

# Bellman Calibration for $V$ -Learning in Offline Reinforcement Learning

Lars van der Laan\*  
 University of Washington

Nathan Kallus  
 Netflix & Cornell University

## Abstract

We introduce *Iterated Bellman Calibration*, a simple, model-agnostic, post-hoc procedure for calibrating off-policy value predictions in infinite-horizon Markov decision processes. Bellman calibration requires that states with similar predicted long-term returns exhibit one-step returns consistent with the Bellman equation under the target policy. We adapt classical histogram and isotonic calibration to the dynamic, counterfactual setting by repeatedly regressing fitted Bellman targets onto a model’s predictions, using a doubly robust pseudo-outcome to handle off-policy data. This yields a one-dimensional fitted value iteration scheme that can be applied to any value estimator. Our analysis provides finite-sample guarantees for both calibration and prediction under weak assumptions, and—critically—*without* requiring Bellman completeness or realizability.

## 1 Introduction

Many applications require predicting the long-term consequences of a decision policy in a sequential, stochastic environment. We consider settings modeled as a Markov decision process (MDP) and aim to forecast the long-run returns that would occur *under a target policy*  $\pi$ , which may differ from the behavior policy that generated the data. This problem is widespread: clinicians anticipate long-term health outcomes under proposed treatment rules (Van Calster et al., 2019); online platforms estimate customer lifetime value and retention under alternative recommendation strategies (Maystre & Russo, 2022; Theocharous et al., 2015; Xue et al., 2025); and economists assess the downstream impact of counterfactual programs (Cowgill & Tucker, 2019; Rust, 1987). In all these settings, practitioners rely not only on correct rankings but also on *accurate* numerical predictions, since value estimates must reflect the long-term outcomes individuals actually experience. As a result, value calibration is essential for personalized forecasting, long-term prediction, and reliable policy evaluation, as miscalibrated estimates can distort policy comparisons and undermine decision-making.

Modern machine learning models such as neural networks and gradient-boosted trees often produce predictions that deviate from realized outcomes due to model misspecification, distribution shift, or limited data (Bella et al., 2010; Guo et al., 2017; Niculescu-Mizil &

---

\*Corresponding author

Caruana, 2005; Zadrozny & Elkan, 2001). Similar issues arise in reinforcement learning, where value estimates can exhibit systematic overestimation, instability, and off-policy bias (Fujimoto et al., 2019; Thrun & Schwartz, 2014; Van Hasselt et al., 2016). A natural requirement in this setting is that value estimates be *calibrated*: individuals with similar predicted returns should, on average, realize long-term outcomes that match those predictions under the target policy. Calibration improves uncertainty quantification, counterfactual evaluation, and the interpretability and reliability of value estimates. It has been extensively studied in classification and regression, where calibrated predictors are constructed to match empirical outcome frequencies or conditional means (Lichtenstein et al., 1977; Platt et al., 1999; Vovk et al., 2005; Zadrozny & Elkan, 2001). However, calibration of long-term values remains largely unexplored in reinforcement learning.

Although long-horizon prediction resembles supervised learning, it introduces challenges absent from standard regression. Value prediction is inherently counterfactual: it concerns the long-run outcomes that would unfold under a target policy  $\pi$  rather than the behavior policy that generated the data. Long-term returns are never directly observed – only one-step transitions are seen – so multi-step returns must be reconstructed through a model or the Bellman equation. The state distribution also shifts with  $\pi$ , and small modeling errors propagate through the transition dynamics, causing even mild misspecification to compound (Agarwal et al., 2019; Farahmand et al., 2010; Gordon, 1995; Munos & Szepesvári, 2008). Moreover, fitted value and  $Q$ -iteration are iterative regression procedures, and stopping after only finitely many iterations may introduce bias, while function approximation error and optimization instability can further distort the iterates in practice. As a result, common value-function estimators such as Monte Carlo prediction, temporal-difference methods, and fitted value or  $Q$ -iteration may produce systematically biased or unstable predictions (Agarwal et al., 2021; Fujimoto et al., 2019; Thrun & Schwartz, 2014; Tsitsiklis & Van Roy, 1996).

These empirical challenges reflect deeper theoretical limitations. Classical analyses of fitted value or  $Q$ -iteration rely on strong assumptions such as (Bellman) completeness, realizability, or low-dimensional state spaces (Baird et al., 1995; Fan et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2025; Munos & Szepesvári, 2008; Tsitsiklis & Van Roy, 1996). Completeness ensures that the Bellman target lies within the function class, so each regression step is well specified. When completeness fails, the Bellman target falls outside the class, the regression becomes misspecified, and projection errors accumulate – potentially compounding exponentially with the horizon and yielding arbitrarily poor estimates (Amortila et al., 2020; Chen & Jiang, 2019; Foster et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021). Recent work replaces Bellman completeness with min–max or adversarial formulations, but these approaches require highly expressive critics, dual realizability, and partial coverage (Jin et al., 2021; Uehara et al., 2020, 2021, 2023).

**Contributions.** We study calibration of the *value function* associated with a target policy  $\pi$ . We show classical calibration tools – histogram binning and isotonic regression – can be adapted to the dynamic, counterfactual setting of reinforcement learning when

combined with off-policy fitted value iteration and a doubly robust Bellman target. Building on these components, we develop *iterated Bellman calibration*, a simple and model-agnostic post-hoc procedure that corrects systematic biases in long-horizon value prediction and produces calibrated estimates of long-run returns.

Our main contributions are:

1. We formalize weak and strong notions of **Bellman calibration**, analogous to regression calibration but tailored to the fixed-point structure of infinite-horizon value functions.
2. We introduce histogram- and isotonic-based **calibration algorithms** applicable to any value-function estimator, including those produced by fitted value and Q iteration, and construct a novel doubly robust Bellman target for off-policy data.
3. We provide **finite-sample guarantees** for iterated Bellman calibration, bounding calibration error through finite-iteration, statistical, and nuisance-estimation terms. We obtain guarantees for both calibration and prediction error, showing that calibration does not degrade accuracy and can strictly improve it – all *without requiring Bellman completeness*.

**Related work.** Our work is most closely related to iterated  $Q$ -function calibration, where fitted  $Q$ -iteration is used to calibrate initial  $Q$ -estimates for *policy evaluation* (van der Laan et al., 2025a). That line of work targets global policy values rather than per-state value prediction, uses calibration primarily to debias value estimators in DRL (Kallus & Uehara, 2020, 2022), and does not analyze calibration or estimation error of the resulting predictor. Moreover, calibrating the  $Q$ -function does not in general imply calibration of the induced value function. In contrast, we calibrate the value function directly and construct a doubly robust Bellman target tailored to off-policy data, extending causal calibration for *static* treatment-effect predictors (Van Der Laan et al., 2023; Whitehouse et al., 2024) to dynamic, long-horizon MDPs.

Many practical variants of FQI aim to improve approximation quality or robustness in offline settings. These include adversarial or minimax formulations (Di et al., 2023; Jin et al., 2021; Uehara et al., 2020, 2021, 2023; Xie & Jiang, 2021), boosted methods that iteratively regress Bellman residuals (Tosatto et al., 2017), conservative or pessimistic updates (An et al., 2021; Di et al., 2023; Kumar et al., 2020), operator-regularized variants such as regularized FQI (massoud Farahmand et al., 2009), structural approaches based on linear or low-rank models (Shah et al., 2020), and distributionally robust variants (Zhou et al., 2021). These methods may stabilize training but also modify the effective Bellman operator. Our approach is complementary: Iterated Bellman Calibration applies atop any of them, restoring a clear fixed-point interpretation.

To our knowledge, no prior work defines or enforces calibration of value predictions in RL. Sequential calibration in forecasting and online prediction (e.g., multicalibration (Foster & Vohra, 1997) or probability calibration (Gneiting & Katzfuss, 2014)) concerns one-step predictive accuracy and does not enforce consistency with Bellman dynamics. Bellman

conformal inference (Yang et al., 2024) provides calibrated prediction intervals for time-series forecasting rather than value functions in MDPs. Relatedly, Malik et al. (2019) calibrate uncertainty in learned dynamics models, while conformal RL methods provide distribution-free uncertainty sets (Sun et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023). Distributional RL focuses on modeling the full return distribution (Bellemare et al., 2017; Dabney et al., 2018).

## 2 Calibration for Value Functions

### 2.1 Setup and Notation

We consider an MDP with continuous state space  $\mathcal{S}$ , discrete action space  $\mathcal{A}$ , initial state distribution  $\rho$ , transition kernel  $P(s' | s, a)$ , reward function  $r_0(s, a)$ , and discount factor  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ . Data are collected under a behavior policy  $b_0(a | s)$ , and each sample consists of a transition  $(S, A, R, S')$ , where  $(S, A) \sim \rho \times b_0$ ,  $S' \sim P(\cdot | S, A)$ , and  $R = r_0(S, A) + \varepsilon$  with  $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon | S, A] = 0$ . We observe a calibration dataset of  $n$  i.i.d. transitions,  $\mathcal{C}_n := \{(S_i, A_i, R_i, S'_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ .

Let  $\pi(a | s)$  denote a target policy and  $w_\pi := \pi/b_0$  the corresponding importance ratio. Define  $(\pi f)(s) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a | s) f(s, a)$  and  $(Pv)(s, a) := \mathbb{E}[v(S') | S = s, A = a]$ . The policy-marginalized quantities are  $P_\pi := \pi P$  and  $r_{0,\pi} := \pi r_0$ , with  $\mathcal{T}_\pi(f) := r_{0,\pi} + \gamma P_\pi f$  the associated Bellman operator. A measure  $\mu$  is *stationary* for a Markov operator  $P$  if  $\mu P = \mu$ .

The *value function* under policy  $\pi$  is the expected discounted return starting in state  $s$  and following  $\pi$ :

$$v_0(s) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \mid S_0 = s \right].$$

Here  $\mathbb{E}_\pi$  denotes expectation over  $A \sim \pi(\cdot | S)$  and  $S' \sim P(\cdot | S, A)$ . It is the unique bounded fixed point of the Bellman equation (Bellman, 1952, 1966)

$$v_0 = \mathcal{T}_\pi(v_0), \quad \mathcal{T}_\pi(v_0)(s) = r_{0,\pi}(s) + \gamma (P_\pi v_0)(s). \quad (1)$$

Let  $\|f\| := \{\mathbb{E}_{b_0}[f(A, S)^2]\}^{1/2}$  denote the  $L^2$  norm under the behavior distribution, and for any measure  $\mu$ , let  $\|f\|_{2,\mu} := \{\int f(s, a)^2 \mu(ds, da)\}^{1/2}$ . Let  $\|f\|_{n,S,A}$  and  $\|g\|_{n,S'}$  denote the empirical  $L^2$  norms over the samples  $\{(S_i, A_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  and  $\{S'_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , respectively. We write  $\lesssim$  to denote inequalities holding up to absolute constants, and use  $[K] := \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$ .

### 2.2 Bellman Calibration: Weak and Strong Forms

Let  $\hat{v}$  denote an estimated value function, which we treat as a predictor of long-term discounted returns under the target policy  $\pi$ . We assume  $\hat{v}$  is trained on data independent of the calibration set  $\mathcal{C}_n$ .

For each  $v$ , define the **Bellman-calibration map**

$$\Gamma_0(v)(s) := \mathbb{E}_\pi[R + \gamma v(S') | v(S) = v(s)], \quad (2)$$

which returns the expected one-step reward plus continuation value implied by  $v$  under policy  $\pi$ , conditional on  $v(S) = v(s)$ . Equivalently,

$$\Gamma_0(v)(s) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}_\pi(v)(S) \mid v(S) = v(s)]. \quad (3)$$

The true value function is a fixed point of this map, satisfying the coarsened Bellman equation  $v_0(s) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}_\pi(v_0)(S) \mid v_0(S) = v_0(s)] = \Gamma_0(v_0)(s)$ .

Bellman calibration requires that states with similar predicted long-term returns exhibit one-step returns consistent with the Bellman equation under the target policy. We say that  $\hat{v}$  is **perfectly Bellman calibrated** if  $\hat{v}(S) = \Gamma_0(\hat{v})(S)$  almost surely. The associated **Bellman calibration error** is

$$\text{Cal}_{\ell^2}(\hat{v}) := \|\hat{v} - \Gamma_0(\hat{v})\|. \quad (4)$$

Equivalently, perfect calibration means that  $\hat{v}(S)$  is conditionally unbiased for the Bellman target  $R + \gamma \hat{v}(S')$  under  $\pi$ . In other words, among individuals with identical predicted long-term returns, the realized reward plus continuation value  $\hat{v}(S')$  matches their shared prediction on average.

