

Best Policy Identification in discounted MDPs: Problem-specific Sample Complexity

Aymen Al Marjani and Alexandre Proutiere*
KTH, Royal Institute of Technology
Stockholm, Sweden

November 19, 2021

Abstract

We investigate the problem of best-policy identification in discounted Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) with finite state and action spaces. We assume that the agent has access to a generative model and that the MDP possesses a unique optimal policy. In this setting, we derive a problem-specific lower bound of the sample complexity satisfied by any learning algorithm. This lower bound corresponds to an optimal sample allocation that solves a non-convex program, and hence, is hard to exploit in the design of efficient algorithms. We provide a simple and tight upper bound of the sample complexity lower bound, whose corresponding nearly-optimal sample allocation becomes explicit. The upper bound depends on specific functionals of the MDP such as the sub-optimal gaps and the variance of the next-state value function, and thus really summarizes the hardness of the MDP. We devise KLB-TS (KL Ball Track-and-Stop), an algorithm tracking this nearly-optimal allocation, and provide asymptotic guarantees for its sample complexity (both almost surely and in expectation). The advantages of KLB-TS against state-of-the-art algorithms are finally discussed.

1 Introduction

Reinforcement Learning (RL) algorithms are designed to interact with an unknown stochastic dynamical system, and through this interaction, to identify, as fast as possible, an optimal control policy. This paper, as most related work in this field, focuses on systems and control objectives that are modelled as a standard discounted Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) with finite state and action spaces. Various interaction models have been investigated, but most algorithms have been devised in the so-called *generative model*, where in each step, the algorithm may sample a transition and a reward from any given (state, action) pair. We also restrict our attention to this model. In this setting, the efficiency of an RL algorithm is measured through its *sample complexity*, defined as the number of samples (the number of times the algorithm interacts with the system) required to identify an optimal policy with some prescribed levels of accuracy and certainty.

We investigate the design of RL algorithms with minimal sample complexity. This problem has attracted a lot of attention over the last two decades. Most studies follow a minimax approach. For example, it is known that for the worst possible MDP, identifying an ϵ -optimal policy with probability $1 - \delta$ requires at least $\frac{SA}{\epsilon^2(1-\gamma)^3} \log(\frac{SA}{\delta})$ samples, where S and A are the number of states and actions, respectively. Note that to obtain this sample complexity lower bound, one needs to

*Emails: {aymen.al.marjani@gmail.com, alepro@kth.se}

design a very specific worst-case MDP (in particular, its transition probabilities must depend on ϵ and γ). Since the aforementioned minimax lower bound appeared, most researchers have been aiming at devising algorithms matching this bound. In contrast, in this paper, we are interested in analyzing the minimal *problem-specific* sample complexity. Specifically, we seek to understand the dependence of the sample complexity on the MDP that has to be learnt. Problem-specific performance metrics are much more informative than their minimax counterparts, because they encode and express the inherent hardness of the MDP. Minimax metrics just represents the hardness of a very specific MDP, the worst MDP. In particular, establishing that the sample complexity of an algorithm does not exceed the minimax lower bound just reveals that the algorithm performs well for this worst possible MDP. However, it does not indicate whether the algorithm adapts to the hardness of the MDP, i.e., whether the optimal policy of a very easy MDP would be learnt very quickly. As a matter of fact, an algorithm with sample complexity matching the minimax lower bound just consists in sampling (state, action) pairs uniformly at random.

The problem-specific sample complexity of identifying the best arm in stochastic Multi-Armed Bandit (MAB) problems is now well understood. In [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#), the authors derive a problem-specific sample complexity lower bound, and devise a track-and-stop algorithm achieving this lower bound. A first step towards extending these results to learning in MDP has been taken in [Zanette et al. \(2019\)](#). There, the authors present Bespoke, an algorithm that leverages the problem-dependent structure of the MDP and in turn, offers problem-specific sample complexity guarantees. Indeed, the upper bound of the sample complexity of Bespoke depends explicitly on the sub-optimality gaps of sub-optimal actions and on the variances of the rewards and next-state value function. However, the design of Bespoke is not driven by any problem-specific sample complexity lower bound, and it is hard to state how optimal Bespoke is. In this work, we explore whether the methodology used in [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#) for MAB problems can be extended to RL problems. This methodology consists in first deriving a problem-specific sample complexity lower bound. The latter should reveal the sample allocation leading to the minimal sample complexity. One may then devise a *track-and-stop* algorithm that (i) tracks the optimal sample allocation identified in the lower bound, and (ii) stops when the information gathered is judged sufficient to get the desired PAC guarantees. As it turns out, extending this methodology from MAB to RL problems raises fundamental issues, mainly due to the difficulty of computing the sample allocation leading to the minimal problem-specific sample complexity. We propose a set of tools to solve these issues. Our contributions are as follows.

- We derive a problem-specific sample complexity lower bound for identifying an optimal policy in a given MDP ϕ . This bound is expressed as $K(\phi) \log(1/\delta)$, where the constant $K(\phi)$ encodes the hardness of the MDP ϕ . $K(\phi)$ is the value of a complex non-convex optimization problem. This complexity makes the design of a track-and-stop algorithm similar to that proposed in [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#) and achieving the sample complexity lower bound elusive. To circumvent this difficulty, we derive an explicit upper bound $U(\phi)$ of $K(\phi)$. The advantage of $U(\phi)$ is two-fold: (i) $U(\phi)$ remains problem-specific, and explicitly depends on functionals of the MDP characterizing its hardness. (ii) $U(\phi)$ corresponds to an explicit and simple sample allocation, which in turn, allows us to devise a procedure that tracks this allocation.
- Based on our sample complexity lower bound analysis, we devise KLB-TS (KL Ball Track-and-Stop), an algorithm whose sample complexity is at most $U(\phi) \log(1/\delta)$. Our algorithm relies on a procedure tracking the sample allocation leading to $U(\phi)$, and a stopping rule that we refer to as KL Ball Stopping rule because of its analogy to the way we derive the upper bound $U(\phi)$.

- We highlight the differences of our approach compared to that leading to BESPOKE [Zanette et al. \(2019\)](#), and explain the advantages of KLB-TS. Finally, we present numerical experiments comparing the sample complexity of the two algorithms. These experiments illustrate the superiority of KLB-TS.

2 Related work

One of the first works best-policy identification in discounted MDPs is [Kearns and Singh \(1999\)](#). There, the authors introduce a model referred to as *parallel sampling*, where the agent can sample transitions from all (state,action) pairs simultaneously (instead of following a trajectory determined by the MDP dynamics). They proposed Phased Q-Learning and showed that it requires $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{SA \log(SA/\delta)}{\epsilon^2}\right)$ samples¹ to find an ϵ -optimal value function. Later on, ([Kakade, 2003](#), Chapter 2.5) proposed the generative model as a variant of the parallel sampling model. Both [Kearns and Singh \(1999\)](#) and [Kakade \(2003\)](#) proved upper-bounds on the sample complexity of model-based Q-Value-Iteration (QVI) by $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{SA \log(SA/\delta)}{\epsilon^2(1-\gamma)^4}\right)$. Using a variance trick, [Azar et al. \(2013\)](#) improved their analysis and showed that when $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1-\gamma)S}}]$, both model-based QVI along and Policy Iteration (PI) can find an ϵ -optimal policy after collecting $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{SA \log(SA/\delta)}{\epsilon^2(1-\gamma)^3}\right)$ samples. They also proved that the latter quantity is the minimax lower bound of sample complexity required to find an ϵ -optimal policy. [Sidford et al. \(2018\)](#) proposed Variance-Reduced-Q-Value-Iteration (vQVI) which matches the minimax bound for a wider range of $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$. The same bound was derived by [Agarwal et al. \(2020\)](#) for $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}}]$ using a model-based approach. Finally, [Li et al. \(2020\)](#) used a reward perturbation technique to widen the set of ϵ where their algorithm is minimax optimal to the full range of accuracy levels: $(0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]$. It is worth noting that the aforementioned papers only sample transitions and assume a reward function known in advance by the agent.

All the results cited above concern the minimax sample complexity. As far as we are aware, the only paper attempting to propose a problem-specific approach of the sample complexity using a generative model is [Zanette et al. \(2019\)](#). There, the authors proposed BESPOKE, an adaptive allocation algorithm designed to find ϵ -optimal policies in discounted MDPs. At each iteration, BESPOKE solves a convex program whose objective is an upper-bound of the sub-optimal gap (in terms of the ℓ_∞ -norm of the value function) of the empirical optimal policy. The solution of this program corresponds to the sampling strategy the algorithm uses to halve the sub-optimality gap of the empirical policy in the next iteration. Interestingly, BESPOKE is the first algorithm with problem-dependent sample complexity upper-bound. In Section 7, we provide a more detailed description of BESPOKE. We explain how the design principles behind our algorithm, KLB-TS, differ from those of BESPOKE. We further compare the sample complexity upper bounds of the two algorithms, and show that KLB-TS significantly outperforms BESPOKE numerically.

3 Preliminaries and Notation

3.1 Discounted MDPs

We investigate the optimal control of dynamical systems modelled as an infinite time-horizon MDP with finite state space \mathcal{S} and finite action spaces \mathcal{A}_s for any $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \cup_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{A}_s$. The MDP is defined by its kernels : $\phi = (p_\phi, q_\phi)$, where p_ϕ captures the system dynamics and q_ϕ the random

¹Their analysis ignored the dependency on the horizon $H = \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$, treating γ as a constant.

collected rewards. Specifically, $p_\phi(s'|s, a)$ denotes the probability of the system to be in state s' after taking the action $a \in \mathcal{A}_s$ in state s . $q_\phi(\cdot|s, a)$ is the density of the distribution of the reward collected in state s when action a is selected, w.r.t. some positive measure λ with support included in $[0, 1]$. Let $r_\phi(s, a)$ denote the expected reward collected in state s when action a is selected, $r_\phi(s, a) = \int_0^1 u q_\phi(u|s, a) \lambda(du)$.

The objective is to identify a control policy $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ maximizing the long-term discounted reward $\mathbb{E}_\phi[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_\phi(s^\pi(t), \pi(s^\pi(t)))]$, where $s^\pi(t)$ is the state of the system at time t under the policy π and $\mathbb{E}_\phi[\cdot]$ represents the expectation taken w.r.t. to the randomness induced by (p_ϕ, q_ϕ) .

We denote by V_ϕ^π the value function of the MDP ϕ when the control policy is π : for any s , $V_\phi^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_\phi[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_\phi(s^\pi(t), \pi(s^\pi(t))) | s^\pi(0) = s]$. V_ϕ^* corresponds to the value function when the policy π is optimal. Note that since the rewards are lower and upper bounded by 0 and 1, respectively, we have for any s , $V_\phi^*(s) \in [0, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}]$. Similarly, the Q -function is denoted by Q_ϕ^π , and Q_ϕ^* when π is optimal. The sub-optimality gap of action a in state s is defined as $\delta_\phi(s, a) = V_\phi^*(s) - Q_\phi^*(s, a)$.

Assumption 1. To simplify notation and the analysis, we assume that ϕ admits a unique optimal control policy denoted by π_ϕ^* . This means that if $\mathcal{O}(\phi)$ denotes the set of optimal state-action pairs in ϕ , then $|\mathcal{O}(\phi)| = S$, ie we have one optimal action at every state. In general, we denote by Π_ϕ^* the set of optimal policies for ϕ . Hence $\phi \in \Phi = \{\phi : |\Pi_\phi^*| = 1\}$.

3.2 Best-policy identification

Our objective is to design an algorithm identifying π_ϕ^* as quickly as possible in the fixed-confidence setting: when the algorithm stops and returns an estimated optimal policy $\hat{\pi}$, we wish that $\mathbb{P}_\phi[\hat{\pi} \neq \pi_\phi^*] \leq \delta$, for some pre-defined confidence parameter $\delta > 0$. Such an algorithm consists of a sampling rule, a stopping rule, and a decision rule. An algorithm χ gathers information sequentially, and we denote by \mathcal{F}_t^χ the σ -algebra generated by all observations made under χ up and including round t .

Sampling rule. In round t , the algorithm χ selects a (state, action) pair (s_t, a_t) to explore, depending on past observations. (s_t, a_t) is \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^χ -measurable. χ observes the next state denoted by s'_t and a random reward R_t . Observe that the algorithm may select any admissible (state, action) pair: we consider a generative model.

Stopping and decision rules. After gathering enough information, χ may decide to stop sampling and to return an estimated best policy. The algorithm stops after collecting τ samples, and τ is a stopping time w.r.t. the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^\chi)_{t \geq 1}$. The estimated best policy $\hat{\pi}$ is then \mathcal{F}_τ^χ -measurable. τ is referred to as the sample complexity of χ .

δ -PAC algorithms. An algorithm is δ -PAC if it satisfies the two following conditions: for any MDP $\phi \in \Phi$, (i) it stops in finite time almost surely, $\mathbb{P}_\phi[\tau < \infty] = 1$, and (ii) $\mathbb{P}_\phi[\hat{\pi} \neq \pi_\phi^*] \leq \delta$.

3.3 Additional notation

We use \bar{E} to denote the closure of a set E . $\Sigma = \{\omega \in [0, 1]^{S \times A} \sum_{s,a} w_{sa} = 1\}$ denotes the simplex in $\mathbb{R}^{S \times A}$. The Kullback–Leibler divergence between two probability distributions P, Q on some discrete space \mathcal{S} is defined as: $KL(P||Q) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P(s) \log(\frac{P(s)}{Q(s)})$. For distributions P and Q of a continuous random variable, the KL divergence is defined to be the integral: $KL(P||Q) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x) \log(\frac{p(x)}{q(x)}) \lambda(dx)$, where p and q denote the probability densities of P and Q w.r.t some positive measure λ . For two MDPs ϕ and ψ , we write $q_\phi(\cdot|s, a) \neq q_\psi(\cdot|s, a)$ if the reward densities

differ on a set with non-zero measure: $\lambda(\{u \in [0, 1] : q_\psi(u|s, a) \neq q_\phi(u|s, a)\}) > 0$. We define $\text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s, a)$ as the KL divergence between the distributions of the random observations made for the (state, action) pair (s, a) under ϕ and ψ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s, a) &= \text{KL}(p_\phi(\cdot|s, a) \parallel p_\psi(\cdot|s, a)) + \text{KL}(q_\phi(\cdot|s, a) \parallel q_\psi(\cdot|s, a)) \\ &= \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} p_\phi(s'|s, a) \log \frac{p_\phi(s'|s, a)}{p_\psi(s'|s, a)} + \int_0^1 q_\phi(u|s, a) \log \frac{q_\phi(u|s, a)}{q_\psi(u|s, a)} \lambda(du). \end{aligned}$$

4 Problem-specific Sample Complexity Lower Bound

To derive problem-specific sample complexity, we use classical change-of-measure arguments as those leveraged towards regret and sample complexity lower bounds [Lai and Robbins \(1985\)](#); [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#) in bandit problems. These arguments lead to constraints for the expected number of times each (state, action) pair should be explored under any δ -PAC algorithm. More precisely, let ψ an MDP whose optimal policies differ from that of ϕ , i.e., $\psi \in \Delta(\phi)$ where $\Delta(\phi) = \{\psi : \Pi_\phi^* \cap \Pi_\psi^* = \emptyset\}$.

Consider a δ -PAC algorithm, and denote by O_τ the set of observations made under the algorithm until it stops. Further consider L_τ the log-likelihood ratio of O_τ under the MDPs ϕ and ψ . Using similar techniques as those used in the proof of Wald's first lemma, we get (all proofs are detailed in the appendix):

Lemma 1. *For any $\phi \in \Phi$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\phi[L_\tau] = \sum_{s, a} \mathbb{E}_\phi[n_\tau(s, a)] \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s, a),$$

where $n_t(s, a)$ represents the number of times (s, a) has been explored up to and including step t .

