_\star)}{4\Psi_\star^2\alpha_\star^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \vee \|S_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sigma_{\max, \text{id}} := \sqrt{\Psi_\star},$$

such that the function  $f_{\star, \text{id}}(y) := S_{\text{id}} f_{\star}(y)$  and the learned decoder  $\hat{f}_{\text{id}}$  satisfy

$$\mathbb{E} \|f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) - \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{id}, h}^2.$$

In particular, for

$$n_{\text{id}} = \Omega_{\star}(d_{\mathbf{x}} d_{\mathbf{u}} \kappa (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \kappa)),$$

we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \|f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) - \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_{\star} \left( \frac{d_{\mathbf{u}} \kappa (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \kappa) \ln^2 \left( \frac{n_{\text{id}}}{\delta} \right)}{n_{\text{id}}} \right).$$

**Proof.** The proof of this theorem follows from two propositions which we establish in the sequel. The first, [Proposition D.1](#), demonstrates that the learned function  $\hat{h}_{\text{id}}$  satisfies the following bound with probability  $1 - 3\delta/2$ :

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}} [\|\hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) - h_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{id}, h}^2,$$

where  $h_{\star, \text{id}}(y) := \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1} f_{\star}(y)$ . Now recall that the function  $\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(y)$  is constructed as  $\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} h_{\star, \text{id}}(y)$ , where  $\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}$  has orthonormal columns. Defining  $S_{\text{id}} = \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1}$ , we see that  $\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} h_{\star, \text{id}}(y) = S_{\text{id}} f_{\star}(y) = f_{\star, \text{id}}(y)$ . Thus, since  $\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}$  has operator norm 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}} [\|\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) - f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}} [\|\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} (\hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) - h_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}))\|^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}} [\|\hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) - h_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{id}, h}^2. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, the norm bounds for the matrix  $S_{\text{id}}$  are provided by [Proposition D.2](#), which hold with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .  $\square$

### D.2.1 Prediction Error Guarantee for $\hat{h}_{\text{id}}$

**Proposition D.1.** Let  $(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{v}^{(i)})_{i=1}^{n_{\text{id}}}$  be as described in [Algorithm 2](#) and [Section 2.2](#), and let

$$\hat{h}_{\text{id}} \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{id}}} \|h(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{v}^{(i)}\|^2.$$

Then there is a universal constant  $\bar{c}_{\text{id}, 1} \geq 8$  such that with probability at least  $1 - \frac{3}{2}\delta$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}} [\|\hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) - h_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{id}, h}^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_{\star} \left( \frac{\ln^2 \left( \frac{n_{\text{id}}}{\delta} \right) d_{\mathbf{u}} \kappa (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \kappa)}{n_{\text{id}}} \right).$$

We let  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id}, h}$  denote the event that this inequality holds.

**Proof.** From [Lemma D.3](#), we have  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1} = y] = h_{\star, \text{id}}(y)$ , so  $h_{\star, \text{id}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{id}}$ . To prove the result, we simply apply our general-purpose error bound for least-square regression, [Corollary B.1](#), with  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}$ ,  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}$ , and  $\mathbf{e} = 0$ . We verify that each precondition for the proposition holds.

- **Structure of function classes:**  $\mathcal{F}$  is finite, and by [Assumption 5](#),  $\|f(y)\| \leq L \max\{1, \|f_{\star}(y)\|\}$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{id}} := \{M \cdot f : \|M\| \leq \sqrt{\Psi_{\star}}, f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ .

- **Concentration Property.** By Lemma D.2, defining  $\varphi(y) := L^2\Psi_\star \max\{1, \|f_\star(y)\|^2\}$  we see that  $\varphi(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})$  is  $d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc,id}}$ -concentrated. Moreover, since  $\mathbf{v} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{d_{\mathbf{u}}\kappa})$ , we have that  $\|\mathbf{v}\|^2$  is  $5d_{\mathbf{u}}\kappa$ -concentrated by Lemma B.2. Hence,  $c = 5d_{\mathbf{u}}\kappa + d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc,id}}$  is a valid choice for the concentration constant  $c$  in Proposition B.1.

Thus, Corollary B.1 with  $c \lesssim d_{\mathbf{u}}\kappa + d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc,id}}$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}}[\|\hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) - h_{\star,\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2] &\lesssim \frac{\ln^2(\frac{n_{\text{id}}}{\delta})(d_{\mathbf{u}}\kappa + d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc,id}})(\ln|\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}}d_{\mathbf{x}}\kappa)}{n_{\text{id}}} \\ &= \mathcal{O}_\star\left(\frac{\ln^2(\frac{n_{\text{id}}}{\delta})(d_{\mathbf{u}}\kappa + d_{\mathbf{x}})(\ln|\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}}d_{\mathbf{x}}\kappa)}{n_{\text{id}}}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}_\star\left(\frac{\ln^2(\frac{n_{\text{id}}}{\delta})d_{\mathbf{u}}\kappa(\ln|\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}}d_{\mathbf{x}}\kappa)}{n_{\text{id}}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last simplification uses that controllability requires  $d_{\mathbf{u}}\kappa \geq d_{\mathbf{x}}$ .  $\square$

## D.2.2 Dimension Reduction

**Proposition D.2.** Suppose that  $\kappa_0$  satisfies Eq. (D.3). Let  $\hat{V}_{\text{id}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}} \times d_{\mathbf{x}}}$  be an eigenbasis for the top  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$  eigenvalues of  $\hat{\Lambda}_n$ , where we define

$$\hat{\Lambda}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) \hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^\top.$$

Further, let  $S_{\text{id}} := \hat{V}_{\text{id}}^\top \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{x}} \times d_{\mathbf{x}}}$ . Then if

$$\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc,id}}\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}} \leq \frac{(1 - \gamma_\star)\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2}{71\alpha_\star^2\Psi_\star^2}, \quad (\text{D.14})$$

we have that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , an event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id},\text{pca}}$  occurs such that on  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id},h} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{id},\text{pca}}$ ,

$$1 \wedge \sigma_{\min}(S_{\text{id}}) \geq \sigma_{\min,\text{id}} := \frac{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)(1 - \gamma_\star)}{4\Psi_\star^2\alpha_\star^2}, \quad 1 \vee \|S_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sigma_{\max,\text{id}} := \sqrt{\Psi_\star}.$$

**Proof.** Introduce  $\Lambda_\star := \mathcal{C}_\kappa \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top$ , and let  $V_{\text{id}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}} \times d_{\mathbf{x}}}$  be an eigenbasis for its  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$  non-zero eigenvectors. From Lemma D.3 and Fact D.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h_{\star,\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) h_{\star,\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})^\top] &= \mathcal{C}_\kappa \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})^\top] \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \\ &= \mathcal{C}_\kappa \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}^\top] \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \\ &= \mathcal{C}_\kappa \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top = \mathcal{C}_\kappa \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top := \Lambda_\star. \end{aligned}$$

We apply Proposition B.2 and Corollary B.3, with  $\hat{\Lambda}_n$  and  $\Lambda_\star$  as above. To apply this proposition, first observe that  $\|\hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2$  is  $c = d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc,id}}$ -concentrated by Lemma D.2. Moreover, on  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id},h}$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{h}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) - h_{\star,\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}^2$ . Thus, the term  $\varepsilon_{\text{pca},n,\delta}$  in Proposition B.2, specializes to

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},\text{pca}} := 3\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc,id}}\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}} + 5d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc,id}}n_{\text{id}}^{-1/2} \ln(2\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}}n_{\text{id}}/\delta)^{3/2}.$$

By the fact that  $n_{\text{id}} \geq \kappa d_{\mathbf{u}}$  (it can be verified that this is required to ensure the upper bound on  $\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}$ ), we can bound

$$d_{\mathbf{x}} c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} n_{\text{id}}^{-1/2} \ln(2\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}} n_{\text{id}}/\delta)^{3/2} \leq \sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}} c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}},$$

where  $\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}$  is as in [Proposition D.1](#). Hence, we can bound

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},\text{pca}} = 3\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}} c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}} + 5d_{\mathbf{x}} c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} n_{\text{id}}^{-1/2} \ln(2\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}} n_{\text{id}}/\delta)^{3/2} \leq 8\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}} c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}}.$$

Thus, if we denote the event above by  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id},\text{pca}}$ , we that have on  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id},h} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{id},\text{pca}}$ ,

$$\|\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} (\widehat{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_{\star}) \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} = \|\widehat{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_{\star}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 8\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}} c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}}.$$

From the fourth point of [Lemma D.1](#), we have that  $\lambda_{\min}(\Lambda_{\star}) \geq \frac{5(1-\gamma_{\star})\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2}{11\alpha_{\star}^2\Psi_{\star}^2}$ . Hence, [Corollary B.3](#) ensures that under the  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id},h} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{id},\text{pca}}$ , we have

$$\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} V_{\text{id}}) \geq \frac{2}{3}, \quad (\text{D.15})$$

as long as

$$\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}} c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}} \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_{\star})\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2}{71\alpha_{\star}^2\Psi_{\star}^2} \leq \frac{1}{4 \cdot 8} \cdot \frac{5(1-\gamma_{\star})\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2}{11\alpha_{\star}^2\Psi_{\star}^2},$$

which is precisely the condition [Eq. \(D.14\)](#) required by the theorem. To conclude, let us bound the singular values of  $S_{\text{id}} := \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1}$  under the assumption that the bound above holds. Since  $\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}$  has orthonormal columns, have that

$$\|S_{\text{id}}\| \leq \|\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1}\| \leq \sqrt{\Psi_{\star}}. \quad (\text{Lemma D.1})$$

On the other hand, we can lower bound

$$\sigma_{\min}(S_{\text{id}}) = \sigma_{\min}(\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1}) \geq \sigma_{\min}(\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}) \sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{D.16})$$

where we have used that  $\Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}$  and  $\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}$  are square. We now prove the following claim, which is also reused in a number of subsequent proofs.

**Claim D.3.** On  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id},h} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{id},\text{pca}}$ , we have

$$\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}) \geq \frac{2}{3} \sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}).$$

**Proof of Claim D.3.** Since  $V_{\text{id}}$  is an eigenbasis for  $\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}$ , we have that  $\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2} = V_{\text{id}} V_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}$ , and  $\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(V_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}) = \sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2})$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\min}(\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}) &= \sigma_{\min}(\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} V_{\text{id}} V_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}) \\ &\geq \sigma_{\min}(\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} V_{\text{id}}) \sigma_{\min}(V_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}) \\ &\geq \frac{2}{3} \sigma_{\min}(V_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{by Eq. (D.15)})$$

where the first inequality uses that  $\sigma_{\min}(XY) \geq \sigma_{\min}(X) \sigma_{\min}(Y)$  for  $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{x}} \times d_{\mathbf{x}}}$ . Again, since  $V_{\text{id}}$  is an eigenbasis for the non-zero eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}$ , we have

$$\sigma_{\min}(V_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}) = \sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}).$$

□

Combining the above claim with Eq. (D.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{\min}(S_{\text{id}}) &\geq \frac{2}{3} \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1/2}) \sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1/2}) \\
&\geq \frac{5 \cdot 2 \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)(1 - \gamma_\star)}{11 \cdot 3 \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2} \quad (\text{Eq. (D.7) in Lemma D.1}) \\
&\geq \frac{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)(1 - \gamma_\star)}{4 \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2},
\end{aligned}$$

as needed.  $\square$

### D.3 Estimating Costs and Dynamics (Theorem 2.2)

To begin this section, we state the full version of Theorem 2.2, which shows that Phase II (Algorithm 3) accurately recovers the system matrices, noise covariance, and state cost up to a similarity transformation.

**Theorem 2.2a.** *For a possibly inflated numerical constant  $\bar{c}_{\text{id},1}$  in Eq. (D.13), suppose  $\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}$  satisfies*

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \sqrt{\ln(2n_{\text{id}}/\delta)} \leq \frac{\sigma_{d_\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)^2}{80 \cdot 12L^2 \Psi_\star^5 \alpha_\star^4 d_\mathbf{x}}.$$

*Then, with probability at least  $1 - 11\delta$  over both Phase I and Phase II, the following bounds hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{Q}_{\text{id}} - Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} &\lesssim \varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \cdot \frac{\alpha_\star^6 \Psi_\star^7 \sqrt{c_{\text{conc}, \text{id}} d_\mathbf{x} \ln(n_{\text{id}}/\delta)}}{(1 - \gamma_\star)^3 \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^4}, \\
\|[\widehat{A}_{\text{id}}; \widehat{B}_{\text{id}}] - [A_{\text{id}}; B_{\text{id}}]\|_{\text{op}} &\lesssim \varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \cdot \frac{\Psi_\star^{7/2} \alpha_\star^3}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)^{3/2}}, \\
\|\widehat{\Sigma}_{w, \text{id}} - \Sigma_{w, \text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} &\lesssim \varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \cdot \frac{\Psi_\star^{5/2} \alpha_\star^4}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa) (1 - \gamma_\star)}.
\end{aligned}$$

*In particular, for*

$$n_{\text{id}} = \Omega_\star(d_\mathbf{x}^2 d_\mathbf{u} \kappa (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_\mathbf{u} d_\mathbf{x} \kappa) \max\{1, \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^{-4}\}),$$

*we have that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\widehat{Q}_{\text{id}} - Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|[\widehat{A}_{\text{id}}; \widehat{B}_{\text{id}}] - [A_{\text{id}}; B_{\text{id}}]\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|\widehat{\Sigma}_{w, \text{id}} - \Sigma_{w, \text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \\
&\leq \mathcal{O}_\star\left(n_{\text{id}}^{-1/2} \cdot \sqrt{d_\mathbf{x} d_\mathbf{u} \kappa (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_\mathbf{u} d_\mathbf{x} \kappa) \ln(n_{\text{id}}/\delta)^4}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

#### D.3.1 Preliminaries for Theorem 2.2

Before proceeding with the proof of Theorem 2.2, we recall some notation. First, following Appendix D.3, we let

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{id},h} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_{\text{id},\text{pca}}$$

denote the events from Proposition D.1 and Proposition D.2, respectively. Next, we introduce some functions used throughout the proof and prove some basic facts about them.

**Definition 6.** Recall that  $S_{\text{id}} := \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^\top \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1}$  ([Proposition D.2](#)). Define functions  $f_{\star, \text{id}}, \widehat{f}_{\text{id}}, \text{err}_{f, \text{id}} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\star}$  via:

$$\widehat{f}_{\text{id}} := \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^\top \widehat{h}_{\text{id}}, \quad f_{\star, \text{id}} := S_{\text{id}} f_\star, \quad \text{err}_{f, \text{id}} := \widehat{f}_{\text{id}} - f_{\star, \text{id}}.$$

**Lemma D.4.** Let  $\kappa$  satisfy the conditions of [Lemma D.1](#). Then, under the good event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id}, h} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{id}, \text{pca}}$ ,

1.  $\mathbb{E} \|\text{err}_{f, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{id}, h}^2$ .
2. For any  $k \geq \kappa_0$  (in particular, for  $k = \kappa_1 + 1$ ),  $\mathbb{E} \|\text{err}_{f, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_k)\|^2 \leq 2\varepsilon_{\text{id}, h}^2$ .
3. For any  $k \geq \kappa_1$  (in particular, for  $k \in \{\kappa_1, \kappa_1 + 1\}$ ),  $\max\{\|\widehat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_k)\|, \|f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_k)\|\}^2$  is  $d_\star c_{\text{conc}, \text{id}}$ -concentrated, and  $\|\text{err}_{f, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_k)\|^2$  is  $4d_\star c_{\text{conc}, \text{id}}$ -concentrated.
4. We have that  $f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) = S_{\text{id}} \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}$  is zero-mean Gaussian, with

$$\mathbb{E}[f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})^\top] = S_{\text{id}} (\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}^\top]) S_{\text{id}}^\top \succeq I \cdot \frac{\sigma_{d_\star}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)}{10 \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2}.$$

**Proof.** For point 1, we have that  $f_{\star, \text{id}} := S_{\text{id}} f_\star = \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^\top \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1} f_\star = \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^\top h_{\star, \text{id}}$ . Hence,

$$\mathbb{E} \|\text{err}_{f, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2 = \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^\top (\widehat{h}_{\text{id}} - h_{\star, \text{id}})\|^2 \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{h}_{\text{id}} - h_{\star, \text{id}}\|^2 \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \varepsilon_{\text{id}, h}^2,$$

where inequality (i) uses that  $\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}$  has orthonormal columns, and inequality (ii) uses the definition of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id}, h}$  ([Proposition D.1](#)). Points 2 and 3 follow from [Lemma D.1](#) and [Lemma D.2](#), respectively.

Finally, for point 4, we use that  $S_{\text{id}} = \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^\top \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1}$  to write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}) f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1})^\top] &= S_{\text{id}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}^\top] S_{\text{id}}^\top \\ &= S_{\text{id}} (\Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}) S_{\text{id}}^\top \\ &= \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^\top \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1} \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}} \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_\kappa \widehat{V}_{\text{id}} \\ &= \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^\top \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_\kappa \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min}(S_{\text{id}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}^\top] S_{\text{id}}^\top) &\geq \sigma_{\min}(\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^\top \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1/2})^2 \\ &\geq \frac{4}{9} \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1/2})^2 && \text{(Claim D.3)} \\ &\geq \frac{4}{9} \cdot \frac{5\sigma_{d_\star}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)}{11 \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2} && \text{(Lemma D.1)} \\ &\geq \frac{\sigma_{d_\star}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)}{10 \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2}, \end{aligned}$$

as needed.  $\square$

### D.3.2 Estimation of $A_{\text{id}}$ , $B_{\text{id}}$ , and $\Sigma_{w,\text{id}}$

We first show that Phase II recovers the system matrices and system noise covariance.

**Proposition D.3.** Define

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{A}_{\text{id}}, \widehat{B}_{\text{id}}) &\in \arg \min_{(A,B)} \frac{1}{n_{\text{id}}} \sum_{i=2n_{\text{id}}+1}^{n_{\text{id}}} \|\widehat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1+1}^{(i)}) - A\widehat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) - B\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}\|^2, \\ \widehat{\Sigma}_{w,\text{id}} &= \frac{1}{n_{\text{id}}} \sum_{i=2n_{\text{id}}+1}^{n_{\text{id}}} (\widehat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1+1}^{(i)}) - \widehat{A}_{\text{id}}\widehat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) - \widehat{B}_{\text{id}}\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2}. \end{aligned}$$

Further, define the matrices  $A_{\text{id}} := S_{\text{id}}AS_{\text{id}}^{-1}$ ,  $B_{\text{id}} := S_{\text{id}}B$ , and  $\Sigma_{w,\text{id}} := S_{\text{id}}\Sigma_w S_{\text{id}}^\top$ . Suppose  $\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}$  satisfies Eq. (D.14) (which is the prerequisite of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id},\text{pca}}$  of Proposition D.2), and  $n \geq c_0(d_{\mathbf{x}} + \ln(1/\delta))$  for some universal constant  $c_0$ . Then on  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id},\text{pca}} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{id},h}$ , the following event, designated  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{id},\text{ls}}$ , holds with probability  $1 - 7\delta$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\widehat{A}_{\text{id}}; \widehat{B}_{\text{id}}] - [A_{\text{id}}; B_{\text{id}}]\|_{\text{op}} &\lesssim \frac{\Psi_\star^{7/2} \alpha_\star^3}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)^{3/2}} \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}, \\ \|\widehat{\Sigma}_{w,\text{id}} - \Sigma_{w,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} &\lesssim \frac{\Psi_\star^{5/2} \alpha_\star^4}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa) (1 - \gamma_\star)} \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof.** We cast the regressions above as an instance of error-in-variable regression, then apply our general guarantees for this problem (Propositions B.3 and B.4). We restate the guarantees here:

**Proposition B.3** (Linear regression with errors in variables). Let  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{e}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$  be a collection of random variables defined over a shared probability space, and let  $\{(\mathbf{u}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}^{(i)}, \mathbf{w}^{(i)}, \mathbf{e}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^n$  be i.i.d. copies. Suppose the following conditions hold:

1.  $\mathbf{y} = M_\star \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{e}$  with probability 1, where  $M_\star \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{y}} \times d_{\mathbf{u}}}$ .
2.  $\mathbf{w} \mid \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\delta} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_w)$  and  $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_u)$ .
3. We have  $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 \leq \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|^2 \leq \varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^2$ .
4.  $\mathbf{e}$  is  $c_{\mathbf{e}}$ -concentrated and  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$  is  $c_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ -concentrated for  $c_{\mathbf{e}} \geq \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2$  and  $c_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \geq \varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^2$ .
5.  $\varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{16} \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u)$ .

Let  $\delta \leq 1/e$ , and let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy

1.  $\psi(n, \delta) \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2 \varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^2}{c_{\mathbf{e}} c_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}} \right\}$ , where  $\psi(n, \delta) := \frac{2 \ln(2n/\delta) \ln(2/\delta)}{n}$ .
2.  $n \geq c_1(d_{\mathbf{u}} + \ln(1/\delta))$ , for some universal constant  $c_1 > 0$ .

Then the solution to the least squares problem

$$\widehat{M} = \min_M \sum_{i=1}^n \|M(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(i)}\|^2,$$

satisfies the following inequality with probability at least  $1 - 4\delta$ :

$$\|\widehat{M} - M_\star\|_{\text{op}}^2 \lesssim \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_u)^{-1} \left( \|M_\star\|_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2 + \frac{\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}(d_{\mathbf{y}} + d_{\mathbf{u}} + \ln(1/\delta))}{n} \right). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

**Proposition B.4.** Consider the setting of [Proposition B.3](#), and suppose we additionally require that  $n \geq c_0(d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta))$  for some (possibly inflated) universal constant  $c_0$ . Furthermore, suppose we have  $\varepsilon_{\tilde{\delta}}^2 \|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2 \leq 2\lambda_+$  for some  $\lambda_+ \geq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_w)$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - 7\delta$ , [\(B.2\)](#) holds, and moreover

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{M}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - \mathbf{y}^{(i)})^{\otimes 2} - \Sigma_w \right\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \sqrt{\lambda_+ (\varepsilon_{\tilde{\delta}}^2 \|M_{\star}\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}}^2) + \frac{\lambda_+^2 (d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta))}{n}}.$$

To distinguish between our present notation and the notation of these propositions, we mark the terms to which we apply the proposition with a tilde. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{y}} &:= \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1+1}^{(i)}), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{e}} &:= \text{err}_{f_{\star, \text{id}}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1+1}^{(i)}) = (f_{\star, \text{id}} - \hat{f}_{\text{id}})(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1+1}^{(i)}), \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}} &:= [-\text{err}_{f_{\star, \text{id}}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})^{\top}; 0_{d_{\mathbf{u}}}^{\top}]^{\top}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}} &:= [f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})^{\top}; \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{\top}]^{\top}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{w}} &:= -S_{\text{id}} \mathbf{w}_{\kappa_1}, \\ d_{\tilde{\mathbf{y}}} &:= d_{\mathbf{x}}, \\ d_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}} &:= d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}}, \\ \tilde{M} &:= [A_{\text{id}}; B_{\text{id}}]. \end{aligned}$$

To proceed, we verify that this correspondence satisfies the conditions of the propositions above.

**Claim D.4.** It holds that  $\tilde{M}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \tilde{\mathbf{y}} + \tilde{\mathbf{e}} + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$  and

$$[\hat{A}_{\text{id}}; \hat{B}_{\text{id}}] \in \arg \min_M \sum_{i=1}^n \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^{(i)} - M(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{(i)} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^{(i)})\|^2.$$

**Proof.** Observe that we have the dynamics

$$A\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} + B\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1} = \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1+1} - \mathbf{w}_{\kappa_1}$$

and

$$Af_{\star}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) + B\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1} = f_{\star}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1+1}) - \mathbf{w}_{\kappa_1}.$$

Thus, recalling that  $f_{\star, \text{id}}(y) = S_{\text{id}} f_{\star}(y)$ , we have

$$S_{\text{id}} A S_{\text{id}}^{-1} f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) + S_{\text{id}} B \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1} = f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1+1}) - S_{\text{id}} \mathbf{w}_{\kappa_1}.$$

In our new notation, this implies that

$$[A_{\text{id}}; B_{\text{id}}] \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1+1}) + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}.$$

Finally, writing  $f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) = \tilde{\mathbf{y}} + \tilde{\mathbf{e}}$  yields the first part of the claim. The second part follows from similar manipulations.  $\square$

Next, we check the Gaussianity and covariance properties of  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ .

**Claim D.5.** The following properties hold:

- $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ , and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$  are mutually independent.
- $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{w,\text{id}})$ , where  $\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{w,\text{id}}) \leq 1$ .
- $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{\tilde{u}})$ , where  $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\tilde{u}}) \geq \frac{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2(1-\gamma_{\star})}{10\Psi_{\star}^2\alpha_{\star}^2}$ .

**Proof of Claim D.5.** The first point of the claim follows because  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$  is determined by  $\mathbf{w}_{\kappa_1}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$  are determined by  $\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}$  and  $\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}$ , respectively.

For the second claim, we have that  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = -S_{\text{id}}\mathbf{w}$ . Since  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{w}\mathbf{w}^{\top}] = \Sigma_w$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{w}}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{\top}] = S_{\text{id}}\Sigma_w S_{\text{id}}^{\top}$ . Recalling that  $S_{\text{id}} = \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^{\top} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1}$  for some orthonormal  $\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\max}(S_{\text{id}}\Sigma_w S_{\text{id}}^{\top}) &\leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \Sigma_w \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}) \\ &= \sigma_{\max}^2(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1} \Sigma_w^{1/2}) \leq \left( \sigma_{\max}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}) \sigma_{\max}(\Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2} \Sigma_w^{1/2}) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}} \succeq \Sigma_w$  and since  $\Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}} \succeq \mathcal{C}_{\kappa} \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top}$ , we have that  $\sigma_{\max}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}^{\top} \Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2}), \sigma_{\max}(\Sigma_{\kappa_1,\text{id}}^{-1/2} \Sigma_w^{1/2}) \leq 1$ , and we conclude that  $\lambda_{\max}(S_{\text{id}}\Sigma_w S_{\text{id}}^{\top}) \leq 1$  as needed.

For the second-to-last claim, we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \begin{bmatrix} f_{\star,\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) \\ \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} S_{\text{id}}\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} \\ \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since  $\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1} \perp \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}$ , we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\top}] = \begin{bmatrix} S_{\text{id}}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}^{\top}]S_{\text{id}}^{\top} & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \succeq \begin{bmatrix} I \cdot \frac{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2(1-\gamma_{\star})}{10\Psi_{\star}^2\alpha_{\star}^2} & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix},$$

where the last inequality uses part 4 of [Lemma D.4](#). One can verify that the lower bound on the upper left block is less than 1. Thus,

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\top}]) \geq \frac{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2(1-\gamma_{\star})}{10\Psi_{\star}^2\alpha_{\star}^2}.$$

□

Lastly, we check the relevant concentration properties for the errors  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ .

**Claim D.6.** The following bounds hold:

- $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}$  are both  $c_{\text{ls}} := 4c_{\text{conc},\text{id}}$ -concentrated, and satisfy  $\mathbb{E}\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\|^2 \vee \mathbb{E}\|\tilde{\mathbf{e}}\|^2 \leq 2\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}^2 =: \varepsilon_{\text{ls}}^2$ .
- For  $n \geq n_{\text{id}}$ , we have that  $\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}/c_{\text{ls}} \geq \psi(n, \delta) = \frac{2\ln(2n/\delta)\ln(2/\delta)}{n}$ .
- $\|\tilde{M}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{4\Psi_{\star}^{5/2}\alpha_{\star}^2}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})(1-\gamma_{\star})}$ , and thus

$$(1 + \|\tilde{M}\|_{\text{op}}^2)\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}^2 \leq \frac{65\Psi_{\star}^5\alpha_{\star}^4}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2(1-\gamma_{\star})^2}\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}^2 \leq \frac{130\Psi_{\star}^5\alpha_{\star}^4}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2(1-\gamma_{\star})^2}\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}^2.$$

- For  $\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}$  satisfying [Eq. \(D.14\)](#), we have  $\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{16}\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\tilde{u}})$  and thus  $(1 + \|\tilde{M}\|_{\text{op}}^2)\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}^2 \leq \lambda_{+} =: 1$

**Proof.** The first claim follows from [Lemma D.4](#).

The second claim uses that, examining the definition of  $\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}$  in [Proposition D.1](#), we have  $\varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \leq 4\psi(n_{\text{id}}, \delta)/c_{\text{conc},\text{id}}$ , implying  $\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}/c_{\text{ls}} \geq \psi(n_{\text{id}}, \delta)$ . Lastly use that  $n \geq n_{\text{id}}$  and that  $n \mapsto \psi(n, \delta)$  is decreasing.

For the third point,

$$\|\tilde{M}\|_{\text{op}} = \|[A_{\text{id}}; B_{\text{id}}]\|_{\text{op}} = \|[S_{\text{id}}AS_{\text{id}}^{-1}; S_{\text{id}}B]\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2(1 \vee \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(S_{\text{id}}))(\|S_{\text{id}}A\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|S_{\text{id}}B\|_{\text{op}}).$$

Recalling  $S_{\text{id}} = \widehat{V}_{\text{id}}^\top \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top \Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1}$ , we use that  $\|\widehat{V}_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$  and  $\Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}} \succeq \mathcal{C}_\kappa^\top$  to bound

$$\|S_{\text{id}}A\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|S_{\text{id}}B\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1/2}A\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|\Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}}^{-1/2}B\|_{\text{op}}.$$

Since  $\Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}} \succeq A\Sigma_w A^\top \succeq AA^\top/\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_w) \succeq AA^\top\Psi_\star^{-1}$  and  $\Sigma_{\kappa_1, \text{id}} \succeq BB^\top$ , we conclude that  $\|S_{\text{id}}A\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|S_{\text{id}}B\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Psi_\star^{1/2}$ . Lastly, using  $\sigma_{\min}(S_{\text{id}}) \geq \sigma_{\min, \text{id}} = \frac{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)(1-\gamma_\star)}{4\Psi_\star^2\alpha_\star^2}$  from [Proposition D.2](#), we conclude that

$$\|\tilde{M}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sqrt{\Psi_\star} \frac{8\Psi_\star^2\alpha_\star^2}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)(1-\gamma_\star)} = \frac{8\Psi_\star^{5/2}\alpha_\star^2}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)(1-\gamma_\star)},$$

as needed. The following inequality follows directly:

$$(\|\tilde{M}\|_{\text{op}}^2 + 1)\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}^2 \leq \frac{65\Psi_\star^5\alpha_\star^4}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2(1-\gamma_\star)^2}\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}^2 \leq \frac{130\Psi_\star^5\alpha_\star^4}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2(1-\gamma_\star)^2}\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}^2. \quad (\text{D.17})$$

For the fourth point, we examine the condition in [Eq. \(D.14\)](#),  $\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc},\text{id}}}\varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_\star)\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2}{71\alpha_\star^2\Psi_\star^2}$ , which is equivalent to

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}^2 \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_\star)^2\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2}{d_{\mathbf{x}}c_{\text{conc},\text{id}}71^2\alpha_\star^2\Psi_\star^2} \cdot (\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2/\alpha_\star^2\Psi_\star^2).$$

Using the definition of  $c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} = 12\Psi_\star^3\alpha_\star^2L^2/(1-\gamma_\star)$  and that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}, L \geq 1$ , this further implies that

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}^2 \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_\star)^2\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2}{12 \cdot 71^2\alpha_\star^2\Psi_\star^2} \cdot (\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2/\alpha_\star^2\Psi_\star^2) \cdot \frac{(1-\gamma_\star)}{\Psi_\star^3\alpha_\star^2}.$$

One can verify that  $(\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2/\alpha_\star^2\Psi_\star^2) \leq 1$  using the same arguments as in [Lemma D.1](#). Thus, under the above condition,

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}^2 \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_\star)^2\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2}{12 \cdot 71^2\alpha_\star^2\Psi_\star^2} \cdot \frac{(1-\gamma_\star)}{\Psi_\star^3\alpha_\star^2}.$$

Recalling  $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\tilde{u}}) \geq \frac{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2(1-\gamma_\star)}{10\Psi_\star^2\alpha_\star^2}$  from [Claim D.5](#), we can directly verify that this implies  $\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}^2 = 2\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}^2 \leq \frac{1}{16}\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\tilde{u}})$ . Similarly, using the bound in [Eq. \(D.17\)](#) we can check that  $(\|\tilde{M}\|_{\text{op}}^2 + 1)\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}^2 \leq \lambda_+ := 1$ .  $\square$

To summarize, the claims above verify that, for  $\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}$  satisfying [Eq. \(D.14\)](#), and  $n_{\text{id}} \geq c_0(d_{\tilde{u}} + d_{\tilde{y}} + \ln(1/\delta))$ , the conditions for [Propositions B.3](#) and [B.4](#) hold. It follows that with probability at least  $1 - 7\delta$ ,

$$\|[\widehat{A}_{\text{id}}; \widehat{B}_{\text{id}}] - [A_{\text{id}}; B_{\text{id}}]\|_{\text{op}}^2 \lesssim \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\tilde{u}})^{-1} \left( (1 + \|\tilde{M}\|_{\text{op}}^2)\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}^2 + \frac{\|\Sigma_{w,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}}(d_{\tilde{y}} + d_{\tilde{u}} + \ln(1/\delta))}{n_{\text{id}}} \right),$$

and

$$\|\widehat{\Sigma}_{w,\text{id}} - \Sigma_{w,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \sqrt{\lambda_+(1 + \|\tilde{M}\|_{\text{op}}^2)\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}^2 + \frac{\lambda_+^2(d_{\mathbf{y}} + \ln(1/\delta))}{n_{\text{id}}}}.$$

Finally, to conclude, we note that  $d_{\tilde{y}} + d_{\tilde{u}} = 2d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}}$ , so that (also recalling  $d_{\mathbf{u}} \leq d_{\mathbf{x}}$ ) it suffices to ensure  $\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}$  satisfying Eq. (D.14), and  $n_{\text{id}} \geq c_0(d_{\mathbf{x}} + \ln(1/\delta))$  for a larger universal constant  $c_0$ . Moreover, we can check that  $(d_{\mathbf{x}} + \ln(1/\delta))/n_{\text{id}} \lesssim \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}^2$ , which together with the bound  $\|\Sigma_{w,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \lambda_+ = 1$  means that the dominant terms above are the terms  $(1 + \|\tilde{M}\|_{\text{op}}^2)\varepsilon_{\text{ls}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\Psi_*^5 \alpha_*^4}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2(1-\gamma_*)^2}\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}^2$ . Thus, recalling  $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\tilde{u}}) \gtrsim \frac{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2(1-\gamma_*)}{\Psi_*^2 \alpha_*^2}$  from Claim D.5, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\widehat{A}_{\text{id}}; \widehat{B}_{\text{id}}] - \tilde{M}\|_{\text{op}} &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\Psi_*^2 \alpha_*^2}{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2(1-\gamma_*)} \cdot \frac{\Psi_*^5 \alpha_*^4}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2(1-\gamma_*)^2}\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\Psi_*^{7/2} \alpha_*^3}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2(1-\gamma_*)^{3/2}}\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\widehat{\Sigma}_{w,\text{id}} - \Sigma_{w,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \frac{\Psi_*^{5/2} \alpha_*^4}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)(1-\gamma_*)}\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}.$$

□

### D.3.3 Recovering the Cost Matrix $Q_{\text{id}}$

We now show that Phase II successfully recovers the system cost matrix  $Q$  up to a similarity transform.

**Proposition D.4** (Guarantee for Recovery of  $Q_{\text{id}}$ ). Recall the estimator

$$\widehat{Q}_{\text{id}} = \left( \frac{1}{2}\tilde{Q}_{\text{id}} + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{Q}_{\text{id}}^\top \right)_+,$$

$$\tilde{Q}_{\text{id}} = \min_Q \sum_{i=2n_{\text{id}}+1}^{3n_{\text{id}}} \left( \mathbf{c}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)} - (\mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^\top R \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)} - \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^\top Q \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) \right)^2.$$

Suppose that the following conditions hold for a sufficiently large numerical constant  $c_0$ :

$$n_{\text{id}} \geq c_0(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln(1/\delta)), \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \sqrt{\ln(2n_{\text{id}}/\delta)} \leq \frac{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2(1-\gamma_*)}{8 \cdot 10c_{\text{conc,id}}\Psi_*^2\alpha_*^2d_{\mathbf{x}}}.$$

Then with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ , we have

$$\|\widehat{Q}_{\text{id}} - Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \frac{\alpha_*^6 \Psi_*^7 \sqrt{c_{\text{conc,id}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(n_{\text{id}}/\delta)}}{(1-\gamma_*)^3 \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^4} \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}.$$

**Proof.** We first rewrite the regression as a special case of [Proposition B.5](#), which offers a generic guarantee for matrix regression with rank-one measurements. Observe that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{c}_{\kappa_1} - \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^\top R \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1} &= \left( f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})^\top Q f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) + \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^\top R \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1} \right) - \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1}^\top R \mathbf{u}_{\kappa_1} \\
&= f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})^\top Q f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) \\
&= f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})^\top S_{\text{id}}^{-\top} Q S_{\text{id}}^{-1} f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) \\
&= f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})^\top Q_{\text{id}} f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the above regression is equivalent to solving

$$\tilde{Q}_{\text{id}} = \min_Q \sum_{i=2n_{\text{id}}+1}^{3n_{\text{id}}} \left( f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^\top Q_{\text{id}} f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) - \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)})^\top Q \hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}^{(i)}) \right)^2.$$

We now recall the statement of [Proposition B.5](#).

**Proposition B.5** (Regression with matrix measurements). Let  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$  be a random variable, and let  $\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathbf{y}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Fix two regression functions  $\hat{g}, g_\star : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , and suppose that  $\mathbf{z} := \max\{\|\hat{g}(\mathbf{y})\|^2, \|g_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2\}$  is  $c$ -concentrated, and that  $\mathbf{x} := g_\star(\mathbf{y}) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_x)$ . Let  $Q^\star \succeq 0$  be a fixed matrix, and consider the regression.

$$\tilde{Q} \in \arg \min_M \sum_{i=1}^n \left( g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top Q^\star g_\star(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) - \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)})^\top M \hat{g}(\mathbf{y}^{(i)}) \right)^2.$$

Set  $\hat{Q} := (\frac{1}{2}\tilde{Q}^\top + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{Q})_+$ , where  $(\cdot)_+$  truncates all negative eigenvalues to zero. Then, there is a universal constant  $c_0 > 0$  such that if the following conditions hold:

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{g}(\mathbf{y}) - g_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq \varepsilon^2, \quad \psi(n, \delta/2) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4c}, \quad n \geq c_0(d^2 + \ln(1/\delta)), \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon^2 \leq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)^2}{64c \ln(2n/\delta)},$$

then with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\|\hat{Q} - Q^\star\|_{\text{F}}^2 \leq \|\tilde{Q} - Q^\star\|_{\text{F}}^2 \leq 64c\varepsilon^2 \ln(4n/\delta) \cdot \frac{\|Q^\star\|_{\text{op}}^2}{\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x)^2}.$$

To apply the proposition, we make the following substitutions:

$$Q^\star \leftarrow Q_{\text{id}}, \quad \hat{Q} \leftarrow \hat{Q}_{\text{id}}, \quad g_\star \leftarrow f_{\star, \text{id}}, \quad \hat{g} \leftarrow \hat{f}_{\text{id}}, \quad \Sigma_x \leftarrow \mathbb{E}[f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})^\top], \quad n \leftarrow n_{\text{id}}.$$

We now verify that the conditions for the proposition are satisfied.

1. From [Lemma D.4](#),  $\max\{\|\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2, \|f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2\}$  is  $d_{\mathbf{x}} c_{\text{conc}, \text{id}}$ -concentrated, and  $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{f}_{\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) - f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})\|^2 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{id}, h}^2$ .
2. We have that  $\psi(n_{\text{id}}, \delta/2) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{id}, h}^2}{d_{\mathbf{x}} c_{\text{conc}, \text{id}}}$  by examining the definition of  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}, h}$  in [Proposition D.1](#).
3. We have that  $f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) = S_{\text{id}} \mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1}$  is zero-mean Gaussian, with

$$\mathbb{E}[f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1}) f_{\star, \text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa_1})^\top] \succeq I \cdot \frac{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)}{10 \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2}$$

by [Lemma D.4](#). Hence, the conditions

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id}, h} \sqrt{\ln(2n_{\text{id}}/\delta)} \leq \frac{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^2 (1 - \gamma_\star)}{8 \cdot 10 c_{\text{conc}, \text{id}} \Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2 d_{\mathbf{x}}}, \quad \text{and} \quad n_{\text{id}} \geq c_0(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln(1/\delta)),$$

suffice to satisfy the third condition of the proposition.

We conclude that when the conditions above hold, with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widehat{Q}_{\text{id}} - Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \|\widehat{Q}_{\text{id}} - Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{F}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\alpha_{\star}^2 \Psi_{\star}^2 \sqrt{c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(n_{\text{id}}/\delta)} \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}}{(1 - \gamma_{\star}) \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2} \|Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we bound

$$\begin{aligned}\|Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} &= \|S_{\text{id}}^{-1} Q_{\text{id}} S_{\text{id}}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \sigma_{\min}^{-2}(S_{\text{id}}) \\ &= \Psi_{\star} \sigma_{\min}^{-2}(S_{\text{id}}) \\ &\leq \Psi_{\star} \left( \frac{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})(1 - \gamma_{\star})}{4\Psi_{\star}^2 \alpha_{\star}^2} \right)^{-2} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\Psi_{\star}^5 \alpha_{\star}^4}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2 (1 - \gamma_{\star})^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, altogether,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widehat{Q}_{\text{id}} - Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \|\widehat{Q}_{\text{id}} - Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{F}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\alpha_{\star}^6 \Psi_{\star}^7 \sqrt{c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(n_{\text{id}}/\delta)}}{(1 - \gamma_{\star})^3 \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^4} \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}.\end{aligned}$$

□

### D.3.4 Concluding the Proof of Theorem 2.2a

In total, by combining Propositions D.3 and D.4 and conditioning on the probability  $1 - 4\delta$  event from Propositions D.1 and D.2, we have that as long as (for some universal  $c_0$ ),

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \sqrt{\ln(2n_{\text{id}}/\delta)} \leq \frac{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2 (1 - \gamma_{\star})}{8 \cdot 10 c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} \Psi_{\star}^2 \alpha_{\star}^2 d_{\mathbf{x}}},$$

$\varepsilon_{\text{id},h}$  satisfies Eq. (D.14),

and  $n_{\text{id}} \geq c_0(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln(1/\delta))$ ,

then with total failure probability at most  $1 - 9\delta - 4\delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widehat{Q}_{\text{id}} - Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} &\lesssim \frac{\alpha_{\star}^6 \Psi_{\star}^7 \sqrt{c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(n_{\text{id}}/\delta)}}{(1 - \gamma_{\star})^3 \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^4} \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}, \\ \|[\widehat{A}_{\text{id}}; \widehat{B}_{\text{id}}] - [A_{\text{id}}; B_{\text{id}}]\|_{\text{op}} &\lesssim \frac{\Psi_{\star}^{7/2} \alpha_{\star}^3}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2 (1 - \gamma_{\star})^{3/2}} \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}, \\ \|\widehat{\Sigma}_{w,\text{id}} - \Sigma_{w,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} &\lesssim \frac{\Psi_{\star}^{5/2} \alpha_{\star}^4}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}) (1 - \gamma_{\star})} \varepsilon_{\text{id},h}.\end{aligned}$$

To simplify the conditions slightly, we observe that since  $\varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \geq \bar{c}_{\text{id},1} \frac{d_{\mathbf{x}}^2}{n_{\text{id}}}$  for some universal constant  $\bar{c}_{\text{id},1} \geq 4$ , by inflating this constant, we can ensure that  $n_{\text{id}} \geq c_0(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln(1/\delta))$ . Next let us consolidate the conditions

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \sqrt{\ln(2n_{\text{id}}/\delta)} \leq \frac{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2 (1 - \gamma_{\star})}{8 \cdot 10 c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} \Psi_{\star}^2 \alpha_{\star}^2 d_{\mathbf{x}}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \text{ satisfies Eq. (D.14)}.$$

Restating Eq. (D.14), we require that

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}} c_{\text{conc},\text{id}}} \leq \frac{(1 - \gamma_{\star}) \sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2}{71 \alpha_{\star}^2 \Psi_{\star}^2}.$$

Since  $c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \geq 1$ , it suffices to take

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \sqrt{\ln(2n_{\text{id}}/\delta)} \leq \frac{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2 (1 - \gamma_{\star})}{80 c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} \Psi_{\star}^2 \alpha_{\star}^2 d_{\mathbf{x}}}.$$

Recalling that  $c_{\text{conc},\text{id}} = \frac{12L^2 \Psi_{\star}^3 \alpha_{\star}^2}{1 - \gamma_{\star}}$ , the final condition,

$$\varepsilon_{\text{id},h} \sqrt{\ln(2n_{\text{id}}/\delta)} \leq \frac{\sigma_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\kappa})^2 (1 - \gamma_{\star})^2}{80 \cdot 12L^2 \Psi_{\star}^5 \alpha_{\star}^4 d_{\mathbf{x}}}.$$

□

## E Proofs for RichID Phase III

**Section organization.** This section is dedicated to the proof of [Theorem 2.3](#), which is the main result concerning Phase III of [SquareCB](#) (cf. [Section 2.4](#)). We state a number of intermediate results, leading up to the proof of theorem. In [Appendix E.2](#), we present a performance bound for the state decoders  $(\hat{f}_t)_{t \geq 1}$  as a function of the decoding error of the initial state decoder  $\hat{f}_1$ . [Appendix E.3](#) is dedicated to the performance of  $\hat{f}_1$ , as this requires extra steps to the decode the initial state  $\mathbf{x}_0$ . In [Appendix E.4](#), we combine these results to prove [Theorem 2.3](#). Finally, [Appendix F](#) contains the proofs of all the intermediate results.

We recall that the definition of the decoders  $(\hat{f}_\tau)$  requires a clipping step (see [\(18\)](#)). Performing this step allows us to use standard concentration tools to bound the decoding error for the predictors that come out of the regression problems solved in Phase III (see [Lemma E.3](#)). The impact of clipping on the prediction error is low: In [Theorem E.2](#) we show that the probability of ever clipping is very small, so long as the clipping parameter  $\bar{b}$  is chosen appropriately.

### E.1 Preliminaries

Before proceeding to the main results, we first provide additional notation and definitions, as well as some basic lemmas which will be used in subsequent proofs.

**Additional notation.** For  $t \geq 0$  and a policy  $\pi: \bigcup_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{Y}^{\tau} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{u}}}$ , where  $\pi(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})$  maps past and current observations  $\mathbf{y}_{0:t}$  to the current action  $\mathbf{u}_t$ , we let  $\mathbb{P}_{\pi}$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi}$  be the probability and expectation with respect to the system’s dynamics and policy  $\pi$ . We will use  $\mathcal{E}$  to denote events which hold over the randomness in the learning procedure, and  $\mathcal{E}^{\circ}$  to denote events which hold under a given rollout from, say,  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi}$ .

Throughout this section we let  $\hat{\pi}$  denote the policy returned by [Algorithm 4](#).

**Basic definitions for Phase III.** To simplify presentation, we assume going forward that  $S_{\text{id}} = I_{d_{\mathbf{x}}}$  at the cost of increasing problem-dependent parameters such as  $\Psi_{\star}$  and  $\alpha_{\star}$  by a factor of  $\|S_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|S_{\text{id}}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}$ —we make this reasoning precise in the proof of [Theorem 1.1a](#). We therefore

drop the subscript id, so that the system parameters we take as a given are  $(\widehat{A}, \widehat{B}, \widehat{Q}, \widehat{\Sigma}_w)$ . We will consider the following function class

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}} := \left\{ M \cdot f(\cdot) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad M \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{x}} \times d_{\mathbf{x}}}, \quad \|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Psi_{\star}^3 \right\}, \quad (\text{E.1})$$

that is, we take  $r_{\text{op}} = \Psi_{\star}^3$  (note that the final value for  $r_{\text{op}}$  when [Algorithm 4](#) is invoked within [Algorithm 1](#) will be inflated to account for the similarity transformation above).