This condition can also be expressed in terms of the implied reward model  $\hat{r}_{\pi,\hat{v}}(s) := \hat{v}(s) - \gamma P_\pi \hat{v}(s)$ . Perfect Bellman calibration is equivalent to requiring that this reward model is calibrated for the true reward:

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi[R \mid \hat{v}(S)] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{r}_{\pi,\hat{v}}(S) \mid \hat{v}(S)].$$

This is the natural dynamic analogue of regression calibration (recovering the classical case when  $\gamma = 0$  and  $\pi = b_0$ ) (Noarov & Roth, 2023). Since the true value function is itself Bellman calibrated, imposing this property on  $\hat{v}$  is a minimal form of self-consistency.

**Strong Bellman calibration.** The definition above calibrates  $\hat{v}$  only with respect to its own Bellman target  $r_{0,\pi} + P_\pi \hat{v}$ . A stricter notion requires calibration with respect to the *true* Bellman target  $r_{0,\pi} + P_\pi v_0$ , that is, with respect to the value function  $v_0$  itself. We say that  $\hat{v}$  is *strongly* Bellman calibrated if  $\hat{v}(s) = \mathbb{E}[v_0(S) \mid \hat{v}(S) = \hat{v}(s)]$ . Equivalently, individuals with identical predicted long-term returns realize, on average, the *true* long-term returns under  $\pi$ :

$$\hat{v}(s) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t \mid \hat{v}(S) = \hat{v}(s) \right].$$

This stronger notion is generally unattainable without accurate estimation of either the full  $Q$ -function or the discounted occupancy ratio, both of which are typically more difficult than value prediction itself. In particular, achieving strong calibration is at least as hard as efficient estimation of average policy values, which involves estimation of both nuisances (Kallus & Uehara, 2020, 2022). For this reason, we focus on the weaker but practically achievable notion of Bellman calibration introduced above.

### 2.3 Bellman calibration reduces estimation error

We now link Bellman calibration to estimation error, showing that calibration removes one error component and tightens the overall bound.

Define the  $L^2(\rho)$  projection onto functions of  $\hat{v}$  by

$$\Pi_{\hat{v}} q := \arg \min_{\theta \circ \hat{v}} \|q - \theta \circ \hat{v}\|.$$

Let  $P_{\pi, \hat{v}} := \Pi_{\hat{v}} P_{\pi}$  denote the coarsened transition operator. This is a valid Markov operator, given explicitly by

$$P_{\pi, \hat{v}} f(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f(S') \mid \hat{v}(S) = \hat{v}(s)].$$

Let  $\hat{v}_0 = \theta \circ \hat{v}$  be the fixed point of the coarsened Bellman operator

$$\hat{v}_0 = \mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} \hat{v}_0, \quad \mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} q := \Pi_{\hat{v}} \mathcal{T}_{\pi} q. \quad (5)$$

Since  $\hat{v}_0$  is a transformation of  $\hat{v}$ , conditioning on  $\hat{v}_0(S)$  is a coarsening of conditioning on  $\hat{v}(S)$ , and therefore

$$\Gamma_0(\hat{v}_0)(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[R + \gamma \hat{v}_0(S') \mid \hat{v}_0(S) = \hat{v}_0(s)] = \hat{v}_0(s).$$

Thus  $\hat{v}_0$  is perfectly Bellman calibrated.

**A1** There exists a stationary measure  $\mu_{\hat{v}}$  for  $P_{\pi, \hat{v}}$ .

**Theorem 1** (Calibration–Refinement Bound). *Under A1,*

$$\|\hat{v} - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \|\Pi_{\hat{v}} v_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}} + \|\hat{v} - \hat{v}_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}}.$$

The estimation error decomposes into two components: a *refinement error*  $\|\Pi_{\hat{v}} v_0 - v_0\|$ , which measures the best approximation to  $v_0$  using only the scalar representation  $\hat{v}$ , and a *calibration error*  $\|\hat{v} - \hat{v}_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}}$ , which measures how far  $\hat{v}$  is from the fixed point of the coarsened Bellman operator. If  $\hat{v}$  is perfectly Bellman calibrated, then  $\hat{v} = \hat{v}_0$  and the calibration error vanishes. In this case, the estimation error (under the stationary norm) is as small as the  $L^2(\rho b_0)$ -optimal transformation  $\Pi_{\hat{v}} v_0$  of  $\hat{v}$ , up to a factor  $(1 - \gamma)^{-1}$ . This mirrors classical calibration–refinement decompositions in classification and regression (DeGroot & Fienberg, 1983; Murphy, 1973; Van Der Laan et al., 2023; Whitehouse et al., 2024).

Condition A1 ensures that  $\mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}}$  is a  $\gamma$ -contraction on  $L^2(\mu_{\hat{v}})$  (Appendix A). When the behavior distribution  $\rho$  is stationary for  $P_{\pi}$ , it is also stationary for the coarsened kernel  $P_{\pi, \hat{v}}$ . In this case we may take  $\mu_{\hat{v}} = \rho$ , yielding

$$\|\Pi_{\hat{v}} v_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}} = \min_{\theta: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} \|\theta \circ \hat{v} - v_0\|.$$

## 2.4 A Doubly Robust Bellman Target

Off-policy prediction requires an (approximately) unbiased estimate of  $\mathcal{T}_\pi(v)$  despite data being generated by the behavior policy  $b_0$ . Importance weighting with  $w_\pi = \pi/b_0$  corrects this mismatch but is highly sensitive to estimation error in the weights. To obtain a more stable update, we use a *doubly robust* Bellman pseudo-outcome that combines importance weighting with estimates of the reward function and transition kernel. This target is unbiased if either the weights or the reward–transition model is correctly specified.

Let  $\hat{w}_\pi$  estimate the importance ratio  $w_\pi := \pi/b_0$ , let  $\hat{r}$  estimate the reward function  $r_0$ , and let  $\hat{P}$  estimate the Markov operator  $P$ . For any function  $v$ , we define the *doubly robust fitted Bellman target*  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(v)(S, A, R, S')$  as

$$(\pi \hat{q}_v)(S) + \hat{w}_\pi(A | S) [R + \gamma v(S') - \hat{q}_v(S, A)],$$

where the true and estimated  $Q$ -functions under  $v$  are

$$q_v := r_0 + \gamma P v, \quad \hat{q}_v := \hat{r} + \gamma \hat{P} v.$$

When  $\gamma = 0$ , this pseudo-outcome reduces to the standard doubly robust scores used in static treatment-effect estimation (Kennedy, 2023; Rubin & van der Laan, 2006; Van Der Laan et al., 2023).

Recall that  $(b_0 f)(s) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} b_0(a | s) f(s, a)$  and define the denoised Bellman operator

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(v)(s) := \mathbb{E} [\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(v)(S, A, R, S') | S = s].$$

**Theorem 2** (Doubly robust errors). *For any  $v$ ,*

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(v) - \mathcal{T}_\pi(v) = b_0 \{ (w_\pi - \hat{w}_\pi) (\hat{q}_v - q_v) \}.$$

The fitted Bellman target is *doubly robust*: it is unbiased whenever  $\hat{w}_\pi = w_\pi$  or  $\hat{q}_v = q_v$  (e.g., if  $\hat{r} = r$  and  $\hat{P} = P$ ). For instance,  $w_\pi$  is known whenever the behavior policy  $b_0$  is known or when  $b_0 = \pi$ , in which case  $w_\pi \equiv 1$ . In this case the pseudo-outcome remains valid even with trivial models  $\hat{r} = 0$  and  $\hat{P}v = 0$ , reducing to the standard importance-weighted target

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(v)(S, A, R, S') = w_\pi(A | S) (R + \gamma v(S')). \tag{6}$$

Conversely, in robotics and simulation settings the transition kernel is often known ( $\hat{P} = P$ ), in which case the error simplifies to  $b_0 \{ (\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi) (\hat{r} - r) \}$  and doubly robustness holds with respect to the weight and reward estimators.

---

**Algorithm 1 Iterated Bellman Calibration**

---

**input** Value predictor  $\hat{v}$ , calibration data  $\mathcal{C}_n$ , fitted Bellman operator  $\hat{T}_\pi$ , calibrator class  $\mathcal{F}$ , iterations  $K$   
1: Initialize  $\hat{v}^{(0)} \leftarrow \hat{v}$   
2: **for**  $k = 0, \dots, K - 1$  **do**  
    # Construct Bellman target  
3:    $\hat{\chi}_i^{(k)} \leftarrow \hat{T}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(k)})(S_i, A_i, R_i, S'_i)$   
    # Fit 1D calibrator  
4:    $\theta_n^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\chi}_i^{(k)} - \theta(\hat{v}(S_i)))^2$   
    # Update predictor  
5:    $\hat{v}^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \theta_n^{(k+1)} \circ \hat{v}$   
6: **end for**  
**output**  $\hat{v}^{(K)}$

---

### 3 Algorithms and Theory

#### 3.1 Iterated Bellman Calibration Algorithm

Algorithm 1 introduces a simple post-hoc calibration method, *Iterated Bellman Calibration*, which transforms a given value predictor  $\hat{v}$  into a Bellman-calibrated predictor of the form

$$\hat{v}^{\text{cal}} := \theta_n \circ \hat{v},$$

where the calibrator  $\theta_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is learned from the calibration dataset  $\mathcal{C}_n$ . At a high level, we learn  $\theta_n$  by iteratively regressing the doubly robust targets  $\{\hat{T}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(k)})(S_i, A_i, R_i, S'_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  onto the initial value predictions  $\{\hat{v}(S_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  using a regression class  $\mathcal{F}$ . The procedure follows the structure of fitted value iteration (Munos, 2005; Munos & Szepesvári, 2008), but crucially avoids high-dimensional function approximation by restricting  $\hat{v}^{(k+1)}$  to lie in the one-dimensional class  $\{\theta \circ \hat{v} : \theta \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . Because the finite-iteration error of fitted value iteration decays at a geometric rate  $\gamma^K$  (Munos & Szepesvári, 2008), only a small number of iterations ( $K \asymp \log n$ ) are needed. As a result, Algorithm 1 is computationally efficient.

Heuristically,  $\hat{v}^{\text{cal}}$  is calibrated because it targets the fixed point  $\hat{v}_0$  of the coarsened Bellman equation in (5), which is perfectly Bellman calibrated. Achieving this in finite samples would typically require Bellman completeness together with a realizability condition – namely, that  $\hat{v}_0$  can be written as a transformation of  $\hat{v}$  within the calibrator class  $\mathcal{F}$ . The procedures we introduce next avoid these requirements.

We study assumption-light instantiations of Algorithm 1 based on histogram regression (Stone, 1977) and isotonic regression (Barlow & Brunk, 1972). These methods extend widely used calibration procedures – histogram binning (Gupta & Ramdas, 2021; Zadrozny & Elkan, 2001, 2002) and isotonic calibration (Niculescu-Mizil & Caruana, 2005; van der Laan & Alaa, 2025; Van Der Laan et al., 2023; van der Laan et al., 2024b; Zadrozny & Elkan, 2002) – from classification and regression to the dynamic setting, and they admit finite-sample calibration guarantees.

### 3.2 Histogram Calibration

Histogram binning constructs a piecewise-constant calibrator by grouping examples with similar predicted values. We partition the initial value predictions  $\{\hat{v}(S_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  into  $B$  nondecreasing bins  $\{I_1, \dots, I_B\}$ , formed either by empirical quantiles (*equal-mass* binning) or by discretizing the prediction range into uniform intervals (*equal-width* binning). We implement *histogram iterated Bellman calibration* by applying Algorithm 1 with the calibrator class  $\mathcal{F}_B := \text{span}\{1_{I_b} : b \in [B]\}$ , consisting of piecewise-constant functions that are constant within each bin. The bins may be data-adaptive (e.g., empirical quantiles) provided that the bin count  $B$  is deterministic, possibly growing with  $n$ . Histogram calibration is computationally efficient as it simply involves computing empirical means within bins.

Histogram calibration enforces approximate Bellman calibration by requiring that, within each bin, the fitted value equals the empirical average of the Bellman target. In Step 4, the resulting calibrator has the step-function form

$$\theta_n^{(K)}(t) = \sum_{b=1}^B \hat{m}_b^{(K)} \mathbf{1}\{t \in I_b\},$$

where  $\hat{m}_b^{(K)} = |I_b|^{-1} \sum_{i: \hat{v}(S_i) \in I_b} \hat{\chi}_i^{(K)}$  is the empirical mean of the fitted Bellman target in bin  $b$ . This binwise representation yields the empirical fixed-point relation

$$\hat{v}^{(K)}(s) = \mathbb{E}_n \left[ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})(S, A, R, S') \mid \hat{v}^{(K)}(S) = \hat{v}^{(K)}(s) \right],$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_n$  denotes the empirical conditional expectation over the calibration sample  $\mathcal{C}_n$ . Hence, at convergence ( $\hat{v}^{(K)} \approx \hat{v}^{(K-1)}$ ), the calibrated predictor is an approximate empirical fixed point of (2), ensuring approximate Bellman calibration.