From the above lemma, and using the same arguments as in [Kaufmann et al. \(2016\)](#), one may derive the following data processing inequality, valid for any \mathcal{F}_τ -measurable event E :

$$\sum_{s, a} \mathbb{E}_\phi[n_\tau(s, a)] \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s, a) \geq \text{kl}(\mathbb{P}_\phi[E], \mathbb{P}_\psi[E]).$$

Next, we select the event E as $\{\hat{\pi}_\tau \notin \Pi^*(\phi)\}$. If \mathcal{L} is δ -PAC, then since $\psi \in \Delta(\phi)$, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}_\phi[E] \leq \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}_\psi[E] \geq \mathbb{P}_\psi[\hat{\pi}_\tau \in \Pi^*(\psi)] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Using the monotonicity of the KL divergence, we deduce that $\text{kl}(\mathbb{P}_\phi^\mathcal{L}[E], \mathbb{P}_\psi^\mathcal{L}[E]) \geq \text{kl}(\delta, 1 - \delta)$. We have established that under any δ -PAC algorithm, the numbers of times $(n_\tau(s, a))_{s, a}$ the different (state, action) pairs are explored satisfy: for any MDP $\psi \in \Delta(\phi)$,

$$\sum_{s, a} \mathbb{E}_\phi[n_\tau(s, a)] \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s, a) \geq \text{kl}(\delta, 1 - \delta). \quad (1)$$

Combining the above constraints with the fact that $\tau = \sum_{s, a} n_\tau(s, a)$, we obtain the following sample complexity lower bound.

Proposition 1. *The sample complexity of any δ -PAC algorithm satisfies: for any $\phi \in \Phi$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\phi[\tau] \geq K(\phi) \text{kl}(\delta, 1 - \delta), \quad (2)$$

where

$$K(\phi)^{-1} = \sup_{\omega \in \Sigma} \inf_{\psi \in \Delta(\phi)} \sum_{s, a} \omega_{s, a} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s, a). \quad (3)$$

In the above proposition, $\omega_{s,a}\text{kl}(\delta, 1 - \delta)$ can be interpreted as the expected proportion of times the pair (s, a) is explored under the algorithm. Taking the supremum over ω then corresponds to selecting an optimal sampling rule. In the following, ω is referred to as the allocation vector.

4.1 Properties of the problem (3)

Next, we provide useful properties of the optimization problem (3), characterizing our sample complexity lower bound.

(i) The set of confusing MDPs. Henceforth, to ease notation we use π^* as a shorthand for π_ϕ^* . Our first result concerns the set of confusing MDPs $\Delta(\phi)$:

Lemma 2. $\Delta(\phi) = \bigcup_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \Delta_{sa}(\phi)$ where

$$\Delta_{sa}(\phi) = \{\psi : Q_\psi^{\pi^*}(s, a) > V_\psi^{\pi^*}(s)\}.$$

The above lemma states that a confusing MDP ψ is such that π^* , the optimal policy of ϕ , can be improved under ψ locally at some state s , by selecting in s some previously sub-optimal action a , instead of $\pi^*(s)$. Using this lemma, we can simplify the expression of the sample complexity lower bound derived in Proposition 1. Indeed, (3) is equivalent to:

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Sigma} \min_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \inf_{\psi \in \Delta_{sa}(\phi)} \sum_{s', a'} \omega_{s', a'} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s', a'). \quad (4)$$

Next we rewrite the problem in an analytic manner. To this aim, we parametrize ψ by its transition probabilities and rewards : $u = (q_\psi(s, a), p_\psi(s, a))_{s,a \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$ and introduce the following notations: for all (s, a) , $dr(s, a) = (r_\psi - r_\phi)(s, a)$ and $dp(s, a) = (p_\psi - p_\phi)(s, a)$. Further define dV^{π^*} as:

$$dV^{\pi^*} = \left([V_\psi^{\pi^*} - V_\phi^{\pi^*}](s) \right)_{s \in \mathcal{S}} = \left(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} r_\psi^{\pi^*} - \left(I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} r_\phi^{\pi^*}.$$

Combining the condition : $Q_\psi^{\pi^*}(s, a) > V_\psi^{\pi^*}(s)$ with the fact that $Q_\phi^{\pi^*}(s, a) + \delta_\phi(s, a) = V_\phi^{\pi^*}(s)$ we obtain that $\psi \in \Delta_{sa}(\phi)$ if and only if:

$$\delta_\phi(s, a) < dr_\psi(s, a) + \gamma dp_\psi(s, a)^\top V_\phi^{\pi^*} + [\gamma p_\psi(s, a) - \mathbb{1}(s)]^\top dV^{\pi^*}. \quad (5)$$

The above inequality states that for ψ to be in $\Delta_{sa}(\phi)$, the changes in the rewards and transitions between ϕ and ψ should be greater than the sub-optimality gap of action a in state s . Defining $\mathcal{U}_{sa} = \{u : (5) \text{ holds}\}$, we conclude that both the optimization problems (3) and (4) are equivalent to:

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Sigma} \min_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{sa}} \sum_{s', a'} \omega_{s', a'} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s', a'). \quad (6)$$

(ii) Non-convexity of the problem (3). The sample complexity lower bound, as well as the optimal sampling rule are characterized by the solution of (3) or that of (4). If we think of a track-and-stop algorithm to identify the best policy (as proposed in [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#) for the simple multi-armed bandit problem), one would need to repeatedly solve these optimization problems. It is then important to be able to do it in a computationally efficient way. Unfortunately,

these problems are probably very hard to solve. This is well illustrated by the fact that the following sub-problem (7) is not convex.

$$K(\phi, \omega)^{-1} = \inf_{\psi \in \Delta(\phi)} \sum_{s,a} \omega_{s,a} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s, a). \quad (7)$$

Actually, in the example presented in Fig. 1, we can specify ϕ such that the sets $\Delta(\phi)$ and $\Delta_{sa}(\phi)$ are not convex.




Figure 1: A class of two-state MDP, with $\gamma = 0.9$. Actions a_1 and a_2 are available in state s_1 . State s_2 is absorbing. Dashed (resp. full) arrows indicate the transitions when action a_1 (resp. a_2) is chosen. Numbers above each arrow indicate the transition probability and the average reward, e.g. $p'_2 = \mathbb{P}[s_2|s_1, a_2]$.

Consider $\phi, \psi, \bar{\psi}$ belonging to the class specified in Fig1, each defined by the vector (r_2, r_1, p_1) (all other parameters values are fixed as in the figure):

$$\begin{cases} \psi = (r_2 = 0.25, r_1 = 0.93, p_1 = 0.7) \\ \bar{\psi} = (r_2 = 0.1, r_1 = 0.47, p_1 = 0.6) \\ \phi = \frac{\psi + \bar{\psi}}{2} = (r_2 = 0.175, r_1 = 0.6925, p_1 = 0.65) \end{cases}$$

Then a simple calculation shows that the pair (s_1, a_1) is optimal : $\frac{r_1}{1-\gamma p_1} > \frac{r_2}{1-\gamma p_2}$ for both ψ and $\bar{\psi}$, while it is sub-optimal : $\frac{r_1}{1-\gamma p_1} < \frac{r_2}{1-\gamma p_2}$ for ϕ . In other words, both ψ and $\bar{\psi}$ are in $\Delta(\phi)$ and $\Delta_{s_1 a_1}(\phi)$ but their average isn't : $\frac{\psi + \bar{\psi}}{2} = \phi \notin \Delta(\phi)$. Therefore the sets $\Delta(\phi)$ and $\Delta_{s_1 a_1}(\phi)$ are not convex.

(iii) Most confusing MDPs. We refer to an MDP $\psi \in \overline{\Delta(\phi)}$ solving the problem (7) as *most confusing*, since for a given allocation ω , the sample complexity lower bound is determined by the number of samples needed to distinguish ϕ from ψ .

Observe that the condition (5) involves transition probabilities and rewards of the (state, action) pairs (s, a) and $(s', \pi^*(s'))$ for all s' , only. Hence $\psi \in \Delta_{sa}(\phi)$ can be obtained from ϕ by changing at most the transition probabilities and rewards of these (state, action) pairs. Next, let $\psi \in \overline{\Delta_{sa}(\phi)}$ solve (7). Then we can verify that the constraint (5) is active and that we have:

$$\delta_\phi(s, a) = dr_\psi(s, a) + \gamma dp_\psi(s, a)^\top V_\phi^{\pi^*} + [\gamma p_\psi(s, a) - \mathbb{1}(s)]^\top dV^{\pi^*}$$

This means that to design a most confusing MDP, one should change the rewards and transitions of optimal (state,action) pairs and only one sub-optimal pair (s, a) and those changes should be just enough to fill sub-optimality gap $\delta_\phi(s, a)$. The next lemma formalizes these findings.

Lemma 3. Let $\psi \in \overline{\Delta(\phi)}$ solve (7). Then:

- (i) For all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, $(p_\psi(\cdot|s, a), q_\psi(\cdot|s, a)) \neq (p_\phi(\cdot|s, a), q_\phi(\cdot|s, a)) \implies (s, a) \in \mathcal{O}(\psi) \setminus \mathcal{O}(\phi)$ or $a = \pi^*(s)$;
- (ii) $\mathcal{O}(\phi) \subset \mathcal{O}(\psi)$.

4.2 Upper bound of $K(\phi)$

We use the analytic version (6) of the optimization problem of the sample complexity lower bound to derive a simple (but still problem-specific) upper bound of this lower bound. The upper bound actually corresponds to a sampling rule that is explicit, i.e., we do not need to solve any optimization problem to get it. Using this upper bound and the corresponding sampling rule, we will be able to devise a simple track-and-stop algorithm with provable performance guarantees. In addition, the upper bound has the right dependence in the sub-optimality gaps, and we also prove that it remains smaller than existing minimax sample complexity lower bounds.

Before we state the main result leading to our upper bound, we introduce additional notations.

- $\delta_{\min}(\phi) = \min_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \delta_\phi(s, a)$ denotes the minimum sub-optimality gap in ϕ .
- $\text{Var}_{p_\phi(s,a)}[V_\phi^*] = \text{Var}_{s' \sim p_\phi(\cdot|s,a)}[V_\phi^*(s')]$ (resp. $\text{MD}_{p_\phi(s,a)}[V_\phi^*] = \left\| V_\phi^* - \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim p_\phi(\cdot|s,a)}[V_\phi^*(s')] \right\|_\infty$) is the variance (resp. maximum deviation from the mean) of the next-state value after taking state-action pair (s, a) .
- $\text{Var}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*] = \max_s \text{Var}_{p_\phi(s, \pi^*(s))}[V_\phi^*]$ (resp. $\text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*] = \max_s \text{MD}_{p_\phi(s, \pi^*(s))}[V_\phi^*]$) is the maximum variance (resp. maximum deviation) of the next-state value after taking an optimal action.

Theorem 1. We have:

$$K(\phi) \leq \inf_{\omega \in \Sigma} \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{T_1(s, a; \phi) + T_2(s, a; \phi)}{\omega_{s_0, a}} + \frac{T_3(\phi) + T_4(\phi)}{\min_s \omega_{s, \pi^*(s)}} \right), \quad (8)$$

where

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} T_1(s, a; \phi) = \frac{2}{\delta_\phi(s, a)^2}, \\ T_2(s, a; \phi) = \max \left(\frac{16 \text{Var}_{p_\phi(s,a)}[V_\phi^*]}{\delta_\phi(s, a)^2}, \frac{6 \text{MD}_{p_\phi(s,a)}[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}}{\delta_\phi(s, a)^{4/3}} \right), \\ T_3(\phi) = \frac{2}{[\delta_{\min}(\phi)(1-\gamma)]^2}, \\ T_4(\phi) = \min \left(\frac{27}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^3}, \max \left(\frac{16 \text{Var}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^2}, \frac{6 \text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^{4/3}(1-\gamma)^{4/3}} \right) \right). \end{array} \right. \quad (9)$$

The proof of the theorem relies on writing each of the difference terms $dr_\psi(s, a)$, $dp_\psi(s, a)$, $dr_\psi^{\pi^*}$ and $dp_\psi^{\pi^*}$ involved in the constraint (5) as a proportion of the sub-optimality gap $\delta_\phi(s, a)$. Then, using classical f-divergences inequalities, as well as a variance inequality from Azar et al. (2013), we relate each difference term to the KL divergences appearing in the objective function

of the problem (6). With this perspective in mind, the terms $T_1(s, a; \phi)$ and $T_2(s, a; \phi)$ can be interpreted as the sample complexity costs to learn the reward of (state,action) pair (s, a) and the corresponding transition probabilities, respectively. Similarly, the terms $T_3(\phi)$ and $T_4(\phi)$ are interpreted as the sample complexity costs to estimate the future rewards collected from the next state and the transitions from the next state.

Corollary 1. *Let $A_{s,a} = T_1(s, a; \phi) + T_2(s, a; \phi)$ and $A^* = S(T_3(\phi) + T_4(\phi))$. Then the optimal solution of the problem (8) is given by the unique allocation vector $\bar{\omega} \in \Sigma$ such that (\sim means proportional to): for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$,*

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\omega}_{s,a} \sim A_{s,a} & \forall (s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi), \\ \bar{\omega}_{s,\pi^*(s)} \sim \frac{1}{S} \sqrt{A^* \left(\sum_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} A_{s,a} \right)} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

This allocation yields the following upper bound:

$$K(\phi) \leq U(\phi) = 2(A^* + \sum_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} A_{s,a}). \quad (11)$$

In the previous corollary, $A_{s,a}$ may be interpreted as the *relevance* of the sub-optimal state-action pair (s, a) . It is a decreasing function of the gap $\delta_\phi(s, a)$ and proportional to the variance of future rewards after taking (s, a) . Note that the relevance of optimal pairs is determined by $\delta_{\min}(\phi)$: The greater the minimum gap is, the easier we can statistically distinguish the estimated π^* from other policies.

Further observe that since the rewards are normalized, we always have: for all (s, a) , $\text{Var}_{p_\phi(s,a)}[V_\phi^*] \leq \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2}$ and $\text{MD}_{p_\phi(s,a)}[V_\phi^*] \leq \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)}$. In addition, we show in Lemma 6 that $\delta_{\min}(\phi)$ is always smaller than 1. These observations allow us to upper bound $T_1(s, a; \phi)$, $T_2(s, a; \phi)$, $T_3(\phi)$ and $T_4(\phi)$, and to prove the following corollary.

Corollary 2. *We have:*

$$U(\phi) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{SA}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^3} \right). \quad (12)$$

The above result is obtained by plugging the uniform allocation $\omega_{sa} = 1/SA$ in (8). Hence this naive uniform allocation yields an upper bound scaling as the known minimax sample complexity lower bound $\frac{SA}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^3}$. This result also implies that a track-and-stop algorithm sampling the pairs (s, a) proportionally to their relevance A_{sa} will perform better than the minimax bound. This happens when $\text{Var}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*] = o(1/(1-\gamma))$, i.e., when the variance of the next-state value after taking the optimal action is small.

5 Algorithm

In this section, we present KLB-TS (KL Ball Track-and-Stop), an algorithm that selects the successive (state, action) pairs so as to track the allocation $\bar{\omega}$, the problem-specific allocation (10) that leads to the upper bound (11) of the sample complexity lower bound. The algorithm follows the track-and-stop principles as those of the algorithm proposed in [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#)

for stochastic MAB problems. KLB-TS is adapted to learning in MDPs, which induces important differences. In particular, the stopping rule of KLB-TS does not follow a generic Generalized Likelihood Ratio Test as that used [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#) (refer to Subsection 5.2 for detail).

The algorithm takes as input the confidence parameter δ and any black-box planner MDP-SOLVER. The latter takes as input an MDP ϕ , and returns an optimal policy $\pi_\phi^* \in \Pi_\phi^*$. For practical implementations, we use the Policy Iteration algorithm.

KLB-TS starts exploring each (state, action) pair once, to construct an initial estimate $\hat{\phi}$ of the true MDP ϕ . The algorithm maintains, after t collected observations, an estimate $\hat{\phi}_t$ of the true MDP. Based on this estimate, KLB-TS computes an estimate of the allocation $\bar{\omega}$, and selects the next (state, action) pair to track it. After each observation, the estimated MDP $\hat{\phi}_t$ is updated. Finally, the algorithm checks if a stopping condition is satisfied, in which case the algorithm stops and returns the empirical optimal policy $\hat{\pi}_\tau^*$. The stopping condition is referred to as the *KL Ball stopping rule* since it is inspired by the derivation of the upper bound of the sample complexity lower bound. There, the various terms involved in the exploration constraints are upper bounded by KL divergences, i.e., are in a KL ball.

The pseudo-code of KLB-TS is presented in Algorithm 1. Its sampling and stopping rule are described in detail in the next two sub-sections.

Algorithm 1: KLB-TS

Input: Black-box planner MDP-SOLVER(), Confidence parameter δ .