In what follows, we will construct a sequence of functions  $(\hat{f}_t: \mathcal{Y}^{t+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{x}}})$  which map observations  $(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})$  to estimates of the true states  $(\mathbf{x}_t = f_{\star}(\mathbf{y}_t))$ . We will denote by  $\widehat{\pi}$  the randomized policy defined by  $\widehat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) := \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) + \mathbf{v}_t$ , for all  $t \geq 0$ , where  $\mathbf{v}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_{d_{\mathbf{u}}})$  for some  $\sigma \in (0, 1]$  to be determined later. Furthermore, for  $t \geq 0$ , we define the policy  $\widetilde{\pi}_t$  which satisfies

$$\widetilde{\pi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) = \begin{cases} \widehat{\pi}(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}), & \text{if } \tau \leq t; \\ \mathbf{v}_{\tau} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_{d_{\mathbf{u}}}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{E.2})$$

**Additional problem parameters.** Our final results for this section are stated in  $\mathcal{O}_{\star}(\cdot)$ , but we state many of our intermediate results with precise dependence on the problem parameters. To simplify these statements, we use the following definitions.

**Definition 7** (Aggregated problem parameters).

$$\Psi_{\Sigma} := \alpha_A^2 \|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + \|\Sigma_{\infty, \text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} + 1, \quad (\text{E.3})$$

$$\text{dev}_x := \frac{3\alpha_A^2}{1 - \gamma_A} \cdot \Psi_{\star}^2 \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2, \quad (\text{E.4})$$

$$\Psi_M := \max \left\{ 1, \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}, \|\mathcal{M}\|_{\text{op}}, \max_{k \in \kappa} \|M_k\|_{\text{op}} \right\},$$

$$L_{\text{op}} := \Psi_{\star}^3 L. \quad (\text{E.5})$$

We simplify our intermediate results to get the final  $\mathcal{O}_{\star}(\cdot)$ -based bound for [Theorem 2.3](#) in [Appendix E.4](#).

### E.1.1 Approximation Error for Plug-In Estimators.

Recall that Phase III uses the estimates for  $\widehat{A}$ ,  $\widehat{B}$ , and so forth from Phase II to form plug-in estimates for a number of important system parameters. Before proceeding, we give some guarantees on the error of these estimates as a function of the error from Phase II.

For  $k \in [\kappa]$ , recall that we define the matrices  $M_k \in \mathbb{R}^{k d_{\mathbf{u}} \times d_{\mathbf{x}}}$  and  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\kappa+1)\kappa/2 \times \kappa}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} M_k &:= \mathcal{C}_k^{\top} (\mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^{\top} + \sigma^{-2} \Sigma_w + \dots + \sigma^{-2} A^{k-1} \Sigma_w (A^{k-1})^{\top})^{-1}, \\ \mathcal{M} &:= [M_1^{\top}, (M_2 A)^{\top}, \dots, (M_{\kappa} A^{k-1})^{\top}]^{\top} \quad \text{where } \mathcal{C}_k := [A^{k-1} B \mid \dots \mid B] \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathbf{x}} \times k d_{\mathbf{u}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.6})$$

We also let  $\widehat{M}_k$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$  be the *plug-in estimators* of  $M_k$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$  respectively, obtained by replacing  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $\Sigma_w$  in the definitions of  $M_k$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  by the previously derived estimators  $\widehat{A}$ ,  $\widehat{B}$ , and  $\widehat{\Sigma}_w$ , respectively (see [Section 2.3](#)).

For  $0 < \varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \leq 1 \wedge \|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}} \wedge \|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}^{-1}$ , let  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$  be the event

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}} := \left\{ \max_{k \in [\kappa]} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|\widehat{K} - K_{\infty}\|_{\text{op}}, \|\widehat{M}_k \widehat{A}^k - M_k A^k\|_{\text{op}}, \\ \|\widehat{M}_k \widehat{A}^k \widehat{B} - M_k A^k B\|_{\text{op}}, \|\widehat{B} \widehat{K} - B \widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}, \\ \|I_{d_{\mathbf{x}}} - \widehat{\Sigma}_w \Sigma_w^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}, \|\widehat{\Sigma}_w^{-1} - \Sigma_w^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}, \\ \|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\text{op}}, \|\widehat{B} - B\|_{\text{op}}, \|\widehat{\mathcal{M}} - \mathcal{M}\|_{\text{op}} \end{array} \right\} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \right\} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{stab}}, \quad (\text{E.7})$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{stab}} := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (A + B\widehat{K}) \text{ is } (\alpha_\infty, \bar{\gamma}_\infty)\text{-strongly stable with } \bar{\gamma}_\infty := (1 + \gamma_\infty)/2, \\ \text{and } \widehat{A} \text{ is } (\alpha_A, \bar{\gamma}_A)\text{-strongly stable with } \bar{\gamma}_A := (1 + \gamma_A)/2. \end{array} \right\}. \quad (\text{E.8})$$

**Lemma E.1.** Suppose that  $\sigma^2 = \mathcal{O}_\star(1)$  and

$$\left\| \widehat{A} - A \right\|_{\text{op}} \vee \left\| \widehat{B} - B \right\|_{\text{op}} \vee \left\| \widehat{Q} - Q \right\|_{\text{op}} \vee \left\| \widehat{\Sigma}_w - \Sigma_w \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{id}}.$$

Then once  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq c_{\text{sys}} := \text{poly}(\gamma_\star(1 - \gamma_\star), \alpha_\star^{-1}, \Psi_\star^{-1}) = \check{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ , we have that  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$  holds for

$$\varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \leq \mathcal{O}_\star(\varepsilon_{\text{id}}).$$

### E.1.2 Conditioning for the $\mathcal{M}$ Matrix

[Assumption 9](#) is central to the results in this section. In particular, we will use the following implication of this assumption.

**Lemma E.2.** Let  $\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2}$  denote the value of the matrix  $\mathcal{M}$  in [\(E.6\)](#) for noise parameter  $\sigma^2$ . Then  $\|\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2}\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_\star(1)$  whenever  $\sigma^2 = \mathcal{O}_\star(1)$ . Moreover, suppose [Assumption 9](#) holds. Then there exists  $\bar{\sigma} = \check{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda_{\mathcal{M}})$ , such that for all  $\sigma^2 \leq \bar{\sigma}^2$ , we have

$$\lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2}^\top \mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2}) \geq \lambda_{\mathcal{M}} \cdot \sigma^2 / 2 > 0, \quad (\text{E.9})$$

where  $\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}$  is as in [Assumption 9](#).

Throughout this section, we make the following assumption, which will eventually be justified by the choice of  $\sigma$  in [SquareCB](#).

**Assumption 10.**  $\sigma \leq 1$  is sufficiently small such that [Eq. \(E.9\)](#) holds.

In particular, this assumption implies that the matrix  $\mathcal{M}$  in [\(E.6\)](#) has full row rank.

## E.2 Learning State Decoders for Rounds $t \geq 1$

We now prove that Phase III successfully learns decoders for  $t \geq 1$  with high probability, up to an error term determined by the auxiliary predictor  $\hat{f}_{A,0}$  produced during the separate initial state learning phase; the error of this predictor is handled in the next subsection. For the rest of this subsection, we assume the iteration  $t \geq 0$  of [Algorithm 4](#) is fixed, meaning we already have  $\hat{f}_t$  and our goal is to compute  $\hat{f}_{t+1}$ . We introduce the following quantities.

- Let  $(\mathbf{y}_\tau)_{\tau \geq 0}$  be the observations induced by following the policy  $\tilde{\pi}_t$  defined in [\(E.2\)](#).
- Let  $\{(\mathbf{y}_\tau^{(i)}, \mathbf{x}_\tau^{(i)}, \mathbf{v}_\tau^{(i)})\}_{i \in [2n]}$  be i.i.d. copies of  $(\mathbf{y}_\tau, \mathbf{x}_\tau, \mathbf{v}_\tau)$ , where  $(\mathbf{v}_\tau)$  are the random Gaussian vectors used by the policy  $\tilde{\pi}_t$ . This is simply the data collected by the  $t$ th iteration of the loop in [Algorithm 4](#).

We also adopt the shorthand  $n = n_{\text{op}}$ .

**Learning the decoder at a single step.** Let us recall some notation. For round  $t$ , we already have a state decoder  $\hat{f}_t: \mathcal{Y}^{t+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  produced by the previous iteration. As the first step, for each  $k \in [\kappa]$ , with  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  as in (E.1), Algorithm 4 solves

$$\hat{h}_{t,k} \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \widehat{M}_k \left( h(\mathbf{y}_{t+k}^{(i)}) - \widehat{A}^k h(\mathbf{y}_t^{(i)}) - \widehat{A}^{k-1} \widehat{B} \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}^{(i)}) \right) - \mathbf{v}_{t:t+k-1}^{(i)} \right\|^2. \quad (\text{E.10})$$

Using the solutions of the above regressions for  $k \in [\kappa]$ , the algorithm constructs the stacked vector

$$\widehat{\Phi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) := [\widehat{\phi}_{t,1}(\hat{h}_{t,1}, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+1})^\top, \dots, \widehat{\phi}_{t,\kappa}(\hat{h}_{t,\kappa}, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+\kappa})^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(1+\kappa)\kappa/2},$$

where

$$\widehat{\phi}_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+k}) := \widehat{M}_k \left( h(\mathbf{y}_{t+k}) - \widehat{A}^k h(\mathbf{y}_t) - \widehat{A}^{k-1} \widehat{B} \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) \right), \quad k \in [\kappa]. \quad (\text{E.11})$$

Finally, the algorithm computes the intermediate estimator  $\hat{h}_t$ :

$$\hat{h}_t \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{M}} \left( h(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}^{(i)}) - \widehat{A} h(\mathbf{y}_t^{(i)}) - \widehat{B} \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}^{(i)}) \right) - \widehat{\Phi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}^{(i)}) \right\|^2. \quad (\text{E.12})$$

Our first guarantee for this section shows that the function  $\hat{h}_t$  estimates the system's noise  $\mathbf{w}_t$  up to a linear transformation given by the matrix  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**Theorem E.1.** *Let  $t \geq 0$  and  $\bar{b} > 0$  be given. For  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  and  $\hat{f}_t: \mathcal{Y}^{t+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ , let*

$$\phi_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) := \mathcal{M}(h(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - Ah(\mathbf{y}_t) - B\widehat{K}\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})).$$

*If the event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$  holds and  $\|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})\| \leq \bar{b}$  a.s., then for  $\hat{h}_t$  as in (E.12), with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \left[ \left\| \phi_t(\hat{h}_t, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) - \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t) \right\|^2 \right] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{noise}}^2(\delta), \quad (\text{E.13})$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{\text{noise}}^2(\delta) \lesssim \kappa(1 + \ln(\kappa)) \left( \frac{c_{w,\phi}(\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}}^2) \ln^2(n\kappa/\delta)}{n} + L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_{\Sigma} + \text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2) \right) \quad (\text{E.14})$$

with

$$c_{w,\phi} := 30\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}} \sigma^2 + 18\alpha_A^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_M^2 (32d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_{\Sigma} + 3\bar{b}^2 \cdot \text{dev}_x). \quad (\text{E.15})$$

For the remainder of the subsection, we let  $\delta \in (0, e^{-1}]$  be fixed and define

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{noise}} := \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \left[ \left\| \phi_{\tau}(\hat{h}_{\tau}, \mathbf{y}_{0:\tau+1}) - \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w}_{\tau} + B\mathbf{v}_{\tau}) \right\|^2 \right] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{noise}}^2(\delta), \text{ for all } 0 \leq \tau \leq t \right\}. \quad (\text{E.16})$$

**From noise estimate to state estimate.** Now that we can estimate the noise at round  $t$  using  $\hat{h}_t$ , we build a state decoder  $\hat{f}_{t+1}$  for round  $t+1$  by combining  $\hat{h}_t$  with the decoder  $\hat{f}_t$ . Recall that  $\tilde{f}_0 \equiv \hat{f}_0 \equiv 0$ , and that Algorithm 4 forms  $\hat{f}_t$  for all  $t \geq 1$  via

$$\hat{f}_{t+1}(\cdot) := \tilde{f}_{t+1}(\cdot) \mathbb{I}\{\|\tilde{f}_{t+1}(\cdot)\| \leq \bar{b}\}, \text{ where } \tilde{f}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) := \hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) + \widehat{A}\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - \widehat{A}\hat{h}_t(\mathbf{y}_t), \quad (\text{E.17})$$

where  $\bar{b} > 0$  is the clipping parameter. Note that we treat  $\bar{b}$  as a free parameter throughout this section unless explicitly specified. The case  $t = 0$  needs special care as it requires decoding the initial state; we set

$$\hat{f}_1(\cdot) := \tilde{f}_1(\cdot) \mathbb{I}\{\|\tilde{f}_1(\cdot)\| \leq \bar{b}\}, \quad \text{where } \tilde{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_{0:1}) := \hat{h}_1(\mathbf{y}_1) + \hat{f}_{A,0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - \hat{A}\hat{h}_0(\mathbf{y}_0), \quad (\text{E.18})$$

and  $\hat{f}_{A,0}(\mathbf{y}_0)$  is the estimator for  $Af_\star(\mathbf{y}_0)$  which we will construct in the next subsection.

Our goal now is to prove that the  $\hat{f}_{t+1}$  is good whenever  $\hat{h}_0, \dots, \hat{h}_t$  are good. To this end, we first give a guarantee on the unprojected decoder  $\tilde{f}_{t+1}$ , which shows that it has low prediction error for trajectories in which the event

$$\mathcal{E}_{0:t} := \left\{ \tilde{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) = \hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}), \text{ for all } 0 \leq \tau \leq t \right\} \quad (\text{E.19})$$

occurs.

**Lemma E.3.** Let  $t \geq 0$  be given. Let  $(\tilde{f}_\tau)_{\tau \in [t+1]}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{0:t}$  be defined as in (E.17), and (E.19), respectively. If the events  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{noise}}$  hold, then for  $\varepsilon_{\text{noise}}$  as in (E.14), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \|\tilde{f}_{\tau+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau+1}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{\tau+1})\|^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_{0:t}\} \right] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t}^2, \quad (\text{E.20})$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{\text{dec},t}^2 := 3\alpha_A^2(1 - \gamma_A)^{-2} (\varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2 + \varepsilon_{\text{init}}^2 + \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{M})^{-2} \varepsilon_{\text{noise}}^2 t), \quad \text{and } \varepsilon_{\text{init}}^2 := \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}}[\|\hat{f}_{A,0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - Af_\star(\mathbf{y}_0)\|^2]. \quad (\text{E.21})$$

For the next theorem, we show that the event  $\mathcal{E}_{0:t}$  occurs with overwhelming probability whenever the clipping parameter  $\bar{b}$  is selected appropriately. We need the following definitions. For  $t \geq 0$  and  $\eta > 0$ , let

$$\mathbf{z}_t := \sum_{\tau=0}^t (A + B\hat{K})^{t-\tau} (B\mathbf{v}_\tau + \mathbf{w}_\tau)$$

denote the contribution of the process noise and Gaussian inputs to the state  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ . The associated covariance of this random variable when  $t \rightarrow \infty$  is given by

$$\Sigma_{z,\infty} := \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} (A + B\hat{K})^\tau (\sigma^2 BB^\top + \Sigma_w) ((A + B\hat{K})^\tau)^\top. \quad (\text{E.22})$$

The sum in (E.22) converges under the event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$ , since in this case  $\|(A + B\hat{K})^t\|_{\text{op}} \leq \alpha_\infty \bar{\gamma}_\infty^t$ , for all  $t \geq 0$ , and  $\bar{\gamma}_\infty < 1$ ; see Eq. (E.8). Finally, we consider the following useful event:

$$\mathcal{E}'_{0:t} := \left\{ \alpha_\infty^2 \|\mathbf{x}_0\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{z}_\tau\|^2 \leq (d_{\mathbf{u}} \alpha_\infty^2 \|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + d_{\mathbf{x}} \|\Sigma_{z,\infty}\|_{\text{op}}) \ln(2\eta), \text{ for all } 0 \leq \tau \leq t \right\}.$$

Lastly, we define the following term which guides how we select the clipping in the definition of  $(\hat{f}_t)$  in (E.17):

$$\bar{b}_\infty := \frac{6(1 - \gamma_\infty)^{-1} \alpha_\infty \Psi_\star \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t} \sqrt{\eta} + \sqrt{2(d_{\mathbf{u}} \alpha_\infty^2 \|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + d_{\mathbf{x}} \|\Sigma_{z,\infty}\|_{\text{op}}) \ln(2\eta)}}{1 - 2\alpha_\infty \varepsilon_{\text{sys}} (1 - \gamma_\infty)^{-1}}, \quad (\text{E.23})$$

where  $\eta > e$  is a free parameter.

We now show that if the clipping parameter  $\bar{b}$  in (E.17) is chosen sufficiently large, then under a given execution of  $\hat{\pi}$ , the clipping operator is never activated (i.e.  $\mathcal{E}_{0:t}$  holds) with high enough probability, provided that the clipping operator is not activated at  $t = 1$ .

**Theorem E.2.** Let  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\eta > 0$ , and  $\bar{b} > 0$  be given. Let  $\varepsilon_{\text{dec},t}$ ,  $\Sigma_{z,\infty}$ , and  $\bar{b}_\infty$  be defined as in (E.21), (E.22), and (E.23), respectively. If (I) the events  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{noise}}$  hold; (II)  $\varepsilon_{\text{sys}} < (1 - \gamma_\infty)(2\alpha_\infty)^{-1}$ ; and (III)  $\bar{b} \geq \bar{b}_\infty$ , then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{0:t} \wedge \mathcal{E}'_{0:t}] \geq \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\tilde{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_{0:1}) = \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_{0:1})] - 2(t+1)/\eta.$$

**Concluding the guarantee for the state decoders.** We now put together the preceding results to give the main guarantee for our state decoders ( $\hat{f}_t$ ) for  $t \geq 1$ .

**Theorem E.3.** Let  $T \geq 0$ ,  $\eta > 0$ , and  $\bar{b} > 0$  be given. Under the conditions (I), (II), and (III) of Theorem E.2, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t}^2 + (4T^{1/2}c_{\mathbf{x}} + 2\bar{b}^2) \left( \frac{4T}{\eta} + 1 - \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\{\tilde{f}_0(\mathbf{y}_0) = \hat{f}_0(\mathbf{y}_0)\} \wedge \mathcal{E}'_0] \right),$$

where  $c_{\mathbf{x}} := 30d_{\mathbf{x}}\Psi_\Sigma + 2\bar{b}^2 \cdot \text{dev}_x$ .

### E.3 Learning the Initial State

Theorem E.3 ensures that the decoders  $\hat{f}_0, \dots, \hat{f}_T$  have low error only if the initial error  $\varepsilon_{\text{init}}^2 := \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}}[\|\hat{f}_{A,0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - Af_\star(\mathbf{y}_0)\|^2]$  is small. In this subsection, we show that the extra initial state learning procedure in Algorithm 4 ensures that this happens with high probability.

Recall that  $n_{\text{init}} \in \mathbb{N}$  denotes the sample size used by Algorithm 4 for learning the initial state. During the initial state learning phase (Line 19 through Line 25 of Algorithm 4), the algorithm gathers data by following a policy we denote  $\pi_{\text{ol}}$  which plays random noise ( $\mathbf{v}_\tau$ ), where  $\mathbf{v}_\tau \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_{d_{\mathbf{u}}})$ , for  $\tau \geq 0$  and  $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ .

Let  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},0} := \hat{h}_0$  (recall that the “ol” subscript refers to *open loop*), where we recall that  $\hat{h}_0$  is computed on Line 17 of Algorithm 4 prior to the initial state learning phase, using the procedure analyzed Appendix E.2. In particular, by instantiating the result of Theorem E.1 with  $\hat{f}_0 \equiv 0$ , we get that under the event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$ , for any  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}} \left[ \left\| \hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_1) - A\hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - B\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{w}_0 \right\|^2 \right] \leq \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{M})^{-2} \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{noise}}^2(\delta). \quad (\text{E.24})$$

We recall that the minimum singular value of  $\mathcal{M}$  is bounded away from zero for all sufficiently small  $\sigma > 0$  (see Lemma E.2). It follows from (E.24) that  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_1) - A\hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - B\mathbf{v}_0$  can be used as an estimator for the noise vector  $\mathbf{w}_0$ . Using this estimator, we solve the following regression problem in Line 21:

$$\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1} \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{init}}} \left\| h(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}) - \left( \hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}) - \widehat{A}\hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0^{(i)}) - \widehat{B}\mathbf{v}_0^{(i)} \right) \right\|^2, \quad (\text{E.25})$$

where  $\{(\mathbf{y}_\tau^{(i)}, \mathbf{x}_\tau^{(i)}, \mathbf{v}_\tau^{(i)})\}_{1 \leq i \leq n_{\text{init}}}$ , are the fresh i.i.d. trajectories generated by the policy  $\pi_{\text{ol}}$  on Line 19.

We first show that up to a linear transformation, this regression recovers the vector  $A\mathbf{x}_0$  (our target), plus a linear combination  $B\mathbf{v}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0$  of the system noise and injected noise for  $t = 0$ . This guarantee is quite useful: Since we can already predict  $B\mathbf{v}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0$  well via Eq. (E.24), we will be able to extract  $A\mathbf{x}_0$  from this representation.

**Lemma E.4.** Let  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}$  be defined as in (E.25), and let  $\Sigma_1 := \sigma^2 BB^\top + A\Sigma_0 A^\top + \Sigma_w$ . If  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$  holds, then for any  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ , with probability at least  $1 - 5\delta/2$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}} \left[ \|\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1) - \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1}(\mathbf{w}_0 + B\mathbf{v}_0 + A\mathbf{x}_0)\|^2 \right] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{ol},1}^2, \quad (\text{E.26})$$

where we have

$$\varepsilon_{\text{ol},1}^2 \lesssim \frac{c_1(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln|\mathcal{F}|) \ln^2 \frac{n_{\text{init}}}{\delta}}{n_{\text{init}}} + \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{M})^{-2} \varepsilon_{\text{noise}}^2(\delta) + \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + d_{\mathbf{x}} \|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + \sigma^2 d_{\mathbf{u}}),$$

and

$$c_1 := L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_{\star}^2 (1 + d_{\mathbf{u}} \sigma^2 + d_{\mathbf{x}} (\|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}} + \|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}})). \quad (\text{E.27})$$

To make use of this lemma, we must invert the linear transformation  $\Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1}$ . In fact, the prediction error guarantee from Lemma E.4 implies that we can estimate  $\Sigma_{\text{cov}} := \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_w$  (where  $\Sigma_1$  is as in Lemma E.4) by computing

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_{\text{init}}+1}^{2n_{\text{init}}} \hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}) \hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)})^\top, \quad (\text{E.28})$$

where  $\{(\mathbf{y}_\tau^{(i)}, \mathbf{x}_\tau^{(i)}, \mathbf{v}_\tau^{(i)})\}_{n_{\text{init}} < i \leq 2n_{\text{init}}}$ , are fresh i.i.d. trajectories generated by the policy  $\pi_{\text{ol}}$ . To see this, observe that by (E.26) implies that up to the error  $\varepsilon_{\text{ol},1}$ , (E.28) is an estimator for the covariance matrix of the Gaussian vector  $\Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1}(\mathbf{w}_0 + B\mathbf{v}_0 + A\mathbf{x}_0)$  which is just  $\Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_w$ . The following lemma gives a guarantee for the estimated covariance  $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}$ .