**Calibration error.** We establish finite-sample, finite-iteration bounds for the calibration error in (4).

- C1** (*Boundedness*)  $R, r, \hat{r}, w_\pi, \hat{w}_\pi$ , and  $\hat{v}$  are uniformly bounded by a constant  $M \in (0, \infty)$ .
- C2** (*Sample splitting*) The estimators  $\hat{r}, \hat{w}_\pi, \hat{P}$ , and  $\hat{v}$  are obtained from data independent of  $\mathcal{C}_n$ .
- C3** ( $\hat{P}$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz) For all  $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_B$  with  $\|f\|_\infty, \|g\|_\infty \leq M$ ,  $\|\hat{P}(f \circ \hat{v}) - \hat{P}(g \circ \hat{v})\|_{n, A, S} \leq L \|(f - g) \circ \hat{v}\|_{n, S'}$ .

C1 is imposed for technical convenience. C2 can be relaxed via cross-fitting (Van Der Laan et al., 2023). At least when  $\gamma = 0$ , outcome-agnostic histogram binning allows  $\hat{v}$  to be fit on the same data used for calibration (Gupta & Ramdas, 2021). C3 simplifies the analysis by controlling the metric entropy of  $\{\hat{P}f \circ \hat{v} : f \in \mathcal{F}_B\}$  through that of  $\mathcal{F}_B$ . It holds trivially when  $\hat{P} = 0$ , as in the importance-weighted target (6). It also holds with  $L = 1$  when  $\hat{P}$  is a discrete nonparametric MLE. When  $\hat{P} = P$ , the condition is satisfied at the population level and, under mild regularity assumptions, empirically with high probability.




Figure 1: Piecewise-constant calibration maps showing the calibrated values  $\hat{v}^{\text{cal}}(S)$  as a function of the original predictions  $\hat{v}(S)$  using (a) histogram and (b) isotonic calibration

**Theorem 3** (Calibration Error for Histogram Binning). *Assume C1-C3. Then, there exists a  $C \in (0, \infty)$  such that, for any  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cal}_{\ell^2}(\hat{v}^{(K)}) &\leq C \left( \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log \left( \frac{n}{B} \right)} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right) \\ &\quad + \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(K)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(K)}})\| \\ &\quad + \|\hat{T}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{T}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})\|. \end{aligned}$$

The first two terms represent the oracle calibration error that would be achievable by regression calibration if the full return  $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_t$  were observed under  $\pi$ , matching classical bounds for histogram binning (Gupta & Ramdas, 2021; Gupta et al., 2020; van der Laan & Alaa, 2025). The third term reflects the doubly robust nuisance estimation error from Theorem 2. The final term is the finite-iteration error, which decays at the geometric rate  $\gamma^K$  as  $K \rightarrow \infty$  under mild conditions (Appendix F.4), consistent with the theory of fitted value iteration (Munos & Szepesvári, 2008).

Interestingly, the calibration bounds do not depend on the discount factor  $\gamma$  (except indirectly through the finite-iteration term). This reflects that calibration is fundamentally a one-step prediction problem: unlike value estimation, calibration error does not compound over future timesteps, making it substantially easier to control statistically. By Theorem 1, however, the extent to which calibration controls estimation error weakens as  $\gamma$  increases and coverage decreases, as we now formalize.

**Estimation error.** The next theorem shows that calibration preserves – and can even improve – the estimation error of the original predictor  $\hat{v}$ . Thus, Bellman calibration can be applied post hoc without sacrificing predictive accuracy, and may be especially beneficial

under model misspecification.

Define the  $L^2(\rho)$  projection induced by  $\mathcal{F}_B$

$$\Pi_{\hat{v},B}q := \arg \min_{\theta \circ \hat{v}: \theta \in \mathcal{F}_B} \|q - \theta \circ \hat{v}\|.$$

Let  $\hat{v}_{0,B} \in \{\theta \circ \hat{v} : \theta \in \mathcal{F}_B\}$  be the unique fixed point of the corresponding coarsened Bellman equation

$$\hat{v}_{0,B} = \mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}, B} \hat{v}_{0,B}, \quad \mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}, B} q := \Pi_{\hat{v}, B} \mathcal{T}_\pi q.$$

The corresponding Markov operator is  $P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B} := \Pi_{\hat{v}, B} P_\pi$ , satisfying

$$P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B} f(s) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ f(S') \mid \hat{v}(S) \in I_{\hat{b}(s)} \right],$$

with  $\hat{b}(s) = b$  whenever  $\hat{v}(s) \in I_b$ .

**C4** (*Stationary coverage*) There exists a stationary measure  $\mu_{\hat{v}, B}$  for  $P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B}$  and  $\hat{\kappa}_B \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $\|h\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}, B}} \leq \hat{\kappa}_B \|h\|$  for all  $h : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

**Theorem 4** (Estimation Error for Histogram Binning). *Assume C1-C4. Then, there exists a  $C \in (0, \infty)$  such that, for any  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{v}^{(K)} - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}, B}} &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \|\Pi_{\hat{v}, B} v_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}, B}} \\ &\quad + \gamma^K \|\hat{v} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}, B}} \\ &\quad + \frac{C \hat{\kappa}_B}{1 - \gamma} \left( \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log \frac{n}{B}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(K/\delta)}{n}} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\hat{\kappa}_B}{1 - \gamma} \max_{j \in [K]} \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(j)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(j)}})\|. \end{aligned}$$

*Remark.* The proof also shows that the same bound holds for  $\|\hat{v}^{(K)} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}, B}}$ , but without the approximation term  $\|\Pi_{\hat{v}, B} v_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}, B}}$ , implying that the algorithm converges rapidly to  $\hat{v}_{0,B}$  even when  $\hat{v}$  is a poor initial fit.

**Discussion.** Neither Theorem 3 nor Theorem 4 requires any Bellman completeness assumptions. The key observation is that Bellman completeness *does* hold for the coarsened Bellman operator  $P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B}$ . Defining  $\mathcal{F}_{B, \hat{v}} := \{\theta \circ \hat{v} : \theta \in \mathcal{F}_B\}$ , we have  $P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B} f \in \mathcal{F}_{B, \hat{v}}$  for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{B, \hat{v}}$ , since  $P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B}$  averages  $P_\pi$  over the bins of  $\hat{v}$  and therefore yields a function that is constant on those bins. Our proof first shows that  $\hat{v}^{(K)}$  converges to the fixed point  $\hat{v}_{0,B}$  of this coarsened operator, and then bounds the discrepancy  $\hat{v}_{0,B} - v_0$  using a modification of Theorem 1.

When the importance weights  $w_\pi$  are known and  $K$  is sufficiently large, Theorem 3 shows that the calibration error vanishes at rate  $\sqrt{(B/n) \log(n/B)}$ . In contrast, Theorem 4 shows that the estimation error consists of an approximation term  $(1 - \gamma)^{-1} \|\Pi_{\hat{v}, B} v_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}, B}}$  (reflecting lack of realizability) plus the same  $\sqrt{(B/n) \log(n/B)}$  term. Thus the choice of bin

number  $B$  induces the usual bias–variance tradeoff: if  $B$  is too small, the calibrator is overly coarse and may distort  $\hat{v}$ , while if  $B$  is too large, bins contain too few samples, increasing variance and harming calibration. To preserve the predictive structure of  $\hat{v}$ ,  $B$  should be large enough that  $\mathcal{F}_B$  approximates the identity map well. A simple bound illustrates this:

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{F}_B} \|\theta \circ \hat{v} - v_0\| \leq \|\hat{v} - v_0\| + \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{F}_B} \|\theta \circ \hat{v} - \hat{v}\|. \quad (7)$$

For uniform-mass binning, choosing  $B \asymp n^{1/3}$  yields the worst-case guarantee (Györfi et al., 2002)

$$\|\hat{v}^{(K)} - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}, B}} \leq \frac{\hat{\kappa}_B}{1 - \gamma} \|\hat{v} - v_0\| + O_p((\log n/n)^{1/3}).$$

Under the same scaling, the calibration error produced by our procedure also vanishes at rate  $(\log n/n)^{1/3}$ . This suggests that selecting  $B$  based on predictive performance – for example, via cross-validation – typically yields good calibration in practice.

### 3.3 Isotonic Calibration

Histogram binning requires choosing the number of bins  $B$  to manage the bias–variance tradeoff. As a tuning-free alternative, we consider *isotonic iterated Bellman calibration*, implemented by setting  $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_{\text{iso}}$  in Algorithm 1, the class of monotone nondecreasing functions on the real line. In this case, Step 4 performs isotonic regression of the Bellman target to obtain  $\theta_n^{(k)} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{iso}}$ , which can be computed in near-linear time using the pool-adjacent-violators algorithm (Best & Chakravarti, 1990). Each isotonic regression step is equivalent to histogram regression over an outcome-adaptive partition of the predicted values (van der Laan & Alaa, 2025). The monotonicity constraint regularizes the calibrator and mitigates overfitting to small or noisy bins, and because the identity map is monotone, isotonic calibration tends not to distort already well-calibrated predictors.

We next establish finite-sample calibration guarantees.

**C5** (*Finite variation of the calibrated target*) There exists  $C \in (0, \infty)$  such that, almost surely, the function  $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K)})(S) \mid \hat{v}(S) = t, \mathcal{C}_n]$  has total variation at most  $C$ .

**Theorem 5** (Calibration Error for Isotonic Calibration). *Assume C1–C5 for  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{iso}}$ . Then, there exists a  $C \in (0, \infty)$  such that, for any  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cal}_{\ell^2}(\hat{v}^{(K)}) &\leq C \left( n^{-1/3} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right) \\ &\quad + \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(K)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(K)}})\| \\ &\quad + \|\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})\|. \end{aligned}$$

The isotonic case parallels the histogram-binning analysis but uses an adaptively chosen partition determined by the pool-adjacent-violators algorithm. Importantly, calibration does

---

**Algorithm 2 Iso–Hist Iterated Bellman Calibration**

---

**input** Value predictor  $\hat{v}$ , calibration data  $\mathcal{C}_n$ , fitted Bellman operator  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi$ , iterations  $K$

- 1: **Stage 1: fit outcome-adaptive partition**
- 2:  $\hat{\chi}_i \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v})(S_i, A_i, R_i, S'_i)$
- 3:  $\theta_{n,\text{iso}} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{iso}}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\chi}_i - \theta(\hat{v}(S_i)))^2$
- 4: Extract bins  $\hat{I}_1, \dots, \hat{I}_{\hat{B}}$  from flat regions of  $\theta_{n,\text{iso}}$
- 5: Define  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\hat{B}} := \{\theta : \theta \text{ is constant on each } \hat{I}_b\}$
- 6: **Stage 2: histogram calibration**
- 7: Apply Algorithm 1 with class  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\hat{B}}$  to obtain  $\hat{v}^{(K)}$

**output**  $\hat{v}^{(K)}$

---

not require any monotonicity assumptions; monotonicity simply provides a data-adaptive partition of  $\hat{v}$ . The resulting  $n^{-1/3}$  term matches classical isotonic regression rates (Chatterjee et al., 2013; van der Laan & Alaa, 2025; van der Laan et al., 2024a). In effect, isotonic calibration achieves the calibration error that histogram binning would obtain with  $B \asymp n^{1/3}$  bins.

### 3.4 Hybrid Isotonic–Histogram Calibration

While isotonic iterated Bellman calibration guarantees finite-sample Bellman calibration, extending the analysis to obtain an analogue of Theorem 4 – showing that calibration does not worsen the estimation error – is challenging. The difficulty is that the class of monotone functions is not Bellman complete, so an argument based on approximate Bellman completeness (Munos & Szepesvári, 2008) would introduce additional approximation error. Although isotonic regression can be viewed as outcome-adaptive histogram binning, the analysis in Section 3.2 relies on the partition remaining fixed across iterations. In contrast, applying Algorithm 1 with  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\text{iso}}$  produces a *new*, data-dependent partition at each iteration, so each step targets the fixed point of a different coarsened Bellman operator. This instability obstructs a direct extension of the histogram argument. Nevertheless, when  $\hat{v}$  is already a good estimator of  $v_0$ , it lies near a fixed point of  $\mathcal{T}_\pi$ , so the Bellman iterates modify it only slightly. We therefore expect predictive performance to be preserved in this regime, even though a formal analysis is left for future work.

To obtain formal estimation guarantees while still avoiding manual tuning of the binning, we introduce a hybrid isotonic–histogram method (Algorithm 2). The procedure performs a *single* isotonic regression step to learn an outcome-adaptive partition of the range of  $\hat{v}$ , and then applies histogram-based calibration over this fixed partition. Specifically, we regress the initial Bellman target on  $\hat{v}$  using isotonic regression to obtain a data-adaptive binning, and then run Algorithm 1 using this partition for all subsequent iterations. Similar ideas—using isotonic regression to learn data-adaptive partitions—have been used to construct conformal prediction intervals (Nouretdinov et al., 2018; van der Laan & Alaa, 2024).