1 Collect one sample from each (s,a) in $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$.

2 $t \leftarrow SA$.

3 $n_t(s, a) \leftarrow 1$, for all (s,a).

4 Initialize empirical estimate $\hat{\phi}_t$ of ϕ .

5 $\hat{\pi}_t^* \leftarrow \text{MDP-SOLVER}(\hat{\phi}_t)$.

6 **while** *Stopping condition (16) is not satisfied* **do**

7 Compute optimal allocation vector $\bar{\omega}(\hat{\phi}_t)$ of equation (10).

8 Sample from (s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) determined by equation (13).

9 For all (s,a) set :

$$n_{t+1}(s, a) \leftarrow \begin{cases} n_t(s, a) + 1 & \text{if } (s, a) = (s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) \\ n_t(s, a) & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

10 $t \leftarrow t + 1$.

11 Update empirical estimate $\hat{\phi}_t$ of ϕ .

12 $\hat{\pi}_t^* \leftarrow \text{MDP-SOLVER}(\hat{\phi}_t)$.

13 **end**

Output: Empirical optimal policy $\hat{\pi}_\tau^*$

5.1 Sampling rule

In order for the sample complexity to match the upper-bound of Corollary 1, the sampling proportions of (state,action) pairs should be as close as possible to the near-optimal weights defined in (10). To this aim, we simply use the C-tracking rule defined in [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#), which we recall below.

Define $\epsilon_t = (S^2 A^2 + t)^{-1/2}/2$ and let $\bar{\omega}^\epsilon(\phi)$ be a L^∞ projection of $\bar{\omega}(\phi)$ onto

$$\Sigma^\epsilon = \left\{ \omega \in [\epsilon, 1]^{SA} : \sum_{s,a} \omega_{s,a} = 1 \right\}.$$

Then the (state,action) pair to be sampled at round $t + 1$ is defined as :

$$(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) \in \arg \max_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \sum_{s=1}^t \bar{\omega}_{s,a}^{\epsilon_s}(\hat{\phi}_s) - n_t(s, a) \quad (13)$$

with ties broken arbitrarily. The projection onto Σ^ϵ forces a minimal amount of exploration so that no pair is left under-explored because of bad initial estimates. The same analysis of the sampling rule given in [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#) holds in the MDP case and guarantees that:

$$\mathbb{P}_\phi \left(\forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_t(s, a)}{t} = \bar{\omega}_{s,a}(\phi) \right) = 1.$$

5.2 Stopping rule

Before we present the KL Ball stopping rule, we briefly explain why a classical Generalized Likelihood Ratio test [Chernoff \(1959\)](#), [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#), [Kaufmann and Koolen \(2018\)](#), [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2019\)](#) is hard to implement.

Implementing a GLR test is as hard as solving (3). To implement a GLR test in the MDP setting, we would need to define and compute $\ell_\psi(t)$, the likelihood of the observations under some MDPs ψ of transitions and rewards observed up to time t . We have:

$$\ell_\psi(t) = \prod_{k=1}^t p_\psi(s'_k | s_k, a_k) q_\psi(R_k | s_k, a_k),$$

where the algorithm samples the pair (s_k, a_k) in step k and observes s'_k (the next state) and R_k the reward associated with the transition. Performing a GLR test in step t consists in computing the optimal policy $\hat{\pi}_t^*$ for the estimated MDP $\hat{\phi}_t$ and then comparing the likelihood of observations under the most likely model where $\hat{\pi}_t^*$ is optimal with the likelihood under the most likely model where $\hat{\pi}_t^*$ is sub-optimal. In turn, the test requires us to compute:

$$G_{\hat{\pi}_t^*}(t) = \log \frac{\sup_{\psi: \hat{\pi}_t^* \in \Pi^*(\psi)} \ell_\psi(t)}{\sup_{\psi: \hat{\pi}_t^* \notin \Pi^*(\psi)} \ell_\psi(t)} = \log \frac{\ell_{\hat{\phi}_t}(t)}{\sup_{\psi: \psi \in \Delta(\hat{\phi}_t)} \ell_\psi(t)} = \inf_{\psi: \psi \in \Delta(\hat{\phi}_t)} \log \frac{\ell_{\hat{\phi}_t}(t)}{\ell_\psi(t)}$$

The hypothesis ($\hat{\pi}_t^* \neq \pi^*$) is then rejected as soon as the ratio of likelihoods becomes greater than a certain threshold $\beta(\delta, t)$, properly tuned to ensure that the algorithm is δ -PAC. Unfortunately, to obtain $G_{\hat{\pi}_t^*}(t)$, we need to solve the optimization problem $\inf_{\psi: \psi \in \Delta(\hat{\phi}_t)} \log \frac{\ell_{\hat{\phi}_t}(t)}{\ell_\psi(t)}$, which is essentially identical to solving the sub-problem (7) involved in the sample complexity lower bound problem (3). Hence, because of the non-convexity of $\Delta(\hat{\phi}_t)$, it is difficult to compute $G_{\hat{\pi}_t^*}(t)$.

The KL Ball test. It is worth noting that the proposed stopping condition constitutes the first stopping rule for best-policy identification in the MDP setting. Previous stopping rules in the literature are designed for determining ϵ -optimal policies. Unless we have access to an oracle that

reveals $\delta_{\min}(\phi)$ – in which case, it suffices to set ϵ to some value $\epsilon \ll \delta_{\min}(\phi)$ – we cannot identify the best-policy using these rules.

A good stopping rule determines when the set of collected samples is *just* enough to declare that $\hat{\pi}_t^* = \pi^*$ with probability $1 - \delta$. The design of our stopping rule is inspired by the proof of the upper-bound $U(\phi)$, which uses the following fact (refer to the inequalities (22)-(23)-(24)-(27)-(26) in the appendix): For all $\psi \in \Delta(\phi)$, there exists $(s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)$ and a vector α in the simplex of \mathbb{R}^4 (which we denote Σ_4) such that the four following conditions are verified:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\alpha_1^2}{T_1(s,a;\phi)} \leq KL(r_\phi(s,a) || r_\psi(s,a)), \\ \frac{\alpha_2^2}{T_2(s,a;\phi)} \leq KL(p_\phi(s,a) || p_\psi(s,a)), \\ \frac{\alpha_3^2}{T_3(\phi)} \leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} KL\left(r_\phi(s, \pi_\phi^*(s)) || r_\psi(s, \pi_\phi^*(s))\right), \\ \frac{\alpha_4^2}{T_4(\phi)} \leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} KL\left(p_\phi(\cdot | s, \pi_\phi^*(s)) || p_\psi(\cdot | s, \pi_\phi^*(s))\right). \end{array} \right. \quad (14)$$

Then defining the quantities

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \rho_1(\phi, \psi)(s, a) = T_1(s, a; \phi) KL(r_\phi(s, a) || r_\psi(s, a)), \\ \rho_2(\phi, \psi)(s, a) = T_2(s, a; \phi) KL(p_\phi(s, a) || p_\psi(s, a)), \\ \rho_3(\phi, \psi) = \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} T_3(\phi) KL(r_\phi(s, \pi_\phi^*(s)) || r_\psi(s, \pi_\phi^*(s))), \\ \rho_4(\phi, \psi) = \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} T_4(\phi) KL(p_\phi(\cdot | s, \pi_\phi^*(s)) || p_\psi(\cdot | s, \pi_\phi^*(s))), \end{array} \right. \quad (15)$$

(14) suggests that to design a PAC stopping condition, it is sufficient to check that the event:

$$\mathcal{E} = \left(\forall \alpha \in \Sigma_4 \forall (s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t), \rho_1(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s, a) < \alpha_1^2 \text{ or} \right. \\ \left. \rho_2(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s, a) < \alpha_2^2 \text{ or } \rho_3(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi) < \alpha_3^2 \text{ or } \rho_4(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi) < \alpha_4^2 \right)$$

holds with probability $1 - \delta$. Indeed, if \mathcal{E} is verified then by contraposition of (14), we have $\phi \notin \Delta(\hat{\phi}_t)$, which means that $\hat{\pi}_t^* = \pi^*$. To define our stopping rule, we further introduce the threshold function:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} x(\delta, n, m) = \log(1/\delta) + (m - 1) + (m - 1) \log(1 + n/(m - 1)) \\ \delta' = \frac{\delta}{4S^3A} \end{array} \right.$$

We finally define $\hat{T}_1(s, a) = T_1(s, a; \hat{\phi}_t)$, $\hat{T}_2(s, a) = T_2(s, a; \hat{\phi}_t)$, $\hat{T}_3 = T_3(\hat{\phi}_t)$ and $\hat{T}_4 = T_4(\hat{\phi}_t)$. The KL Ball stopping condition is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)} \frac{\sqrt{\hat{T}_1(s,a)x(\delta', n_t(s,a), 2)} + \sqrt{\hat{T}_2(s,a)x(\delta', n_t(s,a), S)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s,a)}} \\ & + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{\hat{T}_3x(\delta', n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)), 2)} + \sqrt{\hat{T}_4x(\delta', n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)), S)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s))}} \leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

More precisely:

$$\tau_\delta = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{N} : (16) \text{ holds}\}. \quad (17)$$

Theorem 2. *Under the KL-Ball stopping rule, we have: $\mathbb{P}_\phi(\tau_\delta < \infty, \hat{\pi}_{\tau_\delta}^* \neq \pi_\phi^*) \leq \delta$.*

6 Sample Complexity Analysis

We now present our main results which take the form of asymptotic (when δ goes to 0) upper bounds on the sample complexity of KLB-TS. The proof of these bounds relies on two main ingredients: First, the use of the C-tracking rule makes it possible to establish the convergence of the vector $(n_t(s, a))_{s,a}/t$ (the (state, action) pair visit frequencies) to the nearly-optimal allocation vector $\bar{\omega}$, as well as the convergence of the empirical MDP $\hat{\phi}_t$ to the true MDP ϕ . Then, the second ingredient consists in plugging these asymptotics in the definition of the stopping rule (16), and combining the obtained results with the asymptotical shape of the threshold function: $x(\delta', n, m) \underset{\delta \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \log(1/\delta)$.

Written in an informal way, this reasoning yields²:

$$\tau_\delta \underset{\delta \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \inf \left\{ t \in \mathbb{N} : \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s, a; \phi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s, a; \phi)}}{\sqrt{t\bar{\omega}_{sa}}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\phi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\phi)}}{\sqrt{t\bar{\omega}_{s, \pi^*(s)}}} \right) \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Finally, we show that the condition in the inf above holds as soon as $t \geq 4U(\phi) \log(1/\delta)$ (see Lemma Lemma 10). We begin with an almost-sure upper-bound on the sample complexity:

Proposition 2. *Using the KL-Ball stopping rule, coupled with any sampling rule ensuring that for every state-action pair (s, a) , $n_t(s, a)/t$ converges almost surely to the nearly-optimal allocations $\bar{\omega}_{s,a}$ of Corollary 1, yields a sample complexity τ_δ satisfying for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$: $\mathbb{P}_\phi(\tau_\delta < \infty) = 1$ and*

$$\mathbb{P}_\phi \left(\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tau_\delta}{\log(1/\delta)} \leq 4U(\phi) \right) = 1.$$

The second result is an upper-bound on the expected sample complexity:

Theorem 3. *Using the KL-Ball stopping rule, coupled with the C-tracking rule defined in (13) yields a sample complexity τ_δ satisfying for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbb{E}_\phi[\tau_\delta]$ is finite and:*

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}_\phi[\tau_\delta]}{\log(1/\delta)} \leq 4U(\phi).$$

The proof of the theorem above is similar to that of Theorem 14 in [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#) with a few notable differences. First, we defined a distance on MDPs through the L^∞ -norm of their reward and transition kernels. Then we adapted Lemma 19 from [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#), which gives a concentration inequality of the empirical average-rewards in the MAB setting, to include the concentration of transition probabilities of the empirical MDP.

7 Comparison with State-of-the-art Algorithms and Experiments

7.1 The BESPOKE algorithm

As KLB-TS, BESPOKE is an algorithm that adapts its sampling strategy to the learnt MDP. The two algorithms have however different objectives: BESPOKE aims at returning an ϵ -optimal

²Refer to Appendix E for details.

policy. BESPOKE starts with an initialization phase where each (state, action) pair is sampled $n_{\min} = \frac{2 \times 625^2 \times \gamma^2 \times S^2 A}{(1-\gamma)^2}$ times. After this first phase, the algorithm enters an inner loop. Each iteration of the loop aims at halving the sub-optimality gap $\left\| V_{\phi}^* - V_{\phi}^{\widehat{\pi}^*} \right\|_{\infty}$ of the empirical best policy. The algorithm iterates until the gap becomes smaller than ϵ . At the beginning of each iteration, the algorithm solves a convex program whose solution provides the numbers of times each (state, action) pair should be sampled in this iteration. The program minimizes a weighted sum of "confidence intervals" of rewards and transitions estimates at each (state, action) pair, subject to a maximum budget constraint. This objective is known, thanks to the Simulation Lemma³, to be an upper bound of the sub-optimality gap of the empirical optimal policy. BESPOKE uses a doubling trick to compute the maximum budget for each iteration (this budget is defined so that the gap is halved).

We note the following important differences between KLB-TS and BESPOKE.

1. KLB-TS does not need to solve any convex program to update its sampling strategy, because given an estimate of the MDP, this strategy is explicit.
2. It is also worth noting that the initialization phase of BESPOKE is extremely long: $\frac{2 \times 625^2 \times \gamma^2 \times S^2 A}{(1-\gamma)^2}$ samples must be gathered. During this phase, the algorithm is not adaptive at all. As we will see in the numerical experiments, even with small state and action spaces, the initialization phase constitutes a very large proportion of the sample complexity – which makes the algorithm less adaptive than it seems, and really leads to poor performance. KLB-TS has a much smaller initialization phase and is really adaptive.
3. BESPOKE's stopping rule is suited to identify ϵ -optimal policies. Unless it has access an oracle revealing $\delta_{\min}(\phi)$, it cannot perform best policy identification.

7.2 Theoretical guarantees of BESPOKE and KLB-TS

Theorem 2 in Zanette et al. (2019) states that with a probability at least $1 - \delta$, the sample complexity of best-policy identification using BESPOKE is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\delta} = & \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\sum_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \left(\frac{\text{Var}[R(s,a)] + \gamma^2 \text{Var}_{p(s,a)}[V_{\phi}^*]}{\delta_{\phi}(s,a)^2} + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)\delta_{\phi}(s,a)} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^3 \delta_{\min}(\phi)^2}, \frac{\text{Var}[R(s, \pi^*(s))] + \gamma^2 \text{Var}_{p(s, \pi^*(s))}[V_{\phi}^*]}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2} + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^2 \delta_{\min}(\phi)} \right\} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{S^2 A}{(1-\gamma)^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

In contrast, the sample complexity of KLB-TS scales as:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\delta} = & \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \left(\max \left\{ \frac{\text{Var}_{p(s,a)}[V_{\phi}^*]}{\delta_{\phi}(s,a)^2}, \frac{\text{MD}_{p(s,a)}[V_{\phi}^*]^{4/3}}{\delta_{\phi}(s,a)^{4/3}} \right\} + \frac{1}{\delta_{\phi}(s,a)^2} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + S \times \min \left\{ \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)^3 \delta_{\min}(\phi)^2}, \max \left\{ \frac{\text{Var}_{\max}^*[V_{\phi}^*]}{(1-\gamma)^2 \delta_{\min}(\phi)^2}, \frac{\text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_{\phi}^*]^{4/3}}{(1-\gamma)^{4/3} \delta_{\min}(\phi)^{4/3}} \right\} \right\} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{S}{(1-\gamma)^2 \delta_{\min}(\phi)^2} \right) \log(1/\delta) + o(\log(1/\delta)) \end{aligned}$$

³see Lemma 2 in Zanette et al. (2019)

From the above upper bounds, we can make the following comments.

1. Both bounds depend on functionals of the particular MDP to be learnt, such as the minimum gap, the variance or maximum deviations of value functions. This means that BESPOKE and KLB-TS can adapt to the hardness of the problem, and in particular perform significantly better than minimax approaches when the MDP is easy (eg when the minimum gap is high or the variances of the value function very low).
2. In the worst case, both sample complexities scale at most as $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{SA}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^3}\right)$, which corresponds to the minimax bound.
3. When the rewards have strictly positive variances, then the two upper bounds are very similar, except for the large constant term $\frac{S^2A}{(1-\gamma)^2}$ for BESPOKE which comes from its very long initialization phase. We believe that this constant term makes BESPOKE impractical.
4. While BESPOKE’s bound has the advantage of being non-asymptotic, it only holds with probability $1 - \delta$ only. In contrast, KLB-TS comes with an asymptotic bound on the expected sample complexity which we also proved to be finite for all confidence levels δ .