**Lemma E.5.** Let  $c_{\text{cov}} := L_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + (3d_{\mathbf{x}} + 2) \|\sigma^2 BB^\top + A\Sigma_0 A^\top + \Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}})$  and

$$\varepsilon'_{\text{cov}} := 3\varepsilon_{\text{ol},1} \sqrt{c_{\text{cov}}} + 5c_{\text{cov}} \ln(2d_{\mathbf{x}} n_{\text{init}}/\delta)^{3/2} n_{\text{init}}^{-1/2}. \quad (\text{E.29})$$

Suppose that  $n_{\text{init}}$  is large enough such that

$$\varepsilon'_{\text{cov}} < \sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_{\text{cov}})/2, \quad \text{where} \quad \Sigma_{\text{cov}} := \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_w \preceq \Sigma_w, \quad (\text{E.30})$$

and  $\Sigma_1$  is as in Lemma E.4. Then under the event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$ , with probability at least  $1 - (3\kappa + 4)\delta$ ,

$$\|I_{d_{\mathbf{x}}} - \hat{\Sigma}_w \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{cov}}, \quad \|\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\|\Sigma_{\text{cov}}\|_{\text{op}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}) \geq \sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_{\text{cov}})/2 \quad (\text{E.31})$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{\text{cov}} := 2\Psi_{\star} \left( \varepsilon_{\text{sys}} + \frac{2\|\Sigma_w^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \varepsilon'_{\text{cov}}}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_w)} \right). \quad (\text{E.32})$$

Lemma E.5 shows that  $\hat{\Sigma}_w \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \approx (\Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1})^{-1}$ , which is exactly what we require to invert the linear transformation in Eq. (E.26). To finish up, we solve the regression problem (Line 23)

$$\tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0} \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i=n_{\text{init}}+1}^{2n_{\text{init}}} \|h(\mathbf{y}_0^{(i)}) - \hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)})\|^2. \quad (\text{E.33})$$

Note that the argument to  $h$  in Eq. (E.33) is  $\mathbf{y}_0$ , while the argument to  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}$  is  $\mathbf{y}_1$ , so that the Bayes predictor, by Eq. (31), is equal to  $h(\mathbf{y}_0) = \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} A\mathbf{x}_0$ . Motivated by this observation, the final step is to set

$$\hat{f}_{A,0}(\mathbf{y}_0) = \hat{\Sigma}_w \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0).$$

Our main theorem for this subsection gives the desired prediction error guarantee for this predictor.

**Theorem E.4.** Let  $\tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0}$  be as in Eq. (E.33), and set  $\hat{f}_{A,0}(\mathbf{y}_0) := \widehat{\Sigma}_w \widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0)$ . If  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$  holds and Eq. (E.30) is satisfied, then for any  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ , with probability at least  $1 - (3\kappa + 9)\delta$ , the following properties hold

1. The estimator  $\hat{f}_{A,0}$  satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \left\| \hat{f}_{A,0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - Af_{\star}(\mathbf{y}_0) \right\|^2 \right] \lesssim \varepsilon_{\text{init}}^2, \quad (\text{E.34})$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{\text{init}}^2 := \|\Sigma_w^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \|\Sigma_{\text{cov}}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \left( \frac{c_0(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln|\mathcal{F}|) \ln(\frac{n_{\text{init}}}{\delta})^2}{n_{\text{init}}} + \varepsilon_{\text{ol},1}^2 \right) + d_{\mathbf{x}} \varepsilon_{\text{cov}}^2 \|A\|_{\text{op}}^2 \|\Sigma_0\|,$$

with  $\varepsilon_{\text{ol},1}$  as in Lemma E.4,  $\varepsilon_{\text{cov}}$  as in Eq. (E.32), and  $c_0 := 32L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_{\star}^3 d_{\mathbf{x}}$ .

2. Let  $\eta > e$  be given, and let  $\tilde{f}_1$  and  $\hat{f}_1$  be defined as in Line 28 of Algorithm 4. If

$$\bar{b}^2 \geq \bar{b}_0^2 \ln(2\eta), \quad \text{where } \bar{b}_0^2 := 10^4 d_{\mathbf{x}} L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_{\star}^{12} (1 + \|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + \|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}}). \quad (\text{E.35})$$

then it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\tilde{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_{0:1}) = \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_{0:1})] \geq 1 - \eta^{-1}. \quad (\text{E.36})$$

## E.4 Master Theorem for Phase III

By combining Theorems E.3 and E.4, we derive the proof of Theorem 2.3.

**Proof of Theorem 2.3.** Let  $\eta > e$  and  $\sigma^2 \leq 1$  be fixed. Introduce the shorthand  $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{M}^{\top} \mathcal{M})$ , and recall from Lemma E.2 that  $\lambda = \mathcal{O}_{\star}(1)$  whenever  $\sigma^2 \leq 1$ . Lastly, let us set  $n_{\text{init}} = n_{\text{op}}$ .

Let us begin with some initial parameter choices. First, we set  $n_{\text{init}} = n_{\text{op}}$ . Following Lemma E.1, we assume that  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} = \check{\mathcal{O}}(1)$  is sufficiently small such that  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$  holds and  $\varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \leq \frac{1-\gamma_{\infty}}{8\alpha_{\infty}} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\star}(\varepsilon_{\text{id}}) = \mathcal{O}_{\star}(1)$ . Next, following Lemma E.2, we assume that  $\sigma \leq 1$  is chosen such that  $\sigma = \check{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda_{\mathcal{M}})$  and  $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{M}^{\top} \mathcal{M}) \geq \lambda_{\mathcal{M}}^2 \sigma^4 / 4$ .

Since  $\sigma^2 = \mathcal{O}_{\star}(1)$ , we observe from (E.23) that

$$\bar{b}_{\infty}^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_{\star}(\varepsilon_{\text{dec},T}^2 \eta + (d_{\mathbf{u}} + d_{\mathbf{x}}) \ln(\eta)),$$

and from (E.35) we have

$$\bar{b}_0^2 \ln(2\eta) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\star}(d_{\mathbf{x}} \ln(\eta)).$$

Let us assume for now that  $\bar{b}^2 = \Omega_{\star}(d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})$ ; we will specify a precise choice at the end. Note that choosing  $\bar{b} \geq \bar{b}_{\infty} \vee \bar{b}_0 \ln(2\eta)$  is non-trivial, since our bound on  $\bar{b}_{\infty}$  depends on  $\varepsilon_{\text{dec},T}$ , which itself depends on  $\bar{b}$ . Nonetheless, we will show that an appropriate choice of  $\bar{b}$  solves this recurrence.

Let  $\delta \leq 1/e$  be given. Define  $\text{logs} = (d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln|\mathcal{F}|) \ln^2(n_{\text{op}}/\delta) \vee \ln^3(n_{\text{op}}/\delta)$ . As a first step, we simplify the various parameters defined in this section using the  $\mathcal{O}_{\star}(\cdot)$  notation. In particular, we

have

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{w,\phi} &= \mathcal{O}_*(\kappa d_{\mathbf{u}} + \bar{b}^2) = \mathcal{O}_*(\kappa \bar{b}^2), \\
\varepsilon_{\text{noise}}^2(\delta) &= \mathcal{O}_*\left(\kappa \left(\frac{c_{w,\phi} \text{logs}}{n_{\text{op}}} + \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}(d_{\mathbf{x}} + \bar{b}^2)\right)\right) = \mathcal{O}_*\left(\frac{\kappa^2 \bar{b}^2 \text{logs}}{n_{\text{op}}} + \kappa \bar{b}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2\right), \\
c_{\mathbf{x}} &= \mathcal{O}_*(d_{\mathbf{x}} + \bar{b}^2) = \mathcal{O}_*(\bar{b}^2), \\
c_1 &= \mathcal{O}_*(d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}}), \\
\varepsilon_{\text{ol},1}^2 &= \mathcal{O}_*\left(\frac{c_1 \text{logs}}{n_{\text{op}}} + \lambda^{-1} \varepsilon_{\text{noise}}^2(\delta) + \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2(d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})\right) = \mathcal{O}_*\left(\lambda^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{\kappa^2 \bar{b}^2 \text{logs}}{n_{\text{op}}} + \kappa \bar{b}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2\right)\right), \\
c_{\text{cov}} &= \mathcal{O}_*(d_{\mathbf{x}}), \\
(\varepsilon'_{\text{cov}})^2 &= \mathcal{O}_*\left(\varepsilon_{\text{ol},1}^2 d_{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \ln(n_{\text{op}}/\delta)^3}{n_{\text{op}}}\right) = \mathcal{O}_*\left(\lambda^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{\kappa^2 d_{\mathbf{x}} \bar{b}^2 \text{logs}}{n_{\text{op}}} + \kappa d_{\mathbf{x}} \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2\right)\right), \\
\varepsilon_{\text{cov}}^2 &= \mathcal{O}_*(\varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 + (\varepsilon'_{\text{cov}})^2).
\end{aligned}$$

We now appeal to [Theorem E.4](#). Simplifying the upper bounds, we are guaranteed that with probability at least  $1 - \mathcal{O}(\kappa\delta)$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\tilde{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_{0:1}) = \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_{0:1})] \geq 1 - \eta^{-1}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \left\| \hat{f}_{A,0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - Af_*(\mathbf{y}_0) \right\|^2 \right] \lesssim \varepsilon_{\text{init}}^2$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{\text{init}}^2 = \mathcal{O}_*\left(\frac{d_{\mathbf{x}} \text{logs}}{n_{\text{op}}} + \varepsilon_{\text{ol},1}^2 + d_{\mathbf{x}} \varepsilon_{\text{cov}}^2\right) = \mathcal{O}_*\left(\lambda^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{\kappa^2 d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \text{logs}}{n_{\text{op}}} + \kappa d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2\right)\right).$$

We now appeal to [Theorem E.1](#) and [Theorem E.3](#). By the union bound, and in light of [Eq. \(E.36\)](#), we have that with probability at least  $1 - \mathcal{O}(\kappa T\delta)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_*(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] \leq \mathcal{O}_*\left(\varepsilon_{\text{dec},T}^2 + (T^{1/2} c_{\mathbf{x}} + \bar{b}^2)T/\eta\right) \quad (\text{E.37})$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{\text{dec},T}^2 = \mathcal{O}_*(\varepsilon_{\text{init}}^2 + \lambda^{-1} T \varepsilon_{\text{noise}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2) = \mathcal{O}_*\left(\lambda^{-1} T \cdot \left(\frac{\kappa^2 d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \text{logs}}{n_{\text{op}}} + \kappa d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2\right)\right).$$

Hence, we can simplify to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_*(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \mathcal{O}_*\left(T^{3/2} \bar{b}^2 \eta^{-1} + \lambda^{-1} T \cdot \left(\frac{\kappa^2 d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \text{logs}}{n_{\text{op}}} + \kappa d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2\right)\right) \\
&\leq \mathcal{O}_*\left(T^{3/2} \bar{b}^2 \eta^{-1} + \varepsilon_0^2 + \lambda^{-1} T \kappa d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2\right), \quad (\text{E.38})
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\varepsilon_0^2 := \lambda^{-1} T \cdot \frac{\kappa^2 d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \text{logs}}{n_{\text{op}}}$ .

It remains to choose  $\eta$  and ensure that the condition on  $\bar{b}$  is satisfied. We choose  $\eta = \varepsilon_0^{-2}$ . Since  $\varepsilon_{\text{dec},T}^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_*(\varepsilon_0^2 + \lambda^{-1}T\kappa d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2)$ , this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{b}_0^2 \ln(2\eta) \vee \bar{b}_\infty^2 &= \Theta_*(\varepsilon_{\text{dec},T}^2 \eta + (d_{\mathbf{u}} + d_{\mathbf{x}}) \ln(\eta)) \\ &= \mathcal{O}_*(1 + \varepsilon_0^{-2} \cdot \lambda^{-1}T\kappa d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2 + (d_{\mathbf{u}} + d_{\mathbf{x}}) \ln(\varepsilon_0^{-2})). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that if  $\varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \leq \check{\mathcal{O}}(\frac{\varepsilon_0^2 \lambda}{\kappa d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 b^2 T})$ , we have

$$\bar{b}_0^2 \ln(2\eta) \vee \bar{b}_\infty^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_*((d_{\mathbf{u}} + d_{\mathbf{x}}) \ln(\varepsilon_0^{-2})) = \mathcal{O}_*((d_{\mathbf{u}} + d_{\mathbf{x}}) \ln(n_{\text{op}})).$$

Hence, we can satisfy the constraint that  $\bar{b}_0 \vee \bar{b}_\infty \leq \bar{b}$  by choosing  $\bar{b} = \Theta_*((d_{\mathbf{u}} + d_{\mathbf{x}}) \ln(n_{\text{op}}))$ . Returning to the final error bound, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_*(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_*\left(\bar{b}^2 T^{3/2} \eta^{-1} + \varepsilon_0^2 + \lambda^{-1}T\kappa d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}_*\left(\bar{b}^2 T^{3/2} \varepsilon_0^2 + \lambda^{-1}T\kappa d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}_*\left(\lambda^{-1}T^3 \kappa^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^4 \ln^2(n_{\text{op}}) \cdot \left(\frac{\text{logs}}{n_{\text{op}}} + \varepsilon_{\text{id}}^2\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

To simplify, we recall that (1)  $\lambda^{-1} \leq 4\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}^{-2}\sigma^{-4}$ , and (2)  $\text{logs} = \mathcal{O}_*((d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln|\mathcal{F}|) \ln^3(n_{\text{op}}/\delta))$ . Moreover, our condition on  $\varepsilon_{\text{sys}}$  above implies that

$$\varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \leq \check{\mathcal{O}}(\text{logs}/n_{\text{op}}),$$

which means it suffices to take  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}}^2 = \check{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2) = \check{\mathcal{O}}(\text{logs}/n_{\text{op}})$  as well. Hence, for the final bound, we can simplify to

$$\mathcal{O}_*\left(\frac{\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}^{-2}}{\sigma^4} T^3 \kappa^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^4 \cdot \frac{(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln|\mathcal{F}|) \ln^5(n_{\text{op}}/\delta)}{n_{\text{op}}}\right).$$

□

## F Supporting Proofs for [Appendix E](#)

### F.1 A Truncation Bound for the Iterates

Before proceeding with the main proofs in this section, we state a lemma which bounds the magnitudes of the states under the event that  $\hat{f}_\tau$  returns state estimates bounded by  $\bar{b}$ . This bound is used by a number of subsequent proofs.

**Lemma F.1.** Let  $\bar{b} > 0$  and  $t \geq 0$ . If  $\|\hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau})\| \leq \bar{b}$  a.s. for all  $\tau \geq 0$ , then for all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$  and all  $\tau \geq 0$ , we have that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \|\mathbf{x}_\tau\|^2 \geq 30d_{\mathbf{x}}\Psi_\Sigma + 2\bar{b}^2 \cdot \text{dev}_x \ln \frac{2}{\delta} \right] \leq \delta, \quad \text{and} \quad (\text{F.1})$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} [\|\mathbf{x}_\tau\|^2] \leq 3d_{\mathbf{x}}\Psi_\Sigma + \text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2. \quad (\text{F.2})$$

Moreover, both displays above also hold with  $\tilde{\pi}_t$  replaced by  $\hat{\pi}_t$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\tau \geq 0$  be fixed. By the system's dynamics and the definition of  $\tilde{\pi}_t$  (cf. Eq. (E.2)), we have

$$\mathbf{x}_\tau = A^\tau \mathbf{x}_0 + \sum_{s=0}^{\tau-1} A^{\tau-s-1} (B\hat{K}\hat{f}_s(\mathbf{y}_{0:s})\mathbb{I}_{s \leq t} + B\mathbf{v}_s + \mathbf{w}_s). \quad (\text{F.3})$$

Thus, by Jensen's inequality, and using strong stability of  $A$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}_\tau\|^2 &\leq 3\|A^\tau \mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + 3\left\| \sum_{s=0}^{\tau-1} A^{\tau-s-1} (B\mathbf{v}_s + \mathbf{w}_s) \right\|^2 + 3\left\| \sum_{s=0}^{t \wedge (\tau-1)} A^{\tau-s-1} B\hat{K}\hat{f}_s(\mathbf{y}_{0:s}) \right\|^2, \\ &\leq 3\alpha_A^2 \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + 3\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\tau\|^2 + \frac{3\alpha_A^2}{1-\gamma_A^2} \cdot \|B\hat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \cdot \bar{b}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.4})$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\tau := \sum_{s=0}^{\tau-1} A^{\tau-s-1} (B\mathbf{v}_s + \mathbf{w}_s) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_\xi)$ , with  $\Sigma_\xi \preceq \Sigma_{\infty, \text{id}}$  since  $\sigma \leq 1$  under Assumption 10 (cf. Eq. (D.2)). By Lemma F.11, the expression above implies that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \|\mathbf{x}_\tau\|^2 \geq \left( \alpha_A^2 \|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + \|\Sigma_{\infty, \text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \right) (9d_{\mathbf{x}} + 6) + \frac{3\alpha_A^2}{1-\gamma_A^2} \cdot \|B\hat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \right] \ln(2/\delta) \leq \delta. \quad (\text{F.5})$$

which we simplify to

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \|\mathbf{x}_\tau\|^2 \geq \left( 2(\alpha_A^2 \|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + \|\Sigma_{\infty, \text{id}}\|_{\text{op}}) (9d_{\mathbf{x}} + 6) + \frac{3\alpha_A^2}{1-\gamma_A^2} \cdot \|B\hat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \right) \ln(1/\delta) \right] \leq \delta.$$

Substituting in the definition of  $\text{dev}_x$  and  $\Psi_\Sigma$  (Eqs. (E.3) and (E.4)), with  $\gamma_A^2 \leq 1$  establishes (F.1). We now show Eq. (F.2). by (F.4) and Lemma F.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} [\|\mathbf{x}_\tau\|^2] &\leq 2\alpha_A^2 \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} [\|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2] + 3\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} [\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\tau\|^2] + \frac{3\alpha_A^2}{1-\gamma_A^2} \cdot \|B\hat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2, \\ &\leq 3d_{\mathbf{x}} (\|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + \|\Sigma_{\infty, \text{id}}\|_{\text{op}}) + \frac{3\alpha_A^2}{1-\gamma_A^2} \cdot \|B\hat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.6})$$

The second part of the lemma follows from (F.5) and (F.6) by the fact that  $\tilde{\pi}_t$  and  $\hat{\pi}$  coincide up to round  $t$  (inclusive).  $\square$

## F.2 Proof of Lemma E.1

**Proof of Lemma E.1.** The bounds on  $\|\hat{A} - A\|_{\text{op}}$  and  $\|\hat{B} - B\|_{\text{op}}$  immediately follow from the conditions of the lemma. To show that  $\hat{A}$  is  $(\alpha_A, \bar{\gamma}_A)$ -strongly stable, we observe that if  $S$  is the matrix that witnesses strong stability for  $A$ , we have

$$\|S^{-1}\hat{A}S\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|S^{-1}(\hat{A} - A)S\|_{\text{op}} + \|S^{-1}AS\|_{\text{op}} \leq \alpha_A \varepsilon_{\text{id}} + \bar{\gamma}_A.$$

Hence, once  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq \frac{1-\bar{\gamma}_A}{2\alpha_A}$ , we have  $\|S^{-1}\hat{A}S\|_{\text{op}} \leq \bar{\gamma}_A$ .

Next, we appeal to Theorem C.1, which implies that once  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq c \cdot \alpha_\infty^{-4} (1 - \gamma_\infty^2)^2 \Psi_\star^{-11}$  for a sufficiently small numerical constant  $c$ , we have

$$\|\hat{K} - K_\infty\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_\star(\varepsilon_{\text{id}}),$$

and  $A + B\widehat{K}$  is  $(\alpha_\infty, \bar{\gamma}_\infty)$ -strongly stable for  $\bar{\gamma}_\infty = (1 + \gamma_\infty)/2$ . In particular, for  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}}$  sufficiently small we have  $\|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\|K_\infty\|_{\text{op}}$ , so that

$$\|\widehat{B}\widehat{K} - B\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_*(\varepsilon_{\text{id}}).$$

Next, we observe that once  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq \Psi_\star^{-1}/2 \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_w)/2$ , we have  $\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\Sigma}_w) \geq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_w)/2$ , and so we can apply [Proposition F.1](#) to deduce that

$$\|I_{d_x} - \widehat{\Sigma}_w \Sigma_w^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|\widehat{\Sigma}_w^{-1} - \Sigma_w^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_*(\varepsilon_{\text{id}}).$$

Finally, we bound the errors for the terms involving  $\widehat{M}_k$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ . We first show that to do this, it suffices to bound  $\max_{1 \leq k \leq \kappa} \|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}}$ . First, as long as  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} = \mathcal{O}_*(1)$ , we have

$$\|\widehat{M}_k \widehat{A}^k \widehat{B} - M_k A^k B\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_*(\|\widehat{M}_k \widehat{A}^k - M_k A^k\|_{\text{op}} + \varepsilon_{\text{id}}),$$

by triangle inequality. Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{M}_k \widehat{A}^k - M_k A^k\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \|\widehat{A}^k\|_{\text{op}} \|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}} + \|M_k\|_{\text{op}} \|\widehat{A}^k - A^k\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \|\widehat{A}^k\|_{\text{op}} \|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}} + \mathcal{O}_*(\|\widehat{A}^k - A^k\|_{\text{op}}). \end{aligned}$$

By [Lemma F.2](#), once  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_A)}{2\alpha_A}$ , this is upper bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}_*(\bar{\gamma}_A^{k-1} k \cdot (\|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}} + \varepsilon_{\text{id}})).$$

Note that  $\max_{k \geq 1} \bar{\gamma}_A^{k-1} k \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \bar{\gamma}_A^{k-1} k \leq 1/(1-\bar{\gamma}_A)^2 = \mathcal{O}_*(1)$ , so the bound above further simplifies to

$$\mathcal{O}_*(\|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}} + \varepsilon_{\text{id}}).$$

Finally, by similar reasoning, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mathcal{M}} - \mathcal{M}\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \|\widehat{M}_k \widehat{A}^k - M_k A^k\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \mathcal{O}\left(\bar{\gamma}_A^{k-1} k (\|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}} + \varepsilon_{\text{id}})\right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq \kappa} \|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}} + \varepsilon_{\text{id}}\right) \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \bar{\gamma}_A^{k-1} k \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_*\left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq \kappa} \|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}} + \varepsilon_{\text{id}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we appeal to [Lemma F.3](#), which implies that  $\max_{1 \leq k \leq \kappa} \|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_*(\varepsilon_{\text{id}})$ . □

### F.2.1 Supporting Results

**Proposition F.1.** Let  $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be positive definite matrices with  $\|X - Y\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon$ . Then we have  $\|I - XY^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|Y^{-1}\| \cdot \varepsilon$  and  $\|X^{-1} - Y^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|X^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \|Y^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \cdot \varepsilon$ .

**Proof of Proposition F.1.** The result follows by the inequalities

$$\|X^{-1} - Y^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|X^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \cdot \|I - XY^{-1}\|_{\text{op}},$$

and

$$\|I - XY^{-1}\| \leq \|Y^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \cdot \|Y - X\|_{\text{op}}.$$

□

**Lemma F.2.** Suppose  $\|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_A)}{2\alpha_A}$ . Then for all  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\|\widehat{A}^k - A^k\|_{\text{op}} \leq \alpha_A^2 \bar{\gamma}_A^{k-1} k \|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\text{op}},$$

where  $\bar{\gamma}_A = (1 + \gamma_A)/2$ . Furthermore, we have  $\|\widehat{A}^k\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\alpha_A \bar{\gamma}_A^{k-1} k$ .

**Proof of Lemma F.2.** Using Lemma 5 of Mania et al. (2019), we are guaranteed that<sup>12</sup>

$$\|\widehat{A}^k - A^k\|_{\text{op}} \leq \alpha_A^2 \left( \alpha_A \|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\text{op}} + \gamma_A \right)^{k-1} k \|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\text{op}}.$$

The condition in the lemma statement ensures that  $\alpha_A \|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\text{op}} + \gamma_A \leq \bar{\gamma}_A$ , leading to the first result. As a consequence, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{A}^k\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \|A^k\|_{\text{op}} + \|\widehat{A}^k - A^k\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \alpha_A \gamma_A^k + \alpha_A^2 \bar{\gamma}_A^{k-1} k \|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \alpha_A \gamma_A^k + \alpha_A (1 - \bar{\gamma}_A) \bar{\gamma}_A^{k-1} k \\ &\leq 2\alpha_A \bar{\gamma}_A^{k-1} k. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma F.3.** If  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_A)}{2\alpha_A} \wedge \frac{\Psi_{\star}^{-1}}{2}$  and  $\sigma^2 = \mathcal{O}_{\star}(1)$ , then for all  $1 \leq k \leq \kappa$ ,  $\|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\star}(\varepsilon_{\text{id}})$ .