Given a deterministic bound on the number of bins learned in the isotonic regression

step, the theoretical guarantees of Section 3.2 for histogram binning apply directly.

**Theorem 6** (Calibration and Estimation Error for Alg. 2). *Let  $\hat{v}^{(K)}$  denote the output of Algorithm 2. Suppose the isotonic regression step produces at most  $\hat{B}$  bins, where  $\hat{B} \leq B_n$  for some deterministic sequence  $B_n$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ . Assume C1-C5 with  $B = B_n$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ , the guarantees in Theorems 3 and 4 hold for  $\hat{v}^{(K)}$  with  $B := B_n$ .*

Existing theory for isotonic regression suggests that the effective number of bins satisfies  $B_n = O(n^{1/3})$  (Deng et al., 2021), implying that the  $B$ -dependent error term in Theorem 4 scales as  $O_p(n^{-1/3})$ , consistent with Theorem 5.

For the approximation term in Theorem 4 to be no larger than the initial error  $\|\hat{v} - v_0\|$  (up to constants), the histogram class must approximate the identity map on the range of  $\hat{v}$ . In particular, we require  $\min_{\theta \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\hat{B}}} \|\theta \circ \hat{v} - \hat{v}\| \approx 0$ , so that step functions in  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\hat{B}}$  nearly preserve the original predictions. This approximation term is small when  $\hat{v}$  is consistent for  $v_0$ : in this case,  $\hat{v}$  lies close to a Bellman fixed point, and isotonic regression typically outputs a near-identity transformation. When  $\hat{v}$  is miscalibrated, however, isotonic regression induces a coarse partition, collapsing regions of poor prediction into a single calibrated value.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Synthetic CRM environment

We evaluate all methods in a synthetic customer-relationship-management (CRM) Markov decision process (MDP) that mimics monthly retention and revenue dynamics for a subscription service. The state  $s_t \in \mathbb{R}^6$  encodes tenure in months, engagement, fatigue, value segment, price sensitivity, and an indicator of whether the customer is active. At each time  $t$ , the agent selects one of three actions: no promotion, light promotion, or strong promotion. Rewards correspond to monthly revenue after discounts and are zero after churn.

Transitions capture key CRM effects. Churn probability depends on tenure, engagement, fatigue, and action via a logistic model; visit probability depends on engagement, fatigue, and action; and revenue conditional on visit scales a baseline value segment by an action-dependent uplift and a price-sensitivity effect, with log-normal noise. Engagement decays over time but is boosted by successful promotions, while fatigue increases with promotion intensity and decays slowly otherwise. Once a customer churns or reaches a maximum tenure of 60 months, the process enters an absorbing state.

We simulate offline datasets of  $n_{\text{cust}} = 50,000$  customers over a horizon of  $T = 24$  months with discount factor  $\gamma = 0.99$ . Behavior data are generated by a fixed heuristic policy that sends light promotions by default, suppresses promotions for highly engaged and fatigued customers, and occasionally sends strong promotions to low-engagement, high-value customers. We evaluate off-policy value estimation for a deterministic *aggressive* revenue-seeking target policy that sends strong promotions to low-engagement, high-sensitivity

<i>n</i>	Model	Raw	Iso	Hybrid Iso
10,000	Boosted	0.681±0.1	<b>0.671±0.1</b>	0.697±0.2
	Linear	0.640±0.04	<b>0.612±0.05</b>	0.641±0.05
	Neural	0.582±0.2	0.550±0.2	<b>0.520±0.1</b>
50,000	Boosted	0.433±0.06	<b>0.429±0.06</b>	0.438±0.08
	Linear	0.625±0.02	<b>0.614±0.03</b>	0.616±0.03
	Neural	0.419±0.1	0.383±0.08	<b>0.374±0.08</b>
100,000	Boosted	0.360±0.05	0.358±0.05	<b>0.353±0.07</b>
	Linear	0.616±0.02	<b>0.605±0.02</b>	0.606±0.02
	Neural	0.379±0.09	0.351±0.05	<b>0.342±0.05</b>

Table 1: Main results with sample splitting.

Iter	Raw	Iso	Quantile	Hybrid Iso
10	1.424±0.1	1.330±0.1	<b>0.735±0.2</b>	0.737±0.2
25	0.665±0.1	0.646±0.1	0.577±0.1	<b>0.571±0.1</b>
50	0.612±0.2	0.585±0.2	0.555±0.1	<b>0.547±0.1</b>
100	0.582±0.2	0.550±0.2	0.524±0.1	<b>0.520±0.1</b>

Table 2: Neural snapshot performance (with sample splitting).

customers and avoids promotions for highly engaged, high-value customers.

Ground-truth values  $V^\pi(s_0)$  are estimated via Monte Carlo rollouts in the same environment, and we report  $(1 - \gamma)$ -scaled RMSE between the estimated and Monte Carlo values at initial states, averaged across 50 independent runs.

## 4.2 Results

Table 1 reports off-policy value estimation error under *sample splitting*, where the offline data are divided into a 50% training fold for fitting the base value estimator and a disjoint 50% calibration fold for Bellman calibration. Across all model classes and sample sizes, isotonic calibration consistently improves over the raw estimates, and hybrid isotonic calibration typically attains the lowest error. The gains are modest but stable for boosted and linear models. In contrast, calibration yields substantially larger improvements for neural estimators, with hybrid calibration reducing error by about 10–15% relative to the raw network across all sample sizes. Table 2 examines neural snapshots taken at different stages of training. Early snapshots exhibit severe miscalibration, with large raw errors that are sharply reduced by calibration. At later snapshots, both isotonic and hybrid calibration continue to provide consistent refinements, with hybrid calibration achieving the lowest error at every iteration beyond 10. These results indicate that Bellman calibration is most effective when base estimators are misspecified or under-trained, while remaining beneficial in the well-trained regime.

$n$	Model	Iso	Quantile	Hybrid Iso
10,000	Boosted	0.671 $\pm$ 0.1	0.694 $\pm$ 0.2	0.697 $\pm$ 0.2
	Linear	0.612 $\pm$ 0.05	0.643 $\pm$ 0.04	0.641 $\pm$ 0.05
	Neural	0.550 $\pm$ 0.2	0.524 $\pm$ 0.1	<b>0.520<math>\pm</math>0.1</b>
50,000	Boosted	0.429 $\pm$ 0.06	0.439 $\pm$ 0.08	0.438 $\pm$ 0.08
	Linear	0.614 $\pm$ 0.03	0.616 $\pm$ 0.03	0.616 $\pm$ 0.03
	Neural	0.383 $\pm$ 0.08	0.375 $\pm$ 0.08	<b>0.374<math>\pm</math>0.08</b>
100,000	Boosted	0.358 $\pm$ 0.05	0.356 $\pm$ 0.08	0.353 $\pm$ 0.07
	Linear	0.605 $\pm$ 0.02	0.606 $\pm$ 0.02	0.606 $\pm$ 0.02
	Neural	0.351 $\pm$ 0.05	<b>0.342<math>\pm</math>0.05</b>	0.343 $\pm$ 0.05

Table 3: Main results with sample splitting (quantile binning included).

$n$	Model	Iso	Quantile	Hybrid Iso
10,000	Boosted	0.604 $\pm$ 0.1	0.995 $\pm$ 0.3	1.037 $\pm$ 0.4
	Linear	0.611 $\pm$ 0.05	0.626 $\pm$ 0.04	0.626 $\pm$ 0.04
	Neural	0.474 $\pm$ 0.1	0.452 $\pm$ 0.1	<b>0.448<math>\pm</math>0.1</b>
50,000	Boosted	0.363 $\pm$ 0.04	0.423 $\pm$ 0.09	0.418 $\pm$ 0.09
	Linear	0.613 $\pm$ 0.02	0.614 $\pm$ 0.02	0.614 $\pm$ 0.02
	Neural	0.369 $\pm$ 0.07	0.347 $\pm$ 0.05	<b>0.347<math>\pm</math>0.05</b>
100,000	Boosted	0.308 $\pm$ 0.02	0.315 $\pm$ 0.04	0.314 $\pm$ 0.04
	Linear	0.604 $\pm$ 0.02	0.604 $\pm$ 0.02	0.604 $\pm$ 0.02
	Neural	0.331 $\pm$ 0.06	<b>0.323<math>\pm</math>0.06</b>	0.323 $\pm$ 0.06

Table 4: Main results without sample splitting (quantile binning included).

## 5 Conclusion and Future Work

We introduced Iterated Bellman Calibration as a simple, model-agnostic *post-hoc* procedure for calibrating off-policy value predictions in infinite-horizon MDPs. The method operates on top of any existing value estimator by iteratively regressing Bellman targets onto its one-dimensional output. It produces calibrated value estimates satisfying a coarsened Bellman self-consistency condition, with finite-sample guarantees for both calibration and prediction error under weak assumptions. We further show that the calibrated iterates converge to the fixed point of a coarsened Bellman operator, without requiring Bellman completeness or realizability.

We propose several algorithms based on isotonic calibration and histogram binning. Based on our theory and experiments, we recommend the hybrid isotonic–histogram calibration method (Algorithm 2), as it retains the tuning-free advantages of isotonic calibration while inheriting the calibration guarantees of fixed-bin histogram regression, making it a practical and robust choice for post-hoc value calibration.

Beyond these guarantees, Iterated Bellman Calibration provides a practical post-hoc correction for value estimates that are miscalibrated due to finite-iteration bias, early stopping

Iter	Raw	Iso	Quantile	Hybrid Iso
10	1.320±0.1	1.230±0.1	<b>0.591±0.1</b>	0.591±0.1
25	0.599±0.1	0.581±0.1	0.486±0.07	<b>0.484±0.07</b>
50	0.524±0.2	0.487±0.09	0.456±0.07	<b>0.453±0.07</b>
100	0.538±0.2	0.474±0.1	0.452±0.1	<b>0.448±0.1</b>

Table 5: Neural snapshot performance (no sample splitting).

under compute constraints, or unstable and diverging training dynamics. Because calibration reduces to a cheap one-dimensional regression, it can be applied using small, targeted datasets – including recent historical data or a limited amount of on-policy interaction – enabling rapid deployment-time recalibration and targeted correction on subpopulations. Our guarantees are, however, inherently distribution-dependent. Calibration error in Theorem 3 is controlled in  $L^2(\rho)$  under the behavior distribution, which need not control error off distribution. Similarly, the prediction error in Theorem 4 is measured under the stationary distribution  $\mu_{\hat{v}}$ , and nuisance and statistical estimation errors are amplified by the factor  $\hat{\kappa}_B$  when the behavior distribution differs from the stationary distribution of the target policy. When overlap is limited, predictions may therefore generalize poorly to under-represented regions of the state space. Thus, Iterated Bellman Calibration does not fully resolve distribution shift, but it does provide calibration and convergence guarantees under minimal assumptions, without requiring realizability or Bellman completeness.

A natural direction for future work is to explicitly target this remaining distribution mismatch by calibrating under distributions closer to the target policy’s stationary distribution, or by reweighting the calibration sample to better align with it, as suggested by recent work on stationary reweighting for fitted  $Q$ -evaluation and control (van der Laan & Kallus, 2025a,b). Density-ratio estimators for stationary distributions and discounted occupancy measures (Kim et al., 2022; Lee et al., 2021; Nachum et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020) provide promising tools for this purpose.

## References

Agarwal, A., Jiang, N., Kakade, S. M., and Sun, W. Reinforcement learning: Theory and algorithms. *CS Dept., UW Seattle, Seattle, WA, USA, Tech. Rep*, 32:96, 2019.

Agarwal, R., Schwarzer, M., Castro, P. S., Courville, A. C., and Bellemare, M. Deep reinforcement learning at the edge of the statistical precipice. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:29304–29320, 2021.

Amortila, P., Jiang, N., and Xie, T. A variant of the wang-foster-kakade lower bound for the discounted setting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.01075*, 2020.

An, G., Moon, S., Kim, J.-H., and Song, H. O. Uncertainty-based offline reinforcement

learning with diversified q-ensemble. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:7436–7447, 2021.

Baird, L. et al. Residual algorithms: Reinforcement learning with function approximation. In *Proceedings of the twelfth international conference on machine learning*, pp. 30–37, 1995.

Barlow, R. E. and Brunk, H. D. The isotonic regression problem and its dual. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 67(337):140–147, 1972.

Bella, A., Ferri, C., Hernández-Orallo, J., and Ramírez-Quintana, M. J. Calibration of machine learning models. In *Handbook of Research on Machine Learning Applications and Trends: Algorithms, Methods, and Techniques*, pp. 128–146. IGI Global, 2010.

Bellemare, M. G., Dabney, W., and Munos, R. A distributional perspective on reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 449–458. PMLR, 2017.

Bellman, R. On the theory of dynamic programming. *Proceedings of the national Academy of Sciences*, 38(8):716–719, 1952.