7.3 Experiments

Finally, we compare BESPOKE and KLB-TS on small-sized MDPs. Note that BESPOKE had not been implemented before (no experiments were presented in [Zanette et al. \(2019\)](#)). To compare KLB-TS and BESPOKE, we generated two MDPs randomly. In the first experiment, we use a very small MDP with two states and two actions and a discount factor $\gamma = 0.5$. Then for each value of the confidence level δ , we run 10 simulations under both algorithms. We used BESPOKE with an accuracy parameter $\epsilon = 0.9 \times \delta_{\min}(\phi)$ (note that $\delta_{\min}(\phi)$ is revealed to BESPOKE). Figures 2 and 3 show the log-mean sample complexity along with its 2-standard-deviations interval.

The small confidence intervals in Figure 2a are the result of the log scale that shrinks the variance. We note in Figure 3 that KLB-TS sample complexity (blue) is greater than the asymptotic value $4U(\phi) \log(1/\delta)$ (red) for moderate values of δ and only matches it for $\delta = 10^{-14}$. On Figure 2b, we see that BESPOKE’s large sample complexity is mainly due to the constant term corresponding to the minimum number of samples it allocates to each (state, action) pair in the initialization phase. Note that this minimum number of samples cannot be avoided as it is necessary to ensure that BESPOKE halves the accuracy of the empirical policy after each iteration⁴.

In the second experiment, we used a more realistic MDP with five states and ten actions per state and a discount factor $\gamma = 0.7$. To save computation time, we only compare KLB-TS’s sample complexity with BESPOKE’s initial number of samples which, as noted previously, makes more than 99% of its sample complexity. Also, due to the size of the MDP, we only run 5 simulations for each value of δ . Figure 4 shows the results.

8 Conclusion

In this work, we have investigated the design of RL algorithms with *minimal problem-specific* sample complexity. To this aim, we first derived the information-theoretical sample complexity limit (a lower bound on the sample complexity satisfied by any algorithm) and the corresponding optimal sample allocation. Our hope was that, as for the MAB problem, this allocation would be easy to

⁴see Lemma 16 and the proof of Theorem 1 in [Zanette et al. \(2019\)](#).


compute and could then lead to a simple and optimal track-and-stop algorithm. Unfortunately, for RL problems, it turns out that the optimal allocation solves an involved non-convex program. Approaching the fundamental sample complexity limit seems possible only if one could solve this program. To circumvent this issue, we derived a tight upper bound of the information-theoretical limit. Remarkably, this bound corresponds to a sample allocation that is explicit, and hence can be easily plugged in into a track-and-stop algorithm. Based on this upper bound, we proposed KLB-TS, an algorithm whose sample complexity matches this upper bound.

This work opens up interesting research directions. First, the computational complexity of the sample complexity lower bound strongly suggests the existence of a fundamental trade-off between sample and computational complexities. Investigating this trade-off is intriguing. Then, we restricted our attention to the generative model, where one can sample any (state, action) pair at any step. In most practical cases however, one needs to learn an optimal policy by observing a single trajectory of the system. Hence, the numbers of times one observes the various (state, action) pairs are correlated, inducing some additional constraints in the optimization problem leading to the sample complexity lower bound. It is worth studying the impact of these navigation constraints on the sample complexity. Finally, from a practical perspective, it seems important to extend our results to the framework of RL with function approximation (i.e., to cases where the MDP functionals can be expressed on a low-dimensional functional space).


References

- Agarwal, A., Kakade, S., and Yang, L. F. (2020). Model-based reinforcement learning with a generative model is minimax optimal. volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 67–83. PMLR.
- Azar, M. G., Munos, R., and Kappen, H. (2013). Minimax pac bounds on the sample complexity of reinforcement learning with a generative model. *Machine Learning*, 91:325–349.
- Chernoff, H. (1959). Sequential design of experiments. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 30(3):755–770.
- Garivier, A. and Kaufmann, E. (2016). Optimal best arm identification with fixed confidence. In Feldman, V., Rakhlin, A., and Shamir, O., editors, *29th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 49 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 998–1027, Columbia University, New York, New York, USA. PMLR.
- Garivier, A. and Kaufmann, E. (2019). Non-asymptotic sequential tests for overlapping hypotheses and application to near optimal arm identification in bandit models. *arXiv preprint, Statistics Theory*, arXiv:1905.03495.
- Kakade, S. M. (2003). *On the sample complexity of reinforcement learning*. PhD thesis, University of London, England.
- Kaufmann, E., Cappé, O., and Garivier, A. (2016). On the complexity of best-arm identification in multi-armed bandit models. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):1–42.
- Kaufmann, E. and Koolen, W. M. (2018). Mixture martingales revisited with applications to sequential tests and confidence intervals. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:1811.11419.
- Kearns, M. and Singh, S. (1999). Finite-sample convergence rates for q-learning and indirect algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing*, 11.

- Lai, T. and Robbins, H. (1985). Asymptotically efficient adaptive allocation rules. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 6(1):4–2.
- Li, G., Wei, Y., Chi, Y., Gu, Y., and Chen, Y. (2020). Breaking the sample size barrier in model-based reinforcement learning with a generative model. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2005.12900.
- Sidford, A., Wang, M., Wu, X., Yang, L., and Ye, Y. (2018). Near-optimal time and sample complexities for solving markov decision processes with a generative model. In Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Grauman, K., Cesa-Bianchi, N., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31*, pages 5186–5196. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Zanette, A., Kochenderfer, M. J., and Brunskill, E. (2019). Almost horizon-free structure-aware best policy identification with a generative model. In Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Beygelzimer, A., d’Alché Buc, F., Fox, E., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 5625–5634. Curran Associates, Inc.



(a) KLB-TS vs BESPOKE (log-scale)



(b) Comparing BESPOKE's minimum number of samples n_{\min} vs it's sample complexity τ : $-\log(1 - \frac{n_{\min}}{\tau})$ as a function of $\log(1/\delta)$

Figure 2: $S=A=2, \gamma = 0.5$




Figure 3: Sample complexity of KLB-TS versus the asymptotic upper bound of Theorem 3 (no log-scale), $S = A = 2, \gamma = 0.5$




Figure 4: KLB-TS vs BESPOKE (log-scale), $S = 5, A = 10, \gamma = 0.7$

A Lower Bound $K(\phi)$

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Let τ be a stopping time w.r.t. the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 1}$. The observations made up to the beginning of round t is $\mathcal{O}_t = (s_1, a_1, R_1, s'_1 \dots, s_t, a_t, R_t, s'_t)$. Let $p(\cdot)$ denote the distribution of the first state. We have:

$$\mathbb{P}_\phi(\mathcal{O}_t) = p(s_1) \prod_{k=1}^t p_\phi(s'_k | s_k, a_k) \times \prod_{k=1}^t q_\phi(R_k | s_k, a_k).$$

The log-likelihood ratio of the observations up to the end of round t under ϕ and ψ is then:

$$\begin{aligned} L_t &= \sum_{k=1}^t \left(\log \frac{p_\phi(s'_k | s_k, a_k)}{p_\psi(s'_k | s_k, a_k)} + \log \frac{q_\phi(R_k | s_k, a_k)}{q_\psi(R_k | s_k, a_k)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{s,a} L_t^{s,a}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$L_t^{s,a} = \sum_{k=1}^t \mathbb{1}_{\{s_k=s, a_k=a\}} \left(\log \frac{p_\phi(s'_k | s, a)}{p_\psi(s'_k | s, a)} + \log \frac{q_\phi(R_k | s, a)}{q_\psi(R_k | s, a)} \right).$$

Next we study $L_t^{s,a}$ for a given pair (s, a) . Introduce the following random variables: Y_k and Z_k denote the next state and the collected reward after the k -th time (s, a) has been visited. We can re-write $L_t^{s,a}$ as:

$$L_t^{s,a} = \sum_{k=1}^{N_t(s,a)} \left(\log \frac{p_\phi(Y_k | s, a)}{p_\psi(Y_k | s, a)} + \log \frac{q_\phi(Z_k | s, a)}{q_\psi(Z_k | s, a)} \right)$$

Observe that $\xi_k := \log \frac{p_\phi(Y_k | s, a)}{p_\psi(Y_k | s, a)} + \log \frac{q_\phi(Z_k | s, a)}{q_\psi(Z_k | s, a)}$ and $\mathbb{1}_{\{N_\tau(s,a) > k-1\}}$ are independent, because under the event $\{N_\tau(s, a) \leq k-1\}$, Y_s and Z_s have not been observed yet. Further notice that $\mathbb{E}_\phi^\mathcal{L}[\xi_k] = \text{KL}_{\psi|\phi}(s, a)$. We deduce that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\phi^\mathcal{L}[L_\tau^{s,a}] &= \mathbb{E}_\phi^\mathcal{L} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \xi_k \mathbb{1}_{\{N_\tau(s,a) > k-1\}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_\phi^\mathcal{L}[N_\tau(s, a) > k-1] \text{KL}_{\psi|\phi}(s, a) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\phi^\mathcal{L}[N_\tau(s, a)] \text{KL}_{\psi|\phi}(s, a). \end{aligned}$$

Summing over all pairs (s, a) completes the proof. \square

B Properties of the problem (3)

B.1 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. For ease of notation, we denote $\pi = \pi_\phi^*$.

First part : $\Delta(\phi) \subset \bigcup_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \{\psi : Q_\psi^\pi(s, a) > V_\psi^\pi(s)\}$

By contradiction : Suppose there exists $\psi \in \Delta(\phi)$ such that $\forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{O}(\phi)$, $Q_\psi^\pi(s, a) \leq V_\psi^\pi(s)$. Since $Q_\psi^\pi(s, \pi(s)) = V_\psi^\pi(s)$ then the inequality is valid for all pairs :

$$\forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, Q_\psi^\pi(s, a) \leq V_\psi^\pi(s)$$

Consider π_ψ^* an optimal policy under ψ . Then :

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, Q_\psi^\pi(s, \pi_\psi^*(s)) \leq V_\psi^\pi(s)$$

Using the bellman operator of the policy π_ψ^* under ψ , we rewrite the inequalities above :

$$\mathcal{B}_\psi^{\pi_\psi^*} V_\psi^\pi \leq V_\psi^\pi$$

Since the bellman operator is non-decreasing, this implies that : $\forall n \geq 1$, $\left(\mathcal{B}_\psi^{\pi_\psi^*}\right)^n V_\psi^\pi \leq V_\psi^\pi$ Hence :

$$V_\psi^* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathcal{B}_\psi^{\pi_\psi^*}\right)^n V_\psi^\pi \leq V_\psi^\pi$$

ie the policy π is optimal under ψ , hence a contradiction.

Second part : $\bigcup_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \{\psi : Q_\psi^\pi(s, a) > V_\psi^\pi(s)\} \subset \Delta(\phi)$

By contradiction : Let $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{O}(\phi)$ and suppose there exists $\psi \in \{\psi : Q_\psi^\pi(s, a) > V_\psi^\pi(s)\}$ such that $\pi = \pi_\psi^*$ is optimal under ψ . Define the modified policy π_1 as :

$$\pi_1(s') = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } s' = s \\ \pi(s') & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then the fact that $Q_\psi^\pi(s, a) > V_\psi^\pi(s)$ translates as :

$$\mathcal{B}_\psi^{\pi_1} V_\psi^* = \mathcal{B}_\psi^{\pi_1} V_\psi^\pi > V_\psi^\pi = V_\psi^*$$

where the equality comes from the assumption that π is an optimal policy in ψ . Therefore, by monotonicity of bellman operator we have :

$$V_\psi^{\pi_1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathcal{B}_\psi^{\pi_1}\right)^n V_\psi^* > V_\psi^*$$

Hence a contradiction. □

B.2 Proof of Lemma 3

First we recall the following facts which we will make use of :

Fact 1 : Q^* is Lipschitz w.r.t rewards and transitions (By gross bounds on Bellman operator)

$$\|Q_\phi^* - Q_\psi^*\|_\infty \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right) \left(\|r_\phi - r_\psi\|_\infty + \frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)} \|p_\phi - p_\psi\|_{1,\infty}\right)$$

Fact 2 : If we change only the kernels: $(p_\phi(s, a), q_\phi(s, a)) \rightarrow (p_\psi(s, a), q_\psi(s, a))$ of some **not-strictly-optimal (state,action) pair** $a : \mathcal{O}(s, \phi) \neq \{a\}$ and the action a doesn't become **strictly optimal** : $\mathcal{O}(s, \psi) \neq \{a\}$, then the value function will stay unchanged: $V_\psi^* = V_\phi^*$. This is because $\exists(\pi_1, \pi_2) \in \Pi_\phi^* \times \Pi_\psi^*$ such that: $\pi_2(a|s) = \pi_1(a|s) = 0$ which implies:

$$\begin{cases} (P_\psi^{\pi_1}, r_\psi^{\pi_1}) = (P_\phi^{\pi_1}, r_\phi^{\pi_1}) \\ (P_\psi^{\pi_2}, r_\psi^{\pi_2}) = (P_\phi^{\pi_2}, r_\phi^{\pi_2}) \end{cases} \implies \begin{cases} V_\psi^* \geq V_\psi^{\pi_1} = (I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi_1})^{-1} r_\psi^{\pi_1} = (I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi_1})^{-1} r_\phi^{\pi_1} = V_\phi^* \\ V_\psi^* \geq V_\psi^{\pi_2} = (I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi_2})^{-1} r_\psi^{\pi_2} = (I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi_2})^{-1} r_\phi^{\pi_2} = V_\phi^* \end{cases}$$

Remark: We only restrict our attention to allocation vectors ω with non-null entries: $\forall(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} : \omega_{s,a} > 0$. In fact, any allocation vector ω with a null entry $\omega_{s,a} = 0$ is suboptimal: Consider ψ obtained from ϕ by changing the kernels in (s, a) so that they become equal to the kernels in $(s, \pi^*(s))$, while keeping everything else unchanged. Then by definition of $\psi : \sum_{s', a'} \omega_{s', a'} KL_{\phi|\psi}(s', a') = 0$. Furthermore one can easily show that $\psi \in \overline{\Delta(\phi)}$ which implies that $K(\phi, \omega)^{-1} = 0$.

Proof. Consider $\psi \in \overline{\Delta(\phi)}$ solving (7), then we can write : $\psi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_n$, where $(\psi_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \Delta(\phi)^\mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{s,a} \omega_{s,a} KL_{\phi|\psi_n}(s, a) = \inf_{\psi \in \Delta(\phi)} \sum_{s,a} \omega_{s,a} KL_{\phi|\psi}(s, a)$.