**Proof of Lemma F.3.** Let  $k$  be fixed. Define

$$\Sigma_k = \sum_{i=1}^k A^{i-1} \Sigma_w (A^{\top})^{i-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\Sigma}_k = \sum_{i=1}^k \widehat{A}^{i-1} \widehat{\Sigma}_w (\widehat{A}^{\top})^{i-1},$$

so that we have

$$M_k = \mathcal{C}_k^{\top} (\mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^{\top} + \sigma^{-2} \Sigma_k)^{-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{M}_k = \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k^{\top} (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k^{\top} + \sigma^{-2} \widehat{\Sigma}_k)^{-1},$$

where  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k := [\widehat{A}^{k-1} \widehat{B} \mid \dots \mid \widehat{B}]$ .

As a starting point, we have by Lemma F.4 that  $\|\mathcal{C}_k - \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\star}(\varepsilon_{\text{id}})$  once  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_A)}{2\alpha_A}$ . As such our task will mainly boil down to relating the error of  $\widehat{M}_k$  to that of  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k$ . We will use going forward that  $\|\mathcal{C}_k\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_{\star}(1)$ .

For the first step, by the triangle inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \|\mathcal{C}_k - \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k\|_{\text{op}} \|(\mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^{\top} + \sigma^{-2} \Sigma_k)^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} + \|\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k\|_{\text{op}} \|(\mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^{\top} + \sigma^{-2} \Sigma_k)^{-1} - (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k^{\top} + \sigma^{-2} \widehat{\Sigma}_k)^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}. \end{aligned}$$

<sup>12</sup>In the notation of Mania et al. (2019), we can take  $\rho \leq \gamma_A$  and  $\tau(A, \gamma_A) \leq \alpha_A$ .

Now, note that  $\mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^\top + \sigma^{-2} \Sigma_k \succeq \sigma^{-2} \Sigma_w$ , so  $\|(\mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^\top + \sigma^{-2} \Sigma_k)^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_*(\sigma^2)$ . Similarly, as long as  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq \Psi_*^{-1}/2 \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_w)/2$ , we have  $\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\Sigma}_w) \geq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_w)/2 > 0$ , so we have  $\|(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k^\top + \sigma^{-2} \widehat{\Sigma}_k)^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_*(\sigma^2)$ . This leads allows us to simplify the bound above to

$$\|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_*(\sigma^2 \varepsilon_{\text{id}}) + \mathcal{O}_*\left(\|(\mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^\top + \sigma^{-2} \Sigma_k)^{-1} - (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k^\top + \sigma^{-2} \widehat{\Sigma}_k)^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}\right),$$

and moreover, by invoking [Proposition F.1](#) with the aforementioned operator norm bounds for the inverse matrices, we can further upper bound by

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \mathcal{O}_*(\sigma^2 \varepsilon_{\text{id}}) + \mathcal{O}_*\left(\sigma^4 \|(\mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^\top + \sigma^{-2} \Sigma_k) - (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k^\top + \sigma^{-2} \widehat{\Sigma}_k)\|_{\text{op}}\right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_*(\sigma^2 \varepsilon_{\text{id}}) + \mathcal{O}_*\left(\sigma^4 \|\mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^\top - \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k^\top\|_{\text{op}} + \sigma^2 \|\Sigma_k - \widehat{\Sigma}_k\|_{\text{op}}\right), \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_*(\varepsilon_{\text{id}} + \|\Sigma_k - \widehat{\Sigma}_k\|_{\text{op}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the final step uses that  $\sigma^2 = \mathcal{O}_*(1)$  to simplify. Finally, we bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Sigma_k - \widehat{\Sigma}_k\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \|A^{i-1} - \widehat{A}^{i-1}\|_{\text{op}} \|\Sigma_w (A^\top)^{i-1}\|_{\text{op}} + \|\widehat{A}^{i-1}\|_{\text{op}} \|\Sigma_w - \widehat{\Sigma}_w\|_{\text{op}} \|(A^\top)^{i-1}\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\quad + \|\widehat{A}^{i-1} \widehat{\Sigma}_w\|_{\text{op}} \|A^{i-1} - \widehat{A}^{i-1}\|_{\text{op}}. \end{aligned}$$

By [Lemma F.2](#), once  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_A)}{2\alpha_A}$ , we have  $\|\widehat{A}^i\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_*(\bar{\gamma}_A^{i-1} i)$  and  $\|\widehat{A}^i - A^i\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_*(\bar{\gamma}_A^{i-1} i \varepsilon_{\text{id}})$ . We also have  $\|A^i\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_*(\bar{\gamma}_\infty^i)$  and  $\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|\widehat{\Sigma}_w\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_*(1)$ , so we can bound the sum above as

$$\|\Sigma_k - \widehat{\Sigma}_k\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_*\left(\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{i=2}^k \bar{\gamma}_A^{2(i-2)} i^2\right)\right) \leq \mathcal{O}_*\left(\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \bar{\gamma}_A^{2(i-2)} i^2\right)\right) = \mathcal{O}_*(\varepsilon_{\text{id}}).$$

□

**Lemma F.4.** If  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_A)}{2\alpha_A}$  then for all  $1 \leq k \leq \kappa$ ,  $\|\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k - \mathcal{C}_k\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_*(\varepsilon_{\text{id}})$ .

**Proof of Lemma F.4.** Let  $k$  be fixed. As a first step, we use the block structure to bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k - \mathcal{C}_k\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \|\widehat{A}^{i-1} \widehat{B} - A^{i-1} B\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \|\widehat{B}\|_{\text{op}} \|\widehat{A}^{i-1} - A^{i-1}\|_{\text{op}} + \|A^{i-1}\|_{\text{op}} \|\widehat{B} - B\|_{\text{op}}. \end{aligned}$$

By [Lemma F.2](#), once  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq \frac{(1-\gamma_A)}{2\alpha_A}$ , we have  $\|\widehat{A}^i\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_*(\bar{\gamma}_A^{i-1} i)$  and  $\|\widehat{A}^i - A^i\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_*(\bar{\gamma}_A^{i-1} i \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{id}})$ . We further have  $\|A^i\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_*(\bar{\gamma}_\infty^i)$  and  $\|B\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|\widehat{B}\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_*(1)$ , since  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} = \mathcal{O}_*(1)$ . Plugging in these bounds above and simplifying, we have

$$\|\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_k - \mathcal{C}_k\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_*\left(\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \left(1 + \sum_{i=2}^k \bar{\gamma}_A^{i-2} i\right)\right) \leq \mathcal{O}_*\left(\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \left(1 + \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \bar{\gamma}_A^{i-2} i\right)\right) = \mathcal{O}_*(\varepsilon_{\text{id}}).$$

□

### F.3 Proof of Lemma E.2

Let  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$  be as in Eq. (24). For the first point, it is easy to see that  $\|M_k\| = \mathcal{O}_\star(1)$  whenever  $\sigma^2 = \mathcal{O}_\star(1)$  using strong stability. It follows that

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \|A^{k-1}\| \|M_k\| \leq \mathcal{O}_\star\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \gamma_A^{k-1}\right) = \mathcal{O}_\star(1).$$

To prove the second point, we first recall the following result.

**Lemma F.5** (Phien (2012), Theorem 2.2). Let  $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . If  $X$  is non-singular and  $r := \|X^{-1}Y\|_{\text{op}} < 1$ , then  $X + Y$  is non-singular and  $\|(X + Y)^{-1} - X^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|Y\|_{\text{op}} \|X^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 / (1 - r)$ .

Let  $k$  be fixed. We set  $X = \sum_{i=1}^k A^{i-1} \Sigma_w (A^{i-1})^\top$  and  $Y = \sigma^2 \mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^\top$ . Since  $X \succeq \Sigma_w \succ 0$ , we have that  $\|X^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_\star(1)$  and  $\|Y\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_\star(\sigma^2)$ . Moreover,  $\|\mathcal{C}_k\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_\star(1)$ . This implies that for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\bar{\sigma} = \check{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon)$  such that for all  $\sigma^2 \leq \bar{\sigma}^2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\geq \left\| \mathcal{C}_k^\top \left( \sigma^2 \mathcal{C}_k \mathcal{C}_k^\top + \sum_{i=1}^k A^{i-1} \Sigma_w (A^{i-1})^\top \right)^{-1} - \mathcal{C}_k^\top \left( \sum_{i=1}^k A^{i-1} \Sigma_w (A^{i-1})^\top \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\text{op}}, \\ &= \left\| M_k / \sigma^2 - \mathcal{C}_k^\top \left( \sum_{i=1}^k A^{i-1} \Sigma_w (A^{i-1})^\top \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\text{op}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.7})$$

Define  $\bar{M}_k = \mathcal{C}_k^\top \left( \sum_{i=1}^k A^{i-1} \Sigma_w (A^{i-1})^\top \right)^{-1}$ . Then using the definitions of  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2}^\top \mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2} / \sigma^4 - \bar{\mathcal{M}}^\top \bar{\mathcal{M}}\|_{\text{op}} &\leq 2 \left( \|\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2} / \sigma^2\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|\bar{\mathcal{M}}\|_{\text{op}} \right) \cdot \|\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2} / \sigma^2 - \bar{\mathcal{M}}\|_{\text{op}} \\ &= \mathcal{O}_\star \left( \|\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2} / \sigma^2 - \bar{\mathcal{M}}\|_{\text{op}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2} / \sigma^2 - \bar{\mathcal{M}}\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \|A^{k-1}\|_{\text{op}} \|M_k / \sigma^2 - \bar{M}_k\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}_\star \left( \max_{1 \leq k \leq \kappa} \|M_k / \sigma^2 - \bar{M}_k\|_{\text{op}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Together with (F.7), this implies that

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2}^\top \mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2} / \sigma^4 - \bar{\mathcal{M}}^\top \bar{\mathcal{M}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \mathcal{O}_\star(\varepsilon), \quad \forall \sigma^2 \leq \bar{\sigma}^2. \quad (\text{F.8})$$

Now, note that

$$|\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2}^\top \mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2} / \sigma^4) - \lambda_{\min}(\bar{\mathcal{M}}^\top \bar{\mathcal{M}})| \leq \|\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2}^\top \mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2} / \sigma^4 - \bar{\mathcal{M}}^\top \bar{\mathcal{M}}\|_{\text{op}}.$$

Combining this with (F.8) implies that, for all  $\sigma^2 \leq \bar{\sigma}^2$ ,

$$\left| \lambda_{\min}^{1/2}(\mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2}^\top \mathcal{M}_{\sigma^2}) / \sigma^2 - \lambda_{\mathcal{M}} \right| \leq \mathcal{O}_\star(\varepsilon). \quad (\text{F.9})$$

Finally, by definition of the  $\mathcal{O}_\star(\cdot)$  notation, there exists  $\varepsilon = \check{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda_{\mathcal{M}})$  such that the right-hand side of Eq. (F.9) is at most  $\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}/2$ , which yields the desired result.  $\square$

## F.4 Proof of Theorem E.1

### F.4.1 Regression Bound for $\phi_{t,k}$

Let  $t \geq 0$  and  $k \in [\kappa]$  be fixed and introduce the shorthand

$$\mathbf{z}_{t,k} := (\mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+k}). \quad (\text{F.10})$$

Define the “true”  $\phi$ -function

$$\phi_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{z}_{t,k}) := M_k \left( h(\mathbf{y}_{t+k}) - A^k h(\mathbf{y}_t) - A^{k-1} B \widehat{K} \widehat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) \right), \quad (\text{F.11})$$

for  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$ , and its plug-in estimate analogue:

$$\widehat{\phi}_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{z}_{t,k}) := \widehat{M}_k \left( h(\mathbf{y}_{t+k}) - \widehat{A}^k h(\mathbf{y}_t) - \widehat{A}^{k-1} \widehat{B} \widehat{K} \widehat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) \right).$$

Finally, define their difference by

$$\delta_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{z}_{t,k}) := \widehat{\phi}_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{z}_{t,k}) - \phi_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{z}_{t,k}).$$

**Lemma F.6.** For  $k \in [\kappa]$  define the error bound

$$\psi_{t,k}(\mathbf{z}_{t,k})^2 := 6\alpha_A^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_M^2 \left( 2 + \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|_2^2 + \Psi_\star^2 \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \right), \quad (\text{F.12})$$

which is well defined since  $\mathbf{x}_\tau = f_\star(\mathbf{y}_\tau)$  due to the decodability assumption. Further, introduce the error constant

$$c_{w,\phi} := 50kd_{\mathbf{u}}\sigma^2 + 30\alpha_A^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_M^2 (62d_{\mathbf{x}}\Psi_\Sigma + 5\bar{b}^2 \cdot \text{dev}_x). \quad (\text{F.13})$$

Then, recalling  $\mathbf{v} := [\mathbf{v}_t^\top, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{t+k}^\top]^\top$ , for all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$  and  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$ , the following results hold.

1. We have the bound

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\phi_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{z}_{t,k})\|^2 + \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\delta_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{z}_{t,k})\|^2 \leq \psi_{t,k}(\mathbf{z}_{t,k})^2. \quad (\text{F.14})$$

2. We have the bound

$$L_{\text{op}}(\|\widehat{M}_k\|_{\text{op}} + \|\widehat{M}_k \widehat{A}^k\|_{\text{op}})(2 + \|f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2 + \|f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{t+k})\|_2) \lesssim \psi_{t,k}(\mathbf{z}_{t,k}). \quad (\text{F.15})$$

3. For all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \psi_{t,k}(\mathbf{z}_{t,k})^2 + \|\delta_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{z}_{t,k}) - \mathbf{v}\|^2 \geq \frac{5}{3} c_{w,\phi} \ln(1/\delta) \right] \leq \delta. \quad (\text{F.16})$$

4. We have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\delta_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{z}_{t,k})\|^2 \right] \leq 24L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}}\Psi_\Sigma + \text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2). \quad (\text{F.17})$$

**Proof.** For notational convenience, we will drop the subscripts  $t, k$  in the expressions of  $\phi_{t,k}, \widehat{\phi}_{t,k}, \psi_{t,k}, \delta_{t,k}$ , and  $\mathbf{z}_{t,k}$ . Let  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  be fixed throughout.

1. **Proof of Eq. (F.14)** By Jensen's inequality and Cauchy-Schwarz, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\phi(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2 &\leq 3\|M_k\|_{\text{op}}^2 \left( \|h(\mathbf{y}_{t+k})\|^2 + \alpha_A^2 \gamma_A^{2k} \|h(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 + \alpha_A^2 \gamma_A^{2k-2} \|B\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \right), \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} 3\|M_k\|_{\text{op}}^2 \left( L_{\text{op}}^2 \cdot (1 + \alpha_A^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|^2 + \alpha_A^2 \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2) + \alpha_A^2 \|B\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \right), \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} 3\Psi_M^2 \alpha_A^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 \left( 2 + \|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2 + \Psi_\star^2 \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \right), \tag{F.18}
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (i) follows by the definition of the function class  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$ , and (ii) uses that  $\alpha_A, L_{\text{op}} \geq 1$ ,  $\|M_k\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Psi_M$ , and  $\|B\| \leq \Psi_\star$ . Similarly, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\delta(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2 &\leq 3L_{\text{op}}^2 \|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|^2) + 3L_{\text{op}}^2 \|\widehat{M}_k \widehat{A}^k - M_k A^k\|_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2) \\
&\quad + 3\|\widehat{M}_k \widehat{A}^{k-1} \widehat{B} - M_k A^{k-1} B\|_{\text{op}}^2 \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2, \\
&\leq 3L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|^2) + 3L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2) + 3\varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2, \\
&\leq 3L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \left( 2 + \|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2 + \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \right), \tag{F.19}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second-to-last inequality follows since we have assumed that the event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$  holds, and the last uses  $L_{\text{op}}^2 \geq 1$ . Combining (F.18) and (F.19), with  $\alpha_A, \Psi_\star \geq 1$  and  $\Psi_M \geq \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}$ ,

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\phi(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2 + \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\delta(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2 \leq 6\alpha_A^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_M^2 \left( 2 + \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|_2^2 + \Psi_\star^2 \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \right) =: \psi(\mathbf{z})^2,$$

where we use the simplification  $\alpha_A \geq 1$ , and the definitions of  $\Psi_M$  and  $\Psi_\star$ , followed by  $L_{\text{op}} \geq 1$ . This shows (F.14).

2. **Proof of Eq. (F.15)** Using the bounds  $\|\widehat{M}_k \widehat{A}^k - M_k A^k\|_{\text{op}}, \|\widehat{M}_k - M_k\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \leq 1$ , and  $\|M_k\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Psi_M, \|A^k\|_{\text{op}} \leq \alpha_A$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&L_{\text{op}} (\|\widehat{M}_k\|_{\text{op}} + \|\widehat{M}_k \widehat{A}^k\|_{\text{op}}) (2 + \|f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2 + \|f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{t+k})\|_2) \\
&= L_{\text{op}} (\|\widehat{M}_k\|_{\text{op}} + \|\widehat{M}_k \widehat{A}^k\|_{\text{op}}) (2 + \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2 + \|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|_2) \\
&= L_{\text{op}} (2\varepsilon_{\text{sys}} + \|M_k\|_{\text{op}} + \|M_k A^k\|_{\text{op}}) (2 + \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2 + \|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|_2) \\
&\leq L_{\text{op}} (2\varepsilon_{\text{sys}} + \Psi_M (1 + \alpha_A)) (2 + \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2 + \|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \leq 1 \leq \Psi_M$ , and  $\alpha_A \geq 1$ , the bound follows.

3. **Proof of Eq. (F.16)** By Lemmas F.1 and F.11 we have, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ , and any  $\tau \leq t+k$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} [\|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \geq \sigma^2 \cdot (3kd_{\mathbf{u}} + 2) \ln \delta^{-1}] \leq \delta, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \|\mathbf{x}_\tau\|^2 \geq 15d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_\Sigma + \bar{b}^2 \cdot \text{dev}_x \ln \frac{2}{\delta} \right] \leq \delta,$$

and so by a union bound, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left( \ln \frac{5}{\delta} \right)^{-1} \cdot (\psi(\mathbf{z})^2 \vee \|\delta(h_\star, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{v}\|^2) \\
&\leq \left( \ln \frac{5}{\delta} \right)^{-1} \cdot (2\psi(\mathbf{z})^2 + 2\|\mathbf{v}\|^2) \\
&\leq \underbrace{(2\sigma^2 \cdot (3kd_{\mathbf{u}} + 2))}_{\leq 10kd_{\mathbf{u}}\sigma^2} + 6\alpha_A^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_M^2 \left( 2 + 30d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_\Sigma + 2\bar{b}^2 \cdot \text{dev}_x + \Psi_\star^2 \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, since  $\text{dev}_x \geq \Psi_\star^2 \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2$  by definition (see Eq. (E.4)), and  $\Psi_\Sigma \geq 1$ , the above is at most

$$\left(\ln \frac{5}{\delta}\right)^{-1} \cdot (\psi(\mathbf{z})^2 \vee \|\delta(f_\star, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{v}\|^2) \leq 10kd_{\mathbf{u}}\sigma^2 + 6\alpha_A^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_M^2 (32d_{\mathbf{x}}\Psi_\Sigma + 3\bar{b}^2 \cdot \text{dev}_x) := c_{w,\phi}/5.$$

Finally, for  $\delta \leq 1/e$ , we have that  $(\ln \frac{5}{\delta}) \leq 5 \ln(1/\delta)$ . This bound follows by the fact that  $\ln(5/\delta) = \ln(5) + \ln(1/\delta) \leq (\ln 5 + 1) \ln(1/\delta) \leq 5 \ln(1/\delta)$ , for all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ .

4. **Proof of Eq. (F.17).** We bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\delta(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\delta_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+k})\|^2 \right], \\ &\leq 3L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \left( 2 + \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} [\|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.20})$$

where we use Eq. (F.19) in the last step. From Lemma F.1, we have

$$3L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \left( 2 + \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} [\|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2] \right) \leq 3L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \left( 2 + \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 + 6d_{\mathbf{x}}\Psi_\Sigma + 2\text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2 \right),$$

Using the above two displays together with  $\text{dev}_x \geq \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2$  and  $\Psi_\Sigma \geq 1$  yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\delta(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2 \right] \leq 3L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (8d_{\mathbf{x}}\Psi_\Sigma + 3\text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2) \leq 24L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}}\Psi_\Sigma + \text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2).$$

□

**Lemma F.7.** Let  $t \geq 0$ ,  $k \in [\kappa]$ . For  $\hat{h}_{t,k}$  and  $\phi_{t,k}$  as in (E.10) and (F.11), respectively, we have with probability at least  $1 - 3\delta/2$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \left\| \phi_{t,k}(\hat{h}_{t,k}, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+k}) - M_k(A^{k-1}\mathbf{w}_t + \dots + \mathbf{w}_{t+k-1} + A^{k-1}B\mathbf{v}_t + \dots + B\mathbf{v}_{t+k-1}) \right\|^2 \right] \leq \varepsilon_w^2(\delta),$$

$$\text{where } \varepsilon_w^2(\delta) = c_{\varepsilon_w} \left( \frac{c_{w,\phi}(\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}}^2) \ln^2(n/\delta)}{n} + L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}}\Psi_\Sigma + \text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2) \right), \quad (\text{F.21})$$

and where  $c_{\varepsilon_w}$  is a sufficiently large constant, chosen to be at least 100 without loss of generality, and  $c_{w,\phi}$  is defined in Eq. (F.13).

We denote the event of Lemma F.7 by  $\mathcal{E}_{\phi;t,k}(\delta)$ .

**Proof.** We will apply Corollary B.2. We verify that the conditions of the corollary hold one by one.

1. **Substitutions.** We apply Corollary B.2 with  $\mathbf{e} = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{z} := (\mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+k})$ ,  $\mathbf{v} = [\mathbf{v}_t^\top, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{t+k}^\top]^\top$ ,  $\phi = \phi_{t,k}$ ,  $\psi = \psi_{t,k}$ ,  $\delta_\phi = \delta_{t,k}$ , and  $c = c_{w,\phi}$ , where  $\phi_{t,k}$ ,  $\psi_{t,k}$ ,  $\delta_{t,k}$ , and  $c_{w,\phi}$  are as in Lemma F.6. Moreover, we let  $c_\psi$  be the constant implicit in Eq. (F.15). The dimension parameters are  $d_{\mathbf{x}}, d_1 \leftarrow d_{\mathbf{x}}$ .

2. **Realizability.** By our assumption on the function class  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$ , there exists  $f_{\star} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  such that  $f_{\star}(y) = x$ , for all  $y \in \text{supp } q(\cdot | x)$ . Therefore, by the system's dynamics and the definition of the policy  $\tilde{\pi}_t$ , we have almost surely

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(h_{\star}, \mathbf{z}) &= M_k(f_{\star}(\mathbf{y}_{t+k}) - A^k f_{\star}(\mathbf{y}_t) - A^{k-1} B \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})), \\ &= M_k(A^{k-1} \mathbf{w}_t + \cdots + \mathbf{w}_{t+k-1} + A^{k-1} B \mathbf{v}_t + \cdots + B \mathbf{v}_{t+k-1}), \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t}[\mathbf{v} | A^{k-1} \mathbf{w}_t + \cdots + \mathbf{w}_{t+k-1} + A^{k-1} B \mathbf{v}_t + \cdots + B \mathbf{v}_{t+k-1}], \quad (\text{by Fact D.2}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \mathbf{v} \left| \sum_{j=1}^k (A^{j-1} \mathbf{w}_{t+k-j} + A^{j-1} B \mathbf{v}_{t+k-j}) \right. \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.22})$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \mathbf{v} \left| A^k f_{\star}(\mathbf{y}_t) + A^{k-1} B \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) + \sum_{j=1}^k (A^{j-1} \mathbf{w}_{t+k-j} + A^{j-1} B \mathbf{v}_{t+k-j}) \right. \right], \quad (\text{F.23})$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t}[\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, f_{\star}(\mathbf{y}_{t+k})], \quad (\text{F.24})$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t}[\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+k}], \quad (\text{F.25})$$

where (F.22) follows by the fact that  $(\mathbf{v}_{\tau})_{\tau \geq t}$  and  $(\mathbf{w}_{\tau})_{\tau \geq t}$  are independent of  $\mathbf{y}_{0:t}$ , (F.23) follows by the conditioning on  $\mathbf{y}_{0:t}$  (which determines the term  $A^k f_{\star}(\mathbf{y}_t) + A^{k-1} B \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})$ ), and (F.24) uses the system's dynamics. Finally, (F.25) uses the realizability assumption. Thus, (F.25) ensures the realizability assumption in Corollary B.2 is satisfied.