Bellman, R. Dynamic programming. *science*, 153(3731):34–37, 1966.

Best, M. J. and Chakravarti, N. Active set algorithms for isotonic regression; a unifying framework. *Mathematical Programming*, 47(1):425–439, 1990.

Chatterjee, S., Guntuboyina, A., and Sen, B. Improved risk bounds in isotonic regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.3765*, 2013.

Chen, J. and Jiang, N. Information-theoretic considerations in batch reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1042–1051. PMLR, 2019.

Cowgill, B. and Tucker, C. E. Economics, fairness and algorithmic bias. *preparation for: Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2019.

Dabney, W., Ostrovski, G., Silver, D., and Munos, R. Implicit quantile networks for distributional reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1096–1105. PMLR, 2018.

DeGroot, M. H. and Fienberg, S. E. The comparison and evaluation of forecasters. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (The Statistician)*, 32(1-2):12–22, 1983.

Deng, H., Han, Q., and Zhang, C.-H. Confidence intervals for multiple isotonic regression and other monotone models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(4):2021–2052, 2021.

Di, Q., Zhao, H., He, J., and Gu, Q. Pessimistic nonlinear least-squares value iteration for offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01380*, 2023.

Fan, J., Wang, Z., Xie, Y., and Yang, Z. A theoretical analysis of deep q-learning. In *Learning for dynamics and control*, pp. 486–489. PMLR, 2020.

Farahmand, A.-m., Szepesvári, C., and Munos, R. Error propagation for approximate policy and value iteration. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 23, 2010.

Foster, D. J., Krishnamurthy, A., Simchi-Levi, D., and Xu, Y. Offline reinforcement learning: Fundamental barriers for value function approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.10919*, 2021.

Foster, D. P. and Vohra, R. V. Calibrated learning and correlated equilibrium. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 21(589):40–55, 1997.

Fujimoto, S., Meger, D., and Precup, D. Off-policy deep reinforcement learning without exploration. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2052–2062. PMLR, 2019.

Gneiting, T. and Katzfuss, M. Probabilistic forecasting. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 1(1):125–151, 2014.

Gordon, G. J. Stable function approximation in dynamic programming. In *Machine learning proceedings 1995*, pp. 261–268. Elsevier, 1995.

Guo, C., Pleiss, G., Sun, Y., and Weinberger, K. Q. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017.

Gupta, C. and Ramdas, A. Distribution-free calibration guarantees for histogram binning without sample splitting. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3942–3952. PMLR, 2021.

Gupta, C., Podkopaev, A., and Ramdas, A. Distribution-free binary classification: prediction sets, confidence intervals and calibration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:3711–3723, 2020.

Györfi, L., Kohler, M., Krzyżak, A., and Walk, H. *A distribution-free theory of nonparametric regression*. Springer, 2002.

Hu, Y., Kallus, N., and Uehara, M. Fast rates for the regret of offline reinforcement learning. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 50(1):633–655, 2025.

Jin, C., Liu, Q., and Miryoosefi, S. Bellman eluder dimension: New rich classes of rl problems, and sample-efficient algorithms. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34: 13406–13418, 2021.

Kallus, N. and Uehara, M. Double reinforcement learning for efficient off-policy evaluation in markov decision processes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(167):1–63, 2020.

Kallus, N. and Uehara, M. Efficiently breaking the curse of horizon in off-policy evaluation with double reinforcement learning. *Operations Research*, 70(6):3282–3302, 2022.

Kennedy, E. H. Towards optimal doubly robust estimation of heterogeneous causal effects. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 17(2):3008–3049, 2023.

Kim, G.-H., Lee, J., Jang, Y., Yang, H., and Kim, K.-E. Lobsdice: Offline learning from observation via stationary distribution correction estimation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:8252–8264, 2022.

Kumar, A., Zhou, A., Tucker, G., and Levine, S. Conservative q-learning for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1179–1191, 2020.

Lee, J., Jeon, W., Lee, B., Pineau, J., and Kim, K.-E. Optidice: Offline policy optimization via stationary distribution correction estimation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 6120–6130. PMLR, 2021.

Lichtenstein, S., Fischhoff, B., and Phillips, L. D. Calibration of probabilities: The state of the art. In *Decision Making and Change in Human Affairs: Proceedings of the Fifth Research Conference on Subjective Probability, Utility, and Decision Making, Darmstadt, 1–4 September, 1975*, pp. 275–324. Springer, 1977.

Malik, A., Kuleshov, V., Song, J., Nemer, D., Seymour, H., and Ermon, S. Calibrated model-based deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4314–4323. PMLR, 2019.

massoud Farahmand, A., Ghavamzadeh, M., Szepesvári, C., and Mannor, S. Regularized fitted q-iteration for planning in continuous-space markovian decision problems. In *2009 American Control Conference*, pp. 725–730. IEEE, 2009.

Maystre, L. and Russo, D. Temporally-consistent survival analysis. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:10671–10683, 2022.

Munos, R. Error bounds for approximate value iteration. In *Proceedings of the National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 20, pp. 1006. Menlo Park, CA; Cambridge, MA; London; AAAI Press; MIT Press; 1999, 2005.

Munos, R. and Szepesvári, C. Finite-time bounds for fitted value iteration. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(5), 2008.

Murphy, A. H. A new vector partition of the probability score. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 12(4):595–600, 1973.

Nachum, O., Chow, Y., Dai, B., and Li, L. Dualdice: Behavior-agnostic estimation of discounted stationary distribution corrections. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.

Niculescu-Mizil, A. and Caruana, R. Predicting good probabilities with supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*, pp. 625–632, 2005.

Noarov, G. and Roth, A. The scope of multicalibration: Characterizing multicalibration via property elicitation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08507*, 2023.

Nouretdinov, I., Volkonskiy, D., Lim, P., Toccaceli, P., and Gammerman, A. Inductive venn-abels predictive distribution. In *Conformal and Probabilistic Prediction and Applications*, pp. 15–36. PMLR, 2018.

Platt, J. et al. Probabilistic outputs for support vector machines and comparisons to regularized likelihood methods. *Advances in large margin classifiers*, 10(3):61–74, 1999.

Rubin, D. and van der Laan, M. J. Doubly robust censoring unbiased transformations. 2006.

Rust, J. Optimal replacement of gmc bus engines: An empirical model of harold zurcher. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 999–1033, 1987.

Shah, D., Song, D., Xu, Z., and Yang, Y. Sample efficient reinforcement learning via low-rank matrix estimation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:12092–12103, 2020.

Stone, C. J. Consistent nonparametric regression. *The annals of statistics*, pp. 595–620, 1977.

Sun, J., Jiang, Y., Qiu, J., Nobel, P., Kochenderfer, M. J., and Schwager, M. Conformal prediction for uncertainty-aware planning with diffusion dynamics model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:80324–80337, 2023.

Theocharous, G., Thomas, P. S., and Ghavamzadeh, M. Ad recommendation systems for life-time value optimization. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on world wide web*, pp. 1305–1310, 2015.

Thrun, S. and Schwartz, A. Issues in using function approximation for reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 1993 connectionist models summer school*, pp. 255–263. Psychology Press, 2014.

Tosatto, S., Pirotta, M., d’Eramo, C., and Restelli, M. Boosted fitted q-iteration. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3434–3443. PMLR, 2017.

Tsitsiklis, J. and Van Roy, B. Analysis of temporal-difference learning with function approximation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 9, 1996.

Uehara, M., Huang, J., and Jiang, N. Minimax weight and q-function learning for off-policy evaluation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 9659–9668. PMLR, 2020.

Uehara, M., Imaizumi, M., Jiang, N., Kallus, N., Sun, W., and Xie, T. Finite sample analysis of minimax offline reinforcement learning: Completeness, fast rates and first-order efficiency. 2021.

Uehara, M., Kallus, N., Lee, J. D., and Sun, W. Offline minimax soft-q-learning under realizability and partial coverage. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36: 12797–12809, 2023.

Van Calster, B., McLernon, D. J., van Smeden, M., Wynants, L., Steyerberg, E. W., Bossuyt, P., Collins, G. S., Macaskill, P., Moons, K. G. M., and Vickers, A. J. Calibration: the achilles heel of predictive analytics. *BMC Medicine*, 17(1):230, 2019. ISSN 1741-7015. On behalf of Topic Group “Evaluating diagnostic tests and prediction models” of the STRATOS initiative.

van der Laan, L. and Alaa, A. Generalized venn and venn-abers calibration with applications in conformal prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.05676*, 2025.

van der Laan, L. and Alaa, A. M. Self-calibrating conformal prediction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:107138–107170, 2024.

van der Laan, L. and Kallus, N. Fitted q evaluation without bellman completeness via stationary weighting. Manuscript, submitted to arXiv, 2025a.

van der Laan, L. and Kallus, N. Stationary reweighting yields local convergence of soft fitted q-iteration. Manuscript, submitted to arXiv, 2025b.

Van Der Laan, L., Ulloa-Pérez, E., Carone, M., and Luedtke, A. Causal isotonic calibration for heterogeneous treatment effects. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 34831–34854. PMLR, 2023.

van der Laan, L., Lin, Z., Carone, M., and Luedtke, A. Stabilized inverse probability weighting via isotonic calibration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.06342*, 2024a.

van der Laan, L., Luedtke, A., and Carone, M. Doubly robust inference via calibration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.02771*, 2024b.

van der Laan, L., Hubbard, D., Tran, A., Kallus, N., and Bibaut, A. Semiparametric double reinforcement learning with applications to long-term causal inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.06926*, 2025a.

van der Laan, L., Kallus, N., and Bibaut, A. Inverse reinforcement learning using just classification and a few regressions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.21172*, 2025b.

van der Laan, L., Kallus, N., and Bibaut, A. Nonparametric instrumental variable inference with many weak instruments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.07729*, 2025c.

Van Der Vaart, A. and Wellner, J. A. A local maximal inequality under uniform entropy. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 5(2011):192, 2011.

Van Der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. Weak convergence. In *Weak convergence and empirical processes: with applications to statistics*, pp. 16–28. Springer, 1996.

Van Hasselt, H., Guez, A., and Silver, D. Deep reinforcement learning with double q-learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 30, 2016.

Vovk, V., Gammerman, A., and Shafer, G. *Algorithmic learning in a random world*, volume 29. Springer, 2005.

Wang, Y., Wang, R., and Kakade, S. An exponential lower bound for linearly realizable mdp with constant suboptimality gap. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 9521–9533, 2021.

Whitehouse, J., Jung, C., Syrgkanis, V., Wilder, B., and Wu, Z. S. Orthogonal causal calibration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01933*, 2024.

Xie, T. and Jiang, N. Batch value-function approximation with only realizability. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 11404–11413. PMLR, 2021.

Xue, Z., Cai, Q., Yang, B., Hu, L., Jiang, P., Gai, K., and An, B. Auro: Reinforcement learning for adaptive user retention optimization in recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*, pp. 391–401, 2025.

Yang, Z., Candès, E., and Lei, L. Bellman conformal inference: Calibrating prediction intervals for time series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05203*, 2024.

Zadrozny, B. and Elkan, C. Obtaining calibrated probability estimates from decision trees and naive bayesian classifiers. In *Icml*, volume 1, pp. 609–616, 2001.

Zadrozny, B. and Elkan, C. Transforming classifier scores into accurate multiclass probability estimates. In *Proceedings of the eighth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pp. 694–699, 2002.

Zhang, R., Dai, B., Li, L., and Schuurmans, D. Gendice: Generalized offline estimation of stationary values. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09072*, 2020.

Zhang, Y., Shi, C., and Luo, S. Conformal off-policy prediction. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 2751–2768. PMLR, 2023.

Zhou, Z., Zhou, Z., Bai, Q., Qiu, L., Blanchet, J., and Glynn, P. Finite-sample regret bound for distributionally robust offline tabular reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 3331–3339. PMLR, 2021.