Therefore, by continuity of KL function:

$$\sum_{s,a} \omega_{s,a} KL_{\phi|\psi}(s, a) = \inf_{\psi \in \Delta(\phi)} \sum_{s,a} \omega_{s,a} KL_{\phi|\psi}(s, a) \quad (18)$$

1st statement: $(p_\psi(\cdot|s, a), q_\psi(\cdot|s, a)) \neq (p_\phi(\cdot|s, a), q_\phi(\cdot|s, a)) \implies (s, a) \in \mathcal{O}(\psi) \setminus \mathcal{O}(\phi)$ **or** $a = \pi^*(s)$

By contradiction : Suppose there exists (s, a) such that: $(p_\psi(s, a), q_\psi(s, a)) \neq (p_\phi(s, a), q_\phi(s, a))$ and $(s, a) \in \mathcal{O}(\psi)^c \cup \mathcal{O}(\phi)$ and $a \neq \pi^*(s)$. Combined together, the latter two conditions imply that:

$$(s, a) \in \mathcal{O}(\psi)^c \quad (19)$$

We will use the following operator (ϵ -transform) where we move the rewards and transitions of ψ at (s, a) in the direction of ϕ by $\epsilon \geq 0 : T_{\phi, \epsilon}^{s,a}(\psi) := \psi_\epsilon$ where

$$(p_{\psi_\epsilon}(s', a'), q_{\psi_\epsilon}(s', a')) = \begin{cases} (1 - \epsilon) (p_\psi(s, a), q_\psi(s, a)) + \epsilon (p_\phi(s, a), q_\phi(s, a)), & \text{if } (s', a') = (s, a) \\ (p_\psi(s', a'), q_\psi(s', a')) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Note that the objective function of the infimum problem takes a smaller value at ψ_ϵ than at ψ :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s', a'} \omega_{s', a'} KL_{\phi|\psi_\epsilon}(s', a') &\leq [(1 - \epsilon) \sum_{s,a} \omega_{s,a} KL_{\phi|\psi}(s, a) + \epsilon \sum_{s,a} \omega_{s,a} KL_{\phi|\phi}(s, a)] + \sum_{(s', a') \neq (s, a)} \omega_{s', a'} KL_{\phi|\psi}(s', a') \\ &< \sum_{s', a'} \omega_{s', a'} KL_{\phi|\psi}(s', a') \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality comes from the convexity of KL-function and the second from the propriety $p \neq q \implies KL(p||q) > 0$. We will prove that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that ψ_ϵ is the limit of a sequence of elements in $\Delta(\phi)$, which clearly contradicts the optimality of ψ (see equation 18) :

Consider a^* an optimal action at state s in ψ , ie such $(s, a^*) \in \mathcal{O}(\psi)$. Since $(s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\psi)$ (19), then for $\epsilon = 0$ we have : $\psi_0 = \psi$ and $\delta := \delta_\psi(s, a) = Q_\psi^*(s, a^*) - Q_\psi^*(s, a) > 0$. By continuity of Q^* w.r.t the rewards and transitions (**Fact 1**), there exists $\epsilon > 0$ small enough such that:

$$Q_{\psi_\epsilon}^*(s, a^*) - Q_{\psi_\epsilon}^*(s, a) > \delta/2 > 0$$

Fix such ϵ and define $(\theta_n)_{n \geq 1} = \left(T_{\phi, \epsilon}^{s, a}(\psi_n) \right)_{n \geq 1}$ where $(\psi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is any sequence converging to ψ . By continuity of the operator $T_{\phi, \epsilon}^{s, a}$, we have: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n = \psi_\epsilon$. It remains to show that $(\theta_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \Delta(\phi)^\mathbb{N}$. Using the continuity of Q^* another time with get:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{cases} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_n = \psi \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n = \psi_\epsilon \end{cases} &\implies \begin{cases} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_{\psi_n}^*(s, a^*) - Q_{\psi_n}^*(s, a) = Q_\psi^*(s, a^*) - Q_\psi^*(s, a) > \delta/2 \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_{\theta_n}^*(s, a^*) - Q_{\theta_n}^*(s, a) = Q_{\psi_\epsilon}^*(s, a^*) - Q_{\psi_\epsilon}^*(s, a) > \delta/2 \end{cases} \\ &\implies \exists N_0 \in \mathbb{N} \quad \forall n \geq N_0 \quad \begin{cases} Q_{\psi_n}^*(s, a^*) - Q_{\psi_n}^*(s, a) > \delta/2 \\ Q_{\theta_n}^*(s, a^*) - Q_{\theta_n}^*(s, a) > \delta/2 \end{cases} \\ &\implies \forall n \geq N_0 : (s, a) \text{ is sub-optimal in both } \psi_n \text{ and } \theta_n \end{aligned}$$

This implies, by Fact 2 on ψ_n and θ_n , that: $\forall n \geq N_0 \quad V_{\theta_n}^* = V_{\psi_n}^*$. Since, we only changed kernels of ψ_n at (s, a) to obtain θ_n , then this also implies that for all $n \geq N_0$:

$$\begin{cases} \forall (s', a') \neq (s, a), \quad Q_{\psi_n}^*(s', a') = r_{\psi_n}(s', a') + \gamma p_{\psi_n}(s', a')^T V_{\psi_n}^* = r_{\theta_n}(s', a') + \gamma p_{\theta_n}(s', a')^T V_{\theta_n}^* = Q_{\theta_n}^*(s', a') \\ (s, a) \text{ is sub-optimal in both } \psi_n \text{ and } \theta_n \end{cases}$$

Therefore, $\forall n \geq N_0, \Pi_{\theta_n}^* = \Pi_{\psi_n}^*$, and consequently $\theta_n \in \Delta(\phi)$.

To sum up, modulo a reindexing of the sequence: $\exists (\theta_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \Delta(\phi)^\mathbb{N} : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n = \psi_\epsilon$. Hence a contradiction.

Second statement : $\mathcal{O}(\phi) \subset \mathcal{O}(\psi)$

We proceed in the same fashion, ie we suppose that there exists $(s, a) \in \mathcal{O}(\phi) \setminus \mathcal{O}(\psi)$. Only this time we consider $\psi_\epsilon := \prod_{s', a'} T_{\phi, \epsilon}^{s', a'}(\psi)$ where the product sign stands for composition of operators.

It's straightforward to show, using continuity of Q^* w.r.t rewards and transitions, that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that (s, a) is still not optimal : $a \notin \mathcal{O}(\psi_\epsilon)$. Hence $\psi_\epsilon \in \Delta(\phi)$, which contradicts the optimality of ψ . \square

C Upper bound $U(\phi)$ and near-optimal sampling weights $\bar{\omega}$

C.1 First technical lemma:

We will need the following technical lemma which relates the change in the future discounted rewards between ϕ and ψ due to different transitions: $dp_\psi(s, a)^\top V_\phi^*$, relates it to the Kullback-Leibler divergence of the transition kernels as well as the variance and maximum-deviation of the next-state value :

Lemma 4. *Using notations of section 4.3 :*

$$|dp_\psi(s, a)^\top V_\phi^*|^2 \leq 8KL(p_\phi(s, a) \parallel p_\psi(s, a)) \text{Var}_{p_\phi(\cdot | s, a)}[V_\phi^*(s')] + 4\sqrt{2}KL(p_\phi(s, a) \parallel p_\psi(s, a))^{3/2} MD_{p_\phi(s, a)}[V_\phi^*]^2.$$

Proof. We have :

$$\begin{aligned} dp_\psi(s, a)^\top V_\phi^* &= \sum_{s'} (p_\psi(s'|s, a) - p_\phi(s'|s, a)) \left[V_\phi^*(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim p_\phi(\cdot|s, a)} [V_\phi^*(\tilde{s})] \right] \\ &= \sum_{s'} \left(\sqrt{p_\psi(s'|s, a)} - \sqrt{p_\phi(s'|s, a)} \right) \\ &\quad \times \left[\left(\sqrt{p_\psi(s'|s, a)} + \sqrt{p_\phi(s'|s, a)} \right) \left(V_\phi^*(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{s} \sim p_\phi(\cdot|s, a)} [V_\phi^*(\tilde{s})] \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality :

$$\begin{aligned} |dp_\psi(s, a)^\top V_\phi^*|^2 &\leq 2d_H(p_\phi(s'|s, a), p_\psi(s'|s, a))^2 \times \\ &\quad \left[\sum_{s'} \left(\sqrt{p_\psi(s'|s, a)} + \sqrt{p_\phi(s'|s, a)} \right)^2 \left(V_\phi^*(s') - \mathbb{E}_{p_\phi(\cdot|s, a)} [V_\phi^*(\tilde{s})] \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq 4d_H(p_\phi(s'|s, a), p_\psi(s'|s, a))^2 \left[\sum_{s'} (p_\psi(s'|s, a) + p_\phi(s'|s, a)) \left(V_\phi^*(s') - \mathbb{E}_{p_\phi(\cdot|s, a)} [V_\phi^*(\tilde{s})] \right)^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Where we have used $(a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$ and $d_H(p, q) = [\frac{1}{2} \sum_i (\sqrt{p_i} - \sqrt{q_i})^2]^{1/2}$ is the Hellinger distance between two probability distributions. Therefore :

$$\begin{aligned} |dp_\psi(s, a)^\top V_\phi^*|^2 &\leq 4d_H(p_\phi(s'|s, a), p_\psi(s'|s, a))^2 \\ &\quad \times \left[2\text{Var}_{s' \sim p_\phi(\cdot|s, a)} [V_\phi^*(s')] + \|p_\phi(s'|s, a) - p_\psi(s'|s, a)\|_1 \left\| V_\phi^* - \mathbb{E}_{p_\phi(\cdot|s, a)} [V_\phi^*(s')] \right\|_\infty^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

We conclude by using Pinsker's inequality : $\|p - q\|_1 \leq \sqrt{2KL(p \| q)}$ along with the inequality $d_H(p, q)^2 \leq KL(p \| q)$ (see ?). \square

C.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Consider the simplified problem (6). Note that the constraint (5) doesn't involve the pairs $(\tilde{s}, \tilde{a}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \setminus \{(s, a), (s', \pi^*(s'))\}_{s' \in \mathcal{S}}$. One can easily show that any solution of the \inf part of (6) must satisfy $KL_{\phi|\psi}(\tilde{s}, \tilde{a}) = 0$ for these unconstrained pairs $(\tilde{s}, \tilde{a}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \setminus \{(s, a), (\tilde{s}, \pi^*(\tilde{s}))\}_{\tilde{s} \in \mathcal{S}}$ (a trivial way to do it is by setting $(p_\psi(\cdot|\tilde{s}, \tilde{a}), q_\psi(\cdot|\tilde{s}, \tilde{a})) = (p_\phi(\cdot|\tilde{s}, \tilde{a}), q_\phi(\cdot|\tilde{s}, \tilde{a}))$). Therefore:

$$K(\phi)^{-1} = \sup_{\omega \in \Sigma} \min_{(s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{sa}} \omega_{s, a} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s, a) + \sum_{s'} \omega_{s', \pi_\phi^*(s')} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s', \pi_\phi^*(s')) \quad (21)$$

We fix $(s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)$ and derive a lower bound of $\inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{sa}} \omega_{s, a} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s, a) + \sum_{s'} \omega_{s', \pi_\phi^*(s')} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s', \pi_\phi^*(s'))$.

To do so, we rewrite the condition (5) by expanding the expression of dV^{π^*} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} dr_\psi(s, a) + \gamma dp_\psi(s, a)^\top V_\phi^* + [\gamma p_\psi(s, a) - \mathbb{1}(s)]^\top \left(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left[r_\psi^{\pi^*} - r_\phi^{\pi^*} \right] \\ + [\gamma p_\psi(s, a) - \mathbb{1}(s)]^\top \left[\left(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} - \left(I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \right] r_\phi^{\pi^*} > \delta_\phi(s, a) \end{aligned}$$

then write each of the four terms on the left-hand side as a "proportion" of $\delta_\phi(s, a)$:

$$\begin{cases} dr_\psi(s, a) = \alpha_1 \delta_\phi(s, a) \\ dp_\psi(s, a)^\top V_\phi^* = \alpha_2 \delta_\phi(s, a) \\ [\gamma p_\psi(s, a) - \mathbb{1}(s)]^\top \left(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left[r_\psi^{\pi^*} - r_\phi^{\pi^*} \right] = \alpha_3 \delta_\phi(s, a) \\ [\gamma p_\psi(s, a) - \mathbb{1}(s)]^\top \left[\left(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} - \left(I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \right] r_\phi^{\pi^*} = \alpha_4 \delta_\phi(s, a) \\ \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 > 1 \end{cases}$$

Next we use Pinsker's inequality and Lemma 4 to lower bound each term :

1st term : By Pinsker's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} |dr_\psi(s, a)| &= \left| \int_0^1 u [q_\psi(u|s, a) - q_\phi(u|s, a)] \lambda(du) \right| \leq \int_0^1 |q_\psi(u|s, a) - q_\phi(u|s, a)| \lambda(du) \\ &\leq \sqrt{2KL(q_\phi(\cdot|s, a) || q_\psi(\cdot|s, a))} \end{aligned}$$

Thus:

$$\boxed{\frac{1}{2}(\alpha_1 \delta_\phi(s, a))^2 \leq KL(q_\phi(\cdot|s, a) || q_\psi(\cdot|s, a))} \quad (22)$$

2nd term :

By Lemma 4, we have:

$$(\alpha_2 \delta_\phi(s, a))^2 \leq 8KL(p_\phi(s, a) || p_\psi(s, a)) \text{Var}_{s' \sim p_\phi(\cdot|s, a)} [V_\phi^*(s')] + 4\sqrt{2}KL(p_\phi(s, a) || p_\psi(s, a))^{3/2} \text{MD}_{p_\phi(s, a)} [V_\phi^*]^2$$

Thus either :

$$\frac{1}{2}(\alpha_2 \delta_\phi(s, a))^2 \leq 8KL(p_\phi(s, a) || p_\psi(s, a)) \text{Var}_{s' \sim p_\phi(\cdot|s, a)} [V_\phi^*(s')]$$

or

$$\frac{1}{2}(\alpha_2 \delta_\phi(s, a))^2 \leq 4\sqrt{2}KL(p_\phi(s, a) || p_\psi(s, a))^{3/2} \text{MD}_{p_\phi(s, a)} [V_\phi^*]^2$$

Therefore, we obtain :

$$\boxed{\min \left(\frac{\alpha_2^2 \delta_\phi(s, a)^2}{16 \text{Var}_{p_\phi(s, a)} [V_\phi^*]}, \frac{\alpha_2^{4/3} \delta_\phi(s, a)^{4/3}}{2^{7/3} \text{MD}_{p_\phi(s, a)} [V_\phi^*]^{4/3}} \right) \leq KL(p_\phi(s, a) || p_\psi(s, a))} \quad (23)$$

3rd term :

We have :

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha_3 \delta_\phi(s, a)| &= \left\| [\gamma p_\psi(s, a) - \mathbb{1}(s)]^\top \left(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left[r_\psi^{\pi^*} - r_\phi^{\pi^*} \right] \right\| \\ &\leq \|\gamma p_\psi(s, a) - \mathbb{1}(s)\|_\infty \times \left\| \left(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \right\|_\infty \times \|r_\psi^{\pi^*} - r_\phi^{\pi^*}\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \|r_\psi^{\pi^*} - r_\phi^{\pi^*}\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

which, following the same reasoning as the first term, implies:

$$\boxed{\frac{(\alpha_3 \delta_\phi(s, a)(1 - \gamma))^2}{2} \leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} KL(q_\phi(\cdot | s, \pi^*(s)) \parallel q_\psi(\cdot | s, \pi^*(s)))} \quad (24)$$

4th term (first bound):

We have :

$$|\alpha_4| \delta_\phi(s, a) = \left\| [\gamma p_\psi(s, a) - \mathbb{1}(s)]^\top \left[(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*})^{-1} - (I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*})^{-1} \right] r_\phi^{\pi^*} \right\| \leq \|B\|_\infty \quad (25)$$

where $B = \left[(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*})^{-1} - (I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*})^{-1} \right] r_\phi^{\pi^*}$. Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha_4| \delta_\phi(s, a) &\leq \|B\|_\infty = \gamma \left\| (I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*})^{-1} [P_\psi^{\pi^*} - P_\phi^{\pi^*}] V_\phi^* \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{\max_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} |dp_\psi(s', \pi^*(s'))^\top V_\phi^*|}{1 - \gamma} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, applying Lemma 4 we get :

$$\boxed{\min \left(\frac{[\alpha_4 \delta_\phi(s, a)(1 - \gamma)]^2}{16 \text{Var}_{max}^*[V_\phi^*]}, \frac{\alpha_4^{4/3} \delta_\phi(s, a)^{4/3} (1 - \gamma)^{4/3}}{2^{7/3} \text{MD}_{max}^*[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}} \right) \leq \max_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} KL(p_\phi(s', \pi_\phi^*(s')) \parallel p_\psi(s', \pi_\psi^*(s')))} \quad (26)$$

4th term (second bound):