3. **Conditions 1 & 2.** Lemma F.6 ensures that conditions 1 and 2 of Corollary B.2 are satisfied.
4. **Condition 3.** By the structure of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$ , condition 3 is satisfied with  $L$  as in Assumption 5 and  $bL = L_{\text{op}}$ . Examining  $\hat{\phi}_{t,k}$ , we can take  $X_1 = \widehat{M}_k$ , and  $X_2 = \widehat{A}^k$ .
5. **Condition 4.** By Eq. (F.15), this holds for some  $c_{\psi} \lesssim 1$ .

Recall the notation  $\text{logs}(n, \delta) \lesssim \ln^2(n/\delta)$  defined in Corollary B.2. With the substitutions above, Corollary B.2 implies that with probability at least  $1 - \frac{3\delta}{2}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\phi_{t,k}(\hat{h}, \mathbf{z}) - \phi_{t,k}(f_{\star}, \mathbf{z})\|^2 &\leq \frac{12c_{w,\phi}(\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot d_{\mathbf{x}}) \text{logs}(c_{\psi} n, \delta)}{n} + 16\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 + 8 \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E} \|\delta_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2 \\ &= \frac{12c_{w,\phi}(\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}}^2) \text{logs}(c_{\psi} n, \delta)}{n} + 8 \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E} \|\delta_{t,k}(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2, \\ &\lesssim \frac{c_{w,\phi}(\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}}^2) \ln^2(n/\delta)}{n} + L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_{\Sigma} + \text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{by Eq. (F.17)})$$

□

#### F.4.2 Regression bound for $\phi$

Let  $t \geq 0$  be fixed. Recall the various functions defined at the start of Appendix F.4.1. In addition, consider the following functions for  $k \in [\kappa]$ ,  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\phi}_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) &:= \widehat{\mathcal{M}} \left( h(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \widehat{A}h(\mathbf{y}_t) - \widehat{B} \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) \right), \\ \phi_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) &:= \mathcal{M} \left( h(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - Ah(\mathbf{y}_t) - B \widehat{K} \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) \right), \\ \delta_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) &:= \widehat{\phi}_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) - \phi_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Further, for  $(\hat{h}_{t,k})_{k \in \kappa}$  as in Eq. (E.10), define

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Phi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) &:= [\widehat{\phi}_{t,1}(\hat{h}_{t,1}, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+1})^\top, \dots, \widehat{\phi}_{t,\kappa}(\hat{h}_{t,\kappa}, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+\kappa})^\top]^\top, \\ \Phi_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) &:= [\phi_{t,1}(\hat{h}_{t,1}, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+1})^\top, \dots, \phi_{t,\kappa}(\hat{h}_{t,\kappa}, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+\kappa})^\top]^\top, \\ \Phi_t^*(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) &:= [\phi_{t,1}(f_\star, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+1})^\top, \dots, \phi_{t,\kappa}(f_\star, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+\kappa})^\top]^\top.\end{aligned}$$

Here, the first term uses estimated dynamics and estimates  $\hat{h}$  of  $f_\star$ ; the second term uses true dynamics and estimates  $\hat{h}$ ; the third term uses true dynamics *and* the ground truth  $f_\star$ .

**Lemma F.8.** Let  $\mathbf{v} := \Phi_t^*(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa})$ ,  $\mathbf{e} := \Phi_t^*(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) - \widehat{\Phi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa})$ . Recall the function  $\psi_{t,1}$  defined in Eq. (F.12). Then the following properties hold.

1. We have the bound

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\phi_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})\|^2 + \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\delta_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})\|^2 \leq \psi_{t,1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})^2. \quad (\text{F.26})$$

2. We have the bound

$$L_{\text{op}}(\|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}\|_{\text{op}} + \|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}\widehat{A}\|_{\text{op}})(2 + \|f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2 + \|f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{t+1})\|_2) \lesssim \psi_{t,1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}). \quad (\text{F.27})$$

3. For any  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\pi}_t}[\psi_{t,1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})^2 \vee \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{e}\|^2 \leq 2\kappa c_{w,\phi}(1 + \ln(\kappa)) \ln(1/\delta)] \leq \delta. \quad (\text{F.28})$$

4. For any  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ , on the event  $\bigcap_{k=1}^{\kappa} \mathcal{E}_{\phi_t,k}(\delta)$  (cf. Lemma F.7), we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \|\mathbf{e}\|^2 \leq 3\kappa \varepsilon_w(\delta)^2. \quad (\text{F.29})$$

5. For any  $\delta > 0$ , we have the following bound (independent of  $\delta$ )

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \mathbb{E} \|\delta_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})\|^2 \leq \varepsilon_w(\delta)^2. \quad (\text{F.30})$$

**Proof of Lemma F.8.** In what follows, let us suppress dependence on  $\mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathbf{z}_{t,k}$  when clear from context, where  $\mathbf{z}_{t,k}$  is as in (F.10).

1. **Bounding**  $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\phi_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})\| + \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\delta_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})\| \leq \psi_{t,1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})^2$ .

The bound in (F.26) actually follows from the same argument as in the proof of Lemma F.6 with  $k = 1$  and  $(\widehat{M}_k, M_k)$  replaced by  $(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}, \mathcal{M})$  (using that  $\Psi_M$  also bounds  $\|\mathcal{M}\|_{\text{op}}$ , and  $\varepsilon_{\text{sys}}$  upper bounds  $\|\mathcal{M} - \widehat{\mathcal{M}}\|_{\text{op}}$ ) under  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$ .

2. **Establishing Eq. (F.27).** This is also analogous to the proof of Eq. (F.15) in Lemma F.6.

- 3a. **Bounding**  $\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{e}\|^2$ . We bound

$$\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{e}\|^2 = \left\| \widehat{\Phi}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) \right\|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \left\| \widehat{\phi}_{t,k}(\hat{h}_{t,k}, \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+k}) \right\|^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \psi_{t,k}(\mathbf{z}_{t,k})^2,$$

where we use Eq. (F.14).

3b. **Establishing Eq. (F.28).** We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_{t,1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})^2 \vee \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{e}\|^2 &\leq \psi_{t,1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})^2 \vee \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \psi_{t,k}(\mathbf{z}_{t,k})^2, \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \psi_{t,k}(\mathbf{z}_{t,k})^2, \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} 6\alpha_A^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_M^2 \left( 2 + \|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_{t+k}\|_2^2 + \Psi_*^2 \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, with probability  $1 - (\kappa + 1)\delta$ , we have that all  $\|\mathbf{x}_{t+i}\|_2^2$  for  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \kappa\}$  simultaneously satisfy

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{t+i}\|_2^2 \leq 30d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_{\Sigma} + 2\bar{b}^2 \cdot \text{dev}_x \ln \frac{2}{\delta}$$

by [Lemma F.1](#). Hence, with probability  $1 - (\kappa + 1)\delta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\psi_{t,1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})^2 \vee \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{e}\|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \psi_{t,k}(\mathbf{z}_{t,k})^2 \\
&= \kappa 6\alpha_A^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_M^2 \left( 2 + 60d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_{\Sigma} + 4\bar{b}^2 \cdot \text{dev}_x \ln \frac{2}{\delta} + \Psi_*^2 \|\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \bar{b}^2 \right) \\
&\leq \kappa 6\alpha_A^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_M^2 (62d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_{\Sigma} + 5\bar{b}^2 \cdot \text{dev}_x) \ln \frac{2}{\delta} \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa c_{w,\phi} \ln \frac{2}{\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line, we absorb various parameters into larger ones. Finally, replacing  $\delta$  by  $\delta/(\kappa + 1)$  gives  $(1/2) \cdot \ln(2(\kappa + 1)/\delta) = (1/2) \cdot \ln(2/\delta) + \ln(2(\kappa + 1)) \leq 2(1 + \ln(\kappa)) \ln(1/\delta)$  for  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ . This gives that,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \psi_{t,1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})^2 \vee \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{e}\|^2 \geq 2\kappa c_{w,\phi} (1 + \ln(\kappa)) \ln(1/\delta) \right] \leq \delta.$$

4. **Establishing Eq. (F.29).** First, we bound

$$\|\Phi_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) - \Phi_t^*(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa})\|_2^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \|\phi_{t,k}(\hat{h}_{t,k}) - \phi_{t,k}(h_*)\|^2.$$

From [Lemma F.7](#), we have on the event  $\bigcap_{k=1}^{\kappa} \mathcal{E}_{\phi;t,k}(\delta)$  (recall the definition of the event  $\mathcal{E}_{\phi;t,k}(\delta)$  from [Lemma F.7](#)) that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_k} \|\Phi_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) - \widehat{\Phi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa})\|^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \varepsilon_w(\delta)^2 = \kappa \varepsilon_w(\delta)^2. \quad (\text{F.31})$$

Second, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Phi_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) - \Phi_t^*(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa})\|_2^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \|\phi_{t,k}(\hat{h}_{t,k}) - \phi_{t,k}(\hat{h}_{t,k})\|^2, \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa} \|\delta_{t,1}(\hat{h}_{t,k})\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

so that by Eq. (F.17),

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_k} \|\Phi_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) - \Phi_t^*(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa})\|_2^2 \leq 24\kappa L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_{\Sigma} + \text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2).$$

Hence, on  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}} \cap \bigcap_{k=1}^{\kappa} \mathcal{E}_{\phi;t,k}(\delta)$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 &\leq 2\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_k} \|\Phi_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) - \Phi_t^*(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa})\|_2 + 2\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_k} \|\Phi_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) - \widehat{\Phi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa})\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\kappa\varepsilon_w(\delta)^2 + 48\kappa L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_{\Sigma} + \text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2) \leq 3\kappa\varepsilon_w(\delta)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line uses the definition of  $\varepsilon_w(\delta)^2$  from Lemma F.7.

5. **Establishing Eq. (F.30).** By using an analogous proof to that of Eq. (F.17) (in particular, exploiting that  $\varepsilon_{\text{sys}}$  bounds the error of both  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $\widehat{M}_k$ ), we can show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \|\delta_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})\|^2 \right] \leq 24L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_{\Sigma} + \text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2).$$

The right-hand-side is crudely bounded by  $\varepsilon_w(\delta)^2$  for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ .

□

### F.4.3 Proof of Theorem E.1

Again, we appeal to Corollary B.2. We verify one by one that the conditions require to apply the corollary hold.

1. **Substitutions.** We appeal to the corollary with  $\mathbf{e} = \Phi_t^*(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa}) - \widehat{\Phi}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa})$ ,  $\mathbf{z} := \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}$ ,  $\mathbf{v} = \Phi_t^*(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+\kappa})$ ,  $\phi = \phi_t$ ,  $\psi = \psi_t$ ,  $\delta_{\phi} = \delta_t$ , and  $c = \kappa(\ln \kappa + 1)c_{w,\phi}$ , where  $\phi_t$ ,  $\psi_t$ ,  $\delta_t$ , and  $c_{w,\phi}$  are as in Lemma F.8. We also take  $d_1, d_{\mathbf{x}} \leftarrow d_{\mathbf{x}}$ .

2. **Realizability.**

By our assumption on the function class  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$ , there exists  $f_{\star} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  such that  $f_{\star}(y) = x$  for all  $y \in \text{supp } q(\cdot | x)$ . Therefore, by the system's dynamics and the definition of the policy  $\tilde{\pi}_t$ ,

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(f_\star, \mathbf{z}) &= \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{w}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t), \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} M_1(\mathbf{w}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t) \\ \vdots \\ M_\kappa A^{\kappa-1}(\mathbf{w}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t) \end{bmatrix}, \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \begin{bmatrix} M_1(\mathbf{w}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t) \\ \vdots \\ M_\kappa(\sum_{j=1}^\kappa A^{j-1}\mathbf{w}_{t+\kappa-j} + A^{j-1}B\mathbf{v}_{t+\kappa-j}) \end{bmatrix} \middle| \begin{matrix} \mathbf{w}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t \\ \mathbf{y}_{0:t} \end{matrix} \right], \tag{F.32} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \begin{bmatrix} M_1(\mathbf{w}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t) \\ \vdots \\ M_\kappa(\sum_{j=1}^\kappa A^{j-1}\mathbf{w}_{t+\kappa-j} + A^{j-1}B\mathbf{v}_{t+\kappa-j}) \end{bmatrix} \middle| \begin{matrix} \mathbf{w}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t, \\ \mathbf{y}_{0:t} \end{matrix} \right], \tag{F.33} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \begin{bmatrix} M_1(\mathbf{w}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t) \\ \vdots \\ M_\kappa(\sum_{j=1}^\kappa A^{j-1}\mathbf{w}_{t+\kappa-j} + A^{j-1}B\mathbf{v}_{t+\kappa-1}) \end{bmatrix} \middle| \begin{matrix} \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{x}_{t+1} \\ \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+1} \end{matrix} \right], \tag{F.34} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_t} \left[ \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{t,1}^\star(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+1}) \\ \vdots \\ \phi_{t,\kappa}^\star(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+\kappa}) \end{bmatrix} \middle| \begin{matrix} \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+1} \\ \mathbf{y}_{0:t}, \mathbf{y}_{t+\kappa} \end{matrix} \right], \tag{F.34}
\end{aligned}$$

where: (F.32) follows by the fact that  $(\mathbf{v}_\tau)_{\tau \geq t}$  and  $(\mathbf{w}_\tau)_{\tau \geq t}$  are independent of  $\mathbf{y}_{0:t}$ ; (F.33) follows by the fact that  $\mathbf{w}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t$  can be recovered from  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$  given  $\mathbf{y}_{0:t}$  and vice-versa; and finally, (F.34) follows from the system's dynamics and the definition of  $\tilde{\pi}_t$ . Thus, (F.34) ensures that the realizability assumption in Corollary B.2 is satisfied.

3. **Conditions 1& 2.** Lemma F.8 ensures that conditions 1 and 2 of Corollary B.2 are satisfied.
4. **Condition 3.** By the structure of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$ , condition 3 is satisfied with  $L$  as in Assumption 5 and  $bL = L_{\text{op}}$ . Examining  $\hat{\phi}_t(h, \mathbf{y}_{0:t+1}) := \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(h(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}) - \widehat{A}h(\mathbf{y}_t) - \widehat{B}\widehat{K}\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}))$ , we can take  $X_1 = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ , and  $X_2 = \widehat{A}$ . The term  $\mathcal{M}\widehat{B}\widehat{K}\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t})$  does not depend on  $h$ , and thus corresponds to  $\delta_0$ .
5. **Condition 4.** By Eq. (F.27), this holds for some  $c_\psi \lesssim 1$ .

Recall  $\text{logs}(n, \delta) \lesssim \ln^2(n/\delta)$ , defined in Corollary B.2. Corollary B.2 implies that with probability at least  $1 - \frac{3}{2}\delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\|\phi_t(\hat{h}, \mathbf{z}) - \phi_t(f_\star, \mathbf{z})\|^2 &\leq \frac{12\kappa(\ln \kappa + 1)c_{w,\phi}(\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot d_{\mathbf{x}})\text{logs}(c_\psi n, \delta)}{n} + 16\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 + 8 \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \mathbb{E}\|\delta_t(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{c_{w,\phi}\kappa(\ln \kappa + 1)(\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}}^2)\ln^2(n/\delta)}{n} + \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 + \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \mathbb{E}\|\delta_t(h, \mathbf{z})\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting in the bounds in Eqs. (F.29) and (F.30), which hold on the events  $\bigcap_{k=1}^\kappa \mathcal{E}_{\phi_t, k}(\delta)$  (i.e., the intersection of the events from Lemma F.7), followed by the definition of  $\varepsilon_w$  given in Eq. (F.21),

the expression above is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \|\phi_t(\hat{h}, \mathbf{z}) - \phi_t(f_\star, \mathbf{z})\|^2 \\
& \lesssim \frac{c_{w,\phi} \kappa (\ln \kappa + 1) (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}}^2) \ln^2(n/\delta)}{n} + \kappa \varepsilon_w(\delta)^2 \\
& \lesssim \kappa (1 + \ln(\kappa)) \varepsilon_w(\delta)^2 \\
& \lesssim \kappa (1 + \ln(\kappa)) \left( \frac{c_{w,\phi} (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}}^2) \ln^2(n/\delta)}{n} + L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_\Sigma + \text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, let us account for the total failure probability. By [Lemma F.7](#), we have  $\mathbb{P}[\bigcap_{k=1}^{\kappa} \mathcal{E}_{\phi;t,k}(\delta)] \geq 1 - \frac{3\kappa}{2}\delta$ , and the above display holds with another probability  $1 - \frac{3}{2}\delta$ . Hence, our failure probability is at most  $\frac{3(\kappa+1)\delta}{2}$ . Rescaling  $\delta \leftarrow \frac{2\delta}{3(\kappa+1)}$ , and noting that  $\ln(c_1/\delta) \lesssim c_1 \ln(1/\delta)$  for constants  $c_1$ , we find that with probability  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\phi_t(\hat{h}, \mathbf{z}) - \phi_t(f_\star, \mathbf{z})\|^2 & \lesssim \kappa (1 + \ln(\kappa)) \left( \frac{c_{w,\phi} (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}}^2) \ln^2(n\kappa/\delta)}{n} + L_{\text{op}}^2 \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} \Psi_\Sigma + \text{dev}_x \bar{b}^2) \right) \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon_{\text{noise}}^2(\delta).
\end{aligned}$$

□

## F.5 Proof of [Lemma E.3](#)

**Proof of [Lemma E.3](#).** Let  $t \geq 0$  be fixed. To begin, consider a fixed  $0 \leq \tau \leq t$ , and let  $(\hat{h}_\tau)$  and  $(\phi_\tau)$  be as in [Lemma F.8](#). For notational convenience, we define  $\tilde{\phi}_\tau := \phi_\tau - \mathcal{M}B\mathbf{v}_\tau$ . From the definitions of  $\tilde{f}_{\tau+1}$  and  $\phi_\tau$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{f}_{\tau+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau+1}) & := \hat{A}\hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) + \hat{h}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{\tau+1}) - \hat{A}\hat{h}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_\tau), \\
& = \hat{A}\hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) + B\hat{K}\hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) + B\mathbf{v}_\tau + ((\hat{h}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{\tau+1}) - A\hat{h}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_\tau) - B\hat{K}\hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau})) - B\mathbf{v}_\tau), \\
& = \hat{A}\hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) + B\hat{K}\hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) + B\mathbf{v}_\tau + \mathcal{M}^\dagger \tilde{\phi}_\tau(\hat{h}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_{0:\tau+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that  $\mathcal{M}$  has full row rank by [Assumption 10](#). This implies that

$$\tilde{f}_{\tau+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau+1}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{\tau+1}) = (\hat{A} - A)\hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) + A(\hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau})) + (\mathcal{M}^\dagger \tilde{\phi}_\tau(\hat{h}_\tau, \mathbf{y}_{0:\tau+1}) - \mathbf{w}_\tau).$$

Under the event  $\mathcal{E}_{0:t}$ , we have in particular that  $\hat{f}_s = \tilde{f}_s$ , for all  $0 \leq s \leq \tau$ . Thus, by induction we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{f}_{\tau+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau+1}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_{\tau+1}) & = \sum_{s=0}^{\tau} A^{\tau-s} \left( (\hat{A} - A)\tilde{f}_s(\mathbf{y}_{0:s}) + (\mathcal{M}^\dagger \tilde{\phi}_s(\hat{h}_s, \mathbf{y}_{0:s+1}) - \mathbf{w}_s) \right) \\
& \quad + A^{\tau-1}(\hat{f}_{A,0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - Af_\star(\mathbf{y}_0)),
\end{aligned}$$

with  $\hat{f}_0 \equiv \tilde{f}_0 \equiv 0$ . As a result, we have, for  $\epsilon_0 := \|\hat{f}_{A,0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - Af_*(\mathbf{y}_0)\|$  and  $\epsilon_{\text{sys}}$  as in (E.7),

$$\|\tilde{f}_{\tau+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau+1}) - f_*(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\| \tag{F.35}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left\| \sum_{s=0}^{\tau} A^{\tau-s} (\hat{A} - A) \tilde{f}_s(\mathbf{y}_{0:s}) \right\| + \left\| \sum_{s=0}^{\tau} A^{\tau-s} (\mathcal{M}^\dagger \tilde{\phi}_s(\hat{h}_s, \mathbf{y}_{0:s+1}) - \mathbf{w}_s) \right\| + \alpha_A \gamma_A^{\tau-1} \epsilon_0, \\ &\leq \alpha_A \epsilon_{\text{sys}} \bar{b} (1 - \gamma_A)^{-1} + \alpha_A \gamma_A^{\tau-1} \epsilon_0 + \sum_{s=0}^{\tau} \|A^{\tau-s}\|_{\text{op}} \left\| (\mathcal{M}^\dagger \tilde{\phi}_s(\hat{h}_s, \mathbf{y}_{0:s+1}) - \mathbf{w}_s) \right\|, \\ &\leq \alpha_A \epsilon_{\text{sys}} \bar{b} (1 - \gamma_A)^{-1} + \alpha_A \gamma_A^{\tau-1} \epsilon_0 + \alpha_A \sum_{s=0}^{\tau} \gamma_A^{\tau-s} \left\| (\mathcal{M}^\dagger \tilde{\phi}_s(\hat{h}_s, \mathbf{y}_{0:s+1}) - \mathbf{w}_s) \right\|, \\ &\leq \alpha_A \epsilon_{\text{sys}} \bar{b} (1 - \gamma_A)^{-1} + \alpha_A \gamma_A^{\tau-1} \epsilon_0 + \alpha_A \|\mathcal{M}^\dagger\|_{\text{op}} \sum_{s=0}^{\tau} \gamma_A^{\tau-s} \left\| \tilde{\phi}_s(\hat{h}_s, \mathbf{y}_{0:s+1}) - \mathcal{M} \mathbf{w}_s \right\|, \\ &\leq \alpha_A \epsilon_{\text{sys}} \bar{b} (1 - \gamma_A)^{-1} + \alpha_A \gamma_A^{\tau-1} \epsilon_0 + \alpha_A \|\mathcal{M}^\dagger\|_{\text{op}} \sqrt{\sum_{s=0}^{\tau} \gamma_A^{2(\tau-s)} \sum_{s=0}^{\tau} \left\| \tilde{\phi}_s(\hat{h}_s, \mathbf{y}_{0:s+1}) - \mathcal{M} \mathbf{w}_s \right\|^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{F.36}$$

Taking the square on both sides of (F.36), then applying the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}}$ , we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \|\tilde{f}_{\tau+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau+1}) - f_*(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\|^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_{0:t}\} \right] \tag{F.37}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq 3\alpha_A^2 \epsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2 (1 - \gamma_A)^{-2} + 3\alpha_A^2 \epsilon_{\text{init}}^2 + 3\alpha_A^2 (1 - \gamma_A^2)^{-1} \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{M})^{-2} \sum_{s=0}^t \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \|\tilde{\phi}_s(\hat{h}_s, \mathbf{y}_{0:s+1}) - \mathcal{M} \mathbf{w}_s\|^2 \right], \\ &\leq 3\alpha_A^2 \epsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2 (1 - \gamma_A)^{-2} + 3\alpha_A^2 \epsilon_{\text{init}}^2 + 3\alpha_A^2 (1 - \gamma_A^2)^{-1} \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{M})^{-2} \epsilon_{\text{noise}}^2 t, \end{aligned} \tag{F.38}$$

where the last inequality follows by the fact that under the event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{noise}}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \|\tilde{\phi}_s(\hat{h}_s, \mathbf{y}_{0:s+1}) - \mathcal{M} \mathbf{w}_s\|^2 \right] \leq \epsilon_{\text{noise}}^2, \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq s \leq t.$$