## A Stationary Measures and Contraction Results

**Lemma 1** (Bellman contraction under a stationary measure). *Let  $P$  be a Markov operator with stationary distribution  $\mu$  (i.e.,  $\mu = \mu P$ ), and define the Bellman operator  $\mathcal{T}f := r + \gamma Pf$ . Then  $P$  is nonexpansive in  $L^2(\mu)$ :*

$$\|P(f - g)\|_{2,\mu} \leq \|f - g\|_{2,\mu}.$$

Consequently,  $\mathcal{T}$  is a  $\gamma$ -contraction:

$$\|\mathcal{T}(f - g)\|_{2,\mu} \leq \gamma \|f - g\|_{2,\mu}.$$

*Proof.* Because  $\mu$  is stationary for  $P$ , the operator  $P$  is nonexpansive in  $L^2(\mu)$ . Jensen's inequality implies

$$(Ph)^2 \leq P(h^2) \quad \text{pointwise.}$$

Integrating both sides with respect to  $\mu$  and using  $\mu = \mu P$  yields

$$\|Ph\|_{2,\mu}^2 = \int (Ph)^2 d\mu \leq \int P(h^2) d\mu = \int h^2 d\mu = \|h\|_{2,\mu}^2.$$

Now apply this with  $h = f - g$ . Since the reward function  $r$  cancels,

$$\mathcal{T}f - \mathcal{T}g = \gamma P(f - g).$$

Therefore,

$$\|\mathcal{T}f - \mathcal{T}g\|_{2,\mu} = \gamma \|P(f - g)\|_{2,\mu} \leq \gamma \|f - g\|_{2,\mu},$$

which proves the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 2** (Stationarity under coarsening). *Let  $P$  be a Markov kernel on  $\mathcal{S}$  and let  $\rho$  be stationary for  $P$  (i.e.,  $\rho P = \rho$ ). For any measurable coarsening map  $g : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define*

$$P_g f(s) := \mathbb{E}[f(S') \mid g(S) = g(s)],$$

where  $(S, S')$  has joint law  $\rho(ds) P(s, ds')$ . Then  $\rho$  is stationary for  $P_g$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(S, S') \sim \rho(ds) P(s, ds')$ , so  $S \sim \rho$  and  $S' \mid S \sim P(S, \cdot)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int P_g f(s) \rho(ds) &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho, P}[P_g f(S)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho, P}[\mathbb{E}_{\rho, P}[f(S') \mid g(S)]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho, P}[f(S')]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\rho$  is stationary for  $P$ , the marginal of  $S'$  is again  $\rho$ , hence  $\mathbb{E}_{\rho, P}[f(S')] = \int f(s) \rho(ds)$ .  $\square$

## B Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Define  $P_{\pi, \hat{v}} := \Pi_{\hat{v}} P_{\pi}$  and  $r_{\pi, \hat{v}} := \Pi_{\hat{v}} r_{\pi}$ . Because  $v_0$  and  $\hat{v}_0$  satisfy the fixed-point equations

$$v_0 = \mathcal{T}_{\pi} v_0, \quad \hat{v}_0 = \mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} \hat{v}_0 = r_{\pi, \hat{v}} + \gamma P_{\pi, \hat{v}} \hat{v}_0,$$

we begin by writing

$$\hat{v}_0 - v_0 = (\mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} \hat{v}_0 - \mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} v_0) + (\mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} v_0 - \mathcal{T}_{\pi} v_0).$$

Using linearity of the conditional expectation in  $\mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}}$  on differences,

$$\mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} \hat{v}_0 - \mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} v_0 = \gamma P_{\pi, \hat{v}} (\hat{v}_0 - v_0),$$

so

$$\hat{v}_0 - v_0 = \gamma P_{\pi, \hat{v}} (\hat{v}_0 - v_0) + (\mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} v_0 - v_0),$$

where we used  $\mathcal{T}_{\pi} v_0 = v_0$  for the second term.

Taking  $L^2(\mu_{\hat{v}})$  norms and applying the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{v}_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}} &\leq \gamma \|P_{\pi, \hat{v}} (\hat{v}_0 - v_0)\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}} \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} v_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1,

$$\|P_{\pi, \hat{v}} h\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}} \leq \|h\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}}.$$

Applying this with  $h = \hat{v}_0 - v_0$  gives

$$\|\hat{v}_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}} \leq \gamma \|\hat{v}_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}} + \|\mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} v_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}}.$$

Note that  $\mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} v = \Pi_{\hat{v}} \mathcal{T}_{\pi} v$ , where  $\Pi_{\hat{v}}$  is the  $L^2$  projection onto functions of  $\hat{v}$ . Thus  $\mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}} v_0 = \Pi_{\hat{v}} v_0$ , and therefore

$$\|\hat{v}_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}} \leq \gamma \|\hat{v}_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}} + \|\Pi_{\hat{v}} v_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}}.$$

Rearranging,

$$\|\hat{v}_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \|\Pi_{\hat{v}} v_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}}. \quad (\star)$$

By the assumed norm comparison,

$$\|\Pi_{\hat{v}} v_0 - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}}} \leq \kappa_{\hat{v}} \|\Pi_{\hat{v}} v_0 - v_0\|.$$

Combining with  $(\star)$  gives

$$\|\hat{v}_0 - v_0\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v}}} \leq \frac{\kappa_{\hat{v}}}{1-\gamma} \|\Pi_{\hat{v}} v_0 - v_0\|.$$

Finally, by the triangle inequality,

$$\|\hat{v} - v_0\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v}}} \leq \|\hat{v} - \hat{v}_0\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v}}} + \|\hat{v}_0 - v_0\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v}}},$$

which yields the stated result.  $\square$

## C Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Fix  $v$  and treat the nuisance estimates as fixed functions. By definition,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(v)(s) = \mathbb{E}\left[(\pi\hat{q}_v)(S) + \widehat{w}_\pi(A \mid S)\{R + \gamma v(S') - \hat{q}_v(S, A)\} \mid S = s\right].$$

Since  $(\pi\hat{q}_v)(S)$  depends only on  $S$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\pi\hat{q}_v)(S) \mid S = s] = (\pi\hat{q}_v)(s).$$

For the second term, using the definition of  $b_0$  and  $q_v := r_0 + \gamma Pv$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[\widehat{w}_\pi(A \mid S)\{R + \gamma v(S') - \hat{q}_v(S, A)\} \mid S = s\right] \\ &= b_0 \left\{ \widehat{w}_\pi(\cdot \mid s) \mathbb{E}[R + \gamma v(S') - \hat{q}_v(s, \cdot) \mid S = s, A = \cdot] \right\}(s) \\ &= b_0 \{ \widehat{w}_\pi(q_v - \hat{q}_v) \}(s). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(v)(s) = (\pi\hat{q}_v)(s) + b_0 \{ \widehat{w}_\pi(q_v - \hat{q}_v) \}(s).$$

Subtracting  $\mathcal{T}_\pi(v)(s) = (\pi q_v)(s)$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(v)(s) - \mathcal{T}_\pi(v)(s) &= (\pi\hat{q}_v - \pi q_v)(s) + b_0 \{ \widehat{w}_\pi(q_v - \hat{q}_v) \}(s) \\ &= (\pi(\hat{q}_v - q_v))(s) - b_0 \{ \widehat{w}_\pi(\hat{q}_v - q_v) \}(s). \end{aligned}$$

Using  $(\pi f)(s) = b_0 \{ w_\pi f \}(s)$  with  $f = \hat{q}_v - q_v$  gives

$$(\pi(\hat{q}_v - q_v))(s) = b_0 \{ w_\pi(\hat{q}_v - q_v) \}(s),$$

so

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(v)(s) - \mathcal{T}_\pi(v)(s) = b_0 \{ (w_\pi - \widehat{w}_\pi)(\hat{q}_v - q_v) \}(s).$$

This proves the claim.  $\square$

## D Notation and Maximal Inequalities

Let  $P_0$  denote the joint distribution of  $(S, A, R, S')$  induced by the behavior policy, and let  $P_n$  denote the empirical measure of the calibration sample  $\mathcal{C}_n$ .

We define empirical  $L^2$  norms with respect to the state and next-state samples. For any state function  $f$ , let

$$\|f\|_{n,S} := \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(S_i)^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad \|f\|_{n,S'} := \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(S'_i)^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where  $S_i$  and  $S'_i$  denote the observed states and next states, respectively, in the calibration sample  $\mathcal{C}_n$ .

Further define

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}} := \left\{ (f_1 - f_2)(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(f_2) - f_2) : f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{B,\hat{v}} \right\}.$$

By assumption, both  $\hat{v}$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi$  are fixed (non-random) operators conditional on the training data, which is independent of the calibration sample  $\mathcal{C}_n$ . Consequently, the classes  $\mathcal{F}_{B,\hat{v}}$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$  are non-random conditional on the training dataset.

For any distribution  $Q$  and any uniformly bounded function class  $\mathcal{F}$ , let  $N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L^2(Q))$  denote the  $\varepsilon$ -covering number of  $\mathcal{F}$  under the  $L^2(Q)$  norm (Van Der Vaart & Wellner, 1996). Define the uniform entropy integral of  $\mathcal{F}$  by

$$\mathcal{J}(\delta, \mathcal{F}) := \int_0^\delta \sup_Q \sqrt{\log N(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, L^2(Q))} d\epsilon,$$

where the supremum is taken over all discrete probability distributions  $Q$ .

Finally, for two quantities  $x$  and  $y$ , we write  $x \lesssim y$  to mean that  $x$  is bounded above by  $y$  up to a universal constant that depends only on global constants appearing in our conditions.

### D.1 Local maximal inequality

Let  $O_1, \dots, O_n \in \mathcal{O}$  be independent random variables. For any function  $f : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define

$$\|f\| := \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[f(O_i)^2]}. \tag{8}$$

For a star-shaped class of functions  $\mathcal{F}$  and a radius  $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ , define the localized Rademacher complexity

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{F}, \delta) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{F} \\ \|f\| \leq \delta}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i f(O_i) \right],$$

where  $\epsilon_i$  are i.i.d. Rademacher random variables.

The following lemma provides a local maximal inequality and is a restatement of Lemma 11 in [van der Laan et al. \(2025c\)](#).

**Lemma 3** (Local maximal inequality). *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a star-shaped class of functions satisfying  $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_\infty \leq M$ . Let  $\delta > 0$  satisfy the critical radius condition  $\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{F}, \delta) \leq \delta^2$ . Suppose further that  $n^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log \log(1/\delta)} = o(\delta)$ . Then there exists a universal constant  $C > 0$  such that, for all  $u \geq 1$ , with probability at least  $1 - e^{-u^2}$ , every  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(O_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(O_i)]) \leq C \left( \delta^2 + \delta \|f\| + \frac{u \|f\|}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{Mu^2}{n} \right).$$

The following lemma bounds the localized Rademacher complexity in terms of the uniform entropy integral and is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.1 of [Van Der Vaart & Wellner \(2011\)](#).

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a star-shaped class of functions such that  $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_\infty \leq M$ . Then, for every  $\delta > 0$ ,*

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\mathcal{F}, \delta) \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{J}(\delta, \mathcal{F}) \left( 1 + \frac{\mathcal{J}(\delta, \mathcal{F})}{\delta \sqrt{n}} \right),$$

where the implicit constant depends only on  $M$ .

*Proof.* This bound follows directly from the argument in the proof of Theorem 2.1 of [Van Der Vaart & Wellner \(2011\)](#); see in particular the step where the local Rademacher complexity is controlled by the uniform entropy integral for star-shaped classes.  $\square$

## E Proof of Theorem 3

### E.1 Technical lemmas

**Lemma 5.** *Under our conditions,*

$$\mathcal{J}(\delta, \hat{\mathcal{G}}) \lesssim \delta \sqrt{B \log(1/\delta)},$$

where the implicit constant is independent of  $B$ .

*Proof.* By assumption,  $\|\hat{P}f - \hat{P}g\|_{n,A,S} \leq L\|f - g\|_{n,S'}$  almost surely. For each  $s$ , by Jensen's inequality,

$$|\pi h(s)|^2 = \left| \sum_a \pi(a \mid s) h(a, s) \right|^2 \leq \sum_a \pi(a \mid s) |h(a, s)|^2,$$

so  $\|\pi h\|_{n,S} \leq \|h\|_{n,A,S}$ . Hence, we also have

$$\|\pi \hat{P}f - \pi \hat{P}g\|_{n,S} \leq \|\hat{P}f - \hat{P}g\|_{n,A,S} \leq L\|f - g\|_{n,S'}.$$

Hence, by boundedness of all nuisances,

$$\|\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(f) - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(g)\|_{L^2(P_n)} \lesssim \|f - g\|_{n,S} + \|f - g\|_{n,S'}.$$

Take  $f, g \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$  with  $f = (f_1 - f_2)(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(f_2) - f_2)$  and  $g = (g_1 - g_2)(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(g_2) - g_2)$  for  $f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{B,\hat{v}}$ . By Lipschitz continuity of multiplication and boundedness of nuisances, we have

$$\|f - g\|_{L^2(P_n)} \lesssim \|f_1 - g_1\|_{n,S} + \|f_2 - g_2\|_{n,S} + \|f_2 - g_2\|_{n,S'}.$$

Taking the supremum over all discrete distributions  $Q$ , we obtain

$$\|f - g\|_{L^2(P_n)} \lesssim \sup_Q \|f_1 - g_1\|_{L^2(Q)} + \sup_Q \|f_2 - g_2\|_{L^2(Q)}.$$

Hence, by preservation of entropy integrals in [Van Der Vaart & Wellner \(1996\)](#),

$$\log N(\varepsilon, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}, L^2(P_n)) \lesssim \sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{B,\hat{v}}, L^2(Q)).$$

Taking the supremum over discrete distributions  $Q$  on both sides yields the uniform covering number bound

$$\sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}, L^2(Q)) \lesssim \sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{B,\hat{v}}, L^2(Q)).$$