We will now derive a second bound for the 4th term. Using Lemma 5, we get :

$$|\alpha_4| \delta_\phi(s, a) \leq \|B\|_\infty \leq \frac{2^{5/2} \log(2) \text{KL}^{1/2}}{(1 - \gamma)^{3/2}} + \frac{2^3 \log(2) \gamma \text{KL}}{(1 - \gamma)^{5/2}} + \frac{2^{5/4} \text{KL}^{3/4} \text{MD}_{max}^*[V_\phi^*]}{1 - \gamma}$$

where $\text{KL} = \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} KL(p_\phi(s, \pi_\phi^*(s)) \parallel p_\psi(s, \pi_\psi^*(s)))$. This means one of the three terms on the right-hand side is greater than $\frac{|\alpha_4| \delta_\phi(s, a)}{3}$, which implies:

$$\boxed{\min \left(\frac{\alpha_4^2 \delta_\phi(s, a)^2 (1 - \gamma)^3}{288 \log(2)^2}, \frac{|\alpha_4| \delta_\phi(s, a) (1 - \gamma)^{5/2}}{24 \log(2)}, \frac{\alpha_4^{4/3} \delta_\phi(s, a)^{4/3} (1 - \gamma)^{4/3}}{2^{5/3} \times 3^{4/3} \text{MD}_{max}^*[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}} \right) \leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} KL(p_\phi(s, \pi_\phi^*(s)) \parallel p_\psi(s, \pi_\psi^*(s)))} \quad (27)$$

Assembling the individual lower bounds into one bound:

Summing up all inequalities from (22), (23), (24), (27) and (26), we deduce :

$$\inf_{\sum \alpha_i > 1} \sum_{i=1}^3 B_i + \max(B_4, B_5) \leq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{sa}} \omega_{s,a} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s, a) + \sum_{s'} \omega_{s', \pi_\phi^*(s')} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s', \pi_\phi^*(s'))$$

where :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} B_1 = \frac{1}{2}\omega_{s,a}(\alpha_1\delta_\phi(s,a))^2 \\ B_2 = \omega_{s,a} \min \left(\frac{\alpha_2^2\delta_\phi(s,a)^2}{16\text{Var}_{p_\phi(s,a)}[V_\phi^*]}, \frac{\alpha_2^{4/3}\delta_\phi(s,a)^{4/3}}{2^{7/3}\text{MD}_{p_\phi(s,a)}[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}} \right) \\ B_3 = \frac{1}{2}\min_s \omega_{s,\pi^*(s)} (\alpha_3\delta_\phi(s,a)(1-\gamma))^2 \\ B_4 = \min_s \omega_{s,\pi^*(s)} \min \left(\frac{\alpha_4^2\delta_\phi(s,a)^2(1-\gamma)^3}{288\log(2)^2}, \frac{|\alpha_4|\delta_\phi(s,a)(1-\gamma)^{5/2}}{24\log(2)}, \frac{\alpha_4^{4/3}\delta_\phi(s,a)^{4/3}(1-\gamma)^{4/3}}{2^{5/3}\times 3^{4/3}\text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}} \right) \\ B_5 = \min_s \omega_{s,\pi^*(s)} \min \left(\frac{[\alpha_4\delta_\phi(s,a)(1-\gamma)]^2}{16\text{Var}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]}, \frac{\alpha_4^{4/3}\delta_\phi(s,a)^{4/3}(1-\gamma)^{4/3}}{2^{7/3}\text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}} \right) \end{array} \right.$$

Notice that if α verifies the inequalities above, and $\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i > 1$, then the vector whose entries are $\left(\frac{|\alpha_i|}{\sum_{j=1}^4 |\alpha_j|} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq 4}$ also verifies these inequalities. Therefore we can restrict our attention to vectors α in the simplex Σ_4 . In particular, we have $\alpha_i^2 \leq \alpha_i^{4/3} \leq \alpha_i$. Furthermore, we lower bound $\delta_\phi(s,a)$ by $\delta_{\min}(\phi)$ in the terms $(B_j)_{3 \leq j \leq 5}$. This simplifies the bound to :

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\omega \in \Sigma} \min_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \inf_{\alpha \in \Sigma_4} \sum_{i=1}^3 B'_i \alpha_i^2 + \max(B'_4, B'_5) \alpha_4^2 &\leq \sup_{\omega \in \Sigma} \min_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{sa}} \left(\omega_{s,a} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s,a) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{s'} \omega_{s',\pi_\phi^*(s')} \text{KL}_{\phi|\psi}(s',\pi_\phi^*(s')) \right) \\ &= K(\phi)^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} B'_1 = \frac{1}{2}\omega_{s,a}(\delta_\phi(s,a))^2 \\ B'_2 = \omega_{s,a} \min \left(\frac{\delta_\phi(s,a)^2}{16\text{Var}_{p_\phi(s,a)}[V_\phi^*]}, \frac{\delta_\phi(s,a)^{4/3}}{2^{7/3}\text{MD}_{p_\phi(s,a)}[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}} \right) \\ B'_3 = \frac{1}{2}\min_s \omega_{s,\pi^*(s)} (\delta_{\min}(\phi)(1-\gamma))^2 \\ B'_4 = \min_s \omega_{s,\pi^*(s)} \min \left(\frac{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^3}{288\log(2)^2}, \frac{\delta_{\min}(\phi)(1-\gamma)^{5/2}}{24\log(2)}, \frac{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^{4/3}(1-\gamma)^{4/3}}{2^{5/3}\times 3^{4/3}\text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}} \right) \\ B'_5 = \min_s \omega_{s,\pi^*(s)} \min \left(\frac{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^2}{16\text{Var}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]}, \frac{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^{4/3}(1-\gamma)^{4/3}}{2^{7/3}\text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}} \right) \end{array} \right.$$

Solving the left-hand side problem above in α , we get :

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Sigma} \min_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{1}{B'_i} + \min\left(\frac{1}{B'_4}, \frac{1}{B'_5}\right) \right)^{-1} \leq K(\phi)^{-1}$$

Therefore :

$$K(\phi) \leq \inf_{\omega \in \Sigma} \max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{T_1(s,a;\phi) + T_2(s,a;\phi)}{\omega_{s,a}} + \frac{T_3(\phi) + T_4(\phi)}{\min_s \omega_{s,\pi^*(s)}},$$

where :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} T_1(s,a;\phi) = \frac{2}{\delta_\phi(s,a)^2} \\ T_2(s,a;\phi) = \max \left(\frac{16 \text{Var}_{p_\phi(s,a)}[V_\phi^*]}{\delta_\phi(s,a)^2}, \frac{6 \text{MD}_{p_\phi(s,a)}[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}}{\delta_\phi(s,a)^{4/3}} \right) \\ T_3(\phi) = \frac{2}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^2} \\ T_4(\phi) = \min \left(V_1(\phi), V_2(\phi) \right), \end{array} \right.$$

and

$$V_1(\phi) = \max \left(\frac{27}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^3}, \frac{8}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)(1-\gamma)^{5/2}}, \frac{14 \text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^{4/3}(1-\gamma)^{4/3}} \right),$$

$$V_2(\phi) = \max \left(\frac{16 \text{Var}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^2}, \frac{6 \text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^{4/3}(1-\gamma)^{4/3}} \right).$$

By Lemma 6, we always have $\delta_{\min}(\phi) \leq 1$. In addition $\text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*] \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$, hence $V_1(\phi) = \frac{27}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^3}$, which simplifies the expression of T_4 :

$$T_4(\phi) = \min \left(\frac{27}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^3}, \max \left(\frac{16 \text{Var}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^2(1-\gamma)^2}, \frac{6 \text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]^{4/3}}{\delta_{\min}(\phi)^{4/3}(1-\gamma)^{4/3}} \right) \right)$$

□

C.3 Second technical lemma: contributions of transitions at optimal pairs to the sample complexity

Lemma 5. *Define :*

$$B = \left[\left(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} - \left(I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \right] r_\phi^{\pi^*} \quad \text{and} \quad KL = \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} KL(p_\phi(s, \pi^*(s)) \parallel p_\psi(s, \pi^*(s)))$$

Then we have :

$$\|B\|_\infty \leq \frac{2^{5/2} \log(2) KL^{1/2}}{(1-\gamma)^{3/2}} + \frac{2^3 \log(2) \gamma KL}{(1-\gamma)^{5/2}} + \frac{2^{5/4} KL^{3/4} \text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]}{1-\gamma}. \quad (29)$$

Proof. Let us further develop the expression of B :

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= \left[\left(I - \gamma P_{\psi}^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} - \left(I - \gamma P_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \right] r_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \\
&= \left(I - \gamma P_{\psi}^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left[\gamma P_{\psi}^{\pi^*} - \gamma P_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \right] \left(I - \gamma P_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} r_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \\
&= \gamma \left(I - \gamma P_{\psi}^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left[P_{\psi}^{\pi^*} - P_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \right] V_{\phi}^* \\
&= \gamma \left[\left(I - \gamma P_{\psi}^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left(I - \gamma P_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \right) \right] \left(I - \gamma P_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left[P_{\psi}^{\pi^*} - P_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \right] V_{\phi}^* \\
&:= \gamma M_{\psi, \phi} \left(I - \gamma P_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left[P_{\psi}^{\pi^*} - P_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \right] V_{\phi}^*
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Notice that the quantity $\gamma \left(I - \gamma P_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left[P_{\psi}^{\pi^*} - P_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \right] V_{\phi}^*$ is similar to the one that appears in Lemma 3 of Azar et al. (2013), with ψ playing the role of $\hat{\phi}$ in this case. We will try to relate it to the variances of the value function in the ϕ . Define:

$$\begin{cases}
M_{\psi, \phi} = \left(I - \gamma P_{\psi}^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left(I - \gamma P_{\phi}^{\pi^*} \right) \\
\text{KL} = \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} KL(p_{\phi}(s, \pi^*(s)) \parallel p_{\psi}(s, \pi^*(s))) \\
v^{\pi}(s) = \gamma^2 \text{Var}_{s' \sim p_{\phi}(\cdot | s, \pi(s))} [V_{\phi}^{\pi}(s')] \\
\sigma^{\pi}(s) = \gamma^2 \text{Var}_{(s', a') \sim p_{\phi}(\cdot | s, \pi(s)) \otimes \pi(\cdot | s')} [Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s', a')]
\end{cases}$$

Using Lemma 4 and $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\forall s \in \mathcal{S} : \quad & \left| \gamma \left([P_{\psi}^{\pi^*} - P_{\phi}^{\pi^*}] V_{\phi}^* \right) (s) \right| = \left| \gamma dp_{\psi}(s, \pi^*(s))^{\top} V_{\phi}^* \right| \\
& \leq \gamma \sqrt{8KL(p_{\phi}(s, \pi^*(s)) \parallel p_{\psi}(s, \pi^*(s))) \text{Var}_{s' \sim p_{\phi}(\cdot | s, \pi^*(s))} [V_{\phi}^*(s')]} \\
& \quad + \gamma \sqrt{4\sqrt{2}KL(p_{\phi}(s, \pi^*(s)) \parallel p_{\psi}(s, \pi^*(s)))^{3/2} \text{MD}_{p_{\phi}(s, \pi^*(s))} [V_{\phi}^*]^2} \\
& \leq 2^{3/2} \text{KL}^{1/2} \sqrt{v^{\pi^*}(s)} + 2^{5/4} \text{KL}^{3/4} \text{MD}_{max}^* [V_{\phi}^*] \\
& \leq 2^{3/2} \text{KL}^{1/2} \sqrt{\sigma^{\pi^*}(s)} + 2^{5/4} \text{KL}^{3/4} \text{MD}_{max}^* [V_{\phi}^*]
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where the last inequality comes from Total Variance theorem:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^{\pi}(s) &= \gamma^2 \text{Var}_{(s', a') \sim p_{\phi}(\cdot | s, \pi(s)) \otimes \pi(\cdot | s')} [Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s', a')] \\
&= \gamma^2 \text{Var}_{s' \sim p_{\phi}(\cdot | s, \pi(s))} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \pi(\cdot | s')} [Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s', a')] \right] + \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim p_{\phi}(\cdot | s, \pi(s))} \left[\text{Var}_{a' \sim \pi(\cdot | s')} [Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s', a')] \right] \\
&= v^{\pi}(s) + \gamma^2 \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim p_{\phi}(\cdot | s, \pi(s))} \left[\text{Var}_{a' \sim \pi(\cdot | s')} [Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s', a')] \right] \\
&\geq v^{\pi}(s)
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $\sqrt{\sigma^{\pi^*}} := \left(\sqrt{\sigma^{\pi^*}(s)} \right)_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$. Then from (30) and (31) we deduce:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|B\|_\infty &= \left\| M_{\psi, \phi} \left(I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \gamma [P_\psi^{\pi^*} - P_\phi^{\pi^*}] V_\phi^* \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \left\| M_{\psi, \phi} \left(I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left[2^{3/2} \text{KL}^{1/2} \sqrt{\sigma^{\pi^*}} + 2^{5/4} \text{KL}^{3/4} \text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*] \mathbb{1} \right] \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq 2^{3/2} \text{KL}^{1/2} \|M_{\psi, \phi}\|_\infty \left\| \left(I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \sqrt{\sigma^{\pi^*}} \right\|_\infty + 2^{5/4} \text{KL}^{3/4} \text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*] \left\| M_{\psi, \phi} \left(I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \mathbb{1} \right\|_\infty \\
&= 2^{3/2} \text{KL}^{1/2} \|M_{\psi, \phi}\|_\infty \left\| \left(I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \sqrt{\sigma^{\pi^*}} \right\|_\infty + 2^{5/4} \text{KL}^{3/4} \text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*] \left\| \left(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \mathbb{1} \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq 2^{3/2} \text{KL}^{1/2} \|M_{\psi, \phi}\|_\infty \left\| \left(I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \sqrt{\sigma^{\pi^*}} \right\|_\infty + \frac{2^{5/4}}{1 - \gamma} \text{KL}^{3/4} \text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

By lemma 8 from Azar et al. (2013) we have:

$$\left\| \left(I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \sqrt{\sigma^{\pi^*}} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{2 \log(2)}{(1 - \gamma)^{3/2}} \tag{33}$$

On the other hand:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|M_{\psi, \phi}\|_\infty &= \left\| \left(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left(I - \gamma P_\phi^{\pi^*} \right) \right\|_\infty \\
&= \left\| I - \gamma \left(I - \gamma P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right)^{-1} \left(P_\phi^{\pi^*} - P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right) \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq 1 + \frac{\gamma \left\| P_\phi^{\pi^*} - P_\psi^{\pi^*} \right\|_\infty}{1 - \gamma} \\
&\leq 1 + \frac{\gamma (2 \text{KL})^{1/2}}{1 - \gamma}
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Where the last inequality comes from Pinsker's inequality. Summing up (25),(32),(33) and (34) we get:

$$\|B\|_\infty \leq \frac{2^{5/2} \log(2) \text{KL}^{1/2}}{(1 - \gamma)^{3/2}} + \frac{2^3 \log(2) \gamma \text{KL}}{(1 - \gamma)^{5/2}} + \frac{2^{5/4} \text{KL}^{3/4} \text{MD}_{\max}^*[V_\phi^*]}{1 - \gamma}. \tag{35}$$

□

C.4 Third technical lemma: The minimum gap is smaller than 1

Lemma 6. *We always have $\delta_{\min}(\phi) \leq 1$.*

Proof. By contradiction: suppose $\delta_{\min}(\phi) > 1$, then:

$$\forall (s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi), \delta_\phi(s, a) = V_\phi^*(s) - Q_\phi^*(s, a) > 1$$

This means that for all policies $\pi \in \{\pi : \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, (s, \pi(s)) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)\}$ we have:

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, Q_\phi^*(s, \pi(s)) < V_\phi^*(s) - 1$$

When written in terms of Bellman operator, the above inequality becomes:

$$\mathcal{B}_\phi^\pi V_\phi^* < V_\phi^* - \mathbb{1}$$

By induction, using that Bellman-operator is non-decreasing:

$$\forall n \geq 1, \left(\mathcal{B}_\phi^\pi \right)^n V_\phi^* < V_\phi^* - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \gamma^i \right) \mathbb{1}$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \pi \in \{ \pi : \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, (s, \pi(s)) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi) \}, V_\phi^\pi &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathcal{B}_\phi^\pi \right)^{n+1} V_\phi^* \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathcal{B}_\phi^\pi \right) \left[V_\phi^* - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \gamma^i \right) \mathbb{1} \right] \\ &= \left(\mathcal{B}_\phi^\pi \right) V_\phi^* - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma^i \right) \mathbb{1} \\ &= \left(\mathcal{B}_\phi^\pi \right) V_\phi^* - \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \mathbb{1} \\ &< V_\phi^* - \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \\ &< 0 \end{aligned}$$

Hence a contradiction. In conclusion: $\delta_{\min}(\phi) \leq 1$ □

C.5 Proof of Corollary 1:

The optimal ω solving the right-hand side of (8) clearly verifies :

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S} : \omega_{s, \pi^*(s)} = \min_s \omega_{s, \pi^*(s)} := \omega_0$$

The problem of Theorem 1 then rewrites as :

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\omega_0} \quad & \max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{A_{s,a}}{\omega_{s,a}} + \frac{A^*}{S\omega_0} \\ & (\omega_{s',a'})_{(s',a') \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \end{aligned} \tag{P}$$

where $A_{s,a} = T_1(s, a; \phi) + T_2(s, a; \phi)$ and $A^* = S(T_3(\phi) + T_4(\phi))$. We reformulate (P) as a convex program :

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{t, \omega_0} \quad & t + \frac{A^*}{S\omega_0} \\ & (\omega_{s',a'})_{(s',a') \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \\ \text{s.t:} \quad & \\ & \omega^\top \mathbb{1} = 1 \\ & t \geq \frac{A_{s,a}}{\omega_{s,a}}, \forall (s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi) \end{aligned}$$

Using KKT conditions, one can easily derive the expression of the optimal solution:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bar{\omega}_{s,a} = \frac{A_{s,a}}{\sum_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} A_{s,a} + \sqrt{A^* \left(\sum_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} A_{s,a} \right)}} \quad \forall (s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi) \\ \bar{\omega}_{s,\pi^*(s)} = \frac{1}{S} \times \frac{\sqrt{A^* \left(\sum_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} A_{s,a} \right)}}{\sum_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} A_{s,a} + \sqrt{A^* \left(\sum_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} A_{s,a} \right)}} \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \end{array} \right.$$

and the value V_P of the program is :

$$V_P = \sum_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} A_{s,a} + A^* + 2 \sqrt{A^* \left(\sum_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} A_{s,a} \right)} \leq 2 \left(\sum_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} A_{s,a} + A^* \right) := U(\phi)$$

D PAC Guarantee:

D.1 Proof of Theorem 2

First we recall two concentration inequalities and a technical lemma that we will be using. The first two lemmas are taken as-is from (?). The third's proof is trivial.