Finally, we simplify Eq. (F.38) to

$$3\alpha_A^2 (1 - \gamma_A)^{-2} (\epsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \bar{b}^2 + \epsilon_{\text{init}}^2 + \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{M})^{-2} \epsilon_{\text{noise}}^2 t).$$

□

## F.6 Proof of Theorem E.2

**Proof of Theorem E.2.** Define  $\mathcal{E}_{0:t}'' := \mathcal{E}_{0:t} \wedge \mathcal{E}'_{0:t}$  and let  $p_t := \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{0:t}'']$ . We will recursively prove a lower bound on  $p_{t+1}$  in terms of  $p_t$ . From Lemma E.3 and Markov's inequality, for all  $\tau \in [t+1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{\tau \in [t+1]} \|\tilde{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\| \geq \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t} \sqrt{\eta} \mid \mathcal{E}_{0:t}'' \right] \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{\tau \in [t+1]} \|\tilde{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\|^2 \geq \eta \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t}^2 \mid \mathcal{E}_{0:t}'' \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\eta \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t}^2} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{\tau \in [t+1]} \|\tilde{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{E}_{0:t}'' \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\eta p_t \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t}^2} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{\tau \in [t+1]} \|\tilde{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\|^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_{0:t}''\} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\eta p_t \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t}^2} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{\tau \in [t+1]} \|\tilde{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\|^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_{0:t}\} \right], \\
&\leq p_t^{-1} \eta^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{F.39}$$

On the other hand, we also have that under the event  $\mathcal{E}_{0:t}$ , since no clipping occurs, the dynamics satisfy

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = (A + B\hat{K})\mathbf{x}_t + B\mathbf{v}_t + \boldsymbol{\delta}_t + \mathbf{w}_t, \quad \text{where } \boldsymbol{\delta}_t := \hat{B}\hat{K}\tilde{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - B\hat{K}f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t).$$

Thus, by induction we obtain,

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = (A + B\hat{K})^t \mathbf{x}_0 + \sum_{\tau=0}^t (A + B\hat{K})^{t-\tau} (B\mathbf{v}_\tau + \boldsymbol{\delta}_\tau + \mathbf{w}_\tau),$$

By Jensen's inequality, we have for  $\bar{\gamma}_\infty$  as in (E.8),

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}\| &= \alpha_\infty \bar{\gamma}_\infty^t \|\mathbf{x}_0\| + \alpha_\infty \sum_{\tau=0}^t \bar{\gamma}_\infty^{t-\tau} \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_\tau\|_2 + \left\| \sum_{\tau=0}^t (A + B\hat{K})^{t-\tau} (B\mathbf{v}_\tau + \mathbf{w}_\tau) \right\|, \\
&= \alpha_\infty \bar{\gamma}_\infty^t \|\mathbf{x}_0\| + \alpha_\infty \sum_{\tau=0}^t \bar{\gamma}_\infty^{t-\tau} \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_\tau\|_2 + \|\mathbf{z}_t\|,
\end{aligned} \tag{F.41}$$

where  $\mathbf{z}_t := \sum_{\tau=0}^t (A + B\hat{K})^{t-\tau} (B\mathbf{v}_\tau + \mathbf{w}_\tau)$ . In this case, we have  $\mathbf{z}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_z)$ , where

$$\Sigma_z := \sum_{\tau=0}^t (A + B\hat{K})^{t-\tau} (\sigma^2 B B^\top + \Sigma_w) ((A + B\hat{K})^{t-\tau})^\top \preceq \Sigma_{z,\infty}, \tag{F.42}$$

with  $\Sigma_{z,\infty}$  is as in (E.22). Under the event  $\mathcal{E}'_{0:t}$ , (and since  $\bar{\gamma}_\infty < 1$ ) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
b_\eta &:= \sqrt{2(d_{\mathbf{u}} \|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} \alpha_\infty^2 + d_{\mathbf{x}} \|\Sigma_{z,\infty}\|_{\text{op}}) \ln(2\eta)} \geq \sqrt{2\hat{\alpha}_\infty^2 \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + 2\|\mathbf{z}_t\|^2}, \\
&\geq \alpha_\infty \bar{\gamma}_\infty^t \|\mathbf{x}_0\| + \|\mathbf{z}_t\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{F.43}$$

On the other hand, by Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_\infty \sum_{\tau=0}^t \bar{\gamma}_\infty^{t-\tau} \|\delta_\tau\| &\leq \frac{\alpha_\infty}{1 - \bar{\gamma}_\infty} \max_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \|\delta_\tau\|, \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha_\infty}{1 - \bar{\gamma}_\infty} \left( \varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \bar{b} + \max_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \|B\widehat{K}(\tilde{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_\tau))\| \right), \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha_\infty}{1 - \bar{\gamma}_\infty} \left( \varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \bar{b} + 2\Psi_\star \max_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \|\tilde{f}_\tau(\mathbf{y}_{0:\tau}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_\tau)\| \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that under  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$ ,  $\|B\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|A\|_{\text{op}} + \|A + B\widehat{K}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Psi_\star + \alpha_\infty \bar{\gamma}_\infty \leq 2\Psi_\star$ . From (F.40), it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \alpha_\infty \sum_{\tau=0}^t \bar{\gamma}_\infty^{t-\tau} \|\delta_\tau\| \geq \frac{\alpha_\infty (\varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \bar{b} + 2\Psi_\star \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t} \sqrt{\eta})}{1 - \bar{\gamma}_\infty} \mid \mathcal{E}_{0:t}'' \right] \leq p_t^{-1} \eta^{-1}. \quad (\text{F.44})$$

Thus, by (F.41), (F.40), (F.43), and (F.44), we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E} \mid \mathcal{E}_{0:t}''] \leq \eta^{-1} p_t^{-1},$$

where

$$\mathcal{E} := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}\| \geq (1 - \bar{\gamma}_\infty)^{-1} \alpha_\infty (\varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \bar{b} + 2\Psi_\star \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t} \sqrt{\eta}) + b_\eta, \\ \text{or } \|\tilde{f}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:t+1})\| \geq \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}\| + \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t} \sqrt{\eta} \end{array} \right\}.$$

This implies that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \|\tilde{f}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{t+1})\| \geq \frac{\alpha_\infty \varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \bar{b} + (2\Psi_\star \alpha_\infty + 1 - \bar{\gamma}_\infty) \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t} \sqrt{\eta}}{1 - \bar{\gamma}_\infty} + b_\eta \mid \mathcal{E}_{0:t}'' \right] \leq \eta^{-1} p_t^{-1}. \quad (\text{F.45})$$

which we simplify to

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \|\tilde{f}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{t+1})\| \geq \frac{\alpha_\infty \varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \bar{b} + 3\Psi_\star \alpha_\infty \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t} \sqrt{\eta}}{1 - \bar{\gamma}_\infty} + b_\eta \mid \mathcal{E}_{0:t}'' \right] \leq \eta^{-1} p_t^{-1}. \quad (\text{F.46})$$

On the other hand, by Lemma F.11, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \alpha_\infty^2 \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + \|\mathbf{z}_{t+1}\|^2 \geq b_\eta 2^{-1/2} \right] \leq \eta^{-1}. \quad (\text{F.47})$$

Thus, for

$$\bar{b} \geq (1 - \bar{\gamma}_\infty)^{-1} (\alpha_\infty \varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \bar{b} + 3\Psi_\star \alpha_\infty \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t} \sqrt{\eta}) + b_\eta, \quad (\text{F.48})$$

we have with (F.47), (F.46), and a union bound,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \left\{ \|\tilde{f}_{t+1}(\mathbf{y}_{t+1})\| \geq \bar{b} \right\} \vee \left\{ \alpha_\infty^2 \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + \|\mathbf{z}_{t+1}\|^2 \geq b_\eta 2^{-1/2} \right\} \mid \mathcal{E}_{0:t}'' \right] \leq 2\eta^{-1} p_t^{-1}.$$

This implies that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{t+1} \wedge \mathcal{E}'_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{E}_{0:t}''] \geq 1 - 2\eta^{-1} p_t^{-1}. \quad (\text{F.49})$$

Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{0:t+1}''] = p_t \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{t+1} \wedge \mathcal{E}'_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{E}_{0:t}''] \geq p_t - 2\eta^{-1} = \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{0:t}''] - 2\eta^{-1}.$$

Now by induction on  $t$  we get, for all  $\tau \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{0:\tau}'' ] \geq \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{0:1} \wedge \mathcal{E}_{0:1'}] - 2\tau/\eta. \quad (\text{F.50})$$

For the base case, by (F.47) and a union bound, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\neg \mathcal{E}'_{0:1}] \leq 2\eta^{-1}, \quad (\text{F.51})$$

and therefore, by (F.50), we get

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{0:\tau}'' ] \geq \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{0:1}] - 2(\tau + 1)/\eta.$$

Finally, as  $\tilde{f}_0 \equiv 0$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{0:1}] = \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_1]$ , which completes the proof. To get the stated value for  $\bar{b}_\infty$ , we rearrange Eq. (F.48) and recall that  $\bar{\gamma}_\infty = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma_\infty)$ .  $\square$

### F.7 Proof of Theorem E.3

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{E}_{0:T}'' := \mathcal{E}_{0:T} \wedge \mathcal{E}'_{0:T}$ . By Lemma E.3, under the events  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{noise}}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_{0:T}\} \right] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{dec},T}^2. \quad (\text{F.52})$$

It follows that for all  $0 \leq t \leq T$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_{0:T}''\} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\neg \mathcal{E}_{0:T}''\} \right], \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{E}_{0:T}\} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ (2\bar{b} + 2 \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\neg \mathcal{E}_{0:T}''\} \right], \\ &\leq \varepsilon_{\text{dec},T}^2 + 2(1 - \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{0:T}'']) \left( \bar{b} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^4 \right]} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.53})$$

where the last inequality follows by Cauchy Schwarz and Eq. (F.52). Now by Lemma F.1, we have that the random variable  $\|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2$  is  $c_{\mathbf{x}}$ -concentrated for all  $0 \leq t \leq T$  with

$$c_{\mathbf{x}} := 30d_{\mathbf{x}}\Psi_\Sigma + 2\bar{b}^2 \cdot \text{dev}_x.$$

Therefore, by Lemma B.1, we have  $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\|\mathbf{x}_t\|^4] \leq 4c_{\mathbf{x}}^2$ . Using this, we get that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^4 \right] \leq (T + 1) \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\|\mathbf{x}_t\|^4] \leq 8Tc_{\mathbf{x}}^2.$$

Combining this with (F.53), and Theorem E.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_\star(\mathbf{y}_t)\|^2 \right] &\leq \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t}^2 + (4T^{1/2}c_{\mathbf{x}} + 2\bar{b}^2)(1 - \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathcal{E}_{0:T}'']) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_{\text{dec},t}^2 + (4T^{1/2}c_{\mathbf{x}} + 2\bar{b}^2) \left( \frac{2(T+1)}{\eta} + 1 - \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[\{\tilde{f}_0(\mathbf{y}_0) = \hat{f}_0(\mathbf{y}_0)\} \wedge \mathcal{E}'_0] \right). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

## F.8 Proof of Lemma E.4

For the proof of Lemma E.4, we introduce the following functions and random vectors:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(\mathbf{y}_1) &:= L_{\text{op}}^2(1 \vee \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2), \\ \mathbf{u} &:= \mathbf{w}_0, \\ \mathbf{e} &:= \mathbf{w}_0 - (\hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}) - \widehat{A}\hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0^{(i)}) - \widehat{B}\mathbf{v}_0).\end{aligned}$$

Let us abbreviate  $n \equiv n_{\text{init}}$ . Recall that we are analyzing the regression

$$\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1} \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| h(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}) - \left( \hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}) - \widehat{A}\hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0^{(i)}) - \widehat{B}\mathbf{v}_0^{(i)} \right) \right\|^2,$$

where  $\{(\mathbf{y}_\tau^{(i)}, \mathbf{x}_\tau^{(i)}, \mathbf{v}_\tau^{(i)})\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  are fresh i.i.d. trajectories generated by the policy  $\pi_{\text{ol}}$ .

**Proof of Lemma E.4.** Our strategy will be to invoke Corollary B.1 with  $\varphi, \mathbf{u}$ , and  $\mathbf{e}$  as above. We start by verifying the technical conditions of the corollary.

1. We directly verify from the structure of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  we may take  $b = \Psi_\star^3$  and  $L$  as in Assumption 5. Hence,  $bL = L_{\text{op}}$ , and thus  $\varphi(\mathbf{y}_1)$  satisfies the requisite conditions of the  $\varphi$  function. In addition, we may take  $d_{\mathbf{u}}, d_{\mathbf{x}} \leftarrow d_{\mathbf{x}}$ .
2. **Concentration Property.** Next, we bound the concentration parameter  $c$ . Recall that all  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  have  $\|h(\mathbf{y}_t)\| \leq L_{\text{op}} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{x}_t\|\}$ . Hence, under the event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$ , we have by Jensen's inequality, Cauchy-Schwarz, and the fact that  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},0} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(\mathbf{y}_1) \vee \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 &\leq \varphi(\mathbf{y}_1) + 5L_{\text{op}}^2(1 + \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2) + 5L_{\text{op}}^2(\|A\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2)(1 + \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2) \\ &\quad + 5(\|B\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2)\|\mathbf{v}_0\|^2, \\ &\leq 6L_{\text{op}}^2(1 + \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2) + 5L_{\text{op}}^2(\|A\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2)(1 + \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2) \\ &\quad + 5(\|B\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2)\|\mathbf{v}_0\|^2, \\ &= 6L_{\text{op}}^2 + 5L_{\text{op}}^2(\|A\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2) + 5(\|B\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2)\|\mathbf{v}_0\|^2 \\ &\quad + 6L_{\text{op}}^2\|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2 + 5L_{\text{op}}^2(\|A\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2)\|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2.\end{aligned}\tag{F.54}$$

Let us simplify the above. Assume  $\varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 \leq \Psi_\star^2$  (where  $\Psi_\star \geq \max\{1, \|A\|_{\text{op}}, \|B\|_{\text{op}}\}$ ). This lets us simplify the above by

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(\mathbf{y}_1) \vee \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 &\leq L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_\star^2 (6 + 10 + 10\|\mathbf{v}_0\|^2 + 6\|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2 + 10\|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2) \\ &\leq 16L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_\star^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{v}_0\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2).\end{aligned}\tag{F.55}$$

Since  $\mathbf{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_{d_{\mathbf{u}}})$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 BB^\top + A\Sigma_0 A^\top + \Sigma_w)$ , we have by Lemma F.11 and the fact that  $\ln 3 + 1 \leq 3$ , the following holds: For all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}} [\varphi(\mathbf{y}_1) \vee \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 \geq c_1 \ln \delta^{-1}] \leq \delta,\tag{F.56}$$

where

$$c_1 := 48L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_\star^2 (1 + 5d_{\mathbf{u}}\sigma^2 + 5d_{\mathbf{x}}(\|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}} + \|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}})),\tag{F.57}$$

$$\Sigma_1 := \sigma^2 BB^\top + A\Sigma_0 A^\top + \Sigma_w.\tag{F.58}$$

3. **Bounding the error  $\mathbf{e}$ .** On the other hand, by Jensen's inequality and Cauchy-Schwarz, we can bound the error  $\mathbf{e}$  by

$$\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 \leq 2\|\mathbf{w}_0 - \hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}) - A\hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0^{(i)}) - B\mathbf{v}_0\|^2 + 4\varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + \|\mathbf{v}_0\|^2).$$

Therefore, by [Lemma F.9](#) and [\(E.24\)](#), we have with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  over the trajectories used to form  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},0}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}}[\|\mathbf{e}\|^2] \leq 2\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{M})^{-2}\varepsilon_{\text{noise}}^2(\delta) + 4\varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + d_{\mathbf{x}}\|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + \sigma^2 d_{\mathbf{u}}). \quad (\text{F.59})$$

4. **Realizability.** We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}}[\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{y}_1] &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}}[\mathbf{w}_0 \mid \mathbf{x}_1], \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}}[\mathbf{w}_0 \mid A\mathbf{x}_0 + B\mathbf{v}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0], \\ &= \Sigma_w(\Sigma_w + \sigma^2 BB^\top + A\Sigma_0 A^\top)^{-1}\mathbf{x}_1 =: h_\star(\mathbf{y}_1), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.60})$$

where the last inequality follows by [Fact D.2](#). Therefore, by the definition of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  in [\(E.1\)](#) and the fact that  $\|\Sigma_w(\Sigma_w + \sigma^2 BB^\top + A\Sigma_0 A^\top)^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1 \leq \Psi_\star^3$ , we are guaranteed the existence of  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  such that  $h(\mathbf{x}_1) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{y}_1]$ .

Applying [Corollary B.1](#) with  $c \leftarrow c_1$ ,  $d_{\mathbf{u}}, d_{\mathbf{x}} \leftarrow d_{\mathbf{x}}$ , and the above bound on  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}}[\|\mathbf{e}\|^2]$ , we obtain for  $n \leftarrow n_{\text{init}}$  that with probability  $1 - \frac{3\delta}{2} - \delta = 1 - 5\delta/2$  (the second  $\delta$  factor comes from the event used to bound  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}}[\|\mathbf{e}\|^2]$ ),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 &\lesssim \\ &\frac{c_1(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln|\mathcal{F}|)\ln^2 \frac{n_{\text{init}}}{\delta}}{n_{\text{init}}} + \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{M})^{-2}\varepsilon_{\text{noise}}^2(\delta) + \varepsilon_{\text{sys}}^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + d_{\mathbf{x}}\|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + \sigma^2 d_{\mathbf{u}}), \end{aligned}$$

as needed. Moreover, because the above bound suppresses constants, we can replace  $c_1$  in [Eq. \(F.57\)](#) by  $c_1 \leftarrow L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_\star^2 (1 + d_{\mathbf{u}}\sigma^2 + d_{\mathbf{x}}(\|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}} + \|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}}))$ . Substituting in the definition of  $h_\star$  concludes the proof.  $\square$

## F.9 Proof of [Lemma E.5](#)

**Proof.** Since  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$ , we have  $\|\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1)\| \leq L_{\text{op}}(1 \vee \|\mathbf{x}_1\|)$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_1)$  and  $\Sigma_1 := \sigma^2 BB^\top + A\Sigma_0 A^\top + \Sigma_w$ . Therefore, by [Lemma F.11](#), we have, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}}\left[\|\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}\|^2 \geq L_{\text{op}}^2(1 + (3d_{\mathbf{x}} + 2)\|\sigma^2 BB^\top + A\Sigma_0 A^\top + \Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}})\ln \delta^{-1}\right] \leq \delta. \quad (\text{F.61})$$

Combining this with the fact that  $\|\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1)\| \leq L_{\text{op}}(1 \vee \|\mathbf{x}_1\|)$  implies that  $\varphi(\mathbf{y}_1) := L_{\text{op}}^2(1 \vee \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2)$  is  $c$ -concentrated with  $c = L_{\text{op}}^2(1 + (3d_{\mathbf{x}} + 2)\|\sigma^2 BB^\top + A\Sigma_0 A^\top + \Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}})$ . Thus, applying [Proposition B.2](#) with

$$(\varphi(\mathbf{y}_1), \hat{h}(\mathbf{y}_1), h_\star(\mathbf{y}_1)) = (L_{\text{op}}^2(1 \vee \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2), \hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1), \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} \mathbf{x}_1)$$

and invoking [Lemma E.4](#), we get for all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ , with probability at least  $1 - (3\kappa + 4)\delta$ ,

$$\|\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}} - \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon'_{\text{cov}}, \quad (\text{F.62})$$

for  $\varepsilon'_{\text{cov}}$  as in the lemma statement. By the triangle inequality, whenever the condition (E.30) that  $\varepsilon'_{\text{cov}} < \sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_{\text{cov}})/2 \leq \|\Sigma_{\text{cov}}\|_{\text{op}}$  holds, this implies that

$$\|\widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\|\Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{\min}(\widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}) \geq \sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_{\text{cov}})/2 \quad (\text{F.63})$$

which shows the second inequality in (E.31). Furthermore, whenever (F.62) holds, Lemma F.12 and the condition Eq. (E.30) imply that

$$\|\Sigma_w^{-1} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{2\|\Sigma_w^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \varepsilon'_{\text{cov}}}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_w)}. \quad (\text{F.64})$$

By the triangle inequality, this implies that under  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$ ,

$$\|\widehat{\Sigma}_w^{-1} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sys}} + \frac{2\|\Sigma_w^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \varepsilon'_{\text{cov}}}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_w)}.$$

This further implies that

$$\|I_{d_x} - \widehat{\Sigma}_w \widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\widehat{\Sigma}_w\|_{\text{op}} \left( \varepsilon_{\text{sys}} + \frac{2\|\Sigma_w^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \varepsilon'_{\text{cov}}}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_w)} \right). \quad (\text{F.65})$$

Since  $\varepsilon_{\text{sys}} \leq 1$  by the definition of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$ , we have that  $\|\widehat{\Sigma}_w\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\Psi_*$ , leading to the result. This establishes the main inequality in (E.31).  $\square$

## F.10 Proof of Theorem E.4

For the proof of Theorem E.4, we introduce the following functions and random vectors:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\mathbf{y}_0) &:= L_{\text{op}}^2 (1 \vee \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2) \\ \mathbf{v} &:= \Sigma_w (\Sigma_w + \sigma^2 B B^\top + A \Sigma_0 A^\top)^{-1} (A \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{v}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0) \\ \mathbf{e} &:= \mathbf{v} - \hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that we are analyzing the following regression problem, where for  $n \equiv n_{\text{init}}$ :

$$\tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0} \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} \left\| h(\mathbf{y}_0^{(i)}) - \hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1^{(i)}) \right\|^2.$$

**Proof of Theorem E.4.** Our strategy will be to invoke Corollary B.1 with  $\varphi$ ,  $\mathbf{v}$ , and  $\mathbf{e}$  as above. We verify the technical conditions of the corollary.

1. We directly verify from the structure of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  we may take  $b = \Psi_*^3$  and  $L$  as in Assumption 5. Hence,  $bL = L_{\text{op}}$ , and thus  $\varphi(\mathbf{y}_1)$  satisfies the requisite conditions of the  $\varphi$  function.
2. **Concentration property.** Now, under event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$ , by Jensen's inequality, Cauchy-Schwarz, and the fact that  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  (and hence satisfies  $\|\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}(\mathbf{y}_1)\| \leq L_{\text{op}} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{x}_1\|\}$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\mathbf{y}_0) \vee \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}\|^2 &\leq \varphi(\mathbf{y}_0) \vee (L_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2)), \\ &\leq L_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbf{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$  and  $\mathbf{x}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_1)$ , where  $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_w + \sigma^2 BB^\top + A\Sigma_0 A^\top$ , we have by [Lemma F.11](#) that for all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}} [\varphi(\mathbf{y}_0) \vee \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}\|^2 \geq c'_0 \ln \delta^{-1}] \leq \delta, \quad \text{where } c'_0 := 2L_{\text{op}}^2(1 + 5d_{\mathbf{x}}(\|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + \|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}})). \quad (\text{F.66})$$

Moreover, since  $\sigma \leq 1$  under [Assumption 10](#), we have  $\|\Sigma_1\| \leq 3\Psi_\star^3$ , so that

$$c'_0 \leq 32L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_\star^3 d_{\mathbf{x}} =: c_0,$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}} [\varphi(\mathbf{y}_0) \vee \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}\|^2 \geq c_0 \ln \delta^{-1}] \leq \delta. \quad (\text{F.67})$$

3. **Bounding the error  $\mathbf{e}$ .** By [Lemma E.4](#), we have with probability at least  $1 - 5\delta/2$  over  $\hat{h}_{\text{ol},1}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}} [\|\mathbf{e}\|^2] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{ol},1}^2. \quad (\text{F.68})$$

4. **Realizability.** We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}}[\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{y}_0] &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}}[\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{x}_0], \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}}[\Sigma_w(\Sigma_w + \sigma^2 BB^\top + A\Sigma_0 A^\top)^{-1}(A\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{v}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0) \mid \mathbf{x}_0], \\ &= \Sigma_w(\Sigma_w + \sigma^2 BB^\top + A\Sigma_0 A^\top)^{-1}A\mathbf{x}_0, \\ &= \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} A\mathbf{x}_0 := h_\star(\mathbf{x}_0). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.69})$$

Therefore, by the definition of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  in [\(E.1\)](#) and the fact that  $\|\Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} A\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Psi_\star^3$ , we are guaranteed the existence of  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  such that  $h(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{y}_0]$ .