The class  $\mathcal{F}_{B,\hat{v}}$  satisfies

$$\sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{B,\hat{v}}, L^2(Q)) \leq \sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_B, L^2(Q \circ \hat{v}^{-1})),$$

where  $Q \circ \hat{v}^{-1}$  denotes the pushforward of  $Q$  under  $\hat{v}$ . Hence,

$$\sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{B,\hat{v}}, L^2(Q)) \leq \sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_B, L^2(Q)),$$

where, by a slight abuse of notation, the supremum on the right-hand side is taken over all discrete probability distributions  $Q$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ . The class  $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_B$  consists of all piecewise-constant functions on  $\mathbb{R}$  taking at most  $B$  values. Therefore,  $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_B$  has VC-subgraph dimension  $O(B)$ , and [Van Der Vaart & Wellner \(1996\)](#) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{B,\hat{v}}, L^2(Q)) &\lesssim \sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_B, L^2(Q)) \\ &\lesssim B \log(1/\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,  $\mathcal{J}(\delta, \mathcal{F}_{B,\hat{v}}) \lesssim \delta \sqrt{B \log(1/\delta)}$ .  $\square$

## E.2 Proof of Theorem 3

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Denote  $O_i := (S_i, A_i, R_i, S'_i)$ . The first-order optimality conditions for  $\theta_n^{(K)}$  imply that, for each bin  $b \in [B]$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{I_b}(\hat{v}(S_i)) \{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})(O_i) - \hat{v}^{(K)}(S_i) \} = 0.$$

Hence, for any  $f \in \mathcal{F}_B$ , which is a linear combination of these indicators,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\hat{v}(S_i)) \{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})(O_i) - \hat{v}^{(K)}(S_i) \} = 0. \quad (9)$$

Moreover, for any function  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we may write  $g \circ \hat{v}^{(K)} = f \circ \hat{v}$  for some  $f$ , and therefore, for all such  $g$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(\hat{v}^{(K)}(S_i)) \{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})(O_i) - \hat{v}^{(K)}(S_i) \} = 0.$$

Noting that  $\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}$  is of the form  $g \circ \hat{v}^{(K)}$  for some function  $g$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)})(S_i) - \hat{v}^{(K)}(S_i) \right\} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})(O_i) - \hat{v}^{(K)}(S_i) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Adding and subtracting  $P_0$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} &P_0 \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \\ &= (P_0 - P_n) \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \\ &\quad + P_0 \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)}) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

We rewrite the left-hand side of (10). Adding and subtracting and applying the law of total expectation, the calibration error decomposes as

$$\begin{aligned} &\| \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \|^2 \\ &= P_0 \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \\ &\quad + P_0 \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K)}) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The first term on the right-hand side can be decomposed as in (10). By the law of total expectation, the proof of Theorem 2, and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, the second term

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| P_0 \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) \right\} \right| \\
&= \left| P_0 \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \mathcal{T}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K)}) \right\} \right| \\
&\leq \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\| \|(\widehat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\widehat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(K)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(K)}})\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, (10) and (11) together imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\|^2 \\
&\leq (P_0 - P_n) \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \\
&\quad + \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\| \|\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})\| \\
&\quad + \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\| \|(\widehat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\widehat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(K)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(K)}})\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(v)(s) := \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(v)(S) \mid S = s]$ . Here, the second term on the right-hand side follows from (10), noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| P_0 \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)}) \right\} \right| \\
&= \left| P_0 \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \mathbb{E} \left[ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)}) \mid S \right] \right| \\
&\leq \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\| \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)}) \mid S \right] \right\| \\
&= \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\| \|\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})\|.
\end{aligned}$$

We now turn to bounding the empirical process term on the right-hand side of (12). Observe that

$$(\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)})(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)})$$

lies in a uniformly bounded subset of the class

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}} := \{(f_1 - f_2)(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(f_2) - f_2) : f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{B,\hat{v}}\},$$

By Lemma 5, it holds that  $\mathcal{J}(\delta, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}) \lesssim \delta \sqrt{B \log(1/\delta)}$ . By assumption,  $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$  is a fixed, nonrandom function class conditional on the training data, which is independent of the

calibration sample  $\mathcal{C}_n$ . Hence, applying Lemma 4 conditional on the training data, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_n(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \delta) &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{J}(\delta, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}) \left( 1 + \frac{\mathcal{J}(\delta, \widehat{\mathcal{G}})}{\delta \sqrt{n}} \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \delta \sqrt{B \log(1/\delta)} \left( 1 + \frac{\delta \sqrt{B \log(1/\delta)}}{\delta \sqrt{n}} \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{\delta \sqrt{B \log(1/\delta)}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{B \log(1/\delta)}{n}.\end{aligned}$$

The critical radius

$$\delta_n := \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{B}\right)},$$

satisfies

$$\delta_n = \inf\{\delta > 0 : \mathcal{R}_n(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \delta) \lesssim \delta^2\}.$$

Applying Lemma 3 conditional on the training data with  $\mathcal{F} := \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ , we conclude that the following holds with probability at least  $1 - e^{-u^2}$  for every  $f \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ :

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(O_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(O_i)]) \lesssim \delta_n^2 + \delta_n \|f\| + \frac{u \|f\|}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{u^2}{n}.$$

Choosing  $u = \sqrt{\log(1/\eta)}$  gives  $1 - e^{-u^2} = 1 - \eta$ . Hence, with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(O_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(O_i)]) \\ \lesssim \delta_n^2 + \delta_n \|f\| + \frac{\sqrt{\log(1/\eta)} \|f\|}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\log(1/\eta)}{n}.\end{aligned}$$

By boundedness of our nuisances,

$$\|\{\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\} \{\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\}\| \lesssim \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\|.$$

Hence, with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}(P_n - P_0) \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)} \right\} \\ \lesssim \delta_n^2 + \delta_n \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\| \\ + \frac{\sqrt{\log(1/\eta)} \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\|}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\log(1/\eta)}{n},\end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constants do not depend on  $B$ .

Combining the above with (12), we find with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\|^2 \\
& \lesssim \delta_n^2 + \delta_n \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\| \\
& \quad + \frac{\sqrt{\log(1/\eta)}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\| + \frac{\log(1/\eta)}{n} \\
& \quad + \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\| \|\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})\| \\
& \quad + \|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\| \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(K)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(K)}})\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The inequality in (13) implies that, with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ , the calibration error satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\| & \lesssim \delta_n + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\eta)}{n}} \\
& \quad + \|\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})\| \\
& \quad + \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(K)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(K)}})\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $\delta_n := \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{B}\right)}$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}\| & \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{B}\right)} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\eta)}{n}} \\
& \quad + \|\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\pi}(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})\| \\
& \quad + \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(K)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(K)}})\|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

## F Proof of Theorem 4

### F.1 Additional notation

Define the bin–index map  $\hat{b}(s)$  by setting  $\hat{b}(s) = b$  whenever  $\hat{v}(s) \in I_b$ . Let  $\Pi_{\hat{v},B}$  denote the binning projection

$$(\Pi_{\hat{v},B}g)(s) := E\left[g(S) \mid \hat{v}(S) \in I_{\hat{b}(s)}\right].$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{T}_{\pi,\hat{v},B}(g)(s) := (\Pi_{\hat{v},B}\mathcal{T}_\pi(g))(s)$$

Define  $\hat{v}_{0,B}$  denote the fixed point satisfying

$$\mathcal{T}_{\pi,\hat{v},B}(\hat{v}_{0,B}) = \hat{v}_{0,B}.$$

Such a fixed point exists by Banach's fixed point theorem because  $\mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}, B}(g) \in \mathcal{F}_{B, \hat{v}}$  whenever  $g \in \mathcal{F}_{B, \hat{v}}$ , and the operator is a  $\gamma$ -contraction in the sup-norm.

Recall the projected transition operator

$$(P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B} h)(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[ h(S') \mid \hat{v}(S) \in I_{b(s)} \right].$$

It holds that

$$P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B} := \Pi_{\hat{v}, B} P_{\pi},$$

and

$$\Pi_{\hat{v}, B} \mathcal{T}_{\pi}(f) - \Pi_{\hat{v}, B} \mathcal{T}_{\pi}(g) = \gamma P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B}(f - g).$$

## F.2 Supporting lemmas

We begin by bounding the error between the projected fixed point  $\hat{v}_{0, B}$  and the true value function  $v_0$ .

**Lemma 6** (Approximation error for the projected fixed point). *Assume that  $\mu_{\hat{v}, B}$  is stationary for  $P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B}$ . Then*

$$\|\hat{v}_{0, B} - v_0\|_{L^2(\mu_{\hat{v}, B})} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \|(I - \Pi_{\hat{v}, B})v_0\|_{L^2(\mu_{\hat{v}, B})}.$$

*Proof.* Because  $v_0$  and  $\hat{v}_{0, B}$  satisfy  $v_0 = \mathcal{T}_{\pi}v_0$  and  $\hat{v}_{0, B} = \Pi_{\hat{v}, B} \mathcal{T}_{\pi} \hat{v}_{0, B}$ , we have

$$\hat{v}_{0, B} - v_0 = \Pi_{\hat{v}, B} (\mathcal{T}_{\pi} \hat{v}_{0, B} - \mathcal{T}_{\pi} v_0) + (I - \Pi_{\hat{v}, B}) \mathcal{T}_{\pi} v_0.$$

Since  $\mathcal{T}_{\pi}(f) - \mathcal{T}_{\pi}(g) = \gamma P_{\pi}(f - g)$  and  $\Pi_{\hat{v}, B}$  is affine but linear on differences, the first term equals

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\hat{v}, B} (\mathcal{T}_{\pi} \hat{v}_{0, B} - \mathcal{T}_{\pi} v_0) &= \gamma \Pi_{\hat{v}, B} P_{\pi} (\hat{v}_{0, B} - v_0) \\ &= \gamma P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B} (\hat{v}_{0, B} - v_0). \end{aligned}$$

Using  $\mathcal{T}_{\pi} v_0 = v_0$ , we therefore obtain the error identity

$$\hat{v}_{0, B} - v_0 = \gamma P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B} (\hat{v}_{0, B} - v_0) + (I - \Pi_{\hat{v}, B}) v_0.$$

Taking  $L^2(\mu_{\hat{v}, B})$  norms and applying the triangle inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{v}_{0, B} - v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}, B}} &\leq \gamma \|P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B} (\hat{v}_{0, B} - v_0)\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}, B}} \\ &\quad + \|(I - \Pi_{\hat{v}, B}) v_0\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}, B}}. \end{aligned}$$

Because  $P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B}$  is a Markov operator and  $\mu_{\hat{v}, B}$  is stationary for  $P_{\pi, \hat{v}, B}$ , it is nonexpansive in

$L^2(\mu_{\hat{v},B})$ . By Jensen's inequality,  $(P_{\pi,\hat{v},B}h)^2 \leq P_{\pi,\hat{v},B}(h^2)$  pointwise, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{\pi,\hat{v},B}h\|_{L^2(\mu_{\hat{v},B})}^2 &= \int (P_{\pi,\hat{v},B}h)^2 d\mu_{\hat{v},B} \\ &\leq \int P_{\pi,\hat{v},B}(h^2) d\mu_{\hat{v},B} \\ &= \int h^2 d\mu_{\hat{v},B} \\ &= \|h\|_{L^2(\mu_{\hat{v},B})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

where the equality uses stationarity of  $\mu_{\hat{v},B}$ . Applying this with  $h = \hat{v}_{0,B} - v_0$  gives  $\|P_{\pi,\hat{v},B}(\hat{v}_{0,B} - v_0)\|_{L^2(\mu_{\hat{v},B})} \leq \|\hat{v}_{0,B} - v_0\|_{L^2(\mu_{\hat{v},B})}$ . Therefore,

$$\|\hat{v}_{0,B} - v_0\|_{L^2(\mu_{\hat{v},B})} \leq \gamma \|\hat{v}_{0,B} - v_0\|_{L^2(\mu_{\hat{v},B})} + \|(I - \Pi_{\hat{v},B})v_0\|_{L^2(\mu_{\hat{v},B})}.$$

Rearranging completes the proof:

$$\|\hat{v}_{0,B} - v_0\|_{L^2(\mu_{\hat{v},B})} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \|(I - \Pi_{\hat{v},B})v_0\|_{L^2(\mu_{\hat{v},B})}.$$

□

**Lemma 7** (Inexact iterations of  $\mathcal{T}_{\pi,\hat{v},B}$ ). *Assume  $\mu_{\hat{v},B}$  is stationary for  $P_{\pi,\hat{v},B}$ , so  $\mu_{\hat{v},B} = \mu_{\hat{v},B}P_{\pi,\hat{v},B}$ . Let  $\{\eta_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  be any sequence such that*

$$\|\hat{v}^{(k)} - \mathcal{T}_{\pi,\hat{v},B}(\hat{v}^{(k-1)})\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \leq \eta_k \quad \text{for all } k.$$

Then, for any  $K \geq 1$ ,

$$\|\hat{v}^{(K)} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \leq \gamma^K \|\hat{v} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} + \sum_{j=1}^K \gamma^{K-j} \eta_j.$$

*Proof.* Because  $\mathcal{F}_B$  consists of functions that are constant on each bin, conditioning on  $\hat{b}(S)$  yields a function that is also constant on bins. Thus  $\mathcal{T}_{\pi,\hat{v},B}$  maps  $\mathcal{F}_B$  into itself.