Define the threshold function $x(\delta, n, m) = x(n, \delta, m) = \log(1/\delta) + (m - 1) \log \left(e(1 + n/(m - 1)) \right)$

Lemma 7. (Proposition 2, ?) For all distributions q of mean r supported on the unit interval, for all $\delta \in [0, 1]$:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} \ nKL(\hat{r}_n \parallel r) > x(\delta, n, 2) \right) \leq \delta.$$

Lemma 8. (Proposition 1, ?) Let P be a distribution over a finite set \mathcal{S} , and $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ iid variables with law P . For $s \in \mathcal{S}$, denote by $\hat{P}_n = (\hat{p}_n(s))_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$ the empirical estimate of P from the first n samples. Then for all $\delta \in [0, 1]$:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N} \ nKL(\hat{P}_n \parallel P) > x(\delta, n, S) \right) \leq \delta.$$

where we used S as a shorthand for $|\mathcal{S}|$

Lemma 9. Let $(\rho_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \in \mathbb{R}_+^4$ then :

$$\forall \alpha \in \Sigma_4 \ \exists i \in [1, 4], \ \rho_i < \alpha_i^2 \iff \sum_{i=1}^4 \sqrt{\rho_i} < 1.$$

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2 :

Proof. Recall the "correctness" event :

$$\mathcal{E}_t = \left(\forall \alpha \in \Sigma_4 \ \forall (s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t), \ \rho_1(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s, a) < \alpha_1^2 \text{ or } \rho_2(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s, a) < \alpha_2^2 \text{ or } \rho_3(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi) < \alpha_3^2 \text{ or } \rho_4(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi) < \alpha_4^2 \right)$$

where:

$$\begin{cases} \rho_1(\phi, \psi)(s, a) := T_1(s, a; \phi)KL(r_\phi(s, a) \parallel r_\psi(s, a)) \\ \rho_2(\phi, \psi)(s, a) := T_2(s, a; \phi)KL(p_\phi(s, a) \parallel p_\psi(s, a)) \\ \rho_3(\phi, \psi)(s) := T_3(\phi)KL \left(r_\phi(s, \pi_\phi^*(s)) \parallel r_\psi(s, \pi_\phi^*(s)) \right) \\ \rho_4(\phi, \psi)(s) := T_4(\phi)KL \left(p_\phi(s, \pi_\phi^*(s)) \parallel p_\psi(s, \pi_\phi^*(s)) \right) \\ \rho_3(\phi, \psi) := \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \rho_3(\phi, \psi)(s) \\ \rho_4(\phi, \psi) := \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \rho_4(\phi, \psi)(s) \end{cases}$$

Now using Lemma 9 above, we can simplify the event \mathcal{E}_t :

$$\mathcal{E}_t = \bigcap_{(s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)} \left(\sqrt{\rho_1(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s, a)} + \sqrt{\rho_2(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s, a)} + \sqrt{\rho_3(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)} + \sqrt{\rho_4(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)} < 1 \right) \quad (36)$$

$$= \bigcap_{(s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)} \bigcap_{s', s'' \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\sqrt{\rho_1(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s, a)} + \sqrt{\rho_2(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s, a)} + \sqrt{\rho_3(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s')} + \sqrt{\rho_4(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s'')} < 1 \right) \quad (37)$$

On the other hand, define the stopping event:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{STOP}_t &= \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_1(s,a)x(\delta', n_t(s,a), 2)} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_2(s,a)x(\delta', n_t(s,a), S)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s,a)}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_3x(\delta', n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)), 2)} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_4x(\delta', n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)), S)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s))}} < 1 \right) \\
&= \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_1(s,a)x(\delta', n_t(s,a), 2)} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_2(s,a)x(\delta', n_t(s,a), S)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s,a)}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_3x(\delta', n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)), 2)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s))}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_4x(\delta', n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)), S)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s))}} < 1 \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where the last equality is because both $n \rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_3x(\delta', n, 2)}}{\sqrt{n}}$ and $n \rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_4x(\delta', n, S)}}{\sqrt{n}}$ are decreasing as soon as $n \geq 7(\mathcal{S} - 1)$, therefore reaching their maximum at the same point. From the proof of Theorem 1 (equations 22,23,24,27,26), we have the correctness property:

$$(\phi \in \Delta(\hat{\phi}_t)) \subset \mathcal{E}_t^c \tag{39}$$

where \mathcal{E}_t^c stands for the complement of event \mathcal{E} . Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tau_\delta < \infty) \cap (\hat{\pi}_{\tau_\delta}^* \neq \pi^*) &= (\exists t \geq 1, \text{STOP}_t \text{ and } \phi \in \Delta(\hat{\phi}_t)) \\
&\subset (\exists t \geq 1, \text{STOP}_t \cap \mathcal{E}_t^c) \\
&= \left(\exists t \geq 1, \bigcup_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)} \bigcup_{s', s'' \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\left(\sqrt{\rho_1(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s,a)} + \sqrt{\rho_2(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s,a)} + \sqrt{\rho_3(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s')} + \sqrt{\rho_4(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s'')} \geq 1 \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \cap \text{STOP}_t \right) \right) \\
&\subset \left(\exists t \geq 1, \bigcup_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)} \bigcup_{s', s'' \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\mathcal{E}_{1,t}(s,a) \cup \mathcal{E}_{2,t}(s,a) \cup \mathcal{E}_{3,t}(s') \cup \mathcal{E}_{4,t}(s'') \right) \right) \\
&\subset \bigcup_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \bigcup_{s', s'' \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\left(\exists t \geq 1, \mathcal{E}_{1,t}(s,a) \cap ((s,a) \in \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)) \right) \cup \left(\exists t \geq 1, \mathcal{E}_{2,t}(s,a) \cap ((s,a) \in \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cup \left(\exists t \geq 1, \mathcal{E}_{3,t}(s') \right) \cup \left(\exists t \geq 1, \mathcal{E}_{4,t}(s'') \right) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{E}_{1,t}(s, a) := \left\{ \sqrt{\rho_1(\widehat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s, a)} > \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_1(s, a)x(\delta', n_t(s, a), 2)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, a)}} \right\}, \quad \forall (s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\widehat{\phi}_t) \\ \mathcal{E}_{2,t}(s, a) := \left\{ \sqrt{\rho_2(\widehat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s, a)} > \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_2(s, a)x(\delta', n_t(s, a), S)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, a)}} \right\}, \quad \forall (s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\widehat{\phi}_t) \\ \mathcal{E}_{3,t}(s) := \left\{ \sqrt{\rho_3(\widehat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s)} > \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_3x(\delta', n_t(s, \widehat{\pi}_t^*(s)), 2)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \widehat{\pi}_t^*(s))}} \right\}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \\ \mathcal{E}_{4,t}(s) := \left\{ \sqrt{\rho_4(\widehat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s)} > \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_4x(\delta', n_t(s, \widehat{\pi}_t^*(s)), S)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \widehat{\pi}_t^*(s))}} \right\}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \end{array} \right.$$

Therefore :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\phi(\tau_\delta < \infty, \widehat{\pi}_{\tau_\delta}^* \neq \pi_\phi^*) &\leq \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \sum_{s', s'' \in \mathcal{S}} \left[\mathbb{P} \left(\exists t \geq 1, \mathcal{E}_{1,t}(s, a) \cap \left((s, a) \in \mathcal{O}(\widehat{\phi}_t) \right) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{P} \left(\exists t \geq 1, \mathcal{E}_{2,t}(s, a) \cap \left((s, a) \in \mathcal{O}(\widehat{\phi}_t) \right) \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\exists t \geq 1, \mathcal{E}_3(s') \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\exists t \geq 1, \mathcal{E}_4(s'') \right) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} \sum_{s', s'' \in \mathcal{S}} 4\delta' \\ &= 4\mathcal{S}^3 \mathcal{A} \delta' := \delta \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we have used the concentration inequalities (40),(41),(42) and (43) :

First term :

Using Lemma 7, for $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{4\mathcal{S}^3 \mathcal{A}}$ we have :

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\exists t \geq 1, \sqrt{\rho_1(\widehat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s, a)} > \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_1(s, a)x(\delta', n_t(s, a), 2)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, a)}} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\exists t \geq 1, n_t(s, a)KL(\widehat{r}_{n_t(s, a)}(s, a) \parallel r(s, a)) > x(\delta', n_t(s, a), 2) \right) \quad (40) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, nKL(\widehat{r}_n(s, a) \parallel r(s, a)) > x(\delta', n, 2) \right) \\ &\leq \delta' \end{aligned}$$

Second term :

Using Lemma 8, we get :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\exists t \geq 1, \sqrt{\rho_2(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s, a)} > \frac{\sqrt{\hat{T}_2(s, a)x(\delta', n_t(s, a), \mathcal{S})}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, a)}}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\exists t \geq 1, n_t(s, a)KL(\hat{p}_{n_t(s, a)}(s, a) \parallel p(s, a)) > x(\delta', n_t(s, a), \mathcal{S})\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, KL(\hat{p}_n(s, a) \parallel p(s, a)) > x(\delta', n, \mathcal{S})\right) \\
&\leq \delta'
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Third term :

Following the same reasoning as in the first condition we get :

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \mathbb{P}\left(\exists t \geq 1, \sqrt{\rho_3(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s)} > \frac{\sqrt{\hat{T}_{3,t}x(\delta', n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t(s)), 2)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \hat{\pi}^*(s))}}\right) \leq \delta' \tag{42}$$

Fourth term :

Following the same reasoning as in the second condition we get :

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \mathbb{P}\left(\exists t \geq 1, \sqrt{\rho_4(\hat{\phi}_t, \phi)(s)} > \frac{\sqrt{\hat{T}_{4,t}x(\delta', n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t(s)), \mathcal{S})}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \hat{\pi}^*(s))}}\right) \leq \delta' \tag{43}$$

□

E Asymptotic Upper bounds on KLB-TS's sample complexity

In the following, we use the notation: $y(n, m) := (m - 1) + (m - 1) \log(1 + n/(m - 1))$. Hence the threshold function can be rewritten as: $x(\delta, n, m) = \log(1/\delta) + y(n, m)$.

E.1 First technical lemma:

We begin with a technical lemma which will be useful in the proof of both the almost-sure and the expectation bounds :

Lemma 10. *For all ϕ in Φ :*

$$\left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s, a; \phi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s, a; \phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,a}}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\phi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)}}} \right)^2 \leq 4U(\phi).$$

Proof. Denote by LHS the left-hand side term above. Using $(A + B)^2 \leq 2(A^2 + B^2)$ twice, and $(\max_x f(x))^2 = \max_x f(x)^2$ for non-negative f , we write :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS} &\leq 2 \left(\left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s, a; \phi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s, a; \phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,a}}} \right)^2 + \left(\max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\phi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)}}} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= 2 \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \left(\frac{\sqrt{T_1(s, a; \phi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s, a; \phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,a}}} \right)^2 + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{T_3(\phi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)}}} \right)^2 \right) \\ &\leq 4 \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{T_1(s, a; \phi) + T_2(s, a; \phi)}{\bar{\omega}_{s,a}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{T_3(\phi) + T_4(\phi)}{\bar{\omega}_{s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)}} \right) \\ &\leq 4U(\phi) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from Corollary 1. □

E.2 Proof of Proposition 2

Proof. Recall the stopping condition :

$$\tau_\delta = \inf \left\{ t \in \mathbb{N} : \max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_1(s, a) x(\delta', n_t(s, a), 2)} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_2(s, a) x(\delta', n_t(s, a), S)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, a)}} \right. \\ \left. + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_3 x(\delta', n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)), 2)} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_4 x(\delta', n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)), S)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s))}} \leq 1 \right\}$$

First we derive a convenient upper-bound of the left-hand-side term of the inequality above (which we denote by LHS_t).

Rewrite the definition of $x(\delta, n, m) = \log(1/\delta) + (m - 1) + (m - 1) \log(1 + n/(m - 1)) := \log(1/\delta) +$

$y(n, m)$. Then, using the fact that $\sqrt{A+B} \leq \sqrt{A} + \sqrt{B}$, we have :

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{LHS}_t &\leq \sqrt{\log(\delta')} \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_1(s,a)} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_2(s,a)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s,a)}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_3} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_4}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s))}} \right) \\
&+ \max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_1(s,a)y(n_t(s,a), 2)} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_2(s,a)y(n_t(s,a), S)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s,a)}} \\
&+ \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_3 y(n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)), 2)} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_4 y(n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)), S)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s))}} \\
&:= \sqrt{\log(\delta')} \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_1(s,a)} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_2(s,a)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s,a)}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_3} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_4}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s))}} \right) + f(n_t, \hat{\phi}_t)
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where $n_t = (n_t(s, a))_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}}$ denotes the number of visits vector. Note that when the terms $(\widehat{T}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 4}$ are bounded and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} n_t(s, a) = \infty$, which we will soon show to be the case, then we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(n_t, \hat{\phi}_t) = 0$

Next define the convergence event :

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_t(s, a)}{t} = \bar{\omega}_{s,a}, \hat{\phi}_t \rightarrow \phi \right\}$$

Then by assumptions of the theorem and since $\forall (s, a), \bar{\omega}_{s,a} > 0$, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} n_t(s, a) = \infty$ which implies $\mathbb{P}_\phi(\mathcal{C}) = 1$. Under \mathcal{C} , by continuity of the involved functionals of the MDP, we have :

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists t_1(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{N}, \forall t \geq t_1 : \begin{cases} \widehat{\pi}_t^* = \pi^* \text{ ie } \mathcal{O}(\phi) = \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t), \text{ as soon as } \left\| Q_{\hat{\phi}_t}^* - Q_\phi^* \right\|_\infty < \delta_{\min}(\phi)/2 \\ \widehat{T}_{1,t}(s, a) < (1 + \epsilon)T_1(s, a), \quad \forall (s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi) \\ \widehat{T}_{2,t}(s, a) < (1 + \epsilon)T_2(s, a), \quad \forall (s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi) \\ \widehat{T}_{3,t} \leq (1 + \epsilon)T_3 \\ \widehat{T}_{4,t} \leq (1 + \epsilon)T_4 \\ n_t(s, a)/t \geq (1 - \epsilon)\bar{\omega}_{s,a}, \quad \forall (s, a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi) \\ n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s))/t \geq (1 - \epsilon)\bar{\omega}_{s, \pi^*(s)}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \\ f(n_t, \hat{\phi}_t) \leq \epsilon \end{cases}$$