Applying [Corollary B.1](#) with  $c \leftarrow c_0$ ,  $d_{\mathbf{u}}, d_{\mathbf{x}} \leftarrow d_{\mathbf{x}}$ , and the above bound on  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}}[\|\mathbf{e}\|^2]$ , we obtain for  $n \leftarrow n_{\text{init}}$  that with probability  $1 - \frac{3\delta}{2} - \frac{5\delta}{2} = 1 - 4\delta$  (the second term comes from the event used to bound  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}}[\|\mathbf{e}\|^2]$ ),

$$\mathbb{E}\|\tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - h_\star(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \lesssim \frac{c_0(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln |\mathcal{F}|) \ln(\frac{n_{\text{init}}}{\delta})^2}{n_{\text{init}}} + \varepsilon_{\text{ol},1}^2$$

as needed. In particular, recalling that  $h_\star(\mathbf{y}_0) = \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} A\mathbf{x}_0$  in the above realizability discussion, we find that for an appropriate upper bound  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\text{ol},1}^2$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} A\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\text{ol},1}^2 \lesssim \frac{c_0(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln |\mathcal{F}|) \ln(\frac{n_{\text{init}}}{\delta})^2}{n_{\text{init}}} + \varepsilon_{\text{ol},1}^2$$

This further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}} \left[ \|\hat{\Sigma}_w \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - A\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 \right] &\leq 2\|\hat{\Sigma}_w^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \|\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\text{ol},1}^2 \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}} \left[ \|(I_{d_{\mathbf{x}}} - \hat{\Sigma}_w \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1}) A\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 \right], \\ &\leq 2\|\hat{\Sigma}_w^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \|\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\text{ol},1}^2 \\ &\quad + 2d_{\mathbf{x}} \|(I_{d_{\mathbf{x}}} - \hat{\Sigma}_w \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1}) A\|_{\text{op}}^2 \|\Sigma_0\|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.70})$$

where the last inequality follows by [Lemma F.9](#) since  $\mathbf{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$ . Thus, under the event  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$ , we have by [Lemma E.5](#) and a union bound, with probability at least  $1 - (3\kappa + 9)\delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ol}}} \left[ \left\| \widehat{\Sigma}_w \widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0) - A \mathbf{x}_0 \right\|^2 \right] &\lesssim \|\Sigma_w^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \|\Sigma_{\text{cov}}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \left( \frac{c_0(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln |\mathcal{F}|) \ln \left(\frac{n_{\text{init}}}{\delta}\right)^2}{n_{\text{init}}} + \varepsilon_{\text{ol},1}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + d_{\mathbf{x}} \varepsilon_{\text{cov}}^2 \|A\|_{\text{op}}^2 \|\Sigma_0\|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.71})$$

where we recall that  $\Sigma_{\text{cov}} = \Sigma_w \Sigma_1^{-1} \Sigma_w$  by definition. The desired bound [\(E.34\)](#) follows by the fact  $\pi_{\text{ol}}$  and  $\widehat{\pi}$  match at round zero.

We now prove that [Eq. \(E.36\)](#) holds. By definition of  $\tilde{f}_1$ , we have

$$\tilde{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_{0:1}) = \widehat{\Sigma}_w \widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1} \tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0}(\mathbf{y}_0) + \hat{h}_0(\mathbf{y}_1) - \widehat{A} \hat{h}_0(\mathbf{y}_0), \quad (\text{F.72})$$

and so since  $\tilde{h}_{\text{ol},0}$  and  $\hat{h}_0$  are in  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$ , we have by Jensen's inequality and Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_{0:1})\|^2 &\leq 4 \|\widehat{\Sigma}_w\|_{\text{op}}^2 \|\widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 L_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2) \\ &\quad + 4L_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2) + 4\|A\|_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2) + 4\|A - \widehat{A}\|_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.73})$$

Under  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{sys}}$  we have  $\|\widehat{\Sigma}_w\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\|\Sigma_w\|$  and  $\|\widehat{A} - A\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$ , and the event of [Lemma E.5](#) implies that  $\|\widehat{\Sigma}_{\text{cov}}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\|\Sigma_{\text{cov}}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}$ . Hence, using that  $L_{\text{op}} \geq 1$ , we can further upper bound by

$$\|\tilde{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_{0:1})\|^2 \leq L_{\text{op}}^2 (64\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}}^2 \|\Sigma_{\text{cov}}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 + 4\|A\|_{\text{op}}^2 + 4)(1 + \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2) + 4L_{\text{op}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2).$$

Next, we note that  $\|\Sigma_w\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Psi_{\star}$  and  $\|\Sigma_{\text{cov}}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 3\Psi_{\star}^5$ . Hence, we can further simplify this bound to

$$584L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_{\star}^{12} (2 + \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2).$$

Since  $\mathbf{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$  and  $\mathbf{x}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_1)$ , we have, by [Lemma F.11](#),

$$\mathbb{P}_{\widehat{\pi}} \left[ \|\tilde{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_{0:1})\|^2 \geq 584L_{\text{op}} \Psi_{\star}^{12} (2 + (3d_{\mathbf{x}} + 2)(\|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + \|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}})) \ln(2\eta) \right] \leq \eta^{-1},$$

so that in particular, we may take

$$\bar{b}_0^2 := 10^4 d_{\mathbf{x}} L_{\text{op}}^2 \Psi_{\star}^{12} (1 + \|\Sigma_0\|_{\text{op}} + \|\Sigma_1\|_{\text{op}}). \quad (\text{F.74})$$

This establishes [Eq. \(E.36\)](#).  $\square$

## F.11 Supporting Results

**Lemma F.9.** Let  $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ , where  $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  is a positive definite matrix. Then  $\mathbb{E}[\|z\|^2] \leq m\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}}$ .

**Proof.** Let  $z' := \Sigma^{-1/2} z$  and note that  $z' \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_m)$ , and so  $\|z'\|^2 \sim \chi^2(m)$ . As a result, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|z\|^2] = \mathbb{E}[\|\Sigma^{1/2} z'\|^2] \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}} \mathbb{E}[\|z'\|^2] = m\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}},$$

where  $(*)$  follows by Cauchy-Schwarz.  $\square$

**Lemma F.10.** Let  $a_0 > 0$  and  $(a_1, c_1, z_1), \dots, (a_s, c_s, z_s) \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$ , where  $(z_i)$  are (potentially dependent) non-negative random variables satisfying  $\mathbb{P}[z_i \geq c_i \ln \delta^{-1}] \leq \delta$ , for all  $i \in [s]$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &\geq \mathbb{P} \left[ a_0 + a_1 z_1 + \dots + a_s z_s \geq \left( a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^s a_i c_i \right) \ln(s/\delta) \right], \\ &\geq \mathbb{P} \left[ a_0 + a_1 z_1 + \dots + a_s z_s \geq (\ln s + 1) \left( a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^s a_i c_i \right) \ln \delta^{-1} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.75})$$

**Proof.** Let  $c(\delta) := (a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^s a_i c_i) \ln \delta^{-1}$ . Define  $z_0 = c_0 = 1$ . Since  $\delta \in (0, e^{-1}]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[a_0 + a_1 z_1 + \dots + a_s z_s \geq c(\delta)] &= \mathbb{P} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^s a_i (z_i - c_i \ln \delta^{-1}) \geq 0 \right], \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}[\exists i \in [s] : z_i - c_i \ln \delta^{-1} \geq 0], \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^s \mathbb{P}[z_i - c_i \ln \delta^{-1} \geq 0], \\ &\leq s\delta. \quad (\text{by assumption}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.76})$$

For any given  $\delta \leq 1/e$ , by applying this result with  $\delta' := \delta/s$ , we have for all  $\delta \in (0, 1/(se)]$ ,  $\delta' \leq 1/e$ , and so

$$c(\delta') = \left( a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^s a_i c_i \right) \ln(s/\delta) \leq (\ln s + 1) \left( a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^s a_i c_i \right) \ln(1/\delta).$$

This together with (F.76) implies (F.75).  $\square$

**Lemma F.11.** Let  $a_0 > 0$  and  $(a_1, c_1, \mathbf{z}_1), \dots, (a_s, c_s, \mathbf{z}_s)$  be such that  $(a_i, c_i) \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$  and  $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$  are random vectors satisfying  $\mathbf{z}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_i)$  for  $i \in [s]$ . Then, for all  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &\geq \mathbb{P} \left[ a_0 + a_1 \|\mathbf{z}_1\|^2 + \dots + a_s \|\mathbf{z}_s\|^2 \geq \left( a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^s a_i \|\Sigma_i\|_{\text{op}} \cdot (3d_i + 2) \right) \ln(s/\delta) \right], \\ &\geq \mathbb{P} \left[ a_0 + a_1 \|\mathbf{z}_1\|^2 + \dots + a_s \|\mathbf{z}_s\|^2 \geq (\ln s + 1) \left( a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^s a_i \|\Sigma_i\|_{\text{op}} \cdot (3d_i + 2) \right) \ln \delta^{-1} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.77})$$

**Proof.** For  $i \in [s]$ , let  $\mathbf{z}'_i := \Sigma_i^{-1/2} \mathbf{z}_i$ ; in this case,  $\mathbf{z}'_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{d_i})$ . Thus, by Lemma 1 of [Laurent and Massart \(2000\)](#), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &\geq \mathbb{P} \left[ \|\mathbf{z}'_i\|^2 \geq d_i + 2\sqrt{d_i \ln \delta^{-1}} + 2 \ln \delta^{-1} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{P} \left[ \|\mathbf{z}_i\|^2 \geq \|\Sigma_i\|_{\text{op}} \left( d_i + 2\sqrt{d_i \ln \delta^{-1}} + 2 \ln \delta^{-1} \right) \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{P} \left[ \|\mathbf{z}_i\|^2 \geq \|\Sigma_i\|_{\text{op}} \left( d_i + 2\sqrt{d_i \ln \delta^{-1}} + 2 \ln \delta^{-1} \right) \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{P} \left[ \|\mathbf{z}_i\|^2 \geq \|\Sigma_i\|_{\text{op}} \cdot (3d_i + 2) \ln \delta^{-1} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.78})$$

where the last inequality follows by the fact that  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ . By (F.78) and Lemma F.10, we get (F.77).  $\square$

**Lemma F.12.** Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and  $M, N \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  be given. Suppose  $N$  is non-singular and  $\|M - N\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon$ . Then if  $\varepsilon < \sigma_{\min}(N)/2$ ,  $M$  is non-singular and

$$\|I_m - M^{-1}N\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{2\varepsilon}{\sigma_{\min}(N)}. \quad (\text{F.79})$$

**Proof.** We first bound the minimum singular value of  $M$ . Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be a unit-norm vector such that  $\|Mx\| = \sigma_{\min}(M)$ . Then, from the fact that  $\|M - N\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon$ , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\geq \|Mx - Nx\|, \\ &\geq \|Nx\| - \|Mx\|, \quad (\text{by the triangle inequality}) \\ &= \sigma_{\min}(N) - \sigma_{\min}(M). \quad (\text{using that } \|x\| = 1) \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the last inequality implies that

$$\sigma_{\min}(M) \geq \sigma_{\min}(N) - \varepsilon. \quad (\text{F.80})$$

Thus, since  $\varepsilon < \sigma_{\min}(N)$ , the matrix  $M$  is invertible. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\geq \|M - N\|_{\text{op}}, \\ &\geq \sigma_{\min}(M) \cdot \|I_m - (M)^{-1}N\|_{\text{op}}, \\ &\geq (\sigma_{\min}(N) - \varepsilon) \|I_m - M^{-1}N\|_{\text{op}}. \quad (\text{by (F.80)}) \end{aligned}$$

The desired result follows by the fact that  $\varepsilon < \sigma_{\min}(N)/2$ .  $\square$

## G Main Theorem and Proof

We now state and prove the main guarantee for RichID-CE (Algorithm 1). To begin, we state the values for the algorithm's parameters  $n_{\text{id}}$  and  $n_{\text{op}}$ :

$$n_{\text{id}} = \Omega_{\star} \left( \lambda_{\mathcal{M}}^{-2} T^3 \kappa^5 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^{16} \ln^{15}(1/\delta) \cdot \frac{\ln|\mathcal{F}|}{\varepsilon^6} \right), \quad (\text{G.1})$$

$$n_{\text{op}} = \Omega_{\star} \left( \lambda_{\mathcal{M}}^{-2} T^3 \kappa^3 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^{12} \ln^{11}(1/\delta) \cdot \frac{\ln|\mathcal{F}|}{\varepsilon^6} \right). \quad (\text{G.2})$$

We also recall from Section 2.2 that for the burn-in time, we use the choice

$$\kappa_0 := \lceil (1 - \gamma_{\star})^{-1} \ln(84 \Psi_{\star}^5 \alpha_{\star}^4 d_{\mathbf{x}} (1 - \gamma_{\star})^{-2} \ln(10^3 \cdot n_{\text{id}})) \rceil.$$

Finally, we set  $r_{\text{id}} = \sqrt{\Psi_{\star}}$ , and set  $r_{\text{op}} = \Omega_{\star}(1)$  to be a sufficiently large problem-dependent constant. The values for  $\sigma^2$  and  $\bar{b}$  are given in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1a.** Let  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$  and  $\varepsilon = \check{\mathcal{O}}(1)$  be given. Suppose we set  $\bar{b}^2 = \Theta_{\star}((d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}}) \ln(1/\delta))$ ,  $\sigma^2 = \check{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^2/\bar{b}^2 \wedge \lambda_{\mathcal{M}})$ , and choose  $n_{\text{id}}$  and  $n_{\text{op}}$  as in (G.1) and (G.2). Then with probability at least  $1 - \mathcal{O}(\kappa T \cdot \delta)$ , Algorithm 1 produces a policy  $\hat{\pi}$  with

$$J_T(\hat{\pi}) - J_T(\pi_{\infty}) \leq \varepsilon, \quad (\text{G.3})$$

and does so while using at most

$$\mathcal{O}_{\star} \left( \lambda_{\mathcal{M}}^{-2} T^4 \kappa^5 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^{16} \ln^{15}(1/\delta) \cdot \frac{\ln|\mathcal{F}|}{\varepsilon^6} \right)$$

trajectories of length  $\mathcal{O}_{\star}(T)$ .

## G.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1a

**Proof of Theorem 1.1a.** We first restate [Theorem 2.2](#), which bounds the estimation error for the system parameter estimates produced by Phase II of [Algorithm 1](#).

**Theorem 2.2** (Guarantee for Phase II). *If  $n_{\text{id}} = \Omega_\star(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 d_{\mathbf{u}} \kappa (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \kappa) \max\{1, \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^{-4}\})$ , then with probability at least  $1 - 11\delta$  over Phases I and II,*

$$\|[\widehat{A}_{\text{id}}; \widehat{B}_{\text{id}}] - [A_{\text{id}}; B_{\text{id}}]\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|\widehat{Q}_{\text{id}} - Q_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|\widehat{\Sigma}_{w,\text{id}} - \Sigma_{w,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{id}}, \quad (16)$$

where  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq \mathcal{O}_\star\left(n_{\text{id}}^{-1/2} \ln^2(n_{\text{id}}/\delta) \sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}} d_{\mathbf{u}} \kappa (\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{u}} d_{\mathbf{x}} \kappa)}\right)$ .

Going forward we condition on the event in [Theorem 2.2](#), and define  $f_{\star,\text{id}} := S_{\text{id}} f_{\star,\text{id}}$  and  $K_{\infty,\text{id}} := K_\infty S_{\text{id}}^{-1}$ . We recall that whenever this event holds, we have

$$\|S_{\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} \vee \|S_{\text{id}}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \Psi_\star^{1/2} \vee (1 - \gamma_\star)^{-1} (4\Psi_\star^2 \alpha_\star^2) \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathcal{C}_\kappa) = \mathcal{O}_\star(1),$$

as per [Theorem 2.1](#). As a consequence, we have the following fact, which we will use heavily going forward: If we define  $(\Psi'_\star, \alpha'_\star, \gamma'_\star, \kappa'_\star, L')$  to be the analogues of  $(\Psi_\star, \alpha_\star, \gamma_\star, \kappa_\star, L)$  for  $(A_{\text{id}}, B_{\text{id}}, Q_{\text{id}}, R, \Sigma_{w,\text{id}}, f_{\star,\text{id}})$ , we have  $\Psi'_\star = \mathcal{O}_\star(\Psi_\star)$  and  $L' = \mathcal{O}_\star(L)$ , and we may take  $\alpha'_\star = \mathcal{O}_\star(\alpha_\star)$ ,  $\gamma'_\star \leq \gamma_\star$ , and  $\kappa'_\star \leq \kappa_\star$ .

We first apply [Lemma E.1](#), which implies that once  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} = \check{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ , we have

$$\|\widehat{K} - K_{\infty,\text{id}}\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_\star(\varepsilon_{\text{id}}). \quad (\text{G.4})$$

Next, we invoke [Theorem 2.3](#), associating  $A \leftarrow A_{\text{id}}$ ,  $B \leftarrow B_{\text{id}}$ ,  $Q \leftarrow Q_{\text{id}}$ ,  $\Sigma_w \leftarrow \Sigma_{w,\text{id}}$ ,  $f_\star \leftarrow f_{\star,\text{id}}$ , and inflating the problem-dependent parameters by  $\mathcal{O}_\star(1)$  accordingly. In particular, suppose that  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}}^2 \leq \check{\mathcal{O}}((\ln |\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}}^2) n_{\text{op}}^{-1})$  for a problem-dependent constant  $c'_{\text{id}} = \check{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ , and suppose we set  $\bar{b}^2 = \Theta_\star((d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}}) \ln(n_{\text{op}}))$  and  $\sigma^2 = \check{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda'_{\mathcal{M}}) = \check{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda_{\mathcal{M}})$ . Then conditioned on the event of [Theorem 2.2](#), we are guaranteed that for any  $\delta \in (0, 1/e]$ , with probability at least  $1 - \mathcal{O}(\kappa T \delta)$ ,

$$\varepsilon_{\text{op}}^2 := \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\pi}} \left[ \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{y}_{0:t}) - f_{\star,\text{id}}(\mathbf{y}_t)\|_2^2 \right] \leq \mathcal{O}_\star \left( \frac{\lambda'_{\mathcal{M}}{}^{-2}}{\sigma^4} \cdot T^3 \kappa^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^4 \cdot \frac{(d_{\mathbf{x}}^2 + \ln |\mathcal{F}|) \ln^5(n_{\text{op}}/\delta)}{n_{\text{op}}} \right).$$

where  $\lambda'_{\mathcal{M}}$  is the analogue of  $\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}$  for the parameters  $(A_{\text{id}}, B_{\text{id}}, \Sigma_{w,\text{id}})$ ; note that to apply the theorem, we must set the radius of the class  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{op}}$  based on  $\Psi'_\star$  rather than  $\Psi_\star$ , which leads to the value for this parameter passed into [Algorithm 4](#) when it is invoked within [Algorithm 1](#). Likewise, we must inflate  $\bar{b}$  by  $\Omega_\star(1)$ . Lastly, we note that  $\lambda'_{\mathcal{M}} \geq \Omega_\star(\lambda_{\mathcal{M}})$ ; which can be quickly verified.

Taking a union bound and simplifying the upper bounds slightly, we are guaranteed that with probability at least  $1 - \mathcal{O}_\star(\kappa T \delta)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\text{id}}^2 &\leq \kappa^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^4 \ln^4(n_{\text{id}}/\delta) \frac{\ln |\mathcal{F}|}{n_{\text{id}}} \\ \varepsilon_{\text{op}}^2 &\leq \mathcal{O}_\star \left( \frac{\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}^{-2}}{\sigma^4} T^3 \kappa^3 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^6 \ln^5(n_{\text{op}}/\delta) \cdot \frac{\ln |\mathcal{F}|}{n_{\text{op}}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

so long as the conditions on  $n_{\text{id}}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}}$ ,  $\bar{b}$ , and  $\sigma^2$  described so far hold. We next invoke [Theorem C.2](#) with  $\tau = T$  (again, we use that changing the basis by  $S_{\text{id}}$  inflates problem-dependent constants by  $\mathcal{O}_\star(1)$ ),<sup>13</sup> which implies that

$$J_T(\widehat{\pi}) - J_T(\pi_\infty) \leq \mathcal{O}_\star(\bar{b} \cdot c_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (c_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{id}} + \varepsilon_{\text{op}} + \sigma)),$$

<sup>13</sup>It is possible to get better dependence on  $T$  by choosing different values for  $\tau$  based on  $\varepsilon$ , but for the sake of simplicity we do not pursue this here.

where  $c_{\mathbf{x}}^2 = \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2$ , so long as  $\sigma^2 = \mathcal{O}_*(1)$ . From [Lemma F.1](#), we have  $c_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_*(\bar{b}^2 + d_{\mathbf{x}}) = \mathcal{O}_*(\bar{b}^2)$ , so we may further simplify to

$$J_T(\hat{\pi}) - J_T(\pi_{\infty}) \leq \mathcal{O}_*(\bar{b}^2 \cdot (\bar{b} \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{id}} + \varepsilon_{\text{op}} + \sigma)).$$

Hence, to ensure the regret is at most  $\mathcal{O}_*(\varepsilon)$ , as a first step we choose  $\sigma = \check{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon/\bar{b}^2)$ . This leads to

$$\varepsilon_{\text{op}}^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_* \left( \lambda_{\mathcal{M}}^{-2} T^3 \kappa^3 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^{10} \ln^9(1/\delta) \cdot \frac{\ln|\mathcal{F}|}{n_{\text{op}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} \right).$$

We next choose  $\varepsilon_{\text{op}}^2 = \check{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^2/\bar{b}^4)$  which, per the inequality above, entails setting

$$n_{\text{op}} = \Omega_* \left( \lambda_{\mathcal{M}}^{-2} \kappa^3 T^3 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^{12} \ln^{11}(1/\delta) \cdot \frac{\ln|\mathcal{F}|}{\varepsilon^6} \right).$$

Finally, we require that  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}} \leq \check{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon/\bar{b}^3)$ , and we also require  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}}$  to satisfy the earlier constraint that  $\varepsilon_{\text{id}}^2 \leq \check{\mathcal{O}}((\ln|\mathcal{F}| + d_{\mathbf{x}}^2)n_{\text{op}}^{-1})$ . To satisfy the first constraint, it suffices to take

$$n_{\text{id}} = \Omega_* \left( \kappa^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^6 \ln^6(1/\delta) \frac{\ln|\mathcal{F}|}{\varepsilon^2} \right).$$

For the second constraint, it suffices to take

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\text{id}} &= \Omega_*(n_{\text{op}} \cdot \kappa^2 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^4 \ln^4(1/\delta)) \\ &= \Omega_* \left( \lambda_{\mathcal{M}}^{-2} T^3 \kappa^5 (d_{\mathbf{x}} + d_{\mathbf{u}})^{16} \ln^{15}(1/\delta) \cdot \frac{\ln|\mathcal{F}|}{\varepsilon^6} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, we observe that the algorithm uses  $\mathcal{O}(n_{\text{op}} \cdot T + n_{\text{id}})$  trajectories in total, leading to the final calculation in the theorem statement.  $\square$