Define the per-iteration error function

$$e_k := \hat{v}^{(k)} - \mathcal{T}_{\pi,\hat{v},B}(\hat{v}^{(k-1)}), \quad \|e_k\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \leq \eta_k.$$

Since  $\hat{v}^{(k)}, \hat{v}_{0,B} \in \mathcal{F}_B$ , there exist  $\hat{\theta}^{(k)}$  and  $\theta^*$  such that  $\hat{v}^{(k)} = \hat{\theta}^{(k)} \circ \hat{v}$  and  $\hat{v}_{0,B} = \theta^* \circ \hat{v}$ . By Lemma 1,  $\mathcal{T}_{\pi,\hat{v},B}$  is a  $\gamma$ -contraction under  $\|\cdot\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}}$ . Applying the standard inexact-iteration bound (e.g., Lemma 4 of [van der Laan et al. \(2025b\)](#)) gives

$$\|(\hat{\theta}^{(K)} - \theta^*) \circ \hat{v}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \leq \gamma^K \|(\hat{\theta}^{(0)} - \theta^*) \circ \hat{v}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} + \sum_{j=1}^K \gamma^{K-j} \|e_j\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}}.$$

Substituting  $\hat{v}^{(k)} = \hat{\theta}^{(k)} \circ \hat{v}$  and  $\hat{v}_{0,B} = \theta^* \circ \hat{v}$  yields

$$\|\hat{v}^{(K)} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \leq \gamma^K \|\hat{v} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} + \sum_{j=1}^K \gamma^{K-j} \eta_j.$$

□

**Lemma 8** (Error bound for inexact updates). *There exists a  $C < \infty$ , such that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , it holds that, uniformly over  $k \in [K]$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{v}^{(k)} - \mathcal{T}_{\pi,\hat{v},B}(v^{(k-1)})\| \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{B}\right)} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(K/\delta)}{n}} \\ & \quad + C \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}})\|. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Equation 9 in the proof of Theorem 3 shows that, for any transformation  $f \in \mathcal{F}_B$  and any  $k$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\hat{v}(S_i)) \{ \hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(k-1)})(O_i) - \hat{v}^{(k)}(S_i) \} = 0.$$

Applying the above with  $f \circ \hat{v} = \hat{v}_B^{*(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}$ , where

$$\hat{v}_B^{*(k)} := \mathcal{T}_{\pi,\hat{v},B}(\theta^{(k-1)}),$$

we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{v}_B^{*(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)})(S_i) \{ \hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(k-1)})(O_i) - \hat{v}^{(k)}(S_i) \} = 0.$$

Adding and subtracting  $P_0$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} & P_0 \left[ (\hat{v}_B^{*(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}) \{ \hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(k-1)}) - \hat{v}^{(k)} \} \right] \\ & = (P_0 - P_n) \left[ (\hat{v}_B^{*(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}) \{ \hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(k-1)}) - \hat{v}^{(k)} \} \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

First, we study the left-hand side of (14). We have

$$\begin{aligned} & P_0 \left[ (\hat{v}_B^{*(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}) \{ \hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(k-1)}) - \hat{v}^{(k)} \} \right] \\ & = \|\hat{v}_B^{*(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\|^2 \\ & \quad + P_0 \left[ (\hat{v}_B^{*(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}) \{ \hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(k-1)}) - \hat{v}_B^{*(k)} \} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the law of total expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_0 \left[ (\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}) \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi \left( \hat{v}^{(k-1)} \right) - \hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} \right\} \right] \\
&= P_0 \left[ (\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}) \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi \left( \hat{v}^{(k-1)} \right) - \mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}, B} \left( \theta^{(k-1)} \right) \right\} \right] \\
&= P_0 \left[ (\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}) \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi \left( \hat{v}^{(k-1)} \right) - \mathcal{T}_\pi \left( \hat{v}^{(k-1)} \right) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2 and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| P_0 \left[ (\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}) \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi \left( \hat{v}^{(k-1)} \right) - \hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} \right\} \right] \right| \\
& \leq \|\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\| \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}})\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting it all together,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\|^2 & \leq P_0 \left[ (\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}) \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi \left( \hat{v}^{(k-1)} \right) - \hat{v}^{(k)} \right\} \right] \\
& + \|\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\| \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}})\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (14),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\|^2 \\
& \leq (P_0 - P_n) \left[ (\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}) \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi \left( \hat{v}^{(k-1)} \right) - \hat{v}^{(k)} \right\} \right] \\
& + \|\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\| \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}})\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Next, we obtain a high-probability bound for the first term right-hand side of (15). Applying Lemmas 3, 4, and 5, and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 3, we obtain that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| (P_0 - P_n) \left[ (\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}) \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi \left( \hat{v}^{(k-1)} \right) - \hat{v}^{(k)} \right\} \right] \right| \\
& \lesssim \delta_n^2 + \delta_n \|\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\| \\
& + \frac{\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \|\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\|}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta_n := \sqrt{(B/n) \log(B/\delta)}$ , and the implicit constants do not depend on  $B$ .

Plugging this high probability bound into (15), we obtain that, with probability at least

$1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\|^2 \\
& \lesssim \delta_n^2 + \delta_n \|\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\| \\
& \quad + \frac{\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \|\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\|}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n} \\
& \quad + \|\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\| \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}})\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that  $\delta_n := \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{B}\right)}$ , the inequality above implies that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{v}_B^{\star(k)} - \hat{v}^{(k)}\| & \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{B}\right)} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}} \\
& \quad + \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}})\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that  $\eta_k = \hat{v}_B^{\star(k)}$ , the result follows by a union bound over  $k \in [K]$ .  $\square$

### F.3 Proof of Theorem 4

*Proof of Theorem 4.* For  $C \in (0, \infty)$  large enough, define

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_k & = C \left( \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{B}\right)} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(K/\delta)}{n}} \right) \\
& \quad + \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(k-1)}})\|.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 8 and the norm bound in C4, for  $C$  large enough, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  and uniformly over  $k \in [K]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{v}^{(k)} - \mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}, B}(\hat{v}^{(k-1)})\|_{2, \mu_{\hat{v}, B}} & \leq \hat{\kappa} \|\hat{v}^{(k)} - \mathcal{T}_{\pi, \hat{v}, B}(\hat{v}^{(k-1)})\| \\
& \leq \hat{\kappa} \eta_k.
\end{aligned}$$

Define  $\tilde{\eta}_k := \hat{\kappa} \eta_k$ . Then the above shows that the assumption of Lemma 7 holds with  $\tilde{\eta}_k$  in place of  $\eta_k$ .

Applying the deterministic inequality of Lemma 7 with  $\tilde{\eta}_k$  yields, with probability at

least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{v}^{(K)} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \\
& \leq \gamma^K \|\hat{v} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} + \sum_{j=1}^K \gamma^{K-j} \tilde{\eta}_j \\
& \leq \gamma^K \|\hat{v} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \\
& \quad + \frac{C\hat{\kappa}}{1-\gamma} \left( \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{B}\right)} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(K/\delta)}{n}} \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{\hat{\kappa}}{1-\gamma} \max_{j \in [K]} \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(j-1)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(j-1)}})\|.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6,

$$\|\hat{v}_{0,B} - v_0\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \|(I - \Pi_{\hat{v},B})v_0\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}}.$$

Combining this with our high-probability bound on  $\|\hat{v}^{(K)} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}}$ , we find that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{v}^{(K)} - v_0\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \|\Pi_{\hat{v},B}v_0 - v_0\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \\
& \quad + \gamma^K \|\hat{v} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \\
& \quad + \frac{C\hat{\kappa}}{1-\gamma} \left( \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{B}\right)} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(K/\delta)}{n}} \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{\hat{\kappa}}{1-\gamma} \max_{j \in [K]} \|(\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi)(\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(j-1)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(j-1)}})\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Pi_{\hat{v},B}$  is a projection under  $\|\cdot\|$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{v}_{0,B} - v_0\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} & \leq \frac{\hat{\kappa}}{1-\gamma} \|(I - \Pi_{\hat{v},B})v_0\| \\
& \leq \frac{\hat{\kappa}}{1-\gamma} \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{F}_B} \|\theta \circ \hat{v} - v_0\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the second norm bound in C4.  $\square$

## F.4 Bound on Successive Iteration Errors

**Lemma 9** (Bound on Successive Iteration Errors). *Under the conditions of Theorem 4,*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{v}^{(K)} - \hat{v}^{(K-1)}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \\
& \lesssim \gamma^K \|\hat{v} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \\
& + \frac{C}{1-\gamma} \left( \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{B}\right)} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(K/\delta)}{n}} \right) \\
& + \frac{\kappa_{\hat{v},B}}{1-\gamma} \max_{j \in [K]} \left\| (\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi) (\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(j-1)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(j-1)}}) \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof of Theorem 4 established that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{v}^{(K)} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \\
& \leq \gamma^K \|\hat{v} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \\
& + \frac{C\kappa_{\hat{v},B}}{1-\gamma} \left( \sqrt{\frac{B}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{B}\right)} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(K/\delta)}{n}} \right) \\
& + \frac{\kappa_{\hat{v},B}}{1-\gamma} \max_{j \in [K]} \left\| (\hat{w}_\pi - w_\pi) (\hat{q}_{\hat{v}^{(j-1)}} - q_{\hat{v}^{(j-1)}}) \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{v}^{(K)} - \hat{v}^{(K-1)}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} & \leq \|\hat{v}^{(K-1)} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}} \\
& + \|\hat{v}^{(K)} - \hat{v}_{0,B}\|_{2,\mu_{\hat{v},B}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The result follows by applying the above bound with  $K-1$  and  $K$ .  $\square$

## G Proofs of Theorems 5 and 6

*Proof of Theorem 5.* The first-order optimality conditions for isotonic regression (equivalently, its interpretation as a histogram estimator) imply that for any function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that is a linear combination of the indicator functions defining the isotonic partition,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\hat{v}^{(K)}(S_i)) \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})(O_i) - \hat{v}^{(K)}(S_i) \right\} = 0.$$

See, for example, the proof of Lemma C.1 in [Van Der Laan et al. \(2023\)](#) and [van der Laan et al. \(2024a\)](#). Choosing  $f$  appropriately yields

$$0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)})(S_i) - \hat{v}^{(K)}(S_i) \right\} \\ \times \left\{ \hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)})(O_i) - \hat{v}^{(K)}(S_i) \right\},$$

which is the same basic equality as (10) in the proof of Theorem 3. The remainder of the argument proceeds along the same lines with minor modifications.

Specifically, let  $\mathcal{F}_{TV}$  denote the union of  $\mathcal{F}_{iso}$ , which is uniformly bounded by  $2M$  under Condition C1, with all functions of bounded total variation bounded by the constant  $C$  in Condition C5. By [Van Der Vaart & Wellner \(1996\)](#), this class satisfies the uniform entropy integral bound  $\mathcal{J}(\delta, \mathcal{F}_{TV}) \lesssim \sqrt{\delta}$ .

Under Condition C5 and by Lemma 6 of [van der Laan et al. \(2024a\)](#),  $\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)})$  has finite total variation bounded and lies in  $\mathcal{F}_{TV, \hat{v}} := \{f \circ \hat{v} : f \in \mathcal{F}_{TV}\}$ . Thus, it holds that

$$(\Gamma_0(\hat{v}^{(K)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)}) (\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(\hat{v}^{(K-1)}) - \hat{v}^{(K)})$$

lies in a uniformly bounded subset of the class

$$\hat{\mathcal{G}} := \left\{ (f_1 - f_2) (\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\pi(f_2) - f_2) : f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{TV, \hat{v}} \right\}.$$

Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 3, we have

$$\mathcal{J}(\delta, \hat{\mathcal{G}}) \lesssim \mathcal{J}(\delta, \mathcal{F}_{TV}) \lesssim \sqrt{\delta}.$$

The proof now follows directly from Theorem 3 with this new choice of  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$  and its associated critical radius  $\delta_n = n^{-1/3}$  for monotone functions.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 6.* The result follows directly from a union bound and the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4, with  $\mathcal{F}_B$  replaced by  $\mathcal{F}_{B_n}$ , the class of all piecewise-constant functions with at most  $B_n$  constant segments. In particular, the entropy bound in Lemma 5 continues to apply to this class. Notably, the proofs of these theorems allow for data-adaptive partitions and require only a deterministic upper bound on the number of constant segments.  $\square$