Thus when $t \geq t_1(\epsilon)$, inequality (44) implies :

$$\text{LHS}_t \leq \sqrt{\frac{(1 + \epsilon) \log(\delta')}{(1 - \epsilon)t}} \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s, a; \phi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s, a; \phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,a}}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\phi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s)}}} \right) + \epsilon \tag{45}$$

Next we define :

$$\begin{aligned}
t_2(\delta, \epsilon) &= \inf \left\{ t > 0 \mid \sqrt{\frac{(1+\epsilon)\log(\delta')}{(1-\epsilon)t}} \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s,a;\phi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s,a;\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,a}}} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\phi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,\hat{\pi}_t^*(s)}}} \right) \leq 1 - \epsilon \right\} \\
&= \frac{(1+\epsilon)\log(\delta')}{(1-\epsilon)^3} \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s,a;\phi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s,a;\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,a}}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\phi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,\hat{\pi}_t^*(s)}}} \right)^2
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

Combining (45) and (46) we have for $t \geq \max(t_1(\epsilon), t_2(\delta, \epsilon))$: $LHS_t \leq 1$. Therefore :

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_\delta &\leq \max(t_1(\epsilon), t_2(\delta, \epsilon)) \\
&= \max \left(t_1(\epsilon), \frac{(1+\epsilon)\log(\delta')}{(1-\epsilon)^3} \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s,a;\phi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s,a;\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,a}}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\phi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,\hat{\pi}_t^*(s)}}} \right)^2 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\forall \delta \in (0, 1)$, τ_δ is finite on \mathcal{C} and we have:

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tau_\delta}{\log(1/\delta)} \leq \frac{1+\epsilon}{(1-\epsilon)^3} \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s,a;\phi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s,a;\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,a}}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\phi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,\hat{\pi}_t^*(s)}}} \right)^2$$

Taking the limit when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get:

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tau_\delta}{\log(1/\delta)} \leq \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s,a;\phi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s,a;\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,a}}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\phi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\phi)}}{\sqrt{\bar{\omega}_{s,\hat{\pi}_t^*(s)}}} \right)^2$$

We conclude by using Lemma 10. \square

E.3 Proof of Theorem 3 :

We define the following distance on MDPs :

$$\|\psi - \phi\| = \max_{s,a} (|r_\psi(s,a) - r_\phi(s,a)| \vee \|p_\psi(\cdot|s,a) - p_\phi(\cdot|s,a)\|_1)$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$. By applying gross bounds on the bellman operator recursively, one can prove that Q^* is Lipschitz w.r.t rewards and transitions :

$$\|Q_\phi^* - Q_\psi^*\|_\infty \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right) \left(\|r_\phi - r_\psi\|_\infty + \frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)} \|p_\phi - p_\psi\|_{1,\infty} \right)$$

Thus there exists $\xi = \xi(\epsilon) > 0$ such that:

$$\forall \psi \in \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\phi, \xi), \quad \|Q_\phi^* - Q_\psi^*\|_\infty < \delta_{\min}(\phi)/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{s,a} |\bar{\omega}_{s,a}(\psi) - \bar{\omega}_{s,a}(\phi)| \leq \epsilon$$

Crucially, the first inequality implies that $\pi_\psi^* = \pi_\phi^*$ and $\mathcal{O}(\psi) = \mathcal{O}(\phi)$. For $T \in \mathbb{N}$ consider the concentration event:

$$\mathcal{E}_T = \bigcap_{t=T^{1/4}}^T \left(\hat{\phi}_t \in \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\phi, \xi) \right)$$

We will be using the following technical lemmas. The first is simply lemma 20 in [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#) which can be straightforward reformulated in our case by replacing the number of arms of the bandit by the number of (state,action) pairs of the MDP:

Lemma 11. *There exists a constant T_ϵ such that for $T \geq T_\epsilon$, it holds on \mathcal{E}_T , for C -Tracking:*

$$\forall t \geq T_\epsilon, \max_{s,a} \left| \frac{n_t(s,a)}{t} - \bar{\omega}_{s,a} \right| \leq 3(SA - 1)\epsilon.$$

The second is a concentration inequality similar to lemma 19 in [Garivier and Kaufmann \(2016\)](#). (We defer its proof to the end) :

Lemma 12. *Denote by \mathcal{E}_T^c the complementary of the event \mathcal{E}_T . There exists two constants B, C (that depend on ϕ and ϵ) such that:*

$$\forall T \geq 1, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_T^c) \leq BT \exp(-CT^{1/8}).$$

Recall inequality (44) which gives an upper bound of the left-hand side of the stopping condition:

$$\text{LHS}_t \leq \sqrt{\log(\delta')} \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\hat{\phi}_t)} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_1(s,a)} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_2(s,a)}}{\sqrt{n_t(s,a)}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{T}_3} + \sqrt{\widehat{T}_4}}{\sqrt{n_t(s, \hat{\pi}_t^*(s))}} \right) + f(n_t, \hat{\phi}_t)$$

where $f(.,.)$ is a continuous function in both arguments. Define :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} D(\phi, \epsilon) = \sup_{\substack{\psi \in \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\phi, \xi(\epsilon)) \\ \|\omega' - \omega(\phi)\| \leq 3(SA - 1)\epsilon}} \max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s,a;\psi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s,a;\psi)}}{\sqrt{\omega'_{s,a}}} \\ E(\phi, \epsilon) = \sup_{\substack{\psi \in \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\phi, \xi(\epsilon)) \\ \|\omega' - \omega(\phi)\| \leq 3(SA - 1)\epsilon}} \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\psi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\psi)}}{\sqrt{\omega'_{s,\pi^*(s)}}} \\ F(\phi, \epsilon, t) = \sup_{\substack{\psi \in \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\phi, \xi(\epsilon)) \\ \|\omega' - \omega(\phi)\| \leq 3(SA - 1)\epsilon}} f(t \times \omega', \psi) \end{array} \right.$$

For $T \geq T_\epsilon$, on the event \mathcal{E}_T , we have : $\forall t \geq T^{1/4}$, $\hat{\pi}_t^* = \pi^*$ and $\mathcal{O}(\psi) = \mathcal{O}(\phi)$, and using Lemma 11, $\left\| \frac{n_t(s,a)}{t} - \bar{\omega}_{s,a} \right\|_\infty \leq 3(SA - 1)\epsilon$. Therefore, for the stopping condition $\text{LHS}_t \leq 1$ to be satisfied, it is sufficient to have :

$$\frac{\sqrt{\log(\delta')}}{\sqrt{t}} \left(D(\phi, \epsilon) + E(\phi, \epsilon) \right) + F(\phi, \epsilon, t) \leq 1 \quad (47)$$

By Lemma 13, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(\phi, \epsilon, t) = 0$. Hence we can define the following times :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} t_1(\phi, \epsilon, \eta, \delta) = \inf \left\{ t > 0 \mid \forall x > t, \quad \frac{\sqrt{\log(\delta')}}{\sqrt{x}} \left(D(\phi, \epsilon) + E(\phi, \epsilon) \right) \leq 1 - \eta \right\} \\ \qquad \qquad \qquad = \frac{\log(\delta') \left(D(\phi, \epsilon) + E(\phi, \epsilon) \right)^2}{(1 - \eta)^2} \\ t_2(\phi, \epsilon, \eta) = \inf \left\{ t > 0 \mid \forall x > t, \quad F(\phi, \epsilon, t) \leq \eta \right\} \end{array} \right.$$

It's easy to see that for $T \geq \max(T_\epsilon, t_1, t_2)$, condition (47) is verified and consequently: $\tau_\delta \leq T$. In other terms, we just proved that :

$$\forall T \geq \max(T_\epsilon, t_1, t_2), \quad \mathcal{E}_T \subset (\tau_\delta \leq T)$$

Therefore :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\phi[\tau_\delta] &= \sum_{T=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau_\delta > T) \\ &\leq \sum_{T=1}^{\max(T_\epsilon, t_1, t_2)} 1 + \sum_{T=\max(T_\epsilon, t_1, t_2)}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_T^c) \\ &\leq T_\epsilon + t_1(\phi, \epsilon, \eta, \delta) + t_2(\phi, \epsilon, \eta) + \sum_{T=1}^{\infty} BT \exp(-CT^{1/8}) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from Lemma 12. Thus, $\mathbb{E}[\tau_\delta]$ is finite and we have:

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\tau_\delta]}{\log(1/\delta)} \leq \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{t_1(\phi, \epsilon, \eta, \delta)}{\log(1/\delta)} = \frac{\left(D(\phi, \epsilon) + E(\phi, \epsilon) \right)^2}{(1 - \eta)^2}$$

Letting η and ϵ go to zero, and noting that :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} D(\phi, \epsilon) = \max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s, a; \phi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s, a; \phi)}}{\sqrt{\omega_{s,a}}} \\ \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} E(\phi, \epsilon) = \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\phi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\phi)}}{\sqrt{\omega_{s, \pi^*(s)}}} \\ \left(\max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s, a; \phi)} + \sqrt{T_2(s, a; \phi)}}{\sqrt{\omega_{s,a}}} + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\phi)} + \sqrt{T_4(\phi)}}{\sqrt{\omega_{s, \pi^*(s)}}} \right)^2 \leq 4U(\phi) \quad (\text{Lemma 10}) \end{array} \right.$$

we get the desired result.

E.4 Second technical lemma

Lemma 13. Fix $\pi^* = \pi_\phi^*$ and define :

$$f(n, \psi) = \max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{T_1(s, a; \psi)y(n(s, a), 2)} + \sqrt{T_2(s, a; \psi)y(n(s, a), S)}}{\sqrt{n(s, a)}} \\ + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{T_3(\psi)y(n(s, \pi^*(s)), 2)} + \sqrt{T_4(\psi)y(n(s, \pi^*(s)), S)}}{\sqrt{n(s, \pi^*(s))}}$$

and

$$F(\phi, \epsilon, t) = \sup_{\substack{\psi \in \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\phi, \xi(\epsilon)) \\ \|\omega' - \omega(\phi)\| \leq 3(SA - 1)\epsilon}} f(t \times \omega', \psi)$$

Then there exists ϵ_0 such that: $\forall \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(\phi, \epsilon, t) = 0$.

Proof. Define:

$$\begin{cases} T_1(s, a, \phi, \epsilon) := \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\phi, \xi(\epsilon))} T_1(s, a; \psi) \\ T_2(s, a, \phi, \epsilon) := \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\phi, \xi(\epsilon))} T_2(s, a; \psi) \\ T_3(\phi, \epsilon) := \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\phi, \xi(\epsilon))} T_3(\psi) \\ T_4(\phi, \epsilon) := \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\phi, \xi(\epsilon))} T_4(\psi) \end{cases}$$

By continuity of the functionals $(T_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 4}$ in ϕ , there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$, such that for all $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, the supremums defined above are upper bounded by $M = 2 \times \max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} (T_1(s, a; \phi), T_2(s, a; \phi), T_3(\phi), T_4(\phi))$.

Furthermore, if $\|\omega' - \omega(\phi)\| \leq 3(SA - 1)\epsilon$ then for all (s, a) : $\omega_{sa}(\phi) - 3(SA - 1)\epsilon \leq \omega'_{sa} \leq \omega_{sa}(\phi) + 3(SA - 1)\epsilon$. Summing up these inequalities we get, for ϵ small enough:

$$F(\phi, \epsilon, t) \leq \sqrt{M} \max_{(s,a) \notin \mathcal{O}(\phi)} \frac{\sqrt{y(t[\omega_{sa}(\phi) + 3(SA - 1)\epsilon], 2)} + \sqrt{y(t[\omega_{sa}(\phi) + 3(SA - 1)\epsilon], S)}}{\sqrt{t[\omega_{sa}(\phi) - 3(SA - 1)\epsilon]}} \\ + \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\sqrt{y(t[\omega_{s, \pi^*(s)}(\phi) + 3(SA - 1)\epsilon], 2)} + \sqrt{y(t[\omega_{s, \pi^*(s)}(\phi) + 3(SA - 1)\epsilon], S)}}{\sqrt{t[\omega_{s, \pi^*(s)}(\phi) - 3(SA - 1)\epsilon]}} \quad (48)$$

Since $\forall a > 0 \forall m \geq 2, \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sqrt{y(ax, m)}}{\sqrt{x}} = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sqrt{(m-1)+(m-1)\log(1+ax/(m-1))}}{\sqrt{x}} = 0$, and the maximums in (48) are taken over finite sets, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(\phi, \epsilon, t) = 0$. \square

E.5 Proof of Lemma 12

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_T^c) &\leq \sum_{t=T^{1/4}}^T \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{\phi}_t \notin \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\phi, \xi)\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=T^{1/4}}^T \sum_{s,a} \left[\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{r}_t(s,a) - r(s,a) > \xi\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{r}_t(s,a) - r(s,a) < -\xi\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{s'} \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{p}_t(s'|s,a) - p(s'|s,a) > \xi/S\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{p}_t(s'|s,a) - p(s'|s,a) < -\xi/S\right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Let T be such that $T^{1/4} \geq (SA)^2$. Then for $t \geq T^{1/4}$ we have $\forall(s,a)$, $n_t(s,a) \geq (\sqrt{t}-SA/2)_+ - 1 \geq \sqrt{t} - SA$. Therefore, using a union bound and a Chernoff inequality one can write :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{p}_t(s'|s,a) - p(s'|s,a) > \xi/S\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{p}_t(s'|s,a) - p(s'|s,a) > \xi/S, n_t(s,a) \geq \sqrt{t} - SA\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{t'=\sqrt{t}-SA}^t \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{p}_t(s'|s,a) - p(s'|s,a) > \xi/S, n_t(s,a) = t'\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{t'=\sqrt{t}-SA}^t \exp\left(-t' \cdot KL(p(s'|s,a) + \xi/S, p(s'|s,a))\right) \\ &\quad \exp\left(-(\sqrt{t}-SA)KL(p(s'|s,a) + \xi/S, p(s'|s,a))\right) \\ &= \frac{\exp\left(-(\sqrt{t}-SA)KL(p(s'|s,a) + \xi/S, p(s'|s,a))\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-KL(p(s'|s,a) + \xi/S, p(s'|s,a))\right)} \end{aligned}$$

Using the same reasoning, we can prove that :

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{p}_t(s'|s,a) - p(s'|s,a) < -\xi/S\right) &\leq \frac{\exp\left(-(\sqrt{t}-SA)KL(p(s'|s,a) - \xi/S, p(s'|s,a))\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-KL(p(s'|s,a) - \xi/S, p(s'|s,a))\right)} \\ \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{r}_t(s,a) - r(s,a) > \xi\right) &\leq \frac{\exp\left(-(\sqrt{t}-SA)KL(r(s,a) + \xi, r(s,a))\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-KL(r(s,a) + \xi, r(s,a))\right)} \\ \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{r}_t(s,a) - r(s,a) < -\xi\right) &\leq \frac{\exp\left(-(\sqrt{t}-SA)KL(r(s,a) - \xi, r(s,a))\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-KL(r(s,a) - \xi, r(s,a))\right)} \end{aligned} \right.$$

Thus for the following choice of constants :

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \min_{s,a} \left(KL(r(s,a) - \xi, r(s,a)) \wedge KL(r(s,a) + \xi, r(s,a)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \wedge \min_{s'} \left(KL(p(s'|s,a) - \xi/S, p(s'|s,a)) \wedge KL(p(s'|s,a) + \xi/S, p(s'|s,a)) \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and :

$$B = \sum_{s,a} \left[\frac{\exp\left(SA \cdot KL(r(s,a) + \xi, r(s,a))\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-KL(r(s,a) + \xi, r(s,a))\right)} + \frac{\exp\left(SA \cdot KL(r(s,a) - \xi, r(s,a))\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-KL(r(s,a) - \xi, r(s,a))\right)} \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{s'} \left[\frac{\exp\left(SA \cdot KL(p(s'|s,a) + \xi/S, p(s'|s,a))\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-KL(p(s'|s,a) + \xi/S, p(s'|s,a))\right)} + \frac{\exp\left(SA \cdot KL(p(s'|s,a) - \xi/S, p(s'|s,a))\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-KL(p(s'|s,a) - \xi/S, p(s'|s,a))\right)} \right] \right]$$

we have :

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_T^c) \leq \sum_{t=T^{1/4}}^T B \exp(-C\sqrt{t}) \leq BT \exp(-CT^{1/8}).$$

□